



## **Land Use and Natural Resources Committee**

**Meeting Date:** 4/5/2018

**Agenda Item No.:** 2018-April-3.

**Subject:** 2020 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS) Land Use Scenario (Estimated time: 30 minutes)

### **Information**

**Prepared by:** Jennifer Hargrove

**Approved by:** Kacey Lizon

**Attachments:** Yes

### **1. Issue:**

Each update of the MTP/SCS includes an update of the land use forecast—an estimate of where future development is likely to occur. Staff proposes an approach to developing the land use forecast for the 2020 MTP/SCS that starts with a Discussion Draft Land Use Scenario.

### **2. Recommendation:**

Staff will present a draft approach for creating a Discussion Draft Land Use Scenario. This will lead to an approach for creating a Discussion Draft Transportation Scenario. This information item will be presented to the Committee for input and discussion.

### **3. Background/Analysis:**

Staff is proposing that we use the learnings from the past MTP/SCS scenarios to set guardrails that will be used to create one land use scenario for the 2020 MTP/SCS. This would be a Discussion Draft Land Use Scenario used for testing and analyzing the new policy topics identified in the Policy Framework, such as autonomous vehicles, congestion pricing, next generation transit, and cost-benefit strategies. In March 2018, the Committee heard that the California Air Resources Board is recommending that the greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduction target that SACOG must meet with the MTP/SCS is being changed from -16 percent to -19 percent. Our current MTP/SCS meets its -16 percent target by a very narrow margin so we know that the land use forecast and transportation project list in the current MTP/SCS will not achieve a new -19 percent target. Staff would like to narrow in on a single Discussion Draft Land Use Scenario to allow for more testing and learning related to transportation policies and innovations that could help us achieve the new GHG target. A draft approach for a Discussion Draft Transportation Scenario will define the process and analysis we will use to update the transportation project list. A key input to creating a transportation scenario is land use. Because transportation serves land use, the Discussion Draft Land Use Scenario is created first and will be used as an input to the Discussion Draft Transportation Scenario. The approach for creating a Discussion

Draft Transportation Scenario will be presented to the Board in June 2018.

In December 2017, the Board adopted regional growth projections for 2040 for use in the 2020 MTP/SCS. The land use forecast is the allocation of those regional 2040 projections to subareas of the region: jurisdiction and subareas of jurisdictions called community types. In addition to a 2040 land use forecast, the MTP/SCS will include a land use forecast for 2035 because that is the Senate Bill (SB) 375 benchmark year for measuring greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction. The chart below shows the growth planned in the current MTP/SCS land use forecast from 2012 to 2036, and the growth planned in the 2020 MTP/SCS for the periods 2016 to 2035 and 2016 to 2040.

| Regional Totals | <b><u>2016 MTP/SCS</u></b><br>Growth from 2012<br>to 2036 | <b><u>2020 MTP/SCS</u></b><br>Growth from 2016<br>to 2035 | <b><u>2020 MTP/SCS</u></b><br>Growth from 2016<br>to 2040 |
|-----------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|
| Housing Units   | 285,000                                                   | 224,000                                                   | 260,000                                                   |
| Employees       | 439,000                                                   | 197,000                                                   | 248,000                                                   |

The overarching challenge in preparing the land use forecast is to estimate, as realistically as possible, the amount, type, and location of growth for the next two-plus decades so that a transportation system can be planned and built to serve that growth, while maximizing the positive benefits for the region and its residents.

### **Background on 2016 MTP/SCS Scenarios**

Since the Blueprint, SACOG has adopted scenario planning as a data-driven way to examine a wide range of alternative growth and transportation patterns for the region. Scenario planning was used in the Blueprint project and in every subsequent MTP/SCS update. The current 2016 MTP/SCS land use forecast was created after analyzing three different land use and transportation scenarios. Each scenario planned for the same regional total of people, jobs, and homes, were fiscally constrained to the same transportation budget, and all represented a reasonable range of possible futures. They varied principally by how much housing and transportation choice they created. These three scenarios were used to test the effect of different regional land use and transportation investment packages on land use, travel, and air quality policy objectives. The scenarios were designed to be realistic—based on the most recent regulatory, demographic, and market trends. The scenarios ranged from Scenario 1 (highest amount of outward development and corresponding roadways expansion) to Scenario 3 (highest amount of infill development and corresponding maintenance of the existing transportation system, new transit, and multi-modal infrastructure), with a Scenario 2 in the middle. The transportation investments of these scenarios were designed this way because we know from the Blueprint and subsequent national studies of land use pattern and travel behavior that low density development is best served by auto-oriented investments (roadways), and medium to higher density development is best served by transit, walking, and bicycling infrastructure.

Attachment A provides a detailed description of the transportation and land use inputs into the three scenarios and their performance outcomes.

### **2016 MTP/SCS Scenario Outcomes**

We learned that Scenario 3, which had the most infill, most housing choice (including

higher density homes), most jobs and homes near transit, was the scenario that performed the best in terms of the outcomes measured in the MTP/SCS. Scenario 3 had the biggest reduction in vehicle miles traveled and congestion, the biggest increase in walking, biking, and transit use, the highest access to jobs and amenities, the biggest reduction in greenhouse gas emissions, and the lowest consumption of natural resource lands. The adopted 2016 MTP/SCS land use forecast performs in between Scenario 2 and Scenario 3 in terms of most of the land use inputs and performance outcomes.

## **4. Discussion/Analysis:**

### **Approach to a Discussion Draft Land Use Scenario**

Staff proposes to create a Discussion Draft Land Use Scenario that aims to maintain, or improve, the performance outcomes of the current plan, including meeting the new GHG reduction target. To meet these outcomes, we must start from land use inputs that are comparable to or better than what is in the current plan. From a land use perspective, our previous MTP/SCS scenario analysis provided some key takeaways about our ability to get the quality of life outcomes we want to see in the future and achieve our GHG reduction target:

- 1) **The balance of growth between infill and greenfield matters.** Infill development utilizes and invests in existing public infrastructure, shortens travel distances between destinations, encourages more walking, biking, and transit trips, brings new investment into older suburban corridors, and helps to conserve our natural resources and agricultural lands. A scenario with more growth in infill areas than in greenfield areas will revitalize older suburban corridors and downtowns, and is essential to maintaining or improving the plan's performance.
- 2) **The diversity of the housing stock matters.** A variety of housing choices, such as apartments, townhouses, and single-family detached homes on varying lot sizes, creates opportunities for the variety of people who live in them: families, singles, seniors, and people with special needs. This issue is of particular concern for people with very low-, low-, and moderate-income, for whom finding affordable housing close to work is challenging. We know existing housing stock is overwhelmingly made up of large-lot single-family homes because much of it was built at a time when a high percentage of our population was made up of married couples with children. This is no longer the majority demographic today or in the future: our demographic forecasts tell us we will see significant increases in the number of singles living alone and in the number of households headed by someone 65 years or older. We have a mismatch between the diversity of our households and our housing stock. A scenario with a large percentage of the new homes in other housing types will meet future demand, offer more housing choice in the future than exists today, and is essential to achieving the performance goals of the plan.
- 3) **The timing of development and the rate of absorption in Developing Communities matters.** A traditional residential greenfield development pattern starts with construction of homes first, then eventually, after enough homes are built, construction of some neighborhood-serving retail, schools, transit, etc. Until the neighborhood reaches a critical mass of homes (which varies by community), a lot of people living in these Developing Communities will likely be driving relatively

long distances for many of their daily activities. While most of the Developing Communities proposed in our region are Blueprint supportive in their plans for jobs, services, transit, and other public amenities, those non-residential components—the components that create complete communities—are usually built after most of the homes are constructed. That means the transportation benefits of a Developing Community don't show up until the jobs, services, transit, and other public amenities start showing up. Uncoordinated new growth, characterized by small amounts of development across a large number of spread out Developing Communities could increase vehicle miles traveled and congestion if the homes are not contributing to a better jobs-housing balance for the area. A scenario with fewer Developing Communities that are more built-out will provide housing choice and maintain or improve the plan's performance.

### **Proposed Framework for a Discussion Draft Preferred Scenario**

The two most important land use inputs to maintain or improve from the current plan are the balance of growth between community types and the housing type diversity. Below is a table showing the land use inputs from the three scenarios analyzed in the 2016 plan, the adopted 2016 plan, and the range staff is proposing to use to create a Discussion Draft Scenario for the 2020 MTP/SCS. Attachment B provides background information on the Community Types used in the MTP/SCS and the various housing types discussed in the MTP/SCS.

The proposed Discussion Draft Scenario is targeting a range between the current MTP/SCS and Scenario 3 that was analyzed during the development of the current MTP/SCS. Because Scenario 3 performed better than the MTP/SCS, but the current MTP/SCS performed better than Scenario 2, keeping the inputs of the Discussion Draft Scenario between the current plan and Scenario 3 is a way to maintain or improve the performance of the current plan.

| <b>Target Land Use Inputs for a Discussion Draft Preferred Scenario</b> |            |            |            |                 |                                                         |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------------|---------------------------------------------------------|
| Land Use Inputs                                                         | Scenario 1 | Scenario 2 | Scenario 3 | Current MTP/SCS | <b>Proposed Discussion Draft Scenario 2035 and 2040</b> |
| Share of new homes in Established and Center and Corridor Communities   | 49%        | 56%        | 63%        | 58%             | <b>58-63%</b>                                           |
| Share of new homes in Developing Communities                            | 47%        | 42%        | 36%        | 40%             | <b>36-40%</b>                                           |
| Share of new homes in Rural Residential Communities                     | 4%         | 2%         | 1%         | 2%              | <b>1-2%</b>                                             |
| Share of new homes in large-lot single-family homes                     | 39%        | 28%        | 24%        | 29%             | <b>24-29%</b>                                           |
|                                                                         |            |            |            |                 |                                                         |

|                                                                  |     |     |     |     |               |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|---------------|
| Share of new homes in small-lot single-family and attached homes | 61% | 71% | 76% | 71% | <b>71-76%</b> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|---------------|

This target range of land use inputs would be for both a 2035 and 2040 land use forecast. The range provides flexibility, but also stays within the land use parameters we have previously tested. In other words, a Discussion Draft Land Use Scenario that has a land use pattern within this target range would set us up for the best possible outcomes from a land use perspective: achieving Blueprint land use principles within the reality of current and future market and regulatory conditions.

In 2017, staff presented a Regional Progress Report to the Board. The Progress Report shows that our most recent development trend is not in line with the housing targets proposed for the Discussion Draft Scenario. We recognize that implementation is the most important part of the plan and believe that despite recent trends, the region can in fact change development trends in the next twenty years. For SACOG's part, the MTP/SCS will need stronger implementation-focused policies and strategies. More on this will be presented under a separate item on SACOG's Housing Strategy, which is also being presented to the Committee this month.

### **Methodology for creating the Discussion Draft Land Use Scenario**

These target land use inputs provide an important foundation for the MTP/SCS land use forecast. However, many additional factors are taken into consideration when creating the land use forecast. SACOG's process for creating a land use allocation, whether for alternatives scenarios, a Discussion Draft Scenario, or a preferred scenario, considers many policy, regulatory, and market factors that can affect the location, type, and rate of development, starting first and foremost with each adopted and proposed land use plan identified and inventoried in consultation with local agency planning staff. Last month, staff provided a draft report of the growth capacity in local plans. The report showed that the sum of development capacity in local plans far exceeds the demand we are projecting by 2040 in the MTP/SCS.

This inventory of land use plans forms the basis for allocating housing and employment growth spatially within a jurisdiction. The decision on how much and what kind of housing and employment to allocate is based on an analysis of other policy, regulatory, and market factors. These data are particularly important in assessing development readiness of specific plans and master plans, which, unless they are under construction, inevitably require some amount of local, state or regional entitlement plus infrastructure improvement required in order to begin construction. The following is a sample list of factors considered in the estimation of growth within subareas of a jurisdiction: status of local, state and federal entitlement applications, as applicable; past housing permit activity in the vicinity of the project; major infrastructure requirements; developer readiness to pursue entitlement and construction; proximity to job centers and services; and housing product mix. These and additional factors are described in detail in Attachment C. Not all of these factors are easily quantifiable; SACOG considers factors about each area in relative terms. In other words, for any given development factor (e.g., major infrastructure requirements), all projects are evaluated relative to each other. Attachment C also provides a summary of the initial research staff has done on some of these development factors. Additionally, while the build out capacity presented to the Committee last month assumes

maximum build out of every parcel, the land use forecast does not. The land use forecast does consider environmental constraints such as wetlands, vernal pools, and oak woodlands, as well as market constraints such as parcel size, and the fact that not every parcel builds to the maximum allowed density or intensity. The effect of this evaluation is a filtering of projects that are more likely and less likely to build during the course of the plan update, followed by how much growth can be expected.

The process and resulting preliminary draft growth estimate consider each jurisdiction individually. However, the MTP/SCS growth projections are created for the region, so each jurisdiction must also be considered as a share of the regional economy. To do this, the preliminary jurisdiction growth estimate is analyzed and adjusted to achieve the regional projections for housing and employment growth by considering: the jurisdiction's share of regional housing and employment today compared to historical share, what it will be in the future, and what the basis is for the changes; how quickly or slowly the jurisdiction has grown in the past relative to the regional average growth rate and relative to other jurisdictions in the same market area and/or of similar size; how adopted and proposed plans might change the jurisdiction's growth rate from past trends; the amount of growth assumed in the market area; and the jobs/housing ratio today compared to the jobs/housing ratio for the estimated growth. This overall process is described in more detail in Attachment D.

### **Next Steps**

Pending changes or suggestions from the Committee on this proposed approach for creating a Discussion Draft Land Use Scenario for 2035 and 2040, these are the next steps in the process:

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |                                |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Staff will share a Discussion Draft Land Use Scenario with member agencies. Local agency planning and public works staff will have a six-week review period to provide any comments on the Discussion Draft Land Use Scenario. Because the Discussion Draft Land Use Scenario will affect decisions made in the Discussion Draft Transportation Scenario, we will ask both planning and public works staff to review. | April 2018                     |
| Staff will share the Discussion Draft Land Use Scenario with the MTP/SCS Stakeholder Sounding Board.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | May 2018                       |
| Staff will bring a proposed approach for creating a Discussion Draft Transportation Scenario to the Committees in June.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | June 2018                      |
| Staff will bring information back to Board on the various policies we are testing with the Discussion Draft. The analysis and policy discussions are all to inform a framework for a draft preferred land use and transportation scenario for Board consideration in November.                                                                                                                                        | June 2018<br>–<br>October 2018 |
| Staff will hold public workshops on policy trade-offs that the Board will be considering as part of the November framework for a draft preferred land use and transportation scenario. More information on the                                                                                                                                                                                                        | August 2018                    |

|                                                                                     |               |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| workshops will come to the Committees in June.                                      |               |
| Board action on Framework for a Draft Preferred Land Use & Transportation Scenario. | November 2018 |

## **5. Fiscal Impact/Grant Information:**

This project is budgeted in SACOG's adopted FY17/18 OWP and budget.

### **ATTACHMENTS:**

Description

Attachment A - 2016 MTP/SCS Scenario Inputs and Outputs

Attachment B - Community Types and Housing Types

Attachment C - Land Use Development Factors

Attachment D - Methodology for Land Use Allocation

## Description of 2016 MTP/SCS Land Use and Transportation Scenarios

A total of three scenarios were identified for analysis during the development of the 2016 MTP/SCS. The land use components of the scenarios were designed in a progression from most dispersed development pattern to least dispersed development pattern; the corresponding transportation components followed a progression of most auto-oriented transportation system to most multi-modal transportation system. The scenarios are described according to this progression in below. All scenarios analyzed accommodate the same amount of regional growth: 811,000 new people, 439,000 new jobs, and 285,000 new housing units. The table below summarizes the land use and transportation characteristics of each scenario and the performance outcomes. Additional descriptions of each scenario are provided below the table.

**Comparison of Scenarios**

| Land Use Characteristics                                                                                 | 2012<br>Baseline | Adopted<br>2016<br>MTP/SCS | Scenario 1     | Scenario 2     | Scenario<br>3  |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Share of homes in Center & Corridor Communities <sup>1</sup><br>(percent of homes)                       | 107,718<br>12%   | 86,167<br>30%              | 57,359<br>20%  | 89,830<br>31%  | 102,027<br>36% |
| Share of homes in Established Communities <sup>1</sup><br>(percent of homes)                             | 686,075<br>76%   | 78,750<br>28%              | 81,147<br>29%  | 68,597<br>25%  | 75,648<br>27%  |
| Share of homes in Developing Communities <sup>1</sup><br>(percent of homes)                              | 31,422<br>3%     | 114,836<br>40%             | 165,101<br>47% | 154,682<br>42% | 143,139<br>36% |
| Share of homes in Rural Residential Communities <sup>1</sup><br>(percent of homes)                       | 78,237<br>9%     | 5,143<br>2%                | 13,325<br>4%   | 4,896<br>2%    | 4,382<br>2%    |
| Share of homes in rural residential and large-lot single-family <sup>1</sup> homes<br>(percent of homes) | 577,299<br>64%   | 83,335<br>29%              | 111,652<br>39% | 82,232<br>28%  | 65,140<br>24%  |
| Share of homes in small-lot, single-family <sup>1</sup> homes<br>(percent of homes)                      | 101,173<br>11%   | 72,612<br>26%              | 83,031<br>29%  | 79,547<br>28%  | 68,227<br>23%  |
| Share of homes in attached homes <sup>1</sup><br>(percent of homes)                                      | 225,029<br>25%   | 128,954<br>45%             | 90,597<br>32%  | 123,371<br>43% | 151,665<br>53% |
| Gross Acres of development <sup>1,4</sup><br>(percent increase in developed acres from 2012)             | 718,356<br>n/a   | 47,563<br>7%               | 75,622<br>11%  | 48,777<br>7%   | 37,350<br>5%   |
| Jobs Housing Ratio (within 4 miles of primary and secondary jobs centers)<br>Regional Average = 1.2      | 1.16             | 1.26                       | 1.28           | 1.27           | 1.26           |
| Transportation Attributes                                                                                | 2012<br>Baseline | Adopted<br>2016<br>MTP/SCS | Scenario 1     | Scenario 2     | Scenario<br>3  |
| Road Lane Miles <sup>2</sup>                                                                             | 6,340            | 7,680                      | 8,070          | 7,840          | 7,570          |

|                                                                                                           |                          |                                     |                   |                   |                       |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|
| (new or expanded roads lane miles, percent increase from 2012)                                            | n/a                      | 24%                                 | 31%               | 27%               | 23%                   |
| Transit Service                                                                                           | 3,780                    | 8,400                               | 6,230             | 7,910             | 9,190                 |
| (vehicle service hours, percent increase from 2012)                                                       | n/a                      | 122%                                | 54%               | 109%              | 143%                  |
| Funding for transit (\$ in billions)                                                                      | n/a                      | \$10.6                              | \$10.7            | \$11.30           | \$13.7                |
| Farebox Recovery                                                                                          | 38%                      | 38%                                 | 38%               | 41%               | 51%                   |
| (percent of transit costs recovered by ticket sales)                                                      |                          |                                     |                   |                   |                       |
| Funding for road, bike and ped maintenance and operations (\$ in billions) 8                              | n/a                      | \$12.60                             | \$10.90           | \$11.50           | \$11.00               |
| Funding for new road capacity (\$ in billions) 8                                                          | n/a                      | \$5.80                              | \$8.70            | \$7.40            | \$6.70                |
| Funding for bike/ped street and trail improvements (\$ in billions) 8                                     | n/a                      | \$2.80                              | \$2.80            | \$2.80            | \$3.00                |
| Funding for programs (community design, tdm, etc.) (\$ in billions) 8                                     | n/a                      | \$1.70                              | \$1.50            | \$2.20            | \$1.70                |
| <b>Performance Outcomes</b>                                                                               | <b>2012<br/>Baseline</b> | <b>Adopted<br/>2016<br/>MTP/SCS</b> | <b>Scenario 1</b> | <b>Scenario 2</b> | <b>Scenario<br/>3</b> |
| Square miles of farmland converted to development <sup>6</sup>                                            | n/a                      | 58                                  | 93                | 61                | 45                    |
| (4,158 square miles of farmland in 2012)                                                                  |                          |                                     |                   |                   |                       |
| Square miles of vernal pools affected by development <sup>7</sup>                                         | n/a                      | 6                                   | 7                 | 5                 | 2                     |
| Total number of homes near high-frequency transit <sup>3</sup>                                            | 141,862                  | 442,915                             | 320,857           | 463,487           | 463,492               |
| (share of all homes near high-frequency transit)                                                          | 16%                      | 37%                                 | 27%               | 39%               | 39%                   |
| Total number of jobs near high-frequency transit <sup>3</sup>                                             | 243,773                  | 631,958                             | 531,091           | 583,963           | 570,756               |
| (share of all jobs near high-frequency transit)                                                           | 27%                      | 42%                                 | 40%               | 44%               | 43%                   |
| Jobs within 20-minute drive of residence (200,100 jobs in 2008)                                           | 199,100                  | 272,7000                            | 253,500           | 260,100           | 267,800               |
| Vehicle miles traveled to jobs centers (Commute VMT per worker at jobs centers)                           | 20                       | 17.1                                | 17.3              | 17.5              | 15.7                  |
| Trips by transit, bike or walk to jobs centers (Transit/bike/walk commute tips per worker at jobs center) | 7%                       | 17%                                 | 19%               | 15%               | 22%                   |
| Mode share for transit, walking and bicycling <sup>5</sup>                                                | 10%                      | 13%                                 | 12%               | 12%               | 14%                   |
| Percent of all person trips                                                                               |                          |                                     |                   |                   |                       |
| Vehicle miles traveled (VMT) <sup>5</sup>                                                                 | 18.0                     | 17.0                                | 17.6              | 17.2              | 16.0                  |
| Per capita per day                                                                                        |                          |                                     |                   |                   |                       |

|                                                                  |     |      |      |      |      |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|------|------|------|------|
| Vehicle miles traveled in heavy congestion                       | 4%  | 6%   | 5%   | 6%   | 5%   |
| (percent of total VMT: 6% of total VMT in 2008)                  |     |      |      |      |      |
| Weekday passenger vehicle CO <sub>2</sub> emissions <sup>9</sup> | n/a | -16% | -11% | -13% | -18% |
| (percent change per capita from 2005)                            |     |      |      |      |      |

<sup>1</sup> Values shown are for growth assumed in the MTP/SCS between 2012-2036, except in 2012 where values are total for 2012.

<sup>2</sup> Values represented are for new or expanded roads in the MTP/SCS between 2012-2036, except for the 2012 scenario where values are total for 2012.

<sup>3</sup> Values represented are total (in 2012 scenario values are total for 2012 and in all other scenarios the value is existing plus new growth).

<sup>4</sup> Except for 2012 acres which represent net acres, for which roads and other public uses have been excluded.

<sup>5</sup> Values for the scenarios were adjusted to account for changes to forecasting model made since the workshop, in order to make the comparable to the current baseline and proposed MTP/SCS results.

<sup>6</sup> A generalized analysis of impacts to farmland was conducted for the scenarios based on all Farmland Monitoring and Mapping Program categories; the same method was applied to the proposed MTP/SCS to allow for comparison.

<sup>7</sup> A generalized analysis of impacts to vernal pools was conducted for the scenarios using Central Valley Vernal Pool Complexes (Holland, 2009); the same method was applied to the proposed MTP/SCS to allow for comparison.

<sup>8</sup> Proposed MTP/SCS budget allocations have been re-calculated to match the same categorical classifications as the workshop alternatives (Alternatives 1, 2, 3).

<sup>9</sup> The greenhouse gas emissions reduction target approved by the CARB for the SACOG region is a 16 percent per capita GHG reduction below 2005 levels by 2035.

## Scenario 1

Scenario 1 assumes the same growth and transportation investment as the proposed MTP/SCS, but with less compact development and less focus on maintaining and improving the current transportation system. Overall this scenario is the most dispersed and provides the fewest housing and transportation options.

### Land Use Pattern

Compared to the other two scenarios and the proposed MTP/SCS, this scenario provides the most amount of large lot single family and rural residential new housing, the least amount of growth through infill and redevelopment, and the least improvement in jobs-housing balance within sub-areas of the region. Specifically, 61 percent of the new homes are small-lot or attached and just over half (51 percent) of the new homes are located in Developing or Rural Residential Communities, which is significantly higher than the other scenarios. Scenario 1 has the largest growth footprint, consuming almost 76,000 acres of land.

### Transportation

Compared to the other two scenarios, Scenario 1 has a higher amount of funding for, and the largest number of, new roads and road expansion projects. Scenario 1 has significantly lower investments in road maintenance and transit than the other two scenarios. This is largely due to the more dispersed land use pattern.

## Scenario 2

Scenario 2 was constructed to be consistent with the growth patterns and transportation investment priorities of the 2012 MTP/SCS. The growth in population, jobs, and homes is slightly less as a result of a new base year, but the total population, jobs, and housing achieved by Scenario 2 by 2036 is the

same as the 2035 totals used in the 2012 MTP/SCS. Projected revenues for transportation investments and funding allocations are consistent with the 2012 MTP/SCS. This scenario assumes the same housing and employment growth as the proposed MTP/SCS, but distributes the growth differently as described below. Overall, this scenario would be less dispersed than Scenario 1, but slightly more dispersed than the proposed MTP/SCS.

#### *Land Use Pattern*

The percentage of the new housing that is rural residential, large-lot single-family, small-lot single-family, and attached; the amount of new growth that is projected to occur through infill versus greenfield development; the proportion of housing and jobs growth expected to occur through redevelopment; and the jobs-housing balance within major sub-areas of the region are all the same under Scenario 2 as under the proposed MTP/SCS. Compared to Scenario 1, this scenario would have a higher share of new compact housing (71 percent), more growth in TPAs and fewer developed acres due to a more compact development pattern. This is in part due to a higher percentage of new homes in Center and Corridor Communities and Established Communities, when compared to Scenario 1. In contrast, compared to Scenario 3, this scenario has less compact housing, less growth in TPAs, and more acres developed. This scenario has the same percentage of large-lot versus compact (small-lot or attached) housing as the proposed MTP/SCS. However, the proposed MTP/SCS has more housing in infill versus greenfield areas, and improves the jobs-housing balance within major sub-areas of the region when compared to this scenario.

#### *Transportation*

The transportation system for Scenario 2 matches the investment priorities in the 2012 MTP/SCS. The percentage of the budget dedicated to operations and maintenance, transit, new road capacity, bicycle and pedestrian improvements, and programs is the same as the current 2012 plan. This scenario would have more transit service, including more new BRT, streetcar, and light rail service than Scenario 1. Scenario 2 would have a 109 percent increase in transit service from 2012. It also would have more bicycle and pedestrian improvements, and fewer new roads and road expansions, than Scenario 1. These differences in the transportation system would support a more compact development pattern. Scenario 2 has more new roads and road expansions, and less transit service than in Scenario 3 and the proposed MTP/SCS, as those scenarios have a more compact development pattern than Scenario 2.

### **Scenario 3**

This scenario assumes the same growth as the proposed MTP/SCS, but with more compact and mixed land uses. Overall this scenario would be less dispersed than the proposed MTP/SCS. During the 2012 MTP/SCS scenario development process, the SACOG Board wanted to analyze a scenario (Scenario 3) that maximized transit ridership for the purposes of gaining an understanding of what would be required to generate a high increase in transit ridership. That Scenario 3 from the 2012 MTP/SCS was the basis for this scenario. Scenario 3 and Scenario 1 are bookends to Scenario 2 in terms of analyzing land use and transportation options. To achieve this level of transit performance for Scenario 3, land use assumptions were made that go beyond the federal requirements of what is reasonable to assume. For instance, the scenario relies on a higher amount of attached housing, especially near transit, than the market and financial incentives currently will support. Additionally, Scenario 3 includes a high funding allocation for transit and relies on an exceptionally high farebox recovery rate, which are unlikely to occur under current operations.

#### *Land Use Pattern*

Scenario 3 has the highest percentage of new compact housing (76 percent) and the smallest development footprint in comparison to the proposed MTP/SCS and the scenario scenarios described above. This scenario would have the highest percentage of new homes in Center and Corridor Communities and the least amount of new growth in Developing Communities and Rural Residential Communities.

*Transportation*

Because it has the least dispersed development pattern, this scenario has the highest amount of bus and rail projects of all of the scenarios and would increase transit service (vehicle service hours) by 143 percent from 2012. It also has the highest amount of bicycle and pedestrian projects, and the fewest new roads and road expansions.

# COMMUNITY TYPES

## CENTER & CORRIDOR COMMUNITIES

Land uses in Center and Corridor Communities are typically higher density and more mixed than surrounding land uses. Centers and Corridors are identified in local plans as historic downtowns, main streets, suburban or urban commercial corridors, rail station areas, central business districts, or town centers. They typically have more compact development patterns, a greater mix of uses, and a wider variety of transportation infrastructure compared to the communities surrounding them.

Some have frequent transit service, either bus or rail, and all have pedestrian and bicycling infrastructure that is more supportive of walking and bicycling than other Community Types.



## ESTABLISHED COMMUNITIES

Established Communities are typically the areas adjacent to, or surrounding, Center and Corridor Communities.

Many are characterized as “first tier,” “inner ring,” or mature suburban communities. Local land use plans aim to maintain the existing character and land use pattern in these areas. Land uses in Established Communities are typically made up of existing low- to medium-density residential neighborhoods, office and industrial parks, or commercial strip centers. Depending on the density of existing land uses, some Established Communities have bus service; others may have commuter bus service or very little service. The majority of the region’s roads are in Established Communities in 2012 and in 2036.

# COMMUNITY TYPES



## DEVELOPING COMMUNITIES

Developing Communities are typically, though not always, situated on vacant land at the edge of existing urban or suburban development; they are the next increment of urban expansion. Developing Communities are identified in local plans as special plan areas, specific plans, or master plans and may be residential-only, employment-only, or a mix of residential and employment uses.

Transportation options in Developing Communities often depend, to a great extent, on the timing of development. Bus service, for example, may be infrequent or unavailable today, but may be available every 30 minutes or less once a community builds out. Walking and bicycling environments vary widely though many Developing Communities are designed with dedicated pedestrian and bicycle trails.



## RURAL RESIDENTIAL COMMUNITIES

Rural Residential Communities are typically located outside of urbanized areas and designated in local land use plans for rural residential development. Rural Residential Communities are predominantly residential with some small-scale hobby or commercial farming. Travel occurs almost exclusively by automobile and transit service is minimal or nonexistent.

## LANDS NOT IDENTIFIED FOR DEVELOPMENT



These areas of the region are not expected to develop to urban levels during the MTP/SCS planning period. Today, these areas are dominated by commercial agriculture, forestry, resource conservation, mining, flood protection, or a combination of these uses. Some have long-term plans and policies to preserve or maintain the existing "non-urban" uses; however, some are covered under adopted or proposed plans that allow urban development and/or are included in the adopted Blueprint vision for future growth.

## Housing Types



### Attached Residential

Single-family or multifamily housing that shares common walls with another unit. This could include housing types like townhomes, duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, apartments, or condos.



### Small-Lot Residential

Single-family detached housing that is typically one to two stories and built on lots 5500 square feet or smaller.



### Large Lot Residential

Single-family detached housing that is typically one to two stories and built on lots 5500 square feet or larger.



### Rural Residential

Single-family housing typically located outside of urbanized areas, built at a density less than or equal to one unit per acre.



## Attachment C: Factors Considered in Updating the MTP/SCS Land Use Forecast

|            | Regulatory/Policy and Market Factors                    | Description of projects assumed to have the highest likelihood to build within 20 years                                                 | Middle range of conditions                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Description of projects assumed to have the lowest likelihood to build within 20 years                                   |
|------------|---------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| REGULATORY | Local Entitlements                                      | Specific Plan approved, Annexation complete (if required), Tentative Map(s) in process                                                  | Range of conditions includes: projects that are approved but still need annexation; projects approved but no tentative maps submitted; projects approved but have unsettled lawsuit; projects currently in process; projects in pre-application                                                                                                                                                                                                            | No current entitlement activity; identified by general plan or SOI as future growth area                                 |
|            | State/Federal Entitlements                              | Approved                                                                                                                                | Range of conditions includes: projects that are not yet approved but in process; projects participating in an HCP or NCCP; projects with no significant resource issues                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | Significant, unresolved resource issues                                                                                  |
| POLICY     | Air Quality                                             | In SCS with lower VMT than average for Developing Communities                                                                           | Range of conditions includes: projects that are in the SCS with average VMT; projects in the SCS with higher than average VMT; projects not in the SCS with lower than average VMT; projects not in the SCS with average VMT                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | Not in SCS with above average VMT for Developing Communities                                                             |
|            | Regional Plans and Policies                             | Consistent with 2012 MTP/SCS and Blueprint                                                                                              | Range of conditions includes: projects in MTP/SCS and partially consistent with Blueprint; projects in MTP/SCS and not consistent with Blueprint; projects consistent with Blueprint and not MTP/SCS; projects partially consistent with Blueprint and not in MTP/SCS                                                                                                                                                                                      | Not consistent with 2012 MTP/SCS or Blueprint                                                                            |
| MARKET     | Proximity to Job Centers                                | Close proximity to a regional jobs center                                                                                               | Range of conditions includes: projects partially within 4 miles of a regional job center; projects within 4 miles of a secondary job center; partially within 4 miles of a secondary job center                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            | Significant distance from any job center(s)                                                                              |
|            | Housing Mix                                             | Mix of housing types including mostly small-lot and attached                                                                            | Range of conditions includes: projects that have a mix of housing types including small-lot and attached housing at varying amounts; projects that are primarily large-lot residential because they are in more rural areas                                                                                                                                                                                                                                | All large-lot single-family where higher densities could be supported (i.e more urban or suburban locations)             |
|            | Market Area Saturation                                  | Historically high market demand and limited number of approved or pending projects in market area                                       | Range of conditions includes: projects in areas with high market demand and high number of approved or pending projects in market area; projects in areas with average market demand and a high number of approved or pending projects in market area; projects in area with lower market demand and a high number of approved or pending projects in market area, but have a unique factor that could significantly change the market demand for the area | Historically low market demand and a high number of approved or pending projects in market area                          |
|            | Adjacency                                               | Adjacent to existing urban development or has significant borders with a city boundary or areas designated for future urban development | Range of conditions includes: projects that are adjacent to existing development at varying rates                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | Less than 10% adjacent with existing urban development, a city boundary or areas designated for future urban development |
|            | Developer Activity                                      | Very active, single ownership or experienced ownership partnerships, multiple completed projects in region                              | Range of conditions includes: very active to active, single or multiple ownerships with no development history; single or multiple ownerships with varying levels of activity and some projects completed in the region; single or multiple ownerships with varying levels of activity and no history of completed projects in or outside the region                                                                                                       | Not active, single or multiple ownership, no completed projects in the region                                            |
|            | Transportation Infrastructure                           | No major or regional infrastructure needed or infrastructure is fully funded                                                            | Range of conditions includes: projects that have some infrastructure, but need more; projects that can build some before significant infrastructure investment is needed; projects that need significant infrastructure and have funding                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | Significant infrastructure needed and not funded or not yet defined                                                      |
|            | Other Infrastructure (sewer, water, flood control, etc) | No major or regional infrastructure needed or infrastructure is fully funded                                                            | Range of conditions includes: projects that have some infrastructure, but need more; projects that can build some before significant infrastructure investment is needed; projects that need significant infrastructure and have funding                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | Significant infrastructure needed and not funded or not yet defined                                                      |

### Summary of Research on Factors Influencing Development

Staff is updating research from the 2016 plan on a variety of development factors in order to have the most up-to-date information for the 2020 plan. Since this research directly informs the land use scenario process, which will begin this month, staff is providing a brief summary on the findings of the research to date and how each factor is likely to affect the regional land use scenarios.

*Inventory of Adopted and Proposed Local Land Use Plans:* This is the basis for all MTP/SCS scenario development. The current inventory shows that there is significantly more residential and employment capacity planned than projected demand. This was shared with the Committees in March.

*Floodplains and Levee Improvements:* Local governments within floodplains are working toward compliance with state and federal floodplain regulations. The timing of funding and construction of levee improvements is one factor that may influence the timing of construction of land development projects in these jurisdictions.

*Habitat Conservation Plans/Natural Communities Conservation Plans Development:* With the exception of the Natomas Basin Habitat Conservation Plan, the HCPs and NCCPs in the region continue to be under development. Two major conservation plans that cover much of the new development areas being contemplated in the MTP/SCS are the Placer County Conservation Plan and the South Sacramento Habitat Conservation Plan. Both plans are currently anticipated to be adopted in 2018. Several development projects located within the HCPs/NCCPs subject to Clean Water Act and Endangered Species Act permitting requirements have previously received or currently pursuing their independent permits. For the purposes of scenario development, federal and state permit status are assumed to affect timing of development.

*Water Supply:* Staff is still researching this topic but information gathered during the development of the 2016 MTP/SCS indicates that long term (20-year) water supply is not likely to be a limiter of growth. Rather, the factors that would have the greatest effect on the timing of development projects are the timing of financing and construction of new treatment, storage and conveyance facilities needed for new development areas, and consideration of the amount of development that could be built before significant investments in water infrastructure are needed. Staff is still gathering information on the timing aspects of water infrastructure (i.e., which projects have sufficient water supply and infrastructure available such that a large percentage of a project could be constructed in the next four years).

*Housing Market Trends:* A housing market trends white paper was written to support the 2012 and 2016 MTP/SCS. Research is underway to update the literature review for that paper. A review of literature to date on local and national housing market and demographic trends, as well as consultation with the development industry, points to a continuation of the trends identified in the 2016 paper. One of the

major driving forces for this MTP/SCS update is the cost of housing: what are the housing product types that homebuyers and renters can afford. For the purposes of scenario development, this affects the type and location of new housing that will likely be produced. Staff presented to the Committees in February a briefing on the status of housing production in the region and will present the major findings of the housing market white paper in May to the Land Use and Natural Resources Committee.

## Methodology for MTP/SCS Jurisdiction-Level Land Use Allocation

*Last updated: March 15, 2018*

**Purpose:** The purpose of this document is to provide specific information about how jurisdiction-level growth allocations are developed for MTP/SCS land use scenarios.

### 1. Creating Jurisdiction Growth Estimates

SACOG's process for creating a land use allocation begins with creating housing and employment growth estimates by jurisdiction. The following is a description of how SACOG creates housing unit and employee scenario allocations for a jurisdiction in the MTP/SCS.

#### a. What do base line and historic residential and employment growth trends indicate about a jurisdiction's potential long-term growth?

First, SACOG assembles all of the numerical data considerations available and relevant to each jurisdiction. This data is not intended to be definitive; it is the best available useful information that is considered as part of the analytical process that leads to the jurisdictional growth estimates. This includes jurisdiction-level summaries of:

- Baseline data
  - o Total number of housing units and employees today (2016);
  - o Jobs/Housing ratio today (2016);
  - o Percent of regional growth share for housing units and employees today (2016).
- Historic reference data
  - o Annual, five-year average and ten-year average historic residential building permits;
  - o Percent of regional five-year and ten-year residential permits;
  - o An extrapolation of the five-year and ten-year building permit averages to estimate 2016-2040 housing unit growth if those past trends defined the future;
  - o Historic county-level employment estimates from State of California Employment Development Department;
  - o Employment estimates from past SACOG MTP and MTP/SCS base years (2004, 2008, 2012);
  - o Percent of regional employment estimates from past SACOG MTP and MTP/SCS base years (2004, 2008, and 2012);
- Capacity data
  - o General Plan and specific plan capacity for housing units and employees;
  - o How close existing housing units and employees are to reaching the capacity estimate (how close the jurisdiction is to build-out today);
  - o Mix of planned employment uses; mix of planned residential uses.
- MTP/SCS data

- o Housing units and employees assumed in the last MTP/SCS;
- o Regional share of growth of housing units and employees in the last MTP/SCS;
- o Job/Housing ratio in the last MTP/SCS;
- o A projection of housing unit and employee growth based on percentage share of growth from the current MTP/SCS applied to the new regional growth forecast.

While local land use plans have a strong influence on the estimated growth pattern, it is more accurate to state that they are the start, not the end, of the process. There are many reasons for this, but essentially the sum of all local policies and regulations never yields a growth pattern exactly consistent with the projected amount of employment and housing growth for the entire region. For example, the current sum of adopted and proposed local plans can accommodate 60 to 70 years of residential and go to 110 years of employment growth compared to the 24-year growth rate of the 2020 MTP/SCS update. Additionally, the time horizons of general plans seldom exactly match the time horizon for an MTP/SCS. All of these plans and regulations are also likely to change many times throughout the planning horizon of the MTP/SCS. So assuming that they are, in effect, frozen for two or more decades on the date the MTP/SCS is adopted is not likely to be accurate. For this reason, other policy, regulatory and market information is gathered and analyzed.

**b. What other policy, regulatory and market factors might influence the location, shape, and pace of growth within a jurisdiction?**

Next, for each jurisdiction SACOG gathers and considers a number of other policy, regulatory and market factors that can affect the location or rate of development, not all of which are easily quantifiable in a spreadsheet. In addition to local land use plans, other data are gathered and used to assess development readiness of specific plans and master plans, which, unless they are under construction, inevitably have some amount of local, state or regional entitlement plus infrastructure improvement required in order to begin construction.

This information comes largely from local government planning staff at each SACOG member agency, but can also come from other sources. For additional policy and regulatory factors, SACOG consults with other governmental agencies such as flood control agencies, local agency formation commissions, federal and state natural resources agencies, and water agencies. SACOG also reaches out to the development industry through the MTP/SCS cross-sectoral sounding board to solicit input on the market and regulatory factors influencing development. Again, data gathered through these interactions are not intended to be conclusive by themselves; they are part of the information gathered and considered in the process of creating jurisdictional growth estimates. SACOG considers factors about each project in relative terms. In other words, for any given development factor (e.g., major infrastructure requirements), all projects are evaluated relative to each other. The information considered includes:

- The number and development capacity of greenfield (Developing Communities) and/or infill opportunities (Center and Corridor and Established Communities) in and around the jurisdiction.
  - o For specific plans:
    - Is the plan approved; and what levels of approval does it have?
    - Has construction started on the site?
    - Does the project require annexation through a local agency formation commission (LAFCo)?
    - Are there natural resource issues to consider and does the project require federal and/or state permit(s)?

- Are there development agreements to consider?
- Is there pending litigation on the project?
- Does the plan help or hinder the region's ability to attain air quality conformance under the federal Clean Air Act?
- Was the plan part of the last MTP/SCS and is there updated information about the plan that should be considered?
- What type of infrastructure needs to be built to support the development (wastewater treatment plant, water conveyance, highway interchange, etc.)?
- Are there other specific plans in the area and if so what is their entitlement status?
- How competitive is the project's location in the regional market/how close is it to job centers and services?
- How close is the project to existing urban development and/or how far is it from urban development in the future?
- How does the project's mix of housing products compare to projected housing product demand?
- How does the project's mix of employment land uses compare to projected growth in employment sectors?
- How active is the developer(s) in pursuing entitlements?
- General Plan land use policies that may influence the timing, shape and location of development:
  - o When was the plan adopted?
  - o Is the plan currently being updated?
  - o What are the land uses, densities, and intensities allowed?
  - o Are there policies about mixed-use and/or redevelopment?
  - o Are there policies about jobs-housing balance?
  - o Are there policies about infrastructure provision?
  - o Are there agricultural preservation policies?
- Major job centers in or near the jurisdiction (existing or proposed)
- Strength of the current residential market in the jurisdiction's market area
- Strength of the commercial, office and industrial markets in the jurisdiction's market area
- Major infrastructure or natural resource constraints to building (such as water/sewer capacity, flooding, habitat issues, etc.)
- The level of transit service today and planned in the last MTP/SCS

**c. Combining base line and historic data with policy, regulatory and market factors to create a preliminary jurisdiction growth estimate.**

The jurisdiction-level base line and historic data are used to estimate a jurisdiction's overall housing and employment growth. The policy, regulatory and market factors are evaluated to assess which subareas and projects within a jurisdiction are more likely and less likely to build during the course of the plan update, and how much of their capacity might be absorbed. Using all of the data and information above, SACOG creates a preliminary draft allocation of housing and employment growth for each jurisdiction.

**d. Adjusting the preliminary jurisdiction growth estimates to achieve the regional projections for housing and employment growth.**

The process described in steps 1a through 1c and resulting preliminary draft growth estimate consider each jurisdiction individually. However, the MTP/SCS growth projections are created for the region, so each jurisdiction must also be considered as a share of the regional economy. The MTP/SCS land use forecast is bounded by SACOG's regional growth forecast. For the 2020 MTP/SCS, this equates to 260,000 new homes and 248,000 new jobs between 2016 and 2040. These regional housing and employment growth projections are further divided into projections by housing type and employment sector. Therefore, the preliminary jurisdiction growth estimate is analyzed and adjusted to achieve the regional projections for housing and employment growth, by considering the following:

- The jurisdiction's share of regional housing and employment today compared to what it will be in the future, and the basis for the changes;
- How quickly or slowly the jurisdiction has grown in the past relative to the regional average growth rate and relative to other jurisdictions in the same market area and/or of a similar size;
- How adopted and proposed plans might change the jurisdiction's growth rate from past trends;
- The amount of growth assumed in the larger sub-regional market area;
- The jobs/housing ratio today compared to the jobs/housing ratio for the estimated growth.

Creating jurisdictional growth estimates that match the region's growth forecast is an iterative process involving the above steps 1a through 1d. Once preliminary housing and employment growth "targets" are set for all jurisdictions, they are then modeled in a GIS.

## **2. Modeling the Preliminary Draft Growth Estimates**

The primary reasons for modeling the preliminary allocation are to 1) be able to account spatially for the estimated growth, which makes it possible to make further refinements if needed and, 2) to provide the ability to vet all preliminary assumptions with local jurisdictions in an easily understandable format.

Land use scenario software tools are used for developing and comparing land use scenarios; by themselves, they are not projections or forecasting tools. SACOG uses a combination of GIS and a GIS-based software tool called Envision Tomorrow to model the land use allocation. The modeling is done to spatially allocate development to jurisdictions by subareas (which are defined by local planning areas) to reach the jurisdictional estimates developed according to the land use allocation process described above. If the resulting modeled land use allocation does not match the jurisdiction target of housing and employment growth, both sets of numbers are then analyzed to determine whether one, or both, should be adjusted. The allocation process is thus an iterative process to achieve a land use scenario that reflects the regional growth forecast.

Once the scenario is modeled, it can be visually displayed in a number of ways and can also be tallied and summarized by different geographies. For the 2016 MTP/SCS land use forecast and accompanying scenarios, SACOG primarily summarized and displayed the dataset using the MTP/SCS Community Types.

### **3. Vetting Draft Land Use Scenarios**

Regional land use scenarios and the draft preferred scenario are vetted through planning staff at each SACOG member jurisdiction. To support local staff's review, SACOG provides jurisdiction-level tabular summaries showing housing and employment estimates for 2016, 2035, 2040, and build out capacity at the Community Type level, as well as a corresponding Community Type map. If other summaries, maps, or individual data files are requested, SACOG also provides these. After receiving comments and feedback from the jurisdictions, SACOG uses the new information provided as well as all the data and considerations outlined earlier in this document, to determine if proposed refinements should be made to a scenario. A change in one jurisdiction can affect growth assumptions elsewhere in the region, so when refinements are proposed, all jurisdictions are re-analyzed to determine whether or not the refinements should be made and where other refinements may be required in order to maintain the regional housing and employee growth totals. The revised information is again circulated to local jurisdiction planning staff for review.

Throughout the 2020 MTP/SCS process, SACOG will conduct review periods directed to local planning staff at various stages of the plan update. The various review periods are summarized below. The first vetting of information occurred in early 2018, with local staff review of the 2016 existing conditions and build out estimates. The next period of review will occur in April and May with local staff review of the 2035 and 2040 Discussion Draft Scenario. After the Board directs the development of a draft preferred scenario in fall of 2018, SACOG staff will develop a preliminary draft preferred scenario for vetting again through local planning and public works staff, with reasonable opportunity for local elected bodies to provide input on the assumptions in early 2019, if they so choose. These review periods are anticipated to occur in February and April of 2019.