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• Founded 1955

• 501(c)(3) research and education arm of:
  – League of California Cities
    (Represents nearly all 480 cities)
  – California State Association of Counties
    (Represents all 58 counties)
ILG program areas:

- Land Use and Environment
- Public Service Ethics
- California Climate Action Network
- Public Engagement & Collaborative Governance
- Healthy Communities
- Intergovernmental Conflict Resolution
- Local Government 101
- Communities for Healthy Kids
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AGENDA

• Steve Sanders  
  *Introduction & overview*

• Mike McKeever  
  *Sacramento Area Council of Governments*

• Joe DiStefano  
  *Calthorpe Associates*

• Panel Discussion

• Closing Comments

• Update on Planning Grants webinar (2/16/10) & what’s next from ILG?
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Quick Poll:

Who’s here today?
Making Sure Your Community Has a Voice in Your Region’s Plan for Growth

Submitting Questions or Comments

Open Control Panel Tab

Click to open control panel

Enter Question or Comment

Enter question or comment
Understanding SB 375:
Public Participation Requirements

What You Will Learn Inside:

• What the Law Requires
• How SB 375 Affects Plans for Transportation and Housing
• Ways Local Officials and the Public Can Participate in Regional Planning
• Tools and Resources to Learn More

Institute for Local Government
Land Use and Environment Program
Public Engagement and Collaborative Governance Program

www.ca-ilg.org
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Executive Director,
Sacramento Area Council of Governments
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Mike McKeever
Executive Director
Sacramento Area Council of Governments

Sacramento Region Blueprint
Transportation & Land Use Study
Sacramento Area Council of Governments

6 counties
22 cities
2.2 million people
BLUEPRINT PUBLIC PROCESS

• INTERACTIVE CITIZEN WORKSHOPS
  – Neighborhood
  – County
  – Region

• LOCAL GOVERNMENT REGIONAL AND COUNTY PLANNERS COMMITTEES

• REGIONAL ELECTED OFFICIALS FORUM

• SURVEY RESEARCH
  – Housing Preferences
  – Public Opinion
Citizen Input — Thousands involved, use interactive I-PLACE3S software
Regional Forum 2004 – 1400 people
KEYS TO INTERACTIVE WORKSHOPS

• Broad outreach
  – Stakeholders Committee within sub-areas to lead
  – Broad representation at small group tables
• Civic organization to help
• Small contracts to reach non-traditional audiences
• Results transparent (in meetings and after)
MTP 2035 Public Outreach

- First to integrate Blueprint
- Interactive Workshops
- Individual Counties
- Regional Scale (satellite technology linked 8 workshop sites)
- 8,000 Participants
- Surveys and focus groups
SB375 PLANNING PROCESS REQUIREMENTS

- 1 Target setting regional workshop
- County Workshops to evaluate alternative scenarios
- Workshops in each county to review draft SCS/APS
KEY LEARNINGS

- Citizen buy-in/involvement critical
- Not all citizen involvement processes created equal
- Good information essential
- Honest listening essential – can’t be selling
- Professionals still have a role
- Create organizational culture of openness
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Regional Planning - Local Perspectives
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Envision Utah
Setting the Stage for Local Action

The Quality Growth Strategy - 1999
3 Keys To Success

1. Public Engagement
2. Modeling of Consequences
3. Local Tools and Examples
Public Workshops – Hands-On Engagement
Public Workshops – Hands-On Engagement
Public Workshops – Direct Input
Public Workshops – Direct Input
Regional Development Alternatives

Scenario A

Scenario D
Regional Development Alternatives

3 Growth Options for South Louisiana

A. Keep Building and Developing As We Are
   Roadway Focus

B. Modify Development Patterns
   Transit / Roadway Focus

C. Focus Development on Existing Cities & Towns
   Transit Focus
Scenario Consequences

Infrastructure Costs (billions of dollars)

Land Area Added (square miles)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Municipal and Developer</th>
<th>Regional Roads</th>
<th>Regional Transit</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scenario A</td>
<td>$19.4</td>
<td>$10.7</td>
<td>$0.6</td>
<td>$38B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario B</td>
<td>$17.8</td>
<td>$10.1</td>
<td>$0.6</td>
<td>$30B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario C</td>
<td>$9.2</td>
<td>$2.3</td>
<td>$0.5</td>
<td>$22B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario D</td>
<td>$7.2</td>
<td>$4.7</td>
<td>$0.5</td>
<td>$23B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scenario Consequences

New Population Located in Floodplain

- Option A: 445,000
- Option B: 200,000
- Option C: 70,000
Regional Highway Infrastructure (local roads, storm water, electrical)

Regional Transit

Total Infrastructure Cost (2005-2050)

Option A
- Regional Highway: $49B
- Regional Transit: $9B

Option B
- Regional Highway: $31B
- Regional Transit: $6B

Option C
- Regional Highway: $19B
- Regional Transit: $5B

Billions of 2007 Dollars

Scenario Consequences
Choosing a Preferred Alternative

- Newspaper & Web Survey
  - 570,000 surveys distributed along with a newspaper spread describing the Alternatives
  - 17,500 surveys returned by mail and website
Regional Vision Polling
The Public “Votes” On Its Preferences
Quality Growth Strategy

Composite Map
The Louisiana Speaks Regional Vision:

Overall Vision
Planning on the Ground

2100 South

Downtown Layton

West Jordan

4500 South
Local Workshops
Illustrative Plans
Regulating Plans and Model Codes
After
West Bench Master Plan
West Bench Master Plan
Vision California
1. Compile Regional and State-Wide Data

% Population change, 2006-2035
% Jobs change, 2006-2035
2. Develop Powerful Analytical Tools

Rapid Fire Model

Map-Based Tool
VISION CALIFORNIA | CHARTING OUR FUTURE
STATEWIDE SCENARIOS REPORT

This report accompanies the California High-Speed Rail Authority’s public release of the Vision California Rapid Feasibility modeling tool and is one of several initiatives that measure the impact of varying land use patterns, transportation investments, and policy directions on greenhouse gas emissions, air pollution, water and energy use, land consumption, and infrastructure costs. It provides a broad description of the Vision California project, and describes the Rapid Feasibility model, scenarios, and results. A detailed description of the Rapid Feasibility model can be found in the Rapid Feasibility White Paper and Technical Guide. More detailed information about the Vision California project can be found at visioncalifornia.ca.gov and at www.california.com/vision-california.

Vision California and Policy Context

Vision California is an unprecedented effort to explore the role of land use and transportation investments in meeting the environmental, local, and public health challenges facing California over the coming decades. Funded by the California High-Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) in partnership with the California Strategic Growth Council (SGC), the project is producing new scenario development and analysis tools to compare physical growth alternatives. By clearly expressing the consequences of different scenarios, Vision California can inform the public and policymakers who will make California’s infrastructure investments. The project’s tools and results can be used to impact local and regional policies and decisions, and to inform and update improvements to regional EMPS travel models.

Vision California will:

- Highlight the unique opportunity presented by California’s planned high-speed rail network in shaping growth and transportation investments.
- Examine California’s development issues in a comprehensive manner, illustrating the role land use in meeting greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction targets through travel modeling.
- Illustrate the connections between land use and other major challenges, including water and energy use, housing affordability, public health, land use planning, infrastructure provision, and economic development.
- Scathingly link land use and infrastructure priorities to mandated targets set forth by AB 32, SB 375, and the California Air Resources Board (CARB).
- Produce scalable tools for use by state agencies, regions, local governments, and the non-profit community, which can independently measure the impacts of land use and transportation investment scenarios.
- Build upon Blueprint and other regional plans to produce statewide growth assumptions that go beyond regional boundaries and assess the combined impact of these plans.
- Present data and numerical facts for energy independence, energy efficiency, and green job creation to land use and transportation investments.

Vision California is driven in part by the challenges set forth by the 2006 passage of the California Global Warming Solutions Act (AB 32), which sets aggressive targets for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions (GHGs). The project is designed to provide critical context for the implementation of Senate Bill 375 (SB 375) and land use-related SB 385 reduction targets for local governments, as it will illustrate and comprehensively measure the role of land use and SB 375-mandated regional “Sustainable Communities Strategies” in meeting AB 32’s GHG targets.

VISION CALIFORNIA | STATEWIDE SCENARIOS SUMMARY

HOUSEHOLD COSTS
More centrally located homes can dramatically reduce household energy cost by 54% per year, in auto-related costs and utility bills.

Over $6,000 saved per household on auto costs and utility bills.

INFRASTRUCTURE COSTS
Less road miles and urban development can save $36 billion per year more than $74,000 per household.

$44,000 saved per new housing unit, or $43.1 billion savings.

WATER
More compact development patterns can reduce urban water use by 15%, at homes and businesses. This leads to lower household utility bills, greater energy security, and fewer carbon emissions.

Seven less water in SB 385 cities.

BUILDING ENERGY USE
More compact development patterns can reduce urban energy use by 15%, at homes and businesses. This leads to lower household utility bills, greater energy security, and fewer carbon emissions.

Energy savings would power all homes in California for 3.2 years.

LAND CONSUMPTION
Less development patterns with exclude California’s urban forest by 2020, conserving more than 50,000 square miles of forest, open space, and agricultural lands. The Grover Strike scenario saves over 7,000 square miles of forest and for the reservoir.

Seven more land than Delaware and Rhode Island combined.

VEHICLE MILES TRAVELED (VMT)
Less development patterns can reduce urban VMT by 35%, taking 34 billion per year off California’s roads for the next 12 years.

VMT reduction equivalent to taking 67,000 cars off California’s roads.

FUEL CONSUMPTION
Reduced VMT in the Grover Strike scenario reduces automobile fuel consumption by nearly $40 billion per year. This saves the average California household $2,000 per year.

Fuel savings equivalent to nearly 2,000 years of oil imports to the US.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS
More compact development patterns, along with efficient cars and buildings, cleaner fuels, and a carbon-energy strategy, are all essential in reducing CCAE emissions. The Grover Strike scenario presents the potential to 30 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent in 2020, or 50% below 1990 levels in a future.

Savings equal to that of a 150,000 acre area in a year.

115,000 MGT CO2
150,000 MGT CO2
130,000 MGT CO2
112,000 MGT CO2

A new approach to greenhouse gas emissions in California.
# Rapid Fire Model

## Scenario Definition & Policy Options Selection

### 1. Define Scenarios

Enter values in cells below, or click button to restore default scenario definitions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Compact</th>
<th>Sprawl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trend</td>
<td>2005-2020 5% 25% 70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-2035 5% 25% 70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035-2050 5% 25% 70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Compact</th>
<th>Sprawl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Conservative</td>
<td>2005-2020 10% 40% 50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-2035 10% 40% 50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035-2050 10% 40% 50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Compact</th>
<th>Sprawl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Smart</td>
<td>2005-2020 20% 50% 30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-2035 20% 50% 30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035-2050 20% 50% 30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Compact</th>
<th>Sprawl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Ultra Smart</td>
<td>2005-2020 55% 55% 10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-2035 55% 55% 10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035-2050 55% 55% 10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 2. Select Policy Group Options

### TRANSPORTATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>ICE Vehicle Efficiency (mi/gal)</th>
<th>Alternative/Electric Vehicles</th>
<th>Battery Electric Vehicle Efficiency (mi/kWh)</th>
<th>Fuel Price ($/gal)</th>
<th>Transportation Fuel Emission Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>ICE Vehicle Efficiency (mi/gal)</th>
<th>Alternative/Electric Vehicles</th>
<th>Battery Electric Vehicle Efficiency (mi/kWh)</th>
<th>Fuel Price ($/gal)</th>
<th>Transportation Fuel Emission Rates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HOUSING UNIT GROWTH BREAKDOWN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Growth Category</th>
<th>Single Family Attached</th>
<th>Single Family Detached</th>
<th>Single Family Attached/MultiFamily</th>
<th>Total Attached/MultiFamily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Trend</td>
<td>2005-2020 54% 16% 70%</td>
<td>16% 14% 50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-2035 54% 16% 70%</td>
<td>16% 14% 50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035-2050 54% 16% 70%</td>
<td>16% 14% 50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Growth Category</th>
<th>Single Family Attached</th>
<th>Single Family Detached</th>
<th>Single Family Attached/MultiFamily</th>
<th>Total Attached/MultiFamily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Conservative</td>
<td>2005-2020 40% 21% 61%</td>
<td>21% 19% 40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-2035 40% 21% 61%</td>
<td>21% 19% 40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035-2050 40% 21% 61%</td>
<td>21% 19% 40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Growth Category</th>
<th>Single Family Attached</th>
<th>Single Family Detached</th>
<th>Single Family Attached/MultiFamily</th>
<th>Total Attached/MultiFamily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Smart</td>
<td>2005-2020 25% 24% 49%</td>
<td>25% 20% 51%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-2035 25% 24% 49%</td>
<td>25% 20% 51%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035-2050 25% 24% 49%</td>
<td>25% 20% 51%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Land Consumed
For New Growth to 2050 (mi²)

More land than Delaware and Rhode Island combined

5,600

3,750 square miles saved

1,850

Business As Usual  Growing Smart

California High Speed Rail Authority
Infrastructure Cost for New Growth
For New Growth to 2050

$24,000 Saved per New Housing Unit : $4.3 Billion/Year

*Includes local roads, waste water and sanitary sewer, water supply, and dry utilities

Flickr: sl-engineer

Business As Usual: $377.8 Billion
Growing Smart: $183.3 Billion

$194 Billion Saved*
Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)
Cumulative to 2050

Equivalent to taking ALL cars off California’s roads for 12 years

3.7 Trillion Miles Reduced

Flickr: trash-photography
Auto Fuel Consumed
Cumulative to 2050

Equivalent to more than 2 years of oil imports to the US

140 Billion Gallons Saved

California High Speed Rail Authority
Auto Fuel Cost
Cost Per Household in 2050

$2,600 Annual Savings Per Household in 2050
Building Energy
Cumulative to 2050

Would Power ALL Homes in California for 8 Years

6.6 Quadrillion BTUs Saved

Business As Usual  Growing Smart
Residential Water Use
Cumulative to 2050

Water Savings Could Fill Hetch Hetchy 50 Times

19 Million Acre Feet Saved

328.0 Million Acre Feet

309.0 Million Acre Feet

Business As Usual  Growing Smart
Annual Household Costs
Per Household Annual in 2050

More than $6,400 Savings Per Household in 2050

Flickr: Diablo_Solar
Greenhouse Gas Emissions
Annual in 2050

Emissions offset by 45,000 square miles of trees in a year.
A forest covering 1/4 of California.

71 MMT CO$_2$e Reduced/Year
Envision Bay Area

Rapid Fire Scenario Exercise
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Panelist Comments

Moderator:
• Steve Sanders
  Director, Land Use & Environment Program
  Institute for Local Government

Panelists:
• Ellen Griffin
  Public Participation Program Manager,
  Metropolitan Transportation Commission
• Jody Hall Esser
  Director of Planning & Development,
  Santa Clara County
• George Johnson
  Director, Transportation & Land Management Agency
  Riverside County
• Tim Snellings
  Director, Department of Development Services,
  Butte County
Update on Planning Grants Webinar

- **Webinar:** “Tools and Resources for Sustainable Community Planning at the Local Level” (2/16/10)
  Posted on ILG Web site:
  [www.ca-ilg.org/RegionalPlanning](http://www.ca-ilg.org/RegionalPlanning)

- **SGC Planning Grants solicitation released**
  Applications due August 30, 2010
  [www.sgc.ca.gov/planning_grants.html](http://www.sgc.ca.gov/planning_grants.html)
Furthering the Conversation – what’s next from ILG on Regional Planning?

Upcoming Publications:
– Guide to Regional Planning for Transportation  
  (*expected publication: early August*)
– Opportunities for Public Participation in Regional Planning  
  (*expected publication: Fall 2010*)
Feedback Welcome

Steve Sanders, Program Director
Land Use & Environment Program
ssanders@ca-ilg.org

Ken Loman, Program Manager
kloman@ca-ilg.org