SB 375

(from 30,000 feet)
Legal and Historical Context

• The Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (“AB 32”)
  – GHG
  – Back to the Future: 1990 in 2020
  – Power to ARB
AB 32 and SB 375

• “It will be necessary to achieve significant additional GHG reductions from changed land use patterns and improved transportation. Without improved land use and transportation policy, California will not be able to achieve the goals of SB 32.”
The Regional Transportation Plan

- Metropolitan Planning Organizations
- The RTP
  - “To encourage and promote the safe and efficient development, management and operation of surface transportation systems.”
Sustainable Communities Strategy

• The bedrock of SB 375
• Combining housing and transportation strategies
• Reaching the GHG emission target
SCS: GHG Target and ARB

- GHG target adopted by ARB
- Regional Targets Advisory Committee
- Get involved!
SCS: Public Input

- Informational meetings
- Public Participation Plan
SCS: Review and the APS

- ARB Review of the SCS
- The Alternative Planning Strategy
Regional Housing Issues

- Significant changes to current law = significant impacts
- Potentially significant penalties
CEQA

• Relief is limited
• Transit Priority Projects
• Sustainable Communities Projects
LAFCO?

- Adequacy of public services
- SB 375 influences population distribution and thus, levels of service
- Consistency considerations
- Regulating land use
Emerging Directions for the Bay Area’s Implementation of SB 375

Ted Droettboom
ABAG/BAAQMD/BCDC/MTC Joint Policy Committee
Premise: Transportation is Critical

Green House Gases Compared

Sources: USEIA, BAAQMD

World: Transportation: 14%

Bay Area: Transportation: 41%

Sources: USEIA, BAAQMD
Growing Cooler:
Compared to sprawl, compact development results in a 20 to 40 percent reduction in VMT and hence in CO₂
SB 375: A Matter of Interpretation
Putting it Together

Planning

Housing Elements

RHNA

FOCUSED GROWTH INITIATIVES

Interaction/Iteration

SCS

RTP

Investment Plan

APS

CEQA Assistance

RTAC

Implementation Qualities

- **Challenge** to *status quo* & business as usual
- **Integration**
  - ABAG & MTC
  - RTP & RHNA
  - Modeling and Planning
  - SB 375 and Other Initiatives
  - Bay Area and Surrounding Regions
- **Inclusion** of all those required to make it work
- **Momentum** building upon our current efforts
- **Impact** on actual emissions
Our Challenge

To achieve actual CO$_2$ reductions, not just forecast results and paper plans
More Information

The Joint Policy Committee

www.abag.ca.gov/jointpolicy
SB 375: So How Will It Work for LAFCO?
Friday, March 27, 2009
San Jose City Hall
Personal Background

José C. Henríquez

• Resident of Sacramento County since 1993

• Policy Analyst for Yolo County LAFCO (2003-2005)

• Executive Officer of El Dorado LAFCO (2005-Present)
SACOG Background

• The Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) is an association of local governments in the six-county Sacramento Region:
  – County of El Dorado
  – County of Placer
  – County of Sacramento
  – County of Sutter
  – County of Yolo
  – County of Yuba
SACOG Background
SACOG Background

SACOG

- Prepares the region’s long-range transportation plan
- Approves the distribution of affordable housing in the region
- Assists in planning for transit, bicycle networks, clean air and airport land uses
The SACOG Experience
The SACOG Experience
The SACOG Experience
The SACOG Experience

• In 2002, SACOG started the process for updating its Metropolitan Transportation Plan

• During this process, staff found a linkage between land use patterns and transportation investments

• If current land use patterns continued at the current pace, transportation funds would simply not keep up with congestion
The SACOG Experience

• Computer models were run to determine a “base case”
• Under the Base Case Scenario, growth would continue outward into largely rural areas and on the fringes of development
The SACOG Experience

• The Blueprint Project was initiated by the SACOG Board of Directors after it viewed regional computer modeling results showing that current growth patterns and transportation investment priorities would result in significant increases in congestion in the future.
The SACOG Experience

• SACOG partnered with Valley Vision to seek broad input from officials and the public

• SACOG and Valley Vision launched a series of workshops in March 2003

• A total of 37 workshops were held in neighborhoods, cities and counties throughout the SACOG region
The SACOG Experience

- An estimated 5,000 people had participated in the workshops and two regional forums between the project launch and April 2004.

- Input from the workshops helped create four distinct growth scenarios for further study:
  - “Hands on” small group sessions and interactive modeling software were used to study how the region might look under different land use scenarios.
The SACOG Experience
The SACOG Experience

- Three growth scenarios and the “Base Case” were created and became the focus of a Regional Forum in April 2004 that drew nearly 1,400 people.
- Asked to select a preference, Forum participants overwhelmingly rejected the Base Case in favor of alternatives providing:
  - A greater range of housing choices,
  - Reinvestment in already developed areas
  - Closer integration of jobs and housing
The SACOG Experience
The SACOG Experience
The SACOG Experience

• Following the Forum, a 1,300 person public opinion telephone poll on growth issues in the region was conducted
• The public opinion poll found strong support for the Blueprint growth principles in all six counties of the SACOG region
• City and county elected officials in the region were then invited to a first-ever Regional Summit to discuss a Draft Preferred Blueprint Scenario and the results of the Poll
The SACOG Experience

• The elected officials at the Summit also supported the growth principles found in the Preferred Blueprint Scenario for 2050

• On December 2004 the SACOG Board of Directors in December approved the Blueprint

• Three cities in the region have endorsed and adopted the Blueprint as their preferred growth model
DEVELOPMENT
Base Case Scenario for 2050
DEVELOPMENT
Preferred Blueprint Scenario for 2050
TRAFFIC CONGESTION
Preferred Blueprint Scenario for 2050

Traffic Approaching Capacity
Traffic Exceeding Capacity
The SACOG Experience

Wait....

Where’s El Dorado County??
The SACOG Experience

- The County of El Dorado’s General Plan was challenged in court at the time of the Blueprint workshops and Regional Forum
- El Dorado County elected not to participate in Blueprint
- Once the court battles ended in 2005, SACOG simply adopted the General Plan growth projections in its Blueprint Preferred Growth Scenario
Life After Blueprint

The Blueprint’s Preferred Scenario is the basis for SACOG’s

• Metropolitan Transportation Plan 2035
• RHNA Allocation 2012
• Rural-Urban Connection Strategies or RUICS (“an economic and environmental sustainability strategy for rural areas”)
Life After Blueprint

• Although endorsed by almost all governments within the SACOG region, the assumptions behind the Blueprint Preferred Growth Scenario have so far been challenged twice
  – Greenbriar Annexation (City of Sacramento)
  – Placer Vineyards (County of Placer)
Blueprint and LAFCO

- Yolo County LAFCO was an active participant in the local workshops and the Regional Forum
- El Dorado LAFCO did not actively participate in the process, although staff is now involved with the development of RUCS
Blueprint and LAFCO

Challenges with Implementation (Yolo County)

- Infrastructure in the unincorporated areas (water and wastewater, roads)
- Economic development
- Service deficiencies, especially with fire protection
- New FEMA maps puts half the county under a floodplain
Blueprint and LAFCO

Challenges with Implementation (El Dorado County)

- Infrastructure (roads)
- Water
- Lack of political buy-in and distrust
- Economic development
- Service deficiencies, especially with fire protection
- Political inclinations of the county and its residents
Blueprints and LAFCOs

LAFCO can be an effective partner because there is a significant amount of overlap between the LAFCO requirements (Government Code Section 56668) and the goals Blueprint is trying to achieve, which is targeted development to ensure:

• The economic viability of communities
• The protection of agriculture
• Smart growth patterns to maximize service efficiencies
COGs and LAFCOs

What LAFCOs can offer COGs

• Independent assessment of the health of an agency to provide services
  – Capability to extend services
  – Capacity to serve new customers

• A Blueprint implementation partner through the sphere of influence process and through annexations and reorganizations

• Get a sense of local government inclinations because of the makeup of commissions
COGs and LAFCOs

What COGs can offer LAFCOs

• Lend support for approval or denial of projects if proposal is inconsistent with Blueprint
• Macro-level demographic data
• Clearinghouse for regional issues
• Provide basis for supporting or developing spheres of influence and growth patterns based on road investments
COGs and LAFCOs

Questions?