Timeline

2012 RTP Development Timeline

- Nov '10-Nov '11: Develop Financial Plan
- Nov '10-Apr '11: Perform Transportation Needs Assessment
- Feb '11-Sep '11: Develop Draft SCS
- May '11-Dec '11: Develop Draft PEIR
- May '11-Jun '11: PEIR Scoping Process
- Jul '11-Aug '11: Hold Transportation Strategy Workshops
- Jul '11-Aug '11: Hold Public Outreach Workshops
- Aug '11-Dec '11: Evaluate Transportation Alternatives
- Aug '11-Dec '11: Develop Draft RTP
- Oct '11-Nov '11: Hold SCS Workshops with Elected Officials
- DEC '11: Release Draft RTP/SCS/PEIR
- Dec '11-Jan '12: Draft RTP/SCS/PEIR Comment Period
- Apr '12: Adopt Final RTP/SCS/PEIR
- Jan '12: Hold Public Hearings
Where we’ve been

2012 RTP Development Timeline

- Nov '10-Nov '11: Develop Financial Plan
- Nov '10-Apr '11: Perform Transportation Needs Assessment
- Apr '11-Jul '11: Develop Transportation Alternatives
- Aug '11-Dec '11: Evaluate Transportation Alternatives
- Aug '11-Dec '11: Develop Draft RTP
- Feb '11-Sep '11: Develop Draft SCS
- May '11-Dec '11: Develop Draft PEIR
- OCT '10
- NOV '10
- DEC '10
- JAN '11
- FEB '11: Hold Data Gathering Planning Sessions
- MAR '11
- APR '11
- MAY '11: May '11-Jun '11 PEIR Scoping Process
- JUN '11
- JUL '11: Jul '11-Aug '11 Hold Transportation Strategy Workshops
- JUL '11: Jul '11-Aug '11 Hold Public Outreach Workshops
- AUG '11
- SEP '11
- OCT '11
- NOV '11: Hold SCS Workshops with Elected Officials
Scenarios for Southern California
Scenarios explore transportation and land development questions...

1. Should we grow up or out?

2. What type of homes should we build?

3. Invest more in roads or public transportation?

4. Bedroom communities, job centers, a balance?
...to understand how different futures might shape our lives, economy, and environment
Today’s Activities

1. Overview of the 2012 RTP Process
2. Discuss objectives that you feel the RTP should meet
3. Identify regional issues that matter most to you
4. Provide input on scenarios for addressing growth and transportation
Scenarios Snapshot
Greenfield vs. Infill / Reuse
New Development 2008-2035
Greenfield vs. Infill / Reuse
New Development 2008-2035

1. Greenfield: 72%
   Reuse: 28%

2. Greenfield: 83%
   Reuse: 17%

3. Greenfield: 88%
   Reuse: 12%

4. Greenfield: 93%
   Reuse: 7%
Development Proportions
New Growth 2008-2035

- Lower Density Auto-Oriented Suburban
- Mid-Density Walkable and/or Transit Oriented
- Higher-Density Transit-Oriented Infill
- Standard Urban Infill
- Mixed-Use Walkable Infill

COMMUNITY/NEIGHBORHOOD DESIGN

Auto-Oriented
Walkable

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
Standard

- Lower Density Auto-Oriented Suburban
- Mid-Density Walkable and/or Transit Oriented
- Higher-Density Transit-Oriented Infill

Source: www.skyscrapercity.com, Orange County, CA.
Standard

Lower Density Auto-Oriented Suburban

Mid-Density Walkable and/or Transit Oriented

Higher-Density Transit-Oriented Infill

San Bernardino

Irvine

Indio

Ventura County
Standard

Lower Density Auto-Oriented Suburban

Mid-Density Walkable and/or Transit Oriented

Higher-Density Transit-Oriented Infill

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
Mixed-Use Walkable

- Standard
- Lower Density Auto-Oriented Suburban
- Mixed Use Walkable and/or Transit Oriented
- Urban
- Higher-Density Transit-Oriented Infill
Mixed-Use Walkable

- Lower Density Auto-Oriented Suburban
- Mid-Density Walkable and/or Transit Oriented
- Higher-Density Transit-Oriented Infill

- Downtown Brea - Brea
- Mixed Use Complex – San Clemente
- Live Work Lofts – Newport Beach
- Depot Walk – Orange Metrolink Station
Mixed-Use Walkable
Urban

- Lower Density Auto-Oriented Suburban
- Mid-Density Walkable and/or Transit Oriented
- Higher-Density Transit-Oriented Infill

Examples:
- Broadway Arms - Anaheim
- The Village - Irvine
- Artist's Village – Santa Ana
Urban

Before

After

Lower Density Auto-Oriented Suburban

Mid-Density Walkable and/or Transit Oriented

Higher-Density Transit-Oriented Infill
Urban

Standard

Lower Density Auto-Oriented Suburban

Mixed Use

Mid-Density Walkable and/or Transit Oriented

Urban

Higher-Density Transit-Oriented Infill

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION of GO

COMMUNITY/NEIGHBORHOOD DESIGN

Auto-Oriented

Walkable
Development Proportions
New Growth 2008-2035

Standard Suburban

Lower Density Auto-Oriented Suburban 41%

Mid-Density Walkable and/or Transit Oriented 45%

Higher-Density Transit-Oriented Infill 14%

Mixed-Use Walkable

6%
75%
19%

Urban Infill

4%
73%
23%

1 2 3 4
Housing Product Mix
New Housing Units 2008-2035
Where is the long-term housing market headed?

Housing Demand Projections for Southern California: 2010 - 2035
Our Aging Population

SCAG Region, 2010 to 2035

Seniors

Over ½ the demand for new homes

In 2040 73% of all households will be without children

Note: Percentages do not add to 100% due to rounding

Source: SCAG, Local Input/General Plan Growth Forecast, March 2010
SCAG Housing Demand 2035

- New Units Needed by 2035

Source: AC Nelson. The Shape of Metropolitan California in the 21st Century: Outlook to 2020 and 2035
SCAG Planning Bottom Line 2035

Holding Large Lot Supply Constant

New Units Needed by 2035

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>Units Needed</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhouse</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Lot</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: AC Nelson. The Shape of Metropolitan California in the 21st Century: Outlook to 2020 and 2035
Housing Product Mix
New Housing Units 2008-2035

- Multifamily: 48%
- Townhome: 34%
- Small Lot Single Family: 22%
- Large Lot: 88%

Anticipated Demand:

1. 48%
2. 34%
3. 22%
4. 88%
Housing Product Mix
All Housing Units in 2035 (Existing + New)

- Multifamily
- Townhome
- Small Lot Single Family
- Large Lot

**Existing (2008)**

1. Multifamily: 36%
   - Townhome: 8%
   - Small Lot: 16%
   - Large Lot: 40%

2. Townhome: 35%
   - Small Lot: 19%
   - Large Lot: 38%

3. Small Lot Single Family: 39%
   - Large Lot: 31%

4. Large Lot: 40%
   - Townhome: 11%
   - Small Lot: 18%

5. Multifamily: 46%
   - Townhome: 8%
   - Small Lot: 14%
   - Large Lot: 32%
Transportation Investments
Types of Transportation Investments

1. Bus Rapid Transit
2. Light and Heavy Rail
3. High Speed Rail
4. **Highway Expansion:**
   1. Lanes
   2. Carpool / Hot Lanes
   3. Interchange Improvements
5. Local Arterial Improvements
6. Transportation System Preservation
7. Truck Ways
8. Freight Rail Improvements
9. **Operation and Maintenance:**
   - Highway and Arterials
   - Transit
10. Bike and Pedestrian Facilities
11. Transportation Demand Management Investments
12. Transportation System Management Investments
Types of Transportation Investments

Build 2035 Fixed-Guideway Transit Network (2008 RTP)

Regional transit ridership growth since 2000

20%
Types of Transportation Investments

Existing Rapid and Express Bus Network (2008)

Buses still carry the majority of transit trips

86% and boardings continue to grow

We need to continue investing in these strategies

Image courtesy of Metro © 2012 LACMTA
Types of Transportation Investments

Existing Bikeways

43% of our population has access to a bikeway

(access defined as ½ mile from a bikeway)

We need to expand our bike network to improve accessibility
Types of Transportation Investments

Transportation Demand Management (TDM)

1% reduction in vehicle miles traveled

54 million fewer gallons of gasoline each year
Scenarios Snapshot
How The Scenarios Compare
Land Consumed

Square Miles
Land Consumed

Square Miles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Land Consumed (Square Miles)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Local Infrastructure Costs
Capital & Operations & Maintenance Costs for New Growth, 2008-2035

Includes capital costs and general fund O&M expenditures for local roads, wastewater and sanitary sewer, water supply, and parks & recreation
Local Infrastructure Costs

Capital & Operations & Maintenance Costs for New Growth, 2008-2035

Includes capital costs and general fund O&M expenditures for local roads, wastewater and sanitary sewer, water supply, and parks & recreation.
Vehicle Miles Traveled

Annual per household, 2035
Vehicle Miles Traveled

Annual per household, 2035

1. 20,924
2. 18,630
3. 18,254
4. 17,994
Fuel Consumption

Billions of Gallons, 2035
Fuel Consumption
Billions of Gallons, Annual, 2035
Household Costs

Annual Costs for Transportation, Building Energy, and Water, 2035
Household Costs
Annual Costs for Transportation, Building Energy, and Water, 2035

2009 Dollars

$15,500
$15,000
$14,500
$14,000
$13,500
$13,000
$12,500
$12,000

1 $15,120
2 $13,620
3 $13,370
4 $13,150
Greenhouse Gas Emissions
Annual Emissions from Buildings and Auto Transportation, 2035
Greenhouse Gas Emissions
Annual Emissions from Buildings and Auto Transportation, 2035

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Autos (MMT CO₂e)</th>
<th>Buildings (MMT CO₂e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>96.1</td>
<td>87.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>86.1</td>
<td>84.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>84.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>84.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Building Energy Use

Trillion BTU, 2035
Building Energy Use
Trillion BTU, Annual, 2035

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trillions</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>746</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Building Energy Use
Trillion BTU, Annual, 2035

Equivalent to powering XX homes in Southern California for a year

- 960,000 homes  1.2 million homes  1.4 million homes
Water Consumption
Acre Feet (Annual in 2035)
Water Consumption

Acre Feet (Annual in 2035)

1. 3.06
2. 2.91
3. 2.90
4. 2.86

Millions of Water Consumption (Acre Feet)
Respiratory Health Impacts
Cost reduction from status quo due to health incidents, Annual in 2035
Respiratory Health Impacts
Cost reduction from status quo due to health incidents, Annual in 2035

Billions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cost (Million)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Orange County Sustainable Communities Strategy

Hon. Kris Murray

Orange County Council of Governments
Creating Orange County’s SCS

- Framing the Effort
  - SB 375
  - SCAG/OCCOG/OCTA MOU

- Input and Sources
  - OCP-2010
  - Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP)
  - OCCOG Board, Joint OCCOG/OCTA Committee, OCCOG TAC

- OC SCS Stakeholders/Public Outreach
Guiding Principles of the OC SCS

- Use a Collaborative, Bottom Up Approach
- Acknowledge our History of Sustainable Planning and Linkage of Transportation and Land Use
- Respect Local Control
The OC SCS

- Addresses all required elements of SB 375 and SCAG’s Framework and Guidelines
- 15 distinct land use and transportation Sustainability Strategies
- More than 200 Sustainability Practices enumerated in the OC SCS
- SCAG will incorporate OC SCS as transmitted
Objectives for the Regional Transportation Plan

Group Discussion
RTP Objectives: what should the plan work to accomplish?

1. What **Mobility / Accessibility** objectives should we strive for?

2. Environmental, Health and Community objectives?

3. Which **Modes** of Travel?

4. Fiscal and Economic objectives?

5. Safety outcomes?

6. Environmental Justice outcomes?

7. Other objectives?

Group Discussion
Potential Objectives for the 2012 RTP

Mobility
1. Reduce the need to travel long distances
2. Reduce commute times
3. Keep drives at or near the posted speed limit, reduce congestion
4. Make commutes more predictable and reliable

Environmental, Health and Community Impacts
8. Reduce demand for fossil fuels
9. Reduce air pollutant emissions for better public health
10. Reduce demand for development at the edge of the region
11. Encourage revitalization of existing communities and infrastructure

Modes of Travel
18. Create more travel choices in more places: driving, riding, walking, biking
19. Enable more people to ride public transportation
20. Enable more people to walk and bike for daily needs
21. Serve more parts of the region with high capacity roadways

Fiscal and Economic Considerations
23. Help our economy thrive and be resilient (e.g., despite energy price spikes)
24. Keep governmental transportation expenditures low
25. Minimize household transportation expenditures (how much it costs me to get around)
26. Prioritize the most cost effective transportation investments
27. Improve the movement of freight through the region

Safety
31. Improve safety for people who walk, take transit, or bike
32. Improve safety for drivers

Environmental Justice
35. Help all residents, not only drivers, get around
36. Avoid disproportionate impacts on lower income communities

Other
39.
40.
41.
42.
43.
Group Discussion Steps

1. Add to an initial list of objectives for the RTP

2. Individually, place a large dot next to your top priority objective

3. Discuss as a group

4. Individually, place 6 small dots based on your priority objectives

5. Identify your group’s overall priorities to be shared
Ground Rules

1. Be respectful of each other’s right to be heard

2. Focus on related topics to the regional transportation plan

3. Your facilitator is neutral

4. Feel free to also record your personal ideas on comment cards
Keypad Polling
Have you ever lied to your mother?

0%  1. Never…Honest!

4%  2. Only once and I paid for it dearly.

25% 3. Only a couple of times.

0%  4. Yes, but I was young and candy was involved.

21%  5. I prefer to call it a “stretching of the truth”

29%  6. Only when it was in her best interest.

4%  7. Yes, but my brother/sister made me do it!

17%  8. Too many times to count!
A few preliminary questions...
## II. Which part of the region do you live in?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coachella Valley</th>
<th>Orange County</th>
<th>Ventura County</th>
<th>Western Riverside</th>
<th>South Bay Cities</th>
<th>San Bernardino County</th>
<th>San Gabriel Valley</th>
<th>Westside Cities</th>
<th>Gateway Cities</th>
<th>Los Angeles City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### III. Which part of the region do you work/go to school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1. Coachella Valley</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>2. Orange County</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3. Ventura County</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4. Western Riverside</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5. South Bay Cities</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6. San Bernardino County</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7. San Gabriel Valley</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8. Westside Cities</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9. Gateway Cities</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10. Los Angeles City</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. What is the first most important priority in Southern California?

1. Economy - 57%
2. Environment - 7%
3. Housing - 4%
4. Infrastructure - 7%
5. Public Health - 18%
6. Social Equity - 7%
7. Transportation - 0%
V. What is the second most important priority in Southern California?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Equity</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VI. Which statement best describes your daily commute?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72%</td>
<td>1. I primarily drive alone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2. I primarily walk or bike to common destinations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3. I primarily carpool.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4. I primarily use public transportation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5. I do not commute.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VII. Which statement describes your access to transportation options?

1. I drive; little access to transit
2. I have some access to transit but choose to drive
3. I have adequate access to transit and do not drive
VIII. What is the biggest barrier to using public transportation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Barrier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31%</td>
<td>1. Does not stop near my home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28%</td>
<td>2. Does not go where I need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24%</td>
<td>3. Does not come frequently enough or run late enough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4. Too crowded, I do not enjoy riding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5. Too expensive for my budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6. None of the above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transportation Investments
Investment in Roads and Transit

FY2007 to 2036

Public Transportation

Debt Service

Other

Highways

Source: 2008 RTP

Summer Outreach Workshop
IX. The RTP should invest most of its money into roads and highways.

1. Strongly Agree: 7%
2. Agree: 21%
3. Neither Agree nor Disagree: 24%
4. Disagree: 31%
5. Strongly Disagree: 17%
X. The RTP should invest in a mix of transportation options, including road, highway, rail transit, express bus and bicycle/pedestrian.

1. Strongly Agree: 45%
2. Agree: 38%
3. Neither Agree nor Disagree: 7%
4. Disagree: 10%
5. Strongly Disagree: 0%
XI. The RTP should invest most of its money into rail transit, express bus and bicycle/pedestrian.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>1. Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21%</td>
<td>2. Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18%</td>
<td>3. Neither Agree nor Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18%</td>
<td>4. Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18%</td>
<td>5. Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Driving Distances in Southern California

- Daily VMT per person (16+)

YEAR:
- 1969
- 1977
- 1983
- 1990*
- 1995
- 2001
- 2009

DISTANCE:
- 0
- 5
- 10
- 15
- 20
- 25
- 30
- 35
Traffic improvements can be difficult to sustain...

Transportation Investment

"I can start my commute at 8:00 again"

"I'll start taking the freeway again"

"I'll buy that home even though it's further from work"

"I'll take that job across town"

Congestion Returns?
Two Approaches to Improve Mobility
(the time it takes to get from A to B)

• Create faster ways to get from A to B…

• Bring A closer to B…
Spectrum of Strategies for Mobility

Adding Supply
- New cross town routes
- New lanes
- Carpool lanes
- Telecommuting
- Development near transit
- Walkable communities
- New homes in job centers

Reducing Demand
XII. The RTP should focus relatively more on expanding ways to travel more quickly, or reduce distances traveled?

1. Expand Mobility (expand roads and transit) 4%

2. Balance between 1 and 3 59%

3. Focus most on reducing distances traveled 37%
Balancing Jobs With Housing?
Residents that work in home county

Opportunities to Work Near Where We Live
Growth’s Impacts Vary By Location

County by County Driving Distances

VMT per household per day

Los Angeles
Ventura
Orange
Riverside
San Bernardino
Imperial
XIII. Encourage more employment growth in or near residential communities.

1. **Strongly Agree**
   - 32%

2. **Agree**
   - 50%

3. **Neither Agree nor Disagree**
   - 7%

4. **Disagree**
   - 11%

5. **Strongly Disagree**
   - 0%
XIV. Encourage more residential growth in or near employment centers.

1. Strongly Agree  48%
2. Agree  48%
3. Neither Agree nor Disagree  0%
4. Disagree  3%
5. Strongly Disagree  0%
Housing Choices?
The Impacts of New Housing

New Homes by Housing Type
2010 to 2035

Development on Greenfields

Household fuel and auto, energy, and water costs
XV. To accommodate the region’s future population, new housing development and housing types in the coming decades should be primarily...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Housing Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4%</td>
<td>Large Lot Detached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26%</td>
<td>Small Lot Detached</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37%</td>
<td>Townhouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33%</td>
<td>Multi-Family Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transit Oriented Development?
Today, **47%** of households live where they can choose to bike to high capacity transit.

About **8%** live a short walk from transit.

Areas with the option of biking or walking to transit include:

- Ventura
- Los Angeles
- Orange
- Riverside
- San Bernardino
- Imperial
- Ventura
- Los Angeles
- Orange
- Riverside
- San Bernardino
- Imperial
Coordinating Growth with Transit

• Following same household, after moving next to transit...

• 10 fewer miles driven

• 25% lower commute expenses
XVI. Future development of employment centers and commercial areas should mostly occur in:

1. Standard Suburban Areas: 7%
2. Part Standard, Part Mixed Use Walkable: 21%
3. Mixed Use Walkable: 29%
4. Part Mixed Use Walkable, Part Urban: 39%
5. Urban Areas: 4%
XVII. Future development of residential areas should mostly occur in:

1. Standard Suburban Areas - 11%
2. Part Standard, Part Mixed Use Walkable - 21%
3. Mixed Use Walkable - 29%
4. Part Mixed Use Walkable, Part Urban - 36%
5. Urban Areas - 4%
Scenario Next Steps

- Concepts will be refined and further tested
- The most effective and supported ideas will become a draft combined scenario
- A preferred scenario, or Sustainable Communities Strategy, will be integrated with the 2012RTP
Stay Involved in the 2012 Plan

Present: July - August 2011
- Public Outreach Workshops

Fall 2011
- Workshops with Local Elected Officials

December 2011
- Release of Draft Plan

December 2011 - January 2012
- Public Hearings

April 2012
- Adoption
THANK YOU!

2012 RTP/SCS
PUBLIC OUTREACH WORKSHOP