



## 2025 Blueprint Discussion Scenario

### Information

**Author:** Zach Miller

**Attachments:** Yes

**Approved by:** James Corless

**Referring Committee:** Land Use & Natural Resources

### Issue:

As the region develops the 2025 Blueprint plan, staff has developed a Discussion Scenario as a potential path to 2050 that achieves the policy goals outlined in the board's Blueprint policy framework, would very likely achieve our greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions target, and is consistent with locally adopted land use and transportation plans. The board will ultimately determine whether the assumptions included in the 2025 Blueprint are feasible, meet regional objectives, and are a fair reflection of local planning and development priorities.

### Recommendation:

None; this is for information only. Staff is requesting that the board provide feedback on the Discussion Scenario and direction on what additional options or information the board wants to weigh before considering final adoption of land use assumptions in June, and final adoption of transportation investments in October.

### Background/Analysis:

#### Updating SACOG's Long-Range Plan

SACOG is undertaking an update to the region's Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS), known as the 2025 Blueprint. Ultimately, this plan will outline a set of transportation and land use strategies that achieve various federal, state, regional, and local policy objectives while taking into account real world financial, growth, and regulatory constraints. As a first step in the update process, in 2022 the board adopted a Policy Framework (see Attachment B) focused on the Triple Bottom Line goals of equity, economy, and environment. This framework has shaped the analysis, board discussions, public and stakeholder engagement, and development of the 2025 Blueprint.

A critical component of building the regional plan is balancing the many state and federal requirements governing the plan with goals that reflect our region's vision and values. The Triple Bottom Line policy framework is a useful way of understanding and dissecting the complex and interrelated nature of the many topics addressed in a comprehensive land use and transportation plan like the Blueprint. These topics include health standards for clean air under the federal Clean Air Act; identifying strategies for addressing ongoing

shortages in the production of affordable or attainable housing, addressing statewide climate goals; keeping transportation infrastructure in a state of good repair; and quantifying, monitoring, and working to reduce congestion and improve reliability of the transportation system.

An important element of the plan update is identifying how the region can achieve the 19 percent per capita GHG reduction target assigned to the region by the California State Air Resources Board (CARB) under Senate Bill (SB) 375. This element of the plan is referred to as the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) and is required to align transportation, housing, and land use decisions toward achieving GHG emissions reductions in line with the state climate policy. Achieving this target ensures the region remains eligible for key sources of state transportation funding and maintains streamlined environmental review for specific types of land use and transportation projects consistent with the plan. Attachment C includes a summary of funding sources that are at risk should the region fall short of the GHG reduction target. The SACOG board will ultimately determine whether achieving the target is feasible. Should the board act to adopt a set of plan assumptions and strategies that achieves the target, SACOG will submit the SCS to CARB for review and certification that, if implemented, the strategies and assumptions in the plan would allow the region to reduce GHG emissions in line with the state target. Should the board determine that achieving the target is not feasible, SACOG must produce an Alternative Planning Strategy (APS) showing how the target would be achieved through alternative development patterns, infrastructure, or additional transportation measures or policies. SACOG would also need to produce an APS if, upon submitting an SCS to CARB, the state determines through its technical review that the plan would not in fact achieve the target.

## ***Where We Have Been***

### **2025 Blueprint Process and Engagement to Date**

Since 2022, SACOG has undertaken a series of steps with multiple points of input to develop a long-range transportation and land use plan that is shaped by the board's adopted Triple Bottom Line and informed by the objective of achieving the region's GHG reduction target. These steps, outlined in more detail below, have aimed at ensuring the data and assumptions that support the plan are rooted in local planning, vetted by local agency staff and statewide experts, and informed by robust public outreach. These steps ensure that the plan reflects local agency and resident priorities and market conditions while also balancing state, federal, and regional imperatives.

#### **Adoption of Regional Growth Forecast**

For each plan update, SACOG prepares a long-range projection of regional population, employment, and household growth. For the 2025 Blueprint, the projections [adopted by the SACOG board in 2022](#) cover a timeframe from 2020 to 2050 and anticipate that the region will grow by nearly 600,000 people, 263,000 new jobs, and 278,000 new homes. This growth, while representing a slower growth rate than the previous plan, reflects the latest birth, mortality, and immigration data available. The growth forecast assembled by SACOG staff with support from the Center for the Continuing Study of the California Economy and a panel of statewide experts asserts that the region will remain among the fastest growing parts of California and will experience robust growth over the coming decades. The region is projected to add more than 8,000 jobs and 9,000 new homes annually, numbers not seen on a recurring basis since the early 2000s.

#### **Call for Transportation Projects and Local Agency Interviews**

SACOG staff conducted a call for transportation project nominations and a series of local agency kickoff meetings with local planning, department of transportation, and public works staff in late 2021 and into Spring 2022. SACOG received nominations for more than \$28 billion in transportation

investments including new or expanded roads and highways, light rail expansions, new transit vehicles, maintenance and rehabilitation, active transportation projects, and other programs. Additionally, SACOG interviewed all 28 member agencies about key development projects, changes since the last MTP/SCS update, and local policy priorities. Interview questions included a jurisdiction-specific conversation around where growth is occurring and will likely occur in the coming years, housing product type trends, recent policy change that could impact land use change, existing plan area absorption rates, and environmental, infrastructure, or regulatory constraints.

#### *Development of Base year, Buildout, and Community Type Geographies*

Over the course of 2020-2021, SACOG staff created a parcel-level 2020 base year (what existed in January 2020), buildout inventory (what is allowed to be built according to local general and specific plans or new plans in process), and pipeline inventory (projects that are under construction or about to break ground). These data form the guardrails for future land use assumptions in the 2025 Blueprint; in other words, staff assumes that any jurisdiction-specific growth between the years 2020-2050 will be an amount and type of growth somewhere between what exists today and what local governments currently allow in their general plans, specific plans, and pipeline projects.

SACOG worked with local staff to review and validate the base year and buildout inventories over a six-week period in January 2022. SACOG staff also made edits to the community type geographies in response to feedback from local staff and the SACOG board. The regional set of community types (the areas for which the land use assumptions are summarized) are summarized in Attachment D and are reflected in the linked interactive [Discussion Scenario map here](#).

While largely the same as what was included in the 2020 MTP/SCS, several of the changes reflect new local planning documents, green zone nominations for the Green Means Go program, annexations, transition of some developing communities to established communities (when more than 50 percent of the plan area is built out), and the disaggregation of developing communities into developing communities already under construction and potential developing communities not yet under construction.

#### *Development and Evaluation of Pathways*

To help inform the board's deliberations on land use and transportation decisions for the 2025 Blueprint, SACOG developed three pathways, or scenarios, that explore the many complex and intersecting growth issues facing the region. Between April 2022, and March 2023, SACOG worked with jurisdictional staff and the board to develop, revise, and evaluate three potential regional growth scenarios for the years 2020 to 2050. These pathways charted distinct land use futures, investment decisions, and underlying development economics. The Pathways development process included the following steps:

- **April-May 2022:** SACOG staff sent local government planners the pathway land use assumptions for a six-week review period. Planners were provided context as to the purpose of each pathway and asked to focus their reviews on the alignment of pathways with local market conditions, planning and policies, the availability of backbone infrastructure, and any other local conditions that would impact the distribution of growth across pathways. Examples of feedback included comments on increasing or decreasing growth in specific community types, whether growth aligned with current understanding of infrastructure phasing, and potential barriers to realizing each of the pathway development patterns.
- **July 2022:** Based on initial feedback, SACOG staff sent a set of revised pathway land use assumptions to local government planners for additional feedback and ground truthing.

- **August 2022:** Presentations to committees and board to discuss Pathways and a guest presentation from Cascadia Partners on the buildout inventory. ([Staff Report/Attachments, Presentation](#)):
- **February 2023:** Based on feedback from planners and the board, SACOG staff sent the [final Pathways land use assumptions](#) to local government planners.
- **March 2023:** Committees and board discuss evaluation of pathway land use performance metrics ([Staff Report/Attachments, Presentation](#))
- **June 2023:** Committees and board discuss evaluation of pathway transportation assumptions and performance metrics ([Staff Report/Attachments, Presentation](#))
- **October & November 2023:** Building on the lessons learned from Pathways, the board discussed the challenges of achieving the regional GHG target, the consequences of not achieving the target, and potential additional strategies (like pricing, school buses, and telework) the region can deploy to help reduce emissions from passenger vehicles.

#### *Development and Evaluation of Discussion Scenario*

SACOG staff used feedback from the public, local planners, the SACOG board, and analysis of the Pathways performance metrics to develop a Discussion Scenario that can be used by the SACOG board, partner agencies, and stakeholders to discuss how the region should grow over the next 25 years.

In August 2023, SACOG held a local planner workshop to discuss how the Pathways perform across the Triple Bottom Line goal metrics and key considerations as SACOG develops a single set of land use and transportation assumptions the plan. A Draft Discussion Scenario was then sent to local government staff for a six-week review period from September to October 2023. During this period, local staff were asked to provide comments related to things like new pipeline projects, key public investments related to new growth areas, potential barriers to realizing the assumptions, and infrastructure phasing. During this review period, SACOG received feedback through a regional workshop with local staff, five countywide “office hours” meetings, 10 individual jurisdiction meetings, and 11 comment letters or emails. While not all suggested changes were made to the Discussion Scenario, SACOG staff revised the Discussion Scenario assumptions to reflect local feedback and made minor adjustments to account for rebalancing to maintain the same regional growth projection and updated pipeline project assumptions. The April 2024, Discussion Scenario land use assumptions are detailed in Attachment A. The Discussion Scenario is described in more detail in the next section.

#### *Public Outreach and Engagement*

SACOG emphasized robust public input in the initial phase of plan development to ensure that residents’ vision for the region’s future is reflected in the 2025 Blueprint. This was conducted through polling, pop up workshops, surveys, focus groups, and a regional workshop which in combination reached more than 7,000 residents, elected officials, business leaders, and staff from every jurisdiction in the region. In March 2023, staff summarized the outcomes of this outreach in presentations to each of the SACOG board committees ([staff report](#) and presentation).

### **Discussion/Analysis:**

#### **Summary of Committee Discussion:**

Staff delivered this presentation to the Land Use and Natural Resources (LUNR) Committee on April 4, 2024. The committee had a robust discussion about the potential policy bases for the distribution of housing and jobs in the Blueprint. Members of the LUNR Committee expressed concern that many of the developing

communities included in, and some not included in the Discussion Scenario, show poor VMT and GHG performance because they are only being partially built out over the timeframe of the plan. Part of why the performance of these areas in SACOG's analysis is poor is the fact that the sum of all locally planned housing growth in developing communities greatly outnumbers SACOG's regional housing demand projection for 2050; there is more than 400,000 units of developing community housing capacity compared to a total of 278,000 additional units anticipated between 2020 and 2050. As a result, the current Discussion Scenario includes only partial buildout, frequently with only a small fraction of the total planned growth, for many developing communities. This small amount of initial growth is usually insufficient to achieve the mix, density, and intensity of land uses envisioned in project proposals that would be required to generate the lower VMT performance that many project specific traffic analyses indicate will be possible at buildout.

To address these concerns, staff offered additional options for how growth could be distributed within the developing communities in the Discussion Scenario such that growth could be focused in fewer new growth areas and concentrate on those with strongest likelihood to lower VMT. These options are described in more detail at the end of this staff report. The LUNR committee came to a consensus around further exploration of Option 3 which would assume more complete build outs of developing and potential developing communities by focusing the roughly 86,000 units in developing community growth from the Discussion Scenario into fewer new growth areas. Note that while the total growth forecast anticipates 278,000 housing units, roughly one-third or 86,000 units, is what is available to distribute to new growth areas in the region while remaining within striking distance of the region's GHG reduction target. Based on our analysis of Pathways, the region will need to plan for at least two-thirds of future growth to occur in Established Communities (those areas that are already more than halfway toward buildout) and Centers and Corridors (those areas most aligned with SACOG's Green Means Go program).

Pending further discussion and direction from the full board, SACOG staff is prepared to reach out to local staff for any further input, develop a revised set of land use assumptions, analyze this additional option at a sketch level, and return to the board in May to present the findings. Subsequently, staff can bring two options, the Discussion Scenario and an alternative option selected by the board, in June for consideration as the board acts to adopt one set of land use assumptions upon which the 2025 Blueprint will be based.

## **2025 Blueprint Discussion Scenario**

Based on what was learned from the Pathways analysis, staff has developed the Discussion Scenario as a potential path that achieves the policy goals outlined by the board in [policy framework](#), would very likely achieve our GHG emissions target, and is consistent with locally adopted land use and transportation plans. This month, the board will dive deeper into the assumptions and performance of the Discussion Scenario. Staff seeks board direction on what additional options or information the board wants to weigh before considering adopting final land use assumptions this June, and transportation assumptions this October.

The strategies and assumptions ultimately included in the Blueprint are, by design, intended to be both achievable and ambitious. They are achievable in that they are rooted in current local plans and policies and based on the latest data available, including recent development activity reported throughout the region, robust feedback from local government staff, and an assessment of national and statewide trends. They are also ambitious in that they are intended to outline a path towards achieving the Triple Bottom Line goals of equity, economy, and environment, including achieving our GHG emissions target. Programs like Green Means Go, technical and grant assistance, and other local regulatory reforms already underway, will be critical components of bridging the gap between the achievable and ambitious nature of the Blueprint.

The plan is not necessarily intended to reflect a growth outcome based on historical development patterns over the last 20 years or even the point-in-time demand of today's residents. Rather, the goal is to accommodate projected growth in a manner that achieves the Triple Bottom Line goals, meets our state and federal requirements, and respects the values and priorities of the communities within the region.

## ***Where We Are***

### **Performance of the Discussion Scenario**

Staff will dig deeper into the overall performance of the Discussion Scenario at the board meeting. However, some key highlights from testing thus far suggest that the scenario:

- Creates a path for achieving the 19 percent regional GHG reduction target. The Discussion Scenario shows that the region is within a single percent or less of achieving the GHG reduction target through a combination of location efficient land uses and transportation investments, and a handful of other strategies that were discussed by the board in the fall of 2023 and earlier this year.
- Creates access to 50,000 more jobs within a 30-minute drive of workers' homes; this is an increase of more than 12 percent from today. Workers living in environmental justice areas have access to even more jobs within a 30-minute drive.
- Doubles the number of homes in the region with access to high frequency (15 minutes or better) transit service, which would provide access to nearly four times as many destinations as measured by the number of jobs within a 30-minute transit ride of the average household. Homes in environmental justice areas see an even larger improvement.
- Maintains the share of trips by people taking modes other than driving alone at roughly 25 percent of commute trips and 56 percent of all trips. These numbers are roughly equivalent if not slightly higher than the region experiences today. Mode shift remains an important part of the long-range plan and will look different in different parts of the region with more dense areas seeing higher shares of residents choosing modes other than driving alone. The relatively modest shifts in mode choice are an indication of the importance of reducing trip distances to reduce emissions from automobiles as most of the region will remain in the driver's seat in the coming decades.
- While congestion grows, it would look similar to today despite the addition of nearly 600,000 new people. For comparison, congested travel makes up roughly 8.4 percent of vehicles miles traveled (VMT) today and increases to 8.9 percent in 2050 in the Discussion Scenario.
- Resident commute distances in the Discussion Scenario decrease from today with a growth pattern focusing on planning for jobs and homes closer to each other. An additional effect of the proximity of homes to jobs is a slight increase in the share of non-driving modes from about 12 percent today to 13 percent in the Discussion Scenario. While these changes may seem modest, at a regional level, they are significant in positively affecting the performance of the Discussion Scenario, a topic staff will dive into more at the board meeting.

### **Overview of Discussion Scenario Assumptions**

The April 2024 Discussion Scenario represents staff's attempt to be responsive to local feedback, outline a path to achieving the GHG reduction target, meet the reasonableness test by being in line with recent trends and planning assumptions, and balance the key Triple Bottom Line objectives of the [adopted](#)

[Blueprint Policy Framework.](#)

Key assumptions of the Discussion Scenario include:

- An ambitious regional growth projection of nearly 600,000 people, 263,000 jobs, and 278,000 homes between 2020 and 2050. The regional growth projection was formally adopted by the SACOG board in 2022. It is important to note that the assumed housing growth rate for the region, more than 9,000 homes built annually, is higher than 9 out of the last 10 years, based on completed permits.
- A distribution of housing growth that is in line with recent permitting trends, and a distribution of employment growth that assumes robust job growth outside of the traditional job centers of the region. See Table 1 for an illustration of the housing and employment assumptions in centers and corridors and established communities from Pathways and the Discussion Scenario as compared to recent trends.

**Table 1: Housing and Employment Distribution in Centers and Corridors and Established Communities (from least to most as a proportion of growth)**

<b>Housing Distribution (% in centers and corridors and established communities)</b>	Pathway 1 (42%)	Pathway 2 (65%)	Recent Trends (67%)	<b>Discussion Scenario (68%)</b>	Pathway 3 (88%)
<b>Employment Distribution (% in in centers and corridors and established communities)</b>	Pathway 1 (76%)	<b>Discussion Scenario (81%)</b>	Pathway 2 (82%)	Pathway 3 (89%)	Recent Trends (89%)

- A housing product type split that continues a trend towards more attached and small lot single family housing types. The Pathways explored futures where 32 to 41 percent of all homes in 2050 were attached. The Discussion Scenario assumes attached homes make up 37 percent of all homes in 2050, which falls between Pathway 1 and Pathway 2. This necessitates a higher proportion of new attached units than recent history in the SACOG region, but still less than the state average. The national trends towards more attached housing products, as reflected in the Discussion Scenario, were discussed in more detail at a consultant presentation provided at the March Land Use and Natural Resources Committee meeting ([staff report here](#), consultant presentation [video link here.](#))
- In addition to the land use assumptions detailed above, staff developed a preliminary list of transportation projects as part of the Discussion Scenario. Attachment G provides a list of all the transportation projects currently part of the Discussion Scenario.
- At a high level, the transportation project list incorporates all the latest updates to the previously nominated projects (nominated in 2022) and aligns those investments with the Discussion Scenario land use assumption to maximize performance. All projects nominated by transportation project sponsors were analyzed relative to a suite of performance metrics, including but not limited to satisfying demand from the land use development pattern in the Discussion Scenario, travel performance, existing congestion needs, location relative to land use growth and major job centers

in the Discussion Scenario, and consideration of current MTIP programming and sponsor priorities. It is important to note that this is a preliminary list of transportation projects for the plan and staff is currently engaging with transportation project sponsors through a process similar to that which was undertaken for the Discussion Scenario land use assumptions. The first phase of engagement and discussion with transportation project sponsors is currently underway and will continue through the first week of May. This engagement consists of a kickoff workshop for all project sponsors on March 21, one-on-one staff-to-staff meetings, and email and phone correspondence. Following board adoption of the land use assumptions, transportation project sponsor engagement will continue as staff works to refine the transportation network and develop a fiscally constrained transportation project list.

- The Discussion Scenario adds between 550 and 600 additional lane miles to the region's major roads and highways (an increase of about 5 percent) and more than doubles the hours of weekday transit service available to residents.

### **Key Considerations for the April 2024 Discussion Scenario**

The creation of the Discussion Scenario is a set of land use and transportation assumptions designed to achieve several policy-based and performance outcomes.

#### *A land use and transportation strategy that achieves the 19 percent GHG reduction target .*

The primary mechanism by which the Blueprint can plan for a reduction in GHG emissions from passenger vehicles is by shortening the distances people must travel on a daily basis to reach their destinations. In order to accomplish this, more growth must occur within the existing urban footprint of the region where the majority of people, jobs, housing, and other activities exist today. SACOG approximates this area by combining two of our regional community types (described in detail in Attachment D): centers and corridors and established communities. These areas include parts of every city/county and are where 90 percent of existing residents live. A key metric for understanding potential growth in the pathways and in the Discussion Scenario is the proportion of new housing that occurs in these centers and corridors and established communities areas.

Initial evaluation of the Pathways demonstrated that Pathway 3 (88 percent in centers and corridors and established communities) would very likely achieve the GHG reduction target and Pathway 1 (42 percent in centers and corridors and established communities) would not. Pathway 2, which most resembles the current MTP/SCS (65 percent in centers and corridors and established communities), likely would fall just short of the GHG reduction target for the SACOG region. This is due to a combination of factors, including: a slightly lower regional growth projection; a number of development projects in developing community areas breaking ground; and, despite robust growth in centers and corridors and established communities more generally, lagging housing production in several center and corridor communities.

As such, the Discussion Scenario explores a future with modest increases in the proportion of housing located in centers and corridors and established communities relative to Pathway 2 as a means of improving GHG performance while also balancing reasonableness factors (see description below), the Triple Bottom Line, and local feedback. The Discussion Scenario also explores ambitious employment growth outside of the region's urban core areas as a means of improving jobs-housing balance and lowering VMT in parts of the region that currently have fewer jobs, services, and destinations.

Meets the “reasonableness test” to ensure assumptions are achievable and acceptable by both state and federal government agencies.

SACOG worked to ensure the Discussion Scenario remained feasible by first aligning all assumptions with adopted and pending local general plans, specific plans, and master plans. Using the aforementioned buildout inventory, SACOG ensured that the Discussion Scenario is implementing local plans that are locally adopted or going through local entitlement. SACOG also inventoried all pipeline projects across the region that have already been built since 2020, are currently under construction, or are approved and have begun grading.

The Discussion Scenario also factors in historical permitting trends across jurisdictions, plan areas, and between centers and corridors, established communities, and developing communities. At a regional level, 67 percent of the housing permits in the last 5 years (2018-2022) have been in centers and corridors and established communities. The Discussion Scenario explores a future where 68 percent of the 2020-2050 growth occurs in centers and corridors and established communities—almost exactly in line with current trends. For a detailed spreadsheet of historical permitting trends see Attachment E. The Discussion Scenario also considers readiness factors for large, proposed projects, including market conditions and the presence of regulatory hurdles like annexation, state and federal permits, litigation, and local agency approvals. These factors are detailed in Attachment F.

Balances Policy Priorities

While achieving the GHG target is a key regional policy priority of the Discussion Scenario, there are a variety of other policy priorities in the [2025 Blueprint Policy Framework](#), which is oriented around the Triple Bottom Line of equity, environment, and economy. The Discussion Scenario attempts to optimize the land use assumptions in ways that maximize performance across the Triple Bottom Line while also balancing other considerations such as improving GHG performance, reasonableness factors, and local feedback.

Incorporates Local Feedback

As discussed above, SACOG received significant feedback from local agencies on the Draft Discussion Scenario land use assumptions last Fall. Local staff were asked to provide feedback that could help refine the assumptions, such as local agency priorities, growth trends, updates to pipeline projects, key public investments and infrastructure phasing related to new growth areas, and reasonableness factors (both regulatory and market). While much of the feedback was on the order of refinements to assumptions, a few jurisdictions requested significant shifts in their land use assumptions. These requests largely included shifts of housing growth from lower VMT-generating centers and corridors and established communities to higher VMT-generating developing communities not yet under construction.

The Discussion Scenario is intended to achieve the GHG reduction target, while balancing the other considerations (e.g., reasonableness factors and the Triple Bottom Line), in large part through a slightly more compact development pattern (68 percent in centers and corridors and established communities) than Pathway 2 (65 percent in centers and corridors and established communities), which we learned through the pathways process does not achieve the GHG reduction target. If SACOG applied all land use changes requested by jurisdictions to the Discussion Scenario, the Discussion Scenario would have less than 60 percent of housing growth in centers and corridors and established communities. In other words, it would be less compact than Pathway 2, and would not achieve the GHG target. Because these changes would both jeopardize the region’s ability to achieve its GHG target and would be out of line with recent trends, (i.e., 67 percent of the housing permits in the last 5

years have been in centers and corridors and established communities), SACOG tried to strategically accommodate only those local agency requests for which strong supporting evidence was provided. The aforementioned evidence included, but was not limited to, pipeline project information like tentative maps, infrastructure investments, or other metrics indicating project readiness. The April 2024, Discussion Scenario represent approximately 68 percent of housing growth in centers and corridors and established communities, which is both responsive to local feedback, has better GHG performance than Pathway 2, meets the reasonableness test by being in line with recent trends and planning assumptions, and balances key Triple Bottom Line policy objectives in the [adopted Blueprint Policy Framework](#).

## ***Where Are We Going***

As described above, the Discussion Scenario is intended to provide a single set of land use and transportation assumptions that meet the “reasonableness test,” is informed by the Triple Bottom Line, achieves the GHG reduction target for the region, and reflects local jurisdictional input and priorities. The board will need to ultimately determine whether the assumptions included in the 2025 Blueprint are feasible, meet regional objectives, and are a fair reflection of local planning and development priorities. To this end, the Discussion Scenario is the board’s first opportunity to discuss and provide direction to staff on a single set of assumptions for the plan, including any additional options or information the board wishes SACOG to bring for further consideration.

An important note for the board to consider in providing direction to staff: based on what we have learned from the Pathways effort and the GHG performance of the Discussion Scenario, it is very likely that any further shifting of housing from centers and corridors and established communities areas to developing communities will jeopardize the region’s ability to hit the GHG target.

This June, the SACOG board will consider adopting a set of land use assumptions for the 2025 Blueprint. In preparation for this action and based on review of the Discussion Scenario being presented this month, the board could request that staff bring forward additional options or information about how housing and jobs could be distributed – particularly in developing communities – for the plan based on policy and/or performance priorities. These options could include, but are not limited to:

- **Option 1: Proceed with Discussion Scenario.** Move forward with Discussion Scenario developed and presented to the board by staff.
- **Option 2: Prioritizing Performance.** Assume more of the overall growth for developing and potential developing communities will occur in those that have the strongest likelihood of lower VMT based on the Pathways analysis and other factors like adjacency to existing development and jobs/housing balance. The assumption is that this alternative would be comparable to the GHG performance of the Discussion Scenario since the total amount of growth in developing community areas would stay the same (roughly one-third of the total growth forecast through 2050);
- **Option 3: Prioritizing Build Out and More Complete Communities.** Assume more complete build outs of developing and potential developing communities but in fewer places. Prioritize those developing communities that have the strongest likelihood of lower VMT based on the Pathways analysis and other factors like adjacency to existing development and jobs/housing balance. The assumption is that this alternative would be comparable to the GHG performance

of the Discussion Scenario since the total amount of growth in developing community areas would stay the same (roughly one-third of the total growth forecast through 2050).

**Fiscal Impact/Grant Information:**

The 2025 Blueprint is funded by a combination of sources including Federal Metropolitan Planning funds, state Sustainable Communities Formula Program Funds, and Transportation Development Act-Local Transportation Funds. The Placer County Transportation Planning Agency and El Dorado County Transportation Commission also provide some funding to SACOG to support development of the 2025 Blueprint to assist with the planning activities, data development, and analysis that is necessary to ensure coordination and consistency between the regional plan and the county-level Regional Transportation Plans.