



SACOG Board of Directors

Item #06-4-28
Receive/File

April 13, 2006

Housing Allocation for 2030 Blueprint Map

Issue: This is a status report on preparing the draft land use allocations for growth in jobs and housing that will be one of the foundations for the next Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP).

Recommendation: The Committee received and filed this item.

Committee Action/Discussion: The first draft of projected growth in dwelling units by jurisdiction is attached. We will bring draft employment growth numbers to the Committee next month. Some version of these numbers, and accompanying map, will need to be adopted by the SACOG Board before the MTP process is completed. We are working with air quality officials to determine when a final decision must be made: at the moment the earliest date appears to be summer this year, the latest date January of 2007. Expressed in engineering terms the SACOG planning staff describes this first set of numbers as about 75% complete. We expect some movement within sub-areas of the region as we receive more detailed feedback over the next few months. Staff is seeking questions and comments from the Land Use & Housing Committee members as part of this feedback process, as well as direction from the Committee regarding when and how to involve the full Board in this process.

Some caveats about these numbers to remember:

- The total growth in houses must equal the Board's adopted growth forecast for the region - and to date the growth estimates from the individual jurisdictions sum to more housing than the regional growth forecast.
- The land use allocation must represent the most realistic estimate of what is actually going to be built - meaning it must be grounded both in market realities and where the local, state and federal policy/regulatory environment is headed in the future.
- Local governments are not bound by these estimates - for instance, a local government that aspires to more housing growth than is included in the regional numbers certainly is not precluded from pursuing that goal.
- However, while the numbers are not regulatory in nature, they also are not intended to be meaningless - the investment priorities in the MTP should be optimized to best serve the projected land use pattern.
- One way to avoid putting too much heat (at the expense of sufficient light) on these numbers is to also test the effectiveness of the MTP investment strategy against the adopted 2050 Blueprint growth map - presumably the 2030 growth allocations are but an interim step on the path of achieving that 2050 growth pattern.
- The analysis for many transportation investments only makes sense under "build-out" land use conditions. For example, it is reasonable to design the ultimate right-of-way needs for roads and transit for the new growth areas for build-out conditions, not some growth number part way through the absorption process. Some of our more detailed travel modeling will be responsive to these dynamics.
- Dates, dates, dates. When we started the MTP process we intended the "planning year" to be 2030. Since that time the federal Transportation Bill has been reauthorized and we have a better understanding of how the new 8-hour federal clean air rules will work. As a result, the planning year needs to change to 2032. The attached numbers reflect this change. We will also need to prepare interim growth allocations for 2013, 2019 and 2024 to meet air quality requirements.

Approved by:

Mike McKeever
Executive Director

MM:ts

Attachment

Key Staff: Kenneth Hough, Director of Community Planning & Operations, (916) 340-6229
Kacey Lizon, Associate Planner, (916) 340-6265

PRELIMINARY DRAFT 2032 Growth Allocation
DRAFT 3-29-2006

Blueprint Subarea	2032 First Draft	2032 Growth as % of 2050 Growth	2050 Preferred Alternative
	Dwelling Units 2002-2032		Dwelling Units 2002-2050
El Dorado County			
Placerville	4,000	74%	5,400
El Dorado County	31,900	146%	21,800
Total	35,900	132%	27,200

Placer County			
Auburn	4,000	74%	5,400
Colfax	400	33%	1,200
Lincoln	32,900	67%	48,900
Loomis	1,100	73%	1,500
Rocklin	10,400	93%	11,200
Roseville	35,400	86%	41,300
SW Placer County	31,800	68%	46,900
Balance of Uninc. Cty.	5,500	71%	7,800
Total	121,500	74%	164,200

Sacramento County			
Northern Sac (City)	43,100	65%	66,400
Central Sac (City)	31,900	67%	47,700
Southern Sac (City)	20,000	65%	30,800
Total for City of Sacramento	95,000	66%	144,900
Delta	1,800	60%	3,000
Elk Grove	41,700	97%	43,100
South County	0	0%	3,100
Galt	3,800	52%	7,300
East County (w/in USB)	31,800	69%	46,400
Rancho Cordova community	74,500	66%	112,300
Arden Arcade/Car/FO/OV	8,500	53%	16,000
East/Southeast County	3,600	54%	6,700
Folsom	18,100	74%	24,400
Citrus Heights	5,300	48%	11,000
Rio Linda/McClellan	23,500	60%	39,100
N. Natomas Vision Area	19,800	48%	41,400
Airport/Air Park	0		0
Total	327,400	66%	498,700

Sutter County			
Live Oak	3,000	60%	5,000
Yuba City	13,800	51%	27,000
South Sutter	4,300	51%	8,500
Sutter Uninc.	0		0
Total	21,100	52%	40,500

Yolo County			
West Sacramento	29,800	69%	43,500
Davis	6,700	49%	13,600
University	1,500	79%	1,900
Woodland	9,900	61%	16,300
Winters	2,700	90%	3,000
New City	0		0
Yolo Uninc.	3,100	65%	4,800
Total	53,700	65%	83,100

Yuba County			
Marysville	1,300	48%	2,700
Wheatland	6,700	64%	10,500
Plumas Lakes	10,500	89%	11,800
Uninc. Yuba County	7,500	125%	6,000
Total	26,000	84%	31,000

REGIONAL TOTAL	585,600	69%	844,700
-----------------------	----------------	------------	----------------