



SACOG Board of Directors

Item #07-3-16 Report

March 8, 2007

Executive Director's Report

The following is a brief status report on some of the major issues and projects currently being advanced by SACOG.

KEY BOARD ITEMS:

OWP: This is a first draft of the Overall Work Program for the year. It is important that we pass this, or an amended version of it, to be sent out for public review at the March meeting. However, as we told all four Board committees, this is very much still a fluid document and significant changes can be made before final adoption in May. After this MTP cycle ends, we also can re-open this document in mid-year if the Board wishes. (Item #8)

STIP Augmentation and other programming: At staff's recommendation and the Board's direction we are at the finish line of another mad dash of programming. As far as it looks from staff's vantage point we have a great batch of projects to move forward with and another good batch in the wings for programming in the fall. We are most appreciative to the City and County of Sacramento, in particular, for being willing to defer programming on some high priority projects of theirs until the fall so that others that are ready to go a few months sooner can proceed now. (Item #10)

Environmental Justice Outreach: This workshop will be much shorter than the one last month on the public opinion poll and focus groups, but there is important new information that has come from the five focus groups with different populations held throughout the region over the last few weeks. I know the Board will find the differences and similarities between how some of these segments of our population approach transportation issues compared to the general population to be interesting and useful in development of the MTP. (Item #12)

MTP: The only substantive action we are asking from the Board on the MTP is to approve a slightly amended, and slower, adoption schedule for the MTP. We will begin in earnest in the April Committee and Board cycle to develop the public review draft of the project list for the new MTP. (Item #11)

ISSUES:

Draft Amendment #4 to 2007/09 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP): This was approved by the Board at its December 2006 meeting and submitted to Caltrans, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) in early January. Amendment #4 has not yet received federal and state approval. FTA and FHWA have reiterated their conditional approval of the 2007/09 MTIP into the 2007 California Federal Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (FSTIP). The federal agencies withheld approval of Sacramento Regional Transit District (RT) projects proposed for inclusion in federal fiscal years (FFY) 2007/08 and 2008/09. Only projects in FFY 2006/07 received federal approval. The approval was withheld pending SACOG's determination that Regional Transit's updated Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP) complies with 23 CFR 450.310, which requires SACOG to fulfill the terms of its Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with transit operators, including RT. The MOU requires that a current Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP) be prepared. SACOG and RT staff have been working together to address the federal agencies' concerns by preparing an update to RT's SRTP. The RT Board approved the SRTP update on February 26, 2007. Our staff is reviewing that document post haste to determine whether it will satisfy the federal requirements and, if not, what further refinements may be needed. Until SACOG and the federal agencies sign off on that document, SACOG is prohibited from amending funding for RT projects. We are optimistic that all this will be resolved in the next few

weeks and RT will be able to get all of its deferred projects funded in the final MTIP amendment of this year, expected in April/May.

TDA Triennial Audits: Proposals for the TDA Triennial Audits of SACOG, the Sacramento Regional Transit District & Paratransit, Inc., and the Smaller Transit Operators were due to SACOG on February 21, 2007. One proposal for both the SACOG and Sacramento Regional Transit District & Paratransit, Inc. audits were received, so the proposing consulting firm Majic Consulting Group was selected. Four proposals were received for the Smaller Transit Operators project; the proposals were analyzed and scored by the smaller transit operators and SACOG staff; and JKaplan & Associates was selected for the project.

Update on Prop 1B Corridor Mobility Improvement Program: By now all of you know which projects were funded through the \$4.5 billion CMIA account of the state transportation bonds. For the 6-county region the results were pretty good. Although we are disappointed that not more projects from the SACOG high priority list were funded, we are thankful that the White Rock Road project was added on the last day by the California Transportation Commission, and have a number of reasons to believe that the I-80 carpool lanes from the river to Longview, while not receiving CMIA funding, are favored by both the CTC staff and commissioners as well as the Governor and Caltrans and that in subsequent rounds of funding we will find a way to get that project funded. There was a good deal of collaboration demonstrated through this process – among the local governments in the six counties, between SACOG and our regional legislative delegation, and between the public agencies and the private sector. We owe a particular debt of gratitude to Matt Mahood, Director of the Metro Chamber, for leading the region's testimony at a pivotal CTC hearing in Sacramento.

RECEIVE & FILE ITEMS: These items were informational items sent through the committee cycle. If you have any questions, please call me prior to the meeting. Backup material for each item is attached and any of these items can be discussed during Other Matters, if the Board so chooses.

1. Update on Floodplain Status Report
2. Metropolitan Transportation Plan 2035 Draft Interim Year Land Use Allocation
3. Update on Employee Benefits Program Addition
4. 2007 Delivery Plan

CALENDAR:

Apr 5 @ 10:00 a.m.	Transportation Committee	SACOG
Apr 5 @ 1:30 p.m.	Government Relations & Public Affairs	SACOG
Apr 9 @ 10:00 a.m.	Housing, Land Use & Air Quality	SACOG
Apr 9 @ 1:30 p.m.	Flood Management	SACOG
Apr 19 @ 9:00 a.m.	SACOG Board of Directors	SACOG

Mike McKeever
Executive Director

Attachment

MM:rt



Update of Floodplain Status Report

SACOG staff, with the help of floodplain managers throughout the region, has updated a report on the status of local flood control activities in the region and how it may affect the implementation of Blueprint and the Metropolitan Transportation Plan.

At the time the status report was written last year, FEMA had just started issuing Preliminary Flood Insurance Rate Maps in the region as part of their Map Modernization process. There were also relatively few levee evaluations completed or started, and those that were completed found that they currently have less than a 100-year level of protection. The status of the levees and FEMA activities suggested that development in many flood-prone areas could be stalled when FEMA's final maps are promulgated.

Two issues provided some hope that development would not be affected by FEMA's maps. First, preliminary maps are advisory and do not affect certification status; therefore, a governing body has the discretion to allow development to proceed. Second, final maps were supposed to be issued up to five years after preliminary maps, giving jurisdictions time to conduct evaluations, create levee improvements plans, and identify funding in order to avoid stringent development regulations.

Recently, at the urging of the Department of Water Resources, FEMA accelerated issuing a final map for the Natomas basin under the Physical Map Revision process. That map will now take effect in November 2007. While FEMA has not yet suggested using this process for other jurisdictions, its approach to mapping Natomas may set precedent for other locations. Though levee evaluations are now underway in many jurisdictions, a lack of plans and funding for levee improvements may result in areas being placed in a Special Flood Hazard Area if final mapping is accelerated. This would create a de facto building moratorium in many parts of the region due to the building elevation requirements that would apply to those areas.

Attachment

S:\SACOG\BRDPCKTS\2007 Packets\March\RF1-Status report.doc 0700601

Yuba County Floodplain Status

February 14, 2007

Plumas Lake, Linda, Olivehurst

Levee Status

Levees around the South Yuba County basin (RD 784) have been studied extensively. The levees currently are not certified as having 100-year level of protection due mainly to the discovery of underseepage problems. The Three Rivers Levee Improvement Authority (TRLIA) continues to implement the levee improvement plan for the basin that addresses the underseepage concerns and will bring it to a 200-year level of protection. TRILA has completed improvements along the north, east, and south levees of the basin and is seeking Corps approval and FEMA 100-year certification. TRILA expects to complete the Feather River improvements in 2008, particularly if proposition 1E bond funding is received. In April 2006, the State Reclamation Board voted to allow the county to increase the annual number of building permits allowed in the basin in order to facilitate the completion of the project.

FEMA Status

Last year FEMA released Preliminary Flood Insurance Rate Maps assigning mainly “A” and “AE” designations across the basin, which would require that the first floor of new buildings be at or above base flood elevation and property owners carry flood insurance for all existing and future dwelling units. Such a designation could essentially stop development in many areas within the basin if it were to become final since it is impractical to raise buildings above the BFE beyond a certain depth.

The preliminary “A” and “AE” designations were assigned to RD 784 despite the county’s significant progress in improving the levees and having a plan to get to approximately 200-year level of protection. One of FEMA’s considerations in making the designation is that the levee improvements are not a federal project (i.e., the levees are not being built by the Corps and the funding is not from federal sources). County staff and TRILA are seeking re-consideration of the preliminary map designations to include levee improvements and planned future work in order to assign at least an “A99” status to the basin. Furthermore, the County and TRILA argue that FEMA’s maps do not accurately represent the actual drainage basin and that the current levees do affect the floodplain. TRILA is seeking certification for improvements completed to date, certifying the north, east, and south levees of the basin at 100-year level of protection. The entire basin cannot be certified until improvements along the Feather River are completed.

Blueprint Implementation

The levee improvement schedule for the South Yuba basin is the shortest of any in the region. Given this schedule, SACOG believes it is likely that the growth allocated to this area in the 2035 MTP and the Blueprint 2050 will occur as currently forecasted. Considering that this area will also likely be the first to have a 200-year level of protection, South Yuba County could see

even more development than envisioned since there will be no federal or state conditions placed on growth thereby making it a relatively attractive area to develop.

If the “AE” designation is applied to the area, development to the north end of the basin could likely still proceed since the elevation requirement (first floor at or above base flood elevation) will be feasible to achieve. At the south end of the basin, an “AE” designation would essentially place a moratorium on growth due to the difficulty of raising structure to the BFE.

Marysville

Levee Status

The levees on the Yuba and Feather Rivers around Marysville are not certified as having 100-year protection, although no deficiencies have been identified at this time. The Department of Water Resources is currently conducting a drilling program along the entire levee around Marysville. Borings are spaced at 1,000-foot intervals, and will provide data for an underseepage analysis. This analysis should indicate what work, if any, will be needed to achieve 100 or 200 year protection for the City.

Levees within the City’s sphere of influence south of Marysville are within the jurisdiction of Reclamation District 784. These levees are being upgraded by RD 784 and Three Rivers Levee Improvement Authority through a levee improvement plan that is intended to achieve 200-year protection. Within Marysville’s sphere of influence to the north, flood protection is provided by Reclamation District 10. These levees are not certified, and the Reclamation District has not started an evaluation program.

FEMA Status

The City of Marysville is not currently within the 100-year floodplain. FEMA has not yet revised the Flood Insurance Rate Maps for Marysville in the digital mapping program. The Corps of Engineers is currently preparing the Upper Feather River Floodplain Mapping Study for the Department of Water Resources. It is anticipated that this study will reflect the results of the current boring program and the associated underseepage analysis of the Feather River levees around Marysville.

Blueprint Implementation

Development within the existing city limits of Marysville will be strictly infill and intensification of existing uses. All such developments are consistent with Blueprint principals and the current Blueprint plan. It is not anticipated that the studies currently underway will affect the City’s efforts to develop within the City.

Wheatland

Levee Status

Levees on the Bear River currently are not certified as having 100-year level of protection. A levee evaluation and improvement plan for 200-year protection has been completed for the north levee of the Bear River adjacent to approved growth areas in the City’s southwest quadrant. Landowners are being assessed for improvements, but other funding sources are needed to

complete the project. Levees along Dry Creek to the north and downstream of Wheatland require evaluation and a plan for improvements. Timing of this work is contingent on funding.

FEMA Status

Except for high ground on which much of the existing city was built, Wheatland is mapped into the 100-year floodplain. FEMA released preliminary maps last year assigning an “A” designation across the sphere of influence on the north and west sides of the city. This designation could essentially stop development in these areas if it were to become final since it implies that the base flood elevation is unknown and hence, building elevation requirements are unknown. However, the floodplain manager may make a judgment as to an appropriate building elevation.

Like in RD 784, the preliminary “A” designation was assigned because Wheatland’s pending improvement plan will not be a federal project and the levees are not certified. Furthermore, since the levee improvements are not a federal project, an interim designation such as “AR” or “A99” cannot be assigned to the area even if improvements are underway. Yuba County’s negotiations with FEMA for an “A99” designation for RD 784, if successful, may set a precedent for other parts of the region.

Blueprint Implementation

Growth phasing in Wheatland will depend on how quickly levee improvements can occur. The city has taken a position that development may not proceed until levee improvements are completed or very close to completion. Therefore in the next few years, growth in the city will be restricted to infill or areas to the east that are not subject to flooding.

The first greenfield development within the floodplain will occur in the southwest part of the city where a levee improvement plan exists. Approvals for 1,200 units, and possibly another 500 units, are contingent on levee project completion. In the north, along Dry Creek, and to the west, greenfield development will occur more slowly as levee evaluations and improvement plans have yet to begin as funding remains an issue for these projects. Therefore SACOG’s growth allocated in the 2035 MTP could start later than anticipated and may not be completed within the planning horizon. Persistent funding shortfalls may also jeopardize the 2050 Blueprint allocation.

Sutter County Floodplain Status
February 14, 2007

Sutter County report is pending.

Yolo County Floodplain Status

February 14, 2007

Unincorporated County (Knights Landing, Clarksburg, and Yolo)

Levee Status

Decades ago, the FEMA certified Yolo County's Sacramento River Flood Control Project levees (excluding Cache Creek levees) as strong enough to withstand a flood event that has a probability of occurring once every 100 years (a so-called "100-year flood event"). This status still applies to Knights Landing and Clarksburg. Yolo is on the north bank of Cache Creek and protected by Sacramento River Flood Control Project levees. The Cache Creek levees protecting Yolo provide 10-year protection.

Yolo County's levees in the unincorporated area may not meet new federal standards for certification, including standards for freeboard, erosion, and geotechnical stability (i.e. throughseepage and underseepage). The only way to determine whether these levees can meet federal standards is to conduct expensive geotechnical or "problem identification" studies. Yolo County and levee maintenance districts are struggling to attract state and federal money to conduct these studies, as well as implement needed repairs, because the County's levees protect small communities and important agricultural land, not urban areas. With the passage of Proposition 84, DWR has indicated they may evaluate levees in small communities. The money, however, will not be available until at least July.

FEMA Status

FEMA, in coordination with the California Department of Water Resources, is in the process of remapping Sacramento River Flood Control Project levees to determine if they meet new federal standards. FEMA has delayed release of the preliminary maps for Yolo County's levees to 2008, and at that time the maps will almost certainly show the unincorporated areas protected by Sacramento River levees to be in the 100-year floodplain. The preliminary maps do not change Yolo County's certification status. If the County and/or levee maintenance districts do not conduct problem identification studies and implement necessary levee repairs however, FEMA will no longer certify the levees as strong enough to withstand a 100-year flood event. As a result, FEMA will require property owners in these areas to carry flood insurance and building restrictions will apply that are consistent with Yolo County's floodplain ordinance. These restrictions include raising new structures to the base flood elevation.

Blueprint Implementation

The only communities in the unincorporated area of Yolo County protected by Sacramento River Flood Control Project levees are Knights Landing, Clarksburg, and Yolo. In terms of the number of dwelling units and employees, proposed growth in these communities is a small component of Blueprint. Nonetheless, even modest growth in these communities is important for maintaining their vitality. Since the county does not have funding for problem identification studies, growth in these areas could be stymied for some time, so 2035 MTP and 2050 Blueprint allocations for the unincorporated county may be affected.

Woodland

Levee Status

The Cache Creek levees were designed to provide the City of Woodland with 10-year level of protection, but generally don't overtop until a 30-year or greater event occurs. Currently there are no levee improvement plans in place to upgrade the protection above a 10-30 year level. Yolo Bypass levees are understood to provide 100-year or greater protection, but very little, if any of the City would be affected by a break in the Bypass levees.

FEMA Status

Woodland's 100-year floodplain covers approximately 50% of the city. Flood depths from a 100-year event are generally 2 feet to 3 feet, but reach up to 12 feet in some areas. The city is currently subject to FEMA's "AE" designation and will be so as long as the levees remain below a 100-year level of protection. DWR will be investigating the Settling Basin levees as part of the AB 142 funding to determine if they can be certified as part of FEMA's issuance of digitized Flood Insurance Rate Maps. There is a possibility that underseepage criteria were not in place when the Settling Basin levees were originally designed and constructed. If the levees are decertified, it would significantly expand the floodplain in the eastern side of town.

Blueprint Implementation

The residential growth areas are generally outside the floodplain, but essentially all the non-residential growth is in the floodplain. Half of the non-residential growth is in the "deep" floodplain (defined as over 4 feet of flooding) where development is prohibited by the General Plan. The redevelopment area is partially in the floodplain, but relatively shallow flood depths make it unlikely that redevelopment would be significantly impacted. SACOG believes that the 2035 MTP and 2050 Blueprint allocations will likely not be affected by flood concerns, assuming the Settling Basin levees remain certified.

West Sacramento

Levee Status

The city currently has 100-year certification, but even its most recent levee project, completed in 2002, pre-dates currently-adopted Corps levee evaluation guidelines. Therefore, until evaluations are completed for all levees protecting the city using the more recent guidelines, it is uncertain to what extent the levees provide 100-year protection under these guidelines. Evaluations are underway for levees along the Sacramento River in Southport and the city plans to have evaluations of all levees protecting the city completed by the end of 2007. A levee improvement plan will be crafted following the evaluations.

FEMA Status

FEMA will begin map updates for West Sacramento in 2008 and is due to issue a final map in 2009. The city intends to complete its levee evaluation and levee improvement plan by the end of 2007. The city also will hold an election in 2007 to establish an assessment district for levee improvements. With a levee improvement plan, a successful election and a funding plan, the city will likely qualify for at least an AR designation when the final map is issued. If any of

these components are not in place at the time a map is finalized, the city may be subject to an AE designation.

Blueprint Implementation

West Sacramento has an average base flood elevation of 10 feet and in parts of Southport, flood depths are as much as 20 feet. Given these depths, final maps with an AE designation over the city would create a de facto moratorium since elevating structures to BFE is impractical. If levee evaluations and levee improvement plans can be completed before final maps are issued, the city may avoid an AE designation or at least find itself on a quick path to AR and then A99 as funding and levee improvements materialize (given that the project is “federal” – see Yuba County discussion above). If growth tracks with changes in floodplain status (i.e., as the city goes from AE to A99), development would progress from virtually none, to infill, to infill and greenfield. SACOG believes this would translate to a delay in realizing the growth allocations in the 2035 MTP and if improvements and funding come slowly, a reduction in total anticipated yield during this period. The 2050 Blueprint is less likely to be affected, but may also be subject to seeing more of the expected growth occurring in the latter years. If the city receives an AR designation, growth should generally proceed as anticipated through 2035, though the 3-foot elevation requirement will be burdensome and may delay development.

Sacramento County Floodplain Status

February 14, 2007

Natomas Basin – Joint Vision Area, Metro Air Park, Natomas Community Plan

Levee Status

Currently, the basin has levees that cannot be certified at a 100-year level of protection due to underseepage problems per a recent SAFCA evaluation and Corps of Engineers notification in July. SAFCA has a plan to bring the basin to an urban standard level of protection (approximately 200-year level of protection) and current estimates are that the work will be completed in 2011.

FEMA Status

FEMA will issue preliminary, revised Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM) for the Natomas Basin in May or June 2007. Leading up to these preliminary maps, the local agencies (City of Sacramento, Sacramento County and Sutter County) will be working with FEMA in preparing a map revision application. The application will be completed and submitted to FEMA on May 1, 2007, after the outcome of an election in which property owners will be asked to decide whether or not to create a new flood control assessment (Capital Assessment District No. 4). The assessment would pay for the region's local share of flood control projects, including Natomas Basin improvements, to achieve better than a 200-year level of flood protection. Should the assessment not be approved by the voters, application for either an "AR" or "A99" flood zone will be precluded as the federal regulations stipulate that funding must be in-place for either of these zones to apply. In this case, FEMA would likely apply the more restrictive "AE" designation over the basin. FEMA will issue the final, revised FIRM for the Natomas Basin in November 2007.

At this point, the only certainty is that the Natomas area will be remapped by FEMA into a flood zone that requires flood insurance for properties secured by a mortgage backed by the federal government. If the assessment district is approved by voters, the local agencies will be able to apply for either an AR or an A99 flood zone designation. The AR zone limits development to "infill" areas and requires a 3-foot elevation for new structures. The A99 zone essentially allows development without restriction, but requires property owners to carry flood insurance. Application for either of these flood zones is subject to review and approval by FEMA.

Blueprint Implementation

Assuming passage of the local assessment and funding from the State's Measure 1E bond sales, SAFCA estimates that the levee improvements to restore the 100-year level of protection will be completed by 2010. Achievement of the 200-year level of protection is expected to be accomplished by 2012. If funding is not available, it is quite possible FEMA will remap the Natomas Basin into a very restrictive AE flood zone. For all intent and purposes, an "AE" zone in a deep floodplain such as the Natomas Basin becomes a de facto building moratorium as structures are required to be built above the base flood elevation.

In the case that an AR flood zone designation is assigned to the area, growth would probably be restricted to infill development within the Natomas Community Plan area. Per the AR flood

zone regulations, infill development within that area would be required to elevate 3-feet above highest adjacent grade. However, the local agencies would likely petition FEMA to waive this 3-foot elevation requirement as such a requirement in this area would not alleviate expected flood damages and would only serve to diminish the aesthetic value of the existing neighborhoods. Because of the depth of the floodplain, the Joint Vision Area would not be allowed to develop until SAFCA has completed sufficient work on the 100-year improvements. This may affect the 2035 MTP allocation, but likely not the 2050 Blueprint expect for a possible moderate shifting of growth to latter years. Again, since SAFCA's levee improvement plan is expected to be well underway, this scenario has a low probability.

If an A99 flood zone designation is assigned to the area, there would be no federal restrictions on building within the Natomas Basin. An A99 designation for the area would require a relaxation of the Federal requirements that stipulate a flood control project must be federally authorized and fully appropriated to qualify for A99.

City of Sacramento - Delta Shores

Levee Status

The levees protecting the area have been certified by the Army Corps of Engineers at 100-year level of protection. FEMA has issued a letter of map revision (LOMR) that will remove most of the area from the regulatory floodplain. However, to get to 200-year protection, some bridges in the area may need to be raised in order to accommodate needed levee height. This could make such a project prohibitively expensive. Further study is needed.

FEMA Status

Most of the area has been removed from the regulatory floodplain. Based on the LOMR of February 21, 2007, most of the Delta Shores area is now designated as an "X" zone, thereby allowing development in this area to proceed.

Blueprint Implementation

Currently the area can develop without FEMA conditions; however, without the ability to get to a 200-year level of protection (or an urban standard above 100-year) in a timely manner, there could be a substantial delay in building the project if an urban standard level of protection becomes a requirement to approve development in the floodplain. Therefore, the 2035 MTP allocation may not occur in its entirety if a plan to get to urban standard flood protection is not in place (given that the state legislature continues to seek this target). Blueprint 2050 may also not materialize for the same reasons.

City of Sacramento (not including Natomas and Delta Shores)

Levee Status

The American River levees are certified at 100-year level of protection. Levees along the Sacramento River are also certified and erosion repairs have been completed.

FEMA Status

This portion of the city has an “X” designation meaning there are no development restrictions. The city expects to maintain this status when preliminary and final FEMA flood maps are issued.

Blueprint Implementation

Growth in the remaining portions of the city will be infill development. As long as there is an “X” designation in this portion of the city, infill will be allowed. Only an “AE” designation would potentially stall development due to the elevation requirement. Otherwise, the 2035 MTP and 2050 Blueprint allocations should not be affected.



Receive & File #2

Metropolitan Transportation Plan 2035 Draft Interim Year Land Use Allocation

This is a status report on preparation of the draft interim year land use allocations for growth in jobs and housing that will be used for the air quality conformity analysis for the Metropolitan Transportation Plan for 2035.

In addition to the 2035 land use allocation that was adopted by the SACOG Board at its December 2006 meeting, staff must also develop eight interim-year land use allocations to demonstrate conformity to the new 8-hour ozone State Implementation Plan (SIP). We began this process by developing a 2018 draft land use allocation, which was distributed to all city and county planning departments for comment in late 2006. This February, we completed a 2013 draft land use allocation, which was distributed to the cities and counties at the February 21st Planners Committee meeting. Both the 2018 and 2013 allocations are interim points along the growth trajectory to the 2035 land use allocation, and as such, must be consistent with it. Like the 2035 allocation, the interim year allocations are based on recent growth trends, the current jobs and housing market, planned projects in each jurisdiction, planning related issues (e.g. flood control, habitat, infrastructure) and the long-range planning efforts of jurisdictions.

Staff is developing the 2018 and 2013 interim year allocations in conjunction with the cities and counties because both years are critical air quality conformity years in the SIP and we want to make sure that they reflect the most likely pace and phasing of growth for each jurisdiction. For this reason, staff developed the attached table so that we can work with the jurisdictions to identify the phasing and pace of growth in each. As you'll see in reviewing the table, some jurisdictions grow faster early in the 30-year MTP time period and then slow down while other jurisdictions grow slowly early on and faster towards 2035. We have asked jurisdictions to give us comments by March 7 so that we can incorporate any changes into a final draft for SACOG Board approval in April. Once the 2013 and 2018 allocations are settled, staff will interpolate the remaining six interim years for the rest of the air quality modeling.

Attachment

S:\SACOG\BRDPCKTS\2007 Packets\March\RF2-MTP land use.doc 0700601

SACOG Metropolitan Transportation Plan 2035 DRAFT Interim Year Land Use Allocations
Summarized by Jurisdiction and SOI/Annexation Area

Updated: 02/21/07

These numbers are for the SACOG Region, which includes the counties of El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo and Yuba and all cities within, but excludes the City of South Lake Tahoe and the Tahoe Basin portions of El Dorado and Placer Counties.

This spreadsheet is for discussion purposes between SACOG staff and jurisdictions to 1) determine the amount of housing and employment growth in each jurisdiction by 2013 and 2018 and 2) determine the phasing of annexations over the MTP planning period (2005-2035).

	2005 SACOG Estimate		2013 TOTAL DRAFT		2018 TOTAL DRAFT		2035 TOTAL*	
	Employees	Dwelling Units	Employees	Dwelling Units	Employees	Dwelling Units	Employees	Dwelling Units
El Dorado County								
City of Placerville	10,896	4,400	11,643	4,971	12,764	5,376	12,910	6,282
Placerville Sphere of Influence	2,031	1,340	2,031	1,346	2,063	1,381	4,216	1,560
City of Placerville plus Sphere of Influence	12,927	5,740	13,674	6,317	14,827	6,757	17,126	7,842
Unincorp. El Dorado County without Spheres of Influence	35,217	55,131	48,207	66,127	55,301	70,784	68,273	79,597
Unincorp. El Dorado County including Sphere of Influence	37,248	56,471	50,238	67,473	57,364	72,165	72,489	81,157
TOTAL	48,144	60,871	61,881	72,444	70,128	77,541	85,399	87,439
Placer County								
City of Auburn	8,153	6,144	8,269	6,596	8,705	7,020	8,525	7,872
Auburn Sphere of Influence	15,510	6,030	15,511	6,056	16,192	6,239	18,063	6,950
City of Auburn plus Sphere of Influence	23,663	12,174	23,780	12,652	24,897	13,259	26,588	14,822
City of Colfax	853	718	1,056	820	1,194	896	1,562	983
Colfax Sphere of Influence	228	653	228	653	341	718	363	829
City of Colfax plus Sphere of Influence	1,081	1,371	1,284	1,473	1,535	1,614	1,925	1,812
City of Lincoln	5,376	10,159	12,392	19,471	14,806	20,013	18,434	20,028
Lincoln Sphere of Influence	2,377	284	4,180	5,660	5,884	6,183	12,470	8,512
Lincoln Proposed Expanded Sphere of Influence	241	63	3,011	225	3,082	516	7,194	11,385
City of Lincoln plus Spheres of Influence	7,994	10,506	19,583	25,356	23,772	26,712	38,098	39,925
City of Loomis	3,762	2,304	4,038	2,519	4,404	2,763	4,822	3,223
City of Rocklin	15,427	19,658	20,042	22,952	21,609	24,452	27,297	26,907
City of Roseville	60,162	42,418	83,054	56,527	85,958	58,918	97,393	60,205
Roseville Sphere of Influence MOU Area Only	5	0	312	1,749	527	3,049	3,002	12,530
Roseville Sphere of Influence without MOU Area	5,011	478	11,317	900	11,508	1,301	15,844	3,872
City of Roseville with entire Sphere of Influence	65,178	42,896	94,683	59,176	97,993	63,268	116,239	76,607
Unincorp. Placer County without Spheres of Influence	14,643	30,928	19,124	39,130	20,093	45,971	32,684	68,477
Southwest Placer as subset of Unincorp. Placer County	113	867	3,648	6,504	4,456	10,626	13,596	28,094
Unincorp Placer County including Spheres of Influence	38,015	38,436	53,683	54,373	57,627	63,977	89,620	112,555
TOTAL	131,748	119,837	182,534	163,258	194,303	178,039	247,653	231,773
Sacramento County								
City of Citrus Heights	18,198	34,374	19,493	34,760	20,392	36,268	24,648	39,641
City of Elk Grove	24,653	38,196	35,005	54,851	41,276	62,086	56,292	69,273
City of Folsom	29,379	22,716	37,315	28,017	41,379	30,918	47,187	33,603
Folsom Sphere of Influence	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,869	7,743
City of Folsom with Sphere of Influence	29,379	22,716	37,315	28,017	41,379	30,918	51,056	41,346
City of Galt	4,470	6,621	5,706	7,452	6,638	7,691	8,457	9,586
Galt Sphere of Influence	169	1,114	195	1,217	195	1,797	759	3,417
Galt potential expansion of Sphere of Influence to Mingo Rd	51	170	51	170	51	170	661	210
City of Galt with SOI and potential expansion	4,690	7,905	5,952	8,839	6,884	9,658	9,877	13,213
City of Isleton	309	374	308	374	340	396	429	630
Isleton proposed Sphere of Influence	112	278	112	277	112	283	154	447
City of Isleton with proposed Sphere of Influence	421	652	420	651	452	679	583	1,077
City of Rancho Cordova	46,128	20,322	57,811	35,624	60,480	43,660	71,206	66,472
Ranch Cordova Sphere of Influence	8,789	28	9,028	43	14,726	500	15,011	500
City of Rancho Cordova with Sphere of Influence	54,917	20,350	66,839	35,667	75,206	44,160	86,217	66,972
City of Sacramento	337,206	173,024	373,775	196,373	390,711	212,512	438,492	247,895
Natomas Pan Handle (part of Sphere of Influence)	7,696	0	10,954	568	11,016	1,394	16,438	1,785
Natomas Joint Vision Area	60	28	348	922	621	1,813	3,660	19,756
City of Sac with Pan Handle and Natomas Joint Vision Area	344,962	173,052	385,077	197,863	402,348	215,719	458,590	269,436
Unincorp. Sacramento County without Spheres of Influence^	201,274	208,656	224,828	229,735	237,860	250,269	280,898	296,709
Unincorp. Sacramento County including all Spheres of Influence/Annexation areas	218,151	210,274	245,516	232,932	264,581	256,226	321,450	330,567
TOTAL	678,494	505,901	774,929	590,383	825,797	649,757	968,161	797,667
Sutter County								
Live Oak	731	1,838	1,176	2,757	1,179	2,581	1,740	3,324
Live Oak Sphere of Influence	409	513	427	513	461	599	972	1,507
City of Live Oak with Sphere of Influence	1,140	2,351	1,603	3,270	1,640	3,180	2,712	4,831
Yuba City	20,902	19,162	27,156	23,804	28,254	22,780	34,780	24,845
Yuba City Sphere of Influence	1,740	2,950	2,060	5,211	2,172	5,588	3,664	10,948
Yuba City with Sphere of Influence	22,642	22,112	29,216	29,015	30,426	28,368	38,444	35,793
Unincorp. Sutter County without Spheres of Influence	4,376	5,224	4,598	5,684	6,722	7,283	8,643	9,305
Sutter County Measure M Area as subset of Unincorp. Sutter County	76	4	297	529	2,374	2,150	4,295	4,172
Unincorp. Sutter County including Spheres of Influence	6,525	8,687	7,085	11,408	9,355	13,470	13,279	21,760
TOTAL	28,158	29,687	35,417	37,969	38,788	38,831	49,799	49,929
Yolo County								
Davis	15,828	22,733	17,158	23,466	17,390	25,447	19,160	28,128
Davis Sphere of Influence	268	815	268	815	396	2,456	954	3,060
Davis with Sphere of Influence	16,096	23,548	17,426	24,281	17,786	27,903	20,114	31,188
West Sacramento	31,093	15,448	41,210	23,320	44,767	25,479	60,973	36,136
Winters	1,871	2,508	2,434	3,101	2,930	3,502	3,898	4,382
Winters Sphere of Influence	0	0	0	0	198	102	271	387
Winters with Sphere of Influence	1,871	2,508	2,434	3,101	3,128	3,604	4,169	4,769
Woodland	23,259	17,370	26,072	20,125	28,565	21,653	32,439	23,542
Woodland Sphere of Influence	1,819	373	1,859	373	2,048	1,564	3,059	4,720
Woodland with Sphere of Influence	25,078	17,743	27,931	20,498	30,613	23,217	35,498	28,262
Unincorp. Yolo County without Spheres of Influence	17,904	7,302	23,461	9,366	24,886	8,620	24,659	10,855
University as subset of Unincorp. Yolo County	11,103	940	15,775	2,391	15,775	2,391	15,775	2,391
Yolo County including Spheres of Influence and University	19,991	8,490	25,588	10,554	27,528	12,742	28,943	19,022
TOTAL	92,042	66,549	112,462	80,566	121,180	88,823	145,413	111,210
Yuba County								
Marysville	7,807	4,890	7,984	5,091	8,264	5,173	9,191	5,759
Marysville Sphere of Influence	298	356	298	356	267	352	294	352
Marysville with Sphere of Influence	8,105	5,246	8,282	5,447	8,531	5,525	9,485	6,111
Wheatland	559	1,263	899	1,429	966	1,507	3,539	1,507
Wheatland Sphere of Influence	75	252	553	1,435	1,158	2,341	1,160	5,941
Wheatland with Sphere of Influence	634	1,515	1,452	2,864	2,124	3,848	4,699	7,448
Unincorp. Yuba County without Spheres of Influence	12,914	18,122	17,200	27,890	19,141	33,019	25,064	41,115
Unincorp. Yuba County including Spheres of Influence	13,287	18,730	18,051	29,681	20,566	35,712	26,518	47,408
TOTAL	21,653	24,883	26,934	36,201	29,796	42,392	39,248	54,674
Regional Total	1,000,239	807,728	1,194,157	980,821	1,279,992	1,075,383	1,535,673	1,332,692

*The SACOG Board by federal law is required to adopt a long range growth forecast and allocation for use in the development of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan. The SACOG Board adopted the 2035 allocation at its December 2006 board meeting.

^Exception to this is the City of Sacramento: only the Pan Handle area of its sphere of influence is excluded from these numbers.



Update on Employee Benefits Program Addition

SACOG currently does not provide short term disability insurance to its employees. Long term disability insurance is provided after three months of leave due to injury or illness. The Employees Association requested during the Memorandum of Understanding discussions that management look into implementing a short term disability program that would be funded solely with employee contributions.

As management researched the options, it was determined that AFLAC had the short term disability program that would best meet the needs of the employees yet was affordable. There are several levels of coverage from which the employee can choose. In addition, AFLAC has a number of other programs that employees might find beneficial such as personal accident insurance, cancer indemnity insurance, specified health event insurance (heart attack, coronary artery bypass surgery, stroke, organ transplant, etc.), life insurance, and a flexible benefits program. The AFLAC representatives made a presentation to those employees who chose to participate about the benefits of the program and how it would enhance the employees existing benefits at SACOG. Afterward, they held one-on-one meetings with employees to address individual questions or concerns.

In order to initiate a program through AFLAC, a minimum of three employees need to enroll and they do not need to enroll in the same insurance program. In other words, one employee could enroll for short term disability, one for life insurance, and one for accident insurance and the plan can get started. Open enrollment will close on March 9 for implementation on the March payroll. Employees may also enroll at any time throughout the year should their personal circumstances warrant. An additional meeting with the AFLAC representatives was held on March 5 for follow up questions or for those not able to attend the first meeting.

There is no SACOG cost for any of these programs; all costs will be borne by the employees through payroll deductions.



2007 Delivery Plan

This item was discussed at the February 22nd Regional Planning Partnership and – despite concerns about inflexibility inherent in air quality requirements and early deadlines imposed because of increased Federal Highways oversight – the Partnership expressed no reservations about moving ahead. At the subsequent March 1st Transportation Committee, Chair Cabaldon asked for staff assurances that it made good sense for SACOG to continue with an aggressive delivery program if it meant that the Obligation Authority (OA) available to the region would be significantly reduced. Staff responded that while there is some risk to this approach, staff believes the potential gains far exceed the small amount of risk involved. Attached is a copy of Caltrans Headquarters' February 2nd letter requesting submission of 2007 Obligation Plans from regions by April 2nd, a month earlier than in prior years. SACOG is asking local agencies to submit their respective 2007 Delivery Plans by March 22nd, with Olin Woods (owoods@sacog.org; or 916-340-6220) as staff contact.

It is likely that this region – along with much of the rest of the State – will go through a period starting in July 2007 and extending through early 2008 when it cannot analyze and make air quality conformity findings. This will seriously limit SACOG's ability to amend the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) or Metropolitan Transportation Plan Improvement Program (MTIP) where projects that are considered Non-Exempt for air quality purposes are involved. Local agencies that intend to include the following types of Non-Exempt projects in the 2007 Delivery Plan should submit these projects to SACOG as soon as possible: projects that (1) will change schedule across an air quality milestone year (2008 or 2013) or (2) are not already included in the current MTP or MTIP. This will allow “rush: projects to get included in the last major amendment (MTP/MTIP Amendment #7) and go through the modeling/public review/federal approval process before the July deadline. Non-Exempt projects that need to be amended but miss MTP/MTIP Amendment #7 may get tangled up bureaucratically for more than a year.

Caltrans expects this to be a difficult year for delivery on a statewide basis for several reasons. In many regions, Non-Exempt projects may get hung up and fail delivery because of air quality problems. Federal Highway Administration has inserted itself into the project review process leading up to funding approval, slowing the process down, which has resulted in Caltrans moving its application deadline from mid-August to early July. Caltrans expects to make available a 30% higher amount of federal funding this year than last, almost \$1 billion of total funding for local projects, which raises the delivery bar statewide. At the same time, the state bond programs may divert projects and project delivery effort away from local assistance delivery.

The air quality and early deadline challenges will make the 2007 Delivery Plan more difficult. Nevertheless, it is important to see the opportunities that exist for this region in 2007, to acquire funding assigned to other regions which they cannot or do not use. SACOG encourages local agencies to be realistic yet aggressive in identifying projects for which they can submit a completed Project Approval Request (PAR) to Caltrans by July 2, 2007. (Transit projects requiring FTA approval may need to be submitted by mid-May)

SACOG is already exploring opportunities to borrow additional apportionments from other regions, and we may come back to the Board for approval of agreements to borrow and pay back funds from other regions in the state. If SACOG does borrow funds to advance key Sacramento region projects, consistent with past practice, we will require written payback commitments from local agencies prior to obligation of funds.

Attachments