



Regional Planning Partnership

April 19, 2007

Metropolitan Transportation Plan 2035 Draft Interim Year Land Use Allocation

Issue: The draft interim year land use allocations for growth in jobs and housing have been developed for the air quality conformity analysis for the Metropolitan Transportation Plan for 2035.

Recommendation: Recommend to the Board that they adopt the draft interim year land use allocations for use in the 8-hour ozone SIP and the air quality conformity analysis of the MTP 2035.

Discussion: 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 both the Rate of progress (ROP) State Implementation Plan (SIP) and the new 8-hour ozone 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 April so that we can incorporate any changes into a final draft for SACOG Board approval in May. Once the 2013 and 2018 allocations are settled, staff will interpolate the remaining six interim years (2008, 2011, 2014, 2017, 2020, 2025) for the rest of the air quality modeling.

These projections will be used for two air quality related purposes. The 2013 and 2018 projections will be used in the development of the 8-hour ozone SIP. The air quality conformity analysis conducted at the completion of the MTP 2035 process will also use these projections. If any changes occur prior to the conformity analysis, the projections will be brought back to this committee for its review and recommendation.

Key Staff: Pete Hathaway, Director of Transportation Planning, (916) 340-6235
Gordon Garry, Director of Research & Analysis, (916) 340-6230
David H. Young, Senior Planner, (916) 340-6232
Jason P. Crow, Senior Planner, (916) 340-6219
Kacey Lizon, Associate Planner, (916) 340-6211

KL:ts
Attachment

S:\RPP\2007 Meetings\Apr 07\10-MTP 2035 draft.doc 0700601

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

Updated: 04/18/07

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	12,023	5,376	12,910	6,282
<i>Placerville Sphere of Influence</i>	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	14,086	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	69,387	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
<i>Auburn Sphere of Influence</i>	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
<i>Colfax Sphere of Influence</i>	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
<i>Lincoln Sphere of Influence</i>	2,377	284	4,180	5,660	5,884	6,183	12,470	8,512
<i>Lincoln Proposed Expanded Sphere of Influence</i>	241	63	3,011	235	3,082	516	7,194	11,385
City of Lincoln plus Spheres of Influence	7,994	10,506	19,583	25,366	23,772	26,712	38,098	39,925
City of Loomis	3,762	2,304	4,055	2,521	4,404	2,763	4,822	3,223
City of Rocklin	15,427	19,658	20,540	22,952	22,107	24,452	27,297	26,907
City of Roseville	60,162	42,418	83,050	55,568	85,958	58,918	97,393	60,205
<i>Roseville Sphere of Influence MOU Area Only</i>	5	0	61	0	527	3,049	3,002	12,530
<i>Roseville Sphere of Influence without MOU Area</i>	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	94,428	56,468	97,993	63,268	116,239	76,607
Unincorp. Placer County without Spheres of Influence	14,343	30,902	18,824	39,103	19,793	45,943	32,090	68,448
<i>Southwest Placer subarea (included in Unincorp. Placer number, but shown here for reference)</i>	113	867	3,648	6,504	4,456	10,626	13,596	28,094
Unincorp. Placer County including Spheres of Influence	37,715	38,410	53,132	52,607	57,327	63,949	89,026	112,526
TOTAL	131,448	119,811	182,494	160,535	194,501	178,011	247,059	231,744
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
<i>Folsom Sphere of Influence</i>	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
<i>Galt Sphere of Influence</i>	169	1,114	195	1,217	195	1,797	759	3,417
<i>Galt potential expansion of Sphere of Influence to Mingo Rd</i>	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	333	487	340	608	429	630
<i>Isleton proposed Sphere of Influence</i>	112	278	112	278	112	283	154	447
City of Isleton with proposed Sphere of Influence	421	652	445	765	452	891	583	1,077
City of Rancho Cordova	46,128	20,322	57,811	35,624	60,480	43,660	71,206	66,472
<i>Ranch Cordova Sphere of Influence</i>	8,789	28	9,238	82	14,726	500	15,011	500
City of Rancho Cordova with Sphere of Influence	54,917	20,350	67,049	35,706	75,206	44,160	86,217	66,972
City of Sacramento	337,206	173,024	372,443	198,726	391,369	212,491	436,221	247,906
<i>Natomas Pan Handle (part of Sphere of Influence)</i>	7,696	0	10,832	568	13,551	1,394	18,457	1,785
<i>Natomas Joint Vision Area</i>	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	383,623	200,216	405,541	215,698	458,338	269,447
Unincorp. Sacramento County without Spheres of Influence ^a	201,274	208,656	224,828	229,735	237,860	250,269	280,941	296,674
Unincorp. Sacramento County including all Spheres of Influence/Annexation areas	218,151	210,274	245,604	232,972	267,116	256,226	323,512	330,532
TOTAL	678,494	505,901	773,710	592,889	828,990	649,948	967,952	797,643
Sutter County								
Live Oak	731	1,838	1,176	2,757	1,442	2,644	1,740	3,324
<i>Live Oak Sphere of Influence</i>	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	1,903	3,243	2,712	4,831
Yuba City	20,902	19,162	27,156	23,803	30,356	23,874	34,780	24,845
<i>Yuba City Sphere of Influence</i>	1,740	2,950	2,160	5,288	3,018	7,257	3,661	10,939
Yuba City with Sphere of Influence	22,642	22,112	29,316	29,091	33,374	31,131	38,441	35,784
Unincorp. Sutter County without Spheres of Influence	4,376	5,224	4,598	5,684	5,792	7,283	8,643	9,305
<i>Sutter County Measure M Area (included in Unincorp. Sutter number, but shown here for reference)</i>	76	4	297	529	1,444	2,150	4,295	4,172
Unincorp. Sutter County including Spheres of Influence	6,525	8,687	7,185	11,485	9,271	15,139	13,276	21,751
TOTAL	28,158	29,687	35,517	38,045	41,069	41,657	49,796	49,920
Yolo County								
Davis	15,828	22,733	17,158	23,466	17,390	25,447	19,160	28,128
<i>Davis Sphere of Influence</i>	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
West Sacramento north study area	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
West Sacramento with north study area	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Winters	1,871	2,508	2,434	3,101	2,930	3,502	3,898	4,382
<i>Winters Sphere of Influence</i>	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
<i>Woodland Sphere of Influence</i>	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	23,245	9,366	24,670	8,620	24,659	10,855
<i>University subarea (included in Unincorp. Yolo number, but shown here for reference)</i>	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	25,372	10,554	27,312	12,742	28,943	19,022
TOTAL	92,042	66,549	112,246	80,566	120,964	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
<i>Marysville Sphere of Influence</i>	298	356	298	356	298	356	325	356
Marysville with Sphere of Influence	8,105	5,246	8,282	5,447	8,562	5,529	9,516	6,115
Wheatland	559	1,263	899	1,429	966	1,507	3,539	1,507
<i>Wheatland Sphere of Influence</i>	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	20,597	35,716	26,549	47,412
TOTAL	21,653	24,883	26,934	36,201	29,827	42,396	39,279	54,678
Regional Total	999,939	807,702	1,192,782	980,680	1,284,738	1,078,376	1,534,898	1,332,634

^aThe 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.

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