



County of Yolo

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

625 Court Street, Room 204
Woodland, California 95695-1265 (530)
66643195 FAX (530) 666-8193 -
yolacounty.org

first District - Michael H. McGowan
Second District - Helen M. ThOrnaen
Third District - Matt Rexroad
Fourth District - I'ilarik Yamada
Fifth District - Duane Chamberlain
County Administrator - Sharon Jensen
County Board - Ana Morales

December 11, 2007

Mike McKeever
Sacramento Area Council of Governments
1415 L Street, Suite 300
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Comments on Metropolitan Transportation Plan 2035

Dear Mr. McKeever:

42-1

On behalf of the Yolo County Board of Supervisors, thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the draft Metropolitan Transportation Plan 2035 (MTP). We applaud the Sacramento Area Council of Government's (SACOG's) efforts to encourage Compact development, transit use, biking, and walking, as well as to reduce congestion in key areas of the regional transportation system. We also support your efforts to involve the public in the development of this comprehensive document.

42-2

Yolo County's primary concern is the lack of direction in the MTP to provide funding to "improve the economic viability of rural areas," a component of Principle 1 — Smart Land Use. The principle is:

"Design a transportation system to support good growth patterns, including increased housing and transportation options, focusing more growth inward and improving the economic viability of rural areas "

We understand the SACOG Board included the language regarding the economic viability of rural areas at the request of the Yolo County Board of Supervisors because of the increasing recognition that counties can play a significant role in encouraging compact development, improving air quality, and reducing vehicle miles traveled by directing growth to cities. According to the MTP, "75 percent of the improved performance that comes from this MTP is derived from local governments implementing Blueprint and uses." The more growth a county directs to cities, however, the less transportation funding a county receives because transportation funding follows people and congestion.

42-3

Yolo County's cities receive more transportation funding than the unincorporated county, as do other counties that choose to develop more in the unincorporated area_ Only 12% of the population lives in the unincorporated area in Yolo County - the lowest percentage of any county in the SACOG region – and Yolo County must compete with its growing cities for the county's share of the region's transportation funding. Yolo County must maintain roads, however, that

Draft Metropolitan Transportation Plan. Page 5-2, October 22, 2001,

Letter to Mike McKeever
December 11, 2007
Page 2

42-3
cont. are used by residents of both the cities and the unincorporated area. The majority of the wear on county roads between cities is from city residents. These roads also are an integral part of expanding agritourism efforts and are an essential part of goods movement for the county's agricultural industry.

42-4 Yolo County strongly believes the MTP should include language that provides funding to compensate for the impact on rural roads of traffic between cities when a county implements growth patterns consistent with the Blueprint. The MTP also should contain language that directs funding to transportation projects to encourage agritourism, goods movement, and biking in rural areas. This funding would be provided as incentives to direct growth to cities, not to reward inefficient land use patterns. The current MTP mentions "a study of rural areas, including identifying areas with high natural resources values to be preserved and economic development opportunities."² The MTP should include more than a study, however.

Rural Economic Viability Comments

Yolo County respectfully provides the following suggestions to include in the Policies and Supportive Strategies section of the MTP to address the issue of improving viability in rural areas:

42-5 1. Page 5-1, add 'Increase investment in funding for transportation projects that improve the economic viability of rural areas located in jurisdictions that implement good growth patterns" to the list of items in the overall MTP philosophy.

42-6 2. Page 5-1, add "Increase investment in transportation projects that compensate counties for the impact to rural roads between cities from implementing land use policies consistent with the Blueprint" to the list of items in the overall MTP philosophy.

42-7 3. Page 5-3: Add a strategy under the policy, "SACOG intends to provide information, tools, incentives and encouragement to local governments that have chosen to grow consistent with Blueprint principles," as follows' "Create and invest in a rural strategy and program to improve transportation systems that affect the economic viability of rural areas located in jurisdictions that implement good growth patterns, consistent with the Blueprint Principles, the urban-rural connections strategy, or other rural initiatives."

42-8 4. Page 5-4: Add a strategy under the policy, "SACOG should seek to develop and inform local governments and businesses about a regional strategy for siting industry and warehousing that needs good freight access," as follows: "Study and consider the needs of the agricultural industry for refrigeration and consolidation units, warehousing, processing plants, and other facilities near transportation access,"

42-9 5. Page 5-5: Under the policy, "SACOG intends to develop a strategy for ensuring good urban-rural connections and promoting the economic viability of rural lands while also protecting open space resources to expand and support the implementation of the Blueprint growth strategy and the MTP, amend the first strategy: "Develop sustainable rural land use policies through a public process that encompass, at a minimum, issues such as agricultural economic development (including energy production), natural resources protection and

²₁(1 pngc 5-3.

Letter to Mike McKeever
December 11, 2007
Page 3

42-9 cont. agricultural land conservation, rural development (including job-housing balance), and infrastructure needs.

42-10 6. Page 5-5: Add a strategy under the policy, "SACOG intends to develop a strategy for ensuring good urban-rural connections and promoting the economic viability of rural lands while also protecting open space resources to expand and support the implementation of the Blueprint growth strategy and the MTP, as follows. "Invest in transportation projects that help implement the urban-rural connections strategy,"

Other Comments

42-11 1. Page 5-15: With regard to the policy, 'SACOG intends to invest funds that are at SACOG's discretion, as long as the existing funding and program structure remains essentially as it is today under these policy guidelines,' Yolo County appreciates the policy guideline "Expect to maintain approximate equity among cities and counties across several program and funding cycle. Equity is determined primarily by identifying the difference between funds received and those that would be realized by formula," While Yolo County is still awaiting the results of the equity study that we requested five months ago, we would like to encourage SACOG in the meantime to ensure there is equity within counties, not just between counties. As part of its equity effort, SACOG should reward counties that direct growth to cities, As stated earlier, the more growth a county directs to cities, the less transportation funding a county receives because transportation funding follows people and congestion_

42-12 2. Page 5-15: Include a guideline that SACOG will "Evaluate the benefits of the project to the population the project serves rather than the population of the submitting jurisdiction. Roads between cities serve the combined population of the cities in Yolo County. The population of the unincorporated area influences the amount of funding Yolo County receives, rather than the combined population of the cities the project serves.

42-13 3 Appendix A2: Draft MTP 2035 Bicycle, Pedestrian, Roads and Other Projects. Appendix A2 lists several Yolo County Department of Planning and Public Works projects incorrectly. The enclosed chart reflects the necessary corrections.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments. If you have any questions, please contact Petrea Marchand, Manager of Intergovernmental Affairs, at (530) 666-8128 or petrea.marchand@yolocounty.org.

Sincerely,

Menke Yamada
Chair
Yolo County Board of Supervisors

cc: Matt Carpenter

**Appendix A2: Draft MTP 2035 Bicycle, Pedestrian, Roads and
Other Projects
(Proposed corrections are in RED)**

County	Jurisdiction	Local Agency	Project Name	Project Description	Draft Year	Cost Estimate
Yolo County	Yolo County	Yolo County Dept of Public Works	County Rd. 98	Bike Improvements: In Yolo County, CR 98 from CR 29 (Davis) to Woodland, add shoulders and bike lanes to roadway and two existing bridges and rehab roadway.	2013 2011	\$11,483,000 \$12,000,000
Yolo County	Yolo County	Yolo County Dept of Public Works	County Rd. 99	Rd. reconstruction and bike lanes: from County Rd. 27 to Woodland city limits: reconstruct roadway and bike lanes	2022 2010	\$2,000,000
Yolo County	Yolo County	Yolo County Dept of Public Works	County Rd. 99, County Rd. 29 & County Rd. 99D	Bikeways: In Yolo County, CR 99 from CR 27 to CR 29 and CR 29 from CR 99 to Highway 113 and CR 99D from CR 29 to Davis City limits: construct class II bikeways by adding four foot shoulders and rehabilitating existing roadway.	2010	\$1,625,912 \$2,600,000
Yolo County	Yolo County	Yolo County Dept of Public Works	Downtown Revitalization	Enhance and facilitate pedestrian and bicycle access to downtown Esparto	2008 2012	\$209,000 \$2,000,000
Yolo County Yuba County	Yolo County Yuba County	Yolo County Dept of Public Works Yuba County	Salt Creek Bridge Replacement	CR 29 over Salt Creek, 2.83 mi. west of CR 88: Replace 1 lane bridge with 2-lane bridge.	2008	\$1,000,000