

Results of Citizen Input

On Preferred Scenarios for Nine Corridors

November 16, 2006, TALL Order Forum

1,225 citizens participated in simultaneous workshops at eight locations throughout the SACOG region. Valley Vision assigned between five and eight citizens to sit at tables for the evening. Citizens self-identified which of eight interests they represented when they registered, and Valley Vision made table assignments designed to create a broad cross-section of community interests at each table (i.e., business, environment, public agency, etc., mixed together at each table). Each table was led by a discussion leader. The discussion leaders were asked to attend at least one SACOG training session and to be neutral facilitators (i.e., not advocate for one choice over another).

There were a total of 190 table discussions at the workshops, as follows:

Elk Grove Workshop	17 Tables
Folsom Workshop	27 Tables
Placerville Workshop	14 Tables
Downtown Sac Workshop	58 Tables
Natomas Workshop	17 Tables
Rocklin Workshop	20 Tables
Yuba City Workshop	15 Tables
Davis Workshop	22 Tables
Regional Total	190 Tables

Some of the exercises at the tables were done by individuals and some were done through majority opinion of the table participants (the discussion leader did not express an opinion).

One exercise was done by the full table. Participants discussed the pros and cons of 3 different Scenarios for as many as 9 corridors, and a simple majority selected their favorite Scenario. Participants were told they could do as many of the 9 corridors as they wished and had time for, and that they had complete freedom to select which corridors they discussed first, second, etc., and how many they completed. Most tables did not complete all 9 corridors. The highest number of table opinions was expressed for corridors geographically closest to the location of each workshop (e.g., Davis participants expressed an opinion about the Yolo-Sacramento corridor more often than the Highway 65 corridor in Placer County).

Exercises that were done by individuals include:

- Identifying first and second choice priority Principles to guide the MTP from a list of 6 Principles.
- Identifying any projects for their community on a “Common” list of transportation investments (i.e., projects included in all 3 scenarios) that they either strongly agreed with or strongly disagreed with, and listing any new projects they would like added to that list.
- Identifying their personal preferences for whether they preferred Scenario 1, 2, or 3 for as many of the 9 corridors as they wished to express an opinion about (and listing any changes they would recommend be made to that Scenario).
- Participants were asked to record their opinions for all of the exercises on various questionnaires and scorecards that were on the table and in their packets and to turn in their “answers” to their Discussion Leader. They were also told that they could complete their work on the Common investments questionnaire after the workshop if they wished and send their opinions in to SACOG within the next week or so. In addition, some Discussion Leaders told their participants that they could finish their Corridor Preferences questionnaire and send it to SACOG within the next several days.

In addition to recording participant’s opinions on these handwritten instruments, SACOG also attempted to record opinions electronically during the meeting so that participants could see each others opinions “live” during the event. This electronic keypad method of recording did not function as expected during the event. We have not been able to determine that the electronic data are sufficiently credible for analysis and to support policy-making and, therefore, have not included that information in this summary report. Therefore, all of the information presented in this summary report is based on hand-counts of all of the questionnaires that were handed in at the event. The questionnaires recording scenario preferences for each table were counted twice. We will update these results based on any additional questionnaires that are received by December 1, 2006. We will also notify participants of our conclusions about the electronic data after we have thoroughly analyzed what we have been provided by the vendor for that service.

Priority MTP Principles

812 of the 1,225 participants completed and handed in a questionnaire that asked them to identify from 6 MTP policy principles their first and second priority principles for guiding the development of the MTP. The six MTP principles are listed below:

1. **Access & Mobility** – Improve opportunities for businesses and citizens to easily access goods, jobs, services and housing.
2. **Equity & Choice** – Provide real, viable travel choices for all people throughout our diverse region.
3. **Economic Vitality** – Efficiently connect people to jobs and get goods to market.
4. **Environmental Quality & Sustainability** – Minimize transportation impacts on the environment for cleaner air and natural resource protection.
5. **Financial Stewardship** – A transportation system that delivers cost-effective results that are feasible to construct and maintain.
6. **Smart Land Use** – Design a transportation system to support good growth patterns, including increased housing and transportation options and focusing more growth inward.

A summary of those results follows. The complete results are included as Attachment 1.

Workshop Location	1st Priority	2nd Priority
Elk Grove Workshop	Accessibility/Mobility	Environmental Quality
Folsom Workshop	Accessibility/Mobility	Smart Land Use
Placerville Workshop	Smart Land Use	Accessibility/Mobility
Downtown Sac Workshop	Environmental Quality	Smart Land Use
Natomas Workshop	Accessibility/Mobility	Smart Land Use
Rocklin Workshop	Accessibility/Mobility	Smart Land Use
Yuba City Workshop	Accessibility/Mobility	Smart Land Use
Davis Workshop	Accessibility/Mobility	Smart Land Use

The results show broad-based agreement that Accessibility/Mobility and Smart Land Use were the top two priorities of most of the participants completing this questionnaire.

571 participants listed other priorities or principles they believed were important to consider when developing the MTP. All of these comments are included in Attachment 2. Some of the most common themes identified were:

- Smarter land use – more mixed use and higher density, more bicycle and pedestrian accessibility
- Increased transit – more efficient and convenient transit (especially rail)
- Regional connections – better connections with transit, freeway enhancements, and bicycle paths

“Common Projects” List

Participants examined and scored projects common to all 3 scenarios that were closest to their home area. SACOG staff are still tallying all of these questionnaires and will notify participants and distribute the results as soon as this process is completed, probably by early December.

Table Votes on Corridor Scenario Preferences

A summary of the score sheets recording the majority opinion of participants at 190 tables at the 8 sites follows. The table opinions were analyzed two different ways. For each of the 9 corridors, SACOG staff identified a workshop site or sites whose geographic proximity to that corridor probably meant that most workshop participants at the site would have higher familiarity with *that venue* and stronger opinions about, the pros and cons of each Scenario for that corridor than most of the participants at the other sites. These workshop sites are titled “target areas” for a particular corridor. The target areas for each corridor are as follows:

Corridor	Target Area Workshop Sites
Southern Sacramento County	Elk Grove, Downtown Sacramento
Elk Grove-Rancho Cordova-El Dorado Hills	Placerville, Folsom, Elk Grove
U.S. 50 Corridor	Placerville, Folsom, Downtown Sacramento
Eastern Sacramento County	Folsom, Downtown Sacramento
Eastern I-80 Corridor	Rocklin, Natomas (Sacramento)
Highway 65/S. Placer	Rocklin, Yuba City
Sutter/Yuba Counties	Yuba City
Yolo County-Sacramento	Davis, Downtown Sacramento
Northern Sacramento County	Natomas (Sacramento), Downtown Sacramento

The regionwide totals were also analyzed, including those participants at the target area workshop sites as well as all other workshop sites.

Participants were given the choice of how many corridors to express an opinion about, and in what order to discuss the corridors. Because every table determined its own approach to working through the corridors, the total number of tables expressing an opinion for each corridor varies.

The complete results for each site are in Attachment 3. A summary of the first choice Scenario for the tables at the workshop sites labeled target areas for each corridor, and the regionwide totals, follows:

Table Preferences for Top Scenario by Corridor		
Corridor	All Tables in Region	Tables at Target Area Sites
Southern Sacramento County	1 (56%)	1 (66%)
Elk Grove-Rancho Cordova-El Dorado Hills	2 (57%)	2 (77%)
U.S. 50 Corridor	1 (71%)	1 (78%)
Eastern Sacramento County	1 (68%)	1 (70%)
Eastern I-80 Corridor	2 (50%)	2 (51%)
Highway 65/S. Placer	1 (53%)	3 (41%)
Sutter/Yuba Counties	3 (42%)	3 (80%)
Yolo County-Sacramento	2 (40%)	3 (38%)
Northern Sacramento County	2 (49%)	2 (43%)

For 7 of the 9 corridors, the first choice Scenario selections of the tables regionwide is the same as the first choice selections of the target area tables. The level of support for the first choice selection varies by more than 20% in some cases (Sutter/Yuba and Elk Grove-Rancho Cordova-El Dorado Hills), although it is within 10% in the other five corridors in which the first choice preferences are the same. The first choice differs for the regionwide and target area tables for both the Highway 65/South Placer corridor and the Yolo County-Sacramento corridor. It should be noted that in both of these corridors, the preferences were very split within each sample group (i.e., there was significant support for all three scenarios in each corridor from both samples). The most important finding may not be the differences of opinion between the two samples, but the fact that people within each sample had a split opinion for these corridors.

U.S. 50 and Eastern Sacramento were the areas with the strongest agreement, with more than 60% of the tables in both sample groups supporting the same Scenario. There was also substantial agreement in the Southern Sacramento, Elk Grove-Rancho Cordova-El Dorado Hills, and Eastern I-80 corridors, with between 50% and 59% of the tables in both sample groups selecting the same first choice Scenario.

Individual Votes on Corridor Scenario Preferences

718 of the 1,225 participants at the workshops completed and handed in score sheets showing their personal preferences for top Scenario for each corridor. We do not know the opinions of the individuals who participated but did not hand in this score sheet. Anecdotally, some discussion leaders have reported that many participants whose personal opinions were the same as the majority votes at their table did not hand in these personal preference score sheets. Others took them home and said they would send them to SACOG in a few days. Some others may have left before the workshop was completed. For these reasons, the results from the tables reported above are probably the most reliable data to capture the opinions of the participants. However, the preferences of the individuals who completed the personal preference score sheets are also useful. In most cases, their first choice Scenario preferences for the 9 corridors are the same as the table votes, but there are some differences. The complete set of results for the individual preferences is included in Attachment 4. A summary of these results follows:

Individual Preferences for Top Scenario by Corridor		
Corridor	All Individuals in Region	Individuals at Target Area Sites
Southern Sacramento County	1 (59%)	1 (68%)
Elk Grove-Rancho Cordova-El Dorado Hills	2 (50%)	2 (70%)
U.S. 50 Corridor	1 (63%)	1 (73%)
Eastern Sacramento County	1 (60%)	1 (63%)
Eastern I-80 Corridor	2 (52%)	2 (49%)
Highway 65/S. Placer	1 (45%)	2 (41%)
Sutter/Yuba Counties	1 (42%)	3 (75%)
Yolo County-Sacramento	2 (41%)	2 (40%)
Northern Sacramento County	2 (49%)	2 (43%)

The individuals from both the regional and the target area samples were in agreement on their top Scenario preferences in 7 of the 9 corridors. The regionwide sample of individual top Scenario preferences is different from the regionwide sample of table top Scenario preferences in only the Yuba-Sutter area. Scenario 1 was selected as top pick in the sample of individuals with 42%, and Scenario 3 was selected as top pick in the sample of tables with 44%. In the target area sample, the top selections of the individuals are the same as the tables except in the Highway 65/South Placer and the Yolo County-Sacramento areas. The target area individuals picked Scenario 2 (41%) as their top pick for Highway 65/South Placer, while the tables selected Scenario 3 (41%). The target area individuals picked Scenario 2 (40%) as their top pick for Yolo County-Sacramento, while the tables selected Scenario 3 (38%).

Individuals were also invited to identify any refinements or changes they would like to see made to their preferred Scenario in each corridor. These comments are listed in Attachment 5.

Budget Issues

Participants were given summary budget information for each Scenario for all 9 corridors, expressed as between 1 and 5 dollar bill signs. They were encouraged to consider this information along with travel performance and other issues in arriving at their preferences, but they were not asked to balance all of their picks to an overall budget. This would not have been possible, given that many chose not to analyze and identify preferences for all 9 corridors.

At the end of the workshop, participants were told that the unannounced “budget” for the corridors exercise was 25 dollar bill signs, which corresponded to approximately \$8 billion. For those who completed all 9 corridors, they were encouraged to tally their costs to see whether they were over, on, or under budget.

The budget results for both table votes follows:

Budget Results for Table Preferences for Top Scenario by Corridor		
Corridor	All Tables in Region	Tables at Target Area Sites
Southern Sacramento County	1 (\$\$)	1 (\$\$)
Elk Grove-Rancho Cordova-El Dorado Hills	2 (\$\$\$)	2 (\$\$\$)
U.S. 50 Corridor	1 (\$\$\$)	1 (\$\$\$)
Eastern Sacramento County	1 (\$\$\$)	1 (\$\$\$)
Eastern I-80 Corridor	2 (\$\$\$\$)	2 (\$\$\$\$)
Highway 65/S. Placer	1 (\$\$\$\$)	3 (\$\$\$\$)
Sutter/Yuba Counties	3 (\$\$)	3 (\$\$)
Yolo County-Sacramento	2 (\$\$)	3 (\$\$\$)
Northern Sacramento County	2 (\$\$\$\$)	2 (\$\$\$\$)
Total Dollar Bills	28	30
"Budget" Dollar Bills	25	25

Each dollar bill represents approximately \$320 million, so the composite first choice Scenario picks for the tables regionwide is, in very round numbers, approximately \$1 billion over the "budget," and the composite first choice Scenario picks for the tables at the target area sites is a little more than \$1.5 billion over "budget."

Budget Results for Individual Preferences for Top Scenario by Corridor		
Corridor	All Tables in Region	Tables at Target Area Sites
Southern Sacramento County	1 (\$\$)	1 (\$\$)
Elk Grove-Rancho Cordova-El Dorado Hills	2 (\$\$\$)	2 (\$\$\$)
U.S. 50 Corridor	1 (\$\$\$)	1 (\$\$\$)
Eastern Sacramento County	1 (\$\$\$)	1 (\$\$\$)
Eastern I-80 Corridor	2 (\$\$\$\$)	2 (\$\$\$\$)
Highway 65/S. Placer	1 (\$\$\$\$)	2 (\$\$)
Sutter/Yuba Counties	1 (\$)	3 (\$\$)
Yolo County-Sacramento	2 (\$\$)	2 (\$\$)
Northern Sacramento County	2 (\$\$\$\$)	2 (\$\$\$\$)
Total Dollar Bills	27	27
"Budget" Dollar Bills	25	25

Both samples of individual preferences were over "budget" by the same amount (about \$640 million).

Again, it is worth stressing that the participants were not asked to balance to a budget, so the fact that the composite votes of all the tables and individuals who participated do not equal the budget should not be a surprise, and it certainly should not be construed as a criticism. But it does highlight the job that the SACOG Board of Directors has in front of it, because the MTP that is submitted to the federal government must have costs that are no greater than revenues. To help ensure that the budget balances with the final MTP, several steps will now be taken.

First, staff will look at estimated total revenues in greater detail than it has to date. It is possible that the \$36 billion overall budget will be refined somewhat to be higher or lower, based on this more detailed analysis.

Second, staff will examine estimated project costs once more to see if adjustments need to be up or down in any cases.

Third, specific expected revenue sources will be tied to specific costs. To keep the exercise at the November 16 workshops from being any more complex than it already was, staff did not try to explain to participants how certain sources of money can only be spent on certain types of expenses. This analysis will now begin, however, and will result in a series of sub-budgets within the total budget. For instance, transit operating costs and road maintenance costs are two items that can only be funded from certain sources. Staff will need to determine whether these scenarios are over or under these limits.

Fourth, the Board will need to determine how much of the overall budget to dedicate to what were titled “Common” projects at the November 16 workshop. If the Board dedicates more or less than the \$28 billion for those projects included at the workshop, then the funds available for the 9 corridor projects could rise or fall.

And fifth, after all this work is completed, the 31 members of the SACOG Board of Directors will, ultimately, have to agree on a plan whose costs are no greater than reasonably expected revenues. It is possible that the Board could decide to adopt, in essence, an addendum to that plan that identifies additional priority transportation investments that will be added to the Plan if and when additional revenue sources are secured.

Participants' Top Two Priority MTP Principles

		1. Access & Mobility	2. Equity & Choice	3. Economic Vitality	4. Environmental Quality & Sustainability	5. Financial Stewardship	6. Smart Land Use
El Dorado County (Placerville)- 41 questionnaires							
	1st Choice	24%	2%	7%	24%	7%	34%
	2nd Choice	29%	7%	17%	17%	7%	22%
	Total	54%	10%	24%	41%	15%	56%
Placer County (Rocklin)- 110 questionnaires							
	1st Choice	45%	5%	7%	25%	6%	11%
	2nd Choice	12%	6%	15%	20%	11%	36%
	Total	56%	12%	23%	45%	17%	47%
Sacramento County Central (Downtown)- 257 questionnaires							
	1st Choice	31%	5%	5%	36%	3%	22%
	2nd Choice	12%	16%	8%	27%	2%	36%
	Total	43%	21%	13%	62%	5%	58%
Sacramento County East (Folsom)- 120 questionnaires							
	1st Choice	37%	6%	8%	23%	9%	18%
	2nd Choice	17%	12%	17%	18%	8%	29%
	Total	53%	18%	24%	41%	18%	47%
Sacramento County North (Natomas)- 72 questionnaires							
	1st Choice	43%	8%	7%	21%	1%	19%
	2nd Choice	10%	22%	10%	15%	7%	36%
	Total	53%	31%	17%	36%	8%	56%
Sacramento County South (Elk Grove)- 22 questionnaires							
	1st Choice	48%	14%	10%	24%	0%	5%
	2nd Choice	14%	14%	24%	29%	10%	10%
	Total	62%	29%	33%	52%	10%	14%
Sutter & Yuba Counties (Yuba City)- 88 questionnaires							
	1st Choice	59%	3%	9%	13%	2%	15%
	2nd Choice	18%	11%	20%	11%	14%	25%
	Total	77%	15%	30%	24%	16%	40%
Yolo County (Davis)- 102 questionnaires							
	1st Choice	32%	8%	6%	29%	4%	22%
	2nd Choice	13%	15%	4%	21%	10%	37%
	Total	45%	23%	10%	50%	14%	59%

Regional Total: 812 questionnaires