



Item #15-2-12 Workshop

SACOG Board of Directors

February 12, 2015

2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy Update: Briefing on Discussion Draft Preferred Scenario

Issue: Staff will continue briefing the Board on the themes of the Discussion Draft Preferred Scenario for the 2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS) Update.

Recommendation: None. This item is for information and discussion.

Discussion: The purpose of this workshop is to present the Board with more detail on the Discussion Draft Preferred Scenario (Discussion Draft) for the 2016 MTP/SCS update, in order to support the Board's deliberations on how best to refine its three main components: the draft transportation revenue forecast and budget, project list, and land use forecast. The specific items that will be presented during the workshop include: 1) more detail on the complete streets program concept for the Discussion Draft budget; 2) information on employment centers and their transportation characteristics; and 3) stakeholder feedback to date on the Discussion Draft.

Background

The Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS) is a long-range transportation plan. SACOG, as a federally-designated Metropolitan Planning Organization, is required to update the MTP/SCS every four years in order to ensure the region's eligibility for federal and state transportation funds.

In December 2013, the Board initiated the 2016 MTP/SCS update with adoption of a Policy Framework that focused the plan update on refinement and implementation of the current MTP/SCS, adopted in 2012. Over the course of 2014, the Board has adopted increasingly detailed frameworks that have provided guidance to staff on research, analysis, public and stakeholder engagement, and other steps that will ultimately lead to completing the plan update. The table in **Attachment A** summarizes the key board actions, past and future, that are guiding the development of the draft update of the MTP/SCS.

Policy Themes of the 2016 MTP/SCS Update

The specific themes of the 2016 update are:

- ***Transportation Funding:*** Can the region capture the revenues projected to come from all sources, local, state and federal?
- ***Investment Strategy:*** Is there enough emphasis in the budget on system maintenance (Fix-it-First) investment?
- ***Investment Timing:*** Should there be changes in the timing of transportation investments?
- ***Land Use Forecast:*** What is the economic viability of the projected infill and greenfield growth?
- ***Plan Effects:*** Follow through on the implementation commitments of the 2012 MTP/SCS to better measure the effects of the plan on different people and issue areas.

Development of a Preferred Scenario

Plan update work conducted in 2014 included transportation and land use scenario development and analysis corresponding to each of the above policy themes (See Framework 1.5 in **Attachment A**). This scenario work culminated in the development of a Framework for a Draft Preferred Scenario (Framework 2.0 in **Attachment A**), which was adopted by the Board in December 2014. This framework provides the guiding principles, method, and process for developing the final preferred scenario for the 2016 MTP/SCS Update.

Discussion Draft Preferred Scenario

Staff developed a Discussion Draft Preferred Scenario (Discussion Draft) according to the action items set forth in Framework 2.0. The Discussion Draft includes a land use forecast, transportation revenue forecast and budget, and transportation project list. To support the Board's review, staff briefed each board committee in February on key pieces of the Discussion Draft. SACOG also sent the Discussion Draft materials to member agencies in late January 2015. This initiated a six-week vetting period (January 26 – March 9) during which time local agencies are being asked to review and provide comment on the Discussion Draft. For the jurisdictions in El Dorado and Placer counties, transportation project list review will be coordinated by the El Dorado County Transportation Commission and Placer County Transportation Planning Agency.

It is important to note that two directives of the Framework for a Draft Preferred Scenario – increasing investment in maintenance and rehabilitation (Fix-it-First) projects and achieving state greenhouse gas targets and federal air quality conformity tests – are not yet settled in this Discussion Draft. The purpose of circulating a Discussion Draft at this point in the plan update is to work with local agencies on refinement of the scenario and to provide analysis to the SACOG Board to support its consideration of the Discussion Draft.

Workshop

The following will be the focus of the February Board workshop and discussion:

- ***Transportation Funding - Increasing the maintenance budget:*** Staff briefed the Board in January on the revenue and budget assumptions for the Discussion Draft. Included in these assumptions is a new revenue source – Cap and Trade revenue – that was not included in the prior plan. The Discussion Draft puts this new revenue toward the maintenance and rehabilitation part of the budget through a complete streets program. In keeping with the themes of the plan update, this new funding source could provide a meaningful increase in the maintenance budget of the plan. **Attachment B** summarizes the revenue and budget assumptions of the Discussion Draft, and describes the general concept of the complete streets program which was presented at the February Committee meetings. In this workshop, staff will provide a more detailed briefing to the Board on the complete streets program concept. Supplemental information will be mailed out in advance of the Board meeting. Staff is seeking Board feedback on this proposal.
- ***Investment Strategy and Land Use Forecast – Transportation access to employment centers:*** Much of the Board's interest during this plan update has been around jobs and employment centers, and the importance of transportation access into job centers. The Framework for a Preferred Scenario includes three new job-related employment metrics. Staff is also developing performance outcomes that describe jobs-housing balance around jobs centers and the

transportation characteristics of those centers. Staff will present the latest information to the Board during the workshop. Supplemental information will be mailed out in advance of the Board meeting.

- ***Outreach and Engagement Update – Stakeholder feedback on Discussion Draft:*** The Sounding Board is a group of stakeholders representing a wide range of interests in the region. This group has been meeting quarterly throughout the plan update process to review and give feedback on the issues and topics associated with the update of the MTP/SCS. The group most recently met in early February to hear a presentation on the Discussion Draft and provide feedback on its themes and contents. A summary of the Sounding Board meeting can be found in **Attachment C**.

Approved by:

Mike McKeever
Chief Executive Officer

MM:KL:ds
Attachment

Key Staff: Matt Carpenter, Director of Transportation Services, (916) 340-6276
Sharon Sprowls, Senior Program Specialist, (916) 340-6235
Kacey Lizon, MTP/SCS Manager, (916) 340-6265
Bruce Griesenbeck, Principal Project Expert, (916) 340-6268

2016 MTP/SCS Update: Schedule of Board Actions Leading to Final Plan Adoption

(Updated January 12, 2015 to reflect Board adoption of Framework 2.0)

Board Action	Date of Action	Contents/Direction
Framework 1.0: Policy Framework	Adopted December 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set implementation-focused theme for plan update with five policy themes: transportation funding, investment strategy, investment timing, land use forecast, plan effects. • Set region-level growth projections of population, employment and housing for the plan horizon year (2036). • Set overall schedule for the plan update.
Framework 1.5: Scenarios Development Framework	Adopted March 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set parameters for three regional land use and transportation scenarios for use in public workshops and plan development. • Initiated phasing analysis of transportation investments in current plan. • Initiated analysis of different levels and types of transportation revenue sources. • Set schedule for creation of Framework 2.0.
Framework 2.0: Draft Preferred Scenario Framework	Adopted December 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sets guidelines, task and process for developing a draft preferred scenario (land use forecast, revenue forecast, project list, performance outcomes). • Sets a minimum of six weeks for review and vetting of a preliminary draft preferred scenario.
Framework 3.0: Draft Preferred Scenario	Targeted for April 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sets details of Draft Preferred Scenario (for years 2020, 2035, and 2036) for use in development of Draft Plan and EIR: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Land use forecast ○ Revenue Forecast ○ Budget and Project List ○ Key Performance Outcomes
Draft Plan (2016 MTP/SCS)	Targeted for September 2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Release Draft 2016 MTP/SCS for public comment. Draft Plan includes written discussion of the detailed land use and transportation information above plus: policies and strategies, an environmental justice analysis, discussion of natural resources.
Final Plan (2016 MTP/SCS)	Targeted for February 2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adopt 2016 MTP/SCS, certify Final EIR, adopt air quality conformity finding.

Attachment B: MTP/SCS Discussion Draft Revenue and Expenditure Summary

This memo was distributed at the February, 2015 Board Committees.

MTP/SCS Discussion Draft Revenues and Expenditure Summary

The Discussion Draft Preferred Scenario (Discussion Draft) revenues and budget are based on the Framework adopted by the Board at its December 2014 meeting. The Framework for a Draft Preferred Scenario (Framework 2.0¹) directs staff to develop a draft land use forecast, transportation revenue forecast and budget, and transportation project list. A large part of the work leading to the Discussion Draft was focused on identifying a range of possible revenue and budget strategies that could shift more investment into road and transit maintenance than the current plan. Attachments B1 and B2 are summary tables of the Discussion Draft expenditures and revenues.

The information described in the tables is intended to provide information to the SACOG Board related to two questions; 1) How much of the MTP/SCS budget should be shifted toward maintenance and rehabilitation of the existing road and highway system? 2) What strategies are available to the region for prioritizing the spending of new revenues, specifically Cap and Trade revenues, which could be reasonably assumed to be available during the MTP/SCS planning period?

The expenditures described in Table 1, Attachment B1 are reflective of the project list that was sent to local agency staff on January 26. SACOG anticipates that total expenditures will shift following further technical analysis and discussions with local staff during the six-week vetting period on the Discussion Draft. Part of the work SACOG staff will be undertaking during this review period will include analyzing projects that could shift outside of the plan without damaging system performance to make room for more maintenance and rehabilitation budget. Conversations regarding any changes to specific projects will be had on a case by case basis with local staff.

The expenditure categories used to describe the spending contained in the Discussion Draft represent broad groupings of projects of similar type. While there is certainly overlap between categories, such as road expansion projects that also include bicycle and pedestrian or operational elements, the categories are intended to illustrate the overall expenditure priorities contained in the plan. The following definitions provide additional detail about the types of projects contained in each expenditure category:

Maintenance & Rehabilitation- The primary purpose of projects in this category is to preserve, maintain, and rehabilitate the region's roads, highways, bridges, sidewalks and other bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Projects in this category may include:

- Routine and preventive maintenance projects intended to extend the life of roads, and highways, including sealing cracks, repairing pavement, cleaning and repairing drains, fixing signals, and sweeping streets
- More extensive repair, rehabilitation, and reconstruction of roadways, including sealing pavement, repaving, reconstructing subgrade and drainage, and reconfiguring intersections
- Bicycle, pedestrian, safety and aesthetic improvements, such as striping, curb ramps, sidewalk gap closures, rail crossings, and landscaping as part of larger rehabilitation projects
- Replacement, rehabilitation, painting, scour countermeasures, and bridge approach barrier and railing replacements on local and state-owned bridges

System Management, Operations, and ITS- The primary purpose of projects in this category is improve the efficiency, operations, and safety of the regional transportation system. Projects in this category may include:

¹ <http://sacog.org/calendar/2014/12/board/pdf/10-MTP%20Framework.pdf>

Attachment B: MTP/SCS Discussion Draft Revenue and Expenditure Summary

- Non-capacity increasing intersection or interchange improvements
- Intelligent Transportation System improvements such as traveler information and incident management technology
- Road and highway safety improvements such as guardrails, message signs, shoulder widening, and rumble strips
- Signal coordination and ramp metering

Road & Highway Capacity- The primary purpose of projects in this category is to expand the region's roads, highways, and bridges. Projects in this category may include:

- Addition of lanes on existing local roads and highways, including the addition of high-occupancy vehicle, auxiliary, and transition lanes on state highways
- New and expanded interchanges
- New or extended local roads and major arterials to accommodate new growth areas
- New or expanded bridges that add additional capacity over waterways, roads, or other barriers

Bicycle & Pedestrian- The primary purpose of projects in this category is to expand and improve the region's bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Projects in this category may include:

- New, extended, and completed sidewalks
- Bicycle and pedestrian bridges and intersection improvements including ADA-compatible ramps, bulb-outs, bicycle detection, and special crossing signals
- Bike lane striping and route signage
- Multi-use bicycle and pedestrian trails
- Other projects that support the implementation of local bicycle and pedestrian master plans and the Regional Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Trails Master Plan

Transit Capital- The primary purpose of projects in this category is to support the capital needs of the existing and expanded transit network included in the MTP/SCS. Projects in this category may include:

- The design and construction of new transit infrastructure and expansion of the existing system
- Replacement, renovation, or major repairs of existing or acquisition of new rolling stock such as buses, shuttles, and light rail vehicles.
- Replacement, renovation, or major repairs of fixed assets such as fixed guideway systems, stations, facilities, and equipment.

Transit Operations & Maintenance- The primary purpose of projects in this category is to operate and perform ongoing preventive maintenance on the regional transit system. Projects in this category may include:

Attachment B: MTP/SCS Discussion Draft Revenue and Expenditure Summary

- Operating assistance costs including fuels and lubricants, insurance, driver wages, administration and dispatch, routine or preventive maintenance (including engine maintenance, tires, cleaning, and other basic vehicle maintenance) that are part of the ongoing costs of providing transit service.

Programs & Planning- The primary purpose of projects in this category is to support ongoing planning, program, and project development efforts throughout the region. Projects in this category may include:

- Studies and planning intended to identify system safety, capacity, and operational needs
- Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs such as rideshare, promotional campaigns, and incentives for telecommuting and alternative modes
- Air Quality programs such as Spare the Air
- Project development support for projects not included in the financially constrained MTP/SCS to account for spending on the early stages of development, including project design, preliminary engineering, environmental clearance, and right-of-way acquisition

Discussion Draft Budget

The Discussion Draft budget has two primary components; a base budget that includes all of the same revenue sources as the current plan and an expanded budget that includes assumption for new revenues SACOG believes could be reasonably available for this plan update.

Overall, the Discussion Draft makes progress toward increasing spending on system maintenance and preservation by adding about \$1.5 billion over the \$10.5 billion included in the current plan. This is a roughly 14% increase. This additional expenditure comes from a combination of shifting revenues in the base budget out of road and highway expansion and new revenues that could be available for maintenance and rehabilitation.

The \$1.5 billion represents a relatively small, but potentially meaningful dent in the overall needs SACOG identified in a staff report to the board in Summer of 2014 which identified a ten year need of \$3-4 billion with potential to become a \$10 to \$12 billion problem by the end of the plan unless more funding could be found to maintain the existing system.²

The base budget described in Section B of Table 1, Attachment B1 has lower overall revenues and expenditures than the current plan described in Section A of Table 1 by about \$300 million. This reduction is largely due to less funding available from fuel tax revenues that come to the region through a number of existing state and federal programs. The decrease in fuel tax projections is the result of slower growth in forecasted fuel price compared to the current plan. This decline is discussed further in the December Framework for a Draft Preferred Scenario.³

The only new revenue source included in the current plan and the Discussion Draft base budget is a new half-cent sales tax equivalent in Sacramento County which is assumed to be split equally between road maintenance and transit operations. However, ongoing discussions at the Sacramento Transportation Authority about how a potential future sales tax could be spent could require SACOG to revisit these assumptions and how they affect the overall plan budget.

² <http://sacog.org/calendar/2014/04/board/pdf/13-System%20Maintenance.pdf>

³ <http://sacog.org/calendar/2014/12/board/pdf/10-MTP%20Framework.pdf>

Attachment B: MTP/SCS Discussion Draft Revenue and Expenditure Summary

The expanded budget described in Section C of Table 1, Attachment B1 adds in the new revenues described in more detail in Table 2, Attachment B1. These new revenues result in an overall increase to the discussion draft budget of \$3.1 billion that could be included in this plan update. The largest increases come from \$1.5 billion in a potential new sales tax in Placer County and up to \$1 billion in Cap and Trade funding. The balance comes from a better accounting of Highway Bridge Program funds totaling roughly \$600 million. The Highway Bridge Program funds come to the region primarily for preserving and replacing structurally deficient or obsolete bridges, though in some cases, this funding can be used for bridge expansions.

The additional funding in the expanded budget results in a number of important changes to the expenditures in the Discussion Draft. For transit, despite less funding from existing revenues, additional funding, primarily from the Low Carbon Transit Program out of Cap and Trade, allows the Discussion Draft to maintain roughly the same level of transit service as the current plan. In terms of total vehicle service hours (VSH) of transit by 2036, both the current plan and Discussion Draft include more than double the amount of service compared to today, increasing total service by all types of transit from around 3,500 annual VSH today to approximately 8,100 annual VSH by 2036. Potential additional funding from the competitive Cap and Trade Intercity Rail program that could be captured by transit operators in the region would increase the Discussion Draft budget for rail or bus rapid transit expansion projects by up to \$200 million compared to the current plan.

On the road and highway expansion side, the Discussion Draft reduces the total amount of road and highway expansion projects by about \$200 to \$250 million compared to the current plan, representing a roughly 5% to 6% reduction in lane miles- from 1,550 to 1,450. Despite the overall reduction in lane miles, the Discussion Draft does include some notable new projects compared to the current plan including a much more expansive set of projects addressing congestion on the Capital City Freeway (SR 51) and some additional highway and interchange expansion projects on Highway 65 in Placer County, among other more local projects.

To maintain and make room for an expanded maintenance and rehabilitation budget, the Discussion Draft proposes to delay or exclude a large number of road and highway expansion projects. These projects are either tied to land use changes that are not assumed to occur during the planning period of the MTP/SCS (2012 to 2036) or can likely be delayed without significant implications for overall system performance. The overall budget for new capacity projects in the Discussion Draft is \$6.2 billion compared to \$6.4 billion in the current plan, a 3% reduction in spending.

The total cost of road and highway expansion projects nominated by local sponsors for consideration in the MTP/SCS update started at \$9.2 billion. In total, \$3 billion in expansion projects are not included in the Discussion Draft as shown in Section D of Table 1, Attachment B1. Of this, local agencies proposed about \$1.6 billion in projects that could be delayed until after 2036 or removed from consideration for this plan update. SACOG staff's analysis thus far has identified another \$500 million in projects that are included in the current plan, but that could be delayed to post-2036 without sacrificing overall system performance. Another \$900 million in project nominations that are new to this plan update are not included in the Discussion Draft because SACOG's modeling shows that they are likely adding road capacity that would go underutilized by 2036 based on the increase in travel demand forecast in the Discussion Draft. However, the assumptions about delayed projects are still being analyzed by SACOG and subject to change pending discussions with sponsor agency staff.

The 3% reduction in total road and highway expansion project costs allows the discussion draft to shift about \$250 million to the maintenance and rehabilitation budget. Staff is still investigating opportunities to increase this amount, but there are challenges in identifying candidate projects to that would result in meaningful savings. Some of the challenge of finding more money for maintenance is related to the sources of revenues paying for projects. In certain cases, particularly where new road or highway projects are tied to development, or part of an existing fee program, those revenues are not available to transfer to another purpose. In other cases, a road or highway expansion project may be needed to relieve a congestion bottleneck or accommodate vehicle trips generated by a new land use development. Delaying these projects could erode overall system performance or result in new or worsened bottlenecks.

Attachment B: MTP/SCS Discussion Draft Revenue and Expenditure Summary

The largest portion of the \$1.5 billion increase for the maintenance and rehabilitation budget in the Discussion Draft is due to assumed new revenues. As mentioned previously, about \$600 million of this comes from better accounting of Highway Bridge Program funding. A new ½ cent sales tax measure in Placer County would likely also generate additional funding for road maintenance, though assumptions regarding the use of these revenues are still being discussed by Placer County Transportation Planning Agency as part of their regional transportation plan update.

One potential source of funding explored in the Discussion Draft is the Cap and Trade funding described in more detail in Attachment B2. This funding source could generate up to \$1 billion from a combination of formula and competitive grants that support greenhouse gas reducing projects. As discussed above, some of these revenues are available for transit operations and help the Discussion Draft maintain the service from the current plan. Another portion of these revenues is available for intercity rail and bus rapid transit capital projects. Lastly, the Discussion Draft assumes that up to \$400 million could be captured by this region for transportation projects through the competitive Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities Program.

This budget assumption is an idea for the SACOG Board to discuss: the Discussion Draft budget assumes the funds will be used in a way that is consistent with historic board actions regarding SACOG's Regional Funding Programs, which prioritize fix-it-first (i.e., rehabilitation) projects that present opportunities to enhance complete streets and active transportation. This type of approach would be dependent on identifying projects on the existing system where road condition, lack of complete streets elements, and surrounding land uses are an obstacle to greater utilization by bicycles, pedestrians, and transit. Projects that could utilize state cap and trade funding to better address the needs of non-automobile modes as part of a larger rehabilitation project may be competitive for these statewide funds.

SACOG staff will present additional information to the Board in February and March to support its discussion on the expenditure priorities in the MTP/SCS and how the plan should address system maintenance and preservation questions such as:

- What do the increases in the maintenance and rehabilitation budget buy the region in terms of meeting short- and long-term maintenance needs?
- What does the region give up by shifting funding from expansion projects into maintenance and rehabilitation?
- Is there more that the MTP/SCS can do toward meeting the region's maintenance needs?
- Are the assumptions regarding the spending of new revenues, particularly Cap and Trade revenues, something the Board is interested in investigating further?

Attachment B1: Preliminary Discussion Draft Preferred Scenario- Summary of Expenditures and Revenues

1) Expenditures	Budget Category	A. Current MTP/SCS		B. Base Revenue Expenditures by Budget Category		C. Base + New Revenue Expenditures by Budget Category		D. Not in Discussion Draft Preferred Scenario		
		Plan Expenditures	% of Total Expenditures	Expenditures	% of Total	Expenditures	% of Total	Projects removed by sponsor agency	Current plan projects delayed to post-2036 in Discussion DPS	New projects proposed by sponsors, but not included in Discussion DPS
	Maintenance & Rehabilitation	\$10.5	32%	\$10.8	34%	\$12.3	35%	\$0.1	\$0.0	\$0.0
	System Management, Operations, and ITS	\$0.8	2%	\$0.8	2%	\$1.5	4%	\$0.1	\$0.0	\$0.0
	Road & Highway Capacity	\$6.4	20%	\$6.2	19%	\$6.2	18%	\$1.6	\$0.5	\$0.9
	Bicycle & Pedestrian	\$2.5	8%	\$2.6	8%	\$2.8	8%	\$0.1	\$0.0	\$0.0
	Transit Capital	\$3.3	10%	\$3.0	9%	\$3.5	10%	\$0.3	\$0.5	\$0.1
	Transit Operations & Maintenance	\$7.1	22%	\$6.9	22%	\$7.1	20%	\$0.0	\$0.4	\$0.0
	Programs & Planning	\$1.8	6%	\$1.8	6%	\$1.8	5%	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
	TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$32.4	100%	\$32.1	100%	\$35.2	100%	\$2.2	\$1.4	\$1.0

2) Revenues	Revenue Source	Discussion DPS Budget	Notes
		Base Revenues	\$32.1
	<i>Federal Highway</i>	\$2.1	All projections are preliminary and subject to change through additional research, refinement, and coordination with partner agencies.
	<i>Federal Transit</i>	\$1.4	
	<i>State Fuel Taxes</i>	\$9.2	
	<i>State Transit</i>	\$1.2	
	<i>Sales Tax</i>	\$6.1	
	<i>Other Local Revenues</i>	\$9.9	
	<i>Transit Fares</i>	\$2.2	
	New Revenues	\$3.1	
	Highway Bridge Program (Bridge Maintenance & Preservation)	\$0.6	These additional revenues more fully account for funds from the Highway Bridge Program (HBP). The purpose of the HBP is to replace or rehabilitate public highway bridges over waterways, other topographical barriers, other highways, or railroads when the State and the Federal Highway Administration determine that a bridge is significantly important and is unsafe because of structural deficiencies, physical deterioration, or functional obsolescence.
	Placer 1/2 cent Sales Tax	\$1.5	Based on the Placer County Transportation Planning Agency draft RTP financial element.
	Cap & Trade (by 2020)	\$0.2	Cap and Trade revenues are made up of the 35% of auction proceeds that are allocated to Affordable Housing & Sustainable Communities (20%) (with 10% available to projects that reduce VMT and auto trips under the Sustainable Communities program), Intercity Rail (10%), and Low Carbon Transit (5%). The region's capture of these revenues assumes SACOG member agencies receive revenues roughly equivalent the region's share of statewide population. Consistent with Board direction to focus this plan update on fix-it-first projects, the Discussion DPS assumes revenues captured under the Sustainable Communities program would support roadway rehabilitation projects that provide strong complete streets opportunities that encourage biking, walking, and transit use.
	Cap & Trade (2021-2036)	\$0.8	The Governor's budgets for FY 14/15 and 15/16 allocate an additional 20% to ARB's Low Carbon Transportation Program. Assuming SACOG agencies are eligible for these programs, this could create an another roughly \$700 million for the plan.
	TOTAL REVENUES (Base + New)	\$35.2	

Attachment B2: Preliminary Discussion Draft Preferred Scenario- Cap and Trade Revenue

Potential Statewide Cap and Trade Revenues				
	Program Share	Potential Revenues By 2020	Potential Revenues 2021-2036	Assumptions and Program Descriptions
Total Auction Proceeds	100%	\$11.5	\$46.7	Assumes all available state-owned allowances will be purchased at the minimum reserve price through 2020. For 2021 to 2036, assume 5% growth in reserve price as set by the state and maintain a consistent number of allowances available in each fiscal year based on the average number of allowances sold between FYs 2013/14 and 2019/20. Actual revenues available will vary depending on state policy, technology, and the market prices for allowances.
High Speed Rail	25%	\$2.9	\$11.7	These funds will support the construction of the California High-Speed Rail project.
Other Programs (allocated annually)	40%	\$4.6	\$18.7	These funds will be allocated annually to support a variety of other programs aimed at reducing greenhouse gas emissions such as clean energy, energy conservation, low or zero emission vehicles, and fire prevention and urban forestry.
Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities	20%	\$2.3	\$9.3	
<i>Affordable Housing</i>	<i>10%</i>	<i>\$1.2</i>	<i>\$4.7</i>	<i>Half (10% of the 20%) must be used for affordable housing that supports infill and compact development.</i>
<i>Sustainable Communities</i>	<i>10%</i>	<i>\$1.2</i>	<i>\$4.7</i>	<i>Half (10% of the 20%) may be available for projects aimed at reducing auto trips and vehicle miles traveled in regional transportation plans/sustainable community strategies, including complete streets and active transportation style projects.</i>
Intercity Rail	10%	\$1.2	\$4.7	These funds are for commuter and inter-regional rail and bus rapid transit projects.
Low Carbon Transit Operations	5%	\$0.6	\$2.3	Funding goes out under the State Transit Assistance formula for new and expanded service (including equipment); and 50% of the funding must be expended for disadvantaged communities.

Potential Discussion DPS Cap and Trade Revenues				
	Share of Statewide Revenues	Potential Revenues By 2020	Potential Revenues 2021-2036	Assumptions and Program Descriptions
Sustainable Communities	Equal to population Share (roughly 6.2% increasing to 7% by 2036)	\$0.1	\$0.3	Included in expanded Discussion DPS Maintenance and Rehabilitation budget to support fix-it-first investments that present complete streets and active transportation opportunities.
Intercity Rail		\$0.1	\$0.3	Included in expanded Discussion DPS transit capital budget for eligible intercity rail and BRT projects.
Low Carbon Transit Operations		\$0.04	\$0.2	Included in expanded Discussion DPS transit operating budget for new and expanded service in eligible communities. Funds are distributed via existing State Transit Assistance formulas to transit operators.
Total		\$0.2	\$0.8	

Public Outreach Background

SACOG has both state and federal statutory requirements for outreach during the development of any Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS). Outreach includes, but is not limited to, developing a process to allow for interested residents, agencies, representatives of the senior and disabled, and other interested parties to be involved in the process. The outreach process must include strategies that plan for reasonable outreach to low-income and minority populations.

In 2014, SACOG conducted eight public workshops throughout the region and a statistically valid public opinion phone poll. The public workshop results and phone poll findings were presented to the SACOG Board in November 2014. The results from both the workshop survey and phone poll were considered by the Board prior to adopting the Framework for the Draft Preferred Scenario for the MTP/SCS.

In addition to required public outreach, in 2013 the Board directed staff to develop a stakeholder group to provide feedback to the staff and Board throughout the 2016 MTP/SCS update process. Known as the Stakeholder Sounding Board, this group consists of executive and/or senior level staff from a broad range of stakeholder interests from throughout the region. The Sounding Board has met quarterly since October 2013. Its most recent meeting, on February 6, focused on the Discussion Draft Preferred Scenario.

Sounding Board Meeting Summary

February 6, 2015

Meeting Location: West Sacramento Community Center

Meeting Attendees:

Area 4 Agency on Aging	North State BIA
CA Rural Legal Assistance	Sacramento Housing Alliance
Domus Development	SMUD
Environmental Council of Sacramento	Taylor & Wiley
Health Education Council	Wade & Associates
League of Women Voters	Yolo County Housing Authority
National Safe Routes to School Partnership	

Meeting Agenda

- Welcome & Introductions
- Discussion Draft Preferred Scenario
- Environmental Justice Area Definition
- Scenario, Plan and Monitoring Indicators
- Meeting Evaluation

Meeting Summary

Staff provided an overview of the Discussion Draft Preferred Scenario (Discussion Draft) that was shared with member jurisdiction staff and the SACOG Board of Directors in January. The overview included information on the revenue projections, budget, transportation projects, land use forecast, complete streets approach to seeking Cap and Trade funds, and 2020 regional growth projections.

Discussion Draft Preferred Scenario***Theme: Revenues***

- For the Placer County sales tax, does SACOG or PCTPA make assumptions about what specifically will be funded with the tax measure?
- Similar to Placer County, do the overall MTP/SCS revenue projections include an assumption for an additional sales tax in Sacramento County?
- To what degree are local revenues tied to local jurisdictions and their projects?
- If a transportation project is tied to a land use project and the land use project is held up, would the transportation project also be held up? Is the timing of the linked projects considered in the projections of the plan?
- You're assuming \$400 million through the Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities (AHSC) program, how did you get to that number?
- The group discussed the limitations of Cal EnviroScreen as a tool to identify projects worthy of Cap and Trade funding (it's used as part of the AHSC program) with staff noting that they are working within the current system while advocating for better tools to be used in the future.

Theme: Transit

- How does transit service in the draft plan compare to the current plan?
- What is the SACOG Board discussing in regards to capital investments versus operations costs for transit? Do discussions about capital investments happen in tandem with discussions about investments in operations?
- To what extent is the MTP/SCS influencing Regional Transit's Master Plan, and as we get more infill will there be a response to have transit service where people need it?
- New studies are out that show that, despite our thinking about standard transit options, most low-income people live far from transit. Is there room to think about that in a different, more data-driven way? For example, if you look at Yolo County, the entire county is a transportation desert despite the fact that there is transit.

Theme: Complete Streets & Cap and Trade Funding

- Make sure accessibility improvements mirror Cap and Trade guidelines.
- Transit is key in rural areas and adding stops means you have to increase affordability and frequency of transit.
- There is no mention of jobs in this discussion; for rural areas if you are talking about greenhouse gas reductions and sustainable communities you have to be talking about

jobs. Think through the overlap and the connections between transit, infill, and affordable housing in rural areas to identify what will make rural areas more competitive because right now in the sustainable communities programs the rural areas are by definition not competitive.

- There is a need to help local jurisdictions apply for funding such as the Strategic Growth Council's planning grants to help rural areas in particular with implementation of complete streets projects.
- Planning for complete streets should be the standard business plan for local jurisdictions. There needs to be some kind of planning grant to help jurisdictions bring their areas up to date. Road rehabilitation is expensive; it is much cheaper to plan for and build complete streets from the start instead of having to make changes later.
- Local jurisdictions need help planning complete streets that work with emergency response and utility vehicles (fire protection and waste management in particular).

Theme: *Land Use*

- Is there a map that shows just the areas that are projected to grow differently from the current adopted plan?
- When you look at areas that have increases in infill, are you measuring that relative to the larger area? Are rural areas compared to their existing conditions instead of to an urban standard?

Theme: *Jobs and/or Housing*

- The region relies heavily on government jobs; do your projections for locations of jobs seem to make sense with where those government jobs will be located?
- Do you have a jobs-housing balance map?
- You look at growth areas for housing and proximity to job centers, but do you plan for where job centers will be in the future? When you describe when homes come on line, do you anticipate there will be some jobs that come on line as well on the same timeframe?
- You might want to look at South Placer plans from the mid-1980's; they had plans to build the bypass in exchange for job growth, and jurisdictions adopted ordinances to balance jobs and housing for that portion of region.
- Small lot is noted as a 5,500 square foot lot, but 5,200 square feet is the standard suburban density so if that's your benchmark it is going to be the same growth pattern we've seen historically.
- Are accessory housing units accounted for in the plan? There was a presentation by UC Berkeley recently that discussed the growth of accessory housing as affordable housing.
- There are many limitations of accessory housing to solve the affordable housing issue.
- It's important to consider jobs that will be created by emission reduction programs and having provisions in place to encourage the incorporation of charging and electric vehicle infrastructure (including electric buses) during development because it's very expensive to add it in after the fact.

Theme: 2020 Projections

- This information is based on new estimates and you're showing that population and employment caught up but housing is behind?
- It would be useful to look at where people locate, and marry that to some of the demographic information to have integration with the Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) data to support the SCS.
- How do the 2020 forecast and analyzing the underperforming economy now affect the 2036 projections?
- To what degree do you think about changes in lifestyle? Will the young people of today who are living in downtown centers without cars still live that lifestyle when they are 45? Will the big boxes (homes) in Elk Grove be full of multi-generational households?
- Are you going to see reduction in greenhouse gas emissions from people (Millennials) not getting drivers licenses at the same rate?

Environmental Justice (EJ) Area Definition

- How do these approaches of defining EJ areas compare to other regions?
- From Yolo County perspective, that large census tract area in the southwest region on the map is largely impoverished so that would be consistent and correlate to where we have public housing.
- In recognition of the fact that the American Community Survey has its own sample bias, in the sense that it doesn't over-sample in undercounted areas and populations, it makes sense to be over-inclusive on your analysis of EJ areas.
- It would be interesting to know household size and what that might show; crowding could be part of a vulnerability index.
- In large areas that are not densely populated you don't have reliability of data, so narrative support is needed to clarify these issues.

Scenario, Plan and Monitoring Indicators

- You can report on overpaying (affordability) of housing by showing the change over time. Why isn't affordability a measure? Local governments report the number of affordable units they permit. There aren't perfect metrics but there are metrics and you could get information from locals moving forward.
- There is a geography component to metrics as well, for example, using standards of percentages that make transit difficult in certain areas. If a goal is to make transit available and that requires concentration of residents but you have some dispersion in some communities, how do you get transit where people are dispersed? The goals are inherently at odds.
- Do you have or are you developing metrics for travel to K-12 schools?
- You use SACSIM to model VMT. Do you monitor this as well?
- We need the streetlight program from the Bay Area.

Meeting Evaluation

RANKING:

5. Strongly Agree 4. Agree 3. Neutral 2. Disagree 1. Strongly Disagree

This meeting was well organized. **4.75**

The length of the meeting was appropriate to get through the material: **3.75**

I was able to express issues and/or concerns about the Discussion Draft Preferred Scenario: **4.25**

I was able to express issues and/or concerns about the approach to defining Environmental Justice areas: **4**

I was able to express issues and/or concerns about the Scenario, Plan and Monitoring Indicators: **4**

I have understand the next major steps in the 2016 MTP/SCS process, and how my input is being considered: **4.25**

Additional comments:

-Ran a bit short on time

-please give copies of PowerPoints

Staff Contact:

Monica Hernández, (916) 340-6237, mhernandez@sacog.org