Chapter 12—Land Use and Planning

12.1 Introduction

This chapter describes the existing conditions (environmental and regulatory) for land use and planning and assesses the potential of the 2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (proposed MTP/SCS) to affect the land use and planning environment within the MTP/SCS plan area. This chapter evaluates potential impacts on land use and planning that may result from implementation of the proposed MTP/SCS. Where necessary and feasible, mitigation measures are identified to reduce these impacts.

The information presented in this chapter is based on a review of existing and available information and is regional in scope. Data provided in this section is programmatic. It is appropriate for general policy planning and tiering of subsequent environmental documents; however site-specific evaluations may be necessary to determine future project-level environmental effects and appropriate mitigation.

Four comment letters, plus additional comments at the scoping meeting, were received addressing topics relevant to this chapter during circulation of the Notice of Preparation (NOP). These comments fell into two categories: comments specifically about potential CEQA impacts and comments more generally related to the proposed MTP/SCS and the planning process. The following comments, included in a letter from the Delta Stewardship Council, were directed at the EIR analysis of land use impacts and are addressed in this chapter:

- ensure that urban boundaries are consistent with those in the Delta Plan;
- create MTP/SCS policies and strategies that contribute to protecting the values of the Delta;
- discuss any inconsistencies between the proposed MTP/SCS and the Delta Plan; and
- address Delta Plan regulations and recommendations in the regulatory settings.

Appendix PD-1 contains the full set of letters submitted during circulation of the NOP.

12.2 Environmental Setting

The Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) is a voluntary association of governments, a federally-designated metropolitan planning organization (MPO), and state-designated regional transportation planning agency (RTPA). Member jurisdictions include: the County of El Dorado (including the City of Placerville); the County of Placer (including the cities of Auburn, Colfax, Lincoln, Rocklin, and Roseville and the Town of Loomis); the County of Sacramento (including the cities of Citrus Heights, Elk Grove, Folsom, Galt, Isleton, Rancho Cordova, and Sacramento); the County of Sutter (including the cities of Live Oak and Yuba City); the County of Yolo (including the cities of Davis, West Sacramento, Winters, and Woodland); and the County of Yuba (including the cities of Marysville and Wheatland). SACOG’s designated RTPA status does not include the unincorporated areas and cities within El Dorado and Placer counties.
which have their own RTPAs: the El Dorado County Transportation Commission and the Placer County Transportation Planning Agency.

The MTP/SCS plan area encompasses the entire 28-jurisdiction area (except for the portions of El Dorado and Placer counties within the Lake Tahoe Basin), totaling approximately 6,193 square miles (3,963,626 acres). See Figure 12.1 for a map of the MTP/SCS plan area. The MTP/SCS plan area spans a diverse geography, including productive agricultural lands, the rapidly growing urban core and foothill communities, and the sparsely populated forestlands of the western Sierra Nevada Mountains. Existing development is heavily concentrated near the geographic center of the region in Sacramento County and southwest Placer County, with outlying development occurring mainly along major freeways such as I-80, I-5, US-50, and Highway 99. Near the edges of the region, outside of some small incorporated cities, most land is either productive agricultural land (Yolo, Sutter, and southwest Sacramento counties) or protected forests and open space in the Sierra Nevada foothills (eastern Placer, El Dorado, and Yuba counties).

12.2.1 Existing Land Uses by County

The MTP/SCS plan area contained 718,356 acres of developed land in 2012. Tables 12.1 and 12.2 summarize, existing housing units, employees, and land uses by county within the MTP/SCS plan area. The following paragraphs describe the existing land use conditions in each of the region’s six counties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County (incorporated and unincorporated areas)</th>
<th>Dwelling Units</th>
<th>Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012 Dwelling Units</td>
<td>2012 Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Percent of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado</td>
<td>64,358</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer</td>
<td>142,583</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>558,836</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutter</td>
<td>33,790</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolo</td>
<td>75,553</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuba</td>
<td>28,331</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region Total</td>
<td>903,451</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Totals may not match due to rounding.
2 Due to different protocols among GIS models for tallying spatial data, housing unit numbers in this DEIR differ marginally (less than 0.3 percent) from those reported in the proposed MTP/SCS.
Source: SACOG, June 2015
Figure 12.1 Sacramento Metropolitan Planning Area
Table 12.2
2012 Existing Land Uses in the MTP/SCS Plan Area by County (Acres)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Types</th>
<th>El Dorado County</th>
<th>Placer County</th>
<th>Sacramento County</th>
<th>Sutter County</th>
<th>Yolo County</th>
<th>Yuba County</th>
<th>Regional Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>195,099</td>
<td>121,912</td>
<td>157,401</td>
<td>25,342</td>
<td>22,728</td>
<td>70,311</td>
<td>592,794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use (vertical)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail, Office, and Commercial</td>
<td>2,296</td>
<td>5,390</td>
<td>15,282</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>1,804</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>26,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>1,278</td>
<td>3,521</td>
<td>20,792</td>
<td>1,238</td>
<td>5,565</td>
<td>1,448</td>
<td>33,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>2,461</td>
<td>6,150</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>1,212</td>
<td>7,982</td>
<td>24,047</td>
<td>64,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Developed Acres</strong></td>
<td><strong>201,148</strong></td>
<td><strong>137,021</strong></td>
<td><strong>216,752</strong></td>
<td><strong>28,679</strong></td>
<td><strong>38,244</strong></td>
<td><strong>96,512</strong></td>
<td><strong>718,356</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Excludes Agriculture, Open Space, Parks, Recreation, and Vacant Land

Source: SACOG, June 2015

**El Dorado County**

El Dorado County extends from the Sacramento County line on the west to the summit of the Sierra Nevada Mountains on the east. From west to east, the geography of El Dorado County progresses from foothill to mountainous terrain. Existing land uses primarily include residential, commercial, and industrial urban development, and rural and agricultural lands used for agricultural production, resource extraction, open space, and recreation. There is also a new mixed-use development in the Missouri Flat area. The only incorporated city in the county within the plan area is Placerville (the Lake Tahoe Basin, including South Lake Tahoe, is not part of the MTP/SCS plan area). Residential development is primarily concentrated on the west side of the county in clusters along US-50, including Placerville and the unincorporated communities of El Dorado Hills and Cameron Park, and to a lesser extent in the communities Camino and Pollock Pines. El Dorado Hills and Cameron Park are more recently urbanized areas of the county, where housing and commercial development are suburban in nature. Camino and Pollock Pines include housing and commercial development that is more rural in nature. Commercial development has generally followed the same growth patterns as residential development, clustering along US-50 and SR 49 and SR 193. A newer business park in El Dorado Hills south of US-50 and just east of the El Dorado-Sacramento County border has generated some job growth outside of the traditional jobs center in the city of Placerville. Additional employment clusters exist in the unincorporated county within Diamond Springs and Shingle Springs.

Over half of the land in the county is in public ownership. Agricultural and forestlands make up the largest percentage of undeveloped lands. Forestlands are managed by the United States Forest Service (USFS), and the United States Bureau of Land Management (BLM) also manages forested lands in the American and Cosumnes River canyons.

**Placer County**

With a similar geography to El Dorado County, the unincorporated portion of Placer County is predominantly rural. The majority of the population lives in the suburban southwest portion of the county where residential development has primarily occurred in and around the fast-growing cities of Roseville, Rocklin, and Lincoln. Residential development in these cities is predominantly single-family, although there are some medium- and high-density attached dwelling units. Outside of these...
cities, suburban residential uses are concentrated along I-80 in the incorporated cities of Loomis, Auburn, Colfax, and, to a lesser extent, the community of Granite Bay. The predominant land use in these cities is low-density residential, though Auburn has a concentration of employment uses due to its role as the county seat of government. The unincorporated area of the county is broken up into several rural communities and a substantial amount of agriculture and protected open space.

The highest concentrations of commercial, light industrial, and office uses in the county fall within the cities of Roseville, Rocklin, and Lincoln. Industrial and heavy commercial uses are also scattered in various locations outside the incorporated urban boundaries, mainly along I-80 near Loomis, Newcastle, Auburn, Foresthill, and Weimar, and near Highway 49 in Auburn and Highway 174 in Colfax.

Non-urban uses within Placer County include agricultural, resource extractive (timber and mining), public lands, and open space. A large portion of the county, particularly in the eastern half, is under public ownership. The largest amount of public land within Placer County is under the control of the BLM. Smaller amounts of land in central Placer County are under the jurisdiction of the USFS and the Bureau of Reclamation.

SACRAMENTO COUNTY

Sacramento County lies at the geographic center of the region and contains both agricultural land uses as well as the most urbanized areas of the region. The geographic boundaries of the County of Sacramento include several unincorporated communities and seven incorporated cities, including Citrus Heights, Elk Grove, Folsom, Galt, Isleton, Rancho Cordova, and Sacramento. The county has established two growth boundaries to promote orderly growth and the efficient extension of infrastructure and the provision of urban services. The Urban Services Boundary (USB) delineates the ultimate growth boundary for the unincorporated area, where county services shall be provided and where they will not be extended. The Urban Policy Area (UPA) delineates the area within the USB expected to receive county services in the near term.

The highest densities of employment and residential uses are located in the urban core of the city of Sacramento. Two of the three regional employment centers in the proposed MTP/SCS plan area are located in Sacramento County, including downtown Sacramento and a newer employment center along the US-50 corridor in the cities of Rancho Cordova and Folsom. Land uses north of the American River are primarily suburban residential with concentrations of commercial and employment uses along major transportation routes. The southern half of the county, including south Sacramento, the unincorporated Vineyard community, and the cities of Elk Grove and Galt, are predominantly residential. The latter three areas also have fairly low suburban to rural densities. The Cosumnes River flood plain and existing agricultural operations separate the cities of Elk Grove and Galt. The southeast county (outside of existing cities and the USB) is in agricultural use with pockets of Rural Residential Communities, as defined in Chapter 2 – Project Description.

SUTTER COUNTY

Land use in Sutter County is predominantly agricultural, with agriculture as the county’s primary industry. Yuba City and Live Oak are the two incorporated cities in Sutter County, which are suburban and rural in their current land use pattern. Several unincorporated rural communities include Meridian, Nicolaus, East Nicolaus, Rio Oso, Robbins, Sutter, Trowbridge, Tudor, and two
employment centers in the unincorporated areas north and south of Yuba City. Historically, general plan policy in Sutter County has encouraged agricultural preservation in the unincorporated areas of the county and directed new development adjacent to and within the county’s two cities and other clearly defined and comprehensively planned development areas. While generally continuing this policy, a recent exception is the Sutter Pointe specific plan area, located at the southern end of the unincorporated county. A development approval for this area was approved by voters under “Measure M” in 2004 and the Sutter Pointe Specific Plan was adopted in 2009. As of June 2015, only limited industrial development exists in the area, as development of the Sutter Pointe specific plan has not yet begun.

**YOLO COUNTY**

Agriculture is Yolo County’s primary industry. The eastern two-thirds of the County consists of nearly level alluvial fans, flat plains, and basins, while the western third is largely composed of rolling terraces and steep uplands used for dry-farmed grain and range. The elevation ranges from slightly below sea level near the Sacramento River around Clarksburg to 3,000 feet along the ridge of the western mountains. About 88 percent of the population lives in the County’s four cities (Davis, West Sacramento, Woodland, and Winters). Yolo County and its cities operate under an agriculture preservation policy that directs urban development into existing urban areas (including the many small rural towns within the unincorporated area). The cities of Davis, Woodland, and West Sacramento have received most of this growth. Additionally, the cities of Davis and Woodland have growth control measures limiting and containing growth. For this reason, land uses in the cities are relatively compact compared to other cities in the region.

**YUBA COUNTY**

Yuba County is located in the northern Sacramento Valley, approximately 40 miles north of Sacramento. Its boundaries stretch from the farms and orchards of the valley to the timberlands of the Sierras. Historically, Yuba County has been primarily rural and agricultural. However, the southern Highway 70 corridor in unincorporated Yuba County has recently experienced suburban residential growth since approval of the Plumas Lakes Specific Plan. Similarly, the Highway 65 corridor running through the city of Wheatland has resulted in modest residential growth in the city. The city of Marysville maintains its compact footprint due, in large part, to significant physical and flood constraints.

**12.2.2 Existing Land Uses by Community Type**

The Community Types Framework was used in the land use allocation process of the proposed MTP/SCS. Local land use plans (e.g., adopted and proposed general plans, specific plans, master plans, corridor plans) were divided into one of five “Community Types” based on the location and land use composition of the plans, as described in Chapter 2 – Project Description. These Community Types are described below and illustrated in Figure 12.2. Table 12.3 and 12.4 provide the distribution of housing, employment, and land use development by Community Type.
Figure 12.2: MTP/SCS with Blueprint Footprint References with TPA
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Transit Priority Areas (TPA*): Areas within one-half mile of a rail station stop or a high-quality transit corridor included in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan. A high-quality transit corridor has fixed route bus service with service intervals of 15 minutes or less during peak commute hours.

Sources: USGS, Esri, TANA, AND
Table 12.3
Summary of 2012 Housing and Employment by Community Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Type</th>
<th>2012 Dwelling Units(^1,3)</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
<th>2012 Employees(^1,3)</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Center and Corridor Communities</td>
<td>107,718</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>307,652</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established Communities</td>
<td>686,075</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>527,095</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Communities</td>
<td>31,422</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>20,037</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Residential Communities</td>
<td>78,237</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>33,181</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lands Not Identified for Development in the MTP/SCS Planning Period</td>
<td>n/a(^2)</td>
<td>n/a(^2)</td>
<td>n/a(^2)</td>
<td>n/a(^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region Total</td>
<td>903,452</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>887,965</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Totals may not match due to rounding.

\(^2\) The proposed MTP/SCS does not forecast or model growth in the Lands Not Identified for Development in the Proposed MTP/SCS Community Type during the planning period, though there is existing development in these areas (e.g., farm homes, agricultural-related uses, public lands). As a result, existing developed acres in the Lands Not Identified for Development Community Type was included in established and rural residential Community Type totals. Some lands within the Lands Not Identified for Development Community Type areas are within spheres of influence and/or urban growth boundaries and will be targeted for urbanization over the longer term (beyond 2036).

\(^3\) Due to different protocols among GIS models for tallying spatial data, housing unit numbers in this DEIR differ marginally (less than 0.3 percent) from those reported in the proposed MTP/SCS.

Source: SACOG, June 2015

Table 12.4
2012 Existing Land Uses in the MTP/SCS Plan Area by Community Type (Acres)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Types</th>
<th>Center and Corridor Communities</th>
<th>Established Communities</th>
<th>Developing Communities</th>
<th>Rural Residential Communities</th>
<th>Lands Not Identified for Development</th>
<th>Regional Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>10,245</td>
<td>175,488</td>
<td>19,442</td>
<td>387,619</td>
<td>n/a(^2)</td>
<td>592,794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use (vertical)</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>n/a(^2)</td>
<td>539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail, Office, and Commercial</td>
<td>7,632</td>
<td>14,507</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>3,660</td>
<td>n/a(^2)</td>
<td>26,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>3,244</td>
<td>21,571</td>
<td>2,049</td>
<td>6,977</td>
<td>n/a(^2)</td>
<td>33,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>5,364</td>
<td>52,364</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>5,374</td>
<td>n/a(^2)</td>
<td>64,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Developed Acres(^1)</td>
<td>26,684</td>
<td>264,242</td>
<td>23,793</td>
<td>403,637</td>
<td>n/a(^2)</td>
<td>718,356</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Excludes Agriculture, Open Space, Parks, Recreation, and Vacant Land

\(^2\) The proposed MTP/SCS does not forecast or model growth in the Lands Not Identified for Development in the Proposed MTP/SCS Community Type during the planning period, though there is existing development in these areas (e.g., farm homes, agricultural-related uses, public lands). As a result, existing developed acres in the Lands Not Identified for Development Community Type was included in established and rural residential Community Type totals. Some lands within the Lands Not Identified for Development Community Type areas are within spheres of influence and/or urban growth boundaries and may be targeted for urbanization over the longer term (beyond 2036).

Source: SACOG, June 2015
CENTER AND CORRIDOR COMMUNITIES

Land uses in Center and Corridor Communities are typically higher-density and more mixed than surrounding land uses of other Community Types. Centers and Corridor Communities are identified in local plans as historic downtowns, main streets, commercial corridors, rail station areas, central business districts, town centers, or other high-density destinations. In 2012, these areas had higher concentrations of employment, especially commercial and office uses, than their surroundings. They typically have more compact development patterns, a greater mix of uses, and a wider variety of transportation infrastructure as compared to the rest of the region. Some have frequent transit service, either bus or rail, and all have pedestrian and bicycling infrastructure that is more supportive of walking and bicycling than other Community Types.

ESTABLISHED COMMUNITIES

Established Communities are the areas adjacent to or surrounding Center and Corridor Communities. Local land use plans aim to maintain the existing character and land use pattern in these areas. Land uses in Established Communities are typically low- to medium-density residential neighborhoods, office and industrial parks, or commercial strip centers. Depending on the density of existing land uses, some Established Communities have bus service, while others may have commuter bus service or very little service. The majority of the region’s roads are in Established Communities as of 2012, a trend that is expected to continue in 2036.

DEVELOPING COMMUNITIES

Developing Communities are typically, though not always, situated on vacant land at the edge of existing urban or suburban development. They are the next increment of urban expansion. Developing Communities are identified in local plans as special plan areas, specific plans, or master plans, and may include only residential or employment development or a mix of residential and employment uses. In 2012, some of these areas were partially-developed, while others were used for farming, grazing, natural resource extraction, or other non-urban uses. Transportation options in Developing Communities often depend, to a great extent, on the timing of development. Bus service, for example, may be infrequent or unavailable today, but may be available every 30 minutes or less once a community builds out. Walking and bicycling environments vary widely, though many Developing Communities are designed with dedicated pedestrian and bicycle trails.

RURAL RESIDENTIAL COMMUNITIES

Rural Residential Communities are typically located outside of urbanized areas and designated in local land use plans for rural residential development. Rural Residential Communities are predominantly residential with some small-scale hobby or commercial farming. Travel occurs almost exclusively by automobile and transit service is minimal or nonexistent.

LANDS NOT IDENTIFIED FOR DEVELOPMENT IN THE MTP/SCS PLANNING PERIOD

These areas of the region are not expected to develop to urban levels during the MTP/SCS planning period. Existing land use in these areas consists primarily of farm homes, agricultural-related uses, forestry, mining, public lands (e.g., waste water treatment facilities), and other rural uses. Some of these areas have long-term plans and policies to preserve or maintain the existing “non-urban” uses,
while other areas are included in adopted or proposed plans that allow urban development and/or are included in the adopted Blueprint vision for future growth.

12.2.3 Existing Land Uses by Transit Priority Area

A subset of the proposed MTP/SCS housing and employment growth falls within what are referred to as Transit Priority Areas (TPAs). TPAs are areas of the region within one-half mile of a major transit stop (existing or planned light rail, street car, or train station) or an existing or planned high-quality transit corridor included in the proposed MTP/SCS. A high-quality transit corridor is a corridor with fixed route bus service that has service intervals of no longer than 15 minutes during peak commute hours (Pub. Resources Code, § 21155). In both the proposed MTP/SCS and this DEIR, TPAs are considered an overlay geography and do not necessarily correspond directly to Community Types (see Chapter 2 – Project Description for more detailed information about the region’s TPAs).

Blueprint principles call for diverse housing options, in the form of housing products that are currently not widely available, in places where transit service can be efficiently provided. In 2012, 37 percent of housing units and 51 percent of employees were within areas that meet the definition of TPAs. Table 12.5 provides the amount of the housing and employment in TPAs in the baseline (2012).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012 TPAs</th>
<th></th>
<th>2012 TPAs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing Dwelling Units</td>
<td>Existing Employees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer TPAs</td>
<td>17,005</td>
<td>42,732</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento TPAs</td>
<td>281,324</td>
<td>357,755</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolo TPAs</td>
<td>39,562</td>
<td>48,277</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All TPAs</td>
<td>337,892</td>
<td>448,764</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TPAs are those areas of the region within one-half mile of a major transit stop (existing or planned light rail, street car, or train station) or an existing or planned high-quality transit corridor. A high-quality transit corridor is a corridor with fixed route bus service that has service intervals of no longer than 15 minutes during peak commute hours (Pub. Resources Code, § 1155).

Source: SACOG, June 2015

12.2.4 Land within the Delta Primary Zone

Pursuant to the Delta Protection Act (Pub. Resources Code, § 29760 et seq.), the Delta Protection Commission (DPC) adopted the first Land Use and Resource Management Plan (LURMP) for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta on February 23, 1995 and updated the plan on February 25, 2010. The LURMP guides conservation and enhancement of natural resources in the Delta, while concurrently sustaining agriculture and meeting increased recreational demand. It defines a Primary Zone, which comprises the principal jurisdiction of DPC, and a Secondary Zone outside the Primary Zone and jurisdiction of DPC, but within the legal Delta area. Most of the land in this area is privately-owned and designated for agriculture and agriculturally-oriented uses, outdoor recreation, wildlife habitat, public facilities, and limited commercial, industrial, and rural residential development (Delta Protection Commission, 2010).
The southernmost portions of Sacramento and Yolo counties within the MTP/SCS plan area are located within the Delta Primary Zone. Isleton and a portion of West Sacramento are located within the Delta Secondary Zone. Additionally, the city of Sacramento is located directly adjacent to the Secondary Zone. Figure 12.2 shows the portions of the MTP/SCS plan area located within Delta Primary and Secondary Zones.

The LURMP includes land use policies for preserving the cultural heritage, strong agricultural and economic base, unique recreational resources, and biological diversity of the Primary Zone of the Delta. The LURMP directs new non-agricultural development toward existing towns and encourages growth in farms and other agriculturally-related businesses. Where new development will occur within the Delta area, the LURMP requires developments that are clustered, buffered, and setback from levees (Delta Protection Commission, 2010).

Additionally, the Delta Reform Act (Wat. Code, § 10610 et seq.) charged the DSC with developing a Delta Plan, adopted on May 16, 2013, that addresses the coequal goals of providing a more reliable water supply for California and protecting, restoring, and enhancing the Delta ecosystem (Delta Protection Commission, 2014). DSC has the authority to evaluate all plans, projects, and programs adopted by local governments within the Primary Zone for consistency. DSC requires these plans, projects, and programs to direct development within the existing city limits and designate other areas within the Delta for agricultural use.

As shown in Figure 12.3, DSC has established growth boundaries for the cities of West Sacramento and Isleton, the Sacramento sphere of influence (SOI), and the communities of Locke, Walnut Grove, Ryde, Courtland, Freeport, and Clarksburg. However, a plan or project within the Secondary Zone of the Delta is exempt from the consistency requirement if the applicable MPO has determined that it is consistent with the approved and adopted sustainable communities strategy. Consistency refers to the land use designation, density, building intensity, transportation plan, and applicable policies specified for the area.

### 12.3 Regulatory Setting

#### 12.3.1 Federal Regulations

**The Transfer Act of 1905**

While a department overseeing forestry has been a part of the federal government in some form since 1876, the Transfer Act (16 U.S. Code, § 472, 524, and 554) transferred the management of forest reserves from the General Land Office of the Interior Department to the Bureau of Forestry, renaming the agency the USFS. The USFS is responsible for the management of large areas of national forest land. National forests are primarily managed for outdoor recreational uses and for resource preservation by the USFS. The Eldorado National Forest and Tahoe National Forest are under USFS jurisdiction.
Figure 12.3 Delta Primary and Secondary Zones and Development Boundaries
Section 4(f) of the DOT Act of 1966 (49 U.S. Code, § 303) was enacted to preserve the natural beauty of the countryside, public park and recreation lands, wildlife and waterfowl refuges, and historic sites. Section 4(f) requires a comprehensive evaluation of all environmental impacts resulting from federal-aid transportation projects administered by the Federal Highway Administration, Federal Transit Administration, and Federal Aviation Administration that involve the use – or interference with use – of the following types of land:

- public park lands,
- recreation areas,
- wildlife and waterfowl refuges, or
- publicly- or privately-owned historic properties of federal, state, or local significance.

For further discussion of the requirements of Section 4(f), see Chapter 15 – Public Services and Recreation.

Clean Water Act of 1972 (CWA) and Endangered Species Act of 1973 (ESA)

The Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), through enforcing the requirements of the CWA (33 U.S. Code, § 1251 et seq.) and ESA (16 U.S. Code, § 1531 et seq.), have a significant influence on the location and yield of development in the region. See Chapter 6 – Biological Resources for a discussion of these federal regulations.

The Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA)

The FLPMA (43 U.S. Code, § 1701) established the BLM in its current iteration and bestowed upon the agency the responsibility for land management. BLM manages large rural land areas, including environmentally sensitive land. The BLM governs the uses allowed on land that it manages, striving to balance environmental protection and conservation goals with other uses such as recreation and grazing. BLM manages lands in Yolo County, Yuba County, and the Placer and El Dorado county foothills.

Indian Gaming Regulatory Act of 1988 (IGRA): Tribal Sovereignty

Tribal sovereign lands within the MTP/SCS plan area include those of the Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians in El Dorado County, United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria in Placer County, Wilton Miwok Indians in Sacramento County, and Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation in Yolo County.

Under federal law, tribes are deemed domestic dependent nations and, as such, exercise a limited sovereignty that is subject to congressional authority. States may apply state law to activities within tribal territories only with permission from Congress to do so. As a result, most land use decisions on tribal land are not subject to CEQA or the planning and zoning codes of local jurisdictions (California Planning Roundtable, October 2007).
The most complex and extensive body of federal land use regulation regarding tribal land use concerns the siting and operating of casinos. In 1988, Congress passed the IGRA of 1988 (29 U.S. Code, § 2701 et seq.) in response to concerns by states over increased tribal gaming. IGRA rejected states’ claims of authority over low stakes gambling, but it did stipulate that Class III or “Las Vegas style” games such as slot machines, black jack, and roulette could only occur under a “compact” between the tribe and the state. In 2000, California voters passed Proposition 1A to allow the state to enter these compacts for certain Class III games throughout the state. The compacts require a Tribal Environmental Impact Review (TEIR) process to address off-reservation impacts of casino projects. Also, any project undertaken by a local jurisdiction in conjunction with a casino project, such as an infrastructure upgrade or extension, is subject to the CEQA process as applicable (California Planning Roundtable, October 2007).

12.3.2 State Regulations

STATE LANDS COMMISSION SIGNIFICANT LANDS INVENTORY

The State Lands Commission is responsible for managing lands owned by the state, including lands that the state has received from the federal government (Pub. Resources Code, § 6370). These lands total more than four million acres and include tide and submerged lands, swamp and overflow lands, the beds of navigable waterways, and state school lands. The state’s sovereign interests within Placer County include, but are not limited to Lake Tahoe, the Truckee River, and the North Fork of the American River. The State Lands Commission has a legal responsibility for, and a strong interest in, protecting the ecological and Public Trust values associated with the state’s sovereign lands, including the use of these lands for habitat preservation, open space, and recreation. Proposed MTP/SCS projects located within these lands in the MTP/SCS plan area would be subject to the State Lands Commission permitting process.

CALIFORNIA LAND CONSERVATION ACT OF 1965 (WILLIAMSON ACT)

The Williamson Act (Gov. Code, §§ 51200-51207) was enacted by the California State Legislature in 1965 to encourage the preservation of agricultural lands. The Williamson Act program permits property tax adjustments for landowners who contract with a city or county to keep their land in agricultural production or approved open space. Lands covered by Williamson Act contracts are assessed on the basis of their agricultural value instead of their potential market value under non-agricultural uses. In return for the preferential tax rate, the landowner is required to agree contractually to not develop the land for a period of at least 10 years.

Williamson Act contracts are renewed annually (adding an additional year to the 10-year contract), unless a party to the contract files for non-renewal. The filing of a non-renewal application by a landowner ends the automatic annual extension of a contract and starts a nine-year phase-out of the contract. During the phase-out period, the land remains restricted to agricultural and open-space uses, but property taxes gradually return to levels associated with the market value of the land. The contract expires at the end of the nine-year non-renewal process and then use of the land is only subject to local zoning regulations.

The Williamson Act defines compatible use of contracted lands as any use determined by the county or city administering the preserve to be compatible with the agricultural, recreational, or open space use of land within the preserve and subject to contract (Gov. Code, § 51202(e)). However, uses
deemed compatible by a county or city government must be consistent with the principles of compatibility set forth in Government Code Sections 51231, 51238, or 51238.1 (Gov. Code, § 51201(e)). Also see Chapter 4 – Agriculture and Forestry Resources for more information about the Williamson Act.

**CALIFORNIA ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT OF 1970 (CESA)**

See Chapter 6 – Biological Resources, for a discussion of this state regulation. The California Department of Fish and Wildlife has no direct land use authority, but in enforcing the requirements of the CESA, it participates with the federal resource agencies (i.e., U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, USFS, and EPA) in commenting on the impacts of new development on natural resource areas.

**THE SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES AND CLIMATE PROTECTION ACT OF 2008 (SEN. BILL 375)**

In 2008, California enacted Sen. Bill No. 375 (Stats. 2008, ch. 728) (SB 375), which coordinates regional land use and transportation planning to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from cars and light trucks. The law resulted in several amendments to the federally required MTP process. Although the law has many smaller process-oriented changes that affect only the MPO preparing the plan, the bill also resulted in three significant changes to the MTP process and the plan itself.

**Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS)**

The first major change is that the bill requires the MPO to adopt a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) as part of the MTP. The SCS is a land use and transportation plan designed to achieve certain goals for the reduction of GHG emissions from automobiles and light trucks in the region. The GHG targets are set by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) for the years 2020 and 2035, and will be updated every eight years.

The MTP has always been required to have a land use component that forecasts the amount and location of growth that is most likely to occur within the planning period. The purpose of the land use plan in the MTP is to pair expected growth with the transportation projects in the plan and inform the regional travel model, which forms the basis for the MTP. The SCS serves to more effectively link the land use and transportation components of the MTP.

As in the past, the proposed MTP/SCS will be constrained and based on the most current and reasonable projections. Pursuant to the requirements of SB 375, if the land use and transportation projects analyzed in the proposed MTP/SCS do not meet the GHG emissions reduction targets set for the region for either 2020 or 2035, in addition to the proposed MTP/SCS, the MPO is required to adopt an Alternative Planning Strategy (APS) that does meet the targets. The APS is not a regulatory document for transportation or land use projects and, therefore, would not have the same constraints as the proposed MTP/SCS. However, as the CEQA streamlining benefits of SB 375 (described below) are intended to help the region meet the GHG emissions reduction targets, in the event that an MPO is required to adopt an APS, the CEQA benefits will be activated by consistency with the APS rather than the proposed MTP/SCS.
CEQA Streamlining Benefits for Land Use Projects

The second significant change to regional land use planning under SB 375 is that the plan now offers various levels of CEQA benefits to certain projects. SB 375 provides three tiers of CEQA benefits for Residential Mixed Use Projects, Transit Priority Projects, and Sustainable Community Projects.

Generally, a Residential Mixed Use project must be at least 75 percent residential and be consistent with the general land use designation, density, building intensity, and applicable policies of an SCS or APS accepted by CARB as achieving the GHG emissions reduction targets specified for the SACOG region. Environmental documents for these projects are not required to discuss growth inducing impacts, reduced density alternatives, or any project specific or cumulative impacts from cars and light-duty truck trips on global warming or the regional transportation network.

Transit Priority Projects (TPPs) must also be consistent with the SCS/APS as described above. In addition, the TPP must meet the following requirements: (1) the project must contain at least 50 percent residential use based on total building square footage, but if less than 75 percent residential, it must have a minimum Floor Area Ratio of 0.75; (2) it must have a minimum net density of 20 dwelling units per acre; and (3) it must be located within one-half mile of a major transit stop or high quality transit corridor included in the regional transportation plan (RTP).

Projects meeting the above requirements will have all the benefits of Residential Mixed Use projects, discussed above, plus the option to conduct a “Sustainable Communities Environmental Assessment” (SCEA), rather than prepare an environmental impact report or negative declaration. Under the SCEA, an Initial Study is prepared identifying significant or potentially significant impacts. Where the lead agency determines that cumulative impacts have already been addressed and mitigated in an SCS or APS accepted by CARB, they are not “considerable” for purposes of further environmental review. Also, traffic control and mitigation may be covered by jurisdiction-wide measures, and off-site alternatives do not need to be addressed. The standard of review for the SCEA is the “substantial evidence” standard, which is deferential to the agency. In the case of a legal challenge, the agency’s analysis is presumed to be adequate and the burden of proof is on the plaintiff to demonstrate otherwise.

The highest level of CEQA clearance under SB 375 is provided to “Sustainable Community Projects,” which must meet all the qualifications of a TPP as well as the following requirements, in return for complete exemption from CEQA review:

- served by existing utilities;
- no impacts to wetlands, riparian habitats, endangered species, or native plants;
- no impacts to historic resources;
- no risks from hazardous substances;
- no risk from wildfires, seismic issues, or floods;
- 15 percent more energy efficient than California requirements and 25 percent more water efficient than average for area;
- no more than eight acres in project area;
- no more than 200 units;
- no building greater than 75,000 square feet;
- no net loss of affordable housing for jurisdiction;
- compatible with surrounding industrial uses if applicable;
- within one-half mile of rail or ferry stop or one-quarter mile of high quality bus line; and
- meets affordable housing minimum or open space minimum or pay in-lieu fee.

**Linkage to Regional Housing Needs Allocation**

The last significant change to the regional land use planning process under SB 375 is that the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) process has been updated and linked to the MTP/SCS process. There are four areas of major change to the RHNA process under SB 375: extending the frequency of required updates to eight years, allowing some flexibility in the population projections used in the RHNA determination, allowing greater flexibility in implementation timelines, and timing the RHNA process to coincide with the MTP/SCS update process. For more information on how SB 375 affects the RHNA process, see Chapter 14 – Population and Housing.

**Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Reform Act of 2009 (Delta Reform Act)**

In November 2009, the California Legislature enacted the Delta Reform Act (Wat. Code, § 10610 et seq.), also known as Sen. Bill No. 1 (Stats. 2009, 7th Ex. Sess., ch. 5) (SB X7-1), one of several bills passed at that time related to water supply reliability, ecosystem health, and the Delta. The Delta Reform Act created the DSC. The DSC is made up of seven members that are advised by a 10-member board of scientists. The DSC is charged with developing and adopting a Delta Plan that addresses the coequal goals of providing a more reliable water supply for California and protecting, restoring, and enhancing the Delta ecosystem. These coequal goals shall be achieved in a manner that protects and enhances the unique cultural, recreational, natural resource, and agricultural values of the Delta as an evolving place. The DSC adopted the Delta Plan on May 16, 2013 (Delta Protection Commission, 2014).

Under the Delta Reform Act, the DSC is charged with reviewing and advising local and regional agencies regarding the consistency of local and regional planning documents, including the MTP/SCS, with the Delta Plan. The DSC’s input includes reviewing and providing timely advice on the consistency of local and regional plans with the ecosystem restoration needs of the Delta and whether the lands set aside for natural resource protection are sufficient to meet the Delta’s ecosystem needs. The Act requires that “covered actions,” as defined, which include plans, programs, or projects within the primary or secondary zones of the Delta, be consistent with the Delta Plan.

The Act expressly provides that “covered actions” do not include the following: (1) RTPs, such as this proposed MTP/SCS; and (2) plans, programs, projects, activities (and any infrastructure necessary to support those plans, programs, projects, or activities) within the secondary zone of the Delta that SACOG has determined is consistent with the proposed MTP/SCS (Wat. Code, § 85057.5). However, the DSC reviews any plan that includes land within the Delta zones, whether or not it is a covered action. MPOs that have a planning area crossing these boundaries are required to follow a consultation procedure with the DSC. This procedure includes early coordination to
determine consistency of the proposed RTP with the Delta Plan. If the DSC concludes that the proposed MTP/SCS is inconsistent with the Delta Plan, it must provide written notice of the claimed inconsistency no later than 30 days prior to the adoption of the final MTP/SCS. If the DSC provides timely notice of a claimed inconsistency, SACOG shall include a detailed response to the council’s notice in the final MTP/SCS for 2036 (Wat. Code, § 85212).

SACOG has consulted with the DSC on the application of the law, the geography under DSC authority, and the policies established by the DSC, and will follow the Act’s consultation requirements. The main land use concern brought up during early consultation by DSC was consistency of the proposed MTP/SCS with Delta Plan Policy 1: Locate New Development Wisely (23 Cal. Code Regs., § 5010) which limits new growth within the Delta to communities as defined in Appendices 6 and 7 of the plan. The proposed MTP/SCS assumes that new growth will occur within the defined Delta Legacy Communities\(^1\) and does not project development within areas planned for agriculture, open space and recreation, or natural preserve and marsh in the Delta Plan (see Figure 12.3 above). Therefore, SACOG has considered and supported the coequal goals of the Act in developing the proposed MTP/SCS related to land use, consistent with the Delta Plan.

**DELTA VISION STRATEGIC PLAN, 2008**

The Delta Vision Blue Ribbon Task Force (Task Force) was initiated by the Governor’s Executive Order (Executive Order S-17-06) in 1996 to develop recommendations on the overall management and governance of the Delta, including goals related to improving safety, ensuring water supply and water quality, expanding recreation, coordinating emergency response, and protecting infrastructure and public safety. The Task Force recommended two co-equal goals: to restore the Delta ecosystem and to create a reliable water supply for California.

The Task Force adopted the Delta Vision Strategic Plan in October 2008, which emphasizes the two co-equal goals and, in total, contains seven goals, 22 strategies, and 73 actions to achieve these overarching goals. The seven goals of the Strategic Plan are listed below.

1. Legally acknowledge the co-equal goals of restoring the Delta ecosystem and creating a more reliable water supply for California.
2. Recognize and enhance the unique cultural, recreational, and agricultural values of the California Delta as an evolving place, an action critical to achieving the co-equal goals.
3. Restore the Delta ecosystem as the heart of a healthy estuary.
4. Promote statewide water conservation, efficiency, and sustainable use.
5. Build facilities to improve the existing water conveyance system and expand statewide storage, and operate both to achieve the co-equal goals.

\(^1\) Delta Legacy Communities, as defined in the 2009 Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Reform Act, are selected Delta towns that have high cultural, historic, or ambiance value that give the Delta a distinctive sense of place, including Bethel Island, Clarksburg, Courtland, Freeport, Hood, Isleton, Knightsen, Locke, Rio Vista, Ryde, and Walnut Grove.
6. Reduce risks to people, property, and state interests in the Delta by effective emergency preparedness, appropriate land uses, and strategic levee investments.

7. Establish a new governance structure with the authority, responsibility, accountability, science support, and secure funding to achieve these goals.

The Strategic Plan proposed a governance structure for the Delta based on a new California Delta Ecosystem and Water (CDEW) Plan to be developed and adopted by the California Delta Ecosystem and Water Council (Governor’s Delta Vision Blue Ribbon Task Force, 2008). In 2009, the Delta Reform Act established this authority as the DSC, which adopted the Delta Plan in 2013, as discussed below (Delta Stewardship Council, 2013).

**LURMP for the Primary Zone of the Delta**

Pursuant to the Delta Protection Act of 1992 (Pub. Resources Code, § 29760 et seq.), the DPC adopted the LURMP, which outlines the long-term land use requirements for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta and provides direction for land use decisions by the local jurisdictions in the Delta region. The Act defines two delta zones: the Primary Zone, which comprises the principal jurisdiction of the DPC, and the Secondary Zone, which while part of the “Legal Delta” is outside the planning area of the DPC. Both Primary and Secondary Delta Zones overlay the southern end of the plan area within Yolo and Sacramento counties.

The DPC adopted the updated LURMP on February 25, 2010. The update addressed recent court decisions related to water export, Delta ecosystem issues, levee stability, and global climate change. Local jurisdictions are required to review their general plans for consistency with the LURMP update and make amendments as necessary. The DPC is currently (May 2015) starting the process for updating the LURMP, following the fifth anniversary of its adoption.

The DPC must ensure that proposed amendments to the general plan, and any development approved or proposed that is consistent with the general plan, will be consistent with the regional plan and will not result in the following:

- wetland or riparian loss;
- degradation of water quality;
- increased nonpoint source pollution;
- degradation or reduction of Pacific Flyway habitat;
- reduced public access, provided the access does not infringe on private property rights;
- expose the public to increased flood hazard;
- adversely impact agricultural lands or increase the potential for vandalism, trespass, or the creation of public private nuisance on public or private land;
- degradation or impairment of levee integrity; or
- increased requirements or restrictions upon agricultural practices in the Primary Zone.

SACOG has consulted with the DPC through a coordination phone call to clarify DPC comments and to address the actions SACOG could take to maintain consistency with the LURMP in developing the proposed MTP/SCS.
Since the BDCP Public Draft EIR/EIS was released in 2013, state and Federal agencies have proposed a new sub-alternative, Alternative 4A, which would replace Alternative 4 (the proposed BDCP) as the state’s proposed project. Alternative 4A reflects the state’s proposal to separate the conveyance facility and habitat restoration measures into two separate efforts: California WaterFix and California EcoRestore.

The California Water Fix and California EcoRestore plans include key elements of the BDCP, including north-of-Delta diversion structures, habitat restoration actions (30,000 acres of restoration over a five-year period) to support the long-term health of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta’s native fish and wildlife will be funded by the following:

- Floodplain and tidal/sub-tidal habitat restoration required by existing regulatory frameworks will be funded by state and federal water contractors;
- Wetlands restored for subsidence reversal and carbon management will be supported by the AB 32 Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund and other sources;
- Various aquatic, riparian, and upland restoration and multi-benefit flood management projects will be supported by Proposition 1 & IE; and
- Additional projects will be supported by various local and federal partners.

The California WaterFix sub-alternatives would achieve compliance with the U.S. Endangered Species Act through the Section 7 consultation process and California Endangered Species Act through obtaining a 2081b incidental take permit and would not include long-term assurances for water project operators. Alternative 4A is being evaluated through a Recirculated Draft EIR/Supplemental Draft EIS, which was released to the public on July 9, 2015 for review.

The Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Act (Gov. Code, § 56000 et seq.) establishes the process through which local agency boundaries are established and revised. Each county must have a local agency formation commission (LAFCo), which is the agency that has the responsibility to create orderly local government boundaries, with the goal of encouraging “planned, well-ordered, efficient urban development patterns,” the preservation of open space lands, and the discouragement of urban sprawl. A LAFCo typically consists of two county supervisors, two representatives of the county’s cities, and one member of the public. Many LAFCos also include one special district representative. While LAFCos have no land use authority, their actions determine which local government will be responsible for planning new areas.

LAFCos address a wide range of boundary actions, including the creation of SOIs for cities, adjustments to boundaries of special districts, annexations, incorporations, detachments of areas from cities, and dissolutions of cities. A city’s SOI is an indication of the city’s future boundaries. Since 1992, state law requires that the incorporation of a new city must not financially harm the
county and must result in a positive cash flow for the new city, a requirement that has slowed the rate of new city incorporation.

12.3.3 Local Regulations

GENERAL PLANS

The most comprehensive land use planning for the proposed MTP/SCS plan area is provided by city and county general plans, which local governments are required by state law (Gov. Code, §§ 65300-65404) to prepare as a guide for future development. The general plan contains goals and policies concerning topics that are mandated by state law or which the jurisdiction has voluntarily chosen to include. The general plan must contain land use, housing, circulation, open space, conservation, noise, and safety elements, as well as any other elements that the city or county may wish to adopt. The circulation element of a local general plan must be correlated with the land use element. Other topics that local governments frequently choose to address are public facilities, parks and recreation, and agriculture, among others. County general plans cover unincorporated areas, while city general plans are required to cover an area that is generally larger than the existing city limits (i.e., portions of the unincorporated area that fall within a city’s sphere of influence).

The 28 jurisdictions in the Sacramento region are at various stages of updating or augmenting their local land use plans:

- General plans adopted since adoption of the Blueprint Vision in 2004 (with dates for those recently adopted during the last eight years), include the City of Citrus Heights (2011), El Dorado County, the City of Galt (2009), the City of Lincoln (2008), the City of Live Oak (2009), Placer County (2013), the City of Rancho Cordova, the City of Rocklin (2012), the City of Roseville (2010), the City of Sacramento (2015), Sutter County (2010), the City of Wheatland, Yolo County, the City of Yuba City, and Yuba County (2011).

- Local governments that are currently undergoing general plan updates (as of 2015), include the City of Elk Grove, City of Folsom, the City of West Sacramento, and the City of Woodland. El Dorado County is also undergoing a Land Use Policy Programmatic update and the Sacramento County General Plan has been amended to include changes up to 2012.

- Local governments that are not updating their general plans, but are currently developing area-specific land use plans (since 2012), include the City of Colfax, City of Davis, El Dorado County, the City of Lincoln, the City of Roseville, Placer County, the City of Placerville, the City of Rancho Cordova, the City of Roseville, Sacramento County, the City of Wheatland, Yolo County, and Yuba County.

- Local governments that are not currently updating general plans or community-level land use plans include the City of Auburn, the City of Isleton, the Town of Loomis, the City of Marysville, and the City of Winters.

The first three categories, those that recently updated general plans, are currently updating general plans, or are currently working on community-level land use plans, represent 94 percent of regional growth during the MTP/SCS planning period.
ZONING

The city or county zoning code is the set of detailed requirements that implement the general plan policies at the parcel level. The zoning code presents standards for different uses and identifies which uses are allowed in the various zoning districts of the jurisdiction. Since 1971, state law has required the city or county zoning code to be consistent with the jurisdiction’s general plan, except in charter cities (Gov. Code, § 65860).

SPECIFIC AND COMMUNITY PLANS

A city or county may also provide land use planning by developing community or specific plans for smaller, more specific areas within their jurisdiction. These more localized plans provide for focused guidance for developing a specific area, with development standards tailored to the area, as well as systematic implementation of the general plan. Specific and community plans are required to be consistent with the city’s or county’s general plan.

Consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15125 (Cal. Code Regs., § 15125), SACOG must analyze the consistency of proposed projects with applicable plans, including specific plans. SACOG worked closely with each jurisdiction to gather information about adopted specific and master plans that have yet to be implemented to ensure that all anticipated development is consistent with the goals and policies of the proposed MTP/SCS. SACOG conducted an inventory of proposed and adopted specific and master plans including information on the type of development allowed, buildout assumptions, development to date, and the potential buildout year of each plan.

HABITAT CONSERVATION PLANS

There are six habitat conservation plans (HCPs) and natural community conservation plans (NCCPs) within the MTP/SCS plan area, including the Natomas Basin HCP, the Placer County Conservation Plan, the South Sacramento HCP, the Yolo County Natural Heritage Program (NCCP/HCP), the Yuba/Sutter Regional Conservation Plan, and El Dorado County General Plan Biological Policy Review. A summary of these plans is provided in Chapter 6 – Biological Resources. Not all of these plans have been adopted or fully implemented. During implementation of specific projects, an activity subject to Section 10 of the ESA (16 U.S. Code, §1531 et seq.) and considered a covered project under the implementing rules of an adopted HCP or NCCP may be able to participate in the plan in order to avoid adverse effects on covered species.

AIRPORT LAND USE COMPATIBILITY PLANS

Pursuant to state law, each county has an Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC). The ALUC prepares an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) for each general use airport. The plan provides for the orderly growth of the airport and the area surrounding the airport, excluding existing land uses. Its primary function is to safeguard the general welfare of the inhabitants within the vicinity of the airport and the public in general. Cities and counties must submit their general and specific plans to the ALUC upon adoption or amendment, which must be consistent with the ALUCP. For more information on airport land use compatibility, see Chapter 10 – Hazards and Hazardous Materials.
GROWTH CONTROL

Local growth control measures manage community growth through various methods, including tying development to infrastructure capacity, limiting the number of new housing units, setting limits on the increase of commercial square footage, and the adoption of urban growth boundaries, among others.

The following jurisdictions in the MTP/SCS plan area have some form of growth control measure:

- The City of Davis has voter-approved Measure L (1986) to grow “as slow as legally possible”; voter approved Measure J (2000) mandating voter approval for certain changes in land use, especially certain conversions of agricultural lands into an urban designation; and a General Plan policy limiting population and dwelling unit growth. Additionally, voter-approved Measure R (2010) amended Measure L to require voter approval for conversions of agricultural lands to an urban reserve designation and for any development project on the Covell Center and Nishi properties. Measure R also extends the sunset date of Measure L to 2020.
- The City of Woodland has a voter-approved Urban Limit Line Ordinance (2006), an Urban Development Policy to provide urban services only to areas within the Urban Limit Line and to encourage city annexation through a prohibition by Yolo County for urban development in the unincorporated area lying within the Urban Limit Line, and a General Plan policy limiting population growth.
- Sacramento County established two growth boundaries in the General Plan to promote orderly growth and the efficient extension of infrastructure and the provision of urban services. The Urban Services Boundary (USB) delineates the ultimate growth boundary for the unincorporated area where county services shall be provided and where they will not be extended. The Urban Policy Area (UPA) delineates the area within the USB expected to receive county services in the near term.

SACOG BLUEPRINT VISION

In December 2004, the SACOG Board of Directors adopted the Blueprint Vision, which includes a conceptual map and seven growth principles (hereafter referred to as Blueprint principles). Those principles are:

1. housing choice and diversity;
2. using existing assets;
3. compact development;
4. natural resources conservation;
5. design for quality;
6. mixed use developments; and
7. provide transportation choices.

The Blueprint Vision is the result of a three-year regional visioning process, which engaged SACOG’s member jurisdictions, the general public, and special interest groups on how the region
should accommodate the future population and employment that is forecast to come to the region. Without land use planning authority, SACOG serves in an advisory role for its member jurisdictions regarding implementation of the Blueprint Vision. Since SACOG Board adoption of the Blueprint Vision, many jurisdictions in the region have begun implementing the Blueprint principles in their planning processes.

The conceptual map depicts a way for the region to grow through the year 2050 in a manner generally consistent with the Blueprint principles. The map is the result of numerous public workshops and meetings with local staff and elected officials. While the adopted vision map is not intended to be implemented literally, the map is intended to be interpreted and used as a concept-level illustration of the growth principles. The goal and result of the Blueprint map and principles, is a reduction in traffic congestion, air pollution, and consumption of agricultural and resource lands through more efficient development within and contiguous to the existing urban area, paired with a transportation system that is more integrated with the land uses. The housing stock of the Blueprint map is more diverse than the current stock, which is dominated by single-family units, and housing, shopping, and employment uses are also closer together so that people are able to make shorter auto trips, or even non-auto trips, to reach their various destinations.

**Rural Urban Connections Strategy (RUCS)**

RUCS was launched at the conclusion of the 2008 MTP in an effort to provide policy and technical approaches to addressing or avoiding impacts to rural resources in the Sacramento region. In the same way that the Blueprint is seen as an economic development and environmental sustainability strategy for urban areas, the RUCS program is seen as an economic and environmental sustainability strategy for rural areas. The RUCS program is thus an integral piece of a regional strategy for the region’s economic and environmental sustainability and viability.

SACOG assembled working groups around five broad topic areas to identify rural challenges and opportunities. These five topic areas include:

1. land use and conservation,
2. the infrastructure of agriculture,
3. economic opportunities,
4. forest management, and
5. regulations.

SACOG also developed working papers with input from local agriculture, planning, economic development, and environmental representatives in order to help the region better understand the unique issues affecting rural areas. Stakeholder workshops were included as part of this process in order to vet the research and findings on each of the above topics. The SACOG Board participated in a series of agriculture field trips to learn about the opportunities and challenges facing the agricultural economy in different parts of the region.

RUCS has developed or is currently developing several tools and supporting data to support policy discussion and understanding about the influence of the rural and urban economies on each other. One example is the Geographic Information System (GIS)-based tool that the RUCS team created using information about crop data, pesticide use, and economic data to assess agricultural
production in the region. This tool provides the capacity to evaluate both urban and rural land use changes when combined with the land use model. These efforts are intended to broaden the region’s understanding of how land use and transportation investments affect rural areas.

The RUCS program is ongoing, with the ultimate goal of bridging the urban and rural planning needs in the region. In addition to continuing to gather and assess information on agricultural production in the region, RUCS is preparing to conduct two specific studies over the next fiscal year (June 2015 to July 2016): the Food System Multipliers for Specialty Crops in the Sacramento Region study and the Delta Protection Commission Case Study.

The Food System Multipliers study is funded by a grant from the California Department of Food and Agriculture for the purpose of gathering detailed primary data on specialty crops from local growers, processors and distributors. This data, including revenue, input purchases, taxes, job creation and regulatory costs, will be used to model the direct, indirect, and induced multipliers of the various components of the regional agricultural cluster. The results of the study will better quantify the full contribution of this important economic driver.

The Delta Case Study is funded by the DPC for the purpose of conducting a food hub feasibility analysis for the portions of Sacramento and Yolo counties in the legal Delta. The study will apply existing RUCS tools for analyzing data on the costs of inputs and operations for agricultural producers and the market prices for food products in order to determine the economic practicality of farmers growing products for the food hub. The results of the study will reveal the potential for Delta farmers to take advantage of the bourgeoning market for locally-grown food by expanding or creating new agricultural infrastructure.

12.4 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

12.4.1 Methods and Assumptions

During each MTP/SCS update cycle, SACOG prepares a land use forecast to accommodate the regional growth forecast of population, employment, and housing demand. The proposed MTP/SCS includes a forecast of the amount of growth that will occur in the study area over a 24-year period (2012-2036). The regional growth forecast is based on economic and demographic projections through the year 2036, adopted and pending land use plans and policies, market and economic considerations, and other state and federal policies and regulations that can affect the location and pace of growth. In the proposed plan, it also serves as the land use pattern of the SCS.

Impacts are assessed in terms of both the proposed land use pattern and transportation network for each of the three levels of analysis (i.e., regional, Community Type, and TPAs). By 2036, implementation of the proposed MTP/SCS will result in a land use pattern and transportation network that is different from existing conditions. Unless otherwise stated, “existing conditions” in the proposed MTP/SCS refers to conditions in the baseline of 2012. The proposed MTP/SCS uses 2012 because it is the most recent year for which comprehensive land use, demographic, traffic count and VMT data are available for the SACOG region. Chapter 1 – Introduction includes a more detailed discussion of the baseline for the proposed MTP/SCS.
Appendix G to the CEQA Guidelines includes a sample “environmental checklist form” that poses numerous questions regarding whether a project would contribute to various kinds of environmental impacts. The questions posed for land use and planning impacts ask whether the project would:

a) physically divide an established community;

b) conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect; or

c) conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

Impacts to habitat conservation plans, identified in criteria “c” above, are addressed in Chapter 6 – Biological Resources. This DEIR does not address impacts to established communities or to local land use plans, as identified in criteria “a” and “b” above, because SACOG has no land use authority to adopt local land use plans or approve local land use projects. SB 375 specifically provides that nothing in the law supersedes the land use authority of cities and counties, so the Appendix G criteria are not applicable to MPOs. Additionally, SB 375 requires MPOs to utilize the most recent local planning assumptions. Therefore, SACOG developed the proposed MTP/SCS Land Use Forecast in consultation with local jurisdictions and using local land use plans as a foundation. While SACOG can encourage local jurisdictions to consider implementing regional policies through such incentives as CEQA streamlining benefits, cities and counties are not required to adopt land use plans and policies that are consistent with the MTP/SCS.

While the environmental checklist form included in CEQA Guidelines Appendix G is a commonly-used source of significance thresholds, lead agencies have discretion to determine the appropriate thresholds of significance. Because SACOG does not have land use authority, as described above, and the questions posed by the Appendix G checklist are therefore not relevant to analyze the land use impacts associated with the MTP/SCS, this DEIR instead uses environmental impact evaluation criteria established by state law that are applicable to MPOs. For this analysis, the Land Use Forecast outlined above was compared with the land use requirements of SB 375 and with the provisions of the LURMP. SACOG is required by law to comply with the requirements of SB 375, including those pertaining to the SCS. The full list of SB 375 SCS requirements may be found in Government Code Section 65080(b)(2)(B) and listed below in Section 12.4.2: Criteria for Determining Significance. The Land Use Forecast was also analyzed for impacts causing conflict with the LURMP adopted by the DPC. Since portions of the MTP/SCS plan area fall within the Primary Zone of the Delta, the proposed MTP/SCS is required to be consistent with the LURMP pursuant to the requirements of the Delta Protection Act (Pub. Resources Code, § 29760 et seq.).

**12.4.2 Criteria for Determining Significance**

For the purposes of this EIR, SACOG has determined that adoption and/or implementation of the proposed MTP/SCS (including adoption of the proposed MTP policies, adoption of the proposed SCS, and adoption of the proposed transportation project list and proposed financing plan) would result in significant impacts under CEQA, if the following would occur:

1. Conflict with any of the following land use requirements and objectives of Senate Bill 375.
a. Identify the general location of uses, residential densities, and building intensities within the region.

b. Identify areas within the region sufficient to house all the population of the region, including all economic segments of the population, over the course of the planning period of the regional transportation plan taking into account net migration into the region, population growth, household formation, and employment growth.

c. Identify areas within the region sufficient to house an eight-year projection of the regional housing need for the region pursuant to Section 65584 of the Government Code.

d. Identify a transportation network to service the transportation needs of the region.

e. Gather and consider the best practically available scientific information regarding resource areas and farmland in the region as defined in subdivisions (a) and (b) of Section 65080.01 of the Government Code.

f. Consider the state housing goals specified in Sections 65580 and 65581 of the Government Code.

g. Set forth a forecasted development pattern for the region, which, when integrated with the transportation network, and other transportation measures and policies, will reduce the GHG emissions from automobiles and light trucks to achieve, if there is a feasible way to do so, the GHG emission reduction targets approved by the state board.

h. Allow the regional transportation plan to comply with Section 176 of the federal Clean Air Act (42 U.S. Code, Sec. 7506).

2. Conflict with any of the following requirements included in the Land Use and Resource Management Plan adopted by the Delta Protection Commission.

a. Direct new non-agriculturally oriented non-farmworker residential development within existing unincorporated towns and encourage a critical mass of farms, agriculturally-related businesses, and supporting infrastructure to ensure the economic vitality of agriculture within the Delta.

b. Support the long-term viability of agriculture and discourage inappropriate development of agricultural lands.

c. Preserve and protect the natural resources of the Delta; promote protection of remnants of riparian and aquatic habitat; and encourage compatibility between agricultural practices and wildlife habitat.

d. Promote continued recreational use of the land and waters of the Delta and ensure that needed facilities that support such uses are constructed, maintained, and supervised.
e. Protect and enhance long-term water quality in the Delta for agriculture, municipal, industrial, water-contact recreation, and fish and wildlife habitat uses, as well as all other beneficial uses.

f. Ensure that the construction of new utility and infrastructure facilities is appropriate and the impacts of such new construction on the integrity of levees, wildlife, recreation, agriculture and Delta communities are avoided, minimized and mitigated.

12.4.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

**IMPACT LU-1: CONFLICT WITH THE LAND USE REQUIREMENTS AND OBJECTIVES OF SENATE BILL 375.**

**Regional Impacts**

Sections a through h below evaluate the proposed MTP/SCS for consistency with each land use requirement included in Senate Bill 375.

a. Identify the general location of uses, residential densities, and building intensities within the region.

SB 375 requires that MPOs adopt an SCS that forecasts the amount and location of growth, including a detailed allocation of land uses addressing regional housing need, transportation demand, and natural resources. The proposed MTP/SCS identifies the general location of uses, residential densities, and building intensities within the region in the proposed MTP/SCS Land Use Forecast, described in detail in Chapter 2 – Project Description. The Land Use Forecast identifies housing by density and type; employment uses by industry, building intensity, and number of employees; and other uses including agriculture, open space, and recreation areas by the following geographic area types: county, jurisdiction, Community Type, and TPA. Maps and tables with this information, as well as further impact analysis, can be found in Chapter 2 – Project Description, Chapter 4 – Agriculture and Forestry Resources, Chapter 14 – Population and Housing, and Chapter 15 – Public Services and Recreation.

To accommodate a projected increase of approximately 810,000 people, about 292,000 new housing units, and approximately 439,000 new employees in the region through the year 2036, the proposed MTP/SCS projects the conversion of an additional 47,563 acres of land to developed uses. This new developable area represents 1.2 percent of the acreage of the region, or a seven percent increase in the 2012 development footprint of the region by 2036. Tables 12.6, 12.7, and 12.8 summarize housing growth, employment growth, and land uses by county.
### Table 12.6
**Summary of Expected Housing Growth by County (Dwelling Units)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County (incorporated and unincorporated areas)</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2012-2036</th>
<th>2036</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012 Dwelling Units(^1),(^2)</td>
<td>Percent of Total</td>
<td>New Dwelling Units(^1),(^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado</td>
<td>64,358</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer</td>
<td>142,583</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>54,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>558,836</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>172,521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutter</td>
<td>33,790</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolo</td>
<td>75,553</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>27,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuba</td>
<td>28,331</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region Total</strong></td>
<td>903,451</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>284,896</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Totals may not match due to rounding.

\(^2\) Due to different protocols among GIS models for tallying spatial data, housing unit numbers in this DEIR differ marginally (less than 0.3 percent) from those reported in the proposed MTP/SCS.

Source: SACOG, June 2015

### Table 12.7
**Summary of Employment Growth by County (Employees)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County (incorporated and unincorporated areas)</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2012-2036</th>
<th>2036</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012 Employees(^1),(^2)</td>
<td>Percent of Total</td>
<td>New Employees(^1),(^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado</td>
<td>43,164</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer</td>
<td>128,912</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>81,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>573,014</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>258,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutter</td>
<td>29,525</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>14,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolo</td>
<td>92,943</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>52,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuba</td>
<td>20,408</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>12,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region Total</strong></td>
<td>887,965</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>439,358</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Totals may not match due to rounding.

\(^2\) Due to different protocols among GIS models for tallying spatial data, housing unit numbers in this DEIR differ marginally (less than 0.3 percent) from those reported in the proposed MTP/SCS.

Source: SACOG, June 2015
Table 12.8
Existing and Future Land Uses in the MTP/SCS Plan Area by County (Acres)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Types</th>
<th>El Dorado County</th>
<th>Placer County</th>
<th>Sacramento County</th>
<th>Sutter County</th>
<th>Yolo County</th>
<th>Yuba County</th>
<th>Regional Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2012-2036 Growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential¹</td>
<td>195,099</td>
<td>5,973</td>
<td>11,402</td>
<td>13,833</td>
<td>1,861</td>
<td>2,002</td>
<td>1,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use (vertical)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office &amp; Commercial</td>
<td>2,296</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>1,747</td>
<td>3,523</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>1,278</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>2,461</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Development Acres²</strong></td>
<td><strong>201,148</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,610</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,454</strong></td>
<td><strong>19,635</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,342</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,917</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,606</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Types</th>
<th>El Dorado County</th>
<th>Placer County</th>
<th>Sacramento County</th>
<th>Sutter County</th>
<th>Yolo County</th>
<th>Yuba County</th>
<th>Regional Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2036</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential¹</td>
<td>201,072</td>
<td>201,072</td>
<td>133,315</td>
<td>171,234</td>
<td>27,203</td>
<td>24,730</td>
<td>71,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use (vertical)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office &amp; Commercial</td>
<td>2,840</td>
<td>2,840</td>
<td>7,137</td>
<td>18,805</td>
<td>1,252</td>
<td>2,317</td>
<td>915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>1,302</td>
<td>1,302</td>
<td>3,880</td>
<td>21,691</td>
<td>1,238</td>
<td>5,824</td>
<td>1,589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>2,530</td>
<td>2,530</td>
<td>7,011</td>
<td>23,796</td>
<td>1,296</td>
<td>8,077</td>
<td>24,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Development Acres²</strong></td>
<td><strong>207,758</strong></td>
<td><strong>207,758</strong></td>
<td><strong>151,474</strong></td>
<td><strong>236,387</strong></td>
<td><strong>31,021</strong></td>
<td><strong>41,160</strong></td>
<td><strong>98,118</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Because land use plans for future development do not consistently identify acres for public uses, the gross residential acres in this table include acreage set aside for parks and public services including fire stations, police stations, community centers, churches, etc. that are associated with forecasted residential growth.
² Excludes lands designated in adopted and proposed land use plans as Agriculture, Open Space, Parks, Recreation, and Vacant land estimate. For the purposes of the proposed MTP/SCS, lands with these land use designations are not identified as Developed Acres.

Source: SACOG, June 2015

b. Identify areas of the region sufficient to house all the population of the region, including all economic segments of the population, over the course of the planning period of the regional transportation plan taking into account net migration into the region, population growth, household formation, and employment growth.

As described in Chapter 2 – Project Description, SACOG’s regional forecast methodology identifies the total employment expected to occur in the region and the population that will occur in conjunction with that employment growth, taking into account net migration into the region, population growth within the region, and household formation. New households are converted into housing unit demand for the forecasted workers and residents in the region. Thus, the SCS identifies areas of the region sufficient to house the entire population of the region. The SCS does not assume development on all urban-designated land, because the sum of all local land use plans, adopted and proposed, yields an amount of employment and housing growth that exceeds the total employment and housing growth forecast for the region to 2036.
Recent research suggests a shift in the type of housing products that will be needed to accommodate the region’s population. Evolving demographics and preferences held by specific demographic groups, or generational cohorts, are driving the change. On the housing demand side, the aging of the baby boom cohort (those born between 1946-1964), the preferences of the more populous Generation Y or “Millennial” cohort (those born between 1978 and 1994), and continued immigration will have a major impact on demand. On the supply side, the type and location of new housing construction over the past few decades may not match anticipated future demand according to many researchers (SACOG, 2014).

Based on the available evidence, SACOG has concluded there will be higher demand for attached and small-lot single family housing products over the MTP/SCS planning period, along with lower demand for large lot-single-family housing products, which currently make up the majority of housing in the region. In addition, these housing types have also been shown to be beneficial for increasing densities and mixed uses in Center and Corridor Communities and near high quality transit, thus helping to encourage walkable communities, decrease single occupant vehicle mode share, and reduce GHG emissions (SACOG, 2014).

Based on this research, SACOG forecasted 71 percent of new housing in the proposed MTP/SCS to be small lot single family and attached housing products. Table 12.10 provides a full overview of the current housing product mix in the region in 2012, and the growth from 2012 to 2036.

**Table 12.9**

**Summary of Potential Housing Growth by Community Type (Dwelling Units)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Type</th>
<th>2012 Dwelling Units</th>
<th>2012 -2036 New Dwelling Units</th>
<th>2036 Dwelling Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent of Total</td>
<td>Percent of Total</td>
<td>Percent of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center and Corridor Communities</td>
<td>107,718</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>86,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established Communities</td>
<td>686,075</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>78,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Communities</td>
<td>31,422</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>114,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Residential Communities</td>
<td>78,237</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lands not Identified for Development in the Proposed MTP/SCS</td>
<td>n/a²</td>
<td>n/a²</td>
<td>n/a²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region Total</td>
<td>903,452</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>284,896</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Totals may not match due to rounding.

2 The proposed MTP/SCS does not forecast or model growth in the Lands Not Identified for Development in proposed MTP/SCS Community Type during the planning period, though there is existing development in these areas (e.g., farm homes, agricultural-related uses, public lands). As a result, existing developed acres in the Lands Not Identified for Development in the proposed MTP/SCS Community Type was included in Established and Rural Residential Community Type totals.

3 Due to different protocols among GIS models for tallying spatial data, housing unit numbers in this DEIR differ marginally (less than 0.3 percent) from those reported in the proposed MTP/SCS.

Source: SACOG, MTP/SCS Land Use Forecast, June 2015
Table 12.10
Housing Product Mix in the Proposed MTP/SCS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>Center and Corridor Communities</th>
<th>Established Communities</th>
<th>Developing Communities</th>
<th>Rural Residential Communities</th>
<th>Regional Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 Baseline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Residential</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>17,015</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Lot Detached1</td>
<td>30,301</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>430,260</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>23,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Lot Detached2</td>
<td>15,713</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>79,866</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2,517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached1</td>
<td>61,405</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>158,934</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>3,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total1</td>
<td>107,719</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>686,075</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>31,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2036 (Growth)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Residential1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1,058</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Lot Detached1</td>
<td>2,110</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>25,408</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>48,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Lot Detached2</td>
<td>12,626</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>26,819</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>32,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached1</td>
<td>71,394</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>25,465</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>31,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total1</td>
<td>86,167</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>78,750</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>114,836</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Totals may not match due to rounding.
Source: SACOG, MTP/SCS Land Use Forecast, June 2015

Rural residential housing consists of single-family homes on large lots, typically over one acre in size. This type of housing is mostly located at the edges of the urbanized area. New development of this type will take place primarily through incremental construction, or one house at a time. In 2012, rural residential housing represented eight percent of all housing units in the SACOG region, and will constitute just two percent of the growth expected through 2036.

Large lot detached housing is currently the predominant form of housing in the SACOG region. This type of housing, ranging in density from one to eight units per acre, is found throughout newer suburban subdivisions and also in older traditional neighborhoods of the region’s communities. In 2012, it represented 56 percent of all housing in the SACOG region, but will account for just 28 percent of the growth through 2036.

Small lot detached housing consists of single-family homes on lots smaller than one-eighth of an acre. This housing type has historically had a minor role in the SACOG region, representing just 11 percent of all housing. It has mainly been found in the region’s older, more urbanized cities such as Sacramento, West Sacramento, and Davis. In the proposed MTP/SCS, this housing type will take on a more significant role in the region and will more than double in absolute numbers. Small lot units will be found in jurisdictions throughout the region both as freestanding homes as well as increasingly popular “accessory units” to large lot homes. Additionally, 25 percent of the growth in housing through 2036 is expected to be small-lot, detached units.

Attached housing comprises the highest density form of housing in the region, but can take on a variety of forms, ranging from duplexes at densities similar to small-lot detached housing, up to mid-rise and high-rise multifamily buildings. Attached housing has always had a place in the region and represented 25 percent of all housing as of 2012. In the proposed MTP/SCS it will constitute 45 percent of the expected growth through 2036, which is the highest percentage of growth among the housing types.
Providing a variety of housing options - apartments, condominiums, townhouses, and single-family detached homes on varying lot sizes - creates opportunities for the variety of people who need them: families, singles, seniors, and people living with special needs. The more diverse mix of housing in the proposed MTP/SCS, as identified in Table 12.10, provides more people with access to housing options that fit their circumstances and preferences. See Chapter 14 – Population and Housing for more information and analysis of dwelling units and housing types in the proposed MTP/SCS.

c. Identify areas within the region sufficient to house an eight-year projection of the regional housing need for the region pursuant to Section 65584 of the Government Code.

The RHNA is part of a statewide statutory mandate to address housing issues related to future growth. The RHNA allocates each jurisdiction’s “fair share” of the region’s projected housing needs over the housing element planning period (currently 2013 through 2021). A series of tables indicate the distribution of housing needs for each of four household income groups as compared to the area median income (AMI) and as defined by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD; i.e., extremely low-income or less than 30 percent of the AMI, very low-income or less than 50 percent of the AMI, low-income or less than 80 percent of the AMI, and moderate-income or less than 120 percent of the AMI). The RHNA is used by jurisdictions when updating their housing elements as the basis for assuring that adequate sites and zoning are available to accommodate the allocation.

SB 375 requires that the RHNA be consistent with the growth pattern of the SCS and that the SCS identify areas sufficient to house the projected regional housing need for the region, since in most of California these documents are both prepared by the same regional organization. To ensure this consistency, SB 375 aligns the RHNA process with the SCS update, extending the RHNA and Housing Element update cycle in the SACOG region from five years to eight years. Since RHNA updates are required every eight years, but MTP/SCS updates are required every four years, the SCS and RHNA update process are only linked during every other SCS cycle. Since the 2012 MTP/SCS was prepared concurrently with the 2013-2021 RHNA planning period, the proposed MTP/SCS 2016 update is not tied to a new RHNA determination. The 2016 MTP/SCS and 2013-2021 RHNA are consistent per the requirements of SB 375, because both plans accommodate housing need as determined by the same 2012 growth projections (as described in more detail below). Additionally, the 2016 MTP/SCS accommodates housing need beyond the 2013-2021 RHNA (104,970 housing units) to address growth occurring by 2036 (285,000 housing units). During the next planning period, the 2021-2029 RHNA will be required to be consistent with the projected development pattern for the future SCS update in 2020.

While the proposed MTP/SCS has a planning period of 2012 through 2036, a number of planning processes require SACOG to make some projections for the year 2020. SB 375 requires the SCS to demonstrate that it can achieve a target reduction in passenger vehicle GHG emissions by the years 2020 and 2035. The year 2020 is also very close to the horizon year of the current RHNA cycle (2021) and the attainment year for the ozone State Implementation Plan (2018). For these reasons, during the 2012 MTP/SCS update SACOG worked closely with the DOF and HCD to identify the most accurate population, housing, and employment projections for 2020 and met with each jurisdiction at countywide meetings to discuss the state-mandated factors that must be considered in developing the RHNA.
The proposed MTP/SCS uses the same growth forecast as the 2012 MTP/SCS for the 2036 plan horizon. The same economic and demographic factors used to develop the 2036 regional growth forecast were used to develop the 2020 growth forecast. Thus, the 2020 forecast represents an interim snapshot of the proposed MTP/SCS growth forecast.

However, given the near-term time frame of 2020, new existing development information up to 2012, and updated data regarding regional recovery from the 2008 economic recession for employment and dwelling units, SACOG made some adjustments to the 2012 MTP/SCS growth projections for use in the 2016 update. A number of variables were considered during this process, including vacancy rates, growth rates, household formation behavior, and the health of the home building industry. SACOG revised the 2020 growth forecast based on new data from the 2010 Census and 2014 Department of Finance, as well as additional information about the market from organizations like the Building Industry Association (BIA).

SACOG also validated the revised projections through an objective peer review by six experts, including: Stephen Levy, Director and Senior Economist at the Center for Continuing Study of the California Economy; Dr. Jeffrey Michael, Director at the Center for Business and Policy Research at the University of the Pacific; Greg Paquin, President of The Gregory Group; Walter Schwarm, Demographer at DOF; Ryan Sharp, Senior Vice President at Economic Planning Systems; and Dr. Sanjay Varshney, Vice President and Wealth Advisor at Wells Fargo Bank and former Dean of the School of Business Administration at Sacramento State University (SACOG, 2015). All six experts generally stated that SACOG’s projections were within the range of reasonableness and that many of the assumptions were consistent with their own. Table 12.11, below, shows the regional growth forecast for the proposed MTP/SCS. See Chapter 14 – Population and Housing for more information and analysis of dwelling units and housing types, as well as projections for the proposed MTP/SCS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Employees</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Housing Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>887,911</td>
<td>2,268,138</td>
<td>903,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>1,032,672</td>
<td>2,472,567</td>
<td>951,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2036</td>
<td>1,327,265</td>
<td>3,078,772</td>
<td>1,188,347</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SACOG MTP/SCS Regional Growth Forecast, June 2015

d. Identify a transportation network to service the transportation needs of the region.

SB 375 requires that MPOs adopt a RTP directed at achieving a coordinated and balanced regional transportation system including, but not limited to, mass transportation, highway, railroad, maritime, bicycle, pedestrian, goods movement, and aviation facilities and services. The RTP must be a fiscally and time-constrained plan with forecasted transportation improvements consistent with the amount of forecasted growth for the region by 2036. This is important because state and federal transportation agencies allocate billions of dollars in planning funds annually to help support the transportation planning process. The RTP establishes the basis for programming local, state, and federal transportation projects within a region. Additionally, state statutes require that RTPs serve as the foundation of the Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) prepared by MPOs, which identify the next four years of transportation projects to be funded for construction. The
The transportation network of the proposed MTP/SCS is identified in Figures 12.4, 12.5 and 12.6, and is described in Chapter 2 – Project Description. The transportation network was tailored to the Land Use Forecast to achieve the fiscal, system performance, and GHG reduction objectives of the plan.

The proposed MTP/SCS contains a mix of road and highway investments, including new facilities that serve new development and high growth areas, expansion of existing facilities to relieve existing or future bottlenecks, realignments and bypasses to improve or redirect traffic flow, maintenance of existing infrastructure, and other operational and safety improvements (e.g., the addition of guardrails to highways, rumble strips, intersection signalizations, or restriping). Bicycle and pedestrian projects include explicit bicycle and pedestrian investments such as new shared-use paths and trails, as well as “complete streets” projects incorporating bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure into existing or new and expanded road and transit facilities. Two-thirds of the total transit investment in the proposed MTP/SCS is spent on operating and maintaining the region’s transit system. The balance pays for capital expenses such as purchasing new buses and rail vehicles, infrastructure associated with adding routes and stations to the bus and rail system, building new storage and maintenance facilities, and other improvements to help bus transit vehicles move quickly through traffic. See Chapter 16 – Transportation and Traffic for more information and analysis of the transportation network and traffic.

e. Gather and consider the best practically available scientific information regarding resource areas and farmland in the region as defined in subdivisions (a) and (b) of Section 65080.01 of the Government Code.

SB 375 requires MPOs to address land use and transportation impacts to agriculture and open space from the proposed MTP/SCS, including gathering and considering information about the following natural resource areas and farmland:

- open space or habitat areas protected by NCCPs, HCPS, other natural resource protection plans;
- habitat for species identified as candidate, fully protected, sensitive, or species of special status by local, state, or federal agencies or protected by ESA, CESA (Fish & Game Code, § 2050 et seq.), or the Native Plant Protection Act;
- lands subject to conservation or agricultural easements for conservation or agricultural purposes;
- areas designated for open space or agricultural uses in adopted open space elements or agricultural elements of local plans or ordinances;
- areas containing biological resources as described in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines that may be significantly affected by the SCS;
- an area subject to flooding where a development project would not, at the time of development in the judgment of the agency, meet the requirements of the National Flood Insurance Program or where the area is subject to more protective provisions of state law or local ordinance; and
- farmland outside all existing city SOIs or city limits as of January 2008 and is one of the following: prime or unique farmland or farmland of statewide importance.
Figure 12.4 2036 Transit Network with 2036 Mixed Densities
Figure 12.5 2036 Road Network with 2036 Mixed Density
Figure 12.6 2036 Class I, II, and III Bicycle Network with 2036 Mixed Densities
The proposed MTP/SCS Land Use Forecast was developed in consultation with local jurisdictions and with consideration of the above-listed resources. As discussed in Chapter 6 – Biological Resources, each of the counties in the plan area are engaged in habitat and/or natural communities planning, which has involved extensive inventorying and mapping of resources. SACOG consulted with cities and counties, LAFCos, state and federal resource agencies, and other stakeholders on urban development and natural resource issues within each local jurisdiction. This included collecting information on agricultural and open space protection policies, the status of flood mapping and implications for future development, the status of habitat and/or natural communities planning, and the status of federal resource permits, including those required under Section 404 and Section 401 of CWA (33 U.S. Code § 1251 et seq.) and Section 1602 of the Fish and Game Code where applicable.

This level of data collection allowed SACOG to consider the limitations on urban growth due to various natural resource regulations and policies, as well as the impacts of urban growth on natural resources. Natural resource data was compared to the proposed land use footprint of the proposed MTP/SCS to determine the amount of land potentially affected by the growth planned for 2036. The results of this analysis revealed that implementation of the land use and transportation elements of the proposed MTP/SCS could result in impacts to varying amounts of agricultural land, open space resources, and biological resources including habitat, fish, and wildlife. However, SACOG also evaluated the consistency of the proposed MTP/SCS with existing natural resource plans, policies, and regulations in place to prevent or mitigate impacts to natural resources. Any specific projects proposed in the future are subject to federal, state, and local permits related to natural resource impacts (e.g., USACE Section 404 permit, RWQCB Section 401 certification, and CDFW Streambed Alteration Agreement) and must demonstrate consistency with and satisfy mitigation requirements included in an adopted HCP. In addition to the above-noted consideration of natural resources and farmland, this draft EIR analyzes the potential impacts of the proposed MTP/SCS on the above resources in Chapter 4 – Agriculture and Forestry Resources, Chapter 6 – Biological Resources, Chapter 11 – Hydrology and Water Quality, and Chapter 15 – Public Services and Recreation.

f. Consider the state housing goals specified in Sections 65580 and 65581 of the Government Code.

State law recognizes the availability of housing, including decent housing conditions, farmworker housing, a diverse mix of housing types, and housing affordability for all economic segments of the community, as of vital statewide importance. Providing a variety of housing options – apartments, condominiums, townhouses, and single-family detached homes of various sizes and on varying lot sizes – creates opportunities for the variety of people who need them: families, singles, seniors, and people living with special needs. By providing a diverse mix of housing choice, more people have access to housing options that fit their circumstances and preferences. Since the beginning of the Blueprint project, SACOG has used four categories to describe housing product mix:

- Rural Residential: single-family detached homes built at densities less than 1 dwelling unit per acre.
- Large-Lot Single-Family: single-family detached homes built at densities between one and eight dwelling units per acre, defined by SACOG as very low to low density.
- Small-Lot Single-Family: single-family detached homes built at densities between eight and 25 dwelling units per acre, defined by SACOG as medium to medium-high density.
• Attached: Single-family and multi-family homes including duplexes, triplexes, apartments, condominiums, townhomes, row houses, and half-plexes, built at densities from greater than eight to more than 50 dwelling units per acre (defined by SACOG as high density).

More recent demographic studies indicate that housing choice will become an increasingly important issue in the future as evolving demographics and preferences held by specific demographic groups, or generational cohorts drive a change in housing preference and demand (SACOG, 2014). Based on the available evidence, SACOG has concluded there will be higher demand for attached and small-lot single-family housing products over the planning period of the proposed MTP/SCS, along with lower demand for large-lot single-family housing products, which currently make up the majority of housing in the region. Additionally, the growth principles identified in the Blueprint and adopted by local agencies include providing housing choice and diversity, quality design, and mixed use development, as well as compact development, which supports the remaining principles of natural resources conservation, use of existing assets, and transportation choice. Therefore, the proposed MTP/SCS provides a mix of housing options that address future demand for a variety of product types and implement the Blueprint principles.

Regionally, 45 percent of the new housing in the proposed SCS is attached, 25 percent is small-lot single-family, 28 percent is large-lot single-family, and two percent is rural residential. This represents a significant change from 2012, in which the mix is 25 percent attached, 11 percent single-family small-lot, 56 percent single-family large-lot, and eight percent rural residential (Table 12.12). New housing in Center and Corridor Communities is predominantly attached products, due to higher residential densities proposed or allowed in these areas by local jurisdictions. New housing in Established Communities is balanced between large-lot single-family, small-lot single-family and attached housing. New housing in Developing Communities is predominantly large-lot single-family and small-lot single-family products. New housing in Rural Residential Communities is almost entirely rural residential and large-lot single-family housing product. See Chapter 14 – Population and Housing for more information on dwelling units and housing types.

g. Set forth a forecasted development pattern for the region, which, when integrated with the transportation network, and other transportation measures and policies, will reduce the greenhouse gas emissions from automobiles and light trucks to achieve the greenhouse gas emission reduction targets approved by the California Air Resources Board if there is a feasible way to do so.

The forecasted development pattern of the proposed MTP/SCS was designed to achieve the GHG reduction targets approved by the CARB for the SACOG region: seven percent per capita GHG reduction below 2005 levels by 2020 and 16 percent per capita GHG reduction below 2005 levels by 2035.

In support of the Blueprint principles, one of the primary strategies to achieve GHG emission reduction targets is to increase the number of people – both residents and employees – who have access to high-quality transit. By 2036 the proposed MTP/SCS puts approximately 24 percent of new dwelling units and 29 percent of new employees within TPAs and brings high-quality transit service to an additional 337,892 existing dwelling units and 448,764 existing employees. Table 12.12 summarizes the existing and future housing and employment within TPAs.
SACOG held several public workshops and a conducted a scientific phone poll using a sample including individuals across a range of genders, age groups, racial and ethnic groups, and classes to gather input during the development of the proposed MTP/SCS. The top five concerns expressed by the public surveyed included reducing greenhouse gas emissions from cars, reducing vehicle miles traveled in heavy traffic, increasing trips by transit, bicycle, or walking, reducing total vehicle miles traveled, and decreasing farmland converted to development. Public input also favored shifting funds from road expansion to road and transit maintenance and transit service. Altogether, these themes represent a shift from the 2012 MTP/SCS (Scenario 2) toward Scenario 3, which has a more compact land use pattern and more focus on alternative modes of transportation. Scenario 3 was found in preliminary modeling to meet the GHG reduction targets set by CARB (see Chapter 2 – Project Description for a description of the public workshop results).

Based on the results of the public workshops and SACOG Board direction, SACOG developed a Draft Preferred Scenario of transportation investments and land use growth assumptions. The proposed MTP/SCS considered adopted and proposed plans in each jurisdiction, market conditions, environmental constraints, and availability of funds for transportation and other infrastructure. Based on this framework, SACOG developed the proposed MTP/SCS, which is designed to meet the GHG targets set by CARB. Modeling of the proposed MTP/SCS has produced the following results: eight percent per capita reduction below 2005 levels by 2020 and 16 percent per capita reduction below 2005 levels by 2035. See Chapter 8 – Energy and Global Climate Change for a detailed discussion on and analysis of impacts to GHG emissions.

### h. Allow the regional transportation plan to comply with Section 176 of the federal Clean Air Act.

Section 176 of the federal Clean Air Act of 1970 (42 U.S. Code, § 7401 et seq.) sets forth the definition of conformity for the MTP. SACOG must ensure that the MTP conforms to the state implementation plan (SIP). The determination of conformity must be based on the most recent estimates of emissions, and those estimates must be determined from the most recent population, employment, travel and congestion estimates as determined by the MPO or other agency authorized to make such estimates (42 U.S. Code, § 7506).

---

Table 12.12
Summary of Housing and Employment within TPAs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TPAs¹</th>
<th>Existing Dwelling Units</th>
<th>Existing Employees</th>
<th>New Dwelling Units</th>
<th>New Employees</th>
<th>All Dwelling Units</th>
<th>All Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Placer TPAs</td>
<td>17,005</td>
<td>42,732</td>
<td>2,252</td>
<td>15,147</td>
<td>19,257</td>
<td>57,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento TPAs</td>
<td>281,324</td>
<td>357,755</td>
<td>83,872</td>
<td>135,086</td>
<td>365,196</td>
<td>492,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolo TPAs</td>
<td>39,562</td>
<td>48,277</td>
<td>18,900</td>
<td>32,961</td>
<td>58,462</td>
<td>81,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All TPAs</td>
<td>337,892</td>
<td>448,764</td>
<td>105,024</td>
<td>183,194</td>
<td>442,915</td>
<td>631,958</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ TPAs are those areas of the region within one-half mile of a major transit stop (existing or planned light rail, street car, or train station) or high-quality transit corridor. A high-quality transit corridor is a corridor with fixed route bus service with service intervals no longer than 15 minutes during peak commute hours (Pub. Resources Code, § 21155).

Source: SACOG MTP/SCS Regional Growth Forecast, June 2015
As part of the proposed MTP/SCS, SACOG must examine the long-term air quality impacts of the transportation system and ensure that it is compatible with the region’s air quality goals. In doing so, regional agencies must work with state and local partner agencies to assess the impacts of growth on air pollution and decide how to manage growth.

In compliance with this requirement of the Clean Air Act, SACOG updated its baseline estimates, regional growth forecast, and Land Use Forecast using the most comprehensive, recent, and best available data. Chapter 1 – Introduction, provides a full description of the baseline for the proposed MTP/SCS and this EIR. The discussion of the seven SB 375 requirements above describes the information considered and used in creating both the regional growth forecast and translating that into the Land Use Forecast. The draft conformity determination for this proposed MTP/SCS is included in Appendix F of the draft plan and documents the most recent emissions estimates. Chapter 5 – Air Quality includes more information about the Clean Air Act and analysis of pollutants and emissions.

**Combined Effects of LU-1 (a-h)**

Because the proposed MTP/SCS complies with all eight SB 375 objectives listed above, as demonstrated in the preceding discussion, the impacts of the proposed MTP/SCS are considered less than significant (LS) for Impact LU – 1. No mitigation is required.

**Localized Impacts**

*Center and Corridor Communities, Established Communities, Developing Communities, Rural Residential Communities, and Lands Not Identified for Development in the MTP/SCS*

Because the land use requirements and objectives of SB 375 are regional in scope, no localized impact analysis was conducted.

**Transit Priority Area Impacts**

*Placer County, Sacramento County, and Yolo County TPAs*

Because the land use requirements and objectives of SB 375 are regional in scope, no Transit Priority Area impact analysis was conducted.

**IMPACT LU-2: SUBSTANTIALLY CONFLICT WITH THE PROVISIONS OF THE LAND USE AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN ADOPTED BY THE DELTA PROTECTION COMMISSION.**

**Regional Impacts**

Sections a through f below evaluate the proposed MTP/SCS for consistency with the goals of the LURMP.
a. Direct new non-agriculturally oriented non-farmworker residential development within existing unincorporated towns and encourage a critical mass of farms, agriculturally-related businesses, and supporting infrastructure to ensure the economic vitality of agriculture within the Delta.

The growth and housing patterns from implementation of the proposed MTP/SCS will result in more compact development than existing conditions (see Chapter 2 – Project Description for more information on land use and transportation changes in the proposed MTP/SCS). By developing more compactly, the proposed MTP/SCS directs more growth to areas that are already urbanized and helps prevent undeveloped land from being converted to urban uses. Keeping growth contained to areas that are already developed limits the amount of growth that takes place at the urban edge, adjacent to agricultural areas. Except for the Delta Legacy Communities, the Primary Zone of the Delta is located within Lands Not Identified for Development in the MTP/SCS, where no growth and only minimal transportation improvements are planned. Therefore, consistent with the LURMP, the priority land use of areas in the Primary Zone shall continue to be oriented toward agriculture and open space. Figure 12.2 illustrates the MTP/SCS plan area falling within the Delta Primary and Secondary Zones and Delta Plan development boundaries.

SACOG has no land use authority to adopt local land use plans or approve local land use projects. However, jurisdictions with land in the Primary Zone (i.e., City of Sacramento, Sacramento County, Yolo County, City of West Sacramento) are required by Public Resources Code Section 29763 to adopt general plans with land uses consistent with the goals and policies in the LURMP, subject to review by the DPC. Therefore, subsequent projects within the proposed MTP/SCS that fall within the LURMP boundaries will be required to demonstrate consistency with the LURMP and satisfy mitigation requirements.

While much of the transportation infrastructure from implementation of the proposed MTP/SCS will serve urban uses in urbanized areas of the region, it is likely that implementation of transportation improvements at the urban edge could increase urban traffic patterns on roads that also serve agricultural lands. Frequently, the increased traffic volumes are caused by spillover from congested roads near the exterior of urbanized areas. Increased urban traffic on transitional roads, spanning between urban and rural areas, can lead to increased conflict between uses, which could result in the conversion of additional agricultural lands in order to reduce such conflicts.

As discussed above, the proposed MTP/SCS will result in more compact development than existing conditions. The proposed MTP/SCS is designed to improve transportation options and increase capacity within urbanized areas. Owners of agricultural lands nearest to these urbanized areas may feel pressure to develop as the proposed transportation improvements within proximity of these lands are implemented. Such pressure will also increase as land uses surrounding these properties continue to urbanize.

Chapter 4 – Agriculture and Forestry Resources analyzes impacts to farmland from land use changes and transportation improvements from implementation of the proposed MTP/SCS (Impact AG-1, Impact AG-2, and Impact AG-4). SACOG proposes Mitigation Measure AG-1 for farmland protection and Mitigation Measure AG-4 to mitigate or avoid conversion pressures on farmland.
b. Support the long-term viability of agriculture and discourage inappropriate development of agricultural lands.

SACOG has maintained ongoing communication as part of the RUCS process with the DPC, which is a key partner in the effort to provide policy and technical approaches to addressing or avoiding impacts to rural resources in the Sacramento region. RUCS has identified five topical areas of focus, including land use and conservation, infrastructure of agriculture, economic opportunities, forest management, and regulations. Several tools and supporting data have also been developed to broaden the region’s understanding of how land use and transportation investments affect rural areas. The project is ongoing, with the ultimate goal of bridging the urban and rural planning needs in the region.

Chapter 4—Agriculture and Forestry Resources analyzes impacts from converting farmland identified in the farmland mapping and monitoring program (Impact AG-1), conflicting with local agricultural land designations (Impact AG-2), and converting other farmland (Impact AG-4). SACOG proposes Mitigation Measure AG-1 to mitigate farmland loss and Mitigation AG-4 to support the long-term viability of agriculture in the entire region including the Delta.

c. Preserve and protect the natural resources of the Delta; promote protection of remnants of riparian and aquatic habitat; and encourage compatibility between agricultural practices and wildlife habitat.

For an analysis of biological resource conflicts with local, regional, or state habitat conservation plans, see Impact BIO-9 in Chapter 6—Biological Resources. Chapter 6 also analyzes impacts to plants (Impact BIO-1a), wildlife (Impact BIO-1b), fish (Impact BIO-1c), wetlands (Impact BIO-1e), wildlife corridors (Impact BIO-2), and sensitive natural communities (BIO-1d), as well as impacts to trees and other biological resources protected by local ordinances (BIO-3) or by an HCP or NCCP (BIO-4), for the entire region including the Delta.

d. Promote continued recreational use of the land and waters of the Delta and ensure that needed facilities that support such uses are constructed, maintained, and supervised.

The proposed MTP/SCS does not forecast any growth by 2036 in areas outside those identified by the DPC as city land or areas designated for development that would result in the conversion of recreational land to urban uses. The proposed MTP/SCS land use forecast also assumes increases in public service capital capacity, programming, personnel, equipment, and facilities as the population increases, ensuring that recreational uses are constructed, maintained, and supervised as needed to meet demand.

One of the primary ways that the LURMP promotes recreational use of the Delta is by providing alternative transportation choices allowing urban residents in the Secondary Zone and Delta Legacy Communities (i.e., Clarksburg, Hood, Courtland, Ryde, Walnut Grove, Locke, and Isleton) to visit the Primary Zone for recreation or tourism. The proposed MTP/SCS is designed to improve transportation options and increase capacity within Established and Developing Community Types, which include the Delta Legacy Communities and Secondary Zone areas, by increasing trips per capita by bicycle, walk, or transit above the regional baseline average. The proposed MTP/SCS also includes limited transportation investments in road maintenance, safety enhancements, and other
roadway operational improvements in Lands Not Identified for Development, which include Primary Zone areas.

Additionally, the Great California Trail Act (Chapter 839, statute of 2006) requires the DPC to establish a continuous recreation corridor, including bicycle and hiking trails, around the five county region of the Delta. DPC must adopt a plan and implementation program for a continuous recreational corridor trail network linking the San Francisco Bay Trail system to the planned Sacramento River trails in Yolo and Sacramento counties. Existing law authorizes MPOs to allocate funds to establish a recreation corridor, including a bicycle and hiking trail, around the perimeter of the San Francisco and San Pablo Bays. SB 1556 authorized MPOs to allocate funds directly to the DPC for activities around the Delta, instead of cities and counties, including for establishing and maintaining pedestrian and bicycle trails.

The Great California Delta Trail Plan will include routes for bicycling and hiking that connect to other trails, park and recreational facilities, and public transportation. DPC is currently working on a Delta Blueprint Report for the Eastern region, which includes Sacramento and Yolo counties. The only adopted Delta trail segment within the MTP/SCS plan area to date is the Sacramento River Parkway (Delta Protection Commission, 2014).

Since the Delta Blueprint Report for the Eastern region is still being drafted and has not been released, it would be premature to attempt to analyze the proposed MTP/SCS for consistency. Additionally, since the plan is not adopted, consistency is not required to be analyzed under CEQA. Therefore, an analysis of the MTP/SCS consistency with the draft Delta Blueprint Report is not included in this EIR. SACOG will coordinate with DPC on incorporating the Great California Delta Trail System into the regional trail network in the future. Also see Chapter 16—Transportation and Traffic for an analysis of impacts from causing an interference with existing or planned bicycle and pedestrian facilities (Impact TRN-5).

e. Protect and enhance long-term water quality in the Delta for agriculture, municipal, industrial, water-contact recreation, and fish and wildlife habitat uses, as well as all other beneficial uses.

Two potentially substantial adverse impacts to water quality are urban runoff caused by increased impervious surfaces and discharges of constituents to CWA Section 303(d)-listed waters. Land use and transportation changes in the proposed MTP/SCS would increase impervious surfaces, which could potentially increase the amount of contaminated runoff water flowing into waters identified under CWA as being impaired by a variety of contaminants. Under the CWA listing, these water bodies have no remaining assimilative capacity or ability to accommodate additional quantities of these contaminants, irrespective of concentration.

In order to address impaired waters, several jurisdictions have municipal stormwater permits to reduce the discharge of sediments and other pollutants in runoff. Proponents (public agencies and private developers) of construction projects that disturb one or more acres of soil or disturb less than one acre, but are part of a larger common plan of development that in total disturbs one or more acres, are required to obtain a Construction General Permit from the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). The project proponent must propose control measures consistent with the state’s permit, and develop a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan for each site, which includes BMPs to reduce potential impacts.
Transportation projects where the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) is the lead agency are covered by the Caltrans Stormwater Program, which includes a permit process regulating all stormwater discharges from Caltrans-owned conveyances, maintenance facilities, and construction activities. Caltrans also has a Storm Water Management Plan that describes the procedures and practices used to reduce or eliminate the discharge of pollutants to storm drainage systems and receiving waters. Transportation projects where local agencies are the lead agency are subject to local and state regulations for construction and non-construction runoff prevention.

Chapter 11−Hydrology and Water Quality analyzes impacts to stormwater runoff (Impact HYD-1) and water quality (Impact HYD-7 and Impact HYD-8) for the entire region including the Delta.

f. Ensure that the construction of new utility and infrastructure facilities is appropriate and the impacts of such new construction on the integrity of levees, wildlife, recreation, agriculture and Delta communities are avoided, minimized, and mitigated.

The land use growth footprint of the proposed MTP/SCS includes the land supply needed to accommodate necessary increases in utilities and services, including water supply, conveyance, storage, and distribution systems; energy and power systems; telecommunication systems; or sewer systems.

Construction of new roadway capacity, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, transit facilities, and rehabilitation of existing roadway infrastructure could increase the demand for water for construction-related activities such as concrete mixing, dust settling, and landscaping. Similarly, construction activities could increase the amount of wastewater generated at construction sites and increase demand on local wastewater collection, storage, conveyance, and treatment facilities. Construction activities like demolition, grading, and excavation could generate solid waste, which may be disposed of in municipal waste systems. Finally, construction activities related to the implementation of the proposed MTP/SCS could result in an increased demand for energy to power construction lighting, equipment, and vehicles. Because utility infrastructure often shares the right-of-way with transportation infrastructure, there is the possibility that construction activity related to implementation of the proposed MTP/SCS could disrupt the provision of utility services.

The ongoing operation of new transit facilities, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and roadway facilities could result in increases in electricity to power streetlights, traffic control devices, signage, and intelligent transportation systems (ITS) infrastructure. Similarly, ITS infrastructure often relies on communication systems to relay real-time information to travelers. New transportation infrastructure could require toilets, sinks, drinking fountains, and drains that would generate a small amount of additional wastewater. These projects could result in the conversion of undeveloped land to transportation uses, thereby increasing the amount of impervious surfaces in the region and possibly increasing the amount of runoff. These projects could also potentially increase the amount of waste collected from all land uses. Because the increase in demand for utilities and service systems is expected to be low, little new construction will be required.

Construction of any new utility or service system facilities will be subject to many federal, state, and local laws. Construction-related impacts are typically controllable and can be mitigated below a level of significance through actions of the implementing agency. Chapter 17−Utilities and Service Systems analyzes impacts from the construction of new utility and infrastructure facilities (USS-3) for the entire region including the Delta.
Combined Effects of LU-2 (a-f)

Because the proposed MTP/SCS is consistent with the goals identified in the LURMP and SACOG has consulted with the DPC on maintaining consistency between the proposed MTP/SCS and the LURMP, the land use and transportation impacts associated with implementation of the proposed MTP/SCS at the regional level are considered less than significant (LS) for Impact LU – 2. No mitigation is required.

Localized Impacts

Center and Corridor Communities, Established Communities, Developing Communities, Rural Residential Communities, and Lands Not Identified for Development in the MTP/SCS

Because the LURMP is regional in scope for the five Delta counties, no localized impact analysis was conducted.

Transit Priority Area Impacts

Placer County, Sacramento County, and Yolo County TPAs

Because the LURMP is regional in scope for the five Delta counties, no localized impact analysis was conducted.

Mitigation Measures

None required.