

# Chapter 1—Introduction

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Pub. Resources Code, § 21000 et seq.), this Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) describes the environmental effects associated with adoption and implementation of the 2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (proposed MTP/SCS). For this Draft EIR, “proposed MTP/SCS” means the Draft MTP/SCS released by the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) Board of Directors on September 17, 2015, and available for review at [www.sacog.org/mtpscs/2016update](http://www.sacog.org/mtpscs/2016update). This Draft EIR has been prepared by SACOG pursuant to CEQA (Pub. Resources Code, § 21000 et seq.) and the CEQA Guidelines (14 Cal. Code Regs., § 15000 et seq.)

## 1.1 Regulatory Context for the MTP/SCS

---

SACOG is designated by the state and federal governments as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Sacramento region and, as such, is responsible for developing a metropolitan transportation plan (MTP) and sustainable communities strategy (SCS) every four years in coordination with El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba counties (including the 22 cities within those counties, with the exception of the Tahoe Basin). The proposed MTP/SCS incorporates countywide transportation planning developed by the El Dorado County Transportation Commission (EDCTC) and the Placer County Transportation Planning Agency (PCTPA) under memoranda of understanding (MOUs) between those agencies and SACOG. Federal and state laws regarding the proposed MTP/SCS are described below.

### 1.1.1 Federal Laws Regarding Metropolitan Transportation Plans

#### *MOVING AHEAD FOR PROGRESS IN THE 21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY (MAP-21), 2012*

MAP-21 was signed into law in July 2012 and reauthorized the federal highway and public transportation programs for fiscal years 2013 and 2014. Since then, MAP-21 has been reauthorized three additional times: first in July 2014 through the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014, next in May 2015 through the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2015, and finally in July 2015 through the Surface Transportation and Veterans Health Care Choice Improvement Act of 2015, which extends MAP-21 authorization to October 29, 2015. MAP-21 (23 U.S. Code, § 507) governs the metropolitan transportation planning process which results in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (23 U.S. Code, §§ 134 – 135; Highways, 23 Code Fed. Regs., § 450; Environmental Protection, 40 Code Fed. Regs., § 93). Under this law, MPOs must conduct a metropolitan transportation planning process that is continuous, cooperative, and comprehensive, and that provides for consideration and implementation of projects, strategies, and services that address all modes of transportation. MAP-21 requires the development of a transportation plan every four years, addressing no less than a 20-year planning horizon as of the effective date. MAP-21 requires this transportation plan to address the following factors:

- support the economic vitality of the metropolitan area, especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity, and efficiency;
- increase the safety of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users;

- increase the security of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users;
- increase accessibility and mobility of people and freight;
- protect and enhance the environment, promote energy conservation, improve the quality of life, and promote consistency between transportation improvements and state and local planned growth and economic development patterns;
- enhance the integration and connectivity of the transportation system, across and between modes, for people and freight;
- promote efficient system management and operation; and
- emphasize the preservation of the existing transportation system.

*THE FEDERAL CLEAN AIR ACT (CAA) OF 1970*

CAA (42 U.S. Code, § 7401 et seq.) was passed in response to growing concerns regarding the public health dangers of air pollution. The law was originally formulated in response to pollution generated by workplaces such as factories, and subsequently was amended to address vehicle-generated pollution with a focus on regulating the composition of gasoline. In 1990, a set of CAA Amendments were passed that recognized that the transportation system itself has an effect on travel behavior, and by extension, air quality. As part of the Amendments, new transportation projects were required to be in “conformity” with the CAA, meaning that transportation planning agencies such as SACOG must examine the long-term air quality impacts of their 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.

**1.1.2 California State Laws Regarding Regional Transportation Plans**

*THE SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES AND CLIMATE PROTECTION ACT OF 2008 (SB 375)*

SB 375 (Stats. 2008, ch. 728) focuses on aligning transportation, housing, and other land uses to achieve regional greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reduction targets established under the California Global Warming Solutions Act, also known as Assembly Bill 32 (Stats. 2005, ch. 488; AB 32). While other efforts to reduce GHG emissions focus on alternative fuels and vehicle efficiency, SB 375 is intended to more effectively reduce emissions by coordinating land use and transportation planning at the regional level.

SB 375 requires California MPOs to develop an SCS as part of the MTP, with the purpose of identifying policies and strategies to reduce per capita passenger vehicle-generated GHG emissions. The SCS must identify the general location of land uses, residential densities, and building intensities within the region; identify areas within the region sufficient to house all the population, including all economic segments of the population; identify areas within the region sufficient to house an eight-year projection of the regional housing need; identify a transportation network to service the regional transportation needs; gather and consider the best practically available scientific information regarding resources areas and farmland in the region; 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 GHG emission reduction targets approved by the California Air Resources Board

(ARB), if feasible; consider the state housing goals; and allow the regional transportation plan to comply with the CAA. (Gov. Code, § 65080, subd. (b)(F)(2)(B).) The process for developing an SCS must also follow public participation requirements outlined in SB 375. If the SCS does not achieve the GHG emission reduction targets set by ARB, an Alternative Planning Strategy (APS) must be developed to demonstrate how the targets could be achieved.

## 1.2 Purpose of This Draft EIR

---

The purpose of an EIR is to identify a project's significant effects on the environment, identify alternatives to the project, and indicate the manner in which significant effects can be mitigated or avoided (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002.1(a)). Section 15382 of the CEQA Guidelines defines a "significant effect on the environment" as a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project, including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic or aesthetic significance. An economic or social change by itself shall not be considered a significant effect on the environment. A social or economic change related to a physical change may be considered in determining whether the physical change is significant.

This Draft EIR analyzes the environmental effects of the proposed MTP/SCS and provides local decision-makers and the public with an objective analysis of the potential environmental consequences of implementing the proposed MTP/SCS. Mitigation has been recommended, where necessary and/or feasible, to reduce or avoid significant environmental impacts identified in the analysis. However, SACOG has no authority to enforce recommended mitigation measures on future lead agencies. Agencies with jurisdiction to adopt these measures can and should do so (Pub. Resources Code, § 21081) and projects taking advantage of CEQA Streamlining provisions of SB 375 (Pub. Resources Code § 21155.1, 21155.2, and 21159.28) must apply the mitigation measures described above to address site-specific conditions. For this reason, the mitigation measures listed in the preceding Executive Summary, and fully described in the following chapters, indicate the level of significance after mitigation of an impact, but also disclose SACOG's lack of authority to enforce such measures.

CEQA Guidelines section 15168 defines a program EIR as "...an EIR which may be prepared on a series of actions that can be characterized as one large project and are related either: 1) geographically; 2) as logical parts in the chain of contemplated actions; 3) in connection with issuance of rules, regulations, plans, or other general criteria to govern the conduct of a continuing program; or 4) as individual activities carried out under the same authorizing statutory or regulatory authority and having generally similar environmental effects which can be mitigated in similar ways." As a programmatic document, this Draft EIR presents a region-wide assessment of the impacts of the proposed MTP/SCS. Analysis of site-specific impacts of individual projects is not the intended use of a program EIR. Many specific projects are not currently defined to the level that would allow for such an analysis. Individual specific environmental analysis of each project will be undertaken as necessary by the appropriate implementing agency prior to each project being considered for approval.

This program Draft EIR serves as a first-tier environmental document under CEQA, supporting second-tier environmental documents for:

- transportation projects developed during the engineering design process; and

- residential or mixed-use projects and transit priority projects consistent with the SCS.

Local jurisdictions implementing subsequent projects would undertake future environmental review as CEQA lead agencies for projects in the proposed MTP/SCS. These local jurisdictions would include the six counties and twenty-two cities within the MTP/SCS plan area. Other lead agencies may include public transit providers, other public agencies such as air districts and the California Department of Transportation, Native American tribes, college and university transportation providers, and transportation management associations, among others. All of these types of agencies, as well as the SACOG member agencies, would be able to prepare subsequent environmental documents that incorporate, by reference, the appropriate information from this program Draft EIR regarding secondary effects, cumulative impacts, broad alternatives, and other relevant factors. If the lead agency finds that implementation of a later activity would have no new effects and that no new mitigation measures would be required, that activity would not require additional CEQA review. Where subsequent environmental review is required, such review would focus on project-specific significant effects unique to the project, or its site that have not been considered in this program Draft EIR.

### 1.3 Scope of This Draft EIR

---

This Draft EIR analyzes the potential environmental impacts of the proposed MTP/SCS, in particular the long-term impacts of the plan's components. The Draft EIR also provides the basis for project-level CEQA compliance for implementation of future transportation projects and qualifying land use projects.

For each topic analyzed in this Draft EIR, there is an introduction, a regulatory and environmental setting, an explanation of the methodology and assumptions for the analysis, the criteria for determining significance of impacts, and the impacts and proposed mitigation measures. The following topics are analyzed in this Draft EIR:

- aesthetics;
- agricultural and forestry resources;
- air quality;
- biological resources;
- cultural and paleontological resources;
- energy and global climate change;
- geology, soils, seismicity, and mineral resources;
- hazards and hazardous materials;
- hydrology and water quality;
- land use and planning;
- noise;
- population and housing;
- public services and recreation;
- transportation and traffic;
- utilities and service systems;
- alternatives analysis; and
- other CEQA considerations.

## 1.4 Organization of This Draft EIR

---

### 1.4.1 Report Structure

The content and format of this Draft EIR are designed to meet the requirements of CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. The Draft EIR is organized into the following chapters so that the reader can easily obtain information about the proposed MTP/SCS:

- **Executive Summary:** Presents a summary of the proposed MTP/SCS and alternatives and a summary of the impacts and mitigation measures.
- **Chapter 1 – Introduction:** Describes the overall purpose, scope and organization of this Draft EIR.
- **Chapter 2 – Project Description:** Provides a description of the SACOG region, project background, project objectives, and the components of the proposed MTP/SCS.
- **Chapters 3 through 17 – Environmental Analysis:** Chapters 3 through 17 are devoted to and describe the following for each environmental resource analyzed in this Draft EIR: existing conditions and regulatory setting; significance criteria; potential environmental impacts and their level of significance; and mitigation measures, if necessary and feasible, that would eliminate or reduce significant impacts.
- **Chapter 18 – Alternatives Analysis:** Describes and evaluates alternatives to the proposed project.
- **Chapter 19 – Other CEQA Considerations:** Provides an analysis of growth-inducing impacts, significant irreversible changes, and cumulative impacts.
- **Chapter 20 – References:** Identifies the documents used (printed references) and individuals consulted (personal communications) during preparation of this Draft EIR.
- **Chapter 21 – Report Preparation:** Lists the individuals involved in preparing this Draft EIR.

Technical appendices are included at the end of the Draft EIR.

### 1.4.2 Level of Analysis

Potential impacts of the proposed MTP/SCS are analyzed first in terms of the land use components, then in terms of the transportation components of the plan. Where applicable, the sum total of impacts from the combined land use and transportation components of the proposed MTP/SCS are analyzed. This analytical structure is used to provide the reader information about all components of the proposed MTP/SCS. At the same time, the programmatic nature of this Draft EIR necessitates a general approach to the evaluation of existing conditions and potential impacts associated with implementation of the proposed MTP/SCS. Generally, these analyses are qualitative in nature, with quantitative analysis provided where information is available and applicable.

In addition to describing impacts of both the land use and transportation aspects of the proposed MTP/SCS, this Draft EIR also conducts analyses at three geographic levels: Regional, Localized (Community Type), and Transit Priority Area, as appropriate for the environmental resource. Regional level analysis assesses the extent of the plan's impacts for the entire MTP/SCS plan area.

Localized analysis assesses the extent of the plan’s impact on each of five Community Types (defined fully in Chapter 2 – Project Description). Transit Priority Area analysis assesses the extent of the plan’s impact on each of three Transit Priority Areas (defined fully in Chapter 2 – Project Description). This analytical framework was used to provide greater detail on the potential environmental effects of this regional-scale plan on smaller geographies. It was also employed to provide tiering opportunities for subsequent projects that qualify for SB 375 CEQA streamlining benefits.

### 1.4.3 Timeframe

The planning period of the proposed MTP/SCS spans a 24-year time period, from the year 2012 to 2036.

#### 2012 BASELINE

The CEQA Guidelines provide that the existing physical conditions at the time the Notice of Preparation (“NOP”) is published will “normally” constitute the baseline. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15125). The Supreme Court, in *Communities for a Better Environment v. South Coast Air Quality Management* (2010) 48 Cal.4th 310, 328, reaffirmed that: “[n]either CEQA nor the CEQA Guidelines mandates a uniform, inflexible rule for determination of the existing conditions baseline. Rather an agency enjoys the discretion to decide, in the first instance, exactly how the existing physical conditions without the project can most realistically be measured, subject to review, as with all CEQA factual determinations, for support by substantial evidence.” The NOP for the proposed MTP/SCS was issued June 18, 2014, thus this would “normally” constitute the baseline for purposes of environmental analysis. However, the use of a different baseline is appropriate where circumstances warrant and substantial evidence supports the agency’s assumptions. (*Neighbors for Smart Rail v. Exposition Metro Line Construction Authority* (2013) 57 Cal.4th 439, 445 [A departure from use of the date of the NOP as the baseline “can be justified by substantial evidence that an analysis based on existing conditions would tend to be misleading or without informational value to EIR users”] (“*Smart Rail*”); *Fat v. County of Sacramento* (2002) 97 Cal.App.4th 1270, 1278 [substantial evidence standard governs the determination of the environmental baseline]; see also *Save Our Peninsula Comm. v. Monterey County Bd. of Supervisors* (2001) 87 Cal.App.4th 99, 120 [when the “determination of a baseline condition requires choosing between...differing methodologies, it is the function of the lead agency to make those choices”])).

More specifically, as held by the Supreme Court in the recent *Smart Rail* decision, “in a proper case, and when supported by substantial evidence, use of projected conditions may be an appropriate way to measure the environmental impacts that a project will have on traffic, air quality and greenhouse gas emissions. As a major transportation project that will not even begin to operate until 2015 at the earliest, its impact on presently existing traffic and air quality conditions will yield no practical information to decision makers or the public.” To the extent a departure from the “norm” of an existing conditions baseline (Guidelines, § 15125(a)) “promotes public participation and more informed decisionmaking by providing a more accurate picture of a proposed project’s likely impacts, CEQA permits the departure. Thus an agency may forego analysis of a project’s impacts on existing environmental conditions if such an analysis would be uninformative or misleading to decision makers and the public.” (*Smart Rail, supra*, 57 Cal.4th at p. 453.) Additionally, where appropriate, the environmental baseline may consider environmental conditions over a range of time periods as an alternative to conditions based on a single snapshot in time (*Cherry Valley Pass Acres and*

*Neighbors v. City of Beaumont* (2010) 190 Cal.App.4th 316, 336-338 [upholding use of historic average use as the baseline for water use]; see also *Fairview Neighbors v. County of Ventura* (1999) 70 Cal.App.4th 238, 242 [upholding use of historic traffic counts as the baseline level]. Therefore, a lead agency retains the discretion to select a period or point in time other than the date of publication of the NOP, so long as it reflects existing physical conditions within the project area.

For this Draft EIR, each of the three levels of analysis (Regional, Localized, and Transit Priority Areas) assesses impacts in terms of both land use and transportation impacts. By 2036, implementation of the proposed MTP/SCS will result in a land use pattern and transportation network that differs from existing conditions. Unless otherwise stated, “existing conditions” refers to conditions in the baseline 2012. The year 2012 was chosen as the baseline for this Draft EIR for the following reasons:

SACOG’s travel model requires comprehensive land use data, which are built upon baseline land use data. Baseline land use data are updated at the parcel-level on a four-year cycle to coincide with each MTP/SCS update cycle. The housing unit, employee, and land use data used in the baseline land use data come from different sources with information available for the year selected as the MTP/SCS baseline. For the 2012 baseline, land use data representing 2012 conditions was created using the 2008 existing land use dataset as a starting point, and modified using a number of more recent data sources, including local government inventories (where available), assessor data, and aerial photography. These data sources, in combination with jurisdiction housing permit, 2010 Census, 2012 California Department of Finance, and 2012 InfoUSA employment (updated by SACOG with state and local government data and windshield surveys, and compared to State Employment and Development Department records) data sets, were used to update SACOG’s spatial estimate of existing land uses.

Once data is acquired, it must be processed into a format compatible with SACOG’s travel model. The resulting baseline data set is then vetted through local jurisdictions for accuracy. Edits are made to the baseline data set if local agencies provide corrections; the baseline data set is then recirculated for confirmation of accuracy. This detailed data assembly and vetting at a parcel level for the entire SACOG region is a labor intensive 18 to 24-month process. The baseline land use data set that represents 2012 conditions was created in under two years and was completed in late 2013. As a result, the 2012 land use data set was completed less than a year before the NOP was issued and represents the most current data set compiled and fully vetted prior to release of the NOP. This 2012 data set was then used to develop alternative planning scenarios for consideration by the SACOG Board of Directors and for use in the extensive planning and public engagement process of the proposed MTP/SCS during mid-2014.

The most complete regional data on travel conditions is available for 2012. The U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey’s average five-year estimates for 2008-2012, provide the most complete coverage for many of the demographic data needed to support the baseline in order to simulate travel demand using the Sacramento Regional Activity-Based Simulation Model (SACSIM) model. The 2009-2013 five-year estimates recently (November 2014) became available, but were not published until after the NOP was released. SACOG last assembled traffic counts taken by local agencies within their jurisdictions in 2012. While subsequent year counts taken by local agencies may be available for some locations, 2012 constitutes the most comprehensive and consistent set of counts for the region. Additionally, vehicle miles traveled (VMT) estimates for the region are used in conjunction with traffic count data to establish traffic conditions. The VMT estimates are compiled

from Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS) data, which have been published for years up to 2013 (as of November 2014). Therefore, 2012 is the most current year for which both VMT and traffic count data are available. Because it is important to have VMT and traffic count data for the same year to establish baseline conditions, 2012 is unique in that it is the most recent year for which comprehensive VMT and traffic count data are available.

Because the baseline must be an integrated set of land use, demographic, traffic count and VMT data, 2012 provides the most complete, integrated data portrait of the existing conditions in the region. In other words, 2012 is the most recent year for which comprehensive land use, demographic, traffic count and VMT data are available for the SACOG region.

#### *INTERIM TIMEFRAMES*

The year 2036 is the horizon year of the proposed MTP/SCS. While the plan will be implemented gradually over the planning period, this Draft EIR does not analyze interim timeframes because the four-year update cycle of the MTP/SCS already requires short-term adjustments to the plan. The one exception to this approach is in Chapter 3.6 – Energy and Global Climate Change, which examines impacts for the years 2020 and 2035, and in comparison to a baseline of 2005 to satisfy statutory requirements and state goals related to GHG emissions (Health & Saf. Code, § 38551(b)).

## 1.5 Public Review and Participation Process

---

SACOG is committed to effectively involving the public in the update of the proposed MTP/SCS and, therefore has conducted an extensive outreach process during the preparation of this Draft EIR to affected agencies and organizations interested in the proposed MTP/SCS. In accordance with the Public Participation Plan approved by the Board of Directors at the outset of the MTP/SCS planning process, SACOG has provided, and will continue to provide, opportunities for the public to participate in the development of the proposed MTP/SCS.

Public involvement is a major component of the regional transportation planning process. In accordance with the public outreach requirements of MAP-21 and SB 375, SACOG has provided opportunities for citizens, affected public agencies, representatives of public transportation employees, freight shippers, providers of freight transportation services, private providers of transportation, representatives of users of public transportation, representatives of users of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities, representatives of the disabled, and other interested parties, with reasonable opportunities to be involved in the metropolitan transportation planning process for the development of the proposed MTP/SCS. SACOG conducted nine general public workshops around the region, an online public workshop, a public opinion phone poll, six sounding board meetings with local stakeholders plus over 90 other stakeholder meetings, information meetings for elected officials, and monthly briefings at SACOG board and advisory committees. In addition, SACOG reached out to the federally designated Native American tribal governments within the region. A full summary of this outreach process occurs in Chapter 2 – Project Description.

### **1.5.1 Comments on the MTP/SCS Draft EIR**

SACOG initiated the EIR scoping process on July 18, 2014, with circulation of a Notice of Preparation (NOP) through the State Clearinghouse (SCH No. 2014062060), distributed to public

agencies and persons considered likely to be interested in the plan and its potential impacts. The NOP provided formal notification to all federal, state, and local agencies involved with funding or approval of the proposed MTP/SCS, and to other interested organizations and members of the public, of the preparation of this Draft EIR for the project. A copy of the NOP is provided in Appendix PD-1, as well as the written responses received. A public notice was published in newspapers of general circulation for the NOP comment period. In addition, SACOG held a Scoping Meeting on July 23, 2014.

The Draft EIR for the 2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy is available for a 60-day public review, which is longer than the minimum 45-day review period required by CEQA. It was released as a companion document to the draft MTP/SCS, which the SACOG Board authorized for public review at its September 17, 2015, meeting. A Notice of Availability (NOA) has been published in local newspapers and mailed to an extensive distribution list, and the Draft EIR has been posted on the SACOG website. SACOG has filed a Notice of Completion (NOC) with the Governor's Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse, indicating that this Draft EIR has been completed and is available for review and comment by the public. During this public review period, the Draft EIR, including the technical appendices, is available for review at the SACOG office, located at the address below. It is also available on the SACOG website at: [www.sacog.org/mtpscs/2016update](http://www.sacog.org/mtpscs/2016update) or at the following library locations:

*Sacramento County:*

- Arcade, 2443 Marconi Avenue, Sacramento;
- Arden-Dimick, 891 Watt Avenue, Sacramento;
- Belle Cooledge, 5600 South Land Park Drive, Sacramento;
- Carmichael, 5605 Marconi Avenue, Sacramento;
- Central, 828 I Street, Sacramento;
- Colonial Heights, 4799 Stockton Boulevard, Sacramento;
- Courtland, 170 Primasing Avenue, Courtland;
- Del Paso Heights, 920 Grand Avenue, Sacramento;
- Elk Grove, 8900 Elk Grove Boulevard, Elk Grove;
- Ella K. McClatchy, 2112 22<sup>nd</sup> Street, Sacramento;
- Fair Oaks, 11601 Fair Oaks Boulevard, Fair Oaks;
- Franklin, 10055 Franklin High Road, Elk Grove;
- Galt – Marian O. Lawrence, 1000 Caroline Avenue, Galt;
- Isleton, 412 Union Street, Isleton;
- Martin Luther King, Jr., 7340 24<sup>th</sup> Street Bypass, Sacramento;
- McKinley, 601 Alhambra Boulevard, Sacramento;
- North Highlands-Antelope, 4235 Antelope Road, Antelope;
- North Natomas, 4660 Via Ingoglia, Sacramento;

- North Sacramento – Hagginwood, 2109 Del Paso Boulevard, Sacramento;
- Orangevale, 8820 Greenback Lane, Suite L, Orangevale;
- Rancho Cordova, 9845 Folsom Boulevard, Sacramento;
- Rio Linda, 631 L Street, Rio Linda;
- Robbie Waters Pocket-Greenhaven, 7335 Gloria Drive, Sacramento;
- South Natomas, 2901 Truxel Road, Sacramento;
- Southgate, 6132 66<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Sacramento;
- Sylvan Oaks, 6700 Auburn Boulevard, Citrus Heights;
- Valley Hi-North Laguna, 7400 Imagination Parkway, Sacramento;
- Walnut Grove, 14177 Market Street, Walnut Grove;

*All Other Counties:*

- El Dorado County Library, 345 Fair Lane, Placerville;
- Placer County Library, 350 Nevada Street, Auburn;
- Sutter County Library, 750 Forbes Avenue, Yuba City;
- Yolo County Library, 226 Buckeye Street, Woodland; and
- Yuba County Library, 303 Second Street, Marysville.

Public hearings on the Draft MTP/SCS and this Draft EIR are scheduled as follows:

Thursday, October 29, 2015, 6:30 p.m.  
 Folsom Community Center – Activity Room  
 52 Natoma Street, Folsom, CA 95630

Wednesday, November 4, 2015, 6:30-7:30 p.m.  
 Lincoln City Council Chamber  
 600 6th Street, Lincoln, CA 95648

Thursday, November 5, 2015, 6:30 p.m.  
 Yolo County Board Chambers  
 625 Court Street, Room 206, Woodland, CA 95776

Tuesday, November 10, 2015, 6:30 p.m.  
 SACOG Office  
 1415 L Street, Suite 300, Sacramento, CA 95814

It is anticipated that the Final EIR will be considered for certification at the SACOG Board of Directors meeting on February 18, 2016.

Comments on the 2016 MTP/SCS Draft EIR may be made in writing before the end of the comment period (November 16, 2015). Oral comments at the public hearings will also be accepted, though it is important to note that these comments will be recorded in the form of summary minutes, not transcription. Commenters interested in entering their comments verbatim into the

record must do so in a written form, and they must be received by the close of the comment period. Written comments should be mailed or emailed to the address provided below. Following the close of the public comment period, responses to the comments received on the Draft EIR will be prepared and published, and together with the Draft EIR, and any revisions thereto, will constitute the Final EIR. Comments on this Draft EIR are due to SACOG no later than 5:00 p.m., November 16, 2015, and can be delivered by any of the following methods:

By mail:  
Sacramento Area Council of Governments  
ATTN: EIR Comments  
1415 L Street, Suite 300  
Sacramento, CA 95814

By email:  
[eircomments@sacog.org](mailto:eircomments@sacog.org)  
By fax:  
(916) 321-9551  
ATTN: EIR Comments