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1. Issue:
Update on SACOG's Blueprint Implementation Land Use Activities.

2. Recommendation:
None, this is for receive and file.

3. Background/Analysis:
The purpose of this item is to regularly inform the Board of SACOG land use related activities in support of local implementation of the Blueprint principles. SACOG conducts the following Blueprint Implementation Land Use Activities in response to requests from member agencies and/or developers or non-governmental organizations: (1) provision of data and/or technical support to member agencies implementing the Blueprint; (2) review and comment on development proposals regarding their consistency with the Blueprint principles or the Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS); and (3) educational presentations on the Blueprint.

4. Discussion/Analysis:
In April 2018, SACOG staff conducted the following Blueprint Implementation land use activities:

- On April 13, a group of 25 SACOG board members, local agency staff, and non-profit staff participated in a revitalization tour of the communities around Route 1 in suburban Maryland. Highlights included learning about creating equitable access to transit with bike and pedestrian bridges, the challenges of overcoming infrastructure built for cars only, when a community wants to be more walkable and bikeable, how a small city is revitalizing by enabling live/work/sell zoning for young entrepreneurs and artists, and how the University of Maryland has partnered with the city of College Park to rethink the investments and long-term goals for walkable, bikeable, and equitable spaces. Attachment A is the tour
Provided a Blueprint review of the Public Review Draft of the Folsom 2035 General Plan (letter attached in Attachment B).

At the request of the City of Roseville, provided an SCS consistency determination for the Junction Crossing project (letter attached in Attachment C).

5. Fiscal Impact/Grant Information:
This program is budgeted in SACOG’s adopted Fiscal Year 2017/2018 Overall Work Plan (OWP) and budget.

ATTACHMENTS:
Description
Attachment A - Maryland Tour Packet
Attachment B - Folsom Draft General Plan Letter
Attachment C - Roseville Junction Crossing SCS Letter

This staff report aligns with the following SACOG Work Plan Goals:
#3 - Assist Local Economic Development Strategies
Sacramento Region Visit to Suburban Maryland
April 13, 2018

Rhode Island Avenue Station and Mount Rainier, the Gateway to Maryland
Themes: Urban infill, pedestrian access, redevelopment, affordable housing, suburban style
development in the city, and commuter and recreational bike facilities

Background on some of the highlights of this tour stop:

**Neighborhood profile: Mount Rainier, a haven for artists, and now redevelopment** This short
Washington Post article describes the long-envisioned revitalization of Mount Rainier that is
underway, and is focused on the area near the Rhode Island Avenue Metro Line where our
tour starts.

**Metropolitan Branch Trail** When completed, this bicycle and pedestrian trail will run eight
miles from the Silver Spring, Maryland Transit Center to Union Station in the District of
Columbia, with several connector trails to other area communities. When completed, the
Metropolitan Branch Trail will serve as part of the East Coast Greenway.

**Gateway Arts District** The Gateway Arts District is an arts-based economic development
initiative of the Gateway Community Development Corporation that targets the revitalization
of a two-mile area of U.S. Route One/Rhode Island Avenue in Prince George’s County,
Maryland, just north of the Washington, D.C. border. Along this corridor, the District spans
four communities: Mount Rainier, Brentwood, North Brentwood, and Hyattsville. The District
is already home to arts and cultural resources, but live/work housing for artists and new
homes for area arts organizations are on the way.

Click here for highlights of the Gateway Arts District in Mount Rainier.

**Speakers**

**Cheryl Cort, Policy Director, Coalition for Smarter Growth**
Cheryl leads CSG’s efforts in DC and Maryland. Cheryl is the voice of CSG’s equitable
development campaigns, which work with community activists, nonprofits, and government
agencies to promote transit-oriented development, housing choice, economic development,
pedestrian and bicyclist safety, and access in less-affluent communities throughout the
region. She routinely demonstrates that it’s possible to use the bus system for hard-to-reach
meetings in the suburbs (but boy, is there room for service improvement). Prior to her work
as Policy Director, Cheryl served as the Executive Director for the Washington Regional
Network for Livable Communities (WRN), which merged with the Coalition for Smarter Growth
in 2007. Before WRN, Cheryl worked for the Chesapeake Bay Foundation and the Maryland
Department of Natural Resources. She holds a master’s degree in Sustainable Development
and Conservation Biology from UMD College Park and a Bachelor of Science from UC Berkeley
(go Bears).
Governor Parris Glendening, President of Leadership Institute and Governor’s Institute of Community Design, Smart Growth America

In his role at Smart Growth America, Governor Glendening travels across the country and around the world advising state and local governments on smart growth, transit, and sustainability policies and practices. Parris Glendening served as Governor of the State of Maryland from 1995-2003 where he created the nation’s first state-level smart growth policy package. Prior to being elected Governor, Glendening served three terms as elected county executive of Prince George’s County, Maryland. He taught political science at the University of Maryland, College Park for 27 years and is the author of two books and over 100 articles and conference papers. Glendening has received numerous awards and recognitions, including the American Society of Landscape Architects’ Olmsted Award and the Harvard Innovations in American Government Award. He most recently was named as an Honorary Member of the American Institute of Architects.

Hyattsville and Riverdale
Themes: Suburban redevelopment, infill development, arts district, old town, 1880s type housing, transition of US 1, diversity of mixed use, residential, and a concerted effort to preserve existing retail

Background on some of the highlights of this tour stop:

**Hyattsville** Gateway Arts District Highlights

**Pyramid Atlantic Arts Center** is housed in a re-purposed building along Route 1 in Hyattsville.

**Arts District Hyattsville offers townhouses that are attractive and affordable.** This short Washington Post Article describes the EYA Townhouse Development and the arts district where it is situated.

**Trolley Trail: More than a decade in the making.** When its near 4-mile extent is completed, the Trolley Trail will connect communities along the Route 1 Corridor to trails leading into the District of Columbia’s bike trail network. These north-south communities include the municipalities of College Park, Riverdale Park, University Park, and Hyattsville. The trail is paved, spans 3.8 miles, and takes about 1 hour 30 minutes to walk from start to finish.

Speakers

**Candace Hollingsworth, Mayor, City of Hyattsville**
Mayor Hollingsworth, a native of Memphis, TN, is proud resident of Hyattsville, Maryland, where she was elected to serve as mayor in 2015—the youngest and first African-American to hold the position in the City’s history. Located two miles outside of the District of Columbia, the City of Hyattsville is part of the Prince George’s County Gateway Arts District and is home to a diverse and growing community of families, young professionals, entrepreneurs, artists, public servants, and retirees all working together to make the city a great place to live, work, and play. Candace has a profound commitment to servant leadership that was sparked by the tradition of “non sibi” (not for one’s self) at her alma mater. After moving to Hyattsville in 2009, she quickly sought opportunities to get involved—serving as a tutor and mentor and by
volunteering with local organizations before being first elected to the Hyattsville City Council in 2011. As mayor, Candace dedicates her efforts on creating a more effective, productive, and high-performing government. Under her leadership the city has attracted over $300M in private investment that will position the city for tremendous growth over the next decade and help realize her vision of building a “world-class city that is a model for excellence by every measure.”

Jim Chandler, Director of Community & Economic Development, City of Hyattsville

Jim specializes in the management of local urban revitalization, community, and economic development efforts including capital improvement projects and programs with Federal, State and local funding. In 2007, Jim joined the City of Hyattsville as the Community Development Manager directing the City’s grant and capital projects management, development review, developing the City’s 2007 Community Sustainability Plan, and in 2010, implementing and managing the City’s Commercial Facade Improvement program and GIS operations. In 2011 Jim was promoted to Director of Community & Economic Development with additional responsibilities including oversight of Code Compliance and modernization of parking operations. In 2013, Jim was promoted to the dual role of Assistant City Administrator with an expanded role in modernizing the City’s IT infrastructure, and assisting in city-wide operations and long-range facilities planning. Jim has proudly served as a Board Member of the Anacostia Trails Heritage Area (ATHA), is an active member of the Maryland Economic Development Association and in 2011 earned his Certified Economic Developer (CEcD) certification from the International Economic Development Council.

Stuart Eisenberg, Executive Director, Hyattsville Community Development Corporation

Stuart has served as the Executive Director of the Hyattsville Community Development Corporation since 2005, developing the arts and public spaces of Hyattsville and the Gateway Arts District while delivering economic development and revitalization throughout the urban edge of Prince George’s County and along the Route One Corridor. Stuart is a former Hyattsville City Council President, where he focused on implementing strategic plans, expanding community planning, and funding infrastructure renewal. Stuart has had the privilege to serve on several nonprofit organization and advisory boards in Prince George’s County. He is immediate past-President of the Anacostia Trails Heritage Area Inc.; former Vice President of the Hyattsville Preservation Association; and is currently a member of the Gateway Arts District Management Team. Other affiliations include service on Community Forklift’s Capital Acquisition Committee, the Prince George’s County Council’s Gas Safety Policy Task Force; and WSSC’s Environmental Advisory Board.
**Riverdale**  
Themes: New development in town center, mixed use products, addressing transportation challenges of distance to transit options

Riverdale Park Station is a new community that will bring green space, art, shopping, housing, and dining experiences to the community of Riverdale. You can arrive by bus, train, bike or by a **FREE** shuttle that provides service to College Park Metro Station and Prince George’s Plaza Metro Station. This Patch news article describes more project details.

**Speaker**

Dannielle Glaros, Chair, County Council, Prince George's County  
Dannielle was formerly Chief of Staff to Eric Olson before being elected a council member to District 3 in 2015. Her efforts include redevelopment of metro stations. She is an advocate for promoting small businesses to create more jobs and increase local retail amenities that are attractive to major employers as well as residents. Dannielle fully supports The Purple Line to reduce traffic and congestion. She served as associate director for Smart Growth America and deputy chief of staff, under Gov. Parris Glendening, for the Governor’s Office of Smart Growth, two organizations focused on building stronger, more sustainable communities. She has a Master’s Degree from the University of Maryland of Public Policy in environmental policies.

**Route 1 and University of Maryland College Park**  
Themes: preserving housing, public + private partnerships, transit centers, opportunities and challenges of light rail expansion, office park urbanism, developing, state and local government relationships, urban infill, and leveraging university partnerships.

University of Maryland is bringing upscale hotels, restaurants to College Park. This Washington Post article describes current revitalization occurring around the University campus in College Park, and traces the origins to improved relations between the University and City.

**College Park City-University partnership** The College Park Partnership is the nonprofit local development corporation jointly funded by the City of College Park and the University of Maryland. It is working to make College park a top 20 college town by 2020.

The Purple Line - see attached brief history of this suburban light rail transit service.
Speakers

Eric Olson, Executive Director, College Park City-University Partnership
From 2006 to 2014, Eric represented College Park and surrounding communities as a member of the Prince George’s County Council, serving two years as County Council Vice Chair (2011 & 2012). As a Council Member, Eric focused on redevelopment, neighborhood quality of life & safety, walkability, and increasing transportation choices. This work and collaboration resulted in more than $450 million in new redevelopment projects, a new bus service (the “Route 1 Ride”), four new playgrounds, a recreation building, and new bike trails. He authored legislation to incentivize transit-oriented development, increase recycling, ensure complete and green streets and sidewalks, address nuisance abatement, curtail the proliferation of pawn shops and adult entertainment near neighborhoods, increase security at all-night businesses, and address youth and gang violence. Eric has been diligent in helping redevelopment College Park into more than a “college town” and more for adults that live in the nearby areas such as Riverdale.

Patrick Wojhan, Mayor, City of College Park
Mayor Wojhan graduated from law school in 2002 and immediately started working for the D.C. county superior court and then worked in legal services before becoming a public policy analyst for the National Disability Rights Network (NDRN). In May 2014, he started as the director of government relations for Rails-to-Trails Conservancy, where he still works full-time. The D.C.-based nonprofit aims to create a national trails network from unused rail lines, and Wojahn advocates for trails and safe bicycle and pedestrian networks. Patrick has been a resident of College Park for over 12 years. Patrick ran for Mayor in 2015 after serving for 8 years on the City Council in order to help College Park realize its unfulfilled promise of becoming a top-tier college town. He has worked on committees to help strengthen the City's tools and ensure that vacant and abandoned properties are well-maintained to make the City more environmentally sustainable.

SACOG Tour Contact Information

Monica Hernandez
Communications Manager
916-340-6237 (desk)
mhernandez@sacog.org

Kacey Lizon
Planning Manager
916-340-6265 (desk)
klizon@sacog.org
April 10, 2018

Scott A. Johnson, AICP
City of Folsom, Department of Community Development
50 Natoma Street, Folsom, CA 95630

Re: Comments on February 2018 Public Review Draft of the Folsom General Plan

Dear Mr. Johnson:

SACOG received notification of the February 2018 Public Review Draft of the Folsom 2035 General Plan (Draft General Plan) and would like to offer the following comments. From the materials we have reviewed, it is clear that the City process is examining a full range of opportunities and issues that will be important to the future quality of life for Folsom citizens and the entire region. We appreciate the city including SACOG in this regionally important planning process.

The basis for our comments is the Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS) and Blueprint. SACOG’s primary responsibility is developing and implementing the MTP/SCS, a document that establishes transportation spending priorities throughout the region. The MTP/SCS must be based on the most likely land use pattern to be built over the 20+ year planning period, and it must conform with federal and state air quality regulations. The foundation for the MTP/SCS land use forecast is local government general plans, community plans, specific plans, and other local policies and regulations. Other market and regulatory/policy variables that are considered help refine the sum of the local plans in order to determine the most likely future development pattern for a specific period of time. The Blueprint vision is based on the principles of smart growth and is intended to give general direction on how the region should develop to reap the benefits of the Blueprint Preferred Scenario (and related MTP/SCS). Implementation of the Blueprint vision depends greatly on the efforts of cities and counties to implement that vision through local plans and projects. The MTP/SCS and Blueprint are in alignment with each other because of these local efforts. Because the Blueprint Principles underpin all our regional planning work, we reviewed and evaluated the Draft General Plan as it relates to the Blueprint Principles.

The Blueprint Principle of Transportation Choice means that people have viable options for traveling beyond driving in a car. There is a strong connection between land use patterns, travel behavior, and air quality. Higher densities, mixed uses, locating housing near jobs, and providing strong bicycle and pedestrian connectivity all lead to shorter auto trips and increased walking, biking, and transit use.

We are encouraged to see goals and policies throughout the Draft General Plan that support this. The Mobility chapter includes a number of strong policies that support all modes of travel and all travelers. Goal M 1.1 and Policy M 1.11 are particularly good examples of providing connected transportation services for all modes to serve the needs of all users. Policy NCR 3.1.3 from the Natural and Cultural Resources chapter specifically encourages a reduction in vehicle miles traveled through mixed-use, jobs/housing balance, and encouraging low-carbon transportation choices. The Land Use chapter also has a number of goals and policies directly related to transportation choice, including a new section on Transit-Oriented Development that has an overarching goal of "establishing transit-supported mixed-use districts near rapid transit."
that support the needs of commuters, residents, employees, business owners, and patrons” (Goal LU 4.1). This section includes all new policies in support of this goal. We commend the City for being a leader in setting policies that will help to maximize the use of this important public investment. We recognize that each of the three station areas in the City differ in character and have a unique set of opportunities and challenges. We appreciate that the seven policies in this section are useful to all of them. We strongly support all seven policies in this section and wanted to highlight Policy LU 4.1.3 which aims to maximize TOD-related CEQA streamlining benefits and Policy LU 4.1.4 which restricts auto-oriented uses within one-quarter miles of light rail stations. These are excellent examples of strong TOD-supportive policies that support implementation actions.

Housing Choice and Diversity, another Blueprint Principle, is about providing a range of housing choices to serve the needs of all residents. The Blueprint assumes approximately two-thirds of the new housing growth in the City (from 2005) would be in small-lot single-family or attached homes. This was a big change from the existing housing stock, which was made up of 74 percent of large-lot single-family homes in 2002 at the onset of Blueprint. Today, our estimate is that the City is made up of roughly 60 percent large-lot single-family homes, illustrating that the City has made significant progress towards providing more housing diversity. Blueprint defines large-lot single-family homes as detached homes on lots 5,500 square feet or larger, which translates to 8 units per acre or less. We are happy to see the City supporting an overall increase in average residential densities in identified urban centers and mixed-use districts in the General Plan (Policy LU 6.1.3) as we believe the demand for a variety of housing, as illustrated in the Blueprint, still exists today.

While the City is making strides to plan for more housing choice, based on the Holding Capacity Methodology (Appendix D of the PEIR), roughly half of the new housing units are still large-lot single-family. To allow for more flexibility in the City’s ability to provide more housing choice, we suggest that you consider increasing the maximum density of the Single Family High Density land use from 7 units per acre to 12 units per acre.

Compact Development and Using Existing Assets are two Blueprint Principles that directly support transportation choice by maximizing infill development. Policies like LU 11.11, LU 11.12, and 1.16 that evaluate vacant and underutilized sites, encourage infill development on key parcels, and encourage compact development patterns that support more transportation choices and a more efficient use of the land are in direct support of these Blueprint Principles.

We also appreciate your response to our NOP comment letter confirming that, outside of the relocation of the Corporation Yard, that the City is not currently considering development south of White Rock Road in Planning Area 2 by 2035 in this Draft General Plan. A portion of Planning Area 2 is shown on the Blueprint map as Vacant Urban Lands, meaning that the Blueprint recognized this area a potential development area post 2050. Looking at recent development trends and our updated regional growth projections, our recent research suggests that the Blueprint development assumed by 2025 is likely going to take much longer to achieve. Given the very large supply of housing entitlements in the rest of the region, we do not foresee a need to consider development in this area for a very long time. We are supportive of the City not considering this area for development in this plan update.

The Blueprint Principle of Mixed Use asserts that well planned mixed use developments include elements of all Blueprint Principles. Building homes, shops, entertainment, office, and other uses near each other can create active neighborhoods that can function as local activity centers and encourage non-automobile travel. Mixed use can occur at many scales and can be vertical, horizontal, or both. Goals LU 2.1 and 3.1 support thriving urban centers that serve as community gathering places and encourage mixed-use development projects that create vibrant walkable districts.

It is unclear if the Draft General Plan will supersede the Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan for the area south of Highway 50. We recommend being more explicit in the General Plan about how these two plans will interact. The Draft General Plan assumes some mixed use development in the commercial areas in the South of 50 Area; however, it is not explicit in the policies or the description of the land uses that mixed use
is allowed. We encourage you to include policies and/or land use designation cessions that better communicates the capacity of these sites to be developed as mixed use.

**Natural Resources Conservation**, another important Blueprint Principle, promotes natural resource preservation and encourages the incorporation of public-use open space into development projects and urban areas. The Draft General Plan’s Land Use, Natural and Cultural Resources, and Parks and Recreation elements have many goals and policies that support this Blueprint Principle, including LU 1.1.10 that ensures a connected network of open space.

**Design for Quality** is the Blueprint Principle that relates not only to the attractiveness of buildings, but also to street pattern and urban design of a development. A walkable street pattern is one of the most significant factors in reducing vehicle miles traveled for an area. A pedestrian-friendly street pattern and urban design encourages not only walking, but also biking and transit use. The Draft General Plan includes a lot of attention to the design of streets, neighborhoods, and land uses in general, which is supportive of this principle. In particular, Policy LU 9.1.3 encourages the insertion of new streets or pedestrian ways into large "super blocks" that are common in existing retail corridors.

In summary, the Draft General Plan demonstrates good local planning and is in alignment with the Blueprint and MTP/SCS. We thank you for your continued commitment to the Blueprint implementation. SACOG has begun work on its update of the MTP/SCS. With limited transportation funds available, constrained growth projections, and a higher greenhouse gas reduction target, we are very encouraged to see the City has many shared goals with the region. Additionally, we are encouraged to see a Transportation Funding section in the Draft General Plan with a new goal and new policies related to funding construction, maintenance, and operations of the transportation facilities and services needed to achieve the City’s mobility goals.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment and for continuing to engage with us on this important process. If you have additional questions, please feel free to contact me or Kacey Lizon, Planning Manager, at klizon@sacog.org or 916-340-6286.

Sincerely,

James Cortless
Chief Executive Officer
March 30, 2018

Gregory W. Bitter
City of Roseville
Civic Center, 311 Vernon Street
Roseville, CA 95678

RE: Junction Crossing project consistency with the Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy for 2036

Dear Mr. Bitter,

You requested SACOG’s confirmation that the Junction Crossing project is consistent with the Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy for 2036 (MTP/SCS). SACOG provides a consistency determination at the request of the lead agency. However, it is the responsibility of the lead agency to make the final determination on a project’s consistency with the MTP/SCS. This letter concurs with the City’s determination that the Junction Crossing project is consistent with the MTP/SCS. SACOG reviewed the project description and SCS consistency worksheet that was provided by City staff and compared it to the MTP/SCS assumptions for the project area to make our determination.

The Junction Crossing project is located at 120 Pacific St. in Roseville, near the Roseville Amtrak Station. The project, as defined in the materials you provided, consists of a total of 80 affordable apartment units. The residential density of the project is 62 dwelling units per acre and 100 percent of the total building area square footage.

The project is also located in a Transit Priority Area included in the MTP/SCS. The MTP/SCS defines its Transit Priority Areas as areas within one-half mile of a rail station or within one-half mile of high-quality transit corridors that include fixed route bus service with service intervals no longer than 15 minutes during peak commute hours in the MTP/SCS. As shown in Map 1, the project is entirely within one-half mile of the Amtrak Transit Priority Area.

The Junction Crossing project is an infill project within the Centers/Corridor community type of the MTP/SCS for the City of Roseville (see attached Map 2). Within the Centers/Corridor community type, the MTP/SCS forecasts a range of low to high density residential, commercial, office, and industrial uses (MTP/SCS Appendix E-3, Land Use Forecast Background Documentation, pp. 148, February 19, 2016). The project’s land uses fall within this range of general uses, densities, and building intensities. Therefore, development at the proposed densities is consistent with the build out assumptions for the area within this community type of the MTP/SCS.

With respect to consistency with the MTP/SCS policies, the applicable policies are embedded in the metrics and growth forecast assumptions of the MTP/SCS. For the purposes of determining SCS consistency, projects consistent with the growth forecast assumptions of the MTP/SCS are consistent with these policies.
The Blueprint Preferred Scenario and the adopted MTP/SCS achieve transportation, air quality, and other quality of life benefits by relying in part on infill and redevelopment projects such as this one. The Junction Crossing project is consistent with MTP/SCS growth forecast assumptions. Our confirmation of the project's consistency with the MTP/SCS is not intended to express any opinion on the site design or the appropriate conditions of approval of the project.

Thank you for inviting SACOG's input as to the consistency of the Junction Crossing project with the MTP/SCS for 2036. If you have further questions or need further assistance, please don't hesitate to contact me at (916) 340-6265.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Kacey Lizon
Planning Manager
Map 1: Transit Priority Area
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* 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.
DETERMINATION OF MTP/SCS CONSISTENCY WORKSHEET
For Qualifying Transit Priority Projects and Residential/Mixed-Use Residential Projects
As of February 20, 2018

Background: Pursuant to SB 375, streamlined CEQA review and analysis is available to Transit Priority Projects (TPPs) and residential or mixed-use residential projects that are consistent with the SCS. The SCS was adopted by the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) Board as part of the 2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy on February 18, 2016. The California Air Resources Board (CARB) provided an Acceptance of GHG Quantification Determination for the SACOG SCS in September 2016.

Streamlined CEQA review available to TPPs consists of one of the following: 1) a Sustainable Communities Environmental Assessment (SCEA) pursuant to Public Resources Code (PRC) § 21155.2(b) or 2) an EIR pursuant to PRC § 21155.2(c).

Streamlined CEQA review available to residential or mixed-use residential projects consists of an EIR pursuant to PRC § 21159.28(a).

Purpose: The purpose of this worksheet is to provide lead agencies with assistance on three issues:
1. Whether a proposed project qualifies as a TPP;
2. Whether a proposed project qualifies as a residential or mixed-use residential project (at least 75 percent of the total building square footage is residential);
3. Whether the TPP or residential/mixed-use residential project is consistent with the general land use designation, density, intensity and applicable policies of the 2016 MTP/SCS adopted by the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG).

The lead agency has responsibility to make the final determination on these matters and to determine the applicable and appropriate CEQA streamlining, if any.

Directions: This worksheet should be completed by the lead agency, relying on the project description of the proposed project, MTP/SCS Chapters 3 and 4, and MTP/SCS Appendix E-3. Regardless of whether this worksheet is used, pursuant to PRC § 21155(a) and PRC § 21159.28(a), a project can only be consistent with the MTP/SCS if it is consistent with the general land use designation, density, building intensity, and applicable policies specified for the project area in the adopted SCS. This worksheet only applies to the 2016 MTP/SCS (adopted February 18, 2016); subsequent MTP/SCS adoptions may require updates to this form.

Lead agencies are welcome to contact SACOG for assistance in completing this worksheet. For assistance, contact Kacey Lizon at klizon@sacog.org or 916-340-6265.

Project Title: Junction Crossing Housing Project

Proposed project is located in (city/county name): City of Roseville, Placer County, CA
1. Transit Priority Project Designation (PRC § 21155(b))

A project must meet the requirements of items 1.A, 1.B, 1.C, and 1.D, below, to qualify as a Transit Priority Project. For items 1.C and 1.D, the definition of an MTP/SCS Transit Priority Area is: the area within one-half mile of a rail station stop or a high-quality transit corridor included in the MTP/SCS. A high-quality transit corridor has fixed route bus service with service intervals of 15 minutes or less during peak commute hours. See MTP/SCS Chapter 3 for the map of Transit Priority Areas.

1.A. [x] The Project has a minimum net density of 20 dwelling units per acre.

Calculation:

\[
\text{Total housing units proposed in Project } \div \text{ Total Project parcel area (in net acres)} = 61.5 \quad (\text{Should be } \geq 20 \text{ du/ac})
\]

1.B. [x] At least 50 percent of the Project’s total building square footage is in residential use, AND,

[x] The total building square footage of the Project has 25 percent or less non-residential use, or, if it has between 26 and 50 percent in non-residential use, has a minimum FAR of 0.75.

Calculations:

\[
\text{Total Project residential square footage } \div \text{Total Project building square footage} = \frac{80,460}{80,460} = 100\% \quad (\text{Should be } \geq 50%)
\]

\[
\text{Total Project building square footage } \div \text{Total Project parcel(s) area square footage} = \frac{80,460}{56,628} = 1.42 \quad (\text{Should be } \geq 0.75)
\]

1.C. [x] The Project is located within an MTP/SCS Transit Priority Area and the qualifying transit service is (transit route name/applicable street name/number or light rail stop name as identified in the adopted MTP/SCS): Roseville Capitol Corridor train station

1.D. [x] No more than 25 percent of the area of the Project parcels are farther than one-half mile from the TPA transit stop/corridor and no more than 10 percent of the residential units or 100 units, whichever is less, in the project are farther than one-half mile from the TPA transit stop/corridor.
Calculations:

Project area outside of ½ mile TPA \( \frac{0\%}{1.3 \text{ acres}} \) ÷ Total Project area \( 1.3 \text{ acres} \) = \( 0\% \) (Should be ≤ 25%)

Project residential units outside of ½ mile TPA \( \frac{0\%}{80 \text{ units}} \) ÷ Total Project units \( 80 \text{ units} \) = \( 0\% \) (Should be ≤ 10% or less than 100 units)

SECTION 1 CONCLUSION:

✓ The proposed project meets the requirements of 1.A, 1.B, 1.C, and 1.D and therefore qualifies as a Transit Priority Project.

[] The proposed project does not meet all the requirements of 1.A, 1.B, 1.C, and 1.D and therefore does not qualify as a Transit Priority Project.

SECTION 2 CONCLUSION:

The proposed project meets the requirements of 2.A and therefore qualifies as a residential or mixed-use residential project.

The proposed project does not meet the requirements of 2.A and therefore does not qualify as a residential or mixed-use residential project.

IF A PROJECT DOES NOT QUALIFY AS EITHER A TRANSIT PRIORITY PROJECT (UNDER SECTION 1) OR A RESIDENTIAL OR MIXED-USE RESIDENTIAL PROJECT (UNDER SECTION 2)...
2), THE PROJECT DOES NOT QUALIFY FOR SB 375 CEQA STREAMLINING. DO NOT PROCEED TO SECTION 3.

3. Required Consistency with the SCS: General Use Designation, Density and Intensity, and Applicable MTP/SCS Policies (PRC § 21155(a) and PRC § 21159.28(a))

3.A. Applicable MTP/SCS Policies. For the purposes of determining SCS consistency, the policies of the MTP/SCS are embedded in the metrics and growth forecast assumptions of the MTP/SCS. Projects consistent with the growth forecast assumptions of the MTP/SCS, as determined by application of items 3.B. and 3.C, are consistent with the MTP/SCS and its policies.

3.B. Applicable Community Type. The MTP/SCS land use forecast is illustrated using Community Types. In order to determine the general use designation, density and intensity of the Project area within the MTP/SCS, the Project must be located within a Community Type designated in the MTP/SCS. The MTP/SCS defines density/building intensity in terms of the amount of growth (residential and non-residential) forecasted and the amount of build out potential within each Community Type area. SACOG monitors development activity on an annual basis to check that the amount of development is consistent with the growth forecast of the MTP/SCS.

For the purposes of the lead agency’s determination of SCS consistency, use MTP/SCS Appendix E-3 to identify the Community Type for the Project and fill in the applicable information, below for 3.B.1 and 3.B.2.

3.B.1. The Project is located in the following Community Type:

- [x] Center and Corridor Community
- [ ] Established Community
- [ ] Developing Community (list the specific name of the Developing Community as identified in the jurisdiction narrative in Appendix E-3): ___________________________
- [ ] Rural Residential Community

3.B.2 [x] Development from the project when added to other entitled projects will not exceed the MTP/SCS build out assumptions for the area within this Community Type, which is 1,569 new housing units and 11,172 new employees.:

Attachment C
3.C. General Use Designation, Density and Building Intensity. The foundation of the land use designations for the MTP/SCS is adopted and proposed local general plans, community plans, specific plans and other local policies and regulations. A project is consistent with the MTP/SCS if its uses are identified in the applicable MTP/SCS Community Type and its uses meet the general density and building intensity assumptions for the Community Type. The proposed project does not have to include all allowed uses in the MTP/SCS.

3.C.1. Determine consistency of the Project using one of the methods below:

**Option A:**

[✓] The Project is located in a **Center and Corridor Community or an Established Community** and the Project uses are consistent with the allowed uses of the applicable adopted local land use plan as it existed in 2012 and are at least 80 percent of the maximum allowed density or intensity of the allowed uses of the applicable local land use plans. Therefore, the Project is consistent with the MTP/SCS.

**OR**

**Option B:**

[ ] The Project is located in a **Center and Corridor Community or an Established Community** and the Project uses have been reviewed in the context of, and are found to be consistent with, the general land use, density, and intensity information provided for this Community Type in **Appendix E-3 of the MTP/SCS**. Therefore, the Project is consistent with the MTP/SCS.

**OR**

**Option C:**

[ ] The Project is located in a **Rural Residential Community** and the Project residential density does not exceed the maximum density of one unit per acre as specified in the MTP/SCS, and employment development in the Project is at least 80 percent of the maximum allowed density or intensity of the applicable local land use plans. Therefore, the Project is consistent with the MTP/SCS.

**OR**

**Option D:**

[ ] The Project is located in a **Developing Community** and the Project’s average net density meets or exceed the average net density described for this specific
Developing Community (as referenced by name of applicable specific plan, master plan, or special plan in MTP/SCS Appendix E-3) and employment development in the Project is consistent with the general employment land uses described for this specific Developing Community. Therefore, the Project is consistent with the MTP/SCS.

SECTION 3 CONCLUSION:
The proposed project is consistent with the General Use Designation, Density and Intensity, and Applicable MTP/SCS Policies for the following reasons (summarize findings on use designation, density and intensity for the Project evaluation completed in Section 3):

- The proposed project is located within the City's Downtown Specific Plan area, and designated as Old Town Commercial in the Downtown Specific Plan. This designation permits multi-family development at a minimum density of 16 units per acre. The proposed project would construct 80 residential units within an 80,460 SF, four-story building on 1.31 acres of land. The project density is 61.1 dwelling units/acre. Therefore, the project would meet the density requirements and intensity of allowed uses of the project site under the Downtown Specific Plan. Furthermore, future development of the site with residential and parking uses was evaluated in the Downtown Specific Plan EIR. Therefore, the proposed project is consistent with the Downtown Specific Plan and the MTP/SCS.

---

i This document may be updated as users provide feedback on its utility.
ii If a TPP complies with an additional series of requirements set forth in PRC § 21155.1, it qualifies as a Sustainable Communities Project and becomes eligible for a complete exemption from CEQA. This worksheet does not address Sustainable Communities Projects.
iii Net density is not defined in PRC §2115(b). In the MTP/SCS, net density is defined as follows: Housing units divided by the acres on which housing is built, exclusive of public rights-of-ways, parks, schools and public areas (MTP/SCS Appendix E-3).
iv The MTP/SCS build out for each Community Type assumes development that is entitled as of January 1, 2012. SACOG monitors housing permits on an annual basis and will ensure that housing and employment projects relying on the SB 375 CEQA benefits will not exceed the capacity assumed in the MTP/SCS. SACOG undertakes this review generally every four years as part of the update of the MTP/SCS. In between MTP/SCS updates, projects that exceed the build out of a Community Type in a jurisdiction can be reviewed for consistency by SACOG and will be evaluated on a project by project basis.
v The MTP/SCS general land use, density and intensity in Center and Corridor Communities and Established Communities is based on 80 percent of the maximum allowed density or intensity of the land use designations in applicable local land use plans as they existed in 2012, unless otherwise noted in Appendix E-3.
vi The MTP/SCS land use forecast in Developing Communities was modeled according to adopted and proposed specific plans, master plans, and special plans as they existed in 2012, and is based on the housing and employment totals and the average net density of these plans, as outlined in Appendix E-3.