Chapter 2—Project Description

2.1 Introduction

The proposed project is the 2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (proposed MTP/SCS). The Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) is a long-range comprehensive plan for the region’s multi-modal transportation system; preparing the MTP is one of SACOG’s primary statutory responsibilities under federal and state law. An MTP, also referred to in other regions as a Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) or Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), is the mechanism used in California by both Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) and Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs) to conduct long-range (at least 20-year) planning in their regions. SACOG must adopt an MTP and update it every four years, or more frequently, if the region is to receive federal or state transportation dollars for public transit, streets/roads, and bicycle and pedestrian improvements. In 2008, California enacted the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act, also known as Sen. Bill 375 (Stats. 2012, ch. 728) (SB 375), which requires MPOs to include a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) element in their MTP updates. The SCS is aligned in purpose with the Sacramento Region Blueprint (Blueprint), further integrating smart land use planning principles with an efficient and diverse transportation network. In 2012, SACOG adopted its first Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS) for 2035 (2012 MTP/SCS), a long-range plan for transportation in the region that is informed by the Blueprint and links air quality, land use and transportation needs.

This plan update has focused on the refinement and implementation of the current plan (2012 MTP/SCS), rather than a comprehensive reconsideration of the basic policy foundations of the 2012 MTP/SCS. This focus has allowed for more detailed technical work on evaluating the timing and performance benefits of transportation projects to determine whether the timing of some projects in the 2012 MTP/SCS should be altered, i.e., moved sooner, moved later, even moved past the horizon year of the proposed MTP/SCS. A large part of this work has focused on identifying the range of possible revenue and budget strategies that could shift more investment into road and transit maintenance, termed a “Fix-it-First” emphasis.

This chapter describes the proposed MTP/SCS, which is being evaluated in this program EIR. The adoption and implementation of the proposed MTP/SCS, which updates the 2012 MTP/SCS, is considered the “proposed project.” The project description that follows describes the proposed MTP/SCS for purposes of analyzing the project’s potential to create environmental impacts (see Chapters 3 through 17 and 19 for environmental analyses). This chapter provides an overview of the project’s regional location, project background, project objectives, and a detailed description of the proposed MTP/SCS.

2.2 Summary of Regional Land Use and Transportation Changes

At the regional level, growth patterns and land use patterns will influence the nature of the impacts associated with implementation of the proposed MTP/SCS. By 2036, the proposed MTP/SCS plan area will grow by approximately 811,000 people, 439,000 jobs, and 285,000 housing units. Implementation of the proposed MTP/SCS will convert approximately 47,000 acres of undeveloped
land, which represents a seven percent increase in the amount of developed land over existing conditions. Comparatively, the projected population and housing unit growth represent 36 percent and 32 percent increases over existing conditions, respectively, indicating that implementation of the proposed MTP/SCS will result in more compact development than existing conditions. The location and pattern of this growth is important because it influences travel behavior and provides a means for determining the impact of future vehicle emissions in the proposed MTP/SCS planning area. A compact growth pattern served by an efficient transportation system provides the foundation to reduce automotive travel and increase walking, bicycling, and transit use, behaviors which lower Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and reduce individual trip numbers.

The proposed MTP/SCS is an update of the 2012 MTP/SCS. The proposed MTP/SCS addresses projected changes in population growth, projected changes in funding for transportation projects, and further integrates Blueprint principles through the SCS. The 2036 forecast for the proposed MTP/SCS indicates that population in the plan area is expected to be 3.07 million in 2036 (SACOG, 2015). This forecast is the same amount of people previously forecast in the 2012 MTP/SCS (SACOG, 2011). In addition to a similar population forecast, the proposed MTP/SCS accounts for similar projected funding for transportation as the previous MTP/SCS. The proposed MTP/SCS focuses on maximizing the efficiency of existing infrastructure and identifying investments that bring the most benefit to the regional transportation network. Overall, the proposed MTP/SCS guides the Sacramento region toward a more sustainable future through continued integration of smart land use decisions with an efficient, well-managed, and diverse transportation system. The updated SCS serves to implement SACOG’s longstanding effort to integrate land use and transportation planning by tying the plan’s performance to reduced automotive travel and increased walking, bicycling, and transit use based on Blueprint-influenced land use patterns.

With respect to transportation projects proposed as a part of the proposed MTP/SCS, the plan includes 6,632 new lane miles of highways, arterials, expressways, collectors, bridges, and local streets, as well as new light rail tracks to accommodate the addition of approximately 811,000 people in the plan area. The proposed MTP/SCS also provides maintenance, major reconstruction, and rehabilitation activities on the 34,418 lane miles making up the 2036 road and highway network.

### 2.3 Community Type Areas: Summary of Land Use and Transportation Changes

#### 2.3.1 Center and Corridor Communities

By 2036, Center and Corridor Communities are expected to see approximately 86,000 new housing units and 152,000 new jobs (shown in Table 2.8). This growth will consume approximately 3,800 acres, or eight percent of new developed acres. As a proportion of regional growth, Center and Corridor Communities will account for 30 percent of housing unit growth and 35 percent of employment growth. This is the same proportional share of housing growth, but 6 percent more employment growth, than projected for Center and Corridor Communities in the 2012 MTP/SCS.

The compact and mixed use character of land uses in Center and Corridor Communities helps reduce VMT by providing more opportunities for shorter trips by non-auto modes of travel. Center and Corridor Communities are more effectively served by transit, support potentially higher rates of walking and biking, and generate less vehicle travel.
In addition, Center and Corridor Communities will add a variety of transportation improvements by 2036, including new transit, non-motorized, and roadway projects in addition to ongoing investments in transit operations and roadway maintenance. Center and Corridor Communities receive new and expanded bus and rail transit, and complete streets that serve supportive land uses with higher density and a mix of uses most likely to generate a mix of travel modes. Road and highway projects concentrate on alleviating major bottlenecks and congestion points. Blueprint supportive programs and transportation systems management (TSM) strategies, including technology and demand management programs, allow for greater optimization of existing transportation infrastructure in the Center and Corridor Communities.

2.3.2 Established Communities

Similar to Center and Corridor Communities, Established Communities already have a significant amount of urban development, but these areas are generally not as dense as Center and Corridor Communities and will actually have their proportional share of regional housing decrease from 2012 to 2036. As shown in Table 2.8, the housing units in Established Communities will increase by approximately 79,000, but decrease in proportional share from 76 percent to 64 percent. Employment growth and acres developed generally will maintain their proportional shares, with jobs increasing by about 215,000, and acres developed increasing by almost 17,000 for regional shares of 56 percent and 37 percent respectively. This growth pattern indicates that while Established Communities will add population, housing, and employment, the growth rate will be relatively modest when compared to Center and Corridor Communities and Developing Communities, which have a much higher rate of growth. However, the proposed MTP/SCS projects two percent more of the region’s housing and three percent less employment will occur in Established Communities compared to the 2012 MTP/SCS.

Established Communities are mostly low density residential, office parks, and strip retail. They are considered to be mostly built-out. Most development that occurs is to build-out existing areas or infill on vacant parcels. This type of growth takes advantage of existing transportation infrastructure and surrounding land uses. Established Communities are typically adjacent to, and surrounding, Center and Corridor Communities, taking advantage of higher densities and mixed uses. Established Communities in the proposed MTP/SCS receive 49 percent of the employment growth, in an attempt to better balance the housing and job development.

The type of growth in Established Communities takes advantage of existing transportation infrastructure and surrounding land uses. However, Established Communities will have a variety of transportation improvements by 2036 including new transit, non-motorized and roadway projects, and ongoing investments in transit operations and roadway maintenance. As with Center and Corridor Communities, Established Communities receive new and expanded bus and rail transit, and complete streets that serve supportive land uses with higher density and a mix of uses most likely to generate a mix of travel modes. Road and highway projects concentrate on alleviating major bottlenecks and congestion points along major arterials and freeways leading to and from major employment centers in Sacramento, Rancho Cordova, and Roseville. Blueprint supportive programs and TSM strategies, including technology and demand management programs, allow for greater optimization of existing transportation infrastructure.
2.3.3 Developing Communities

Developing Communities are expected to include a high rate of growth during the proposed MTP/SCS plan period. They will have approximately 115,000 new housing units and 69,000 new jobs, developing approximately 22,000 acres to accommodate the growth. The proposed MTP/SCS projects that Developing Communities will receive two percent less housing growth than they were projected to receive under the 2012 MTP/SCS.

While Developing Communities will serve a substantial portion of the growth in residential units and employment, the housing type will have a significant shift during the planning period from large lot detached (which constitutes 82 percent of the housing in these areas in 2012) to small lot detached and attached (which will constitute 48 percent of the housing in 2036 in Developing Communities compared to only 18 percent in 2012). As these communities become more established with a mix of housing and commercial uses, residents will be able to travel shorter distances to reach most routine destinations. Although the amount of housing and employment growth in Developing Communities in total is very similar between the 2012 MTP/SCS and the proposed project, the proposed plan also projects slightly higher rates of growth in southwest Placer County and the city of Folsom.

Developing Communities will have a somewhat different mix of transportation projects in comparison to Center and Corridor Communities and Established Communities. Developing Communities will have more road widening projects and newly constructed road projects to serve the new residential and employment developments that will be built by 2036. Developing Communities have little or no transit service in 2012, but with the proposed MTP/SCS, by 2036 some areas will include bus service every 30 minutes or less. These areas will also include walk and bike facilities that are included in the new developments. Blueprint supportive programs and TSM strategies, including technology and demand management programs, allow for greater optimization of the transportation infrastructure supporting developing communities.

2.3.4 Rural Residential Communities

Rural Residential Communities are very low-density communities with mostly residential development and some small-scale farming. These communities are expected to have very limited growth by 2036. These areas are expected to increase by about 5,100 housing units and 3,200 jobs, or less than two percent of the regional growth. This development will consume about 5,000 acres. This community type is expected to have the lowest rate of growth and will have a decreasing share of regional population, housing units, and employment.

While the land uses in Rural Residential Communities are staying largely the same in the proposed MTP/SCS, these communities benefit from changes in adjacent Developing Communities and Established Communities that bring important destinations closer and reduce the need to travel long distances on a regular basis. Existing transportation infrastructure in Rural Residential Communities consists primarily of roads serving automobile traffic with some very limited transit service in a few places in the plan area. Implementation of the proposed MTP/SCS will result in the construction of roadway improvements, with the focus on road maintenance and rehabilitation, safety projects and limited new or widened roadways or freeway improvements. Road projects in Rural Residential Communities focus on improving agricultural and goods movement travel as well as improving or maintaining accessibility for slow moving farm equipment. Rural Residential Communities will also
benefit from improvements to lifeline and rural transit services that focus on bringing workers to job sites and providing access to crucial destinations such as hospitals, social services, and shopping. A number of road safety improvements, such as the addition of shoulders, in Rural Residential Communities create a safer environment for pedestrians and bicyclists.

2.3.5 Lands Not Identified for Development

Like the 2012 MTP/SCS, the proposed MTP/SCS does not forecast or model growth in Lands Not Identified for Development during the planning period. Although the proposed MTP/SCS does not assume residential and employment growth in these areas, there is existing development in these areas (e.g., primarily farm homes, agricultural-related uses, and public lands such as waste water treatment facilities) and it is possible that some amount of agricultural-supporting homes and jobs will occur. Since virtually no growth is assumed in the proposed MTP/SCS for this community type, there will be limited transportation investments in this community type by 2036. The focus for investments in these areas is on road maintenance, safety enhancements, other roadway operational improvements, and targeted capacity improvements to existing facilities that accommodate increased travel between urban areas. While the investments intended to serve this community type are limited, proposed transportation investments will equate to approximately 1,955 acres of new and/or expanded roadways in Lands Not Identified for Development. Many of these roadway miles occur within this community type because they are being built to serve urban communities and the required route will run through Lands Not Identified for Development.

2.4 Transit Priority Areas: Summary of Land Use and Transportation Changes

2.4.1 Placer County Transit Priority Areas

The Placer County TPAs include portions of Roseville, Rocklin, and Auburn (around the Amtrak station), in areas that are already developed with urban uses. The geography of the Placer County TPAs is expanded from the 2012 MTP/SCS along the Riverside and Atlantic corridors of the city of Roseville. Placer County TPAs will add approximately 2,200 new housing units and 15,000 new jobs by 2036. Jobs are primarily focused in existing job centers and residential growth in the TPAs is 76 percent attached. This development is generally more densely developed than surrounding areas.

The land use changes, together with the transportation investments in Placer County TPAs, accommodate this growth while reducing the need to travel frequently or over long distances using single occupancy vehicles by putting people closer to jobs and other destinations, and by increasing opportunities to bicycle, walk, or ride transit. This is achieved through compact land uses that are more effectively served by transit, support potentially higher rates of walking and biking, and generate less vehicle travel. In addition to compact development, the amount of complementary, mixed-use development in the proposed MTP/SCS further supports shorter vehicle trips and higher rates of non-motorized travel. Further benefit results from concentrating development in high-quality transit corridors, where residents are more likely to use available transit and are close enough to walk or bike to the transit stops.
Placer County TPAs will have a variety of transportation improvements by 2036, including new transit, non-motorized and roadway projects, and ongoing investments in transit operations and roadway maintenance. Transit service will include increased frequency on local fixed route buses, but the majority of transit service increases will be commuter service to downtown Sacramento. The Placer TPAs are served by the Capitol Corridor train, as well as high-quality transit services in Roseville. These systems are connected to the larger regional transit network, making the Placer TPAs very accessible regional destinations. The sum of the investments creates more efficient travel, as well as opportunities for non-auto modes of travel.

2.4.2 Sacramento County Transit Priority Areas

The Sacramento County TPAs include the majority of the City of Sacramento and portions of Rancho Cordova, Folsom, Citrus Heights and unincorporated Sacramento County. The geography of the Sacramento County TPAs differs between the 2012 MTP/SCS and the proposed MTP/SCS in the following areas: transit corridors were removed from the city of Rancho Cordova and along the Jackson Highway in Sacramento County; transit corridors were added in North Sacramento and in the unincorporated communities of Arden Arcade and Carmichael. The Sacramento County TPAs will include approximately 84,000 new housing units and 135,000 new jobs. The Sacramento County TPAs will include a large amount of residential and employment growth, approximately 37 percent of regional growth, in the proposed MTP/SCS. Approximately 76 percent of all new residential products are attached in Sacramento County TPAs.

The land use changes, together with the transportation investments in Sacramento County TPAs, accommodate this growth while reducing the need to travel frequently or over long distances using single occupancy vehicles by putting people closer to jobs and other destinations, and by increasing opportunities to bicycle, walk, or ride transit. This is achieved through compact land uses that are more effectively served by transit, support potentially higher rates of walking and biking, and generate less vehicle travel. In addition to compact development, the amount of complementary, mixed-use development in the proposed MTP/SCS further supports shorter vehicle trips and higher rates of non-motorized travel. Further benefit results from concentrating development in high-quality transit corridors, where residents are more likely to use available transit and are close enough to walk or bike to the transit stops.

Sacramento County TPAs will have a variety of transportation improvements by 2036 including new transit, non-motorized and roadway projects, and ongoing investments in transit operations and roadway maintenance. Transit service will include increased frequency on local fixed route buses, major increases in light rail service, new streetcar service, and more express bus service. The Sacramento TPA is served by light rail, Capitol Corridor, and numerous bus routes. In 2036, the Sacramento TPAs have a streetcar corridor in downtown, and bus rapid transit service. The transit in the Sacramento TPAs is connected to the larger regional transit network, giving more opportunities for shorter trips and non-auto forms of travel.

2.4.3 Yolo County Transit Priority Areas

The Yolo TPAs include the majority of West Sacramento and Davis, and those portions of Yolo County adjacent to the city limits of Davis that fall within half a miles of a high quality bus route. This geography is unchanged from the 2012 MTP/SCS. Yolo County TPAs will include approximately 19,000 new housing units and 33,000 new jobs. In the Yolo TPAs, about 76 percent
of all residential growth is attached. The area has relatively balanced growth in residential and employment, bolstering the existing jobs centers in downtown West Sacramento and UC Davis.

The land use changes, together with the transportation investments in Yolo County TPAs, accommodate this growth while reducing the need to travel frequently or over long distances using single occupancy vehicles by putting people closer to jobs and other destinations and by increasing opportunities to bicycle, walk, or ride transit. This is achieved through compact land uses that are more effectively served by transit, support potentially higher rates of walking and biking, and generate less vehicle travel. In addition to compact development, the amount of complementary, mixed-use development in the proposed MTP/SCS further supports shorter vehicle trips and higher rates of non-motorized travel. Further benefit results from concentrating development in high-quality transit corridors, where residents are more likely to use available transit and are close enough to walk or bike to the transit stops.

Yolo County TPAs will have a variety of transportation improvements by 2036 including new transit, non-motorized and roadway projects, and ongoing investments in transit operations and roadway maintenance. Transit service will include increased frequency on local fixed route buses, a major light rail extension to Sacramento International Airport, new streetcar service in West Sacramento, and increased express service to downtown Sacramento. In addition, the Yolo TPAs are served by Capitol Corridor as well as numerous bus routes. In 2036, the areas will include bus rapid transit and a streetcar in West Sacramento. These new transit services will be connected to new and existing regional transit service.

### 2.5 Project Location and Study Area

The plan area for the proposed MTP/SCS includes El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba counties, exclusive of the Tahoe Basin. This plan area is shown in Figure 2.1. Located in the north San Joaquin Valley in Central California, the plan area encompasses 3,863,323 acres (6,036 square miles) and is bounded by Colusa, Lake, Napa, and Solano counties to the west; Butte, Sierra, and Nevada counties to the north; the Lake Tahoe Basin, Plumas, and Alpine counties to the east; and Amador, San Joaquin, and Contra Costa counties to the south. The bulk of the plan area is located in the Sacramento Valley, a basin generally bounded by the Sierra Nevada mountain range to the east and the coastal ranges to the west. The eastern portion of the region – Placer County, El Dorado County, and Eastern Yuba County – is located in the Sierra Nevada mountains and foothills. The western portion of the region, in Yolo County, marks the eastern edge of the coastal mountain ranges. North to south, the plan area spans from the lower Sacramento Valley in northern Sutter and Yuba counties to the Sacramento River Delta in southern Sacramento County. In the valley portion of the plan area – Sacramento County, western Placer County, western Yuba County, Sutter County, and eastern Yolo County – the topography is generally flat, with the exception of the Sutter Buttes mountain range in Sutter County.

Urban uses in the MTP/SCS plan area are primarily concentrated in an urban core in northern and central Sacramento County, eastern Yolo County, southwestern Placer County, and western El Dorado County, with smaller urban areas separated from this core and each other by rural lands. Approximately 75 percent of the MTP/SCS plan area is designated for agriculture, open space, or timber uses. The SACOG region includes 22 incorporated cities within its boundaries: Auburn,
Citrus Heights, Colfax, Davis, Elk Grove, Folsom, Galt, Isleton, Lincoln, Live Oak, Loomis, Marysville, Placerville, Rancho Cordova, Rocklin, Roseville, Sacramento, West Sacramento, Wheatland, Winters, Woodland, and Yuba City. As of 2012, 68 percent of jobs, 60 percent of housing units, and 61 percent of the population of the MTP/SCS plan area were in incorporated cities, while 32 percent of jobs, 40 percent of housing units, and 39 percent of the population were in unincorporated areas. The California Department of Finance indicates that in 2015 the current population within the six counties, excluding the Tahoe Basin, is 2,363,524 (estimated using 2010 Census data), representing a nearly 24 percent increase in population since 2000 (1,901,964) (U.S. Census, 2000 & 2010; California Department of Finance, 2015). In addition to the 22 incorporated cities and six counties, the plan area also includes lands owned by state and federal agencies and tribal trust lands of four Native American Tribes (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). SACOG projections indicate that population in the plan area is expected to grow by 811,000 people, an increase of 39 percent, from 2012 to 2036 (SACOG, 2015).

The existing transportation system within the MTP/SCS plan area supports a broad range of passenger and freight travel. The roadway system includes three interstate highways, several state highways, and numerous local roadways that serve various combinations of auto, truck, pedestrian, bicycle, and transit travel. On- and off-road infrastructure also includes over 1,500 miles of Class I and II bicycle trails and routes, and a public transit system that includes approximately 60 miles of light rail transit service and over 1,200 miles of regional and local bus routes. Other infrastructure includes a deep water shipping port, a major international airport, numerous general aviation airports, and freight and passenger rail service.
2.6 Project Background

2.6.1 Regional Planning Context for the Proposed MTP/SCS

This section summarizes the planning context of the proposed MTP/SCS according to three major efforts: the Sacramento Region Blueprint, the Rural-Urban Connections Strategy and the 2012 MTP/SCS.

Sacramento Region Blueprint

In 2002, SACOG adopted the Metropolitan Transportation Plan for 2025 (2002 MTP), a plan that included three years of public involvement, a new set of goals and guiding principles, and major initiatives including new regional funding programs and expansion of public transit. The 2002 MTP Final Environmental Impact Report was certified in June 2002. The travel modeling for the 2002 MTP showed that despite spending an estimated $23 billion through the year 2025 for transportation projects throughout the six-county region, vehicular congestion throughout the Sacramento metropolitan area would increase by nearly 60 percent and vehicle miles traveled per household would increase by 20 percent.

In the interest of changing the trend of increasing traffic congestion and vehicle miles traveled (VMT), the SACOG Board initiated the Blueprint immediately after adopting the 2002 MTP. The goal of this regional transportation and land use study was to determine whether traffic congestion, air quality, and overall quality of life could be improved in the Sacramento region by changing the planned pattern of development. The planning process was designed to combine the best technical information available with a comprehensive, citizen and stakeholder engagement process to revise the region’s planned future growth pattern. The Blueprint’s three-year regional planning process was designed to produce a vision for the region that had sufficient technical grounding and political support to serve as the basis for the next MTP update.

After months of public workshops that engaged over 5,000 participants, a regional land use vision was developed. In December 2004, the SACOG Board of Directors adopted the Blueprint consisting of a conceptual map and seven Blueprint growth principles (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 resulting Blueprint growth strategy is the product of a three-year regional visioning process that engaged citizens, special interest groups, and elected officials from each of SACOG’s member jurisdictions on how the region should accommodate the forecasted population and employment growth. As it does not have land use planning authority, SACOG has served in an advisory role for
its member jurisdictions regarding implementation of the Blueprint. Since adoption of the Blueprint, a number of jurisdictions in the region have begun implementing the Blueprint principles in their own planning efforts. The most notable local implementation efforts are general plan updates that incorporate the Blueprint principles into goals and policies; however, local governments also regularly evaluate proposed master plans and individual projects in the context of the Blueprint principles.

**Rural-Urban Connections Strategy**

In 2008, SACOG launched the Rural-Urban Connections Strategy (RUCS). The RUCS program is designed to help implement the Sacramento Region Blueprint through finding methods to help ensure the economic vitality of rural areas of the region, including sustainable transportation and land use, agriculture, natural resources and other uses for the rural landscape. SACOG staff began RUCS by developing detailed, parcel-specific data on the cropping patterns on the farms in the region, as well as planning and economic analytical tools to help understand the economics of farming and how infrastructure, land use and market factors affect the ability of farmers to profitably get their goods to market. SACOG has focused both on the substantial part of the region’s farm economy that produces food for the nation and world, as well as increasing the share of the region’s collective consumption that is grown within the region. The program is ongoing and the findings are reflected in the proposed MTP/SCS through transportation investments and policies and land use patterns that support the rural economy.

**2012 MTP/SCS (Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy for 2035)**

In 2012, SACOG adopted the Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy for 2035 (2012 MTP/SCS), building upon the consensus achieved through the Blueprint process and the 2008 MTP to develop a long-range regional transportation plan that supports Blueprint priorities. The 2012 MTP/SCS was SACOG’s first MTP to include a Sustainable Communities Strategy, as required by SB 375, which proactively linked land use, air quality, and transportation needs.

Development of the 2012 MTP/SCS included an 18-month public priority-setting process to identify a list of transportation improvement projects to best meet the needs of the region as a whole. The development of the 2012 MTP/SCS used broad public outreach, combined with extensive input from elected officials, community groups and citizen planners, to consider a host of potential transportation investments. Over 150 presentations, 17 community workshops, and an Elected Officials Summit were held; the plan was adopted in April 2012.

The 2012 MTP/SCS improved upon the performance of the 2008 MTP. Some of the major performance improvements included slowing the growth rate of congested VMT per capita from nearly 60 percent to 22 percent, increasing transit trips from 20 percent to 66 percent, and reversing a projected four percent decline to an 83 percent increase in non-motorized trips.

**2.6.2 The Regional Planning Process: Development of the Proposed MTP/SCS**

The coordinated land use and transportation planning envisioned by SB 375 is aligned with the land use and transportation principles of the Blueprint. This is reflected in planning efforts since the Blueprint’s adoption in 2004, including the coordination between the Blueprint and the 2012
MTP/SCS. Since the subject plan update is focused on implementation and refinement of the 2012 MTP/SCS, and not a complete overhaul, this proposed MTP/SCS maintains the integration of land use and transportation planning principles and ties the plan’s performance to greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduction targets through reduced automotive travel and increased walking, bicycling, and transit use based on forecasted land use patterns. The proposed MTP/SCS also has many performance goals that extend well beyond GHG emissions reduction.

The work of developing a regional growth forecast, applying that growth to regional land uses, and integrating the transportation system is a key part of complying with SB 375. This section summarizes the planning process for the development of the proposed MTP/SCS. The planning process began in 2013 and is divided into four major planning phases, each inclusive of public and stakeholder participation, jurisdiction coordination and consultation, and regular updates and direction from the SACOG Board. The four phases are:

1. Adopting the 2016 MTP/SCS Policy Framework and Regional Growth Forecast;
2. Analyzing Land Use and Transportation Scenarios;
3. Adopting a Framework for a Draft Preferred Scenario;
4. Developing the Preferred Scenario;

ADOPTING THE 2016 MTP/SCS POLICY FRAMEWORK AND REGIONAL GROWTH FORECAST

In August through December of 2013, the SACOG Board engaged in an issue identification and exploration period that examined the implementation challenges of the 2012 MTP/SCS. This included a review of statewide and local transportation funding challenges and needs, road maintenance challenges, a review of the regional growth projections, a briefing on regional travel behavior and the current housing market. This research and educational period led to Board action on a policy framework for the 2016 MTP/SCS in December of 2013. This policy framework focused the 2016 MTP/SCS update on refinement and improvement of the 2012 MTP/SCS, rather than rebuilding and revisiting its foundational principles and goals. For more information, see the Draft 2016 MTP/SCS Chapter 2 – Planning Process.

ANALYZING LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION SCENARIOS

With a policy framework and guiding principles for the plan update, SACOG developed a research, analysis and outreach framework to inform the update of the MTP/SCS. In March 2014, the SACOG Board adopted this framework for developing three regional land use and transportation scenarios for use in public workshops and plan development. This framework set up the approach for creating and analyzing scenarios and included: 1) updating and refining the three land use and transportation scenarios from the 2012 MTP/SCS, 2) analyzing different timing to construction of transportation and land use components, and 3) analyzing different levels and types of transportation revenues. The scenarios and information developed in this process were used to illustrate trade-offs and effects of different development patterns and transportation investments compared to the 2012 MTP/SCS. Scenario information was presented to Board, stakeholders, member and partner agencies, and public workshop participants in the summer and fall of 2014. The scenarios were also used as the basis for alternatives in this EIR. More detailed information on the
ADOPTING A FRAMEWORK FOR A DRAFT PREFERRED SCENARIO

Input received from Board, stakeholder, and public engagement, and technical results of the scenarios analysis, were used as the basis for developing a framework for a draft preferred scenario. In December of 2014, the SACOG Board adopted Framework 2.0, which provided the guiding principles, method, and process for developing the Draft Preferred Scenario. Based on prior regional scenario modeling and analysis, the three primary directives of the Framework have been to: 1) develop a Draft Preferred Scenario that meets federal air quality conformity requirements and achieves state greenhouse gas targets, 2) develop a land use forecast that meets federal and state requirements and supports those air quality objectives, and 3) shift budget to system maintenance (Fix-it-First) investments and find new, reasonably foreseeable revenues to put towards those investments, consistent with the policy themes identified in the Policy Framework. For more information, see the Draft 2016 MTP/SCS Chapter 2 – Planning Process. The full Framework for a Draft Preferred Scenario that was adopted by the board can be found in Appendix G-1– Frameworks for the 2016 MTP/SCS Update Process.

DEVELOPING THE PREFERRED SCENARIO

Using the Framework for a Preferred Scenario, SACOG worked with local jurisdictions and member and partner agencies to develop a Preferred Scenario. The Preferred Scenario consists of a land use forecast, and a transportation budget and project list. The land use forecast must be based on the most recent information about regulatory, policy and market conditions and a reasonable economic growth forecast of employment, population and housing. It must identify general location of uses, residential densities and building intensities, and areas within the region sufficient to house all of the projected population of the region. The budget must be financially constrained by assuming only revenues that can reasonably be expected over the planning period.

In addition, with an emphasis on shifting more of the budget to system maintenance (Fix-it-First), the project list was developed with fewer roadway capacity projects, and fewer added roadway capacity, than the current plan. This reduction reflects recommendations in the project list to re-phase some projects from the current plan to the “post-2036” timeframe. In some cases, these recommendations came from project sponsors; in others, from SACOG staff. Where SACOG staff recommended re-phasing to the post-2036 timeframe, screening criteria were used to guide the recommendations. More information on the process for developing the Preferred Scenario can be found in Appendix G-1– Frameworks of the Draft 2016 MTP/SCS.

2.6.3 Project Objectives

SACOG’s mission is to “provide leadership and a dynamic, collaborative public forum for achieving an efficient regional transportation system, innovative and integrated regional planning, and a high quality of life within the greater Sacramento region.” SACOG’s purpose in proposing the MTP/SCS is to provide a strategy to approach the many challenges faced by the Sacramento region as the population grows and the region expands over the next few decades. The proposed MTP/SCS seeks to guide the Sacramento region toward a more sustainable future through better integration of smart land use decisions with a well-managed transportation system, as envisioned by the Blueprint and
the proposed project. The intent of the proposed MTP/SCS is to accommodate the expected population growth and accompanying demand for transportation in the region through a multi-modal approach based on the following objectives:

**OBJECTIVES RELATED TO LAND USE AND ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY:**

1. Support local land use authority with data, tools, incentives, and programs that reinforce the region’s voluntary implementation of the Blueprint.
2. Support housing choice and diversity for all segments of the population that respond to changing economics and demographics in the region.
3. Support improved jobs-housing balance in subareas of the region and complete mixed-use communities.
4. Minimize direct and indirect land use and transportation impacts on agriculture and natural resources.
5. Meet regional air quality plans and goals.
6. Meet federal and state requirements for regional transportation plans, including SB 375 and AB 32.
7. Achieve the greenhouse gas reduction targets assigned to SACOG by the California Air Resources Board.
8. Activate the CEQA streamlining benefits of SB 375.

**OBJECTIVES RELATED TO FINANCIAL STEWARDSHIP:**

1. Support transportation investments that provide high performance benefits for all community types in the region.
2. Improve the condition of the existing transportation system through the maintenance of transportation corridors that can support various modes of travel.
3. Maximize cost-effective investments that both preserve the current system and support the existing and future development served by that system.
4. Deliver cost-effective results from investments in each transportation mode and is feasible to construct and maintain.
5. Satisfy financial constraint requirements, such that all revenues reasonable to assume are used and matched to eligible projects.
6. Deliver more productive and cost-effective public transit services.

**OBJECTIVES RELATED TO THE EXISTING & PLANNED TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM:**

1. Support transportation choice and diversity for all segments of the population through a balanced transportation system where investments in various modes complement each other and support the diversity of travel demand in various community types.
2. Reduce both VMT and congested VMT as long as greenhouse gas emissions and air quality goals are not adversely affected.
3. Broaden mobility options, as measured by an increase in the transit, bicycle and pedestrian travel mode share.

4. Connect workers to jobs across the region.

5. Support the economic vitality of the region through efficient goods movement that includes minimizing disruptions to the movement of agricultural products on rural roadways.

6. Support safety and emergency preparedness, as demonstrated by land use and transportation changes that include capital investments in disaster-prone areas, transit services, and improved system maintenance.

2.7 Description of the Proposed Project

This section describes the contents of the proposed MTP/SCS, including the land use forecast to accommodate forecasted population and employment growth, the transportation system proposed to accommodate the growth pattern, and the supporting policies and strategies to implement the plan. The proposed MTP/SCS is organized into the following chapters:

Chapter 1 – Building a Sustainable System describes the need and purpose of the proposed MTP/SCS, including regulatory requirements of the plan.

Chapter 2 – Planning Process describes the major phases of the planning process, with particular attention to the public engagement process.

Chapter 3 – Summary of Growth and Land Use Forecast highlights the land use aspects of the Sustainable Communities Strategy.

Chapter 4 – Summary of Budgets and Investments summarizes the plan’s $35 billion of transportation revenues and expenditures by program category.

Chapter 5 – Summary of Plan Transportation Performance describes the transportation performance of the proposed MTP/SCS in three parts:

Chapter 5A- Land Use and Transportation Connection Trends and Performance provides an overview of performance and the land use-transportation connection intrinsic to the development of the proposed MTP/SCS;

Chapter 5B- Vehicle Miles traveled (VMT) & Roadway Congestion Trends & Performance describes the performance of the proposed MTP/SCS in terms of vehicle miles traveled and roadway congestion;

Chapter 5C- Transit, Bicycling, and Walking Trends & Performance describes the transit and non-motorized travel performance of the proposed MTP/SCS.

Chapter 6 – Policies and Supportive Strategies contains the policies and strategies that support implementation of the proposed MTP/SCS.
Chapter 7 – Environmental Sustainability describes how environmental resources were considered in the development of the proposed MTP/SCS. Additionally, it provides information related to agriculture, habitat, water, air quality and health, and climate change.

Chapter 8 – Equity and Choice provides an environmental justice analysis of the proposed MTP/SCS transportation investments as required by federal and state law, as well as a broader transportation accessibility analysis of the plan.

Chapter 9 – Economic Vitality analyzes the changing commute patterns of the region over the planning period, including the types of projects that address commuting and congestion, and current efforts to support goods movement.

Chapter 10 – Financial Stewardship analyzes how the proposed MTP/SCS addresses the ongoing funding challenges to road maintenance and rehabilitation, and transit capital and operations. It also describes the investment strategies that support road and transit operations and maintenance including: transportation demand management and transportation system management (including Intelligent Transportation Systems) projects and programs, and projects that address road safety and emergency preparedness.

In summary, Chapters 1 and 2 provide introduction and background to the development of the plan, Chapters 3, 4, and 6 provide action-oriented pieces of the proposed MTP/SCS, and Chapters 5, 7, 8, 9, and 10 provide analysis of the plan’s land use forecast, transportation investments, and policies on various transportation and environmental issues.

The following describes the action-oriented portions of the plan, which compose the project for the purposes of this environmental analysis (MTP/SCS Land Use Forecast, MTP/SCS Transportation System, and MTP/SCS Policies and Strategies).

2.8 MTP/SCS Land Use Forecast

This section summarizes the land use forecast of the proposed MTP/SCS and is divided into three parts. The first part, “2036 Regional Growth Forecast,” describes the regional forecast of population, employment, and housing. The second part, “Developing the Land Use Forecast,” describes how that regional forecast is translated into a land use forecast. The third part, “Details of the Forecasted Land Use Pattern,” describes the actual land use forecast of the proposed MTP/SCS.

2.8.1 2036 Regional Growth Forecast

SACOG typically updates its growth projections on the four-year MTP update cycle. The Center for Continuing Study of the California Economy (CCSCE) develops the growth projections for SACOG, including projections of future employment (by major employment sector), population, and household growth at the regional scale. The CCSCE’s regional growth projection method follows three major steps: 1) employment projections based on projections of U.S. and California job growth and the competitive position of the Sacramento region to capture a share of the state and national job growth; 2) population projections based on projected job growth, accounting for foreign immigration and domestic migration into the region; and 3) household projections based on projected population growth. Housing unit projections are based on the assumption that the region must accommodate all of the projected housing demand for the planning period. This forecasting
methodology for population is similar to the California Department of Finance (DOF) methodology, except that DOF projections do not forecast employment or households. This draft information is summarized for, and reviewed by, the SACOG Board and staff, member cities and counties, and stakeholders, and is ultimately approved by the SACOG Board. Once the projections are approved by the SACOG Board, they become the growth forecast that is utilized for planning purposes in the proposed MTP/SCS.

As mentioned in section 2.3.2 of this chapter, this MTP/SCS update uses the same growth projections used in the current MTP/SCS and extends the horizon year from 2035 to 2036. The 2036 growth forecast indicates that population in the plan area is expected to grow by 811,000 people, an increase of about 36 percent, between 2012 and 2036. As shown in Table 2.1 below, this forecast is almost the same population that was forecasted in the 2012 MTP, which had a 2035 planning horizon and a baseline year of 2008. Since the population forecast is approximately the same, the housing and employment forecast for the region is also similar to that of the previous plan, resulting in the need to accommodate approximately 439,000 new employees and 285,000 new housing units between 2012 and 2036 as shown in Table 2.3 below. These projections are based on the same methodology used for the 2012 plan, which bases projected housing demand on the projected employment and population growth.

Table 2.1
Comparison of 2012 MTP and Proposed MTP/SCS Regional Growth Forecasts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2012 MTP (Forecast Period 2008-2035)</th>
<th>Proposed MTP/SCS (Forecast Period 2012-2036)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employees</td>
<td>Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>966,285</td>
<td>2,215,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>1,068,838</td>
<td>2,519,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035/2036</td>
<td>1,327,423</td>
<td>3,086,213</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SACOG and CCSCE, 2011 and SACOG, 2015

1 Due to different protocols among GIS models for tallying spatial data, housing unit numbers in this DEIR differ marginally (less than 3 percent) from those reported in the proposed MTP/SCS.
Table 2.2
Comparison of Change in Growth Between 2012 MTP/SCS and Proposed MTP/SCS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forecast Period</th>
<th>Employees</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Housing Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed MTP/SCS (2012-2036)</td>
<td>439,354</td>
<td>810,634</td>
<td>292,649</td>
<td>284,896</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SACOG and CCSCE, 2011 and SACOG, 2015

1 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.

The U.S. economy has been growing at a slightly slower rate than what was originally projected for 2008-2012. California is projected to get a smaller share of U.S. job and population growth, and the region’s economy is expected to recover at a slower rate than some other areas of the state, with state budget deficits restraining job growth in the public sector over the next decade. The SACOG region is still expected to outpace the state and nation in job growth in the latter part of the planning period. Appendix D of the proposed MTP/SCS has more detail on the differences between this current set of projections and the projections used in the 2012 MTP/SCS.

Due primarily to the similar population growth projected in the plan area, the proposed MTP/SCS has a similar budget for transportation investments as compared to the 2012 MTP/SCS. Similar growth rates are projected for all revenue sources, but slower growth is projected for local revenues that are closely associated with economic activity and growth. The similar budget for the proposed MTP/SCS necessitates a continued focus on a strategic and limited package of transportation projects. Through consultation with local agency staff and technical analysis, a focused effort was made to identify transportation investments that achieve high cost-effectiveness and strong performance benefits.

2.8.2 Developing the Land Use Forecast

The regional growth forecast is for the region as a whole and is not disaggregated to political jurisdictions or any other geographic subarea. However, SACOG must also project the land use pattern that is most likely to occur over the planning horizon of the proposed plan.

Using the regional growth forecast of employment and housing, SACOG prepared an estimated growth pattern for the region, which is the land use forecast of the proposed MTP/SCS. This land use forecast is the result of two processes: a public engagement process that included SACOG Board direction following the aforementioned public workshops, and a more technical process that included coordination with local agency planning departments and stakeholders, and consideration of market and policy/regulatory factors.

These many factors were used to forecast a land use growth pattern that represents where throughout the region the projected amount of employment and housing will occur during the MTP/SCS planning period. This process is governed by federal requirements related to regional transportation plans and the Clean Air Act (CAA) of 1970 (42 U.S.C. § 7401 et seq.), including Highways (23 C.F.R. § 450) and Environmental Protection (40 C.F.R. § 93), which require that land use, population, and employment model assumptions are based upon the best available information,
and that there is a reasonable relationship between the expected land use and the envisioned transportation system. In the current planning cycle, this process is also affected by SB 375, and specifically by its requirement to develop an SCS.

A number of factors are considered in developing the land use forecast. Local general plans, spheres of influence, community and specific plans, land division and development codes, and design guidelines are considered, as they guide the type and intensity of future land uses. State and federal policies and regulations are also considered, most notably (but not limited to) those relating to development in floodplains and other natural hazard areas (e.g., fire), federal Clean Water Act (CWA) of 1972 (33 U.S.C. § 1251 et seq.) and Endangered Species Act (ESA) of 1973 (16 U.S.C. § 1531 et seq.) permit requirements, Transportation Control Measures in air quality plans under the federal Clean Air Act, and state housing requirements.

Local, state, and federal policies and regulations have a strong influence on the estimated growth pattern, although they are not the final determinant in SACOG’s growth forecasting process for the following reasons. First, the sum of all those policies and regulations never yields a growth pattern exactly consistent with the projected amount of employment and housing growth for the entire region during the planning period. Second, the nature of planning and plan updates is ever-changing and, as a result, the time horizons of local general plans seldom exactly match the time horizon of the MTP/SCS. Finally, local plans and regulations are likely to change many times throughout the planning horizon of the MTP/SCS; assuming such plans are, in effect, unchangeable for the entire 20 plus years of the proposed MTP/SCS is not likely to be accurate.

Many other factors are therefore documented, analyzed, and considered in creating the growth forecast. These may include an estimate of the direction and magnitude of future changes to the policy and regulatory environment. If a major local general plan update is in process, but not yet adopted, SACOG may consider the probable substance of the updated plan in addition to the currently adopted plan. Practical considerations affecting the cost and timing of providing infrastructure (e.g., water, sewer, transportation) are analyzed. Market and economic considerations are also analyzed, such as consumers’ interest in different types of housing and developers’/builders’ ability to deliver that housing at affordable prices. Future demographic trends identified in the regional growth forecast (i.e., percentage of households with children, older heads of households, etc.) are an important part of this analysis. Appendix E-3 of the proposed MTP/SCS provides further detail on the land use forecasting process for the plan.

2.8.3 Details of the Forecasted Land Use Pattern

This section describes the land use forecast of the proposed MTP/SCS by three geographic areas. The first geographic description, “Existing and Forecasted Land Uses in the Region,” provides a regional overview of existing and forecasted land uses, including a map of the general land use pattern of the proposed MTP/SCS. The second description provides an overview by Community Type. “Community Type” is a geography that is used to develop and evaluate the land use forecast of the proposed MTP/SCS. As such, the Community Types are first described in “Community Type Framework,” then followed by a description of the land use forecast by this geography in “Distribution of Land Uses by Community Type.” The third description of the proposed MTP/SCS land use forecast is provided by Transit Priority Area (TPA). Like Community Type, TPA is a geography in used in this plan to develop and evaluate the land use forecast of the proposed MTP/SCS. As such, the TPAs are first described in “Transit Priority Area Framework,” then
followed by a description of the land use forecast by this geography in “Distribution of Land Uses by Transit Priority Area.”

**EXISTING AND FORECASTED LAND USES IN THE REGION**

In each MTP 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 20-year planning 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.

The MTP/SCS plan area contained 718,356 acres of developed land in 2012. To accommodate a projected increase of approximately 811,000 people, 285,000 new housing units and 439,000 new employees in the region through the year 2036, the proposed MTP/SCS projects the development of an additional 47,563 acres of land. In other words, to accommodate a 36 percent increase in population, the regional urban footprint will expand by seven percent between 2012 and 2036. This new development land represents 1.2 percent of the acreage of the region. Table 2.3 provides a list of existing developed acres and forecasted developed acres by county.

The distribution of new development acres in the proposed MTP/SCS reflects an urban and suburban focused development pattern. Of the MTP/SCS plan area’s 47,563 new developed acres, 71 percent are within Placer and Sacramento counties, which are the most urbanized counties in the region in both 2012 and 2036. Although El Dorado County has a relatively large share of existing developed acres, due to its predominantly rural residential land use pattern, its share of new development acres is significantly lower than other counties. The growth footprint in Yolo, Yuba, and Sutter counties is comparably smaller than other counties, as shown in Table 2.3.

As shown in Tables 2.4 and 2.5, the majority of regional housing and employment growth, approximately 77 percent, is projected to occur in Placer and Sacramento counties. Yolo County receives the next highest amount of growth, followed by El Dorado, Sutter, and Yuba counties. In all cases, this results in improved jobs-to-housing ratios. This is illustrated in Table 2.6, which shows starting and ending jobs-to-housing ratios for each county during the MTP/SCS planning period. In regional land use and transportation planning, “improved” jobs-to-housing ratio is defined as a ratio that moves toward the regional average.

The regional average ratio for the Sacramento region in 2012 was 1 job per household. As described above, SACOG’s regional projections methodology identifies the total employment projected 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. The new households are converted into housing unit demand.
### Table 2.3
Summary of Expected Developed Acres by County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County (Incorporated and Unincorporated Areas)</th>
<th>Existing Developed Acres (2012)</th>
<th>Additional Developed Acres (2012-2036)</th>
<th>All Developed Acres (2036)</th>
<th>All Acres (Developed and Undeveloped)</th>
<th>Additional Development as Percent of All Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>Percent Distribution</td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>Percent Distribution</td>
<td>Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado</td>
<td>201,148</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>6,610</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>207,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer</td>
<td>137,021</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>14,454</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>151,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>216,752</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>19,635</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>236,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutter</td>
<td>28,679</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2,342</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>31,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolo</td>
<td>38,244</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2,917</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>41,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuba</td>
<td>96,512</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1,606</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>98,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region Total</td>
<td>718,356</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>47,563</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>765,919</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SACOG, MTP/SCS Preferred Scenario Land Use Forecast, April 2015
Totals may not sum due to rounding.

### Table 2.4
Summary of Expected Housing Growth by County (Dwelling Units)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County (Incorporated and Unincorporated Areas)</th>
<th>2012 Dwelling Units¹</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
<th>2012-2036 New Dwelling Units¹</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
<th>2036 Dwelling Units¹</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado</td>
<td>64,358</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11,911</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>76,269</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer</td>
<td>142,583</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>54,544</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>197,127</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>558,836</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>172,52</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>731,357</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutter</td>
<td>33,790</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11,030</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>44,820</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolo</td>
<td>75,553</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>27,218</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>102,767</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuba</td>
<td>28,331</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7,672</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>36,003</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region Total</td>
<td>903,451</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>284,89</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1,188,347</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Due 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.
Totals may not sum due to rounding.

Source: SACOG, MTP/SCS Preferred Scenario Land Use Forecast, April 2015
### Table 2.5
Summary of Expected Employment Growth by County (Employees)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County (Incorporated and Unincorporated Areas)</th>
<th>2012 Employees¹</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
<th>New Employees¹</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
<th>2036 Employees¹</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado</td>
<td>43,164</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20,915</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>64,079</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer</td>
<td>128,912</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>81,128</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>210,040</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>573,014</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>258,147</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>831,161</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutter</td>
<td>29,525</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>14,279</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>43,804</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolo</td>
<td>92,943</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>52,797</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>145,739</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuba</td>
<td>20,408</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>12,092</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>32,500</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region Total</td>
<td>887,965</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>439,358</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1,327,323</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MTP/SCS Preferred Scenario Land Use Forecast, April 2015.

¹Due 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. Totals may not sum due to rounding.

### Table 2.6
Jobs to Housing Ratios by County¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County (Incorporated and Unincorporated Areas)</th>
<th>2012 Total</th>
<th>2012-2036 Growth</th>
<th>2036 Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jobs / Household</td>
<td>Jobs / Household</td>
<td>Jobs / Household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutter</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolo</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuba</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region Total</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MTP/SCS Preferred Scenario Land Use Forecast, April 2015.

¹Table illustrates how jobs-housing ratios change over the planning period. The 2012-2036 growth column shows the ratio of new jobs to new households added to each county to result in the jobs-housing ratio at the end of the planning period.
Figure 2.2 MTP/SCS with Blueprint Footprint Reference with TPA

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.

Legend
- Blueprint Growth Footprint
- Blueprint Vacant Urban Land
- City Boundaries
- Water Features
- County Boundaries

Community Types
- Center/Corridor Community
- Developing Community
- Established Community
- Rural Residential Community
- Lands not identified for Development in the MTP/SCS Planning Period
- City Boundaries
- Water Features
- County Boundaries

Sources: USGS, Esri, TANA, AND
COMMUNITY TYPES FRAMEWORK

The Community Types Framework was used in the land use forecasting process of the proposed MTP/SCS. Local land use plans (adopted and proposed general plans, specific plans, master plans, corridor plans, etc.) were divided into one of five “Community Types” based on the location and land use composition of the plans. The 2016 Draft MTP/SCS and its Appendix E-3 describe the correspondence of Community Types to the local land use plans that factored into the proposed MTP/SCS land use forecast. These “Community Types” were also used to describe the variations in land use patterns between the three public workshop scenarios (Scenarios 1, 2, and 3) that formed the basis of the land use forecast for the proposed MTP/SCS. Figure 2.2 illustrates these Community Types, which are also defined as follows:

Center and Corridor Communities

Land uses in Center and Corridor Communities are typically higher density and more mixed than surrounding land uses. Center 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. They typically have more compact development patterns, a greater mix of uses, and a wider variety of transportation infrastructure 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 typically the areas adjacent to, or surrounding, Center and Corridor Communities. Many are characterized as “first tier,” “inner ring,” or mature suburban 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 made up of existing 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; others may have commuter bus service or very little service. The majority of the region’s roads are in Established Communities in 2012 and 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 be residential-only, employment-only, or a mix of residential and employment 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 facilities.

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. Today, these areas are dominated by commercial agriculture, forestry, resource conservation, mining, flood protection, or a combination of these uses. Some of these areas have long-term plans and policies to preserve or maintain the existing “non-urban” uses; however, some are covered under adopted or proposed plans that allow urban development and/or are included in the adopted Blueprint vision for future growth. When it was adopted by the SACOG Board in 2004, the regional Blueprint was projected to meet growth needs through 2050. Under today’s slower regional growth rate projections, there is likely capacity in the Blueprint beyond 2050.

Though the proposed MTP/SCS does not forecast any development in these areas by 2036, it is possible that some housing and employment growth associated with agriculture, forestry, mining, and other rural uses could occur in these areas within that timeframe. This is particularly true in the areas that have long-term plans and policies to sustain the current rural uses. It is especially difficult to estimate where this growth will go on a parcel basis because employment in these areas is often seasonal and dispersed over a large geography, and because residential uses are often a secondary or an accessory use to agriculture and/or the other rural uses listed above.

**Distribution of Land Uses by Community Types**

This section describes the land use pattern of the proposed MTP/SCS by the five Community Types previously described. Tables 2.7, 2.8, and 2.9 will be referenced in each Community Type discussion.
### Table 2.7
Summary of Expected Housing and Employment Growth by Community Type (Dwelling Units and Employees)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Type</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2012-2036</th>
<th>2036</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dwelling Units</td>
<td>Percent of Total</td>
<td>Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center and Corridor Communities</td>
<td>107,718</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>307,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established Communities</td>
<td>686,075</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>527,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Communities</td>
<td>31,422</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>20,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Residential Communities</td>
<td>78,237</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>33,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lands Not Identified for Development in the MTP/SCS Planning Period</td>
<td>n/a(^1)</td>
<td>n/a(^1)</td>
<td>n/a(^1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region Total</td>
<td>903,451</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>887,965</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SACOG, MTP/SCS Preferred Scenario Land Use Forecast, April 2015

\(^1\)The proposed MTP/SCS does not forecast or model growth in the "Lands Not Identified for Development in the MTP/SCS Planning Period" Community Type during the planning period, though there is existing development in these areas (primarily farm homes, agricultural-related uses, public lands such as waste water treatment facilities, etc.) As a result, existing developed acres in the "Lands Not Identified for Development in the MTP/SCS Planning Period "Community Type was included in "Established" and "Rural Residential" Community Type totals.

Totals may not sum due to rounding.
Table 2.8  
Summary of Expected Developed Acres by Community Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Type</th>
<th>Existing Developed Acres (2012)</th>
<th>All Developed Acres (2036)</th>
<th>All Acres (Developed and Undeveloped)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acres¹</td>
<td>All Acres¹</td>
<td>New Developed Acres as Percent of All Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center and Corridor Communities</td>
<td>26,684</td>
<td>3,825</td>
<td>36,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established Communities</td>
<td>264,242</td>
<td>280,861</td>
<td>1,287,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Communities</td>
<td>23,793</td>
<td>45,946</td>
<td>105,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Residential Communities</td>
<td>403,637</td>
<td>408,602</td>
<td>2,433,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lands Not Identified for Development in the MTP/SCS Planning Period</td>
<td>n/a²</td>
<td>n/a²</td>
<td>n/a²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region Total</td>
<td>718,356</td>
<td>765,919</td>
<td>3,863,323</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 MTP/SCS Planning Period" Community Type during the planning period, though there is existing development in these areas (primarily farm homes, agricultural-related uses, public lands such as waste water treatment facilities, etc.) As a result, existing developed acres in the "Lands Not Identified for Development in the MTP/SCS Planning Period" Community Type was included in "Established" and "Rural Residential" Community Type totals.

Source: SACOG, MTP/SCS Preferred Scenario Land Use Forecast, April 2015
Table 2.9
Summary of New Housing Product Distribution by Community Type (Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Type</th>
<th>Rural Residential</th>
<th>Large-Lot Single-Family</th>
<th>Small-Lot Single-Family</th>
<th>Attached</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Center and Corridor Communities</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established Communities</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Communities</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Residential Communities</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lands Not Identified for Development in the MTP/SCS Planning Period</td>
<td>n/a²</td>
<td>n/a²</td>
<td>n/a²</td>
<td>n/a²</td>
<td>n/a²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region Total</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SACOG, MTP/SCS Preferred Scenario Land Use Forecast, April 2015

1Rural Residential: single-family detached homes built at densities less than 1 dwelling unit per acre.
2Large-Lot Single-Family: single-family detached homes built at densities between 1 and 8 dwelling units per acre.
3Small-Lot Single-Family: single-family detached homes built at densities between 8 and 25 dwelling units per acre.
4Attached Residential: Single-family or multi-family homes ranging from duplexes, triplexes, apartments, condominiums, townhomes, row houses, halfplexes, etc. built at densities from 8 to over 50 dwelling units per acre.
5Totals may not match due to rounding.
6The 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 (primarily farm homes, agricultural-related uses, public lands such as waste water treatment facilities, etc.) As a result, existing developed acres in the Lands Not Identified for Development in the MTP/SCS Planning Period Community Type was included in Established and Rural Residential Community Type totals.
Center and Corridor Communities

The proposed MTP/SCS projects 30 percent of the regional housing demand and 35 percent of regional employment demand to occur in Center and Corridor Communities. This represents 8 percent of the new development land in the proposed MTP/SCS. Table 2.8 shows the number of dwelling units and employees in Center and Corridor Communities compared to other Community Types and Table 2.9 shows the acreage of new development by Community Type. Center and Corridor Communities were the most employment-oriented Community Type in the region in 2012 (2.9 employees per dwelling unit). The proposed MTP/SCS has an 80 percent increase in housing in Center and Corridor Communities to reuse vacant or underutilized land that is in close proximity to services and employment opportunities, take advantage of existing transportation infrastructure (light rail and bus service where they are present), and create more types of housing products for the projected population in central locations. As shown in Table 2.10, new housing in Center and Corridor Communities is predominantly attached product, due to higher residential densities proposed or allowed in these areas by local jurisdictions.

Established Communities

The proposed MTP/SCS forecasts 28 percent of the projected housing demand and 49 percent of employment demand to Established Communities. This represents 35 percent of the new development land in the proposed MTP/SCS. Table 2.8 shows the number of dwelling units and employees in Established Communities compared to other Community Types and Table 2.9 shows the acreage of new development by Community Type. Established Communities contain the existing residential neighborhoods, office parks, industrial parks, and shopping centers of the region. The modest rate of housing growth in Established Communities is due in part to their substantially “built out” condition, but also because much of the potential housing demand in these areas that might otherwise be realized through amended plans and codes to allow higher densities is channeled to the Center and Corridor Communities. Employment growth in Established Communities is higher than housing growth because the proposed MTP/SCS projects improved employment-to-housing ratios in communities with a low employment base today, and continued build out of existing office and industrial parks in regional jobs centers. New housing in Established Communities is fairly balanced between large-lot single-family, small-lot single-family and attached products, as shown in Table 2.10.

Developing Communities

The proposed MTP/SCS forecasts 40 percent of the new housing and 16 percent of new employment will occur in Developing Communities. This represents 47 percent of the new development land in the proposed MTP/SCS. Table 2.8 shows the number of dwelling units and employees in Developing Communities compared to other Community Types, and Table 2.9 shows the acreage of new development by Community Type. Unlike Established Communities, which experience high employment growth relative to housing growth, Developing Communities experience high housing growth relative to employment growth. This is due to two factors: 1) most Developing Communities in the proposed MTP/SCS are not expected to fully build out by the horizon year of the plan and, therefore, a critical mass of housing will not yet be present to support planned employment growth; 2) most Developing Communities are located around regional jobs centers in southwest Placer County, southeastern Sacramento County, and urbanized Yolo County, and are intended to provide nearby housing for those jobs centers. New housing in Developing
Communities is predominantly large-lot single-family and small-lot single-family product, although attached products comprise a substantial share as well, as shown in Table 2.10.

Rural Residential Communities

The proposed MTP/SCS forecasts that 2 percent of the new housing and less than 1 percent of new employment will occur in Rural Residential Communities. This represents 10 percent of the new development land in the proposed MTP/SCS. Table 2.8 shows the number of dwelling units and employees in Rural Residential Communities compared to other Community Types and Table 2.9 shows the acreage of new development by Community Type. Due to the rural and residential focus of Rural Residential Communities, employment growth is minimal. The majority of growth in Rural Residential Communities is located in the foothills of El Dorado, Placer, and Yuba counties. New housing in Rural Residential Communities is almost entirely rural residential and large-lot single-family housing product, as shown in Table 2.10.

Lands Not Identified for Development in the MTP/SCS Planning Period

The proposed MTP/SCS does not forecast growth in these areas. The unique nature of agricultural, forestry, mining, and other rural economic activity – that it is seasonal and dispersed over a large geography at any given time of the day, week, or year – makes the associated employment difficult to forecast spatially. Similarly, housing growth in this Community Type is difficult to forecast spatially because it is often a secondary or an accessory use to agriculture and/or other rural uses. Though the proposed MTP/SCS does not forecast any development in these areas by 2036, it is possible that some housing and employment growth associated with agriculture, forestry, mining, and other rural uses could occur in these areas within that timeframe. This is particularly true in the areas that have long-term plans and policies to sustain the current rural uses.

**Transit Priority Area Framework**

A subset of the proposed MTP/SCS housing and employment growth falls within what SACOG refers 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 high-quality transit corridor included in the proposed MTP/SCS. 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). Figure 2.2 illustrates the relationship of the TPAs to Community Types. In both the proposed MTP/SCS and this DEIR, TPAs are considered an overlay geography and do not necessarily correspond directly to Community Types.

As stated previously, one of the objectives of the proposed MTP/SCS is to activate the CEQA streamlining benefits of SB 375, in order to encourage implementation of the proposed MTP/SCS land use and transportation pattern and all the resulting performance benefits of that development pattern. The goal, therefore, in identifying TPAs in the proposed MTP/SCS is to facilitate the use of SB 375 CEQA streamlining benefits available to qualifying residential and mixed-use projects.

The housing and employment land use forecast assumptions for the TPAs in the proposed MTP/SCS were first based on an assessment of existing and proposed local land use plans, which identified those existing or proposed rail station areas and transportation corridors where local governments allow new housing and employment uses at development densities high enough to
support high-quality transit. Local market conditions and national housing and employment market trends also factored into the land use forecast assumptions. Some existing transportation corridors with relatively lower growth were also identified for high-quality transit service because of their location between major growth areas or because of existing transit needs that cannot be served at current funding levels but are expected to be served as the region grows in population and revenues for transit funding.

Once the land use forecast assumptions were completed, high-quality transit service was assigned to transportation corridors. Five factors have been shown to influence the transit ridership and productivity of different types of transit service in transit corridors:

- Population and Job Density—higher density corridors support more frequent transit service.
- Mix of use—corridors with a mix of complementary land uses support use of transit during off-peak periods, especially midday and evening.
- Income Demographics—corridors with higher concentrations of lower income households generate higher demand for transit service.
- Block Size/Street Pattern—areas where the street pattern supports walking also support walk access to transit.
- Access to Job Centers—locations with concentrations of employment generate potential for peak/commuter transit. Job centers where parking is normally paid out of pocket generate the highest levels of transit, carpooling, and non-auto modes of commute.

In addition to these primarily land use criteria, roadway improvements (including construction of new roadways, and widening or reconstruction of existing roadways) will consider the utility of the roadway to multiple users, including vehicle drivers and passengers, transit vehicles, transit passengers, pedestrians, bicyclists, and commercial vehicles. This more expansive look at roadway improvements is part of SACOG’s Complete Streets policy.

These factors were used in an iterative process to develop the transit service assumptions that yielded the TPA geography. Appendices C-4 and E-3 of the proposed MTP/SCS include full discussions of the land use and transportation forecasting methodologies.

**Distribution of Land Uses by Transit Priority Areas**

Blueprint principles call for diverse housing options, in the form of housing products not currently widely available, in places where transit service can be efficiently provided. In support of the Blueprint principles, a primary goal of the proposed MTP/SCS is to increase the number of people – both residents and employees – who have access to high-quality transit. By 2036, the proposed MTP/SCS forecasts 37 percent of new dwelling units and 42 percent of new employees within TPAs, and brings high-quality transit service to an additional 105,024 dwelling units and 183,194 employees.

This section describes the land use pattern of the proposed MTP/SCS by the TPAs, which are divided by county. Tables 2.10, 2.11, and 2.12 will be referenced in each TPA discussion. Figure 2.3 illustrates the TPAs of the proposed MTP/SCS, which together cover 91,612 acres.
### Table 2.10
Summary of Expected Housing and Employment within 2036 Transit Priority Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transit Priority Areas (TPAs)¹</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>

Source: SACOG, MTP/SCS Preferred Scenario Land Use Forecast, April 2015

¹Transit Priority Areas 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).

### Table 2.11
Summary of Expected Development by Transit Priority Area (Acres)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transit Priority Areas (TPAs)¹</th>
<th>Existing Developed Acres (2012)</th>
<th>Percent Distribution</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Projected Developed Acres (2036)</th>
<th>Percent Distribution</th>
<th>All Acres (Developed and Undeveloped)</th>
<th>New Development as Percent of All Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Placer TPAs</td>
<td>4,493</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>4,796</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6,159</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento TPAs</td>
<td>57,562</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>4,326</td>
<td>61,889</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>71,904</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolo TPAs</td>
<td>8,294</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1,249</td>
<td>9,543</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13,549</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All TPAs</td>
<td>70,349</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>5,878</td>
<td>76,227</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>91,612</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SACOG, MTP/SCS Preferred Scenario Land Use Forecast, April 2015

¹Transit Priority Areas 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).
Table 2.12
Summary of Expected Housing Product Distribution by County (Percent), 2012-2036

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transit Priority Areas (TPAs)(^1)</th>
<th>Rural Residential(^2)</th>
<th>Large-Lot Single-Family(^3)</th>
<th>Small-Lot Single-Family(^4)</th>
<th>Attached(^5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Placer TPAs</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento TPAs</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolo TPAs</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All TPAs</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SACOG, MTP/SCS Preferred Scenario Land Use Forecast, April 2015

\(^1\) Transit Priority Areas 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).

\(^2\) Rural Residential: single-family detached homes built at densities less than 1 dwelling unit per acre.

\(^3\) Large-Lot Single-Family: single-family detached homes built at densities between 1 and 8 dwelling units per acre.

\(^4\) Small-Lot Single-Family: single-family detached homes built at densities between 8 and 25 dwelling units per acre.

\(^5\) Attached Residential: Single-family or multi-family homes ranging from duplexes, triplexes, apartments, condominiums, townhomes, rowhouses, halfplexes, etc. built at densities from 8 to over 50 dwelling units per acre.
Placer Transit Priority Areas

The Placer TPAs cover Capital Corridor train station areas in the cities of Roseville, Rocklin and Auburn, as well as high-quality bus routes in the city of Roseville. The proposed MTP/SCS projects 0.8 percent of regional housing growth and 2.8 percent of regional employment growth to occur in the Placer TPAs. This new development occupies 303 acres, or 7 percent of the total land area within the Placer TPAs and 1 percent of the new development land in the proposed MTP/SCS. Table 2.10 shows the number of dwelling units and employees in the Placer TPAs compared to other TPAs; Table 2.11 shows the size, in acres, of the Placer TPAs and acres of new development. New development in the Placer TPAs is predominantly employment, due primarily to the concentration of transit service in the Roseville employment centers along the Interstate 80 corridor. Of the new housing in the Placer TPAs, 76 percent are in attached housing product types as shown in Table 2.13.

Sacramento Transit Priority Areas

The Sacramento TPAs cover several types of transit routes: light rail station areas within cities of Folsom, Rancho Cordova, Sacramento, and unincorporated Sacramento County; a Capital Corridor train station area in the City of Sacramento; a streetcar corridor in the central/downtown area of the City of Sacramento, and numerous bus and bus rapid transit routes in the cities of Citrus Heights, Rancho Cordova, Sacramento, and unincorporated Sacramento County. The proposed MTP/SCS projects 29 percent of regional housing and 31 percent of regional employment growth to occur in the Sacramento TPAs. This new development occupies 4,326 acres, or 8 percent of the total land area within the Sacramento TPAs and 9 percent of the new development land in the proposed MTP/SCS. Table 2.10 shows the number of dwelling units and employees in the Sacramento TPAs compared to other TPAs; Table 2.11 shows the size, in acres, of the Sacramento TPAs and acres of new development. New development in the Sacramento TPAs is fairly balanced between housing and employment growth due in part to the extensive geographic coverage of the TPAs, which cover regional job centers (e.g., downtown Sacramento and Rancho Cordova) as well as residential areas and commercial areas. In Sacramento County in particular, most of the cities and the unincorporated county have initiated commercial corridor plans intended to allow significantly more residential development than allowed under past land use plans. Of the new housing in the Sacramento TPAs, 76 percent are in attached housing product types as shown in Table 2.13.

Yolo Transit Priority Areas

The Yolo TPAs covers a Capital Corridor train station in the City of Davis, a streetcar corridor in the central area of West Sacramento, and numerous bus and bus rapid transit routes in the cities of Davis and West Sacramento. The proposed MTP/SCS projects 7 percent of new housing and 8 percent of new employment to the Yolo TPAs. This new development occupies 1,249 acres, or 15 percent of the total land area within the Yolo TPAs and 3 percent of the new development land in the proposed MTP/SCS. Table 2.10 shows the number of dwelling units and employees in the Yolo TPAs compared to other TPAs; Table 2.11 shows the size, in acres, of the Yolo TPAs and acres of new development. New development in the Yolo TPAs is fairly balanced between housing and employment growth due in part to the extensive geographic coverage of the TPAs, which include regional job centers (e.g., central West Sacramento and UC Davis) as well as residential areas and commercial areas. Of the new housing in the Yolo TPAs, 76 percent are in attached housing product types as shown in Table 2.13.
2.8.4 MTP/SCS Transportation System

The proposed MTP/SCS includes a set of capital and operational improvements to the regional transportation system, including road, bicycle, pedestrian, and transit projects. The proposed plan also includes maintenance and rehabilitation activities to preserve the existing and expanded transportation system through 2036.

This section summarizes the transportation system of the proposed MTP/SCS. It is divided into three parts. The first part, “Developing a Transportation System for the Regional Growth Pattern,” describes the process for creating the transportation budgets and investments. The second part, “MTP/SCS Financial Assumptions,” describes the forecast and source of future transportation revenues. The third part, “MTP/SCS Distribution of Expenditures,” describes the actual investments of the proposed MTP/SCS by five major categories of transportation investments in the plan (Maintenance and Rehabilitation, Public Transit Service, Road and Highway, Bicycle and Pedestrian, and Programs and Planning).

DEVELOPING A TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM FOR THE REGIONAL GROWTH PATTERN

The policy priorities for the transportation funds covered by the proposed MTP/SCS influence the projected future growth pattern. Through the last three plan updates, the overall policy priorities for SACOG funds and the establishment of specific programs reflect a commitment to support the Blueprint principles. During this period of increasing SACOG Board support for linking Blueprint principles to the proposed MTP/SCS, a trend towards performance-based outcomes that link integrated land use and transportation decisions has become increasingly evident in federal and state transportation policies and investment priorities. Through its MTP/SCS and short-term funding decisions for transportation projects, SACOG emphasizes investments that reduce vehicle miles traveled; increase transit, pedestrian and bike, and high-occupancy vehicle mode shares; reduce congestion at key bottlenecks; and preserve and rehabilitate the existing transportation system. These transportation infrastructure investments will influence the future growth pattern.

At the onset of the proposed MTP/SCS planning process, SACOG coordinated with state and local agencies to develop a comprehensive package of projects intended to meet the current and future transportation needs of the plan area. Through SACOG Board direction, public and stakeholder engagement, technical analyses, and further coordination with local and state agencies, the alternatives were further refined into a final set of projects tailored to fit projected land uses, demographic changes, and travel needs in the region through 2036.

MTP/SCS FINANCIAL ASSUMPTIONS

Funding to support the transportation investments in the proposed MTP/SCS comes from a number of federal, state, and local sources, each with specific purposes and restrictions. In total, SACOG forecasts $35 billion in revenues ($49.8 billion escalated) for the plan period. On average, this comes out to approximately $1.6 billion ($2.0 billion escalated) per year over 22 years.

Federal and state laws require that the proposed MTP/SCS constrain its budget by assuming only revenues that can reasonably be expected over the planning period. Therefore, the revenue assumptions contained in the plan assume that current sources of revenue in the region will continue into the future at rates of growth consistent with historical trends and projected future economic
conditions. The following provides a summary of MTP/SCS revenues by federal, state, and local sources. Appendix B-1 of the proposed MTP/SCS provides a more detailed description of budget and investment assumptions.

**Federal Revenues**

Federal revenues in the proposed MTP/SCS total $4.1 billion ($5.4 billion escalated), or 12 percent of the total budget. Federal programs typically support one-time capital investments over ongoing investments for road maintenance and transit operations. However, some federal funds are available to support major road rehabilitation projects such as reconstruction and replacement of decaying bridges, as well as transit preventative maintenance aimed at extending the life of transit facilities or vehicles. Federal funding sources come in the form of Congestion, Mitigation, and Air Quality Program (CMAQ), Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP), and Federal Transit Administration Chapter 53 funds, the Highway Bridge Program, and a few other smaller federal discretionary programs.

**State and Local Revenues**

State funds in the proposed MTP/SCS total $11.4 billion ($12.8 billion escalated), or 32 percent of the total budget. California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) maintenance and capital investments for the state highway system and intercity rail services operated within the region comprise 75 percent of the state revenues in the proposed MTP/SCS. State assistance for local projects is similar to federal programs in the support of one-time capital investments. One notable exception is State Transit Assistance (STA), which can be used to support local transit operations. However, in the region, STA typically makes up less than 10 percent of annual transit operating budgets. The new statewide Cap and Trade program also includes some funding for providing ongoing support for transit operations.

Local funds in the proposed MTP/SCS total $19.5 billion ($32.2 billion escalated), or 56 percent of the total budget. Local revenues are the primary financial support for the basic maintenance and operation of the region’s road and transit system (over 95 percent of local road maintenance and rehabilitation and over 75 percent of transit operations). The principal sources of local revenues are sales and fuel taxes, developer fees and contributions, local general funds, and transit fares. On average, local revenues also cover 65 to 90 percent of major capital improvements on local road systems and frequently pay for 100 percent of relatively minor improvements. The proposed MTP/SCS includes three additional revenue sources not included in the 2012 MTP/SCS:

- A new 1/2-cent sales tax in Placer County, which constitutes the largest change in the budget by adding $1.5 billion for strategic capacity, operational, and maintenance projects;
- Nearly $1 billion in projected state Cap and Trade revenues that could be available to the region for certain greenhouse gas-reducing investments;
- An estimated $600 million in state Highway Bridge Funding to replace or rehabilitate public highway bridges over waterways, topographical barriers, other highways, or railroads.

**MTP/SCS Distribution of Expenditures**
The proposed MTP/SCS will make investments totaling $35 billion (in current dollars) to improve the regional transportation system. Table 2.13 summarizes the general categories of investment included in the proposed MTP/SCS through the year 2036. These are expressed in current dollars, as well as year-of-expenditure dollars. MAP-21 requires that all cost estimates be escalated to year-of-expenditure (YOE) values, to reflect both the likely decrease in purchasing power of today’s dollar and the increase in costs for maintaining and building the transportation system over the planning period.

### Table 2.13
**Summary of Proposed MTP/SCS Investments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Category</th>
<th>Total Budget-2015 through 2036 (in billions)</th>
<th>2016 MTP/SCS</th>
<th>2012 MTP/SCS</th>
<th>Total Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Maintenance &amp; Rehabilitation (Current Year $*)</td>
<td>$12.6</td>
<td>$10.5</td>
<td>$2.1</td>
<td>+20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of Expenditure $</td>
<td>$16.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain Caltrans highways &amp; freeways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain local streets &amp; roads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety investments as part of rehabilitation projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Road &amp; Highway Capacity</td>
<td>$5.8</td>
<td>$6.4</td>
<td>$-9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of Expenditure $</td>
<td>$7.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New &amp; widened roads, river crossings, interchanges, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 System Management and Operations</td>
<td>$1.5</td>
<td>$0.8</td>
<td>+87%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of Expenditure $</td>
<td>$2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology and operational improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Transit Operations (Current Year $*)</td>
<td>$7.1</td>
<td>$7.1</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of Expenditure $</td>
<td>$9.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus and rail operations and maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Transit Capital (Current Year $*)</td>
<td>$3.5</td>
<td>$3.3</td>
<td>+6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of Expenditure $</td>
<td>Total Budget-2015 through 2036 (in billions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$4.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Bus &amp; Rail Infrastructure Expansion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle purchases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Bike/Pedestrian (Current Year $*)</td>
<td>$2.8</td>
<td>$2.5</td>
<td>+12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of Expenditure $</td>
<td>$3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA retrofits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Programs, Planning, Enhancements (Current Year $*)</td>
<td>$1.7</td>
<td>$1.8</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of Expenditure $</td>
<td>$2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Analysis and Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Design Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDM &amp; Traveler Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping &amp; Transportation Enhancements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Totals (Current Year $*)</td>
<td>$35.2</td>
<td>$32.4</td>
<td>+8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of Expenditure $</td>
<td>$45.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See Appendix B-1 for documentation of how costs and revenues are calculated and noted throughout this plan in order to meet SAFETEA-LU financial reporting requirements.

The transportation projects contained in the proposed MTP/SCS are matched to the available revenues for the planning period. The general level, type, and extent of investments covered by the plan are described in more detail below:

- $12.6 billion ($16.3 billion YOE) goes to road and highway maintenance and rehabilitation, including routine maintenance, major reconstructions, and various safety improvements.
- $10.6 billion ($13.8 billion YOE) goes to transit investments, including rail extensions and a 122 percent increase in vehicle service hours. An estimated $3.5 billion ($4.7 billion
YOE) in capital investments support the additional $7.1 billion ($9.1 billion YOE) needed to operate these transit services.

- $5.8 billion ($7.7 billion YOE) goes to road and highway capital improvements, including road widening in growth areas, carpool and auxiliary lanes on highways, and new connections for local access.
- $1.5 billion goes to system management and operations, including intersection improvements, safety projects, signal timing.
- $2.8 billion ($3.6 billion YOE) goes to bicycle and pedestrian improvements, including bicycle trails, sidewalks, ADA retrofits, and supporting facilities. In addition, an estimated 8 percent of the road capital projects have a bicycle or pedestrian feature that is not included separately in the bicycle and pedestrian improvement allocation.
- $1.7 billion ($2.3 billion YOE) for other types of improvements important to achieving regional goals, including project development and analysis, community design incentives, travel demand management (including the regional rideshare program), clean air, open space, technology deployment, and enhancement programs.

Table 2.14 summarizes the transportation changes by travel mode between 2012 and 2036, while Table 2.15 provides a summary of illustrative transportation projects in the proposed MTP/SCS. Appendix A-1 of the proposed MTP/SCS includes the full listing of transportation projects.
Table 2.14
Summary of Proposed MTP/SCS Transportation System Changes by Facility Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>2012 Total</th>
<th>2036 Total</th>
<th>Change from 2012</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Purpose Freeways Lane Miles</td>
<td>1,526</td>
<td>1,593</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway HOV Lane Miles</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway Auxiliary Lane Miles</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arterial/Expressway Lane Miles</td>
<td>4,520</td>
<td>5,626</td>
<td>1,106</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector and Local Street Lane Miles</td>
<td>21,444</td>
<td>26,755</td>
<td>5,311</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian Class I Miles</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>1032</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>116%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Class II Miles</td>
<td>1,095</td>
<td>2476</td>
<td>1,381</td>
<td>126%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Total Daily VSH</td>
<td>3,566</td>
<td>8,076</td>
<td>4,509</td>
<td>126%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Route Miles</td>
<td>1,032</td>
<td>1,215</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Route Miles</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2.15
Table of Illustrative Projects

| New Rail | • Capitol Corridor connecting Placer County, Sacramento, and Yolo Counties to the Bay Area  
• Green Line Light Rail to the Sacramento International Airport  
• Downtown Sacramento to West Sacramento streetcar  
• High Speed Rail – Altamont connection from points south, terminating at Sacramento Valley station |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rail</td>
<td>• Increase bus service with 15 minute or better service from roughly one quarter in 2012 to about half of all services by 2036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Bus</td>
<td>• Nine BRT lines with 15-30-minute service connecting Roseville, eastern Sac County, Citrus Heights, northern Sac County, Natomas, Rancho Cordova, South Sac, Elk Grove, Downtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local &amp; Express Buses, Neighborhood Shuttles</td>
<td>• Various street &amp; operational improvements coordinated with complete streets corridor enhancements to enhance bus transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)</td>
<td>• Emphasis on complete street connections within and between cities, areas of high pedestrian-scale development, and to transit and school facilities … Phased Completion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| New Bike/Pedestrian | • New Silva Valley Parkway Interchange...by 2020  
• 4-lane Green Valley Road, Folsom to El Dorado Hills... by 2036 |
| Bike Lanes, Complete Streets & Recreational Trails | • New carpool lanes, Watt Ave to downtown Sacramento... by 2036  
• Modified interchange operational improvements at US50 & SR99, US50 & I-5... Phased Completion  
• New auxiliary lanes, various locations in Sacramento, Rancho Cordova, and Folsom... Phased Completion |
| New Roads | • New auxiliary lanes from Del Paso Rd. to Hwy. 99  
• I-5/State Route 99 interchange improvements  
• New carpool lanes on I-80 and U.S. 50 connecting Davis to Downtown Sacramento, with new bike bridge across the Yolo Causeway  
• New carpool lanes on I-5 and I-80 to downtown Sacramento |
| US 50 El Dorado | • Carpool lane extension, Watt/Longview west to I-5  
• Business 80/Capital City freeway capacity and operational improvements  
• Roseville Road widened to 4 lanes, from Watt Ave to Wal erga Road |
| US 50 Sacramento | • I-80 Placer |
1 – Road & Highway Maintenance & Rehabilitation

The MTP/SCS plan area covers over 22,000 lane miles of existing or new collector and local streets, over 5,300 lane miles of freeway, high-occupancy vehicle (HOV), auxiliary, expressway, and arterials, and numerous small and large bridges that must be kept in a good state of repair for the transportation system to operate efficiently.

The maintenance and rehabilitation budget spends $12.6 billion ($16.3 billion YOE) to preserve, maintain, and rehabilitate the region’s roads, highways, bridges, trails, sidewalks, and other bicycle and pedestrian facilities. For the proposed MTP/SCS, SACOG took a renewed focus on preserving existing assets and reducing maintenance backlogs before adding new infrastructure that would require even more maintenance spending in the future.

Compared to the 2012 MTP/SCS, the proposed 2016 plan increases the budget for maintenance and rehabilitation by more than $2 billion or 20 percent. This increase comes from a greater focus on system preservation using existing revenues by shifting funding away from expanded roadways and new revenues including sales taxes, state cap and trade funding, and a better accounting of federal funding for bridge preservation. Around two-thirds of the maintenance and rehabilitation...
budget is related to city and county maintenance of local streets and facilities. The balance is administered by Caltrans for maintenance of the state highway system.

Types of maintenance and rehabilitation projects include:

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

Many road maintenance or rehabilitation projects present opportunities to improve the travel experience of bicyclists and pedestrians. In addition to the direct investments assumed for the bicycle and pedestrian budget, discussed below, SACOG assumes that when appropriate and feasible, maintenance projects will include bicycle and pedestrian components such as striping and signage, sidewalk gap closures, ADA retrofits, and intersection improvements.

New “complete streets” projects take the place of many of the reduced or deferred road capacity projects discussed below. While in the past, the planning, design, construction, and operation of a street widening or new street might have focused on vehicular capacity and flow only, complete streets projects balance the needs of all potential users of a street. Based on these criteria, SACOG estimates that at least one-third of projects in the proposed MTP/SCS qualify as complete streets. In addition to the plan’s increased investment in complete streets along urban corridors, there is also an increase in investment in complete corridor treatments in rural communities, where closing a shoulder gap or improving a county road intersection can significantly improve the safety of travel for all modes.

2 – Public Transit Investment

The proposed MTP/SCS provides $10.6 billion ($13.8 billion YOE) in transit capital ($3.5 billion) and operating ($7.1 billion) investments. Most of this investment, 67 percent of the total, is consumed by the cost of operating and maintaining the transit system. Intercity rail operations take up about seven percent of the transit budget, or roughly $800 million, and are covered by state funding outside the control of regional operators. The remaining $3.5 billion 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 improvements to help buses move more quickly through traffic.

Providing high-frequency service of 15 minutes or better in areas with more compact and mixed uses allows the MTP/SCS to provide cost-effective and productive transit service. Because of higher productivity, there is a significantly higher percentage of operating costs covered by fares – rising from around 24 percent of operating costs in 2012 to 38 percent of operating costs ($2.6 billion) by
2036. Saving public dollars through higher farebox recovery allows the transit investments in the MTP/SCS to have a larger impact. With the increased transit productivity, by 2036 the proposed MTP/SCS provides roughly double the amount of transit service provided in 2012 and increases total daily transit trips by more than 200 percent.

The proposed MTP/SCS provides increased transit coverage across the region, but focuses on corridors with land uses that support productive transit services. The number of miles covered by bus transit routes in the proposed MTP/SCS increases 19 percent between 2012 and 2036 from 2,290 to 2,727 miles. Rail transit increases its coverage by 54 percent from 104 to 160 route miles. Total daily vehicle service hours increase by 98 percent from 4,074 to 8,062 hours. The types of transit offered in the plan vary by areas of the region. Investments include increasing the amount of service on existing routes, introducing new services, and adding high-capacity rail to high-demand corridors. Figures 2.4 and 2.5 illustrate the transit network and services in 2012 and included in the proposed MTP/SCS by the year 2036.

Types of transit projects in the proposed MTP/SCS include:

- Increased transit options in local areas to better match transit type to the density of development and related demand for service. Options range from increasing the amount of service on existing fixed route and express bus lines, to introducing new services including Bus Rapid Transit lines and neighborhood shuttles.

- More frequent transit service with greater regional coverage, with 15-minute or less service on many corridors. The plan calls for more than half of all transit services (bus and rail) to operate 15-minute or better service by 2036, versus less than a quarter of services today.

- Expansion of ADA paratransit services to keep up with the fast-growing senior population. The proposed MTP/SCS also calls for paratransit vans to be replaced regularly and equipped with technologies that optimize trip planning, as well as use of quality vehicles.

- More replacement buses, running on alternative fuels.

- Strategic expansion of regional and local rail where it can be cost-effective given surrounding housing and employment densities. New local rail expansions include light rail to Cosumnes River College and the Sacramento International Airport and the introduction of a streetcar in between downtown Sacramento and West Sacramento.

- Additional service on the existing Capitol Corridor interregional rail line, provided by Caltrans/Amtrak through a Joint Powers Authority.

- Additional service on the existing San Joaquin intercity rail line, operated by Amtrak and funded by Caltrans.

- Operational improvements to improve rail service frequencies.

- Renovation and reconfiguration of the Sacramento Amtrak station (also called the Sacramento Valley Station) as a central intermodal facility for bus and rail connections. Project elements include moving and renovating of the old Southern Pacific depot and building new sidewalks, a parking garage, and improved freeway ramps.
- Increased transit security (patrols, lighting, etc.) and rubbish collection to enhance the attractiveness of transit travel.

3 – Road, Highway, and Bridge Capital and Operations Investments

The proposed MTP/SCS spends $5.8 billion ($7.7 billion YOE) on road, highway, and bridge operational and capacity projects. The budget is notably different from earlier MTPs in its emphasis on operational improvements to improve system productivity over capacity projects. Compared to the 2012 MTP/SCS, road capacity investments are reduced by 9 percent.

More than two-thirds of the total road and highway investment pays for operational or capacity improvements to existing facilities, while the remainder of the budget includes a mix of new road and highway investments to serve infill and greenfield growth areas. A continued shift in MTP/SCS roadway investment priorities from prior plans is reflected in an investment package that focuses on more cost-effective and strategic capacity projects. Right-sizing, or value-engineering, of roadway investments for maximum cost-effectiveness is an important component of an MTP/SCS that achieves strong performance benefits with lower funding levels. The proposed MTP/SCS includes a reduction in expanded lane miles from the 2012 MTP/SCS of around 100 miles. Figures 2.6 and 2.7 illustrate the local roads, highways, and bridges in 2012 and improvements to these systems by 2036.
Figure 2.4 2012 Transit Network
Figure 2.5 2036 Transit Network
Figure 2.6 2012 Local Road and Highway Network
Figure 2.7 2036 Local Road and Highway Network
Local Road Investments
Of the $5.8 billion total in road, highway, and bridge capital projects, the proposed MTP/SCS invests nearly two-thirds of the budget in local roads to accommodate projected growth. More than 90 percent of new lane miles in the plan are on surface streets, not freeways. The proposed MTP/SCS roadway investments emphasize access to infill development areas, congestion relief, support for bus and rail transit, and improved bicycle and pedestrian access. Local road investments increase capacity for local passenger travel, creating a benefit to goods movement on highways.

Examples of local road investments in the proposed MTP/SCS include:

- New and expanded urban arterial roadways to meet community and regional travel needs. These roadway improvements primarily serve emerging activity centers, including Rancho Cordova, Folsom, West Sacramento, and southern Placer County that shoulder a significant share of projected employment and housing growth by the 2036 horizon year. These expansions include complete streets features in order also to support transit and bicycle/pedestrian travel.
- Connectors, including the Placer Parkway in southern Placer County and the Capitol Southeast Connector serving Elk Grove, Rancho Cordova and Folsom. The Placer Parkway is a four-lane roadway in a new right-of-way, while the Capitol Southeast Connector in the MTP/SCS is an expansion of existing segments of Kammerer Road, Bruceville Road, Grant Line Road and White Rock Road.

State Highway Investments
The proposed MTP/SCS invests the remaining third of the road capacity budget in projects that will primarily be carried out by Caltrans. Investments focus on operational improvements and strategic new carpool and auxiliary lanes in many interior areas of the freeway system. Collectively, these investments serve travel between activity centers and accommodate trucks for inter-regional goods movement. Fixing bottlenecks along trucking corridors is important, as each truck represents the traffic-generating equivalent of two to four automobiles in stop-and-go traffic.

Added freeway lane miles account for less than five percent of the total in new roadway capacity. Of this increase in freeway lane miles, nearly all of them are carpool lanes, auxiliary lanes, new ramps, or widened ramps. Most of the carpool, auxiliary, and transition lane additions occur in the urbanized part of the region and are directed at closing gaps that relieve congestion along major commute corridors during peak commute periods and to serve suburban job centers where it will take time to build up employment densities to the point that transit becomes a serious option for commuting.

Example state highway projects include:

- Carpool lanes between Davis and West Sacramento on I-80/U.S. 50 in Yolo County; as far north as the I-80 interchange on I-5 in Sacramento County; and on the Capital City Freeway (SR 51) from J Street to Arden Way.
- Auxiliary and transition lanes at and between major interchanges to improve traffic flow.
- New interchanges with major arterials along freeways in high growth areas including along U.S. 50 in Folsom and El Dorado, the junction of Highway 65 and the interchange at Highway 99 and Riego Road in Sutter County.

Bridge and River Crossing Investments
As a subset of the road and highway investments, the proposed MTP/SCS includes over $600 million (over $800 million YOE) in investments for the development of more road, transit, bicycle, and pedestrian capacity on the region’s bridges. Three-quarters of this budget pays for major crossings of the American, Sacramento, and Feather Rivers, with the remainder going towards minor capacity expansions on small crossings of creeks and tributaries.

Example bridge projects include:
- Improved river access across the American and Sacramento Rivers into downtown Sacramento – New river crossings across the lower American River from Sacramento to South Natomas, and across the Sacramento River from West Sacramento to Sacramento to provide access into downtown Sacramento where there will be a large increase in jobs and residents by 2036.
- Feather River crossings at Yuba City – Improvements to the 5th Street Bridge, with redesigned approaches and distribution on both ends, to link Yuba City and Marysville more effectively.
- One-to-two and two-to-four lane widenings on a number of small creek crossings.
- Bicycle and pedestrian retrofits on existing and new bridges.

4 – Bicycle and Pedestrian Investments

In addition to “complete street” investments described earlier, the proposed MTP/SCS includes $2.8 billion ($3.6 billion YOE) in direct investments for bicycle and pedestrian facilities. This total is the same budget total as what was included in the 2012 MTP/SCS.

Types of bicycle and pedestrian projects in the proposed MTP/SCS:
- Sidewalk network extensions in neighborhoods, with segments widened where needed.
- Pedestrian bridges and pedestrian intersection improvements that include ADA-compatible ramps, bulb-outs, and special crossing signals.
- Bike lanes on more neighborhood and major streets.
- Multi-use bike/pedestrian trails (off-street, grade-separated) that offer residents the opportunity to make utilitarian and leisure trips separated from vehicular traffic.
- Bike facilities (racks, lockers, restrooms) at major transit stops/hubs (light rail, BRT, etc.) and at key activity centers (downtown Sacramento, shopping malls, large office complexes, etc.)

Projects reflecting the range of bicycle and pedestrian investments in the proposed MTP/SCS are listed in the Regional Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Trails Master Plan (Master Plan). This document is the framework and listing of projects supporting a regional pedestrian and bikeway network and is incorporated by reference. The Master Plan provides a summary of planned bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure projects in each jurisdiction, and among multiple jurisdictions. The goal is to develop a connected system of facilities that provide safe and convenient bicycle and pedestrian travel throughout the region. The development of the regional network is oriented towards utilitarian trips and emphasizes connectivity to current facilities and connections to transit systems and key destinations. Figures 2.8 and 2.9 illustrate the extent of class I and class II bicycle facilities throughout the MTP/SCS plan area.
Figure 2.8 2015 Class I, II, and III Bicycle Network
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Sources: USGS, Esri, TANA, AND
Figure 2.9 2036 Class I, II, and III Bicycle Network
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Sources: USGS, Eiri, TANA, AND.
5 – Programs, Planning, and Operations

The proposed MTP/SCS includes $1.7 billion ($2.3 billion YOE) in funding for supplementary programs, planning, and operational efforts.

Example programs and planning and operations projects include:

- **Community Design:** Seed funding to encourage smart-growth development projects complementary to the MTP/SCS that may otherwise not happen.

- **Air Quality Improvement Programs:** Current funding focuses on Transportation Control Measures (TCMs) that sunset in 2018. Existing TCMs include the Sacramento Emergency Clean Air and Transportation (SECAT) grant program for replacing or retrofitting diesel engines and trucks, and Spare the Air programs to reduce vehicle miles traveled on bad air days. Active efforts are underway to identify air quality improvement programs beyond 2018 that offer strong performance benefits.

- **Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS):** With a focus on cost-effective operational improvements, future ITS investments are important strategies to realize MTP/SCS performance targets. Anticipated investments include automated message signs, crosswalk signals with pedestrian countdown timers, real-time transit message signs, and transit signal priority for buses. These investments also include Smart Corridors, including Sunrise and Hazel avenues in Sacramento, where near-term ITS strategies are planned by local agencies, and expansion of Traffic Operations Centers.

- **Travel Demand Management (TDM):** Current funding through an air quality TCM provides support to programs implemented by Transportation Management Associations (TMAs); promotional campaigns including May is Bike Month and rideshare matching services. Strategic planning efforts are underway to identify TDM funding opportunities beyond 2018 that offer strong performance benefits.

- **511 Traveler Information:** This existing phone and web-based service will continue to expand as a more highly developed and user-friendly source of detailed travel information. Goals for the future include real-time web-based traffic information, voice interactivity, and a public transit trip planner. The web version will include useful maps for alternative modes (transit system networks, bike routes, etc.). A related project is improved highway advisory radio on weather conditions, road closures, or construction on key highways.

- **Community Enhancements:** Funding for investments, including soundwalls, traffic calming, and streetscaping features, which can make a corridor or intersection more attractive while also improving its safety and operation. Traffic-calming investments include street narrowing, alignment changes, roundabouts, sidewalk bulbouts, refuge islands at intersections, pavement treatments, and angled parking. Streetscape investments include landscaped buffers between streets and sidewalks, landscaped median islands, lighting, signage, and street furniture.

- **Project Development Support:** Funding for projects outside of the planning period of the proposed MTP/SCS to begin early stages of development, including project design, preliminary engineering, environmental clearance, and right-of-way acquisition. Due to limited revenues in the financially constrained proposed MTP/SCS, these projects are not anticipated to have sufficient funding to complete construction during the planning period.
This category also includes funding for detailed studies on a wide range of subjects including rail transit opportunities, a regional open space strategy, complete streets design guidelines, and implementation of the Rural-Urban Connections Strategy.

2.9 MTP/SCS Policies and Supportive Strategies

The policy element of the proposed MTP/SCS is required to address the transportation issues of the region, identify and quantify needs expressed within both short- and long-range planning horizons, and maintain internal consistency with other MTP/SCS elements (Gov. Code, § 65080(b)). For the 2012 MTP/SCS, the SACOG Board adopted 31 policies and many supportive strategies to implement the plan. Since this proposed MTP/SCS is an update to the 2012 MTP/SCS, the policies and strategies of the prior plan are largely transferable to the proposed MTP/SCS. For this plan, targeted modifications were made to update the policies and strategies, including the addition and refinement of strategies to reflect new projects, research, and conditions since the 2012 MTP/SCS. The modifications can generally be categorized as one of the following: increasing the emphasis on investing in system maintenance and rehabilitation; further developing project-specific analysis tools; acknowledging and addressing the unique issues in suburban communities, as well as rural, urban and small towns; addressing climate adaptation; identifying strategies for complete streets and road rehabilitation; and reflecting completed or new research, as appropriate. Targeted modifications were also made to further SACOG’s efforts to integrate land use and transportation planning, to ensure the consistency of the proposed MTP/CS with SB 375, and to facilitate use of its CEQA streamlining benefits for qualifying residential and mixed-use residential projects. Policies and strategies are separated into four interrelated categories:

2.9.1 Land Use & Environmental Sustainability

These policies and strategies support implementation of the proposed MTP/SCS land use pattern through incentives, tool development, and coordination that supports Blueprint-style development patterns, rural, urban and suburban sustainability efforts, greenhouse gas reduction efforts, resource conservation, and clean air efforts.

2.9.2 Finance

Federal and state funds that SACOG controls are mainly intended for capital expansion. Policies and strategies in this section guide financial management and priorities for SACOG and local agencies for those funds that SACOG controls. Policies and strategies support SACOG’s prioritization of regional-scale projects and related regional priorities that are hard to fund locally.

2.9.3 System Maintenance and Operations

These policies and strategies express regional expectations about maintenance and operations of the existing road and transit transportation system. They acknowledge and support preservation of the existing system.
2.9.4 System Expansion

These policies and strategies lay out SACOG’s investment priorities for regional funds – to support regional programs, regional-scale system expansion, compact urban land uses, and equitable expenditures over time – and guide decisions about system expansions.

2.10 Intended Uses of This EIR

In compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Pub. Resources Code, § 21000 et seq.), this report describes the environmental consequences of the proposed MTP/SCS. This EIR is designed to fully inform the SACOG Board of Directors, in addition to other responsible agencies, persons, and the general public of the potential environmental effects of the proposed project and identified alternatives.

SACOG is the Lead Agency for environmental review of this EIR. A Notice of Preparation (NOP) was submitted to appropriate agencies to identify any issues of concern prior to preparation of the EIR. The NOP was circulated on June 19, 2014 to public agencies and persons considered likely to be interested in the project and its potential impacts. In addition, SACOG held a Scoping Meeting on July 23, 2014. The NOP was available for public review on SACOG’s website (www.sacog.org). A copy of the NOP and all written comments are provided in Appendix PD-1 of this EIR.

2.10.1 Agencies Expected to Use the EIR

As described in the Future Environmental Review section below, other public agencies may use this EIR in their decision-making regarding these projects. These agencies include local governments within the plan area, state agencies, regional transportation planning agencies within the plan area, public transit providers, air districts, Native American tribes, colleges and university transportation providers, and transportation management associations, among others.

2.10.2 List of Permits or Other Approvals Required to Implement the Project

The proposed MTP/SCS requires a conformity determination under the federal Clean Air Act section 176(c). The Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration make the final determination of conformity determination.

2.10.3 List of Environmental Review and Consultation Requirements

Federal consultation requirements include: 1) a process involving the MPO, state and local air quality planning agencies, state and local transportation agencies, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and the U.S. Department of Transportation; and 2) a proactive public involvement process that provides opportunity for public review and comment by, at a minimum, providing reasonable public access to technical and policy information considered by the agency.

SB 375 requires consultation with: stakeholders, including affordable housing advocates, transportation advocates, neighborhood and community groups, environmental advocates, homebuilder representatives, broad-based business organization, landowners, commercial property interests, homeowners associations, congestion management agencies, transportation agencies, local agency formation commission, and members of city councils and boards of supervisors.
2.10.4 Future Environmental Review

This program EIR serves as a first-tier environmental document under CEQA and will support 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.

Lead agencies implementing subsequent projects would undertake future environmental review for projects in the proposed MTP/SCS. These agencies would include the six counties and 22 cities within the plan area. Other project implementing agencies may include public transit providers, other public agencies such as air districts, Native American tribes, colleges and university transportation providers, the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), 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 could incorporate, by reference, the appropriate information from this program EIR, including secondary effects, cumulative impacts, broad alternatives, and other relevant factors. Subsequent environmental documents would focus on site-specific issues that have not been considered in this program EIR. If an activity were later found to have effects that were not examined in this program EIR, additional CEQA review would be required. 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 require no additional CEQA review.

As a program EIR, the preparation of this document does not relieve subsequent lead agencies from the responsibility of complying with the requirements of CEQA. As previously mentioned, individual projects are required to prepare a more precise, project-level analysis to fulfill CEQA requirements. The lead agency responsible for reviewing these future projects shall determine the level of CEQA review needed. The level of analysis needed, and the scope of that analysis, will depend on the specifics of the particular project.

CEQA STREAMLINING FOR LAND USE PROJECTS CONSISTENT WITH THE SCS

SB 375 provides several CEQA reform provisions. These include streamlined review and analysis of residential or mixed-use projects consistent with the SCS; modified review and analysis, through an expedited Sustainable Communities Environmental Assessment (SCEA), for Transit Priority Projects (TPPs) that are consistent with the SCS; and a complete CEQA exemption for TPPs that are consistent with the SCS and meet a specific list of other requirements. In each of these cases, this MTP/SCS EIR will serve as a first-tier environmental document under CEQA. The CEQA reform provisions are described as follows:

Streamlined Review for Residential or Mixed-Use Projects Consistent with the SCS

Under the provisions of SB 375, an environmental impact report prepared for a residential or mixed-use residential project that is consistent with the general land use designation, density, building intensity, and applicable policies specified for the project area in either an SCS or APS for which the California Air Resources Board has accepted an MPO’s determination that the SCS or APS would, if implemented, achieve its greenhouse gas emissions reduction target, “is not required” to discuss growth inducing impacts, or any project specific or cumulative impacts from cars and
light-duty truck trips on global warming, or on the regional transportation network (Pub. Res. Code, § 21159.28, subd. (a); Gov. Code, § 65080, subd. (b)(2)(I)). In addition, an EIR prepared for a residential or mixed-use project that qualifies for the streamlining provisions is not required to reference, describe, or discuss a reduced residential density alternative to address the effects of car and light-duty truck trips generated by the project as part of its alternatives analysis (Pub. Res. Code, § 21159.28, subd. (b)). Table 2.16 lists the qualifications for Residential or Mixed-Use Residential projects and the corresponding CEQA streamlining benefits.

Streamlined Review for Transit Priority Projects Consistent with the SCS

A Transit Priority Project (TPP) is a new type of project created by SB 375. Public Resources Code section 21155 sets forth the requirements for a project to qualify as a TPP. As with Residential or Mixed-Use Residential Projects, a TPP must be consistent with the general use designations, density, building intensity, and applicable policies specified for the project area in either a SCS or APS for which CARB has accepted an MPO’s determination that the SCS or APS would, if implemented, achieve the greenhouse gas emission reduction targets (Pub. Res. Code, § 21155, subd. (a)). In addition, a TPP must meet the following requirements: (1) the project must contain at least 50 percent residential use based on total building square footage; (2) the project must have a minimum net density of 20 dwelling units per acre; and (3) the project must be located within one-half mile of a major transit stop or high quality transit corridor included in the regional transportation plan (Pub. Res. Code, § 21155, subd. (b)).

Once an agency has determined that a project is a TPP, the project may be reviewed through a Sustainable Communities Environmental Assessment (SCEA). (Pub. Res. Code, § 21155.2, subd. (b)). The standard of review for the SCEA is the “substantial evidence” standard, which is deferential to the agency. Thus, once an SCEA is deemed appropriate, the burden of proof for a legal challenge to the agency’s analysis is presumed to be adequate and the burden of proof is on a petitioner/plaintiff to demonstrate otherwise.

If a TPP must be reviewed by an EIR, the TPP EIR is not required to discuss growth-inducing impacts, any project specific or cumulative impacts from cars and light-duty truck trips on global climate change, or on the regional transportation network. In addition, the EIR is not required to reference, describe, or discuss a reduced residential density alternative to address the effects of car and light-duty truck trips generated by the project as part of its alternatives analysis. Table 2.16 lists the qualifications for TPPs and the corresponding CEQA streamlining benefits.

CEQA Exemption for Sustainable Communities Projects Consistent with the SCS

A TPP that meets additional requirements may qualify as a sustainable communities project, a category of project that is eligible for CEQA exemption. These additional requirements, as well as the requirements for residential and mixed-use residential and TPP projects, are listed in Table 2.16.
### Table 2.16
SB 375 CEQA Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Designation</th>
<th>Qualifications</th>
<th>Streamlining Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Mixed Use Residential Project           | ▪ At least 75% of total building square footage for residential use  
▪ Consistent with the use designation, density, building intensity, and applicable policies for the project area of an SCS or APS accepted by CARB OR  
▪ A Transit Priority Project as defined below | ▪ Environmental documents are not required to reference, describe or discuss: 1) growth-inducing impacts, 2) impacts from car and light-duty truck trips on global warming or regional transportation network, 3) reduced-density alternative to project. |
| Transit Priority Project                | ▪ At least 50% of total building square footage for residential use OR  
▪ If 26-50% of total building square footage is non-residential, a minimum FAR of 0.75  
▪ Minimum net density of 20 du/acre  
▪ Within 0.5 miles of major transit stop or high-quality transit corridor included in the regional transportation plan (No parcel more than 25% further, and less than 10% of units or no more than 100 units further than 0.5 miles)  
▪ Consistent with the use designation, density, building intensity, and applicable policies of an SCS or APS | Benefits described above PLUS:  
▪ Option to review under a “Sustainable Communities Environmental Assessment”  
▪ An Initial Study is prepared identifying significant or potentially significant impacts.  
▪ Where the lead agency determines that cumulative impacts have been addressed and mitigated in SCS/APS, they will not be “considerable.”  
▪ Off-site alternatives do not need to be addressed.  
▪ Deferential review standard – the burden of proof for legal challenge is on the petitioner/plaintiff. |
| Sustainable Communities Project         | ▪ Everything for Transit Priority Project PLUS:  
▪ Served by existing utilities  
▪ Does not contain wetlands or riparian areas  
▪ Does not have significant value as a wildlife habitat and does not harm any protected species  
▪ Not on the Cortese List  
▪ Not on developed open space  
▪ No impacts to historic resources  
▪ No risks from hazardous substances  
▪ No wildfire, seismic, flood, public health risk  
▪ 15% more energy-efficient than CA requirements and 25% more water-efficient than average for community  
▪ No more than 8 acres  
▪ No more than 200 units  
▪ No building greater than 75,000 square feet  
▪ No net loss of affordable housing  
▪ Compatible with surrounding industrial uses  
▪ Within ½-mile of rail/ferry or ¼-mile of high-quality bus line  
▪ Meets minimum affordable housing requirements as prescribed in SB 375 OR in-lieu fee paid OR 5 acres of open space per 1,000 residents provided | Exempt from CEQA |
SB 226

Senate Bill 226 (Stats 2011, Ch. 469) provides additional streamlining of the environmental review process for eligible infill projects. Eligible projects include those located in an urban area, consistent with the general land use, density, intensity, and policies of the SCS, and that satisfy the performance standards outlined in the bill. Performance standards vary by project type and range from project size standards to proximity to transit to project design standards, for example. The full summary of eligibility requirements, including the performance standards can be found in SB 226.