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Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy for 2035

**Issue:** SACOG must update the Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS) at least every four years in accordance with federal and state regulations. A Draft MTP/SCS for 2035 has been prepared over a two year update process and is now ready for adoption.

**Recommendation:** None, this item is for information only. This is an action item for the Transportation Committee.

**Discussion:** After a year and a half of public input, local agency and stakeholder consultation, Board direction, and technical modeling and analysis in support of the MTP/SCS update, the Board released the Draft MTP/SCS for public review in November 2011. The Draft Plan included the project list and land use forecast endorsed by the Board in September 2011, along with policies, strategies, travel performance and environmental justice analyses, and policy discussions related to environmental sustainability, economic vitality and financial stewardship. The November Draft MTP/SCS reflected Board direction and public input provided over an 18-month period.

During the public comment period, SACOG conducted four public hearings on the Draft Plan and informational meetings for elected officials in each of the six counties in the SACOG region. All public comments, both written and oral, are included in Appendix G-7: Comments on the Draft Plan and Responses to Comments. This document, a summary of comments and staff’s responses to comments, was presented for information and consideration to the Board policy committees in March 2012.

**Changes to the November Draft MTP/SCS**
In the March Board committee cycle, staff also presented a Draft Final Plan (dated February 20, 2012) that included staff’s recommended changes to the Draft MTP/SCS in underline/strikethrough format. As staff reported to the committees in the March cycle, minimal changes were made to the Plan in response to comments, generally along the lines of clarification and augmentation of existing information. The most substantive changes to the plan are included in Chapter 6 – Policies and Supportive Strategies. However, edits to these policies and strategies did not change the course set by the Board for the plan update, nor the spirit of the Draft Plan.

**Changes to the February Draft Final MTP/SCS**
Some additional changes were made to the Draft Final Plan in response to comments made by Board members during the March committee cycle and in response to public comments received during the month of March. As with other edits to the Draft Plan, these additional edits are minor and do not change the spirit of the Draft Plan. These additional edits are provided in the Attachment 1 Errata document. The Draft Final Plan, including the edits highlighted in the Attachment 1 Errata document, is also posted on the SACOG website (http://www.sacog.org/2035/draft-final-mtpscs).
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Attachment 1:
Errata for the Draft Final Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy for 2035

The Draft Final Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy for 2035 (dated February 20, 2012) was presented to the SACOG Board policy committees for information and feedback in March 2012. The Draft Final Plan may be viewed through SACOG’s website at: http://www.sacog.org/2035/draft-final-mtpscs.

The following errata for the Draft Final Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy for 2035 (MTP/SCS) are included in this attachment:

- Clarifications to the performance measures listed on pages 2-11 and 2-12 of Chapter 2 – Planning Process. These edits were made in response to comments from Transportation Committee members during the March 1, 2012 Transportation Committee meeting.

- An edit to the City of Lincoln’s Center/Corridor in Figure 3.2 of Chapter 3 – Summary of Growth and Land Use Forecast. This edit was made in response to a request from the City of Lincoln received in March 2012.

- Edits and additions to policies and supportive strategies in Chapter 6 – Policies and Supportive Strategies. These edits were made in response to public comments received on the November 2011 Draft MTP/SCS. The majority of these edits were presented to the Board policy committees in March 2012. Three additional edits have been made in response to subsequent comments received after the March 2012 Board committees, and can be found in Strategies 12.3, 14.7, and 29.2.

- All other errata were documented in the February 20, 2012 version of the Draft Final MTP/SCS in underline/strikethrough. The Draft Final MTP/SCS may be viewed through SACOG’s website at: http://www.sacog.org/2035/draft-final-mtpscs.
Chapter 2
Planning Process

An update to the February 2012 version of the Draft Final MTP/SCS for 2035, Chapter 2 is shown below.
measuring Mix of Uses; this measure received the highest number of votes at 91. The next highest priority was Percent of New Housing Units and Job Growth within ½-mile of high-frequency transit. Both of these measures were categorized in the Smart Land Use principle for the MTP/SCS. The third-highest measure at 52 votes was Acres of Farmland Lost to Development within the Environmental Quality and Sustainability principle. Participants were not asked to prioritize interest in the new GHG measure, as it was required of SACOG to address. Input was sought from participants on what new optional measures should be prioritized.

Recommendations of the focus groups for new performance measures are shown in Table 2.3 below. The full list of measures prioritized and additional recommendations by the focus groups are in Appendix G-3. Also in the appendix are individual focus group summaries that show how the group voted in comparison with all focus groups and narrative discussion highlighting key comments by each group. Several of these performance measures were used to describe the three MTP/SCS scenarios discussed at the public workshops described below; however, many more performance measures are also used to describe the performance of the plan. Performance measure outcomes are discussed in Chapters 3, 5, 7, 8, 9 and 10. A complete list of all of the performance measures used in the MTP/SCS is in Appendix G-6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>New Performance Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle miles traveled</td>
<td>Number of passenger vehicle miles traveled (i.e., cars/light-duty trucks) per capita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(VMT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion</td>
<td>Number of vehicle miles traveled per capita on congested roadways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of hours of travel delay per capita, or per traveler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit ridership</td>
<td>Number of transit trips per capita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of transit passenger boardings per capita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpooling</td>
<td>Percent of work trips by carpool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycling and walking</td>
<td>Number of bike and walk person trips per capita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent of work/school commute trips by bike/walk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation emissions</td>
<td>Greenhouse gases emitted per capita, relative to year 2005 per capita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total greenhouse gases emitted, relative to year 2005 Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit productivity</td>
<td>Number of passenger boardings per vehicle service mile, split by light rail vs. different bus types</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2.3 continued
**Recommendations of Focus Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>New Performance Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population and Employment Change</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Growth</td>
<td>Adding several interim years to population growth from 2008 to 2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adding several interim years to housing growth from 2008 to 2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adding several interim years to job growth from 2008 to 2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic Changes</td>
<td>Information on changes in age, income, and other household demographics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Blueprint Growth and Change to Urban Form</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Percent of jobs within 20-minute commute of households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent of jobs within 45-minute transit ride of households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mix of Use</td>
<td>Residential mix index (0-100 scale)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment center mix index (0-100 scale)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit-Oriented Development</td>
<td>Percent of housing and job growth in high-frequency transit service areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Natural Resources</td>
<td>Number of acres and percent? of farmland affected by development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of acres and percent? of natural resource lands affected by development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Vitality</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost of Travel</td>
<td>Cost per capita of travel and auto ownership (includes cost of auto ownership, auto maintenance and operation, transit fare, parking costs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Vehicle Congestion</td>
<td>Congestion on freeways and major commercial vehicle routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equity and Choice</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure to Traffic Growth(^2)</td>
<td>Percent of population near high-traffic roadways, split by environmental justice and all other areas(^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safety and Health</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collisions</td>
<td>Collisions per vehicle mile traveled</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^2\) This measure was included in the environmental justice analysis in Chapter 8; however, the science behind exposure to high-traffic roadways is still evolving. Please see pages 8-34 and 8-35 for issues in measuring this metric. Many other performance measures are important to environmental justice. For this reason, a full suite of environmental justice measures is described in detail in Chapter 8 as well.
Chapter 3
Summary of Growth and Land Use Forecast

An update to the February 2012 version of the Draft Final MTP/SCS for 2035, Chapter 3 is shown below.
Figure 3.2 MTP/SCS with Blueprint Footprint Reference with TPA

MTP/SCS Community Types
- Center/Corridor Community
- Developing Community
- Established Community
- Rural Residential Community
- Lands not Identified for Development in the MTP/SCS Planning Period

Legend
- Draft Transit Priority Areas (TPA*)
- Blueprint Growth Footprint Not Identified for Development in the MTP/SCS Planning Period
- Blueprint Vacant Urban Land Not Identified for Development in the MTP/SCS Planning Period
- City Boundaries
- Water Features
- County Boundaries
- SACOG Planning Area

*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.
Chapter 6
Policies and Supportive Strategies

An update to the February 2012 version of the Draft Final MTP/SCS for 2035, Chapter 6 is shown below.
1.5 **Strategy:** Work with local jurisdiction staff to develop and maintain a development activity tracking tool, for use in local and regional planning, and to assess growth patterns both at the local and regional level.

2. **Policy:** SACOG intends to educate and provide information to policymakers, local staff, and the public about the mutually supportive relationship between smart growth development, transportation, and resource conservation.

2.1. **Strategy:** Provide computer software, training and technical assistance to local governments.

2.2. **Strategy:** Monitor and report on the transportation and air quality impacts of development patterns and their relationship to Blueprint growth principles.

2.3. **Strategy:** Monitor and report on commute patterns for all modes, traffic levels, and transit use and bicycle and pedestrian mode share compared with the projections in this MTP/SCS.

2.4. **Strategy:** Develop educational materials to inform local discussions, particularly in infill areas, about neighborhood travel behavior, health and the effects of higher density on traffic, transit, walking and bicycling.

2.5. **Strategy:** Continue to develop and apply health and social equity analysis methods and performance measures to help inform MTP/SCS updates and local discussions on development patterns, including transportation performance measures and opportunities related to accessibility, equity, public health and youth.

2.6. **Strategy:** Assist with mapping and coordination between SACOG, transit, and health and human service providers on transit planning and siting of lifeline services needing transit access. Develop educational materials and life-cycle methodology on public facility planning that incorporates the costs of extending transit service to locations outside existing transit corridors.

2.7 **Strategy:** During the design phase, review transportation projects to assess whether they foster transportation choices, improve local community circulation and provide access to opportunities or divide communities, and either avoid or mitigate negative impacts (including those to public health, safety, air quality, housing and the environment).

2.8. **Strategy:** Continue Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) efforts that promote good land use planning around airports, minimize public safety hazards, and support the utility of each airport.

2.9 **Strategy:** Strengthen SACOG’s modeling tools with the development of an economic land use model based on the PECAS framework. This model may support regional economic development efforts and inform a wide range of MTP/SCS efforts, including jobs-housing fit (i.e., the relationship between housing costs and wages around an employment center), infill incentives, congestion and parking pricing, and transportation project phasing.
2.10 **Strategy:** Provide technical analysis and education to inform policy and decision makers, local staff, and regional stakeholders about the benefits of strategic growth management on the region’s open space resources and the economic and environmental benefits they provide.

3. **Policy:** SACOG will encourage local jurisdictions in developing community activity centers well-suited for high quality transit service and complete streets.

3.1. **Strategy:** Support development proposals that are well-suited and located to support high-quality transit use in Transit Priority Areas, through Blueprint analysis.

3.2. **Strategy:** Continue to identify best practices for complete streets, continue to add to the Complete Streets Toolkit, and initiate a technical assistance program to help local agencies develop street designs that are sensitive to their surroundings and context.

3.3. **Strategy:** Establish regional guidance for high-capacity transit station area planning.

3.4. **Strategy:** Support efforts by transit agencies and local governments to site and design transit centers and stations close to economic centers and neighborhoods and to expand park-and-ride facilities at a few key stations.

3.5. **Strategy:** Encourage local agencies to develop an interconnected system of streets, bikeways, and walkways that support a more compact development form; avoid building new circulation barriers; accommodate safe travel for all users; and provide connections across creeks, freeways and high-speed/high volume arterials and through existing gated communities, walls and cul-de-sacs to access schools, activity centers and transit stops.

3.6. **Strategy:** Encourage development patterns that provide safe and efficient pedestrian and bicycle access to transit stops and trunk commuter transit lines.

3.7. **Strategy:** Conduct a research study and perform travel modeling and air emissions analysis to identify alternatives for local governments to use to modify current parking regulations to create incentives for people to use alternative modes. Study will be conducted with local governments and air districts; findings will be presented to all related and essential parties.

4. **Policy:** SACOG encourages every local jurisdiction’s efforts to pursue facilitate development of housing in all price ranges, to meet the housing needs of the local workforce and population, including low-income residents, and forestall pressure for long external commuting trips to work and essential services.

4.1. **Strategy:** Develop the required Regional Housing Needs Plan to guide local agencies’ assessments of housing supply and price ranges.

4.2. **Strategy:** Encourage adequate supply of housing at a variety of price ranges in the region, which will help to meet local demand and prevent the export of housing to adjacent regions, and, consistent with federal and state statutory goals, promote integrated and balanced living patterns that help provide access and opportunity for all residents and reduce the concentration of poverty.
4.3. **Strategy**: Continue to develop tools to assist local jurisdictions in assessing housing needs in a variety of price ranges, including jobs-housing fit tool and housing plus transportation cost analysis.

4.4. **Strategy**: Identify appropriate best practices for successful transit-oriented development in different settings through case studies from this MTP/SCS, and continue to assist local governments with environmental review to capitalize on SB 375 CEQA benefits for residential and residential mixed-use Transit Priority Projects.

4.5. **Strategy**: Provide support for jurisdictions to overcome common issues identified in local analyses of impediments to fair housing and a regional analysis funded by federal grant funding from HUD.

5. **Policy**: SACOG should continue to inform local governments and businesses about a regional strategy for siting industry and warehousing with good freight access.

5.1. **Strategy**: Work to identify and preserve land uses to meet goods movement needs of local, nearby customers.

5.2. **Strategy**: Study and consider the need for land for suppliers, distributors, and other businesses with a regional clientele that may prefer to be near the center of the region with good freeway access, but do not need high-cost center-city sites.

5.3. **Strategy**: Further study and consider the needs of the agricultural industry for aggregation and distribution, cold storage, warehousing, processing plants, and other facilities near transportation access.

5.4. **Strategy**: Share goods movement research and information completed through the RUCS to inform the work of the Next Economy - Capital Region Prosperity Plan, the region’s current recession recovery plan under development.

6. **Policy**: SACOG encourages local governments to direct greenfield developments to areas immediately adjacent to the existing urban edge through data-supported information, incentives and pursuit of regulatory reform for cities and counties.

6.1. **Strategy**: Minimize the urban growth footprint of the region by improving interior circulation and access instead of access to and beyond the urban edge.

6.2. **Strategy**: Provide incentives and invest in alternative modes to serve infill and more compact development.

6.3. **Strategy**: Seek out funding to acquire conservation easements accompanying specific regional connector road projects, to protect land from development in areas that are not intended or zoned for development.

6.4. **Strategy**: Continue to pursue regulatory reform at the state and national levels to remove barriers to environmentally sensitive greenfield developments when appropriate at the edges of existing urbanization.
6.5. **Strategy**: Encourage local jurisdictions to use RUCS data and tools to analyze possible impacts to agriculture and natural resources from the urban growth footprint.

7. **Policy**: Implement the Rural-Urban Connection Strategy (RUCS) which ensures good rural-urban connections and promotes the economic viability of rural lands while also protecting open space resources to expand and support the implementation of the Blueprint growth strategy and the MTP/SCS.

7.1. **Strategy**: Use research, data and modeling to inform a stakeholder-driven process to conceptualize approaches to sustainable rural land use policies encompassing, at a minimum, issues such as agricultural practices, natural resource and agricultural land conservation, economic development and market influences (including markets for energy, carbon sequestration and other environmental services), rural development practices (including methods to encourage jobs-housing fit and minimize the impact of rural development on agriculture), and infrastructure needs.

7.2. **Strategy**: Ensure consistency between the RUCS and local Habitat Conservation Plans and Natural Communities Conservation Plans.

7.3. **Strategy**: Ensure that the RUCS is coordinated with the Blueprint and MTP/SCS to support each of these planning efforts individually, as well as collectively.

7.4. **Strategy**: Conduct analysis on how various rural land use strategies affect vehicle miles of travel, mode share and air emissions, as well as rural economic viability and environmental sustainability.

7.5. **Strategy**: Invest in transportation projects that help implement the RUCS recommendations. Investment recommendations may include agritourism-related and goods movement projects and funding rural road improvements between cities when the county implements growth patterns consistent with the Blueprint.

7.6. **Strategy**: Support improved farm-to-market access, including investments along key rural truck corridors and cost-effective short-line railways and connectivity improvements to the Port of West Sacramento.

7.7. **Strategy**: Continue to refine SACOG funding criteria to ensure that they adequately recognize the unique needs of rural areas and provide proper incentives to reward rural land use and transportation practices that benefit the region and local areas.

8. **Policy**: Support and invest in strategies to reduce vehicle emissions that can be shown as cost effective to help achieve and maintain clean air and better public health.

8.1. **Strategy**: Continue the region’s previous commitment to Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs as a strategy for education and promotion of alternative travel modes for all types of trips toward reducing Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) by 10 percent.
11.3. **Strategy:** Promote competition in the delivery of services, to foster greater efficiency, innovation, and diversity of options, including consideration of revised public agency arrangements, public-private partnerships or contracting out.

11.4 **Strategy:** Advocate for greater flexibility in the use of federal and state formula funds towards system maintenance purposes, especially in rural areas that are particularly limited in the available funding for these purposes.

12. **Policy:** SACOG should support authority for local option funding sources to allow local areas to customize transportation funding and investment for maintenance and operation of the existing system and expansion to meet future needs.

12.1. **Strategy:** Seek authority to set up funding sources for transit operations and road maintenance that can be controlled and adjusted at the local level, so that local agencies can consider using them when needed to support existing and expanded transit services and keep the existing road system in a state of good repair.

12.2. **Strategy:** Seek funding sources that are indexed to growth and inflation to pay for basic maintenance and operations.

12.3. **Strategy:** Support local agencies that seek to collaborate on inter-jurisdictional funding options.

13. **Policy:** SACOG invests federal and state funds that come to SACOG to achieve regional policies and priorities, as described in more detail in the sections that follow.

13.1. **Strategy:** Seek adequate funding so local agencies can maintain and rehabilitate streets and roads to a good state of repair into the future, encompassing more adequate state funding and local option funding authority to preserve regional funding for improvement and expansion of the urban and rural trunk highway and road system.

13.2. **Strategy:** Support new or increased funding resources for local agencies to enable operation of existing and expanded transit services, and maintenance and replacement of equipment and facilities, including local-option funding sources adequate to preserve regional funding for service expansion. Assist agencies with increasing trip reporting to the FTA’s National Transit Database (NTD) to help increase federal transit funding for the region.

13.3. **Strategy:** Encourage cities and counties to collect development-based fees or funding sufficient for both local road improvements and regional-scale road, transit and/or bicycle pedestrian improvements so that regional-scale improvements can be built in a timely way, since SACOG’s regional funding can meet only 25-30 percent of regional project costs in this MTP.

13.4. **Strategy:** Encourage local agencies to fund local arterial access and traffic capacity projects with local development-based fees supplemented with other local funds as appropriate.

13.5. **Strategy:** Study, coordinate discussions, and explore options for establishing a region-wide program dedicated to funding the growing need for roadway improvements and reconstruction.
and mitigation of community impacts on designated arterial truck routes and arterial roads that large trucks commonly use.

13.6. **Strategy:** Support the implementation of mitigation measures for environmental impacts identified at the project-level of analysis through conditioning regional transportation funds. For a project to receive funds managed through SACOG, the sponsoring agency must provide the mitigation monitoring plan and demonstrate adherence to mitigation measures in the certified project-level environmental document.

14. **Policy:** SACOG should look for specialized funding programs, and/or one-time funds at the state or federal level, and work with local agencies to bring in such funds to start innovative projects or advance specific projects that are well-matched to program goals.

14.1. **Strategy:** Keep apprised of federal and state program funding cycles and specific funding opportunities, advise local agencies about them in a timely way, and help to zero in on projects that fit program requirements and are far enough along in delivery to maximize chances for success at bringing federal or state discretionary funds into the region.

14.2. **Strategy:** Help coordinate multi-agency packages of projects for federal and state discretionary programs and grants, where a regional strategy seems likely to improve the chances of success.

14.3. **Strategy:** Fund some project development specifically to create a stock of key hard-to-implement projects ready for ad hoc funding opportunities.

14.4. **Strategy:** Help local agencies get funding from specific safety programs for safety and security improvements.

14.5 **Strategy:** Increase rural transportation mobility by supporting greater coordination of rural transportation services and develop implementation strategies for successful and cost-effective programs, including volunteer driving programs and expanded rural vanpools.

14.6 **Strategy:** Cooperate with federal and state initiatives designed to better integrate planning and actions across multiple disciplines.

14.7 **Strategy:** Cooperate on new initiatives that more fully integrate transportation planning efforts with economic development issues and opportunities in urban and rural areas.

15. **Policy:** Manage state and federal funding that comes into the region so as to simplify and expedite project delivery, including working out ways to exchange various types of funds among local agencies and projects.

15.1. **Strategy:** Seek to pool funds and programs wherever reasonable and feasible, to increase flexibility in the use of funds and delivery of projects.

15.2. **Strategy:** Use available funding to the greatest reasonable extent to ensure timely construction of currently deliverable projects, and shift future funding commitments to projects
that will be delivered in the future. Take into consideration availability of future operating funds when programming construction funds.

15.3. **Strategy:** Seek to focus federal funds on a limited number of projects that must by law be subject to federal requirements, so that many other projects can be funded through sources that allow them to avoid lengthy and/or costly federal requirements and processes.

15.4. **Strategy:** Support judicious use of bonding and other financial tools to enable earlier construction of projects, and consider use of regional funds to supplement or enhance revenue bonding tools when appropriate.

**16. Policy:** Study ways to use pricing more effectively in funding of transportation.

16.1. **Strategy:** Study ways that parking pricing can help achieve objectives of the MTP/SCS, including encouragement of walking, bicycling, transit use, vanpooling, carpooling, support for more intensive land uses, revenue for alternative modes, and surcharges for policy purposes.

16.2. **Strategy:** Seek at an appropriate opportunity a federal Value Pricing Pilot Program grant from the Federal Highway Administration to examine road and auto pricing options, such as high occupancy toll lanes or bridges, pay-at-the-pump auto insurance, or auto loans.

**System Maintenance & Operations Policies and Strategies**

Transportation agencies should keep existing facilities in a state of good repair and continue operation of current services, as a higher priority than system expansion. This responsibility falls primarily to local agencies, since federal and state funds that come to SACOG are mostly limited to capital purposes. Traffic operations improvements can produce more efficiency out of the existing road system. Planning for greater multimodal use as part of roadway maintenance and rehabilitation projects can be an economical way to provide more complete streets. The region could benefit from attention to more efficient truck movement and delivery, which has been growing faster than other traffic and spreading into suburban areas. Through the RUCS work, SACOG is looking at ways to support and plan for smoother truck traffic flow.

The transit system, comprised of a complex mix of services and agencies, can gain efficiency from better coordination of diverse services, better service features, and greater ridership. The current system focuses on lifeline service to those who are transit dependent and low-income and minority areas. Much of the potential for more effective transit service must come from services tailored to attracting riders who otherwise could drive in addition to preserving services for the transit-dependent. Transportation demand management ties this all together, by helping people find ways to travel besides by driving alone. The following policies and strategies express regional expectations about maintenance and operation of the existing transportation system.

**17. Policy:** Acknowledge and support preservation of the existing road and highway system as the top priority for local public works agencies and Caltrans, and expect to help them secure adequate funding sources for necessary work.
17.1. **Strategy:** Encourage and support Caltrans in seeking traffic management and safety improvements along with highway rehabilitation projects from the State Highway Operations and Protection Program. Ensure that both urban and rural needs are targeted.

17.2. **Strategy:** Consider public-private partnerships and competitive service contracts for maintenance and operations, for a more efficient system.

17.3. **Strategy:** Expect local agencies to examine and consider traffic operational strategies and investments as temporary improvements to buy time or develop lower-cost ultimate alternatives for capital projects for road expansion, with SACOG to consider such projects as a high priority for regional funding.

17.4 **Strategy:** Assist local agencies in seeking funding to develop effective pavement management systems that can assist in the evaluation, analysis, and prioritization of maintenance and rehabilitation needs on urban and rural local streets and roads.

17.5 **Strategy:** Support local agencies in developing multi-year maintenance and rehabilitation programs that enable early identification of cost-effective enhancements to improve pedestrian and bicycle access and safety.

18. **Policy:** Support the development and implementation of Corridor System Management Plans as a method of integrating transportation system operational management and regional planning so as to maximize system efficiency and effectiveness.

18.1. **Strategy:** Participate in the ongoing development and implementation of Corridor System Management Plans (CSMP) for the following corridors:

- Interstate 80: State Route 113 to Sierra College Boulevard
- Highway 50: Interstate 80 to Camino
- State Route 99: San Joaquin County Line to Highway 50, Interstate 5 to State Route 20
- Interstate 5: Hood-Franklin to Sacramento International Airport
- State Route 65: Interstate 80 to State Route 70

18.2. **Strategy:** Encourage all stakeholders to actively participate in the development and implementation of each CSMP.

18.3. **Strategy:** Coordinate SACOG transportation modeling and data collection activities with the travel forecasting and analysis activities associated with each CSMP.

18.4 **Strategy:** Continue to work with and seek grant funding from state and federal agencies working to align resources for long-range transportation and land use planning, such as the Federal Partnership for Sustainable Communities and the California Strategic Growth Council

19. **Policy:** Ensure coordination among all forms of existing and expanded transit services, including those provided by social services agencies, for a more effective system.
19.1. **Strategy:** Use timely updates of short range transit plans, the coordinated human services transportation plan, and periodic performance audits to provide guidance on priorities and estimates of funding needs and shortfalls.

19.2. **Strategy:** Support more seamless trips through better traveler information for trip planning (Intelligent Transportation Systems), reliable schedules, coordination between operators for transfers, service changes, complementary services, information available at transit stops, and implementation of the Connect Card, a universal fare card.

20. **Policy:** SACOG should work with transit operators to pursue improvements to transit access, security, comfort, schedules and information whenever opportunities arise.

20.1. **Strategy:** Seek to improve transit access, via safe and pleasant sidewalks and walkways around transit stops, designated bike routes and directional signage, accessibility for the disabled, on-board bike racks, better signs for transit access, shelters and improved transfer points, and secure bike storage facilities and park-and-ride locations.

20.2. **Strategy:** Build on Lifeline Transit Study findings to improve transit and supplemental transportation services for medical appointments by studying effective alternatives and increased connectivity to help meet cross-county health care transportation needs.

20.3. **Strategy:** Take steps to improve safety and security at crosswalks, transit stops, and along main access routes to transit, including rural areas, with higher priority for low income, minority, and high crime areas.

20.4. **Strategy:** Improve connections among all forms of transit service, by seeking better coordinated schedules among operators, more convenient and comfortable transfer locations, notice and coordination of schedule changes, next-bus signs at high use stops, and better trip planning tools and public communication.

20.5 **Strategy:** Implement Connect Card universal fare card and support outreach and marketing in jurisdictions implementing the Connect Card system.

20.6 **Strategy:** Support local jurisdictions and transit operators in implementing the findings of the Downtown Sacramento Transit Circulation Study.

21. **Policy:** SACOG should develop guidelines for rural transit services, as a lifeline for non-drivers and park-and-ride service for commuters.

21.1. **Strategy:** Preserve existing rural transit and paratransit service levels, but examine them periodically to ensure effectiveness for transit-dependent residents.

21.2. **Strategy:** Consider specialty transit services for agricultural areas seasonally and for tourist attractions and events.

22. **Policy:** SACOG in partnership with community and employer organizations intends to support proactive and innovative education and transportation demand management.
programs covering all parts of the urbanized area, to offer a variety of choices to driving alone.

22.1. **Strategy:** Increase public perception of the value, benefits, and use of transit, vanpool and rideshare services, via activities such as an enhanced 511 website, image and product-specific advertising, promotion of new and restructured services, the regional guaranteed ride home program, outreach for special events, and education for those unfamiliar with alternative modes, including transit services and bicycle facilities, with both access and safety education.

22.2. **Strategy:** Expand Transportation Management Associations (TMAs) and outreach partners to provide education and advocacy programs across the region’s six county area, with broader focus on alternative travel choices for all trip types.

22.3. **Strategy:** Assist TMAs to broaden and update rideshare databases, offer incentives for taking alternative modes or teleworking, offer specialty services such as vanpooling, carsharing, or subscription bus service where feasible, expand promotional campaigns, and reach out to the public with personalized alternative trip planning and instant ridematching.

23. **Policy:** SACOG expects operators to plan for service to transit-dependent populations – disabled, low-income, senior, youth – within a context of service to attract riders who now drive.

23.1. **Strategy:** Improve transit services and options for people with disabilities, disabled, low-income, and youth passengers by ensuring all vehicles and facilities are safe and accessible, access routes to transit stops are safe and accessible where feasible, drivers are trained about regulations and good practices, and transfers are convenient and usable.

23.2. **Strategy:** Prepare for a large increase in the senior population by using Universal Design features, such as low-floor vehicles, automatic doorways, flatter walkways and curb ramps, and handrails, to enable seniors to safely use regular transit services wherever possible and preserve limited paratransit resources for those who cannot travel without direct assistance.

23.3. **Strategy:** Continue to follow up on findings and outcomes from the 2011 Lifeline Transit Study with the Transit Coordinating Committee in order to inform transit agency decisions on critical service restoration priorities.

24. **Policy:** SACOG intends to strive to ensure community outreach to low income and minority communities whose needs and concerns otherwise might be overlooked.

24.1. **Strategy:** Ensure transportation system improvements provide equitable and adequate access by road and transit to low-income and minority communities.

24.2. **Strategy:** Ensure that projects to serve those communities with greater transit needs are explicitly considered in the MTP/SCS and, when programming funds, pursue specific federal or state funding grants available for this purpose, and seek better coordination of all types of transit services and connections for these communities.
24.3. **Strategy:** Examine commute pattern travel needs of those in job placement programs such as Cal-Works, those working non-traditional employment shifts, and those with reverse commutes as a guide to transit and supplemental travel service improvements.

24.4. **Strategy:** Seek to facilitate and deploy cost-effective supplemental transportation options, including shared ride arrangements, volunteer drivers, taxi vouchers, community travel companions, cost and fare-sharing, and mobility training on transit and bicycle/pedestrian options, to complement existing public transit and social service transportation.

24.5. **Strategy:** Ensure thorough examination, context sensitive design, and mitigation of transportation system impacts wherever feasible, particularly localized air quality and noise impacts, when building improvements in low-income and minority communities adjacent to freeways, major roadways, and railroad corridors.

24.6. **Strategy:** Continue to make available free-of-charge multilingual video and guidebook on transit, bicycling, walking, and carpooling in the region to individuals, community- and faith-based organizations, as well as on the SacRegion 511 website.

**25. Policy:** SACOG should study, consult with, and help coordinate local agency activities to provide for smoother movement of truck freight through and throughout the region.

25.1. **Strategy:** Improve SACOG’s regional freight forecasting tools, including a periodically updated commodity flow survey that includes both consumer goods and agricultural products, upgraded economic model, shipping and trucking industry contacts to spot and verify trends, ability to estimate up or down from limited data points, and annual truck counts at key locations.

25.2. **Strategy:** Maintain a goods movement advisory group to share information about evolving freight patterns, technologies, and shipping needs, and identify, examine, and coordinate government policies, activities, and improvement projects that can make goods movement more efficient and reduce impacts in both urban and rural areas.

25.3. **Strategy:** Collect reliable information about urban and rural impacts of the logistics industry and the customers it serves, pertaining to infrastructure demands and safety, emissions, noise, and traffic impacts from trucks, and review the implications for nearby and downstream communities when local agencies consider permits for commercial and industrial businesses that involve significant amounts of truck traffic.

25.4. **Strategy:** Identify and reconsider regulatory and institutional barriers that hamper efficient truck travel patterns, identify an adequate number of preferred truck routes for efficient truck access into and across jurisdictions within the region, and actively seek solutions to accommodate truck access and traffic along corridors that do not create significant conflicts with adjacent land uses and minimize community concerns.

25.5. **Strategy:** Consider adding or changing features of projects to facilitate truck travel.

25.6. **Strategy:** Identify and consider projects that could expand the market for shipping freight by rail, merchant ship, or short line railways and that offer an alternative to trucking for more
kinds of freight shipments, such as a deeper port channel, rail intermodal transfer points, and better intermodal connections for trucks to carry goods the “last mile” for delivery.

2.5.7. **Strategy:** Support local jurisdictions and transit operators in implementing the findings of the Downtown Sacramento Transit Circulation Study.

26. **Policy:** SACOG intends to preserve some capacity on major freeways within the region for freight and other interregional traffic by providing additional capacity for local and regional traffic on major arterials running parallel to the major freeways.

   26.1. **Strategy:** Seek to coordinate regional truck routes for large trucks, and expect local agencies to include truck access policies and strategies in mixed-use and large commercial/industrial developments.

   26.2. **Strategy:** Support rail and highway investments that route freight around, not through, the region.

   26.3. **Strategy:** Open up interregional highway capacity only when goods movement and non-commute traffic warrants it. Evidence of this need can also occur when local roadways bear the burden of goods movement activity diverted from congested highways.

### System Expansion Policies and Strategies

Although the region projects slower growth through 2035, it must expand the system to meet the current and future needs of residents. A key part of the system expansion includes planning for the areas that are most likely to grow. With neither funding nor political will to expand the system at the same rate as the projected population growth, road and transit expansion must be carefully targeted to achieve the region’s growth and quality of life objectives. The MTP/SCS will double transit service, tailored to Center and Corridor and Established Communities, to bring in riders who now drive and more fare revenues to support operation of the larger system needed to do that.

Complete streets, designed for walking, bicycling and transit as well as autos, can offer good alternatives to driving locally, and reduce need for overall road expansion. However, roads must also be expanded strategically, to provide good access for infill development, support bus transit, and confine congestion to peak commute hours (a standard condition for robust urban economies nationwide). This region is unlikely to support significant freeway widening or new freeways, so it must conserve a portion of existing freeway capacity for trucking and interregional travel by providing alternatives for regional and local travel. Residents should have more access to high-frequency transit, bicycle and walking options to goods, services and amenities. The following 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 expansion.

27. **Policy:** Support road, transit, and bridge expansion investments that are supportive of MTP/SCS land use patterns.
first/transit-second strategies for suburban job centers until employment density indicates a shift.

28.9. **Strategy:** Seek to develop good bus transit service with heavy established ridership as a precursor to investment in rail transit, to ensure return on the high capital investment for rail.

28.10. **Strategy:** Factor in the benefit of rail transit as a permanent investment, with stronger ability to attract transit-oriented development patterns around it, where local smart growth planning and the real estate market already promise development dense enough to support rail investment.

28.11. **Strategy:** When a transit route or service fills to capacity, examine complementary service of another type as an alternative simply to adding capacity to the route that is full.

28.12. **Strategy:** When planning high-quality transit along light rail, regional rail and high speed rail corridors, also plan for supportive features that include sidewalks and walkways, passenger shelters, or transfer stations, next-bus notification signs, signal preemption and park-and-ride lots.

**29. Policy:** SACOG encourages locally determined developments consistent with Blueprint principles and local circulation plans to be designed with walking, bicycling and transit use as primary transportation considerations.

29.1. **Strategy:** Invest in safe bicycle and pedestrian routes that improve connectivity and access to common destinations, such as connections between residential areas and schools, work sites, neighborhood shopping, and transit stops and stations. Also invest in safe routes to and around schools so trips can be made by bicycling or walking.

29.2. **Strategy:** Invest toward the eventual creation of a regional bicycle and pedestrian network, connecting first those communities that already have good local circulation networks in place, but also supporting efforts throughout the region to improve connectivity and realize public health benefits from these investments.

29.3. **Strategy:** Utilize the Planners Committee, Regional Planning Partnership and Transit Coordinating Committee to better coordinate information-sharing between jurisdictions on transit, bicycle and pedestrian improvements to ensure connected routes, sharing of effective ideas, and more complete public information.

29.4. **Strategy:** Continue to support improved bicycle and pedestrian connectivity through SACOG’s Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian and Community Design Grant funding programs and maintaining program criteria that regional road rehabilitation projects include complete streets or complete corridor features.

29.5 **Strategy:** Help facilitate improved coordination between transit agencies, public works departments and local land use authorities in planning new developments that are transit-, bicycle-, and pedestrian-supportive and timed so that new facilities and transit services are more likely to be available at the time the new growth occurs.
30. **Policy:** SACOG also gives primary priority to selective road expansion, to support infill development and forestall midday congestion.

30.1. **Strategy:** Pursue strategic road expansion that improves congestion and supports effective transit services, walking and bicycling.

30.2. **Strategy:** Expect that feasibility and corridor studies, project study reports, and environmental studies will consider high-quality transit, bicycle and pedestrian investments when examining how to provide additional capacity on main highway or bridge corridors.

30.3. **Strategy:** Pursue strategic road expansion that reduces congestion on access routes to areas with significant infill development.

30.4. **Strategy:** Give priority for roadway and intersection expansion to routes where midday demand approaches existing capacity or excessive peak period demand threatens to spill over into midday, so no part of the system fails to function continuously for much of the day.

30.5. **Strategy:** Support expansion of trunk arterials that provide access to job centers and freeway interchanges to provide enough capacity to forestall traffic diversion through neighborhood streets.

30.6. **Strategy:** Provide technical guidance to local agencies and invest regional funds to build complete streets projects through designated and planned community activity centers, to ensure bicycles, pedestrians, and transit can share the road safely and compatibly with autos.

31. **Policy:** As long as the existing funding and program structure remains essentially as it is today, SACOG intends to invest funds that are at SACOG's discretion, following these policy guidelines:

31.1. **Strategy:** Continue to use funds coming through SACOG to fund regional objectives for air quality, community design, transportation demand management, and bicycle and pedestrian programs. The funding level should be proportionally at least as great as programming levels since the regional programs began in 2003.

31.2. **Strategy:** Continue to help fund regional-scale and local investments across urban, suburban, small community and rural areas with the priorities and performance outcomes to be endorsed by the SACOG Board prior to the biennial funding cycle.
Attachment 2: New Comments Received on Draft Final Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy for 2035

The Draft Final Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy for 2035 (dated February 20, 2012) and all comments received through February 17, 2012 were presented to the SACOG Board policy committees for information and feedback in March 2012. Comments received through February 17, 2012 were included in Appendix G-7 of the Draft Final Plan. The information included in this attachment reflects only the information that has been added to Appendix G-7 since the March Board Committees. A full version of Appendix G-7, including all comments, responses and master responses may be viewed through SACOG’s website at: http://www.sacog.org/2035/draft-mtpscs-released/

This Attachment 2 includes additional comments received on the Draft Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS) from February 17, 2012 through March 26, 2012. The following additions to Appendix G-7: Comments on the Draft Plan and Responses to Comments are included in this attachment:

- An update to Chapter 2- List of Commenters, which reflects the comments received from February 17, 2012 to March 26, 2012.

- An update to Chapter 3- Comments and Responses, which includes the comments received from February 17, 2012 to March 26, 2012 and the draft staff responses.

- An update to Chapter 4- Summaries of Elected Official Information Meetings, which includes a summary of the Sutter County Elected Information Session that was held on March 8, 2012.
CHAPTER 2 – LIST OF COMMENTERS

An update to the February 2012 version of Appendix G-7, Chapter 2 is shown below. The following is a list of commenters who provided comments from February 17, 2012 through March 26, 2012.

79- Governor’s Office of Planning and Research/California Department of Public Health/Department of General Services, Chris Ganson, Linda Rudolph, Anne Garbeff 3/1/2012
80- Legal Services of Northern California, Mona Tawatao 3/1/2012
81- Coalition on Regional Equity (CORE), Kendra Bridges 3/1/2012
82- Private Citizen, John Larimer 3/8/2012
83- Private Citizen, Debra Gaylord 3/8/2012
84- Private Citizen, Dan Silva 3/8/2012
85- Private Citizen, Santos Vigil 3/8/2012
86- County of Yolo Board of Supervisors, Jim Provenza 3/13/2012
87- Delta Stewardship Council, Cindy Messer 3/23/2012
CHAPTER 3 – COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

An update to the February 2012 version of Appendix G-7, Chapter 3 is shown below. This chapter contains individual responses to comments received from February 16, 2012 through March 26, 2012.
March 1, 2012

Mike McKeever
Executive Director
Sacramento Area Council of Governments
1415 L Street, Suite 300
Sacramento, California 95814

Dear Mr. McKeever,

The Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) appreciates this opportunity to provide input on the Sacramento Area Council of Governments’ (SACOG) 2035 Draft Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). This letter highlights elements of the MTP we believe can serve as examples to other Metropolitan Planning Organizations’ (MPOs) Regional Transportation Plans (RTPs) and Sustainable Communities Strategies (SCS), and also opportunities for improvement. Additionally, we enclose comments shared with us by the California Department of Public Health and the California Department of General Services.

SACOG’s MTP is a performance-based plan that is grounded in empirical data and that uses performance metrics to guide development of land use scenarios and investment in transportation infrastructure. The MTP applies advanced and transparent modeling to measure expected performance of the plan in a technically sound and clearly written document. SACOG’s plan will assist decision-makers and the public to better understand the broad implications of transportation and land use decisions. The plan’s achievements include a 16 percent reduction in greenhouse gases (GHGs) by 2035, among the largest of any MPO over that timeframe. It directs more money to active transportation infrastructure and projects a substantial increase in active mode share, which will reduce congestion and benefit health and the environment. We look forward to working with SACOG as it proceeds with implementation of this plan.

Specific comments and suggestions are provided below.

Performance-Based Planning

SACOG’s work on the MTP has advanced the state of the art in performance-based planning (planning based on projected performance of transportation and land use strategies and scenarios). This MTP demonstrates SACOG’s ability and commitment to provide the information needed to understand the outcomes of the plan, and provides the basis for broadly informed decision-making from a diverse set of stakeholders.

SACOG is the first MPO to deploy an Activity-Based Model (ABM) in developing its transportation plan. An ABM provides more detailed information on travel behavior, which better informs transportation and land use decision-making by providing a more
detailed picture of travel patterns. The ABM’s precision reduces reliance on off-model post-processing, which is less accurate.

No transportation data or model can be perfectly precise. SACOG’s MTP employs the best available data and a state of the art model, but it also specifies explicitly where data is missing or accuracy is lacking. Further, it describes the analyses that would be possible with better data, in order to inform allocation of resources for future data collection and analysis efforts.

Determining Performance: Transparency in Modeling

Models used in regional planning are increasingly important in informing transportation and land use decisions. These decisions direct billions of dollars in infrastructure investments and influence regional and local growth patterns. Transparency of models is therefore a prerequisite to transparency in the planning process and decision-making. The 2010 California Regional Transportation Plan Guidelines require MPOs to “disseminate the methodology, results, and key assumptions of whichever models it uses in a way that would be useable and understandable to the public” (p. 52). To provide this transparency, MPOs should make the model code itself, as well as inputs, available to members of the technical public for analysis. We commend SACOG for making its transportation model available for public examination, as well as for explaining in the MTP how the model is used, discussing the context and meaning of inputs and outputs, and discussing the accuracy of its estimates. The SACOG MTP also reports critical inputs to the travel demand model. For example, the document contains a discussion about the price of gasoline in future years, and provides the estimate it uses for model calculations (p. 7-40).

Applying Performance Metrics to Inform Policy

In order to construct a performance-based plan, performance is best assessed with metrics (quantitative descriptors of factors deemed important to the planning process). Some metrics describe performance of the transportation-land use scenario, such as average travel time to work. Others describe social or environmental outcomes, such as open space consumed, percent of low income population served by high quality transit, or greenhouse gas emissions. Metrics should be carefully chosen to quantify factors that pertain to local, regional, state and federal government, and stakeholder and public interests. They should capture the effects of variations in both the transportation system and land use between scenarios.

The SACOG MTP provides thorough, technically sound, and understandable descriptions for its performance metrics, as well as sound justifications for choosing those metrics. For example, SACOG includes both vehicle miles traveled (VMT) under congested conditions and the share of VMT occurring at “optimal utilization levels” in order to more thoroughly frame the complex topic of road capacity and usage and better inform decision making (pp. 5B-20 to 5B-31).
Through its performance metrics, SACOG’s MTP provides a cogent and comprehensive description of future transportation network performance and the effect of MTP policy decisions on performance. For example, Figure 5B.9 (p. 5B-27) reveals that a small increase in transit commute ridership yields a large reduction in the share of VMT traveled in congested conditions, demonstrating that a corresponding reduction in transit funding would substantially degrade roadway conditions. By measuring the effect of various policy options on future travel patterns, the MTP provides elected officials with tools to identify the potential impacts of policy decisions, and enables the allocation of transportation funding to maximize the efficiency of the complete transportation system.

The MTP also provides a clear estimate of how and why metrics are expected to vary over time. For example, in neighborhoods with proposed development through the MTP horizon year, estimated VMT per household will rise slightly, and then decrease in later years of the MTP. The analysis shows that initially new development in outlying areas will lead to higher VMT, but over time more neighborhood-serving mixed uses will develop, increasing accessibility to nearby destinations, shortening trip distances, and reducing VMT. Both reliable data and clear interpretation of those data are needed to understand the implications of transportation planning decisions.

SACOG conducted an extensive public outreach process to determine metrics that would best inform the development of the MTP and choices between growth scenarios. The MTP provides clear and understandable reasoning for each choice of metric, as well as clear and understandable explanations of the relevance of each metric to decisions made in the MTP.

SACOG’s MTP also describes weaknesses in some traditionally used metrics, and provides alternatives to those metrics that better inform decision-making. For example, the MTP calculates traditional metrics of delay (pp. 5B14-5B15) but points out that those metrics can be misleading in a comparison involving variations in land use. It then presents a metric devised by SACOG, “VMT traveled in congestion,” which, unlike delay, is sensitive to land use and trip distance.

In sum, SACOG’s MTP stands out as a good example of transparency in modeling and performance-based plan development. By providing the best available information to decision-makers and the public, and by showing its work, SACOG enables a robust democratic process, built on a foundation of empirical data. In doing so, SACOG sets forth how future land use and infrastructure development can best serve present and future residents, the economy, and the environment.

Interpretation of Data: Providing Context

In order to make informed transportation planning decisions, decision-makers must know the breadth of available options and the long-term implications of each, based on current research and best practices. An example of the broad range of policy implications can be seen in how the SACOG MTP addresses impacts of expanding
roadways on congestion. The MTP explains, “The statement, ‘we cannot build our way out of congestion,’ is essentially correct…” (p. 9-5). The MTP provides two problems with “building our way out of congestion.” First, funding is insufficient. Gas tax receipts have decreased, leaving insufficient funding for highway expansion, and that funding has not been sufficiently supplemented or replaced from other sources. Second, the land around highways is already developed, leaving insufficient room for expansion. In addition, by reducing travel times in the short term, expansion of a congested roadway leads to greater use of the roadway. This phenomenon, called “induced demand,” is worth considering explicitly in transportation planning decisions. We note that the MTP contains a discussion of induced demand in the appendices, but not in the body of the MTP itself.

In characterizing congestion, the MTP also includes a discussion on metrics of delay. It references and compares delay metrics calculated by Caltrans and the Texas Transportation Institute (p. 5B-15). Metrics of delay, however, ignore distance as a factor in commute time. In other words, a congestion metric depicts a short commute in traffic unfavorably compared to a long commute on a clear freeway. Reliance solely on delay metrics would fail to point decision-makers to key strategies, such as compact development, to improve the function of the transportation network. SACOG provides average commute time and distance, which do capture the effects of land use strategies that improve transportation network function.

The MTP provides an updated context for transportation decision making, although tolling may be worth considering (and we note that the Southern California Association of Governments is evaluating it in its SCS). Studies suggest that roadway tolling can reduce congestion and improve system performance, while also providing revenue and human health and environmental benefits.

Developing an Internally Consistent Plan by Considering Integrated Land Use and Transportation Scenarios

SB 375 requires that land use patterns and transportation behavior be considered together. Accordingly, SACOG develops integrated land use and transportation scenarios, varying both the transportation system and land use patterns together between scenarios (Table 2.1). The development of these integrated scenarios will allow better coordination of land use and transportation policies.

Supplying Housing that Meets Market Demand and Reduces Environmental Impact

A number of recent studies, including the New California Dream by the Urban Land Institute, point to an oversupply of large lot single-family homes at present and in the future. Demographics and shifts in housing preference both play a part in this change in demand. Because large lot single-family homes consume large amounts of land, they increase the urban footprint, which can lead to both increased pressure on habitat and agricultural land, and increased VMT. This MTP describes a substantial shift from
earlier development patterns. However, an even greater shift may be needed to bring the supply of housing in line with demand.

The MTP refers to the region’s Habitat Conservation Plans for protection of the natural environment. However, completion of one of these plans has been delayed. We encourage SACOG to continue to engage the relevant parties in the development and implementation of regional conservation plans, but note that in some cases additional safeguards to protect habitat may be needed. We also note that development inconsistent with the MTP would exacerbate this problem, diverting growth from planned locations to locations where it will have an even larger environmental impact.

Quantifying the Benefits of Active Transportation

SACOG has increased the share of transportation funding designated for active transportation (i.e., pedestrian and bicycle facilities), which will provide broad benefits. The MTP quantifies some of the economic benefits of increasing active mode transportation (pp. 9-22 to 9-23), but should also include an estimate of what is probably its largest single benefit, improvement in human health. In a letter commenting on MTP-SCS / RTP-SCS development, The California Department of Public Health points out that “...the potential for reducing chronic disease and greenhouse gases appears to be large on an absolute scale, and far larger than co-benefits from fine particulate matter reductions, which are a traditional focus of health effects” (letter enclosed).

Quantifying the benefits of active transportation may help SACOG to chart a better path through policy conflicts and funding limitations. For example, the MTP points out the tradeoffs between the health benefits and risks of siting new residential development in infill areas near transit, which is in many cases subject to near roadway health impacts. That discussion of tradeoffs could be better informed if the full value of active transportation were presented.

Using Aspirational Scenarios to Inform Decision-Making at Other Levels of Government

In this MTP, SACOG puts forth a transparent and readable plan that substantially improves access to destinations, environmental outcomes, and human health. We encourage SACOG to consider scenarios that allow further concentration within the existing urban footprint and additional funding for transit and active transportation. Doing so may illuminate constraints and show what would be possible in their absence.

Implementation Monitoring: Tracking Results of the Planning Process

The MTP represents significant work in coordinating land use and transportation policies and resources in the six-county SACOG region. The benefits it projects will be realized through implementation, and in the MTP SACOG employs an array of metrics to estimate future outcomes. We suggest SACOG include an implementation-monitoring program to assess whether local jurisdictions within SACOG are approving
development in accordance with the plan. Implementation monitoring could help the region to stay on track to meet its targets as well as provide information to calibrate assumptions used in the planning process.

We appreciate SACOG's efforts to develop this MTP, as well as the past work upon which this document is based. We hope that our comments are helpful, and offer our assistance in MTP development and implementation. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at 916-324-9236 or chris.ganson@opr.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Chris Ganson
Senior Planner

For: Ken Alex
Director

cc:
Heather Fargo, SGC
Linda Rudolph, CDPH
Lynn Terry, CARB
Doug Ito, CARB
Terry Roberts, CARB
Garth Hopkins, Caltrans
Anne Garbeff, DGS

Attached:

Comments by the California Department of Public Health on the SCS Process and Plan Content

Comments by the California Department of General Services
January 19, 2012

Christopher P. Ganson, Senior Planner
Office of Planning and Research
1400 Tenth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Ganson,

We welcome the opportunity to comment on the Sustainable Community Strategies (SCS) that have recently been presented in draft or final formats by the large Metropolitan Planning Organizations. Although the California Department of Public Health does not have a regulatory role in the SB375 process, there are a number of compelling public health interests in the SCSs because of the documented health impacts of housing and transportation in combination with economic development, education, and their interactions to create healthy community environments. As the convener of the Strategic Growth Council's Health in All Policies Task Force, CDPH is working with other State agencies to optimize opportunities to improve public health and sustainability. CDPH staff has also played an educational and technical advisory role in some MPOs' discussions of performance targets and methodologies to assess project performance. CDPH also routinely interacts with local public health departments around the state, many of whom have become involved in regional SCS planning.

Our general and specific comments are detailed in the attached pages. We do note, however, that there are several health issues that fall outside of the current framework of SCSs but are concerns CDPH believes needs more attention. Although greenhouse gas reduction is a goal of the SCSs, climate change will increase risks from higher temperatures on the backdrop of an increasingly urbanized California. We feel there is a critical need to integrate urban heat island (UHI) mitigation strategies into regional and local plans that will implement transit oriented development (TOD) and in-fill development so that UHI risks are reduced as new development takes place. Access to health-promoting features of the built environment, including food systems, parks, and green space also should be integrated into planning.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or comments.

Sincerely,

Linda Rudolph, M.D., M.P.H
Deputy Director, Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion
General Comments

Health is a critical component of sustainable communities. The California Department of Public Health encourages regional planning organizations to embrace the concepts outlined in the Healthy Community framework developed by the Strategic Growth Council's Health in All Policies Task Force. Many strategies that increase community sustainability can also support improved health outcomes. For example, policies that support active transportation help Californians incorporate more health-promoting physical activity into their lives, while also advancing goals to achieve greenhouse gas emission reductions. Infill development can help to reduce urban sprawl, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and support location-efficient housing that promotes active transportation and allows workers to reap both economic and health benefits. Good health is critical for economic sustainability, increasing workforce participation and productivity, and slowing the ongoing rise in medical care expenditures, which diverts resources from other State priorities such as education or investments in green energy.

CDPH staff has reviewed the drafts and final versions of SCSs updates to the Regional Transportation Plans of the 4 large MPOs and the following comments represent a high level synthesis. First, we must laud the MPOs for the diligent work that has gone into these documents, and each represents an improvement from the original RTPs. We note an increasing number of performance measures that go beyond the traditional health focus on traffic injuries and air pollution. We refer to physical activity from active modes of travel, including bicycling, walking, and public transit that includes active transport from and to transit destinations. Noise and other physical hazards are also getting more attention as health performance measures. We also note that discussions of equity increasingly recognize that health inequities are caused and exacerbated by built environment factors and the uneven distribution of community resources. We are supportive of these developments which will deepen the appreciation of how public health is embodied in the many actions outside the field of health or health care.

Specific Recommendations

We have several recommendations that are based on existing trends in the SCSs and recent scientific developments in the transportation and public health fields.

1. Activity time in active transport (walking, bicycling, etc.) is indispensable as a health-related transportation performance measure (e.g., mean daily minutes per person of walking and bicycling). Health co-benefits of active transport in one of the large MPOs (Metropolitan Transportation Commission, MTC) has recently been quantified and the potential for reducing chronic disease and greenhouse gases appears to be large on an absolute scale and far larger than co-benefits from fine particulate matter reductions, which are a traditional focus of health effects. These findings are consistent with emerging evidence from studies of other regions of the United States, London, Barcelona, and the Netherlands. Attempts to monetize health co-benefits from active transport suggest savings of billions of dollars in health care costs and the value of statistical lives saved.
2. MPOs should consider new tools that have recently become available to quantify the health co-benefits of active transport in SCS scenarios and projects. This fills a gap in project performance assessment at most MPOs. One such tool co-developed by the CDPH, MTC, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District and other researchers is called the Integrated Transport and Health Impacts Model (ITHIM), which was used to quantify the health co-benefits of active transport and low carbon driving in the San Francisco Bay Area. This tool could function as a post processor to travel demand models that generate miles traveled and activity times by mode. Modelers at several large MPOs are already exploring how it can be used to complement their methods for project performance assessment.

3. As tools such as ITHIM become available to MPOs, health co-benefits can be used as a criterion for a unique project category that a priori could get a high priority score in the project assessment methodologies used by MPOs.

4. Likewise, using these tools, health co-benefits can be used as a criterion to screen projects for cost-benefit and other in-depth analysis. In some MPOs current practice is to screen projects based on cost, so that only high cost projects get quantitative assessment. This would allow projects with large health co-benefits to also get additional scrutiny in cost-benefit analyses.

5. Equity/inequity in RTPS is currently framed using title VI of the Civil Rights Act, concepts of "no disparate impacts" and "increase access (to affordable housing/transit) to poor people", participation of communities of concern, environmental justice. In the development of SCSs some MPOs have been exposed to a health-based approach which explicitly calls for ways to narrow existing differences in health status and of determinants of health. The Sustainable Transportation Council (LEED-like approach to rating transportation systems) is considering a goal area in its transportation rating system that explicitly considers reducing health disparities. This is a promising approach that deserves more attention.

6. Local health departments are highly interested and would benefit from mechanisms that enhance their participation in SCS development and follow-up. We noted with interest that SANDAG has a standing Public Health Advisory Committee in which the San Diego County Health Department is a partner, and our staff was able to attend one of their meetings. National organizations like the Transportation Research Board have recently created standing health subcommittees with an expanded focus. It is worth exploring ways local health departments and others interested in public health and equity can stay engaged on an on-going basis.

This is particularly germane to a multidisciplinary approach to address the multiple health issues and the complexity of health impacts. In this setting expertise could be leveraged to explore the potential consequences of different scenarios and SCSs in the context of health risks and benefits, addressing air quality, physical activity, access to health promoting resources (e.g., transportation, food, employment, education), noise, injuries, social networks, etc. for the regional population and vulnerable subgroups.
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Date: December 30, 2011

To: Chris Ganson
Governor’s Office of Planning and Research
1400 10th Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

From: Department of General Services
Real Estate Services Division
Asset Management Branch

Subject: SACOG DRAFT METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN
SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES STRATEGY

In response to Director Ken Alex’s letter dated November 28, 2011, to Director Fred Klass, the Department of General Services (DGS) looks forward to working with you as you consolidate State agencies’ responses to draft sustainable communities strategies developed as part of the regional transportation planning process.

The DGS Asset Management Branch staff reviewed the Sacramento Area Council of Governments Draft Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS) for 2035 and the associated Draft Environmental Impact Report. We are interested in this planning effort because of the State of California’s significant presence in the Sacramento region. The DGS oversees approximately 18.9 million square feet of office space in both State-owned and leased facilities in Sacramento County and the City of West Sacramento. The Department is responsible for administering the Capitol Area Plan, the master plan for the development of State facilities on approximately 42 blocks of State-owned land in downtown Sacramento. The Capitol Area Plan also provides land use designations on the State-owned land for a mix of uses including State offices, parking, housing, retail, and open space. It addresses community development, energy conservation, and transportation in the area surrounding the State Capitol and Capitol Park.

A variety of administrative directives, policies, and statutory mandates guide the State when locating and constructing State-owned buildings or leasing private-sector facilities. The DGS considers smart growth priorities, green building initiatives, excellence in public buildings features, energy efficiency, sustainable building measures, and environmental impacts, as well as State building operation measures to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Transportation policies reinforce the importance of transit access and transportation management. The State is required to situate large facilities within one-quarter mile of public transportation and provides for discounted public transit passes and preferential parking for carpools and vanpools.
Additionally, the DGS conducts periodic transportation surveys of State employees working in the Sacramento region to collect information on commute choices and patterns.

In reviewing the draft MTP/SCS, we did not identify any areas of concern regarding impacts on DGS facilities. As the DGS updates long-range strategic State facilities plans and prepares the annual Capitol Area Plan Progress Report, the MTP/SCS will serve as a useful resource regarding land use patterns and future transportation projects. Therefore, we will be interested as the plan is implemented or updated. If you have additional questions regarding our review, please contact me at (916) 376-1807.

ANNE GARBEFF
Assistant Chief

AG:JB:jb

cc: Joe Mugartegui, Chief, Asset Management Branch, Real Estate Services Division, Department of General Services
RESPONSE TO MTP/SCS LETTER 79 – Governor’s Office of Planning and Research, California Department of Public Health, and Department of General Services

79-1. Thank you for your comments supporting the positive outcomes of the MTP/SCS. These introductory comments are noted.

79-2. Thank you for acknowledging the benefits and supporting the use of SACOG’s activity-based travel model. SACOG strives to provide the best possible data to inform decision-makers throughout the planning process.

79-3. Thank you for your comment. SACOG believes transparency in our planning process and in our data and models is critical to supporting engagement of the public, our member jurisdictions, and decision-makers.

79-4. Thank you for your supportive comments related to SACOG’s use of performance metrics to inform policy. SACOG agrees that clear and understandable explanation of each performance metric and showing our work is key to more informed decision-making.

79-5. Thank you for acknowledging the MTP/SCS’ updated context related to roadway congestion and delay. Regarding the suggestion that SACOG study road tolling, the agency has sponsored two corridor level studies of high occupancy toll (HOT) lanes in the region and in both cases the financial and congestion benefits identified did not warrant further study for project implementation. A system-wide approach to road tolling was considered through the scenario-development phase of the MTP/SCS and that time it was determined to not be a necessary instrument to support congestion reduction and greenhouse gas reductions during planning period out to 2035. Recognizing that conditions may change in the future, Policies 9 and 16 call for SACOG to study pricing strategies as a potential tool for a variety of goals. Policy 9 focuses on greenhouse gas reduction strategies and Policy 16 focuses on new means of funding transportation.

79-6. Thank you for your comment supportive of SACOG’s approach to integrated land use and transportation scenarios.

79-7. Thank you for your comments. As your comment notes, the MTP/SCS does include a substantial shift in the type of new housing that is likely to be built in the region compared to what exists today. SACOG agrees that a greater shift may be needed to bring the supply of housing in line with demand. However, the MTP/SCS land use forecast is the product of planned land uses within existing general plans, approved projects, and market trends. As part of its ongoing monitoring activities and in preparation for the next MTP/SCS update, SACOG will track and document actual development activity to assess whether or not the housing mix and growth pattern of the MTP/SCS should be adjusted. This will be done both because federal and state regulations require it, and in order to determine how the trends identified in the ULI report are playing out in the Sacramento region.
Thank you for your observations related to environmental protection. Through the Rural Urban Connections Strategy, SACOG is committed to continuing to engage in the development of the various Habitat Conservation Plans in our region as well as in the broader issues surrounding natural resource protection and conservation.

79-8. SACOG has a history of trying to better understand and quantify various impacts of the MTP and is committed to improving in future MTP/SCS. Within budget constraints, we expect to continue working with health and other organizations to expand our ability to quantify benefits related to active transportation, and hope that groups will work with us on developing new tools. Please also see Master Response B: Health.

79-9. Workshop Scenario 3 was designed to allow further concentration within the existing urban footprint and additional funding for transit and active transportation. Chapter 2 provides the framework for all three workshop scenarios. This scenario had the smallest footprint and the most funding for transit and active transportation. This high-performing scenario was considered to be aspirational due to speculative land use and revenue assumptions. For detailed information on the workshop scenarios, please see Appendix G-1.

79-10. As part of its ongoing monitoring activities and in preparation for the next MTP/SCS update, SACOG will track and document actual development activity to assess whether or not the housing mix and growth pattern of the MTP/SCS should be adjusted. SACOG is pursuing funding through the Strategic Growth Council to better manage this monitoring activity so results can be shared with member agencies, the SACOG Board, and interested parties.

79-11. Thank you for your encouraging comments and suggestions on the MTP/SCS. This conclusion comment is noted.

79-12. This introductory comment describes the California Department of Public Health’s perspective on and interest in commenting on sustainable communities strategies. Specific comments are described in the letter’s subsequent comments. Responses to these specific comments are provided below.

79-13. These general comments are noted.

79-14. Thank you for providing recommendations. Responses to your specific recommendations are provided below in responses 79-15 to 79-20.

79-15. Thank you for your suggestion. As noted in response 79-8, SACOG expects to continue to expand our ability to quantify health benefits of the MTP/SCS in future plans.


79-17. Please see response 79-15
79-18. Please see response 79-15


79-21. Thank you, these references are appreciated.

79-22. These introductory comments are noted.

79-23. This comment explains the DGS’ interest in the MTP/SCS and the relationship to the Capitol Area Plan and other policies and directives that guide the State. This information is helpful for future planning and is noted.

79-24. Thank you. These concluding comments are noted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mona Tawatao, Legal Services of Northern California</td>
<td>LSNC submitted written comments on the Draft MTP/SCS and appreciates the detailed responses provided by staff. Our comments were complimentary on SACOG’s efforts to expand social equity measures. There were also comments and suggestions on how to build and improve on the plan for the next update. We ask that low income and ethnic communities are not left behind in this process. Equity and inclusivity are a matter of economics and economic investment. We encourage SACOG to look at this plan from an economic growth and vitality standpoint and look at how far the plan can go in supporting the potential to create the workforce needed for robust and sustainable growth. It matters for the suburbs how kids are doing in the cities. There is a lot of potential for collaboration. There is data and empirical evidence that equity is not just a social good, but also an economic solution for not leaving communities behind. We are encouraged by SACOG’s approach. One concrete proposal is to create an Equity Advisory Committee so equity remains an important component as SACOG works on case study TPAs and the next MTP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendra Bridges, Coalition on Regional Equity (CORE)</td>
<td>I echo comments made by Mona Tawatao. We were pleased with the productive and inclusive process in this MTP. CORE is very interested in Mona's idea for an Equity Advisory Committee and in working with SACOG on implementation to lift up the great work of this plan and help implement strategies that benefit low income communities and communities of color as well as everyone in the region.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The comments here are summaries of the oral testimonies provided at this public hearing.
RESPONSE TO MTP/SCS Comment 80 – Legal Services of Northern California

80-1. Thank you for these supportive introductory comments.

80-2. SACOG appreciates that Legal Services of Northern California (LSNC) values the MTP/SCS as a potential support tool for economic growth and vitality. Thank you as well for pointing out recent studies that show a positive link between equity and economic growth. We have started reviewing them and intend to share them with the SACOG Board and stakeholders in the months ahead.

In the next few years, this agency will help support economic development efforts in the region. For example, SACOG is a participant in the Next Economy initiative and is ready to share research to support this effort. SACOG is also involved in the discussion of state legislation and new tools for local governments to support affordable housing, infill and transit-oriented development in the wake of redevelopment’s elimination. The TPA case studies are also opportunities to help communities develop tools and strategies to support TOD in a down economy. SACOG agrees that there is much potential for collaboration on this topic in the near future. We hope that LSNC and other interested stakeholders will continue to be engaged as we work on implementation of the MTP/SCS.

80-3. Thank you for this proposal. SACOG’s advisory committees are structured to engage staff from member and partner agencies with particular expertise on the topic of each committee. All meetings are publicized, and members of the public and stakeholder groups are welcome and encouraged to participate. We believe there is a role for equity interests in a number of the existing advisory committees, as evidenced by the increased involvement of LSNC and other equity advocacy groups in the MTP/SCS planning process. In addition, SACOG will continue to engage the Equity, Housing and Health working group that was formed as part of our Sustainable Communities Regional Planning grant as we focus on transit priority case studies, housing analysis, and other tasks of that grant program.
RESPONSE TO MTP/SCS COMMENT 81 – Coalition on Regional Equity (CORE)

81-1. Thank you for your comments. Please see responses to Comment #80 (Responses 80-1, through 80-3).
### Sutter County Elected Official Information Session Public Comments from March 8, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>82-1</th>
<th>John Larimer</th>
<th>Growth projections are unrealistic; this is all based on global warming which is a hoax with the idea to put us all in stack and pack housing and not allowing people who want to drive automobiles and live in rural areas to do either.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>82-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>People in this area do not want rapid transit, buses, or regional planning. We don’t want AB 32 or SB 375 and we shouldn’t be spending money on this.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The comments here are summaries of the oral testimonies provided at this public meeting.
RESPONSE TO MTP/SCS COMMENT 82 – John Larimer

82-1. Thank you for taking the time to provide your comments. Please see Master Response G: Sustainable Communities.

82-2. Many people in the region want or need to use different modes of transportation, including buses, light rail, automobiles, walking and bicycling. The MTP/SCS is designed to support these different options of travel, which differ among and within the 22 cities and 6 counties of the Sacramento region. In order for the Sacramento region to receive federal funds for transportation infrastructure projects, which include roads, highways and bridges in addition to transit, and in order to comply with the federal Clean Air Act, SACOG must create an MTP in accordance with federal and state laws. For more information on the regulatory framework of the MTP/SCS, please see Appendix G-5.
| Sutter County Elected Official Information Session Public Comments from March 8, 2012 |
|---|---|
| **83-1** | Debra Gaylord | I read most of plan and find several issues bothersome. |
| **83-2** | | SACOG updated the PPP (p2-9) to include various stakeholders, but what about people like me. Raise 4 kids, like being able to drive car, being able to work. Don’t think SACOG identified all the key stakeholders in this area. |
| **83-3** | | P3-13 says region will have high demand for mixed use housing near transit and commercial. No one wants to live on Colusa Ave, where MTP has housing. Large-lot would have between 1-8 units per acre. You can’t do that without zero lot lines. 38% of new construction will be large lot, which is postage stamp lots, 62% will be small lot which goes up to 25 units per acres and that is impossible to have single family units at that density. |
| **83-4** | | P3-20 discusses jobs-housing fit measure. This sounds like because Sutter County has lower priced housing that SACOG will only help the county get low-wage jobs and that’s not what we want. |

The comments here are summaries of the oral testimonies provided at this public meeting.
RESPONSE TO MTP/SCS COMMENT 83 – Debra Gaylord

83-1. SACOG appreciates the time you took reviewing the plan. Please see the following responses to your specific concerns.

83-2. The paragraph cited on page 2-9 of the draft MTP/SCS notes that the stakeholder groups involved in the PPP update helped to frame SACOG’s optional outreach activities. The list of focus groups listed on page 2-9 of MTP/SCS reflects one type of outreach conducted during the MTP/SCS planning process but is not reflective of the entire public process that SACOG conducted during the MTP/SCS planning process. As noted on page 2-14 and 2-15, in addition to these focus groups, SACOG participated in over 130 meetings to gather input from a broad range of residents and other stakeholders. To gather input from the broader public, including residents of Sutter County, SACOG hosted nine county-level workshops. Workshop participants around the region expressed a desire to live in a variety of housing, including rural homes on acreage, large lot single family homes, small lot single family homes, and attached housing. Participants also indicated that they traveled by a variety of modes, including automobile, walking, bicycling, and transit.

83-3. Page 3-13 notes that real estate research forecasts that there will be significant demand for new housing, including small-lot homes in mixed-use communities close to public transit, employment, and services. This does not mean that all people in all parts of the region will want to live in these types of housing, but that an increasing number of people in some parts of the region will want this type of housing. Please see Appendix D-1 and E-6 for the references supporting that statement.

As defined in the MTP/SCS, large-lot single-family homes have densities between 1 and 8 units per acre (5,000 to 40,000 square foot lots) without zero lot lines. There are many existing examples of this type of housing in the Sacramento region. There are also examples in the region of small lot single family homes up to 25 units per acre.

83-4. The “jobs-housing fit” measure, referenced on page 3-28, is one SACOG is studying for the next MTP/SCS update. The purpose of this study is to better understand the relationship of where people live and work and the resulting transportation pattern. However, the MTP/SCS states on page 3-28, “that some people will always choose to commute long distances to work. There are many reasons for this, including two-person households, cost of housing, quality of schools, and lifestyle preferences. The MTP/SCS does not strive to eliminate those choices, but rather to increase the choices of people who wish to live closer to their place of employment.” Though the jobs/housing fit measure will likely inform the next MTP/SCS, that final conclusion will remain unchanged.
| Dan Silva | Previously sat on the SACOG Board. SACOG is the regional body for this area. Without participating in SACOG smaller counties like Sutter County would be left out of regional planning and we would miss out on significant benefits. |
RESPONSE TO MTP/SCS COMMENT 84 – Dan Silva

84-1. Thank you for your comment and for supporting SACOG’s efforts in regional planning and coordination.
## Sutter County Elected Official Information Session Public Comments from March 8, 2012

| Santos Vigil       | Which comes first bike paths/transportation system or industry? Infrastructure will bring industry later? |

The comments here are summaries of the oral testimonies provided at this public meeting.
RESPONSE TO MTP/SCS COMMENT 85 – Santos Vigil

85-1. Transportation infrastructure is one of several issues that companies and industries look at when determining where to locate. Other types of infrastructure (for example, wastewater) are also important considerations, as well as civic infrastructure, amenities and housing for employees. In some cases, the arrival of an industry or company to an area may spur additional economic development which leads to the construction of infrastructure.
March 13, 2012

Mike McKeever, Executive Director
Sacramento Area Council of Governments
1415 L Street, Suite 3000
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE:  Public Draft 2035 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy

Dear Mr. McKeever:

The Yolo County Board of Supervisors appreciates the opportunity to comment on the public draft of the 2035 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy. The Board is pleased that SACOG has developed a draft plan that integrates smart growth principles and supports the transportation needs of our region’s rural areas. The Board especially appreciates and supports the plan’s emphasis on maintenance and rehabilitation of existing facilities, and bicycle and pedestrian projects, funding for which is increasing 4% and 7% per capita over the 2008 MTP, despite a 5% per capita decrease in aggregate funding.

The Board the attached detailed comments on the policies and supporting strategies contained in the 2035 MTP/SCS by a unanimous vote. These comments were developed with a focus on three key themes:

- **Rural-Urban Connections:** The plan should continue to focus on sustaining rural-urban connections in the areas of transportation, agricultural economic development and land use.

- **Regional Collaboration:** The plan should promote and incentivize enhanced collaboration between jurisdictions in developing and implementing transportation projects; both under existing programs and through any new revenue sources or programs that become available.

- **Incentives for Smart Growth:** In addition to research, information and education, the plan should guide SACOG to implement policies that create incentives for implementing Blueprint land use principles.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the 2035 MTP/SCS. Please contact Yolo County’s SACOG representative, Supervisor Don Saylor, at (530) 666-8195, or Petrea Marchand, Manager of Intergovernmental Affairs, at (530) 666-8128 or petrea.marchand@yolocounty.org, with any questions about the Board’s comments.

Sincerely,

Jim Provenza, Chairman
Yolo County Board of Supervisors

Attachment
Detailed Comments
SACOG 2035 MTP/SCS Policies and Supporting Strategies

Comment 1: The County strongly supports Policy 1; especially Strategy 1.4.

Comment 2: While the County supports the goal of Policy 2, Strategy 2.11 should be added to analyze the consistency of transportation funding formulas and policies that promote compact urban forms and the preservation of open space. For instance, formulas that weigh population more heavily than road mileage can put areas with high concentrations of open space at a disadvantage for funding transportation maintenance and rehabilitation projects.

2. Policy: SACOG intends to educate and provide information to policymakers, local staff, and the public about the mutually supportive relationship between smart growth development, transportation, and resource conservation.

2.11 Strategy: Provide technical analysis to inform policy makers about inconsistencies between policies that promote strategic growth management and local government fiscal incentives.

Comment 3: Policy 6 must acknowledge difficulty in funding inter-community connections in jurisdictions that have minimized the urban growth footprint. Strategies 6.1 and 6.3 should be revised as follows to clarify this distinction:

6. Policy: SACOG encourages local governments to direct greenfield developments to areas immediately adjacent to the existing urban edge through data-supported information, incentives and pursuit of regulatory reform for cities and counties.

6.1. Strategy: Minimize the urban growth footprint of the region by improving interior circulation and access instead of access to and beyond the urban edge, with exception for inter-community routes between jurisdictions that have maintained a compact urban form.

6.3. Strategy: Seek out funding to acquire conservation easements accompanying specific regional connector road projects and rural urban connector projects, to protect land from development in areas that are not intended or zoned for development.

Comment 4: The County supports Policy 7; especially Strategies 7.5, 7.6 and 7.7.

Comment 5: Yolo County supports Policy 9 and supporting strategies. The climate change action plan developed pursuant to Strategy 9.5 should include actions that recognize the regional GHG emissions benefits of the preservation of agricultural lands. For instance, the
action plan should include advocacy to encourage the California Air Resources Board to award carbon credits toward the purchase of carbon easements on agricultural lands, eliminating development rights on those properties and preventing future conversion to urban use.

Comment 6: The County strongly supports Policy 11; especially Strategy 11.4.

Comment 7: The County supports Policy 12, but requests the addition of a supporting strategy 12.3 to create incentives for the development of inter-jurisdictional funding options between local agencies: [collab]

12. Policy: SACOG should support authority for local option funding sources to allow local areas to customize transportation funding and investment for maintenance and operation of the existing system and expansion to meet future needs.

12.3 Strategy: Create incentives for local agencies to collaborate on inter-jurisdictional funding options.

Comment 8: The County suggests the following edits to the supporting strategies for Policy 13:

13. Policy: SACOG invests federal and state funds that come to SACOG to achieve regional policies and priorities, as described in more detail in the sections that follow.

13.3. Strategy: Encourage Create incentives for cities and counties to collect development-based fees or funding sufficient for both local road improvements and regional-scale road, transit and/or bicycle pedestrian improvements so that regional-scale improvements can be built in a timely way, since SACOG’s regional funding can meet only 25-30 percent of regional project costs in this MTP.

13.8. Strategy: Create incentives for local agencies to collaborate to prioritize and fund projects that benefit multiple jurisdictions.

13.9 Strategy: Create incentives to encourage strategic growth management.

Comment 9: Yolo County supports Policy 14 and requests the following addition to strategy 14.7:

14. Policy: SACOG should look for specialized funding programs, and/or one-time funds at the state or federal level, and work with local agencies to bring in such funds to start innovative projects or advance specific projects that are well-matched to program goals.

14.7 Strategy: Cooperate on new initiatives that more fully integrate transportation planning efforts with economic development issues and opportunities, including improving the infrastructure that supports agricultural economic development and the market for locally-grown food.

Comment 10: The County supports Policy 25 and related supporting strategies.
Comment 11: The County supports Policy 29 and related supportive strategies, but requests a stronger policy regarding investment in a regional bicycle and pedestrian network, and an additional strategy related to funding for bicycle facilities that serve both recreational and transportation functions.

29. Policy: SACOG encourages locally determined developments consistent with Blueprint principles and local circulation plans to be designed with walking, bicycling and transit use as primary transportation considerations.

29.2. Strategy: Invest toward in the eventual creation of a regional bicycle and pedestrian network, connecting first those communities that already have good local circulation networks in place, but also supporting efforts throughout the region to improve connectivity.

29.5 Strategy: Assist local agencies in identifying and apply for state, local and private grant funding opportunities for bicycle projects that will serve a mix of recreational users and commuters.
RESPONSE TO MTP/SCS LETTER 86 – County of Yolo Board of Supervisors

86-1. SACOG thanks Yolo County for providing comments and for its participation throughout the MTP/SCS process. These introductory comments are noted.

86-2. Thank you for support of Policy 1 and its supporting strategies.

86-3. Thank you for your support of Policy 2 and your suggestion to add a new strategy; however, we believe the substance of this strategy is captured in Strategy 2.10.

86-4. Thank you for your suggested revisions to Strategies 6.1 and 6.3. Regarding proposed revisions to Strategy 6.1, we find these revisions to be inconsistent with the focus of Policy 6, which is focused on encouraging new growth to be immediately adjacent to existing development. Regarding proposed revisions to Strategy 6.3, the existing strategy’s use of “regional connector road projects” includes all types of regional connectors, including rural-urban, urban-urban, and rural-rural.

86-5. Thank you for your support of Policy 7 and its supporting strategies.

86-6. Thank you for your support of Policy 9 and comments regarding Strategy 9.5. SACOG agrees the plan should, and will, recognize the regional GHG emissions benefits of the preservation of agricultural land.

86-7. Thank you for your support of Policy 11 and its supporting strategies.

86-8. Thank you for your support of Policy 12 and your suggestion to add a new strategy. The following new Strategy 12.3 has been added:

Strategy 12.3: Support local agencies that seek to collaborate on inter-jurisdictional funding options.

86-9. Thank you for your support of Policy 13. Regarding proposed revisions to Strategy 13.3, SACOG can encourage, but in the MTP/SCS has no current means, to create incentives for the collection of development based fees. Regarding the proposed new Strategy 13.8, SACOG already supports local agencies that choose to collaborate to prioritize and fund projects that benefit multiple jurisdictions. Regarding proposed new Strategy 13.9, SACOG’s regional funding programs are designed to encourage strategic growth management. In general, your proposed revisions to the supporting strategies of Policy 13 are good issues to discuss as part of the biannual update of guidelines for the SACOG regional funding programs. We encourage you to bring these ideas to that discussion when it next occurs, in 2013.

86-10. Thank you for your support of Policy 14 and for your suggested revisions to Strategy 14.7. We have modified your proposed language to apply to both urban and rural economic development issues in general. The revised strategy reads as follows:
Strategy 14.7: Cooperate on new initiatives that more fully integrate transportation planning efforts with economic development issues and opportunities in urban and rural areas.

86-11. Thank you for your support of Policy 25 and its supporting strategies.

86-12. Thank you for your support of Policy 29. Regarding proposed revisions to Strategy 29.2, this strategy has been proposed for similar modifications and now reads:

Strategy 29.2: Invest toward the eventual creation of a regional bicycle and pedestrian network, connecting first those communities that already have good local circulation networks in place, but also supporting efforts through the region to improve connectivity and realize public health benefits from these investments.

Regarding your proposed new Strategy 29.5, we believe Strategy 29.2 addresses this issue.
February 17, 2012

Kirk E. Trost, Chief Operating Officer
Sacramento Area Council of Governments
1415 L Street, Suite 300
Sacramento, California 95814

Dear Mr. Trost:

We have reviewed the Sacramento Area Council of Governments’ (SACOG) draft Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy for 2035 (MTP/SCS) and welcome the opportunity to provide input regarding the consistency of the MTP/SCS with the Delta Plan. Though the Delta Plan has not yet been adopted, were the current draft Delta Plan in effect, our initial analysis is that the MTP/SCS would be consistent with it. We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the MTP/SCS and continued coordination between our agencies to further our related efforts. We are particularly interested in working with you to understand how the exemption process (for “covered actions”) defined in Water Code 85057.5 should work.

As you are aware, in 2009 the California Legislature created the Delta Stewardship Council (DSC) to play a synthesizing and coordinating role among the many agencies and interest groups who have a stake in the Delta’s future. The DSC was also tasked with developing the Delta Plan. The Delta Plan is an enforceable plan to achieve the coequal goals of providing a more reliable water supply for California and protecting, restoring, and enhancing the Delta ecosystem. The coequal goals are to be achieved in a manner that protects and enhances the unique cultural, recreational, natural resource, and agricultural values of the Delta as an evolving place.

Pursuant to Water Code Section 85212, the DSC is required to review the MTP/SCS for consistency with Delta Plan. The DSC’s comments may include, but are not be limited to, the consistency of the MTP/SCS with the ecosystem restoration needs of the Delta and whether lands set aside for natural protection are sufficient to meet the Delta’s ecosystems needs. In addition, Water Code Section 85057.5(4) states that the applicable Metropolitan Planning Organization will determine if plans, programs, projects or activities within the secondary zone of the Delta are consistent with the SCS and therefore exempt from the authority of the DSC. This stature provides SACOG with a potentially significant role in shaping the DSC’s authority in urban areas.

“Coequal goals” means the two goals of providing a more reliable water supply for California and protecting, restoring, and enhancing the Delta ecosystem. The coequal goals shall be achieved in a manner that protects and enhances the unique cultural, recreational, natural resource, and agricultural values of the Delta as an evolving place.”

— CA Water Code §85054

Update to Draft Final MTP/SCS Appendix G-7 - March 26, 2012
Given that the DSC is in the drafting process of the Delta Plan, our review and recommendations for the MTP/SCS are based on the fifth and most recent draft of the Delta Plan. Our review of the MTP/SCS identified the following areas of consistency:

- Urban development and other land uses. The urban boundaries identified in the MTP/SCS are consistent with the Delta Plan. The MTP/SCS identifies Community Type and boundaries within the Delta that are consistent with the boundaries that the Delta Plan uses for urban development limits and are also consistent with the ecosystem restoration needs of the Delta. Community type and boundaries within the Delta identified in the MTP/SCS are the existing West Sacramento city limits and the City of Sacramento.

- We are especially pleased that the MTP/SCS development pattern which accommodates a 39% increase in regional population while only expanding the urban boundaries by 7%. These housing density goals ease the pressure on local communities to keep expanding into the Delta, protecting valuable habitats and ecosystem functions without restricting economic growth. This is central to the Delta Plan's strategy of balancing the protection, enhancement and restoration the Delta ecosystem in a manner that protects the values of communities within the Delta.

- Ecosystem protection. The MTP/SCS does not specifically set aside or protect any land within the Delta for ecosystem needs. However, it's our understanding that by not identifying community types within the vast majority of the Delta, urban development within the Delta would not be consistent with the MTP/SCS. In this respect, almost all the lands within the Delta will remain available for ecosystem needs, as well as their current agricultural uses. In addition, Sustainable Communities projects cannot occur in wetland or riparian areas, in areas that offer significant value as a wildlife habitat, nor can they harm any protected species. This is consistent with the Delta Plan and with the "protecting, restoring, and enhancing the Delta ecosystem" goal of the coequal goals.

- Water supply reliability. The water use efficiency standards a project is required to meet to qualify as a SCS is entirely consistent with the water conservation, water use efficiency and sustainable water use the Delta Plan is trying to achieve statewide. The DSC applauds SACOG's commitment to bringing water efficiency to the forefront of local planning decisions. Our goal is to promote this shift in understanding how important it is to maximize the beneficial uses of our existing water supplies.

- Risk reduction. Sustainable Communities projects cannot introduce flood risk. This is consistent with the Delta Plan and Water Code Section 85020(g) that requires a reduction of risk to people, property and state interests through appropriate land uses.

- Protecting the Delta as a place. The Rural-Urban Connections Strategy (RUCS) highlights the importance and benefits of agriculture in the region and informs the MTP/SCS. This is consistent with the Delta Plan's goal of protecting and enhancing the unique cultural, recreational, natural resources, and agricultural values of the Delta. Both the MTP/SCS and the Delta Plan appreciate and promote the benefits of the existing land uses within the Delta in terms of small and historic communities, wildlife habitat, potential flood control uses and agricultural production.
In reviewing the MTP/SCS we have also identified a need for ongoing and close coordination between our agencies due to the timing of updates required of both plans and the planning periods. The MTP/SCS provides a forecast of growth through 2035 and will be updated every four years. The DSC is required to update the Delta Plan at least every five years. The planning period for the two plans is quite different. The Delta Plan has a planning period through 2100 in comparison to the current MTP/SCS which plans through 2035. The Delta Plan uses current city boundaries and spheres of influence as the basis for some of the regulatory policies for the Delta Plan. Changes moving forward will require the agencies to work together closely.

Also as a result of our review of the MTP/SCS we have the following recommendations for ways the MTP/SCS could further promote the achievement of the coequal goals.

- Co-equal goals. With respect to MTP/SCS Strategy 2.10, SACOG could educate Delta-region policy and decision makers, local staff, and regional stakeholders about the importance and benefits of making development decisions that are consistent with, or further, the coequal goals and the Delta Plan. The RUCS may be an appropriate vehicle to promote understanding and appreciation for the Delta, the coequal goals, Delta Plan policies and recommendations and the relationship between the Delta Plan and the MTP/SCS. SACOG could develop and include a strategy that specifically promotes development that is consistent with, or furthers, the coequal goals.

- Risk reduction and flood safety. With respect to the MTP/SCS System Expansion category of Policies and Strategies (Policies and Strategies 27 thru 31), SACOG should include a policy to support road, transit, and bridge expansion investments that are designed to accommodate a 200-year, or greater, flood event to ensure the ability of population centers to evacuate safely and for emergency personnel to be able to reach flooded areas.

- The MTP/SCS uses a sea level rise range of 22 to 35 inches by 2100 (Page 7-34). We suggest using the range of values used in the Delta Plan, and in many other public agency documents, which have the upper average range as 55 inches by 21001.

- Finally, to further clarify the scope of the SCS, SACOG should describe or list the plans, programs, projects or activities within the secondary zone that are included within the SCS. In addition, the plan or its EIR should describe what infrastructure besides the listed transportation projects are necessary to support the SCS or the plans, programs, projects, or activities encompassed within it. This would assist both DSC and other parties in understanding the variety of projects that would be exempt from the definition of “covered actions” provided in Water Code 85057.5. We propose working jointly on this as a separate effort and as part of implementation of our respective plans.

We look forward to working with you and your staff to ensure consistency between the MTP/SCS and the Delta Plan, and that the two plans are complementary in nature and serve

---

to protect the Delta while promoting sustainable growth and economic vitality in the broader region. We anticipate briefing the Delta Stewardship Council on this matter at either our March 15-16 or 29-30 meeting and may receive additional direction or input from the Council. If possible, we would welcome your participation in presenting information on the MTP/SCS to the Council and assisting us with addressing their questions.

If you have any questions, please contact Kevan Samsam at (916) 455-5011 or ksamsam@DeltaCouncil.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Cindy Messer
Acting Deputy Executive Officer, Delta Plan

Cc:   Phil Isenberg, Chair, Delta Stewardship Council  
P. Joseph Grindstaff, Executive Officer, Delta Stewardship Council  
Chris Stevens, Chief Counsel, Delta Stewardship Council  
Dan Ray, Chief Deputy Executive Officer, Delta Stewardship Council  
Carl Lischeske, Principal Engineer, Delta Stewardship Council
RESPONSE TO MTP/SCS LETTER 86 – Delta Stewardship Council

87-1. Thank you for reviewing the Draft MTP/SCS and providing these comments. SACOG also appreciates the opportunity to coordinate with the Delta Stewardship Council (DSC) and looks forward to continued coordination as our agencies move forward on implementing our respective plans.

87-2. This comment describes the DSC’s roles and responsibilities related to the Delta Plan and Water Code Section 85212 and is noted. We understand that the Delta Plan is not yet adopted, but appreciate the DSC’s interest in understanding how the Delta Plan and MTP/SCS may relate to each other.

87-3. Thank you for your comments. Responses to individual comments follow, below.

87-4. Thank you for acknowledging the use of Community Types in the MTP/SCS to identify general locations of development during the planning period of the MTP/SCS. We note that the City of Isleton is also an Established Community in the MTP/SCS; however, it is also our understanding that it is located within the Delta Primary Zone.

87-5. Thank you for acknowledging the compact development pattern of the MTP/SCS and its benefits to the Delta.

87-6. The DSC is correct in noting that the MTP/SCS does not specifically set aside or protect any land within the Delta for ecosystem needs. It is also true that within the vast majority of the Delta, urban development would not be consistent with the MTP/SCS, which forecasts development to occur only with the Centers and Corridors, Established, Developing, and Rural Residential Community Types. It is also important to note, however, that while the areas identified as “Lands Not Identified for Development” are technically available for ecosystem needs, the MTP/SCS growth forecast only predicts a certain amount of growth for a certain time period (2008-2035 for this Plan) and that there may be local plans for growth outside of the MTP/SCS footprint that are not included in the current MTP/SCS. The DSC is correct in noting that Sustainable Communities projects cannot occur in wetland or riparian areas, in areas that offer significant value as a wildlife habitat, nor harm any protected species. This is a requirement of SB 375.

87-7. Thank you for this comment. We believe this comment refers to the SB 375 requirements for Sustainable Communities Projects. Per SB 375, such projects are exempt from CEQA if they fulfill a list of requirements, which includes certain water use efficiency standards.

87-8. Thank you for this comment. We believe this comment refers to the SB 375 requirements for Sustainable Communities Projects. Per SB 375, such projects are exempt from CEQA if they fulfill a list of requirements, which includes introducing no new flood risk.
87-9. Thank you for acknowledging the RUCS project and its appreciation of the Delta for its many benefits.

87-10. SACOG agrees that ongoing coordination between SACOG and the DSC would be beneficial to both agencies. We look forward to coordinating with the DSC in the future.

87-11. SACOG agrees that the Rural Urban Connections Strategy is an appropriate vehicle to promote understanding and appreciation for the Delta and the Delta Plan. We believe Strategy 2.10, as currently written, provides the necessary guidance to allow future discussion and education on the Delta and the issues addressed in the Delta Plan.

87-12. SACOG recognizes the importance of risk reduction and flood safety, but also acknowledges that many other agencies have a role in this, including local, state and federal agencies. SACOG has recently begun participating in the Cal EMA Working Group on Hazard Mitigation Planning and is working to identify its role in regional hazard mitigation planning, including flood risk.

87-13. Thank you for providing this new reference. The sea level rise range used in the MTP/SCS came from the California interpretation of the IPCC climate scenarios. Moving forward and as part of MTP/SCS implementation, SACOG will be developing a climate change action plan. As part of this project, we will review newer sources of information, including the source you have cited for sea level rise.

87-14. Thank you for this suggestion. SACOG will be working closely with our member agencies in defining those projects that would be exempt from the definition of “covered actions” provided in Water Code Section 85057.5. We appreciate the DSC’s offer to work jointly on this as part of implementation of our respective plans and look forward to starting the conversation.

87-15. SACOG also looks forward to working with the DSC in understanding the relationship between the MTP/SCS and the Delta Plan, particularly as the two plans are implemented. Thank you again for providing your comments and for your interest in coordinating with SACOG on Delta issues.
CHAPTER 4 – SUMMARIES OF ELECTED OFFICIAL INFORMATION MEETINGS

An update to the February 2012 version of Appendix G-7, Chapter 4 is shown below.

Summary for: Sutter County Elected Official Information Session
Meeting Date: March 8, 2012

Participants:
Live Oak Councilmember Diane Hodges
Sutter County Board of Supervisor Larry Montna
Yuba City Mayor Pro Tem Leslie McBride
Yuba City Councilmember John Dukes
Members of the public

Total participants: 11

Summary of Elected Officials’ comments:
A number of comments were made related to the importance of planning in general, the importance of infrastructure planning as a means of supporting and attracting economic development, and the benefits of participating in SACOG and the MTP process. Comments noted that population growth can’t be stopped or regulated, which means that planning for future growth will need to continue. The comment was made that the county needs transportation infrastructure available in order to attract industry and that in the past Sutter County had lost some opportunities to attract new industries to the area as a result of a lack of preparedness. It was also noted that the MTP/SCS is just a plan for growth and that local jurisdictions can choose whether or not to make decisions based on it. Another comment was made acknowledging the extensive public outreach process undertaken for the update of the plan.

There were specific questions related to how the plan affected local land use authority and how it deals with high speed rail.

Staff responded to all comments and questions in the Elected Official Information sessions. There were no comments that resulted in changes to the draft MTP/SCS.
WHEREAS, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG), is the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Sacramento metropolitan planning area as defined by Section 134(c) of the Federal Highway Act, as well as for the Yuba City-Marysville urbanized area;

WHEREAS, SACOG and the Secretary of Business, Transportation and Housing have executed memoranda of understanding (MOUs) with both the Placer County Transportation Planning Agency (PCTPA) and the El Dorado County Transportation Commission (EDCTC) which establish a framework of representation for how SACOG will carry out its federal MPO responsibilities in both El Dorado and Placer counties in cooperation and coordination with the agencies and jurisdictions in those areas within the ozone nonattainment area;

WHEREAS, federal planning regulations require SACOG as a Metropolitan Planning Organization to prepare and update a long range Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) every four years;

WHEREAS, state planning regulations require SACOG as a Metropolitan Planning Organization to prepare and update a long range MTP and Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) every four years;

WHEREAS, from April 2010 through March 2012, through the conduct of a continuing, comprehensive, and coordinated transportation planning process in conformance with all applicable federal and state requirements including SACOG’s adopted Public Participation Plan, SACOG developed its Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS) with a 2035 horizon year;

WHEREAS, the MTP/SCS is a long-range comprehensive plan for the region’s multi-modal system;

WHEREAS, this is the first MTP in the SACOG region to include a Sustainable Communities Strategy pursuant to SB 375 (Statutes of 2008);

WHEREAS, the MTP/SCS facilitates the implementation of the Sacramento Region Blueprint and Rural-Urban Connection Strategy (RUCS);
WHEREAS, the MTP/SCS addresses six primary principles, including: Access and Mobility, Equity and Choice, Economic Vitality, Environmental Quality and Sustainability, Financial Stewardship, and Smart Land Use;

WHEREAS, the MTP/SCS contains an integrated set of public policies, strategies and investments to maintain, manage and improve the transportation system in the SACOG region through the year 2035 and calls for development of an integrated multimodal transportation system that facilitates the efficient, economic movement of people and goods;

WHEREAS, the MTP/SCS is based on a regional growth forecast that contains adjusted rates for population, housing, and economic growth, reflective of the current economic recession;

WHEREAS, the regional growth forecast of the MTP/SCS was developed for planning purposes by working with local jurisdictions, and projects growth based on existing land use plans and policies, demographic and economic trends, and other regulatory factors;

WHEREAS, the MTP/SCS best achieves federal and state requirements and the objectives of SACOG in aligning land use, environmental sustainability, the transportation system, greenhouse gas emission reductions, and transportation system revenues/expenditures;

WHEREAS, SACOG has conducted an air quality analysis of the MTP/SCS utilizing latest planning assumptions, emissions model, and consultation provisions, including a quantitative regional emissions analysis that meets emissions budget requirements as described in transportation conformity regulation;

WHEREAS, the California Air Resources Board (CARB) set the per capita greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets for automobiles and light trucks for the SACOG region at 7 percent by 2020 and 16 percent by 2035 from a 2005 base year;

WHEREAS, the Board of Directors, by Resolution No. ______ has certified the Environmental Impact Report on the MTP/SCS (SCH # 2011012081) and has adopted findings of fact, a statement of overriding considerations, and a mitigation monitoring and reporting program pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq.).

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Directors of the Sacramento Area Council of Governments hereby adopts the MTP/SCS;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the SACOG Board of Directors finds that the MTP/SCS achieves the regional greenhouse gas reduction targets established by the CARB and meets the requirements of SB 375;
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board of Directors directs staff to immediately (within five working days) commence to: a) file of a Notice of Determination documenting these decisions (CEQA Guidelines Section 15094); b) retain a copy of the certified Final EIR as a public record; and c) provide a copy of the certified Final EIR to the planning agencies of all member jurisdictions (CEQA Guidelines Section 15095).

PASSED AND ADOPTED, this 19th day of April 2012, by the following vote of the SACOG Board of Directors:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

ATTEST:

_________________________________ ___________________________________
Peter Hill Mike McKeever
Chair Chief Executive Officer

Attached:

Final MTP/SCS