



## Transportation Committee

February 27, 2014

### MTP/SCS Approach to Scenario Development

**Issue:** How should new land use and transportation information be incorporated into the update of the 2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (2016 MTP/SCS)?

**Recommendation:** That the Transportation Committee recommend that the SACOG board adopt the “Approach to Creating and Analyzing Scenarios” (Attachment A).

**Discussion:** In December 2013, the Board adopted a policy framework to focus the 2016 update of the MTP/SCS on five broad implementation challenges of the current plan: transportation funding, investment strategy, investment timing, land use forecast, and plan effects. The full description of these topics is in the policy framework in Attachment B. This framework also broadly divides the plan update schedule into two parts: the work in 2014 will be focused on research, analysis, and public engagement on the implementation challenges identified in the policy framework, culminating at the end of the year in a framework for a draft preferred scenario (land use, revenues, transportation project assumptions); and the work in 2015 will focus on developing a draft plan, policies and technical assumptions based on the draft preferred scenario framework.

Following the direction set by the policy framework, staff presented to the Transportation Committee and other board policy committees last month an inventory of adopted and proposed land use plans, initially focused on new greenfield plans. This research task of inventorying local plans is one of the first technical steps of every MTP/SCS update cycle, the purpose of which is to inform decisions of if and how to adjust the MTP/SCS land use forecast and transportation investment package. The challenge in dealing with this new land use information is that it represents a large potential supply of housing relative to the regional projected housing demand. At all three board policy committees there was discussion around the various factors that might affect the timing of development in different parts of the region, the nature of development activity (in large bursts of activity as opposed to slowly and steadily over time), and the fiscal implications to local government of different development patterns.

Staff also presented an approach to developing land use and transportation scenarios that incorporates this new land use information and addresses the other implementation issues identified in the Board’s policy framework. That is, the scenario development approach would update the regional land use and transportation scenarios used in the 2012 MTP/SCS with updated local land use and transportation information while at the same time focusing more effort on analyzing the effects of different timing of transportation investments and land development patterns on the transportation system, local road and transit maintenance budgets, air quality, greenhouse gas, and other resources. A full description of this approach is included in Attachment A.

Upon hearing this proposed approach, Board members provided feedback as follows: the level of effort around scenario development be relatively low compared to past plan updates; staff bring more information on how the scenarios would be used in an implementation-focused plan update; and staff bring a process map to the Board that shows how each piece of the update process builds toward major

milestones. The first two comments are addressed in modifications to Attachment A in underline/strikethrough. Staff is developing a process map to address the third request and will have a hand out at the committee meeting. This process map will be maintained as a working document and provided to Board committees monthly. The stakeholder sounding board heard the same land use inventory and scenario development proposal as the Board committees. Attendees of the meeting asked clarifying questions but generally agreed with the proposed approach (detailed comments are included in a separate staff report to the committee).

Approved by:

Mike McKeever  
Chief Executive Officer

MM:MC:KL:gg  
Attachments

Key Staff: Matt Carpenter, Director of Transportation Services, (916) 340-6276  
Kacey Lizon, MTP/SCS Manager, (916) 340-6265

1400701

## DRAFT

MTP/SCS Framework: Approach to Creating and Analyzing Scenarios

Consistent with the Board's direction to focus this MTP/SCS update on implementation issues, the following approach will be used to create and analyze scenarios to inform the 2016 MTP/SCS update. ~~staff is raising a trial balloon on how to create and analyze scenarios. We will get Board input at the three February committees and have meetings with stakeholders in February and then ask the Board to take action on this in March.~~ The scenarios developed in this process will be used to illustrate trade-offs and effects of different development patterns and transportation investments compared to the adopted MTP/SCS. In keeping with the implementation themes of the plan update, the scenarios will be used in the following ways: to inform discussions of the Board, stakeholders, member and partner agencies, and public workshop participants on policy issues of the plan update; as alternatives for the environmental impact report; as the basis for making necessary refinements to Scenario 2 (the adopted MTP/SCS).

1. Three scenarios for plan horizon year 2036 will be based on the current plan plus two updated/refined scenarios from last plan cycle.

Discussion: Scenarios should bracket a reasonable range of possible futures, taking into account all major market and policy/regulatory influences. All scenarios are designed to represent reasonable possibilities of what might occur (i.e. not idealized futures driven solely by 1 or 2 considerations to the exclusion of others). The three scenarios analyzed last time met this real world test, and varied principally by how much housing and transportation choice they created. The S\scenario (#3) with the most use of a range of transportation modes had the most amounts of new development in Centers and Corridors and Established Communities and attached housing. On the other end, the scenario (#1) with the least use of transportation modes other than the automobile had the most amounts of new development in Developing Communities and Rural Communities and large lot single family housing. The final plan adopted by the Board was most like the scenario in the middle (#2), but it included elements of both Scenarios #1 and #3 based on input from our members, the public and stakeholders and technical analysis. (See attached Table to compare the adopted MTP/SCS with the three scenarios analyzed during that plan's development process.)

For the 2016 MTP/SCS update staff suggests that the existing MTP/SCS be one of the scenarios, with the other 2 scenarios being similar to the first and third Scenarios from the last plan cycle, refreshed and updated to reflect relevant actions and trends that have occurred in the interim. For example, the updated Scenario 1 would have similar amounts of new growth in each of the 4 community types as Scenario 1 from the last plan cycle, but the specific properties forecasted to be developed within each community type would differ at least to some extent based on local government land use approvals since the last plan, market trends, and the intentions and capability of the property owners/developers. Similarly this updated Scenario 1 would have similar amounts of housing growth in the lower density and higher density housing types as Scenario 1 from the last cycle, though they may be located to some extent in different places. A preliminary look at the data leads staff to believe that this approach likely creates sufficient flexibility to ensure that the Plan and EIR documents this cycle analyze a reasonable range of alternatives that might be likely to occur.

## DRAFT

While this step will be important, we are trying to keep the level of effort contained so that it is possible to maximize the effort available for Step 2.

2. Analyze different timing to construction of transportation and land use components of current MTP/SCS.

Discussion: Key components of the Board's December 2013 action focusing this plan cycle on implementation issues were to explore the full potential for a "fix-it-first" investment strategy, and to analyze whether there are reasons to alter the timing that land use and transportation projects in the current plan should be constructed. In other words, even if the end state in 2035 (now 2036) was the same, does it make a difference how (in what order) the region builds the projects that lead to that end condition? Staff has done some very preliminary thinking on this topic and believes that in some areas differences in timing might have a substantial impact on the life cycle costs and benefits of the plan. To illustrate the point at the extremes, there may be significant differences in variables such as total new lane miles, vehicle miles traveled, air pollution and water use from first building the growth forecast in the plan for Rural Communities and Developing Communities versus first building the growth forecast for Centers and Corridors and Established Communities. SACOG has never focused on this type of information when constructing the plan (except to ensure compliance with federal clear air act and SB 375 standards) and staff believes it could really help the Board and stakeholders focus on new policy issues that might improve life cycle plan performance (i.e. even if the end state in 2036 remained substantially the same as the current plan).

3. Analyze different levels and types of transportation revenue

Discussion: Every plan cycle SACOG must refresh its revenue assumptions, consistent with federal requirements that our plan contain "reasonably reliable" revenues. Mainly this involves scrutinizing existing, long-term revenue streams like federal, state and local transportation taxes and local development fees, but within reasonable limits it can also involve new future revenue streams that we forecast to be available in the plan. Staff suggests that this revenue analysis first be focused on the currently adopted MTP/SCS (i.e. will we have the same, more or less revenues to build the projects included in the plan?). Then, if the scenario and timing analyses conducted under #1 and #2 above indicate there may be a need for new revenue (which seems likely), that we analyze the merits and viability of a focused list of new revenue sources. For example, the following new revenue sources are potential candidates for consideration: state cap and trade revenue, new local transportation sales taxes, statewide vehicle registration fee.

4. Prepare draft plan scenario

Discussion: Based on input from public workshops, stakeholders (including our cross-sectoral working group), member and partner staff and Board members over the next several months staff will create by the end of 2014 a framework for a draft preferred scenario for Board consideration that includes both the end state condition in 2036, and a timing sequence for building the transportation network and estimating when development projects will be constructed.

Table A-1. Description of 2012 MTP/SCS Scenarios 1, 2 and 3 (for the planning period 2008-2035)

	Land Use Inputs	Scenario #1	Scenario #2 (Adopted MTP/SCS)	Scenario #3	Adopted MTP/SCS
1	Share of growth in Center & Corridor Communities (percent of new homes)	19%	<del>30%</del> 28%	36%	30%
2	Share of growth in Established Communities (percent of new homes)	30%	<del>26%</del> 28%	27%	26%
3	Share of growth in Developing Communities (percent of new homes)	46%	<del>42%</del> 41%	35%	42%
4	Share of growth in Rural Residential Communities (percent of new homes)	5%	<del>1%</del> 3%	2%	1%
5	Share of growth in large-lot single-family homes (percent)	39%	<del>28%</del> 33%	25%	28%
6	Share of growth in small-lot, single-family homes (percent)	30%	<del>28%</del> 25%	23%	28%
7	Share of growth in attached homes (percent)	31%	<del>43%</del> 42%	52%	43%
	Transportation Inputs	Scenario #1	Scenario #2 (Adopted MTP/SCS)	Scenario #3	Adopted MTP/SCS
8	New or expanded roads (lane miles, percent increase from 2008)	32%	<del>29%</del> 31%	26%	29%
9	Transit service (Vehicle Service Hours, percent increases from 2008)	54%	<del>98%</del> 88%	127%	98%
10	Funding for transit (\$ in billions)	\$10.7	<del>\$11.3</del> \$11.7	\$13.7	\$11.3
11	Funding for road, bike and pedestrian maintenance (\$ in billions)	\$10.9	<del>\$11.3</del> \$11	\$11	\$11.3
12	Funding for new road capacity (\$ in billions)	\$8.7	<del>\$7.4</del> \$8	\$6.7	\$7.4
13	Funding for bike and pedestrian street and trail improvements (\$ in billions)	\$2.8	<del>\$3.0</del> \$2.9	\$3.0	\$3.0
14	Additional miles of bicycle paths, lanes and routes (Class 1, 2 and 3 = 1,700 in 2008)	800	<del>1,100</del> 1,100	1,300	1,100
15	Funding for Programs (\$ in billions)	\$1.5	<del>\$2.2</del> \$1.6	\$1.7	\$2.2

Table B-1 (continued)					
Description of 2012 MTP/SCS Scenarios 1, 2 and 3 (for the planning period 2008-2035)					
	Performance Outcomes	Scenario #1	Scenario #2 (Adopted MTP/SCS)	Scenario #3	Adopted MTP/SCS
16	Square miles of farmland converted to development (4,166 square miles of farmland in 2008)	93	<del>57</del> 70	50	57
17	Square miles of vernal pools affected by development	9	<del>7</del> 8	7	7
18	Share of new homes near high-frequency transit (percent of new homes)	22%	<del>38%</del> 28%	35%	38%
19	Share of new jobs near high-frequency transit (percent of new jobs)	26%	<del>39%</del> 35%	44%	39%
20	Transit costs recovered by ticket sales (percent)	38%	<del>38%</del> 41%	51%	38%
21	Total homes in environmental justice areas near high-frequency transit (percent of homes, 30% in 2008)	43%	<del>55%</del> 45%	47%	55%
22	Share of trips by transit, bike or walk (percent increase per capita from 2008)	12%	<del>33%</del> 22%	31%	33%
23	Vehicle miles traveled (VMT) (percent change per capita from 2008)	-6%	<del>-6.9%</del> -8%	-9%	-6.9%
24	Vehicle miles traveled in heavy congestion (percent of total VMT)	5%	<del>6%</del> 6%	7%	6%
25	Travel time spent in car per capita (percent change from 2008)	-3%	<del>-4%</del> -4%	-4%	-4%
26	Weekday passenger vehicle CO <sub>2</sub> emissions (percent change per capita from 2005)	-14%	<del>-16%</del> -16%	-17%	-16%

## Policy Framework for the 2016 MTP/SCS Update

November 19, 2013

The 2016 update to the Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (2016 MTP/SCS) will focus on implementation challenges and commitments of the current plan with the goal of moving toward the transportation, air quality and quality of life outcomes set forth in the plan. These implementation challenges and commitments are broadly defined in the below *Implementation Themes* table, along with examples of the research and analysis that will be used to address these issues.

### Foundational Assumptions for the Update: *Regional Growth Projections*

The same regional growth projections of the 2012 MTP/SCS will be used for the 2016 MTP/SCS except that the growth is assumed to arrive one year later, 2036. This equates to 361,000 new jobs, 871,000 new people and 303,000 new housing units from 2008:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Jobs</u>	<u>Population</u>	<u>Housing Units</u>
2008	966,316	2,215,044	884,725
2036	1,327,424	3,086,213	1,187,744

### Implementation Themes for the 2016 MTP/SCS Update

<b>Implementation Question/Challenge</b>	<b>Examples of research and analysis to address question/challenge</b>
<b>Transportation Funding:</b> Can the region capture the revenues projected to come from all sources local, state and federal?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Update revenue projections for local, state and federal sources, considering long-term/historic and short-term/recent losses or revenue.</li> <li>Identify strategies for new revenue generation and cost-effective investments.</li> </ul>
<b>Investment Strategy:</b> Is there enough emphasis on system maintenance ("fix-it-first") investments?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify and compare local and state system maintenance needs for different modes of travel.</li> <li>Identify tradeoffs between system maintenance and system expansion priorities.</li> <li>Identify unique challenges and opportunities in urban, suburban and rural communities, with particular attention to suburban economic challenges.</li> <li>Identify new strategies for SACOG planning and funding efforts that consider fix-it-first.</li> </ul>
<b>Investment Timing:</b> Should there be changes in the timing of transportation investments?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Examine the cost effectiveness of moving certain projects forward or backward in the planning period.</li> <li>Analyze the effect of project phasing on performance of the regional transportation system, air quality, and land use pattern.</li> <li>Identify short-term strategies to improve regional travel patterns.</li> </ul>
<b>Land Use Forecast (allocation):</b> What is the economic viability of the projected greenfield and infill growth?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inventory adopted and proposed land use plans in the region.</li> <li>Analyze the effect of more greenfield versus more infill growth, and vice versa, on transportation system performance.</li> <li>Analyze recent market performance for greenfield and infill, residential and non-residential development.</li> <li>Determine if and how the estimated growth in Center/Corridor, Established, Developing, and Rural Residential Community Types should be changed or refined.</li> </ul>
<b>Plan Effects:</b> Follow through on the implementation commitments of the 2012 MTP/SCS to better measure the effects of the plan on different people and issue areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Track travel behavior, land development pattern, demographic, air quality and transportation project delivery trends to better understand how the MTP/SCS is being implemented over time.</li> <li>Develop additional performance metrics to assess the impact of the MTP/SCS on different groups of people and issues (e.g. environmental justice communities; health; access to jobs, services, and affordable housing).</li> <li>Develop decision-making support tools to support regional and local decision-making.</li> <li>Research the effect of our growing region on the agricultural economy and open space.</li> </ul> <p><i>(Appendix A contains more description of the Implementation Commitments in the MTP/SCS)</i></p>

### Update Schedule and Public Outreach

The greater part of 2014 will be focused on research, analysis and public engagement around implementation questions and challenges broadly defined in this policy framework. SACOG staff will conduct research and analysis in consultation with member jurisdictions, partner agencies and interested stakeholders. The SACOG Board will use the results of the research and public input to direct the update of the draft plan and technical assumptions in 2015. **Appendix B** contains the plan update schedule and **Appendix C** contains the outreach plan.

## Appendix A: Implementation Commitments from the 2012 MTP/SCS

1. **Performance Monitoring:** Track and strive to better understand how the 2012 MTP/SCS is being implemented over time in the areas of a) transportation trends, b) development pattern, c) demographics, d) transportation project delivery and e) air quality. Performance monitoring allows the agency to determine what kinds of adjustments to make to future MTP/SCS' and supports SACOG's strategic goal to maximize the quality of life benefits that the MTP/SCS contributes to the region (See Strategic Plan Goal 2, attached).

- a. Transportation trends: monitor how people are traveling in the region and the impacts of their travel on the transportation system.

Examples of monitoring metrics:

- Vehicle miles traveled;
- Congested travel;
- Travel by auto, transit, bicycling or walking (mode split);
- Transit passenger boardings.

- b. Development pattern: monitor how private and public sector influences are shaping growth in the region to compare to projected land use patterns in the 2012 MTP/SCS and inform the projected land use patterns for the 2016 MTP/SCS.

Examples of monitoring metrics:

- Residential construction in center and corridor, established, developing and rural residential communities;
- Construction of different types of housing (e.g., large lot single family, small lot single family, attached multi-family);
- Changes to federal, state and local policies and regulations that affect the rate and location of development;
- Financial incentives and tools such as funding for affordable housing or infill development;
- Viability of agriculture and open spaces.

- c. Demographics: monitor demographic characteristics that influence where people live, work and how they travel.

Examples of monitoring metrics:

- Household size, age and income;
- Auto ownership.

- d. Transportation Project Construction (Project Delivery): monitor construction of transportation projects and how those projects align with the policies of the 2012 MTP/SCS.

Examples of monitoring metrics:

## Appendix A: Implementation Commitments from the 2012 MTP/SCS

- Efficient use of federal and state transportation dollars;
- Blueprint supportive projects;
- Projects supporting rural economies;
- Projects that support a variety of modes including transit, bicycle, pedestrian, roads, and highways;
- Condition of existing transit and road infrastructure.

e. Air Quality: monitor regional air quality.

Examples of monitoring metrics:

- Levels of ozone, particulate matter, and other air pollutants;
- Number of days per year with Spare the Air notifications.

2. **Impact Assessment:** Improve SACOG's ability to accurately estimate the impacts of the MTP/SCS on different people and issue areas. This supports SACOG's strategic goals of information-based decision making and serving as a source of high-quality information (See Strategic Plan Goals 1 and 3, attached). The 2012 MTP/SCS made great strides in measuring the impacts of the plan on travel, air quality, the environment, and low income and minority residents (environmental justice populations).

Examples of impact assessments to improve:

- a. Air quality related health impacts of locating housing near major roadways.
- b. Balance of jobs and housing within communities and across the region;
- c. Access to key services (e.g., medical, schools, colleges and universities, parks);
- d. Public safety and health;
- e. Effects on specific populations such as youth, the elderly, low income and minorities;
- f. Climate change.

3. **Decision-Making Support Tools:** Improve decision-making support tools for regional and local decisions so that member cities and counties, partner agencies, stakeholders and residents of the region have information about transportation investments, growth patterns, and policies that relate to the 2012 MTP/SCS. This will increase opportunities for member jurisdictions to utilize regional data, models and analysis to analyze impacts of their decisions on transportation, land use, air quality and other policy areas that affect quality of life. These tools support SACOG's strategic plan goal to sustain the agency's emphasis on information-based decision making (see Strategic Plan Goal 1, attached).

Examples of decision-making support tools:

- a. Software that models the economic effects of land use and transportation policies (PECAS);
- b. Bus and light rail inventory information readily available to emergency operations centers;
- c. Support changes to federal and state regulations that increase local flexibility and encourage use of existing streamlining options that will help implement the 2012 MTP/SCS.

## Appendix A: Implementation Commitments from the 2012 MTP/SCS

- d. Work to align federal natural resources, habitat and clean air policies and regulations with the goals of the 2012 MTP/SCS;
  - e. Quantify the importance of the rural economy within the region (Rural-Urban Connections Strategy).
4. **Financial Tools & Incentives:** Support financial tools and incentives to help implement the 2012 MTP/SCS to realize its performance. These tools and incentives will support the construction of projects critical to the MTP/SCS' performance and bring real quality of life benefits to the region (see Strategic Plan Goals 2 and 3, attached).

### Examples:

- a. Reestablish some tools that redevelopment agencies previously had such as tax-increment financing to promote infill and revitalization;
- b. Provide local governments more funding flexibility and options, particularly for transit operations and capital and road maintenance and rehabilitation, in both rural and urban areas;

Reform regulations to speed up review and approval of transportation and land use projects with low environmental impacts and positive benefits to state regional, and local goals.

## Appendix A: Implementation Commitments from the 2012 MTP/SCS

### Goals 1-3 from the SACOG Strategic Plan

**Goal 1: Sustain the agency's emphasis on information-based decision making by providing state-of-the-art data and tools to members, partners, stakeholders and residents to help them shape the futures of their communities and the region.**

#### Goal 1 Strategies:

1. Increase opportunities for member jurisdictions to utilize regional data, models and analysis to analyze impacts of their decisions on transportation, land use, air quality and other policy areas that affect quality of life.
2. Increase agency capacity to provide scientific information and analysis of transportation, land use, air quality and other matters of regional importance.

#### Goal 1 Performance Indicators:

- A. Members and planning partners routinely use a combination of appropriate planning tools (e.g., I-PLACE<sup>3</sup>S and SACSIM) to conduct technical analysis of general plan updates, corridor plans, transportation circulation plans, and neighborhood and community plans, and use of such planning tools by stakeholders and residents to evaluate proposed development projects.
- B. Interactive, information-based citizen engagement practices are commonly used by members in support of general plan updates, development of neighborhood and community plans, and evaluation of the impacts of significant proposed development projects. The Agency has an effective and active process for sharing information about SACOG activities with staff in service to local government
- C. Appointment to the SACOG Board is viewed as an attractive opportunity for local elected officials and SACOG's Board members are actively engaged in pursuing the mission of the agency and the agency's local, state and national recognition for leadership in the implementation of information rich, consensus-driven regional efforts to improve the quality of life in the region continues to be enhanced. SACOG actively engages in providing information to all elected leaders about the role it plays in regional affairs and how this role contributes to an improved quality of life.

## Appendix A: Implementation Commitments from the 2012 MTP/SCS

**Goal 2: Maximize strategic influence for the region through developing and implementing integrated regional transportation plans that produce unique and significant quality of life benefits for residents of the region.**

### Goal 2 Strategies:

1. Consolidate, expand and maximize strategic advantage from the agency's state and national leadership role and access to the best tools and methods for preparing an outstanding MTP.
2. Maximize the benefits of comprehensive planning and project implementation in the Sacramento region.

### Goal 2 Performance Indicators:

- A. SACOG's MTP will remain a leader in the state in improving per capita VMT, congestion, air emissions and other performance measures that advance the quality of life.
- B. SACOG will leverage its high performing MTP to secure additional funding and policy support from federal, state and local sources to build key projects sooner than would otherwise be possible.
- C. SACOG and its member agencies continue to be leaders in the State in the timely delivery of projects.

## Appendix A: Implementation Commitments from the 2012 MTP/SCS

**Goal 3: Serve as a source of high quality information, convener, and/or advocate on a range of regional issues when the agency's involvement would provide unique, added value to promoting a sustainable future for the region.**

### Goal 3 Strategies:

1. Continue to expand SACOG's data and modeling capabilities to include topics that influence transportation behavior and planning (e.g., energy, climate change, land use economics and infrastructure).
2. Assist regional partners with the evaluation of functional service delivery opportunities and act upon the ones that will most assist the agencies.
3. Analyze options for increasing SACOG's financial analysis and capacity so that it is able to serve the region if and when new service needs are identified.

### Goal 3 Performance Indicators:

1. Deliver cost savings to local governments by building the capacity of the agency in areas of highest need to member jurisdictions, and/or leveraging new revenues in collaboration with local governments.
2. SACOG's member services program will increase coordination activities relating to assistance with policy development, joint project delivery, grant development, and requests for technical assistance as measured by increase in requests from member jurisdictions for assistance and resulting grant acquisition or more integrated policy making

## Appendix B: Schedule for 2016 MTP/SCS Update

November 19, 2013

Major Deliverables and Milestones	SACOG Action	Complete By
<b>FY13/14 – Focused on: Issue Identification, Policy Framework Development, Research and Analysis</b>		
Update Public Participation Plan	Board action	complete
Early public and stakeholder outreach on planning and policy issues; Board consideration and identification of policy issues	Board direction	complete
Develop draft regional growth projections	Board direction	complete
Adopt policy framework for 2016 MTP/SCS update; Adopt draft regional growth projections for use in plan update	Board action	December 2013
Technical work to refresh land use and transportation planning assumptions including inventorying of local land use plans and <i>Call for Review of Transportation Projects</i> <sup>1</sup>	Staff work with local agencies	Fall 2013 – Fall 2014
Board direction <sup>2</sup>	Board direction	February 2014
Board direction <sup>2</sup>	Board direction	June 2014
<b>FY 14/15 – Focused on: Public Workshops, Update of Planning Assumptions and Draft Plan Development</b>		
Conduct at least 8 public workshops on policy choices and issues related to the MTP/SCS	Board receive & consider	Summer/Fall 2014
Review public workshop results	Board direction	Summer/Fall 2014
Board direction <sup>2</sup>	Board direction	September 2014
Create Framework for Draft 2016 MTP/SCS	Board action	December 2014
Release Notice of Preparation for Environmental Impact Report	Staff work	December 2014
Develop draft land use forecast and transportation project list assumptions	Staff work with local agencies	Dec. 2014 – Mar. 2014
Endorse draft land use forecast and transportation project list assumptions for use in development of Draft Plan, Draft EIR, and Draft Air Quality Conformity	Board action	March 2014
Direction on Draft Plan Policies and Strategies	Board action	Jan. 2015 – Mar. 2015
Draft Plan and Draft EIR development	Staff work	Mar. 2015 – Aug. 2015
Board direction <sup>2</sup>	Board direction	June 2015
<b>FY 15/16 – Focused on: Draft Plan and Draft EIR Completion, Public Comment Period on Draft Plan, Adoption</b>		
Draft Plan and Draft EIR development	Staff work	Mar. 2015 - Aug. 2015
Board direction <sup>2</sup>	Board direction	August 2015
<i>Adoption of RTPs/EIRs by El Dorado County Transportation Commission and Placer County Transportation Agency</i>	<i>Coordination</i> <sup>3</sup>	<i>Fall 2015</i>

<sup>1</sup> There are ongoing meetings with the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to determine when CARB will revisit the SB 375 greenhouse gas targets for all California MPOs.

<sup>2</sup> Staff anticipates periodic check-ins with the Board in addition to major actions noted in the calendar. Some key check-ins with the Board during the 2012 MTP/SCS update included input on revenue forecast assumptions, updating policies and strategies, direction on CARB greenhouse gas target-setting scenarios, and coordination with the Regional Housing Needs process.

<sup>3</sup> This milestone is included in the Work Plan for reference. The SACOG Board does not act on the RTPs of either PCTPA or EDCTC. SACOG coordinates with PCTPA and EDCTC to incorporate their adopted plans into the SACOG MTP/SCS.

## Appendix B: Schedule for 2016 MTP/SCS Update

November 19, 2013

*(continued)*

Major Deliverables and Milestones	SACOG Action	Complete By
<b>FY 15/16 – Focused on: Draft Plan and Draft EIR Completion, Public Comment Period on Draft Plan, Adoption</b>		
Release Draft 2016 MTP/SCS for 30-day public comment period	Board action	September 2015
Release Draft EIR for public comment (60-day comment period)	Staff work	September 2015
Hold at least 6 information meetings with local elected officials	Board receive & consider	Sept. 2015 – Dec. 2015
Hold 3 public hearings on Draft 2016 MTP/SCS	Board receive & consider	Sept. 2015 – Dec. 2015
Review public comments and recommendations on Final Draft Plan and Final EIR	Board direction	January 2016
Certify Final EIR Adopt 2016 MTP/SCS Adopt Air Quality Conformity Determination	Board action	February 2016

## Appendix C: Outreach Plan for 2016 MTP/SCS

November 19, 2013

**Working document that can be added to throughout the engagement process**

### **BOARD MEMBER, JURISDICTION STAFF & PUBLIC AGENCY COMMUNICATIONS**

- Regular communication and updates will occur at all SACOG board committee meetings and at board meetings as needed
  - Timing: Ongoing
- Regular communication and opportunity for feedback from the Planners Committee, Transit Coordinating Committee, Regional Planning Partnership, Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee, with membership drawn from member jurisdictions and partner agencies
  - Timing: Ongoing
- Meetings with and communications to member jurisdiction staff on the process, requesting information, providing information for review and feedback
  - Timing: Ongoing
- Regional Managers Meetings
  - Timing: Quarterly
- Meetings with state and federal agencies
  - Timing: As needed to align with planning calendar and as dictated by statutory requirements
- Presentations to various public agency staff and boards in the region.
  - Timing: As coordinated by SACOG staff or by request

### **STAKEHOLDER OUTREACH**

In addition to ongoing communications outlined above, staff will use methods such as those listed below to engage communities across the region about the 2016 MTP/SCS update:

- A comprehensive stakeholder list including stakeholders who participated in the previous MTP/SCS process will be updated and utilized.
  - Timing: Ongoing
- A one-stop request for information on the 2016 MTP/SCS update will be on the SACOG website for access to key input and feedback points for the public, key decision points for the Board, technical information, and meeting/workshop information.
  - Timing: Winter 2013/2014, dependent on board adoption of 2016 MTP/SCS Framework
- Early engagement of a cross-sectoral stakeholder group
  - Timing: complete
- To maintain a consistent message, a PowerPoint presentation will be prepared to highlight both background on the MTP/SCS and the process for the update. The presentation will be used by various staff at presentations throughout the region coordinated by staff and/or by request from stakeholders and board members.
  - Timing: March 2014
- Stakeholder meetings, member and partner agency coordination, and public communications on policy issues and areas of research for the 2016 MTP/SCS
  - Timing: 2013-2015
- Staff will collaborate with key partners to publicize and present a greenhouse gas target-setting public workshop (contingent on actions of the California Air Resources Board).
- Staff will provide updates and gather feedback from SACOG advisory groups
- Public Workshops
  - Timing: Summer/Fall 2014
  - Staff will conduct at least eight public workshops in the region
  - Workshops held in El Dorado and Placer counties will be coordinated with EDCTC and PCTPA.

## Appendix C: Outreach Plan for 2016 MTP/SCS

November 19, 2013

- Stakeholder meetings, member and partner agency coordination, and public communications on development of draft plan and next steps
  - Timing: Summer 2014-Fall 2015
- Elected Official Information Meetings on draft Sustainable Communities Strategy
  - Staff will conduct at least six elected official information meetings on the draft Sustainable Communities Strategy/Alternative Planning Strategy (SCS/APS) in the update, one in each county with representatives of the county board of supervisors and city councils that represent a majority of the cities representing a majority of the population in the incorporated areas of that county. Meetings held in El Dorado and Placer counties will be coordinated with EDCTC and PCTPA.
  - Timing: Fall/Winter 2015
- At least three public hearings on the draft SCS/APS. Any meetings held in El Dorado and Placer counties will be coordinated with EDCTC and PCTPA.
  - Timing: Fall/Winter 2015
- Tribal consultation will occur in alignment with the outreach and communication principles, and as guided by the adopted Public Participation Plan. Outreach will occur on a government-to-government basis. For the Tribal Governments with land within Placer and El Dorado counties, tribal consultation will occur through collaboration with the Regional Transportation Planning agencies (RTPAs) in those counties.
  - Timing: Ongoing and in coordination with PCTPA and EDCTC

### MASS COMMUNICATIONS

To supplement the ongoing routine media coverage of transportation issues, the following strategies will be used to inform and engage interested stakeholders

- A series of articles in the electronic newsletter *Regional Report* on the content of the current MTP/SCS, what projects have begun or been completed in the interim, and an overview of the planning process with opportunities for feedback noticed in a timely manner
  - Timing: Beginning September 2013
- On the MTP/SCS website general information and a timeline for the update, including but not limited to why the update is taking place, contact information, meeting locations. The website will be easily accessible and updated as needed. The link to the MTP/SCS website will be prominent on the SACOG homepage.
  - Timing: September 2013
- Press releases and media outreach as needed.
- White papers and issue briefs may be developed on specific policy issues as the MTP/SCS Update process evolves, or new information or technical analysis needs to be communicated
- Staff will continue to reach out to community newsletters, social media, blogs and other similar publications outside of traditional media that work with SACOG in its media outreach.
  - Timing: Ongoing
- Staff will develop and place op-ed pieces by board members as appropriate.

Staff contacts:

Kacey Lizon, Project Manager, [klizon@sacog.org](mailto:klizon@sacog.org) (916) 340-6265

Monica Hernández, Communications Coordinator, [mhernandez@sacog.org](mailto:mhernandez@sacog.org), (916) 340-6237

Jennifer Hargrove, Land Use Coordinator, [jhargrove@sacog.org](mailto:jhargrove@sacog.org), (916) 340-6216

Clint Holtzen, Transportation Coordinator, [choltzen@sacog.org](mailto:choltzen@sacog.org), (916) 340-6246