Chapter 8
Equity and Choice
Provide real, viable travel choices for all people throughout our diverse region
Introduction

SACOG is required by law to conduct an environmental justice analysis as part of the MTP/SCS, to determine whether the MTP/SCS benefits low-income and minority communities equitably, and whether the Plan’s transportation investments have any disproportionate negative effects on minority and/or low-income populations in the SACOG region. SACOG has conducted such analyses in the last several MTPs.

While Chapter 5 analyzes the general performance of the MTP/SCS, this chapter provides SACOG’s environmental justice analysis. The chapter seeks not only to fulfill SACOG’s legal requirement to analyze the environmental justice impacts of the MTP/SCS, including expanded performance measures from previous MTPs, but also to understand and compare the benefits and effects of the MTP/SCS for the region’s residents, including those who live in more low-income or minority communities.

The chapter includes the following:

- Legal requirements for environmental justice analysis
- How Environmental Justice (EJ) Areas are defined
- Characteristics of EJ Areas
- Analysis of EJ impacts of the MTP/SCS, including new performance measures
- Strategies for building analytical capacity and expertise

Legal Framework

Planning Process and Environmental Justice

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act, first adopted in 1964, set the initial legal framework for environmental justice analysis, stating that “No person . . . shall, on the grounds of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.” Title VI was later amended to include gender, religion, and disability. In 1987, it was further amended to extend non-discrimination requirements for recipients of federal aid to all of their programs and activities, not just those funded with federal funds.

California Government Code Section 11135(a) also addresses discrimination by recipients of state funds:

No person in the State of California shall, on the basis of race, national origin, ethnic group identification, religion, age, sex, sexual orientation, color, or disability, be unlawfully denied full and equal access to the benefits of, or be unlawfully subjected to discrimination under, any program or activity that is conducted, operated, or administered by the state or by any state agency, is funded directly by the state, or receives any financial assistance from the state.

To implement and ensure compliance with these statutes, federal and state agencies have issued a series of orders, regulations and guidance on environmental justice. In 1994, President Clinton issued Executive Order 12898 on “Federal Actions To Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations.”1 In 1997, the Department of Transportation followed up with an Order on Environmental Justice2 designed to implement the Executive Order.

In December 1998, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) issued its own environmental justice order. As a federally designated metropolitan transportation planning organization (MPO), SACOG is required to comply with the rules and policies set forth by FHWA. FHWA outlines three main principles underlying environmental justice:

- To avoid, minimize, or mitigate disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects, including social and economic effects, on minority and low-income populations.
- Ensure full and fair participation by all potentially affected communities in the transportation decision making process.

---

2 http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/environmental_justice/facts/dot_ord.cfm
• Prevent denial of, reduction in, or significant delay in the receipt of benefits by minority populations and low-income groups.

Per FHWA’s guidance on environmental justice:

\textit{MPOs serve as the primary forum where State DOTs, transit providers, local agencies, and the public develop local transportation plans and programs that address a metropolitan area’s needs. MPOs can help local public officials understand how Title VI and environmental justice requirements improve planning and decision making. To certify compliance with Title VI and address environmental justice, MPOs need to:}

• Enhance their analytical capabilities to ensure that the long-range transportation plan and the transportation improvement program (TIP) comply with Title VI.

• Identify residential, employment, and transportation patterns of low-income and minority populations so that their needs can be identified and addressed, and the benefits and burdens of transportation investments can be fairly distributed.

• Evaluate and—where necessary—improve their public involvement processes to eliminate participation barriers and engage minority and low-income populations in transportation decision making.

\textbf{Engagement & Education for the MTP/SCS}

\textbf{Public Involvement Process for Low-Income and Minority Communities in the MTP/SCS}

SACOG’s adopted guide for public involvement, the Public Participation Plan (PPP), identifies opportunities for public input at the front end of the MTP/SCS planning process and also prior to final hearings. The process provides complete information on transportation plans, timely public notice, full public access to key decisions, and opportunities for early and continuing involvement in the process for all segments of the region’s population, including low-income and minority communities.

In February through April of 2011, staff conducted a PPP amendment including a working group meeting of representatives of environmental justice communities. This meeting specifically asked for input on additional techniques and strategies that could be used to augment the required outreach activities to better meet the needs of our environmental justice populations. Additionally, this group was asked to engage from this first step in framing the public participation process through the entire MTP/SCS process as a partner in outreach and education. The full PPP is located in Appendix G-2.

As part of the development process for the MTP/SCS, SACOG worked to bring in more members of environmental justice communities as defined by statute, and to reach out to other underrepresented populations including persons with disabilities, youth, seniors, recent immigrants and limited English speakers. The goal of this outreach strategy was to obtain feedback from all segments of the population and to ensure broad participation representative of the region’s demographic profile at the public workshops.

Critical to SACOG’s overall effort to reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and greenhouse gas emissions is understanding the travel choices residents of the region will want and need to make in the future. As such, public input from all segments of the population was critical to development of this MTP/SCS. Beyond meeting the federal requirement for addressing unique needs of low-income and minority communities, SACOG is sensitive to ensuring that transportation investments set forth in this MTP/SCS help support diverse transportation choices that reflect and meet the travel needs of the region’s residents.

To meet the goal of better engaging with environmental justice communities and underrepresented residents, SACOG not only used the legally required techniques described in Chapter 2, but also sought out underrepresented residents not included in the environmental justice statute.
Key efforts included:

- Presentations to over 130 community groups during the 2010 and 2011 planning process.
- Focus groups with a number of representatives from equity, public health, affordable housing, and human service groups, and minority, low-income, senior, youth, disabled and recent immigrant populations, identified in Appendix G-3.
- Translation of MTP/SCS workshop fliers into Spanish for all locations (Spanish is the most common non-English language spoken in the region).
- Advance preparation work with translators and translation of workshop materials into Russian and Vietnamese.
- On-site translators for participants needing translation into Russian, Asian languages, and Spanish.
- Financial assistance to low-income residents who would be burdened by the cost of transportation, plus free dial-a-ride service by Paratransit, Inc. provided by request for all workshops, including areas not in the Paratransit service area.
- Findings from eight focus groups with residents from environmental justice populations in the region, including Asian-Pacific Islander, African-American, Hispanic/Latino, Native American/American Indian, and low-income populations, conducted with support from Caltrans and the consulting firm MIG. (For a focus group summary, see Appendix G-3.)
- Consideration of findings and recommendations from a SACOG study completed in February 2011 assessing the needs of transit-dependent residents in the region to reach essential or “lifeline” destinations.3

For more information related specifically to the MTP/SCS 2010 workshops, see Chapter 2, The Planning Process.

Environmental Justice Area Definitions

FHWA requires MPOs’ environmental justice analyses to address persons belonging to any of the following groups:

- Black—a person having origins in any of the black racial groups of Africa.
- Hispanic—a person of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American, or other Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race.
- Asian—a person having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, or the Indian subcontinent.
- American Indian and Alaskan Native—a person having origins in any of the original people of North America and who maintains cultural identification through tribal affiliation or community recognition.
- Low-Income—a person whose household income (or in the case of a community or group, whose median household income) is at or below the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services poverty guidelines.

The Council on Environmental Quality’s guidance for environmental justice analysis under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) also provides the following definitions for minority individuals and minority populations:

**Minority individuals are defined as members of the following population groups:** American Indian or Alaskan Native; Asian or Pacific Islander; Black; or Hispanic.

**Minority populations should be identified where either:** (a) the minority population of the affected area exceeds 50 percent or (b) the minority population percentage of the affected area is meaningfully greater than the minority population percentage in the general population or other appropriate unit of geographic analysis.

However, Caltrans’ Desk Guide on Environmental Justice in Transportation Planning and Investments—developed for public agencies, elected officials, community-based organizations, and concerned citizens—cautions that, “while these are the official definitions for NEPA analyses, they may not be appropriate for assessing environmental justice issues in transportation plans, particularly in a state like California where minority individuals are the majority of residents.”4

In January 2011, SACOG received a grant from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development for regional planning to complete a Regional Plan for Sustainable Development and accelerate transit-oriented development (TOD) to support implementation of the Blueprint Vision and MTP/SCS. As part of this grant work, SACOG has had the opportunity to work with faculty and students of the UC

---


Davis Center for Regional Change (CRC) on enhanced equity indicators and performance measures to inform the MTP/SCS environmental justice analysis and Transit Priority Area work.

CRC’s focus included assistance on defining Environmental Justice Areas for the MTP/SCS analysis to reflect both changes in Census data availability between 2000 and 2010 and changes in the six-county region. Several factors were of particular significance:

The previous 2008 MTP used 2000 Census data. This MTP/SCS uses 2010 Census data, or where that information is not available, data from the 2005-2009 American Community Survey (ACS). This reflects the major shift in how the Census is and will be produced in the future—away from the more detailed decennial surveying of a larger population to more frequent, less-detailed surveying of smaller populations in the ACS. While this shift over time will have the positive effect of providing Census information more often than every 10 years, it unfortunately has also removed some categories of long-form information that were available in the 2000 Census—such as more detailed household income data—and created more significant issues with margins of error that result from a small number of Census surveys being used to estimate income across a large urban and rural region. As a result the definition of areas with low income can only be determined at the Census “tract” level versus the smaller “block group” level that is used for the other definitions of Environmental Justice areas included in this chapter.

Population data from the 2010 Census shows that the Sacramento region has significantly increased in diversity since the prior Census. Between 2000 and 2010, the Black/African-American population in the region grew by 21 percent, the population of two or more races grew by 29 percent, Hispanic and Asian populations both grew by 56 percent, and the Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander population grew by 93 percent, compared with 5 percent total growth in the Caucasian/White population. As shown in Table 8.1, the “minority” population has grown to half or more of the population in Sacramento, Sutter and Yolo counties, and 44 percent of the region’s population.

**Table 8.1**

**Minority Population in the SACOG Region, 2000–2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutter</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolo</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuba</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SACOG, September 2011.

This led to a reexamination of how to define “minority” communities. (A complete description of how the definition was developed is included in Appendix C-5.)

CRC’s HUD grant work included evaluation of the TOD areas to be studied in the Regional Plan for Sustainable Development. CRC developed two neighborhood indices, a vulnerability index and an opportunity index, that could be used to compare the demographic and socio-economic characteristics of specific neighborhoods to the region as a whole.

Informed by CRC and the grant project’s Equity, Housing and Public Health Working Group, SACOG developed the following criteria to define low-income and minority communities for this environmental justice analysis:

- **Low-Income Communities:** Census Tracts where 45 percent or more of the population earns 200 percent or less of the federal poverty level, based on 2005–2009 ACS data. Tracts meeting this threshold include about 19 percent of the region’s population.
- **Minority Communities:** Census Block Groups where 70 percent or more of the population is Asian Pacific Islander, African American, Hispanic, Native American or other Non-White ethnic group, based on 2010 Census data. Block groups meeting this threshold include about 19 percent of the region’s population.
Communities meeting one or both criteria are considered environmental justice areas (EJ Areas) for purposes of this analysis. In addition, SACOG added the following new criteria for defining EJ Areas, drawn from the CRC vulnerability index:

- **Vulnerable Communities**: Block groups in the region that, according to U.S. Census information, when compared with the regional average, are in the top quintile on at least four of these five vulnerability measures:
  - Housing cost burden: percent of renter- and owner-occupied housing units paying more than 50 percent of household income in housing costs.
  - Single parent households: percent of family households with their own children under age 18 with a single householder.
  - Older population: percentage of population aged 75 and older.
  - Educational attainment: percentage of population 25 years and older with less than a high school degree.
  - Linguistic isolation: percent of households where English is not the primary language and is not spoken very well.

This third criterion added to the EJ Areas three block groups totaling about 4,400 people in Sutter County and one block group in Sacramento County with a population of about 2,800. Combined, the total population of the resulting EJ Areas is about 26.5 percent of the total regional population.

A more in-depth technical review of the changes in Census data and EJ Area definition methodology is contained in Appendix C-5.

Before describing EJ Area characteristics, it is also important to note that:

- Whether areas qualify as “EJ” or “Non-EJ” depends on thresholds for block groups or census tracts that quantify the residents of an area, but they are not monolithic. There are residents who do not have low incomes and/or who are not from minority groups who reside in EJ Areas. There are also low-income and minority residents who live in Non-EJ Areas.
- With its current analytical tools, SACOG is not able to forecast the location of future low-income and minority populations or EJ Areas. As a result, the areas that qualify as EJ Areas in the 2008 base year are assumed to be the same for the 2035 analysis. SACOG analyzes performance measures for all residents of both EJ and Non-EJ Areas in 2008 and 2035, but cannot meaningfully say whether those residents will continue to have the same minority, income and/or vulnerability characteristics in 2035 as in 2008. Although SACOG currently does not have the forecasting capacity to make more accurate predictions, the populations living in what are now EJ or Non-EJ Areas will likely be different in 2035. The Center for Continuing Study of the California Economy (CCSCE) projects that the Sacramento region will continue to become more diverse, with the largest population growth coming from Hispanic and Asian residents over the coming decades. This continued diversification, combined with the MTP/SCS commitment to provide a full range of housing choices in sub-areas throughout the region—reinforced by state Regional Housing Needs Allocation requirements—means that some of the MTP/SCS analysis for later years may underestimate benefits or overstate impacts on future minority and/or low-income populations.

- Senior and disabled populations are not included in the FHWA low-income and minority definitions, and were consequently not specifically included in the demographic analysis in this chapter. However, the transportation needs and opportunities to improve transportation services for these groups were also considered in developing the MTP recommendations.
- Youth are also not specifically included in the FHWA definitions, but have their own transportation needs. The Healthy Youth/Healthy Regions study for the area, commissioned by Sierra Health Foundation with additional funding provided by The California Endowment and conducted by the UC Davis Center for Regional Change found that, “Vulnerable youth often perceive the physical infrastructure of the Capital Region as an obstacle to their well-being. Young people bemoan the lack of sidewalks or bike lanes on routes they must travel to study, work and shop, inadequate and expensive public transportation and the absence of areas designated for teen gathering and recreation.”

5 Center for Regional Change, Healthy Youth/Healthy Regions: Informing Action for the 9 County Capital Region and its Youth, July 2011, p. 19
Environmental Justice Area Characteristics

Of the 1,426 block groups in the region, 386 make up the region’s EJ Areas. A total of 164 block groups meet low-income criteria alone and 112 meet both low-income and minority criteria, totaling 67 percent of the EJ Area population. Another 106 block groups meet minority community criteria alone, with 32 percent of the EJ Area population. Four block groups meet vulnerability criteria alone, with 1 percent of the population. Figure 8.1 illustrates where block groups meet only a single threshold compared with block groups that meet both low-income and minority thresholds. The following is a general description of the EJ Areas across the region:

In Elk Grove, the EJ area consists of four block groups on the western edge of Laguna West along I-5, 14 in the Cresleigh Ranch/Giliam Meadows area of southern Elk Grove, three in northern Elk Grove between Calvine Road and Sheldon Road east of Hwy 99, and four between Big Horn Blvd. and the city’s northern border with Sacramento.

In Galt, the EJ area consists of three block groups between McFarland St & State Route 99, from A St to Twin Cities Rd.

The EJ Area in Rancho Cordova consists of 10 block groups in and around Lincoln Village, Cordova Meadows, and Mills Park.

In the city of Sacramento, EJ areas consist of 173 total block groups. Of these, 44 block groups cover the Parkcrest Estates, Valley Hi, Parkway, and Cosumnes River College areas, four block groups are in the Pocket, ten are around and include Executive Airport, 21 are in North and South City Farms, Oak Park, Tallac Village, and the UCD Medical Center areas, five in Colonial Village, 17 in the Fruitridge Manor, Lemon Hill, and Glen Elder areas south of Fruitridge, and four in the Muir Park area. In downtown Sacramento, nine block groups are between R Street & Broadway, and nine more in the SP/Richards area, Midtown, Mansion Flats, and Southside Park areas. Two block groups that make up CSUS are included. In northern Sacramento, 52 block groups are in the South Natomas, Gardenland, Oak Knoll, and Swanston Estates areas between I-80 and the American River, eight in the Glenwood Meadows and Bell Avenue areas north of I-80, and five in North Natomas around Power Balance Pavilion, Creekside Estates and Regency Park. Some of these block groups, particularly those on the city limit boundary, are partially in the unincorporated area or the city of Elk Grove as well as the city of Sacramento.

In unincorporated Sacramento County, the EJ area includes six block groups north of McClellan Air Park, and 14 block groups in the communities of North Highlands and Baywood North. Four block groups are included in the La Riviera area and 38 in the unincorporated areas in south Sacramento County bordering on the City of Sacramento and the City of Elk Grove.

The EJ Areas in Sutter County include the five block groups including and surrounding the city of Live Oak, and 15 block groups in central Yuba City.

In Yolo County, the EJ Area includes eight block groups in northern West Sacramento, one of which extends north along the Sacramento River all the way to Knights Landing (a large geographic area but lightly populated), and four block groups in West Sacramento west of Sycamore Avenue between the Union Pacific rail line and the shipping channel. In Davis, the EJ area consists of 11 block groups in Central Davis and the South Cape area south of I-80, and four block groups in the Sycamore South area east of State Route 113 between West Covell and Russell Boulevards. Woodland’s EJ area consists of five block groups surrounding the Main and East Street intersection including Beamer Park, Campbell Park, Donnelly Circle, and the Yolo County Fairgrounds, one block group on California Street south of Main Street, and one block group east of Pioneer Street south of I-5.

In Yuba County, the EJ Area includes the five block groups covering downtown Marysville, 15 block groups covering the unincorporated areas of Olivehurst and Linda, and two block groups covering Beale Air Force Base.

While all of these areas, shown in Figure 8.1, are included for purposes of this analysis, it is interesting to note that there are a number of block groups defined as EJ Areas that are ethnically diverse, but without the low-income or vulnerability characteristics that tend to predict greater needs for public transportation or other services due to income, age, household status, or transit-dependency.
Figure 8.1
Environmental Justice Areas
SACOG 2011

- **200% US Poverty***
  Areas where 40% or more of people are living at 200% or less of the federal poverty level

- **70% Minority**
  Areas where 70% or more of people are Non-White and/or Hispanic

- **Minority and Poverty**

- **Other Vulnerability**

- **City Boundaries**

---

* 2010 Census/2005–2009 ACS
** 2010 Census
Table 8.2 provides basic demographic information for EJ vs. Non-EJ Areas in the region:

**Table 8.2**

**Demographic Information for EJ vs. Non-EJ Areas**

Basic Census Statistics for Environmental Justice Analysis Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>EJ Analysis Areas</th>
<th>Non-EJ Areas</th>
<th>Persons per Household</th>
<th>Persons living in households earning less than 200% of federal poverty level</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>American Indian/Alaskan Native</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander</th>
<th>Other Race</th>
<th>Two or More Races</th>
<th>Hispanic or Latino</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado County (part)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJ Analysis Areas</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-EJ Areas</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer County (part)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJ Analysis Areas</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-EJ Areas</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJ Analysis Areas</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-EJ Areas</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutter County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJ Analysis Areas</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-EJ Areas</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolo County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJ Analysis Areas</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-EJ Areas</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuba County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJ Analysis Areas</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-EJ Areas</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJ Analysis Areas</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-EJ Areas</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Does not include Lake Tahoe portions of either county.

Source: SACOG, September 2011.
Key characteristics of EJ analysis areas include:

- About 26 percent of the region’s population lives in the defined EJ Areas. With the change in the 2010 Census data collection between the 2008 MTP and this MTP/SCS, El Dorado County and Placer County no longer have defined EJ Areas because of income data limitations, described more fully in Appendix C-5. As a result, previously observable communities with low-income residents are now only observed within the context of larger geographies that do not meet the thresholds.

- People in the EJ Areas are more than twice as likely to be classified as low income as people in other areas.

- Between 2000 and 2010, population diversity in the Sacramento region increased in both EJ and Non-EJ Areas. Regionally, the proportion of Hispanics living in EJ Areas grew from 24 to 32 percent, and from 10 to 16 percent in Non-EJ Areas. The Asian population increased from 15 to 19 percent in EJ Areas and from 4 to 9 percent in Non-EJ Areas. The African-American or Black population rose from 12 to 13 percent in EJ Areas, and 2 to 4 percent in Non-EJ Areas, while the proportion of people of two or more races grew from 3 to 4 percent in Non-EJ Areas. Minority population growth rates were greater in Non-EJ areas (66.7 percent increase) than in EJ Areas (18.6 percent increase).

- Meanwhile, the white population dropped by 11 percent (41 percent to 30 percent) in EJ Areas, and 14 percent in Non-EJ Areas (79 percent to 65 percent) between 2000 and 2010.

- Between 2000 and 2010, household size increased in EJ Areas in Sacramento and Yuba counties, and in Non-EJ Areas in Placer and Sacramento counties. This may reflect in part the increase in adult children living with parents or doubling-up of families due to the economic downturn, as well as cultural traditions of multi-generational households and higher birthrates among some ethnic groups.

- Households in EJ Areas tend to use transit, walking and bicycling at significantly higher rates than Non-EJ households—more than twice the rate for transit use and a 50 percent greater rate for walking and bicycling region-wide. Table 8.3 shows regional mode shares for both EJ and Non-EJ Areas. This also indicates that, while less than Non-EJ Areas, the large majority of EJ Area residents use personal vehicles for transportation.

### Table 8.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Type</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Bicycle &amp; Walk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EJ Areas</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-EJ Areas</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SACOG, September 2011.
Analysis of Environmental Justice Area Impacts

Chapters 5A, 5B, and 5C provide an in-depth discussion of the overall MTP/SCS performance and access and mobility improvements over the plan period. This chapter analyzes MTP/SCS performance and impacts specifically on EJ Areas compared with Non-EJ Areas.

The 2008 MTP focused primarily on measuring transit and auto access to jobs, transit access to retail jobs and medical services, and population living close to 15-minute transit lines for EJ and Non-EJ Areas. SACOG also worked with the UC Davis Center for Regional Change (CRC) to review and develop the performance measures used in this analysis. As a result of this work, the performance measures used in this MTP/SCS analysis have been expanded to include measures of housing mix, transit access to higher education and parks, auto accessibility and shifts in mode share, and proximity to high-volume roadways that may be a source of toxic air contaminants. The following sections detail these performance measures.

Table 8.4
EJ and Non-EJ Area Population in Community Types, 2008 and 2035

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Type</th>
<th>Percent of EJ Area population in 2008</th>
<th>Percent of EJ Area population in 2035</th>
<th>Percent of Non-EJ Area population in 2008</th>
<th>Percent of Non-EJ Area population in 2035</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Center/Corridor</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Residential</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SACOG, September 2011.

Population in Transit Priority Areas

MTP transit investments are especially focused on supporting high-quality transit in Transit Priority Areas slated for greater housing and employment growth, as described in more detail in Chapters 3 and 4. The MTP/SCS identifies Transit Priority Areas (TPAs) within a half-mile of quality transit service in Placer, Sacramento and Yolo counties. El Dorado and Placer counties did not meet thresholds for EJ Areas so there is no overlap between EJ Areas and TPA population in those counties. However, as shown in Table 8.5, a quarter of Sacramento County’s EJ Area residents and 41 percent of Yolo County’s EJ Area residents lived in TPAs in 2008.

By 2035, EJ Area population in Sacramento and Yolo counties is expected to grow by 36 percent overall, but with a 193 percent increase in the population and 191 percent increase in the jobs within TPAs. This provides over 400,000 minority, low-income, or other residents of EJ Areas with greater opportunities to live and/or work near quality transit.

The population and employment growth in TPAs is also proportionate in the benefits for Non-EJ Areas, where population overall is expected to grow by 40 percent, with a 216 percent increase in the population and 199 percent increase in the jobs in TPAs. This should provide new opportunities for residents who live in Non-EJ Areas to live and/or work near transit as well, including minority or low-income individuals.

Location and Housing Choice

Community Types
Chapter 3 discusses in more detail the Community Types developed as part of the land use framework for the MTP/SCS. Center and Corridor Communities and Established Communities are allocated significant growth in both housing and employment in the MTP/SCS, with these infill areas also supported by a greater mix of uses and transportation options.

In 2008, one-fifth of the population of EJ Areas lived in Centers and Corridors and over three-quarters in Established Communities. By 2035, over 175,000 more people in EJ Areas and 295,000 people in Non-EJ Areas will live in these Community Types, where land uses and housing and employment densities are planned to better support transit services and other mode choices for access to home, work, daily needs and services. By the end of the plan period, nearly 30 percent of the EJ Area population and 9 percent of the Non-EJ Area population will be in Centers and Corridors and 66 percent of EJ Area population and 65 percent of Non-EJ Area population will be in Established Communities. Table 8.4 shows these shifts between 2008 and 2035. The other major increase of Non-EJ Area population will be in Developing Communities.
Table 8.5  
Comparison of EJ and Non-EJ Areas with Transit Priority Areas, 2008 and 2035

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Population EJ Area % in TPA</th>
<th>Population Non-EJ Area % in TPA</th>
<th>Jobs EJ Area % in TPA</th>
<th>Jobs Non-EJ Area % in TPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutter</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolo</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuba</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2035</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutter</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolo</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuba</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SACOG, September 2011.

Demographic Shifts

As noted earlier, SACOG does not forecast future locations of low-income and minority populations, so our analysis is limited to what is expected to happen concerning the population growth in identified geographic locations in the region, but not the demographic make-up of the population in these locations. However, it is likely that there will be a greater demographic and income mix in the various Community Types and TPAs over the planning period.

Dowell Myers, Director of the Population Dynamics Research Group in the University of Southern California’s School of Policy, Planning and Development, notes that in California, "An earlier generation—predominantly white and now aging—is being replaced by a new generation comprising immigrants and their children, who are a mix of U.S.-born young of all ethnicities." Myers has found upward mobility in terms of education, English proficiency, income, and homeownership among long-term first generation Latino and other immigrants, their second-generation children and third-generation grandchildren, which will likely impact the demographic mix in current EJ and non-EJ Areas and Community Types over the planning period.

Myers’ analysis of Census data also found that in California a significant sell-off of homes took place in the 2000s, beginning with those who were 55-64 in 2000, and increasing to 67 percent of homeowners who were 75+ in 2000. Myers notes that, “The front half of the Baby Boomers are now positioned at ages 55–64 and about to begin this decline, and their initial numbers are 45.0% larger than the cohort occupying that age group in 2000. If the same attrition rates are applied in the coming decade, the sell-off of homeowners will be 45% greater.” Myers found that replacement homebuyers are largely younger Latino and Asian households rather than white non-Hispanic home

---

purchasers, which reinforces the likelihood of increasing demographic diversification across the region’s Community Types.

Additionally, SB 375 requires COGs to “identify areas within the region sufficient to house all the population of the region, including all economic segments of the population, over the course of the planning period of the regional transportation plan taking into account net migration into the region, population growth, household formation and employment [and to] identify areas within the region sufficient to house an eight-year projection of the regional housing need for the region.” Additionally, SB 375 requires that a COG’s regional housing need allocation (RHNA) to individual cities and counties be consistent with the SCS (provided the aggregate regional RHNA is maintained and that every jurisdiction receives an allocation of housing need for very low- and low-income households). Changing housing demand plus California’s unique law, with its emphasis on housing for all income groups as one of its factors and the new requirement that the SCS and RHNA must be consistent with each other, may also mean more increasing income diversity in what are currently EJ and non-EJ Areas.

**Housing Product Mix**

As discussed in more detail in Chapter 3, the MTP/SCS land use plan projects significant housing and employment growth in more central areas of the region. Consistent with the Blueprint Vision, this growth provides a greater range of housing and transportation options for both existing and new households.

The MTP/SCS projects over 170,000 new homes and over 255,000 new jobs in Center and Corridor and Established Communities, where EJ Area populations are expected to increase significantly, as well as over 125,000 homes and 56,000 jobs in Developing Communities. The MTP/SCS projects 38 percent of new housing units and 39 percent of new employees will be in Transit Priority Areas, within a half-mile of quality transit service. This means that a significant portion of new homes will be close to employment, and in areas with a mix of uses and transportation mode alternatives. The increased accessibility provided within TPAs is discussed in more detail later in this chapter.

In addition, the MTP/SCS projects an increasing diversity of housing types in the region, providing more choices and a greater range of housing prices. In 2008, 77 percent of the region’s housing stock was large-lot single family, with 12 percent small-lot single family homes, and 35 percent attached—such as condominiums, townhomes, apartments, and lofts. The Center for Continuing Study of the California Economy (CCSCE) and DB Consulting prepared a report for SACOG projecting population growth in the Sacramento region for the MTP/SCS plan period. The report identifies several major factors that will likely change the demand for these housing types in the region over the plan period:

- Population growth will be concentrated in two groups to 2020: 1) baby boomers moving from the 35–54 age groups into the 55–64 and 65+ age groups, and 2) growth in the young adult (25–34) age group.
- The majority of the region’s population growth will come from Hispanic and Asian residents, continuing the trends since 2000. For cultural reasons, Asian and Hispanic residents tend to form fewer households because, beyond primary family members, these households often include other family members, such as grandparents and/or cousins.
- Household formation rates are also lower for younger age groups, because some younger adults live with parents or housemates.
- There will not be growth in the number of households headed by residents aged 35–54 for the next 10–15 years; after 2025, there will be some growth in children and family age population.
- Most of the household growth will occur in households headed by residents aged 65 and above, since older people tend to live alone after divorce or death of a spouse. Two-thirds of households added in the region to 2035 will be headed by people 65 and over. Dowell Myers’ research cited above suggests that many older homeowners will choose to sell their homes to downsize, shift into rental housing or assisted living, or move out of state (presumably to retire or be nearer to family).

Because of these population shifts, CCSCE suggests that demand for housing in the region will be influenced particularly by the choices of older residents to stay in their homes or downsize, and by younger households. CCSCE predicts that demand for smaller homes and rentals will increase for both groups, due to smaller household sizes and affordability to more households.

As shown in Table 8.6, by 2035, the MTP/SCS plans for these demographic shifts by increasing the proportion of small-lot and attached homes to 57 percent of the new housing stock in EJ Areas, and 39 percent of the new housing options in Non-EJ Areas.

---

9 http://leginfo.ca.gov/pub/07-08/bill/sen/sb_0351-0400/sb_375_bill_20080930_chaptered.html

Table 8.6
Housing Product Mix, 2008 and 2035 by EJ and Non-EJ Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rural Residential</th>
<th>Large-Lot Single Family</th>
<th>Small-Lot Single Family</th>
<th>Attached</th>
<th>Small Lot Plus Attached</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EJ Areas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of EJ Area homes by type, 2008</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of total homes in EJ Areas by type, 2035</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-EJ Areas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of Non-EJ Area homes by type, 2008</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of total homes in Non-EJ Areas by type, 2035</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SACOG, September 2011.

SACOG cannot project the rental or sales prices of new development in particular communities, but smaller lot and attached housing types generally cost less to own or rent than large-lot homes. Chapter 3 notes that attached homes generally include a higher proportion of rentals than detached homes. The growth in these options is expected to increase housing choices and affordability for lower income, minority and other households throughout the region. Chapter 3 contains more detail on these housing types and their growth in the different Community Types over the plan period.

Transportation and Accessibility
The MTP/SCS complements planned land use changes with improvements in transportation options that increase residents’ access to key destinations. This section analyzes a series of transportation performance measures used to assess the plan’s benefits for EJ and Non-EJ Area residents, including accessibility from EJ and Non-EJ Areas by both transit and driving to such key destinations as jobs, medical facilities, higher education and parks.

The analysis uses a weighted average for the jobs, higher education enrollments, and park acres that can be accessed by transit or car in the region. These weighted averages make it possible to assess changes in accessibility for the average resident in the region, given that the number of origins and destinations varies over time for each county. Both transit and auto accessibility performance measures use 30 minutes for travel time to allow some comparisons.

Transit Service in the MTP/SCS
The 2008 MTP contained a significant increase in funding for transit service. However, as described in more detail in Chapter 10, Financial Stewardship, transit revenues have dropped since 2008, which required adjustments in this MTP/SCS. Because EJ Area residents tend to be more reliant upon transit service than other segments of the population, scenarios that add transit services have been consistently high priorities in community workshops and focus groups. Despite revenue constraints, the MTP/SCS seeks to optimize the provision of transit services in the region, and invest in transit improvements that serve EJ Areas.

Although the draft MTP/SCS contains a 17 percent reduction (10 percent per capita) in transit expenditures from the 2008 MTP, it still nearly doubles vehicle service hours regionwide compared with the base year. Service hours on buses serving EJ Areas increase by 82 percent; service hours on rail and bus routes that serve EJ Areas increase by 88 percent. Transit investments in the MTP/SCS allow service frequencies to improve on existing and new routes and provide new transit options. Figure 8.2 shows the expanded transit network by 2035.

For shorter trips, the increase in shuttle services can improve access to longer distance bus and rail options. New shuttle services benefit all residents, but the greatest benefit for EJ Area residents comes from improved service targeting local trips to shopping, medical facilities, and other public services.

For longer distance trips, extensions of light rail south to Cosumnes River College and north to Natomas, along with a network of bus rapid transit (BRT)/enhanced bus corridors in the MTP/SCS, benefit EJ as well as non-EJ Areas. BRT services are limited-stop buses that run frequently all day to connect major activity centers. Many higher-density areas become “activity centers” by 2035 that contain a large share of the new jobs, shopping and medical facilities. The MTP connects existing and new activity centers with numerous proposed bus rapid transit corridors. While routes provide regionwide benefits, corridors directly serving EJ Areas include new bus rapid transit routes planned for Florin Road, Stockton Blvd., Watt Ave., El Camino Ave., and Auburn Blvd. that will help improve cross-town travel speeds and connect activity centers to neighborhoods with poor connections today.
Reducing transfers is also important to transit-dependent and choice riders who seek a trip that is comparable to the time it would take to drive. The number of transfers will continue to largely depend on the distance traveled, but with the new land use pattern in 2035 changing to better reflect Blueprint principles, many trips will be shorter because of compact and mixed land uses. For longer transit trips that do require a transfer, the increased frequency of service along many routes results in improved “timed transfers” (shorter waiting times), and ultimately a faster transit trip.

Chapter 4 provides additional detail on transit investments in the plan. Chapter 10 and Appendix B-1 discuss some of the ongoing transit funding challenges facing the region.
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Transit Accessibility

EJ Areas already tend to have higher concentrations of jobs and housing. As detailed in Chapter 3, the MTP/SCS projects significant future housing and employment growth in Centers and Corridor and Established Communities. The combination of this land use pattern with the transit investments in the MTP/SCS is expected to improve transit access to a variety of destinations over the plan period for residents of both EJ and Non-EJ Areas. This section assesses changes in transit access to jobs and medical services, as in the last plan, along with new measures including access to higher education and parks. For the following measures of transit accessibility, transit travel time is calculated from first stop to last stop, including an initial five-minute wait time and time for transfers.

As noted previously, SACOG uses weighted regional averages for 2008 and 2035 for each measure (jobs, higher education, etc.). The two weighted averages are then compared to calculate the percentage increase in accessibility over the plan period. However, these weighted averages should not be read as the total numbers of jobs, enrollments or park acres that residents in the region can access, which vary from county to county. As a weighted average, the numbers instead provide an indication of the average number of jobs or other destinations that the average resident in the region can reach via transit (or auto later in the chapter), rather than total access for individuals living in EJ or Non-EJ Areas in a particular county.

Job Access

Transit access to jobs between 2008 and 2035 improves for both EJ and Non-EJ Areas. Regionwide between 2008 and 2035, as shown in Figure 8.3, jobs accessible within 30 minutes via transit increase by 48 percent from EJ Areas, and 49 percent from Non-EJ Areas, using the weighted average methodology described above.

Access by transit to retail jobs also improves for EJ and Non-EJ Areas. Projections of retail job growth are developed starting with a regional estimate of retail demand provided by the Center for the Continuing Study of the California Economy. That regional demand is then allocated to local land use plans, based on a methodology described in more detail in Appendix E-3. Retail job access is included as a performance measure in this analysis both to measure access to jobs which tend to be entry-level, lower-wage employment opportunities and to measure access to necessary retail services.

As shown in Figure 8.3, between 2008 and 2035, retail jobs accessible by transit from EJ Areas increase by 47 percent and from Non-EJ Areas by 35 percent.

Figure 8.3
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Source: SACOG, September 2011.
Access to Medical Care

Access by transit to medical services as measured by access to medical-related jobs also improves between 2008 and 2035 as illustrated in Figure 8.4.

SACOG defines medically-related services broadly: doctors, dentists, chiropractors, radiologists, mental health professionals, laboratories, imaging centers, etc. These services are provided throughout the region in a multitude of settings, including public and private hospitals and clinics, medical and dental complexes, and individual practitioners’ offices. The most effective way that SACOG has found to date to assess transit access to “medical services” is to measure access to “medical jobs” as defined above. The current number and location of these medical jobs is derived from SACOG’s parcel-based employment inventory described in Appendix E-3. SACOG then forecasts the growth in medical jobs to 2035. Figure 8.5 shows the location of medical jobs throughout the region in 2008.

SACOG does recognize limitations with this measure. The measure used in this EJ analysis is of transit access to medical jobs, rather than to medical services. It is currently not possible to measure or forecast each resident’s access to their available medical services due to the range of providers available for insured or uninsured medical clients, the fact that residents may or may not have an applicable health or dental insurance plan for a nearby facility, or be able to afford co-pays or direct fees for service.

Figure 8.4
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Increase in Medical Jobs Accessible within 30-Minute Transit Travel Time
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Source: SACOG, September 2011.
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Access to Higher Education
Transit access to higher education is a new performance measure in this MTP/SCS. Higher education is an important stepping stone to careers and employment for many of the region’s EJ and Non-EJ Area residents. For this analysis, higher education is defined as public and private universities and colleges, including all of the region’s community colleges and satellite campuses (but not adult schools, GED, remediation or vocational training programs that serve targeted populations).

Similar to the previous measure, the most accurate measure in SACOG’s current toolbox is transit access to enrollments at colleges and universities in the region. This serves as a proxy for all of the institutions of higher education that the average student in an EJ or Non-EJ Area can reach via transit. Enrollments are projected to 2035 based on current enrollments, enrollment growth projected by individual colleges and universities, planned campus sites, and expected population growth.

Access to higher education improves with investments made in the MTP/SCS, as demonstrated in Figure 8.6. Regionwide between 2008 and 2035, the number of enrollments accessible via transit within 30 minutes increases by 69 percent from EJ Areas, as well as 27 percent from Non-EJ Areas. These increases are due both to improved transit service, as well as a 30 percent projected growth over the plan period in higher education capacity in the region, particularly in more central areas.

No transit accessibility measure can address which colleges or universities offer the training or degree programs sought by EJ or Non-EJ Area residents or whether student applicants will be accepted for admission, but SACOG recognizes limitations even with its current methodology. Assessing transit access to enrollment levels may understate or overstate transit access from EJ Areas to the variety of higher education institutions in the region. This is another performance measure for which SACOG intends to search for more comprehensive data sources for use in future plan updates.

Figure 8.6
Transit Access to Higher Education
Increase in Higher Education Enrollments Accessible within 30-Minute Transit Travel Time
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Source: SACOG, September 2011.
Access to Parks

Another new measure added by SACOG is transit access to parks. Access to parks is important for youth and adult physical activity, health and recreation opportunities.

Access to parks in this analysis is defined as access to park acres. Future park acreage is projected through 2035 using a standard park ratio of 5 acres per 1,000 population for areas with new growth. As shown in Figure 8.7, by this measure transit park acres accessible within 30 minutes by transit increase by 18 percent from EJ Areas and by 13 percent from Non-EJ Areas. EJ Area residents also have transit access to more park acres than Non-EJ Area residents, likely due to the greater availability of transit services in more central areas.

Parks vary from small neighborhood playgrounds to large regional parks, and in park conditions, such as the presence of a community or recreational center in the park, or problems with vandalism or crime that deter use. SACOG’s methodology measures access to the number of park acres, rather than the number or types of parks the average person in EJ and Non-EJ Areas can access via transit. SACOG plans to explore new methodologies that can better capture transit access to parks from EJ and Non-EJ Areas, taking into account the significant variation in parks across the region, as well as proximity for walk or bike access.

Figure 8.7
Transit Access to Parks
Increases in Park Acreage Accessible within 30-Minute Transit Travel Time

Transit Access to Park Acres

Increase in Park Acres Accessible by Transit

Source: SACOG, September 2011.
Transit Mode Share

As a result of the land use pattern and transit projects and expenditures in the MTP/SCS, transit use increases as a mode share. Table 8.7 shows transit mode share increases in the region between 2008 and 2035. Although transit use remains limited, in most counties transit mode share more than doubles for both EJ and Non-EJ Areas.

Table 8.7
EJ and Non-EJ Area Transit Mode Share, 2008 & 2035

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Percent of All Travel by Transit 2008</th>
<th>Percent of All Travel by Transit 2035</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EJ Areas</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-EJ Areas</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SACOG, September 2011.

Roads and Related Improvements

Road projects in the MTP/SCS are located throughout the region and are not disproportionately concentrated in EJ Areas. Figure 8.8 illustrates the key road projects overlaid on EJ and non-EJ Areas. Due to funding shortfalls, the MTP/SCS reduces funds for road capacity investments by 14 percent per capita from the level in the 2008 MTP, while increasing road maintenance/rehabilitation and bicycle/pedestrian funding by 4 and 7 percent per capita, respectively.

The MTP/SCS supports complete streets and investments in bicycle and pedestrian facilities. As discussed in Chapter 4, bike and pedestrian improvements are funded both directly and indirectly in the MTP/SCS. While $2.8 billion is included specifically for bicycle and pedestrian improvements, including bicycle trails, sidewalks, ADA retrofits, and supporting facilities, SACOG estimates that another nearly $600 million will support bicycle and pedestrian facilities as part of maintenance and rehabilitation projects in the region.

Sample MTP/SCS road projects that benefit EJ Areas include:

City of Live Oak: Road rehabilitation and streetscape improvement projects to support redevelopment, including drainage, curb and gutter, sidewalks, bike lanes, and a new Class I bikeway.

City of Rancho Cordova: Safety and aesthetic improvements on Folsom Blvd. between Bradshaw Rd. and Sunrise Blvd., including along the frontage of the planned Los Rios Community College satellite campus, including landscaped medians, sidewalks, streetscape improvements at intersections, street lights, and safety improvements for bicycle and pedestrian access to light rail and bus transit.

City of Sacramento:
- Improvements at Broadway and Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd., including improved curbs, gutters and sidewalks, higher visibility crosswalks, accessibility ramps, upgraded signals and traffic-calming measures.
- On Del Paso Blvd. between Arden Way and Hwy 160: road diet between Barstow and Acoma streets; streetscape improvements, including pedestrian plaza, sidewalks, bulb-outs, restriped pedestrian crossings, street furniture, landscaping; and new traffic signals at intersections of Del Paso Blvd. with Colfax Street/Southgate Road and Baxter Street.
- Replacement of two-lane bridge at Norwood Ave. over Arcade Creek with sidewalks and widened shoulders.
- On R Street between 2nd and 18th Streets, paving and streetscape improvements, including curb, gutter, sidewalk, accessibility features, landscaping, lighting, and street furniture.

Sacramento County: Antelope Road widening between Watt Ave. and Roseville Rd. to address congestion, safety and aesthetics, and mobility for bicycles, pedestrians and transit.

City of West Sacramento: Streetscape improvements on West Capitol Ave. from Sycamore Ave. to Harbor Blvd., including wider sidewalks, flatter road cross-section, reconfigured lanes, utility relocation, new lighting, hard scape and landscaping improvements.

City of Woodland: Streetscape improvements on Main Street between Third and Sixth Streets, including improved sidewalks, landscaping, trees, bulb-outs, A.D.A. ramps, and pedestrian-actuated signals.

Yuba City: Walton Ave. widening from Lincoln Rd. to Franklin Rd., including upgrades to bike lanes, sidewalks, curbs, gutters, and drainage.

Yuba County: Improvements to Olivehurst Ave. from 7th Ave. to McGowan Pkwy, including curb and gutter, sidewalks, bicycle lanes, center turn lane, improved transit stops, and drainage improvements; and new sidewalks and bicycle lanes on Powerline Rd. from 9th to 15th Avenues.

A complete list of projects is in Appendix A-1. As a result of these investments and the MTP/SCS land use pattern, walking and bicycling are expected to increase as a mode share in the region in both EJ and Non-EJ Areas, as shown in Table 8.8.

Table 8.8
Bike and Walk Mode Share in the SACOG Region, 2008 & 2035

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2035</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EJ Areas</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-EJ Areas</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SACOG, September 2011.
Auto Accessibility

As noted earlier, a majority of EJ Area residents travel by personal vehicle to their destinations, as do a majority of Non-EJ Area residents. For this reason, this analysis also examines the effect of the MTP/SCS on access by auto from both EJ and Non-EJ Areas to key destinations. It is important to note that SACOG uses the same methodology for assessing auto accessibility as for transit accessibility, so the explanations and caveats for performance measures found in the transit accessibility section apply to measurements of auto accessibility as well.

As noted previously, this analysis uses a weighted average for the jobs, higher education enrollments, and park acres that can be accessed by car. Auto travel time is calculated as the time spent driving from home to destination, including time to park.

Job Access by Car

As shown in Figure 8.9, access to jobs within a 30-minute drive increases. Jobs that can be accessed increase by 30 percent from EJ Areas and 32 percent from Non-EJ Areas between 2008 and 2035. Increases are similar for auto access to retail jobs, 29 percent from EJ Areas and 28 percent from Non-EJ areas, although the total job base is lower.
Access to Medical Jobs
Figure 8.10 illustrates the approximately 35 percent increase in medical jobs that can be accessed within a 30-minute drive from both EJ and Non-EJ areas across the region. As with the transit access measure, SACOG is using medical jobs as the best currently available proxy for access to medical services.

**Figure 8.10**
**Auto Access to Medical Jobs**
Increase in Medical Jobs Accessible within 30 Minutes by Car, 2008–2035

**Higher Education Access**
Auto access to higher education also improves for residents of both EJ and Non-EJ Areas in the region. Figure 8.11 shows these increases in auto access within 30 minutes to higher education enrollments.

**Figure 8.11**
**Auto Access to Higher Education, 2008–2035**
Increase in Higher Education Enrollments Accessible within 30 Minutes by Car

Source: SACOG, September 2011.
Access to Parks
Lastly, SACOG measured the improvement in auto access to parks between 2008 and 2035. By 2035, as shown in Figure 8.12, park acres accessible by car increase by 13 percent from EJ Areas and 12 percent from Non-EJ Areas.

Figure 8.12
Auto Access to Parks
Increase in Park Acreage Accessible within 30 Minutes by Car

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FROM EJ AREAS</th>
<th>FROM NON-EJ AREAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SACOG, September 2011.
Transit and Auto Access Comparison

SACOG also conducted a regional analysis comparing transit and driving access within 30 minutes from EJ and Non-EJ Areas. Table 8.9 shows the change over the plan period in the percentage of the region’s total jobs, higher education enrollments, and park acreage that can be accessed by transit and car from EJ and Non-EJ Areas within 30 minutes. Table 8.10 also uses a weighted average for the jobs, higher education enrollments, and park acres that can be accessed by transit or driving.

Table 8.9 indicates that regionally, transit accessibility within 30 minutes to jobs, medical jobs, and higher education is projected to improve for residents of EJ Areas, but auto accessibility from EJ and non-EJ Areas to jobs declines slightly when viewed from a region-wide perspective. This can likely be explained by the MTP/SCS’s emphasis on employment growth and transit improvements particularly in Centers and Corridors and Established Communities. While transit access improves for these areas over the plan period, driving to these infill areas in 2035 may take longer for more outlying residents, slightly reducing the number of destinations that can be reached within a 30-minute drive.

However, not surprisingly for our region, driving will continue to provide greater access than transit. By 2035 from EJ areas, about 50 percent of the region’s jobs and medical jobs, and nearly 70 percent of higher education enrollments will be accessible within 30 minutes by car, compared with around 10 percent of jobs and 18 percent of higher education enrollments that are accessible within 30 minutes by transit. This is not unexpected, given that transit often takes longer for similar trips due to routing, stops, and transfers, and does not serve all locations.

From Non-EJ Areas, about 35 percent of the region’s jobs and medical jobs and 45 percent of higher education enrollments will be accessible within 30 minutes by car and about 6 to 8 percent by transit. This difference is likely because Non-EJ Areas include more Developing and Rural Residential Communities with less local employment, fewer college campuses, lower levels of transit service, and from which workers and students tend to commute longer distances by car.

For park access, by 2035 residents of EJ Areas are expected to have access to about 40 percent of the region’s park acres by car but only 5.5 percent by transit within 30 minutes. Residents of Non-EJ Areas are projected to have access to 32 percent of the region’s park acres by car vs. 4 percent by transit within 30 minutes. As discussed previously, SACOG plans to continue refining these performance measures over time.

### Table 8.9
Comparison of Transit and Driving Accessibility within 30 Minutes from EJ and Non-EJ Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Accessibility</th>
<th>Percent of Regional Total Accessible within 30 Minutes by Transit</th>
<th>Percent of Regional Total Accessible within 30 Minutes by Car</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>from EJ Area</td>
<td>from Non-EJ Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs 2008</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs 2035</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Jobs 2008</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Jobs 2035</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education Enrollments 2008</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education Enrollments 2035</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Acres 2008</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Acres 2035</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SACOG, September 2011.
### Toxic Air Contaminants

A final addition to SACOG’s EJ analysis this year examines areas near major roadways that may be a source of toxic air contaminants. The California Air Resources Board in 2005 developed guidance stating that “sensitive receptors” (homes, schools, day care centers, parks, hospitals, etc.) be located outside a 500-foot buffer of major roadways, defined as freeways or urban roads with traffic volumes of 100,000 or more vehicles per day or rural roads with 50,000 or more vehicles per day.\(^{11}\)

\(^{11}\) California Air Resources Board, Land Use and Air Quality Handbook: A Community Perspective, 2005

Table 8.10 shows the percent of the population within and outside this 500-foot buffer in EJ and Non-EJ Areas in the region. In both 2008 and 2035, the percentage of total EJ Area population exceeds the percentage of total Non-EJ Area population within the buffer zone by about 2:1; however combined, both EJ and Non-EJ Area population within the buffer zone represent only 2 percent of the entire region’s population.

---

#### Table 8.10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>2008—within 500' Buffer</th>
<th>2008—Outside 500' Buffer</th>
<th>2035—within 500' Buffer</th>
<th>2035—Outside 500' Buffer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Regional Population</td>
<td>% of Total EJ Area Population</td>
<td>% of Total Non-EJ Area Population</td>
<td>% of Total EJ Area Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>99.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>98.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>96.3%</td>
<td>97.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutter</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolo</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>96.9%</td>
<td>99.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuba</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region Total</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>96.7%</td>
<td>98.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2035—within 500' Buffer</th>
<th>2035—Outside 500' Buffer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Regional Population</td>
<td>% of Total EJ Area Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutter</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolo</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuba</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region Total</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SACOG, September 2011.
The science behind such environmental hazards analysis is evolving. The Sacramento Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) has developed its own guidance for project developers to use in assessing potential risks to residents from siting in particular locations, and mitigation strategies to address any identified risks. According to SMAQMD, risk is highly site-specific. The height of nearby freeways, prevailing winds, and other factors can make a significant difference in whether potential development sites pose elevated risks or not. Risks are different for children, seniors and those with certain health conditions than for healthy adults, and are based on a standard 70-year exposure, although many people do not necessarily live in the same location for 70 years.

At the same time, a statewide discussion has been taking place among affordable homebuilders, equity interests, and public health experts seeking to better understand the relationship between infill development and public health. Through discussions with SMAQMD, academics and these interests, SACOG has identified a number of considerations for assessing exposure to high-volume roadway toxic air contaminants:

- SACOG does not have the capacity to assess every individual site within the buffer zone for potential variations in risk, but SMAQMD asks developers to conduct assessments on a project-by-project basis to assess risk for planned residents or users.
- There are tradeoffs between the health benefits and risks of siting new residential development in infill areas near transit, which often runs on major roadway corridors. Risks of exposure to toxic air contaminants from proximity to high-volume roadways may need to be weighed along with such benefits as better transit access to health care, lower transportation costs that leave more money for medical care, and new higher quality housing and increased physical activity for residents that can help improve health.
- State and federal agencies provide points in competitive housing funding programs for affordable home developments near frequent transit, recognizing that lower income residents tend to be more transit-dependent.
- Increasingly cleaner vehicles are reducing some of the health risks from air contaminants. Strategies exist to mitigate risks, such as siting residences and sensitive receptors away from the roadway, reducing windows facing the freeway or roadway, installing HVAC systems and planting trees that filter out air contaminants, etc.

Given the site-specific nature of exposure risk and available mitigation strategies, it is likely that the population that may experience exposure risk is even less than the 2 percent of the population in SACOG’s analysis. In addition, of the small number of residents within the buffer zone in EJ and Non-EJ Areas, it is likely that the population is diverse in ethnicity and income level, especially by 2035. Trends that will likely continue to geographically decentralize the concentrations of EJ populations compared to today, together with the inherent limitations in estimating impacts on EJ compared with Non-EJ populations in 2035 when SACOG is not able to project the location of the new population within these two categories, likely mean that these data over-state the differences between EJ and Non-EJ populations for exposure to air contaminants. SACOG simply has no way of further quantifying these effects at this time.

SACOG sees the addition of high-volume roadway exposure as a performance measure as a first step towards identifying the effects on EJ and Non-EJ Areas of environmental hazards. The Air Resources Board has also developed guidance for siting sensitive receptors near other permitted sources of toxic air contaminants, such as chrome plating operations, dry cleaners using perchloroethylene, petroleum refineries, and large gasoline dispensing facilities. SACOG is also seeking to identify these uses in the region and the potential for exposure. SACOG plans to expand its capacity to analyze environmental hazards and infill tradeoffs in future MTP/SCS.
Strategies

Chapter 6 contains a number of policies and strategies SACOG intends to pursue to help implement the MTP/SCS consistent with the Blueprint Principles and Rural-Urban Connections Strategy, support local governments with data, tools, analysis and technical assistance, and address roadway, transit, goods movement, bicycle/pedestrian, and other transportation needs in the region.

As part of its work to begin the implementation of SB 375 and establish greenhouse gas emissions targets, the California Air Resources Board convened a Regional Targets Advisory Committee (RTAC). The RTAC developed a series of recommendations for SB 375 implementation, including development of performance indicators to help ARB monitor regional performance and update regional targets, and for MPOs to use to document their progress over time. Their recommendations include the following:

- Social equity factors should be incorporated in the 2010 greenhouse gas target setting to the extent modeling or “off-modeling” methodologies exist and in subsequent adjustments to the targets pursuant to Cal. Govt. Code §65080(b)(2)(A)(iv). Social equity factors include, but are not limited to, housing and transportation affordability, displacement/gentrification, and the jobs-housing fit.
- ARB should take all steps necessary to ensure completion of the appropriate research and model development so that social equity factors are fully incorporated into the greenhouse gas modeling for the second SCS round and before any adjustments to the targets.
- Adverse social consequences of changing land use patterns, such as displacement, gentrification and increased housing costs should be addressed and specifically avoided to the extent possible in the SCS/APS submitted by MPOs pursuant to Cal. Govt. Code § 65080(b)(2)(I)(i) and in the SCS/APS submitted to ARB pursuant to Cal. Govt. Code § 65080(b)(2)(I)(ii).
- To the extent adverse social consequences cannot be avoided they must be mitigated to the extent feasible.
- ARB should encourage the MPOs to develop and enhance “visioning” tools that enable the public and policymakers to clearly see the social equity impacts of various planning scenarios and make informed choices. These include impacts on air quality, access to transit, household transportation costs, housing costs and the overall housing supply.
- Regional and statewide model improvement efforts should incorporate housing affordability and social equity factors. From RTAC recommendations, “We encourage the state to identify and pursue the necessary research efforts and model development efforts that would support the development of this capability.”

SACOG is committed to deepening its ability to analyze and address RTAC recommendations and ongoing performance considerations in its planning activities. Specific areas where SACOG hopes to build analytical capacity and expertise for future MTP/SCS and planning efforts include:

- Jobs-Housing Fit and Housing plus Transportation Cost measures. Development of these measures is underway to increase the understanding of SACOG and its members of local housing costs and their relationship to local wages paid and transportation costs, to help support housing and transportation planning efforts.
- Refinement of MTP/SCS projections of the location of future populations, housing and employment, and of performance measures such as medical, higher education, and park access.
- Environmental hazard measures to reflect evolving science and address evolving legal requirements for environmental analysis.
- Measures of public health benefits of planning efforts, such as access to food, walkability, etc.
- Measures of benefits to youth as the future residents of the region.