

APPENDIX E – MTP/SCS Chapter on Planning Process

CHAPTER 2

Planning Process

Why Does SACOG Prepare a Metropolitan Transportation Plan?

SACOG is designated by the state and federal governments as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and is responsible for developing a regional transportation plan every four years in coordination with Sacramento, Yolo, Yuba, Sutter, El Dorado and Placer counties and the 22 cities within those counties (excluding the Tahoe Basin). The plan incorporates county-wide transportation planning developed by the Placer County Transportation Planning Agency and the El Dorado County Transportation Commission, under memoranda of understanding (MOUs) between those agencies and SACOG.

The regional planning area is shown in Figure 2.1. Portions of the planning area are designated as federal non-attainment areas for ozone and particulate matter. A nonattainment area is an area considered to have air quality worse than the National Ambient Air Quality Standards as defined in the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1970. For the region to be eligible to receive federal transportation funds, the region's transportation system must be able to show a steady decrease in pollution emissions until the area's air is clean enough to meet federal air quality standards. More information on these nonattainment areas is in Chapter 7: Environmental Sustainability.

Transportation systems are best planned at a regional level because people don't confine their trips to a single physical jurisdiction. Federal law established regional agencies for the purpose of region-wide, long-range transportation planning in 1962 so that planning for highways, roads, and public transit would be comprehensive and cooperative between local agencies and governments. The law further requires the long-range regional transportation plan to cover at least a 20-year planning horizon, and be updated at least every four years.

If a city, county, or public agency in the Sacramento region wants to use federal transportation funding for projects or programs, those projects must be included in the MTP/SCS project list. The MTP/SCS includes

transportation improvements and investments that will serve the Sacramento region's projected land use pattern and population growth for a 20 year period. All transportation projects that are regionally significant for potential air quality impacts must also be included in the MTP/SCS. SACOG works collaboratively with local government planning and public works departments, transit service providers, air quality management districts, state and federal transportation departments, stakeholder interests, and residents across the region to develop the land use forecasts and transportation system for the MTP/SCS.

This plan, the 2016 MTP/SCS covers the period from 2012 to 2036 and is an update to the 2012 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy that was adopted in April 2012. This MTP/SCS provides the regional plan for transportation investments, integrated with projected land use, and funding constraints the region can reasonably expect to see through 2036. The plan takes an integrated approach to transportation and land use, and their impacts on air quality and climate change, with a focus on implementation and maintenance of the existing transportation system to achieve a number of transportation and air quality benefits across the region.

In order to comply with Senate Bill 375 (SB 375) and federal regulations, the 2016 MTP/SCS must be adopted by February 2016 in accordance with the four-year cycle requirement. Failure to adopt this plan, or any future MTP/SCS, within the four-year timeframe could result in a lapse in federal air quality conformity requirements. Such a lapse in conformity could make the region ineligible for certain types of funding, including one-time competitive funds. The planning work for the next update cycle typically starts approximately two years after the current MTP/SCS is adopted.

A complete description of planning regulations and laws is in Appendix G-7 – Regulatory Framework for the MTP/SCS.

How Was this Plan Created?

The SACOG Board of Directors, in its policy role overseeing long-range transportation planning in the region, is ultimately responsible for this plan. The board considered recommendations from SACOG policy committees, advisory committees, local agencies, residents, public and private sector stakeholders, and SACOG staff, and actively deliberated on the plan during all stages of development. In addition, regional public works agencies and transit operators participated in the technical screening process that was based on ongoing Congestion Management Process (CMP) activities. A full discussion of CMP activities is in Appendix C-3 – Congestion Management Process.

The development of this MTP/SCS began in 2013 and can be generally divided into four planning phases, each inclusive of public and private stakeholder participation, jurisdiction and partner agency coordination and consultation, and regular direction from the SACOG board. The four areas are:

- Issue Exploration and 2016 MTP/SCS Policy Framework
- Scenario Development Framework and Analysis
- Framework for Draft Preferred Scenario
- Preferred Scenario Development and Analysis

Further discussion of the local agency, stakeholder and public involvement is in the “Who Was Involved in the Plan Development?” section of this chapter.

2016 MTP/SCS Policy Framework

In August through November of 2013, the SACOG Board engaged in an issue identification and exploration period that examined the implementation challenges of the 2012 MTP/SCS. This included a review of statewide and local transportation funding challenges and needs, road maintenance challenges, a review of the regional growth projections, a briefing on regional travel behavior and the current housing market. This research and educational period led to Board action on a policy framework for the 2016 MTP/SCS in December of 2013. This policy framework focused the 2016 MTP/SCS to be a true update of the 2012 MTP/SCS, rather than an overhaul. The framework was focused on addressing the implementation challenges of the current plan and directed this 2016 MTP/SCS to address five key implementation themes. These are described on the next page.

Implementation Question/Challenge	Examples of research and analysis to address question/challenge
<p>Transportation Funding: Can the region capture the revenues projected to come from all sources local, state and federal?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update revenue projections for local, state and federal sources, considering long-term/historic and short-term/recent losses or revenue. • Identify strategies for new revenue generation and cost-effective investments.
<p>Investment Strategy: Is there enough emphasis on system maintenance (“fix-it-first”) investments?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify and compare local and state system maintenance needs for different modes of travel. • Identify tradeoffs between system maintenance and system expansion priorities. • Identify unique challenges and opportunities in urban, suburban and rural communities, with particular attention to suburban economic challenges. • Identify new strategies for SACOG planning and funding efforts that consider fix-it-first.
<p>Investment Timing: Should there be changes in the timing of transportation investments?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examine the cost effectiveness of moving certain projects forward or backward in the planning period. • Analyze the effect of project phasing on performance of the regional transportation system, air quality, and land use pattern. • Identify short-term strategies to improve regional travel patterns.
<p>Land Use Forecast (allocation): What is the economic viability of the projected greenfield and infill growth?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inventory adopted and proposed land use plans in the region. • Analyze the effect of more greenfield versus more infill growth, and vice versa, on transportation system performance. • Analyze recent market performance for greenfield and infill, residential and non-residential development. • Determine if and how the estimated growth in Center/Corridor, Established, Developing, and Rural Residential Community Types should be changed or refined.
<p>Plan Effects: 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.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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). • Develop decision-making support tools to support regional and local decision-making. • Research the effect of our growing region on the agricultural economy and open space.

Because the policy framework has an implementation focus, keeping the horizon year's employment, population, and housing projections unchanged from the 2012 MTP/SCS and extending the horizon year only to 2036 is part of that strategy. Along with the policy framework, in December of 2013 the SACOG board adopted this approach after vetting it and the idea of the implementation-focused plan with member agency planning staff and stakeholders. More information on the regional growth projections can be found in Chapter 3, Chapter 5, and Appendix D-1 – Regional Projections. The Policy Framework can be found in Appendix G-1 – Frameworks for the 2016 MTP/SCS Update Process.

Though the policy framework is focused on implementation themes, the 2016 MTP/SCS is still rooted in the board-adopted MTP/SCS principles of access and mobility, equity and choice, economic vitality, environmental quality and sustainability, financial stewardship, and smart land use.

Scenario Development Framework and Analysis

In March 2014, the SACOG Board adopted a framework for developing three regional land use and transportation scenarios for use in public workshops and plan development. This framework set up the approach for creating and analyzing scenarios and included: 1) updating and refining the three land use and transportation scenarios from the 2012 MTP/SCS, 2) analyzing different timing to construction of transportation and land use components, and 3) analyzing different levels and types of transportation revenues.

1. The three land use and transportation scenarios analyzed in the 2012 MTP/SCS varied principally by how much housing and transportation choice they created. They each took into account all fiscal constraint, major market and policy/regulatory influences and represented a reasonable range of possible futures. Mirroring the 2012 MTP/SCS scenarios, the scenarios started with a refresh of the 2012 MTP/SCS as Scenario 2 and then bracketed it with a lower density, high auto investment Scenario 1 and a higher density, high multimodal investment Scenario 3. More information on the land use and transportation scenarios can be found in Appendix G-1 – Frameworks for the 2016 MTP/SCS Update Process and G-2 – Public Workshop Scenarios and Workshop Results.

2. A key component of the policy framework focusing the plan update on implementation was to explore the full potential for a “fix-it-first” investment strategy and to analyze whether there are reasons to alter the construction timing of transportation projects in the plan. Under the scenario framework, SACOG analyzed a number of transportation projects in the 2012 MTP/SCS and met with local agency staff to discuss the results and any potential changes to the timing of certain transportation projects. More information on the analysis of transportation project timing can be found in Chapter 10.
3. Every plan cycle SACOG must refresh its revenue assumptions, consistent with federal requirements. To address this part of the scenario framework, SACOG first focused on analysis of the 2012 MTP/SCS (i.e. will the region have the same, more or less revenues to build the projects included in the 2012 MTP/SCS?). Then, an analysis of the merits and viability of potential new revenue sources was completed. New revenue sources researched included state cap and trade revenue, new local transportation sales taxes, and statewide vehicle registration fees. More information on the revenue analysis can be found in Chapter 4 and Appendix B-1 – Financial Plan.

The scenarios and information developed in this process were used to illustrate trade-offs and effects of different development patterns and transportation investments compared to the 2012 MTP/SCS. They informed discussions of the Board, stakeholders, member and partner agencies, and public workshop participants on policy issues of the plan update. The scenarios were also used as alternatives for the environmental impact report and as the basis for making necessary refinements to Scenario 2 (the 2012 MTP/SCS) to create a preferred scenario for the 2016 MTP/SCS. More detailed information on the scenario framework and the public workshops can be found in Appendix G-1- Frameworks for the 2016 MTP/SCS Update Process and G-2 – Public Workshop Scenarios and Workshop Results.

Framework for a Draft Preferred Scenario

In December 2014, the SACOG Board adopted a framework for developing a draft preferred scenario. The framework was built upon the results of the research, analysis and outreach conducted throughout the planning process and was designed to identify necessary changes to the current plan that would allow the updated plan to align with the Board's implementation themes and meet state and federal regulatory requirements. The framework provided policy and process guidance to staff, local agencies and stakeholders for creating a Draft Preferred Scenario that included:

- As much or slightly more growth in infill areas, and, correspondingly slightly less growth in green-field areas as the 2012 MTP/SCS;
- As much or slightly more growth in small-lot single-family and attached housing as in Scenario 2, but not as much as in Scenario 3;
- As much or slightly more improvement in sub-regional jobs-housing balance as in the 2012 MTP/SCS;
- Continued monitoring of the market and regulatory/policy factors that could influence the pace, location, and shape of growth in the region;
- A revenue forecast that fulfills federal requirements and is based on the best information that can be researched and analyzed;
- Researching new and innovative funding sources that are reasonable to assume for the plan;
- A transportation budget that increases the fix-it-first funding commitment;
- Optimizing the performance of the project list through strategic changes in project phasing;
- Continued development of transportation project-level performance evaluation methods and provide the Board a proposed strategy for incorporating such method(s) into SACOG planning and programming activities.

The full Framework for a Draft Preferred Scenario that was adopted by the board can be found in Appendix G-1 – Frameworks for the 2016 MTP/SCS Update Process.

Preferred Scenario

In April 2015, the SACOG Board of Directors endorsed a Preferred Scenario, comprised of a land use forecast, revenue forecast, transportation projects and programs, and performance outcomes, and consistent with the guidance from the framework discussed above.

Additionally, the Preferred Scenario meets the key policy and regulatory requirements of the plan, including:

- Land Use Forecast: The land use forecast must be based on the most recent information about regulatory, policy and market conditions and a reasonable economic growth forecast of employment, population and housing. It must identify general location of uses, residential densities and building intensities, and areas within the region sufficient to house all of the projected population of the region.
- Revenue Forecast: The MTP/SCS must constrain its budget by assuming only revenues that can reasonably be expected over the planning period. This is a financial constraint test.
- Balance revenues and expenditures over the planning period: Projects must be scheduled to match the pace at which revenues are available to pay for them, proportionally over 20 years, which limits the number of projects that can be planned for any given year and forces decisions about relative priority. This is a financial constraint test.
- Performance Outcomes: For several plan cycles SACOG has evaluated land use and transportation scenarios with a number of performance outcomes. Many of these are helpful to determining if a scenario is achieving policy goals of the plan. Others measure the coBenefits of the MTP/SCS. Two performance outcomes are important for the added reason that they are required under federal and state law:
 - Support attainment of air quality standards: The MTP/SCS must be analyzed as an overall package via technical modeling to verify that its implementation would meet federal air quality requirements in the region's Rate of Progress State Implementation Plan, and the sequence in which projects are scheduled could make a difference in that analysis. This is the air quality conformity test.
 - Achieve regional greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets set by the California Air Resources Board (CARB): The MTP/SCS must demonstrate a reduction in GHG emissions via technical modeling of the forecasted land use pattern and supporting transportation network designed to serve the regional transportation needs. This is the SB 375 test.

Who Was Involved in the Plan Development?

As noted earlier, in addition to the SACOG Board and board committees, the plan was informed by advisory committees, local agencies, residents, and public and private sector stakeholders during all stages of development.

Member Agencies

Early in the 2016 MTP/SCS development process, SACOG met with staff from each member jurisdiction to discuss the plan process, milestones, and coordination for incorporating the most recent local plans and policies into the regional land use and transportation assumptions. At these kick-off meetings, SACOG also vetted the idea of an implementation-focused approach and re-using the 2012 MTP/SCS growth projections that are discussed in the “2016 Policy Framework” section earlier in this chapter. Throughout the 2016 MTP/SCS update process, the SACOG Planners Committee¹ and Regional Planning Partnership² were the primary venue for regular coordination between local agency planning staff and SACOG. Throughout the plan update, both committees met monthly or as needed and received regular updates regarding the 2016 MTP/SCS development. A number of jurisdiction-specific meetings

1 A 28-member committee consisting of the planning director, or designee, from each of SACOG’s member jurisdictions. The committee was originally formed to advise SACOG on the development of the Sacramento Region Blueprint and is now advising on all land use related items. This committee meets monthly (or as needed). The Planners Committee is open to the public, and noticed on the SACOG website.

2 A committee with close to 100 representatives from local, regional, state, federal agencies, and tribal governments, as well as representatives of business, environmental, and minority organizations and associations. The Partnership assists SACOG with its transportation and air quality planning responsibilities. It also serves as the primary forum for interagency and public consultation requirements of federal transportation and air quality regulations. This committee meets monthly (or as needed). The Regional Planning Partnership meetings are open to the public, and noticed on the SACOG website.

and correspondence were conducted on an as-needed basis. Additionally, more formal comment periods corresponding to the planning process described earlier in this chapter were held specifically for member jurisdiction comment and feedback. These included:

- A vetting of the 2012 existing land use conditions in Summer 2013;
- A vetting of the land use build out inventory in Winter 2013;
- A call for transportation projects for consideration in the plan (including project scope, cost, and timing) in Fall 2013;
- A vetting of the transportation and land use scenarios in Summer 2014;
- and a vetting of a Discussion Draft Preferred Transportation and Land Use Scenario in Winter 2015.

Technical Analysis & Congestion Management Process

As part of the 2016 MTP/SCS development and ongoing Congestion Management Process (CMP) efforts, technical committees comprised of local public works agencies and transit operators made specific recommendations considered by the SACOG Board of Directors. Input was also incorporated from SACOG advisory committees, including the Regional Planning Partnership, the Transit Coordinating Committee, the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee, the Transportation Demand Management Task Force, and the Planners Committee.

Collaborations between local jurisdiction staff and agency partners included the development of regional-scale land use and transportation scenarios that the SACOG board directed staff to develop for use in the MTP/SCS public workshops and scenario evaluation process described above. The range of investments was taken from existing plans and new proposals developed through agency collaborations. The scenarios reflected different emphases on specific investments in roads, transit, bicycle and pedestrian modes, and transportation programs, and each specific land use pattern was based on population growth estimates through 2036.

At the 2014 public workshops, SACOG provided

results of three transportation project investment and forecasted land use scenarios and a comprehensive list of CMP performance measurements. These measures, consistently reported across the scenarios, included percentage of travel by mode, vehicle miles traveled per person, percent of vehicle miles traveled in congestion, transit share of commute trips, and other statistics related to new miles of roads, rail transit, and bus transit. The performance measurements were made available in electronic and print formats for review by the general public, agency partners and the SACOG Board.

Communication between SACOG and local agencies over the course of the 2016 MTP/SCS development led to a project list that was more financially constrained than in the 2012 MTP/SCS, with consistent performance measures to track through ongoing CMP efforts. In 2013, SACOG staff initiated a call for local projects. Local agency plans were reviewed by SACOG staff in early 2014 for the purpose of studying and developing plan alternatives, and again in late 2014, when agencies were asked to nominate projects through a call for projects to request scopes, costs, and schedules as well as priorities and information on developer-funded projects. Because the regional plan takes into account local funds—including developer fees and developer-built projects—as well as regional, state, and federal funds, projects that local agencies submitted were considered through multiple rounds of review.

SACOG analyzed projects nominated by member jurisdictions against the priorities identified through the public outreach activities, technical performance, and financial constraint requirements. SACOG included as many member jurisdiction priorities as possible into the plan, given the constraint of reasonably expected revenues and a more fiscally constrained budget than the 2012 MTP/SCS. The result was a draft staff recommendation that reflects strong performance, financial realities, and an emphasis on transportation system maintenance.

SACOG provided the technical analysis for the plan, prepared materials for the 2016 MTP/SCS workshops, met with interest groups and the public, and in the end developed the draft 2016 MTP/SCS for the SACOG board. The staff also prepared:

- Financial forecasts of amounts and types of funds expected to be available between 2012 and 2036.

Federal statutes require that regional transportation plans be limited to improvements that can be afforded with funds reasonably expected to be available. Issues arising from the forecasting of and limitations on funding are discussed in detail in Chapter 10 on Financial Stewardship and Appendix B-1.

- Information from the regional transportation model, SACSIM, and other data sources to allow evaluation of the impacts of changes to the transportation system. Chapter 3 and Appendix E-3 provide the assumptions that are used for the land use forecast. Chapter 5 details the results of the transportation modeling performed for this plan.

Public Involvement

In 2013, before beginning the 2016 MTP/SCS development process, and in compliance with federal and state requirements the SACOG Board of Directors adopted a Public Participation Plan (PPP) as a guide to effective public involvement. The PPP provides direction for the required public involvement activities to be conducted by SACOG. The full PPP is in Appendix G-5 - Public Participation Plan. Building on the PPP the SACOG developed a detailed Outreach and Communications plan, which included goals and strategies that extended beyond state and federal requirements. Specifically, more detailed strategies were developed to engage a broad spectrum of residents, with attention to hard-to-reach communities, and residents in rural areas. The Outreach and Communications plan was designed as a working document that could be enhanced throughout the planning process. The Outreach and Communications Plan can be found in Appendix G-6 – Outreach and Communications Plan.

Sounding Board

In addition to the required outreach conducted as directed by the Public Participation Plan, the SACOG Board directed staff to implement a strategy to engage a range of public and private stakeholder interests throughout the 2016 MTP/SCS planning Process. In response, staff began the development and engagement of the Sounding Board. The purpose of the



Sounding Board was to provide feedback to the board and staff on research topics, policy considerations, plan implementation themes, and other 2016 MTP/SCS topics and issues as they arise. The Sounding Board met quarterly starting in October 2013. Meeting summaries, and participant comments were presented at all SACOG Board Policy Committees for consideration.

The regular cross-sector engagement and feedback of the Sounding Board were beneficial to representing the issues and interests of a broad range of stakeholders - especially the traditionally underrepresented communities throughout the planning process. The Sounding Board played a critical role in informing the presentation format, location selection approach, and outreach partners for the MTP/SCS public workshops. The Sounding Board also played a key advisory role in the methodology for the Environmental Justice analysis.

In building the Sounding Board stakeholder list, special care was taken to ensure that the interests from suburban, urban, rural, and disadvantaged communities were represented. The stakeholder list is comprised of executive and senior level staff from the following sectors:

- Environmental Advocates
- Public Health & Human Services
- Water/Sanitation Services
- Energy
- Agriculture
- Philanthropy/Foundation
- Pre-Kindergarten - 12 Education
- Faith & Community-Based Organizations
- Senior/Aging
- Goods Movement & Freight
- Higher Education
- Market Rate Housing Developers
- Affordable Housing Advocates/Developers
- Regional, Local and Ethnic Chambers

- Service Providers for Seniors/Aging
- Service Providers for the Disabled
- Health Care Providers
- Rural Communities
- Transit Advocates
- Active Transportation Advocates
- Food Banks/Food Access
- Parks and Recreation Services
- CBOs Working with Low-income and/or Minority Residents
- Law Enforcement
- Fire Departments
- Commercial Real Estate Brokers

Meeting summaries and participant evaluations were provided in staff reports to all SACOG Board Policy Committees. The meeting summaries for all of the Sounding Board meetings can be found in Appendix G-4 – Sounding Board Meeting Summaries.

Native American Tribal Government Outreach

As referenced above, the PPP guides public participation and set the framework for Native American Tribal Government outreach on the development of the MTP/SCS. Section four of the PPP describes the process for SACOG's work with tribal governments as well as recommended strategies for gathering input. In advance of the 2014 public workshops, SACOG reached out to the federally designated Native American tribal governments within the region. SACOG's intention was to meet the federal requirements for tribal government outreach and to provide early and frequent opportunity to discuss and provide input on the 2016 MTP/SCS.

SACOG reached out to representatives of the Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation, United Auburn Indian Community, Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians, and Wilton Rancheria regularly beginning in early 2014. Only the tribal governments from the United Auburn Indian Community and Wilton Rancheria elected to engage

with SACOG staff regarding the development of the 2016 MTP/SCS. Uniquely, the United Auburn Indian Community works with Placer County Transportation Planning Agency within Placer County, and the Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians works with El Dorado County Transportation Commission within El Dorado County on local transportation plans and investments that are incorporated into the regional plan.

MTP/SCS Public Workshops

State requirements and federal guidance require at least eight public workshops be held throughout the region as part of the MTP/SCS planning process. In order to expand participation in the public workshops for the 2016 MTP/SCS, SACOG staff collaborated with jurisdiction staff and community groups to hold workshops in locations frequented by local residents, and to the extent possible, accessible by transit. For the workshops in El Dorado and Placer counties, staff worked with the El Dorado County Transportation Commission and Placer County Transportation Planning Agency to identify ideal locations and customize the workshop content.

At the nine county-level workshops in October and November of 2014, attendees participated in self-directed workshops that allowed for one-on-one and small group conversations with members of the SACOG Board of Directors, SACOG staff, and other workshop participants. The public workshops were designed with a “drop in” format allowing for participants to arrive and depart at their convenience. The workshops had seven main interaction points:

1. Planning for the Future: What is an MTP/SCS and What Does it Do?
2. Follow the Money: Where Do We Get Our Money for the Transportation System?
3. Balancing Priorities: Investing in Transportation Choices.
4. More Choices: Our Diverse Communities.
5. More Choices: The Transportation System We Build and How We Grow Affects Our Region.
6. Interactive Transportation Project Mapping Center
7. Workshop Survey

The primary purpose of the workshops was to get public participation in the workshop survey, which focused largely soliciting from respondents their biggest trans-

portation challenges today and the plan performance outcomes most important to them. Points 1 through 6, listed above, were described and illustrated on large posters that participants could review at their own pace and priority and with or without SACOG assistance. The materials were largely informed by the scenarios and analysis referenced in the “Scenario Development Framework and Analysis” section earlier in this chapter. The purpose of the materials was to help inform participants about the plan so they could make more informed decisions about their personal priorities when taking the survey. In general participants identified increased funding for the existing road and highway system, reducing congestion, reducing greenhouse gas emissions, and having more transit, walking, and biking options, as priorities.

Renderings of the MTP/SCS in-person and online workshop materials, as well as the full workshop results, are available in Appendix G-2 – Public Workshop Scenarios and Workshop Results.

MTP/SCS Online Public Workshops

In addition to the public workshops required by federal and state statute, an online workshop and survey were made available. The use of a web-based option allowed for a broader geographic reach of participants. The online workshop replicated the in-person workshop content and survey questions in an easy-to-navigate format. There were 187 online surveys completed with 347 unique visits to the online workshop website.



Public Opinion Polling

A scientific public opinion telephone poll was conducted to provide the SACOG Board with scientifically valid public perspectives on the region's transportation system and the policy themes for the plan update. This public opinion poll was part of the expanded outreach and communications, beyond what is required in the Public Participation Plan.

Conducted in October, the telephone poll was comprised of 1,600 regional respondents. Almost 200 interviews were completed each in El Dorado, Placer, Sutter, Yolo and Yuba counties. Approximately 600 interviews were completed within Sacramento County, and distribution was roughly proportionate to populations in the City of Sacramento, the unincorporated areas of Sacramento County, and the other incorporated areas within the county. The telephone poll was considered scientifically valid and was reviewed and considered by the SACOG Board of Directors in conjunction with the online and in-person workshop survey results. The full report on the phone poll results can be found in Appendix G-3 – Public Opinion Poll Report.

All of the public workshop and phone results informed the SACOG Board's direction in developing the framework for Draft Preferred Scenario for the 2016 MTP/SCS.

In addition to the SACOG Board and board committees, the plan was informed by advisory committees, local agencies, residents, and public and private sector stakeholders during all stages of development.

Elected Official Information Meetings

In accordance with Senate Bill 375, SACOG hosted Elected Official Meeting in each county of the SACOG region. The purpose of these meetings was to provide city and county elected officials who may not sit on the SACOG Board ample opportunity to provide input on the MTP/SCS, and gain better understanding of how the MTP/SCS builds off of existing local plans (e.g., capital improvements programs and general plans). While the statute identifies local elected officials as the target audience, SACOG staff conducted specific outreach for the meetings to include city managers, county administrators, and jurisdiction staff working on the 2016 MTP/SCS. In addition to the required meetings per county, staff offered additional meetings at the request of board members.

Additional Outreach

In addition to regular meetings of the Sounding Board, SACOG staff participated in over 90 stakeholder meetings to share information and encourage participation from a broad range of residents, advocates, jurisdiction staff and other stakeholders in the region. Development of the 2016 MTP/SCS includes public hearings during circulation of the draft 2016 MTP/SCS that satisfy the public outreach requirements of SB 375 and SACOG's PPP.

What Federal and State Requirements Must Be Met?

Federal statutes require adherence to eight planning objectives in the development of regional transportation plans:

- support economic vitality of the region,
- increase the safety of the system,
- increase the security of the system,
- increase accessibility and mobility options for people and freight,
- protect and enhance the environment and quality of life,
- improve integration and connection among modes for people and freight,
- promote efficient system management and operations, and
- emphasize preservation of the existing system.

All of these federal objectives coincide with the adopted goals in the plan and thus have been considered in defining the policies, strategies, and projects for the plan. The 2016 MTP/SCS is also consistent with other plans and regulations. Detailed descriptions of the following plans and regulations are found in Appendix G-7 – Regulatory Framework for the MTP/SCS:

- The plan is consistent with the transportation plans of adjacent regions, short-range transit plans, air quality plans, airport plans, and plans for intelligent transportation systems (ITS).
- The plan is consistent with the California Transportation Plan, a statewide document with policies that should be followed in all regional transportation plans. The California Transportation Plan (CTP) provides a long-range policy framework to meet the state's mobility needs and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The CTP defines goals, performance based policies, and strategies to achieve the state's collective vision for California's future statewide, integrated, multimodal transportation system.
- The plan must conform to the federal Clean Air Act, which requires demonstration that emissions from transportation activities in the plan decline steadily until a date by which federal clean air standards must be reached in the region.

- The plan is consistent with the California Clean Air Act, a state regulation that specifies air quality management strategies that must be adopted.
- The plan is consistent with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), through the development of an environmental impact report (EIR) that documents impacts and mitigation issues for the region.
- The plan is consistent with the Coordinated Human Services Transportation Plan (CHSTP) and CHSTP recommendations consistent with the environmental justice analysis described in Chapter 8 – Equity and Choice.
- The plan includes access to interregional transportation, such as Amtrak stations, freight rail yards, airports, and the Port of West Sacramento, but does not include planning for those systems, which are owned and operated by other entities.
- The plan meets the requirements of Senate Bill 375.
- The plan meets the requirements of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Reform Act of 2009.
- The plan meets the requirements of Title VI, California Government Code Section 11135, and environmental justice orders as described in Chapter 8 – Equity and Choice.