



SACOG Board of Directors

SACOG Board Room
1415 L Street, Suite 300
Sacramento, CA 95814

November 13, 2014 @ 9:30 a.m.

The Board may take up any agenda item at any time, regardless of the order listed. Public comment will be taken on the item at the time that it is taken up by the Board. We ask that members of the public complete a request to speak form, submit it to the Clerk of the Board, and keep their remarks brief. If several persons wish to address the board on a single item, the chair may impose a time limit on individual remarks at the beginning of the discussion. Action may be taken on any item on this agenda.

Pledge of Allegiance

Roll Call: Directors Aguiar-Curry, Ashby, Buckland, Cabaldon, Cleveland, Crews, Davis, Duran, Frerichs, Griego, Hagen, Hanley, Hesch, Hodges, Jankovitz, Joiner, MacGlashan, Miklos, Peters, Rohan, Samayoa, Sander, Serna, Slowey, Stallard, Veerkamp, West, Wheeler, Yuill, Vice-Chair Saylor, Chair Cohn, and Ex-Officio Member Benipal

Public Communications: Any person wishing to address the Board on any item not on the agenda may do so at this time. After ten minutes of testimony, any additional testimony will be heard following the action items.

Consent Calendar: ◀

1. Approve Minutes of October 16, 2014, Board Meeting
2. Approve the Transportation Development Act Claims for the City of Citrus Heights and the City of West Sacramento
3. Approve Funding of Transit Projects Using Proposition 1B Transit—Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement, and Service Enhancement Account (PTMISEA) Funds
4. Adopt SACOG Board of Directors and Committee Schedule for 2015
5. Approve Amendment to Contract for Finance Software Assistance
6. Approve Contract Amendment with URS Corporation for Downtown/Riverfront Transit Study
7. Approve Overall Work Program Fiscal Year 2014-15 Amendment #2
8. Approve Sacramento Housing & Redevelopment Agency Promise Zone Designation Application

**Adjourn as SACOG, convene as SAFE (separate agenda attached)
Adjourn as SAFE, reconvene as SACOG**

Action: ◀

9. Environmental Impact Report on Crude Oil Shipments in the SACOG Region (Mr. Trost)
10. 2015 Board Chair and Vice-Chair Nominations

Workshop:

11. 2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS) Public Opinion Phone Poll and Public Workshop Results (Mr. Chew)

Presentation:

12. Recognition of Outgoing Board Chair and Directors

Reports:

13. Chair's Report
14. Board Members' Reports
15. Chief Executive Officer's Report

Adjournment: The next meeting of the SACOG Board will be held on Thursday, **December 18**, at 9:30 a.m. in the SACOG Board Room, 1415, L Street, Sacramento, CA.

◀ Action Requested

Prepared by:

Approved by:

Mike McKeever
Chief Executive Officer

Steve Cohn
Chair

This agenda and attachments are available on SACOG's website at www.sacog.org.

The Meridian Plaza is accessible to the disabled. If requested, this agenda, and documents in the agenda packet can be made available in appropriate alternative formats to persons with a disability, as required by Section 202 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 and the Federal Rules and Regulations adopted in implementation thereof. Persons seeking an alternative format should contact SACOG for further information. In addition, a person with a disability who requires a modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services, in order to participate in a public meeting should contact SACOG by phone at 916-321-9000, e-mail (sacog@sacog.org) or in person as soon as possible and preferably at least 72 hours prior to the meeting. Parking is available at 15th and K Streets.



SACOG Board of Directors

**Item #14-11-1
Consent**

November 6, 2014

Approve Minutes of the October 16, 2014, Board Meeting

Issue: The SACOG Board of Directors met on October 16, 2014, for a regular SACOG Board meeting.

Recommendation: Approve the minutes of the meetings as submitted.

Discussion: Attached are the Draft Action Minutes of the October 16, 2014, SACOG Board.

Approved by:

Mike McKeever
Chief Executive Officer

MM:gg

Attachment



Sacramento Area Council of Governments

Draft Action Minutes

The SACOG Board of Directors met in regular session on October 16, 2014 at 9:30 a.m. in the SACOG Board Chambers located at 1415 L Street, Sacramento, CA 95814.

Call to Order: Chair Cohn called the meeting to order at 9:31 a.m.

Present: Directors Anderson, Ashby, Buckland, Cleveland, Crews, Davis*, Duran, Frerichs, Hagen, Hodges, Joiner, Peters, Rohan, Sander, Serna, Stallard, Veerkamp, West, Wheeler, Yuill, Vice-Chair Saylor, Chair Cohn and Ex-Officio Member Benipal

Absent: Directors Cabaldon, Griego, Hanley, Hesch, Jankovitz, MacGlashan, Miklos, Samayoa and Slowey

*arrived as noted below

Public Communications: Mike Barnbaum, representing Here We Ride on Twitter provided comments in support of the Unmet Transit Needs hearings within the region.

Director Cohn introduced Director Amarjeet Benipal to the Board.

Consent Calendar: It was moved, seconded (Peters/Rohan) and passed by unanimous vote that the following Consent items be approved:

1. Approve the Minutes of September 18, 2014, Regular and Special Board Meetings
2. Approve the Transportation Development Act Claim for the City of Rancho Cordova
3. Approve Reappointment of SACOG's Representative to the Paratransit, Inc., Board of Directors
4. Approve SACOG Public Transit and Human Services Transportation Coordinated Plan Update
5. Approve Submission of Grant Application for FTA Pilot Program for TOD Planning

Action:

6. Submission of Applications for FY 2015-16 Caltrans Transportation Planning Discretionary Grants (Ms. Sprowls) Sharon Sprowls, SACOG staff, presented the staff report. It was moved, seconded (Buckland/Sander), and passed by unanimous vote that:

THE BOARD APPROVE A RESOLUTION FOR PROJECTS TO BE SUBMITTED TO CALTRANS FOR DISCRETIONARY FUNDING AND AUTHORIZE THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER TO EXECUTE ANY FUNDING AGREEMENTS ASSOCIATED WITH THESE GRANTS.

Director Davis arrived at 9:50

Workshop:

7. Special Presentations from the Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Authority, the San Joaquin Joint Powers Authority, and the CA High Speed Rail Authority

Special presentations by: James Allison of the Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Authority; Dan Leavitt of the San Joaquin Joint Powers Authority; David Kutrosky and Ben Tripousis of the CA High Speed Rail Authority.

Mike Barnbaum representing Here We Ride on Twitter provided public comments regarding train and public transit connections.

Reports:

8. **Chair's Report:** Chair Cohn provided his report.
9. **Board Members' Reports:** Board members reported on current local issues.
10. **Chief Executive Officer's Report:** Mike McKeever gave his report to the Board.

Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 11:10 a.m.

Prepared by:

Approved by:

Mike McKeever
Chief Executive Officer

Steve Cohn
Chair

This agenda and attachments are available on SACOG's website at www.sacog.org.

The Meridian Plaza is accessible to the disabled. If requested, this agenda, and documents in the agenda packet can be made available in appropriate alternative formats to persons with a disability, as required by Section 202 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 and the Federal Rules and Regulations adopted in implementation thereof. Persons seeking an alternative format should contact SACOG for further information. In addition, a person with a disability who requires a modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services, in order to participate in a public meeting should contact SACOG by phone at 916-321-9000, e-mail (sacog@sacog.org) or in person as soon as possible and preferably at least 72 hours prior to the meeting. Parking is available at 15th and K Streets.



SACOG Board of Directors

November 6, 2014

Approve the Transportation Development Act Claim(s) for the City of Citrus Heights and for the City of West Sacramento

Issue: The Transportation Development Act (TDA) authorizes eligible cities, counties, and transit operators to receive TDA funds for transportation purposes and street and road projects. The TDA funds are made available from sales tax receipts.

Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Board approve this summary resolution of the TDA claims listed below.

- | | |
|---|--------------------------|
| 1. City of Citrus Heights for \$6,859,790 | Resolution No. 54 – 2014 |
| 2. City of West Sacramento for \$4,122,933 | Resolution No. 55 – 2014 |

Committee Action/Discussion: Current Board policy calls for routine TDA allocations to cities, counties, and transit operators to come directly to the Board without review by a committee. These funds will be used as authorized by law for various purposes and in the amount shown on the attached resolutions. The claims have been reviewed by staff and found to be in compliance with the TDA and are consistent with the Metropolitan Transportation Plan and the Short-Range Transit Plans.

Approved by:

Mike McKeever
Chief Executive Officer

MM:GT:gg
Attachments

Key Staff: Matt Carpenter, Director of Transportation Services, (916) 340-6276
Sharon Sprowls, Senior Program Specialist, (916) 340-6235
Gary Taylor, Senior Planner, (916) 340-6279
Barbara VaughanBechtold, Associate Planner, (916) 340-6226

cc: Mary Poole, Operations Manager, General Services Department, City of Citrus Heights
Josette Reina, Public Works Administrative Manager, City of West Sacramento
Linda McLeod, County of Sacramento



SACRAMENTO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

RESOLUTION NO. 54– 2014

**APPROVING THE CITY OF CITRUS HEIGHTS’ TRANSPORTATION
DEVELOPMENT ACT CLAIM FOR FY 2013-14 AND FOR FY 2014-15 IN THE
AMOUNT OF \$6,859,790**

WHEREAS, the City of Citrus Heights has submitted a claim amendment for FY 2013-14 Local Transportation Funds of \$3,023,130 and State Transit Assistance Funds of \$436,309; and a new claim for FY 2014-15 Local Transportation Funds of \$2,985,928 and State Transit Assistance Funds of \$414,423 under the provisions of the Transportation Development Act for the amounts and purposes as follows:

Local Transportation Fund

Approved: 11/13/2014

<u>Public Utility Code</u>	<u>Purpose</u>	<u>Year of Funds</u>	<u>Amounts</u>
Article 8 – Section 99400(c)	SRTD Transit Operations	FY 2013/14	\$2,642,208
Article 3 – Section 99234	Pedestrian & Bicycle Impr	FY 2013/14	60,463
Article 8 – Section 99400(d)	Citrus Heights Contract Admin	FY 2013/14	229,765
Subtotal			2,932,436
Article 8 – Section 99402	SACOG Planning	FY 2013/14	90,694
Subtotal Including SACOG			3,023,130

Article 8 – Section 99400(c)	SRTD Transit Operations	FY 2014/15	2,603,050
Article 3 – Section 99234	Pedestrian & Bicycle Impr	FY 2014/15	59,719
Article 8 – Section 99400(d)	Citrus Heights Contract Admin	FY 2014/15	233,581
Subtotal			2,896,350
Article 8 – Section 99402	SACOG Planning	FY 2014/15	\$89,578
Subtotal Including SACOG			2,985,928

State Transit Assistance Fund

Approved: 11/13/2014

<u>Public Utility Code</u>	<u>Purpose</u>	<u>Year of Funds</u>	<u>Amounts</u>
Article 4 – Section 6731(b)	SRTD Transit Operations	FY 2013/14	436,309
Subtotal			436,309
Article 4 – Section 6731(b)	SRTD Transit Operations	FY 2014/15	414,423
Subtotal			414,423

Total **\$6,859,790**

WHEREAS, such claim is consistent with State Law, with Guidelines adopted by the Board and with approved apportionments for FY 2013-14 and for FY 2014-15; and

WHEREAS, the Board Resolution No. 5-2014 on February 20, 2014 found that there are unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet in the City of Citrus Heights.

WHEREAS, Section 19 of the Agreement for Bus Services between the City of Citrus Heights and Sacramento Regional Transit District (SRTD) provides for funding of transit enhancements in the City of Citrus Heights using non-TDA funding; and

WHEREAS, the City of Citrus Heights and SRTD have advised SACOG that transit enhancements in the City of Citrus Heights will be funded using non-TDA revenue sources.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board hereby makes the following findings in accordance with Subchapter 2.5, Article 5, Section 6754 of the Transportation Development Act:

1. The City of Citrus Heights's proposed expenditures are in conformity with the Metropolitan Transportation Plan.
2. The combined level of passenger fares and charges for Sacramento County as allowed by AB432 is sufficient to enable the City of Citrus Heights to meet the fare revenue requirements of the Public Utilities Code.
3. The City of Citrus Heights is making full use of federal funds available under the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, as amended.
4. The sum of the City of Citrus Heights's allocations from the state transit assistance fund and from the local transportation fund does not exceed the amount the claimant is eligible to receive during the fiscal year.
5. Priority consideration has been given to claims to offset reductions in federal operating assistance and the unanticipated increase in the cost of fuel, to enhance existing public transportation services, and to meet high priority area wide public transportation needs.
6. The City of Citrus Heights has made a reasonable effort to implement the productivity improvements recommended pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 99244.
7. The City of Citrus Heights is not precluded by any contract entered into on or after June 28, 1979 from employing part-time drivers or from contracting with common carriers of persons operating under a franchise or license.
8. The contractor, SRTD, has submitted the certification required by the Department of the California Highway Patrol verifying that the operator is in compliance with Section 1801.1 of the Vehicle Code.

9. The City of Citrus Heights is in compliance with the eligibility requirements of Public Utilities Code Section 99314.6.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board hereby approves the request for Local Transportation Funds for FY2014-15 with the condition that none of the Local Transportation Funds provided to the City of Citrus Heights and its contract with SRTD will be used for the purposes of Transit Enhancement as identified in Section 19 of the Agreement between Citrus Heights and SRTD relating to bus services.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Board hereby approves the request for Local Transportation Funds for a claim amendment for FY 2013-14 Local Transportation Funds of \$3,023,130 and State Transit Assistance Funds of \$436,309; and a new claim for FY 2014-15 Local Transportation Funds of \$2,985,928 and State Transit Assistance Funds of \$414,423 for a total claim amount of \$6,859,790 and authorizes the forwarding of funds to the City of Citrus Heights in proportion to funds received from the State.

PASSED AND ADOPTED, this 13th day of November 2014, by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

Steve Cohn
Chair

Mike McKeever
Chief Executive Officer



SACRAMENTO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

RESOLUTION NO. 55 – 2014

APPROVING THE CITY OF WEST SACRAMENTO’S TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDED CLAIM FOR FY 2012-13 AND AMENDED CLAIM FOR FY 2013-14 AND CLAIM FOR FY 2014-15 IN THE AMOUNT OF \$4,122,933

WHEREAS, the City of West Sacramento has amended its claim for FY 2012-13 Local Transportation Funds for a total of \$2,308,527 under the provisions of the Transportation Development Act for the amounts and purposes as follows; and

WHEREAS, the City of West Sacramento has amended its claim for FY 2013-14 Local Transportation Funds for a total of \$1,736,789 under the provisions of the Transportation Development Act for the amounts and purposes as follows; and

WHEREAS, the City of West Sacramento has submitted its claim for FY 2014-15 Local Transportation Funds for a total of \$77,617 under the provisions of the Transportation Development Act for the amounts and purposes as follows:

Local Transportation Fund

		Approved: 11/13/2014		
<u>Public Utility Code</u>	<u>Purpose</u>	<u>Year of Funds</u>	<u>Previous Award</u>	<u>Total Award</u>
Article 8 – Section 99400(c)	FY12-13 Yolobus Operations	FY 2012/13	\$ 293,466	\$1,647,593
Article 8 – Section 99400(c)	FY13-14 Yolobus Operations	FY 2012/13	1,647,593	269,467
Article 8 – Section 99400(c)	FY14-15 Yolobus Operations	FY 2012/13	0	64,815
Article 8 – Section 99400(c)	FY13-14 Yolobus ADA Op	FY 2012/13	195,191	219,191
Article 4 – Section 99260(a)	FY12-13 Bus Shelter Mte	FY 2012/13	10,109	13,511
Article 8 – Section 99400(d)	FY13-14 Administration	FY 2012/13	0	24,694
Article 8 – Section 99400(c)	FY14-15 Yolobus Operations	FY 2013/14	0	1,465,780
Article 8 – Section 99400(c)	FY14-15 Yolobus ADA Op	FY 2013/14	0	171,056
Article 8 – Section 99400(d)	FY14-15 Administration	FY 2013/14	0	25,872
Subtotal (excluding SACOG Planning)			<u>2,146,359</u>	<u>3,901,979</u>
Article 8 – Section 99402	FY12-13 SACOG Planning	FY 2012/13	69,256	69,256
Article 8 – Section 99402	FY13-14 SACOG Planning	FY 2013/14	74,081	74,081
Article 8 – Section 99402	FY14-15 SACOG Planning	FY 2014/15	0	77,617
Subtotal			<u>143,337</u>	<u>220,954</u>
Total			<u>\$2,289,696</u>	<u>\$4,122,933</u>

WHEREAS, such claim is consistent with State Law, with Guidelines adopted by the Board and with approved apportionments for FY 2012-13 and FY 2013-14 and FY 2014-15; and

WHEREAS, the Board Resolution No. 19-2014 on February 20, 2014, found that there are no unmet transit needs that are reasonable to meet in the City of West Sacramento.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board hereby approves the request for Local Transportation Funds for FY 2012-13 in the amount of \$2,308,527 and FY 2013-14 in the amount of \$1,736,789 and FY 2014-15 in the amount of \$77,617 for a total claim amount of \$4,122,933 and authorizes the forwarding of funds to the City of West Sacramento in proportion to funds received from the State.

PASSED AND ADOPTED, this 13th day of November 2014, by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

Steve Cohn
Chair

Mike McKeever
Chief Executive Officer



**Item #14-11-3
Consent**

SACOG Board of Directors

November 6, 2014

Approve Funding of Transit Projects Using Proposition 1B Transit – Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement, and Service Enhancement Account (PTMISEA) Funds

Issue: Should funding be approved for PTMISEA transit projects?

Recommendation: The Transportation Committee unanimously recommends that the Board: (1) approve \$439,551 in regional PTMISEA funding, comprised of \$295,414 of YCTD regional PTMISEA funds and \$144,137 of City of Davis regional PTMISEA funds, to the Yolo County Transportation District (YCTD) for a Seat and Wheelchair tie-down system upgrade project; (2) approve \$1,741,330 in regional PTMISEA funds to the City of Elk Grove for e-tran fixed route bus replacements; (3) approve \$40,000 in regional PTMISEA funds to the City of Davis through Unitrans for the purchase of one replacement paratransit vehicle for Davis Community Transit; and (4) authorize the Chief Executive Officer to sign, submit required Division of Mass Transportation applications/forms, and enter into subrecipient agreements with project sponsors.

Committee Action/Discussion: The PTMISEA program is a ten-year, transit capital, state bond program for which SACOG is the recipient of regional (GC 8879.55(a)(2)/PUC 99313) funds for the four-county region. SACOG passes the funding through to transit agencies who act as project sponsors.

For FY 2014/15, FY 2015/16, and FY 2016/17, SACOG received an apportionment of \$18,659,634. SACOG held a call for projects to solicit project applications for the remaining funds and received three funding requests (described in Attachment A). SACOG staff reviewed the requests and determined that the projects meet the criteria for PTMISEA funding and are consistent with the PTMISEA regional expenditure plan. The Transit Coordinating Committee then reviewed the projects and recommends that the Board approve in full the projects in Attachment A. Such action will still leave \$8.38 million in regional PTMISEA funding available to fund projects in future funding rounds over the next three fiscal years.

With Board approval, funding applications and required forms for the recommended projects will be submitted to Caltrans' Division of Mass Transportation by the January 2015 deadline, and subrecipient agreements will be executed with project sponsors.

Approved by:

Mike McKeever
Chief Executive Officer

MM:AD:gg
Attachment

Key Staff: Matt Carpenter, Director of Transportation Services, (916) 340-6276
Sharon Sprowls, Senior Program Specialist, (916) 340-6235
Azadeh Doherty, Senior Planner, (916) 340-6221

Attachment A

Projects Recommended for Regional (GC 8879.55(a)(2)/PUC 99313) PTMISEA Funding

<i>FY 2014/15, FY 2015/16, and FY 2016/17 Regional PTMISEA Allocation:</i>	\$	18,659,634
<i>Accumulated Interest on PTMISEA funds:</i>	\$	165,871
<i>Amount Previously Awarded:</i>	\$	<u>(8,223,016)</u>
<i>Recommended Projects (#1-3 below):</i>	\$	<u>(2,220,881)</u>
<i>Remaining Regional PTMISEA Balance</i>	\$	<u>8,381,608</u>

Project	Agency	Title	Project Description	Regional Amount	Local Contribution	Total Project Cost
(1)	YCTD	Seat and wheelchair tie-down system upgrade	This project involves making modifications and upgrades to the flipseats and wheelchair tie-down systems on approximately 35 coaches that have forward-facing flip seats at the wheelchair tie-down locations. Some of the side-facing seats in that area may also be moved, modified, reupholstered and/or replaced, and stanchion modifications made, as well, depending on the seat configuration of each particular bus.	\$ 439,551	\$ -	\$ 439,551
(2)	City of Elk Grove	City of Elk Grove Fixed Route Bus Replacement	The City of Elk Grove will replace three (3) 40-passenger seat buses that have reached the end of their useful lives.	\$ 1,741,330		\$ 1,741,330
(3)	City of Davis	DCT Paratransit Vehicle Replacement	Purchase of one replacement paratransit vehicle for Davis Community Transit	\$ 40,000.00		\$ 40,000.00
Total				\$ 2,220,881	\$ -	\$ 2,220,881



SACRAMENTO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

RESOLUTION NO. 57 – 2014

**APPROVING THE PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION MODERNIZATION,
IMPROVEMENT, AND SERVICE ENHANCEMENT ACCOUNT FUNDING REQUEST
FOR FY 2014/15 CYCLE 1 IN THE AMOUNT OF \$2,220,881**

WHEREAS, the Proposition 1B Transportation Bond program has made funds available under the Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement, and Service Enhancement Account (PTMISEA); and

WHEREAS, SACOG has a balance of regional Government Code (GC) 8879.55(a)(2)/PUC 99313 PTMISEA funding in the amount of \$18,486,251; and

WHEREAS, the regional PTMISEA account has an accumulated interest balance of \$165,871; and

WHEREAS, the Guidelines issued by Caltrans require SACOG to identify eligible projects as the sponsoring agency for regional PTMISEA funds; and

WHEREAS, the SACOG Transit Coordinating Committee has reviewed the proposed projects and recommended that SACOG support and submit applications for these projects; and

WHEREAS, Yolo County Transit District has requested \$439,551 in regional GC 8879.55(a)(2)/PUC 99313 funding for the seat and wheelchair tie-down system upgrade. This claim is comprised of \$295,414 of YCTD regional PTMISEA funds and \$144,137 of City of Davis regional PTMISEA funds; and

WHEREAS, the City of Elk Grove has requested \$1,741,330 in regional GC 8879.55(a)(2)/PUC 99313 funding for the e-tran fixed route bus replacement.

WHEREAS, the City of Davis through Unitrans has requested \$40,000 in regional GC 8879.55(a)(2)/PUC 99313 funding for the replacement of a paratransit vehicle for Davis Community Transit.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the SACOG Board of Directors hereby authorizes the Chief Executive Officer to submit PTMISEA funding applications for these projects, and execute any grant agreements and subrecipient funding agreements for the purpose of developing and implementing these projects in the Sacramento region.

PASSED AND ADOPTED, this 13th day of November 2014, by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

Steve Cohn
Chair

Mike McKeever
Chief Executive Officer



SACOG Board of Directors

November 6, 2014

Adopt SACOG Board of Directors and Committee Schedule for 2015

Issue: Adoption of the SACOG Board of Directors and Committee meeting schedule for the 2015 calendar year.

Recommendation: The Government Relations & Public Affairs Committee recommends that the Board approve a resolution adopting the SACOG Board of Directors and Committee meeting schedule for calendar year 2015.

Committee Action/Discussion: The SACOG Board of Directors must adopt its Board and committee meeting schedule for the following year prior to the beginning of the calendar year.

Typically, the SACOG Board meets the third Thursday of the month. The Transportation Committee and the Land Use & Natural Resources Committee meet the first Thursday of the month. The Government Relations & Public Affairs Committee meets the Monday following the other two committee meetings. In January, the Strategic Planning Committee meets in lieu of the Board policy committee meetings. The Strategic Planning Committee will meet on January 12, to be followed by the Board meeting on January 29. As is typical, the Board will be in recess during the month of July. Due to the Labor Day holiday, the Government Relations & Public Affairs Committee September meeting will be held on August 31.

This year, there are two annual conference conflicts with our regular meeting schedule. The first conflict is in October, with the League of California Cities Annual Conference scheduled for September 30 – October 3. These dates conflict with the Transportation and Land Use & Natural Resource Committee meetings. Staff recommends that the October Transportation and Land Use & Natural Resource Committee meetings be moved to October 15, with the Government Relations & Public Affairs Committee meeting on October 19. The second conflict is in December, with the California State Association of Counties Annual Meeting scheduled for December 1-4. Staff recommends that the November and December committee and Board meetings be combined in order for the Government Relations & Public Affairs Committee to meet on November 16 and the Transportation and Land Use & Natural Resources Committee to meet on November 19, to be followed by the Board meeting on December 10. The attached schedule reflects the recommended schedule changes noted above.

The schedule assumes that the committee structure remains as it currently exists; however, it is the discretion of the 2015 Chair to amend the committee structure. Should the 2015 Chair choose to amend the committee structure, the schedule would be changed accordingly. It is also the 2015 Chair's prerogative to add or cancel meetings to address the needs of SACOG. The final schedule and committee assignments will be distributed in late January 2015.

Approved by:

Mike McKeever
Chief Executive Officer

MM:gg
Attachments

Key Staff: Kirk Trost, Chief Operating Officer/General Counsel, (916) 340-6210
Rebecca Sloan, Director of External Affairs & Member Services, (916) 340-6224
Erik Johnson, Acting Manager of Policy and Administration, (916) 340-6247
Lisa Olsen, Clerk of the Board, (916) 340-6222

2015 SACOG DRAFT BOARD AND COMMITTEE SCHEDULE

January						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11		13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28		30	31

February						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4		6	7
8		10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18		20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28

March						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4		6	7
8		10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18		20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30	31				

April						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
			1		3	4
5		7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15		17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30		

Cap-to-Cap 4/18-22

May						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
					1	2
3	4	5	6		8	9
10		12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20		22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30

June						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
	1	2	3		5	6
7		9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17		19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30				

July						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
No committee or board meetings for July.						

August						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
						1
2	3	4	5		7	8
9		11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19		21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30						

September						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
		1	2		4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16		18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30			

League of CA Cities – 9/30-10/3

October						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14		16	17
18		20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28		30	31

League of CA Cities – 9/30-10/3

November						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15		17	18		20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30					

December						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9		11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30	31		

CSAC – 12/1-4; CTC deadline 12/15

Notes:
2015 Strategic Plng Comm @ 10
Transportation Committee @ 10
Land Use & Natural Res @ 1
Govt Rel & Public Affairs @ 10
SACOG closed for holiday
SACOG Board of Dir @ 9:30
Innovation Task Force @ 11 or after Board Mtg and alternating with Board Lunch Discussions.
<i>Typically, the SACOG Board meets the third Thursday of the month. Trans and LUNR meet the first Thursday of the month. GRPA meets the first Monday following the first Thursday of the month. The normal GRPA September meeting falls on Labor Day, so it is proposed for August 31 so as not to conflict with county meetings on the Tuesday following Labor Day. The October cycle has been revised to accommodate the League of CA Cities conference. The November and December cycles have been combined to accommodate both the CSAC conference and the CTC deadline for programming round submissions. The calendar and committees may be revised as required by SACOG's needs.</i>
Schedule subject to change. See www.sacog.org/calendar for current schedule.



SACRAMENTO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

RESOLUTION NO. 56 – 2014

**ADOPTING THE SACOG BOARD OF DIRECTORS
AND COMMITTEE SCHEDULE FOR 2015**

WHEREAS, the Ralph M. Brown Act (Government Code Section 54954) requires that the SACOG Board adopt its Board and Committee meeting schedule by resolution; and

WHEREAS, the SACOG Board wishes to adopt its Board and Committee meeting schedule for 2015 at the November Board meeting; and

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that SACOG does hereby adopt the SACOG Board of Directors and SACOG Committee meetings for 2015 as indicated by the schedule attached hereto and made a part hereof.

PASSED AND ADOPTED, this 13th day of November 2014, by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

AYES:

NAYS:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

Steve Cohn
Chair

Mike McKeever
Chief Executive Officer



SACOG Board of Directors

November 6, 2014

Approve Amendment to Contract for Finance Software Assistance

Issue: Should SACOG amend our contract for assistance in implementing our Integrated Finance and Accounting System to include new deliverables?

Recommendation: The Government Relations & Public Affairs Committee recommends that the Board delegate authority to the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to contract for up to \$90,000 in the current fiscal year for assistance in implementing our integrated finance and accounting system.

Committee Action/Discussion: In June 2013, staff started a project to upgrade SACOG's integrated accounting and finance software from Axium's Protrax software to Axium's Ajera software. This project was started when staff was notified that the Protrax software would no longer be supported. A short review of the available options, including developing an entirely new software system, were reviewed and found to be both higher risk and higher cost to the agency.

As SACOG's fund-based accounting system required both software customization and expert advice on accounting systems design, SACOG sought consulting assistance to transfer fund balances and accounting processes over to the new system. Three vendors provided quotes for services and Unlock the Data was chosen and the best qualified to assist in developing the new system. Staff started work with Mr. Brennan in September 2013 on a \$49,000 work scope under the CEO's authority to enter into contracts under \$50,000.

Unlock the Data has completed their initial scope of services implementing new integrated accounting and finance software, building reports and training staff to use the software. Staff have identified three additional projects expected that potentially cost up to \$41,000. First, staff would like to have spreadsheets for the Comprehensive Annual Finance Report (CAFR) automatically populated by Ajera. Second, staff would like add annual budget and work program development tools to the software system. Finally, staff would like to explore creating project management spreadsheets that are automatically tied to the software. Staff expects these tools could all be created by the end of the current fiscal year.

Approved by:

Mike McKeever
Chief Executive Officer

MM:JC:ts

Key Staff: Erik Johnson, Acting Manager of Policy and Administration, (916) 340-6247
Joe Concannon, Data Services Manager, (916) 340-6234



**Item #14-11-6
Consent**

SACOG Board of Directors

November 6, 2014

Approve Contract Amendment with URS Corporation for Downtown/Riverfront Transit Study

Issue: Should SACOG amend a contract with URS Corporation (URS) for work on the environmental clearance process for the Sacramento/West Sacramento Streetcar?

Recommendation: The Government Relations & Public Affairs Committee recommends that the Board authorize the CEO to increase the contract for environmental clearance with URS by \$67,348, for a total contract amount not to exceed \$117,348.

Committee Action/Discussion: SACOG is acting as the Project Manager for the Sacramento/West Sacramento Streetcar Project, in partnership with the cities of Sacramento and West Sacramento, the Sacramento Regional Transit District, and the Yolo County Transportation District. The project has entered the environmental clearance stage. The purpose of this contract amendment is to perform additional environmental work necessary to complete environmental clearance for the project.

URS's prior contract with SACOG called for completion of an Administrative Review Draft Environmental Assessment/Initial Study for FTA review, which was submitted in June 2014. A number of substantive comments were received that require additional analysis and direction from FTA and others, and will require re-submittal to FTA. Earlier this year, SACOG issued a Request for Quotations for on-call environmental services. After a competitive process, SACOG selected URS and entered into its current \$50,000 contract with URS to continue the environmental clearance process. The additional costs anticipated by this amendment are intended to now complete the entire environmental clearance process.

Staff is bringing this item to the Board for authorization, because the CEO can only approve contracts up to \$50,000.

Approved by:

Mike McKeever
Chief Executive Officer

MM:KT:EJ:ts

Key Staff: Kirk Trost, Chief Operating Officer/General Counsel, (916) 340-6210
Erik Johnson, Acting Manager of Policy and Administration, (916) 340-6247



SACOG Board of Directors

Item #14-11-7
Consent

November 6, 2014

Approve Overall Work Program Fiscal Year 2014-15 Amendment #2

Issue: Should Amendment #2 be made to the Overall Work Program (OWP) for Fiscal Year 2014/15?

Recommendation: The Government Relations & Public Affairs Committee recommends that the Board approve Amendment #2 to the OWP for Fiscal Year 2014/15.

Committee Action/Discussion: The Board of Directors adopted the Fiscal Year 2014/15 OWP in May 2014 and administrative Amendment #1 in September 2014. Administrative amendments to the OWP are typical throughout every year to modify OWP projects, add revenue to the OWP, change project descriptions, or adjust staff and expenditures between OWP projects. The purpose of this amendment is to add or return five projects to the OWP and make task/schedule revisions as summarized below. It should be noted that the recommended actions in this amendment do not result in a net change to the overall SACOG Operations Budget.

New projects:

- *Delta Protection Commission Case Study* (Project #005-20) — This two-year project was approved at the September Board meeting. The project will employ SACOG's food hub toolkit to conduct a food hub feasibility analysis for the portions of Sacramento and Yolo counties in the legal Delta.
- *Elk Grove Comprehensive Operational Analysis* (Project #008-15) — This project reflects a pass-through of a new Caltrans Discretionary Transportation Grant to the City of Elk Grove for a comprehensive analysis of local and fixed route transit service within the city and to enhance connectivity with the Blue Line light rail extension to Cosumnes River College.
- *Woodland Area Transit Planning and Short Range Transit Plan Update* (Project #008-17) — This project reflects a pass-through of Woodland Area Section 5307 funds and local match to the Yolo County Transportation District for transit service evaluation and planning assistance from a consultant for the portion of the Yolo bus fixed-route bus system that affects the City of Woodland.

Projects returned to the OWP:

- *SGC2 Task D — PECAS Integrated Land Use/Transport Model Development* (Project #0013-04)
- *SGC2 Task E — SCS Information Center* (Project #0013-05)

These two activities, funded by SACOG's second round Strategic Growth Council grant, were not included in the OWP adopted in May 2014, but FY 2014/15 work and funding remains for both projects, so they are being returned to the OWP.

Modifications to existing project descriptions:

- *Multi-Agency Planning and Coordination* (Project #001-03) – the description has been updated to reflect the revised teaming structure and work related to the Innovations Task Force.
- *Bicycle and Pedestrian Planning* (Project #002-02) – wording update
- *Major Investment Studies* (Project #002-04) – updated to reflect focus on Corridor System Management planning.

- *Coordinated Human Services Transportation Plan* (Project #002-05) – schedule revision
- *Goods Movement/Freight Planning* (Project #002-06) – minor language revisions
- *Safe Routes to School* (Project #003-06) – update of tasks and schedule
- *Paratransit, Inc. Short Range Transit Plan* (Project #003-15) –update to tasks and schedule
- *CalVans Joint Powers Authority Administration* (Project #003-20) – removed to reflect SACOG’s withdrawal from CalVans JPA
- *SACOG Connect Card Transit Planning Student Internship* (Project #003-25) – schedule update
- *County of Sacramento Short Range Transit Plan* (Project #003-26) – schedule updated to reflect later-than-anticipated signing of contract.
- *CycleTracks Data Collection* (Project #003-27) – schedule update
- *Federal and State Programming* (Project #004-02) – revised to reflect new Active Transportation Program, Cap and Trade, and 2015 funding rounds.
- *Connect Card Implementation* (Project #004-06) – schedule update
- *Connect Card On Board Transit Survey* (Project #004-09) – schedule update to reflect later implementation of the Connect Card system
- *Yolo County Transportation District Transit Planning Student Internship* (Project #008-12) – reflects receipt of a new Caltrans grant to support YCTD’s transit planning student internship program.
- *Interjurisdictional Traffic Impact Mitigation Management* (Project #009-08) – update to tasks and schedule

Attachment A offers the project description details for the new or changed projects included in OWP Amendment #2.

Approved by:

Mike McKeever
Chief Executive Officer

MM:MC:SS:gg
Attachment

Key Staff: Kirk Trost, Chief Operating Officer/General Counsel, (916) 340-6210
Erik Johnson, Acting Manager of Policy and Administration, (916) 340-6247
Matt Carpenter, Director of Transportation Services, (916) 340-6276
Sharon Sprows, Senior Program Specialist, (916) 340-6235
Joe Concannon, Data Services Manager, (916) 340-6234

**Attachment A:
Project Description Details**

MULTI-AGENCY PLANNING AND COORDINATION

Project #001-03

(Board Policy)

Liaise with ~~outside partner member~~ agencies, committees and their related staffs; attend meetings with ~~member agency staff, public agency partners and stakeholders; and support SACOG's Innovation Task Force as an ad hoc committee~~ SACOG advisory and technical committees such as ~~the Regional Planning Partnership, Transit Coordinating Committee, Goods Movement Advisory Group, and Planners Committee; and attend meetings at various partner and tribal agencies.~~ Input from ~~the task force these committees~~ will be used by SACOG in its research projects, member communications, technical support and service delivery activities. ~~for implementing the MTP/SCS for 2035 and Regional Blueprint Plan; completing various transit studies and projects; performing other transportation planning activities; SACOG planning and coordination activities will include~~ maintaining regular contact with member and partner agency staff; review and preparation of agendas; and facilitating or participating in regional forums and policy discussions led by SACOG or others ~~and participating in transportation studies led by others.~~

This work will be performed by SACOG staff.

Tasks and ***End Products:***

- a. Preparation of meeting agendas and staff reports for SACOG ~~advisory and technical ad hoc~~ committees (Ongoing)
- b. Attendance at local jurisdictional meetings (Ongoing)
- c. Member jurisdiction staff coordinating meetings. (Ongoing)
- ~~e.~~d. Meeting summaries and comments on studies by partner organizations (Available upon request)
- ~~d.~~e. Member communications of SACOG programs, activities and services in newsletters, web content, and other materials. (Available upon request)
- e.f. Documentation of tribal government-to-government relations (i.e., coordination, consultation, and collaboration efforts) (Available upon request)

2. PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE PLANNING

Project #002-02

(State and Federal Requirements)

SACOG will continue to serve as a forum for bicycle and pedestrian planning activities throughout the region. Staff will be available to local jurisdictions and partner organizations to collaborate on bicycle and pedestrian planning, advocacy, and education efforts. The SACOG Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee will continue to meet regularly to discuss bicycle and pedestrian issues affecting the region and will continue to function as an advisory committee to the SACOG Board of Directors. Staff will continue to support increased funding for bicycle and pedestrian projects, provide technical assistance to local jurisdiction for grant applications, review local Bicycle Transportation/Master Plans ~~for consistency with Caltrans~~, and coordinate regional efforts. SACOG will maintain its role in planning and coordinating *May Is Bike Month*. The Regional Bicycle, Pedestrian and Trails Master Plan will be updated in the spring prior to the launch of the upcoming funding program.

This work will be performed by SACOG staff.

Tasks and *End Products*:

- a. Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee meetings (Quarterly)
- b. *May Is Bike Month activities (May 2015)*
- c. *Regional Bicycle, Pedestrian & Trails Master Plan Update (May 2015)*

MAJOR INVESTMENT STUDIES

Project #002-04

(State and Federal Requirements)

Regional transportation planning encompasses all modes, including coordination and analytic work related to highway, local roads, transit and active transportation. For the fiscal year, SACOG will focus on supporting the development and implementation of Corridor System Management Plans (CSMPs) as a method of integrating transportation system operational management and regional planning so as to maximize system efficiency and effectiveness. SACOG will also focus on supporting the development and implementation of Corridor System Management Plans (CSMPs) as a method of integrating transportation system operational management and regional planning so as to maximize system efficiency and effectiveness. SACOG will also focus on evaluating selective road expansion efforts that are supportive of MTP/SCS land use patterns which support infill development and forestall midday congestion~~between road improvements and Blueprint infill and redevelopment and will assist partner organizations in understanding these relationships. In this effort, SACOG will could~~ analyze road-related issues, such as High-Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes and ITS effectiveness, the integration of bicycles and transit into existing roadway design, road tolls and parking charges, the degree and spread of congestion, and how changing travel demands affect bottleneck points on the road system. Topics explored will inform the regional transportation plan and programming processes. These activities may in some cases yield a report, but in general, the output will be used in the implementation of the new MTP/SCS.

This work will be performed by SACOG staff.

Tasks and *End Products*:

- a. *Topical reports or issue papers in support of MTP/SCS Implementation efforts (Through June 2015)*
- b. *Participate in Technical Advisory Committees and review proposed project study reports for regionally significant efforts (Through June 2015)*

COORDINATED HUMAN SERVICES TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND PARATRANSIT, INC., MONITORING

Project #002-05

(State and Federal Requirements/Board Policy and Local Agreement)

This work will assist with updating the SACOG Coordinated Human Services Transportation Plan (CHSTP) ~~in fall 2014, following completion of the Demand-Response Connectivity Study in early 2015.~~ Requirements for coordinated planning were originally contained in the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) for projects funded through Section 5316 Job Access and Reverse Commute, Section 5317 New Freedom programs, and Section 5310 Elderly and Disabled Transit Project. The two-year federal transportation reauthorization, Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21), continued the coordinated requirements for Section 5310, which incorporated the New Freedom Program and is now called Formula Grants for the Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities.

This CHSTP update will build upon the 2007 CHSTP, the Lifeline Transit Study completed by SACOG in 2011, updates of [local services and](#) Short Range Transit Plans for operators in the region, and [updated federal guidance](#) ~~the Connectivity Study contained in Project #15-003-23~~. SACOG will continue to work with the Transit Coordinating Committee, regional partners, tribal governments, representatives of the region's human service agencies, private non-profit service providers, consumers, and social service programs to identify critical updates to the CHSTP and follow-up tasks. SACOG will coordinate these activities with Caltrans and other partners.

This work element also includes work that was formerly carried out under the Paratransit, Inc., Monitoring and Evaluation work element. During FY 2014-15, SACOG will continue work to implement provisions of the Collaborative MOU with Paratransit, Inc. and Regional Transit that was adopted by the SACOG Board in June 2013.

This work will be performed by SACOG staff.

Tasks and *End Products*:

- a. *Facilitation of Collaborative (Ongoing)*
- b. *Updated Human Services Transportation Plan (~~April 2015~~ [October 2014](#))*

GOODS MOVEMENT/FREIGHT PLANNING

Project #002-06

(State and Federal Requirements)

SACOG participates in and leads a number of planning activities related to freight hauling and goods movement on the region's roads, freeways, railways, airports, and seaways/ports. SACOG works with partner organizations and local officials to evaluate the effect of freight haulers on the transportation infrastructure in the region and promote the most effective methods of moving the maximum amount of goods within and through the region.

As one of the fastest growing segments of the economy, goods movement will have a tremendous impact on the region's highways, railroads, and airports. Through implementation of the MTP/SCS, SACOG will help ensure that freight continues to move given the constraints of the current transportation infrastructure and other planning challenges.

In partnership with Caltrans District 3 Goods Movement staff and Caltrans Headquarters Division of Freight Planning, SACOG will ~~re~~convene a regional Task Force to provide [a](#) policy forum for goods movement issues, [as needed](#). SACOG will also continue to participate in the state's Proposition 1B Trade Corridor Improvement Fund (TCIF) implementation efforts. Through the Task Force, SACOG will coordinate this activity with Caltrans, the California Transportation Commission, the California Freight Advisory Commission, and other partners.

This work will be performed by SACOG staff.

Tasks and ***End Products:***

- a. Assist partners and member agencies with the implementation of goods movement projects identified in SACOG's regional goods movement studies and the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (As needed)
- b. Participate in meetings and workshops related to the state's TCIF program and assist local TCIF project sponsors (As needed)
- c. Continue to work with the Port of West Sacramento in implementing projects and studies consistent with the region's overall goods movement strategies (Ongoing)
- d. Convene the regional Goods Movement Task Force and engage stakeholders in regional and statewide planning issues for goods movement (As needed)

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL

Project #003-06

(Board Policy – [Federal Safe Routes to School Grant](#))

This Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Education and Encouragement project will support the creation of regional tools and materials via outreach and education partners to help sustain new and continuing SRTS programs in the region. This project will focus on encouraging more students to walk and bicycle to elementary schools (K-6) and middle schools in the six-county region (El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba counties).

SACOG activities will include surveying SRTS needs in the region, holding a SRTS summit for SRTS program partners, collecting student mode travel tallies and parent surveys, holding training workshops for program partners, and coordinating SRTS marketing activities with May is Bike Month marketing.

This work will be performed by SACOG staff and through contracts with non-profits and public agencies.

Tasks and ***End Products:***

- a. Survey Regional SRTS implementation and needs (October 2014)
- b. Collect SRTS Travel Tallies and Parent Surveys (October 2014 and May 2015)
- c. **Hold SRTS Summit (November 2014)**
- d. **Organize and Hold SRTS Training Workshops (January to April 2015)**
- e. Support SRTS marketing with May is Bike Month marketing and activities (May 2015)
- f. **Host Summit presentations, Travel Data, Training resources, and Networking resources on SACOG's website (ongoing)**

~~This Safe Routes to School Education and Encouragement project will support the creation of regional tools, programs, and materials as well as local implementation via outreach and education partners.~~

~~The project will focus on elementary schools (K-6) and middle schools with appropriate presentations and message for children 5 to 14 years old within the six-county region (Sutter, Yuba, Yolo, Sacramento, Placer, and El Dorado counties). SACOG will work in coordination with local governments, school districts, county offices of education, parent teacher organizations, and transportation management associations as outreach partners. Education and encouragement activities will include presentations to elementary schools as well as special events in conjunction with SACOG's travel behavior change campaign, *May is Bike Month*. The schools element of the campaign will include student targeted incentives, collateral materials, and web tools. SACOG staff~~

~~is outreaching to community-based organizations, schools, and other volunteer and advocacy groups to establish a safe routes network for further education and encouragement activities at the local level.~~

~~This work will be performed by SACOG staff and through contracts with local governments, school districts, county offices of education, parent teacher organizations, and transportation management associations as outreach partners.~~

~~Tasks and **End Products:**~~

- ~~a. **Educational materials and grants to local groups to promote May is Bike Month at schools in the six-county SACOG region (May 2015)**~~
- ~~b. **Tools for Internet web site targeted to school-age bicyclists integrated into MayisBikeMonth.com (May 2015)**~~
- ~~c. Increased awareness by school staff of bicycle safety habits and health benefits from bicycling for ongoing youth education~~
- ~~d. **Incentive items for participating students (e.g., bookmarks and pencils) (May 2015)**~~
- ~~e. **Collateral materials targeting school audiences (staff, students, and parents) (May 2015)**~~

PARATRANSIT, INC., SHORT-RANGE TRANSIT PLAN

Project #003-15

(State and Federal Requirements)

This project is the update of the Short-Range Transit Plan (SRTP) for Paratransit, Inc. The project study area consists of the current and potential boundaries of Paratransit, Inc., which is the Consolidated Transportation Services Agency (CTSA) for an area that is coterminous with the activated boundaries of the Sacramento Regional Transit District. Currently, the cities of Citrus Heights, Folsom and Elk Grove are not a part of the CTSA service area. The SRTP provides essential information, analysis, and recommendations regarding future operations and capital expenditures. It also provides the planning analysis and documentation for a transit operator to be eligible to receive certain state and federal funds.

This work will be performed by SACOG staff.

Tasks and **End Products:**

- a. **Develop outline draft of SRTP (November 2014)**
- b. **Work with Paratransit, Inc. on service goals, issues, alternatives and analysis (March 2015)**
- c. **Community outreach and meetings, as necessary (April 2015)**
- d. **Prepare recommendations (April 2015)**
- e. **Draft SRTP (May 2015)**
- f. **Final SRTP (June 2015)**

~~Tasks and **End Products:**~~

- ~~a. Introduction/background and description of system (December 2013)~~
- ~~b. Paratransit, Inc. service, system and program analysis (March 2014)~~
- ~~c. Review of Paratransit, Inc., business plan, service plan, goals, policies, and objectives (March 2014)~~
- ~~d. Financial analysis (April 2014)~~
- ~~e. Develop service alternatives (May 2014)~~
- ~~f. Community outreach and meetings, as necessary (June 2014)~~

- ~~g. Prepare recommendations (May 2014)~~
- ~~h. *Draft SRTP (May 2014)*~~
- ~~i. *Final SRTP (June 2014)*~~

~~**CALVANS JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY ADMINISTRATION** *Project #003-20*
(State and Federal Requirements)~~

~~This project continues the CalVans JPA vanpools in the SACOG region and SACOG's membership in the statewide CalVans JPA. Efforts include assisting CalVans to place agricultural worker vanpools in the SACOG region, reviewing CalVans budget and reports, as well as voting on action items of the CalVans statewide JPA.~~

~~A key effort is reporting vanpool miles into the National Transit Database to receive additional formula Federal Transit Administration funds for the SACOG region.~~

~~This work will be performed by SACOG staff.~~

~~Tasks and *End Products:*~~

- ~~a. Represent SACOG region on CalVans JPA (Ongoing)~~
- ~~b. Facilitate NTD reporting of vanpools operating in the SACOG region (Ongoing)~~

SACOG CONNECT CARD TRANSIT PLANNING STUDENT INTERNSHIP *Project #003-25*
(Caltrans Statewide or Urban Transit Planning Studies Grant)

This project will continue the Transportation Intern program through SACOG, providing interested students in planning or related fields the opportunity to gain real-world planning experience while assisting SACOG with pre- and post-surveying, implementation, procedures, and evaluation of the Connect Card electronic fare system.

This work will be performed by the intern and is funded by a Caltrans Connect Card Transit Planning Internship grant.

Tasks and *End Products:*

- a. Assist with Connect Card public education and outreach (July-August 2014)
- b. Assist with developing Connect Card Standard Operating Procedures (July-August 2014)
- c. Assist with coordinating Connect Card distribution network (July-August 2014)
- d. Project management and administration (Ongoing)
- e. *Quarterly Reports/Invoices (Quarterly)*
- f. *Final Caltrans Report and Invoice (October ~~November~~ 2014)*

~~SCT/LINK~~ SACRAMENTO COUNTY SHORT-RANGE TRANSIT PLAN
(~~Board Policy~~ Caltrans Statewide or Urban Transit Planning Studies Grant)

Project #003-26

The project is an update of the County of Sacramento ~~SCT/LINK~~ Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP). Stakeholders will be included in development of the plan. The new SRTP will guide future transit services and planning for the population and areas served by South County Transit and the East County Transit program, ~~SCT/LINK~~ and East County Transit.

This work will be performed SACOG, and is funded by Sacramento County.

Tasks and *End Products*:

- a. Project kickoff (~~Early 2015~~ July 2014)
- b. *Draft SRTP sections* (~~April~~ Fall 2015)
- c. *Summary of public comments on draft SRTP, Final SRTP* (~~June~~ Winter 2015)

CYCLETRACKS DATA COLLECTION

Project #003-27

(Federal Requirement)

SACOG staff will develop a pilot bicycle/pedestrian counter data collection program and bicycle/pedestrian project evaluation standards for future funding rounds. As part of this project, staff will also test, launch, and promote the new CycleTracks application for the Sacramento region, called CycleSac, with additional resources in Project #003-14. Staff will organize a working group made up of member agency and local advocacy staff to study and recommend preferred bicycle/pedestrian counters and installation sites for the pilot program. Staff will use this information to analyze the needs for data counters in the Sacramento region, procure data counters, develop a leasing program, and work with select member agency departments to install and maintain counters. ~~procure data counters and work with select member agency departments to install and maintain the hardware in the region.~~

This work will be performed by SACOG staff and will involve hiring a vendor for the bicycle/pedestrian data counters.

Tasks and *End Products*:

- a. Work with stakeholders to design a bicycle/pedestrian data collection pilot program (December 2014)
- b. Work with stakeholders to study and recommend project evaluation standards (~~December~~ March 2015)
- c. Work with member agency staff to secure contracts to install and maintain hardware (June 2015)
- d. Conduct procurement for bicycle/pedestrian counters (June 2015)
- e. Test and promote CycleTracks application (June 2015)
- ~~f. Recommendation by working group for pilot program and evaluation standards (December 2014)~~
- ~~f.g. Recommendation by working group for evaluation standards (March 2015)~~
- ~~g.h. Contract with local agency(ies) to install and maintain bicycle/pedestrian counters (June 2015)~~
- ~~h.i. Contract with vendor to procure bicycle/pedestrian counters (June 2015)~~
- ~~i.j. Tailored CycleTracks application for May is Bike Month (March 2015)~~

FEDERAL AND STATE PROGRAMMING

Project #004-02

(State and Federal Requirements)

The FY 2014-15 SACOG federal and state programming activities will involve administering existing programs and taking advantage of any new funding opportunities.

SACOG will prepare MTIP amendments during this period on a quarterly basis and make administrative modifications to the MTIP. In the early part of the year, work will begin on the adoption of the new 2015-2018 MTIP.

In FY 2014-15, programming activities include participation in guideline development and reviews for the 2015 programming round. This includes, liaison work to support partner organizations on programming requirements for both state and federal programming, collaborating with others for developing positions for the reauthorization of a new federal transportation act, monitoring the USDOT implementation of MAP-21 performance provisions, participating with the California Federal Programming Group (CFPG), monitor California Transportation Committee programs, ongoing coordination with the FHWA and FTA, and coordination on programming related topics with PCTPA and EDCTC.

In the summer and fall of 2014 and spring of 2015, SACOG will evaluate and select projects for the Active Transportation Program eCycle 1. In the fall/winter of 2014 and spring of 2015 preparation activities for the Cycle 2015 call for projects will commence. During this time SACOG will continue to monitor and participate in guideline development activities.

In the winter of 2015 and spring of 2015, SACOG will participate, monitor and engage in the selection of projects within the Cap and Trade Program.

In the fall/winter of 2014 and spring of 2015, SACOG will commence all preparation activities for the 2015 funding round. In the spring of 2015 SACOG will initiate a call for projects and engage stakeholders.

SACOG will also continue implementation, improvements, and maintenance of its SACTrak Database. Improvements to SACTrak will place an emphasis on project tracking and monitoring capabilities in addition to the associated reporting and financial management capabilities that the system has in place to assist SACOG in its Designated Recipient role. Hosting and maintenance of the database will be provided by the consultant throughout the fiscal year.

This work will be performed by SACOG staff and a consultant for technical assistance on programming issues and the federal transportation bill.

Tasks and *End Products*:

- a. *Regular MTIP amendments (Quarterly)*
- b. *Administrative modifications to the MTIP (Periodically)*
- c. Participation and liaison on federal programming with the Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration (Ongoing)
- d. Continued improvements to the SACTrak database (Ongoing)
- e. *Evaluate and select projects for federal and state programming to coincide with the Active Transportation Program cycle (Summer 2014, **Spring 2015**)*
- f. Monitor the USDOT implementation of MAP-21 performance provisions (Ongoing)

- g. *Develop the 2015-2018 MTIP (Summer-December 2014)*
- h. Coordination on programming related topics with PCTPA and EDCTC (Ongoing)
- i. *Draft Guidelines for the 2015 programming round (Fall/winter 2014-spring 2015)*
- j. *CMAQ Annual Report (Annually, November or December)*
- k. *Annual Listing of Obligated Projects (Annually, January)*

CONNECT CARD IMPLEMENTATION

Project #004-06

(State and Federal Requirements)

This project is the implementation planning, procurement, and deployment of a regional universal transit fare card system (Connect Card). A new electronic fare system is expected to simplify transit system operations, improve system connectivity, contribute to regional air quality goals, and increase the attractiveness of transit to new patrons.

In June 2011, the SACOG Board approved a contract with a primary vendor for the Connect Card System. The successful conclusion of this contractor selection process began Phase 3 (Implementation) of the project. A memorandum of understanding (MOU) to govern the project through Phase 3 was executed in March 2011. The consortium consists of seven transit operators and SACOG. SACOG is managing the vendor contract on behalf of the consortium. Placer County Transit and SCT/LINK have the option to join the consortium at a later date.

Phase 3 involves full system design, deployment, integration, and testing. This third phase of the project is guided by the Implementation Plan, the System Design Documents, and the MOU. Included in the current phase is the establishment of a regional financial and management clearinghouse, the development of the regional maintenance and supply systems, and the implementation of smart card technology on the participating transit properties. Supporting activities vital to project success include an on-board transit survey, civil engineering work on light rail platforms, and a public education campaign. Full system deployment and acceptance is anticipated by February 2015.

This work will be performed by SACOG staff, consultants hired for system engineering services, partner agency staff, and system vendors.

Tasks and *End Products*:

- a. *Factory acceptance testing (August 2013)*
- b. *System pilot (May 2014)*
- c. *System roll out, Phase 1 (~~Summer~~ Winter 2014)*
- d. *System roll out, Phases 2-5 (Late winter 2014, early spring 2015~~fall 2014~~)*
- e. *RMAT approved/final acceptance (~~December 2014~~ June 2015)*

CONNECT CARD ON BOARD TRANSIT SURVEY

Project #004-09

(Federal Requirement)

This project will provide transit operators with important transit ridership information, including rider demographics and travel behavior. Surveys will be administered both before and after the Connect Card is implemented. The surveys will provide insight into whether the smart card conversion process and project inadvertently affected disadvantaged communities and will, therefore, help inform transit operators. Additionally, the surveys will reveal the types of riders on the system both before and after the smart card implementation, providing useful information about different types of ridership increases and/or decreases. This information will support education, outreach, marketing, and other efforts. This is a multi-year project.

This work will be performed by a contractor yet to be determined.

Tasks and *End Products*:

- a. Staff will actively manage contract and contractor's work (Ongoing)
- b. Staff will work with transit partners to interpret and apply phase 1 survey results (Ongoing)
- c. Contractor will work with staff and transit operators to revise survey instrument (February ~~2014~~2015)
- d. *Revised survey instrument (March ~~2014~~2015)*
- e. Contractor will collect on-board survey data (~~April-May 2015~~October-November 2015)
- f. Contractor will enter data, clean up, compile and correct records (~~July-August, 2015~~January-February 2016)
- g. *Contractor will submit a technical memo (September 2015April 2016)*
- h. *Contractor will submit an analysis of survey results (October 2015May 2016)*

DELTA PROTECTION COMMISSION CASE STUDY

Project #005-20

(Board Policy)

As part of the Rural-Urban Connections Strategy work, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) has been building data and models to help answer questions about how to stimulate economic development in rural communities, and expand market opportunities for agricultural producers. Regional stakeholder outreach revealed that a major impediment to expansion in the agricultural sector is a lack of infrastructure, including distribution, aggregation, and storage. SACOG has developed tools to test the feasibility of these enterprises, collectively called a "food hub." The toolkit includes data on the food system costs and market prices for food products. This project will employ those tools to conduct a food hub feasibility analysis for the portions of Sacramento and Yolo counties in the legal Delta. The work will involve developing data specific to the study area, which will be used for economic modeling. The project will also examine a key consumer market, the San Francisco Bay Area, to which the Delta is strategically located to capitalize on growing demand for locally grown food, in addition to the Sacramento region. Scenarios will be analyzed to demonstrate possible strategies that Delta stakeholders (member jurisdictions, partner agencies, non-profits, agricultural businesses and investors) may explore for food system economic development.

This two-year project will be performed by SACOG staff and consultants.

Tasks and *End Products*:

- a. Build the field-level datasets needed to establish "existing conditions" of the Delta's agriculture

- b. Conduct analysis of potential market opportunities, particularly demand for locally grown food in the San Francisco Bay Area
- c. Assess existing and excess capacity for aggregation, distribution, processing, and capacity for marketing, including in-depth analysis of existing wholesale distributors
- d. Use food hub cost estimates to determine the type and amount of investment needed to advance a food system in the Delta oriented toward local market demand
- e. Synthesize the results of the market analysis and facility cost analysis to estimate the demand for a range of crops
- f. Develop scenarios and sensitivity analysis to help users select the most desirable food system models for their communities
- g. Assemble reports describing project work, with assumptions, pro-forma analyses and findings
- h. Present findings to stakeholders and the SACOG board
- i. *Field-level datasets of crop types, cost and return data, soil type, and water availability (June 2015)*
- j. *Agriculture economic analysis model and documentation describing parameters, operating assumptions, existing food system infrastructure capacity, and data gaps (October 2015)*
- k. *Feasibility analysis toolkit (October 2015)*
- l. *Estimate of crop demand (type and amount), acres of production for local markets, and feasibility of crop production for local markets (January 2016)*
- m. *Scenarios and analysis of model results (March 2016)*
- n. *Draft and final reports (June 2016)*

**YOLO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT TRANSIT PLANNING
STUDENT INTERNSHIP**

Project #008-12

(Caltrans Transit Planning Student Internship Grant)

The Yolo County Transportation District (YCTD) will select two to three interns to assist with transportation planning activities, including onboard surveys, transit service research and marketing, and analyses of demand, ridership, service standards, bus stops and amenities. ~~The~~ Each internship ~~program~~ will last for one year.

This work will be performed by the YCTD interns.

Tasks and ***End Products:***

- a. Select transit interns (March-August 2014, January 2015)
- b. Internship orientation and training (August 2014, June 2014.)
- c. Intern transportation planning activities (June 2015, January 2016)
- d. Project management and administration (Ongoing)
- e. *Copies of intern work (June 2015, January 2016)*
- f. *Quarterly Reports/Invoices (Quarterly)*
- g. *Final Caltrans Report and Invoice (June 2015, January 2016)*

ELK GROVE COMPREHENSIVE OPERATIONAL ANALYSIS

Project 008-15

(Caltrans Transportation Planning Grant)

The Elk Grove Comprehensive Operational Analysis (COA) will provide recommendations and an implementation plan to improve the efficiency of e-tran's fixed route transit services within Elk Grove and enhance connectivity to the regional light rail and bus services that will be available with the opening of the Cosumnes River College Light Rail Station in Fall 2015.

This work will be performed by the City of Elk Grove in combination with a qualified consultant or consulting team.

Tasks and **End Products:**

- a. Project Kick-off (February 2015)
- b. Secure Consultant Services and Initiate Project (June 2015)
- c. Background Analysis (August 2015)
- d. Community and Stakeholder Engagement (February 2016)
- e. Coordination with other Transit Agencies (January 2016)
- f. Analysis of Potential Service Alternatives (September 2015)
- g. Develop draft local and commuter service COA (December 2015)**
- h. Review, complete and adopt COA (January 2016)**
- i. Final Report (February 2016)**
- j. Fiscal and Administrative Management (Ongoing)
- k. Quarterly and Final Reports (Quarterly)

WOODLAND AREA TRANSIT PLANNING AND SHORT-RANGE TRANSIT PLAN UPDATE

Project #008-17

(Local Agreement)

In this project, the Yolo County Transportation District, on behalf of the City of Woodland, will use \$80,000 in Woodland Area Section 5307 funds and \$20,000 in local match to seek transit service evaluation and planning assistance from a consultant to support development of an Operational and Capital Needs Analysis (OCNA) and alternative short-, mid-, and long-range service plans for the portion of the Yolo bus fixed-route bus system that affects the City of Woodland. An outcome of this project will be adjustments to a 2014 draft Short-Range Transit Plan developed by YCTD and SACOG through a Caltrans transportation planning grant.

This work will be performed by an outside consultant.

Tasks and **End Products:**

- a. Select consultant and finalize contract (December 2014)**
- b. Complete an operational and capital needs analysis of public transportation services to, from, through and within the City of Woodland.
- c. Make recommendations to YCTD and the City of Woodland regarding Woodland-related service and capital changes and improvements, and related changes needed to complete YCTD's 2014 Draft Short Range Transit Plan. (May 2015)**

INTERJURISDICTIONAL TRAFFIC IMPACT MITIGATION MANAGEMENT

Project #009-08

(Caltrans Partnership Planning Grant)

This project, a partnership between Sutter, Placer, and Sacramento counties, the City of Roseville, Caltrans District 3, with SACOG as the lead agency, seeks to develop an agreement between the local entities to address inter-jurisdictional transportation impacts on regional and state transportation facilities, including State Routes 65, 70, 99, and Interstate Route 5, due to expected population growth. SACOG will lead the project in partnership with Sutter, Placer, and Sacramento counties, the City of Roseville, and Caltrans District 3.

The work will be performed by SACOG staff, with additional support from consultants.

Tasks and *End Products*:

- a. Project kickoff meeting (April 2013)
- b. *Secure consulting services (May-Dec 2014)*
- c. *Complete Partner/Stakeholder interviews (January 2015 ongoing)*
- d. Complete facilitated meetings (Ongoing)
- e. Partner Consensus (ongoing)
- f. *Complete data collection (August-June 2014-2015)*
- g. *Model trip generation in planning area (January 2016)*
- ~~h. *Draft Baseline Fair Share Contribution to projects (January 2016)*~~
- ~~g. *Apply Draft Interjurisdictional Strategy to a Pilot Project (December 2014)*~~
- ~~h. *Develop Best Practices for Developing Interjurisdictional Agreements (February 2015)*~~
- i. *Develop & Execute Memorandum of Understanding (February-April 2015-2016)*
- j. Partner coordination, project management and administration (Ongoing)
- k. *Quarterly Reports/Invoices (Quarterly)*
- l. *Final Caltrans Report and Invoice (February-June 2015-2016)*

SGC2 TASK D — PECAS INTEGRATED LAND USE/TRANSPORT MODEL DEVELOPMENT

Project # 013-04

(State and Federal Requirements)

Since 2010, CTC guidelines for regional transportation planning require the four largest MPOs in the state to build formal micro-economic land use models for use in developing and evaluating future growth scenarios. SACOG has partially developed a model which would meet this requirement, known as the SACOG Production-Exchange-Consumption-Allocation System or "PECAS." This project, combined with in-kind support described under the "Model Development" project (15-002-01), would complete technical development of SACOG's PECAS and work with local agencies to determine an appropriate role for PECAS in the regional growth allocation process.

This work will be performed primarily by SACOG staff with technical support and review by a consultant specializing in PECAS model development.

Tasks and *End Products*:

- a. *PECAS software and Project Report (June 2015)*

SGC2 TASK E — SCS INFORMATION CENTER

Project #013-05

(State and Federal Requirement)

SACOG's Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS) relies on detailed communication with local jurisdictions about their land use plans, regional forecasted growth, and progress towards achieving regional greenhouse gas reduction targets. This project component will work with SACOG members to create a web-based information center that provides local jurisdictions with SCS land uses and detailed information developed in SACOG's state-of-the-art travel forecasting system. The system will provide better communication for the MTP/SCS updates and facilitate member agency grant applications.

This work will be performed by SACOG staff.

Tasks and *End Products*:

- a. Convene focus groups and discuss member agency needs for data and site functionality (April 2013)
- b. Design prototype version of website and data tools (December 2013)
- c. Refine prototype version of webtools through review with our members (March 2014)
- d. ***Complete web-based SCS Information Center and user guide (September 2014)***



SACOG Board of Directors

November 6, 2014

Approve Sacramento Housing & Redevelopment Agency Promise Zone Designation Application

Issue: Sacramento Housing & Redevelopment Agency (SHRA) is seeking a letter of support and implementation partnership for their application for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's Promise Zone designation.

Recommendation: The Government Relations & Public Affairs Committee recommends that the Board authorize the Chief Executive Officer to provide a letter of support and partnership for SHRA's application for federal Promise Zone designation.

Committee Action/Discussion: In 2013, HUD announced the development of the Promise Zone program nationwide. The eligible areas include urban, rural, and tribal communities where federal departments will partner with local leaders to create jobs, increase economic activity, improve educational opportunities, and reduce violent crime.

Benefits of receiving Promise Zone designation include, but are not limited; to five AmeriCorps VISTA members assigned to build the capacity of the Promise Zone designees, to work with federal agencies, coordinate key stakeholders, and create programs that address the community's needs. A federal liaison will also be assigned in each designated community to assist local leaders in navigating federal programs. The Promise Zone designation will be for a term of ten years and may be extended as necessary to capture the full term of availability of Promise Zone incentives and/or support services.

The designation of the Promise Zone in the SACOG region will help to advance the effort of leveraging federal resources to our region including those of the Sustainable Communities Planning Grant awarded to the region in 2010. Attachment A shows the criteria for a Promise Zone and the proposed zone for Sacramento County and the City of Sacramento. The inclusion of two HUD Choice Neighborhoods within SACOG region furthers the competitive advantage of this application. The grant application is due November 21.

Approved by:

Mike McKeever
Chief Executive Officer

MM:MH:ts
Attachment

Key Staff: Erik Johnson, Acting Manager of Policy and Administration, (916) 340-6247
Monica Hernández, Associate Public Information Officer, (916) 340-6237

PROMISE ZONE MAPPING TOOL DATA

Update version - 10/31/2014

Attachment A

Sac City County PZ v 14

Target Area ID: 8898345

Email of User: klflood@shra.org

Name of Lead Applicant: SHRA

Address of Lead Applicant:

Email of Lead Applicant: klflood@shra.org

Name of Target Geography: Sac City County PZ v 14

Estimated number of All Housing Units in Target Area (Census 2010): 51070

Qualifying Criteria:

This tool provides information on some qualifying criteria.

Urban

1. Promise Zones must be one contiguous geography.
2. The overall poverty rate within the Promise Zone must be over 33 percent.
3. Promise Zone boundaries must encompass a population of at least 10,000 but no more than 200,000 residents.

Rural

1. Promise Zones must be one contiguous geography.
2. The overall poverty rate within the Promise Zone must be at or above 20 percent, and the Promise Zone must contain at least one census tract with a poverty rate at or above 30 percent.
3. Promise Zone boundaries must encompass a population of no more than 200,000 residents. The population limit of 200,000 may not include any incorporated municipalities or unincorporated areas with individual populations greater than 50,000.

Tribal

1. Applicants can define boundaries which can encompass: multiple census tracts and nearby tribally-owned areas; or reservations; or consortia of tribal and non-tribal jurisdictions. The defined community does not have to be one continuous geography.
2. The overall poverty rate within the Promise Zone must be at or above 20 percent, and the Promise Zone must contain at least one census tract with a poverty rate at or above 30 percent.
3. Promise Zone boundaries must encompass a population of no more than 200,000 residents. The population limit of 200,000 may not include any incorporated municipalities or unincorporated areas with individual populations greater than 50,000.

Target Neighborhood/Community Poverty Rate (Poverty Rate from ACS 2011 or ELI Rate from CHAS 2010, the greater of both): 34.39%

Highest Tract Poverty Rate in Target Neighborhood/Community (Poverty Rate from ACS 2011 or ELI Rate from CHAS 2010, the greater of both): 64.00%

Population in Target Neighborhood/Community (Census 2010): 127893

Need Selection Criteria:

In addition to the qualifying criteria above which includes the poverty rates, the tool will provide the following data that will help determine the need within the boundaries of the proposed Promise Zone. Note, this tool does not provide information on crime rates.

1. Percent of labor force (age 16 and above) that is employed or in the armed forces. **Target**

Neighborhood/Community Employment Rate (ACS 2011): 81.16%

2. Percent of housing stock that is long-term vacant (*Only applies to the urban applications*). **Target**

Neighborhood/Community Vacancy Rate (ACS 2011 or USPS 2013, the greater of both): 7.92%

Vacancy rate in Surrounding County/Parish: 3.00%

Project Map Snapshot for 8898345-1



NOTES ON AGGREGATION:

The Promise Zone mapping tool overlays the locally defined neighborhood/community boundaries with data associated with that area and estimates the rates of certain indicators in that area using a proportional allocation methodology. For metropolitan areas, the tool uses Census block group (as defined for Census 2010) as the smallest statistical boundary for the available data. For non-metropolitan areas, the tool uses census tract data to account for less precision in low-population areas. If the locally defined neighborhood/community is partially within two different Census areas, the data for each factor or threshold criteria are calculated based on the portion of the 2010 housing units located in each Census area for the vacancy variables and 2010 population for the population, poverty, and employment variables. The 2010 housing unit and population count data are available to HUD at the block level and thus can be used as the underlying data to apportion each block group and tract's appropriate share of importance.

For example, based on a user defined geography, 80 percent of the housing units in the locally defined neighborhood/community are in a block group with a poverty rate of 40 percent and 20 percent of the units are in a Block group with a poverty rate of 10 percent. The "neighborhood poverty rate" would be calculated as: $(80\% \times 40\%) + (20\% \times 10\%) = 34\%$.

DATA SOURCES:

The data are from a variety of sources:

1. **ACS 2011** refers to the US Census American Community Survey 2007-2011 five-year estimates. These are the most recent nationally available data for small geographies at the same Census 2010 boundaries as the other data provided, using a statistical technique that combines five years of data to create reliable estimates for small areas.
2. **CHAS 2010** refers to the Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) special tabulations HUD receives of Census ACS data. The CHAS data used for this tool are based on ACS 2006-2010 five-year estimates see <http://www.huduser.org/portal/datasets/cp.html> for more information.
3. **Census 2010** refers to block-level 2010 decennial counts of housing and population.
4. **USPS 2013** refers to the United States Postal Service long-term vacancy data as of June 30, 2013.

ADDITIONAL NOTES ON SPECIFIC VARIABLES:

Concentration of People in Poverty is calculated with data at the block group level from ACS 2011 for metropolitan areas and the tract level for non-metropolitan areas. This indicator represents the percent of people within the target geography who are below the poverty line. The estimated concentration of Extremely Low Income (ELI) households represents an approximation of the percent of households within the specified area whose household combined income is below 30% of the HUD defined Area Median Income (AMI). This ELI indicator is calculated with data from the block group level from CHAS 2010. The final number included in this report for "poverty rate" is the greater of these two indicators.

Employment Rate is calculated with data at the block group level from ACS 2011 for metropolitan areas and the tract level for non-metropolitan areas. This indicator represents the percent of the labor force (age 16 and above) that is employed or in the armed forces. Neither the numerator nor the denominator includes people outside of the labor force.

Long-term vacancy rates are calculated with data at the block group level with ACS 2011 and the USPS 2013, which ever source produces the greatest percentage.

For the USPS data, HUD calculates the percent of residential addresses (excluding "no-stat" addresses) that are vacant. In the USPS data, a "vacant" address is one that has not had mail picked up for 90 days or longer. The USPS Vacant addresses can also include vacation or migrant labor addresses so HUD uses ACS data to reduce vacancy counts in these cases.

Using the ACS data, HUD calculates the vacancy rate as the percent of housing units that are "other" vacant. These are units not for sale, for rent or vacant for seasonal or migrant housing. This is considered another proxy for long-term vacant housing.

In theory the USPS data should be a stronger measure of distress than the ACS data because they are for 100 percent of the units (ACS is a sample), are more current (ACS aggregates data over a 5 year period), and are intended specifically to capture addresses 90 or more days vacant. However, USPS data are particularly poor at capturing vacancy in rural areas. As such, we use the ACS as a check on the USPS data so that every location gets a vacancy rate based on the greater of their USPS vacancy rate or their ACS 2007-2011 rate. For more information on HUD's USPS dataset, see:

<http://www.huduser.org/portal/datasets/usps.html>.



**Item #14-11-9
Action**

SACOG Board of Directors

November 6, 2014

Environmental Impact Report on Crude Oil Shipments in the SACOG Region

Issue: Should SACOG, on behalf of and in coordination with its member jurisdictions, provide comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the crude by rail project proposed in San Luis Obispo County by Phillips 66?

Recommendation: The Government Relations & Public Affairs Committee recommends that the Board of Directors authorize the CEO to work with SACOG's members and submit regional comments on the Phillips 66 DEIR.

Committee Action/Discussion: In June, the Board directed staff to submit comments on the DEIR for the Valero Benicia Refinery. SACOG staff has also submitted comments on proposed federal rulemakings related to transportation of crude oil. The timing for final rulemaking is unknown.

The Phillips 66 project in San Luis Obispo County similarly intends to transport crude oil using existing Union Pacific tracks in California, including through numerous communities in the Sacramento region. SACOG's principal concern remains safety for communities within the Sacramento region. After SACOG submitted comments on the Valero project, SACOG staff continued to facilitate meetings with members to discuss other proposed projects, as well as what measures jurisdictions can take independently to be prepared for response to any incidents involving crude oil.

SACOG and local jurisdiction staff are reviewing the DEIR and intend to model comments on those submitted for the Valero project. In contrast to the Valero DEIR, the Phillips 66 DEIR does analyze impacts on the entire Sacramento region, but many of the concerns expressed in the Valero comments remain. Staff will again focus on the Board-adopted general areas of safety concern:

- Advance notification of shipments;
- Limitations on storage of shipments in urbanized areas;
- Support for training and outfitting emergency response crews;
- Utilization of best available freight cars;
- Priority funding for rail safety projects;
- Utilization of best-available inspection equipment and protocols; and
- Implementation of positive train controls to prioritize areas with crude oil shipments.

Staff will submit a copy of the draft comments prior to the Board meeting. Comments on the Phillips 66 DEIR are due by Monday, November 24, 2014.

Approved by:

Mike McKeever
Chief Executive Officer

MM:KT:EJ:ts

Key Staff: Kirk Trost, Chief Operating Officer/General Counsel, (916) 340-6210
Erik Johnson, Acting Manager of Policy and Administration, (916) 340-6247



**Item #14-11-10
Action**

SACOG Board of Directors

November 6, 2014

2015 Board Chair and Vice-Chair Nominations

Issue: The annual nomination and election of Board Chair and Vice-Chair.

Recommendation: The Ad Hoc Nominating Committee, consisting of Chair Cohn and Directors Cabaldon, Griego, MacGlashan and Joiner, will nominate the 2015 Chair and Vice-Chair of SACOG at the November Board meeting.

Discussion: New officers are elected at the last regular meeting in each calendar year and begin serving at the first meeting in January. This year, the 2014 Board Chair will not preside over the December Board meeting due to expiration of his Sacramento City Council term. Therefore, the election of officers for 2015 will take place at the November Board meeting, which has been rescheduled as the last regular Board meeting of the calendar year. The December Board meeting will be rescheduled as a special meeting. The new officers will begin serving at the first meeting in January.

Approved by:

Mike McKeever
Chief Executive Officer

MM:RS:gg

Key Staff: Kirk Trost, Chief Operating Officer/General Counsel, (916) 340-6210
Rebecca Sloan, Director of External Affairs and Member Services, (916) 340-6224



Item #14-11-11 Workshop

SACOG Board of Directors

November 6, 2014

2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS) Public Opinion Phone Poll and Public Workshop Results

Issue: The results of the MTP/SCS telephone poll conducted in October 2014 will be presented by the polling consultant. Results from the MTP/SCS public workshops and online questionnaire will also be presented.

Recommendation: None. This is a workshop.

Discussion: A scientific public opinion telephone poll, an online questionnaire, and an in-person questionnaire at the MTP/SCS public workshops were conducted to provide the SACOG Board with public perspectives on the themes in the MTP/SCS policy framework adopted in December 2013. This information is part of a larger outreach and communications plan for the update to the MTP/SCS. Only the telephone poll is considered scientifically valid, but the online and workshop surveys provide some insight on thoughts about the region's views on transportation issues from a self-selected group of residents.

In the development of the phone poll, the consultant, CJI Research, worked with SACOG Board members who identified interest in providing direction on the purpose and outcomes of the poll. The consultant considered Board direction, the 2006 MTP poll, and the 2004 Blueprint poll in the development of the draft survey. The draft poll was circulated to the Board for comments.

The phone poll was conducted in October with 1,600 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. Attachment A shows the summary results of the phone poll. The summary includes results for the region as a whole and broken out by county (with Sacramento County divided into the unincorporated area, the City of Sacramento, and other incorporated areas). The consultant is preparing a more detailed report of the poll data and analysis that will be available after the November Board meeting. Results from the online and public workshop questionnaires are also shown in Attachment B.

Attachment C is a summary of the demographic data of the online and in-person questionnaire respondents, public workshop participation numbers, and a summary of written comments from the public workshops. Attachment C will be provided separately in advance of the Board meeting. Due to the timing of the last MTP/SCS workshop, this item was not complete at the time of the packet mail out.

Approved by:

Mike McKeever
Chief Executive Officer

MM:MH:gg
Attachments

Key Staff: Kacey Lizon, Planning Manager (916) 340-6247
Greg Chew, Senior Planner, (916) 340-6227
Monica Hernandez, Associate Public Information Coordinator, (916) 340-6237

	Region (all)	El Dorado Co	Placer Co.	Sac City only	Uninc Sac Co	Other Incorp Areas Sac Co	Sutter Co	Yolo Co	Yuba Co
Notes: (1) totals may not add up to 100% in all questions due to rounding or other responses not included; (2) Questions 1-4 are interviewee screening questions and not shown.									
5. How long have you lived in the Sacramento Region?									
- Two years or less (%)	6%	5%	4%	9%	1%	8%	2%	12%	5%
- Three to nine years (%)	12%	13%	10%	13%	13%	12%	9%	8%	13%
- Ten years or more (%)	82%	82%	86%	78%	86%	80%	89%	80%	81%
6. Compared to a few years ago, is your community headed in the right direction to become an even better place to live, staying about the same, or getting off on the wrong track?									
- % Saying "Right Direction"	32%	23%	41%	33%	28%	35%	34%	38%	20%
- % Saying "Staying the Same"	40%	42%	39%	35%	41%	38%	45%	42%	50%
- % Saying "Off on the Wrong Track"	22%	29%	16%	22%	26%	22%	18%	16%	27%
	6%	6%	4%	10%	5%	6%	2%	5%	2%
7. How would you describe the situation related to transportation here in the 6-county Sacramento region?									
- A critical problem	10%	10%	8%	12%	10%	15%	4%	5%	6%
- A serious problem	26%	30%	25%	25%	28%	23%	14%	30%	19%
- A problem but not that serious	28%	24%	32%	30%	26%	20%	40%	30%	28%
- Not a serious problem	34%	31%	34%	30%	32%	37%	40%	32%	44%
	3%	5%	2%	3%	3%	4%	2%	2%	3%
7B. With respect to all aspects of transportation in the Sacramento region, do you think things currently are getting better, staying about the same, or getting worse?									
- Getting better	22%	21%	25%	30%	22%	13%	30%	17%	22%
- Staying same	42%	43%	39%	39%	35%	49%	43%	51%	52%
- Getting worse	31%	30%	28%	28%	38%	35%	21%	26%	21%
- Not sure	5%	7%	7%	2%	5%	3%	7%	6%	5%
9. Which of the following could you say is the biggest problem in your area?									
- Traffic congestion	33%	21%	36%	25%	34%	48%	26%	31%	35%
- Condition of the roads	22%	25%	17%	19%	29%	14%	32%	23%	29%
- Lack of public transit	18%	25%	16%	23%	16%	16%	18%	19%	10%
- Lack of bicycle/pedestrian options	15%	23%	18%	18%	11%	13%	10%	16%	15%
- Other	3%	2%	3%	2%	3%	3%	4%	2%	3%
- Don't know	9%	4%	10%	13%	7%	6%	9%	7%	8%
10. Are you employed outside the home, work from home for pay, a full-time student, retired or unemployed									
- Employed outside the home	44%	37%	43%	42%	39%	51%	41%	57%	32%
- Work from the home	8%	9%	9%	6%	8%	9%	4%	6%	6%
- Full time student	9%	2%	7%	10%	9%	11%	11%	10%	14%
- Homemaker	7%	11%	6%	6%	4%	9%	10%	4%	13%
- Retired	24%	29%	27%	21%	28%	20%	25%	17%	18%
- Unemployed	9%	11%	8%	14%	11%	1%	10%	5%	14%
- Refused	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	3%
11. Thinking about the trip within the Sacramento region you make most often is it for:									
- Work	48%	47%	49%	44%	44%	54%	42%	61%	37%
- School	9%	1%	6%	14%	10%	11%	6%	7%	20%
- Medical appointments	9%	12%	7%	9%	11%	4%	15%	7%	13%
- Shopping	15%	15%	15%	14%	17%	16%	15%	10%	19%
- Other personal business	18%	24%	22%	19%	18%	15%	21%	15%	12%

	Region (all)	El Dorado Co	Placer Co.	Sac City only	Uninc Sac Co	Other Incorp Areas Sac Co	Sutter Co	Yolo Co	Yuba Co
--	--------------	--------------	------------	---------------	--------------	---------------------------	-----------	---------	---------

12. When you make the trip for (response to Q #11), which of the following do you do ALWAYS or MOST TIMES?

- Drive all the way there alone	68%	65%	74%	62%	68%	76%	67%	64%	61%
- Drive with other people/carpool	32%	37%	29%	27%	31%	39%	46%	27%	36%
- Take a bus	7%	4%	4%	6%	15%	4%	5%	7%	12%
- Take light rail	6%	2%	0%	15%	6%	6%	0%	0%	0%
- Ride a bicycle	7%	6%	3%	5%	7%	5%	6%	26%	1%
- Take Amtrak, the train also called Capital Corridor	1%	2%	1%	2%	3%	0%	1%	1%	0%
- Walk all the way	8%	7%	4%	18%	10%	2%	2%	9%	3%

13. How many days a week do you usual make that trip

- Less than one day	9%	19%	13%	4%	8%	7%	17%	7%	16%
- One Day	9%	12%	10%	6%	10%	5%	16%	8%	22%
- Two Days	12%	9%	12%	14%	13%	10%	11%	5%	18%
- Three Days	11%	8%	8%	15%	11%	12%	9%	9%	10%
- Four Days	12%	10%	14%	8%	12%	15%	4%	18%	5%
- Five Days	35%	31%	34%	40%	30%	44%	36%	34%	24%
- Six Days	5%	4%	6%	6%	6%	2%	3%	6%	3%
- Every day	7%	7%	4%	8%	11%	5%	4%	12%	2%

14. About how many minutes would it take to drive from home to (response to Q#11):

- 10 minutes or less	27%	14%	34%	29%	26%	25%	26%	35%	19%
- 11 to 15 minutes	17%	13%	16%	27%	14%	16%	10%	20%	7%
- 16-20 minutes	16%	14%	17%	14%	23%	14%	12%	12%	14%
- 21 to 35 minutes	20%	27%	16%	22%	18%	24%	20%	16%	21%
- more than 35 minutes	19%	33%	17%	8%	19%	21%	31%	17%	39%

15. If you wanted to use is, is there light rail or bus service frequent enough, close enough and running where you need to go for use to use it regularly?

- Yes/I think so	36%	22%	28%	45%	40%	33%	31%	44%	36%
- No, I don't think so	59%	74%	68%	51%	55%	61%	62%	54%	61%
- Not sure	4%	5%	4%	5%	4%	5%	7%	2%	3%

16. If bus or light ail service were nearby, ran often, went where you go on your usual trips, and did not take too much longer than driving, how often would you use it if it you used it alt all?

- probably not use it	32%	30%	35%	21%	36%	41%	36%	30%	26%
- use it a few times a year	12%	16%	12%	13%	13%	10%	14%	10%	17%
- use it maybe once a month	6%	10%	8%	5%	5%	3%	10%	10%	6%
- use it a few times a month	14%	15%	11%	15%	9%	17%	14%	15%	24%
- use it every week	29%	22%	29%	38%	29%	27%	22%	32%	19%
- already using bus or light rail for all trips	3%	2%	2%	4%	6%	1%	0%	2%	4%
- don't know	3%	4%	3%	4%	4%	0%	4%	1%	5%

17 - 29. PERCENT WHO SAID " THE SAME" OR "GETTING BETTER": In the past (response to Q5) years, have the follow aspects of living in Sacramento have the following aspects of living in the Sacramento region become better, stayed the same or become worse for you?

17. The time it takes you to commute	68%	62%	69%	73%	68%	58%	79%	75%	77%
18. The time it takes getting to shopping and other errands	69%	72%	70%	74%	67%	59%	74%	77%	76%
19. Transit service that gets you where you want to go fast enough	77%	74%	73%	80%	72%	81%	78%	85%	82%
20. Pavement condition on the roads and streets you use	62%	64%	67%	65%	50%	67%	64%	66%	59%
21. Traffic on the roads and streets you use	46%	43%	44%	56%	41%	41%	46%	51%	54%
22. Pavement condition on the freeways you use	67%	75%	69%	65%	66%	64%	75%	68%	72%
23. Traffic on the freeways you use	41%	45%	37%	47%	40%	35%	54%	36%	51%
24. Having stores, a pharmacy, restaurants, other services, and/or	89%	91%	91%	88%	87%	92%	87%	93%	85%
25. Safe walking routes you can use	84%	85%	92%	83%	77%	84%	87%	92%	79%

(November 6, 2014)

	Region (all)	El Dorado Co	Placer Co.	Sac City only	Uninc Sac Co	Other Incorp Areas Sac Co	Sutter Co	Yolo Co	Yuba Co
26. Having safe driving conditions on roads you use regularly	76%	78%	77%	75%	66%	81%	86%	84%	81%
27. Feeling personally safe when using public transit	72%	76%	78%	76%	58%	69%	71%	87%	78%
28. Bicycle routes you can use safely	80%	78%	78%	81%	76%	80%	83%	90%	74%
29. The number and frequency of Amtrak trains running from Auburn and Roseville through Sacramento and Davis and to the Bay Area	71%	70%	72%	71%	68%	68%	56%	87%	55%

30-42. PERCENT WHO SAID "JUST FINE AS IS" OR "A LITTLE IMPROVEMENT For those same things please tell me whether at present it just fine as is, or if it is something that needs only a little improvement, or is something that needs a lot of improvement

30. The time it takes you to commute	80%	88%	76%	81%	77%	78%	84%	88%	76%
31. The time it takes getting to shopping and other errands	81%	90%	84%	80%	74%	78%	84%	91%	81%
32. Transit service that gets you where you want to go fast enough	49%	45%	48%	51%	51%	45%	37%	55%	50%
33. Pavement condition on the roads and streets you use	70%	76%	76%	68%	57%	79%	69%	77%	61%
34. Traffic on the roads and streets you use	67%	71%	69%	68%	61%	62%	72%	76%	67%
35. Pavement condition on the freeways you use	72%	82%	74%	68%	66%	74%	78%	76%	77%
36. Traffic on the freeways you use	56%	60%	59%	53%	51%	49%	66%	68%	72%
37. Having stores, a pharmacy, restaurants, other services, and/or	80%	72%	84%	81%	79%	86%	73%	83%	61%
38. Safe walking routes you can use	76%	67%	80%	76%	72%	81%	67%	82%	62%
39. Having safe driving conditions on roads you use regularly	79%	86%	78%	77%	78%	82%	81%	80%	76%
40. Feeling personally safe when using public transit	50%	53%	49%	53%	44%	52%	41%	60%	52%
41. Bicycle routes you can use safely	58%	53%	57%	62%	50%	60%	59%	69%	53%
42. The number and frequency of Amtrak trains running from Auburn and Roseville through Sacramento and Davis and to the Bay area	45%	40%	46%	52%	45%	35%	32%	56%	35%

43. Respondent Ages

18-24	14%	8%	14%	14%	14%	14%	12%	16%	18%
25-39	24%	18%	16%	30%	25%	24%	21%	29%	27%
40-54	24%	26%	25%	24%	22%	26%	24%	20%	20%
55-64	21%	26%	22%	18%	20%	21%	25%	20%	21%
65+	25%	31%	31%	22%	26%	21%	26%	21%	19%

45. Do you have a car, truck or motorcycle available you can use for daily trips?

Yes	91%	91%	96%	85%	87%	98%	93%	91%	91%
No	9%	9%	4%	15%	13%	2%	7%	9%	9%

46. Race/Ethnicity:

African American	6%	2%	4%	12%	7%	5%	5%	1%	1%
Hispanic	13%	6%	6%	18%	9%	13%	16%	29%	20%
Caucasian or White	76%	95%	87%	60%	78%	77%	74%	72%	80%
Asian	10%	3%	8%	17%	6%	13%	13%	12%	8%
Other	7%	4%	6%	10%	10%	5%	4%	6%	8%

47. Annual Household Income

- Less than \$25,000	18%	17%	14%	23%	20%	9%	24%	21%	27%
\$25,000 to \$49,999	24%	33%	18%	24%	23%	22%	22%	27%	36%
between \$50,000 and \$99,999	33%	26%	37%	30%	36%	34%	35%	30%	24%
more than \$100,000	25%	24%	30%	23%	20%	35%	20%	23%	13%

	El Dorado Co	Placer Co.	Sacramento Co.	Sutter	Yolo	Yuba
Number of respondents living in county (or sub-area as noted):						
How long have you lived in the Sacramento Region?						
- Two years or less (%)	0%	12%	9%	3%	11%	11%
- Three to nine years (%)	0%	14%	8%	8%	11%	0%
- Ten years or more (%)	100%	73%	78%	84%	74%	89%

3. Which of the following could you say is the biggest problem in your area? [Question 9 in phone poll]

- Traffic congestion	4%	30%	23%	19%	16%	39%
- Condition of the roads	33%	12%	16%	28%	16%	22%
- Lack of public transit	4%	21%	27%	19%	25%	33%
- Lack of bicycle/pedestrian options	38%	33%	27%	22%	21%	22%
- Road Safety	4%	5%	11%	3%	11%	0%
- Other	33%	2%	8%	11%	16%	17%

1. PERCENT WHO SAID " THE SAME" OR "GETTING BETTER":

In the time that you have lived here, have the following aspects of living in Sacramento become better, stayed the same or become worse? [Questions 17-29 in phone poll]

a. The time it takes you to commute	30%	42%	46%	51%	49%	61%
b. The time it takes getting to shopping and other errands	55%	53%	52%	54%	57%	39%
c. Transit service that gets you where you want to go fast enough	35%	37%	38%	33%	62%	39%
d. Pavement condition on the roads and streets you use	38%	67%	42%	57%	36%	39%
e. Traffic on the roads and streets you use	24%	37%	34%	32%	31%	18%
f. Pavement condition on the freeways you use	86%	63%	54%	65%	53%	72%
g. Traffic on the freeways you use	18%	33%	32%	44%	28%	39%
h. Having stores, a pharmacy, restaurants, other services, and/or	71%	88%	84%	57%	90%	78%
i. Safe walking routes you can use	59%	77%	78%	65%	90%	59%
j. Having safe driving conditions on roads you use regularly	62%	88%	70%	75%	67%	67%
k. Feeling personally safe when using public transit	35%	37%	41%	44%	64%	33%
l. Bicycle routes you can use safely	50%	67%	61%	59%	76%	44%
m. The number and frequency of Amtrak trains running from Auburn and Roseville through Sacramento and Davis and to the Bay Area	14%	34%	36%	8%	53%	28%

El Dorado Co **Placer Co.** **Sacramento Co.**
Sutter **Yolo** **Yuba**

2. PERCENT WHO SAID "JUST FINE AS IS" OR "A LITTLE IMPROVEMENT

Thinking about each of the travel aspects listed above, is it just fine as it is, is it something that needs only a little improvement, or is it something that really needs a lot of improvement?[Question 30-42 in phone poll]

a. The time it takes you to commute	58%	58%	64%	65%	72%	89%
b. The time it takes getting to shopping and other errands	79%	83%	79%	73%	88%	72%
c. Transit service that gets you where you want to go fast enough	42%	21%	27%	30%	45%	44%
d. Pavement condition on the roads and streets you use	46%	86%	59%	65%	65%	67%
e. Traffic on the roads and streets you use	67%	79%	61%	67%	70%	50%
f. Pavement condition on the freeways you use	83%	74%	63%	67%	71%	82%
g. Traffic on the freeways you use	63%	62%	50%	64%	54%	50%
h. Having stores, a pharmacy, restaurants, other services, and/or	58%	79%	74%	61%	87%	50%
i. Safe walking routes you can use	63%	72%	65%	61%	84%	44%
j. Having safe driving conditions on roads you use regularly	79%	98%	72%	78%	84%	82%
k. Feeling personally safe when using public transit	38%	36%	44%	50%	67%	39%
l. Bicycle routes you can use safely	38%	48%	42%	50%	62%	27%
m. The number and frequency of Amtrak trains running from Auburn and Roseville through Sacramento and Davis and to the Bay area	17%	33%	34%	17%	48%	31%

Respondent Ages

18-24	0%	5%	13%	0%	14%	0%
25-39	5%	21%	31%	37%	19%	46%
40-54	52%	36%	29%	27%	31%	8%
55-64	29%	31%	17%	27%	19%	8%
65+	14%	8%	9%	10%	15%	38%

Do you have a car, truck or motorcycle available you can use for daily trips?

Yes	100%	98%	90%	85%	90%	94%
No	0%	2%	10%	15%	10%	6%

Race/Ethnicity:

African American	6%	3%	11%	0%	1%	0%
Hispanic	0%	5%	12%	6%	4%	6%
Caucasian or White	94%	87%	71%	76%	83%	94%
Asian	0%	10%	8%	6%	7%	0%
Other	6%	0%	7%	12%	6%	6%

Annual Household Income

- Less than \$25,000	0%	3%	20%	10%	17%	18%
\$25,000 to \$49,999	15%	11%	14%	13%	12%	6%
between \$50,000 and \$99,999	46%	32%	32%	45%	28%	47%
more than \$100,000	38%	55%	34%	32%	43%	29%

County of Workshop	2014 Walk Ins (participated but did not complete survey)	2014 Surveys Completed	2010 Surveys Completed
El Dorado County	35	22	65
Placer County	22	19	37
Sacramento County (central)	214	163	203
Sacramento County (north)	120	100	60
Sacramento County (south)	36	25	43
Sutter County	34	26	40
Yolo County	100	87	98
Yuba County	32	24	37
Online Survey	347*	187	<i>Not applicable</i>

*Number of hits to website

Gender	2014 Workshop Survey Responses	2014 Online Survey Responses	2013 Regional Census ACS
Female	46%	44%	51%
Male	51%	55%	49%
Other	0.2%	0%	<i>Not available</i>
Decline to State	2%	2%	<i>Not applicable</i>

Note: Excludes 62 respondents who chose not to answer this question

Age Distribution	2014 Workshop Survey Responses	2014 Online Survey Responses	2013 Regional Census ACS
14-24	17%	1%	14% (15-24 yrs)
25-34	18%	15%	14%
35-54	38%	43%	26%
55-64	16%	27%	12%
65+	10%	14%	13%

Note: Excludes 103 respondents who chose not to answer this question

Race/Ethnicity Distribution	2014 Workshop Survey Responses	2014 Online Survey Responses	2013 Regional Census ACS
African American	7%	1%	7%
Asian	7%	5%	13%
Hispanic/Latino	10%	1%	21%
Caucasian	65%	88%	54%
Multiple	6%	4%	<i>Not available</i>
Other	5%	2%	<i>Not available</i>

Note: Excludes 99 respondents who chose not to answer this question

Household Income Distribution	2014 Workshop Survey Responses	2014 Online Survey Responses	2013 Regional Census ACS
Less than \$15,000	14%	1%	12%
\$15,000 - \$24,999	9%	1%	10%
\$25,000 - \$34,999	8%	1%	10%
\$35,000 - \$49,999	7%	6%	13%
\$50,000 - \$74,999	17%	18%	18%
\$75,000 - \$99,999	15%	17%	12%
\$100,000 - \$149,999	16%	33%	14%
\$150,000 - \$199,999	7%	14%	6%
More than \$200,000	6%	9%	5%

Note: Excludes 108 respondents who chose not to answer this question

Which of the following would you say is the biggest problem in your area?		
	Comments	Themes
1	Poor bicycle path between Davis and Sacramento	bike/ped
2	Other - need more sidewalks!	bike/ped
3	Road Safety - Relative to bicycle between Davis and Sacramento especially Road 32A between Road 105 and Yolo Causeway	bike/ped
4	Road Safety - Bicyclist education	bike/ped
5	Get cyclists off the sidewalks and into their own bike lanes	bike/ped
6	Condition of the roads..."for bicycling (bicycle lane is the worst part of the road)"	bike/ped
7	need for electric vehicles infrastructure	electric vehicles
8	Traffic signals need to be removed on 99 and replaced w/ interchanges between highway 20 and highway 113 in Sutter county & Yuba city (reduce GHG's from stopped and idling traffic in Sutter county which is a non attainment area)	freeway/highways & local roads
9	El Dorado County politicians creating projects that qualify for funding when the public doesn't want the project = wasteful	general
10	lack of public transit..."more frequency and more routes"	general
11	drivers in general very mad and impatient drive fast	general
12	the biggest road hazard are the deer.	general
13	Politicians in El Dorado County who want to urbanize our county electric vehicles though SACOG's Blueprint plan does not match that concept for EDC	growth
14	State and SACOG's mandates on growth that is attached to funds. Do not want development forced on others so that from Rancho to Pollock Pines is one continued city-dvelopment	growth
15	Condition of the roads	maintenance
16	Other (the high speed of vehicles makes it difficult for pedestrian and cyclist safety)	safety
17	Rural community - people move in then hall ass to get where they are going. Going above the speed limit endangering electric vehicles everyone else	safety
18	Road Safety - motorist going too fast, speed limits too high, motorists driving unsafely, too few protected crosswalks + crosswalks too far apart, too many untrained bicyclists going the wrong way and pedaling into the crosswalks from sidewalks without yielding, and motorists harassing bicyclists who are riding in a legal manner	safety
19	Other - Drivers running stop signs/RT on red when pedestrians are in crosswalk	safety
20	Other - Andros Karperos School Safety	safety
21	Road Safety - Need day-glow paint on some areas to avoid banging into traffic separators in street. Ex: Gray street/Yuba City St. Parts of Bridge St	safety
22	Road safety - should lower speed limit on art... and local roads	safety
23	Bike riders need to know the rules.	safety & bike/ped
24	lack of adequate transportation for seniors	seniors
25	Traffic - Need better light timing, please road exit from highway 99	transit
26	Lack of public transit - especially to Yuba College until last classes at 9pm	transit
27	Lack of public Transit - "dismal for seniors"	transit

28	lack of convenient and affordable public transit	transit
29	cutbacks to transit service after the recession	transit
30	Lack of public transit ..."Dixon to Solano College. Schedule does not allow one to take classes scheduled after 2:00 pm"	transit
31	Lack of public transit ..."Buses not going to campus"	transit

Following the suite of questions regarding plan outcomes: "Other outcomes of the plan you would like to see (fill in the blank)		
	Comments	Themes
32	More new homes..."not new! Buy old ones & improve"	growth
33	Road capacity	local roads
34	Reduce travel time..."I need to be able to the bus to and from church on Sundays and Wednesday evening"	transit
35	we need a major reduction in VMT, which even scenario 3 does not achieve.	air quality
36	I would like to see bike only roads. Also, cars should not be allowed to drive on one day a month, to encourage other means of transportation	bike/ped
37	narrowing the 4 lane suburban roads to 2 lane with better bike lanes and sidewalks	bike/ped
38	Establish commute subsidies for cyclists, pedestrians (many transit commuters already get them)	bike/ped
39	More safe bike and walking trails that go to schools, jobs, stores, churches, parks.	bike/ped
40	More money spent on GOOD, off road bike paths; protected bike lanes in downtown areas.	bike/ped
41	More bike lanes to key shopping areas	bike/ped
42	Bike lanes, raised and marked, walker and sidewalks on all residential roads - starting with the 4-lane stretch of Whitney ...4 schools	bike/ped
43	more walkable, sustainable communities with local jobs - paramount!	bike/ped
44	Make County Road 32 safer for commuting bicyclists	bike/ped
45	I commute to SF - riding my bike in Sac. I'd like better downtown bike lanes/bicycle safety awareness for drivers	bike/ped
46	emphasis on reducing emissions through improvements in walking and biking routes	bike/ped
47	Other - Bike safety for UC Davis students	bike/ped
48	More, improved inter-city bike facilities for commuters	bike/ped
49	More and better NETWORK of protected bike and walk routes, connecting housing to school, work centers, recreation and shopping.	bike/ped
50	More quality support for bicycling as transportation, not just recreation. Would also like to see transit to the Bay Area more efficient and practical. We need to invest in mass transit and bicycling to make it a reasonable option instead of delectric vehiclesoting such large percentages of \$\$s to more roads. This will also help with better air quality.	bike/ped
51	better bike options	bike/ped
52	pedestrian activated signal crossing that lights up	bike/ped
53	More interconnectivity of bike lanes from one neighborhood with bike lanes to another across major thoroughfares (green lanes, separate lanes). More frequent transit and transit within one mile walk/bike in low income areas	bike/ped
54	Better transit + bike connectivity between Davis and Woodland	bike/ped
55	more bike lanes	bike/ped
56	Encourage more time traveling by foot/bike to encourage community	bike/ped
57	More bike commuters	bike/ped

Following the suite of questions regarding plan outcomes: "Other outcomes of the plan you would like to see (fill in the blank)		
	Comments	Themes
58	Other - more bicycle-oriented transportation	bike/ped
59	bike path or lane on Hwy 16 between Woodland and Esparto	bike/ped
60	bike path between Davis and Sac, esp. Rd 32A, needs improvement! Yolobus route 43 should have a 2pm and 3pm route. Low income people should be subsidized for public trans.	bike/ped
61	designated bike lane like J street all over the county	bike/ped
62	I see reduced VMT, reduced VMT in heavy traffic, and reduced time in car as linked and all achievable by less need for a car and more use of bicycling and walking	bike/ped
63	more emphasis on short and long term on bike, ped, and transit. The current system is wildly unbalanced in favor of autos. To achieve balance, we should not be putting more weight on the auto side of the scale	bike/ped
64	more pedestrian infrastructure in general - no sidewalk gaps, more buffered walking paths	bike/ped
65	invest more money sooner to improve bicycle network throughout region	bike/ped
66	More money spent on GOOD, off road bike paths; protected bike lanes in downtown areas.	bike/ped & recreation
67	no "door zone" bike lanes. No intersections with 10 or more legs closed to ped crossing. No urban roads with speed limit over 30 mph. Transit service to my neighborhood @ 15 minute headways. Allow transit passengers to transfer without paying another full price!!	bike/ped & safety
68	Improve bicycle safety. More alternatives to automobile transportation	bike/ped safety
69	improve safety and accessibility for cyclists	bike/ped safety
70	Reduce on 80 to and from Davis	congestion
71	electric light trucks with a 300 mile range on 1 charge	electric vehicles
72	more electric vehicle charging stations	electric vehicles
73	facilitate electric vehicles travel through infrastructure	electric vehicles
74	Substantial increase in number of free electric vehicles charging stations, plus code requirement for all new businesses and existing businesses over a certain size	electric vehicles
75	Green vehicles only laws, get rid of fossil fuels	electric vehicles
76	More electric vehicles use	electric vehicles
77	Other - fewer stoplights on highway 99 in Yuba City	freeway/highways & local roads
78	Investment in alternative-powered bus fleets...making walking & biking access a high priority	funding strategy
79	A special lane on freeways for slower/lower emitting vehicles (i.e. Vespa's)	general
80	Less cars/more efficient cars	general
81	growth limits, safer bike lanes, age minimums for driving at 18	general
82	Better coordination between Caltrans + local jurisdictions for traffic lights	general
83	Most of the above are personal choices, not choices that government or RPAs should be making	general
84	Easier parking	general
85	Mode connectivity ... car (parking) to transit, etc. bus to RT, streetcar to bike, etc.	general
86	healthier communities, safer transportation options, economic growth, bus rapid transit, better coordination between local + regional + state government	general

Following the suite of questions regarding plan outcomes: "Other outcomes of the plan you would like to see (fill in the blank)		
	Comments	Themes
87	sponsor or advocate for research/pilot testing of innovative telecommuting/tele-shopping/other trip reducing strategies	general
88	More common public areas - parks etc.	general
89	Improve individual and community health through less car dependence and encouraging transportation based exercise in our daily lives	general
90	Pick a mode and focus on it. Do not try and please electric vehicles everyone and let the minority dictate where transportation funds are spent.	general
91	more transportation in the Yuba Co. Foothills + Wheatland	general
92	Density equity safeguards for historically blighted neighborhoods to account for gentrification risks (i.e. North Oak Park)	general
93	parks, community center	general
94	established conservation plan	general
95	El Dorado Co has a large rural flavor - with recreational equestrians, monthly we see growth of people moving in purchasing acreage for horses. Would like to see them added to the transportation list of uses	general
96	Better interagency coordination; no focus on motorist loss; sinking lid on car parking supply	general
97	Instead of population growth model use/account for greenhouse gases cause by people, expand growth/delectric vehicles/development from that average	growth
98	Private sector jobs in city center	growth
99	NO new development south and/or east of the South East Capitol Connector	growth
100	less sprawl	growth
101	more regional perspective on where NOT to build as apposed to where TO build	growth
102	green space retained in city	growth
103	Keep El Dorado County rural	growth
104	more compact + mixed use development	growth
105	infrastructure should be built ahead of rooftops (house/apartments) and commercial, not after congestions is unbearable.	growth
106	stop building and leave the land alone!	growth
107	better planning of shopping centers	growth
108	More homes within walking distance to stores & restaurants	growth
109	Promote economic growth and vitality while providing the roadway system needed to support it.	growth
110	more walkable bikeable communities	growth
111	continue to invest in urban core; try to reduce development of open space	growth
112	Stop messing with land use and the natural economy. People in general do not want to get out of their cars. Decisions need to be made on that reality and when developing high density traffic impact still needs to be considered, otherwise the condition only becomes worse with the opportunity to mitigate lost	highway/freeway & local roads
113	more affordable housing	housing
114	More local control of funding and priorities	local control
115	more local jurisdiction control. Less unelected regionalism	local control
116	more local and less regional planning and control of projects	local control

117	More bridges across the river	local roads
	Following the suite of questions regarding plan outcomes: "Other outcomes of the plan you would like to see (fill in the blank)	
	Comments	Themes
118	More road projects in Yuba City	local roads
119	Improvement on what we have already and well maintained before adding to it	maintenance
120	Improvement in Condition of Roads	maintenance
121	safer coexistence of motorists/cyclists/pedestrians	safety
122	Safer biking routes with more separation from automobile traffic.	safety
123	Reduce traffic speed in residential communities; reduce noise produced by traffic (highway, trucks, motorcycles) in area near residential communities.	safety
124	Provide adequate funding for alternatives to vehicle travel. Funding to educate electric vehicles everyone on proper vehicle/bicycle interaction, Rules of the road, slow down vehicle traffic speed.	safety
125	light rail to airport	transit
126	an additional transit funding source through public-private partnerships	transit
127	Improvement of Amtrak train railways	transit
128	more bus routes	transit
129	extended light rail services	transit
130	Better long distance public transit	transit
131	Pay for transit costs by increasing taxes	transit
132	Education for UCD students about biking in the road and lights at night	transit
133	more transit for seniors who often cannot walk to bus stops + can't afford taxis, our senior population is exploding	transit
134	improved rail transit; incentives to use non-car transportation	transit
135	Improved high-frequency transit in urbanized areas outside the Sacramento city limits	transit
136	cheaper transit	transit
137	more interest in supporting our senior population with accessible transit	transit
138	regional interconnection of transit options	transit
139	A card in which you can use on all transit	transit
140	Public transit needs to be faster and cheaper enough relative to cars to tip the balance away from cars, also car pooling options easier	transit
141	Less cares, less focus on auto as transit 1 option. Less space dedicated to cars	transit
142	transit investments in built out, underserved areas	transit
143	Other - improve public transportation in rural communities that are providing affordable housing - to urban schools hubs and urban work hubs	transit
144	West Sacramento needs more public transportation	transit
145	better and safe transit in low income areas; better connections for public transit	transit
146	light rail to Davis instead of airport	transit
147	Actually, I am a daily commuter to Sacramento. Y-S Transit is Fabulous! Wrote "We need a light rail!!" under questions 5 - Balancing Priorities	transit
148	better schedules for public transit -- bus transit from community colleges up until 10:15 pm	transit

149	Transit to airport	transit
	Following the suite of questions regarding plan outcomes: "Other outcomes of the plan you would like to see (fill in the blank)	
	Comments	Themes
150	Get light rail built to natomas area + airport	transit
151	more intercity hi-speed transit, possible direct travel from Natomas to Rancho Cordova . Above ground train?	transit
152	Bus Rapid Transit on major corridors and freeways	transit
153	massive shift to rail and bus transit	transit
154	Increased safe well maintained multi-use paths that move from residential to business areas. A safe transit system that gets a person from point A to point B faster than a personal vehicle.	transit
155	While cost recovery is important, taking mass transit needs to be incentivized either by transit agencies and/or employers. We need livable communities that have a low impact on our environment.	transit
156	create easier commute transit options that are affordable and thus will encourage more people to use/support (also helps environment)	transit
157	Amtrak ridership increased to reduce ticket fares	transit
158	light rail to the airport	transit
159	increased spending devoted to transit, beyond fare revenues	transit
160	affordable (sliding scale fee for public transit), more hours of service, 24/7 if possible or early and late service hours too	transit
161	high quality transit does NOT need 15 minute headway	transit
162	better transit from Folsom to Sacramento and other areas	transit
163	More buses and light rail - you cannot go further east than Folsom lake	transit
164	BRT, bikes, safer transportation options	transit & bike/ped
165	Travel to and from suburbs, and within, without need of a car	transit & bike/ped
166	Transit (light rail) extended to airport; Better flow of traffic downtown for arena project; Safe bike lanes for downtown commuting	transit & bike/ped
167	Other - Drought plan - solutions	water availability
168	Water is major limitation, so add it as major determinant of growth	water availability

Write in comments on blank comment cards		
	Comments	Themes
169	We need real, not planned, funding for transit if there are to be real reductions in VMT.	air quality
170	B Street in Davis between 8th and 14th Streets is a TEMPORARY BIKE LANE and worse than unsafe for kids travelling on bikes...Allowing parking 6 pm - 6 am M_F and all days weekends is reprehensible.	bike/ped
171	The woodland Davis connection in the Yolo County bike plan should be taken off the list and other projects moved up in priority. The build it and they will come thinking will not work in this case. With the opening of road 98 there is a good way to bike between the cities for those that want to. You are not going to get people to brave 100 degree heat and North winds unless they already bike and there are now good enough routes for them. Resources should go to improving routes that have a better potential of increased ridership with improvements, such as Davis to Downtown Sacramento. All of the above is my opinion, influenced by years of riding and observing other riders.	bike/ped
172	Please rate the Road 32A bike bypass as "high" priority for Yolo County and fund the project in FY 15-16 with minimum local match. Thank you.	bike/ped
173	Keep in mind cyclists commuting from Davis to Sacramento, and Sacramento to Davis via Road 32A...	bike/ped
174	More inter-city bicycle transportation, especially between Davis and Sacramento, specifically building a Rd 32-A bypass. Too much high-speed traffic is intermingled with cycling on this route.	bike/ped
175	I would like to see the 32A bike bypass project implemented.	bike/ped
176	It would be great to see the 32A bike bypass being pushed forward!	bike/ped
177	More people would commute from Davis (homes) to Sacramento (jobs) -- and some in the reverse direction -- if there were a safer, more pleasant route. This would also have the effect of reducing congestion on the I-80 freeway & on commute-hour trains/buses -- since these people have to get to work somehow. So, the best and most cost-effective solution is to complete Yolo County's "32A Bike Bypass" as soon as possible!	bike/ped
178	As a Davis resident that commutes by bike to Sacramento, I would appreciate a safer route along County Road 32 between the Causeway and the existing Class 1 bike route that parallels I-80. Additionally, an at grade trail through the Yolo Bypass would be preferable to the trail immediately adjacent to the freeway. Both actions would make the bike commute between Davis and Sacramento safer and more enjoyable, and potentially more attractive as a viable commuting option for more people.	bike/ped
179	I have tried to cycle from Davis to Sacramento and had a very scary experience with speeding cars on the frontage road in Davis. For me, for this reason, cycling to Sacramento is not an option. The 32A bicycle bypass should be made a high priority as Sacramento is a major destination from Davis but there is no safe alternative.	bike/ped
180	The bicyclist route between Sacramento and Davis should receive a high priority for safety improvements; in particular the frontage road north of I-8- in Yolo County (Road 32A) is not very safe for bicycling during commute hours	bike/ped
181	I like the projected ideas for more walking and biking access. But the projected plan seems to focus more on congestion and traffic more than greener transportation which is what I would like to see	bike/ped
182	Priority for class I bikeway from RR tracks to Causeway east of Davis needs to be bumped up.	bike/ped

Write in comments on blank comment cards		
	Comments	Themes
183	We need a safe commuter route between Sacramento and Davis - the 32A bike bypass would be fantastic!	bike/ped
184	The bike route between Davis and Sac is intimidating. Rd 32A is scary b/c of cars. The shoulders need expanding to at least 6 ft. The western causeway electric vehicles pavement is literally falling apart. Biking in downtown Sac is also scary w traffic. Wish we could improve that. Civil improvements cost money and I usually vote for more taxes because I like environmentally friendly infrastructure that supports getting people out of cars. I think the tax should be on gas and cars. Drivers (including myself) should fairly pay for the cradle to grave costs of cars, including environmental and public health costs of pollution. Then people would use public transportation, traffic would get better and less \$ spent on road repair. My family supports scenario 3!	bike/ped
185	Would like to see improved bicycle infrastructure between Davis and Sacramento -- the 32A bike bypass should be a high priority.	bike/ped
186	We have for too long neglected the bike as a transportation option. The current bike transit system from Davis to Sacramento is noisy with toxic fumes. There should be a safe way to connect the two. Europe is far ahead of us on this. I don't support anything that puts more cars on the road.	bike/ped
187	Need to look seriously at increasing short trip needs shifting frequent travel to bike, ped, transit. Need well paved bike track <u>separate</u> from cars yet maintained clean of debris.	bike/ped
188	I am at my limit on new taxes and fees. No more! I can't afford it. Allocate funds to make walking and biking more safe. A lot of people don't bike or walk because they are scared to get on city streets.	bike/ped
189	I hope there will be consideration for a County Road 32A bike bypass. I would like to see a separated (Class 1) bike path from the RR crossing on the I-80 frontage road (City Rd 32A) all the way to the causeway. The route would be on the north side of the RR tracks and would ultimately create a Class 1 bike path from Olive Drive all the way to West Capitol Ave. On weekends, and through most of the day, there is no problem cycling from Davis to Sacramento. But during rush hour, this section is dangerous for cyclists. When the freeway gets backed up, many motorists use the frontage road as extra freeway lanes. So, traffic is moving very fast and the shoulders are too narrow to qualify as bike lanes.	bike/ped
190	Please make 32A bike bypass a priority. This is very necessary for Davis - Sac bike commuter safety. Happy to discuss!	bike/ped
191	I know so many who say they would use a bike more if they felt safe doing so. We could fix multiple problems at once by boosting bike infrastructure, and at a lower cost than expanding car lanes. We should also keep in mind that we influence behavior (biking vs. driving) by how we design our roads. We should give priority to those who use public transit, walk or bike, instead of to those who pollute, contribute to traffic congestion, and require expensive roadwork.	bike/ped
192	Regional bicycle connectivity between Sacramento and Davis needs significant improvement. CA 32A is very unsafe with narrow bike lanes.	bike/ped
193	I support the bike path on the north side of the RR tracks for Sacramento commutes	bike/ped
194	Just put in the bike lanes/paths in Yolo County.	bike/ped

Write in comments on blank comment cards		
	Comments	Themes
195	1. Small project comment - the bike route between Davis + Sacramento needs serious improvements. They causeway bike path approach ramps are in abysmal condition. 2. The Plan should acknowledge the massive subsidies given to highways + motorists including "free" parking, federal tax abatement for state highway	bike/ped
196	I would really encourage heavy investment into using bikes for transportation. Bike trails aren't enough. We need bike only roads. People won't ride bikes if the road isn't friendly and bikes provide the cleanest option for transportation. I wish I could bike to school but as it is, the bike lanes are too if there are any and the road that is "good enough" for cars would tear up my road bike tires. We need to be a more bike friendly community. Not only will it be cleaner but provide more community and a healthier lifestyle	bike/ped
197	Better bicycle paths are needed away from traffic especially along road 32A in Davis.	bike/ped
198	Re-prioritize plan for bike path north of frontage road. Make it a higher priority.	bike/ped
199	I support the construction of a "Class 1" bike path that would follow the train tracks between Davis and Sacramento. It would <u>very</u> much improve the conditions of my commute.	bike/ped
200	If you would improve the Sacramento-Davis bike route you could reduce traffic on the freeway & GHG. We need a CA32A bike bypass to allow for a Class I path for Davis to West Sacramento. The 1 mile gap in the route we have now is dangerous to cyclists. We have narrow shoulders, high speed traffic, and 1 dangerous crossings. The route has lots of potential to reduce freeway traffic because lots of people live in Davis and work in Sac and/or live in Sac and work at UCD or in Davis.	bike/ped
201	I realize that the bike community advocates more bike routes. I ride a bike 100 to 200 miles/week but I think the cost per rider miles is too high.	bike/ped
202	Move 32A widening project up on priority list. Thanks	bike/ped
203	I live in Davis and commute to Sacramento on my bike. County Road 32A has a narrow shoulder for bicycles and I am putting myself at risk of injury electric vehicles every time I commute. I support the delectric vehicleselopment of the 32A bike bypass not only to improve safety for bike commuters but to help enhance Davis as a cycling specific tourist destination.	bike/ped
204	Major bike paths that substitute for medium distance commuters should be a high priority.	bike/ped
205	The Missouri Flat bike/walk path to Placerville has been widely successful. We need more great paths like that/ Would love to see a lelectric vehiclesel two charger somewhere in Pollock Pines so electric vehicleses can drive to Tahoe.	bike/ped
206	I support strongly the delectric vehicleselopment of Class 1 bike path options to link Davis to West Sac & Woodland. These should be regional priorities.	bike/ped
207	Please consider a CR 32A bike bypass to establish a separated bike path from Davis to West Sacramento.	bike/ped
208	I really support improving the grade separation of the Davis to Sacramento bike path that parallels the freeway (CR 32A bicycle bypass)	bike/ped
209	Yolo County needs to make the bicycling route along Road 32A a higher priority in its transportation/bicycling plan. This route has heavy traffic during commute periods (many cars use as alternative route from I80). Shoulders are not wide enough for cyclists from a safety standpoint.	bike/ped

Write in comments on blank comment cards		
	Comments	Themes
210	Identify key stretches of road which make bicycle commuting difficult for people. For instance, I bike commute electric vehicles every day, all year long, from Davis to Sacramento. But, there is a stretch of County Road 32A which scare the hell out of potential bike commuters. The bike lane is much too narrow considering how fast traffic travels on 32A (~65 mph). Fix those few miles by building a wider bike lane or separated path and a lot more people would be willing to commute by bike.	bike/ped
211	increase funding for County Road 32A bike bypass between Davis and Sacramento	bike/ped
212	I would like to see the CR 32A bicycle bypass project to go to the top of the priority list for Yolo County bicycle projects.	bike/ped
213	Stop conflicting recreational trails, bike paths, and multi-use paths with utilitarian. Walking and bicycling place in separate categories. Remove trails from bicycle and pedestrian category.	bike/ped
214	Please improve road 32A for bicyclists (wider bike lane or separate path) Also, for the east end of Olive Drive in Davis needs resurfacing. I think it's the worst section of road in town.	bike/ped & maintenance
215	1. The number and frequency of Amtrak trains running from Auburn Rose electric vehicles through Sac to Davis and to the Bay Area should be increased. 2. Safety for bicycles on busses and light rail are needed as well as more bike racks and seats for people that ride. Then, people that ride their bikes would increase. With more people riding bikes to work, money would be saved as well as less money spent on fossil fuels. 3. Hybrid and solar or water powered vehicle research is vital to have sustainability of our nation which affects global society; coupled with a better transit system, automobiles would decrease carbon emissions and greenhouse gases plus it would reduce the amount of fossil fuels used and leave less of a carbon footprint 4. More bicycle routes which can be used would increase safety. Having safe conditions on roadways and more bicycle lanes is also very important (to save lives). Having proper lighting would also make it more safe	electric vehicles, transit, bike/ped, water, energy
216	I would like to see more consideration and implementation of electric vehicles in public transit plans/delectric vehicles development. And efforts/consideration to effect policy to reduce space for parking	electric vehicles
217	There are many assumptions in this survey - which make data collected of dubious value.	general
218	Elk Grove needs a skating rink, ice skating rink, and a arcade	general
219	100% of Applications for Grant Monies MUST have the Approval & Engineer's Seal, in order to avoid FRAUD. All applicants must be required to have a Licensed CA Engineer's Seal on all submissions. Engineers are sworn to enforce laws, so use them in this fashion and cut the fraudulent applications. Also be CERTAIN each project was circulated to the public and the CA State Clearinghouse: check the SCH Comments on each project (coming from all agencies). Use SACOG as an enforcement tool, not a target of graft-steers.	general

Write in comments on blank comment cards		
	Comments	Themes
220	Can SACOG please do something when local governments take the law into their own hands and put up illegal signs? In Yolo County, where eastbound Russell Blvd approaches the leftward curve onto Road 93A, Russell Blvd continues straight ahead as a single lane, physically configured like a freeway off-ramp. This is obviously dangerous if cars want to zoom straight ahead when bicycles using the bike lane are following the road curving to the left. Just before that point, there is a non-standard sign that says "Bicycles Yield to Vehicle Traffic." The sign is a safety hazard because it makes people think that bicycles are required to get out of the way of vehicles approaching from behind. If people driving cars expect bicycle riders to take all the responsibility for avoiding a collision, that is obviously unsafe. The sign is contrary to state law, because bicycles have the same rights as vehicles, and vehicle drivers are not allowed to cross a bike lane if there is a bicycle there. I assume the intent of the sign is to tell bicycle riders to be cautious, so a better sign could say, "watch out for passing vehicles." It is a problem that too many of our government decision makers have a car-culture bias ("blame the victim"), and that we don't have any continuing education to improve people's knowledge of traffic laws.	general
221	#9 is difficult to answer without more information.	general
222	SACOG liaison with DGS about taking transportation issues into account when planning for state worker workplace planning	general
223	I found this event very interesting and it is something I have been interested since moving here. My city has abandoned the "River Side" of Folsom Blvd. Most of their infrastructure programs have been developed in new areas that are yet to be populated.	general
224	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is very important to focus on less greenhouse gas emissions from cars + trucks in order to leave less of a carbon footprint. 2. It is also very important to reduce vehicle miles traveled in heavy traffic, as well as having less vehicle miles traveled to reduce carbon dioxide and noxious fumes, as well as less use of fossil fuels 3. Instead of cutting bus routes and not expanding the light rail systems, more attention should be placed on these areas. With the increase, it would improve the economy because people would be able to get to and from jobs as well as bettering themselves as well. 4. More focus on improving the connections of buses and light rail trains is important so individuals would not have to wait 1/2 hour to 1 hour in the cold or blistering heats; this should be addressed since more individuals are handicapped. most successful systems only wait 5+ minutes for next bus. 5. Just a suggestion that perhaps more research (when developing this project) should be placed on taking a look at other successful transit systems like New York; Bay Area transit, or New Jersey transit. I become ashamed when I run into people traveling from other countries or places like Switzerland and they are astounded that the Capitol of California should have such an unsustainable system. What's going on? 	general
225	#9 is a trick question- I resent this question and its implications!	general
226	subjective/difficult questionnaire to answer, especially since I don't really understand info presented in question 4	general
227	Add lanes to highways for lower speed vehicles such as Vespa's that get better gas mileage	general
228	How would 9 be assessed? I suspect this would color my opinion. WRT 8, we should not be building new infrastructure if we cannot adequately maintain what we have. More and bigger roads is NOT the answer. This is defeatist if our long term goal is sustainability.	general

Write in comments on blank comment cards		
	Comments	Themes
229	<p>Money my household is willing to spend question 7 refers to transit not roads + really depends on what its spent for.</p> <p>Some survey items don't apply since I bike only a few minutes to work</p> <p>Bike routes improved along 5th Street Davis are nice but you breathe a lot of exhaust - bike routes should be on streets with less traffic or on paths separated by barriers like tall bushes.</p> <p>Public transit in Davis is good along some set routes. For others a friend said on days buses ran once an hour, with transfer can take 2 hours to get across town. So she bought a car.</p> <p>Please use a greater % of taxes for public transit walk bike options + getting people out of cars!</p> <p>We need carbon tax on gas to fund transit - to use less gas and encourage transit</p>	general
230	Everyone should not have to pay for the roads, when not everyone owns a car...especially those who cannot afford it already. It should come from those who can afford to pay more to drive a car.	general
231	Delete "residential" from "rural residential communities" to "rural communities" should exist with the businesses, jobs, etc. -not as s	general
232	The room was too loud.	general
233	You are ignoring the low income and senior and disabled population in your considerations	general
234	<p>The category of new, expanded, and improved roads should be zeroed out, and the \$7.3B redistributed to other modes. Biking and walking should be 20% of budget. The region should not be adding lanes miles at all, in any location, unless paid for 100% by developers, and probably not even then. The MTP/SCS should strongly discourage the category of developing communities by not funding any infrastructure costs associated with our induced by this greenfield development. We have enough of this type of development to last forever; what we don't have is re-investment in center and corridor communities and established communities.</p> <p>No projects should be funded that do not reduce VMT by at least 5%.</p> <p>The scenarios chart grossly underestimates the impacts of continued sprawl. The percentages shown are at odds with current research.</p>	growth
235	Some of the questions were written to obtain certain answers that discriminated against improvement to roadways and highways and promoted unachievable transit expectations.	highway/freeway & local roads
236	Leaders need to quit trying to be everything to everybody. The fact is most people drive, so logically that's where the monies should go. However, we continue to subsidize mass transit, which will never be self operating in our region. No one would select transit over a car if they have a choice. You cannot put a price on the personal freedom a car gives you. I rode Yuba Sutter transit for two years and hated it. My list of complaints are long; however, the point being is I took a demotion so that I would not have to commute by transit. Please use some common sense and put the money where it is needed most (be objective about it) and quit pushing other agendas.	highway/freeway & local roads
237	This survey should differentiate between highways and local roads. My answer could be different for each.	highway/freeway & local roads
238	Money has to be redistributed from expensive categories. Transit (particularly light rail) is disproportionately expensive. So are new roads. Bike/ped and programs/planning are cheap. Also, we need bridges!.	investment strategy
239	It is stupid to provide 50% of the money to serve the 5-8% of people who use transit and only 50% of the money for the 90+% of people who travel by automobile. Make transit users pay to cover the costs of transit.	investment strategy
240	There should be higher taxes on trucking. Wealthy persons and corporations are not paying their fair share of transportation costs.	investment strategy

Write in comments on blank comment cards		
	Comments	Themes
241	I think most if not all of the funding should come from a gas tax or a vmt tax.	investment strategy
242	1.) increase gas taxes to pay for roads. 2.) create separated bike path from Davis to downtown Sacramento	investment strategy & bike/ped
243	current funding structure results in regressive taxations/fees on lower-income households. Taxes and fees should be adjustable to have a progressive or near constant percentage of household income going to funding better transit/bike/pedestrian options to reduce GHG	investment strategy, transit & bike/ped
244	How can El Dorado County drop SACOG and do its own transportation funding? One of your employees said that SACOG is just a 'middle man'. We don't need an ineffective middle man. Do we?	local control
245	Stop expanding the roads, please. It discourages alternatives. Focus on maintenance of existing roads, and developing alternatives to automobile traffic. Improve the appeal of alternatives like trains, buses, light rail, bicycling...especially bicycling!	maintenance
246	We need to repair what we have before we go adding more use on to it--	maintenance
247	If you don't have the funds to maintain and operate the systems you have (road and transit) don't build more until you do. Transportation needs to be funded through direct user costs ... gas tax doesn't work anymore. Consider re-phrasing Question 9 as it is too general ... I may be willing to pay more for better roads but not more for transit - gets to the individual user.	maintenance
248	The condition of the freeways is dangerous in some areas there is no stripes to separate the lanes and damage on the sides off far right lanes pulls car off the road. Potholes and other road/freeway damage increases need for repairs on all vehicles.	maintenance
249	Our current infrastructure is in substantial disrepair. It's incredibly frustrating to see decent streets torn up and then not fixed. It's disheartening to pay increasingly higher taxes and see the Sacramento County roads I use on a regular basis continue to crumble. I strongly feel that someone needs to be held responsible for the overall condition of the roads and that no expansion should take place until the existing roads are properly maintained.	maintenance
250	As a driver, I find the poorly-maintained roads harm safety, fuel-efficiency, and cost in car maintenance. As a cyclist, I find road and intersection design helps create a hostile environment and potentially deadly scenario (e.g., major intersections with only 3 crossings. Seriously?? Who or what thought that was a good idea??) What I would like to see is short - Responsible delectric vehicleselopment - increased connectivity to bike and peds - Borrowing ideas from places where transport works well - Making more roads user friendly - connections specifically to the river bike path from other areas, county included	safety
251	The majority of funding should come from increased fuel taxes, or taxes on VMT.	taxes
252	Do not acquire new money from property taxes.	taxes
253	Placerville is increasing its sales tax for roads.	taxes
254	It is important that the existing transit system has adequate resources to be effective to get people where they need to go conveniently, safely and cost effectively. In the Citrus Heights, Carmichael, Rancho and other suburbs, transit is very challenging to utilize in a way that provides a reasonable alternative to driving.	transit

Write in comments on blank comment cards		
	Comments	Themes
255	1. Would take Amtrak however too expensive. So much cheaper to drive. 2. I live in Davis. But do not even drive to Sac due to traffic.	transit
256	extend light rail to Natomas, and on up to airport!	transit
257	I would like to see routes more often in Rancho Cordova electric vehiclesery 15 min instead of electric vehiclesery 30 min. More direct routes to American River College along Fair Oaks Blvd.	transit
258	I would like to see the money poured into the speed rail system used for viable, cost-effective transportation options.	transit
259	Light rail to cities outside Sacramento County (West Sacramento, Roseville, Davis, etc.) would be a nice improvement	transit
260	the problem a few cities are option out and are not part of the average (American?) public transit and it effects bus, light rail and paratransit	transit
261	Planners don't seem to recognize the "silver tsunami" where seniors are going to dominate the need for better access to all services. Seniors have money and spend money and need to be included. Where is a commonly quoted rule of thumb that if a senior who may have mobility challenges may not be able to walk to a transit stop more than 2 blocks away - or can't without a bench or shelter at that stop. More inter-transit shuttles or options are needed. Also need more transit training men (?) for those who have nelectric vehicleser ridden able transit	transit
262	We have underfunded transportation for a long time and need to make major investments now. Low carbon dioxide should be a high priority so biking and high efficiency mass transport must be encouraged.	transit & bike/ped
263	Transit is important in Sacramento and on commuter lines, but can be reduced elsewhere to pay for bike/ped facilities and more road maintenance.	transit & bike/ped
264	I would preferably have a lot of new money to fund additional public transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities - but if people won't vote for that, it will have to come from highway funds.	transit & bike/ped
265	Public transportation: assaults, drugs, and other illegal activities occur throughout the week. More security is needed and more laws need to be enforced. Elevators, benches, etc. need better maintenance, etc. (and updating). PLEASE clean the light rail and bus seats!!	transit safety



SACOG Board of Directors

Item #14-11-12 Presentation

November 6, 2013

Recognition of Outgoing Board Chair and Directors

Issue: Special recognition for the SACOG 2014 Board Chair Steve Cohn and outgoing Board of Directors.

Recommendation: This item is for information only.

Discussion: The SACOG Board and staff will recognize the service of the outgoing Board Chair and Directors with the presentation of plaques and Board comments. The November Board Meeting will be the last Board meeting for the following members of the Board of Directors:

Board Chair Steve Cohn, City Councilmember, City of Sacramento
Director Stan Cleveland, Supervisor, Sutter County
Director Carl Hagen, City Council Member, City of Placerville
Director Kevin Hanley, City Council Member, City of Auburn

Together, these SACOG Directors represent 22 years of service to the SACOG region. Their leadership and service is greatly appreciated by the members of the Board of Directors and staff of SACOG. Each of them will be replaced by appointment through processes of their local jurisdictions' governing bodies and will be seated in January or February 2015. Their 2014 Board Alternates may participate in the SACOG Board meetings until their jurisdiction's appointments are confirmed.

Approved by:

Mike McKeever
Chief Executive Officer

MM:RS:gg

Key Staff: Rebecca Sloan, Director of External Affairs and Member Services, (916) 340-6224



Item #14-19-13
Report

SACOG Board of Directors

November 6, 2014

Chair's Report

Chair Cohn will brief the Board members on current issues.

Approved by:

Mike McKeever
Chief Executive Officer



SACOG Board of Directors

November 6, 2014

Board Members' Reports

Board members will provide updates on local issues.

Approved by:

Mike McKeever
Chief Executive Officer

**Item #14-19-14
Report**



S A C O G

SACOG Board of Directors

Item #14-11-15
Report

November 6, 2014

Chief Executive Officer's Report

The following is a brief status report on some of the major issues and projects currently being advanced by SACOG.

Note: The consent and action calendars are light this month, but include several time sensitive items for which we will need a Board quorum to move forward.

We very much appreciate the thoughtful discussion on the Draft Framework for the Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy Update in each of the policy committee meetings this month and will be returning to you in December with a Revised Framework for your consideration and action. This Framework will guide the development of a Preferred Draft Scenario in January, which our staff will be vetting with your local government staff in February and March.

We are also working with our member jurisdictions to identify needs for technical support for key community projects through our SGC Planning Grant to help implement the Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy in Centers, Corridors and Established Communities. This grant is also in partnership with Portland State University (PSU). SACOG is currently refining grant scope and will be working in partnership with PSU Urban Sustainability Accelerator Program to identify jurisdiction projects to be included in the grant work.

SACOG and the City of West Sacramento are in preparations for the Code for America Fellowship Program work to begin in February 2015. West Sacramento City Manager Marty Tuttle will be joining the SACOG CEO and staff in providing a process overview for the program in the Innovation Task Force Meeting, immediately following the SACOG Board meeting on November 13. That presentation will include a sample council resolution and municipal policy on open data as an integral resource to the Fellowship work to benefit the region. This is part of an overall effort on behalf of SACOG to engage the full Board and their respective colleagues in the Code for America Fellowship Program in order to maximize regional benefit.

CONSENT ITEMS: All items on the consent calendar received unanimous support in committee.

ACTION ITEM: #9—The Government Relations & Public Affairs Committee directed SACOG staff to prepare a comment letter on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the crude by rail project proposed in San Luis Obispo by Phillips 66. The deadline for public comments on the DEIR is November 24. Staff will provide an overview of SACOG's draft comment letter for full Board discussion and action.

LAND USE ACTIVITIES:

During the month of October, SACOG staff conducted the following work:

- Using grant funds from Strategic Growth Council Round 3 (SGC-3), staff from SACOG and PSU visited sites in 12 jurisdictions to discuss potential technical assistance opportunities in support of each community's individual community revitalization efforts. The cities of Elk Grove, Rancho Cordova, and the county of Sacramento participated in the first round of this program last year.

- Submitted a grant application in partnership with the cities of Sacramento and West Sacramento to the Federal Transit Administration for comprehensive planning work to remove barriers to transit-oriented development around the streetcar.
- Attended at the invitation of Sacramento County planning department, a workshop regarding the Natomas Vision Plan.
- Participated in the Sacramento Real Estate Connect Event “Regional Economic Review and 2015 Outlook.” SACOG CEO Mike McKeever was the keynote speaker.
- Using grant funds from the Sierra Health Foundation and the third round of Strategic Growth Council Grants, SACOG worked with the City of Sacramento and Sacramento County to bring researchers from the Center for Public Interest Design to the communities of Del Paso Heights and South Sacramento. The researchers conducted on-the-ground data and mapping and began community conversations about revitalization in each community. The two study areas were selected based on their inclusion in state-defined disadvantaged communities.

MTP/SCS WORKSHOPS:

In October and November, staff conducted eight public workshops in the six-county region as part of the update to the 2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy. The workshops were open house format allowing for participants to drop in. In addition to public workshops, residents could give input on transportation priorities via an online survey. Input from the public outreach was summarized in committee staff items in each of SACOG’s three policy committees prior to the November 13 Board meeting. This information will also be used to inform the SACOG Board in coming Board actions related to the MTP/SCS Framework and development of the Draft Preferred Scenario, which will also be subject to public comment in 2015.

CALENDAR:

November 13 – 9:30 a.m. SACOG Board Meeting

November 13 – 11:00 a.m. Innovation Task Force Meeting.

December 4 – 10:00 a.m. Transportation Committee

December 4 – 1:00 p.m. Land Use & Natural Resources Committee

December 8 – 10:00 a.m. Government Relations & Public Affairs Committee

December 18 – 9:30 a.m. SACOG Board Meeting

Approved by:

Mike McKeever
Chief Executive Officer

MM:RS:gg