Chapter 12—Land Use and Planning

12.1 Introduction

This chapter describes the existing conditions (environmental and regulatory) and assesses the potential land use and planning impacts of the 2020 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (proposed MTP/SCS). Where necessary and feasible, mitigation measures are identified to reduce these impacts.

The information presented in this chapter is based on a review of existing and available information and is regional in scope. Data, analysis, and findings provided in this chapter were considered and prepared at a programmatic level. In response to the Notice of Preparation (NOP), SACOG received comments related to land use and planning from the Sierra Club (Placer County), Yolo LAFCO, University of California, Davis (UCD), ECOS, Delta Protection Commission (DPC), and Delta Stewardship Council (DSC). The commenters expressed that the Draft EIR should consider the following:

- Different land use assumptions for Placer County as part of the proposed MTP/SCS
- Consideration of Placer County Conservation Plan (PCCP)
- Relationship of growth areas to city and service provider boundaries, and spheres of influence
- Growth within the UCD Long Range Development Plan and related campus documents as part of the proposed MTP/SCS
- Improved implementation of MTP/SCS by member jurisdictions
- Different land use assumptions for Sacramento County as part of the proposed MTP/SCS
- Delta Land Use and Resources Management Plan (LURMP)
- Early consultation and SCS review by the DSC
- Consistency with Delta Plan policies

The CEQA Guidelines note that comments received during the NOP scoping process can be helpful in “identifying the range of actions, alternatives, mitigation measures, and significant effects to be analyzed in depth in an EIR and in eliminating from detailed study issues found not to be important.” (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15083.) Neither the CEQA Guidelines nor Statutes require a lead agency to respond directly to comments received in response to the NOP, but they do require they be considered. Consistent with these requirements, this comment has been carefully reviewed and considered by SACOG and is reflected in the analysis of impacts in this chapter. Appendix PD-1 includes all NOP comments received.

12.2 Environmental Setting

The Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) is a voluntary association of governments, a federally-designated metropolitan planning organization (MPO), and a state-designated regional transportation planning agency (RTPA). Member jurisdictions include: the
County of El Dorado (including the City of Placerville); the County of Placer (including the cities of Auburn, Colfax, Lincoln, Rocklin, and Roseville and the Town of Loomis); the County of Sacramento (including the cities of Citrus Heights, Elk Grove, Folsom, Galt, Isleton, Rancho Cordova, and Sacramento); the County of Sutter (including the cities of Live Oak and Yuba City); the County of Yolo (including the cities of Davis, West Sacramento, Winters, and Woodland); and the County of Yuba (including the cities of Marysville and Wheatland). SACOG’s designated RTPA status does not include the unincorporated areas and cities within El Dorado and Placer counties which have their own RTPAs: the El Dorado County Transportation Commission and the Placer County Transportation Planning Agency.

The plan area of the proposed MTP/SCS encompasses the entire 28-jurisdiction area (except for the portions of El Dorado and Placer counties within the Lake Tahoe Basin), totaling approximately 6,193 square miles (3,963,626 acres). See Figure 12-1 for a map of the plan area plan area of the proposed MTP/SCS which spans a diverse geography, including productive agricultural lands, the rapidly growing urban core and foothill communities, and the sparsely populated forestlands of the western Sierra Nevada Mountains. Existing development is heavily concentrated near the geographic center of the region in Sacramento County and southwest Placer County, with outlying development occurring mainly along major freeways such as I-80, I-5, US-50, and Highway 99. Near the edges of the region, outside of some small incorporated cities, most land is either productive agricultural land (Yolo, Sutter, and southwest Sacramento counties) or protected forests and open space in the Sierra Nevada foothills (eastern Placer, El Dorado, and Yuba counties).

12.2.1 Existing Land Uses by County

The plan area of the proposed MTP/SCS currently contains approximately 686,847 acres of developed land. Tables 12-1 and 12-2 summarize, existing housing units, employees, and land uses by county within the plan area of the proposed MTP/SCS. The following paragraphs describe the existing land use conditions in each of the region’s six counties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County (incorporated and unincorporated areas)</th>
<th>2016 Dwelling Units</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
<th>2016 Employees</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado</td>
<td>63,793</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>48,690</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer</td>
<td>146,701</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>162,577</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>570,360</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
<td>688,895</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutter</td>
<td>34,186</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>34,417</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolo</td>
<td>77,705</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>104,771</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuba</td>
<td>28,378</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>21,401</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region Total</td>
<td>921,123</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1,060,751</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Totals may not match due to rounding.
2 Due to different protocols among GIS models for tallying spatial data, housing unit numbers in this DEIR differ marginally from those reported in the proposed MTP/SCS.

Source: Data compiled by SACOG, MTP/SCS Land Use Forecast, in June 2019
Figure 12-1
Plan Area of the Proposed MTP/SCS
Table 12-2
2016 Existing Land Uses in the Plan Area of the Proposed MTP/SCS by County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Types</th>
<th>El Dorado County</th>
<th>Placer County</th>
<th>Sacramento County</th>
<th>Sutter County</th>
<th>Yolo County</th>
<th>Yuba County</th>
<th>Regional Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>189,637</td>
<td>126,127</td>
<td>130,182</td>
<td>6,986</td>
<td>22,429</td>
<td>68,513</td>
<td>543,874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use (vertical)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office &amp; Commercial</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>4,089</td>
<td>15,489</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>1,652</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>25,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>4,822</td>
<td>3,150</td>
<td>20,652</td>
<td>3,070</td>
<td>10,088</td>
<td>1,614</td>
<td>44,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>11,733</td>
<td>6,184</td>
<td>24,058</td>
<td>5,465</td>
<td>23,042</td>
<td>72,095</td>
<td>686,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Development Acres</td>
<td>208,992</td>
<td>139,588</td>
<td>190,564</td>
<td>12,691</td>
<td>39,671</td>
<td>95,341</td>
<td>686,847</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Excludes Agriculture, Farm Homes, Open Space, Parks, Recreation, and Vacant land estimate (land that is not developed in the proposed MTP/SCS but is available for development based on currently adopted general plans and specific plans.)

Source: Data compiled by SACOG, MTP/SCS Land Use Forecast, in June 2019

**EL DORADO COUNTY**

El Dorado County extends from the Sacramento County line on the west to the summit of the Sierra Nevada Mountains on the east. From west to east, the geography of El Dorado County progresses from foothill to mountainous terrain. Existing land uses primarily include residential, commercial, and industrial development, and rural and agricultural lands used for agricultural production, resource extraction, open space, and recreation. There is also a mixed-use development in the Missouri Flat area. The only incorporated city in the county within the plan area is Placerville (the Lake Tahoe Basin, including South Lake Tahoe, is not part of the plan area of the proposed MTP/SCS). Residential development is primarily concentrated on the west side of the county in clusters along US-50, including Placerville and the unincorporated communities of El Dorado Hills, El Dorado, Diamond Springs and Cameron Park, and throughout several rural communities. El Dorado Hills and Cameron Park are more recently urbanized areas of the county, where housing and commercial development are suburban in nature. Camino and Pollock Pines are examples of more rural communities that include housing and commercial development that is more rural in nature. Commercial development has generally followed the same growth patterns as residential development, clustering along US-50 and SR 49 and SR 193. A newer business park in El Dorado Hills south of US-50 and just east of the El Dorado-Sacramento County border has generated some job growth outside of the traditional jobs center in the city of Placerville. Additional employment clusters exist in the unincorporated county within Diamond Springs and Shingle Springs.

Over half of the land in the county is in public ownership. Agricultural and forestlands make up the largest percentage of undeveloped lands. Forestlands are managed by the United States Forest Service (USFS), and the United States Bureau of Land Management (BLM) also manages forested lands in the American and Cosumnes River canyons.
**PLACER COUNTY**

With a similar geography to El Dorado County, the unincorporated portion of Placer County is predominantly rural communities today. The majority of the population lives in the suburban southwest portion of the county where residential development has primarily occurred in and around the fast-growing cities of Roseville, Rocklin, and Lincoln. Residential development in these cities is predominantly single-family, although there are some medium- and high-density attached dwelling units. Outside of these cities, suburban residential uses are concentrated along I-80 in the incorporated cities of Loomis, Auburn, Colfax, and the community of Granite Bay. The predominant land use in these cities is low-density residential, though Auburn has a concentration of employment uses due to its role as the county seat of government. The unincorporated area of the county is broken up into several rural communities and a substantial amount of agriculture and protected open space.

The highest concentrations of commercial, light industrial, and office uses in the county fall within the cities of Roseville, Rocklin, and Lincoln. Industrial and heavy commercial uses are also scattered in various locations outside the incorporated urban boundaries, mainly along I-80 near Loomis, Newcastle, Auburn, Foresthill, and Weimar, and near Highway 49 in Auburn and Highway 174 in Colfax.

Non-urban uses within Placer County include agricultural, resource extractive (timber and mining), public lands, and open space. A large portion of the county, particularly in the eastern half, is under public ownership. The largest amount of public land within Placer County is under the control of the BLM. Smaller amounts of land in central Placer County are under the jurisdiction of the USFS and the Bureau of Reclamation.

**SACRAMENTO COUNTY**

Sacramento County lies at the geographic center of the region and contains both agricultural land uses as well as the most urbanized areas of the region. The geographic boundaries of the County of Sacramento include several unincorporated communities and seven incorporated cities, including Citrus Heights, Elk Grove, Folsom, Galt, Isleton, Rancho Cordova, and Sacramento. The county has established two growth boundaries to promote orderly growth and the efficient extension of infrastructure and the provision of urban services. The Urban Services Boundary (USB) delineates the ultimate growth boundary for the unincorporated area, where county services shall be provided and where they will not be extended unless the USB is amended. The Urban Policy Area (UPA) delineates the area within the USB expected to receive county services in the near term.

The highest densities of employment and residential uses are located in the urban core of the city of Sacramento. Two of the three regional employment centers in the plan area of the proposed MTP/SCS are located in Sacramento County, including downtown Sacramento and the employment center along the US-50 corridor in the cities of Rancho Cordova and Folsom. Land uses north of the American River are primarily suburban residential with concentrations of commercial and employment uses along major transportation routes. The southern half of the county, including south Sacramento, the unincorporated Vineyard community, and the cities of Elk Grove and Galt, are predominantly residential. The latter three areas also have fairly low suburban to rural densities. The Cosumnes River flood plain and existing agricultural operations separate the cities of Elk Grove and Galt. The southeast county (outside of existing cities and the USB) is in agricultural use with pockets of Rural Residential Communities, as defined in Chapter 2 – Project Description.
**SUTTER COUNTY**

Land use in Sutter County is predominantly agricultural, with agriculture as the county’s primary industry. Yuba City and Live Oak are the two incorporated cities in Sutter County, which are suburban and rural in their current land use pattern. Several unincorporated rural communities include Meridian, Nicolaus, East Nicolaus, Rio Oso, Robbins, Sutter, Trowbridge, and Tudor. Historically, general plan policy in Sutter County has encouraged agricultural preservation in the unincorporated areas of the county and directed new development adjacent to and within the county’s two cities and other clearly defined and comprehensively planned development areas. While generally continuing this policy, an exception is the Sutter Pointe specific plan area, located at the southern end of the unincorporated county. A development proposal for this area was approved by voters under “Measure M” in 2004 and the Sutter Pointe Specific Plan was adopted in 2009. As of July 2019, only limited industrial development exists in the area, as development of the Sutter Pointe specific plan has not yet begun.

**YOLO COUNTY**

Yolo County borders Sacramento and Sutter counties along the Sacramento River. Agriculture is Yolo County’s primary industry. The eastern two-thirds of the County consists of nearly level alluvial fans, flat plains, and basins, while the western third is largely composed of rolling terraces and steep uplands used for dry-farmed grain and range. The elevation ranges from slightly below sea level near the Sacramento River around Clarksburg to 3,000 feet along the ridge of the western mountains. About 88 percent of the population lives in the County’s four cities (Davis, West Sacramento, Woodland, and Winters). Yolo County and its cities operate under an agriculture preservation policy that directs urban development into existing urban areas (including the many small rural towns within the unincorporated area). The cities of Davis, Woodland, and West Sacramento have received most of this growth. Additionally, the cities of Davis and Woodland have growth control measures limiting and containing growth.

**YUBA COUNTY**

Yuba County is located in the northern Sacramento Valley, approximately 40 miles north of the City of Sacramento. Its boundaries stretch from the farms and orchards of the valley to the timberlands of the Sierras. Historically, Yuba County has been primarily rural and agricultural. However, the southern Highway 70 corridor in unincorporated Yuba County experienced suburban residential growth since approval of the Plumas Lakes Specific Plan in the early 2000s. Similarly, the Highway 65 corridor running through the city of Wheatland has resulted in some residential growth in the city, prior to the Great Recession. The city of Marysville maintains its compact footprint due, in large part, to flood constraints.

### 12.2.2 Existing Land Uses by Community Type

The Community Types Framework was used in the land use allocation process of the proposed MTP/SCS. Local land use plans (e.g., adopted and proposed general plans, specific plans, master plans, corridor plans) were divided into one of five “Community Types” based on the location and land use composition of the plans, as described in Chapter 2 – Project Description. These Community Types are described below and illustrated in Figure 12-2. Tables 12-3 and 12-4 provide the distribution of housing, employment, and land use development by Community Type.
Figure 12-2
Community Types and High Frequency Transit Areas in the Plan Area of the Proposed MTP/SCS

*Areas within one-half mile of a rail station stop or a high-quality transit corridor included in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan. A high-quality transit corridor has fixed route bus service with service intervals of 15 minutes or less during peak commute hours.

Sources: Esri, USGS, NOAA
Table 12-3
Summary of 2016 Housing and Employment by Community Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Type</th>
<th>2016 Dwelling Units(^1,3)</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
<th>2016 Employees(^1,3)</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Center and Corridor Communities</td>
<td>113,880</td>
<td>12.36%</td>
<td>370,890</td>
<td>34.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established Communities</td>
<td>712,012</td>
<td>77.30%</td>
<td>645,326</td>
<td>60.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Communities</td>
<td>20,793</td>
<td>2.26%</td>
<td>12,339</td>
<td>1.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Residential Communities</td>
<td>74,438</td>
<td>8.08%</td>
<td>32,196</td>
<td>3.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lands Not Identified for Development in the MTP/SCS Planning Period</td>
<td>n/a(^2)</td>
<td>n/a(^2)</td>
<td>n/a(^2)</td>
<td>n/a(^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region Total</td>
<td>921,123</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1,060,751</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Totals may not match due to rounding.

\(^2\) The proposed MTP/SCS does not forecast or model growth in the Lands Not Identified for Development in the Proposed MTP/SCS Community Type during the planning period, though there is existing development in these areas (primarily farm homes, agricultural-related uses, public lands such as waste water treatment facilities, etc.). As a result, existing developed acres in the Lands Not Identified for Development Community Type was included in established and rural residential Community Type totals. Some lands within the Lands Not Identified for Development Community Type areas are within spheres of influence and/or urban growth boundaries and will be targeted for urbanization over the longer term (beyond 2040).

\(^3\) Due to different protocols among GIS models for tallying spatial data, housing unit numbers in this DEIR differ marginally from those reported in the proposed MTP/SCS.

Source: Data compiled by SACOG, MTP/SCS Land Use Forecast, in June 2019

Table 12-4
2016 Existing Land Uses in the Plan Area of the Proposed MTP/SCS by Community Type (Acres)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Types</th>
<th>Center and Corridor Communities</th>
<th>Established Communities</th>
<th>Developing Communities</th>
<th>Rural Residential Communities</th>
<th>Lands Not Identified for Development</th>
<th>Regional Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>10,305</td>
<td>158,063</td>
<td>13,298</td>
<td>362,209</td>
<td>n/a(^2)</td>
<td>543,874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use (vertical)</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>n/a(^2)</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office &amp; Commercial</td>
<td>8,240</td>
<td>13,477</td>
<td>317,212</td>
<td>3,532</td>
<td>n/a(^2)</td>
<td>25,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>3,513</td>
<td>26,971</td>
<td>2,957</td>
<td>11,508</td>
<td>n/a(^2)</td>
<td>44,949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>3,915</td>
<td>54,469</td>
<td>1,276</td>
<td>12,435</td>
<td>n/a(^2)</td>
<td>72,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Development Acres(^3)</td>
<td>26,118</td>
<td>253,187</td>
<td>17,850</td>
<td>389,693</td>
<td>n/a(^3)</td>
<td>686,847</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Excludes Agriculture, Open Space, Parks, Recreation, and Vacant land estimate (land that is not developed in the proposed MTP/SCS but is available for development based on currently adopted general plans and specific plans.)

\(^2\) The proposed MTP/SCS does not forecast or model growth in the Lands Not Identified for Development in the Proposed MTP/SCS Community Type during the planning period, though there is existing development in these areas (primarily farm homes, agricultural-related uses, public lands such as waste water treatment facilities, etc.). As a result, existing developed acres in the Lands Not Identified for Development Community Type was included in established and rural residential Community Type totals. Some lands within the lands not identified for development Community Type areas are within spheres of influence and/or urban growth boundaries and will be targeted for urbanization over the longer term (beyond 2040).

Source: Data compiled by SACOG, MTP/SCS Land Use Forecast, in June 2019
CENTER AND CORRIDOR COMMUNITIES

Land uses in Center and Corridor Communities are typically higher-density and more mixed than surrounding land uses of other Community Types. Centers and Corridor Communities are identified in local plans as historic downtowns, main streets, commercial corridors, rail station areas, central business districts, town centers, or other high-density destinations. In 2016, these areas had higher densities of employment, especially commercial and office uses, than their surroundings. They typically have more compact development patterns, a greater mix of uses, and a wider variety of transportation infrastructure as compared to the rest of the region. Some have frequent transit service, either bus or rail, and all have pedestrian and bicycling infrastructure that is more supportive of walking and bicycling than other Community Types.

ESTABLISHED COMMUNITIES

Established Communities are the areas adjacent to, or surrounding, Center and Corridor Communities. Local land use plans aim to maintain the existing character and land use pattern in these areas. Land uses in Established Communities are typically low- to medium-density residential neighborhoods, office and industrial parks, or commercial strip centers. Depending on the density of existing land uses, some Established Communities have bus service, while others may have commuter bus service or very little service.

DEVELOPING COMMUNITIES

Developing Communities are typically, though not always, situated on vacant land at the edge of existing urban or suburban development. They are the next increment of urban expansion. Developing Communities are identified in local plans as special plan areas, specific plans, or master plans, and may include only residential or employment development or a mix of residential and employment uses. In 2016, some of these areas were partially-developed, while others were used for farming, grazing, natural resource extraction, or other non-urban uses. Transportation options in Developing Communities often depend on the timing of development. Bus service, for example, may be infrequent or unavailable today, but may be available every 30 minutes or less once a community builds out. Walking and bicycling environments vary widely, though many Developing Communities are designed with dedicated pedestrian and bicycle trails.

RURAL RESIDENTIAL COMMUNITIES

Rural Residential Communities are typically located outside of urbanized areas and designated in local land use plans for rural residential development. Rural Residential Communities are predominantly residential with some small-scale hobby or commercial farming. Travel occurs almost exclusively by automobile, and transit service is minimal or nonexistent.

LANDS NOT IDENTIFIED FOR DEVELOPMENT IN THE MTP/SCS PLANNING PERIOD

These areas of the region are not expected to develop during the MTP/SCS planning period. Existing land use in these areas consists primarily of farm homes, agricultural-related uses, forestry, mining, public lands (e.g., waste water treatment facilities), and other rural uses. Some of these areas have long-term plans and policies to preserve or maintain the existing non-urban uses, while other
areas are included in adopted or proposed plans that allow urban development and/or are included in the adopted Blueprint vision for future growth.

12.2.3 Existing Land Uses by High Frequency Transit Area

A subset of the proposed MTP/SCS housing and employment growth falls within what are referred to as High Frequency Transit Areas (HFTAs). HFTAs are areas of the region within one-half mile of a major transit stop (existing or planned light rail, street car, or train station) or an existing or planned high-quality transit corridor included in the proposed MTP/SCS. A high-quality transit corridor is a corridor with fixed route bus service that has service intervals of no longer than 15 minutes during peak commute hours (PRC Section21155). In both the proposed MTP/SCS and this DEIR, HFTAs are considered an overlay geography and do not necessarily correspond directly to Community Types (see Chapter 2 – Project Description for more detailed information about the region’s HFTAs).

Blueprint principles call for diverse housing options, in the form of housing products that are currently not widely available, in places where transit service can be efficiently provided. In 2016, 41 percent of housing units and 48 percent of employees were within areas that meet the definition of HFTAs. Table 12-5 provides the amount of the housing and employment in HFTAs in the baseline (2016).

Table 12-5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Frequency Transit Areas (HFTAs)1</th>
<th>2040 High Frequency Transit Areas1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing Dwelling Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer HFTAs</td>
<td>17,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento HFTAs</td>
<td>325,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolo HFTAs</td>
<td>42,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All HFTAs</td>
<td>385,067</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Transit Priority Areas are those areas of the region within one-half mile of a major transit stop (existing or planned light rail, street car, or train station) or an existing or planned high-quality transit corridor. A high-quality transit corridor is a corridor with fixed route bus service with service intervals no longer than 15 minutes during peak commute hours. (PRC Section1155)

Source: Data compiled by SACOG, MTP/SCS Land Use Forecast, in June 2019

12.2.4 Land within the Delta Primary Zone

Pursuant to the Delta Protection Act (PRC Section 29760 et seq.), the Delta Protection Commission (DPC) adopted the first Land Use and Resource Management Plan (LURMP) for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta on February 23, 1995 and updated the plan on February 25, 2010. The LURMP guides conservation and enhancement of natural resources in the Delta, while concurrently sustaining agriculture and meeting increased recreational demand. It defines a Primary Zone, which comprises the principal jurisdiction of DPC, and a Secondary Zone outside the Primary Zone and jurisdiction of DPC, but within the legal Delta area. Most of the land in this area is privately-owned and designated for agriculture and agriculturally-oriented uses, outdoor recreation, wildlife habitat, public facilities, and limited commercial, industrial, and rural residential development (Delta Protection Commission 2010).
The southernmost portions of Sacramento and Yolo counties within the plan area of the proposed MTP/SCS are located within the Delta Primary Zone. Isleton, a portion of City of Sacramento, and a portion of West Sacramento are located within the Delta Secondary Zone. Figure 12-3 shows the portions of the plan area of the proposed MTP/SCS located within Delta Primary and Secondary Zones.

12.3 Regulatory Setting

12.3.1 Federal Regulations

The Transfer Act of 1905

While a department overseeing forestry has been a part of the federal government in some form since 1876, the Transfer Act (16 U.S. Code Section 472, 524, and 554) transferred the management of forest reserves from the General Land Office of the Interior Department to the Bureau of Forestry, renaming the agency the USFS. The USFS is responsible for the management of large areas of national forest land. National forests are primarily managed for outdoor recreational uses and for resource preservation by the USFS. The Eldorado National Forest and Tahoe National Forest are under USFS jurisdiction.

United States Department of Transportation Act of 1966 (DOT Act), Section 4(f)

Section 4(f) of the DOT Act of 1966 (49 U.S. Code Section 303) was enacted to preserve the natural beauty of the countryside, public park and recreation lands, wildlife and waterfowl refuges, and historic sites. Section 4(f) requires a comprehensive evaluation of all environmental impacts resulting from federal-aid transportation projects administered by the Federal Highway Administration, Federal Transit Administration, and Federal Aviation Administration that involve the use—or interference with use—of the following types of land:

- public park lands,
- recreation areas,
- wildlife and waterfowl refuges, or
- publicly- or privately-owned historic properties of federal, state, or local significance.

For further discussion of the requirements of Section 4(f), see Chapter 15 – Public Services and Recreation.

Clean Water Act of 1972 (CWA) and Endangered Species Act of 1973 (ESA)

The Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), through enforcing the requirements of the CWA (33 U.S. Code Section 1251 et seq.) and ESA (16 U.S. Code Section 1531 et seq.), have a significant influence on the location and yield of development in the region. See Chapter 6 – Biological Resources for a discussion of these federal regulations.
Delta Primary and Secondary Zones and Development Boundaries

Figure 12-3

Sources: Esri, USGS, NOAA
THE FEDERAL LAND POLICY AND MANAGEMENT ACT OF 1976 (FLPMA)

The FLPMA (43 U.S. Code Section 1701) established the BLM in its current iteration and bestowed upon the agency the responsibility for federal land management. BLM manages large rural land areas, including environmentally sensitive land. The BLM governs the uses allowed on land that it manages, striving to balance environmental protection and conservation goals with other uses such as recreation and grazing. BLM manages federal lands in Yolo County, Yuba County, and the Placer and El Dorado County foothills.

INDIAN GAMING REGULATORY ACT OF 1988 (IGRA): TRIBAL SOVEREIGNTY

Tribal sovereign lands within the plan area of the proposed MTP/SCS include those of the Shingle Springs Band of Miwok Indians in El Dorado County, United Auburn Indian Community of the Auburn Rancheria in Placer County, Wilton Miwok Indians in Sacramento County, Estom Yumeka Maidu Tribe of the Enterprise Rancheria in Sutter and Yuba counties, and Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation in Yolo County.

Under federal law, tribes are deemed domestic dependent nations and, as such, exercise a limited sovereignty that is subject to congressional authority. States may apply state law to activities within tribal territories only with permission from Congress to do so. As a result, most land use decisions on tribal land are not subject to CEQA or the planning and zoning codes of local jurisdictions (California Planning Roundtable 2007).

The most complex and extensive body of federal land use regulation regarding tribal land use concerns the siting and operating of casinos. In 1988, Congress passed the IGRA of 1988 (29 U.S. Code Section 2701 et seq.) in response to concerns by states over increased tribal gaming. IGRA rejected states’ claims of authority over low stakes gambling, but it did stipulate that Class III or “Las Vegas style” games such as slot machines, black jack, and roulette could only occur under a “compact” between the tribe and the state. In 2000, California voters passed Proposition 1A to allow the state to enter these compacts for certain Class III games throughout the state. The compacts require a Tribal Environmental Impact Review (TEIR) process to address off-reservation impacts of casino projects. Also, any project undertaken by a local jurisdiction in conjunction with a casino project, such as an infrastructure upgrade or extension, is subject to the CEQA process as applicable (California Planning Roundtable 2007).

JOHN D. DINGELL, JR. CONSERVATION, MANAGEMENT, AND RECREATION ACT: SACRAMENTO-SAN JOAQUIN DELTA NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA

On March 12, 2019, President Trump signed the John D. Dingell, Jr. Conservation, Management, and Recreation Act, a large conservation and public lands bill that includes the establishment of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta National Heritage Area (NHA). The Delta will be the first California NHA. The new NHA boundaries extend from Sacramento to Stockton to Vallejo. The DPC will be the local coordinating entity for the Delta NHA and has three years to prepare a management plan, which will provide guidance on ways to preserve, enhance, and educate the public about Delta and Carquinez Strait heritage. NHAs are grassroots, community-driven approach to heritage conservation and economic development. NHAs are large lived-in landscapes. Through public-private partnerships, NHA entities support historic preservation, natural resource conservation,
recreation, heritage tourism, and educational projects. NHAs have no effect on water rights, property rights, or hunting and fishing rights within the designated area.

**Federal Clean Air Act (CAA) of 1970 – Conformity Requirements**

Federal Clean Air Act Air Quality Conformity for Transportation (Conformity) requirements pursuant to the Amendments of 1990 apply in all MPO nonattainment and maintenance areas. Section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act (CAA), as amended (Title 42 U.S.C. 7506(c), and the related requirements of Title 23 U.S.C. 109(j), “Transportation Conformity” ensure that federal funding and approval are given to transportation plans, programs and projects that are consistent with the air quality goals established by a SIP. For MPO nonattainment regions, the MPO, FHWA, and FTA are responsible for making the RTP Conformity determination. Under the U.S. Department of Transportation (U.S. DOT) Metropolitan Planning Regulations (Title 23 CFR Part 450 and 771 and Title 49 CFR Part 613) and EPA’s Transportation Conformity Rule (Title 40 CFR Part 93) requirements, the RTP needs to meet four requirements: 1.) Regional emissions analysis, 2.) Timely implementation of Transportation Control Measures, 3.) Financial constraints analysis, and 4.) Interagency consultation and public involvement. The transportation conformity rule (Title 40 CFR Part 93 Subpart A) sets forth the policy, criteria, and procedures for demonstrating and assuring conformity of transportation activities.

Section 176(c) of the federal Clean Air Act of 1970 (42 U.S. Code Section 7401 et seq.) sets forth the definition of conformity for an RTP. SACOG must ensure that the transportation and transit projects and the emissions associated with such projects contained in the MTP conforms to the state implementation plan (SIP). The determination of Conformity must be based on the most recent estimates of emissions found in the SIP, and those estimates must be determined from the most recent population, employment, travel, congestion, and land use estimates as determined by the MPO or other agency authorized to make such estimates and approved by the MPO (42 U.S. Code Section 7506).

**12.3.2 State Regulations**

**State Lands Commission Significant Lands Inventory**

The State Lands Commission is responsible for managing lands owned by the state, including lands that the state has received from the federal government (PRC Section6370). These lands total more than four million acres and include tide and submerged lands, swamp and overflow lands, the beds of navigable waterways, and state school lands. The state’s sovereign interests within Placer County include, but are not limited to Lake Tahoe, the Truckee River, and the North Fork of the American River. The State Lands Commission has a legal responsibility for, and a strong interest in, protecting the ecological and Public Trust values associated with the state’s sovereign lands, including the use of these lands for habitat preservation, open space, and recreation. Proposed MTP/SCS projects located within these lands in the plan area of the proposed MTP/SCS would be subject to the State Lands Commission permitting process.

**California Land Conservation Act of 1965 (Williamson Act)**

The Williamson Act (Gov. Code, Sections 51200-51207) was enacted by the California State Legislature in 1965 to encourage the preservation of agricultural lands. The Williamson Act program
permits property tax adjustments for landowners who contract with a city or county to keep their land in agricultural production or approved open space. Lands covered by Williamson Act contracts are assessed on the basis of their agricultural value instead of their potential market value under non-agricultural uses. In return for the preferential tax rate, the landowner is required to agree contractually to not develop the land for a period of at least 10 years.

Williamson Act contracts are renewed annually (adding an additional year to the 10-year contract), unless a party to the contract files for non-renewal. The filing of a non-renewal application by a landowner ends the automatic annual extension of a contract and starts a nine-year phase-out of the contract. During the phase-out period, the land remains restricted to agricultural and open-space uses, but property taxes gradually return to levels associated with the market value of the land. The contract expires at the end of the nine-year non-renewal process and then use of the land is only subject to local zoning regulations.

The Williamson Act defines compatible use of contracted lands as any use determined by the county or city administering the preserve to be compatible with the agricultural, recreational, or open space use of land within the preserve and subject to contract (Gov. Code Section 51202(e)). However, uses deemed compatible by a county or city government must be consistent with the principles of compatibility set forth in Government Code Sections 51231, 51238, or 51238.1 (Gov. Code, Section 51201(e)). Also see Chapter 4 – Agriculture and Forestry Resources for more information about the Williamson Act.

**CALIFORNIA ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT OF 1970 (CESA)**

See Chapter 6 – Biological Resources, for a discussion of this state law. The California Department of Fish and Wildlife has no direct land use authority, but in enforcing the requirements of the CESA, it participates with the federal resource agencies (i.e., U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, USFS, and EPA) in commenting on the impacts of new development on natural resource areas.

**THE SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES AND CLIMATE PROTECTION ACT OF 2008**

In 2008, California enacted Senate Bill (SB) 375 (Stats. 2008, ch. 728) (SB 375), which coordinates regional land use and transportation planning to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from cars and light trucks. The law resulted in several amendments to the federally required MTP process. Although the law has many smaller process-oriented changes that affect only the MPO preparing the plan, the bill also resulted in the following three major changes to the MTP process and contents. See Chapter 1 – Introduction and Chapter 2 – Project Description for an additional description of this regulation and the requirements applicable to SACOG.

**Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS)**

The first major change is that the bill requires the MPO to adopt a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) as part of the MTP. The SCS is a land use and transportation plan designed to achieve State targets for the reduction of GHG emissions from automobiles and light trucks (passenger vehicles) in the region. The GHG targets are set by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) for the years 2020 and 2035 and expressed as a percent change in per capita passenger vehicle GHG emissions relative to a 2005 baseline. CARB approved updated targets in 2018.
Separate from SB 375, the MTP is required by federal regulations to reflect the most recent planning assumptions developed by SACOG or other designated agencies (40 CFR 93.110). The purpose of the land use plan in the MTP is to pair forecasted growth with the transportation projects in the plan and inform the regional travel model, which forms the basis for the MTP. The SCS serves to more effectively link the land use and transportation components of the MTP.

Pursuant to the requirements of SB 375 and in light of CARB’s 2018 Target Update, if the proposed MTP/SCS does not meet the GHG emissions reduction target for passenger vehicles set for the region for 2035, in addition to the proposed MTP/SCS, the MPO is required to adopt an Alternative Planning Strategy (APS) that demonstrates how the targets could be achieved through alternative development patterns, infrastructure, or additional transportation measures or policies. However, as the CEQA streamlining benefits of SB 375 (described below) are intended to help regions meet the GHG emissions reduction targets, in the event that an MPO adopts an APS, and CARB accepts the MPO’s determination that the APS, if implemented, would achieve the targets, the CEQA benefits would be activated by consistency with the APS.

**CEQA Streamlining Benefits for Land Use Projects**

The second major change under SB 375 is that specified projects that are consistent with an SCS or APS accepted by CARB receive CEQA streamlining benefits. SB 375 provides three tiers of CEQA streamlining benefits for Residential Mixed-Use Projects, Transit Priority Projects, and Sustainable Community Projects, as described below.

Generally, a Residential Mixed-Use project must be at least 75 percent residential and be consistent with the general land use designation, density, building intensity, and applicable policies of an SCS or APS accepted by CARB as achieving the GHG emissions reduction targets for cars and light duty trucks established for the SACOG region. CEQA documents for these projects are not required to discuss growth inducing impacts, reduced density alternatives, or any project specific or cumulative impacts from cars and light-duty truck trips on global warming or the regional transportation network.

Transit Priority Projects (TPPs) must also be consistent with an SCS or APS accepted by CARB as described above. In addition, the TPP must meet the following requirements: (1) the project must contain at least 50 percent residential use based on total building square footage, but if less than 75 percent residential, it must have a minimum Floor Area Ratio of 0.75; (2) it must have a minimum net density of 20 dwelling units per acre; and (3) it must be located within one-half mile of a major transit stop or high quality transit corridor included in the MTP.

Projects meeting the above requirements will have all the benefits of Residential Mixed-Use projects, discussed above, plus the option to conduct a “Sustainable Communities Environmental Assessment” (SCEA), rather than prepare an environmental impact report or negative declaration. Under the SCEA, an Initial Study is prepared identifying significant or potentially significant impacts. Where the lead agency determines that cumulative impacts have already been addressed and mitigated in an SCS or APS accepted by CARB, they are not “cumulatively considerable” for purposes of further environmental review. Also, traffic control and mitigation may be covered by jurisdiction-wide measures, and off-site alternatives do not need to be addressed. The standard of review for the SCEA is the “substantial evidence” standard, which is deferential to the agency.
The highest level of CEQA streamlining under SB 375 is provided to “Sustainable Community Projects,” which are projects that meet all the qualifications of a TPP described above, as well as the following requirements, and are exempt from CEQA review:

- served by existing utilities;
- no impacts to wetlands, riparian habitats, endangered species, or native plants;
- no impacts to historic resources;
- no risks from hazardous substances;
- no risk from wildfires, seismic issues, or floods;
- 15 percent more energy efficient than California requirements and 25 percent more water efficient than average for area;
- no more than 8 acres in project area;
- no more than 200 units;
- no building greater than 75,000 square feet;
- no net loss of affordable housing for jurisdiction;
- compatible with surrounding industrial uses if applicable;
- within one-half mile of rail or ferry stop or one-quarter mile of high-quality bus line; and
- meets affordable housing minimum or open space minimum or pay in-lieu fee.

Linkage to Regional Housing Needs Allocation

SB 375 linked the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) process to the RTP/SCS in the following ways: extended the frequency of required updates to 8 years, allowed some flexibility in the population projections used in the RHNA determination, allowed greater flexibility in implementation timelines, and aligned the timing of the RHNA process and local housing element preparation with RTP/SCS preparation and adoption. The preparation of the proposed MTP/SCS is taking place concurrent with the RHNA methodology and plan, for the second time since passage of the SB 375. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15283, CEQA does not apply to regional housing needs determinations; therefore, the current RHNA process is not analyzed in this EIR.

However, the proposed MTP/SCS does provide sufficient housing to meet the need of the RHNA at a regional level. Specifically, the MTP/SCS would accommodate 260,000 new housing units, which would be enough to meet the need for 153,512 new housing units identified through the draft RHNA. State statute requires that housing units allocated through RHNA be “consistent with the development pattern included in the sustainable communities strategy.” The forecasted growth from 2016 to 2035 identified in the proposed MTP/SCS will be the starting point for the RHNA methodology of allocating units to jurisdictions. By using the MTP/SCS growth forecast as the basis for total RHNA calculations by jurisdiction, SACOG can effectively ensure consistency across these two planning efforts. For more information on how SB 375 has affected the RHNA process, see Chapter 14 – Population and Housing.
SACRAMENTO-SAN JOAQUIN DELTA REFORM ACT OF 2009 (DELTA REFORM ACT)

In November 2009, the California Legislature enacted the Delta Reform Act (Wat. Code, Section 10610 et seq.), also known as Sen. Bill No. 1 (Stats. 2009, 7th Ex. Sess., ch. 5) (SB X7-1), one of several bills passed at that time related to water supply reliability, ecosystem health, and the Delta. The Delta Reform Act created DSC. The DSC is made up of seven members that are advised by a 10-member board of scientists. The DSC is charged with developing and adopting a Delta Plan that addresses the coequal goals of providing a more reliable water supply for California and protecting, restoring, and enhancing the Delta ecosystem. These coequal goals shall be achieved in a manner that protects and enhances the unique cultural, recreational, natural resource, and agricultural values of the Delta as an evolving place. The DSC adopted the Delta Plan on May 16, 2013 (Delta Stewardship Council, 2018). Subsequently, its 14 regulatory policies were approved by the Office of Administrative Law and became effective with legally-enforceable regulations on September 1, 2013.

The Delta Plan was amended on February 2016 to include refined performance measures, which were again amended in April 2018. A September 2016 amendment made permanent an exemption for single-year water transfers to be considered as covered actions. Also, in April 2018, the Delta Plan was amended to revise Chapter 3 to include new text and recommendations for conveyance, storage and operations, and to revise Chapter 7 to include new text and policy for setting priorities for State investments in Delta levees.

Under the Delta Reform Act, the DSC is charged with reviewing and advising local and regional agencies regarding the consistency of local and regional planning documents, including the proposed MTP/SCS, with the Delta Plan. The DSC’s input includes reviewing and providing timely advice on the consistency of local and regional plans with the ecosystem restoration needs of the Delta and whether the lands set aside for natural resource protection are sufficient to meet the Delta’s ecosystem needs. The Act requires that “covered actions,” as defined, which include plans, programs, or projects within the primary or secondary zones of the Delta, be consistent with the Delta Plan.

The Act expressly provides that “covered actions” do not include the following: (1) RTPs, such as this proposed MTP/SCS; and (2) plans, programs, projects, activities (and any infrastructure necessary to support those plans, programs, projects, or activities) within the secondary zone of the Delta that SACOG has determined are consistent with an SCS or APS that CARB has accepted (Wat. Code Section 85057.5). However, the DSC reviews any plan that includes land within the Delta zones, whether or not it is a covered action. MPOs with a planning area that crosses these boundaries are required to follow a consultation procedure with the DSC. This procedure includes early coordination to determine consistency of the proposed MTP/SCS with the Delta Plan. If the DSC concludes that the proposed MTP/SCS is inconsistent with the Delta Plan, it must provide written notice of the claimed inconsistency no later than 30 days prior to the adoption of the final MTP/SCS. If the DSC provides timely notice of a claimed inconsistency, SACOG shall include a detailed response to the council’s notice in the final MTP/SCS (Wat. Code Section 85212).

SACOG consulted with the DSC on January 15, 2019, April 2, 2019, and August 19, 2019, on the application of the law, the geography under DSC authority, and the policies established by the DSC, and will follow the Act’s consultation requirements. From these early consultations, SACOG believes the proposed MTP/SCS is consistent with Delta Plan; however, the DSC has not provided their official review.
DELTA VISION STRATEGIC PLAN, 2008

The Delta Vision Blue Ribbon Task Force (Task Force) was initiated by the Governor’s Executive Order (Executive Order S-17-06) in 1996 to develop recommendations on the overall management and governance of the Delta, including goals related to improving safety, ensuring water supply and water quality, expanding recreation, coordinating emergency response, and protecting infrastructure and public safety. The Task Force recommended two co-equal goals: to restore the Delta ecosystem and to create a reliable water supply for California.

The Task Force adopted the Delta Vision Strategic Plan in October 2008, which emphasizes the two co-equal goals and, in total, contains seven goals, 22 strategies, and 73 actions to achieve these overarching goals. The seven goals of the Strategic Plan are listed below.

1. Legally acknowledge the co-equal goals of restoring the Delta ecosystem and creating a more reliable water supply for California.
2. Recognize and enhance the unique cultural, recreational, and agricultural values of the California Delta as an evolving place, an action critical to achieving the co-equal goals.
3. Restore the Delta ecosystem as the heart of a healthy estuary.
4. Promote statewide water conservation, efficiency, and sustainable use.
5. Build facilities to improve the existing water conveyance system and expand statewide storage, and operate both to achieve the co-equal goals.
6. Reduce risks to people, property, and state interests in the Delta by effective emergency preparedness, appropriate land uses, and strategic levee investments.
7. Establish a new governance structure with the authority, responsibility, accountability, science support, and secure funding to achieve these goals.

The Strategic Plan proposed a governance structure for the Delta based on a new California Delta Ecosystem and Water (CDEW) Plan to be developed and adopted by the California Delta Ecosystem and Water Council (Governor’s Delta Vision Blue Ribbon Task Force 2008). In 2009, the Delta Reform Act established this authority as the DSC, which adopted the Delta Plan in 2013 (Delta Stewardship Council 2018).

LURMP FOR THE PRIMARY ZONE OF THE DELTA

Pursuant to the Delta Protection Act of 1992 (PRC Section 29760 et seq.), the DPC adopted the LURMP, which outlines the long-term land use requirements for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta and provides direction for land use decisions by the local jurisdictions in the Delta region. The Act defines two delta zones: the Primary Zone, which comprises the principal jurisdiction of the DPC, and the Secondary Zone, which while part of the “Legal Delta” is outside the planning area of the DPC. Both Primary and Secondary Delta Zones overlay the southern end of the plan area within Yolo and Sacramento counties.

The DPC adopted the updated LURMP on February 25, 2010. The update addressed recent court decisions related to water export, Delta ecosystem issues, levee stability, and global climate change. Local jurisdictions are required to review their general plans for consistency with the LURMP update and make amendments as necessary. The DPC has recently initiated an update to the
LURMP. The first draft of the LURMP update has been a collaboration between DPC staff and local land use planners, the Delta stakeholder community, and partner state agencies and became available for public review and comment in April 2019. The primary goals of the LURMP update is to engage stakeholders to assist the DPC in the update process, and to provide a regional framework for overall land use planning that also respects local land use authority using a transparent and collaborative process.

The DPC must ensure that proposed amendments to the general plan, and any development approved or proposed that is consistent with the general plan, will be consistent with the regional plan and will not result in the following:

- wetland or riparian loss;
- degradation of water quality;
- increased nonpoint source pollution;
- degradation or reduction of Pacific Flyway habitat;
- reduced public access, provided the access does not infringe on private property rights;
- expose the public to increased flood hazard;
- adversely impact agricultural lands or increase the potential for vandalism, trespass, or the creation of public private nuisance on public or private land;
- degradation or impairment of levee integrity; or
- increased requirements or restrictions upon agricultural practices in the Primary Zone.

**California Eco Restore**

California EcoRestore is a California Natural Resources Agency initiative implemented in coordination with state and federal agencies to advance the restoration of at least 30,000 acres of Delta habitat by 2020. The goal of California EcoRestore is to pursue habitat restoration projects with clearly defined goals, measurable objectives, and financial resources to help ensure success. The types of habitat targeted include tidal wetlands, floodplain, upland, riparian, fish passage improvements, and others.


The Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Act (Gov. Code Section 56000 et seq.) establishes the process through which local agency boundaries are established and revised. Each county must have a local agency formation commission (LAFCo), which is the agency that has the responsibility to create orderly local government boundaries, with the goal of encouraging “planned, well-ordered, efficient urban development patterns,” the preservation of open space lands, and the discouragement of urban sprawl. A LAFCo typically consists of two county supervisors, two representatives of the county’s cities, and one member of the public. Many LAFCos also include one special district representative. While LAFCos have no land use authority, their actions determine which local government will be responsible for planning new areas.

LAFCos address a wide range of boundary actions, including the creation of SOIs for cities, adjustments to boundaries of special districts, annexations, incorporations, detachments of areas...
from cities, and dissolutions of cities. A city’s SOI is an indication of the city’s future boundaries. Since 1992, state law requires that the incorporation of a new city must not financially harm the county and must result in a positive cash flow for the new city, a requirement that has slowed the rate of new city incorporation.

12.3.3 Local Regulations

GENERAL PLANS

The legal framework in which California cities and counties exercise local planning and land use functions is provided in the California Planning and Zoning Law (Government Code Section 65000 et seq.) Under state planning law, each city and county are required to adopt a general plan “for the physical development of the county or city, and any land outside its boundaries which bears relation to its planning” (Government Code Section 65300 et seq.). The most comprehensive land use planning for the proposed plan area of the proposed MTP/SCS is provided in city and county general plans. The general plans contain goals and policies concerning topics that are mandated by state law or which the jurisdiction has voluntarily chosen to include. They must contain land use, housing, circulation, open space, conservation, noise, safety, and (in many cases) environmental justice elements, as well as any other elements that the city or county may wish to adopt. Other topics that local governments frequently choose to address are public facilities, parks and recreation, and agriculture, among others. All elements must be consistent with one another. County general plans cover unincorporated areas, while city general plans are required to cover an area that is generally larger than the existing city limits (i.e., portions of the unincorporated area that fall within a city’s sphere of influence).

The 28 jurisdictions in the plan area of the proposed MTP/SCS are at various stages of updating or augmenting their general plans and other local land use plans. An overview of existing General Plans for the 28 jurisdictions in the area is provided in Table 12-6. This table is not reflective of general plan amendments or the Housing Element updates that happen on a more frequent basis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>General Plan Last Updated Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auburn</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citrus Heights</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colfax</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado County</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elk Grove</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folsom</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galt</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isleton</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live Oak</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loomis</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marysville</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer County</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placerville</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Cordova</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ZONING

The city or county zoning code is the set of detailed land use regulations that implement the general plan policies at the parcel level. The zoning code identifies allowed uses and required development regulations by district or area. Since 1971, state law has required the city or county zoning code to be consistent with the jurisdiction’s general plan. (Gov. Code, Section 65860). As of 2018, this requirement now also applies to charter cities. (Gov. Code, Section 65860, subd. (d).)

SPECIFIC AND COMMUNITY PLANS

A city or county may also provide land use planning by developing community or specific plans for smaller, more specific areas within their jurisdiction. These more localized plans provide for focused guidance for developing a specific area, with development standards tailored to the area, as well as systematic implementation of the general plan. Specific and community plans are required to be consistent with the city’s or county’s general plan. Zoning ordinances and land use approvals must be consistent with applicable specific plans as well as the general plan. Cities and counties are also required to comply with the Subdivision Map Act (Government Code Section 66410 et seq.). The Subdivision Map Act sets forth the conditions for approval of a subdivision map and requires enactment of subdivision ordinances by which local governments have direct control over the types of subdivision projects to be approved and the physical improvements to be installed.

Consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15125(d) (Cal. Code Regs. Section 15125(d)), SACOG must discuss any inconsistency between the proposed project and applicable general plans, specific plans, and regional plans. SACOG worked closely with each jurisdiction to gather information about adopted specific and master plans. SACOG conducted an inventory of proposed and adopted specific and master plans including information on the type of development allowed, buildout assumptions, and development to date.

HABITAT CONSERVATION PLANS

There are five habitat conservation plans (HCPs) and natural community conservation plans (NCCPs) within the plan area of the proposed MTP/SCS, including the Natomas Basin HCP, the Placer County Conservation Plan, the South Sacramento HCP, the Yolo HCP/NCCP, and the Yuba/Sutter Regional Conservation Plan. A summary of these plans is provided in Chapter 6 –

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>General Plan Last Updated Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rocklin</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseville</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento*</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento County</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutter County</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Sacramento</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheatland</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winters</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolo County</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuba</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuba County</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: *update in progress
Biological Resources. Not all of these plans have been adopted or fully implemented. During implementation of specific projects, an activity subject to Section 10 of the ESA (16 U.S. Code Section 1531 et seq.) and considered a covered project under the implementing rules of an adopted HCP or NCCP may be able to participate in the plan in order to avoid adverse effects on covered species.

**Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans**

Pursuant to state law, each county with an airport has an Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC). The ALUC prepares an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) for each public use airport. The plan provides for the orderly growth of the airport and the area surrounding the airport, excluding existing land uses. Its primary function is to safeguard the general welfare of the inhabitants within the vicinity of the airport and the public in general. Cities and counties must submit their general and specific plans to the ALUC upon adoption or amendment, which must be consistent with the ALUCP. Local jurisdictions are responsible for land use compatibility controls around airports. For more information on airport land use compatibility, see Chapter 10 – Hazards and Hazardous Materials.

**Growth Control**

Local growth control measures manage community growth through various methods, including tying development to infrastructure capacity, limiting the number of new housing units, setting limits on the increase of commercial square footage, and the adoption of urban growth boundaries, among others.

The following jurisdictions in the plan area of the proposed MTP/SCS have some form of growth control measure:

- The City of Davis has voter-approved Measure L (1986) to grow “as slow as legally possible”; voter approved Measure J (2000) mandating voter approval for certain changes in land use, especially certain conversions of agricultural lands into an urban designation; and a General Plan policy limiting population and dwelling unit growth. Voter-approved Measure R (2010) amended Measure L to require voter approval for conversions of agricultural lands to an urban reserve designation and for any development project on the Covell Center and Nishi properties. Measure R also extended the sunset date of Measure L to 2020.
- The City of Woodland has a voter-approved Urban Limit Line Ordinance (2006), which sets the City’s ultimate boundaries. The Urban Limit Line may only be modified by another vote by the people. The initiative also placed restrictions on the provision of services outside of the Urban Limit Line.
- Sacramento County established two growth boundaries in the General Plan to promote orderly growth and the efficient extension of infrastructure and the provision of urban services. The Urban Services Boundary (USB) generally delineates the ultimate growth boundary for the unincorporated area where county services shall be provided and where they will not be extended. The Urban Policy Area (UPA) generally delineates the area within the USB expected to receive county services in the near term. The USB and UPA limit urban uses in areas of the county not included in the “Natomas Joint Vision Study Area,” which is the only location within the unincorporated County and outside of the USB with an overlay.
that allows for the Board to consider urbanization beyond the USB, if it meets criteria specified in the General Plan.

**SACOG Blueprint Vision**

In December 2004, the SACOG Board of Directors adopted the Blueprint Vision, which included a conceptual map and seven growth principles (hereafter referred to as Blueprint principles). Those principles are:

1. housing choice and diversity;
2. use existing assets;
3. compact development;
4. natural resources conservation;
5. design for quality;
6. mixed use developments; and
7. provide transportation choices.

The Blueprint Vision was the result of a three-year regional visioning process, which engaged SACOG’s member jurisdictions, the general public, and special interest groups on how the region should accommodate the future population and employment that is forecast to come to the region. Without land use planning authority, SACOG serves in an advisory role for its member jurisdictions regarding implementation of the Blueprint Vision. Since SACOG Board adoption of the Blueprint Vision, many jurisdictions in the region have implemented the Blueprint principles in their planning processes. The most notable local implementation efforts are general plan updates that incorporate the Blueprint principles into goals and policies; however, local governments also regularly evaluate proposed master plans and individual projects in the context of the Blueprint principles.

The conceptual map depicts a way for the region to grow through the year 2050 in a manner generally consistent with the Blueprint principles. The map is the result of numerous public workshops and meetings with local staff and elected officials. While the adopted vision map is not intended to be implemented literally, the map is intended to be interpreted and used as a concept-level illustration of the growth principles. The goal and result of the Blueprint map and principles, is a reduction in traffic congestion, air pollution, and consumption of agricultural and resource lands through more efficient development within and contiguous to the existing urban area, paired with a transportation system that is more integrated with the land uses. The housing stock of the Blueprint map is more diverse than the current stock, which is dominated by single-family units, and housing, shopping, and employment uses are also closer together so that people are able to make shorter auto trips, or even non-auto trips, to reach their various destinations.

**Rural-Urban Connections Strategy**

The Rural-Urban Connections Strategy (RUCS) was launched at the conclusion of the 2008 MTP to provide policy and technical approaches to addressing or avoiding impacts to rural resources in the Sacramento region. In the same way that the Blueprint is seen as an economic development and environmental sustainability strategy for urban areas, the RUCS program is seen as an economic and
environmental sustainability strategy for rural areas. The RUCS program is thus an integral piece of a regional strategy for the region’s economic and environmental sustainability and viability.

SACOG assembled working groups around five broad topic areas to identify rural challenges and opportunities. These five topic areas included:

1. land use and conservation,
2. the infrastructure of agriculture,
3. economic opportunities,
4. forest management, and
5. regulations.

SACOG also developed working papers with input from local agriculture, planning, economic development, and environmental representatives in order to help the region better understand the unique issues affecting rural areas. Stakeholder workshops were included as part of this process in order to vet the research and findings on each of the above topics.

RUCS has developed and maintains several tools and supporting data to support policy discussion and understanding about the influence of the rural and urban economies on each other. One example is the Geographic Information System (GIS)-based tool that the RUCS program created using information about crop data, pesticide use, and economic data to assess agricultural production in the region. This tool provides the capacity to evaluate both urban and rural land use changes when combined with the land use model and includes parcel-specific data on the cropping patterns on the farms in the region, as well as planning and economic analytical tools to help understand the economics of farming and how infrastructure, land use and market factors affect the ability of farmers to profitably get their goods to market. These efforts are intended to broaden the region’s understanding of how land use and transportation improvements affect rural areas. The RUCS program is ongoing, with the ultimate goal of bridging the urban and rural planning needs in the region. The SACOG Board participates in various RUCS 2.0 activities to promote learning about the opportunities and challenges facing the agricultural economy in different parts of the region with focus on new implementation efforts.

**12.4 Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

**12.4.1 Methods and Assumptions**

This program-level analysis generally evaluates potentially significant land use and planning impacts resulting from implementation of the projected land use pattern and planned transportation improvements of the proposed MTP/SCS. By 2040, implementation of the proposed MTP/SCS would result in a land use pattern and transportation network that is different from existing conditions. Unless otherwise stated, “existing conditions” in the proposed MTP/SCS refers to conditions in the baseline of 2016. The proposed MTP/SCS uses 2016 because it is the most recent year for which comprehensive land use, demographic, traffic count and VMT data are available for the SACOG region. Chapter 1 – Introduction includes a more detailed discussion of the baseline for the proposed MTP/SCS.
For each impact, implementation of the proposed MTP/SCS is assessed on three levels. First, impacts are assessed at the regional level for the entire plan area. Second, impacts are assessed for the plan area’s five Community Types: Center and Corridor Communities, Established Communities, Developing Communities, Rural Residential Communities, and Lands Not Identified for Development. And third, implementation of the proposed MTP/SCS is assessed in terms of its impacts to the region’s High Frequency Transit Areas (HFTAs). Refer to Chapter 2 – Project Description for a full description of the Community Types and HFTAs and the projected land use pattern and planned transportation improvements within these areas. For Impacts LU-2 and LU-3, implementation of the proposed MTP/SCS is assessed at the regional level only. This is because land use requirements and objectives of SB 375, the Delta Plan, and the LURMP are regional in scope.

During each MTP/SCS update cycle, SACOG prepares a land use forecast to accommodate the regional growth forecast of population, employment, and housing demand (see Section 2.6.3 for details).

For the Impact LU-1 analysis, general location of uses, residential densities, and building intensities within the region located in the proposed MTP/SCS Land Use Forecast, described in detail in Chapter 2 – Project Description were used to compare with existing type of development in the region, to determine whether or not various types of land use and planned transportation network improvements proposed under the MTP/SCS have the potential to physically divide an existing community. For analysis under Impact LU-2, the Land Use Forecast outlined above was compared with the SCS requirements of SB 375. SACOG is required by law to comply with the requirements of SB 375, including those pertaining to the SCS. The full list of SB 375 SCS requirements may be found in Government Code Section 65080(b)(2)(B) and listed below in Section 12.4.2: Criteria for Determining Significance. SCS requirements were adopted in part for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating environmental effects, including greenhouse gas emissions, air pollution, and energy (petroleum) consumption. For Impact LU-3, the Land Use Forecast was also analyzed for conflicts with the LURMP adopted by the DPC in 2010. Since portions of the plan area of the proposed MTP/SCS fall within the Primary Zone of the Delta, the proposed MTP/SCS is required to be consistent with the LURMP pursuant to the requirements of the Delta Protection Act (PRC Section 29760 et seq.).

The analysis assumes implementing agencies will ensure that land use and planning are treated in accordance with applicable federal, state and local laws and regulations as part of project planning, design and engineering.

12.4.2 Criteria for Determining Significance

For the purposes of this EIR, SACOG has determined that adoption and/or implementation of the proposed MTP/SCS would result in significant impacts under CEQA, if the following would occur:

LU-1  Physically divide an existing community.

LU-2  Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any of the following SCS requirements of Senate Bill 375 (California Government Code Section 65080(b)(2)(B)).
a. Identify the general location of uses, residential densities, and building intensities within the region.

b. Identify areas within the region sufficient to house all the population of the region, including all economic segments of the population, over the course of the planning period of the regional transportation plan taking into account net migration into the region, population growth, household formation, and employment growth.

c. Identify areas within the region sufficient to house an eight-year projection of the regional housing need for the region pursuant to Section 65584 of the Government Code.

d. Identify a transportation network to service the transportation needs of the region.

e. Gather and consider the best practically available scientific information regarding resource areas and farmland in the region as defined in subdivisions (a) and (b) of Section 65080.01 of the Government Code.

f. Consider the state housing goals specified in Sections 65580 and 65581 of the Government Code.

g. Set forth a forecasted development pattern for the region, which, when integrated with the transportation network, and other transportation measures and policies, will reduce the GHG emissions from automobiles and light trucks to achieve, if there is a feasible way to do so, the GHG emission reduction targets approved by the state board.

h. Allow the regional transportation plan to comply with Section 176 of the federal Clean Air Act (42 U.S. Code Section 7506).

LU-3 Cause a significant environmental impact resulting from a conflict with any of the following requirements included in the Land Use and Resource Management Plan adopted by the Delta Protection Commission.

a. Direct new non-agriculturally oriented non-farmworker residential development within existing unincorporated towns and encourage a critical mass of farms, agriculturally-related businesses, and supporting infrastructure to ensure the economic vitality of agriculture within the Delta.

b. Support the long-term viability of agriculture and discourage inappropriate development of agricultural lands.

c. Preserve and protect the natural resources of the Delta; promote protection of remnants of riparian and aquatic habitat; and encourage compatibility between agricultural practices and wildlife habitat.

d. Promote continued recreational use of the land and waters of the Delta and ensure that needed facilities that support such uses are constructed, maintained, and supervised.
e. Protect and enhance long-term water quality in the Delta for agriculture, municipal, industrial, water-contact recreation, and fish and wildlife habitat uses, as well as all other beneficial uses.

f. Ensure that the construction of new utility and infrastructure facilities is appropriate and the impacts of such new construction on the integrity of levees, wildlife, recreation, agriculture and Delta communities are avoided, minimized and mitigated (Delta Protection Commission 2010).

12.4.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

**IMPACT LU-1: PHYSICALLY DIVIDE AN EXISTING COMMUNITY**

**Regional Impacts**

To accommodate a projected increase of approximately 620,500 people, the proposed MTP/SCS would result in about 260,000 new housing units, and approximately 270,000 new employees in the region through the year 2040, and conversion of an additional 46,403 acres of land to developed uses.

The majority of the new development would occur as infill development, in accordance with the adopted land use plans and zoning ordinances of the cities and counties in the proposed MTP/SCS area. The projected land use pattern of the proposed MTP/SCS reflects the regional growth forecast and generally focuses new land uses within existing communities. The projected land use pattern would serve to promote connectivity within an existing community by siting land uses of similar character and nature in a more compact and mixed-use pattern. Thus, it is reasonably foreseeable that the projected land use pattern of the proposed MTP/SCS would result in beneficial impacts related to the connectivity of an existing community, rather than an adverse effect. Construction activities associated with implementation of the projected land use pattern would not physically divide existing communities.

Therefore, the regional impacts on physical division of existing communities related to the projected land use pattern of the proposed MTP/SCS are considered less than significant (LS) for Impact LU-1. No mitigation is required.

In existing developed areas, where the majority of proposed MTP/SCS roadway improvements would occur, roadway infrastructure is already a dominant feature of the landscape, and improvements to existing roadway facilities would not necessarily physically divide existing communities. There may be localized exceptions, which are analyzed at the Community Type and HFTA level. In developing areas, where existing transportation infrastructure is less prevalent, implementation of new transportation infrastructure could potentially divide established communities, depending on the location and design of planned transportation improvements relative to existing communities.

The additional vehicle service hours of existing bus service or the addition of new bus service would not physically divide existing communities because the buses operate on existing infrastructure. Light rail or fixed guideway projects, unlike bus routes, add permanent infrastructure to the landscape, which could physically divide existing communities, depending on the siting and design
of rail projects. Similarly, roadway projects such as a widening or the conversion of a road to an expressway, with limited access, could also physically divide existing communities, depending on the siting and design of the project. As such, depending on their future siting and location, the construction of new transportation projects or the implementation of new light rail transit service could result in physical division of existing communities.

Therefore, regional impacts on physical division of existing communities from the planned transportation improvements at the regional level would be potentially significant (PS) for Impact LU-1. Mitigation is required. Mitigation measure LU-1 is described below.

**Localized Impacts**

*Center, Corridor Communities, and Established Communities*

Because Center and Corridor Communities and Established Communities are already urbanized, the majority of land development in these Community Types would likely involve higher-density infill development. As discussed above, the proposed MTP/SCS would create more centralized areas of residential areas and commercial centers and would not create features that would physically divide existing communities. More specifically, land use development within Center and Corridor Communities would include a 76 percent increase in housing in Center and Corridor Communities to develop vacant or underutilized land that is in close proximity to services and employment opportunities, take advantage of existing transportation infrastructure (light rail and bus service where they are present), and create more types of housing products for the projected population in central locations. New housing in Center and Corridor Communities is predominantly attached product (multi-family and mixed land uses), due to higher residential densities proposed or allowed in these areas by local jurisdictions.

Similar to Center and Corridor Communities, Established Communities already have a significant amount of development, but these areas are generally not as dense as Center and Corridor Communities. More specifically, land development within Established Communities would result in a modest rate of housing growth. This is in part due in part to their substantially “built out” existing condition, but also because much of the potential housing demand in these areas that might otherwise be realized through amended plans and codes to allow higher densities is channeled to the Center and Corridor Communities. Employment growth in Established Communities is higher than housing growth. As such, because the majority of development within Center, Corridor, and Established Communities would occur within already developed areas and because the projected land use pattern would expand the capacity of these Community Types to support new population growth, the projected land use pattern in these communities is not expected to physically divide established communities.

Therefore, impacts on physical division of existing communities related to the projected land use pattern from implementation of the proposed MTP/SCS in Center and Corridor Communities and Established Communities are considered less than significant (LS) for Impact LU-1. No mitigation is required.

Center and Corridor Communities and Established Communities would receive a variety of transportation improvements by 2040, including new transit, non-motorized, and roadway projects in addition to ongoing improvements in transit operations and roadway maintenance. Most of the roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian infrastructure projects are improvements to existing facilities.
Further, transportation infrastructure is already a dominant feature of the landscape in Center and Corridor Communities and Established Communities that would not result in division of an existing community. However, light rail and fixed guideway projects, unlike bus routes, add permanent infrastructure to the landscape, which could physically divide existing communities, depending on siting and design details. Nonetheless, depending on their future siting and location, the construction of new transportation projects or the implementation of new light rail transit service could result in physical division of existing communities in Center, Corridor, and Established Communities.

Therefore, impacts on physical division of existing communities related to the planned transportation improvements from implementation of the proposed MTP/SCS in Center and Corridor Communities and Established Communities are considered potentially significant (PS) for Impact LU-1. Mitigation is required. Mitigation measure LU-1 is described below.

**Developing Communities**
Currently, land uses in Developing Communities include vacant open space, residential development, some low-density office and commercial development and some transportation infrastructure. Although new employment centers and housing units would not necessarily be built at the same density as Established Communities or Center and Corridor Communities, development in Development and redevelopment proposed in Developing Communities would be more concentrated than existing uses and would create more centralized areas of residential areas and commercial centers. Thus, land use development in Developing Communities would not involve features that would physically divide an existing community.

Therefore, impacts on physical division of existing communities related to the projected land use pattern from implementation of the proposed MTP/SCS in Developing Communities are considered less than significant (LS) for Impact LU-1. No mitigation is required.

Implementation of the proposed MTP/SCS would result in the construction of various transportation improvement projects throughout Developing Communities. However, Developing Communities would not necessarily receive the same mix of transportation projects as Center and Corridor Communities and Established Communities. Developing Communities would receive more road widening projects and newly constructed road projects to serve the new residential and employment developments that would be built by 2040. These areas would receive road maintenance and rehabilitation projects, but because these areas have less transportation infrastructure to begin with, these projects would not be as prevalent as in Center and Corridor Communities and Established Communities. Developing Communities generally are not served by transit today, but new transit service would be added incrementally to align with the completion of new housing and employment centers. Pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure would be similarly phased in over the life of the proposed MTP/SCS.

Because Developing Communities do not have as much existing transportation infrastructure as other Community Types, the construction and operation of new transportation projects or the implementation of new transit service could result in physical division of existing communities, depending on the location and design of such projects.

Therefore, impacts on physical division of existing communities from planned transportation improvements impacts related in Developing Communities would be potentially significant (PS) for Impact LU-1. Mitigation is required. Mitigation measure LU-1 is described below.
Rural Residential Communities

Rural Residential Communities are surrounded by open space, forested lands, and agricultural lands. These communities are expected to have very limited growth by 2040. More specifically, these areas are expected to increase by about 2,790 housing units and 1,400 jobs, or around one percent of the regional growth. This development would consume about 10,251 acres; however, most of that is not developed land in the way the other Community Types are. Development in this Community Type is primarily rural homes on very large lots where only a portion of the land is “developed”, and the remainder of the parcel remains undeveloped. Because the growth in this community type is modest, it is unlikely that the proposed MTP/SCS would result in division of existing communities.

Therefore, the impacts on physical division of existing communities related to the projected land use pattern from implementation of the proposed MTP/SCS in Rural Residential Communities are considered less than significant (LS) for Impact LU-1. No mitigation is required.

Transportation infrastructure in Rural Residential Communities consists primarily of roads serving automobile traffic with some very limited transit service in a few places in the region. Implementation of the proposed MTP/SCS would result in the construction of roadway improvements including road maintenance and rehabilitation, roadway widenings, newly constructed roadways, and freeway improvements. There may also be limited improvements to transit service. Because most of these projects would make improvements to existing service that operates on existing rights-of-way, such improvements would not result in physical division of existing communities. Nonetheless, because Rural Residential Communities do not have as much existing transportation infrastructure as other Community Types, the construction of new transportation projects or the implementation of new transit service could result in the physical division of existing communities.

Therefore, the impacts on physical division of existing communities from planned transportation improvements in Rural Residential Communities would be potentially significant (PS) for Impact LU-1. Mitigation is required. Mitigation Measure LU-1 is described below.

Lands Not Identified for Development in the Proposed MTP/SCS

Although some housing and employment growth, consistent with historical trends, may occur in this Community Type within the MTP/SCS planning period, the proposed MTP/SCS does not forecast any development in these areas by 2040.

Therefore, the impacts on physical division of existing communities related to the projected land use pattern from implementation of the proposed MTP/SCS in Lands Not Identified for Development are considered less than significant (LS) for Impact LU-1. No mitigation is required.

The focus for planned transportation improvements in these areas is on road maintenance, safety enhancements, other roadway operational improvements, and targeted capacity improvements to existing facilities that accommodate increased travel between urban areas. Because of the limited number of projects being implemented, implementation of the proposed MTP/SCS would likely not result in physical division of existing communities for this Community Type.

Therefore, the impacts on physical division of existing communities related to planned transportation improvements from implementation of the proposed MTP/SCS in Lands Not Identified for Development are considered less than significant (LS) for Impact LU-1. No mitigation is required.
High Frequency Transit Area Impacts

Placer County, Sacramento County, and Yolo County High Frequency Transit Areas

The HFTAs already contain mostly urban uses and are relatively compact. The additional housing units and jobs would increase the amount of infill development and density in these areas. For instance, new development in the Placer HFTAs is predominantly employment, due primarily to the concentration of transit service in the Roseville employment centers along the Interstate 80 corridor. Of the new housing in the Placer HFTAs, 45 percent are in attached housing product types. This development is generally more densely developed than surrounding areas. Compact land uses that are more effectively served by transit, support potentially higher rates of walking and biking, and generate less vehicle travel are proposed within Sacramento HFTAs. Similarly, land development within Yolo County HFTAs would include compact land uses that are more effectively served by transit, support potentially higher rates of walking and biking, and generate less vehicle travel. In addition to compact development, the amount of complementary, mixed-use development in the proposed MTP/SCS further supports shorter vehicle trips and higher rates of non-motorized travel. As such, because proposed land use development under the MTP/SCS would be located within existing developed areas and create centralized areas of residential areas and commercial centers, land development would not physically divide an existing community.

Therefore, the impacts on physical division of existing communities related to the projected land use pattern from implementation of the proposed MTP/SCS in the HFTAs are considered less than significant (LS) for Impact LU-1. No mitigation is required.

The HFTAs would receive a variety of transportation improvements by 2040, including new HOV lanes, auxiliary lanes, roadway widenings, bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure improvements, transit facilities, increased transit service, and roadway maintenance and rehabilitation projects. Transit service would include increased frequency on local fixed route buses, but the majority of transit service increases would be commuter service to downtown Sacramento. Projects such as light rail projects, add permanent infrastructure to the landscape, which could physically divide existing communities, depending on the siting and design of rail projects. As such, depending on their future siting and location, the construction and operation of new transportation projects or the implementation of new transit service could result in physical division of existing communities. Thus, planned transportation network improvements impacts related to community separation in the TPAs would be potentially significant (PS) for Impact LU-1. Mitigation measure LU-1 is described below.

Mitigation Measures

SACOG does not have authority to require the implementing agencies to adopt the identified mitigation measures; the mitigation measures are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency. However, implementation of the following mitigation measures at a project-level would reduce these impacts, and agencies with jurisdiction to adopt these measures can and should do so (PRC Section 21081).
Mitigation Measure LU-1: Implementing agencies and/or project sponsors shall implement measures, where feasible and necessary based on project- and site-specific considerations that include, but are not limited to:

- New transportation projects shall be required to incorporate design features such as sidewalks, bike lanes, and bike/pedestrian bridges or tunnels that maintain or improve access and connections within existing communities.
- SACOG shall continue to support planning efforts for locally sponsored traffic calming and alternative transportation initiatives, such as paths, trails, overcrossings, bicycle plans, that foster improved neighborhoods and community connections such as through the regional Community Design grant program.

**Significance after Mitigation**

If the implementing agency adopts this mitigation measure, Impact LU-1 would be reduced to a less than significant level (LS). Projects taking advantage of CEQA streamlining provisions of SB 375 (PRC Sections 21155.1, 21155.2, and 21159.28) must apply the mitigation measure described above to address site-specific conditions, resulting in impacts that are less than significant (LS). However, SACOG cannot require the implementing agency to adopt this mitigation measure, and it is ultimately the responsibility of the implementing agency to determine and adopt project-specific mitigation. Therefore, Impact LU-1 remains significant and unavoidable (SU) for purposes of this program-level review.

**Impact LU-2: Cause a significant environmental impact resulting from a conflict with the SCS requirements of Senate Bill 375.**

**Regional Impacts**

Sections a through h below address whether the proposed MTP/SCS would cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with the SCS requirements included in SB 375 (California Government Code Section 65080(b)(2)(B)).

a. **Identify the general location of uses, residential densities, and building intensities within the region.**

SB 375 requires that MPOs adopt an SCS that forecasts the amount and location of growth, including a detailed allocation of land uses addressing regional housing need, transportation demand, and natural resources (California Government Code Section 65080(b)(2)(B)). The proposed MTP/SCS identifies the general location of uses, residential densities, and building intensities within the region in the proposed MTP/SCS Land Use Forecast, described in detail in Chapter 2 – Project Description. The Land Use Forecast identifies housing by density and type; employment uses by industry, building intensity, and number of employees; and other uses including agriculture, open space, and recreation areas by the following geographic area types: county, jurisdiction, Community Type, and HFTA. Maps and tables with this information, as well as further impact analysis, can be found in Chapter 2 – Project Description, Chapter 4 – Agriculture and Forestry Resources, Chapter 14 – Population and Housing, and Chapter 15 – Public Services and Recreation.
To accommodate a projected increase of approximately 620,521 people, about 260,000 new housing units, and approximately 270,000 new employees in the region through the year 2040, the proposed MTP/SCS projects the conversion of an additional 46,403 acres of land to developed uses. Tables 12-7, 12-8, and 12-9 summarize housing growth, employment growth, and land uses by county.

Table 12-7
Summary of Expected Housing Growth by County (Dwelling Units)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>2016 Dwelling Units</th>
<th>2016-2040</th>
<th>2040 Dwelling Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Percent of Total</td>
<td>New Dwelling Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado</td>
<td>63,793</td>
<td>6.93%</td>
<td>8,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer</td>
<td>146,701</td>
<td>15.93%</td>
<td>54,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>570,360</td>
<td>61.92%</td>
<td>154,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutter</td>
<td>34,186</td>
<td>3.71%</td>
<td>8,093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolo</td>
<td>77,705</td>
<td>8.44%</td>
<td>28,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuba</td>
<td>28,378</td>
<td>3.08%</td>
<td>6,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region Total</td>
<td>921,123</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>260,128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Totals may not match due to rounding.
2 Due to different protocols among GIS models for tallying spatial data, housing unit numbers in this DEIR differ marginally from those reported in the proposed MTP/SCS.

Source: Data compiled by SACOG, MTP/SCS Land Use Forecast, in June 2019

Table 12-8
Summary of Employment Growth by County (Employees)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>2016 Employees</th>
<th>2016-2040</th>
<th>2040 Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Percent of Total</td>
<td>New Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado</td>
<td>48,690</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer</td>
<td>162,577</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>61,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>688,895</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>151,377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutter</td>
<td>34,147</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolo</td>
<td>104,771</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuba</td>
<td>21,401</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region Total</td>
<td>1,060,751</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>270,062</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Totals may not match due to rounding.
2 Due to different protocols among GIS models for tallying spatial data, housing unit numbers in this DEIR differ marginally from those reported in the proposed MTP/SCS.

Source: Data compiled by SACOG, MTP/SCS Land Use Forecast, in June 2019
Table 12-9
Existing and Future Land Uses in the MTP/SCS Plan Area by County (Acres)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Types</th>
<th>El Dorado County</th>
<th>Placer County</th>
<th>Sacramento County</th>
<th>Sutter County</th>
<th>Yolo County</th>
<th>Yuba County</th>
<th>Regional Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2016</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential¹</td>
<td>189,637</td>
<td>126,127</td>
<td>130,182</td>
<td>6,986</td>
<td>22,429</td>
<td>68,513</td>
<td>543,874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vertical)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office &amp;</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>4,089</td>
<td>15,489</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>1,652</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>25,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>4,822</td>
<td>3,150</td>
<td>20,652</td>
<td>3,070</td>
<td>10,088</td>
<td>3,168</td>
<td>44,949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>11,733</td>
<td>6,184</td>
<td>24,058</td>
<td>1,614</td>
<td>5,465</td>
<td>23,042</td>
<td>72,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>208,992</td>
<td>139,588</td>
<td>190,564</td>
<td>12,691</td>
<td>39,671</td>
<td>95,341</td>
<td>686,847</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Development Acres² |                  |               |                   |               |            |            |                |
| **2016-2040 Growth** |                 |               |                   |               |            |            |                |
| Residential¹      | 5,327            | 14,501        | 11,807            | 1,059         | 1,750      | 1,472      | 35,915         |
| Mixed Use         | 3                | 394           | 1,243             | 67            | 168        | 32         | 1,907          |
| (vertical)        |                  |               |                   |               |            |            |                |
| Office &          | 300              | 1,077         | 1,721             | 145           | 140        | 180        | 3,563          |
| Commercial        |                  |               |                   |               |            |            |                |
| Industrial        | 217              | 1,314         | 1,391             | 266           | 865        | 92         | 4,145          |
| Public            | 12               | 301           | 409               | 64            | 41         | 45         | 872            |
| **Total**         | 5,859            | 17,587        | 16,571            | 1,602         | 2,963      | 1,820      | 46,403         |

| Development Acres² |                  |               |                   |               |            |            |                |
| **2040**          |                  |               |                   |               |            |            |                |
| Residential¹      | 194,964          | 140,628       | 141,989           | 8,045         | 24,179     | 69,985     | 579,790        |
| Mixed Use         | 4                | 432           | 1,426             | 161           | 205        | 42         | 2,269          |
| (vertical)        |                  |               |                   |               |            |            |                |
| Office &          | 3,100            | 5,167         | 17,210            | 1,073         | 1,792      | 788        | 29,130         |
| Commercial        |                  |               |                   |               |            |            |                |
| Industrial        | 5,039            | 4,464         | 22,043            | 3,336         | 10,953     | 3,260      | 49,095         |
| Public            | 11,744           | 6,485         | 24,467            | 1,678         | 5,506      | 23,086     | 72,967         |
| **Total**         | 214,851          | 157,175       | 207,135           | 14,292        | 42,635     | 97,162     | 733,250        |

¹ Because land use plans for future development do not consistently identify acres for public uses, the gross residential acres in this table include acreage set asides for parks and public services including fire stations, police stations, community centers, churches, etc. that are associated with forecasted residential growth.

² Excludes lands designated in adopted and proposed land use plans as Agriculture, Farm Homes, Open Space, Parks, Recreation, and Vacant land estimate. For the purposes of the MTP/SCS, lands with these land use designations are not identified as Developed Acres.

Source: Data compiled by SACOG, MTP/SCS Land Use Forecast, in June 2019
b. Identify areas of the region sufficient to house all the population of the region, including all economic segments of the population, over the course of the planning period of the regional transportation plan taking into account net migration into the region, population growth, household formation, and employment growth.

As described in Chapter 2 – Project Description, SACOG’s regional forecast methodology identifies the total employment expected to occur in the region and the population that would occur in conjunction with that employment growth, taking into account net migration into the region, population growth within the region, and household formation. New households are converted into housing unit demand for the forecasted workers and residents in the region. Thus, the SCS identifies areas of the region sufficient to house the entire population of the region. The SCS does not assume development on all urban-designated land, because the sum of all local land use plans, adopted and proposed, yields an amount of employment and housing growth that exceeds the total employment and housing growth forecast for the region to 2040.

Recent research suggests a shift in the type of housing products that would be needed to accommodate the region’s population. Evolving demographics and preferences held by specific demographic groups, or generational cohorts, are driving the change. On the housing demand side, the aging of the baby boom cohort (those born between 1946-1964), the preferences of the more populous Generation Y or “Millenial” cohort (those born between 1978 and 1994), and continued immigration would have a major impact on demand. On the supply side, the type and location of new housing construction over the past few decades may not match anticipated future demand according to many researchers (SACOG 2019).

Based on the available evidence, SACOG has concluded there would be higher demand for attached and small-lot single family housing products over the MTP/SCS planning period, along with lower demand for large lot-single-family housing products, which currently make up the majority of housing in the region. In addition, these housing types have also been shown to be beneficial for increasing densities and mixed uses in Center and Corridor Communities and near high quality transit (Table 12-10), thus helping to encourage walkable communities, decrease single occupant vehicle mode share, and reduce GHG emissions (SACOG 2019).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Type</th>
<th>2016 Dwelling Units¹,³</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
<th>New Dwelling Units¹,³</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
<th>2040 Dwelling Units¹,³</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Center and Corridor Communities</td>
<td>113,880</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>86,661</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>200,541</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established Communities</td>
<td>712,012</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>81,365</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>793,377</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Communities</td>
<td>20,793</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>89,313</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>110,106</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Residential Communities</td>
<td>74,438</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2,789</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>77,227</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12-10
Summary of Potential Housing Growth by Community Type (Dwelling Units)
Based on this research, SACOG forecasted 74 percent of new housing in the proposed MTP/SCS to be small lot single family and attached housing products. Table 12-11 provides a full overview of the current housing product mix in the region in 2016, and the growth from 2016 to 2040.

### Table 12-11

#### Housing Product Mix in the Proposed MTP/SCS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Type</th>
<th>Center and Corridor Communities</th>
<th>Established Communities</th>
<th>Developing Communities</th>
<th>Rural Residential Communities</th>
<th>Regional Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2016 Baseline</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Residential[^1^]</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>19,378</td>
<td>2,171</td>
<td>53,295</td>
<td>75,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Lot Detached[^1^]</td>
<td>27,312</td>
<td>419,485</td>
<td>14,525</td>
<td>16,781</td>
<td>478,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Lot Detached[^1^]</td>
<td>17,968</td>
<td>88,387</td>
<td>1,785</td>
<td>3,263</td>
<td>111,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached[^1^]</td>
<td>68,232</td>
<td>184,761</td>
<td>2,312</td>
<td>1,099</td>
<td>256,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total[^1^]</td>
<td>113,880</td>
<td>712,011</td>
<td>20,793</td>
<td>74,438</td>
<td>921,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2040 (Growth)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Residential[^1^]</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2,467</td>
<td>2,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Lot Detached[^1^]</td>
<td>1,840</td>
<td>21,288</td>
<td>42,311</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>65,741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Lot Detached[^1^]</td>
<td>11,350</td>
<td>17,291</td>
<td>22,972</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attached[^1^]</td>
<td>73,490</td>
<td>42,494</td>
<td>24,012</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>140,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total[^1^]</td>
<td>86,686</td>
<td>81,348</td>
<td>89,314</td>
<td>2,789</td>
<td>260,137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[^1^] Due to different protocols among GIS models for tallying spatial data, housing unit numbers in this DEIR differ marginally from those reported in the proposed MTP/SCS.

*Source: Data compiled by SACOG, MTP/SCS Land Use Forecast, in June 2019*

Rural residential housing consists of single-family homes on large lots, typically over one acre in size. This type of housing is mostly located at the edges of the urbanized area. New development of this type would take place primarily through incremental construction, or one house at a time. In 2016, rural residential housing represented eight percent of all housing units in the SACOG region and would constitute just one percent of the growth expected through 2040.

Large lot detached housing is currently the predominant form of housing in the SACOG region. This type of housing, ranging in density from one to eight units per acre, is found throughout newer suburban subdivisions and also in older traditional neighborhoods of the region’s communities. In
2016, it represented 52 percent of all housing in the SACOG region but would account for just 25 percent of the growth through 2040.

Small lot detached housing consists of single-family homes on lots smaller than one-eighth of an acre. This housing type has historically had a minor role in the SACOG region, and currently represents just 12 percent of all housing. It has mainly been found in the region’s older, more urbanized cities such as Sacramento, West Sacramento, and Davis. In the proposed MTP/SCS, this housing type would take on a more significant role in the region and would almost double in absolute numbers. Small lot units would be found in jurisdictions throughout the region both as freestanding homes as well as increasingly popular “accessory units” to large lot homes. Additionally, 20 percent of the growth in housing through 2040 is expected to be small-lot, detached units.

Attached housing comprises the highest density form of housing in the region, but can take on a variety of forms, ranging from duplexes at densities similar to small-lot detached housing, up to mid-rise and high-rise multifamily buildings. Attached housing has always had a place in the region and represented 28 percent of all housing as of 2016. In the proposed MTP/SCS it would constitute 54 percent of the expected growth through 2040, which is the highest percentage of growth among the housing types.

Providing a variety of housing options - apartments, condominiums, townhouses, and single-family detached homes on varying lot sizes - creates opportunities for the variety of people who need them: families, singles, seniors, and people living with special needs. The more diverse mix of housing in the proposed MTP/SCS, as identified in Table 12-11, provides more people with access to housing options that fit their circumstances and preferences. See Chapter 14 – Population and Housing for more information and analysis of dwelling units and housing types in the proposed MTP/SCS.

c. Identify areas within the region sufficient to house an eight-year projection of the regional housing need for the region pursuant to Section 65584 of the Government Code.

The RHNA is part of a statewide statutory mandate to address housing issues related to future growth. The RHNA allocates each jurisdiction’s “fair share” of the region’s projected housing needs over the housing element planning period (2021-2029) for each of four household income groups as compared to the area median income (AMI) and as defined by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD; i.e., extremely low-income or less than 30 percent of the AMI, very low-income or less than 50 percent of the AMI, low-income or less than 80 percent of the AMI, and moderate-income or less than 120 percent of the AMI). The RHNA is used by jurisdictions when updating their housing elements as the basis for assuring that adequate sites and zoning are available to accommodate the allocation.

SB 375 requires that the RHNA be consistent with the SCS and that the SCS identify areas sufficient to house the projected regional housing need for the region, since in most of California these documents are both prepared by the same regional organization. To ensure this consistency, SB 375 aligned the RHNA process with the SCS update, which has extended the RHNA and Housing Element update cycle in the SACOG region from five years to eight years. Because RHNA updates are required every eight years and MTP/SCS updates are required every four years, the SCS and RHNA update process are linked during every other SCS cycle. For the current planning period, the 2021-2029 RHNA is required to be consistent with the proposed MTP/SCS.
The current RHNA process is not analyzed in this EIR; however, the proposed MTP/SCS does provide sufficient housing to meet the need of the RHNA at a regional level. The regional growth forecast of the proposed MTP/SCS is identified in Table 12-12. State statute requires that housing units allocated through RHNA be “consistent with the development pattern included in the sustainable communities strategy.” The forecasted identified in the proposed MTP/SCS will be the starting point for the RHNA methodology of allocating units to jurisdictions. By using the MTP/SCS growth forecast as the basis for total RHNA calculations by jurisdiction, SACOG can effectively ensure consistency across these two planning efforts.

### Table 12-12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Employees</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Housing Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1,060,751</td>
<td>2,376,311</td>
<td>921,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>1,279,016</td>
<td>2,903,090</td>
<td>1,144,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040</td>
<td>1,330,813</td>
<td>2,996,832</td>
<td>1,181,251</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: SACOG and CCSCE 2017; SACOG 2019*

d. Identify a transportation network to service the transportation needs of the region.

SB 375 requires that MPOs adopt a RTP directed at achieving a coordinated and balanced regional transportation system including, but not limited to, mass transportation, highway, railroad, maritime, bicycle, pedestrian, goods movement, and aviation facilities and services. The RTP must be a fiscally and time-constrained plan with forecasted transportation improvements consistent with the amount of forecasted growth for the region by 2040. This is important because state and federal transportation agencies allocate billions of dollars in planning funds annually to help support the transportation planning process. The RTP establishes the basis for programming local, state, and federal transportation projects within a region. Additionally, state statutes require that RTPs serve as the foundation of the Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) prepared by MPOs, which identify the next four years of transportation projects to be funded for construction. The transportation network of the proposed MTP/SCS is identified in Figures 12-4, 12-5 and 12-6, and is described in Chapter 2 – Project Description. The transportation network was tailored to the Land Use Forecast to achieve the fiscal, system performance, and GHG reduction objectives of the plan.

The proposed MTP/SCS contains a mix of road and highway improvements, including new facilities that serve new development and high growth areas, expansion of existing facilities to relieve existing or future bottlenecks, realignments and bypasses to improve or redirect traffic flow, maintenance of existing infrastructure, and other operational and safety improvements (e.g., the addition of guardrails to highways, rumble strips, intersection signalizations, or restriping). Bicycle and pedestrian projects include new shared-use paths and trails, as well as “complete streets” projects incorporating bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure into existing or new and expanded road and transit facilities. Two-thirds of the total transit investment in the proposed MTP/SCS is spent on operating and maintaining the region’s transit system. The balance pays for capital expenses such as purchasing new buses and rail vehicles, infrastructure associated with adding routes and stations to the bus and rail system, building new storage and maintenance facilities, and other improvements to help bus transit vehicles move quickly through traffic. See Chapter 16 – Transportation and Traffic for more information and analysis of the transportation network and traffic.
Figure 12-4
2040 Transit Network with 2040 Mixed Densities

Sources: Esri, USGS, NOAA
Figure 12-5
2040 Road Network with 2040 Mixed Density
Figure 12-6
2040 Class I, II, and III Bicycle Network with 2040 Mixed Densities
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e. Gather and consider the best practically available scientific information regarding resource areas and farmland in the region as defined in subdivisions (a) and (b) of Section 65080.01 of the Government Code.

SB 375 requires MPOs to gather and consider information about the following natural resource areas and farmland in the SCS:

- open space or habitat areas protected by NCCPs, HCPS, other natural resource protection plans;
- habitat for species identified as candidate, fully protected, sensitive, or species of special status by local, state, or federal agencies or protected by ESA, CESA (Fish & Game Code, Section 2050 et seq.), or the Native Plant Protection Act;
- lands subject to conservation or agricultural easements for conservation or agricultural purposes;
- areas designated for open space or agricultural uses in adopted open space elements or agricultural elements of local plans or ordinances;
- areas containing biological resources as described in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines that may be significantly affected by the SCS;
- an area subject to flooding where a development project would not, at the time of development in the judgment of the agency, meet the requirements of the National Flood Insurance Program or where the area is subject to more protective provisions of state law or local ordinance; and
- farmland outside all existing city SOIs or city limits as of January 2008 and is one of the following: prime or unique farmland or farmland of statewide importance.

The proposed MTP/SCS Land Use Forecast was developed in consultation with local jurisdictions and with consideration of the above-listed resources. As discussed in Chapter 6 – Biological Resources, each of the counties in the plan area are engaged in habitat and/or natural communities planning, which has involved extensive inventorying and mapping of resources. SACOG consulted with cities and counties, LAFCos, state and federal resource agencies, and other stakeholders on urban development and natural resource issues within each local jurisdiction. This included collecting information on agricultural and open space protection policies, the status of flood mapping and implications for future development, the status of habitat and/or natural communities planning, and the status of federal resource permits, including those required under Section 404 and Section 401 of CWA (33 U.S. Code Section 1251 et seq.) and section 1602 of the Fish and Game Code where applicable.

This level of data collection allowed SACOG to consider the limitations on urban growth due to various natural resource regulations and policies, as well as the impacts of urban growth on natural resources. Natural resource data was compared to the projected land use footprint of the proposed MTP/SCS to determine the amount of land potentially affected by the growth planned for 2040. The results of this analysis revealed that implementation of the land use and transportation elements of the proposed MTP/SCS could result in impacts to varying amounts of agricultural land, open space resources, and biological resources including habitat, fish, and wildlife. However, SACOG also evaluated the consistency of the proposed MTP/SCS with existing natural resource plans, policies,
and regulations in place to prevent or mitigate impacts to natural resources. Any specific projects proposed in the future are subject to federal, state, and local permits related to natural resource impacts (e.g., USACE Section 404 permit, RWQCB Section 401 certification, and CDFW Streambed Alteration Agreement) and must demonstrate consistency with and satisfy mitigation requirements included in an adopted HCP. In addition to the above-noted consideration of natural resources and farmland, this draft EIR analyzes the potential impacts of the proposed MTP/SCS on the above resources in Chapter 4 – Agriculture and Forestry Resources, Chapter 6 – Biological Resources, Chapter 11 – Hydrology and Water Quality, and Chapter 15 – Public Services and Recreation.

f. Consider the state housing goals specified in Sections 65580 and 65581 of the Government Code.

State law recognizes the availability of housing, including decent housing conditions, farmworker housing, a diverse mix of housing types, and housing affordability for all economic segments of the community, as of vital statewide importance. Providing a variety of housing options – apartments, condominiums, townhouses, and single-family detached homes of various sizes and on varying lot sizes – creates opportunities for the variety of people who need them: families, singles, seniors, and people with special needs. By providing a diverse mix of housing choice, more people have access to housing options that fit their circumstances and preferences. Since the beginning of the Blueprint project, SACOG has used four categories to describe housing product mix:

- **Rural Residential:** single-family detached homes built at densities less than 1 dwelling unit per acre.
- **Large-Lot Single-Family:** single-family detached homes built at densities between one and eight dwelling units per acre, defined by SACOG as very low to low density.
- **Small-Lot Single-Family:** single-family detached homes built at densities between eight and 25 dwelling units per acre, defined by SACOG as medium to medium-high density.
- **Attached:** Single-family and multi-family homes including duplexes, triplexes, apartments, condominiums, townhomes, row houses, and half-plexes, built at densities from greater than eight to more than 50 dwelling units per acre (defined by SACOG as high density).

More recent demographic studies indicate that housing choice would become an increasingly important issue in the future as evolving demographics and preferences held by specific demographic groups, or generational cohorts drive a change in housing preference and demand (SACOG 2018). Based on the available evidence, SACOG has concluded there would be higher demand for attached and small-lot single-family housing products over the planning period of the proposed MTP/SCS, along with lower demand for large-lot single-family housing products, which currently make up the majority of housing in the region. Additionally, the growth principles identified in the Blueprint and adopted by local agencies include providing housing choice and diversity, quality design, and mixed-use development, as well as compact development, which supports the remaining principles of natural resources conservation, use of existing assets, and transportation choice. Therefore, the proposed MTP/SCS provides a mix of housing options that address future demand for a variety of product types and implement the Blueprint principles.

Regionally, 54 percent of the new housing in the proposed SCS would be attached, 20 percent would be small-lot single-family, 25 percent would be large-lot single-family, and one percent would be rural residential. This represents a significant change from 2016, in which the mix is 28 percent
attached, 12 percent single-family small-lot, 52 percent single-family large-lot, and eight percent rural residential (Table 12-10). New housing in Center and Corridor Communities is predominantly attached products, due to higher residential densities proposed or allowed in these areas by local jurisdictions. New housing in Established Communities is balanced between large-lot single-family, small-lot single-family and attached housing. New housing in Developing Communities is predominantly large-lot single-family and small-lot single-family products. New housing in Rural Residential Communities is almost entirely rural residential and large-lot single-family housing product. See Chapter 14 – Population and Housing for more information on dwelling units and housing types.

**g. Set forth a forecasted development pattern for the region, which, when integrated with the transportation network, and other transportation measures and policies, will reduce the greenhouse gas emissions from automobiles and light trucks to achieve the greenhouse gas emission reduction targets approved by the California Air Resources Board if there is a feasible way to do so.**

The forecasted development pattern of the proposed MTP/SCS was designed to achieve the GHG reduction targets approved by the CARB in consideration of CARB guidance for the SACOG region: a 19 percent per capita GHG reduction below 2005 levels by 2035 (CARB 2018). If SACOG is not able to secure the funding and commitments to implement their proposed pilot project, CARB staff would evaluate the SCS performance against an 18 percent target.

In support of the Blueprint principles, one of the primary strategies to achieve GHG emission reduction targets is to increase the number of people – both residents and employees – who have access to high-quality transit. By 2040 the proposed MTP/SCS puts approximately 27 percent of new dwelling units and 20 percent of new employees within HFTAs and brings high-quality transit service to an additional 105,243 existing dwelling units and 104,531 existing employees. Table 12-13 summarizes the existing and future housing and employment within HFTAs.

**Table 12-13**

**Summary of Housing and Employment within High Frequency Transit Areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Frequency Transit Areas (TPA)</th>
<th>2040 High Frequency Transit Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing Dwelling Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer HFTAs</td>
<td>17,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento HFTAs</td>
<td>325,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolo HFTAs</td>
<td>42,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All HFTAs</td>
<td>385,067</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 High Frequency Transit Areas are those areas of the region within one-half mile of a major transit stop (existing or planned light rail, street car, or train station) or high-quality transit corridor. A high-quality transit corridor is a corridor with fixed route bus service with service intervals no longer than 15 minutes during peak commute hours (PRC Section 21155).

*Source: Data compiled by SACOG, MTP/SCS Preferred Scenario Land Use Forecast, in June 2019*

Based on the SACOG Board direction, SACOG developed a Draft Preferred Scenario of land use growth and planned transportation improvements assumptions. The proposed MTP/SCS considered adopted and proposed plans in each jurisdiction, market conditions, environmental constraints, and availability of funds for transportation and other infrastructure. Based on this
framework, SACOG developed the proposed MTP/SCS, which is designed to meet the GHG targets set by CARB. Modeling of the proposed MTP/SCS shows a 19 percent per capita reduction below 2005 levels by 2035. See Chapter 8 – Energy and Global Climate Change for a detailed discussion on and analysis of impacts to GHG emissions.

**h. Allow the regional transportation plan to comply with Section 176 of the federal Clean Air Act.**

Section 176 of the federal Clean Air Act of 1970 (42 U.S. Code Section 7401 et seq.) sets forth the definition of Conformity for the MTP. SACOG must ensure that the MTP conforms to the SIP. The determination of Conformity must be based on the most recent estimates of emissions, and those estimates must be determined from the most recent population, employment, travel and congestion estimates as determined by the MPO or other agency authorized to make such estimates (42 U.S. Code Section 7506).

As part of the proposed MTP/SCS, SACOG must examine the long-term air quality impacts of the transportation system and ensure that it is compatible with the region’s air quality goals. In doing so, regional agencies must work with state and local partner agencies to assess the impacts of growth on air pollution and decide how to manage growth.

In compliance with this requirement of the Clean Air Act, SACOG updated its baseline estimates, regional growth forecast, and Land Use Forecast using the most comprehensive, recent, and best available data. Chapter 1 – Introduction, provides a full description of the baseline for the proposed MTP/SCS and this EIR. The discussion of the seven SB 375 requirements above describes the information considered and used in creating both the regional growth forecast and translating that into the Land Use Forecast. The draft Conformity determination for this proposed MTP/SCS is included in Appendix I of the draft plan and documents the most recent emissions estimates. Chapter 5 – Air Quality includes more information about the Clean Air Act and analysis of pollutants and emissions.

**Combined Effects of LU–1 (a-h)**

Because the proposed MTP/SCS complies with all eight SB 375 objectives listed above, as demonstrated in the preceding discussion, the proposed MTP/SCS would not cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with the SCS requirements included in SB 375. The impacts of the proposed MTP/SCS are considered less than significant (LS) for Impact LU – 2. No mitigation is required.

**Localized Impacts**

*Center and Corridor Communities, Established Communities, Developing Communities, Rural Residential Communities, and Lands Not Identified for Development in the Proposed MTP/SCS*

Because the land use requirements and objectives of SB 375 are regional in scope, no localized impact analysis is required.
High Frequency Transit Area Impacts

Placer County, Sacramento County, and Yolo County High Frequency Transit Areas

Because the land use requirements and objectives of SB 375 are regional in scope, no High Frequency Transit Area impact analysis is required.

Mitigation Measures

None required.


Regional Impacts

Sections a through f below evaluate the proposed MTP/SCS for consistency with the goals of the 2010 LURMP (DPC 2010).

i. Direct new non-agriculturally oriented non-farmworker residential development within existing unincorporated towns and encourage a critical mass of farms, agriculturally-related businesses, and supporting infrastructure to ensure the economic vitality of agriculture within the Delta.

By developing more compactly, the proposed MTP/SCS directs more growth to areas that are already urbanized and helps prevent undeveloped land from being converted to urban uses. Keeping growth contained to areas that are already developed limits the amount of growth that takes place at the urban edge, adjacent to agricultural areas. Except for the Delta Legacy Communities, the Primary Zone of the Delta is located within Lands Not Identified for Development in the MTP/SCS, where no growth and only minimal transportation improvements are planned. Therefore, consistent with the LURMP, the priority land use of areas in the Primary Zone shall continue to be oriented toward agriculture and open space.

SACOG does not have land use authority to adopt local land use plans or approve local land use projects. However, jurisdictions with land in the Primary Zone (i.e., City of Sacramento, Sacramento County, Yolo County, City of West Sacramento) are required by PRC Section 29763 to adopt general plans with land uses consistent with the goals and policies in the LURMP, subject to review by the DPC. Therefore, subsequent projects within the proposed MTP/SCS that fall within the LURMP boundaries would be required to demonstrate consistency with the LURMP and satisfy mitigation requirements.

While much of the transportation infrastructure from implementation of the proposed MTP/SCS would serve urban uses in urbanized areas of the region, it is likely that implementation of planned transportation improvements at the urban edge could increase urban traffic patterns on roads that also serve agricultural lands. Frequently, the increased traffic volumes are caused by spillover from congested roads near the exterior of urbanized areas. Increased urban traffic on transitional roads, spanning between urban and rural areas, can lead to increased conflict between uses, which could result in the conversion of additional agricultural lands in order to reduce such conflicts.
As discussed above, the proposed MTP/SCS would result in more compact development than existing conditions. The proposed MTP/SCS is designed to improve transportation options and increase capacity within urbanized areas. Owners of agricultural lands nearest to these urbanized areas may feel pressure to develop as the planned transportation improvements within proximity of these lands are implemented. Such pressure would also increase as land uses surrounding these properties continue to urbanize.

Chapter 4—Agriculture and Forestry Resources analyzes impacts to farmland from implementation of the projected land use pattern and planned transportation improvements of the proposed MTP/SCS (Impact AG-1, Impact AG-2, and Impact AG-4). SACOG proposes Mitigation Measure AG-1 to avoid or substantially lessen the loss of farmland, Mitigation Measure AG-3 to avoid or minimize conflicts and inconsistencies with lands under agricultural zoning designations or Williamson Act contracts, and Mitigation Measure AG-5 to mitigate or avoid conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use.

j. **Support the long-term viability of agriculture and discourage inappropriate development of agricultural lands.**

SACOG has maintained ongoing communication as part of the RUCS process with the DPC, which is a key partner in the effort to provide policy and technical approaches to addressing or avoiding impacts to rural resources in the Sacramento region. RUCS has identified five topical areas of focus, including land use and conservation, infrastructure of agriculture, economic opportunities, forest management, and regulations. Several tools and supporting data have also been developed to broaden the region’s understanding of how the projected land use pattern and planned transportation improvements affect rural areas. The project is ongoing, with the ultimate goal of bridging the urban and rural planning needs in the region.

Chapter 4—Agriculture and Forestry Resources analyzes impacts from converting farmland identified in the farmland mapping and monitoring program (Impact AG-1), conflicting with local agricultural land designations (Impact AG-2), and converting other farmland (Impact AG-4). SACOG proposes Mitigation Measure AG-1 to avoid or substantially lessen the loss of farmland, Mitigation Measure AG-3 to avoid or minimize conflicts and inconsistencies with lands under agricultural zoning designations or Williamson Act contracts, and Mitigation Measure AG-5 to mitigate or avoid conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use.

k. **Preserve and protect the natural resources of the Delta; promote protection of remnants of riparian and aquatic habitat; and encourage compatibility between agricultural practices and wildlife habitat.**

For an analysis of biological resource conflicts with local, regional, or state habitat conservation plans, see Impact BIO-6 in Chapter 6 – Biological Resources. Chapter 6 also analyzes impacts to plants, wildlife, wetlands, and sensitive natural communities (Impact BIO-1, BIO-2, and BIO-3), wildlife corridors (Impact BIO-4), impacts to trees and other biological resources protected by local ordinances (Impact BIO-5), for the entire plan area of the proposed MTP/SCS including the Delta.
1. **Promote continued recreational use of the land and waters of the Delta and ensure that needed facilities that support such uses are constructed, maintained, and supervised.**

The proposed MTP/SCS does not forecast any growth by 2040 in areas outside those identified by the DPC as city land or areas designated for development that would result in the conversion of recreational land to urban uses. The proposed MTP/SCS land use forecast also assumes increases in public service capital capacity, programming, personnel, equipment, and facilities as the population increases, ensuring that recreational uses are constructed, maintained, and supervised as needed to meet demand. The public services and recreational facilities impacts of the proposed MTP/SCS are analyzed in Chapter 15 – Public Services and Recreation.

One of the primary ways that the LURMP promotes recreational use of the Delta is by providing alternative transportation choices allowing urban residents in the Secondary Zone and Delta Legacy Communities (i.e., Clarksburg, Hood, Courtland, Ryde, Walnut Grove, Locke, and Isleton) to visit the Primary Zone for recreation or tourism. The proposed MTP/SCS is designed to improve transportation options and increase capacity within Established and Developing Community Types, which include the Delta Legacy Communities and Secondary Zone areas, by increasing trips per capita by bicycle, walk, or transit above the regional baseline average. The proposed MTP/SCS also includes limited transportation improvements in road maintenance, safety enhancements, and other roadway operational improvements in Lands Not Identified for Development, which include Primary Zone areas.

Additionally, the Great California Trail Act (Chapter 839, statute of 2006) requires the DPC to establish a continuous recreation corridor, including bicycle and hiking trails, around the five-county region of the Delta. DPC must adopt a plan and implementation program for a continuous recreational corridor trail network linking the San Francisco Bay Trail system to the planned Sacramento River trails in Yolo and Sacramento counties. Existing law authorizes MPOs to allocate funds to establish a recreation corridor, including a bicycle and hiking trail, around the perimeter of the San Francisco and San Pablo Bays. SB 1556 authorized MPOs to allocate funds directly to the DPC for activities around the Delta, instead of cities and counties, including for establishing and maintaining pedestrian and bicycle trails.

The Great California Delta Trail Plan is anticipated to be published in June 2020 and would include routes for bicycling and hiking that connect to other trails, park and recreational facilities, and public transportation. DPC is currently working on a Delta Blueprint Report for the Eastern region, which includes Sacramento and Yolo counties. Adopted Delta trail segments within the plan area of the proposed MTP/SCS to date include the West Sacramento River Walk, the Sacramento River Parkway, and the Clarksburg Branch Line Trail (DPC 2019).

The Delta Blueprint Report for the Eastern region is still being drafted and has not been publicly released, so it cannot be analyzed for consistency with the proposed MTP/SCS. Additionally, since the plan is not adopted, consistency is not required to be analyzed under CEQA. Therefore, an analysis of the MTP/SCS consistency with the draft Delta Blueprint Report is not included in this EIR. SACOG would coordinate with DPC on incorporating the Great California Delta Trail System into the regional trail network in the future. Also see Chapter 16−Transportation and Traffic for an analysis of impacts from causing an interference with existing or planned bicycle and pedestrian facilities (Impact TRN-4).
m. Protect and enhance long-term water quality in the Delta for agriculture, municipal, industrial, water-contact recreation, and fish and wildlife habitat uses, as well as all other beneficial uses.

Two potentially substantial adverse impacts to water quality are urban runoff caused by increased impervious surfaces and discharges of constituents to CWA Section 303(d)-listed waters. The projected land use pattern and planned network improvements in the proposed MTP/SCS would increase impervious surfaces, which could potentially increase the amount of contaminated runoff water flowing into waters identified under CWA as being impaired by a variety of contaminants. Under the CWA listing, these water bodies have no remaining assimilative capacity or ability to accommodate additional quantities of these contaminants, irrespective of concentration.

In order to address impaired waters, several jurisdictions have municipal stormwater permits to reduce the discharge of sediments and other pollutants in runoff. Proponents (public agencies and private developers) of construction projects that disturb one or more acres of soil or disturb less than one acre, but are part of a larger common plan of development that in total disturbs one or more acres, are required to obtain a Construction General Permit from the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). The project proponent must propose control measures consistent with the state’s permit, and develop a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan for each site, which includes BMPs to reduce potential impacts.

Transportation projects where Caltrans is the lead agency are covered by the Caltrans Stormwater Program, which includes a permit process regulating all stormwater discharges from Caltrans-owned conveyances, maintenance facilities, and construction activities. Caltrans also has a Storm Water Management Plan that describes the procedures and practices used to reduce or eliminate the discharge of pollutants to storm drainage systems and receiving waters. Planned transportation improvements where local agencies are the lead agency are subject to local and state regulations for construction and non-construction runoff prevention.

Chapter 11−Hydrology and Water Quality analyzes impacts related to water quality (HYD-1, HYD-5, HYD-6) and stormwater runoff and altered drainage patterns (Impact HYD-3A, HYD-3B, HYD-3C) for the entire plan area of the proposed MTP/SCS including the Delta.

n. Ensure that the construction of new utility and infrastructure facilities is appropriate and the impacts of such new construction on the integrity of levees, wildlife, recreation, agriculture and Delta communities are avoided, minimized, and mitigated.

The projected land use pattern of the proposed MTP/SCS includes the land supply needed to accommodate necessary increases in utilities and services, including water supply, conveyance, storage, and distribution systems; energy and power systems; telecommunication systems; or sewer systems.

Construction of new roadway capacity, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, transit facilities, and rehabilitation of existing roadway infrastructure could increase the demand for water for construction-related activities such as concrete mixing, dust settling, and landscaping. Similarly, construction activities could increase the amount of wastewater generated at construction sites and increase demand on local wastewater collection, storage, conveyance, and treatment facilities.
Construction activities like demolition, grading, and excavation could generate solid waste, which may be disposed of in municipal waste systems. Finally, construction activities related to the implementation of the proposed MTP/SCS could result in an increased demand for energy to power construction lighting, equipment, and vehicles. Because utility infrastructure often shares the right-of-way with transportation infrastructure, there is the possibility that construction activity related to implementation of the proposed MTP/SCS could disrupt the provision of utility services.

The ongoing operation of new transit facilities, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and roadway facilities could result in increases in electricity to power streetlights, traffic control devices, signage, and intelligent transportation systems (ITS) infrastructure. Similarly, ITS infrastructure often relies on communication systems to relay real-time information to travelers. New transportation infrastructure could require toilets, sinks, drinking fountains, and drains that would generate a small amount of additional wastewater. These projects could result in the conversion of undeveloped land to transportation uses, thereby increasing the amount of impervious surfaces in the region and possibly increasing the amount of runoff. These projects could also potentially increase the amount of waste collected from all land uses. Because the increase in demand for utilities and service systems is expected to be low, little new construction would be required.

Construction of any new utility or service system facilities would be subject to many federal, state, and local laws. Construction-related impacts are typically controllable and can be mitigated below a level of significance through actions of the implementing agency. Chapter 17—Utilities and Service Systems analyzes impacts from the construction of new utility and infrastructure facilities (Impact USS-2 and USS-3) for the entire region including the Delta.

**Combined Effects of LU−2 (a-f)**
Because the proposed MTP/SCS is consistent with the goals identified in the LURMP the proposed MTP/SCS would not result in a significant environmental impact resulting from a conflict with the LURMP at the regional level. Impacts are considered less than significant (LS) for Impact LU – 3. No mitigation is required.

**Localized Impacts**

*Center and Corridor Communities, Established Communities, Developing Communities, Rural Residential Communities, and Lands Not Identified for Development in the Proposed MTP/SCS*
Because the LURMP is regional in scope for the five Delta counties, no localized impact analysis is required.

**High Frequency Transit Area Impacts**

*Placer County, Sacramento County, and Yolo County High Frequency Transit Areas*
Because the LURMP is regional in scope for the five Delta counties, no localized impact analysis is required.

**Mitigation Measures**

None required.