

Chapter 1—Introduction

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code [PRC] Section 21000 et seq.), this Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) describes the environmental effects associated with adoption and implementation of the 2020 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (proposed MTP/SCS). For this Draft EIR, “proposed MTP/SCS” means the Draft MTP/SCS released by the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) Board of Directors on September 23, 2019, and available for review at <https://www.sacog.org>. This Draft EIR has been prepared by SACOG pursuant to CEQA (PRC Section 21000 et seq.) and the CEQA Guidelines (14 California Code of Regulation [CCR] Section 15000 et seq.)

1.1 Regulatory Context for the MTP/SCS

SACOG is designated by the state and federal governments as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Sacramento region and, as such, is responsible for developing a metropolitan transportation plan (MTP) and sustainable communities strategy (SCS) every four years in coordination with El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba counties (including the 22 cities within those counties, with the exception of the Tahoe Basin). The proposed MTP/SCS incorporates countywide transportation planning developed by the El Dorado County Transportation Commission and the Placer County Transportation Planning Agency under memoranda of understanding (MOUs) between those agencies and SACOG. Federal and state laws regarding the proposed MTP/SCS are described below.

1.1.1 Federal Laws Regarding Regional Transportation Plans

General Federal Requirements Under the FAST (Fixing America’s Surface Transportation [Public Law 114-94]) Act and MAP-21 (Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act [Public Law 112-141]), the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) requires that MPOs, such as SACOG, prepare long-range regional transportation plans, called RTPs, or MTPs by SACOG, and update them every four years if they are in areas designated as “nonattainment” or “maintenance” for the national ambient air quality standards. SACOG uses the term MTP to differentiate between transportation plans that are developed by El Dorado and Placer counties and the subject regional Plan developed by SACOG. Prior to enactment of MAP-21, the primary federal requirements regarding RTPs were included in the metropolitan transportation planning rules—Title 23 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 450 and 49 CFR Part 613. The FAST Act and MAP-21 make a number of changes to the statutes that underpin these regulations. Key federal requirements for long range plans include the following:

- RTPs must be developed through an open and inclusive process that ensures public input, seeks out and considers the needs of those traditionally under served by existing transportation systems, and consults with resource agencies to ensure potential problems are discovered early in the RTP planning process;
- RTPs must be developed for a period of not less than 20 years into the future;

- RTPs must reflect the most recent assumptions for population, travel, land use, congestion, employment, and economic activity;
- RTPs must have a financially constrained element, transportation revenue assumptions must be reasonable, and the long-range financial estimate must account for construction-related inflation costs;
- RTPs must include a description of the performance measures and performance targets used in assessing the performance of the transportation system;
- RTPs must include a system performance report evaluating the condition and performance of the system with respect to performance targets adopted by the state that detail progress over time;
- RTPs may include multiple scenarios for consideration and evaluation relative to the state performance targets as well as locally-developed measures.
- RTPs must conform to the applicable federal air quality plan, called the State Implementation Plan (SIP), for ozone and other pollutants for which an area is not in attainment; and
- RTPs must consider planning factors and strategies in the local context.

THE FEDERAL CLEAN AIR ACT OF 1970

The federal Clean Air Act (CAA) of 1970 (42 U.S. Code Section 7401 et seq.) was passed in response to growing concerns regarding the public health dangers of air pollution. The law was originally formulated in response to pollution generated by workplaces such as factories, and subsequently was amended to address vehicle-generated pollution with a focus on regulating the composition of gasoline. In 1990, a set of CAA Amendments were passed that recognized the transportation system itself affects travel behavior, and by extension, air quality. As part of the Amendments, new transportation projects are required to be in “conformity” with the CAA, meaning that transportation planning agencies such as SACOG must examine the long-term air quality impacts of their 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.

The CAA conformity requirements pursuant to the Amendments of 1990 apply in all MPO nonattainment and maintenance areas. Section 176(c) of the CAA, as amended (Title 42 U.S. Code Section 7506(c), and the related requirements of Title 23 U.S. Code 109(j)), require “transportation conformity,” to ensure that federal funding and approval are given to transportation plans, programs and projects consistent with the air quality goals established by a SIP. For MPO nonattainment and maintenance regions, which the SACOG region is classified as for ozone and particulate matter, the MPO, Federal Highway Administration, and Federal Transit Administration are responsible for making the RTP conformity determination. Under the USDOT Metropolitan Planning Regulations (Title 23 CFR Part 450 and 771 and Title 49 CFR Part 613) and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’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.

1.1.2 California State Laws Regarding Regional Transportation Plans

THE SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES AND CLIMATE PROTECTION ACT OF 2008

The Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act (Senate Bill [SB] 375) (Statutes of 2008, chapter 728) focuses on aligning transportation, housing, and other land uses to achieve regional greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reduction targets established under the California Global Warming Solutions Act, also known as Assembly Bill (AB) 32 (Statutes 2005, chapter 488). While other efforts to reduce GHG emissions focus on alternative fuels and vehicle efficiency, SB 375 is intended to reduce emissions by coordinating land use and transportation planning at the regional level.

SB 375 requires California MPOs to develop an SCS as a component of an RTP, with the purpose of identifying policies and strategies to reduce per-capita passenger vehicle-generated GHG emissions. The SCS must identify the general location of land uses, residential densities, and building intensities within the region; identify areas within the region sufficient to house all the population, including all economic segments of the population; identify areas within the region sufficient to house an eight-year projection of the regional housing need; identify a transportation network to service the regional transportation needs; gather and consider the best practically available scientific information regarding resource areas and farmland in the region; consider the state's housing goals; set forth a forecasted development pattern for the region, which, when integrated with the transportation network, and other transportation measures and policies, will reduce GHG emissions from automobiles and light-duty trucks to achieve, if there is a feasible way to do so, the GHG emission reduction targets approved by the California Air Resources Board; and allow the regional transportation plan to comply with the CAA (Government Code Section 65080, subd. (b)(F)(2)(B)). The process for developing an SCS must also follow public participation requirements outlined in SB 375. If the SCS does not achieve the GHG emission reduction targets set by ARB, an Alternative Planning Strategy (APS) must be developed to demonstrate how the targets could be achieved. Pursuant to SB 375, CARB approved the most recent set of SCS GHG emission reduction targets in March 2018.

CALIFORNIA GLOBAL WARMING SOLUTIONS ACT, SENATE BILL 32

SB 32 (Statutes of 2016, Chapter 249), extended the state's GHG reduction target under AB 32, requiring achievement of a 40 percent reduction from 1990 levels of GHG emissions by 2030, as initially directed by Executive Order B-30-15. In California's 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan (2017 Scoping Plan), CARB, the state agency tasked with furthering the state toward its long-term GHG reduction targets, provides the framework for the state to achieve its 2030 target as mandated by SB 32. These statewide efforts extend to achieve the state's target of achieving an 80 percent reduction from 1990 levels by 2050 as established by Executive Order S-3-05. CARB identifies passenger vehicle-sourced GHGs as a sector where notable reductions are required, which can be partially achieved through implementation of the land use and transportation strategies in RTP/SCSs.

1.2 Purpose of This Draft EIR

The purpose of an EIR is to identify a project's significant effects on the environment, identify alternatives to the project, and indicate the manner in which significant effects can be mitigated or avoided (PRC Section 21002.1(a)). Section 15382 of the CEQA Guidelines defines a "significant effect on the environment" as a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project, including land, air, water, minerals, flora,

fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic or aesthetic significance as compared to baseline conditions. An economic or social change by itself is not considered a significant effect on the environment. A social or economic change related to a physical change may be considered in determining whether the physical change is significant.

This Draft EIR analyzes the environmental effects of the proposed MTP/SCS and provides local decisionmakers and the public with an objective analysis of the potential environmental consequences of implementing the proposed MTP/SCS. Mitigation has been recommended, where necessary and/or feasible, to reduce or avoid significant environmental impacts identified in the analysis. However, SACOG has no authority to enforce recommended mitigation measures on future lead agencies. Agencies with jurisdiction to adopt these measures can and should do so (PRC Section 21081) and projects taking advantage of CEQA Streamlining provisions of SB 375 (PRC Sections 21155.1, 21155.2, and 21159.28) must apply the mitigation measures described above to address site-specific conditions. For this reason, the mitigation measures listed in the preceding Executive Summary, and fully described in the following chapters, indicate the level of significance after mitigation of an impact, but also disclose SACOG's lack of authority to enforce such measures.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15168 defines a program EIR as "...an EIR which may be prepared on a series of actions that can be characterized as one large project and are related either: 1) geographically; 2) as logical parts in the chain of contemplated actions; 3) in connection with issuance of rules, regulations, plans, or other general criteria to govern the conduct of a continuing program; or 4) as individual activities carried out under the same authorizing statutory or regulatory authority and having generally similar environmental effects which can be mitigated in similar ways."

Generally, the degree of specificity in an EIR should correspond to the degree of specificity of the underlying activity being evaluated (CEQA Guidelines Section 15146). This Draft EIR provides a programmatic analysis of potential impacts of the proposed MTP/SCS and provides a foundation for second-tier CEQA documents for subsequent projects but does not analyze the project-specific impacts of individual projects.

Many specific projects are not currently defined to the level that would allow for project-specific analysis. Individual environmental analysis of each project will be undertaken as necessary by the appropriate implementing agency prior to each project being considered for approval. Project-specific and site-specific details of subsequent transportation and land use projects identified in the proposed MTP/SCS will vary widely. When a first-tier program EIR is prepared, "leaving project-specific details to subsequent EIRs when specific projects are considered" is a proper approach to CEQA tiering (In re Bay Delta [2008] 43 Cal. 4th 1143, 1174).

This Draft EIR serves as a first-tier environmental document under CEQA, supporting second-tier environmental documents for:

- planned transportation improvements consistent with the proposed MTP/SCS; and
- residential or mixed-use projects and HFTA projects consistent with the projected land use pattern presented in the SCS.

Significance determinations reflect the programmatic nature of the analysis of regional-scale, projected land use pattern and planned transportation improvements. The analyses address broadly defined types of impacts without the ability to determine the precise project locations, size, and

design, or site-specific environmental characteristics of proposed projects. Some impact issues are determined to be potentially significant, because the possibility that future projects would cause a substantial adverse effect on environmentally sensitive resources cannot be dismissed. This is a conservative approach (i.e., avoiding a risk of understating environmental impacts), in light of these potentials, which is intended to satisfy the good-faith, full-disclosure purpose of CEQA. When specific projects are proposed and subjected to project-level environmental review, it is possible that impacts recognized as potentially significant in this section can be avoided or maintained at a less-than-significant level through environmentally sensitive project siting and design.

Where feasible, mitigation measures are identified. While the MTP/SCS EIR provides these mitigation measures, SACOG cannot require lead agencies to adopt and enforce them; it is ultimately the responsibility of a lead agency to adopt and implement feasible mitigation.

Consequently, the analysis takes the conservative approach in its post-mitigation significance conclusions (i.e., avoids a risk of overstating the degree to which feasible mitigation will be adopted and implemented by other parties) and discloses, for CEQA compliance purposes, that potentially significant environmental impacts may be unavoidable. Future proposed projects would likely require individual CEQA review. It is expected that the proposed projects would be able to feasibly avoid or mitigate to a less-than-significant level some of these potentially significant impacts as an outcome of their project-specific environmental reviews.

Local jurisdictions and other implementing agencies would undertake future environmental review as CEQA lead agencies for projects in the proposed MTP/SCS. These local jurisdictions would include the six counties and twenty-two cities within the plan area of the proposed MTP/SCS. Other lead agencies may include public transit providers, other public agencies such as air districts and the California Department of Transportation, Native American tribes, college and university transportation providers, and transportation management associations, among others. All of these types of agencies, as well as the SACOG member agencies, would be able to prepare subsequent environmental documents that incorporate, by reference, the appropriate information from this Draft EIR. Please see Section 2.8.4, Future Environmental Review in Chapter 2, Project Description for additional discussion.

1.3 Scope of This Draft EIR

This Draft EIR analyzes the potential environmental impacts of the proposed MTP/SCS, in particular the long-term impacts of the plan's components. The Draft EIR also provides the basis for project-level CEQA compliance for implementation of future transportation projects and qualifying land use projects.

For each topic analyzed in this Draft EIR, there is an introduction, a regulatory and environmental setting, an explanation of the methodology and assumptions for the analysis, the criteria for determining significance of impacts, and the impacts and proposed mitigation measures. The following topics are analyzed in this Draft EIR:

- aesthetics;
- agricultural and forestry resources;
- air quality;
- biological resources;
- cultural, paleontological, and tribal cultural resources;

- energy and global climate change;
- geology, soils, seismicity, and mineral resources;
- hazards, hazardous materials, and wildfire;
- hydrology and water quality;
- land use and planning;
- noise and vibration;
- population and housing;
- public services and recreation;
- transportation;
- utilities and service systems;
- alternatives analysis; and
- other CEQA considerations.

1.4 Organization of This Draft EIR

1.4.1 Report Structure

The content and format of this Draft EIR are designed to meet the requirements of CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. The Draft EIR is organized into the following chapters so that the reader can easily obtain information about the proposed MTP/SCS:

- **Executive Summary:** Presents a summary of the proposed MTP/SCS and alternatives and a summary of the impacts and mitigation measures.
- **Chapter 1 – Introduction:** Describes the overall purpose, scope, and organization of this Draft EIR.
- **Chapter 2 – Project Description:** Provides a description of the SACOG region, project background, project objectives, and the components of the proposed MTP/SCS.
- **Chapters 3 through 17 – Environmental Analysis:** Chapters 3 through 17 are devoted to and describe the following for each environmental resource analyzed in this Draft EIR: existing environmental and regulatory setting; significance criteria; potential environmental impacts and their level of significance; and mitigation measures, if necessary and feasible, that would eliminate or reduce significant impacts.
- **Chapter 18 – Alternatives Analysis:** Describes and evaluates alternatives to the proposed project.
- **Chapter 19 – Other CEQA Considerations:** Provides an analysis of growth-inducing impacts, significant irreversible changes, and cumulative impacts.
- **Chapter 20 – References:** Identifies the documents used (printed references) and individuals consulted (personal communications) during preparation of this Draft EIR.
- **Chapter 21 – Report Preparation:** Lists the individuals involved in preparing this Draft EIR.

Technical appendices are included at the end of the Draft EIR.

1.4.2 Level of Analysis

Potential impacts of the proposed MTP/SCS are analyzed first in terms of the proposed land use pattern, then in terms of the planned transportation improvements of the proposed MTP/SCS. Where applicable, the sum total of impacts from the combined land use pattern and planned

transportation improvements of the proposed MTP/SCS are analyzed. This analytical structure is used to provide the reader information about all components of the proposed MTP/SCS. At the same time, the programmatic and long-term nature of this Draft EIR necessitates a general approach to the evaluation of existing conditions and potential impacts associated with implementation of the proposed MTP/SCS. Generally, these analyses are qualitative in nature, with quantitative analysis provided where information is available and applicable. The Draft EIR meets the CEQA standard for level of analysis by providing sufficient information about the environmental impacts of the proposed MTP/SCS “in light of what is reasonably feasible” (CEQA Guidelines Section 15151).

In addition to describing impacts of both the proposed land use pattern and planned transportation improvements of the proposed MTP/SCS, this Draft EIR includes analysis conducted at three geographic levels. First, land use and transportation impacts are analyzed at the regional level. Second, the analysis breaks the region down into the five Community Types discussed in Chapter 2 – Project Description of this document: Center and Corridor Communities, Established Communities, Developing Communities, Rural Residential Communities, and Lands Not Identified for Development in the proposed MTP/SCS. Finally, implementation of the proposed MTP/SCS is analyzed in terms of its impacts to the region’s High Frequency Transit Areas (HFTAs). HFTAs are areas of the region that are within one-half mile of a major transit stop or high-quality transit corridor. 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. This analytical framework was used to provide greater detail on the potential environmental effects of this regional-scale plan on smaller geographies. It was also employed to provide tiering opportunities for subsequent projects that qualify for SB 375 CEQA streamlining benefits.

1.4.3 Timeframe

The planning period of the proposed MTP/SCS spans a 24-year time period, from 2016 to 2040.

2016 BASELINE

The CEQA Guidelines provide that the existing physical conditions at the time the Notice of Preparation (“NOP”) is published will “normally” constitute the baseline. (Guidelines Section 15125(a).) However, CEQA Guidelines Section 15125(a)(1) indicates that, “where existing conditions change or fluctuate over time, and where necessary to provide the most accurate picture practically possible of the project’s impacts, a lead agency may define existing conditions by referencing historic conditions...that are supported by substantial evidence.”

By 2040, implementation of the proposed MTP/SCS will 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 year of 2016. The proposed MTP/SCS uses 2016, rather than the NOP issuance date, because it is the most recent year for which comprehensive land use, demographic, traffic count, and vehicle miles traveled (VMT) data are available for the plan area of the proposed MTP/SCS, as described further below.

SACOG’s travel model requires comprehensive land use data, which are built upon baseline land use data. Baseline data are created at the parcel-level on a four-year cycle to coincide with each MTP/SCS update cycle. The housing unit, employee, and land use data used in the baseline land use data set come from different sources with information available for the year selected as the proposed

MTP/SCS baseline, including local government inventories (where available), assessor data, and aerial photography. These data sources, in combination with jurisdiction housing permit data from December 2015, the 2010 Census, the 2016 California Department of Finance, and the 2016 InfoUSA employment data sets (updated by SACOG with state and local government data, and compared to State Employment and Development Department records), were used to create SACOG's spatial estimate of existing land uses.

Once data is acquired, it must be processed into a format compatible with SACOG's travel model. The resulting baseline data set is then vetted through local jurisdictions for accuracy. Edits are made to the baseline data set if local agencies provide corrections; the baseline data set is then recirculated for confirmation of accuracy. This detailed data assembly and vetting at a parcel level for the entire SACOG region takes approximately 18 to 24 months. The baseline land use data set that represents 2016 conditions was completed in late 2017. Due to the substantial length of time required to compile and model these data, coupled with the limited accessibility of retrieving more recent data, the 2016 data set represents the most current and feasible data compiled and fully vetted. This 2016 data set was then used to develop alternative planning scenarios for consideration by the SACOG Board of Directors and for use in the extensive planning and public engagement process of the proposed MTP/SCS through September of 2019.

The most complete regional data on travel conditions is available for 2016. The U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey's average five-year estimates up to 2016 provide the most complete coverage for many of the demographic data needed to simulate travel demand using the Sacramento Regional Activity-Based Simulation Model (SACSIM) model. SACOG last assembled traffic counts taken by local agencies within their jurisdictions in 2016. While subsequent year counts taken by local agencies may be available for some locations, 2016 constitutes the most comprehensive and consistent set of counts for the region. Additionally, vehicle miles traveled (VMT) estimates for the region are used in conjunction with traffic count data to establish traffic conditions. The VMT estimates are compiled from Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS) data, which have been published for years up to 2016 at the time the NOP was released. Therefore, 2016 is the most current year for which both comprehensive VMT and traffic count data are available. Because it is important to have VMT and traffic count data for the same year to establish baseline conditions, 2016 is being used as the baseline year.

Because the baseline must be an integrated set of land use, demographic, traffic count, and VMT data, and 2016 provides the most complete, integrated data portrait of the existing conditions in the region, it is being used as the baseline year for purposes of this Draft EIR. In other words, 2016 is the most recent year for which comprehensive land use, demographic, traffic count, and VMT data are available for the SACOG region, and thus will give "the most accurate picture practically possible" of MTP/SCS impacts as required under CEQA Guidelines Section 15125.

Where appropriate and identified throughout this Draft EIR, the environmental and regulatory settings of various resource areas have used more recent data to better characterize baseline conditions. Or, conversely, where data were unavailable for 2016 or a more recent year, the most recent data were used. See the Methods and Assumptions section for each resource area for an additional discussion of data used to characterize environmental and regulatory settings.

INTERIM TIMEFRAMES

The year 2040 is the horizon year of the proposed MTP/SCS. While the proposed MTP/SCS would be implemented gradually over the planning period, this Draft EIR does not analyze interim timeframes because the four-year update cycle of the MTP/SCS already requires short-term adjustments to the proposed MTP/SCS.

An exception to this approach is in Chapter 4 – Air Quality, which evaluates air pollutant emissions consistent with federal Transportation Conformity requirements (42 U.S. Code 7506(c)). See Chapter 4 – Air Quality for a discussion of Transportation Conformity. Additionally, Chapter 8 – Energy and Global Climate Change examines impacts for the year 2035 and in comparison to a baseline of 2005 to satisfy statutory requirements and state goals related to GHG emissions (i.e., a 19 percent reduction in per capita emissions by 2035 as compared to a 2005 baseline pursuant to SB 375) (Health & Safety Code Section 38551(b)). Refer to Chapter 8 – Energy and Global Climate Change for more detailed discussion of SACOG’s 2035 target under SB 375. To address consistency with the 2017 Scoping Plan, Chapter 8 – Energy and Global Climate Change also estimates GHG emissions for the plan area of the proposed MTP/SCS for 2030 (SB 32) and 2050 (Executive Order S-3-05). Refer to Chapter 8 – Energy and Global Climate Change for additional information regarding state regulations, laws, and GHG reduction targets.

1.5 Public Review and Participation Process

SACOG is committed to effectively involving the public in the update of the proposed MTP/SCS and, therefore has conducted an extensive outreach process during the preparation of this Draft EIR to affected agencies and organizations interested in the proposed MTP/SCS. In accordance with the Public Participation Plan approved by the Board of Directors at the outset of the MTP/SCS planning process, SACOG has provided, and will continue to provide, opportunities for the public to participate in the development of the proposed MTP/SCS.

Public involvement is a major component of the regional transportation planning process. In accordance with the public outreach requirements of MAP-21 and SB 375, SACOG has provided opportunities for citizens, affected public agencies, representatives of public transportation employees, freight shippers, providers of freight transportation services, private providers of transportation, representatives of users of public transportation, representatives of users of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities, representatives of the disabled, and other interested parties, with reasonable opportunities to be involved in the metropolitan transportation planning process for the development of the proposed MTP/SCS. SACOG conducted eight general public workshops around the region, an online public workshop, 10 sounding board or Regional Planning Partnership meetings with local stakeholders, plus numerous other stakeholder meetings, six information meetings for elected officials, and monthly briefings at SACOG board and advisory committees. In addition, SACOG reached out to the federally designated Native American tribal governments within the region. A full summary of this outreach process occurs in Chapter 2 – Project Description of this Draft EIR and Appendix G: Communication and Outreach of the proposed MTP/SCS.

1.5.1 Comments on the Draft EIR for the Proposed MTP/SCS

SACOG initiated the EIR scoping process on April 25, 2019, with circulation of a Notice of Preparation (NOP) through the State Clearinghouse (SCH No. 2019049139), distributed to public agencies and persons considered likely to be interested in the plan and its potential impacts. The NOP provided formal notification to all federal, state, and local agencies involved with funding or approval of the proposed MTP/SCS, and to other interested organizations and members of the public, of the preparation of this Draft EIR for the project. A copy of the NOP is provided in Appendix PD-1, as well as the responses received. In addition, SACOG held a Scoping Meeting on May 9, 2019.

The Draft EIR for the 2020 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy is available for a 45-day public review, as required by CEQA. It was released as a companion document to the draft MTP/SCS, which the SACOG Board authorized for public review at its September 19, 2019, meeting. A Notice of Availability has been published in local newspapers and mailed to an extensive distribution list, and the Draft EIR has been posted on the SACOG website with a comment period beginning on September 23, 2019. SACOG has filed a Notice of Completion with the Governor's Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse, indicating that this Draft EIR has been completed and is available for review and comment by the public. During this public review period, the Draft EIR, including the technical appendices, is available for review at the SACOG office, located at the address below. It is also available on the SACOG website at: www.sacog.org or at the following library locations:

Sacramento County:

- Arcade, 2443 Marconi Avenue, Sacramento;
- Carmichael, 5605 Marconi Avenue, Sacramento;
- Central, 828 I Street, Sacramento;
- Colonial Heights, 4799 Stockton Boulevard, Sacramento;
- Belle Cooledge, 5600 South Land Park Drive, Sacramento;
- Courtland, 170 Primasing Avenue, Courtland;
- Del Paso Heights, 920 Grand Avenue, Sacramento;
- Fair Oaks, 11601 Fair Oaks Boulevard, Fair Oaks;
- Franklin, 10055 Franklin High Road, Elk Grove;
- Galt – Marian O. Lawrence, 1000 Caroline Avenue, Galt;
- Ella K. McClatchy, 2112 22nd Street, Sacramento;
- McKinley, 601 Alhambra Boulevard, Sacramento;
- Martin Luther King, Jr., 7340 24th Street Bypass, Sacramento;
- North Natomas, 4660 Via Ingoglia, Sacramento;
- North Sacramento – Hagginwood, 2109 Del Paso Boulevard, Sacramento;
- Orangevale, 8820 Greenback Lane, Suite L, Orangevale;

- Rancho Cordova, 9845 Folsom Boulevard, Sacramento;
- Rio Linda, 631 L Street, Rio Linda;
- Robbie Waters Pocket-Greenhaven, 7335 Gloria Drive, Sacramento;
- South Natomas, 2901 Truxel Road, Sacramento;
- Southgate, 6132 66th Avenue, Sacramento;
- Sylvan Oaks, 6700 Auburn Boulevard, Citrus Heights;
- Valley Hi-North Laguna, 7400 Imagination Parkway, Sacramento; and
- Walnut Grove, 14177 Market Street, Walnut Grove.

All Other Counties:

- El Dorado County Library, 345 Fair Lane, Placerville;
- Placer County Library, 350 Nevada Street, Auburn;
- Sutter County Library, 750 Forbes Avenue, Yuba City;
- Yolo County Library, 226 Buckeye Street, Woodland; and
- Yuba County Library, 303 Second Street, Marysville.

Public hearings on the Draft MTP/SCS are scheduled as follows; a public comment meeting focused on the Draft EIR is noted below:

- Public hearing on the Draft MTP/SCS
Wednesday, October 9, 2019, 6:30-7:30 p.m.
Folsom Community Center – RG Smith Room
50 Natoma Street, Folsom
- Public hearing on the Draft MTP/SCS
Wednesday, October 16, 2019, 6:30-7:30 p.m.
Woodland Senior and Community Center
2001 East Street, Woodland, CA
- Public hearing on the Draft MTP/SCS
Draft EIR Comment Meeting
Thursday, October 24, 2019, 5:30-6:30 p.m.
SACOG Offices
1415 L Street, 3rd Floor, Sacramento, CA

Public hearing on the MTIP and Air Quality Conformity Analysis
Thursday, October 3, 2019 during the Transportation Committee Meeting at SACOG
1415 L Street, Suite 300, Sacramento, CA 95814

It is anticipated that the Final EIR will be considered for certification at the SACOG Board of Directors meeting on February 20, 2020.

Comments on the 2020 MTP/SCS Draft EIR may be made in writing before the end of the comment period (November 7, 2019). Oral comments at the comment meeting will also be accepted, though it is important to note that these comments will be recorded in the form of summary minutes, not transcription. Commenters interested in entering their comments verbatim into the record must do so in a written form, and they must be received by the close of the comment period. Written comments should be mailed or emailed to the address provided below. Following the close of the public comment period, responses to the comments received on the Draft EIR will be prepared and published, and together with the Draft EIR, and any revisions thereto, will constitute the Final EIR. Comments on this Draft EIR are due to SACOG no later than 5:00 p.m., November 7, 2019, and can be delivered by any of the following methods:

By mail:

Sacramento Area Council of Governments
ATTN: EIR Comments
1415 L Street, Suite 300
Sacramento, CA 95814

By email:

eircomments@sacog.org

By fax:

ATTN: EIR Comments
(916) 321-9551