Regional Planning Partnership

Wednesday, March 27, 2019, 2:00 to 4:00 p.m.
SACOG Rivers Room, 1415 L Street, Suite 300, Sacramento, CA

Meeting Information:
https://www.gotomeet.me/GoToMeetingSACOG1

You can also dial in using your phone:
Dial-in #: 877-568-4106
Access Code: 732-591-877

1. Introductions (3 minutes)
2. Action Summary from January 30, 2019, Meeting (Victoria Cacciatore, 1 minute)
3. Update on Project of Air Quality Concern Determinations (Renée DeVere-Oki/Matt Jones, 3 minutes)
   a. Staff will provide an update on the actions taken by MTC and the SACOG Project Level Conformity Group taken since November 7, 2018.
4. Update on the 2020 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (Clint Holtzen, 20 minutes)
   a. Staff will discuss the land use forecast, transportation project list, revenue forecast and budget, and key performance outcomes for the Draft Preferred Scenario. The board will be asked to adopt the Draft Preferred Scenario in April.
5. Regional Housing Needs Allocation (Greg Chew, 40 minutes)
   a. Staff will introduce the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) process. RHNA is a state-required planning process in which SACOG is responsible for allocating a number of housing units to each jurisdiction in the six-county region based on a variety of planning objectives, and each jurisdiction then demonstrates how they can accommodate their allocation through adequate zoning in the Housing Element of their General Plan.
6. Other Matters
7. Adjournment

The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, April 24, 2019, 2:00 to 4:00 p.m.

◆ Indicates Action

The Meridian Plaza Building is accessible to the disabled. If requested, this agenda, and documents in the agenda packet can be made available in appropriate alternative formats to persons with a disability, as required by Section 202 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 and the Federal Rules and Regulations adopted in implementation thereof. Persons seeking an alternative format should contact SACOG for further information. In addition, a person with a disability who requires a modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services, in order to participate in a public meeting should

Sacramento Area
Council of
Governments
1415 L Street,
Suite 300
Sacramento, CA
95814
tel: 916.321.9000
fax: 916.321.9551
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contact SACOG by phone at 916-321-9000, e-mail (contact@sacog.org) or in person as soon as possible and preferably at least 24 hours prior to the meeting.

Parking is available at 15th and K Streets
Regional Planning Partnership
Action Summary
January 30, 2019, Meeting

Attendance
Nader Afzalan, CARB
Lindsey Allagosian, El Dorado County
Matt Baker, ECOS
Garett Ballard-Rosa, SACOG
Jerry Barton, EDCTC
Kevin Bewsey, City of Elk Grove
Van Boeck, Yuba County
Victoria S. Cacciatore, SACOG
Renee Devere-Oki, SACOG
Ryan Dodge, City of Sacramento
Angelia Fanning, CSUS
Shengyi Gao, SACOG
Lynne Goldsmith, ECOS
Stephanie Henry, City of Folsom
Monica Hernandez, SACOG
Clint Holtzen, SACOG
Aaron Hoyt, PCTPA
Antonio Johnson, FHWA
Megan Johnson, City of Sacramento
Matt Jones, Yolo-Solano AQMD
Heather King, CARB
Doug Libbey, Sutter County
Leslie Lindbo, Yolo County
Christina Lokke, SACOG
Qasid Mehirdel, City of Sacramento
Remi Mendoza, City of Sacramento
Gina McColl, City of Roseville
Cindy Norris, City of Woodland
Karina O’Connor, EPA Region 9
Mary Poole, City of Citrus Heights
Natalie Porter, El Dorado County
Shawna Purvines, Placer County
Rupa Somavarapu, City of Rancho Cordova
Elizabeth Sparkman, City of Rancho Cordova
Sharon Sprowls, Franklin Neighborhood Development Corporation
Panah Stauffer, EPA Region 9
David Tilley, City of West Sacramento
Mary Van Voohis, Town of Loomis
Laura Webster, City of Rocklin
Josue Zuniga, CSUS

1. Introductions and Information Sharing.
Remi Mendoza shared that the City of Sacramento is updating their General Plan.

Matt Jones shared that Yolo-Solano air Quality Management District (YSAQMD) has several incentive programs currently open for applications, see https://www.ysaqmd.org/incentives/ for more information.

Victoria Cacciatore noted that this was the first RPP meeting to be conducted using “approval by consensus” for action items instead of “Robert’s Rules of Order”.

2. Action Summary from November 7, 2018, Meeting. Victoria Cacciatore shared the draft action summary with the Partnership. There were no corrections noted and the Partnership approved the action summary by consensus.
3. **Draft Air Quality Conformity Assumptions for the 2020 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS) Adoption and Associated 2019-22 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) Amendment.** Renée Devere-Oki presented the draft assumptions air quality conformity assumptions. She explained that the assumptions are used in the air quality conformity analysis and determination on the 2020 MTP/SCS and associated 2019-22 MTIP amendment. There were no questions about the proposed assumptions. The Partnership approved the presented assumptions by consensus.

4. **Draft Regional Active Transportation Program (ATP) Funding Recommendations.** Victoria Cacciatore provided an update on the status of the State and Regional ATP funding rounds. The State ATP recommendations were released and were scheduled for adoption on January 30. Two projects from the SACOG region—Placer County Transportation Planning Agency’s “Highway 49 Sidewalk Gap Closure” and Rancho Cordova’s “School Zone Improvements”—were included in the recommendation of the 27 submitted to the state. She shared the draft list of Regional ATP recommended projects for funding and contingency list, and walked through the evaluation process to develop the draft recommendation.

   The detailed staff report was forwarded to the Partnership after the meeting.

5. **Project Performance Assessment Update.** Garett Ballard-Rosa provided an overview of lessons learned from the first use of the Project Performance Assessment tool in the four-county Regional Funding Round. Victoria Cacciatore summarized the feedback received from project sponsors and project evaluators who used the PPA tool in the Regional Active Transportation Program.

6. **Regional Housing Needs Assessment.** Greg Chew introduced the Regional Housing Needs Allocation and reviewed what it means for SACOG, its member agencies, and the region. He outlined the calendar for the update, and the shifting of RHNA to tie more closely to housing production instead of just zoning. Members of the Partnership discussed recent news clips regarding the potential of tying transportation funding (e.g., local streets and roads funds) to housing production, though very little is known about whether that will become reality.

7. **Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy Pilot Program Green Means Go Update.** Christina Lokke shared a handout and provided an overview of the Green Means Go pilot program and upcoming application process. She also shared that she will present on the pilot program at the February 8 [Clean Air Partnership](#).

8. **2020 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy Preferred Scenario.** Clint Holtzen discussed the work in progress on draft assumptions for the 2020 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy. This work is currently out for local agency review and comments.
9. **Adjournment.** The meeting was adjourned by consensus. The next RPP is scheduled for Wednesday, February 27, 2019.
Regional Planning Partnership Information
March 27, 2019

Subject: Update on Project of Air Quality Concern Determinations

Issue: Staff will provide an update on the actions taken by MTC and the SACOG Project Level Conformity Group taken since November 7, 2018.

Recommendation: None, this item is for information only.

Discussion: The Sacramento Federal Nonattainment Area (SFNA) for PM$_{2.5}$ includes all of Sacramento County and portions of El Dorado, Placer, Yolo, and Solano Counties. The majority of the PM$_{2.5}$ SFNA and all of the PM$_{10}$ SFNA (i.e., Sacramento County) fall within the boundaries of SACOG’s metropolitan planning area. Using delegated authority from the RPP, the Project Level Conformity Group (PLCG) is tasked with reviewing and taking action on PM$_{2.5}$ and PM$_{10}$ Project of Air Quality Concern (POAQC) determinations and hot spot analyses within the SACOG region.

For the portion of the PM$_{2.5}$ SFNA outside of the SACOG region, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is responsible for making conformity determinations for projects. A representative of the SFNA is responsible for participating in MTC’s interagency consultation and providing quarterly reports of POAQC determinations in Eastern Solano County to the SACOG Regional Planning Partnership, and determining if individual projects need to be presented to both MTC’s Air Quality Conformity Task Force and SACOG’s PLCG. Mr. Matt Jones of Yolo Solano Air Quality Management District serves as the SFNA representative for MTC’s interagency consultation.

Since November 2018, two projects were reviewed by SACOG’s PLCG and were determined not to be POAQC. No projects were reviewed in eastern Solano County through MTC’s process.

1. Sacramento County Kammerer Rd Extension (Connector Segment) Project
2. Sacramento County Power Inn Rd Improvements project

Since the adoption of this process in 2011, the PLCG has reviewed 52 projects (Attachment A). Anyone from the RPP is welcome to be a member of the PLCG (Attachment B) and review POAQC within the SACOG region. If you would like to join, please contact sgao@sacog.org.

Attachment(s):
A. Actions Taken by the Project Level Conformity Group, September 2011, through November 7, 2018
B. Members of the Project Level Conformity Group

Key Staff: Renée Devere-Oki, Regional Air Quality Planning Team Manager, 916-340-6219
Shengyi Gao, Transportation Analyst, (916) 340-6239
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Date Circulated</th>
<th>Action Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12/23/2011</td>
<td>1/4/2012</td>
<td>POAQC Approved</td>
<td>CAL20452</td>
<td>SR 113/SR 99 Interchange</td>
<td>Caltrans District 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1/19/2012</td>
<td>1/27/2012</td>
<td>POAQC Approved</td>
<td>PLA25502</td>
<td>Rocklin Rd/Meyers St. Roundabout</td>
<td>City of Rocklin Division of Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4/23/2012</td>
<td>5/10/2012</td>
<td>POAQC Approved</td>
<td>SAC24470</td>
<td>White Rock Rd. - Sunrise Blvd. to City Limits</td>
<td>City of Rancho Cordova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7/5/2012</td>
<td>7/17/2012</td>
<td>POAQC Approved</td>
<td>PLA25499</td>
<td>Rocklin Rd/Grove St Roundabout</td>
<td>City of Rocklin Division of Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8/6/2012</td>
<td>8/13/2012</td>
<td>POAQC Approved</td>
<td>PLA25252</td>
<td>Swetzer Road / King Road Signalization</td>
<td>Town of Loomis Dept of Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9/11/2012</td>
<td>9/18/2012</td>
<td>POAQC Approved</td>
<td>SAC16800</td>
<td>Fair Oaks Boulevard Improvements Phase 2</td>
<td>Sacramento County Dept of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>12/5/2012</td>
<td>4/23/2013*</td>
<td>POAQC Approved*</td>
<td>PLA25440</td>
<td>I-80/SR 65 Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>Placer County Transportation Planning Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1/4/2013</td>
<td>2/4/2013</td>
<td>POAQC Approved</td>
<td>PLA20721/PLA25299</td>
<td>Placer Parkway Project</td>
<td>Placer County Dept of Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3/21/2013</td>
<td>3/28/2013</td>
<td>POAQC Approved</td>
<td>PLA25520</td>
<td>Oak Street Improvements</td>
<td>City of Roseville Dept of Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4/15/2013</td>
<td>4/30/2013</td>
<td>POAQC Approved</td>
<td>PLA25509</td>
<td>Nelson Ln/Markham Ravine Bridge Replacement</td>
<td>City of Lincoln Dept of Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4/9/2014</td>
<td>5/5/2014</td>
<td>POAQC Approved</td>
<td>YOL17400</td>
<td>Kentucky Avenue Widening &amp; Complete Streets</td>
<td>City of Woodland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Actions Taken by the Project Level Conformity Group since July 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Date Circulated</th>
<th>Action Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12/11/2014</td>
<td>12/19/2014</td>
<td>POAQC Approved</td>
<td>SAC24610 &amp; SAC24656</td>
<td>14th Ave. Extension Phase 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>City of Sacramento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>12/20/2014</td>
<td>12/22/2014</td>
<td>POAQC Approved</td>
<td>YOL19329</td>
<td>Pioneer Bluff Bridge Phase 2 - Village Parkway Extension</td>
<td>City of West Sacramento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>POAQC</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2/20/2015</td>
<td>2/23/2015</td>
<td>SAC24220</td>
<td>Rancho Cordova Parkway Interchange</td>
<td>City of Rancho Cordova</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>5/8/2015</td>
<td>5/22/2015</td>
<td>SAC21280</td>
<td>Green Valley Road Widening</td>
<td>City of Folsom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>8/11/2015</td>
<td>8/26/2015</td>
<td>PLA25542 &amp; PLA25519</td>
<td>I-80 EB and WB Auxiliary Lane</td>
<td>Placer County Transportation Planning Agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>12/8/2015</td>
<td>12/8/2015</td>
<td>SAC24380</td>
<td>Elk Grove – Florin Rd. Bridge</td>
<td>Sacramento County Dept of Transportation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>12/8/2015</td>
<td>12/16/2015</td>
<td>PLA25440</td>
<td>I-80/SR 65 Interchange Improvements Phase 1A</td>
<td>Placer County Transportation Planning Agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>4/14/2016</td>
<td>4/28/2016</td>
<td>CAL20695</td>
<td>Ramp Meters at Various Locations (G13 Contingency Project)</td>
<td>Caltrans District 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4/14/2016</td>
<td>4/18/2016</td>
<td>SAC24650</td>
<td>is Fair Oaks Boulevard Improvements, Phase 3B</td>
<td>Sacramento County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>6/17/2016</td>
<td>8/9/2016</td>
<td>PLA25529</td>
<td>SR 65 Capacity &amp; Operational Improvements Phase 1</td>
<td>Placer County Transportation Planning Agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>12/6/2016</td>
<td>12/9/2016</td>
<td>CAL20700</td>
<td>I-5 Road Rehab Project</td>
<td>Caltrans District 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>12/8/2016</td>
<td>12/9/2016</td>
<td>CAL20679</td>
<td>SR 70 Safety Improvements</td>
<td>Caltrans District 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>12/19/2016</td>
<td>12/23/2016</td>
<td>VAR56128</td>
<td>Capital Southeast Connector - D2</td>
<td>Southeast Connector JPA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>12/20/2016</td>
<td>1/12/2017</td>
<td>SAC24700</td>
<td>Southeast Connector JPA project, Capital Southeast Connector – B2</td>
<td>Southeast Connector JPA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>12/23/2016</td>
<td>12/27/2016</td>
<td>CAL20705</td>
<td>US 50 65th St.. to Howe Ave. Auxiliary Lane</td>
<td>Caltrans District 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1/20/2017</td>
<td>1/20/2017</td>
<td>SUT18865</td>
<td>Live Oak Collaborative Highway 99 Streetscape Improvements</td>
<td>City of Live Oak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>POAQC</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>5/3/2017</td>
<td>5/4/2017</td>
<td>PLA25501</td>
<td>Washington Blvd/Andora Bridge Widening</td>
<td>City of Roseville</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>6/2/2017</td>
<td>6/2/2017</td>
<td>CAL20728</td>
<td>Realign Curves on State Route (SR) 49</td>
<td>City of Auburn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>6/16/2017</td>
<td>6/19/2017</td>
<td>SAC24255</td>
<td>US 50/Hazard Interchange Project</td>
<td>Sacramento County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>6/23/2017</td>
<td>6/28/2017</td>
<td>ELD19347</td>
<td>Western Placerville Interchanges Project</td>
<td>City of Placerville</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>7/7/2017</td>
<td>7/7/2017</td>
<td>SAC24380</td>
<td>Elk Grove-Florin Road Bridge Project</td>
<td>Sacramento County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>7/17/2017</td>
<td>7/28/2017</td>
<td>CAL20502</td>
<td>Caltrans project, widening ramps and installing ramp meters at fourteen on-ramp locations along State Route (SR) 51 and 99</td>
<td>Sacramento County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>7/20/2017</td>
<td>7/25/2017</td>
<td>PLA25635</td>
<td>Intersection of Rocklin Road and Pacific Street Project</td>
<td>City of Rocklin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>9/13/2017</td>
<td>9/18/2017</td>
<td>SAC24998</td>
<td>Improve and transform the North 12th Street Project</td>
<td>City of Sacramento</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>11/28/2017</td>
<td>11/29/2017</td>
<td>SAC24703</td>
<td>Zinfandel Drive interchange improvement</td>
<td>City of Rancho Cordova</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>12/4/2017</td>
<td>12/11/2017</td>
<td>CAL20707</td>
<td>Caltrans Antelope WIM update</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>12/18/2017</td>
<td>12/19/2017</td>
<td>SAC24749</td>
<td>Fair Oaks Blvd bike and Pedestrian mobility</td>
<td>Sacramento County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>1/10/2018</td>
<td>1/11/2018</td>
<td>CAL20541</td>
<td>SR49 Improvements</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>1/25/2018</td>
<td>1/25/2018</td>
<td>SAC25000</td>
<td>City of Sacramento safety and pedestrian improvements</td>
<td>City of Sacramento</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>1/26/2018</td>
<td>2/12/2018</td>
<td>PLA25647</td>
<td>City of Roseville Atlantic St on-ramp</td>
<td>City of Roseville</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>2/23/2018</td>
<td>3/5/2018</td>
<td>SAC24250ELD19468</td>
<td>Capital SouthEast Connector D3E1 Project</td>
<td>City of Folsom, Sacramento County, and El Dorado County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date Approved</td>
<td>Date Action Taken</td>
<td>POAQC Decision</td>
<td>Project Code</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>5/4/2018</td>
<td>5/7/2018</td>
<td>POAQC Approved</td>
<td>SAC25009</td>
<td>Franklin Blvd Project</td>
<td>City of Sacramento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>5/24/2018</td>
<td>5/25/2018</td>
<td>POAQC Approved</td>
<td>SAC24683</td>
<td>I St Bridge Replacement Project</td>
<td>City of Sacramento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>7/11/2018</td>
<td>7/11/2018</td>
<td>POAQC Approved</td>
<td>YOL19288</td>
<td>City of West Sacramento Multi-modal Connectivity Improvement Project</td>
<td>City of West Sacramento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>7/23/2018</td>
<td>7/23/2018</td>
<td>POAQC Approved</td>
<td>CAL20761</td>
<td>Caltrans WB50 Ramp Improvement Project</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>8/24/2018</td>
<td>9/10/2018</td>
<td>POAQC Approved</td>
<td>YOL17140</td>
<td>City of Davis and Caltrans Richards Blvd Project</td>
<td>City of Davis and Caltrans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Actions Taken by the Project Level Conformity Group, November 7, 2018 through March 14, 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date Approved</th>
<th>Date Action Taken</th>
<th>POAQC Decision</th>
<th>Project Code</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>12/6/2018</td>
<td>12/7/2018</td>
<td>POAQC Approved</td>
<td>SAC24094/SAC 24114</td>
<td>Kammerer Rd Extension (Connector Segment)</td>
<td>Sacramento County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>1/28/2019</td>
<td>1/28/2019</td>
<td>POAQC Approved</td>
<td>SAC25035</td>
<td>Power Inn Rd Improvements project</td>
<td>Sacramento County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Members of the Project Level Conformity Group
Updated 10/30/2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>Fong</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>Johnston</td>
<td>El Dorado County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Yang</td>
<td>SMAQMD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>Coleman</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Heather</td>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td>ARB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Janice Lam</td>
<td>Snyder</td>
<td>SMAQMD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Jerry</td>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>EDCTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Ungvarsky</td>
<td>EPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Jose Luis</td>
<td>Caceres</td>
<td>SACOG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Vaughn</td>
<td>FHWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Karina</td>
<td>O'Connor</td>
<td>EPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>Born</td>
<td>Federal DOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>Sanchez</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Luke</td>
<td>McNeel-Caird</td>
<td>PCTPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Loutzenhiser</td>
<td>SMAQMD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Matt*</td>
<td>Jones*</td>
<td>YSAQMD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Philley</td>
<td>SMAQMD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Renée</td>
<td>DeVere-Oki</td>
<td>SACOG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>Tavitas</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Shalanda</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Sharon</td>
<td>Tang</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Sondra</td>
<td>Spaethe</td>
<td>FRAQMD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>Molly</td>
<td>SMAQMD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Yu-Shuo</td>
<td>Chang</td>
<td>Placer County AQMD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*SFNA representative for Eastern Solano POAQC determinations through MTC's interagency process.

**Coordinator**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Shengyi</th>
<th>Gao</th>
<th>SACOG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Attachment B
Regional Planning Partnership

March 21, 2019

Subject: Update on the 2020 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy

Issue: Staff will discuss the land use forecast, transportation project list, revenue forecast and budget, and key performance outcomes for the Draft Preferred Scenario. The board will be asked to adopt the Draft Preferred Scenario in April.

Recommendation: This item is for information and discussion.

Discussion: In April 2019 staff will ask the SACOG Board to adopt the Draft Preferred Scenario for the 2020 MTP/SCS. The Draft Preferred Scenario will consist of a land use forecast, transportation project list, revenue forecast and budget, and key performance outcomes. These components will form the technical foundation for the draft 2020 plan update and environmental impact report. The April action builds on work completed by staff with direction from the board over the last year and will allow staff to conduct final analysis of the plan, discuss implementation policies and strategies with the board, and begin writing the plan document and accompanying environmental impact report in preparation for plan adoption in February 2020. The timeline in Attachment A provides an overview of the full MTP/SCS update schedule.

Materials related to the Draft Preferred Scenario will be shared before the meeting.

Attachment(s): MTP/SCS Schedule

Key Staff: Clint Holtzen, Interim Planning Manager, (916)340-6246
**2020 MTP/SCS Update Timeline**

**2017 Data**
- Local Agency Review and Input
- Issue Exploration to Inform Policy Framework

**2018 Data**
- Sounding Board Review and Input
- Transportation Call for Projects and Land Use Build Out
- Policy Research
  - Revenues
  - Pricing
  - Autonomous Vehicles
- Create and Vet Discussion Scenario

**2019 Data**
- Local Agency Review and Input
- Sounding Board Review and Input
- Public Workshops
- Final Scenario Modeling and Analysis
- Draft Plan and DEIR Writing

**2020 Data**
- Elected Official Info Sessions
- Analysis to Inform Final Scenario
  - Performance Outcomes Scorecard
  - Benefit Cost Analysis
  - Project Performance Assessment
  - Economic Prosperity Goals Integration
  - Environmental Justice Analysis
- Create and Vet Final Scenario
- Release Plan and EIR for Public Review
- Response to Comment and Finalize Plan and EIR
- Adopt Final Plan

**OCTOBER 2018**
- Final Scenario Model and Analysis
- Draft Plan and DEIR Writing
- Response to Comment and Finalize Plan and EIR
- Adopt Final Plan

**KEY:**
- Board Action
- Major Staff Work Informing Process
- Major Public and Stakeholder Informing Process

**Attachment A**
Regional Planning Partnership

March 20, 2019

Subject: Introduction to Regional Housing Needs Allocation

Issue: What is the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA), and what factors should be considered in the RHNA methodology for the allocation?

Recommendation: This item is for information to interested parties.

Discussion: Since 1969, California has required that all local governments (cities and counties) adequately plan to meet the housing needs of everyone in the community. Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) and council of Governments (COGs) such as SACOG play a significant role in how this is done through the Regional Housing Needs Allocation process.

Based on the regional determination provided by Housing and Community Development, SACOG must develop a Regional Housing Needs Allocation and a Regional Housing Needs Plan (RHNP). These State-mandated documents allocate a projected share of the regional determination to each of the cities and counties in SACOG’s six-county region. The RHNA establishes the number of housing units, by income level, that each city and county must plan for within the eight-year planning period. Based on the adopted RHNA, each city and county must update its housing element to demonstrate how the jurisdiction will accommodate its housing need over the eight-year planning period.

The RHNA process is an important planning process that includes State, regional, and local governments. The State provides SACOG a regional goal for new housing. SACOG is responsible for creating and adopting a methodology for distributing that regional number to each jurisdiction. Local governments are then responsible for zoning to accommodate that housing goal in their housing elements. The year 2019 is the start of the RHNA process and the year when many key decisions will have to be made by the SACOG Board.

One of the most important stages in the RHNA process is the development of the methodology to distribute the allocations to local governments. The methodology must consider different factors identified in state law and must be applied consistently throughout the region. SACOG just started working with local government planners on development options for the methodology, and SACOG will be seeking the input of stakeholders through the RPP meetings for input. At this meeting, SACOG will conceptually explore what elements should be considered for different methodology options. Summer 2019, at the RPP meetings, SACOG staff will summarize some of the different methodology options it has developed for stakeholder input. The SACOG
Board of Directors will be asked to publicly release the staff’s recommended option by the board’s August meeting, and will take action to approve one methodology at its October 2019 meeting.

Attachment A provides Frequently Asked Questions about the RHNA, including the requirements on local governments and SACOG, the relationship with the MTP/SCS, and the upcoming timeline and process. Attachment B summarized the objectives of state law and factors that must be considered in the RHNA methodology.

Attachment(s):
  A. Frequently Asked Questions – Regional Housing Needs Allocation; and RHNA Considerations
  B. SACOG RHNA Considerations

Key Staff: Greg Chew, Senior Planner, (916) 340-6227
Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG)

2021-2029 Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) – Cycle 6

FAQ Sheet
(Updated: February 21, 2019)

This Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) sheet addresses the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) for the SACOG region. This document will be periodically updated and the most recent version will be available on the SACOG RHNA Website: https://www.sacog.org/post/rhna-faqs

Background Information

What are the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) and related terms?

According to the California Housing and Community Development Department (HCD), California has required since 1969 that all local governments (cities and counties) adequately plan to meet the housing needs of everyone in the community. MPOs and COGs such as SACOG play a significant role in how this is done through the Regional Housing Needs Allocation process.

HCD will issue a Regional Housing Needs Determination to SACOG’s six-county region for the planning period of October 31, 2021 to October 31, 2029. This is the sixth cycle of RHNA. HCD calculates the regional determination using information provided by the California Department of Finance. The regional determination includes an overall housing need number, as well as a breakdown of the number of units required in four income distribution categories, as further defined below.

Based on the regional determination provided by HCD, SACOG must develop a Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) and a Regional Housing Needs Plan (RHNPP). These State-mandated documents allocate a projected share of the regional determination to each of the cities and counties in SACOG’s six-county region. The RHNA establishes the total number of housing units that each city and county must plan for within the eight-year planning period. Based on the adopted RHNA, each city and county must update its housing element to demonstrate how the jurisdiction will meet the expected growth in housing need over this eight-year planning period.

What does this mean for cities and counties in California, and what is a Housing Element?

Once cities and counties received their allocations, they must then update the housing element of their general plans to demonstrate how zoning can or will accommodate the RHNA. General plans serve as the local government’s "blueprint" for how the city and/or county will grow and develop and include seven elements: land use, transportation, conservation, noise, open space, safety, and housing. The law mandating that housing be included as an element of each jurisdiction’s general plan is known as “housing-element law.”
California’s housing-element law acknowledges that, in order for the private market to adequately address the housing needs and demand of Californians, local governments must adopt plans and regulatory systems that provide opportunities for (and do not unduly constrain), housing development. As a result, housing policy in California rests largely upon the effective implementation of local general plans and, in particular, local housing elements.

What is SACOG’s role in the RHNA Process?

California’s Housing Element Law (Government Code, §§ 65580 et seq.) mandates that SACOG develop and approve a RHNA and RHNP for its six-county region, including the counties of El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba, and their 22 cities. The RHNA and RHNP must also include the Tahoe Basin portions of El Dorado and Placer counties, and the city of South Lake Tahoe, which are not normally within SACOG’s planning area.

It is SACOG’s responsibility to coordinate with HCD prior to its determination of the regional housing need. Once SACOG receives the regional determination, including the overall need number and the income category distribution, it must adopt a methodology for distributing the regional growth number throughout the region. The methodology is the basis for the final RHNA and RHNP that SACOG ultimately adopts.

What are the RHNA Objectives and Factors that must be considered in the RHNA Methodology?

Objectives (§65584.d): Methodology must Further

- Increasing Housing Supply and Mix of Housing Types
- Promote Infill, Equity, and Environment
- Jobs Housing Balance
- Regional Income Parity
- NEW: Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing

RHNA Factors (§65584.04.e): Methodology must Incorporate

1. Jobs and housing relationship
2. Opportunities and constraints to development of additional housing (see below)
   2a. Capacity for sewer and water service
   2b. Availability of land suitable for urban development
   2c. Lands preserved or protected from urban development
   2d. County policies to preserve prime agricultural land
3. Opportunities to maximize transit and existing transportation infrastructure
4. Policies directing growth toward incorporated areas
5. Loss of units contained in assisted housing developments
6. High housing cost burdens
What is the difference between the RHNA Objectives and the RHNA Factors?

The RHNA objectives provide the guiding framework for how SACOG must develop the methodology. SACOG is required to demonstrate how its methodology “furthers” each of the objectives. This language requires proactive inclusion of each objective into the analysis and is a higher bar to clear than last round, which required “consistency.” The RHNA factors include a longer list of considerations that must be “incorporated” into the methodology. Each of the factors should be included to the extent that sufficient data is available.

What are the two types of allocations in the RHNA?

The Regional Housing Needs Allocation has two parts as required by State law:

1. **Overall Allocation:** SACOG receives a total housing unit number for growth during the planning period in the six-county SACOG region, including the Tahoe Regional Planning Area, from HCD. SACOG is required to distribute this regional housing growth number to the jurisdictions within the region for the period from October 31, 2021 to October 31, 2029.

2. **Income Category Distributions:** HCD also breaks up the total regional housing units by income level. As defined by state law, four income categories make up this distribution: very low income (less than 50 percent median family income [MFI]); low income (50 to 80 percent MFI); moderate income (80 to 120 percent MFI); and above moderate income (above 120 percent MFI). The total housing unit growth SACOG allocates to each jurisdiction must be allocated into the four household income categories.

What are the four income categories and what do they mean for cities and counties?

The four economic categories, as listed above, must be addressed in a jurisdiction’s housing element. Specifically, accommodations must be made to ensure that the jurisdiction provides sufficient zoning capacity to accommodate the projected housing need in each income category.

It is important to note that each jurisdiction is responsible for providing sufficient zoning capacity for the units allocated to all four economic income categories, but is NOT responsible for the construction of these units. The intent of the Housing Element Law is to ensure that jurisdictions do not impede the
construction of housing in any income category. Other factors, such as market forces, are well beyond a jurisdiction’s control and have considerable influence over whether or not housing units in each income category are actually constructed.

Is there a relationship between the MTP/SCS and RHNA?

Yes, the Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy 2040 Update plans for the projected growth in the region by 2040 and where it will take place. State law requires that the MTP/SCS be consistent with the RHNA. As such, the RHNA is an attempt to plan for the projected growth between 2021 and 2029 using projections and data used in the MTP/SCS. This relationship will be further discussed in 2019 as the MTP/SCS progresses.

Have there been changes to State Law since the last cycle of RHNA that impact Cycle 6?

Yes, there have been a number of changes to state law, but the overall structure of RHNA and Housing Element law remain the same. Some of the changes to state law affect what may be counted towards RHNA in the Housing Element, and consequences of jurisdictions not meeting their allocations in a timely manner. These new housing laws will be addressed in 2019 when the RHNA process gets fully underway. In the meantime, SACOG is offering housing planners in the 28 member agencies special training opportunities to learn about the details in preparation for RHNA.

Procedural Questions

What's the upcoming RHNA timeline?

The item being brought to the SACOG Board of Director’s three committees in November, 2018, is to introduce RHNA. RHNA will be discussed with the SACOG board throughout 2019 and beyond, with board actions to be taken at key points throughout. Simultaneously, the housing planners in each of SACOG’s 28 member agencies, plus the Tahoe region, have already been meeting and in discussions in preparation for the RHNA activities in 2019 and beyond.

Below are the upcoming major RHNA activities:

- Jan/Feb 2019   SACOG meeting with local governments on RHNA factors [Gov Code 65584.04(b)(1)]
- Late Jan 2019  Local governments review of draft MTP/SCS scenarios
- Feb 2019       SACOG notifies HCD and Caltrans of MTP/SCS adoption date
- Late Feb 2019  Local government comments due on draft MTP/SCS scenarios
- Mar 2019       Housing Planners meeting: kick-off of RHNA methodology development; start of monthly meetings
- April/May 2019  Housing legislative update webinar
- May 2019  Sub-regional delegation notice due to SACOG
- May 2019  Discussion on infill development math in suburban commercial corridors at SACOG Board meeting and housing planners workshop
- July 2019  HCD consultation with SACOG
- Aug 2019  HCD issues Regional Housing Needs Determination (RHND)
- Aug 2019  SACOG issues proposed staff recommended methodology (other alternatives also shown)
- Aug-Oct 2019  HCD reviews draft methodology and comments
- Sept 2019  (tentative) “Missing Middle” board workshop and housing planners workshop
- Oct 2019  SACOG Board adopts methodology
- Nov 2019  HCD issues final determination if objection
- Feb 2020  SACOG adopted MTP/SCS
- Aug 2020  SACOG adopts RHNA Plan and AFFH requirements due
- Aug 2021  Housing elements due by local governments

What's next in the RHNA process for the SACOG Board?

SACOG staff will update the Board throughout 2019 prior to key decision points. SACOG staff will be working regularly with the housing planners from each of the 28 member jurisdictions plus the Tahoe region. SACOG staff is also available to any jurisdictions requesting a planning commission or governing body update.

Is the prior RHNA available to review?

The current 2013-2021 RHNP is available on SACOG’s website at:

https://www.sacog.org/post/regional-housing-needs-allocation
SACOG RHNA Considerations

There have been a number of changes to the State Statute governing the development of the RHNA methodology as a result of two 2018 bills: AB 1771 and SB 828. These changes will apply to the Cycle Six RHNA (2021-2029) are highlighted here in red/orange.

**RHNA Objectives vs RHNA Factors**

The *RHNA objectives* provide the guiding framework for how SACOG must develop the methodology. SACOG is required to demonstrate how its methodology “furthers” each of the objectives. This language requires proactive inclusion of each objective into the analysis and is a higher bar to clear than last round, which required “consistency.” The *RHNA factors* include a longer list of considerations that must be “incorporated” into the methodology. Each of the factors should be included to the extent that sufficient data is available.

**Objectives (§65584.d): Methodology must Further**

- **Increasing Housing Supply and Mix of Housing Types**
  - “Increasing the housing supply and the mix of housing types, tenure, and affordability in all cities and counties within the region in an equitable manner, which shall result in each jurisdiction receiving an allocation of units for low- and very low income households.”

- **Promote Infill, Equity, and Environment**
  - now including a special consideration of SB 375 greenhouse gas reduction targets from ARB
  - “Promoting infill development and socioeconomic equity, the protection of environmental and agricultural resources, the encouragement of efficient development patterns, and the achievement of the region’s greenhouse gas reductions targets provided by the State Air Resources Board pursuant to Section 65080.”

- **Jobs Housing Balance**
  - now including an improved balance between low-wage jobs and lower-income housing
  - “Promoting an improved intraregional relationship between jobs and housing, including an improved balance between the number of low-wage jobs and the number of housing units affordable to low-wage workers in each jurisdiction.”

- **Regional Income Parity**
  - “Allocating a lower proportion of housing need to an income category when a jurisdiction already has a disproportionately high share of households in that income category, as compared to the countywide distribution of households in that category from the most recent American Community Survey.”

- **NEW: Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing**
  - “Affirmatively furthering fair housing means taking meaningful actions, in addition to combating discrimination, that overcome patterns of segregation and foster inclusive communities free from barriers that restrict access to opportunity based on protected characteristics. Specifically, affirmatively furthering fair housing means taking meaningful actions that, taken together, address significant disparities in housing needs and in access to opportunity, replacing segregated living patterns with truly integrated and balanced living patterns, transforming racially and ethnically concentrated areas of poverty into areas of opportunity, and fostering and maintaining compliance with civil rights and fair housing laws.”
RHNA Factors (§65584.04.e): Methodology must *Incorporate*

1. Jobs and housing relationship
   - If data is available, this factor now includes consideration of existing and projected relationships between low-wage jobs and lower-income housing
   - “Each member jurisdiction’s existing and projected jobs and housing relationship. This shall include an estimate based on readily available data on the number of low-wage jobs within the jurisdiction and how many housing units within the jurisdiction are affordable to low-wage workers as well as an estimate based on readily available data, of projected job growth and projected household growth by income level within each member jurisdiction during the planning period.”

2. Opportunities and constraints to development of additional housing (see below)

2a. Capacity for sewer and water service
   - “Lack of capacity for sewer or water service due to federal or state laws, regulations or regulatory actions, or supply and distribution decisions made by a sewer or water service provider other than the local jurisdiction that preclude the jurisdiction from providing necessary infrastructure for additional development during the planning period.”

2b. Availability of land suitable for urban development
   - “The availability of land suitable for urban development or for conversion to residential use, the availability of underutilized land, and opportunities for infill development and increased residential densities. The council of governments may not limit its consideration of suitable housing sites or land suitable for urban development to existing zoning ordinances and land use restrictions of a locality, but shall consider the potential for increased residential development under alternative zoning ordinances and land use restrictions. The determination of available land suitable for urban development may exclude lands where the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) or the Department of Water Resources has determined that the flood management infrastructure designed to protect that land is not adequate to avoid the risk of flooding.”

2c. Lands preserved or protected from urban development
   - “Lands preserved or protected from urban development under existing federal or state programs, or both, designed to protect open space, farmland, environmental habitats, and natural resources on a long-term basis, including land zoned or designated for agricultural protection or preservation that is subject to a local ballot measure that was approved by the voters of that jurisdiction that prohibits or restricts conversion to non-agricultural uses.”

2d. County policies to preserve prime agricultural land
   - “County policies to preserve prime agricultural land, as defined pursuant to Section 56064, within an unincorporated and land within an unincorporated area zoned or designated for agricultural protection or preservation that is subject to a local ballot measure that was approved by the voters of that jurisdiction that prohibits or restricts its conversion to non-agricultural uses.”

3. Opportunities to maximize transit and existing transportation infrastructure
   - “The distribution of household growth assumed for purposes of a comparable period of regional transportation plans and opportunities to maximize the use of public transportation and existing transportation infrastructure.”
4. Policies directing growth toward incorporated areas

- “Agreements between a county and cities in a county to direct growth toward incorporated areas of the county and land within an unincorporated area zoned or designated for agricultural protection or preservation that is subject to a local ballot measure that was approved by the voters of the jurisdiction that prohibits or restricts conversion to non-agricultural uses.”

5. Loss of units contained in assisted housing developments

- “The loss of units contained in assisted housing developments, as defined in paragraph (9) of subdivision (a) of Section 65583, that changed to non-low-income use through mortgage prepayment, subsidy contract expirations, or termination of use restrictions.”

6. High housing cost burdens

- “The percentage of existing households at each of the income levels listed in subdivision (e) of Section 65584 that are paying more than 30 percent and more than 50 percent of their income in rent.”

7. NEW: Rate of Overcrowding

- Overcrowding is defined as more than one resident per room in each room in a dwelling

8. Housing needs of farmworkers

9. Housing needs of UC and Cal State students

- “The housing needs generated by the presence of a private university or a campus of the California State University or the University of California within any member jurisdiction.”

10. NEW: Loss of units during an emergency

- “The loss of units during a state of emergency that was declared by the Governor pursuant to the California Emergency Services Act (Chapter 7 (commencing with Section 8550) of Division 1 of Title 2), during the planning period immediately preceding the relevant revision pursuant to Section 65588 that have yet to be rebuilt or replaced at the time of the analysis.”

11. NEW: SB 375 Greenhouse Gas Reduction Targets

- “The region’s greenhouse gas emissions targets provided by the State Air Resources Board pursuant to Section 65080.”

12. Other factors adopted by Council of Governments

- “Any other factors adopted by the council of governments, that further the objectives listed in subdivision (d) of Section 65584, provided that the council of governments specifies which of the objectives each additional factor is necessary to further. The council of governments may include additional factors unrelated to furthering the objectives listed in subdivision (d) of Section 65584 so long as the additional factors do not undermine the objectives listed in subdivision (d) of Section 65584 and are applied equally across all household income levels as described in subdivision (f) of Section 65584 and the council of governments makes a finding that the factor is necessary to address significant health and safety conditions.”

**SACOG cannot use the following as a basis for a lower RHNA**

- Direct or indirect regulatory density limits (ordinance, policy, voter-approved measure, zoning, general plan)
- Prior underproduction of housing
- Stable population numbers