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SACOG BOARD OF DIRECTORS:

Presented here is management’s recommendation for the fiscal year 2010-11 budget. Throughout the nation public agencies are struggling to cope with declining revenues and controlling costs, and SACOG is not immune to these pressures. In spite of tight cost containment and some success with short-term revenues, this year’s budget is being supplemented by approximately $1.042 million of reserve funds; in order for revenues to match to projected expenditures, to in effect reflect a “balanced budget”. Approximately $992,000 of reserve funds are needed for SACOG’s operating budget and almost $50,000 is needed to balance the Board of Directors and Advocacy budget. The Board provided conditional approval for use of these reserve funds, but only if they are needed. The budget assumption includes revenue from continuous sources and grants/contracts that are signed.

SACOG OPERATING BUDGET

This year’s budget is very challenging, primarily due to the close out of some significant discretionary earmarks/grants (Boxer Earmark and Blueprint state grants) combined with reduced Local Transportation Fund (LTF) planning and administration funds that come from sales tax revenue. In response to those challenges, the budget includes scaled back consulting budgets and personnel cost savings of over $400,000 that are not reflected in the budget. These savings include not hiring three vacation positions; increased use of volunteer interns; concessions agreed to by contract employees and members of the SACOG Employees Association (SEA); another year of zero cost-of-living increases; and additional cost savings through modifying an existing deferred compensation plan.

SACOG staff has increased its efforts to be entrepreneurial and generate new revenue sources. SACOG is aggressively pursuing multiple sources to replace and enhance the declining discretionary funding, but will take some months before we count on those opportunities as being secured. SACOG also has an agreement with a major university to start integrating our modeling programs and trade limited amounts of staff time for much higher amounts of graduate student assistance.

SACOG is aggressively seeking new revenues from a variety of sources, including state grants; a federal earmark for $1 million; numerous federal grants directly related to the update of our MTP and the Rural-Urban Connections Strategy (RUCS) project. We are still optimistic that we will obtain this funding, but for workload planning purposes we need the assurance that, if needed, the reserves will be available to fund the work program fully this year.

The development of the FY 2010-11 work program (OWP) has been guided by SACOG’s new 2010 Strategic Plan. Through this process, staff scrutinized existing and proposed work elements for consistency with the goals, strategies and performance indicators in the recently adopted strategic plan. The OWP acknowledges the need for SACOG to ramp up some activities as it starts the next MTP, including enhanced CEQA Analysis to be able to deliver the regulatory reform advantages available to our members through Senate Bill 375 (SB 375). The work program also acknowledges that we still have much to do, to successfully complete the RUCS project including work on regulatory reform involved within the federal resource agencies. There are other related initiatives consistent with our new
Strategic Plan for which we are also pursuing new revenue. A key strategic date for this organization is December 2011, when the next MTP is anticipated to be completed under provision of both SB 375 and the Federal Clean Air Act.

BOARD AND ADVOCACY

In order to keep the 2010-11 dues the same as last year, the Board will spend an additional $50,000 from the Board and Advocacy reserve to fund a 22% reduction for the year. SACOG is projecting that the Board and Advocacy reserve balance will be approximately $150,000 at year end.

OVERALL WORK PROGRAM & SAFE

The total budgeted expenditures are $39,404,887 of which the O.WP is $39,301,792. The remaining components of the budget are the Board of Directors and Advocacy budget, at $399,246 and the Capital Assets (equipment and furniture) budget of $100,000.
Focus

There are a number of focus areas for fiscal year 2010-11:

- **New Metropolitan Transportation Plan Planning – for update to the MTP2035**

  There are four projects that directly support the development of the new Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). They include scenario development, education and outreach, regional environmental impact report, and planning.

  The technical analysis of the MTP will use the land use and travel demand models to test the various components of the plan and apply the range of performance measures to them. Scenarios will be defined with transportation projects, land use development options, and regional policy options. The performance metrics will include measures used in the current MTP and new metrics, especially greenhouse gas (GHG) targets as specified through the implementation of SB 375. SACOG will facilitate a public outreach and education component to coincide with the preparation of technical research and planning. A program-level Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the new MTP in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) will be prepared. The update to the 2008 plan is timed with the implementation of SB 375 and the region’s first Sustainable Communities Strategy. The four project numbers are 11-006-01 to 11-006-04, with funding/expenditures of $2.1 million.

- **Continuation and finalization of the Rural-Urban Connections Strategy (RUCS)**

  Fiscal year 2010-11 will be the culmination of three years’ worth of study, gathering data and planning to address the region’s growth and sustainability objectives from a rural standpoint. RUCS is designed to study the challenges and opportunities in the rural areas with an eye toward the economic sustainability of rural areas as well as the transportation needs of the rural roads related to competing uses by agricultural equipment and commuters bypassing congested main roads for the same road.

  Working groups have been studying the challenges, opportunities, innovations and implementation strategies for issue areas such as land use, transportation, local markets/agritourism, and regulation. Additional topics, including forestry and water, will be initiated in the 2010-11 year.

  A RUCS Tall Order event is planned in Fall/Winter to present to elected officials, city and county representatives, and the general public the findings of the RUCS work and to develop a plan for implementation of those findings, in the form of a “Toolkit”. The toolkit is to be comprised of policy, planning, funding, regulatory, economic, data and modeling techniques that can be used to implement the innovations. This is project number 11-005-05, with funding/expenditures of $971,000.

- **Connect Card Implementation (formerly called Universal Transit Fare Card Study)**

  This project is the implementation planning, procurement, and deployment of a regional universal transit fare card system. The new fare system is expected to simplify transit system operations, improvement system connectivity, contribute to regional air quality goals, and increase the attractiveness of transit to new patrons. This project is currently in Phase II which is expected to culminate in September 2010. Phase III will involve full system procurement, deployment, integration, and testing. Full system deployment and acceptance is anticipated before June 2012. This is project number 11-004-06 with funding/expenditures equaling $7.9 million.
Next Phase of the 511/STARNET Capital Improvements

The 511/STARNET project is the communications platform that will be used by the operators of transportation facilities and emergency responders in the Sacramento region. It will enable real-time sharing of data and live video, and refinement of joint procedures pertaining to the operation of roadways and public transit safety activities, and improved traveler information. It will also provide more timely and accurate information for travelers via the regions 511 website and interactive telephone service. Phase I of the project, was completed in fiscal year 2009-10. Phase II continues into fiscal year 2011-12. It is anticipated that the project will come to conclusion in the 2012-13 budget cycle. This is project number 11-007-06 with funding/expenditures totaling $2.9 million.

Continuation of the Sacramento Emergency Clean Air and Transportation program (SECAT)

Funding for the program will continue with future programmed CMAQ revenue. $7.3 million of CMAQ funding will be awarded to regional truck operators in FY 2010-11 to continue the retrofitting of diesel engines with cleaner, fuel-efficient engines for the heavy-duty trucks traveling within the SACOG region. SACOG provides contract review and accounting and administration support for this program, but receives no funding for its services. This is project number 11-007-10 with funding/expenditures, to truck operators, totaling $7.3 million.

While these are by no means the only work to be accomplished this year, so many of the projects feed into the concepts of efficient regional transportation and land use that make use of the compact multi-use property, and the preservation of the dynamic rural heritage of the region. The goals and policies achieved through the RUCS project, MTP 2035 and ongoing Blueprint implementation are accomplished with the careful programming of available federal and state monies to projects that achieve those policies, the continued work on improvements to public transportation to encourage wider use by the public, planning for complete streets, bicycle and pedestrian transportation, and goods and freight movement to tie the principles together.

Economy and the Budget

This year’s budget is very challenging, primarily due to the depressed economic conditions. SACOG is not immune to this. While many of the revenues SACOG receives are based on formula planning funds or are discretionary grant awards, the requirement to match those funds with non-Federal and non-State dollars is a challenge. The primary source of those matching dollars is from the 1/4¢ sales tax collected within each county. As the housing market has continued to slide, as unemployment rates rise, as retail businesses reduce service or close, the revenue received from sales tax collections has declined over the past year and is estimated to be included within the budget and either scaled projects back to fit within certain funding limits or postponed projects to future years.

SACOG is fortunate to have a fiscally sound labor agreement with the SACOG Employees Association (SEA) and included in this budget is an agreement that provides for no cost-of-living adjustment in fiscal year 2010-11, which is projected to save $53,000 of salary savings as well as an MOU
In the long term, it is expected that funding levels may change given the national economy. However, there is also the possibility that as the transportation bill works its way through Congress, changes may be made to the formula funding for transportation planning, the FHWA PL and FTA 5303 funds. The number of discretionary grants, of which SACOG typically receives several for the various transportation and transit planning functions, may be reduced or disappear altogether.

The State of California remains in a state of flux with a multi-billion dollar deficit and uncertain revenue estimates. It is anticipated the state may try (again) to take revenues that would normally pass to cities and counties to balance its own budget. Our member agencies are especially hard-pressed to balance their budgets and are looking to severe cost cutting measures including staff layoffs and decreased public services as ways to attempt to balance their budgets. Transit operators in the region are attempting to balance their budgets with fare increases and service reductions.

Federal funds flowing through the state are secure from the state budget crisis as they are segregated from other state funding sources, however, the release of those funds to SACOG can be delayed should the state budget not be approved in a timely manner. Each year SACOG faces the risk of possible cash flow problems, as a result of the state budget issues.
It continues to be SACOG’s policy to achieve a balanced budget, where revenues equal expenditures, throughout the year. As additional funding is received, projects will be assessed to determine their priority within the planning goals for the year and the availability of staff to work on the project. If funding is received and no match is available, then management may decide to postpone the related project to a future year in order to be able to preserve the limited matching funds available.

**Preparation of the Budget**

The annual budget serves as the foundation for SACOG’s financial planning and control. The budget process is a dual path, which converges into this document. One path is for the Overall Work Program and is guided by the mandates of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Federal Transit Administration (FTA), and Caltrans. In January, Caltrans releases the *OWP Guidance Handbook*, which identifies the estimated funding available for California from FHWA and FTA, each of the Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO), and Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPA) in the next fiscal year. These funds are distributed on a formula basis largely comprised of population and percentage of air quality standards. The *OWP Guidance* also contains various instructions and guidelines that must be incorporated into the OWP. Based on this guidance, SACOG will develop a draft OWP through the cooperative efforts of the SACOG project managers, management team, and finance department, which is reviewed by the Board of Directors whose comments are incorporated into the draft OWP and released for a 30-day public review. During that public review time, comments and suggestions are received from FHWA, FTA, Caltrans and other regional partners about the content of the OWP. At the end of the 30-day review period, a public meeting of the Intermodal Planning Group (IPG) is held. This group is comprised of FHWA, FTA, Caltrans and any other interested parties who review and respond to the comments received on the OWP. Based on these discussions, SACOG produces a final OWP, which is adopted by the Board.

In addition to the OWP development process, federal urban transportation planning regulations require that SACOG annually certify that its planning process is being carried out in conformance with all applicable federal requirements. This certification is executed with the adoption of the Overall Work Program and Budget authorizing resolution. In essence, the certification finding to be made by the Board of Directors is based upon five factors: (1) The agency must be officially designated as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Sacramento Region. SACOG must have an adopted (2) Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP), (3) Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) and (4) Overall Work Program (OWP), which meet the necessary federal requirements; and finally, (5) the MTP and MTIP must be found to be consistent with the regionally adopted air quality plan.

At the same time the OWP is in development, SACOG also prepares the remaining parts of the operating budget: Board of Directors and Advocacy, Capital Assets (Equipment and Furnishings), and components of the Indirect Costs. The Board reviews a draft of these budgets one month prior to final adoption and offers it for a 30-day comment period.

Once the final draft of the OWP and the non-OWP budgets have been reviewed and adopted by the Board, the SACOG operating budget is issued.
Throughout the year, the OWP is amended as new grant revenues are received or as funding is revised to address project priorities. The legal level of budgetary control is at the element level. The Executive Director has authority to revise project budgets within an element. Budgets other than the OWP are rarely revised.

The SACOG Board of Directors also sits as the Board of Directors for the Capitol Valley SAFE program, which prepares a draft budget for 30-day review and final adoption by the Board. Because Capitol Valley SAFE is a component unit of SACOG, its budget is included in the SACOG budget document under a separate section.

Revenues

The total revenue budget is $38,363,059 (not including reserve funds), which includes member dues and interest related to the Board of Directors & Advocacy Fund. The SACOG operating budget is derived primarily from Federal and State formula and program funding and discretionary grants. By far the greatest revenue stream, $28.9 million or 76% of the total revenue budget, is from Federal revenues, a great portion of which ($16.2 million) is passed through to other agencies via subrecipient agreements. While these funds are not funding SACOG activities, they must still flow through SACOG’s budget as the MPO and RTPA for the region, and SACOG may take a small administrative fee on some of them to offset staff costs for grant reporting. Also, $7,345,000 (45%) of these federal funds is designated for the SECAT engine program.

The two planning components of the federal funds, FHWA PL and FTA 5303, are Federal formulary funds passed through the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). Funds are allocated to the state and then apportioned out by Caltrans, based primarily on estimated population of the MPO in comparison to the estimated population for the MPOs throughout the state. The PL funds have an added air quality component based on the amount of programmed CMAQ funds in the SACOG region to programmed PL funds. FHWA PL funds for fiscal year 2010-11 are $2,507,004 and FTA 5303 funds are $773,919. Together they total $3,280,923 and comprise 11% of the total federal revenue and 9% of the total revenue budget.

The total state revenue budget is $5,113,781, the most discretionary of which is the Planning, Programming and Monitoring funds, budgeted for $403,500, as they do not require matching funds. These funds are allocated through the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) as four of the counties in the region; Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo and Yuba, for which SACOG acts as the Regional Transportation Planning Agency. Other state revenues are primarily for programmed projects for which SACOG has oversight authority. The largest grant is for the 511/STARNET implementation program, $2,586,924. Other state funds include the PTMISEA funds of $1,401,278 which are primarily being used for match for the Connect Card Implementation project.

Local revenues budgeted total $2,967,470, the greatest portion of which is the Transportation Development Act funds, $1,965,929 or 66% of the total. TDA funds are derived from the 1/4¢ general sales tax collected in Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo and Yuba counties, which amount to $1,692,625. Cooperative agreements with El Dorado County Transportation Commission (EDCTC) and Placer County Transportation Planning Agency (PCTPA) contribute additional funding from their respective
TDA collections. These partners contribute another $273,304. These are the funds used by SACOG as the local match for all the federal and state funding in the budget.

Capitol Valley Regional SAFE (SAFE) provides the match for certain SACOG projects related to the 511/STARNET ($335,163) and full funding for the 511 Motorist Aid project ($161,268). These programs are considered to be key functions to a SAFE program but the projects are administered by SACOG.

Remaining funding for the SACOG projects comes from discretionary grants and programmed funding for specific projects.

Capitol Valley SAFE obtains its primary revenue from the $1 per registered vehicle fee for vehicles in the SAFE district, budgeted to be $2,178,658 in Fiscal Year 2010-11. Even if car sales decline, those cars currently on the road will need to be registered annually so this revenue stream will remain relatively constant. Other revenues include interest earnings, knockdown recovery (insurance claims for call boxes that are destroyed), and reimbursements from Glenn County and Placer County for contracted costs.

**Expenditures**

The total expenditures for OWP reporting budget purposes is $39,301,692; however, that number is reduced by $396,051 (FY 08/09 Indirect Carry forward – included in the OWP number). The reason for this is that SACOG is not certain that it will recover the carry forward amount, and has elected to show a more conservative number, which has an impact on the amount needed from the reserves to balance the budget. Additional non-OWP expenditures include $399,246 for Board and Advocacy costs and $100,000 for Capital Assets (furniture, equipment, and computers).
SACOG’s salary and benefit cost funds 49 staff positions, and a few intern positions. The direct costs related to the projects within the OWP are $5,360,098; labor costs included in the indirect cost budget are $1,417,012. Other minor labor costs are included in the Board of Directors and Advocacy budget. Two of the largest components of employer benefits are for retirement and health care. Retirement costs had a small increase. SACOG is a member of the CalPERS health benefit program and the expectation is, based on preliminary information from CalPERS, the negotiated premiums are projected to show a 4% increase.

Included in the OWP direct costs are staff services and other resources to the Capitol Valley SAFE and Glenn County SAFE programs as well as for various projects on behalf of member agencies for which the costs are reimbursed by these agencies.

There are three other major components of the OWP expenditures budget, consultants, pass through to other agencies, and equipment. The consultant budget provides the services of experts and others to perform planning studies, provide technical research and analysis and reports for current SACOG projects. Since the SACOG staff is limited, outside expertise is often used for these activities and SACOG staff oversees their work. The largest budgets for consultants in FY 2010-11 are for the 511/SARTNET Capital Improvements, Connect Card Implementation, Statewide Development of Transportation-Land Use Planning Tools, MTP Planning, RUCS, and Transportation Development Act consultant budget is for the annual financial audit of the TDA claimants.

The pass-through to other agencies is primarily made up of the funding, either discretionary grants ($1.1 million) for partner agencies, or FTA funding programmed to Unitrans or Sacramento Regional Transit District ($8.9 million). Also included as pass through funding is the estimated $7.4 million to be used for the SECAT engine replacement program. While most of this funding will not be spent in fiscal year 2010-11, it must be shown in the OWP in order to track with the programmed amount.

The equipment budget for the OWP budget of $7.2 million is primarily made up of the software needed to implement the Connect Card Implementation project (formerly called the Universal Transit Fare Card program). Some of this funding will not be spent in fiscal year 2010-11, however, it must be shown in the OWP in order to track with the programmed amount. There is also $100,000 for equipment related to the SACOG operations such as computers, software, furniture and related purchases that meet the capitalized equipment policy requirements, i.e., greater than $5,000.

Indirect costs are a function of the budget for expenditures such as labor costs not specific to any particular project (administrative and financial services), office lease costs, insurance, office supplies, and memberships and legal costs. Based on the cost of labor directly charged to the projects, a percentage of the indirect costs are charged to each project. At the beginning of each fiscal year, SACOG must submit its Indirect Cost allocation plan to Caltrans for its review and approval. Caltrans will review the costs charged in the most recent audited fiscal year and the costs budgeted for this budget year and will negotiate an approved indirect cost rate. SACOG has no expectation that Caltrans will not approve the indirect cost percentage as shown in this budget.

The Board of Directors and Advocacy budget funds the activities of the Board as well as the federal and state advocacy. Member dues for fiscal year 2010-11 for SACOG's six counties and 22 cities are $0.159 per capita, which included an escalator for CPI. This year, the Board recommended another
22% reduction in these dues as a way to ease the financial pain of so many of the members. Over the years, the Board has accumulated a reserve fund (the difference between Board dues and interest earnings and the actual costs for the Board and Advocacy activities), and the reserve fund was $200,018 at June 30, 2010. The offset of the 22% dues reduction was taken from the reserve in order to fully fund the budget. The funding, membership dues computation, and reserves balances are revisited annually.

Capitol Valley SAFE’s budget focuses on the maintenance and operation of the freeway call boxes. While there are still 1,245 call boxes in the region, and sometime in the future it expected that they will be phased out in favor of the 511 Roadside Assistance Program via the 511 regional system, largely due to the increasing number of cell phone users. During this fiscal year, SAFE will monitor the activities of the Freeway Service Patrol in conjunction with Sacramento Transportation Authority, manage the contracts for the call center operations, California Highway Patrol, and the assisting consultant. A large part of the SAFE budget is passing funding to SACOG for the 511/STARNET capital improvement program and for operation of the 511 system.

Reserves

During fiscal year 2006-07, the SACOG Board of Directors adopted a policy that established the criteria under which SACOG would establish reserves and contingencies. Included in this policy was formalizing the already established reserves for legal defense and operating cash. In addition, the Board established policies on the use of any excess dues needed to support the current year Board of Directors and Advocacy Budget and unused budgeted amounts for capital equipment. Also during fiscal year 2006-07, the Board of Directors designated the funds in the SACOG Financing Corporation, for the estimated unfunded liability of the post retirement health plan. While not yet being transferred into the Post Health Retirement Account, the Board, at that time and up until June 30, 2010, had no immediate plans for the use of those funds. SACOG is now anticipating using some of these funds to help balance its 2010-11 budget, if planned revenues do not come in.

As of June 30, 2010 SACOG anticipates that it will have approximately $6 million in reserves, currently placed by the Board in a building fund titled the SACOG Financing Corporation Special Revenue Fund with $4 million, and approximately $2 million in the SACOG Planning and Administration Fund that is comprised of legal reserves ($500,000) and Operating reserve of $1.5 million. Together these reserves represent between eight to nine months of operating reserve for core costs.

It should be noted that if SACOG should need to draw down the reserves by the full $1 million in 2010-11, it would still have over six months of operation reserves. Projecting this forward, our current revenue forecast through FY 2012-13, includes a worst case scenario that involves using $500,000 in reserves in both FY 2011-12 and 2012-13. Even if this were to occur, staff estimates that SACOG would still have approximately five months of operating reserves on June 30, 2013.

The Board established policies on the use of any excess dues needed to support the current year Board of Directors and Advocacy budget. In response to member requests from last year, SACOG utilized a portion of the Board and Advocacy reserve to cover the 20% reduction in membership dues as a way to ease the financial pain of so many of the members.
dues. In order to keep the 2010-11 membership dues the same as last year, the Board will take the same action, which means spending $50,000 from the Board and Advocacy reserves to fund a 22% reduction for fiscal year 2010-11. SACOG is projecting that the Board and Advocacy reserves will be approximately $150,000 at June 30, 2011.

Conclusion

This year’s budget is balanced using reserve funds. Throughout the fiscal year continued diligence will need to be maintained such that it remains balanced, however, the management staff and employees are committed to maintaining the financial health of SACOG. SACOG is committed to providing the highest quality level of service to our member jurisdictions as well as our federal, state and local transportation partners, and to ensuring that the principles of the MTP2035, the regional Blueprint, and RUCS are carried out in a fashion that will ensure the region remains one worthy of envy for its quality of life, economic stability, and viable, smart transportation.

The preparation of this report could not be accomplished without the efficient and dedicated services of the entire staff of the Finance Department and Communications and Administrative staff. Their dedication to professional excellence is reflected in this report. We would like to commend SACOG’s Board of Directors for their interest in and support of this substantial effort, as well a shared commitment to assuring financial viability of SACOG which remains progressively committed to meeting the transportation planning needs of the region.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike McKeever
Executive Director

David Ghiorso
Acting Finance Manager
SACOG Organization

Originally formed in 1965, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) is a joint powers authority of city and county governments, organized "... to provide a forum for the discussion and study of area wide problems of mutual interest and concern to the cities and counties, and to facilitate the development of policies and action recommendations for the solution of such problems."¹ SACOG serves six counties and twenty-two cities, comprising a 6,190 square mile area with an estimated population of 2,300,000. Member agencies are El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba counties; the cities of Auburn, Citrus Heights, Colfax, Davis, Elk Grove, Folsom, Galt, Isleton, Lincoln, Live Oak, Marysville, Placerville, Rancho Cordova, Rocklin, Roseville, Sacramento, West Sacramento, Wheatland, Winters, Woodland, Yuba City; and the town of Loomis.

SACOG is governed by a thirty-two member Board of Directors (thirty-one voting and one non-voting). Voting members are appointed by member jurisdictions. The one non-voting member is the Caltrans District 3 Director. The organization’s mission statement is: **Provide leadership and a dynamic, collaborative public forum for achieving an efficient regional transportation system, innovative and integrated regional planning, and a high quality of life within the greater Sacramento region.**

Under SACOG’s Joint Powers Agreement (JPA), each member city (excluding the City of Sacramento) and each member county (excluding Sacramento County) are entitled to one seat and one vote on the SACOG Board. The City of Sacramento may appoint two directors and is entitled to two votes. Sacramento County may appoint three directors and is entitled to three votes. In addition, jurisdictions may appoint an alternate who shall have full voting rights in the absence of the jurisdiction’s appointed director.

SACOG’s various designations and certifications include:

**Designations as:**

- Regional Transportation Planning Agency for Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba counties by the California State Secretary of Business, Transportation and Housing Agency.
- Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) by the Governor and the U.S. Department of Transportation for the Sacramento, Yuba City, and Davis Urbanized Areas.
- Metropolitan Planning Organization in the Sacramento Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA) by the California State Secretary of Business, Transportation and Housing Agency.
- Airport Land Use Commission for Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo and Yuba counties.
- Service Authority for Freeway and Expressways for Sacramento, San Joaquin, Yolo, Yuba, Sutter, and El Dorado counties.
- Area Wide Clearinghouse for the counties of Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba and the cities of Lincoln, Rocklin, and Roseville by the State of California Procedures of Intergovernmental Review of Federal Financial Assistance and Direct Development Activities.

**Joint Certification as:**

- Sacramento Area Metropolitan Planning Process by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA).

SACOG is the designated Airport Land Use Commission and Regional Transportation Planning Agency for Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba Counties and the Metropolitan Planning Organization for the federally-designated ozone nonattainment area in Sacramento, Yolo, El Dorado, Placer Counties, and the Sutter Buttes. SACOG also staffs the Capitol Valley Service Authority for Freeways and Expressways (SAFE).

**Board of Directors’ Committees**

Annually, the Board Chair appoints committees from among the Board's members to make policy recommendations to the Board. Each Board member serves on at least one committee. The current committees are:

- **Climate & Air Quality Committee:** Eight members appointed to consider climate and air quality issues and the SECAT program. (Meets monthly or as needed)

- **Government Relations & Public Affairs Committee:** Eleven members appointed to consider state and federal advocacy, news media outreach, and other activities related to external affairs and administrative activities such as human resources, audits, the budget, and the Overall Work Program. (Meets monthly or as needed)
Land Use & Housing: Ten members appointed to review topics related to the Blueprint implementation, Airport Land Use, Housing Needs Allocation, and Open Space. (Meets monthly or as needed)

Transportation Committee: Eleven members appointed from the SACOG Board and the Caltrans District 3 Director to review all items relating to transportation issues with MTP, MTIP, and SIP as well as the SAFE program. (Meets monthly or as needed)

Strategic Planning Committee: Eleven members, comprised of the SACOG Chair, Vice Chair, prior year’s Chair and the Chairs and Vice Chairs of the other four committees, to review the JPA, Board representation, and long-term vision planning. This committee also acts a liaison to the regional legislative delegation. (Meets as needed)

Institutional Relationships

SACOG’s planning process includes many regional planning partners, including the tribal governments and other regional stakeholders. In addition to its member agencies, SACOG has a cooperative agreement with the Placer County Transportation Planning Agency and the El Dorado...
County Transportation Commission that spells out the planning and programming relationships between the agencies. SACOG’s jurisdiction as the federal Metropolitan Planning Organization includes large portions of Placer and El Dorado counties, but under state law, they operate as separate regional transportation planning and programming agencies (RTPAs). Furthermore, SACOG is a close working partner of the transit agencies and has an annual agreement with the Sacramento Regional Transit District to identify joint planning projects. Cooperation in the programming process relies on the efforts of the staff and Board of the county transportation agencies in setting county-wide priorities for SAFETEA-LU and STIP funding.

**Interagency and Community Consultations/Outreach**

**Advisory Committees**

The Board has established a number of advisory committees as a means of obtaining advice from citizens, key interest groups in the community, and partner planning agencies on a variety of subjects. SACOG seeks advice from local agencies on transportation and land use plan content and investment decisions. SACOG works not only with the agency staff, but with governing boards, technical committees, and advisory committees. These advisory committees typically include representatives of citizens’ advocacy groups, the private sector, major colleges and universities, transportation management professionals, and private citizens unaffiliated with any of the above groups. Committees are augmented, restructured, added to, or discharged from time to time based upon the issues and concerns faced by the Board. Currently these committees are:

*Airport Advisory Committee:* A fifteen-member committee composed of managers of the public use airports located within SACOG’s Regional Transportation Planning Agency boundary, as well as representatives from Beale Air Force Base. The Committee provides recommendations to the SACOG Board of Directors regarding the Regional Aviation Capital Improvement Plan, prepared biennially, and advises SACOG staff and the SACOG Board on aviation issues of regional concern. (Meets on call)

*Bikeway and Pedestrian Committee:* A committee of about 80 members made up of representatives from local bicycle advocacy groups as well as local government and nonprofit groups involved in bikeway planning. The committee advises SACOG on the non-motorized content of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan and on priorities for non-motorized projects. (Meets quarterly)

*5310 Regional Evaluation Committee:* The role of the Committee is to objectively review and score local project applications for the FTA Section 5310 Capital Grant Program. The program provides funds on a statewide competitive basis for the purchase of equipment to transport elderly and disabled persons. Eligible applicants are private, nonprofit organizations and public bodies that coordinate transportation service. The established scoring criteria are project need, project effectiveness, ability of the applicant, and service coordination efforts. (Meets annually)

*Goods Movement Advisory Group:* The movement of goods or freight has always been one of the most important functions of the transportation system and is certainly of vital importance to the health of the economy and to ensuring a high quality of life. SACOG works with the region’s jurisdictions as well as other state and local agencies and the private sector through its Goods Movement Advisory...
Group (GMAG) to make certain that planning for goods movement is incorporated into the overall transportation planning process. SACOG looks to build on the work of the recently completed Regional Goods Movement Study to identify specific projects and areas of study to evaluate further. The GMAG serves as both an advisory committee for these activities as well as a regional forum for goods movement issues. (Meets quarterly and as needed)

Planners Committee: A twenty-eight-member committee consisting of the planning directors or their designees of each of SACOG’s member jurisdictions. The committee was originally formed to advise SACOG on the development of the Blueprint Project and is now advising on Blueprint implementation and the Regional Housing Needs Allocation process. (Meets on call)

Public Participation Committee: A committee made up of members of organizations required under SAFETEA-LU and includes representatives of the disabled, pedestrian walkways, bicycle transportation, public agencies, transit operators, goods movement, private providers of transportation, and other interested parties.

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

SACMET Travel Demand Model Technical Advisory Committee (TAC): The SACMET TAC is composed of planning and engineering professionals from local public agencies, as well as consultants and others who are registered users of the SACMET travel demand model. The TAC
has two roles: One is to provide SACMET users with training and technical support on the model; the other is to provide a forum for discussion of issues related to SACMET. Proposed SACMET changes and improvements, and the results of changes and improvements made, are presented for information and discussion. Modeling issues of a more general nature, but germane to SACMET or the Sacramento region, are also discussed. The SACMET TAC meets two or three times per year, on an as-needed basis. SACMET TAC mailings go to about 50 people.

Sacramento Emergency Clean Air and Transportation (SECAT) Air Quality Policy Group: A ten-member committee consisting of representatives from each of the air districts within the Sacramento federal ozone nonattainment area, Federal Highway Administration, Environmental Protection Agency, Air Resources Board, and SACOG. The committee assists SACOG and its air quality planning partners in developing a strategy or strategies that focus available resources on achieving both attainment of the National Ambient Air Quality Standard for ozone and conformity goals. (Meets on call)

Sacramento Emergency Clean Air and Transportation (SECAT) Technical Advisory Committee: An eleven-member committee consisting of representatives from each of the air districts within the Sacramento federal ozone nonattainment area, Federal Highway Administration, Environmental Protection Agency, Air Resources Board, Caltrans, and SACOG. The committee advises the SECAT Policy Group on guidelines and criteria for evaluating and approving projects under the SECAT program. (Meets on call)

Social Service Transportation Advisory Council: Three councils have been established – one each for Sacramento and Yolo counties, and a joint Sutter-Yuba county council. Each council is composed of potential transit users who are elderly, handicapped, low-income or general public; representatives of agencies that provide social services or transportation for seniors, handicapped, and low-income persons; representatives from the local Consolidated Transportation Services Agency; and a representative of a transit operator. Each council participates in the identification of transit needs in the county(ies) it serves; makes recommendations regarding unmet transit needs; and advises the Board on other major transportation issues, including the coordination and consolidation of specialized transportation services. These councils are required by state law. (Meets on call)

Transit Coordinating Committee: The Committee provides a forum for the discussion of transit plans and issues, coordinates transit studies and systems on a regional basis, disseminates federal, state and local transit information, reviews and comments on the MTP and the MTIP, and gives input into SACOG’s Overall Work Program. (Meets at least quarterly)

Transportation Demand Management Task Force: The Task Force advises the SACOG Board of Directors on the operations and marketing of the Rideshare Program and on the demand management content of the MTP.
Ad Hoc Committees

Occasionally, projects of great significance warrant the formation of committees of stakeholders or special groups. In these circumstances, the Board has appointed special committees to assist in guiding efforts on these projects. Currently the following are active Ad Hoc Committees:

*ADA Compliance Committee:* A five-member committee composed of an elected official and representatives from the following sectors: disabled, business or non-profit, education, and health/medical. The Committee reviews unresolved ADA-related complaints, requests or suggestions from disabled persons regarding access to and participation in public facilities, services, activities, and functions of SACOG.

*Community Design Grant Review Committee:* A committee made up of members from many of SACOG’s advisory committees, such as the Transit Coordinating Committee, Regional Planning Partnership, Transportation Demand Management Task Force, etc., who review the grant applications for the Community Design Grant Program.

*Sacramento Region Intelligent Transportation Systems Partnership:* A forum for technical staff to share information, coordinate on project planning and implementation, and provide advice and input to SACOG on ITS funding advocacy efforts.
SACOG Participation in Other Public/Private Efforts in Regional Planning-Related Issues

Cooperation and coordination in transportation and air quality issues with other agencies or groups is obtained through participation in the following activities and organizations:

**Liaison to Local Transportation Planning Agencies:** SACOG maintains liaisons with each city and county and with other transportation agencies throughout the region to help coordinate transportation planning and programming and to facilitate information exchange. In some cases, SACOG liaisons serve on both the technical and advisory committees. SACOG maintains liaisons with the following:

- Air Districts - 5 Districts within the Sacramento Air Quality Planning Area
- Caltrans District 3
- El Dorado County Transportation Commission (EDCTC) as the RTPA for El Dorado County
- Native American Tribal Governments
- Paratransit, Inc.
- Placer County Transportation Planning Agency (PCTPA) as the RTPA for Placer County
- Sacramento Regional Transit District (SRTD)
- Sacramento Transportation Authority (STA)
- Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA)
- Transit Operators – 14 regional operators
- Transportation Management Associations (TMAs)
- Yolo County Transportation Advisory Committee
- Yolo County Transportation District (YCTD)

**California Federal Programming Group:** The purpose of this group is to facilitate integration, improvement, and maintenance of state and local databases used in transportation programming and discussion of federal programming issues. The group’s membership includes representatives from Caltrans and several MPOs across the state. (Meets as needed)

**California Service Authority for Freeways and Expressways (SAFE) Committee:** SACOG serves on the California SAFE Committee for the counties of Sacramento, Glenn, El Dorado, Sutter, Yuba, Yolo, and San Joaquin. The committee is composed of SAFE project managers from all SAFE counties, Caltrans and the California Highway Patrol. The committee meets approximately every other month to discuss statewide and local call box program issues.

**Caltrans Regional Coordination Committee:** Caltrans and regional agency representatives meet bimonthly to discuss issues of mutual interest and to forge partnerships for common benefit on state and federal legislation and regulatory matters. SACOG management participates regularly in these meetings.

**Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Authority (CCJPA):** SACOG continues to be very active in the work of the CCJPA that administers the Auburn-Sacramento-Oakland-San Jose (Capitol Corridor) rail service. SACOG is a member of the Staff Coordinating Group (SCG) formed to advise the CCJPA Board on the Capitol service and staff regularly attends both the SCG and Board meetings.
Central Valley Rail Committee: The counties of Sacramento, San Joaquin, and Stanislaus formed a committee to coordinate rail planning activities in their jurisdictions. This committee meets in Stockton; SACOG attends the meetings as appropriate.

Cleaner Air Partnership: The Cleaner Air Partnership was formed in 1986 as a joint project of the American Lung Association of Sacramento-Emigrant Trails and the Sacramento Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce. It is a private/public regional coalition working to solve the ozone problem in the Sacramento metropolitan area by reducing transportation-related emissions. The objectives are to attain air standards for health and economic growth and to avoid business disincentives that occur when an area is unable to achieve clean air standards. The Partnership has achieved a community consensus for new air quality programs, resulting in shifts of opinion and travel behavior; participation by business in clean air programs; innovative public education programs; and the highest per capita participation in clean alternative fuels and vehicles in the nation.

Green Valley Alliance: SACOG has participated in a public-private effort to preserve open space, including agricultural land, in the Sacramento region. Known as the Green Valley Initiative, this effort emerged from the Regional Economic Cluster Project convened by several public and private organizations and is now a joint project of the Regional Action Partnership and Valley Vision. Staff has contributed land use data and growth forecasts to the project and provided some assistance in meeting logistics, writing, and editing.

Public Works Directors Committee. The Committee provides a forum for the discussion of transportation (roads and highways/freeways) plans and issues, coordinates transportation studies and systems on a regional basis, disseminates federal, state and local transportation information, reviews and comments on the MTP and the MTIP, and gives input into SACOG’s Overall Work Program. (Meets quarterly)

Regional Managers Forum: A twenty-seven member committee composed of county executives and city managers. Advises SACOG on a wide range of administrative issues including program, relationships with members, and administration of state and federal programs. (Meets quarterly)

Regional Transportation Planning Agencies Group: Membership composed of state-designated regional transportation planning agencies (RTPAs). The group meets in conjunction with the California Transportation Commission (CTC) and coordinates the regional agencies’ responses to the development and implementation of state transportation policy.

Rural Counties Task Force: The task force consists of representatives from rural counties who meet to discuss transportation issues affecting rural areas and to provide input to California Transportation Commission (CTC) deliberations of rural issues.

Sacramento-Placerville Transportation Corridor Joint Powers Authority: The SACOG Executive Director participates as an ex-officio member of the JPA. The JPA was created to coordinate the efforts of Sacramento County, Sacramento Regional Transit District, the City of Folsom, and El Dorado County in the acquisition, use, and preservation of the railroad right-of-way between the cities of Sacramento, Folsom, and Placerville.

San Joaquin Valley Rail Committee: SACOG participates in the work of the San Joaquin Valley Rail Committee as appropriate. While the agency does not participate as actively in the San Joaquin Valley Rail
Committee’s activities as it does in the Capitol Corridor and Regional Rail efforts, SACOG understands the value of the San Joaquin service to the region and fully supports Caltrans’ efforts to build ridership and revenues on this important line. SACOG attends these meetings when feasible.

Valley Vision: The goal of Valley Vision is to help the region develop in a manner that creates business opportunities, benefits public health and safety, and preserves and enhances our environment and our way of life. Valley Vision serves as a catalyst to energize and help citizens in the Region to reach consensus on a bold vision for our future. Since formulating a vision begins with knowledge, they conduct research on the critical problems confronting the region and serve as a clearinghouse for data and information that support regional efforts. Valley Vision has supported the Blueprint and MTP 2035 projects by recruiting a broad diversity of participation in public workshops.

Public Involvement

Consultation and public participation during the development of transportation plans, programs, and projects is an integral part of the transportation planning process. An open and accessible consultation and public participation process is critical for discussing and resolving regional transportation issues. SACOG has an adopted Community Input Plan that outlines specific procedures for consultation and public participation. This document includes evaluation procedures that measure the effectiveness of SACOG’s outreach and involvement efforts and ensures there is adequate effort made to include the
traditionally under-served and under-represented in the planning process, including coordination and consultation with Native American Tribal Governments.

SACOG uses a mix of committees, public hearings, workshops, surveys, and publications to inform, gauge, and respond to public concerns regarding regional issues. The direct involvement of citizens and organizations that represent specific segments of the population is encouraged to ensure that plans and programs reflect the diverse interests within the region. SACOG allows for public participation at all levels of the planning process. All committee and Board of Directors meetings are open to the public. SACOG also schedules public hearings during the development of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program, Overall Work Program, unmet transit needs process, and air quality conformity process, to allow for public review and comments. All public hearings are noticed in advance in local media. The SACOG Board of Directors also provides for public comment on all items requesting action included in the monthly board agenda, regardless of whether or not a public hearing is required by law. All meeting agendas are posted to the SACOG website and are available for public review and comment.

Additionally, SACOG communicates with citizens and groups through the local media, agency publications, and special presentations and workshops. Newsletters, report summaries, and news releases are used to present technical and policy issues in plain terms to a broad audience. Staff members make presentations on specific issues to local community, civic, and business groups. Additional information on individual topics and copies of full reports are made available on request through the agency’s Regional Information Center, or via the Internet at the SACOG home page at www.sacog.org. SACOG also uses its website for public access to the times and places for citizen involvement in the various projects and issues throughout the SACOG region.

**Federal Certification Process**

Federal urban transportation planning regulations require that SACOG annually certify that its planning process is being carried out in conformance with all applicable federal requirements. This certification is executed with the adoption of the Overall Work Program and Budget and authorizing resolution. In essence, the certification finding to be made by the Board of Directors is based upon five factors: (1) The agency must be officially designated as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Sacramento Region. SACOG must have an adopted (2) Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP), (3) Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) and (4) Overall Work Program (OWP), which meet the necessary federal requirements; and finally, (5) the MTP and MTIP must be found to be consistent with the regionally adopted air quality plan.

As the basis for determining the adequacy of compliance, SACOG provides Caltrans, and maintains on file, copies of the appropriate documents and endorsements. Annually, as a part of the OWP adoption process, the Board makes the required certification finding, which is transmitted to Caltrans and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). Caltrans notifies SACOG if there are any deficiencies in the planning process, which could result in conditional certification. In such a case, the corrective actions and the date by which they must be taken are specified in an agreement between SACOG and Caltrans.

In addition to the annual certification, a triennial review is conducted by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) to jointly review SACOG’s transportation planning process and ensure that the agency’s planning activities are conducted in accordance with FHWA and FTA regulations, policies, procedures, and guidance, including the
provisions of *Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991* (ISTEA) and the *Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users* (SAFETEA-LU). SACOG underwent a triennial review in the summer of 2006 and received notice that the certification had been renewed. The next review is scheduled for October 2010.
Description of the SACOG Region

The Sacramento Region's six contiguous counties—El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo and Yuba—encompass more than 6,500 square miles of beautifully diverse California landscapes. There are Capitol promenades and world-class research universities, Central Valley farms, and relatively affordable housing—all within easy reach of Lake Tahoe, the Sierra foothills, the San Joaquin delta, and the San Francisco Bay.

It's easy to see why our region's population swelled by a third to 2.3 million people by 2009. While 81 percent of the region's residents rated their city or community an "excellent" or "good" place to live in a 2004 poll, they also cited increasing concerns about growth and its impacts on traffic, agriculture and the environment.

The Economy

- The Sacramento Region's declining job growth pattern has persisted, falling in line with the statewide average but below the national average and most other regions in the state.
- Federal, state and local governments are the largest employers and provide more than a quarter of our jobs - roughly a third higher than the statewide average. However, the shedding of state government jobs, as well as the impact of the State worker furlough implementation throughout the State have hit the Sacramento region particularly hard. The second-largest employers remain the The University of California, Davis and its medical center.
The Education & Health Services sector continues its long-term pattern of annual job gains while nearly all other major sectors shed jobs between June 2008-June 2009.

In 2008 Sacramento had the 32nd largest economy in the nation, and the sixth-best in California.

The Social Landscape

- *Time Magazine* named Sacramento the nation's "Most Diverse City" in 2002, based on an analysis in partnership with Harvard University.
- The Sacramento region is the 10th best mid-size metro region for college in the nation.
- Roughly 18 percent of our public-school students are English Language Learners, and they speak more than 54 languages.
- Fifty-seven percent of our school-aged children are enrolled in free or reduced-price meal programs at their schools—a partial measure of poverty—compared to 53 percent statewide.
- The overall number of higher-education degrees awarded to students increased by 15 percent between 2003 and 2007.
- Sixty-six percent of households in the Sacramento Region could afford to buy a median-priced home in April 2009 - better than the state rate of 50 percent.

The Environment

- Sacramento was ranked 7th “Smarter City” by the Natural Resources Defense Council in 2009.
- More than 12,600 acres of the SACOG region’s agricultural lands were converted to urban and built-up uses between 2000 and 2002.
- Roughly 61,000 acres in the region are protected for wildlife and/or recreation by land conservancies and trusts.
- Our residents drive an average of 26 miles every day, more than the residents of Los Angeles and Orange counties. Growth in miles traveled is increasing faster than the population.
- Census data show that 1.8% of commute trips in the Sacramento area are made by bicycle. This is the highest in the nation.
- The American Lung Association has rated the Sacramento region as the seventh worst in the nation for ozone air pollution and eighth-worst for small, lung-damaging particles, based on federal data. Seventy percent of our ozone is produced by cars, trucks and other mobile sources.
- An estimated one in six children in the region has been diagnosed with asthma.
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SACOG Budget FY 2010-11
Team Director: Gordon Garry, Director of Research & Analysis

**Model Operations Team** – SACOG is responsible for developing and maintaining tools for forecasting or projecting future demand and utilization of the region’s transportation system. The key forecasting tool is SACSIM, the regional travel demand forecasting model. This team is responsible for assembling from various sources forecasted land use, demographic, and transportation system data, as well as forecasts or projections of key exogenous factors which affect future conditions (e.g., fuel prices, etc.). Updates to modeling datasets tools are also the responsibility of this team.

**Transportation Monitoring Team** – SACOG collects, assembles, integrates and publishes data and information related to demand for and utilization of the region’s transportation system. The data and information are used directly by SACOG to track changes in demand and use of the system, validation of SACOG travel demand forecasting models, and to assist in framing discussion of transportation issues in its advisory committees. Starting in 2010, this team publishes a compilation of transportation monitoring data.

**Transportation & I-PLACE’S Development Team** – The Transportation and I-PLACE’S Development team creates new tools and updates existing tools to measure the efficiency of land use and transportation, and the interaction between the two. SACOG uses these tools internally to analyze the impacts land use has on travel behavior, local and regional economics, and climate change. The team also works with partner agencies and member jurisdictions in the use of the tools, collection and input of data, and analysis of outputs.

**Data Services/GIS/Monitoring Team** – This team of research analysts collects current information on housing, employment and demographic characteristics in our six county region. The team works with information from California Department of Finance and U.S. Census Bureau to reconcile information developed by these agencies with the information detailed information collected in our monitoring efforts. Much of the information is managed through relationships with our member and partner agency Geographic Information Systems (GIS) programs.

**Information Technology Team** – The Information Technology team is responsible for supporting SACOG staff computers and printers to ensure they have the IT tools and training necessary to complete their jobs; setup, configuration, maintenance and analysis of the SACOG network to keep data readily available to staff; maintenance and repair of computer equipment and printers; maintenance of a valid and functional data backup and archival system; maintenance and management of SACOG's Internet and e-mail systems; maintenance of a safe and secure network system and management of SACOG’s phone system.

**Clerical Team** – The clerical team is responsible for management of the front desk reception duties, document reproduction, document archiving, contract administration, shipping and receiving, travel arrangements, petty cash management, vehicle maintenance, supply requisitions and general secretarial tasks.
Team Descriptions (Continued)

Fiscal Year 2010-11

Team Director: Matt Carpenter, Director of Transportation Services

**Metropolitan Transportation Plan Team** – The MTP team is responsible for updating the plan to meet federal and new state requirements, including state Senate Bill 375. The update process includes development of transportation and land use planning scenarios as part of SB 375 implementation, public and stakeholder outreach on the plan, informing the California Air Resources Board on the SB 375 greenhouse gas emissions reduction target-setting process. As part of the current MTP update, staff will develop a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) and/or Alternative Planning Scenario (APS) for the MTP. A program-level Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the MTP and SCS/APS will be developed as well.

**Programming & Project Delivery Plan Team** – The Programming and Project Delivery Team is responsible for ensuring that the federal and state funds that the SACOG region receives are spent in a timely and appropriate manner. The team actively tracks project delivery and assists project sponsors with any issues that might arise in the delivery of a project. The team has a long history of working with our project sponsors and regions across the state to ensure that SACOG delivers more than our state obligatory authority every year.

**Transit Team** – The SACOG Transit Team provides planning and programming support and a forum for coordination among the region’s transit operators as part of the Transit Coordinating Committee. The Transit Team administers funding, annual apportionments and all other requirements of the Transportation Development Act (TDA). Additionally, the SACOG Transit Team administers various state and federal grant programs and all other requirements of those grant programs while working closely with Caltrans as well as the FTA.

**Intelligent Transportation Team** – The Intelligent Transportation Systems Team (ITS Team) provides expertise to partner agencies and provides a forum for sharing of best practices and lessons learned. Through the application of ITS investments, coordination between the various transportation divisions within the partner agencies the ITS Team has facilitated improved traffic flow, reduced air pollution and continue to improve the data which can be fed into our traveler information system.

**Goods Movement Team** – The Goods Movement Team supports the planning activities in the region as they relate to commercial goods movement. The primary focus is the coordination of truck routes between the individual agencies involved in designating routes. Similarly a planning study has been funded for SACOG in conjunction with the San Joaquin COG to assist in interregional alignment of truck routes. Most of the technical work will be focused in the 2011/12 budget year on this project. The Goods Movement team will be coordinating with representatives from the goods movement industry, transportation agencies and law enforcement as we move forward in our planning activities.

**SAFE/Callbox Team** – The Service Authority for Freeways and Expressways (SAFE) program is responsible for budgeting and oversight of the SAFE program. Through the use of SAFE funds the team is working to improve the safety of motorists through rapid assistance in the event of an incident. The key components of this program include the Freeway Service Patrol (FSP) and the roadside Call Box system. Both of these systems target the safety of the general public when they find themselves disabled and in need of assistance along a major highway. The Team is actively developing and deploying a cellular...
phone base system with the same capabilities as the roadside Call box program, but allowing for public access via the 511 traveler information telephone system.

**Passenger Rail Team** – SACOG’s rail planning currently involves participation in the following groups: 1) the Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Authority (CCJPA) Staff Coordinating Group (SCG)—a group of transportation agencies staffs along the 165-mile Capitol Corridor, from Auburn to San Jose, charged with advising the CCJPA Board on management and operation of the rail service; 2) the California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA), responsible for the planning and implementation of the proposed California High Speed Rail system; 3) Central Valley Regional Rail Group and the Altamont Corridor Partnership Working Group—both groups working in consonant with the CHSRA in planning the high speed rail and regional rail services in their respective corridors; and 4) Caltran’s Central Valley Rail Committee, a group that advises Caltrans on the San Joaquin’s service and rail planning generally in the Central Valley corridor.

**Bicycle/Pedestrian Team** – The Bicycle/Pedestrian Team makes its expertise available to partner organizations and groups throughout the region to support their bicycle and pedestrian planning efforts. Within this role, the Team maintains the Regional Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Trails Master Plan and facilitates the SACOG Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee, which is comprised of 80 members throughout the region and functions as an advisory committee to the SACOG Board of Directors on the non-motorized issues. The Team also participates in the planning and coordination of the Sacramento May is Bike Month campaign. Additionally, the Team manages the Regional Bicycle & Pedestrian Funding Program, which provides millions in bike/pedestrian funding in Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba Counties. The Team also handles information requests and participates in a variety of projects related to bicycle/pedestrian issues.

**Team Director: Rebecca Sloan, Director of External Affairs & Member Services**

**Blueprint Implementation Team** – This team supports local jurisdictions and partner agencies in local Blueprint implementation, including: model, analyze and comment on local plan updates and projects at the request of local jurisdictions; coordinate commenting and monitoring of projects with partner agencies (air districts and transit districts); provide technical assistance in the form of modeling, data, analysis, or tools software training for local planning updates related to Blueprint implementation; provide competitive grant opportunities when funds are available for Blueprint-supportive projects; maintain and update regional land use database of local plan. This team also develops land use forecast for MTP update and Regional Housing Needs Allocation and provides information and support to other internal SACOG teams that interface with local land use and Blueprint issues.

**Rural-Urban Connections Team** – The RUCS team is focused on studying the challenges and opportunities for rural economic viability and environmental sustainability. They assemble data and information on rural land use and conservation, infrastructure, economic opportunities, forestry, and regulations. Data are used for analytical reports, particularly from models that evaluate changes in rural areas that improve or hinder regional and local goal and objectives for economic and environmental sustainability. The team regularly works with stakeholders to gather feedback on the project and address needs in communities throughout the region. The team also works with the SACOG board to determine areas where the agencies should focus ongoing efforts.
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**Housing Team** – The SACOG Housing Team provides assistance to local governments in determining future housing needs projections and meeting the requirements of the California Housing Element Law. The team also evaluates and provides guidance on development projects that are attempting to include smart growth elements and/or affordable housing. The team is comprised of land use planners with backgrounds in modeling, urban design review and program management.

**Airport Land Use Commission Team** – The Airport Land Use Commission Team provides technical airport compatibility reviews for development projects near public use and publicly-owned airports, per the California Aeronautics Law. The team also develops updates to the state-mandated Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans for each public airport.

**511 Traveler Information Team** – The 511 Traveler Information Team is working to improve the safety of motorists through rapid assistance in the event of an incident. The key components of this program include the Freeway Service Patrol (FSP) and the roadside Call Box system. Both of these systems target the safety of the general public when they find themselves disabled and in need of assistance along a major highway. The Team is actively developing and deploying a cellular phone base system with the same capabilities as the roadside Call box program, but allowing for public access via the 511 traveler information telephone system. The 511 Traveler Information deployments continue to evolve in the region with the implementation of the STARNET project. The STARNET project is allowing for real-time information on the status of transit, arterial, and highway information to be integrated into the 511 telephone. It is anticipated that this effort will assist in demonstrating the accessibility and feasibility that alternative modes of transportation provide.

**Transportation Demand Management Team** – The Transportation Demand Management Team supports SACOG’s Rideshare program by designing and implementing tools, materials and outreach campaigns to promote alternative transportation modes. This includes the Sacregioncommuterclub.org, mayisbikemonth.com and sacregion511.org websites and the materials and campaigns that promote them. The team also coordinates the Regional Rideshare Partnership and SACOG's TDM Task Force.

**Communications Team** – This team is responsible for updating and improving SACOG Web sites; coordinating media and public information; planning and executing public meetings, workshops, and special events; managing the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) education and outreach programs; and building and maintaining collaborative and productive relations with SACOG Board Members, member agencies, and the public at large.

**Team Manager: David Ghiorso, Acting Finance Manager**

**Overall Work Program (OWP) Team** – The Overall Work Program Team is comprised of finance staff, directors and department liaisons and is responsible for compiling and coordinating projects for the OWP each fiscal year. The team produces amendments to the OWP throughout the year to incorporate new projects or make adjustments to existing projects. The team also submits quarterly reports to the California Department of Transportation for each project regarding the progress of work. This team works in conjunction with the Finance & Budget Team to determine the availability of funding for projects.
**Finance & Budget Team** – The Finance & Budget team prepares the annual Budget including the OWP and the annual SACOG financial statements. The team is responsible for coordinating and overseeing the annual financial and TDA audits, for interfacing with auditors and outside agencies, for processing accurate paychecks, on time and in compliance with applicable laws and regulations. The team processes timely and accurate payments for vendors, consultants, and employee expenses, including 1099’s. The team prepares revenue billings and the state controllers report. The team also distributes financial reports and budget information to internal staff and Executive Management and provides budget guidance with regard to the OWP, indirect costs and overhead rates.

**Team Manager:** Rochelle Tilton, Clerk of the Board/HR Specialist

**Human Resources Team** – The Human Resources Team is responsible for managing the recruitment process for new employees, providing new employee orientation and providing training to staff and managers. The team works in conjunction with the Benefits Implementation Team to provide information on employee benefits to staff.

**Board & Executive Director Support Team** – The Board and Executive Director Support Team is responsible for providing assistance to the Board of Directors and the Executive Director, which includes scheduling monthly board meetings, taking minutes at the meetings, arranging travel; overseeing the production of monthly board agenda packets; maintaining and filing Fair Political Practice Commission forms; and providing general administrative support.

**Facilities Team** – The facilities team is responsible for serving as a liaison between the building management company and staff, as well as coordinating services and maintenance of the office space.

**Benefits Implementation Team** – The Benefits Implementation Team oversees the management of employee benefits, including providing enrollment information and changes in benefits to staff. The team also researches new benefits for implementation and cost savings. The team works in conjunction with the Human Resources team.
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The Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) plays a unique role in the greater Sacramento area. It was formed as a regional planning commission in 1965 and became a joint powers authority of city and county governments in 1980 to "...to provide a forum for the discussion and study of area wide problems of mutual interest and concern to the cities and counties, and to facilitate the development of policies and action recommendations for the solution of such problems." 1 As a result, it serves as an integrator of city, county and other stakeholder interests in the region; a focus for the resolution of common issues facing the region. Its fundamental core mission is regional transportation planning and serving as the region’s Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), which under Federal Law develop and implement regional transportation plans in partnership with local governments. Most of SACOG’s funding sources are related to this transportation mission. Over the years, its members have expanded its role to address a range of environmental and land use issues requiring consensus building intended to improve the quality of life in the region. A major effort resulted in the preparation of the nationally recognized Blueprint Transportation and Land Use Study which created a vision for the Sacramento region’s future growth.

At the beginning of 2009, SACOG initiated a strategic planning process to guide decision making and priority setting. Management Partners was engaged to assist with this effort by providing process advice and preparing a final written strategic plan. SACOG staff and board members were involved in the process and the resulting strategic plan reflects their ideas and recommendations.

The objectives of the strategic planning process were the following:

- Establish goals for the organization, intended to guide priority setting, decisions about work programs and staffing, and other decisions by staff and Board over the next several years.
- Strengthen SACOG’s ability to successfully provide the support, innovation and assistance needed by our region to meet the challenges it is and will be facing.
- Create a dynamic document and framework which can be used on an ongoing basis to help guide budget and work planning efforts to ensure that they are focused, targeted and meet the interests of the Board and the region.
- Engage SACOG staff, Board and stakeholders in identifying important goals for the strategic plan.

The Strategic Plan which resulted from this effort has three overarching themes which are further spelled out in the familiar strategic plan hierarchy of mission, values, goals, strategies and, finally, an annual business plan. These themes, in no particular order of importance, are summarized below:

1. The Strategic Plan is going to be an important tool in helping SACOG to modernize and improve the federally required Overall Work Program (OWP) process. It will do this by linking the budget and the OWP to the development of annual business plans under the Strategic Plan umbrella.

1 Joint Powers Agreement of the Sacramento Area Council of Governments.
2. The Strategic Plan is intended to establish a process for assisting SACOG with organizing and establishing its priorities. As an organization, SACOG exists in a highly dynamic environment; the Board, staff and community stakeholders will be aided by this structure for deciding what the organization can do successfully.

3. Finally, but importantly, the Strategic Plan is designed to guide SACOG’s work as a partner with its member agencies by assisting the local governments in coping with the tremendous demands for service they face.

The specifics of how SACOG will approach this work are laid out in the Strategic Plan which follows. The overall intent of the Plan is to give the organization the tools necessary to best serve the interests of the greater Sacramento region, and continue to be a leader in this regard across California and the nation.

**Strategic Planning Approach**

A variety of methods were used to gather and analyze data and to engage staff, Board and other stakeholders. SACOG staff was involved through focus groups and a workshop. Through the focus groups and workshop, strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats were identified, along with a set of organizational values. The values are listed in the next section of this report (Strategic Planning Components). The complete list of supporting and detracting behaviors for the values is provided in Attachment A.

The management team was engaged through two workshops and participation in creating the environmental scan. Board members were engaged through a survey. Outside stakeholders were involved through interviews and meetings. Stakeholders included the city and county chief executives from the region, a community activist, a representative of the Building Industry Association and the real estate industry, and a non-profit group engaged in the development of the Blueprint.

In early December 2009, the draft Strategic Plan was reviewed and approved (with some modifications) for forwarding to the full SACOG Board.

As part of this process, an environmental scan was prepared by Management Partners with assistance from SACOG management team. It provided important context for identifying goals for the future. The complete environmental scan is shown in Attachment B.

**Strategic Mission**

SACOG’s new strategic mission statement as created through this strategic planning process is:

*Provide leadership and a dynamic, collaborative public forum for achieving an efficient regional transportation system, innovative and integrated regional planning, and a high quality of life within the greater Sacramento region.*
Goals for the Future

SACOG has identified three goals for the future, each of which has supporting strategies and performance indicators. The three goals are as follows:

**Goal 1:** Sustain the agency’s emphasis on information-based decision making by providing state-of-the-art data and tools to members, partners, stakeholders and residents to help them shape the futures of their communities and the region.

**Goal 2:** Maximize strategic influence for the region through integrated regional transportation plans that produce unique and significant quality of life benefits for residents of the region.

**Goal 3:** Serve as a source of high quality information, convener, and/or advocate on a range of regional issues when the agency’s involvement would provide unique, added value to promoting a sustainable future for the region.

SACOG Organization

SACOG serves six counties and twenty-two cities, comprising a 6,190 square mile area with an estimated population of 2,229,000. Member agencies are El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba counties; the cities of Auburn, Citrus Heights, Colfax, Davis, Elk Grove, Folsom, Galt, Isleton, Lincoln, Live Oak, Marysville, Placerville, Rancho Cordova, Rocklin, Roseville, Sacramento, West Sacramento, Wheatland, Winters, Woodland, Yuba City; and the town of Loomis. SACOG is governed by a thirty-two member Board of Directors (thirty-one voting and one nonvoting). Voting members are appointed by member jurisdictions. The one non-voting member is the Caltrans District 3 Director.

SACOG’s breadth is demonstrated by its designations and certifications. Its range of participation and engagement with regional partners and stakeholders is shown in the types of committees it uses to ensure effective regional planning.

It is designated as:

- Regional Transportation Planning Agency for Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba counties by the California State Secretary of Business, Transportation and Housing Agency
- Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) by the Governor and the U.S. Department of Transportation for the six-county Sacramento region
- Airport Land Use Commission for Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo and Yuba counties
- Service Authority for Freeway and Expressways for Sacramento, San Joaquin, Yolo, Yuba, Sutter, and El Dorado counties
SACOG has a number of Board of Directors’ Committees and other advisory committees. The current Board Committees are:
- Climate & Air Quality Committee
- Government Relations and Public Affairs Committee
- Land Use and Housing Committee
- Transportation Committee
- Strategic Planning Committee

The current advisory committees are:
- Airport Advisory Committee
- Bikeway and Pedestrian Committee
- 5310 Regional Evaluation Committee
- Goods Movement Advisory Group
- Public Participation Committee
- Regional Planning Partnership
- SACMET Travel Demand Model Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
- Sacramento Emergency Clean Air and Transportation (SECAT) Air Quality Policy Group
- Sacramento Emergency Clean Air and Transportation (SECAT) Technical Advisory Committee
- Social Service Transportation Advisory Council
- Transit Coordinating Committee
- Transportation Demand Management Task Force

SACOG also has several ad hoc committees, as follow:
- ADA Compliance Committee
- Community Design Grant Review Committee
- Sacramento Region Intelligent Transportation Systems Partnership

In addition to these committees, SACOG is involved in various other public/private efforts in regional planning. See the Overall Work Program document for a complete list and an explanation of each of the committees noted above.

In FY 2009-10, SACOG had a budget of $38,235,151 and a staff of 54 employees. Its major programs include:
- Long and Short Range Transportation Planning
- Land Use and Housing Planning
- Government Relations, Public Affairs and Administration
- Public Services
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- Member & Agency Services

**Strategic Plan Components**

SACOG’s leadership identified a need to set a path for the future so that SACOG could ensure that its decisions, priorities and work plans are focused on strategic goals for the organization. This strategic plan meets the organizations needs for:

- Clear goals and priorities
- Integration of agency-wide goals and priorities
- Keeping SACOG on the cutting edge
- Implementing the agency’s strategic mission

Strategic planning is about setting multi-year, broad goals and strategies that are consistently used to guide decisions about resources and where effort will be directed. It is about providing the context and basis for a business plan for the agency. Strategic planning is a collaborative process involving staff, policy makers, and other stakeholders in order to ensure that the full range of interests are considered as part of the planning process.

As a designated Metropolitan Planning Organization, SACOG must follow Federal regulations with respect to budget planning in order to be able to draw from a variety of Federal funding programs. The Federal approach, which was first mapped out in the 1970s, is called the Overall Work Program (OWP). This is an annual budget and planning tool which essentially sets the annual SACOG budget and work plan.

One of the intents of this strategic plan effort is to provide a more policy-oriented and modern approach to setting the policy vision of SACOG, which will then be used to shape the development of the annual OWP. In this way, the elements of the OWP contribute to achieving the long-term goals set forth in the strategic plan.

The components of this SACOG strategic plan are shown in the graphic below:
An organization needs both a strategic plan and a business plan. The distinguishing features of both are the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan</th>
<th>Business Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• High level</td>
<td>• Implementation of the strategic plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Overall framework</td>
<td>• Overall Work Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Strategic mission</td>
<td>• Departmental work programs tie to goals and strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Values</td>
<td>• Operational plan for each of the strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Multi year</td>
<td>• Resource allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Broad goals</td>
<td>• Priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Strategies to reach the goals</td>
<td>• Detailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Priorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Simple</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are two important components to the effective use of strategic planning: the “what” and the “how.” The “what” is the content of the plan, which comprises most of this document. It consists of the goals to be achieved and the strategies to reach them. The “how” is a combination of the values the organization uses to implement the plan and the business plan which will be created by the organization following adoption of this strategic plan.

In the SACOG setting, the annual business plan is designed to feed the development of the OWP. The OWP itself will acknowledge the strategic planning process and include the goals, strategies and performance indicators developed in the strategic / business planning process, as well as addressing the MPO requirements which must be addressed by the OWP.

A sample business plan is shown in Attachment C.
Strategic mission

The management team discussed the existing mission statement for SACOG and concepts that the team thought should be part of a strategic mission for the future. A strategic mission statement provides the purpose and direction for the organization. It gives a rationale for programs that are carried out by the organization, and fundamentally defines what the organization stands for and the reason for its existence. The team created the following new strategic mission statement:

*Provide leadership and a dynamic, collaborative public forum for achieving an efficient regional transportation system, innovative and integrated regional planning, and a high quality of life within the greater Sacramento region.*

Organizational Values

The entire SACOG staff was involved in identifying the key organizational values that guide work and behaviors. As a result, six values were identified, as listed and defined below. See Attachment A for a more complete description of behaviors that support each of the values and behaviors that would detract from the values.

**Value: Professional Excellence**
- Produces and communicates consistently high quality, technically competent work of value to the organization.
- Recognizes and maintains a clear focus on strategic goals and outcomes consistent with the organization's work program(s).
- Maximizes opportunities to increase productivity and achieve high quality results.

**Value: Innovation**
- Solves problems creatively and is open to new ideas.
- Creates new ways of moving the organization forward to achieve its mission.
- Fosters new and creative thinking and solutions.

**Value: Integrity**
- Adheres to individual and organizational professional standards in the conduct of the organization's business.
- Produces documents and work products that are objective, credible and reliable.

**Value: Leadership**
- Creates and sustains an atmosphere that fosters a culture of openness, inclusion, trust, and results.
- Contributes to creating a clear vision and direction.
- Inspires results and effective teamwork.
- Exhibits the full range of professional competencies and models integrity and ethics.

**Value: Responsiveness**
- Communicates readily and/or takes action in response to requests from others for information or assistance.
Is observant, considerate and respectful of others’ time and schedules.
Is reliably prompt and does not require reminders to achieve results, communicate or meet obligations.

*Value: Teamwork*
- Takes the initiative to ensure that objectives are met and volunteers to help others for the good of the organization.
- Engages team members to work collaboratively and reliably towards a defined objective. Has a keen sense for having the right people on the team.
- Recognizes, values and leverages each person’s strengths and differences.

**Strategic Plan Goals, Strategies and Performance Indicators**

As a result of this strategic planning process, SACOG has identified three goals. Each of the goals has a set of strategies for implementing the goals. Additionally, each of the goals has a set of performance indicators. The definitions of goals, strategies and performance indicators are provided below.

- **Goal**: Desired long-term outcome.
- **Strategy**: Specific methods of achieving the goal.
- **Performance Indicator**: How achievement of the goal will be measured; how the organization will know if the long-term outcome has been achieved (including progress being made in achieving the long-term outcome).

The three goals and their associated strategies and performance indicators are provided in the following.

**Goal 1: Sustain the agency’s emphasis on information-based decision making by providing state-of-the-art data and tools to members, partners, stakeholders and residents to help them shape the futures of their communities and the region.**

**Goal 1 Strategies:**

1. Increase opportunities for member jurisdictions to utilize regional data, models and analysis to analyze impacts of their decisions on transportation, land use, air quality and other policy areas that affect quality of life.

2. Increase agency capacity to provide scientific information and analysis of transportation, land use, air quality and other matters of regional importance.

**Goal 1 Performance Indicators:**

A. Members and planning partners routinely use a combination of appropriate planning tools (e.g., I-PLACE’S and SACSIM) to conduct technical analysis of general plan updates, corridor plans,
transportation circulation plans, and neighborhood and community plans, and use of such planning tools by stakeholders and residents to evaluate proposed development projects.

B. Interactive, information-based citizen engagement practices are commonly used by members in support of general plan updates, development of neighborhood and community plans, and evaluation of the impacts of significant proposed development projects. The Agency has an effective and active process for sharing information about SACOG activities with staff in service to local government.

C. Appointment to the SACOG Board is viewed as an attractive opportunity for local elected officials and SACOG’s Board members are actively engaged in pursuing the mission of the agency and the agency’s local, state and national recognition for leadership in the implementation of information rich, consensus-driven regional efforts to improve the quality of life in the region continues to be enhanced. SACOG actively engages in providing information to all elected leaders about the role it plays in regional affairs and how this role contributes to an improved quality of life.

---

**Goal 2:** Maximize strategic influence for the region through developing and implementing integrated regional transportation plans that produce unique and significant quality of life benefits for residents of the region.

**Goal 2 Strategies:**

1. Consolidate, expand and maximize strategic advantage from the agency’s state and national leadership role and access to the best tools and methods for preparing an outstanding MTP.

2. Maximize the benefits of comprehensive planning and project implementation in the Sacramento region.

**Goal 2 Performance Indicators:**

A. SACOG’s MTP will remain a leader in the state in improving per capita VMT, congestion, air emissions and other performance measures that advance the quality of life.

B. SACOG will leverage its high performing MTP to secure additional funding and policy support from federal, state and local sources to build key projects sooner than would otherwise be possible.

C. SACOG and its member agencies continue to be leaders in the State in the timely delivery of projects.
Goal 3: Serve as a source of high quality information, convener, and/or advocate on a range of regional issues when the agency’s involvement would provide unique, added value to promoting a sustainable future for the region.

Goal 3 Strategies:

1. Continue to expand SACOG’s data and modeling capabilities to include topics that influence transportation behavior and planning (e.g., energy, climate change, land use economics and infrastructure).

2. Assist regional partners with the evaluation of functional service delivery opportunities and act upon the ones that will most assist the agencies.

3. Analyze options for increasing SACOG’s financial analysis and capacity so that it is able to serve the region if and when new service needs are identified.

Goal 3 Performance Indicators:

1. Deliver cost savings to local governments by building the capacity of the agency in areas of highest need to member jurisdictions, and/or leveraging new revenues in collaboration with local governments.

2. SACOG’s member services program will increase coordination activities relating to assistance with policy development, joint project delivery, grant development, and requests for technical assistance as measured by increase in requests from member jurisdictions for assistance and resulting grant acquisition or more integrated policy making.

Implementing and Updating the Plan

This strategic plan should be updated annually by the staff and Board. When the Overall Work Program and SACOG budgets are prepared, the strategic plan should be reviewed to determine whether changes are warranted. Additionally, accountability for implementation through the business plan will be critical to ensure that this plan is in fact used as the principal policy guide for the organization and Board.

Key steps that will help the organization keep on track and update the plan include:

- Preparing a business plan to implement the strategic plan, integrating the Overall Work Program and other projects. That will enable the organization to ascertain whether it has the resources to accomplish all that it is currently doing, and determine changes needed to match projects to the goals established as part of this strategic planning process.

- Conducting an annual review of the strategic plan that includes a review of progress toward goals and revising elements of the plan as appropriate to meet changing conditions.
• Keeping the Board apprised of status toward achievement of strategic plan goals by sharing information regularly, and referencing the goals and strategies in reports to the Board, including recommended actions.

• Providing a copy of the strategic plan to every SACOG staff member, and having each member of the management team use the plan for their individual work plans and accountability measures.

• Keeping SACOG staff apprised of accomplishments of strategic plan goals by sharing information regularly.

• Making the new SACOG strategic mission, values, and goals highly visible to staff and others, including SACOG board committees and advisory groups.

• Connecting the strategic plan goals and strategies to annual work plans developed collaboratively by SACOG teams.

**Business Plan Template**

A business plan will implement the strategic plan. It is the primary way that resources and timelines are applied to ensure that the strategic plan is made operational. The Overall Work Program should integrate with the strategic plan and be part of the business plan so that the organization has one fully coordinated set of long-term goals, priorities and projects, and so resources can be properly allocated to achieving the intended outcomes of the strategic plan and Overall Work Program.

The following template is provided as a starting point for the organization to use and/or modify as needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 1:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Success indicators for Goal 1:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 1:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OWP projects that contribute to strategy 1:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects to Implement Strategy [OWP and Non-OWP Projects]</th>
<th>Project Sponsor and Lead Team Members</th>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Priority (1, 2, 3) Time to Accomplish</th>
<th>Staffing (Consultant) Resources Required</th>
<th>Financial Resources Required</th>
<th>Unavailable Resources That Are Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

A sample business plan is shown in Attachment C.
Attachment A – Organizational Values

On June 16, 2009, the SACOG staff, working in nine small groups, identified core values for the organization. Each small group recorded the values, along with behaviors that support and behaviors that detract from the top two values on their list. As a result, Management Partners identified six values as representative of those suggested by the nine small groups. The six values are:

- Professional excellence
- Innovation
- Integrity
- Leadership
- Responsiveness
- Teamwork

These are defined in detail below and were presented to the management team for review and confirmation.

Value: Professional Excellence

- Produces and communicates consistently high quality, technically competent work of value to the organization.
- Recognizes and maintains a clear focus on strategic goals and outcomes consistent with the organization’s work program(s).
- Maximizes opportunities to increase productivity and achieve high quality results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviors that support</th>
<th>Behaviors that detract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Strives to achieve maximum productivity and effectiveness.</td>
<td>• Accomplishes the bare minimum or follows the status quo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recognizes professional limitations.</td>
<td>• Produces poor quality work when faced with adversity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Stays focused on results when faced with difficult situations.</td>
<td>• Is easily swayed by political pressures within or outside the organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Performs effectively among different management styles.</td>
<td>• Displays a lack of commitment to the organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sustains balance between professional and personal commitments.</td>
<td>• Does not recognize the significant from the insignificant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Encourages and mentors colleagues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Value: Innovation

- Solves problems creatively and is open to new ideas.
- Creates new ways of moving the organization forward to achieve its mission.
- Fosters new and creative thinking and solutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviors that support</th>
<th>Behaviors that detract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Recognizes patterns and interconnectivity of issues and factors</td>
<td>• Does not see the big picture and how issues relate to one another.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Applies critical thinking skills and checks assumptions.</td>
<td>• Dwells on the issues and is not solution oriented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Welcomes new ideas and change.</td>
<td>• Avoids change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Encourages others to share ideas.</td>
<td>• Does not enable others to contribute solutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is willing to risk failure.</td>
<td>• Defers to old solutions and plays it safe.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value: Integrity

- Adheres to individual and organizational professional standards in the conduct of the organization’s business.
- Produces documents and work products that are objective, credible and reliable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviors that support</th>
<th>Behaviors that detract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Produces complete and thorough work products.</td>
<td>• Does what is easiest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does what is right, even when no one is looking.</td>
<td>• Interferes with others’ success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Gives proper credit for good work.</td>
<td>• Says whatever will keep him or her from getting into trouble.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is honest.</td>
<td>• Blames others or avoids responsibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Admits mistakes.</td>
<td>• Justifies doing the wrong thing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Follows through on commitments.</td>
<td>• Completes work just to get it done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Promotes transparency with the public.</td>
<td>• Seeks personal advantages or perks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Value: Leadership
- Creates and sustains an atmosphere that fosters a culture of openness, inclusion, trust, and results.
- Contributes to creating a clear vision and direction.
- Inspires results and effective teamwork.
- Exhibits the full range of professional competencies and models integrity and ethics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviors that support</th>
<th>Behaviors that detract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inspires others to accomplish organizational objectives.</td>
<td>Micromanages other people’s work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows the subject matter of the work.</td>
<td>Rests on one’s laurels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rises to the occasion during a crisis.</td>
<td>Misses opportunities to accomplish objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizes team members for their accomplishments.</td>
<td>Misuses authority for personal gain or credit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides direction.</td>
<td>Requires obedience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiates problem solving and innovation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Value: Responsiveness
- Communicates readily and/or takes action in response to requests from others for information or assistance.
- Is observant, considerate and respectful of others’ time and schedules.
- Is reliably prompt and does not require reminders to achieve results, communicate or meet obligations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviors that support</th>
<th>Behaviors that detract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responds to requests in a timely manner.</td>
<td>Is dismissive of others’ needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizes and reacts to needs when they arise.</td>
<td>Ignores obvious needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates initiative.</td>
<td>Assumes others will respond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is on time and fulfills commitments.</td>
<td>Is frequently tardy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listens to others.</td>
<td>Provides incomplete work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avoids communication.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Value: Teamwork**

- Takes the initiative to ensure that objectives are met and volunteers to help others for the good of the organization.
- Engages team members to work collaboratively and reliably towards a defined objective. Has a keen sense for having the right people on the team.
- Recognizes, values and leverages each person’s strengths and differences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviors that support</th>
<th>Behaviors that detract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Meets deadlines and commitments to achieve the team’s objectives.</td>
<td>• Uses a “go it alone” approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Includes others when making decisions.</td>
<td>• Works in a silo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Understands common goals.</td>
<td>• Works primarily for personal success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Works towards team successes.</td>
<td>• Is unwilling to accept others’ ideas as valid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Accepts diverse ideas.</td>
<td>• Breaks confidences or gossips.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is dependable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Offers to help others.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment B – Environmental Scan

An Environmental Scan provides critical data to be considered in creating goals and strategies. It identifies factors that:

- **Currently** influence the organization and its decisions
- Will likely affect the organization *in the future*.

Data for the SACOG Environmental Scan was collected from the following:

- SACOG Staff
- Stakeholder Interviews
  - Mary Brill
  - Dennis Rogers, North State Building Industry Association
  - Bill Mueller, Valley Vision
  - Randy Sater, Teichert Inc.
  - Matt Mahood, Sacramento Metro Chamber of Commerce
- Electronic survey of SACOG Board Members
- City and County Chief Executives of the region
- Regional data sources
- Review of results from Sacramento Metro Chamber sponsored State of the Region Forum held on September 18, 2009

**Major Factors Affecting SACOG**

- Slow down in residential growth
- Realignment of region’s economy
- Current economic environment
- Job growth
- State budget impact
- Local government ability to respond to state environmental and other mandates

**Major Challenges Facing SACOG and its Members**

- Slow down in residential growth
- Realignment of region’s economy
- Current economic environment
- Job growth
- State budget impact
- Local government ability to respond to state environmental and other mandates

**Current Economic Environment**

- Region second fastest growing housing market in State prior to downturn
  - Concerns linger about traffic, loss of agricultural lands, quality of life
- Average job growth in region outperformed state and national rates, but has dropped
More than 25% of jobs in Sacramento region are provided by federal, state and local governments
- 1/3 higher than statewide average
- 10 to 15% of professional services jobs are related to government (i.e., lawyers, lobbyists)

**Leveling of Job Growth**

Following ten year growth, 0.7% decrease in job growth in 2008.

**Lower Unemployment Rate Than State Average**

Sacramento region unemployment rate for 2008 was 7.4%, significantly less than the current Statewide unemployment rate of 11.5%. Underemployment, such as the 85% furloughs for state workers, is not counted in these unemployment figures.
After Ten Year Increase, Taxable Sales Declining
Significant Five Year Decline in Building Permits
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SACOG Funding Challenges

• Dependent on formula revenues and planning grants from Federal and State governments for functions beyond core mission
• OWP (mandated) drives the work program
• Funding formulas and grants may not help implementation of the Blueprint
• Sales tax revenue is down
• Challenges to transportation funding and project delivery, including declines in local and state funding sources; federal formula funds have been stable, with a one-time boost made possible by the federal stimulus package
• State and federal legislation linking transportation, land use and air quality planning
• Flexibility in funding transportation projects limited

Sustainability Initiatives Remain

• SB 375 implementation links:
  ○ Transportation and land use planning, affordable housing initiatives and CEQA reform
• Federal climate change legislation
• Blueprint implementation
• Streamlining CEQA
Sacramento Area Council of Governments

2010 Annual Strategic Plan (Continued)

Current Economic Downturn Presents Opportunities
- Broaden region’s economic base to strengthen financial health and capacity for growth
- Implement climate action plan initiatives
- Implement Blueprint through local/regional planning initiatives
- Construct more transportation projects (2009 stimulus dollars)

Possible Opportunities During Economic Slowdown
- “Green Capital Alliance” – economic development initiative
- Rural Economy and Habitat Conservation Study
- Responding to SB 375 mandates through CEQA reform
- Federal climate action initiatives
- Federal stimulus funding for transportation programs/projects

SACOG Legislative Strength
- Sustains a strong federal and state legislative network
- Effective, credible leadership in MPO’s and COG’s nationally
- Maintains strategic and “smart” approach to legislative advocacy

Board as Legislative Advocates
- Ensure alignment of regional priorities with local ones
- Consensus on expanding interests in broader and more national climate change issues

Stakeholder Input: Don’t Forget the Basics
- What’s next after completion of Rural/Urban Connections Strategy
- Where do RUCS and Blueprint fit into the next MTP
- Continue Blueprint advocacy and education
- Impact of AB 32/SB 375 on local government
- Sustaining SACOG’s leadership at all levels of government
- Transportation planning
- Is it time for a Blueprint check in:
  - Impact of new economy on costs of sustainable development
  - New performance measures
  - New and innovative (less expensive) ways to approach sustainability

City/County Managers Input
- Technical assistance with climate change regulatory compliance and mandates
- Serve as forum for coalescing information/ideas around critical topics and issues, e.g., constitutional convention, economic development, regionalization
- Independent broker of information and analytical tools, e.g., trip generation
Survey of Board Members

• 13 Board Members responded
• Questions:
  ▪ What issues are important as SACOG develops their Strategic Plan?
  ▪ What constraints do you think SACOG will face in the future?
  ▪ What you hope will be included in the Strategic Plan
  ▪ What else should we keep in mind?

Input from Board Members: Important Issues for Strategic Plan

• Assistance with implementing regulatory requirements around land use/air quality
• Realignment of the region’s economy is critical to future
• Leadership in transportation planning/funding must be maintained
• RUCS Study policy outcomes are important
Goal 1: Preserve the region’s economic base and quality of life through a balanced and viable regional transportation system.

Success Indicator for the Goal: At least 60% of the region’s residents living in urbanized areas have viable and sustainable alternative sources of commute transportation aside from the single occupancy vehicle.

Strategy 1: Create a long term funding strategy to ensure the region’s bus system can provide a viable, reasonable share of alternative commute services for the next 10 years.

OWP Objectives that contribute to the Strategy:

Element 10-003: **Short-Range Transportation Planning and Studies**
Objective: To identify certain transportation projects that are shorter in term or are related to specific studies.

Element 10-002: **Long-Range Transportation Planning**
Objective: To support the long range planning efforts as they relate to the Metropolitan Transportation Plan implementation and its related components.

Element 10-005: **Continuing Transportation Implementation**
Objective: To identify those projects which are ongoing and span multiple years. These projects support efforts related to programming federal and state funding, regional air quality planning activities and Metropolitan Transportation Plan implementation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects to Implement Strategy [OWP and Non-OWP Projects]</th>
<th>Project Sponsor &amp; Lead Team Members</th>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Priority 1, 2, 3 Time to Accomplish</th>
<th>Staffing (Consultant) Resources Required</th>
<th>Financial Resources Required</th>
<th>Unavailable Resources That Are Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Downtown Sacramento Transit Circulation and Facilities Plan | SACOG Technical Advisory Committee | • Prepare RFP  
• Establish Project Management Team  
• Review and analyze existing and ongoing studies  
• Review existing conditions in the downtown study area. | Priority 1 Six months | Two SACOG staff planners to lead project and staff project committee | $300,000 over two years | None |
In January, the SACOG Board of Directors elected Supervisor Helen Thomson as its chair and Galt Councilmember Darryl Clare as vice chair. SACOG also assumed a state-wide leadership role, when the California Air Resources Board (ARB) appointed SACOG board member and Sacramento County Supervisor Roger Dickinson to the Regional Targets Advisory Committee (RTAC) and appointed Executive Director Mike McKeever as RTAC Chair. The RTAC was tasked in Senate Bill 375 of 2008 with recommending to ARB the methodology to set greenhouse gas emissions targets for cars and light duty trucks for regional planning agencies across the state.

February marked the start of the race to deliver transportation projects under the American Recovery & Reinvestment Act. The SACOG board authorized nearly $32 million for the counties of Yolo, Sutter, Yuba and Sacramento for road rehabilitation. While this action came quickly, it was only because cities, counties and transit agencies had been working furiously for weeks to get a list of projects ready to go.

In March, the recovery act action continued with the board authorizing another $76 million for capital transportation projects in Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo and Yuba counties. As with the funding in February, Placer County Transportation Planning Agency and El Dorado County Transportation Commission awarded road funds and a portion of transit fund for their counties.

In April, the California Association of Public Information Officials (CAPIO) recognized SACOG with Excellence in Communication Awards for its Metropolitan Transportation Plan for 2035 (special publications) and the Rural-Urban Connections Strategy website (websites). This marked the third consecutive year SACOG brought home awards from CAPIO.

In May, the region continued the million mile tradition during May is Bike Month – with 1,288,317 miles logged by over 6,000 individuals. SACOG works with transportation management organizations to promote May is Bike Month.

In June, the SACOG board supported state and federal legislation that would support complete streets, assist with regional transportation planning, extend design-build as an option for transit projects, reform the California Land Conservation (Williamson) Act, and help homeowners finance energy efficiency improvements.
In July, West Sacramento Mayor Christopher Cabaldon testified on behalf of SACOG before a U.S. Senate Banking, Housing & Urban Affairs subcommittee on the role of transit in reducing Greenhouse gas emissions.

In August, SACOG sought additional funding from the federal recovery act. SACOG prioritized three projects for the highly competitive Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) program: the Sacramento Intermodal Transportation Facility in the downtown Railyards, the Green Trade Corridor at the Port of West Sacramento, and the Watt/Highway 50 interchange. The Green Trade Corridor received $30 million.

The board honored long-time community organizer Mary Brill in August, creating a new SACOG Salutes! Award, Mary Brill Youth Excellence Award. Brill, who had been battling cancer, was able to join the board to be recognized for her commitment to the region, but sadly passed away in October.

In September, SACOG worked with local agencies to weigh in on comprehensive state water legislation that was ultimately signed into law. While there were many compromises in the legislation, SACOG helped ensure local land use control was not infringed on, and local representatives had a voice in Delta governance issues.

In October, SACOG board members and community members spent a day exploring agricultural practices in rural (and urban) Sacramento County. The operations were as diverse as the locations, from a produce distribution business near downtown Sacramento and a farm in the middle of Rancho Cordova, to conservation lands and historic town in the Delta.

SACOG staff worked with Sacramento County and WALK-Sacramento staff to hold the first ever regional Safe Routes to School conference. The conference was free to participants and approximately 95 people were in attendance.

In November, SACOG Executive Director Mike McKeever addressed the National Caucus of Environmental Legislators on implementation of SB 375.

In December, SACOG honored leadership in transportation, land use and air quality with SACOG Salutes! Awards for individuals, organizations, and projects emblematic of the best of our region.

SACOG ended a busy year with an excellent report on project delivery: together with local, state and federal agencies, 223 percent of the region’s share of transportation funds was delivered. SACOG utilized funding other regions in California were not able to use on our region’s ready-to-go projects.
BUDGET GUIDE & PROCESS

Section Contents:
  Guide to the Budget
  Budget Process Steps
  Budget Calendar
  Basis of Budget
The format for the Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 budget document has been modified to include the following nine sections: Introduction, Budget Guide and Process, Budget information for FY 10-11, Board of Directors and Advocacy, Fund Balance Information, Overall Work Program, Supplementary Historical Data, Capitol Valley Regional Service Authority for Freeways and Expressways, and an Appendix.

**Introduction**

The Introduction section includes: Executive Director's Budget Message, About SACOG, a Description of the SACOG Region, the Sacramento Metropolitan Planning Area Map, an Organization Chart, Team Descriptions, the 2010 Annual Strategic Plan (which is new) and the 2009 Annual Report.

**Budget Guide and Process**

The section includes a Guide to the Budget, Annual Budget Process Steps, the typical Budget Calendar, and information supporting the Basis for the Budget.

**Budget Information for FY 2010-11:**

This starts with the SACOG Fund Descriptions and is followed by a summary Description of Expenditures category, which is then followed by the Summary of Revenue and Expenditure Graphs, Summary of Revenue and Expenditures (including the Planning and Administration Fund, Board and Advocacy Fund, and Capital Asset Expenditures). The revenue is further shown in the Summary of Revenue Sources and further detailed in the Revenue Sources – Explanations and Detail. The final three documents show the Indirect Costs, Salaried Personnel by Year and Positions, and project Capital Asset Expenditures.

**Board of Directors and Advocacy:**

This section includes the Budget for Board of Directors and Advocacy and the Annual Membership Assessments supporting document.

**Fund Balance Information for Three Funds**

This section includes the Fund Balance Summaries for the Planning and Administration Fund, Board and Advocacy Fund, and the SACOG Financing Corporation. The SACOG Financing Corporation fund balance information is shown (for the first time), since the Planning and Administration fund is projected to use $1 million of these funds to support the SACOG Budget.

**Overall Work Program (OWP)**

The majority of the Planning and Administration Fund planned activity is based on the OWP. The format of the OWP is governed and directed by SACOG’s federal and state funding partners, and is included in the budget document accordingly. Sections include a one page OWP Revenues and Expenditures Graph, the OWP Program Revenues, the OWP Program Expenditures, and the OWP Units and Goals – by work element – and then broken down by project.
Supplementary Historical Data

This section includes historical data for various major revenues, costs, staffing, and some limited statistics on population and wages for the region. Sections include: Primary Revenue Sources – 10-Year History, Indirect Services Cost Comparison – Six-Year History, Summary of Full-Time Equivalent Employees by Function and Program – Six-Year History, Total Population by Jurisdiction – 10-Year History, and Average Wages by County – Five-Year History.

Capitol Valley Regional Service Authority for Freeways and Expressways (CVRS or Capitol Valley SAFE)

This section includes Capitol Valley SAFE, About Capital Valley SAFE, and the Capital Valley SAFE Budget.

Appendix

The Appendix includes the Board Resolution Adopting the FY 2010-11 Budget, Board Resolution Adopting the OWP for FY 2010-11 Budget, Budget and Fiscal Policies, Chart of Accounts, Salary Schedule – Effective August 1, 2008, Air Quality Planning Boundary and Population Map, Glossary of Terms, and a Directory of Acronyms.
SACOG views its budget process as an ongoing, dynamic activity involving the Board of Directors, SACOG staff, federal and state funding partners, and the SACOG region residents. While each year’s budget process includes certain specific steps in the development of the current year’s figures, the budget must also address both short and long term goals and policy matters. Federal and state policy requires the Board adopt a budget by June 1. The Board adopted the FY 2010-11 budget on May 20, 2010. SACOG’s budget provides the structural basis for general operations and overall financial planning. The following table illustrates the budget process:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Process Steps</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Determine projects and funding for FY 2010-11. Estimate carryover projects and funding for 2009-10 that will carry into FY 2010-11. Confirm projects and priorities with Caltrans emphasis areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff draft project descriptions and staff time allocations for the Overall Work Program (OWP). Prepare draft SACOG operating budgets and the OWP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Relations &amp; Public Affairs Committee (GRPA) reviews first draft of SACOG operating budgets and OWP and recommends approval to Board. The Board reviews and then approves the release of SACOG operating budgets and OWP for 30 day review period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACOG Strategic Plan for 2010 approved by the Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft OWP sent to the IPG and posted to website</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPG meeting to discuss FY 2010-11 OWP with Federal/State funding partners – to received their comments and suggested project changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRPA Committee reviews final draft of SACOG annual operating budgets and OWP and recommends approval to Board. The Board reviews then adopts the Annual operating budgets and the Overall Work Program (OWP).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved Annual Budget and OWP is sent to Caltrans, Federal Highway Administration, and Federal Transit Administration for their approval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receive approval for the Annual Budget and OWP from Caltrans, Federal Highway Administration, and Federal Transit Administration for their approval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By January 12</td>
<td>Meet with staff to determine FY 2010-11 projects and funding. Identify existing grant revenues in the Overall Work Program (OWP) that will be spent in remaining months of FY 2009-10 and residual amounts that are likely to be carryover in FY 2010-11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By January 15</td>
<td>Preliminary draft of projected agency revenues/grants for FY 2010-11. For non-grant funded activities an estimate of consultant budget needed out of core revenues (PL, FTA, TDA, PPM, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 19</td>
<td>Mgmt. Staff: draft review of proposed projects compared to Caltrans planning emphasis areas &amp; the SACOG strategic plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 26</td>
<td>Mgmt. Staff: confirm projects for draft OWP with budget strategy for priorities (core vs. discretionary efforts)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2</td>
<td>Mgmt. Staff: draft project descriptions &amp; staff allocations (follows a team review of element objectives, discussions, and project descriptions for technical accuracy).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 9</td>
<td>Mgmt. Staff: draft background sections of OWP (planning emphasis areas, budget tables, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 15</td>
<td>Mgmt. Staff: draft final project descriptions &amp; staff allocations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 23</td>
<td>First draft of SACOG operating budget (includes the OWP), Board and Advocacy Budget, Indirect Budget, Capital budget to administrative staff for formatting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 25</td>
<td>Government Relations &amp; Public Affairs (GRPA) Committee mail out of budget documents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 8</td>
<td>GRPA Committee reviews first draft of budget documents including the OWP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 10</td>
<td>Board mail out of the budget documents approved by GRPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 18</td>
<td>Board approves releasing draft SACOG operating budget (includes the OWP), Board and Advocacy Budget, Indirect Budget, Capital Budget for 30-day public review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 18</td>
<td>Notifications sent to newspapers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 18</td>
<td>2010 Annual Strategic Plan adopted by the Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 19</td>
<td>Draft OWP sent to Intermodal Planning Group and posted to web</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 14</td>
<td>IPG meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 29</td>
<td>GRPA Committee mail out of the budget documents; may include revisions based on the 30 day review period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 10</td>
<td>GRPA Committee approves final SACOG operating budget (which includes the OWP) Board and Advocacy Budget, Indirect Budget, Capital Budget for 30-day public review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 12</td>
<td>Board mail out of the budget documents approved by GRPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 20</td>
<td>Board adopts final SACOG operating budget (includes the OWP), Board and Advocacy Budget, Indirect Budget, Capital Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before June 1 deadline</td>
<td>Copies of final OWP sent to Caltrans (who forwards to FTA and FHWA) and posted to website</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Basis of Budgeting and Accounting

In January 1965, the Sacramento Regional Area Planning Commission (SRAPC) was organized under State Planning Law to provide a forum for elected officials to address multi-county problems, issues, and needs. In January 1981, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) succeeded SRAPC under a new Joint Powers Agreement pursuant to Section 6500 of the California Government Code. SACOG is an association of local governments formed by six counties and 22 cities. SACOG is governed by a 31-member Board of Directors composed of elected officials representing member governments. The Board maintains the budgetary controls over SACOG’s accounts.

SACOG reports its primary activities through the Planning and Administrative Special Revenue Fund, which acts as the “general Fund”, which is based on using the current financial resources measurement focus. SACOG also oversees and administers 10 other Special Revenue Funds.

Budgeted and actual revenues and expenses reported in this document are recognized on the governmental funds basis of accounting in conformity with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) and standards of the Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB), which is consistent with the audited financial statements. Consequently, revenues are recognized as soon as they are measurable and available. Revenues are considered to be available if they are collectible within the current period or soon enough thereafter to pay liabilities of the current period. For this purpose, SACOG considers revenue to be available if they are collected within six months from the end of the fiscal period. SACOG uses a six-month availability period because of the reimbursement timeline associated with most of its funding sources. Revenues considered susceptible to accrual primarily include sales tax revenues, federal, state and local funds, as well as investment earnings. Expenditures generally are recorded when a liability is incurred, as under accrual accounting.

Overview

The budget process typically begins in February with the discussion of the upcoming Overall Work Program (OWP) focus for the next year.

The final budget is not a static guideline for spending but a dynamic document subject to constant scrutiny, revision, and adjustment. The budget process is a year-long continuing process.

Phase 1 Overall Work Program

The SACOG Board of Directors approves the budget in two phases. One phase is the Overall Work Program (OWP) budget which is the plan for the transportation related projects. The OWP is largely funded by Federal and State grants with matching funds from local sources. The projects are composed of functions related to the responsibilities of the Metropolitan Planning Organization and center around transportation planning and project delivery to fulfill those plans.
The OWP is available for public comment for a 30 day period during which grantor agencies, both Federal and State, various public organizations including member agencies, and the general public review the projects planned for the budget year and make comments. During the public comment period, the Intermodal Planning Group, a group formed by Federal Highway Administration, Federal Transit Administration, California Department of Transportation and other parties impacted by the OWP, will meet and discuss the OWP within the broader goals and guidelines of the region. At the close of the public comment period, the SACOG Board of Directors adopts the OWP as it has been amended.

Final Adoption of the OWP usually occurs in May of each year. Throughout the year, amendments to the OWP budget occur for grants that are received, a realignment of priorities for projects or other occurrences that require a budget adjustment, and increases or decreases in Federal or State funding allocations.

**Phase 2 Operating Budget**

The second phase of the budget process is the adoption of the operating budget. This includes the OWP, Board of Directors and Advocacy, Capital Assets, and can include, and other related functions not associated with the OWP. This second phase is adopted no later than June, and can be adopted at the same time as the OWP, in June.

**Budget Preparation**

Preparation, authorization, and execution make up the entire process. Preparation includes determining the objectives and needs of the organization and our funding partners, examining courses of action, and determining the means of attaining these objectives. Authorization consists of Board of Director approval of the OWP and final operating budget. Execution is carrying out the plan and programs in an effective, efficient, and timely manner.

Budget Preparation includes:

Goals, proposed major projects, services to be provided and proposed program changes

The volume of work required to render these services

The methods, facilities, and organization for performing the work

The resources required for performing the work and the price levels of resources

The budget development process provides the funding partners, SACOG management, department heads, and project managers with an opportunity to review work programs, to propose changes in services, to recommend revisions in organizational structure, to hear and discuss budget requests and to provide feedback regarding SACOG’s operations.
Budget Authorization

Budget authorization is concerned with Board of Director hearings, public hearings, and final enactment of the budget, including authorization of funds, establishment of various rates (i.e., member assessments), and the adoption of necessary resolutions to effectuate the budget’s plan.

Presentation of the draft budget before the Board of Directors by the Executive Director and Acting Finance Manager provides an opportunity to explain proposed projects to the Board and to focus attention on problems, services, and programs that require legislative action or support for their ultimate solution, and allow a forum for Board questions and input. After the public hearing process the Board of Directors approves the budget as it has been amended.

Budget Execution

Budget execution includes more than the traditional concept of assuring that goals, programs, services levels and program changes are accomplished. It also is fulfillment of the budget with respect to:

- Realization of estimated revenues
- Accomplishments of the projects planned to be done
- Doing so within budget limits

It includes:

Cost Control — The reduction of costs, and increased efficiencies and economy through placing responsibility on the individual project manager.

Financial Reporting — Maintaining records of labor distribution and expenditures to provide full costs in connection with each project and grant requirements.

Audit — A review of the financial recording of revenues and expenditures in compliance with grant funding provisions.

Management Review — Comparing actual performance with budgeted/project goals and program changes

Basis of Revenue Estimates for the Annual Budget

Because of SACOG’s dependency on federal, state, and local budgetary decisions, revenue estimates are based upon the best available information as to potential sources of funding. SACOG’s annual budget differs from that of a local government in two respects: 1) the uncertain nature of grant awards from other entities, and 2) conversion of grant budgets to a fiscal year basis.
Level of Budgetary Control

Within the Overall Work Plan budget (OWP) the level of budgetary control is at the element level. An example of this is the FY 2010-11 OWP element 11-002 Long Range Transportation Planning. It has a budget of $1.5 million and consists of 12 different projects. Costs for the projects, as well as classifications of costs, can be modified as long as the element total remains the same. Board approval is needed if costs are expected to exceed the element total, or if new projects are added to the element.

Board approval is also sought for the Non-OWP budgets, Board of Director and Advocacy, and Capital Assets) when “total costs” are expected to exceed the original approved amount.

SACOG’s purchasing policy authority limits are: For purchases from $2,500 to $10,000 the authority is with the Director. For purchases greater than $10,000 but less than $20,000 the authority is with the Executive Director. Purchases greater than $20,000 must be approved by the Board of Directors.

Working Capital

One of the important elements of a comprehensive budget is to evaluate the impact of projected revenue, expenditures, and transfers on working capital. These are the balances projected to be available at the end of the budget period. Maintaining adequate working capital levels is critical to ensuring that SACOG is adequately prepared financially to meet ongoing cash flow needs and unforeseen events, opportunities and emergencies.

PERSONNEL ADDITIONS, DELETIONS, OR RECLASSIFICATION

During the budget process, departments may submit requests to add, delete or reclassify positions. Vacant positions are analyzed to ensure that there is an adequate revenue stream to fund the position once it is filled. The Executive Director decides whether the position or change in position should be included in the budget.

EMPLOYEE COMPENSATION

The budget is reflecting a -0- COLA increase per the requirements of the memorandum of understanding with the employee bargaining units, agreed to in May 2010. SACOG also negotiated a slight change to the current Memorandum of Understanding that will reduce future payroll taxes for both employer and employees when an employee meets certain longevity requirements or is terminating or retiring, and for future increases in retirement.

DEBT OBLIGATIONS IN THE BUDGET

SACOG has no debt obligations beyond the typical Accounts Payable activities and Compensated Absences liability. Compensated Absences consist of vacation and sick leave payable balances at year-end.
COST ALLOCATIONS WITHIN THE BUDGET

SACOG’s general and administrative costs, called indirect costs, are allocated to direct projects through a cost allocation plan developed in accordance with federal requirements from the Office of Management and Budget Circular A-102 and in accordance with approved costs under A-87. The cost allocation plan is approved annually by Caltrans. The proposed rate for 2010-06 is 61.8%. The allocation is computed on the direct salary/benefit amount, which is based on the employees fully-costed rate multiplied by hours worked.
BUDGET INFORMATION FOR FY 2010-11
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SACOG’s accounts are organized on the basis of funds, each of which is considered a separate accounting entity. The operation of each fund is accounted for with a separate set of self-balancing accounts comprised of its assets, liabilities, fund equity, revenues and expenditures or expenses, as appropriate. Financial activities are allocated to account for in individual funds based upon the purposes for which they are to be spent and the means by which spending activities are controlled.

The Board adopts an annual budget for the Planning and Administration and the Capitol Valley SAFE Special Revenue funds based on anticipated projects at the beginning of the year. The Board and Advocacy Fund is a special fund within the Planning and Administration fund umbrella.

No annual adopted budget is prepared for the remaining special revenue funds as they are special purpose funds whose ending fund balance at June 30 becomes the amount available for the next fiscal year.

**Special Revenue Funds**

Planning and Administration Fund — used to account for SACOG’s transportation planning and administrative activities funded from various federal, state, and local sources. The funds operates as the “general fund” per se. Under the umbrella of the Planning and Administrative fund is the Board and Advocacy budget.

Capitol Valley Regional SAFE Fund — used to account for SACOG’s administrative activities for implementing, operating, and maintaining the motorist aid system of call boxes within the counties of Sacramento, San Joaquin, Sutter, Yolo and Yuba. Funds are derived from the vehicle registration fee imposed pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 14 of Division 3 of the Street and Highways Code. This fund is included in this document because its resources are expected to be used to supplement certain projects in the Planning and Administration Fund in FY 10-11.

SACOG Financing Corporation Fund — used to account for the proceeds received from the sale of the Meridian Plaza building and interest income earned on the fund balance. SACOG has approval through the Board of Directors use approximately $1 million of funds in this fund to supplement the Planning and Administration Fund, if it becomes necessary, during FY 10-11. There is no budget for this fund.

**Other Special Revenue Funds**

The other Special Revenue Funds that SACOG oversees or administers (but are not included in this budget) are listed below:

Sacramento Emergency Clean Air and Transportation Program Fund (SECAT) — Accounts for the revenues and expenditures associated with SACOG's administration of the SECAT program, using TCRP funds.

Regional Funding Program — Used to accumulate funds from local agencies for reimbursement of projects originally expected to have been completed with local funds, were instead funded with
available Federal funds. The program will award funds to other agencies for eligible projects through the grant application process.

State Transit Assistance Fund — Created pursuant to the Transportation Development Act (TDA) to account for the allocations received from the State for transportation planning and mass transportation purposes. Funds are derived from the statewide sales tax on gasoline and diesel fuel. SACOG handles the administration of these funds.

Public Transportation, Modernization, Improvement & Service Enhancement Account (PTMISEA) — Used to account for funds from Public Transportation, Improvement & Service Enhancement Account (PTMISEA) Regional Funds. SACOG will be the grant recipient for these funds and will pass the funding to transit agencies for approved transit projects. SACOG Board approval is required for the Subrecipient Funding Agreement.

Local Transportation Fund — Created pursuant to the TDA to account for the proceeds received from the State Board of Equalization of the 1/4 cent of the 7.25% retail sales tax collected within the following counties (Sacramento, Yuba, Sutter, and Yolo). SACOG handles the administration of these funds, in conjunction with the four counties.

Glenn County SAFE — Used to account for the activities in accordance with the contract with the County of Glenn, for implementing, operating, and maintaining the motorist aid system of call boxes within the County of Glenn pursuant to Street and Highways Code section 2553.
Direct Labor and Benefits

Salaries and wages are costs associated with where an employee works on a direct project. Benefits are costs associated with the provision of employee benefits, such as SAOG’s contribution for retirement, social security, group insurance, dental, vision, workers compensation insurance, deferred compensation, transit passes, and dental, vision, transit passes, and post retirement health costs.

Indirect Costs

Indirect costs represent costs that cannot be applied to a specific direct project, that are categorized as indirect. These costs are then allocated to direct projects, on a monthly basis, based on a formula. Costs include expected expenditures for the current year plus indirect costs from two years ago, that have not yet been absorbed or used up. Costs include salaries and benefits for employees who can’t charge their work time to a direct project. Expenditures also include meetings, trainings, consultants, mileage, building rent, office equipment and software maintenance, career development costs, postage, phone, legal services, etc.

Consulting Costs

These costs primarily represent payments to outside consultants to perform work on the various projects in the overall work program. Some costs represent computer support services for modeling related projects. The largest consultant cost of $2.7 million pertains to the 511/STARNET Capital Improvements project.

Pass-through to Other Agencies

These costs pertain to activities where SACOG incurs non-labor related costs and then are reimbursed back for the exact costs expended. These costs are in-and-out transactions, with no direct benefit to cover other agency costs or overhead. The two largest amounts relate to the SECAT CMAQ project at $7.3 million and the Sacramento Regional Transit District Downtown-Natomas-Airport Rail Project at $8.7 million.

Equipment and Software

A project specific category in the OWP wherein SACOG recognizes a unique project, that will eventually include equipment and software costs (and perhaps consultant costs) that are paid for by a specific grant, and not recognized anywhere else. The Connect Card Implementation project for $7.2 million is an example of this.

Other Costs

These costs include the remaining direct project costs. These include: printing, meetings and other, supplies, data and communications costs and marketing/advertising.

FY 08-09 Indirect Carry Forward (included in indirect costs)

These costs are derived from past years’ activities and represent a cumulative total as of a certain point in time, June 30, 2009. These are costs that have been incurred in the past that SACOG has
Description of Appropriations (Continued)

not been able to recover (be reimbursed for) due to various factors and the way the indirect formula/calculation works. This amount is allowed to be carried forward in the indirect Calculation for the FY 10/11 budget, and is included in the OWP expense calculation as required. However, SACOG is not certain it can recover the carry forward amount this year, and for overall budget purposes in order to be more conservative, has chosen to reduce the overall SACOG budget by the same amount.

**Board of Directors and Advocacy Costs**

Estimated budgeted expenditures for costs related to Board of Directors activities and for advocacy (lobbying) costs that cannot be accounted for in the Planning and Administration Special Revenue Fund. Costs include meetings/training/travel expenses, board reimbursement and parking passes, federal and state legislative consultants, certain agency memberships and dues, awards, and certain staff time, benefits and overhead.

**Capital Assets**

Estimated budgeted expenditures for furniture, equipment, and computers used in carrying on the operations for the Planning and Administration Fund.
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Summary of Revenue and Expenditure Graphs

Revenues
$38,363,059

- Board of Directors
  $348,270
  1%

- Overall Work Program
  $38,014,789
  99%

Expenditures
$39,404,887

- Board of Directors & Advocacy
  $399,246
  1%

- Capital Assets
  $100,000
  0%

- Overall Work Program
  $38,905,641
  99%
Sacramento Area Council of Governments

Summary of Revenues & Expenditures
Including Planning & Administration Fund,
Board & Advocacy Fund, and
Capital Asset Expenditures
Fiscal Year 2010-11

REVENUES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Work Program:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services to Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Kind Funds from Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL OWP REVENUES</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board of Directors:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member Dues and travel costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXPENDITURES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Work Program:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Labor and Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Costs *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass-through to Other Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment and Software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total OWP Expenditures</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Less: FY 08-09 Indirect Carryforward (included in Indirect costs) | (396,051)

| Board of Directors and Advocacy | 399,246 |
| Capital Assets (Furniture, equipment, computers) | 100,000 |

**TOTAL EXPENDITURES** | **$ 39,404,887**

Use of SACOG Reserves | 991,852
Use of Board of Directors Reserve Fund | 49,976

**Total Revenues vs Expenditures** | **$ -**

* SACOG does not budget for depreciation. However, it is included in the indirect costs for calculation of the Indirect Cost rate. Estimated depreciation = $30,000.
# Sacramento Area Council of Governments

## Summary of Revenue Sources

**Fiscal Year 2010-11**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Percentage of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal Funding:</strong></td>
<td>$28,997,471</td>
<td>75.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Highway Administration - Metropolitan Planning (PL)</td>
<td>2,507,004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Transit Administration (Section 5303)</td>
<td>773,919</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Transit Administration (Section 5304)</td>
<td>551,224</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality</td>
<td>14,870,667</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Highways Administration - Sen. Boxer Earmark</td>
<td>869,249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Planning &amp; Research</td>
<td>292,498</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans Regional Blueprint Planning</td>
<td>228,724</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Administrative Fee for JARC Program</td>
<td>18,692</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Funding Passed through to Unitrans and SRTD</td>
<td>8,885,494</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State of California Funding:</strong></td>
<td>$5,113,781</td>
<td>13.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning, Programming, Monitoring</td>
<td>403,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Surface Transportation Program</td>
<td>2,792,721</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Occupancy Vehicle Fines</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans Grant Agricultural Workers Transportation Plan</td>
<td>68,184</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans Environmental Justice Grant</td>
<td>147,348</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans Partnership Planning Grant</td>
<td>7,626</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans Public Transportation Account</td>
<td>73,124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans Safe Routes to School</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement &amp; Service Enhancement Account (PTMISEA)</td>
<td>1,401,278</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Funds:</strong></td>
<td>$2,967,470</td>
<td>7.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Development Act - Planning &amp; Administration</td>
<td>1,268,530</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Development Act - Administration</td>
<td>424,095</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer County Transportation Planning Agency (PCTPA)</td>
<td>222,448</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado County Transportation Commission (EDCTC)</td>
<td>50,856</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitol Valley Regional SAFE (SAFE)</td>
<td>496,431</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRTD Reimbursement for Audit Services</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Highway Research Program</td>
<td>124,840</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Dues</td>
<td>284,270</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Earnings</td>
<td>64,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Services to Others:</strong></td>
<td>$209,380</td>
<td>0.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitol Valley Regional SAFE (SAFE)</td>
<td>136,215</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn County SAFE</td>
<td>2,699</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuba County</td>
<td>70,466</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In-Kind Funds from Others:</strong></td>
<td>$1,074,957</td>
<td>2.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECAT Program</td>
<td>845,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer County Transportation Planning Agency for grant matc</td>
<td>6,997</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Management Associations (TMAs)</td>
<td>176,130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Partners for Discretionary Grants</td>
<td>46,830</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES:</strong></td>
<td>$38,363,059</td>
<td>100.02%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Federal Funding — $28,997,471

$2,507,004 — METROPOLITAN PLANNING (PL)

Metropolitan Planning (PL) money is provided by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) through the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). PL funds are available to each state for federal highway projects, including transportation planning. They are used to assist state highway agencies in planning the Interstate highway system and for planning or improving the primary, secondary, and urban system roads and streets.

In January of each year SACOG is provided an estimate of what its allocation will be for the next year. The 2010-11 estimate (OWP Guidance) was $2,507,004 million (6.15%), based on a statewide total estimate of $40,788,933 million to be allocated to all the Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs), Council of Governments (COGs), and Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs). The FWHA PL formula allocation has two components:

A two-part population component; which distributes funds by the proportion of the total population of each MPO based on California Department of Finance estimates.

An air quality component based on the proportion of federal Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) funds to total programmatic FHWA PL Funds.
The OWP guidance is prepared in November or December for the next State of California fiscal year, which is July 1 through June 30. The federal fiscal year begins October 1, three months after the July 1 effective date of the OWP and the state's fiscal year. The PL amount listed in the OWP Guidance is Caltrans’ estimate for the next fiscal year. When the actual PL amounts are finalized from the previous year’s federal budget, the OWP is amended to add any PL increases or decreases.

Funds are received on a reimbursement basis and require an 11.47% match.

$773,919 — FTA SECTION 5303

Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5303 monies are administered through Caltrans. These funds are used to assist in planning, engineering, and design of urban mass transportation projects and other technical studies in a program for a unified or officially coordinated urban transportation system. SACOG uses these funds to sponsor transportation planning special projects and information services on behalf of member cities and counties.

In January of each year with the OWP guidance, SACOG is provided an estimate of what its allocation will be for the next fiscal year. The 2010-11 allocation is $773,919 based on a total of $14,729,065 million statewide, to be allocated to all the MPOs, COGs, and RTPAs. The FTA Section 5303 formula allocation has two components:

- A base allocation of $15,000
- A population component, which distributes funds according to each MPO’s percentage of statewide urbanized area population, as of the most recent decennial census.

As with the FHWA PL funds, after the previous federal fiscal year closes, Caltrans will notify SACOG of any increase or decrease to previous years allocation.

Funds are received on a reimbursement basis and require an 11.47% match.

$551,224 — FTA SECTION 5304

Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5304 monies are administered through Caltrans. These discretionary funds are apportioned annually to the states for use in planning and research and require an 11.47% local match. SACOG and its partners annually apply for funding for various projects throughout the region. While the final grant awards for these projects are not known until later in the fiscal year, the budget in fiscal year 2010-11 is the projected amount from prior year awards that will be used in the current fiscal year. Of the budgeted amount, $158,796 is for SACOG managed projects and $392,428 are grants through SACOG to transit partners.

$14,870,667 — CONGESTION MITIGATION & AIR QUALITY (CMAQ)

CMAQ is jointly administered by FHWA and FTA under SAFETEA-LU and provides funding for projects that reduce criteria air pollutants for air quality non-attainment areas. The formula for
distribution of funding is determined partly by the region’s population, but primarily by the severity
of ozone and carbon monoxide problems within the non-attainment area. CMAQ funds require an
11.47% match. CMAQ funding also supports projects classified as Transportation Control
Measures (TCMs). TCM projects include high occupancy vehicles (HOV) lanes, mass transit
investments, transportation demand management (TDM) programs, signal coordination and bicycle
facilities. CMAQ funds will be used for:

$6,500,000 – Sacramento Emergency Clean Air & Transportation (SECAT) Program. SECAT is a
program designed to replace certain diesel engines with cleaner-burning engines to aid in air quality
improvement. Originally funded with other types of state funding, CMAQ money will continue the
program throughout the region.

$6,550,667 – Connect Card Implementation. This funding will be used for implementation
planning, procurement, and deployment of a regional universal transit fare card system.

$1,760,000 – Regional Rideshare Program services. The Rideshare program promotes alternative
transportation mode uses like carpooling, vanpooling, public transit, bicycling, walking, and
telecommuting. SACOG’s ongoing Rideshare project encompasses these control measures. These
services are provided through four projects. Rideshare ($1,345,000); Education, Outreach, and
Marketing ($225,000); MTP Education and Outreach ($190,000).

$60,000 -- Pedestrian and Bicycle Planning. The funds will be used for SACOG to continue to serve
as a forum for bicycle and pedestrian planning activities throughout the region.

**$869,249 — FHWA SENATOR BOXER EARMARK**

This FHWA Earmark was granted through SAFETEA-LU for programs and projects that
contribute to improved air quality. SACOG will use $453,249 of the funds for the Rural-Urban
Connections Strategy (RUCS) project. This project approaches the region’s growth and
sustainability from a rural perspective, emphasizing the challenges and opportunities in rural areas.
The remaining $416,000 will be used to support the MTP Regional EIR Project ($200,000) and the
MTP Planning Project ($216,000).

**$292,498 — STATE PLANNING & RESEARCH**

The majority of these funds will be used for the development of Statewide Development of
Transportation-Land Use Planning tools ($285,789) and the remaining portion for Phase 3 of the
State Economic Land Use Model Development project ($6,709).

**$228,724 — CALTRANS REGIONAL BLUEPRINT PLANNING**

This funding was granted through the California Regional Blueprint Planning Program. The
vision of the program is of an ongoing framework for collaboration among regional agencies, local
governments and state agencies to promote mobility, more housing and transportation choices,
access to jobs, healthy communities, and a thriving economy. As part of continued Blueprint
Implementation, SACOG’s 2010-11 task list is reflected in these two projects: Forecasting Tools for Blueprint ($164,724) and MTP Education and Outreach ($64,000).

$18,692 — FTA ADMINISTRATIVE FEE FOR JARC PROGRAM

The FTA Administrative fee for SACOG to execute its role as the designated recipient for FTA 5316 Jobs Access Reverse Commute (JARC) and 5317 New Freedom Program funds for the Sacramento Urbanized area will be used for the Transit Technical Assistance and Programming project.

$8,885,494 — FTA FUNDING PASSED THROUGH TO UNITRANS AND SACRAMENTO REGIONAL TRANSIT DISTRICT

The FTA funding is to support projects for both Unitrans and Sacramento Regional Transit District awarded directly to them. Because of SACOG’s designation as the RTPA for the region, federal regulations require the funding be in SACOG’s OWP, however, SACOG has no authority over the funding. The projects designated for this funding are: Unitrans – CNG Fueling Facility study ($20,018), Master Plan for Memorial Union Terminal, and a parking lot study in downtown Davis ($200,018); SRTD – the transitional analysis of the Downtown-Natomas-Airport project ($8,665,458).
State Revenue Sources
$5,113,781

State of California Funding — $5,113,781

$403,500 — Planning, Programming and Monitoring

The PPM funding is used to support the budgets for the projects responsible for the planning, programming, and monitoring of projects throughout the region. These activities entail ensuring the project fits within the policies of MTP2035, securing funding for those projects, then following up on the delivery of those projects. This funding supports the Federal and State Programming project ($273,015) and the Project Delivery project ($130,485).

$2,792,721 — Regional Surface Transportation Program

SACOG has budgeted $2,586,924 toward the 511/STARNET Capital project which is a communications platform that will connect the local operations centers for traffic, transit and emergency response operators; $25,797 for project study reports for a number of regional projects; and $180,000 in administrative fee on the RSTP funds for the region that will be used to fund federal and state project programming activities.
$40,000 — High Occupancy Vehicle Fines

SACOG receives a portion of High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) fines occurring within the Sacramento region on an ongoing basis. These funds are applied toward costs associated with the 511 Automated Trip Planner project.

$68,184 — Agriculture Workers Transportation Grant

This Caltrans Mass Transportation Department grant is used to support SACOG’s efforts to help a newly formed joint powers agency implement the agriculture worker transportation program and start a vanpool program for agricultural workers in the four-county planning area. SACOG will assist in leading major marketing development activity also.

$154,974 — Caltrans Environmental Justice Grant and Partnership Planning Grant

Environmental Justice grants are designed to promote community involvement in planning to improve mobility, access, and safety while promoting economic opportunity, equity, and environmental protection. The Environmental Justice Grant is for the Outreach and Analysis of Regional Transit Dependent Needs project ($147,348). The Caltrans Partnership Planning Grant is for the Emergency Preparedness Business Continuity Study project ($7,626).

$73,124 — Caltrans Public Transportation Account

The funds in this revenue stream are Caltrans contribution of matching funds for the development of statewide transportation and land use tools and the grant received as matching funds for the statewide Transportation and Land Use Tools ($71,447) and Phase 3 of State Economic Land Use Model Development ($1,677).

$180,000 — Safe Routes to School

This Caltrans grant is to develop a regional policy for safe routes to school in cooperation with local public schools and local governments within the region. The project will include coordination of the infrastructure, education, and encouragement programs to be used in the educational setting to promote safety and health benefits of walking and bicycling to school.

$1,401,278 — Public Transportation Modernization Improvement & Service Enhancement Account (PTMISEA)

The PTMISEA fund is a portion of the state Proposition 1B bond issue that is designed to make improvements to the public transit system. SACOG will utilize $1,396,278 of the amount designated for the SACOG region to be used as the local match for the CMAQ funding on the Connect Card Implementation project and $5,000 for the Agricultural Worker Grant project.
Local Revenue Sources
$2,967,470

- Strategic Highway Research Program $124,840 4%
- Membership Dues $284,270 10%
- Interest Earnings $64,000 2%
- SRTD Reimbursement for Audit Services $32,000 1%
- Capitol Valley Regional SAFE $496,431 17%
- El Dorado County Transportation Commission $50,856 2%
- Placer County Transportation Planning Agency, $222,448, 7%

Local Funds — $2,967,470

$1,692,625 — LOCAL TRANSPORTATION FUNDS

The Transportation Development Act (TDA) provides funds for an annual planning fee and administrative assessment to perform various responsibilities as required by TDA law.

Local Transportation Funds (LTF) are derived from one-quarter percent of the general sales tax as identified in the Transportation Development Act, and are returned to the county of origin specifically to support transit programs. SACOG receives a 3% planning fee, $1,268,530 in this fiscal year, which is used as the local match for federal and state programs and to fund operations. SACOG also receives a 0.993% administration fee, $424,095, which is used to fund financial audits of the claimants for their TDA receipts and certain other administrative functions. These fees are based on the annual LTF apportionments to four of the counties and cities in the SACOG region.

$222,448 — PLACER COUNTY TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCY (PCTPA)

Pursuant to the terms of a memorandum of understanding, PCTPA compensates SACOG for
performing certain transportation planning and programming responsibilities required by SAFETEA-LU and the Clean Air Act. The amount for FY 2010-11 is $222,448.

$50,856 — EL DORADO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION (EDCTC)

Pursuant to the terms of a memorandum of understanding, EDCTC compensates SACOG for performing certain transportation planning and programming responsibilities required by SAFETEA-LU and the Clean Air Act. The amount for FY 2010-11 is $50,856.

$496,431— CAPITAL VALLEY REGIONAL SAFE

Capital Valley Regional SAFE contributes funding to two SACOG projects. The first is for the 511/STARNET operations, $161,268, and the second is matching funds, $335,163, for the RSTP funding of the 511/STARTNET Capital improvements program related to the communications platform for STARNET.

$32,000 — SACRAMENTO REGIONAL TRANSIT DISTRICT

The contract for audit services related to the Transportation Development Fund includes audit of the pension plan at Sacramento Regional Transit District. This portion of SRTD’s audit scope was included in the contract to achieve cost efficiencies for the service. Since the pension plan is not part of the SRTD operations funded in part with TDA revenues, SRTD will reimburse SACOG for the pension audit costs.

$124,840 — STRATEGIC HIGHWAY RESEARCH PROGRAM

This project is funded through the Strategic Highway Research Program (SHRP 2), “Partnership to Develop an Integrated, Advance Travel Demand Model and a Fine-Grained, Time-Sensitive Network. SACOG is providing subcontractor services for this project and is being reimbursed by Cambridge Systematics, Inc.

$284,270 — MEMBERSHIP DUES

Annual assessments are received from member cities and counties based on population as identified in the most recent California Department of Finance census estimates. Currently, 15.9¢ per capita plus an annual CPI increase (per Board action in May 2005) is the assessment for membership fees, which equals $365,677. However, the dues this year remain the same as last year’s amount, which amounts to a 22% reduction, per the Board’s instruction in order to provide some financial relief to the member agencies. Monies are used to fund the Board of Directors and Advocacy costs.
$64,000 — Interest Earnings

This is the estimated amount of interest earned on SACOG funds held at the County of Sacramento. It is used to supplement member dues for the Board of Directors and Advocacy budget.

Other Revenue Sources
$1,284,337

- Services to Others — $209,380
  - $138,914 – SACOG provides staff time and other services to the Capitol Valley SAFE program ($136,215) and Glenn County SAFE program ($2,699).
  - $70,466 – Yuba County has contracted with SACOG to provide airport land use planning for two airports within the county, Beale Air Force Base and Yuba County Airport.

- In-Kind from Others — $1,074,957
  - $845,000 – SACOG was awarded CMAQ funding to continue the SECAT engine replacement program. As a local match for these funds, the trucking companies receiving funds from the program will report the value of the engine cost in excess of the grant award.
  - $6,997 – These are in-kind funds for the Wheatland/Live Oak Marketing project ($2,409) and the City of Folsom SRTP ($4,588).
$176,130 – Transportation Management Associations are providing match for the Rideshare program. SACOG provides funding for the operations of the TMAs and, in return, the TMAs provide the in-kind match for the Rideshare program.

$46,830 – These are in-kind funds from the grantee used as match for the grants that are passed through SACOG to the subrecipient grantee.
# Indirect Costs

**Sacramento Area Council of Governments**  
**Fiscal Year 2010-11**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Direct Salaries and Benefits from OWP</th>
<th>$5,360,098</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Total Indirect Expenditures: $2,916,660
- Carry Forward (+/-) from FY 08-09: $396,051

**Adjusted Indirect Total Costs**: $3,312,711

### INDIRECT RATE - FY 2010-11

(Total Adjusted Indirect Costs ÷ Total Direct Salaries and Benefits from OWP) = 61.80%

### EXPENDITURES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meetings / Training</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mileage</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Services</td>
<td>$320,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Expenses</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books &amp; Periodicals</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Equipment Maintenance</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memberships</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>$71,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Rent - Meridian Plaza</td>
<td>$613,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACOG Vehicle Parking</td>
<td>$8,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Equipment &lt; $1,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting Processing Costs</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Development Program</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Software Maint/Licences</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Services</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Staffing (salaries/benefits)</td>
<td>$1,417,012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL FOR FY 2010-11**: $2,916,660

The indirect costs are based on the budget for costs not directly attributable to a specific Overall Work Program (OWP) project. The percentage is a calculation of the estimated cost for the indirect costs as a function of the direct labor costs in the OWP plus the over/under of budgeted estimates from two fiscal years prior. The final percentage is charged to each project in the OWP and invoiced to the funding sources of that project. The Indirect Cost rate must be approved by the Caltrans Division of Audits and Investigations before SACOG can invoice for reimbursement.
### Sacramento Area Council of Governments

**Salaried Personnel by Year and Position**

**Fiscal Year 2010-11**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>FY 10-11 Budgeted</th>
<th>Final FY 09-10</th>
<th>Actual FY 08-09</th>
<th>Actual FY 07-08</th>
<th>Actual FY 06-07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accountant I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountant II</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountant III</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting Technician</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant II</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Clerk I</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Clerk II</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Coordinator II</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Planner</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Planner</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Research Analyst</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Research Analyst</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Graphic Designer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Public Information Coordinator</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk of the Board</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk of the Board/Human Resource Specialist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Research Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Community Planning &amp; Operations</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of External Affairs &amp; Member Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Finance/Acting Finance Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Transportation Planning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Research and Analysis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology Analyst II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Planner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager of Communications</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager of Capital Programs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager of Project Delivery</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager of Transportation Planning</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager 511/ITS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Project Expert</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Information Coordinator II</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Technician</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Accountant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Graphic Designer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Information Tech Analyst</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Planner</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Research Analyst</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Senior Planner</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Research Analyst</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Number of Employees                | 49                | 51.5           | 50.5           | 52             | 50             |
Sacramento Area Council of Governments

Capital Asset Expenditures
(Furniture, Equipment, Computers)
Fiscal Year 2010-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>2010-11 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**REVENUE:**
Local Funds $100,000

**EXPENDITURES:**

- Computer Hardware Upgrades/Replacements $40,000
- Software Acquisition $10,000
- Office Furniture and Equipment $20,000
- Other $10,000
- Equipment < $1,000 $20,000

**Total Equipment and Furniture** $100,000
BOARD OF DIRECTORS
& ADVOCACY
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### Budget for Board of Directors and Advocacy

**Fiscal Year 2010-11**

**With Comparison to Fiscal Year 2009-10**

#### REVENUE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2010-11</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2009-10 Projected</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership Dues</td>
<td>$284,270</td>
<td>$284,270</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board and Advocacy reserve funds</td>
<td>49,976</td>
<td>51,755</td>
<td>12,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACOG funding for employee's excess travel costs</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Local Funds - (est. interest on general account)</td>
<td>64,000</td>
<td>64,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES:</strong></td>
<td>$399,246</td>
<td>$401,025</td>
<td>40,717</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### EXPENDITURES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2010-11</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2009-10</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meetings / Training / Travel Expenses</td>
<td>$30,500</td>
<td>$30,500</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Employees</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Directors</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Mission</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board to Cap-to-Cap</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTC/MTC Advisory sponsorships</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refreshments for meetings</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Reimbursement</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>86,613</td>
<td>28,613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Parking Passes</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td>173,796</td>
<td>173,808</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Legislative Consultant</td>
<td>108,732</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Legislative Consultant</td>
<td>65,064</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Expenses</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memberships</td>
<td>51,450</td>
<td>40,950</td>
<td>9,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NARC</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Communities</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRB Dues</td>
<td>4,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTA Dues</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALCOG dues</td>
<td>17,850</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Transit Association</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee’s excess travel costs</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Benefits, and Overhead</td>
<td>64,000</td>
<td>64,654</td>
<td>654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>$399,246</td>
<td>$401,025</td>
<td>40,717</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Sacramento Area Council of Governments
### Annual Membership Assessments
#### Fiscal Year 2010-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Agency</th>
<th>Population (CA Dept. of Finance 01/08)</th>
<th>Population (CA Dept. of Finance 01/09)</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
<th>Dues Calculation at 15.9¢ per capita</th>
<th>Jurisdictions to Pay - same as prior year assessment</th>
<th>Dues</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
<th>Reduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>El Dorado County:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
<td>145,726</td>
<td>145,916</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>$23,207</td>
<td>$18,164</td>
<td>$5,043</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10,271</td>
<td>10,373</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>$1,650</td>
<td>$1,280</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Placer County:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
<td>108,894</td>
<td>110,433</td>
<td>1,539</td>
<td>$17,564</td>
<td>$13,573</td>
<td>$3,991</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn</td>
<td>13,273</td>
<td>13,432</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>$2,136</td>
<td>1,655</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colfax</td>
<td>1,855</td>
<td>1,878</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$299</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>39,758</td>
<td>40,060</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>$6,371</td>
<td>4,955</td>
<td>1,416</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loomis</td>
<td>6,624</td>
<td>6,677</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>$1,062</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocklin</td>
<td>53,843</td>
<td>54,754</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>$8,708</td>
<td>6,711</td>
<td>1,997</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseville</td>
<td>109,154</td>
<td>112,343</td>
<td>3,189</td>
<td>$17,867</td>
<td>13,605</td>
<td>4,262</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sacramento County:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
<td>563,514</td>
<td>565,309</td>
<td>1,795</td>
<td>$89,909</td>
<td>$70,238</td>
<td>$19,671</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citrus Heights</td>
<td>87,321</td>
<td>87,565</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>$13,927</td>
<td>10,884</td>
<td>3,043</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elk Grove</td>
<td>139,542</td>
<td>141,430</td>
<td>1,888</td>
<td>$22,494</td>
<td>17,393</td>
<td>5,101</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folsom</td>
<td>72,590</td>
<td>71,018</td>
<td>(1,572)</td>
<td>$11,295</td>
<td>9,048</td>
<td>2,247</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galt</td>
<td>23,913</td>
<td>24,133</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>$3,838</td>
<td>2,981</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isleton</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$130</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Cordova</td>
<td>60,975</td>
<td>61,817</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>$9,832</td>
<td>7,600</td>
<td>2,232</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>475,743</td>
<td>481,097</td>
<td>5,354</td>
<td>$76,516</td>
<td>59,298</td>
<td>17,218</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sutter County:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
<td>24,001</td>
<td>24,336</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>$3,870</td>
<td>$2,991</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live Oak</td>
<td>8,539</td>
<td>8,571</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>$1,363</td>
<td>1,064</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuba City</td>
<td>63,338</td>
<td>63,647</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>$10,123</td>
<td>7,894</td>
<td>2,229</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yolo County:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
<td>23,265</td>
<td>23,471</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>$3,733</td>
<td>$2,900</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>65,814</td>
<td>66,005</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>$10,498</td>
<td>8,203</td>
<td>2,295</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Sacramento</td>
<td>47,068</td>
<td>47,782</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>$7,599</td>
<td>5,867</td>
<td>1,732</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winters</td>
<td>7,052</td>
<td>7,052</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,122</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland</td>
<td>55,867</td>
<td>56,399</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>$8,970</td>
<td>6,963</td>
<td>2,007</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yuba County:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
<td>55,700</td>
<td>56,517</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>$8,989</td>
<td>$6,942</td>
<td>2,047</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marysville</td>
<td>12,719</td>
<td>12,838</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>$2,042</td>
<td>1,586</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheatland</td>
<td>3,510</td>
<td>3,548</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>$564</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>2,280,686</td>
<td>2,299,219</td>
<td>18,533</td>
<td>$365,677</td>
<td>$284,270</td>
<td>$81,407</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Sacramento Area Council of Governments

Five-Year Budget Comparison Graphs
Fiscal Years 2005 through 2009

**REVENUES**

![Bar graph showing revenues for fiscal years 2006-07 to 2010-11 with data points for final and projected budgets.]

**EXPENDITURES**

![Bar graph showing expenditures for fiscal years 2006-07 to 2010-11 with data points for final and projected budgets.]
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Sacramento Area Council of Governments
Planning & Administration Fund
Five-Year Budget Comparison
Fiscal Years 2006 through 2011

REVENUES:
Federal Funding:
Federal Highway Administration - Metro Plan (PL)  $3,359,656 $2,966,223 $2,396,171
Federal Transit Administration (Section 5303) 646,599 674,653 640,150
Federal Transit Administration (Section 5304) 651,160 709,446 901,055
Federal Transit Administration (Section 5316/5317) 21,923 - -
Federal Transit Administration (Section 5307) 21,923 - -
Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality 1,189,656 10,487,884 10,812,408
Federal Discretionary Earmarks 2,046,639 2,828,721 1,987,353
Other Federal Grants 699,258 436,000 1,899,265
Total Federal Funding $8,684,241 $18,137,710 $18,636,402

State of California Funding:
Planning, Programming, Monitoring 241,075 $608,877 $734,215
State Transportation Improvement Program 6,660,000 - -
Regional Surface Transportation Program 1,249,867 842,631 3,516,316
High Occupancy Vehicle Fines 51,949 81,166 45,000
Other State Grants 256,080 407,397 726,297
Total State of California Funding $1,798,971 $8,600,271 $5,021,828

Local Funds:
Transportation Development Act 2,908,233 $2,539,125 $2,300,605
Placer County Transportation Planning Agency (PCTPA) 389,741 316,733 260,332
El Dorado County Transportation Commission (EDCTC) 79,973 73,816 77,979
Capitol Valley Regional SAFE (SAFE) 576,001 1,173,169 1,017,578
Other Outside Agency Funding 720,825 716,800 851,520
Other Costs 315,086 336,416 349,485
Interest Earnings 64,000 64,000 64,000
Total Local Funds $5,053,459 $5,216,859 $4,921,499

Services to Others:
Capitol Valley Regional SAFE (SAFE) 252,779 $307,087 $121,121
Glenn County SAFE 2,968 3,000 14,827
Partner Agencies 1,074,744 869,027 389,506
Airport Land Use Planning Projects 162,180 300,000 291,375
Sponsorships 215,514 - -
Total Services to Others $1,708,185 $1,479,114 $816,829

In-Kind Funds from Others:
Partner Agencies $370,191 $910,427 $684,578
Transportation Management Associations (TMAs) 74,725 175,009 75,000
SRTD Matching Funds for FTA Funding 1,026,592 8,663,592 9,530,904
PTMISEA Funding - 52,503 107,734
Total In-Kind Funds from Others $444,916 $3,164,531 $9,530,904

Pass Through Grants to Other Agencies $91,250 $423,842 $250,000
Other Revenue $136,286 $186,365 $678,809
TOTAL REVENUES $17,917,308 $37,208,692 $39,856,271

EXPENDITURES:
Overall Work Program:
Direct Labor and Benefits $4,426,185 $5,605,053 $5,986,782
Indirect Costs 2,215,462 3,229,901 3,306,528
Consulting Costs 7,076,067 9,510,998 5,974,855
Pass-through to Other Agencies 2,075,153 12,414,678 13,014,737
Equipment and Software 105,000 6,212,100 10,905,423
Other Costs 915,007 773,364 1,448,841
Board Advocacy 379,086 397,416 414,485
Total EXPENDITURES $17,191,960 $38,153,510 $41,051,651

Difference Revenues vs. EXPENDITURES $725,348 $(944,818) $(1,195,380)
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### SACOG Budget FY 2010-11

#### Sacramento Area Council of Governments

**Planning & Administration Fund**

**Five-Year Budget Comparison**

Fiscal Years 2006 through 2011

---

**REVENUES:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>09-10 Budget</th>
<th>10-11 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal Funding:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Highway Administration - Metro Plan (PL)</td>
<td>2,822,309</td>
<td>2,507,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Transit Administration (Section 5303)</td>
<td>1,202,575</td>
<td>773,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Transit Administration (Section 5304)</td>
<td>890,628</td>
<td>551,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Transit Administration (Section 5316/5317)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Transit Administration (Section 5307)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality</td>
<td>5,541,793</td>
<td>14,870,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Discretionary Earmarks</td>
<td>3,084,960</td>
<td>1,390,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Federal Grants</td>
<td>8,902,284</td>
<td>8,904,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Federal Funding</strong></td>
<td>22,444,549</td>
<td>28,997,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State of California Funding:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning, Programming, Monitoring</td>
<td>809,000</td>
<td>403,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Surface Transportation Program</td>
<td>398,932</td>
<td>2,792,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTMISEA Funding</td>
<td>1,401,278</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Occupancy Vehicle Fines</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other State Grants</td>
<td>1,258,962</td>
<td>476,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total State of California Funding</strong></td>
<td>2,506,894</td>
<td>5,113,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Funds:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Development Act</td>
<td>2,235,006</td>
<td>1,692,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer County Transportation Planning Agency (PCTPA)</td>
<td>273,151</td>
<td>222,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado County Transportation Commission (EDCTC)</td>
<td>63,191</td>
<td>50,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitol Valley Regional SAFE (SAFE)</td>
<td>193,973</td>
<td>496,431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Outside Agency Funding</td>
<td>79,872</td>
<td>156,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Dues</td>
<td>294,270</td>
<td>284,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Local Funds</strong></td>
<td>3,193,463</td>
<td>2,967,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Services to Others:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitol Valley Regional SAFE (SAFE)</td>
<td>171,727</td>
<td>136,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn County SAFE</td>
<td>4,534</td>
<td>2,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner Agencies</td>
<td>119,463</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Land Use Planning Projects</td>
<td>211,229</td>
<td>70,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Services to Others</strong></td>
<td>506,953</td>
<td>209,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>In-Kind Funds from Others:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner Agencies</td>
<td>610,376</td>
<td>851,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Management Associations (TMAs)</td>
<td>123,879</td>
<td>176,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRTD Matching Funds for FTA Funding</td>
<td>46,828</td>
<td>46,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total In-Kind Funds from Others</strong></td>
<td>780,883</td>
<td>1,074,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pass Through Grants to Other Agencies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES:</strong></td>
<td>29,432,742</td>
<td>38,363,059</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXPENDITURES:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>09-10 Budget</th>
<th>10-11 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Work Program:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Labor and Benefits</td>
<td>5,132,244</td>
<td>5,360,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Costs</td>
<td>3,873,819</td>
<td>2,916,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting Costs</td>
<td>4,612,691</td>
<td>4,786,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass-through to Other Agencies</td>
<td>14,919,662</td>
<td>17,438,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment and Software</td>
<td>107,100</td>
<td>7,330,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Costs</td>
<td>393,930</td>
<td>1,172,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Advocacy</td>
<td>401,025</td>
<td>399,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>29,440,471</td>
<td>39,404,887</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>09-10 Budget</th>
<th>10-11 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Difference Revenues vs. Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>(7,729)</td>
<td>(1,041,828)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual 2006-07</th>
<th>Actual 2007-08</th>
<th>Actual 2008-09</th>
<th>Projected Actual 2009-10</th>
<th>Budget 2010-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership Dues</td>
<td>315,086</td>
<td>315,086</td>
<td>349,485</td>
<td>284,270</td>
<td>284,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other local Funds (interest on general acct)</td>
<td>164,736</td>
<td>106,044</td>
<td>64,000</td>
<td>64,000</td>
<td>64,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>3,478</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Reserve Funds to Balance Budget</td>
<td>12,038</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>479,822</td>
<td>427,630</td>
<td>416,963</td>
<td>360,308</td>
<td>399,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings/Trainings/Travel Expenses</td>
<td>23,260</td>
<td>45,598</td>
<td>38,944</td>
<td>30,500</td>
<td>30,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Reimbursements</td>
<td>52,536</td>
<td>46,010</td>
<td>60,338</td>
<td>58,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Parking Passes</td>
<td>1,325</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td>183,200</td>
<td>187,045</td>
<td>188,932</td>
<td>173,808</td>
<td>173,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memberships</td>
<td>26,538</td>
<td>38,683</td>
<td>28,773</td>
<td>31,750</td>
<td>51,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff time &amp; remaining costs</td>
<td>140,635</td>
<td>69,341</td>
<td>56,326</td>
<td>65,250</td>
<td>66,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>427,494</td>
<td>388,677</td>
<td>373,763</td>
<td>360,308</td>
<td>399,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Difference of revenues over expenditures</strong></td>
<td>$52,328</td>
<td>$38,953</td>
<td>$43,200</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER FINANCING SOURCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Reserve Funds to balance Budget</td>
<td>$52,328</td>
<td>$38,953</td>
<td>$43,200</td>
<td>(12,038)</td>
<td>(49,976)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in Fund Balance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(12,038)</td>
<td>(49,976)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Fund Balance</td>
<td>$77,575</td>
<td>$129,903</td>
<td>$168,856</td>
<td>$212,056</td>
<td>$200,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance — Ending</td>
<td>$129,903</td>
<td>$168,856</td>
<td>$212,056</td>
<td>$200,018</td>
<td>$150,042</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Sacramento Area Council of Governments
### Financing Corporation
#### Fiscal Year 2010-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### REVENUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest</th>
<th>80,895</th>
<th>139,201</th>
<th>171,168</th>
<th>156,178</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>80,895</td>
<td>139,201</td>
<td>171,168</td>
<td>156,178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EXPENDITURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Total Expenditures</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### OTHER FINANCING SOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changes in Fund Balance</th>
<th>$80,895</th>
<th>$139,201</th>
<th>$171,168</th>
<th>$156,178</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### REVENUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest</th>
<th>90,203</th>
<th>75,000</th>
<th>55,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>90,203</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>55,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EXPENDITURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>1,000,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER FINANCING SOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changes in Fund Balance</th>
<th>$90,203</th>
<th>$75,000</th>
<th>-$945,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Fund Balance</td>
<td>$3,699,737</td>
<td>$3,789,940</td>
<td>$3,864,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance — Ending</td>
<td>$3,789,940</td>
<td>$3,864,940</td>
<td>$2,919,940</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The SACOG Financing Corporation does not have an annual budget. In May 2010, the SACOG Board of Directors approved the use of approximately $1 million of these funds, if necessary, to cover FY 2010-11 operations, if certain grant funding does not come in as anticipated.

The SACOG Financing Corporation was created to purchase an ownership interest in the Meridian Plaza complex in conjunction with a local developer. During 2004-05, the Meridian Plaza complex was sold, resulting in a net gain to the Financing Corporation of $1.2 million for the initial investment of $2 million. Since then the proceeds have been invested in the Sacramento County investment pool and have accumulated interest earnings, bringing the total cash and investment pool to $3.8 million at June 30, 2009. During 2006-07, the Board of Directors designated the resources in this fund for the funding of the retiree health benefits. In 2009 the funds in SACOG's post retirement medical trust were transferred to the CalPERS Employer Retiree Benefit Trust (CERBT). While the funds in the Financing Corporation were not transferred into the CERBT, the Board has no immediate plans for the use of these funds.
## Summary of Changes in Fund Balance Compared to Budget

**Fiscal Year 2010-11**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2006-07</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2007-08</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2008-09</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2009-10</th>
<th>Project Budget for Fiscal Year 2010-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final Projected Budget Change in Fund Balance</td>
<td>725,348</td>
<td>944,818</td>
<td>1,195,380</td>
<td>7,729</td>
<td>(1,041,828)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Change in Fund Balance</td>
<td>809,018</td>
<td>(84,125)</td>
<td>(243,334)</td>
<td>not yet known</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>(83,670)</td>
<td>(860,693)</td>
<td>(952,046)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Break-out of Actual Change in Fund Balance

| Planning and Administration Fund | 756,690             | 123,078             | 286,534             | (991,852)           |
| Board and Advocacy Fund          | 52,328               | 38,953              | 43,200              | (49,976)            |
|                                    | 809,018              | (84,125)            | (243,334)           | (1,041,828)         |

### FY 2008-09 Explanation of Fund Balance Deficit

The combined Planning and Administration and Board and Advocacy Fund balance decreased by $243,334 which was higher than the previous year's $84,125 decrease. The original budget had projected a $488,188 deficit. The decline in Local Transportation Funds (that impact SACOG’s budgeted operations) helped contribute to the deficit.

SACOG's operations are mostly reimbursement based due to its funding structure. Expenditures drive the offsetting revenues, which in most cases results in a net zero effect. However, every year SACOG does receive a significant stream of revenue that is not reimbursement based. These are the TDA funds for planning and administration which are used as match for our federal grants and can be used to overmatch project costs, if deemed necessary.

A Deficit can occur when SACOG spends more than this annual stream of money, and dips into its reserves to cover operating costs. Reasons for this could include: 1) a project used more TDA funds than another; or 2) less TDA funds are received during the year because of a decrease in sales taxes, in which case, SACOG may decide to still expend the funds and use reserves to cover the costs.

### FY 2008 and FY 2009 Project Budget Change in Fund Balance Number (Deficits)

Due to the budget OWP format requirements of our Federal/State Funding partners, the final Projected Change in Fund Balance can be substantially different from the actual results as noted in these two years, where the variance is $860,693 and $952,046. This is because SACOG had to include entire amounts of grant funding (beyond the needs for the year), which required a higher amount of matching funds (TDA) for the budget to balance.

### FY 2010 and 2011

In 2010, SACOG has attempted to modify the budget methods so that the final budget comes closer to the actual results intended.
OVERALL WORK PROGRAM
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Sacramento Area Council of Governments
Overall Work Program Revenue and Expenditures Graphs
Fiscal Year 2010-11

OWP Revenues
$38,363,059

- Local Funds $2,967,470 (8%)
- Services to Others $209,380 (1%)
- In-Kind Funds from Others $1,074,957 (3%)
- State of California Funding $5,113,781 (13%)
- Federal Funding $28,997,471 (75%)

OWP Expenditures by Work Element
$39,301,692

- Miscellaneous Other Funding $8,885,494 (23%)
- Pass through to Other Agencies $452,013 (1%)
- Member & Agency Services $13,551,413 (34%)
- Metropolitan Transportation Plan Planning $2,105,263 (5%)
- Long-Range Transportation Planning $1,513,016 (4%)
- Short-Range Transportation Planning & Studies $676,213 (2%)
- Continuing Transportation Implementation $8,957,800 (23%)
- Land Use & Housing Planning $1,614,503 (4%)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>FY 2010-11 TOTAL OVERALL WORK PROGRAM DIRECT SERVICES AND PASS THROUGH PROJECT REVENUE ESTIMATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</td>
<td>FBMRA PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8,885,494</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- This table represents the total overall work program for the FY 2010-11 fiscal year.
- **Total Expenditures** include all direct services and pass-through project revenues estimated for the year.
- **SB心头** indicates the specific projects and their associated costs.
- **SB心头** includes details on the matching requirements and the percentage match applied to projects.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCT #</th>
<th>ELEMENT</th>
<th>TOTAL BUDGET</th>
<th>Salaries &amp; Benefits</th>
<th>Indirect Services</th>
<th>Consultants</th>
<th>Printing</th>
<th>Meetings/ Other</th>
<th>Pass-Through</th>
<th>Telecommuni- cation</th>
<th>Equipment/ Software</th>
<th>Marketing</th>
<th>Advertising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11-001</td>
<td>Government Relations, Public Affairs, &amp; Administration</td>
<td>$1,467,063</td>
<td>$835,638</td>
<td>$516,425</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-002</td>
<td>Long Range Transportation Planning</td>
<td>$1,513,016</td>
<td>$621,903</td>
<td>$394,337</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$11,500</td>
<td>$8,124,130</td>
<td>$41,735</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$320,772</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-003</td>
<td>Short Range Transportation Planning &amp; Studies</td>
<td>$876,215</td>
<td>$294,466</td>
<td>$180,742</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$101,295</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-004</td>
<td>Continuing Transportation Implementation</td>
<td>$5,955,955</td>
<td>$733,670</td>
<td>$453,468</td>
<td>$540,000</td>
<td>$7,250,722</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-005</td>
<td>Land Use and Housing Planning</td>
<td>$6,541,895</td>
<td>$681,982</td>
<td>$409,090</td>
<td>$227,000</td>
<td>$316,951</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-006</td>
<td>Metropolitan Transportation Plan Planning</td>
<td>$5,135,262</td>
<td>$567,516</td>
<td>$310,364</td>
<td>$253,000</td>
<td>$146,999</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$117,483</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-007</td>
<td>Member, Agency, &amp; Transportation Services</td>
<td>$13,541,143</td>
<td>$1,169,289</td>
<td>$722,782</td>
<td>$3,085,193</td>
<td>$72,000</td>
<td>$11,500</td>
<td>$6,126,130</td>
<td>$41,735</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$226,772</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-008</td>
<td>Pass-Through to Other Agencies</td>
<td>$452,013</td>
<td>$18,639</td>
<td>$6,575</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$434,799</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-009</td>
<td>Miscellaneous Other Funding</td>
<td>$8,885,494</td>
<td>$7,453</td>
<td>$2,133</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-101</td>
<td>Services to Other Agencies</td>
<td>$128,813</td>
<td>$17,612</td>
<td>$4,964</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$13,338</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL EXPENDITURES for OWP Reporting Purposes:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>$39,309,641</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$36,309,608</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ELEMENT 11-001: GOVERNMENT RELATIONS, PUBLIC AFFAIRS, AND ADMINISTRATION — $1,407,063

Objective: To provide coordinated support for the Board of Directors and its committees; to interact and coordinate with outside partners and agencies; to analyze, comment, and offer recommendations on legislation related to transportation and land use issues; and to provide to the region public outreach related to SACOG activities and issues.

Discussion: This element provides the overall management, coordination, and direction for the Overall Work Program and its activities, including public and partner outreach related to those activities. Activities in this element will provide the interaction with the Board of Directors and its committees, coordination with partner agencies and committees, and Native American tribal councils as they relate to the project activities included in the Overall Work Program, and will further the public participation in SACOG activities so crucial to implementing the OWP. Issues and policies related to transportation and land use planning will be discussed.

1. INTERAGENCY RELATIONS  Project #11-001-01
(Board Policy – State and Federal Requirements)
Interagency relations covers consultations and coordination of SACOG activities with other local agencies in the region, with state and federal agencies, tribal governments, and other agencies outside the region. It includes discussion and development of cooperative activities, meetings to share information, presentations of SACOG policy to other agencies, communications with elected officials and executive staff in member jurisdictions, and attendance at educational conferences, sessions of a general policy nature, and tribal meetings.

Goals:
- Telephone calls and attendance at meetings (As needed)
- Staff memos and communications (As needed)
- Minutes documenting consultations with tribal governments (As needed)

2. PROGRAM MANAGEMENT  Project #11-001-02
(Board Policy – State and Federal Requirements)
Program management encompasses internal direction of staff activities and preparation of materials for the Board and its committees. It includes development of the OWP itself, coordination and oversight of staff work within the OWP, execution of policy direction and cooperative agreements, and preparation of agenda materials, staff reports, and recommendations to the SACOG Board and its committees.

Goals:
- Highlight summary/Executive Director’s Report (Monthly)
- Updated cooperative and funding agreements (As needed)
- Board committee agendas and staff reports (Monthly)
- Board agendas and staff reports (Monthly)
3. Multi-Agency Planning and Coordination  

Project #11-001-03

Liaise with outside partner agencies, committees and their related staffs; attend meetings with SACOG advisory and technical committees such as the Regional Planning Partnership, Transit Coordinating Committee, Goods Movement Advisory Group, and Planners Committee; and attend meetings at various partner and tribal agencies. Input from these committees will be used by SACOG implementing the MTP 2035 and Regional Blueprint Plan; completing various transit studies and projects; performing other transportation planning activities; maintaining regular contact with partner agency staff; review and preparation of agendas; and participating in transportation studies led by others.

Goals:

a. Preparation of meeting agendas and staff reports for SACOG advisory and technical committees (Ongoing)

b. Attendance at local jurisdictional meetings (Ongoing)

c. Meeting summaries and comments on studies by partner organizations (Ongoing)

d. Documentation of tribal government-to-government relations (i.e., coordination, consultation, and collaboration efforts) (Ongoing)

4. Legislative Analysis  

Project #11-001-04

SACOG needs to understand the contents and implications of various bills moving through the state Legislature and Congress each year, as well as track progress of all bills of interest. The SACOG Board adopts individual state and federal advocacy strategies each year reflecting core legislative policy principles to guide efforts throughout the year for tracking legislation for impacts to local and regional governments in SACOG’s core policy areas. Staff canvasses bills that are introduced, reads and analyzes bill language to understand its requirements and consequences, tracks the progress of bills, reports on bills to committees and the Board. This work task covers these analytic activities. Advocacy activities are funded under Lobbying and Advocacy in non-Overall Work Program activities elsewhere in the agency budget.

This project also includes reinforcing relations with our member jurisdictions, public agencies, and service providers within the six-county area by regularly monitoring websites, agendas, and public meetings and maintaining a staff presence on projects and issues related to our core policy areas. Staff will continue to provide regular updates to all interested government agencies and elected officials on SACOG Board actions and staff activity as appropriate with publications, website information, press releases, and other communication tools. Staff will also work closely with our state lobbyist and federal lobbyist to provide appropriate and timely information to the SACOG Board and member jurisdictions.

Goals:

a. Monthly tracking and bill analysis reports to SACOG committees and Board during legislative sessions

b. Monitor and attend public meetings in member jurisdictions (As needed)

c. Legislative Action Summaries (As needed)

d. Year-end report to Board on status and final disposition of tracked bills (November 2010)
5. **EDUCATION, OUTREACH, AND MARKETING**

(Federal Requirement – Board Policy)

This project includes public outreach, marketing, and expanded consultation and cooperation efforts, which are aimed at the general public, stakeholder groups and specific constituencies, such as elected officials, neighborhood associations, special-interest advocacy groups, and Native American tribal governments.

Specific outreach and marketing techniques include special events, such as the annual regional awards known as “SACOG Salutes!,” as well as open houses, workshops, forums, and ribbon-cutting ceremonies for major transportation projects; direct-mail products, such as fliers or brochures, that communicate particular information to particular constituencies; media outreach, including news releases, opinion editorials, targeted meetings with local and regional newspaper editors, appearances on radio, television, and public affair shows; some print and radio advertising; website and new media communications on specific agency projects and special events or education activities; and scheduled publications, such as the Regional Report newsletter and SACOG’s Annual Report. Products from these projects maintain uniformity in the visual aspect of our publications and media outreach program and highlight the value that SACOG adds to the region.

Ongoing documentation of outreach efforts with traditionally under-represented and under-served populations (i.e., elderly, disabled, low-income, and minority communities: Black, Hispanic, Asian American, American Indian/Alaskan Native, and Pacific Islander), and other groups that have not traditionally participated in SACOG’s planning efforts.

**Goals:**

- Special publications for SACOG’s planning projects (As needed)
- Press releases (As needed)
- Website information on individual projects and programs (As needed)
- Advertisements in print and radio (As needed)
- SACOG Salutes! Annual Awards Event (December 2010)
- SACOG Annual Report (March 2011)
- Regional Report (Bi-monthly)
**ELEMENT 11-002: LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING — $1,513,016**

**Objective:** To support long range planning efforts as they relate to, but do not directly support, the fiscal year 2010-11 tasks to develop the new Metropolitan Transportation Plan.

**Discussion:** This element identifies projects that further the planning efforts of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) as it relates to various aspects of MTP 2035 implementation. This element also identifies projects that are longer-term planning projects dictated by SAFETEA-LU.

1. **MODEL DEVELOPMENT**

   **Project #11-002-01**

   (State and Federal Requirements)

   This project is the continuation of a multi-year travel and land use model improvement program.

   The SACSIM regional travel model’s improvement this year will focus on the addition of transportation pricing capabilities. This project was started in FY 2009-10 through a grant from the Strategic Growth Council. This improvement will allow SACSIM to analyze pricing and tolling proposals. The desired pricing/tolling capabilities would include a full suite of options to allow for analysis of: standard toll road proposals, congestion pricing proposals, VMT charges, and transit pricing proposals. The capabilities would take advantage of the disaggregated, micro-simulation basis of SACSIM. This work will be performed by SACOG staff and by a consultant.

   The PECAS economic land use model started a development project in FY 2007-08. Since then, development has proceeded as time and resources permitted. In FY 2009-10, final system integration with SACMET and calibration work was completed. Work this year will focus on validating the model system and developing scenarios to assess its role in the regional planning process. This work will be performed by SACOG staff and a researcher from UC Davis as part of the research partnership SACOG recently formed with UC Davis.

   The I-PLACE’S land use planning model will not have any development work done under this project. A related project, #11-002-11 Forecasting Tools for Blueprint, will fund these improvements.

   **Goals:**
   a. Final report on SACSIM model pricing improvements (March 2011)
   b. Status report on PECAS model evaluation (January 2011)

2. **BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN PLANNING**

   **Project #11-002-02**

   (State and Federal Requirements)

   SACOG will continue to serve as a forum for bicycle and pedestrian planning activities throughout the region. Staff will be available to local jurisdictions and partner organizations to collaborate on bicycle and pedestrian planning, advocacy, and education efforts. The SACOG Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee will continue to meet regularly to discuss bicycle and pedestrian issues affecting the region and will continue to function as an advisory committee to the SACOG Board of Directors. SACOG will
continue refining a web-based bicycle trip planner and developing a regional paper map of existing bicycle facilities. Staff has also started developing a set of survey materials for Walkability Audits designed to feed into SACOG’s Regional Street database file. The audits are intended to help inform the development of a Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Index Tool to compare pedestrian and bicycle accessibility issues within distinct communities in the six-county SACOG region. Staff will continue to support increased funding for bicycle and pedestrian projects. SACOG will maintain its role in planning and coordinating May is Bike Month. To help ensure that bicycling and walking continue to grow as forms of transportation in the region, SACOG will work with member agencies and local groups to develop a mobility training module for bicycle and pedestrian travel.

Goals:

a. Develop and operate a web-based bicycle trip planner for the Sacramento region (Ongoing through June 2011)
b. Create a regional map of existing bicycle facilities for print and distribution to the public (Ongoing)
c. Develop Walkability Audit Survey Materials (Ongoing through June 2011)
d. Begin to develop scope and methodology for Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Index Tool (Ongoing)

3. REGIONAL FORECASTING

(Sacramento Area Council of Governments)

SACOG uses regional growth projections (population, housing, and employment) and travel and vehicle emissions forecasts for the MTP, the MTIP, and other corridor and sub-area plans. This project will provide technical assistance to our planning partner agencies in the region through the use of SACOG data and forecasting tools. Staff will provide assistance on an as-needed basis and through periodic technical committee meetings and training sessions.

Training and orientation meetings for the regional modeling community will be held for the SACSIM activity-based travel model and for I-PLACE’S land use planning model.

Standard tabulations, maps, and charts will be prepared for member jurisdictions from SACOG’s forecasting work and be made available via SACOG’s website. Special reports or analyses requested by member agencies, based on completed regional forecasts, will be prepared as time permits.

Goals:

a. Travel model assistance to partner organizations – Summary report (June 2011)
b. Forecasting datasets and standard tabulations, maps and charts (January 2011)
c. Special tabulations and analyses – Summary report (June 2011)

4. HIGHWAY PLANNING AND OPERATIONS

(Sacramento Area Council of Governments)

Regional transportation planning encompasses all modes, including coordination and analytic work related to highways, streets, and roads. In 2010-11, SACOG will continue to examine the chemistry between road improvements and Blueprint infill and redevelopment and will assist partner organizations in
understanding these relationships. SACOG will analyze road-related issues, such as High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes and ITS effectiveness, the integration of bicycles and transit into existing roadway design, road tolls and parking charges, the degree and spread of congestion, and how changing travel demands affect bottleneck points on the road system. SACOG will examine project scope and cost for inclusion in both the regional transportation plan and programming processes. These activities may in some cases yield a report, but in general, the output will be used in the development of the new MTP.

Goals:

a. Occasional topical reports or issue papers (Ongoing through June 2011)

5. **HUMAN SERVICES TRANSPORTATION COORDINATION AND PARATRANSIT, INC. PLANNING**
   
   Project #11-002-05
   
   (State and Federal Requirements/Board Policy and Local Agreement)
   
   This work will monitor and assist the implementation of the Human Services Transportation Plan (HSTP) completed in the summer of 2007. The HSTP fulfills planning requirements contained in the SAFETEA-LU in Section 5316 Job Access and Reverse Commute, Section 5317 New Freedom programs, and Section 5310 Elderly and Disabled Transit Project. SACOG will continue to work with the Transit Coordinating Committee, regional partners, tribal governments, and representatives of the region’s human service agencies, private non-profit service providers, consumers, and social service programs to implement the HSTP and to identify critical follow up tasks. SACOG will coordinate these activities with Caltrans and other partners.

Goals:

a. Form a Human Services Transportation Coordinated Planning Working Group and hold meetings (As needed)

b. Documentation of tribal government-to-government relations (i.e., coordination, consultation, and collaboration efforts (Ongoing)

c. Update, as needed, the Human Services Transportation Plan (June 2011)

d. Disadvantaged populations map and transit accessibility index (December 2010)

e. Annual Status Report (May 2011)

f. Paratransit, Inc., Short-Range Transit Plan (June 2011)

6. **GOODS MOVEMENT/FREIGHT PLANNING**
   
   Project #11-002-06
   
   (State and Federal Requirements)
   
   SACOG participates in and leads a number of planning activities related to freight hauling and goods movement on the region’s roads, freeways, railways, airports, and seaways/ports. As requested, SACOG monitors and engages in local government land use evaluations as they relate to transportation facilities, to maximize the utility of the transportation facility in an attempt to benefit the public while supporting adjacent land uses. Further, SACOG evaluates the effect of freight haulers on the transportation infrastructure in the region and works with partner organizations and local officials to evaluate and promote the most effective methods of moving the maximum amount of goods within and through the region.
As one of the fastest growing segments of the economy, goods movement will have a tremendous impact on the region’s highways, railroads, and airports. SACOG will help ensure that freight continues to move given the constraints of the current transportation infrastructure and the simultaneous increase in growth in all other modes of transportation. SACOG’s Goods Movement Advisory Group (GMAG) is helping to assist in the development and review of transportation and associated land use planning activities that impact the movement of freight.

SACOG will also continue to participate in the state’s Proposition 1B Trade Corridor Improvement Fund (TCIF) implementation efforts. SACOG will coordinate this activity with Caltrans, the California Transportation Commission, and other partners.

Goals:
- Convene meetings of the Goods Movement Advisory Group (As Needed)
- Assist partners and member agencies with the implementation of goods movement projects identified in the regional goods movement study and the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (Ongoing)
- Continue to work with and assist the Port of Sacramento in implementing projects and studies consistent with the region’s overall goods movement strategies (Ongoing)
- Participate in meetings and workshops related to the state’s TCIF program and assist local TCIF project sponsors as needed (Ongoing)

7. REGIONAL HOUSEHOLD TRAVEL SURVEY  
Project #11-002-07

As current resources allow, this project will monitor the development and implementation of the Caltrans Statewide Travel Behavior Survey. That survey is funded to develop statewide profiles of travel behavior stratified by the demographic characteristics used in the travel demand models in California. The survey includes the minimum number of surveys needed to provide a profile for our region and is not funded to show differing geographic characteristics within our region.

Staff will continue to look for funding to expand the Caltrans Survey to include more responses within our region. Due to the startup expenses of designing the survey, selecting the sample and administering the survey, commitments to expand the survey for our region will need to be found early next fiscal year to increase the number of responses within our region.

Goals:
- Caltrans memoranda on status (As needed)
- Status on Survey Activity for FY 2010-11 (June 2011)

8. SACRAMENTO EMERGENCY TRANSIT RESPONSE PLAN  
Project #11-002-08

The SACOG Transit Emergency and Safety Planning Coordination Program will address transit emergency and safety priorities throughout the SACOG region with guidance from the Transit Coordinating Committee and the Sacramento Transit Emergency Response Plan Committee. Additional
guidance for SACOG and the Transit Coordinating Committee will be obtained through the Federal Transit Administration, Federal Highway Administration, California Office of Homeland Security, California Office of Emergency Services, California Department of Transportation, the National Transit Institute, the National Center for Transit Research, local airport representatives, and local city and county resources, among others. The program will inform the Transit Transit Coordinating Committee members of local, tribal, state and national efforts in emergency and safety planning best practices.

The program will also coordinate efforts with the California Office of Homeland Security to convey funding and training opportunities to the transit and human service providers in the SACOG region. The program will determine emergency and safety priorities to assist in the planning process through the development of the Sacramento Transit Emergency Response Plan.

Goals:

a. Use the Transit Coordinating Committee framework to share transit emergency and safety knowledge between transit service providers within the region (Ongoing)

b. Identify emergency and safety training opportunities on a continuing basis (Ongoing)

c. Identify emergency and safety funding opportunities on a continuing basis (Ongoing)

d. Coordinate with Caltrans to seek safety, security, and emergency training opportunities for small urban and rural transit partners at location(s) in the Sacramento area (Ongoing)

e. Coordinate with Sacramento Transit Emergency Response Plan stakeholders to inventory transit assets, and human resources of the operators participating in the Emergency Response Plan (October 2010-December 2010)

f. Design an improved interoperable communications concept, solidify operational procedures, and define the interaction between emergency operations centers and transit operators (October 2010-December 2010)

g. Delineate the operational procedures of responding to an event and form a methodology for and develop a sustainable reporting, testing, and exercise program for the participating transit operators (February 2011-March 2011)

h. Present a sustainable reporting, testing, and exercise program for the participating transit operators (February 2011-March 2011)

i. Documentation of tribal government-to-government relations (i.e., coordination, consultation, and collaboration efforts) (Ongoing)

j. Sacramento Emergency Transit Response Plan through the Transit Coordinating Committee to facilitate preparedness among transit service providers to produce plans, training materials, and exercises to strengthen the emergency preparedness of the SACOG region (July 2010-June 2011)

9. STATEWIDE DEVELOPMENT OF TRANSPORTATION/LAND USE TOOLS Project #11-002-09

SACOG, in partnership with Caltrans, UC Davis (UCD), and Fehr & Peers Associates, will develop a set of transportation/land use planning tools which would be available to planners across the state. SACOG has two roles in this project: 1) serve as a contractor to the state for purposes of the various funding grants; and 2) serve as lead on developing a parcel-level analysis tool for transportation-and-built-environment (referred to as “the Ds”). As part of this project, the parcel-level “Ds” analysis tool would
be integrated into SACOG’s I-PLACE’S software. UCD will be adapting the parcel-level analysis tool for use in the “UPLAN” software, which is used by many smaller MPOs and counties in the state. Fehr & Peers will undertake basic research on the “Ds” for several MPOs in the state, and use the research results to prepare a post-processor for conventional travel demand models.

Goals:

a. Literature Review (June 2010)
b. Data sets of travel survey, land use, and transportation network data for participating MPOs (June 2010)
c. Interim report on Ds elasticities development (January 2011)
d. Parcel-level Ds analysis tool and documentation (January 2011)
e. I-PLACE3S and UPLAN Ds tools (June 2011)
f. Final report on elasticities development (June 2011)

10. MODEL DEVELOPMENT – FINE-GRAINED NETWORKS

This project is funded by the Strategic Highway Research Program (SHRP 2) Project C10, “Partnership to Develop an Integrated, Advanced Travel Demand Model and a Fine-Grained, Time-Sensitive Network.” The project was initiated in October 2009 and will be complete in April 2012. The overall project budget is $2.6 million. The project team is led by Cambridge Systematics, Inc. The purpose of the project is to integrate an advanced travel demand simulation model (for this project, SACOG’s “SACSIM” model) with an advanced microsimulation of a road and transit transportation network (for this project, University of Arizona’s “DynusT” software). SACOG’s roles in the project are: 1) to serve as a test bed for developing the integrated software, 2) to provide access to SACSIM and all its supporting data files, 3) to comment on the design, development, and testing activities, and 4) to serve as a test bed for initial applications of the integrated software. Other members of the project team are: Fehr & Peers, University of Arizona, University of Illinois at Chicago, and Sonoma Technologies.

Goals:

a. Describe approach to develop dynamic integrated model (June 2010)
b. Assemble data and build model network (June 2010)
c. Build integrated model and test on small-scale network (December 2010)
d. Build and test a full-scale integration (November 2011)
e. Prepare model and test data sets for dissemination (January 2012)
f. Develop Communications Strategy (April 2012)

11. FORECASTING TOOLS FOR BLUEPRINT

This project continues the development of three forecasting tools funded through the Caltrans Blueprint Program. The I-PLACE3S planning tool is being updated to include Greenhouse Gas (GHG) estimates based on changes in land use. A second grant is funding the integration of SACOG’s Activity Based Travel Model, SACSIM, with land use information produced from I-PLACE’S. This tool will estimate a
change in travel behavior from the land use characteristics. This third grant is developing Pedestrian and Accessibility factors for the region’s urbanized areas.

Goals:

a. Updates to the I-PLACE’S planning tool (As needed)

12. **INTERREGIONAL TRUCK OPERATIONS ON I-5 AND SR 99 AND STAA TRUCK ROUTE IMPROVEMENTS**

*Project #11-002-12*

(Board Policy – Local Agreement)

This project will address the lack of continuity in Surface Transportation Assistance Act (STAA) designated routes throughout the Sacramento and San Joaquin County regions and the operational degradation on the I-5/SR 99 goods movement corridors between the City of Sacramento in the north and the City of Stockton in the south. SACOG and the San Joaquin Council of Governments (SJCOG) will work in conjunction with jurisdictions in both regions, and with Caltrans Districts 3 and 10, California Highway Patrol (CHP), Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District and San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control Districts, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the California Trucking Association (CTA) and trucking industry stakeholders (e.g., economic development organizations, West Coast Corridor Coalition (WCCC), and Class I Railroads) to address the STAA truck movement and highway operation challenges. The project will use consistent and consolidated information to improve regional and inter-regional transportation system performance.

Goals:

a. Develop schedule for performance of grant
b. Identify and document existing Interstate, state, county, and city STAA designated truck routes; survey and establish existing STAA routes considering key origination and destination surveys; and identify de facto truck routes outside STAA systems
c. Assemble and review of studies/literature on the I-5/SR 99 corridors between Sacramento and Stockton
d. Outreach with city regional planning, industry stakeholders, public, and community; prepare summary of outreach efforts
e. Develop consolidated Sacramento/San Joaquin region STAA truck route maps
f. Create electronic versions for SACOG, SJCOG, and other regional and state websites
g. Print/distribute large-format STAA route maps for user group stakeholders
h. Analyze STAA routes, I-5/SR 99 operations emerging requirements, and stakeholders input to document unmet needs
i. Assess and identify gaps in the existing system, potential STAA routes (e.g., infrastructure upgrades, potential costs, financial considerations and possible timelines)
j. Identify existing and future contributing impacts on I-5 and SR 99 and develop TDM strategies for IMAP
k. Convene two inter-regional working group sessions to recommend strategies for IMAP
l. Draft IMAP (STAA and I-5 and SR 99 improvement strategies)
m. Approval of IMAP by SACOG/SJCOG policy Boards
**Element 11-003: Short-Range Transportation Planning and Studies — $676,213**

**Objective:** To identify certain transportation planning projects that are shorter in term or are related to specific studies.

**Discussion:** This element identifies certain projects that are designed to have a finite term of one to two years or are studies related to specific planning projects. Projects of high importance are the transit planning assistance for operators in the SACOG region, as well as coordinating and planning Intelligent Transportation Systems in the region and several transit planning projects for transit operators and grant-related activities.

**Projects:**

1. **Central California Traction Company Rail Preservation and Purchase Plan Study**  
   (Board Policy - Discretionary)  
   In FY 2010-11, staff will document the activities of the different interest groups involved in the discussions to purchase the Central California Traction Company (CCTC) Rail Corridor from Woodbridge Road in Lodi to Elder Creek Road in Sacramento County. SACOG will provide a report on the negotiations with the railroad companies to purchase and preserve right-of-way. The CCTC Rail Corridor is one of two alignments that will be studied under the Merced to Sacramento High-Speed Train Project.

   **Goals:**
   a. Reports and materials for Executive Technical Advisory Committee and Board (As needed)

2. **Complete Streets**  
   (State and Federal Requirements)  
   SACOG will serve as an information clearinghouse and technical assistance provider for complete streets activities in the region. Staff will support member agencies and local groups working to develop policies, implement programs and projects, and disseminate information about roadway designs that facilitate the creation of streets that are accessible to all users (auto, transit, bicycle, pedestrian, and special needs). SACOG will continue development of a complete streets technical assistance program to highlight how implementation of complete streets concepts can benefit smart growth corridor development or redevelopment efforts. Additionally, SACOG will work with member agencies to ensure that applications for regional funding programs demonstrate that the planning, design, construction, and maintenance of roadway and transit facilities include the needs of all transportation users. SACOG will also track state and federal activities that relate to complete streets and pursue new funding opportunities.

   **Goals:**
   a. Collaborate and share information with member agencies and local groups to disseminate
   b. information about the benefits and need for complete streets (Ongoing through June 2011)
   c. Adopt a Complete Streets Policy that requires applicants for regional funding programs to
consider the needs of all users in transportation related projects (December 2010)
d. Pursue new state and federal funding opportunities for Complete Streets (Ongoing)
e. Provide technical and grant application assistance to SACOG’s member agencies and other stakeholders (Ongoing)
f. Complete Streets Library (Ongoing)
g. Complete Streets Resource Toolkit (June 2011)

3. SACRAMENTO REGIONAL TRANSIT DISTRICT TRANSIT PLANNING  Project #11-003-03
(Board Policy – Local Agreement)
As part of the development of its major Transit Master Plan, the Sacramento Regional Transit District (SRTD) will prepare an update to its Short-Range Transit Plan. This project was initiated in FY 2006-07 and is scheduled to be completed by FY 2009-10. SRTD will also prepare an annual Performance Report and a Service Plan for 2011. SACOG will continue working with SRTD on a number of efforts. Key initiatives include:

- Complete the implementation of an online trip planning system coordinated with SACOG and the other transit operators in the six county region
- Complete implementation of a Transitional Analysis Study of the Downtown-Natomas-Airport (DNA) Corridor

SACOG’s ongoing work under this work element includes participation in FTA Quarterly Review meetings, SRTD Committee and Board meetings, and periodic RT project-related technical advisory committees. SACOG staff also provides consultation and assistance to RT staff on issues related to programming and project delivery and related transportation funding issues, including but not limited to, relations with the California Transportation Commission and the Federal Transit Administration.

Other activities that SRTD will conduct during the fiscal year 2010-11 include:

- Feasibility studies, environmental analyses, and design work to continue the implementation of enhanced bus and bus rapid transit projects in various locations
- A feasibility and site selection study for a Florin Transit Center

Goals:
- Annual Performance Report/Route Profile (SRTD June 2011)
- FY 2010-11 Service Plan (SRTD June 2011)
- Transitional Analysis of the DNA Corridor (June 2011)

4. DOWNTOWN SACRAMENTO TRANSIT CIRCULATION AND FACILITIES PLAN  Project # 11-003-04
(State and Federal Requirements)
This project is intended to be part of, and/or complementary to, a more comprehensive downtown circulation study and analysis of streetcar alternatives in the City of Sacramento. This component of the overall study will focus on the routing and circulation of the more than eight public transit operators that serve the downtown area and evaluate and develop recommendations for routing, bus stops, transfer
facilities, layover points, and other transit improvements within the downtown area. Alternatives that will be explored include, but not be limited to, exclusive bus lanes, peak hour bus-only lanes, contra flow lanes, signal pre-emption, queue jumps, and other measures to improve the operating speed and reduce customer travel time on transit serving the downtown area.

The study would be conducted through a project technical advisory committee. SACOG will prepare a work program with the committee, prepare an RFP and engage the services of a consultant to conduct the actual study.

Goals:

- Prepare Request for Proposal (RFP), release RFP, evaluate proposals, select consultant, and award contract
- Establish project management team and project advisory committee
- Review and analyze existing and ongoing studies – refine study area boundaries
- Review existing conditions in the downtown study area
- Review of future conditions in the downtown study area
- Public participation and community outreach, including outreach efforts with traditionally under-represented and under-served populations such as the elderly, disabled, low-income, and minority (i.e., Black, Hispanic, Asian American, Native American/Alaskan Native, and Pacific Islander) communities and community leaders (November/December 2010)
- Develop, analyze and evaluate project alternatives (December 2010/January 2011)
- Develop financial analysis of recommendations and summary evaluation of financing alternatives (January/February 2011)
- Develop Downtown Sacramento Transit Circulation and Facilities Plan (March-April 2011); Draft Report (April 2011); Final Report (May-June 2011)
- Support inter-agency and community consensus building (Ongoing)
- Coordinate/facilitate meetings, presentations, minutes, progress reports, inter-agency agreements, etc. (Ongoing)

5. **AGRICULTURAL WORKER TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM**

   (Board Policy)

   SACOG will operate transportation services for the region’s agricultural communities. With grant funding from the State of California, SACOG is developing an agricultural worker transportation program (AWTP) with the goal that it will be cost-effective and self-sustaining by June 2011. SACOG will join the newly formed statewide Joint Powers Agency, California Vanpool Authority (CalVans). With the consultation of SACOG and its program Steering Committee, CalVans will implement the AWTP Business Plan and start a vanpool program for agricultural workers in the four-county planning area.

   SACOG will lead a major market development activity. In coordination with CalVans, SACOG will develop a marketing plan to raise the profile of the AWTP and recruit a viable number of volunteer drivers and fare-paying participants. Elements may include direct marketing, public events, brand development, and customer database development.
Goals:

a. Official relationship with CalVans begins (July 2010)
b. Finalize Marketing Plan (July 2010)
c. Kings County Area Public Transportation Agency (KCAPTA) staff will provide SACOG with monthly financial and operational reports (Ongoing)
d. KCAPTA staff will coordinate with SACOG staff to identify and seek additional sources of funding (Ongoing)
e. System Performance Review (June 2011)

6. SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL

Project #11-003-06

Safe Routes to School is included as a mitigation measure and Transportation Control Measure as part of the MTP 2035. As such, SACOG is responsible for developing a regional policy for safe routes to school including coordination of infrastructure, education, and encouragement programs. This project will support the creation of regional tools, programs, and materials as well as local implementation via outreach and education partners.

The project will focus on elementary schools (K-6) with appropriate presentations and message for children 5 to 12 years old within the six-county region (Sutter, Yuba, Yolo, Sacramento, Placer, and El Dorado counties). SACOG will work in coordination with local governments, school districts, county offices of education, and transportation management associations as outreach partners. Education and encouragement activities will include presentations to elementary schools as well as special events in conjunction with SACOG’s travel behavior change campaign, May is Bike Month. The schools element of the campaign will include student targeted incentives, collateral materials, and web tools. SACOG staff is outreaching to community-based organizations, schools, and other volunteer and advocacy groups to establish a safe routes network for further education and encouragement activities at the local level.

Goals:

a. Educational materials and presentations for schools in the six-county SACOG region (Ongoing)
b. Tools for Internet web site targeted to school-age bicyclists integrated into MayisBikeMonth.com (May 2011)
c. Increased awareness by school staff of bicycle safety habits and health benefits from bicycling for ongoing youth education
d. Incentive items for participating studies (e.g., bookmarks and pencils) (May 2011)
e. Collateral materials targeting school audiences (staff, students and parents) May 2011)

7. SOUTH COUNTY TRANSIT/LINK MANAGEMENT TRANSITION PLAN

Project #11-003-07

(State and Federal Requirements)

This study will detail the issues and implementation scenarios for an administration and management plan for SCT/Link and related analyses of issues, costs, and regulatory requirements; other requirements and cost/benefits; and possible site locations for a maintenance/operations facility. Possible outcomes could be either city or a Joint Powers Authority (JPA) becoming the operator/lead agency.
The proposed study would build on a preliminary analysis that was included in the 2007 Short-Range Transit Plan and would address in detail the issues and implementation plan regarding the city becoming a transit operator and lead agency for South County Transit/Link transit operations, including, but not limited to: FTA and TDA requirements, ADA requirements, and administration responsibilities and requirements. This study would also address the viability of creating a JPA to be the transit operator in lieu of the City of Galt and would analyze a wide range of service, capital, institutional, management, and financial alternatives pursuant to a JPA. Lastly, the study would analyze and detail the benefits, requirements, possible site locations, and associated costs for a dedicated maintenance/operations facility for SCT/Link. The final product would enable the City of Galt and Sacramento County to determine the best administrative and management plan for SCT/Link and would determine the feasibility of a dedicated maintenance/operations facility.

SCT/Link is the contract transit provider for southern Sacramento County and the City of Galt. SCT/Link provides service in and around the small urban setting of Galt and also in the suburban/rural areas of Sacramento County and San Joaquin County, by providing service along the Highway 99 corridor from Lodi through Galt to Elk Grove and the southern part of the Sacramento metropolitan area. SCT/Link also provides a lifeline service to the rural Sacramento/San Joaquin Delta area.

Sacramento County has historically been the lead agency for SCT/Link with the City of Galt acting in a subordinate, ancillary role. Both agencies are desirous that the City of Galt, or if determined feasible, that a JPA become the lead agency.

Due to the multiple jurisdictions involved in SCT/Link and due to very limited staff time to analyze what would be involved in the city or a JPA become the transit operator/lead agency for SCT/Link, a study is needed to determine the best administrative and management plan for SCT/Link to provide the best transit service for the residents of the City of Galt and southern Sacramento County. Additionally, the study would allow whoever would be the Lead Agency to ascertain the cost and logistics of constructing a dedicated maintenance/operations facility.

Goals:

a. RFP Implementation
b. Planning and information meetings with stakeholders (Ongoing)
c. Prepare draft report
d. Prepare final report
e. Project management (Ongoing)
f. SCT/Link Transition Management Plan (November 2011)

8. WHEATLAND AND LIVE OAK TRANSIT MARKETING ASSISTANCE

(State and Federal Requirements)

The project is designed to apply public outreach techniques to attract additional transit riders in the cities of Live Oak and Wheatland. To accomplish this goal, the project will hold a series of public workshops to educate the public about the transit services available to them. The project will also fund advertising the transit services to the residents of the city. Specifically, the advertising will target core groups of senior citizens and transit dependent populations.
The Yuba-Sutter Transit Authority operates service for the cities of Wheatland and Live Oak using State Transit Assistance funds apportioned to Wheatland and Live Oak. With the recent state budget revisions, the State Transit Assistance Fund will be eliminated starting in FY 2009-10. This leaves Live Oak and Wheatland with enough STA reserves to operate the service for two more years until (July 2011). The Wheatland service operates on Tuesdays and Thursdays with three round trips connecting to fixed route services in Marysville and Yuba City. The Live Oak service operates three days a week with three round trips connecting to fixed route services in Marysville and Yuba City. The grant funds will be used to develop and implement a marketing effort in both communities to boost ridership and build support for this lifeline service. An increase in ridership will benefit Wheatland and Live Oak by reducing the operating costs of the service and increasing its viability despite the loss of State Transit Assistance Funds.

The anticipated accomplishments for this project are:

- Increase transit ridership in Live Oak and Wheatland to offset the loss of State Transit Assistance funding
- Maintain the service as it is today, thus providing a lifeline service to its current ridership
- Improve the service farebox recovery ratio to lessen the impact on local funding to maintain the current service
- Build an ongoing relationship with the communities to provide for continued communications to improve the service in the future
- Address concerns found through public outreach efforts by consultation with the Yuba-Sutter Transit Authority

Goals:

a. Kick off meeting with Yuba-Sutter Transit and Live Oak and Wheatland City stakeholders (October 2010)
b. Advertisement of community outreach meetings in Live Oak and Wheatland
c. Community outreach meetings in Live Oak and Wheatland
d. Recommendations to Yuba-Sutter Transit from the community outreach meetings
e. Regular service advertisement and marketing by SACOG staff for a period of one year
f. Monitoring of the service metrics to measure success of the outreach and advertising efforts
g. Performance review of routes in Live Oak and Wheatland (June 2011)

9. **City of Folsom Short-Range Transportation Plan**

*Project #11-003-09*

(State and Federal Requirements)

The proposed project is an update of the FY 2005-06 City of Folsom Short-Range Transit Plan (SRTP). The project study area consists of the City of Folsom, City of Folsom Sphere of Influence (SOI), and Sacramento County and the cities within. A majority of the areas and cities within the urbanized area but outside of the central business districts of Sacramento County, including the City of Folsom, can generally be categorized as suburban in nature. Geographically, the City of Folsom is located in the far northeastern portion of Sacramento County and also has Folsom Lake at its northern edge. Folsom is generally flat topographically, with mountains/foot hills to the north and east.
The SRTP is the vehicle through which the continuing comprehensive and coordinated transit planning process is implemented, and it provides essential information, analysis, and recommendations regarding future operations. There is a significant need for the City of Folsom SRTP to be updated. The needs are outlined below:

- A need to examine the basic elements of the SRTP in a timely way to ensure that the system is operating in the most efficient and effective manner possible. In addition, the primary five-year planning horizon for the existing SRTP ends in FY 2009-10, and most major recommendations will have been implemented by that time.
- A need to study in-depth special issues that have come up since the last update, including:
  - Development and possible expansion of fixed route services—the SRTP will look Folsom Stage Lines’ ability to adequately provide services to residential areas, employment centers, the community college, and feeder service to Regional Transit light rail service. The possibility of expanded service to the job and retail centers of Rancho Cordova, Citrus Heights, and Roseville will also be reviewed.
  - Fiscal issues—financial requirements and potential funding mechanisms, such as fare structure changes and development impact fees, necessary to respond to this issue and must also be evaluated as options helping the City of Folsom meet the required farebox recovery ratios.
  - Coordination of Folsom Dial-A-Ride service with light rail transit—in October 2005, after the completion of the last City of Folsom Short-Range Transit Plan, light rail service came to the City of Folsom. This light rail service is operated by the Sacramento Regional Transit District and paid for by the City of Folsom and allows City of Folsom residents and visitors to connect to Sacramento County and the cities of Rancho Cordova and Sacramento.
  - Expansion of Dial-A-Ride service area and hours of operation (after light rail hours)—expand Dial-A-Ride service hours to operate after light rail (operated by the SRTD) stops running to/from Folsom at 7 p.m. Another option would be to use the Dial-A-Ride vehicles in the evening to shuttle people from the light rail stations to the next nearest light rail station that operates beyond 7 p.m. at Sunrise Blvd.

Goals:

a. Introduction/background and description of system
b. Folsom Transit system analysis
c. Review of City of Folsom Transit goals, policies, and objectives
d. Financial analysis (February 2011)
e. Develop service alternatives (April 2011)
f. Community meetings (June 2011)
g. Prepare recommendations (August 2011)
h. Draft SRTP (October 2011)
i. Final SRTP (November 2011)
10. **OUTREACH AND ANALYSIS OF TRANSIT DEPENDENT NEEDS IN THE REGION**
*(Caltrans Environmental Justice Discretionary Grant)*

This project will focus on the low-income transit dependent populations in the six counties and 22 cities of the SACOG region. The project will bring together a variety of stakeholders to discuss the unique transportation needs of the low-income transit dependent populations within the SACOG region, including county Departments of Human Assistance/Health and Human Services (DHA), other social service providers, transit operators, members of the three regional Social Services Transportation Advisory Councils, SACOG Board Advisory Committees, welfare recipients, other low-income stakeholders, community organizations, and employers. The project will identify, route-by-route, which public transit services are “lifeline” transportation services—those that provide direct links to necessary services for socio-economically disadvantaged, transit-dependent populations in the SACOG region.

Collateral materials will be developed using focus groups to research key messages, input from DHAs, and results of study and mapping by SACOG staff. These materials will promote multiple trip types: both traditional and rural commutes, school, medical services, and retail. The end results of this project will be outreach, collateral materials, and transportation needs analysis. It will expand upon the demographic and transportation needs analysis done in SACOG’s MTP 2035, Regional Senior and Disabled Mobility Study and Regional Public Transit and Human Services Transportation Coordinated Plan.

This work is a carry-over project funded from a Caltrans Environmental Justice, Context-Sensitive grant and will be performed by SACOG staff and by a consultant for outreach marketing.

**Goals:**


b. Final Report of Analysis and Outreach on Transit Dependent Needs in the SACOG Region (February 2011)
ELEMENT 11-004: CONTINUING TRANSPORTATION SERVICES IMPLEMENTATION — $8,957,800

Objective: To identify those projects which are ongoing and span multiple years. These projects support efforts related to programming of federal and state funding, regional air quality planning activities, and Metropolitan Transportation Plan implementation.

Discussion: This element brings together a number of projects that continue from one year to another, such as selection of transportation projects eligible for federal and state programming; the monitoring of the regional transportation system in order to provide the technical tools required of SACOG and members for land use, transportation, air quality planning; and the implementation of the MTP 2035. Also included in this element are those ongoing projects related to transit assistance and monitoring, and implementation of state and federally-mandated climate change and greenhouse gas reductions.

Projects:
1. REGIONAL AIR QUALITY PLANNING
   Project #11-004-01
   (State and Federal Requirements)
   This project will continue the coordination with the local air districts, California Air Resources Board (CARB), Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and other stakeholders toward the development of a PM_{10} Maintenance Plan and a PM_{2.5} Attainment Plan. SACOG will also coordinate with partner agencies in responding to new ozone regulations and plan development as they arise.

   In FY10-11, the local air quality district is expected to complete a PM_{10} redesignation request and maintenance plan for inclusion into the State Implementation Plan. This plan will officially redesignate Sacramento County as attainment for the federal PM_{10} standard and establish transportation conformity budgets. EPA determined that Sacramento County met the federal standards in 2002. The Clean Air Act requires a plan showing continued attainment for at least 10 years after plan submittal to officially redesignate Sacramento County attainment.

   SACOG will prepare ozone, PM_{10}, and CO_{2} conformity determinations for amendments to the MTP 2035 and the 2009-12 MTIP for the Yuba-Sutter and Sacramento air quality planning areas. As part of the air quality consultation process, SACOG will continue to hold meetings of the Regional Planning Partnership to review procedures, assumptions, timelines, and completed conformity determinations.

Goals:
   a. Participate in the regional Air Pollution Control Officers’ meetings (Monthly)
   b. Conformity determinations on amendments to the MTP or MTIP (As needed)
2. **FEDERAL AND STATE PROGRAMMING**

(Federal and State Requirement)

The 2010-11 SACOG federal and state programming activities will involve administering existing programs and taking advantage of any funding opportunities, be they a new stimulus act, reauthorization of the *Safe, Accountable, Flexible Efficient Transportation Equity Act—A Legacy for Users* (SAFETEA-LU), or a new transportation bond measure. SACOG will prepare a new 2011 MTIP, make amendments to the MTIP on a quarterly basis, and make administrative modifications to the MTIP as needed.

SACOG will aggressively work to ensure that all state and federal projects ready for delivery are delivered, irrespective of the years they are programmed. Additionally, SACOG will work with SACOG Proposition 1B bond project sponsors to ensure that all projects are delivered. In FY 2010-11, all state programming activities, including review of requests for fund allocations, time extensions, STIP amendments, participation at the CTC, RTPA, and Rural Counties Task Force meetings, participation in guideline development and reviews, and liaison to support partner organizations on programming requirements for both state and federal programming will be undertaken. Federal programming activities will include monitoring projects funded under the *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009* (ARRA), implementing *Safe, Accountable, Flexible Efficient Transportation Equity Act—A Legacy for Users* (SAFETEA-LU) requirements, collaborating with others for developing positions for the reauthorization of a new federal transportation act, participating with the California Federal Programming Group (CFPG), and liaising with the FHWA and FTA. SACOG will also continue implementation, improvements, and maintenance of its SACTrak database, with an emphasis on linking SACTrak to federal funding databases to enhance the SACOG MPO and Designated Recipient role, and the associated reporting and financial management capabilities.

SACOG staff will continue to work with its city, county, transit operator, and state partners to complete the analysis on the Transportation Programming Transparency and Equity Study that was initiated in FY 2008-09. That study includes an internal analysis of the SACOG programming process, a peer group analysis of other MPOs, and a thorough interactive review process with our local and state partners.

**Goals:**

a. Participation and liaison with the Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration on federal programming (Ongoing)
b. Continued improvements to the SACTrak database (Ongoing)
c. Participation and liaison with Caltrans and the California Transportation Commission on state transportation funding programs (Ongoing)
d. Annual listing of projects with federal funding obligated in FFY 2010 (January 2011)
e. New SACOG 2011 MTIP (October 2010)
f. Regular MTIP amendments (Quarterly)
g. Administrative modifications to the MTIP (As needed)
h. Approved STIP allocation requests (As needed)
i. Materials for meetings and presentations to the SACOG Board, member jurisdictions, transit operators, and county transportation advisory agencies on federal and state funding and programming requirements (As needed)
3. REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION MONITORING  

Project #11-004-03
(State and Federal Requirements)
This project involves assembly of observed transportation data collected by others and the coding and integration of that data to make it useful for various other SACOG projects. Key observed transportation data are: vehicle volumes on roadways (traffic counts); transit passenger boardings and alightings; ongoing Census-related surveys (e.g., American Community Survey); and special surveys conducted by other agencies (e.g., employee surveys by TMAs and passenger surveys at airports) and research institutions. These data will be utilized in the update of the forecasting base year to 2008 for the Regional Forecasting project.

Activities this year relate to SACOG’s support of the national Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS) as Caltrans begins to redesign its reporting process to the Federal Highway Administration. SACOG is serving as a pilot for how to relate local Geographic Information System (GIS) street information to a new statewide system.

Goals:
   a. Progress report on transportation monitoring activities (June 2011)

4. RURAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AND COORDINATION  

Project #11-004-04
(Board Policy)
Implement recommendations of the Rural-Urban Connections Strategy (RUCS) Transportation Working group and coordinate with and support efforts of other RUCS working groups. Work with stakeholders from the rural and small urban areas of the SACOG region to identify transportation planning challenges, help formulate solutions and strategies, and seek the necessary resources to implement programs and/or technical assistance. Lead or collaborate with partner agencies and other stakeholder groups on technical studies. Liaise with outside partner agencies, committees, and their related staffs. Meet with SACOG advisory and technical committees such as the Regional Planning Partnership, Transit Coordinating Committee, Planners Committee, and other stakeholder groups.

Goals:
   a. Consult with rural and small urban stakeholders (Ongoing)
   b. Attend SACOG committees and local jurisdictional meetings (Ongoing)
   c. Deliver technical assistance as recommended by the Transportation Committee (As requested)
   d. RUCS Transportation Report (June 2011)

5. PASSENGER RAIL IMPROVEMENTS  

Project #11-004-05
(State and Federal Requirements)
SACOG will continue to participate in planning, programming, and operations activities of the Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Authority (CCJPA) through its membership on the Staff Coordinating Group (SCG). The main focus of this participation will be to identify funds and resolve issues related to supporting the current sixteen weekday and eleven weekend round trips and to improve travel times and reliability. In this regard, obtaining additional locomotives and coaches and performing needed track upgrades are the highest priority items. Also, SACOG will continue to participate in the Central Valley
Regional Rail Working Group, a collection of Central Valley jurisdictions working with the California High Speed Rail Authority to enhance regional rail in the Central Valley corridor between Sacramento and Merced. In addition, SACOG will monitor the work of the California High-Speed Rail Authority and provide input to the Authority as it proceeds with its plans for implementing a high-speed rail system between northern and southern California. SACOG staff will continue to actively participate in the planning activities connected with development of the downtown Sacramento Intermodal Project. The agency will also monitor and participate in the efforts to implement regional rail (i.e., commuter) service between Auburn and Oakland. SACOG will also attend San Joaquin Valley Rail Committee meetings, as appropriate, working with Caltrans and others to enhance the San Joaquin Rail service. Finally, SACOG responds to various passenger rail proposals, which are reviewed for potential connectivity to the SACOG region.

**Goals:**

a. Coordination of Capitol Corridor Service with Regional Commuter Rail Proposals (Ongoing)
b. Meeting Reports to SACOG Committees and/or Board on passenger rail development efforts (Periodic)
c. Progress Reports on the efforts of the Central Valley Regional Rail Group to implement a regional rail service between Sacramento and Merced (Periodic)

6. **CONNECT CARD IMPLEMENTATION**  
   *Project #11-004-06*  
   *(State and Federal Requirements)*

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

The Connect Card project is currently in Phase 2, Engineering Design. Phase 2 includes the negotiation of all necessary interagency agreements, the formulation of an implementation plan and a system requirements plan, the development of technical specifications and a procurement schedule, and refinements to the cost model. Phase 2 will culminate with the approval of vendor contract(s), forecast for September 2010.

Phase 3 will involve full system procurement, deployment, integration, and testing. This third phase of the project will ensue in a manner guided by the Implementation Plan and the project governance protocols. Included in this latter phase is the establishment of a regional financial and management clearinghouse, the development of the regional maintenance and supply systems, and the implementation of smart card technology on the participating transit properties. Full system deployment and acceptance is anticipated before June 2012.

**Goals:**

a. Request for Proposals; RFP (July 2010)
b. System Procurement; Contracts (September 2010)
c. Final System Design; Report (November 2010)
7. **TRANSIT TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND PROGRAMMING**  
(State and Federal Requirements)

SACOG provides general technical and analytical support for the region’s transit operators, as broadly directed by the Transit Coordinating Committee (TCC). Activities may include data analysis, digital mapping, survey work, research, the hiring of an intern at the graduate school level funded by an FTA Section 5304 Discretionary Grant, and interagency consultations. Tasks already identified by the TCC and staff for continued work in FY 2010-11 include support for building a criteria-based fund programming process, intern assistance with the clean-up of the on-board transit survey database, custom analyses of survey data, intern assistance with the Transportation Development Act, and other now-unanticipated needs.

SACOG will continue to execute its role as the designated recipient for the Davis and Yuba City Urbanized Areas and as the designated recipient for FTA 5316 Jobs Access Reverse Commute and 5317 New Freedom Program funds for the Sacramento Urbanized Area.

Under this task, transit team staff will continue to conduct the programming activities necessary to ensure that the projects of region’s transit operators are properly programmed in the SACOG MTIP and MTP so that the operators can file the grant applications necessary to operate, maintain, and carry out the capital programs of their systems.

This task also includes all of the work of the transit team staff and finance staff necessary to implement, monitor, and report on the Public Transportation, Modernization, and Service Enhancement Account (PTMISEA)/State Transit Bond fund program. SACOG is responsible for the programming, project selection process, application, monitoring, and reporting process for all regional PTMISEA funds for the four-county RTPA area. These activities include a twice-a-year call for projects, project selection process, application process and execution of sub-recipient agreements with selected transit agencies. The transit operators file semi-annual reports and correction action reports, as needed. When projects are completed, close out reports are prepared and filed.

SACOG’s TCC will continue to serve as the FTA fund programming committee associated with the SACOG/transit operator MOUs and will prepare the recommended project lists for SACOG Board action in the MTIP and RTIP programming process. Through the TCC, SACOG will continue to improve the integration of financial planning and the development and integration of short-range transit planning with the region’s long-range transportation plan. TCC will continue to improve its programming process through the ongoing refinement of the project selection process and the timely delivery of projects.

SACOG transit team staff will continue to work with project delivery staff and SACOG’s city, county, transit operator, and state partners to complete the analysis on the Transportation Programming Transparency and Equity Study that was initiated in FY 2008-09. That study includes an internal analysis of the SACOG programming process and a peer group analysis of other MPOs, which were completed in FY 2009-10. Work on the process was both delayed and advanced through work on several funding rounds in FY 2009-10 including ARRA round one, the TIGER application process, and the fall/winter 2009-10 funding process. Work on the project will be completed in FY 2010-11 through a thorough
interactive review process with our local and state partners. Staff will continue to use existing project evaluation criteria and processes until the study is complete and implemented. The target date for implementation of the new programming process is June 2011.

Goals:

a. Annual report documenting the range and extent of technical services, and recommending tasks for the next fiscal year
b. Technical assistance activities requested by the SACOG transit operators and TCC (As needed)
c. Annual FTA fund programming process (5307, 5309, 5310, 5316, and 5317) (January/February 2011)
d. Draft selection criteria and process guidelines for the annual FTA fund programming process (5307, 5309, 5310, 5316, and 5317) (January 2011)
e. Annual PTMISEA Transit Bond Act programming rounds, twice a year depending on Caltrans’ schedule
f. Reporting required by PTMISEA Transit Bond Act, including semi-annual reports, corrective action reports, close out reports, and other documentation required by the program (As needed)
g. Custom on-board survey analyses (As requested)
## ELEMENT 11-005: LAND USE AND HOUSING PLANNING — $1,614,503

**Objective:** To promote meaningful public discussions and provide planning, analysis, and other technical support to housing and land use efforts in the region. These land use activities are designed to gather data and information from around the region to further the activities of MTP 2035 implementation and to set the stage for the next MTP update.

**Discussion:** This element will continue the updating of current and alternative future land use patterns and their impacts on the transportation system; provide the technical monitoring data for analysis critical to that planning; and complete the housing allocation plan for the region. One key project for this fiscal year will be continuation of work begun last year on a rural-urban connections study to develop regional policies and tools to sustain the economic health and quality of life for the region’s rural areas, as well as assess the transportation needs of the rural areas within the SACOG region. Also included is the continuation of the work related to the Airport Land Use Commission and new Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans.

**Projects:**

1. **SACRAMENTO REGION BLUEPRINT IMPLEMENTATION**  
   *(Local Agreement)*
   SACOG staff will continue to update the Blueprint regional land use database with the most recent land use plans and zoning codes for each jurisdiction. The 2035 and 2050 land use data will be updated to a new parcel file. These activities will support ongoing regional Blueprint implementation efforts. SACOG staff will continue to provide educational presentations on Blueprint (as requested), respond to Blueprint data and information requests, and maintain up-to-date content on the Blueprint website. SACOG will organize up to three 2-hour weekday seminars geared toward local government, planning, and public works staffs on topics of Blueprint implementation. The topic areas will be developed in consultation with the Planners Committee.

   SACOG staff will, at the request of a jurisdiction, review and comment on major developments and their alignment to Blueprint principles. These developments are in various stages of the development review process. In most cases, SACOG staff examines modeling data from SACSIM and I-PLACE’S to summarize how the idea or site plan compares with the Blueprint in a comment letter. Sometimes this service includes meetings with local government staff and/or representatives from the applicant and/or public testimony at the council/board hearing for the project. SACOG will also continue to coordinate with the other area Joint Power Authorities (JPAs) and transit districts that frequently comment on development proposals.

   SACOG will host a regional forum for local elected officials, stakeholders, and the general public together to review the Blueprint growth strategy, changing travel patterns and investments planned in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan for 2035, new land use patterns, and real estate market trends. The program will include a review of infrastructure cost savings from more compact land
use, identify resource conservation efforts including Habitat Conservation Plans around the region, and afford time for a brief discussion of water, energy, and air quality benefits of the Blueprint. Participants will also have an opportunity to look at the next level of Blueprint implementation and SACOG’s newest project, the Rural-Urban Connections Strategy, focused on rural and agricultural issues. Participants will hear first hand from a panel of agricultural and rural lands experts about current conditions, challenges, and innovations in the six-county region. The balance between rural and urban lands will be critical to further linking transportation and land use planning.

Goals:

a. Update parcel-level land use database (Ongoing)

b. Blueprint presentations, response to data and information requests, maintain website content (Ongoing)

c. Review of development proposals, upon request (Ongoing)

d. Planners Committee seminars on Blueprint Implementation (Three during the year)

e. TALL Order Forum (Winter 2010-11)

2. **REGIONAL LAND USE MONITORING**  
*Project #11-005-02*

(State and Federal Requirements)

This project maintains up-to-date inventories of available data on housing, employment, land use, and local agency general plans in the region. The inventories developed under this project are primarily for internal use. The Integrated Basemap project (Member, Agency and Transportation Services *Project #11-007-14*) provides our planning partners, the public, and various researchers with these data on an ongoing basis. A number of ongoing monitoring programs are included in this project, and each year, several are highlighted for special attention and included as separate projects. The ongoing monitoring programs included in this project integrate the housing, employment, and general plan information with parcel data sets and land development economic data (including the Performance Monitoring System for the six-county region).

Goals:

a. Information and research for agencies and the public (Ongoing)

3. **REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ALLOCATION (RHNA)**  
*Project #11-005-03*

(State Requirement)

State housing element law requires each council of governments to prepare a Regional Housing Needs Plan (RHNP) for all cities and counties within its jurisdiction. The RHNP provides each city and county with a measure of its share of the region’s projected housing need by household income group over the five-year period of each jurisdiction’s updated housing element. In FY 2007-08, SACOG prepared the RHNP for El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba Counties; SACOG will receive its Regional Housing Needs Determination in September, 2011, and need to adopt the RHNP by May 2012.

The emphasis in FY 2010-11 will be on working with stakeholders to review and possibly revise the prior methodology for the next update. SB 375 made changes to the RHNA process to coordinate the
schedule with the Metropolitan Transportation Plan process and improve consistency between housing and transportation planning.

Goals:
  a. Final Regional Housing Needs Plan (May 2012)

4. **COMMUNITY DESIGN PROGRAM**

   **Project #11-005-04**

   (Local Agreement)

   SACOG will continue this program by monitoring and assisting with the approximately 70 grants distributed in the four rounds of funding in prior years. This cycle will place an emphasis on appropriate timeline programming and delivery.

Goals:
  a. Monitoring of award program-awarded projects (Ongoing through June 2011)

5. **RURAL-URBAN CONNECTIONS STRATEGY**

   **Project #11-005-05**

   (Board Policy)

   The Rural-Urban Connections Strategy (RUUCS) is a mitigation measure and Transportation Control Measure for the MTP 2035 and a complementary effort to Blueprint implementation. It approaches the region’s growth and sustainability objectives from a rural perspective, emphasizing the challenges and opportunities in rural areas. The project will develop policy recommendations and technical tools to support local and regional objectives for enhancing agriculture and rural economies, resource conservation, recreation, quality of life, and regional sustainability. Working groups are informing the study of challenges, opportunities, innovations, and implementation strategies for issue areas including land use, transportation, local markets/agritourism, and regulations. Reports from these working groups draw upon local and national case studies to demonstrate potential for various innovations and strategies. Additional topics, including forestry and water, will be initiated in the 2010-11 fiscal year. Research findings will be presented to the SACOG Board, including elected representatives of the six-county region, to address growth and sustainability objectives for rural areas. Data and I-PLACE’S modeling support is needed to evaluate and compare strategies. These activities will support Board policy discussion, inform local governments, and support the development of a “toolkit” of policy, planning, funding, regulatory, economic, data, and modeling techniques that can be used to implement the innovations.

Goals:
  a. Collect or create data and maps to support the project (Ongoing)
  b. Assemble and convene working groups by topic area (July 2010 – June 2011)
  c. Conduct specific research as needed to support the working groups (July 2010 – June 2011)
  d. Working group meetings, summaries, and reports and topic working papers (July 2010 – June 2011)
  e. Data, maps, and modeling to support the project (Ongoing)
  f. Reports on innovations and strategies for rural sustainability (July 2010 – April 2011)
  g. RUUCS Tall Order Event (Winter 2010-11)
h. Summary of event outcomes (June 2011)

i. Toolkit of policy, planning, funding, regulatory, economic, and modeling techniques (June 2011)

6. **PROJECT #11-005-06 IS NOT IN USE.**

7. **AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION (ALUC)***

   (Board Policy – Local Agreement)
   SACOG is the designated ALUC for Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba counties and is responsible for developing and maintaining Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans (ALUCPs) for the areas around each airport and working with cities and counties to ensure consistency between the ALUCPs and local land-use decisions. Staff will continue to review development proposals for consistency with adopted ALUCPs and provide consistency determinations for member cities and counties. ALUC planning boundary maps will also be updated using GIS tools. During the fiscal year, regional airport operators may request SACOG to update the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans for their airports. Such updates will be added as contracts.

   **Goals:**
   a. Consistency reviews of development proposals (Ongoing)
   b. Up-to-date ALUC planning boundary maps for individual airports (As appropriate)
**Objective:** To build and document consensus in a dynamic forum on policies, strategies and projects to address the transportation needs of the region and to balance state and federal mandates with the needs and interests of our member jurisdictions.

**Discussion:** This element brings together the various projects that directly support the development of the new Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). Ongoing work in various other transportation planning, research, and analysis activities will continue under other work elements.

1. **METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN SCENARIO DEVELOPMENT** *Project #11-006-01 (State and Federal Requirements)*

The technical analysis of the MTP will use the land use and travel demand models to test the various components of the plan and apply the range of performance measures to them. Scenarios will be defined with transportation projects, land use development options, and regional policy options. The performance metrics will include measures used in the current MTP and new metrics, especially greenhouse gas (GHG) targets as specified through the implementation of SB 375. A significant part of this work will be taking the six-county, macro-economic forecasts prepared by the Center for Continuing Study of the California Economy, and developing the necessary land use, population, and demographic data files which will be used for the transportation forecasts. Another significant part of this work will be developing transportation network data files and processes for accounting for factors not currently captured by SACOG forecasting tools.

The GHG target setting and compliance processes, new to this MTP update, will be a particular focus this year. In the first quarter of the year, the GHG targets will be finalized by the California Air Resources Board. Therefore, the scenario development and evaluation during this time will focus on GHG emissions. In addition to the GHG targets, the MTP will also have a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) due to SB 375. There may also be an Alternative Planning Strategy developed as an alternative to the SCS.

This process of defining scenarios, testing them, learning the pros and cons, and then using that knowledge to develop new scenarios is the methodology used in the current MTP and the Regional Blueprint Vision Plan. Final Scenarios will be completed in the FY 2011-12 Fiscal Year.

**Goals:**

a. Technical memoranda on Scenario Development Process (Available upon request)
b. Land Use and Transportation Databases (Available upon request)
2. **Metropolitan Transportation Plan Education & Outreach**  
*Project #11-006-02*  
(State and Federal Requirements)

To support the update of the MTP 2035, SACOG will facilitate a public outreach and education component to coincide with the preparation of technical research and planning. Effective transportation decisions cannot fully meet community needs without the active participation of well-informed, empowered individuals, community groups, and other nongovernmental organizations such as businesses and academic institutions.

**Goals:**

a. Outreach and education materials to support all public events and provide baseline education pertaining to the new MTP (Ongoing)

3. **Metropolitan Transportation Plan Regional Environmental Impact Report**  
*Project #11-006-03*  
(State Requirements and Board Policy)

A program-level Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the new MTP in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) will be prepared. The purpose of the EIR is to provide local decision-makers and the public with an objective analysis of the potential environmental consequences of the implementation of the MTP.

A primary focus for the EIR will be to develop it within the SB 375 framework that will include the region’s first "Sustainable Community Strategy" (SCS) that integrates transportation and land use planning and that meets, to the extent feasible, the regional greenhouse gas reduction targets for the automobile and light truck sector established by the California Air Resources Board. Projects consistent with a SCS qualify for relief from some CEQA requirements, which will reduce project costs, processing time, and legal risks. SB 375 also establishes a new environmental process—a sustainable community’s environmental assessment—to streamline the review of transit priority projects.

Furthermore, the Regional EIR will examine environmental impacts in the context of regional transportation and land development. While the MTP is not subject to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), subsequent federally-funded individual projects or projects requiring federal approval will require a NEPA evaluation. It is anticipated that the program-level EIR will help to expedite subsequent project-level NEPA and CEQA studies and approval of those projects by completing initial environmental analyses that can be tiered in subsequent project-level environmental reviews.

**Goals:**

a. Draft Regional EIR (September 2011)

b. Final Regional EIR (December 2011)
4. **METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN PLANNING**

(State and Federal Requirements)

The update to the 2008 plan is timed to coincide with the implementation of SB 375 and the region’s first Sustainable Communities Strategy. Efforts will include the development of plan alternatives, policies and strategies, project lists and a financial plan that aligns with the outcomes from the technical scenario and outreach efforts. SACOG’s advisory committees will be involved in every step.

**Goals:**

a. **New MTP alternatives (Spring 2011)**
b. **Draft New MTP (October 2011)**
**Element 11-007: Member, Agency, and Transportation Services — $13,551,413**

**Objective:** To inform local government decisions with impacts to the region’s transportation system, SACOG provides core services to its member jurisdictions, local cities, and counties. The agency is responsible for planning, funding, and supporting transportation project delivery within federal requirements for reducing vehicle miles traveled, air quality emissions, and some consideration for impacts of transportation and land use on greenhouse gases. Beyond the core transportation services, there are a variety of data collection, analysis, and regional services that SACOG is in a position to provide to local governments at an economy of scale based on the shared interests of the region’s local governments.

**Discussion:** This element supports projects that include planning consideration for regional amenities such as: Airports, STARNET, Intelligent Transportation Systems Operations, Transportation Development Act Administration, 511 Services, Rideshare Services, I-PLACE’S and SACSIM Training, Transit Assistance, Integrated Basemap Program, Sacramento Emergency Clean Air and Transportation Program, Regional Information Center, Climate Action Planning, Transit Trip Planning, Civic Engagement Grants, Airport Land Use Commissions, McClellan Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan Update, Multi-Agency Project Study Reports, Capitol Valley Service Authority for Freeways and Expressways, Glenn County Service Authority for Freeways and Expressways, and Safe Routes to School.

This element includes reinforcing relations with our member jurisdictions, public agencies, and service providers within the six-county area by regularly monitoring websites, agendas, and public meetings and maintaining a staff presence on projects and issues related to our core policy areas. Staff will continue to provide regular updates to all interested government agencies and elected officials on SACOG Board actions and staff activity and attend regular meetings with jurisdictional staff through advisory committees and regional city and county managers groups. It includes identifying areas of shared needs for new data collection, analysis, and research services to help inform member jurisdiction staff and elected officials. This element may also include pursuing a financing structure or shared staff positions for areas of common interest and need.

1. **Project Delivery**

   (State Requirement – Board Policy)

   Emphasis for FY 2010-11 will be to continue to align the programming process with the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) 2035, foster timely use of funds, provide assistance to member jurisdictions in delivering projects, and improve project readiness. Managing project delivery in the region will ensure that projects in the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) reflect the regional priorities established in the MTP. In addition, state legislation has established provisions concerning timely use of funds for projects adopted into the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and for federal funding programmed by the local agencies. SACOG will ensure that project delivery is successful by assisting project sponsors through the project scoping, environmental, design, right-of-way, and construction phases of these projects. Particular emphasis will be placed on large scale projects with the potential to be delayed by environmental issues.
In cooperation with the project sponsors, SACOG will track projects and ensure that appropriate funding is available to ensure timely completion. Depending on the financial situation after adoption of the state budget, SACOG may work with a delivery plan for summer 2010, as it did in 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008 and 2009 to ensure maximum use and benefit from federal and state funds. Reports will be made to the SACOG Board, regional partners, and the state on the status of projects. Periodic project delivery field visits will be made, and workshops will be developed and presented as needed throughout the region. To assist staff and project sponsors with the tasks of tracking and monitoring project delivery, SACOG has continued to work with a consultant to refine and improve the utility of the SACTrak database. Hosting and maintenance of the database will be provided by the consultant throughout FY 2010-11

Goals:

a. Workshops and training sessions (As needed)

b. Reports on delivery status for Regional Surface Transportation Plan and Congestion Management and Air Quality programs (As required)


2. REGIONAL INFORMATION CENTER

(Federal Requirement – Board Policy)

SACOG provides information for public access through three channels: the Information Center staff, the SACOG library, and our electronic media. The library is primarily used by SACOG staff, but outside users may also view materials. Electronic media include SACOG’s website and e-mail. The Information Center receives most of its data requests by telephone and e-mail, but occasionally users visit in person. Available information ranges from current estimates and forecasts of detailed demographics including population and employment, to detailed U.S. Census data on the region’s population. SACOG’s Information Center staff also provides references to sources of information available at other organizations.

Much of SACOG’s information is available in both written and electronic format, for the convenience of the person requesting it. This year, SACOG staff will poll our members’ data requests to make the most frequently requested data and regional profile information accessible on the agency’s website. New member interaction tracking tools will help staff be more proactive with information and services that can assist in their planning programs and studies. The information is updated regularly as needed.

Goals:

a. Data summaries (As needed)

b. Updated website (As needed)

3. TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT ADMINISTRATION

(State Requirement)

As the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for 4 counties and 15 cities, SACOG provides the review and approval of claims submitted for authorized uses. As part of this process, SACOG prepares and releases Findings of Apportionments for Local Transportation Funds and State Transit Assistance funds.
SACOG conducts the annual unmet transit needs process with public hearings throughout the RTPA region regarding transit needs and supports the development of short-range transit plans to assist in defining unmet transit needs. Based on hearing results, SACOG performs analyses of transit needs to determine whether or not they are reasonable to meet using adopted SACOG criteria. Meetings are held with the Sutter, Yuba, Yolo, and Sacramento County Social Service Transportation Advisory Councils to receive input on the staff analysis. Findings and recommendations are then made to the SACOG Board.

SACOG is also responsible for providing necessary annual fiscal and triennial performance audits of all claimants. Performance Audits of the operators and SACOG were prepared in FY 2009-10; follow-up activities based on the recommendations in the performance audits will continue to be carried out in FY 2010-11.

Goals:

a. Approve claims and file documentation (As needed)

b. Newspaper notices, fliers, and posters (As needed)

c. Minutes of Social Service Transportation Advisory Council Meetings (As needed)

d. Fiscal and compliance audits of all claimants (January 2011)

e. Minutes of Public Hearings (March 2011)

f. Local Transportation Fund (LTF) Findings of Apportionment for FY 2011-12 (February 2011)

g. Unmet Transit Needs Findings for each jurisdiction (April 2011)

h. STA Findings of Apportionment for FY 2011-12 (as necessary)

i. Conduct a Workshop for TDA claimants (February 2011)

j. Follow-up activities, as necessary, to implement recommendations contained in the Performance Audits conducted in FY 2009-10

4. **MULTI-AGENCY PROJECT STUDY REPORTS**

   **Project #11-007-04**

   (Local Agreement)

   In order to move transportation projects from planning into implementation, Project Study Reports (PSRs) must be prepared. PSRs define the scope of work, schedule, and cost of the project. SACOG will facilitate the PSRs on projects as required.

   Goals:

   a. Prepare draft and final PSRs for projects with SACOG involvement (As needed)

5. **EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS, BUSINESS CONTINUITY, AND TRAVEL OPTIONS STUDY**

   **Project #11-007-05**

   (Board Policy)

   This project is funded with Caltrans Planning Grant funds to conduct a study of the best practices and procedures in Transportation Demand Management that allow business continuity during an emergency situation, including telework and travel options other than driving alone. This is a one-time, three-year grant that began in FY 2007-08.
Goals:
a. Coordinate efforts with other emergency preparedness planning efforts conducted by local cities, counties, and transit operators, participating as the TDM stakeholder in those processes
b. Implement recommendations from the best practices study for enhancing SACOG's Rideshare program
c. Steering Committee meetings
d. Draft/Final Report Recommendations

6. 511/STARNET CAPITOL IMPROVEMENTS

Project #11-007-06

(Board Policy)
The SACOG 511/STARNET Capitol Improvements project will continue to develop and deploy modules for the purpose of regional coordination and data collection and for providing traveler information. These activities will be coordinated with our regional partner agencies through the Intelligent Transportation Systems committee.

Goals:
a. Continued discussion of design and deployment options with partner agencies within the Intelligent Transportation Committee (Ongoing)
b. Manage contract with Castle Rock Consultants (Ongoing)
c. Continued interaction with partner agencies as modules are developed for specific individual applications. Review of Interface Control Documents (ICDs), Concept of Operations (ConOps) Testing, and Verification Plans (Ongoing)
d. Develop Testing and Verification Plans for each delivered element (Ongoing)
e. Identify future opportunities with additional partner agencies and within the design contract to best serve the needs of the public (Ongoing)
f. STARNET and 511 website deployment for data input and display to the public (Ongoing)
g. 511 telephone system incorporating real-time data as input by partner agencies in STARNET application (Ongoing)

7. Rideshare

Project #11-007-07

(Board Policy – Local Agreement)
SACOG’s Regional Rideshare Program promotes alternative mode use (carpooling, vanpooling, public transit, bicycling, walking, and telecommuting). SACOG provides region-wide Internet ridematching and alternative mode information through the 511 telephone number and website.

Outreach is done primarily through Outreach Partners (transportation management agencies and public agencies that work directly with employers). The emphasis for FY 2010-11 will be on working with the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Task Force to market alternative modes through the 511 phone system and website. Staff support will be provided to the Task Force and its subcommittees, which will advise SACOG on the TDM program and on other related issues. SACOG will continue its role in planning and coordinating the Sacramento Regional May Is Bike Month campaign. For FY 2010-11, campaigns are planned throughout the year in addition to ongoing ride matching and TDM information services. Staff will also monitor memoranda of understanding with each of the transportation management associations that receive SACOG TDM outreach funds.
Goals:

a. TDM Task Force meetings (Ongoing)
b. Brochures and incentive items (Ongoing)
c. Contract for rideshare database services (Ongoing)
d. Contract for call center services (Ongoing)
e. Coordinate regional *May Is Bike Month* campaign (January – May 2011)
f. Wrap-up report for *May Is Bike Month* campaign (July 2010)
g. Annual Report on TDM Program to the SACOG Board (August 2010)

8. **511/STARNET OPERATIONS**

   *Board Policy – Local Agreement*

   Travelers in the Sacramento region and beyond are able to dial one easy-to-remember telephone number for complete, comprehensive traveler information: 511. 511 provides access to information about all modes of travel: traffic conditions for commuters, bus and light rail information for more than 20 transit agencies, paratransit services for the elderly and disabled, ridesharing information, and information on commuting by bike in both English and Spanish.

   The Sacramento region, which includes El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba counties, is the primary area for this service; however, the number also links callers to 511 services in the Bay Area, Nevada, Oregon, and Butte and Glenn counties.

   In fiscal years 2010-11, the 511 system is being expanded through agreements to include much of the Central Valley, including San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Merced, Madera, Fresno, Kings, and Tulare counties. In addition, the system is preparing to provide “511–Roadside Assistance” services to the public. This will allow access to the system through the use of cellular phones in the regions covered by the California Highway Patrol (CHP) Valley Division (Chico, Truckee, Sacramento, and Stockton communication centers).

   In conjunction with the phone service, the website [www.sacregion511.org](http://www.sacregion511.org) helps users plan their daily commute, access transit providers, find a carpool partner, and learn about bicycling as a commute option. With the traffic information on this site, users can check their commute options and know the road before they go. Once behind the wheel, users can call 511 for traffic updates. 511 is a joint project between SACOG, Caltrans, and other partners. The main emphasis during FY 2010-11 will be to upgrade the 511 system to voice activation and to continue to improve the real-time traffic information.

   In the first quarter of 2010, the initial implementation of the STARNET web-based systems is scheduled to be online for the public. This will be the first step in a three-year program to greatly improve the quality of information provided to the public. Features scheduled for this release include 20 regional closed circuit televisions (CCTVs) (full streaming video), display of Caltrans congestion management systems, highway speed data, chain control information, Amtrak Capitol Corridor real-time location and arrival time prediction information, and CHP incident data on state routes. Staff will also provide regular updates to our region’s Geographic Information System (GIS) street map that serves as background for both public and private sector traveler information efforts.
Goals:

a. 511 phone services (Ongoing)
b. 511 website services (Ongoing)

9. **511 AUTOMATED TRANSIT TRIP PLANNING**  
   (*Project #11-007-09*)  
   (Board Policy – Local Agreement)
   
   This project is administering a regional Google Transit database for eleven transit operators in the Sacramento Region. The Sacramento Regional Transit District (SRTD) is managing the project with SACOG oversight and a performance-based funding agreement. The agreement will fund SRTD based upon delivery of information and successful implementation of each transit operator into the Google Transit database. SRTD is also maintaining relationships with each transit operator to maintain a stops manager database that will allow for updates to Google Transit as service changes are made by each transit operator.

Goals:

a. Staff support for database development, training, and technical assistance (Ongoing)
b. Current Bus/Light Rail information in Google Transit (Ongoing)

10. **SACRAMENTO EMERGENCY CLEAN AIR AND TRANSPORTATION (SECAT) PROGRAM**  
    (*Project #11-007-1*)  
    (State Requirement)

   SECAT funding through Traffic Congestion Relief Program has been exhausted and CMAQ funds have been programmed to SACOG for the continued SECAT program. SACOG will work with the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) to award funding to regional truck operators and administer the program.

Goals:

a. Review and authorize SECAT recipient contracts (Ongoing)
b. Accounting and related activities for the CMAQ funds and contract awards (Ongoing)

11. **I-PLACE³S AND SACSIM TRAINING**  
    (*Project #11-007-11*)  
    (Board Policy/Local Agreement)

   The project will hold training sessions for member and peer agency staff on SACOG’s Land Use Analysis and Transportation Analysis tools. I-PLACE³S allows users to construct and analyze parcel-based land use plans. SACSIM, SACOG’s new activity based travel model, provides detailed estimates of household travel characteristics based on the land use and transportation plans that are provided for an area. Both of these tools can provide our members or their technical advisors with detailed information on the impacts of their planning choices.

Goals:

a. Minimum of two I-PLACE³S training sessions for member and peer agency staff
b. Minimum of one SACSIM training session and one user group meeting for member agency staff
12. SACRAMENTO COUNTY TRANSIT TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE  
(Project #11-007-12)  
(Local Agreement)  
Previously, the Sacramento County Department of Transportation requested that SACOG provide transit technical assistance to the county for the management and operation of the transit programs in southern and eastern Sacramento County. The services provided under this agreement are at a level above and beyond those normally provided by SACOG in its ongoing work with the region’s transit operators. The scope of services may include the full range of transit management and administrative service required for the operation of a transit program, including grants management, contract and service monitoring, purchase of equipment and other related activities. This work is performed and paid for on an as-needed basis; consequently, there is no budget amount for this project.

Goals:  
a. To be determined by discussion with and direction from Sacramento County based on a menu of services in the technical assistance services agreement.

13. SUSTAINABILITY AND CLIMATE ACTION PLANNING ASSISTANCE  
(Project #11-007-13)  
(State and Federal Requirements)  
This project supports a number of climate change efforts at SACOG and around the region. The project will also support Climate and Air Quality Committee. Staff will continue coordinating with member agencies, local air districts, the California Air Resources Board (CARB), and other stakeholders toward the development of AB 32 implementation projects. This project will have limited resources but will strive to provide as much coordination and support as possible to ongoing and new efforts to address climate change and sustainability.

Staff will look for opportunities to use the Greenhouse Gas Regional Inventory Protocol (GRIP) which was developed in 2008 and 2009 to provide technical support and coordination.

Goals:  
a. Participate in the regional climate change meetings (As needed)

14. INTEGRATED BASEMAP PROGRAM  
(Project #11-007-14)  
(State and Federal Requirements)  
This project produces a regional Geographic Information Services (GIS) street and address file, a new housing construction and demolition permit database, and other regional layers that make up SACOG’s portion of the Regional Integrated Basemap used by many of our members. Staff facilitates two formal GIS Cooperative groups in Sacramento and Yolo counties and works with members in El Dorado, Placer, Sutter, and Yuba counties to collect and standardize street and address information for our quarterly published file. The Regional Street and Address file is used by public safety agencies for local dispatch and regional emergency notification systems. The file also supports 511 operations and planning throughout the region.

This year, staff will be working with our members to designate basemap layers that SACOG will maintain and to identify maintenance processes for other information layers that will make up our region’s basemap.
Sacramento Area Council of Governments

Overall Work Program Units and Goals

(Continued)

Fiscal Year 2010-11

Goals:
a. Quarterly Publications of the Regional Street Address File (Upon request)
ELEMENT 11-008: PASS-THROUGH TO OTHER AGENCIES — $452,013

**Objective:** To record grants awarded to partner agencies as subrecipients to SACOG.

**Discussion:** This element identifies those grants that are awarded to transportation partners but must flow through SACOG as the Regional Transportation Planning Agency for the region. SACOG exercises limited administrative duties such as progress reporting and financial reimbursement on behalf of the grantee; however, the grantee has responsibility for managing the tasks associated with the grant.

1. **PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT; TRANSIT INTERNSHIPS,**
   **WOODLAND, YOLO COUNTY**
   (Board Policy – Local Agreement)
The Yolo County Transportation District (YCTD) will provide multiple internship opportunities for university students in the transit planning field and provide appropriate training and peer exposure for the professional development of the YCTD planning staff. The transit internships will allow students to gain a comprehensive overview of a small transit agency operation with an emphasis in planning. This should allow the intern to bridge the gap between classroom theory and real world problem resolution. This will also allow the agency to more completely develop and implement planning projects with this additional staffing. The internships will last for one year, the funding is for two consecutive years of internships.

**Goals:**
   a. Transit Internship Program for FY 2009-10 starts
   b. Internship program continues for next 11 months
   c. Evaluation of program
   d. Recruitment for FY 2010-11 Transit Internship Program
   e. Transit Internship Program for FY 2010-11 starts
   f. Internship program continues for next 11 months
   g. Final Evaluation of program/Final Report (April 2011-June 2011)
   h. Grant Administration/Quarterly Progress Reports

2. **UNITRANS TRANSIT SIGNAL PRIORITY IMPLEMENTATION STUDY**
   (Caltrans Transit Technical Assistance Discretionary Grant)
The Caltrans Discretionary Transportation Planning grant funded Transit Signal Priority (TSP) Implementation Study will provide technical assistance to determine the feasibility of a transit signal priority system in the City of Davis. Phase 1 of this study will provide professional expertise to assist Unitrans in screening an initial list of 32 intersections jointly identified by Unitrans and the City of Davis, prioritizing the top 10 to 15 intersections for further study, and developing a cost estimate for each of these top-tier intersections. Phase 2 will use traffic signal computer software to study the top tier intersections that could improve transit operations without undue impact on general traffic conditions. Unitrans will assemble a Study Steering Committee that will include (at a minimum) Unitrans and City of Davis Public Works senior officials. This committee will be responsible for reviewing the request for proposal for this TSP Implementation Study, analyzing proposals, and assisting in the selection of the
consultant team. The Study Steering Committee will then be responsible for reviewing interim study
documents and providing recommendations to Unitrans senior staff (General Manager and Assistant
General Manager of Administration). The Unitrans General Manager will ultimately be responsible for
ensuring grant contract compliance and successful implementation of the TSP program. The General
Manager will also be responsible for all public outreach activities presented in the Phase I discussion
above.

Goals:

a. Assemble Study Steering Committee and select Consultant Team, including Yolo Bus staff (May
2010)

b. RFP for professional services and contract for professional services (May 2010)

c. Assess preliminary list of 32 Intersections (June 2010)

d. Develop Working Paper #1 with comments from Steering Committee (July 2010)

e. Develop Phase I Draft Report with comments from Steering Committee, Davis Safety Advisory
Commission, and Yolobus Board of Directors (July – September 2010)

f. Develop Phase I Final Report and preliminary contract (September 2010)

g. Execute contract for study of prioritized list of top tier intersections (October 2010)

h. Develop Draft Plan and presentations adding comments from steering Committee, Davis Safety
Advisory Commission, Yolobus Board of Directors, ASUCD Senate and Public (November
2010 – January 2011)

i. Develop Final Plan (January 2010 – February 2011)

3. SACRAMENTO REGIONAL TRANSIT PROFESSIONAL

DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

(Project #11-008-03)

(Sacramento Regional Transit Professional Development Discretionary Grant)

This project will be located in Sacramento but will likely affect the entire Sacramento Regional Transit
District (SRTD) service area, from the northern border of Sacramento County to Elk Grove in the south.
The stakeholders in this case are the many communities that depend on SRTD for continued and growing
transit service. SRTD staff currently comments on over two dozen development applications per month,
in addition to city and county general plans and updates. The training will prepare the SRTD staff to
comment on a holistic basis—from both land use and transportation planning perspectives—on future
development reviews and general plans.

The following are courses taken and planned through this Professional Development grant project:

UC Davis Land Use and Planning Certificate Program:

- Environmental Planning and Site Analysis (2 people)
- Urban Planning Design Studio (2 people)
- Financial Aspects of Planning (2 people)
- Planning for Liveable Communities (2 people)
- Bicycle Planning (1 person)
- Planning & Environmental Law (1 person currently enrolled)
National Charrette Institute: Charrette System Certificate and Management & Facilitation Certificate (3 people)

Local Government Commission Workshops:
- Complete Streets (3 people)
- SB375 (3 people)

APTA Conferences:
- Sustainability & Public Transportation Conference (1 person)
- Intermodal Operations Conference (1 person)

National Transit Institute:
- Paratransit Management & Operations workshop (1 person)
- TOD Webinar (3 people)

Traffic Safety Center Transportation Research Board (1 person)
Transportation Research Board Sustainability Committee (1 person)

Goals:
- Urban Land Institute Training (March 2009, April 2009, and June 2009)
- University of California Davis Certificate Program (April and September 2009, April and September 2010)
- Caltrans/CSUS Planning and Project Management Training (March 2009 – April 2009)
- National Charrette Institute, multi-participant training (September 2009)
- APTA and CUTA Training (March 2009, July – August 2009 and October 2009)
- Online GIS and Planning Training (March 2009 – September 2009)

4. **YOLO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT SERVICE IMPLEMENTATION TRAINING**  
   *(Project #11-008-04)*

(Board Policy – Local Agreement)

The transit planning service implementation training will allow the YCTD planning staff to develop a more comprehensive understanding of service implementation. The transit planning service implementation training will include workshops, seminars, and conferences concerning effective communication and community participation in service implementation, connection between land use and public transit, and the marketing of transit.

Goals:
- Staff will attend training program courses (July 2009-June 2011)
5. **SACRAMENTO REGIONAL TRANSIT DISTRICT TRANSIT**

**MASTER PLAN IMPLEMENTATION**

(Caltrans Statewide Transit Planning Studies Discretionary Grant)

This is a project to supplement the Regional Transit Master Plan by focusing on two or three high-potential service areas and undertaking the detailed planning to improve service based on results of the Sacramento Regional Transit District (SRTD) Transit Master Plan. The communities involved are not certain, but they are highly likely (based on the SACOG Blueprint) to involve Natomas, Rancho Cordova, and Arden-Arcade. These areas are all in SRTD’s service area, they rely upon a common corridor, and they serve a common geographic area, centered on the city of Sacramento. The result of the planning will be a program of service changes that will be presented to the SRTD Board for implementation as early as February 2010, with a goal of providing enhanced service and improved connections between regional transit services, all within available resources. This planning is also in anticipation of accelerated implementation of the Downtown-Natomas-Airport light rail project. The project will be managed by the SRTD Office of Planning, with the assistance of a service planning firm which will be selected competitively. The planning effort will include participation by TMAs serving the U.S. Highway 50 Corridor, Natomas, as well as downtown Sacramento.

**Goals:**

a. Draft board issue paper (Summer 2010)

b. Final product to Caltrans (October 2010)

6. **PHASE 3 OF THE STATE ECONOMIC LAND USE MODEL DEVELOPMENT**

(Board Policy – Local Agreement)

This project’s objective is to assist Caltrans and its model development team at UC Davis. SACOG will act as the administrative agent only but will realize significant benefits when the model development is completed.

The project will initiate the third stage of the statewide PECAS economic land use model, a full production version that will enable Caltrans and the MPOs to begin testing some major policy questions. This project is on the same timeline with another important component, an update of the state travel model, which is fully compatible with the economic land use model. The travel model project will also be done at UC Davis.

The project is a multi-year effort that will carry over to OWPs in subsequent years; previous tasks and end products are included for reference.

**Goals:**

a. Status report on PECAS activity allocation (AA) module (June 2010)

b. Status report on PECAS space development (SD) module (June 2010)

c. Status report on integration of travel model (June 2010)

d. Final report (June 2011)
**Element 11-009: Miscellaneous Other Funding — $8,885,494**

**Objective:** To add required projects to the OWP which are funded and executed by partner agencies.

**Discussion:** Partner agencies receive certain funding from FTA for projects within their district. However, federal regulations require that SACOG carry these authorized projects in its OWP in order to meet the funding guidelines. These are projects over which SACOG has no authority except as the Regional Transportation Planning Agency for the region.

---

1. **Unitrans – CNG Fueling Facility Study**  
   **Project #11-009-01**  
   Unitrans completed its compressed natural gas fueling facility in 1996. This important facility provides primary fueling for Unitrans’ fleet of almost 40 buses, as well as secondary/back-up fueling for Yolobus, Davis Community Transit, and UC Davis Fleet Services. A difficulty with the current facility is that it uses two of the only three Pignone Nuovo natural gas compressors in North America, and parts are becoming difficult to obtain. In fact, Unitrans maintenance staff has had to custom manufacture normal-wear parts, as well as major components, for these two compressors in order to keep the fueling facility online. As such, Unitrans is seeking professional advice from a natural gas fueling facility expert on methods to ensure continued long-term CNG capacity for Unitrans and its partners.

   The start date for this project is unknown as this study currently does not have a source of funding. However, once funding is identified, Unitrans staff anticipates this project will take less than one year to complete.

   **Goals:**
   a. Project initiation and scoping meeting
   b. Publish RFP and award contract
   c. Begin study
   d. Publish Recommendations Report

2. **Project #11-009-02 is not in use.**

3. **Unitrans – Parking Lot Study for Downtown Davis**  
   **Project #11-009-03**  
   The City of Davis has a vibrant downtown, within close proximity of the UC Davis campus. Travelers within the area, as well as those that travel to and from the area, are blessed with a relatively wide range of travel modes, including high-intensity Unitrans fixed route bus service, Amtrak trains, intercity and regional bus (Amtrak Thruway, Yolobus, Fairfield-Suisun Transit), extensive bicycling facilities and use, regional and local Paratransit services, and a high degree of pedestrian travel.

   However, the interaction of these modes, capacity constraints, and access are often in conflict as the city and campus continue to expand. This study will address these conflicts and will attempt to ascertain the need for a long-term parking facility in the downtown area. Specifically, the study will detail the parking...
shortcomings in the downtown area, develop and review a list of potential parking facility sites, review the potential environmental impacts at each site, choose a locally-preferred site, and determine the funding that would be available from the various stakeholders (transit operators, redevelopment agency, city, etc.).

Goals:

a. Project initiation and scoping meeting
b. Publish RFP and award contract
c. Begin study (September 2010)
d. Publish Recommendations Report (September 2011)

4. SACRAMENTO REGIONAL TRANSIT DISTRICT DOWNTOWN-NATOMAS-AIRPORT RAIL PROJECT  
   Project #11-009-04  
   (Federal Requirement)
This Sacramento Regional Transit District project is a transitional analysis of the Downtown-Natomas-Airport. The DNA project is contained in the MTP 2035 and the MTIP.

Goals:

a. Updated information to be provided by Sacramento Regional Transit District.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>FHWA PL</th>
<th>FTA 5303</th>
<th>FTA Discretionary</th>
<th>Federal Earmarks</th>
<th>STIP/PPM/RSTP</th>
<th>Member- ships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010/11 (projected)</td>
<td>$2,507,004</td>
<td>$773,919</td>
<td>$18,692</td>
<td>$869,249</td>
<td>$3,196,221</td>
<td>$284,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10 projected</td>
<td>$2,822,309</td>
<td>$1,202,575</td>
<td>$846,751</td>
<td>$1,207,932</td>
<td>$284,270</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>$2,299,746</td>
<td>$634,963</td>
<td>$110,243</td>
<td>$1,224,639</td>
<td>$1,646,313</td>
<td>$355,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>$2,897,745</td>
<td>$672,553</td>
<td>$230,343</td>
<td>$716,583</td>
<td>$1,231,377</td>
<td>$333,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>$3,359,656</td>
<td>$646,599</td>
<td>$403,217</td>
<td>$939,143</td>
<td>$791,794</td>
<td>$315,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>$2,508,525</td>
<td>$645,527</td>
<td>$197,719</td>
<td>$909,898</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>$1,919,885</td>
<td>$561,783</td>
<td></td>
<td>$326,046</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>$1,736,709</td>
<td>$499,217</td>
<td></td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>$246,559</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002/03</td>
<td>$1,828,516</td>
<td>$461,366</td>
<td></td>
<td>$296,000</td>
<td>$238,470</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001/02</td>
<td>$1,948,983</td>
<td>$433,570</td>
<td></td>
<td>$113,000</td>
<td>$221,984</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>FHWA PL</th>
<th>FTA 5303</th>
<th>FTA Discretionary</th>
<th>Federal Earmarks</th>
<th>STIP/PPM RSTP</th>
<th>Member- ships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010/11 (projected)</td>
<td>$2,507,004</td>
<td>$773,919</td>
<td>$18,692</td>
<td>$869,249</td>
<td>$3,196,221</td>
<td>$284,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10 projected</td>
<td>$2,822,309</td>
<td>$1,202,575</td>
<td></td>
<td>$846,751</td>
<td>$1,207,932</td>
<td>$284,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>$2,299,746</td>
<td>$634,963</td>
<td>$110,243</td>
<td>$1,224,639</td>
<td>$1,646,313</td>
<td>$355,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>$2,897,745</td>
<td>$672,553</td>
<td>$230,343</td>
<td>$716,583</td>
<td>$1,231,377</td>
<td>$333,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>$3,359,656</td>
<td>$646,599</td>
<td>$403,217</td>
<td>$939,143</td>
<td>$791,794</td>
<td>$315,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>$2,508,525</td>
<td>$645,527</td>
<td></td>
<td>$197,719</td>
<td>$909,898</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>$1,919,885</td>
<td>$561,783</td>
<td></td>
<td>$326,046</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>$1,736,709</td>
<td>$499,217</td>
<td></td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>$246,559</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002/03</td>
<td>$1,828,516</td>
<td>$461,366</td>
<td></td>
<td>$296,000</td>
<td>$238,470</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001/02</td>
<td>$1,948,983</td>
<td>$433,570</td>
<td></td>
<td>$113,000</td>
<td>$221,984</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Indirect Services Cost Comparison – Six-Year History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDIRECT COSTS</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Costs</td>
<td>$329,317</td>
<td>$573,940</td>
<td>$573,947</td>
<td>$641,863</td>
<td>$638,875</td>
<td>$677,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Development Program</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>49,890</td>
<td>52,408</td>
<td>89,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td>106,646</td>
<td>80,810</td>
<td>57,038</td>
<td>39,071</td>
<td>116,034</td>
<td>269,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>158,250</td>
<td>168,452</td>
<td>156,390</td>
<td>136,081</td>
<td>133,337</td>
<td>86,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>6,418</td>
<td>15,828</td>
<td>68,658</td>
<td>67,478</td>
<td>69,959</td>
<td>68,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>96,444</td>
<td>88,481</td>
<td>178,649</td>
<td>257,799</td>
<td>320,942</td>
<td>259,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>22,416</td>
<td>15,579</td>
<td>44,048</td>
<td>6,176</td>
<td>13,295</td>
<td>11,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>59,634</td>
<td>40,664</td>
<td>19,059</td>
<td>12,099</td>
<td>5,300</td>
<td>12,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memberships</td>
<td>44,765</td>
<td>21,219</td>
<td>42,139</td>
<td>42,794</td>
<td>25,377</td>
<td>25,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>2,618</td>
<td>3,157</td>
<td>12,265</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>2,530</td>
<td>3,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mileage</td>
<td>13,760</td>
<td>17,120</td>
<td>13,862</td>
<td>11,408</td>
<td>14,093</td>
<td>12,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Equipment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16,825</td>
<td>19,591</td>
<td>11,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>4,700</td>
<td>5,950</td>
<td>6,525</td>
<td>7,400</td>
<td>7,550</td>
<td>9,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>25,540</td>
<td>30,458</td>
<td>24,197</td>
<td>22,605</td>
<td>21,367</td>
<td>9,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>7,528</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16,671</td>
<td>1,762</td>
<td>9,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>4,422</td>
<td>5,013</td>
<td>3,425</td>
<td>4,227</td>
<td>4,869</td>
<td>3,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and Benefits</td>
<td>936,415</td>
<td>1,130,960</td>
<td>1,186,651</td>
<td>1,164,671</td>
<td>1,337,701</td>
<td>1,423,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>41,489</td>
<td>58,531</td>
<td>41,206</td>
<td>36,601</td>
<td>49,921</td>
<td>51,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>70,335</td>
<td>72,979</td>
<td>75,394</td>
<td>38,499</td>
<td>45,429</td>
<td>53,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting Services</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,723</td>
<td>8,169</td>
<td>17,065</td>
<td>9,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Costs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,469</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone/Telecommunications</td>
<td>32,486</td>
<td>29,356</td>
<td>28,693</td>
<td>32,906</td>
<td>34,114</td>
<td>39,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Services</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>6,673</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>2,119</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing Cost Offset</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(71,048)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Indirect Costs</strong></td>
<td>$1,963,864</td>
<td>$2,365,170</td>
<td>$2,477,870</td>
<td>$2,615,828</td>
<td>$2,931,928</td>
<td>$3,135,758</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Sacramento Area Council of Governments
Summary of Full-Time Equivalent Employees -
Six-Year History

BY FUNCTION & PROGRAM
For Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2004-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNCTION</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Analysts*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Affairs and Communications</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interns</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Approved Full-Time Positions</strong></td>
<td><strong>51</strong></td>
<td><strong>49</strong></td>
<td><strong>48</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>51</strong></td>
<td><strong>51</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* formerly Geographic Information Systems

BY PROJECT
For Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2004-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct Projects</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interagency Relations and Program Management</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Delivery and Programming</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multimodal Transportation Planning and Coordination</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality Planning, Analysis and Coordination</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Planning and Coordination</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing and Land Use</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Monitoring and Forecasting</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic Information Systems</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Information/Outreach and Advocacy</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Projects and Local Technical Assistance/NEPA Linkages</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Blueprint Programming</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Transportation Plan</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services to Other Agencies</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board and Advocacy</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Relations, Public Affairs &amp; Administration</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-Range Transportation Planning</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-Range Transportation Planning &amp; Studies</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Transportation Implementation</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use &amp; Housing Planning</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member &amp; Agency Services</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services to Other Agencies</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board and Advocacy</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal - Direct Projects</strong></td>
<td><strong>39.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>36.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>37.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>39.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>39.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>39.4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total FTEs Based on Total Hours</strong></td>
<td><strong>51.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>48.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>48.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>50.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>51.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>51.8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Sacramento Area Council of Governments

### Total Population by Jurisdiction – 10-Year History

For Years 2000 to 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SACOG Region</td>
<td>1,936,046</td>
<td>1,985,974</td>
<td>2,044,599</td>
<td>2,098,505</td>
<td>2,149,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado County</td>
<td>156,299</td>
<td>160,495</td>
<td>164,079</td>
<td>167,252</td>
<td>170,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placerville</td>
<td>9,610</td>
<td>9,959</td>
<td>10,270</td>
<td>10,299</td>
<td>10,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Lake Tahoe</td>
<td>23,609</td>
<td>23,983</td>
<td>24,023</td>
<td>24,037</td>
<td>23,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
<td>123,080</td>
<td>126,553</td>
<td>129,786</td>
<td>132,916</td>
<td>136,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer County</td>
<td>248,429</td>
<td>258,892</td>
<td>271,224</td>
<td>284,039</td>
<td>296,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn</td>
<td>12,462</td>
<td>12,562</td>
<td>12,593</td>
<td>12,610</td>
<td>12,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colfax</td>
<td>1,520</td>
<td>1,576</td>
<td>1,713</td>
<td>1,790</td>
<td>1,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>11,205</td>
<td>13,628</td>
<td>16,835</td>
<td>19,977</td>
<td>23,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocklin</td>
<td>6,260</td>
<td>6,310</td>
<td>6,306</td>
<td>6,353</td>
<td>6,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseville</td>
<td>36,360</td>
<td>39,570</td>
<td>43,147</td>
<td>46,083</td>
<td>49,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loomis</td>
<td>79,921</td>
<td>83,237</td>
<td>87,667</td>
<td>93,534</td>
<td>98,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
<td>100,701</td>
<td>102,009</td>
<td>102,963</td>
<td>103,692</td>
<td>104,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento County</td>
<td>1,223,499</td>
<td>1,252,652</td>
<td>1,287,426</td>
<td>1,317,973</td>
<td>1,346,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citrus Heights</td>
<td>85,071</td>
<td>86,375</td>
<td>87,698</td>
<td>87,744</td>
<td>87,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elk Grove</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>75,647</td>
<td>81,243</td>
<td>86,362</td>
<td>109,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folsom</td>
<td>51,884</td>
<td>56,748</td>
<td>60,968</td>
<td>64,155</td>
<td>66,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galt</td>
<td>19,472</td>
<td>20,106</td>
<td>21,392</td>
<td>22,153</td>
<td>22,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isleton</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Cordova</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>54,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>407,018</td>
<td>414,674</td>
<td>426,595</td>
<td>435,510</td>
<td>444,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
<td>659,226</td>
<td>598,265</td>
<td>608,687</td>
<td>621,206</td>
<td>560,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutter County</td>
<td>78,940</td>
<td>80,209</td>
<td>81,913</td>
<td>84,166</td>
<td>86,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live Oak</td>
<td>6,229</td>
<td>6,379</td>
<td>6,450</td>
<td>6,516</td>
<td>6,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuba City</td>
<td>36,758</td>
<td>45,955</td>
<td>47,220</td>
<td>48,903</td>
<td>51,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
<td>35,953</td>
<td>27,875</td>
<td>28,243</td>
<td>28,747</td>
<td>28,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolo County</td>
<td>168,660</td>
<td>172,677</td>
<td>177,572</td>
<td>181,328</td>
<td>184,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>60,308</td>
<td>61,853</td>
<td>63,349</td>
<td>63,843</td>
<td>64,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Sacramento</td>
<td>31,615</td>
<td>31,998</td>
<td>34,718</td>
<td>36,489</td>
<td>38,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winters</td>
<td>6,125</td>
<td>6,152</td>
<td>6,302</td>
<td>6,570</td>
<td>6,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland</td>
<td>49,155</td>
<td>50,821</td>
<td>51,360</td>
<td>51,630</td>
<td>52,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
<td>21,457</td>
<td>21,853</td>
<td>21,843</td>
<td>22,796</td>
<td>22,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuba County</td>
<td>60,219</td>
<td>61,049</td>
<td>62,385</td>
<td>63,747</td>
<td>65,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marysville</td>
<td>12,268</td>
<td>12,353</td>
<td>12,589</td>
<td>12,715</td>
<td>12,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheatland</td>
<td>2,272</td>
<td>2,306</td>
<td>2,394</td>
<td>2,729</td>
<td>3,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
<td>45,679</td>
<td>46,390</td>
<td>47,402</td>
<td>48,303</td>
<td>49,060</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Department of Finance, E-1 Population Estimates for Cities, Counties and the State, California Department of Finance, Demographic Research Unit, as of January 1 of each year.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,192,359</td>
<td>2,229,940</td>
<td>2,268,620</td>
<td>2,301,411</td>
<td>2,323,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>173,407</td>
<td>176,204</td>
<td>178,674</td>
<td>179,722</td>
<td>180,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12,849</td>
<td>12,975</td>
<td>13,112</td>
<td>13,273</td>
<td>13,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>173,407</td>
<td>176,204</td>
<td>178,674</td>
<td>179,722</td>
<td>180,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,822</td>
<td>1,825</td>
<td>1,838</td>
<td>1,855</td>
<td>1,878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27,356</td>
<td>33,589</td>
<td>37,410</td>
<td>39,758</td>
<td>40,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6,274</td>
<td>6,480</td>
<td>6,529</td>
<td>6,624</td>
<td>6,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,349</td>
<td>4,350</td>
<td>4,363</td>
<td>4,376</td>
<td>4,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>121,609</td>
<td>130,874</td>
<td>136,318</td>
<td>139,542</td>
<td>141,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87,549</td>
<td>86,883</td>
<td>87,017</td>
<td>87,321</td>
<td>87,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>121,609</td>
<td>130,874</td>
<td>136,318</td>
<td>139,542</td>
<td>141,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6,785</td>
<td>7,475</td>
<td>8,126</td>
<td>8,539</td>
<td>8,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58,388</td>
<td>60,507</td>
<td>62,083</td>
<td>63,338</td>
<td>63,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23,792</td>
<td>23,468</td>
<td>23,710</td>
<td>24,001</td>
<td>24,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>187,743</td>
<td>190,344</td>
<td>193,983</td>
<td>199,066</td>
<td>200,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64,401</td>
<td>64,585</td>
<td>64,938</td>
<td>65,814</td>
<td>66,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40,206</td>
<td>43,183</td>
<td>44,928</td>
<td>47,068</td>
<td>47,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6,979</td>
<td>6,867</td>
<td>6,885</td>
<td>7,052</td>
<td>7,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,432</td>
<td>3,465</td>
<td>3,513</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>3,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66,734</td>
<td>53,771</td>
<td>54,519</td>
<td>55,700</td>
<td>56,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>820</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55,145</td>
<td>56,355</td>
<td>59,056</td>
<td>60,975</td>
<td>61,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>452,959</td>
<td>457,514</td>
<td>467,343</td>
<td>475,743</td>
<td>481,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>560,785</td>
<td>560,741</td>
<td>561,951</td>
<td>563,514</td>
<td>565,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88,945</td>
<td>91,450</td>
<td>93,919</td>
<td>95,878</td>
<td>96,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6,785</td>
<td>7,475</td>
<td>8,126</td>
<td>8,539</td>
<td>8,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58,388</td>
<td>60,507</td>
<td>62,083</td>
<td>63,338</td>
<td>63,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23,792</td>
<td>23,468</td>
<td>23,710</td>
<td>24,001</td>
<td>24,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>187,743</td>
<td>190,344</td>
<td>193,983</td>
<td>199,066</td>
<td>200,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64,401</td>
<td>64,585</td>
<td>64,938</td>
<td>65,814</td>
<td>66,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40,206</td>
<td>43,183</td>
<td>44,928</td>
<td>47,068</td>
<td>47,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6,979</td>
<td>6,867</td>
<td>6,885</td>
<td>7,052</td>
<td>7,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,432</td>
<td>3,465</td>
<td>3,513</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>3,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66,734</td>
<td>53,771</td>
<td>54,519</td>
<td>55,700</td>
<td>56,514</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Average Annual Wages by County – Five-Year History

For Years 2003 – 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SACOG Region</td>
<td>$669 $34,788</td>
<td></td>
<td>$690 $35,897</td>
<td></td>
<td>$678 $35,239</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado County</td>
<td>627 32,604</td>
<td></td>
<td>648 33,696</td>
<td></td>
<td>658 34,216</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer County</td>
<td>711 36,972</td>
<td></td>
<td>744 38,688</td>
<td></td>
<td>764 39,728</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento County</td>
<td>809 42,068</td>
<td></td>
<td>831 43,212</td>
<td></td>
<td>784 40,768</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutter County</td>
<td>535 27,820</td>
<td></td>
<td>560 29,120</td>
<td></td>
<td>545 28,340</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolo County</td>
<td>673 34,996</td>
<td></td>
<td>713 37,076</td>
<td></td>
<td>699 36,348</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuba County</td>
<td>659 34,268</td>
<td></td>
<td>646 33,592</td>
<td></td>
<td>616 32,032</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006 Average Weekly Wages</th>
<th>2006 Average Annual Wages</th>
<th>2007 Average Weekly Wages</th>
<th>2007 Average Annual Wages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SACOG Region</td>
<td>$672 $34,944</td>
<td></td>
<td>$732 $38,038</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado County</td>
<td>693 36,036</td>
<td></td>
<td>719 37,388</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer County</td>
<td>797 41,444</td>
<td></td>
<td>822 42,744</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento County</td>
<td>616 32,032</td>
<td></td>
<td>842 43,784</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutter County</td>
<td>580 30,160</td>
<td></td>
<td>590 30,680</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolo County</td>
<td>719 37,388</td>
<td></td>
<td>753 39,156</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuba County</td>
<td>627 32,604</td>
<td></td>
<td>663 34,476</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Average Annual Wages based upon Average Weekly Wages
CAPITOL VALLEY REGIONAL SERVICE AUTHORITY FOR FREeways AND EXPRESSWAYS
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The Sacramento Area Council of Governments Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (SAFE), also known as the Capitol Valley Regional Service Authority for Freeways and Expressways, is a legally constituted public entity created and established pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 14 of Division 3 of the Street and Highways Code of the State of California (the “Freeway Act”) to serve as the service authority for freeway emergencies in the counties of El Dorado, Sacramento, San Joaquin, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba. Under the Freeway Act, SAFE is authorized to impose a fee on vehicles registered in the six counties for the implementation, maintenance and operation of the motorist aid system of call boxes. SAFE is administered by a governing board consisting of members of SACOG’s Board of Directors plus one member representing San Joaquin County and one member representing the cities of San Joaquin County. SACOG provides administrative services for SAFE. SAFE is included in SACOG’s reporting entity because of the significance of its financial or operational relationship and its mutual governing board.

The SAFE Board adopts an annual budget for the Planning and Administration and Capitol Valley Regional SAFE Special Revenue funds based on anticipated projects at the beginning of the year. The Overall Work Program, a portion of the Planning and Administration fund budget, is approved by the California Department of Transportation after adoption by the Board of Directors. Annual budgets are adopted on a basis consistent with generally accepted accounting principles and are presented on the modified accrual basis of accounting.

Capitol Valley Regional SAFE Fund – Used to account for SACOG’s administrative activities for implementing, operating and maintaining the motorist aid system of call boxes within the counties of El Dorado, Sacramento, San Joaquin, Sutter, Yolo and Yuba. Funds are derived from the vehicle registration fee imposed pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 14 of Division 3 of the Streets and Highways Code.

Glenn County SAFE Fund – Used to account for activities in accordance with the contract with the County of Glenn, for implementing, operating and maintaining the motorist aid system of call boxes within the County of Glenn pursuant to Street and Highways Code section 2553.
## Capitol Valley Service Authority for Freeways and Expressways
### Budget
#### Fiscal Year 2010-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2009-10 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>FY 2009-10 Projected Actual</th>
<th>FY 2010-11 Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration Fees</td>
<td>$2,181,775</td>
<td>$2,116,321</td>
<td>$2,095,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reimbursements from Glenn County</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reimbursements from Placer County</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knockdown Recovery</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUE</strong></td>
<td>$2,245,275</td>
<td>$2,201,821</td>
<td>$2,178,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENDITURES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call Box Maintenance (including Placer/Glenn County)</td>
<td>$455,700</td>
<td>$450,700</td>
<td>$469,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway Service Patrol - Sacramento County</td>
<td>$706,000</td>
<td>$706,000</td>
<td>$706,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway Service Patrol - San Joaquin County on I-205</td>
<td>$113,000</td>
<td>$113,000</td>
<td>$113,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway Service Patrol - Yolo County</td>
<td>$26,250</td>
<td>$26,250</td>
<td>$26,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway Service Patrol - El Dorado County</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$50,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFE portion of Statewide CHP Coordinator</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Call Answering Contract - Fixed call boxes</td>
<td>$36,300</td>
<td>$30,936</td>
<td>$37,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Call Answering Contract - Bike Trail Boxes</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACOG Services (staff time and indirect costs)</td>
<td>$128,105</td>
<td>$219,609</td>
<td>$132,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cellular Phone Service (including Placer/Glenn County)</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>$76,000</td>
<td>$51,542</td>
<td>$76,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Information</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Services</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMV Fees</td>
<td>$10,834</td>
<td>$10,507</td>
<td>$10,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings/Printing</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511/STARNET - Capital Improvements Project</td>
<td>$197,938</td>
<td>$126,170</td>
<td>$152,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511/STARNET - Operations</td>
<td>$232,455</td>
<td>$192,530</td>
<td>$212,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511 Program Management - San Joaquin County</td>
<td>$34,000</td>
<td>$34,000</td>
<td>$34,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>$2,178,082</td>
<td>$2,111,244</td>
<td>$2,177,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUE LESS EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>$67,193</td>
<td>$90,578</td>
<td>$1,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROJECTED ENDING CASH BALANCE</strong></td>
<td>$2,644,697</td>
<td>$2,735,275</td>
<td>$2,736,530</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Capitol Valley Regional SAFE
Summary of Call Box Calls to Dispatch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Call Boxes</th>
<th>Calls</th>
<th>Calls/box/month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glenn</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuba</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutter</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>1395</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sacramento Dispatch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boxes</th>
<th>Calls</th>
<th>Calls/box/month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>4850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolo</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>1711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>7081</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stockton Dispatch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boxes</th>
<th>Calls</th>
<th>Calls/box/month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>3233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>3233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placer County</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test / UHS.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVRS Total</td>
<td>1216</td>
<td>11898</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average calls per call box/month: 0.8

Call Volume by Dispatch

- Chico: 28%
- Sacramento: 60%
- Stockton: 12%

Average Call Box Call Length: 3:38
Average Call Answer Delay: 45 seconds

2009 Call Box Calls by Month

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Calls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan-09</td>
<td>787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-09</td>
<td>673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-09</td>
<td>1,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-09</td>
<td>1,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-09</td>
<td>1,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-09</td>
<td>1,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-09</td>
<td>1,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-09</td>
<td>1,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-09</td>
<td>678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-09</td>
<td>1,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-09</td>
<td>748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-09</td>
<td>659</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Calls by CHP Shift

- A Shift (9am - 3pm): 6,140 (52%)
- B Shift (9am - 1pm): 4,285 (35%)
- C Shift (10am - 9pm): 1,470 (12%)

Total Calls: 11,998 (100%)

The contents of this report reflect the views of the author who is responsible for the facts and the accuracy of the data presented herein. The contents do not necessarily reflect the official view or policies of the SAFE. This report does not constitute a standard, specification, or requirement.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Assistance</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 California Highway Patrol (CHP)</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Auto Club (AAA)</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Auto Club (Other)</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Friends &amp; Family</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Freeway Service Patrol</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Rotational Tow</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 No Resources - CHP dispatched to scene</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Informational</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Duplicate Event</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Dial Tone</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Test calls from maintenance technician</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL 100%**

*Note: This report only reflects calls received by the private call answer center. Little or call box calls are answered directly by the local law enforcement agencies.*
### CVRS Bike Trail Call Boxes

The contents of this report reflect the views of the author who is responsible for the facts and the accuracy of the data presented herein. The contents do not necessarily reflect the official views or policies of the SAFE. This report does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation.

**City of Yuba City (SU-COY)**

**City of Davis (YL-COD)**

**Northern Bike Trail (SA-NBT)**

**Sacramento River Bike Trail (SA-RBT)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bike Trail</th>
<th>Number of Call boxes</th>
<th>Number of Calls to Dispatch</th>
<th>Average Calls / box / month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA-NBT</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA-RBT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA-ARP</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SU-COY</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YB-COM</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YL-COD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA-CWS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>65</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,899</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The contents of this report reflect the views of the author who is responsible for the facts and the accuracy of the data presented herein. The contents do not necessarily reflect the official views or policies of the SAFE. This report does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation.*
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WHEREAS, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments must adopt an operating budget annually; and

WHEREAS, the Overall Work Program constitutes a large portion of that annual budget and is approved by separate resolution; and

WHEREAS, there are certain other costs not related to the Overall Work Program for which a budget must be approved;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the SACOG operating budget be approved and the Executive Director is authorized to implement the budget and is approved to make budget adjustments as authorized.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 20th day of May 2010, by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

AYES: Directors Anderson, Billeci, Budge, Cabaldon, Cohn, Dickinson, Gray, Hanley, Hill, Hodges, Karpinski-Costa, Knight, MacGlashan, Montna, Nicolleti, Payne, Resler, Rivas, Roberts, Saylor, Thomson, Vice-Chair Peters, and Chair McBride

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Directors Cosgrove, Davies, Davis, Johnson, Miklos, Rockholm, Scherer, and West

Leslie McBride
Chair

Mike McKeever
Executive Director
WHEREAS, the SACOG staff has prepared an Overall Work Program (OWP) for fiscal year 2009-10 which has been reviewed by member agencies and Board committees; and

WHEREAS, the OWP has been reviewed by the Federal Highway Administration, the Federal Transit Administration, the California Department of Transportation, and stakeholders through a public review process; and

WHEREAS, such OWP becomes the basis for the SACOG’s activities and budget for fiscal year 2009-10; and

WHEREAS, 23 CFR 450.334 requires that the designated MPO certify each year that the planning process is being conducted in conformance with the applicable requirements,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that SACOG does hereby adopt and approve the fiscal year 2009-10 OWP and certifies that its planning process will be implemented through this document in accordance with:


2. Sections 174 and 176(c) and (d) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7504, 7506(c) and (d));

3. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Title VI assurance executed by each state under 23 U.S.C. 324 and 29 U.S.C. 794;

Sacramento Area Council of Governments

Board Resolution (Continued)


BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED:

1. That SACOG hereby authorizes submittal of the OWP for fiscal year 2009-10 to the various participating State and Federal agencies;

2. That SACOG pledges to pay or secure in cash or services, or both, the matching funds necessary for financial assistance;

3. That SACOG’s Executive Director is hereby designated and authorized to submit the OWP for fiscal year 2010-11 and to execute all necessary agreements and contracts on behalf of SACOG to implement the purposes of this resolution; and

4. That the Executive Director is hereby authorized to make and submit to the appropriate funding agencies necessary work program and budget modifications to the OWP based upon actual available funds, and to draw funds as necessary on a letter of credit or other requisition basis.

5. That the Executive Director is hereby authorized to make budget adjustments within the Overall Work Program Element accounts.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 21st day of May 2010, by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

AYES: Directors Anderson, Billeci, Budge, Cabaldon, Cohn, Dickinson, Gray, Hanley, Hill, Hodges, Karpinski-Costa, Knight, MacGlashan, Montna, Nicolleti, Payne, Resler, Rivas, Roberts, Saylor, Thomson, Vice-Chair Peters, and Chair McBride

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Directors Cosgrove, Davies, Davis, Johnson, Miklos, Rockholm, Scherer, and West

Leslie McBride  Mike McKeever
Chair            Executive Director
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Sacramento Area Council of Governments

Budget and Fiscal Policies

**Budget Policy:**

1. SACOG exists to perform activities that local governments value and could not perform as effectively (quality) or efficiently (cost savings) on their own. If there is anything SACOG is doing that does not meet that test then SACOG should either stop doing the activity or do it differently.

2. Money must be spent as efficiently as possible.

3. SACOG has a small staff that provides high-value specialized services to its 28 member governments. SACOG must be able to recruit and retain high quality staff in order to provide value and efficiencies to its member agencies.

4. Strong partnerships with other governmental and non-governmental organizations increase the effectiveness and efficiency of activities that are central to SACOG’s mission.

5. Pro-active advocacy for funds, programs, laws that are consistent with SACOG’s core mission is necessary to ensure that the region’s interests are protected and advanced.

6. Educational activities that expose the SACOG Board and Staff to the experiences of other local government and regions around the country facing similar challenges are beneficial.

7. The budget is complex and should be made as understandable as possible. For example, costs associated with managing our various programs should be funded from revenue streams directly associated with those programs.

8. The base budget should not rely on uncertain or speculative revenues.

9. Any increase in revenues that materialize throughout the year beyond those in the base budget can be used for specific services beyond those included in the OWP, but they must directly benefit our member local governments, and would require Board approval.

10. Finally, and most obviously, the budget must be consistent with the law, regulations and standard accounting practices.

**Fiscal Policy:**

1. SACOG will maintain an operating budget for the Planning and Administrative Fund which provides that revenues are equal to or greater than ongoing expenditures. For FY 10-11 the definition of a balance budget is that current year projected expenditures are being paid with current year operating revenues and from reserve funds from the Special Revenue SACOG Financing Corporation Fund.
2. The Planning and Administrative Fund Balance will not fall below the sum of these three reserves: Operating Cash reserve ($1,500,000), Reserve for Legal Defense ($500,000) and Reserve for Self Insurance ($200,000), unless expressly approved by the Board of Directors.

3. SACOG has the option to fund post-employment health costs on the “pay as you go” basis depending on budgetary needs.

4. SACOG’s general and administrative costs (called indirect costs) are allocated to direct projects through a cost allocation plan developed in accordance with federal requirements under OMB Circular A-102 and A-87. The cost allocation plan is approved annually by Caltrans. The allocation is computed on direct salary/benefit amount, which based on the employees fully-costed rate multiplied by hours worked.

5. SACOG will continue to pay competitive market level compensation to our employees.

6. SACOG will continue to comply with all the requirements of Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP).

7. Capital Assets (expenditures) – Routine -- to support Planning and Administration Fund operating activities. Capital assets are recorded at historical cost or at estimated historical costs if actual historical cost is not available. Donated capital assets are valued at their estimated fair market value on the SACOG date of donation. Capital assets are defined by SACOG, as assets with an initial, individual cost of more than $5,000 and an estimated useful life of in excess of two years. Capital assets used in operations are depreciated using the straight-line method over their estimated useful lives in the government-wide financial statements. The estimated useful lives for furniture and equipment are 3 to 15 years. The estimated depreciation amount is found within the indirect cost structure of SACOG’s Planning and Administration Fund.

8. Capital Assets (expenditures) – Non Routine as part of the Overall Work Program which are project specific – These are typically non-routine capital expenditures that are specific to a certain project, and not directly benefiting the Planning and Administration Fund operations. For FY 10-11 the most significant non-routine capital expenditure is for a project that SACOG is providing planning and assistance with, since it is of regional importance. The project is called Connect Card Implementation, which is the expected deployment of a Regional Universal Fare Card System. The project will require $7.2 million in software costs, to be funded by a specific grant funding, already available for this specific purpose. Full system deployment and acceptance is not expected before June 2012. Any future anticipated savings or revenues cannot be estimated at this time, as the project currently in Phase II, engineering design. It is also the plan to establish a regional financial and management clearing house, and the development of the regional maintenance and supply systems, and the implementation of smart card technology on the participating transit properties, so that future maintenance costs will be born by the participating transit agencies. Therefore, the future equipment and upkeep of the system is expected to be born by the transit agencies (using the system), and not by SACOG, when the system is finished.
| 11-001 Government Relations, Public Affairs and Administration | 06 Connect Card Implementation |
| 01 Interagency Relations | 07 Transit Technical Assistance and Programming |
| 02 Program Management |  |
| 03 Multi-Agency Planning and Coordination |  |
| 04 Legislative Analysis |  |
| 05 Education, Outreach and Marketing |  |

| 11-002 Long-Range Transportation Planning |  |
| 01 Model Development |  |
| 02 Bicycle/Pedestrian Planning |  |
| 03 Regional Forecasting |  |
| 04 Highway Planning and Operations |  |
| 05 Human Services Trans. Coordination & Paratransit, Inc. Planning |  |
| 06 Goods Movement/Freight Planning |  |
| 07 Regional Household Travel Survey |  |
| 08 Sacramento Emergency Transit Response Plan |  |
| 09 Statewide Development of Transportation/Land Use Tools |  |
| 10 Model Development – Fine-Grained Networks |  |
| 11 Forecasting Tools for Blueprint |  |
| 12 Interregional Truck Operations on I-5 and SR 99 & STAA Truck Rte Improvements |  |

| 11-003 Short-Range Transportation Planning and Studies |  |
| 01 Central California Traction Company Rail Preservation & Purchase Plan Study |  |
| 02 Complete Streets |  |
| 03 Sacramento Regional Transit District Planning |  |
| 04 Downtown Sacramento Transit Circulation and Facilities Plan |  |
| 05 Agricultural Worker Transportation Program |  |
| 06 Safe Routes to School |  |
| 07 South Co. Transit/Link Management Transition Plan |  |
| 08 Wheatland & Live Oak Transit Marketing Assistance |  |
| 09 City of Folsom SRTP |  |
| 10 Outreach & Analysis of Transit Needs in the Region |  |

| 11-004 Continuing Transportation Services Implementation |  |
| 01 Regional Air Quality Planning |  |
| 02 Federal and State Programming |  |
| 03 Regional Transportation Monitoring |  |
| 04 Rural Transportation Planning & Coordination |  |
| 05 Passenger Rail Improvements |  |

| 11-005 Land Use and Housing Planning |  |
| 01 Sacramento Region Blueprint Implementation |  |
| 02 Regional Land Use Monitoring |  |
| 03 Regional Housing Needs Allocation |  |
| 04 Community Design Program |  |
| 05 Rural-Urban Connections Strategy |  |
| 06 NOT IN USE |  |
| 07 Airport Land Use Commission |  |

| 11-006 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) Planning |  |
| 01 MTP Scenario Development |  |
| 02 MTP Education & Outreach |  |
| 03 MTP Regional EIR |  |

| 11-007 Member, Agency, & Transportation Services |  |
| 01 Project Delivery |  |
| 02 Regional Information Center |  |
| 03 Transportation Development Act Administration |  |
| 04 Multi-Agency Project Study Reports |  |
| 05 Emergency Preparedness, Business Continuity & Travel Options Study |  |
| 06 511/STARNET Capital Improvements |  |
| 07 Rideshare |  |
| 08 511/STARNET Operations |  |
| 09 511 Automated Transit Trip Planning |  |
| 10 Sacramento Emergency Clean Air & Transportation Program |  |
| 11 I-PLACE³S and SACSIM Training |  |
| 12 Sacramento County Transit Technical Assistance |  |
| 13 Sustainability and Climate Action Planning Assistance |  |
| 14 Integrated Basemap Program |  |

| 11-015 Services to Other Agencies |  |
| 01 Capitol Valley SAFE |  |
| 02 Glenn County SAFE |  |

| 11-020-01 Indirect Services and Support |  |
| 11-021-01 Capital Assets |  |
| 11-022-01 Leave Time |  |
| 11-023-01 Board of Directors and Advocacy |  |
### Salary Schedule
Effective August 1, 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Clerk I</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31,848</td>
<td>2,654</td>
<td>15.31</td>
<td>33,444</td>
<td>2,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Clerk II</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36,112</td>
<td>3,026</td>
<td>17.66</td>
<td>36,976</td>
<td>3,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant I</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42,684</td>
<td>3,557</td>
<td>21.55</td>
<td>44,800</td>
<td>3,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting Technician</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>47,024</td>
<td>3,822</td>
<td>23.03</td>
<td>49,410</td>
<td>4,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Planner</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>49,416</td>
<td>4,118</td>
<td>23.76</td>
<td>51,888</td>
<td>4,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Coordinator I</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>54,490</td>
<td>4,549</td>
<td>26.18</td>
<td>57,204</td>
<td>4,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant II</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>60,060</td>
<td>5,055</td>
<td>28.83</td>
<td>63,072</td>
<td>5,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant III</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>66,216</td>
<td>5,518</td>
<td>31.33</td>
<td>69,528</td>
<td>5,794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant III</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>76,656</td>
<td>6,386</td>
<td>36.55</td>
<td>80,496</td>
<td>6,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Accountant</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>80,496</td>
<td>6,708</td>
<td>38.70</td>
<td>84,166</td>
<td>7,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Staff</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>116,128</td>
<td>9,644</td>
<td>56.75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Regular full-time employees are paid a monthly salary based on this schedule. The hourly rates used for regular part-time employees are computed by dividing the annual salary by 2,080 hours.
Accounting System – The total set of records and procedures which are used to record, classify and report information on the financial status and operations of an entity.

Accrual Basis of Accounting - The method of accounting under which revenues are recorded when they are earned (whether or not cash is received at that time) and expenditures are recorded when goods and services are received (whether or not cash disbursements are made at the time).

Amended Budget – The original adopted budget plus any amendments passed as of a certain date.

Appropriation – An amount of money in the budget authorized by the Board of Directors, for expenditure or obligation within organizational units for specific purposes.

Audit – A systematic examination of resource utilization concluding in a written report. It is a test of management’s internal accounting controls and is intended to:
- Ascertain whether financial statements fairly present financial position and results of operations,
- Test whether transactions have been legally performed,
- Identify areas for possible improvements in accounting practices and procedures,
- Ascertain whether transactions have been recorded accurately and consistently, and
- Ascertain the stewardship of officials responsible for governmental resources.

Bond – A written promise to pay (debt) a specified sum of money (called principal or face value) at a specified future date (called the maturity date(s)) along with periodic interest paid at a specific percentage of the principal (interest rate). Bonds typically are used for long-term debt.

Budget (Operating) – A plan of financial operation embodying an estimate of proposed expenditures for a given period (typically a fiscal year) and the proposed means of financing them (revenue estimates).

Budget Message – A general discussion of the proposed budget presented in writing as a part of the budget document. The budget message explains principal budget issues against the background of financial experience in recent years and presents recommendations made by the District staff.

Caltrans (California Department of Transportation) – The state agency that maintains and operates California’s Highway system.

Capital Assets – Assets of significant value and having a useful life of several years. Capital assets are also called fixed assets.

Capital Budget – A plan of proposed expenditures and the means of financing them, usually based on the first year of the capital improvement program (CIP) and typically enacted as part of the complete annual budget which includes both operating and capital outlays.

Capital Equipment – Fixed assets such vehicles, computers, furniture and technical instruments which have a life expectancy of more than one year and a value over $5,000.

Cash Basis – The method of accounting under which revenues are recorded when received in cash and expenditures are recorded when paid.
Cash Management – A conscious effort to manage cash flow in such a way that interest and penalties paid are minimized and interest earned is maximized. Funds received are deposited on the day of receipt and invested as soon as the funds are available.

Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Improvement Program – A federal source of funding for projects and activities that reduce congestion and improve air quality, both in regions not yet attaining federal air quality standards and those engaged in efforts to preserve their attainment status.

Contingency – A budgetary reserve to provide for emergency or unanticipated expenditures during the fiscal year.

Deficit – The excess of expense over income during an accounting period.

Depreciation – 1) Expiration in the service life of capital assets attributable to wear and tear, deterioration, action of the physical elements, inadequacy, or obsolescence. 2) That portion of the cost of a capital asset which is charged as an expense during a particular period.

Disbursements – Payments made on obligations.

Encumbrance – A commitment of funds against an appropriation, it may be in the form of a purchase order or a contract; until such time as the goods or services are received, the commitment is referred to as an encumbrance.

Fees – Charges for service that are based upon the cost of providing the service.

Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) – U.S. Department of Transportation agency responsible for administering the federal highway aid program to individual states, and helping to plan, develop and coordinate construction of federally funded highway projects. FHWA also governs the safety of hazardous cargo on the nation’s highways.

Fiscal Year – The time frame in which the budget applies. This is the period from July through June 30.

Flexible Funding – Unlike funding that flows only to highways or only to transit by a rigid formula, this is money that can be invested in a range of transportation projects. Examples of flexible funding categories include the Surface Transportation Program (STP) and the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) program.

Federal Transit Administration (FTA) – U.S. Department of Transportation agency that provides financial and planning assistance to help plan, build and operate rail, bus and paratransit systems. The agency also assists in the development of local and regional traffic reduction programs.

Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) – A measure of effective authorized positions, indicating the percentage of time a position or group of positions is funded. It is calculated by equating 2,080 hours of work per year with the full-time equivalent of one position; thus, one position would have an FTE or 1.0 or 100 percent.
**Fund** – An independent fiscal and accounting entity with a self-balancing set of accounts recording cash and/or other resources together with all related liabilities, obligations, reserves, and equities which are segregated for the purpose of carrying on specific activities or attaining certain objectives.

**Fund Balance** – The excess of an entity’s assets over its liabilities. A negative fund balance is sometimes called a deficit.

**Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP)** – Uniform minimum standards of, and guidelines for, external financial accounting and reporting. They govern the form and content of the basic financial statements of an entity. GAAP encompasses the conventions, rules and procedures necessary to define accepted accounting practices at a particular time. They include not only broad guidelines of general application, but also detailed practices and procedures. The primary authoritative statements on the application of GAAP to state and local governments are Government Accounting Standards Board (GASB) pronouncements and Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB) pronouncements. GAAP provides a standard by which to measure financial presentations.

**Geographic Information System (GIS)** – An organized collection of computer hardware, software and geographic data designed to efficiently capture, store, update, manipulate, analyze, and display all forms of geographically referenced information.

**High-Occupancy-Vehicle Lane (HOV Lane)** – The technical term for a carpool lane, commuter lane or diamond lane.

**Interfund Transfers** – Budgeted amounts transferred from one governmental accounting fund to another for work or services provided. As they represent a “double accounting” of expenditures, these amounts are deducted from the total operating budget to calculate the “net” budget.

**Internal Control** – A plan of organization for purchasing, accounting, and other financial activities which, among other things, provides that:

- The duties of employees are subdivided so that no single employee handles a financial transaction from beginning to end,
- Proper authorizations from specific responsible officials are obtained before key steps in the processing of transactions are completed, and
- Records and procedures are arranged appropriately to facilitate effective control.

**Leases and Rentals** – This includes costs to rent equipment, copy machines, temporary easements and other items.

**Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)** – A federally required planning body responsible for the transportation planning and project selection in its region; the governor designates an MPO in every urbanized area with a population of over 50,000. SACOG is the Sacramento region’s MPO.

**Operating Expenditures** – Expenditures of day-to-day operations, such as office supplies, maintenance of equipment, and travel; they include capital costs.
Paratransit – Door-to-door bus, van and taxi services used to transport elderly and disabled riders. Sometimes referred to as dial-a-ride service, since trips are made according to demand instead of along a fixed route or according to a fixed schedule.

Purchase Order – A document issued to authorize a vendor or vendors to deliver specified merchandise or render a specified service for a stated estimated price. Outstanding purchase orders are called encumbrances.

Revenue – Income generated by taxes, investment income, connection fees, stand-by fees, and user charges.

Reserve – An account used to indicate that a portion of fund equity (or Fund Balance) is legally restricted for a specific purpose or not available for appropriation and subsequent spending.

Service Authority for Freeways and Expressways (SAFE) – As the region’s SAFE, SACOG, GET FROM WEBSITE

Special Assessment – A compulsory levy imposed on certain properties to defray part or all of the cost of a specific improvement or service deemed to primarily benefit those properties.

State Transit Assistance (STA) – Provides funding for mass transit operations and capital projects.

State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) – What the California Transportation Commission (CTC) ends up with after combining various RTIPs, as well as a list of specific projects proposed by Caltrans. Covering a five-year span and updated every two years, the STIP determines when and if transportation projects will be funded by the state. Projects included in the STIP must be consistent with the long-range transportation plan.

Strategies – The general approach taken to achieve strategic goals and objectives, inclusive of programs and activities within the programs.

Surface Transportation Program (STP) – One of the key funding programs in TEA 21. STP moneys are “flexible,” meaning they can be spent on mass transit, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, as well as on roads and highways.

Transportation Development Act (TDA) - State law enacted in 1971. TDA funds are generated from a tax of one-quarter of one percent on all retail sales in each county; used for transit, special transit for disabled persons, and bicycle and pedestrian purposes. TDA moneys are collected by the state and allocated to SACOG to fund transit operations and programs. In non-urban areas, TDA funds may be used for streets and roads under certain conditions.

Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) – A short-term (covering three years) program of transportation projects that will be funded with all federal funds expected to flow to the region; the projects contained in the TIP are drawn from, and consistent with, the long-range transportation
plan. Also can be called the MTIP (Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program).

*Travel Demand Model* – Used by transportation planners for simulating current travel conditions and for forecasting future travel patterns and conditions. Models help planners and policy-makers analyze the effectiveness and efficiency of alternative transportation investments in terms of mobility, accessibility, and environmental and equity impacts.

*Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)* – One vehicle (whether a car carrying one passenger or a bus carrying 30 people) traveling one mile constitutes a vehicle mile. VMT is one measure of the use of the Sacramento region freeways and roads.
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AB — Assembly Bill (Number)

ABAG — Association of Bay Area Governments

ACG — Address Coding Guide

ADA — Americans With Disabilities Act

ALUC — Airport Land Use Commission

ALUCP — Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan

AMTRAK — American Tracks Railroad

APCD — Air Pollution Control District

APTA — American Public Transit Association

AQMD — Air Quality Management District

ARB — Air Resources Board

ATP — Automated Trip Planning

BRT — Bus Rapid Transit

CAA — Clean Air Act

CALCOG — California Association of Councils of Governments

CALTRACTION — Central California Traction Company

CALTRANS — The California Department of Transportation

CAP-TO-CAP — Capitol (Sacramento) to Capitol (Washington, D.C.)

CARB — California Air Resources Board

CBD — Central Business District

CBTP — Community Based Transportation Planning

CCJPA — Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Authority

CCJPB — Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Board
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CCTA — Central California Traction Company

CDP — Census Designated Places

CEQA — California Environmental Quality Act

CFPG — California Federal Programming Group

CFR — Code of Federal Regulations

CHP — The California Highway Patrol

CIP — Capitol Improvement Program

CMAQ — Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality

CMP — Congestion Management Program

CMS — Congestion Management System

CMSA — Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Area

CNG — Compressed Natural Gas

COG — Council of Governments

CPI — Consumer Price Index

CPU — Central Processing Unit

CSAC — California State Association of Counties

CTA — California Transit Association

CTC — California Transportation Commission

CTIPS — California Transportation Improvement Program System

CTP — California Transportation Plan

CTSA — Consolidated Transportation Service Agency

CVRS — Capitol Valley Regional Service Authority for Freeways and Expressways

DBE — Disadvantaged Business Enterprise

DEIR — Draft Environmental Impact Report
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DNA — Downtown Natomas Airport Sacramento Regional Transit District Light Rail Line

DOT — Department of Transportation

DTIM — Direct Travel Impact Model

EDCTC — El Dorado County Transportation Commission

EIR — Environmental Impact Report

EIS — Environmental Impact Statement

EJ — Environmental Justice

EPA — Environmental Protection Agency

EPLS — Excluded Parties List System

FAA — Federal Aviation Administration

FEIR — Final Environmental Impact Report

FEIS — Final Environmental Impact Statement

FFY — Federal Fiscal Year

FHWA — Federal Highway Administration

FPPC — Fair Political Practices Commission

FRA — Federal Railroad Administration

FTA — Federal Transit Administration

FTE — Full-Time Equivalent

FTIP — Federal (Metropolitan) Transportation Improvement Program

FY — Fiscal Year

FRAQMD — Feather River Air Quality Management District

GASB — Governmental Accounting Standards Board

GIS — Geographic Information Systems

GMAG — Goods Movement Advisory Group
GPS — Global Positioning System
HCP — Habitat Conservation Plan
HOV — High-Occupancy Vehicle
HPMS — Highway Performance Monitoring System
HSTP — Human Services Transportation Plan
HUD — U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
IIP — Interregional Improvement Program
IPG — Intermodal Planning Group
I-PLACE’S — Planning for Community Energy, Economic and Environmental Sustainability
IRRS — Inter-Regional Road System
ISTEA — Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991
ITS — Intelligent Transportation System
JARC — Job Access Reverse Commute
JPA — Joint Powers Agreement
LAFCO — Local Area Formation Commission
LCC — League of California Cities
LEP — Limited English Proficiency
LTF — Local Transportation Fund
LRT — Light Rail Transit
LRTP — Long-Range Transportation Plan
MIS — Major Investment Studies
MOA — Memorandum of Agreement
MOU — Memorandum of Understanding
MPA — Metropolitan Planning Area
MPO — Metropolitan Planning Organization

MSA — Metropolitan Statistical Area

MTC — Metropolitan Transportation Commission

MTIP — Federal Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program

MTP — Metropolitan Transportation Plan

NAAQS — National Ambient Air Quality Standard

NARC — National Association of Regional Councils

NEPA — National Environmental Policy Act

NF — New Freedom

NHS — National Highway System

OMB — Office of Management and Budget

OWP — Overall Work Program

PAC — Project Advisory Committee

PCTPA — Placer County Transportation Planning Agency

PECAS — Production Exchange and Consumption Allocation System (Model)

PI — Paratransit, Inc.

PL — Metropolitan Planning

PMSA — Primary Metropolitan Statistical Area

PPM — Planning, Programming and Monitoring

PSR — Project Study Report

PTC — Public Transportation Commission

RAD — Regional Analysis District

RFP — Request for Proposal

RHNA — Regional Housing Needs Allocation
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RHNP — Regional Housing Needs Plan

RIP — Regional Improvement Program

ROW — Right-of-Way

RPP — Regional Planning Partnership

RSTP — Regional Surface Transportation Plan

RT — Regional Transit (see also SRTD)

RTP — Regional Transportation Plan

RTPA — Regional Transportation Planning Agency

RTIP — Regional Transportation Improvement Program

RUCS — Rural-Urban Connections Strategy

SB — Senate Bill (Number)

SABA — Sacramento Area Bicycle Advocates

SACMET — Regional Trip-Based Travel Model

SACOG — Sacramento Area Council of Governments

SACSIM — Regional Activity-Based Travel Model

SAFE — Service Authority for Freeways and Expressways

SAFETEA-LU — Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act — A Legacy for Users

SANDAG — San Diego Association of Governments

SCT-LINK — South County Transit Link

SECAT — Sacramento Emergency Clean Air and Transportation Program

SCG — Staff Coordinating Group

SIGMAC — Statewide Intermodal Goods Movement Advisory Committee

SIP — State Implementation Plan

SJCOG — San Joaquin Council of Governments
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SMAQMD — Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District

SOV — Single-Occupant Vehicle

SRTD — Sacramento Regional Transit District

SRTP — Short-Range Transit Plan

STA — Sacramento Transportation Authority

STA Funds — State Transit Assistance Funds

STAC — Social Service Transportation Advisory Council

STARNET — Sacramento Transportation Area Network

STF — Summary Tape File

STIP — State Transportation Improvement Program

STP — Surface Transportation Program

TAC — Technical Advisory Committee

TAZ — Transportation Analysis Zone

TCC — Transportation Coordinating Committee

TCIF — Trade Corridor Improvement Fund

TCM — Transportation Control Measure

TCRP — Traffic Congestion Relief Program

TDA — Transportation Development Act

TDM — Transportation Demand Management

TEA-21 — Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century

TEA FUNDS — Transportation Enhancement Activities Funds

TIGER — Topologically Integrated Geographic Encoding and Referencing

TIP — Transportation Improvement Program

TMA — Transportation Management Association
TMC — Transportation Management Center

TOS — Traffic Operations System

TRPA — Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

TSM — Transportation System Management


U.S. DOT — U.S. Department of Transportation

VMT — Vehicle Miles of Travel or Vehicle Miles Traveled

YCTD — Yolo County Transportation District

YSTA — Yuba-Sutter Transit Agency
WHAT WE DO

The Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) is an association of Sacramento Valley governments formed from the six regional counties—El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo and Yuba—and 22 member cities. SACOG’s directors are chosen from the elected boards of its member governments. SACOG’s primary charge is to provide regional transportation planning and funding, as well as a forum for the study and resolution of regional issues. In this role, SACOG prepares the region’s long-range transportation plan; approves distribution of affordable housing around the region; keeps a region-wide database for its own and local agency use; helps counties and cities use federal transportation funds in a timely way; assists in planning for transit, bicycle networks, clean air and airport land uses; and has completed the Blueprint Project which links transportation and land development more closely.
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