

## Transportation Committee

Thursday, March 6, 2014, at 10:00 a.m.

SACOG Rivers Rooms, 1415 L Street, Suite 300, Sacramento, CA

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

**Roll Call:** Directors Cohn, Crews, Griego, Hagen, Hesch, Holmes (alternate), Joiner, Ex-officio Member Jones, Krovoza, Peters, Slowey, Vice Chairs Cabaldon and Hodges, and Chair Sander

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

1. Minutes of the February 6, 2014, Meeting ◀ (Mr. Carpenter)
2. Funding for the Downtown/Riverfront Streetcar Project Using Proposition 1B Transit – Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement, and Service Enhancement Account (PTMISEA) Funds ◀ (Ms. Doherty/ Ms. O'Rourke)
3. 2013/2014 Regional Program of Projects for the Federal Transit Administration's Section 5311 Funds ◀ (Ms. VaughanBechtold)
4. Consultant Selection for Project Tracker Database Services ◀ (Mr. Heiman)
5. Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy Update
  - A. MTP/SCS Approach to Scenario Development ◀ (Ms. Lizon)
  - B. MTP/SCS Outreach Update (Ms. Hernandez)
  - C. Transit State-of-Good-Repair Needs Assessment (Mr. Carpenter/Mr. Holtzen)
6. Programming Recommendations for Federal Transit Administration Sections 5307 and 5339 FFY 2014 Apportionments to the Sacramento Urbanized Area ◀ (Ms. Doherty)
7. Connect Card Change Order Innovations in Transportation Retail Sales Device ◀ (Mr. McCrary)
8. SACOG Six-County Regional Active Transportation Program Guidelines (Ms. Symons-Holtzen)
9. Receive & File: Transportation Committee Planning Calendar Update

### Other Matters

### Adjournment

◀ Indicates Action

Prepared by:  
Mike McKeever  
Chief Executive Officer

Approved by:  
David Sander  
Chair

**Next committee meeting: Thursday, April 3, 2014**

*The Meridian Plaza Building is accessible to the disabled. If requested, this agenda, and documents in the agenda packet can be made available in appropriate alternative formats to persons with a disability, as required by Section 202 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 and the Federal Rules and Regulations adopted in implementation thereof. Persons seeking an alternative format should contact SACOG for further information. In addition, a person with a disability who requires a modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services, in order to participate in a public meeting should contact SACOG by phone at 916-321-9000, e-mail ([contact@sacog.org](mailto:contact@sacog.org)) or in person as soon as possible and preferably at least 24 hours prior to the meeting. Parking is available at 15<sup>th</sup> and K Streets.*

Auburn  
Citrus Heights  
Colfax  
Davis  
El Dorado County  
Elk Grove  
Folsom  
Galt  
Isleton  
Lincoln  
Live Oak  
Loomis  
Marysville  
Placer County  
Placerville  
Rancho Cordova  
Rocklin  
Roseville  
Sacramento  
Sacramento County  
Sutter County  
West Sacramento  
Wheatland  
Winters  
Woodland  
Yolo County  
Yuba City  
Yuba County



**Item #14-3-1  
Action**

## **Transportation Committee**

February 27, 2014

### **Minutes of the February 6, 2014, Meeting**

**Issue:** The Transportation Committee met February 6, 2014.

**Recommendation:** Approve the minutes of the meetings as submitted.

**Discussion:** The minutes of the February 6, 2014, meeting are attached for approval by the Transportation Committee.

Approved by:

Mike McKeever  
Chief Executive Officer

Key Staff: Matt Carpenter, Director of Transportation Services, (916) 340-6276

MM:MC:gg  
Attachment

**SACRAMENTO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE**

**DRAFT ACTION MINUTES**

---

The SACOG Transportation Committee met on February 6, 2014, in the Rivers Rooms on the Third Floor of the Meridian Plaza Building, located at 1415 L Street, Sacramento, CA, at 10:00 a.m.

---

**CALL TO ORDER:** Chair Sander called the meeting to order at 10:02 a.m.

**ROLL CALL:** Present: Directors Cabaldon, Cohn, Crews, Griego, Hagen, Hesch, Hodges, Joiner, Krovoza, Peters, Slowey, Ex-officio Member Jones, and Chair Sander. Director Cleveland was also in attendance.

Absent: Director Holmes

**1. Minutes of the December 5, 2013, Meeting**

Upon motion by Director Greigo, seconded by Director Slowey, and unanimously carried, the Transportation Committee approved the minutes as submitted. Directors Cabaldon and Krovoza were absent for this vote.

**2. Unmet Transit Needs Findings for Sacramento Regional Transit District, Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba Counties, and the Cities Therein**

Upon motion by Director Griego, seconded by Director Slowey, and unanimously carried, the Transportation Committee recommended that the Board: (1) approve the minutes of the six previously held public hearings on unmet transit needs in Sacramento County, including the cities therein and the Sacramento Regional Transit District (SRTD); in Sutter, Yolo and Yuba counties, and the cities therein; and before the SACOG Board of Directors; and (2) adopt the attached resolutions regarding unmet transit needs in each county, cities therein, and the SRTD. Director Cabaldon was absent for this vote.

**3. Programming Recommendations for Federal Transit Administration Sections 5307 and 5339 FFY 2014 Apportionments to the Sacramento Urbanized Area**

Because necessary information was not available in time for the February Transportation Committee meeting, this item was carried forward to March.

**4A. 2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy Outreach Update**

The Transportation Committee received and reviewed this report, presented by Monica Hernández, SACOG staff.

**4B. Inventory of Adopted and Proposed Land Use Plans**

The Transportation Committee received and reviewed this report, presented by Kacey Lizon, SACOG staff.

**5. Active Transportation Program State Guidelines**

The Transportation Committee received and reviewed this report, presented by Lacey Symons-Holtzen, SACOG staff.

**6. Elk Grove Short-Range Transit Plan**

The Transportation Committee received and reviewed this report, presented by Sharon Sprowls, SACOG staff.

**7. Receive & File: Transportation Committee Planning Calendar Update**

**8. Receive & File: Cap-to-Cap 2014**

**9. Receive & File: Transportation Committee Charge**

**Other Matters**

Mike McKeever, SACOG staff, discussed implications of Senate Bill 375.

**Adjournment**

Chair Sander adjourned the meeting at 11:26 a.m.



## Transportation Committee

February 27, 2014

### **Funding for the Downtown/Riverfront Streetcar Project Using Proposition 1B Transit – Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement, and Service Enhancement Account (PTMISEA) Funds**

**Issue:** Should funding be approved for a PTMISEA transit project?

**Recommendation:** That the Transportation Committee recommend that the Board approve the reprogramming of \$1.57 million in regional PTMISEA funding to the Sacramento Regional Transit District (RT) for continued work on the Downtown/Riverfront Streetcar project; and authorize the Chief Executive Officer to sign and submit required Division of Mass Transportation applications and forms and enter into a subrecipient agreement with RT.

**Discussion:** The PTMISEA program is a ten-year, transit capital, state bond program, and SACOG is the recipient of regional (GC 8879.55(a)(2)/PUC 99313) funds for the four-county region. SACOG passes the funding through to transit agencies that act as project sponsors. The Transit Coordinating Committee (TCC) is responsible for reviewing PTMISEA project applications and making recommendations to the Transportation Committee and the Board of Directors.

SACOG previously awarded \$2.8 million in PTMISEA regional funds to RT for the Paratransit Vehicle Replacement project. In November 2012, the SACOG Board approved allocating \$800,000 of the original \$2.8 million for Mobile Access Routers (MAR) for RT's bus fleet, which left a balance of \$2 million.

At its February 19, 2014, meeting, the TCC recommended approval of the reprogramming of \$1.57 million of the remaining fund balance to the Downtown/Riverfront Streetcar Project to continue project development activities. The Downtown/Riverfront Streetcar is a multi-jurisdictional project, with project development costs of this regionally-significant project being shared by multiple partner agencies, including RT. The \$1.57 million total is equivalent to the amount of regional funding awarded for paratransit vehicle replacements in December 2013, as part of the biennial flexible funding round. Board approval of the reprogramming recommendation will result in a \$0.33 million balance in RT's Paratransit Vehicle Replacement project account.

Upon Board approval, the funding application for this project will be submitted to the Caltrans Division of Mass Transportation. In addition, the necessary forms and a subrecipient agreement will be prepared and executed with RT.

Approved by:

Mike McKeever  
Chief Executive Officer

MM:CO:gg  
Attachment

Key Staff: Matt Carpenter, Director of Transportation Services, (916) 340-6276  
Azadeh Doherty, Senior Planner, (916) 340-6221  
Christine O'Rourke, Assistant Planner, (916) 340-6262



## Item #14-3-3 Action

### Transportation Committee

February 27, 2014

#### 2013/2014 Regional Program of Projects for the Federal Transit Administration's Section 5311 Funds

**Issue:** SACOG, working with the three eligible rural transit operators, has prepared the FY 2013/2014 Regional Program of Projects for Federal Transit Administration (FTA) 5311 rural transit funding. The program will be submitted to Caltrans upon Board approval.

**Recommendation:** That the Transportation Committee recommend that the Board approve the FY 2013/2014 FTA Section 5311 Program of Projects (POPs) based on transit operator submissions.

**Discussion:** The FTA Section 5311 program provides funding for public transportation in non-urbanized areas. The FTA apportions funds for non-urbanized areas to the states according to a statutory formula based on each state's population in non-urbanized areas (under 50,000 population). The funds are available to the state for obligation for the year of apportionment plus two additional years.

In California, 75 percent of these funds are apportioned to the Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs) for the support of non-urbanized public transportation. Ten percent of the funds are set aside in a state reserve, and 15 percent of the funds are set aside for the support of intercity bus transportation. Funds apportioned to RTPAs must be included in the State Program of Projects submitted by Caltrans to FTA. The State Program contains POPs adopted by each RTPA.

In the SACOG region, three public transportation providers are currently eligible to apply for FTA Section 5311 funds. Funds are apportioned to these transit providers based on a policy adopted by the SACOG Board in December 1998. The policy distributes these funds to the providers based on their share of the non-urbanized population denoted in the most recent decennial census (2010 Census).

The FY 2013/2014 FTA Section 5311 apportionment for the SACOG region is \$1,110,943. The POPs will show how Yuba-Sutter Transit, the Yolo County Transportation District, and Sacramento County's South County Transit/Link programs will use these funds in their operating and capital budgets. The Placer County Transportation Planning Agency and the El Dorado County Transportation Commission complete FTA Section 5311 POPs for the respective counties they serve as RTPAs.

After the FY 2013/2014 FTA Section 5311 POP for the SACOG region is approved, the SACOG region's RTPA transit operators can apply for the funds to use for rural transit services.

Approved by:

Mike McKeever  
Chief Executive Officer

MM:BVB:gg  
Attachments

Key Staff: Matt Carpenter, Director of Transportation Services, (916) 340-6276  
Barbara VaughanBechtold, Associate Planner, (916) 340-6226

**FEDERAL FISCAL YEAR 2014**  
**Section 5311 Program of Projects (POP)**  
 Regular 5311                       JARC 5311

**(A) Available Funding:**

	Carryover: (+)	_____
<i>Estimated</i>	Apportionment [FFY 2013]: (+)	_____
<b>(A) TOTAL FUNDS AVAILABLE:</b>	=	_____

**(B) Programming (POP): Complete Parts I and II**

		<i>Federal Share</i>
Part I.	Operating Assistance - Total: (+)	_____
	Part II. Capital - Total: (+)	_____
<b>(B) Total [Programmed]:</b>	<b>(=)</b>	_____

**(C) Balance**

		<i>Federal Share</i>
	(A) Total Funds Available: (+)	_____
	(B) Total [Programmed]: (-)	_____
	<b>* Balance: (=)</b>	_____

**\*BALANCE – Regional Apportionment Funds ONLY:**

- o Please Note -
  - funds must be programmed in subsequent year
  - final approval to be determined by the Department
- o Request/Letter to carryover funds should include -
  - justification for programming postponement
  - purpose and project plan
  - letter of support from local Transportation Planning Agency

**(D) Flexible Funds (CMAO, STP or Federalized STIP): Complete Part III (For reference only).**

*Request for transfer will be applied for directly through the District - Local Assistance District Engineer, and Headquarters' Division of Local Assistance. Division of Mass Transportation will receive a conformation once the transfer is completed.*

		<i>Federal Share</i>
<b>(D) Part III. Flex Fund - Total:</b>		_____

**FUNDING SUMMARY**

		<i>Federal Share</i>
(B) Regional Apportioned - Total [Programmed]:	(+)	_____
(D) Flex Fund - Total:	(+)	_____
<b>GRAND TOTAL [Programmed]:</b>	<b>(=)</b>	_____

Contact Person/Title: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Phone Number: \_\_\_\_\_





**SACRAMENTO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS**

**RESOLUTION NO. ? – 2014**

**APPROVING THE SUBMISSION OF THE  
FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION 5311 RURAL  
TRANSIT OPERATORS PROGRAM OF PROJECTS**

**WHEREAS**, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) is the designated Regional Transportation Planning Agency for the Counties of Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo and Yuba; and

**WHEREAS**, this designation requires that SACOG complete a Program of Projects allocating funds for FTA Section 5311 for fiscal year 2013/2014.

**NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, that the Council hereby approves the SACOG Federal Transit Administration 5311 Program of Projects for FY 2013/2014.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that the SACOG FTA 5311 Program of Projects for FY 2013/2014 be submitted to the California Department of Transportation.

**PASSED AND ADOPTED**, this 20th day of March 2014, by the following vote of the Board of Directors:

**AYES:**

**NOES:**

**ABSTAIN:**

**ABSENT:**

---

Steve Cohn  
Chair

---

Mike McKeever  
Chief Executive Officer



## Transportation Committee

February 27, 2014

### Consultant Selection for Project Tracker Database Services

**Issue:** Should the Transportation Committee recommend a new contract for the Project Tracker Services vendor?

**Recommendation:** That the Transportation Committee recommend that the Board authorize the Chief Executive Officer to negotiate a new contract for Project Tracker Database Services with EcoInteractive for \$185,064 over three years.

**Discussion:** In December of 2013, the Board authorized SACOG staff to release a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for project tracking software services, used by SACOG to manage the projects that comprise the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP), with a contract maximum of \$250,000 for the initial three-year period.

For nearly ten years, EcoInteractive has hosted the project tracking database which they initially developed. Known as SACTrak, the project tracking database software is proprietary and is similar to the tool used by other metropolitan planning organizations elsewhere in the State. SACTrak provides a critical link between the local project sponsors and SACOG staff via a web-based interface which allows registered users the ability to add and modify projects intended for inclusion in the MTIP. SACTrak also maintains a historical record of revisions to the database and all past projects. Included in the database are features allowing for the direct interaction with state and federal funding databases. SACTrak provides staff with the ability to generate many reports required to support the management of the programs.

The RFQ generated four responses. These were reviewed and scored by the evaluation team, which was comprised of staff from SACOG, the Placer County Transportation Planning Agency, and Caltrans District 3. The proposals were analyzed as outlined in the RFQ, and it was determined that all respondents would likely be able to provide a solution that would meet our needs. It was apparent to the review team that one respondent, EcoInteractive, had the most experience in providing products of this nature and would require a significantly lower commitment of staff time to implement. The RFQ requested a cost estimate from the vendors for the basic offering, and EcoInteractive provided the lowest bid of \$185,064 for the first three-year period, with years four and five priced at \$65,424 and \$67,392 (five year total: \$317,880). Awarding the contract to Eco-Interactive was the unanimous recommendation of the evaluation team.

Work remains to negotiate a new contract with EcoInteractive, and staff will develop a prioritized list of specific enhancements for consideration. Those enhancements could include allowing the sharing of the underlying database information with other database systems, expanding the use of Geographic Information Systems, and expanding the service to include other databases, such as the Metropolitan Transportation Plan project list. It is likely that this budget will not allow for inclusion of all desired features, so the enhancements will be prioritized.

Approved by:

Mike McKeever  
Chief Executive Officer

MM:MH:gg

Key Staff: Matt Carpenter, Director of Transportation Services, (916) 340-6276  
Mark Heiman, ITS/511Manager, (916) 340-6232  
José Luis Cáceres, Associate Planner, (916) 340-6218



## Transportation Committee

February 27, 2014

### MTP/SCS Approach to Scenario Development

**Issue:** How should new land use and transportation information be incorporated into the update of the 2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (2016 MTP/SCS)?

**Recommendation:** That the Transportation Committee recommend that the SACOG board adopt the “Approach to Creating and Analyzing Scenarios” (Attachment A).

**Discussion:** In December 2013, the Board adopted a policy framework to focus the 2016 update of the MTP/SCS on five broad implementation challenges of the current plan: transportation funding, investment strategy, investment timing, land use forecast, and plan effects. The full description of these topics is in the policy framework in Attachment B. This framework also broadly divides the plan update schedule into two parts: the work in 2014 will be focused on research, analysis, and public engagement on the implementation challenges identified in the policy framework, culminating at the end of the year in a framework for a draft preferred scenario (land use, revenues, transportation project assumptions); and the work in 2015 will focus on developing a draft plan, policies and technical assumptions based on the draft preferred scenario framework.

Following the direction set by the policy framework, staff presented to the Transportation Committee and other board policy committees last month an inventory of adopted and proposed land use plans, initially focused on new greenfield plans. This research task of inventorying local plans is one of the first technical steps of every MTP/SCS update cycle, the purpose of which is to inform decisions of if and how to adjust the MTP/SCS land use forecast and transportation investment package. The challenge in dealing with this new land use information is that it represents a large potential supply of housing relative to the regional projected housing demand. At all three board policy committees there was discussion around the various factors that might affect the timing of development in different parts of the region, the nature of development activity (in large bursts of activity as opposed to slowly and steadily over time), and the fiscal implications to local government of different development patterns.

Staff also presented an approach to developing land use and transportation scenarios that incorporates this new land use information and addresses the other implementation issues identified in the Board’s policy framework. That is, the scenario development approach would update the regional land use and transportation scenarios used in the 2012 MTP/SCS with updated local land use and transportation information while at the same time focusing more effort on analyzing the effects of different timing of transportation investments and land development patterns on the transportation system, local road and transit maintenance budgets, air quality, greenhouse gas, and other resources. A full description of this approach is included in Attachment A.

Upon hearing this proposed approach, Board members provided feedback as follows: the level of effort around scenario development be relatively low compared to past plan updates; staff bring more information on how the scenarios would be used in an implementation-focused plan update; and staff bring a process map to the Board that shows how each piece of the update process builds toward major

milestones. The first two comments are addressed in modifications to Attachment A in underline/strikethrough. Staff is developing a process map to address the third request and will have a hand out at the committee meeting. This process map will be maintained as a working document and provided to Board committees monthly. The stakeholder sounding board heard the same land use inventory and scenario development proposal as the Board committees. Attendees of the meeting asked clarifying questions but generally agreed with the proposed approach (detailed comments are included in a separate staff report to the committee).

Approved by:

Mike McKeever  
Chief Executive Officer

MM:MC:KL:gg  
Attachments

Key Staff: Matt Carpenter, Director of Transportation Services, (916) 340-6276  
Kacey Lizon, MTP/SCS Manager, (916) 340-6265

## DRAFT

MTP/SCS Framework: Approach to Creating and Analyzing Scenarios

Consistent with the Board's direction to focus this MTP/SCS update on implementation issues, the following approach will be used to create and analyze scenarios to inform the 2016 MTP/SCS update. ~~staff is raising a trial balloon on how to create and analyze scenarios. We will get Board input at the three February committees and have meetings with stakeholders in February and then ask the Board to take action on this in March.~~ The scenarios developed in this process will be used to illustrate trade-offs and effects of different development patterns and transportation investments compared to the adopted MTP/SCS. In keeping with the implementation themes of the plan update, the scenarios will be used in the following ways: to inform discussions of the Board, stakeholders, member and partner agencies, and public workshop participants on policy issues of the plan update; as alternatives for the environmental impact report; as the basis for making necessary refinements to Scenario 2 (the adopted MTP/SCS).

1. Three scenarios for plan horizon year 2036 will be based on the current plan plus two updated/refined scenarios from last plan cycle.

Discussion: Scenarios should bracket a reasonable range of possible futures, taking into account all major market and policy/regulatory influences. All scenarios are designed to represent reasonable possibilities of what might occur (i.e. not idealized futures driven solely by 1 or 2 considerations to the exclusion of others). The three scenarios analyzed last time met this real world test, and varied principally by how much housing and transportation choice they created. The S\scenario (#3) with the most use of a range of transportation modes had the most amounts of new development in Centers and Corridors and Established Communities and attached housing. On the other end, the scenario (#1) with the least use of transportation modes other than the automobile had the most amounts of new development in Developing Communities and Rural Communities and large lot single family housing. The final plan adopted by the Board was most like the scenario in the middle (#2), but it included elements of both Scenarios #1 and #3 based on input from our members, the public and stakeholders and technical analysis. (See attached Table to compare the adopted MTP/SCS with the three scenarios analyzed during that plan's development process.)

For the 2016 MTP/SCS update staff suggests that the existing MTP/SCS be one of the scenarios, with the other 2 scenarios being similar to the first and third Scenarios from the last plan cycle, refreshed and updated to reflect relevant actions and trends that have occurred in the interim. For example, the updated Scenario 1 would have similar amounts of new growth in each of the 4 community types as Scenario 1 from the last plan cycle, but the specific properties forecasted to be developed within each community type would differ at least to some extent based on local government land use approvals since the last plan, market trends, and the intentions and capability of the property owners/developers. Similarly this updated Scenario 1 would have similar amounts of housing growth in the lower density and higher density housing types as Scenario 1 from the last cycle, though they may be located to some extent in different places. A preliminary look at the data leads staff to believe that this approach likely creates sufficient flexibility to ensure that the Plan and EIR documents this cycle analyze a reasonable range of alternatives that might be likely to occur.

## DRAFT

While this step will be important, we are trying to keep the level of effort contained so that it is possible to maximize the effort available for Step 2.

2. Analyze different timing to construction of transportation and land use components of current MTP/SCS.

Discussion: Key components of the Board's December 2013 action focusing this plan cycle on implementation issues were to explore the full potential for a "fix-it-first" investment strategy, and to analyze whether there are reasons to alter the timing that land use and transportation projects in the current plan should be constructed. In other words, even if the end state in 2035 (now 2036) was the same, does it make a difference how (in what order) the region builds the projects that lead to that end condition? Staff has done some very preliminary thinking on this topic and believes that in some areas differences in timing might have a substantial impact on the life cycle costs and benefits of the plan. To illustrate the point at the extremes, there may be significant differences in variables such as total new lane miles, vehicle miles traveled, air pollution and water use from first building the growth forecast in the plan for Rural Communities and Developing Communities versus first building the growth forecast for Centers and Corridors and Established Communities. SACOG has never focused on this type of information when constructing the plan (except to ensure compliance with federal clear air act and SB 375 standards) and staff believes it could really help the Board and stakeholders focus on new policy issues that might improve life cycle plan performance (i.e. even if the end state in 2036 remained substantially the same as the current plan).

3. Analyze different levels and types of transportation revenue

Discussion: Every plan cycle SACOG must refresh its revenue assumptions, consistent with federal requirements that our plan contain "reasonably reliable" revenues. Mainly this involves scrutinizing existing, long-term revenue streams like federal, state and local transportation taxes and local development fees, but within reasonable limits it can also involve new future revenue streams that we forecast to be available in the plan. Staff suggests that this revenue analysis first be focused on the currently adopted MTP/SCS (i.e. will we have the same, more or less revenues to build the projects included in the plan?). Then, if the scenario and timing analyses conducted under #1 and #2 above indicate there may be a need for new revenue (which seems likely), that we analyze the merits and viability of a focused list of new revenue sources. For example, the following new revenue sources are potential candidates for consideration: state cap and trade revenue, new local transportation sales taxes, statewide vehicle registration fee.

4. Prepare draft plan scenario

Discussion: Based on input from public workshops, stakeholders (including our cross-sectoral working group), member and partner staff and Board members over the next several months staff will create by the end of 2014 a framework for a draft preferred scenario for Board consideration that includes both the end state condition in 2036, and a timing sequence for building the transportation network and estimating when development projects will be constructed.

Table A-1. Description of 2012 MTP/SCS Scenarios 1, 2 and 3 (for the planning period 2008-2035)

	Land Use Inputs	Scenario #1	Scenario #2 (Adopted MTP/SCS)	Scenario #3	Adopted MTP/SCS
1	Share of growth in Center & Corridor Communities (percent of new homes)	19%	<del>30%</del> 28%	36%	30%
2	Share of growth in Established Communities (percent of new homes)	30%	<del>26%</del> 28%	27%	26%
3	Share of growth in Developing Communities (percent of new homes)	46%	<del>42%</del> 41%	35%	42%
4	Share of growth in Rural Residential Communities (percent of new homes)	5%	<del>1%</del> 3%	2%	1%
5	Share of growth in large-lot single-family homes (percent)	39%	<del>28%</del> 33%	25%	28%
6	Share of growth in small-lot, single-family homes (percent)	30%	<del>28%</del> 25%	23%	28%
7	Share of growth in attached homes (percent)	31%	<del>43%</del> 42%	52%	43%
	Transportation Inputs	Scenario #1	Scenario #2 (Adopted MTP/SCS)	Scenario #3	Adopted MTP/SCS
8	New or expanded roads (lane miles, percent increase from 2008)	32%	<del>29%</del> 31%	26%	29%
9	Transit service (Vehicle Service Hours, percent increases from 2008)	54%	<del>98%</del> 88%	127%	98%
10	Funding for transit (\$ in billions)	\$10.7	<del>\$11.3</del> \$11.7	\$13.7	\$11.3
11	Funding for road, bike and pedestrian maintenance (\$ in billions)	\$10.9	<del>\$11.3</del> \$11	\$11	\$11.3
12	Funding for new road capacity (\$ in billions)	\$8.7	<del>\$7.4</del> \$8	\$6.7	\$7.4
13	Funding for bike and pedestrian street and trail improvements (\$ in billions)	\$2.8	<del>\$3.0</del> \$2.9	\$3.0	\$3.0
14	Additional miles of bicycle paths, lanes and routes (Class 1, 2 and 3 = 1,700 in 2008)	800	<del>1,100</del> 1,100	1,300	1,100
15	Funding for Programs (\$ in billions)	\$1.5	<del>\$2.2</del> \$1.6	\$1.7	\$2.2

Table B-1 (continued)					
Description of 2012 MTP/SCS Scenarios 1, 2 and 3 (for the planning period 2008-2035)					
	Performance Outcomes	Scenario #1	Scenario #2 (Adopted MTP/SCS)	Scenario #3	Adopted MTP/SCS
16	Square miles of farmland converted to development (4,166 square miles of farmland in 2008)	93	<del>57</del> 70	50	57
17	Square miles of vernal pools affected by development	9	<del>7</del> 8	7	7
18	Share of new homes near high-frequency transit (percent of new homes)	22%	<del>38%</del> 28%	35%	38%
19	Share of new jobs near high-frequency transit (percent of new jobs)	26%	<del>39%</del> 35%	44%	39%
20	Transit costs recovered by ticket sales (percent)	38%	<del>38%</del> 41%	51%	38%
21	Total homes in environmental justice areas near high-frequency transit (percent of homes, 30% in 2008)	43%	<del>55%</del> 45%	47%	55%
22	Share of trips by transit, bike or walk (percent increase per capita from 2008)	12%	<del>33%</del> 22%	31%	33%
23	Vehicle miles traveled (VMT) (percent change per capita from 2008)	-6%	<del>-6.9%</del> -8%	-9%	-6.9%
24	Vehicle miles traveled in heavy congestion (percent of total VMT)	5%	<del>6%</del> 6%	7%	6%
25	Travel time spent in car per capita (percent change from 2008)	-3%	<del>-4%</del> -4%	-4%	-4%
26	Weekday passenger vehicle CO <sub>2</sub> emissions (percent change per capita from 2005)	-14%	<del>-16%</del> -16%	-17%	-16%

## Policy Framework for the 2016 MTP/SCS Update

November 19, 2013

The 2016 update to the Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (2016 MTP/SCS) will focus on implementation challenges and commitments of the current plan with the goal of moving toward the transportation, air quality and quality of life outcomes set forth in the plan. These implementation challenges and commitments are broadly defined in the below *Implementation Themes* table, along with examples of the research and analysis that will be used to address these issues.

### Foundational Assumptions for the Update: *Regional Growth Projections*

The same regional growth projections of the 2012 MTP/SCS will be used for the 2016 MTP/SCS except that the growth is assumed to arrive one year later, 2036. This equates to 361,000 new jobs, 871,000 new people and 303,000 new housing units from 2008:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Jobs</u>	<u>Population</u>	<u>Housing Units</u>
2008	966,316	2,215,044	884,725
2036	1,327,424	3,086,213	1,187,744

### Implementation Themes for the 2016 MTP/SCS Update

<b>Implementation Question/Challenge</b>	<b>Examples of research and analysis to address question/challenge</b>
<b>Transportation Funding:</b> Can the region capture the revenues projected to come from all sources local, state and federal?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Update revenue projections for local, state and federal sources, considering long-term/historic and short-term/recent losses or revenue.</li> <li>Identify strategies for new revenue generation and cost-effective investments.</li> </ul>
<b>Investment Strategy:</b> Is there enough emphasis on system maintenance ("fix-it-first") investments?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify and compare local and state system maintenance needs for different modes of travel.</li> <li>Identify tradeoffs between system maintenance and system expansion priorities.</li> <li>Identify unique challenges and opportunities in urban, suburban and rural communities, with particular attention to suburban economic challenges.</li> <li>Identify new strategies for SACOG planning and funding efforts that consider fix-it-first.</li> </ul>
<b>Investment Timing:</b> Should there be changes in the timing of transportation investments?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Examine the cost effectiveness of moving certain projects forward or backward in the planning period.</li> <li>Analyze the effect of project phasing on performance of the regional transportation system, air quality, and land use pattern.</li> <li>Identify short-term strategies to improve regional travel patterns.</li> </ul>
<b>Land Use Forecast (allocation):</b> What is the economic viability of the projected greenfield and infill growth?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inventory adopted and proposed land use plans in the region.</li> <li>Analyze the effect of more greenfield versus more infill growth, and vice versa, on transportation system performance.</li> <li>Analyze recent market performance for greenfield and infill, residential and non-residential development.</li> <li>Determine if and how the estimated growth in Center/Corridor, Established, Developing, and Rural Residential Community Types should be changed or refined.</li> </ul>
<b>Plan Effects:</b> Follow through on the implementation commitments of the 2012 MTP/SCS to better measure the effects of the plan on different people and issue areas.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Track travel behavior, land development pattern, demographic, air quality and transportation project delivery trends to better understand how the MTP/SCS is being implemented over time.</li> <li>Develop additional performance metrics to assess the impact of the MTP/SCS on different groups of people and issues (e.g. environmental justice communities; health; access to jobs, services, and affordable housing).</li> <li>Develop decision-making support tools to support regional and local decision-making.</li> <li>Research the effect of our growing region on the agricultural economy and open space.</li> </ul> <p>(Appendix A contains more description of the Implementation Commitments in the MTP/SCS)</p>

### Update Schedule and Public Outreach

The greater part of 2014 will be focused on research, analysis and public engagement around implementation questions and challenges broadly defined in this policy framework. SACOG staff will conduct research and analysis in consultation with member jurisdictions, partner agencies and interested stakeholders. The SACOG Board will use the results of the research and public input to direct the update of the draft plan and technical assumptions in 2015. **Appendix B** contains the plan update schedule and **Appendix C** contains the outreach plan.

## Appendix A: Implementation Commitments from the 2012 MTP/SCS

1. **Performance Monitoring:** Track and strive to better understand how the 2012 MTP/SCS is being implemented over time in the areas of a) transportation trends, b) development pattern, c) demographics, d) transportation project delivery and e) air quality. Performance monitoring allows the agency to determine what kinds of adjustments to make to future MTP/SCS' and supports SACOG's strategic goal to maximize the quality of life benefits that the MTP/SCS contributes to the region (See Strategic Plan Goal 2, attached).

- a. Transportation trends: monitor how people are traveling in the region and the impacts of their travel on the transportation system.

Examples of monitoring metrics:

- Vehicle miles traveled;
- Congested travel;
- Travel by auto, transit, bicycling or walking (mode split);
- Transit passenger boardings.

- b. Development pattern: monitor how private and public sector influences are shaping growth in the region to compare to projected land use patterns in the 2012 MTP/SCS and inform the projected land use patterns for the 2016 MTP/SCS.

Examples of monitoring metrics:

- Residential construction in center and corridor, established, developing and rural residential communities;
- Construction of different types of housing (e.g., large lot single family, small lot single family, attached multi-family);
- Changes to federal, state and local policies and regulations that affect the rate and location of development;
- Financial incentives and tools such as funding for affordable housing or infill development;
- Viability of agriculture and open spaces.

- c. Demographics: monitor demographic characteristics that influence where people live, work and how they travel.

Examples of monitoring metrics:

- Household size, age and income;
- Auto ownership.

- d. Transportation Project Construction (Project Delivery): monitor construction of transportation projects and how those projects align with the policies of the 2012 MTP/SCS.

Examples of monitoring metrics:

## Appendix A: Implementation Commitments from the 2012 MTP/SCS

- Efficient use of federal and state transportation dollars;
- Blueprint supportive projects;
- Projects supporting rural economies;
- Projects that support a variety of modes including transit, bicycle, pedestrian, roads, and highways;
- Condition of existing transit and road infrastructure.

e. Air Quality: monitor regional air quality.

Examples of monitoring metrics:

- Levels of ozone, particulate matter, and other air pollutants;
- Number of days per year with Spare the Air notifications.

2. **Impact Assessment:** Improve SACOG's ability to accurately estimate the impacts of the MTP/SCS on different people and issue areas. This supports SACOG's strategic goals of information-based decision making and serving as a source of high-quality information (See Strategic Plan Goals 1 and 3, attached). The 2012 MTP/SCS made great strides in measuring the impacts of the plan on travel, air quality, the environment, and low income and minority residents (environmental justice populations).

Examples of impact assessments to improve:

- a. Air quality related health impacts of locating housing near major roadways.
- b. Balance of jobs and housing within communities and across the region;
- c. Access to key services (e.g., medical, schools, colleges and universities, parks);
- d. Public safety and health;
- e. Effects on specific populations such as youth, the elderly, low income and minorities;
- f. Climate change.

3. **Decision-Making Support Tools:** Improve decision-making support tools for regional and local decisions so that member cities and counties, partner agencies, stakeholders and residents of the region have information about transportation investments, growth patterns, and policies that relate to the 2012 MTP/SCS. This will 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. These tools support SACOG's strategic plan goal to sustain the agency's emphasis on information-based decision making (see Strategic Plan Goal 1, attached).

Examples of decision-making support tools:

- a. Software that models the economic effects of land use and transportation policies (PECAS);
- b. Bus and light rail inventory information readily available to emergency operations centers;
- c. Support changes to federal and state regulations that increase local flexibility and encourage use of existing streamlining options that will help implement the 2012 MTP/SCS.

## Appendix A: Implementation Commitments from the 2012 MTP/SCS

- d. Work to align federal natural resources, habitat and clean air policies and regulations with the goals of the 2012 MTP/SCS;
  - e. Quantify the importance of the rural economy within the region (Rural-Urban Connections Strategy).
4. **Financial Tools & Incentives:** Support financial tools and incentives to help implement the 2012 MTP/SCS to realize its performance. These tools and incentives will support the construction of projects critical to the MTP/SCS' performance and bring real quality of life benefits to the region (see Strategic Plan Goals 2 and 3, attached).

### Examples:

- a. Reestablish some tools that redevelopment agencies previously had such as tax-increment financing to promote infill and revitalization;
- b. Provide local governments more funding flexibility and options, particularly for transit operations and capital and road maintenance and rehabilitation, in both rural and urban areas;

Reform regulations to speed up review and approval of transportation and land use projects with low environmental impacts and positive benefits to state regional, and local goals.

## Appendix A: Implementation Commitments from the 2012 MTP/SCS

### Goals 1-3 from the SACOG Strategic Plan

**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<sup>3</sup>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.

## Appendix A: Implementation Commitments from the 2012 MTP/SCS

**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.

## Appendix A: Implementation Commitments from the 2012 MTP/SCS

**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

## Appendix B: Schedule for 2016 MTP/SCS Update

November 19, 2013

Major Deliverables and Milestones	SACOG Action	Complete By
<b>FY13/14 – Focused on: Issue Identification, Policy Framework Development, Research and Analysis</b>		
Update Public Participation Plan	Board action	complete
Early public and stakeholder outreach on planning and policy issues; Board consideration and identification of policy issues	Board direction	complete
Develop draft regional growth projections	Board direction	complete
Adopt policy framework for 2016 MTP/SCS update; Adopt draft regional growth projections for use in plan update	Board action	December 2013
Technical work to refresh land use and transportation planning assumptions including inventorying of local land use plans and <i>Call for Review of Transportation Projects</i> <sup>1</sup>	Staff work with local agencies	Fall 2013 – Fall 2014
Board direction <sup>2</sup>	Board direction	February 2014
Board direction <sup>2</sup>	Board direction	June 2014
<b>FY 14/15 – Focused on: Public Workshops, Update of Planning Assumptions and Draft Plan Development</b>		
Conduct at least 8 public workshops on policy choices and issues related to the MTP/SCS	Board receive & consider	Summer/Fall 2014
Review public workshop results	Board direction	Summer/Fall 2014
Board direction <sup>2</sup>	Board direction	September 2014
Create Framework for Draft 2016 MTP/SCS	Board action	December 2014
Release Notice of Preparation for Environmental Impact Report	Staff work	December 2014
Develop draft land use forecast and transportation project list assumptions	Staff work with local agencies	Dec. 2014 – Mar. 2014
Endorse draft land use forecast and transportation project list assumptions for use in development of Draft Plan, Draft EIR, and Draft Air Quality Conformity	Board action	March 2014
Direction on Draft Plan Policies and Strategies	Board action	Jan. 2015 – Mar. 2015
Draft Plan and Draft EIR development	Staff work	Mar. 2015 – Aug. 2015
Board direction <sup>2</sup>	Board direction	June 2015
<b>FY 15/16 – Focused on: Draft Plan and Draft EIR Completion, Public Comment Period on Draft Plan, Adoption</b>		
Draft Plan and Draft EIR development	Staff work	Mar. 2015 - Aug. 2015
Board direction <sup>2</sup>	Board direction	August 2015
<i>Adoption of RTPs/EIRs by El Dorado County Transportation Commission and Placer County Transportation Agency</i>	<i>Coordination</i> <sup>3</sup>	<i>Fall 2015</i>

<sup>1</sup> There are ongoing meetings with the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to determine when CARB will revisit the SB 375 greenhouse gas targets for all California MPOs.

<sup>2</sup> Staff anticipates periodic check-ins with the Board in addition to major actions noted in the calendar. Some key check-ins with the Board during the 2012 MTP/SCS update included input on revenue forecast assumptions, updating policies and strategies, direction on CARB greenhouse gas target-setting scenarios, and coordination with the Regional Housing Needs process.

<sup>3</sup> This milestone is included in the Work Plan for reference. The SACOG Board does not act on the RTPs of either PCTPA or EDCTC. SACOG coordinates with PCTPA and EDCTC to incorporate their adopted plans into the SACOG MTP/SCS.

## Appendix B: Schedule for 2016 MTP/SCS Update

November 19, 2013

*(continued)*

<b>Major Deliverables and Milestones</b>	<b>SACOG Action</b>	<b>Complete By</b>
<b>FY 15/16 – Focused on: Draft Plan and Draft EIR Completion, Public Comment Period on Draft Plan, Adoption</b>		
Release Draft 2016 MTP/SCS for 30-day public comment period	Board action	September 2015
Release Draft EIR for public comment (60-day comment period)	Staff work	September 2015
Hold at least 6 information meetings with local elected officials	Board receive & consider	Sept. 2015 – Dec. 2015
Hold 3 public hearings on Draft 2016 MTP/SCS	Board receive & consider	Sept. 2015 – Dec. 2015
Review public comments and recommendations on Final Draft Plan and Final EIR	Board direction	January 2016
Certify Final EIR Adopt 2016 MTP/SCS Adopt Air Quality Conformity Determination	Board action	February 2016

## Appendix C: Outreach Plan for 2016 MTP/SCS

November 19, 2013

**Working document that can be added to throughout the engagement process**

### **BOARD MEMBER, JURISDICTION STAFF & PUBLIC AGENCY COMMUNICATIONS**

- Regular communication and updates will occur at all SACOG board committee meetings and at board meetings as needed
  - Timing: Ongoing
- Regular communication and opportunity for feedback from the Planners Committee, Transit Coordinating Committee, Regional Planning Partnership, Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee, with membership drawn from member jurisdictions and partner agencies
  - Timing: Ongoing
- Meetings with and communications to member jurisdiction staff on the process, requesting information, providing information for review and feedback
  - Timing: Ongoing
- Regional Managers Meetings
  - Timing: Quarterly
- Meetings with state and federal agencies
  - Timing: As needed to align with planning calendar and as dictated by statutory requirements
- Presentations to various public agency staff and boards in the region.
  - Timing: As coordinated by SACOG staff or by request

### **STAKEHOLDER OUTREACH**

In addition to ongoing communications outlined above, staff will use methods such as those listed below to engage communities across the region about the 2016 MTP/SCS update:

- A comprehensive stakeholder list including stakeholders who participated in the previous MTP/SCS process will be updated and utilized.
  - Timing: Ongoing
- A one-stop request for information on the 2016 MTP/SCS update will be on the SACOG website for access to key input and feedback points for the public, key decision points for the Board, technical information, and meeting/workshop information.
  - Timing: Winter 2013/2014, dependent on board adoption of 2016 MTP/SCS Framework
- Early engagement of a cross-sectoral stakeholder group
  - Timing: complete
- To maintain a consistent message, a PowerPoint presentation will be prepared to highlight both background on the MTP/SCS and the process for the update. The presentation will be used by various staff at presentations throughout the region coordinated by staff and/or by request from stakeholders and board members.
  - Timing: March 2014
- Stakeholder meetings, member and partner agency coordination, and public communications on policy issues and areas of research for the 2016 MTP/SCS
  - Timing: 2013-2015
- Staff will collaborate with key partners to publicize and present a greenhouse gas target-setting public workshop (contingent on actions of the California Air Resources Board).
- Staff will provide updates and gather feedback from SACOG advisory groups
- Public Workshops
  - Timing: Summer/Fall 2014
  - Staff will conduct at least eight public workshops in the region
  - Workshops held in El Dorado and Placer counties will be coordinated with EDCTC and PCTPA.

## Appendix C: Outreach Plan for 2016 MTP/SCS

November 19, 2013

- Stakeholder meetings, member and partner agency coordination, and public communications on development of draft plan and next steps
  - Timing: Summer 2014-Fall 2015
- Elected Official Information Meetings on draft Sustainable Communities Strategy
  - Staff will conduct at least six elected official information meetings on the draft Sustainable Communities Strategy/Alternative Planning Strategy (SCS/APS) in the update, one in each county with representatives of the county board of supervisors and city councils that represent a majority of the cities representing a majority of the population in the incorporated areas of that county. Meetings held in El Dorado and Placer counties will be coordinated with EDCTC and PCTPA.
  - Timing: Fall/Winter 2015
- At least three public hearings on the draft SCS/APS. Any meetings held in El Dorado and Placer counties will be coordinated with EDCTC and PCTPA.
  - Timing: Fall/Winter 2015
- Tribal consultation will occur in alignment with the outreach and communication principles, and as guided by the adopted Public Participation Plan. Outreach will occur on a government-to-government basis. For the Tribal Governments with land within Placer and El Dorado counties, tribal consultation will occur through collaboration with the Regional Transportation Planning agencies (RTPAs) in those counties.
  - Timing: Ongoing and in coordination with PCTPA and EDCTC

### MASS COMMUNICATIONS

To supplement the ongoing routine media coverage of transportation issues, the following strategies will be used to inform and engage interested stakeholders

- A series of articles in the electronic newsletter *Regional Report* on the content of the current MTP/SCS, what projects have begun or been completed in the interim, and an overview of the planning process with opportunities for feedback noticed in a timely manner
  - Timing: Beginning September 2013
- On the MTP/SCS website general information and a timeline for the update, including but not limited to why the update is taking place, contact information, meeting locations. The website will be easily accessible and updated as needed. The link to the MTP/SCS website will be prominent on the SACOG homepage.
  - Timing: September 2013
- Press releases and media outreach as needed.
- White papers and issue briefs may be developed on specific policy issues as the MTP/SCS Update process evolves, or new information or technical analysis needs to be communicated
- Staff will continue to reach out to community newsletters, social media, blogs and other similar publications outside of traditional media that work with SACOG in its media outreach.
  - Timing: Ongoing
- Staff will develop and place op-ed pieces by board members as appropriate.

Staff contacts:

Kacey Lizon, Project Manager, [klizon@sacog.org](mailto:klizon@sacog.org) (916) 340-6265

Monica Hernández, Communications Coordinator, [mhernandez@sacog.org](mailto:mhernandez@sacog.org), (916) 340-6237

Jennifer Hargrove, Land Use Coordinator, [jhargrove@sacog.org](mailto:jhargrove@sacog.org), (916) 340-6216

Clint Holtzen, Transportation Coordinator, [choltzen@sacog.org](mailto:choltzen@sacog.org), (916) 340-6246



## Item #14-3-5B Information

### Transportation Committee

February 27, 2014

#### 2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy Outreach Update

**Issue:** Staff is conducting early outreach for the 2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (2016 MTP/SCS).

**Recommendation:** None, this is for information only.

**Discussion:** In 2013, at the request of Board members, staff developed a group of cross-sectoral and regionally representative stakeholders and senior staff to serve as a “sounding board” to provide feedback to the board and staff on research topics, policy considerations, plan implementation themes, and other 2016 MTP/SCS topics as they arise. The sounding board met on February 19, 2014, for the second time. The group provided feedback on the initial findings of the Transit Maintenance Research, Inventory of Adopted and Proposed Greenfield Plans, and the draft approach to scenario development for the 2016 MTP/SCS. The meeting summary notes, agenda, participant evaluations, and attendance list is in Attachment A.

On February 18, 2014 staff from SACOG and Placer County Transportation Planning Agency (PCTPA) met with members of Tribal Council from the United Auburn Indian Community to discuss communications and engagement for the 2016 MTP/SCS and for PCTPA’s Regional Transportation Plan update. Attachment B contains a meeting summary and a list of meeting attendees. Staff is working to schedule a follow-up meeting in addition to meetings with the other two tribes in the SACOG region. Staff is required to work on a government-to-government basis with tribal governments on the development of the 2016 MTP/SCS.

Public workshops for the 2016 MTP/SCS will be conducted in the fall of 2014. Staff will bring forward a proposal for public workshops this spring to receive Board direction.

Approved by:

Mike McKeever  
Chief Executive Officer

MM:MH:gg  
Attachments

Key Staff: Matt Carpenter, Director of Transportation Services, (916) 340-6276  
Kacey Lizon, Senior Planner, (916) 340-6265  
Monica Hernández, Public Information Coordinator, (916) 340-6237

## 2016 MTP/SCS Sounding Board Meeting Summary

Meeting Date: Wednesday, February 19, 2014

Meeting Location: West Sacramento City Hall Galleria

### Meeting Attendees:

Alchemist CDC	Resources for Independent Living
American Institute of Architects	Richland Communities
Brookfield Residential	Sacramento Co Ag Commissioner
CA Rural Legal Assistance	Sacramento County Public Health
Community Link-Capital Region	Sacramento Housing Alliance
Cooley & Associates	Sacramento Tree Foundation
Domus Development	SMUD
Environmental Council of Sacramento	WALKSacramento
Housing California	Yocha Dehe Wintun Nation
League of Women Voters	Yolo Co Housing Authority
North State Building Industry Association	

### Meeting Agenda:

- Welcome & Introductions, Monica Hernandez
- What's Happened Since We Last Met, Monica Hernández
- Transit State of Good-Repair Research Initial Findings, Sharon Sprowls
- Approach to 2016 MTP/SCS Scenario Development, Kacey Lizon & Mike McKeever
- Approach for Public Workshops\*, Monica Hernández
- Wrap up & Next Steps, Monica Hernández

*\*Due to extensive dialogue on earlier agenda items, this topic was not covered thoroughly and will be brought back to the sounding board in a subsequent meeting.*

### Meeting Summary:

Staff provided meeting participants with a summary of the board actions and informational presentations related to the 2016 MTP/SCS update that have happened since the group last met in October 2013. Staff explained how the information the sounding board provided was presented and considered prior to board actions. During the staff summary, participants were reminded of the purpose of the sounding board, the upcoming actions staff will be asking the Board to consider, and the timing of research updates relative to the next sounding board meeting. Participants were encouraged to communicate to staff, if there were any additional concerns or questions not addressed during the meeting.

### Transit State of Good-Repair Initial Findings

Staff presented the initial findings of Transit State of Good-Repair Research (presented to Board Policy Committees in March) to the sounding board. Meeting participants were encouraged to ask clarifying questions as needed during the presentation, and the intent of the presentation was to get feedback on issues of interest and concern to the participants.

### Discussion Themes & Comments

THEME: Fleet Expansion and Clean Fuel Requirements

- When discussing capital costs, are the statutory requirements for clean fuel vehicle replacement and the higher per vehicle cost included?
- A chart that shows what percentage of current fleets, by transit operator, that are clean fuel would be useful.
- Do you have the replacement of transit vehicles and/or additional demand broken out by Community Type—interested in the increased costs associated with new growth areas.
- Has anyone considered the possible diversion of transit (and other transportation) funds to water, water storage, energy for transport, in light of the current and potential future drought?
- When planning for vehicle replacement, is reducing vehicle size considered (shuttles vs. large buses) for lower ridership corridors?

THEME: Transit Operations Cost and Service Differentials between Bus and Light Rail

- Can you compare the number of people being moved on light rail vs. bus in 2020 or 2035?
- What is the per capita cost of operations for light rail vs. bus—when thinking about trade-offs, this seems like an important consideration.
- When working within a constrained budget, an overall policy consideration should include whether investment in bus or light rail will move the plan closer to the 2020 and 2035 numbers.
- When thinking about investment, you have to consider that light rail reaches fewer people, and bus serves to connect to light rail and more destinations and the same when planning for service expansion.
- Can you compare farebox recovery rates for similar metro areas that have higher ridership than our area?
- Can you compare farebox recovery by different bus and light rail lines?

THEME: Transit System Expansion Planning

- Transit passengers need to be better engaged when planning for system expansion, planners need to better understand where people need and want to go—to be successful, transit routes should be like a web as opposed to linear.
- When you talk about the air quality improvements from increased transit ridership, can you talk in terms of public health benefits?
- What are the new technologies and services being adopted—in terms of planning and service delivery, e.g., consideration of electric vehicles, driverless cars?
- When planning for a truly regional transit system, partnerships and collaboration are key—and should not be only the transit agencies, but large employment centers, hospitals, and other desirable/needed destinations.
- Housing Authorities need to be engaged in the rollout of the ConnectCard.

THEME: Transit System Needs in Rural, Suburban and Urban Communities

- When considering fleet replacement needs, is there a way to assess the needs and costs for different community types?
- Will there be more neighborhood shuttles?

## **Approach to 2016 MTP/SCS Scenario Development and Land Use Inventory**

Staff discussed the state and federal requirements associated with the land use inventory, the process collecting the data, and how the land use inventory is used to create scenarios for the Environmental Impact Report for the 2016 MTP/SCS. After the initial process description, staff walked participants through the regional land use inventory map and data used to develop the map. Staff explained to the meeting participants, that this was part one of two land use inventory reports, and that staff would be asking the board to take action in March on the proposed approach to develop scenarios.

### **THEME: Addressing Current and Future Housing Capacity**

- If you look at the table of approved and planned housing a critical factor is affordability, and it isn't factored—if you don't factor in affordability, your assumptions will be wrong—you will overestimate.
- Does this information create a perception of an over-supply, so that it appears there isn't a need to plan for more housing—how you talk about that is very important.
- Be critical of the information from different segments of the development community and the local jurisdictions, they may not give good information for fear of being excluded in the plan, or dropped from the map.
- Rather than picking 'winners and losers' could you consider an approach that allocates market share to an area and essentially allows rules, standards, and/or policies to pick the winners and losers?
- You may be able to demonstrate significant capacity, but it may not be capacity for the people who are here, or will be here—you need to better match the new housing with the need today and in the future.
- Do you look at the regional percentage of growth per community type over time?
- When preparing your land use inventory, across community type, how do you adjust to include, or exclude at different points of time in the plan? This map shows projects that have been approved and/or planned since the early 2000s—but they are not currently being built, and may not be.
- Do you have a sense about how the supply and demand (capacity to 2035) line up in terms of multi-family and single family? For example, do you maybe only have 10 years of multi-family capacity beyond 2035 (or less) while 60 years of single-family products?

### **THEME: Addressing Current and Future Housing Market Demand**

- When you forecast where growth is most likely to occur, how heavily do you weigh how projects are planned (i.e. type of housing, growth pattern, cost to consumer, etc.) compared to current and future market trends and demands? Projects designed and sited in the 1990s don't match the current demand but are still reflected in the map as future growth. They don't seem like viable projects today.
- Addressing the issues of current and future demand is key, with a focus on meeting the current need which may continue to be the needs in the future—related to affordability.
- Is there a way to assess quality education and housing patterns?
- A policy discussion around need and land availability should occur as part of the planning process.

THEME: Current and Future Housing Affordability and Access

- The homeless are not factored into the market segment growth segments.
- There is an equity issue underlying this map, you may need a disproportionate investment in housing for low income/underserved people and seniors.
- Policy considerations beyond affordability need to be given to issues of race, ethnicity, family size, unit size, and income—there is potential to allow/force certain inequitable growth patterns to continue.
- How does the future size and affordability address existing need?

THEME: Regulatory Barriers

- The regulatory environment is “truthing out” greenfield and infill project viability and will continue to do so for the next decade.
- AB 32 and SB 375 have changed how greenfield patterns will happen in the near term.
- When conducting your market tests for potential of greenfield and infill projects, you need to realistically look at the regulatory and infrastructure hurdles they will have to overcome.

THEME: Scenario Development and Performance Metrics

- Will the issues being discussed (affordability, market realities, regulations, infrastructure needs, water availability, etc.) be addressed in the scenarios?
- Will a fix-it-first (maintenance) model self-direct a more compact growth pattern?
- We know that many factors will continue to change, but water availability, energy cost, social equity, and public health will continue to be real issues, Scenario 3 doesn’t go far enough to address these.
- Will you be adding new inputs into performance metrics for the 2016 MTP/SCS update?
- Have you looked at Metropolitan Transportation Commission’s Equity Scenario and compared it to yours?

## MTP/SCS Sounding Board Meeting Participant Evaluation

February 19, 2014

### Ranking

5. Strongly Agree

4. Agree

3. Neutral

2. Disagree

1. Strongly Disagree

---

This meeting was well organized: **4.4**

The length of the meeting was appropriate to get through the material: **3.8**

I was able to express issues and/or concerns about the Land Use Inventory and approach to scenario development: **4.5**

I was able to express issues and/or concerns about the initial findings of the Transit Maintenance Research: **4.2**

I was able to express issues and/or concerns about the draft approaches for conducting public workshops: **3.7**

The meeting was beneficial to me: **4.2**

I have a good understanding of the 2016 MTP/SCS process, and how my input is being considered: **4.2**

### Were there any parts of the meeting that should be avoided in the future?

- I wished Kacey's presentation had more charts to give a better articulation of her dialog. Some of the dialogue was repetitious.

### What should be done next time to make the presentations more effective?

- Average daily VMT would be a good chart. Per Capita was a little bit different. The population density in rural areas would be low so the absolute magnitude is misrepresented. Average VMT/vehicle would be useful.
- Allow more time
- Some supplemental information—emphasizing the benefit of different options
- While I appreciate the free-conversation during presentations, I felt it got away from the presentations a little too much
- Better outline— One overview presentation + workgroups with a final wrap up
- Find ways to be sure everyone participates

### Additional Comments:

- I believe we need to incrementally move more in the direction of Scenario 3
- Meeting could have been longer
- Having the list ahead of time of the questions you'd like our feedback on would be helpful
- Need to discuss Climate Change—droughts and floods do have a lasting effect

**United Auburn Indian Community, Placer County Transportation Planning Agency,  
and SACOG Meeting Summary**

Meeting Date: February 18, 2014, 2 PM

Meeting Location: Thunder Valley Casino, Hotel Board Room  
1200 Athens Ave, Lincoln, 95648

**Meeting Attendees:**

Brenda Adams, Tribal Treasurer, UAIC Tribal Council  
Alison Harvey, Governmental Affairs Director, UAIC  
Calvin Moman, Tribal Council Member, UAIC Tribal Council  
Arlen Opper, Advisor, UAIC  
Danny Rey, Secretary, UAIC Tribal Council  
Gene Whitehouse, Tribal Chairperson, UAIC Tribal Council  
John Williams, Tribal Vice Chairperson, UAIC Tribal Council  
Celia McAdam, Executive Director, PCTPA  
Luke McNeel-Caird, Senior Planner, PCTPA  
Monica Hernández, Public Information Coordinator, SACOG  
Kacey Lizon, Senior Planner, SACOG  
Mike McKeever, Executive Director, SACOG

**Agenda:**

Introductions, All  
Meeting Outcomes, Monica Hernandez & Luke McNeel-Caird  
How PCTPA & SACOG Work Together, Celia McAdam & Mike McKeever  
2036 Regional Transportation Plan Process, Celia McAdam & Luke McNeel-Caird  
2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy Update, Kacey Lizon  
Tribal Engagement & Communications, All  
Wrap Up and Next Steps, Monica Hernandez & Luke McNeel-Caird

**Meeting Summary:**

Due to unforeseen timing constraints, the group was not able to meet for the original time intended.

Summary overviews of PCTPA's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update and SACOG's 2016 MTP/SCS were presented. An update on significant transportation projects in Placer County was given, the subsequent conversations focused on questions and answers on the timing and financing needs for local transportation projects. There was emphasis on the unique roles PCTPA and SACOG play related to the delivery and financing of transportation projects of Tribal interest. Alison Harvey was identified by Tribal Council as the point of contact for both SACOG and PCTPA, staff from both agencies will continue to work with Ms. Harvey to provide timely information and input opportunities on the RTP and MTP/SCS update processes.



## Item #14-3-5C Information

### Transportation Committee

February 27, 2014

#### Transit State-of-Good-Repair Needs Assessment

**Issue:** An important step in preparing for the 2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS) update is to evaluate issues related to the current condition of the regional transit system.

**Recommendation:** None, this item is for information and discussion.

**Discussion:** At the October committee meeting, staff presented an analysis of road maintenance funding needs in the region. The presentation highlighted the continuing decline in road conditions throughout the region and the state, and the growing gap between needs and available resources. In addition to the road maintenance challenge facing public works and transportation departments, transit operators are also facing major challenges in terms of maintaining aging assets and meeting service expectations. In July 2013, the California Transit Association released the California Transit Unmet Funding Needs study, which takes a ten-year look at transit needs and available funding throughout the state. The study found, similar to the road maintenance challenge, growing needs for transit system operations and maintenance along with insufficient funding options to pay for these needs.

As a financially constrained planning document, the MTP/SCS must address the tradeoffs inherent in expanding the region's roadway and transit systems at a time that system maintenance, operations, and preservation needs continue to grow. At the March committee meeting, staff will present an initial analysis of transit system funding needs in the SACOG region. This discussion will help set the stage for future dialogue and analysis regarding MTP/SCS priorities, tradeoffs, and potential policy options that should be explored as part of the plan update.

Approved by:

Mike McKeever  
Chief Executive Officer

MM:CH:gg

Key Staff: Matt Carpenter, Director of Transportation Services, (916) 340-6276  
Kacey Lizon, Senior Planner, (916) 340-6212  
Clint Holtzen, Assistant Planner, (916) 340-6246



**Item #14-3-6  
Action**

## **Transportation Committee**

February 27, 2014

### **Programming Recommendations for Federal Transit Administration Sections 5307 and 5339 FFY 2014 Apportionments to the Sacramento Urbanized Area**

**Issue:** Should programming recommendations for the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) funds for transit projects be approved?

**Discussion:** If information from the FTA is available in time, this item will be sent to the committee prior to the March meeting. If it is not available, then the item will be brought to the committee in April.

Approved by:

Mike McKeever  
Chief Executive Officer

MM:AZ:gg

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

1400102



## Transportation Committee

February 27, 2014

### Connect Card Change Order Innovations in Transportation Retail Sales Device

**Issue:** Should SACOG issue a Change Order to the INIT Contract for the Retail Sales Device?

**Recommendation:** That the Transportation Committee recommend that the Board of Directors grant the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) authority to negotiate and execute a Change Order with Innovations in Transportation (INIT) to modify the retail sales device in an amount not to exceed \$92,000.

**Discussion:** The Connect Card project is currently in the implementation phase, and the Consortium is working to secure retailers to provide customers the ability to get a Connect Card and load fare (passes and cash value) at locations across the region. Instead of selling paper passes or tickets, the stores would load the products onto customers' Connect Cards using Retail Sales Devices (devices) at their customer service counters. The retail network is one of three options for customers to get a card—through the Connect Card website, at transit service centers, or at retail outlets—and provides a cash-payment option for customers, unlike the website or add fare machines that require payment with debit/credit cards. Therefore, the retail network is a key implementation strategy to increase Connect Card accessibility for customers across the region.

The devices are currently configured to connect to the Connect Card background system through a hard-wired Ethernet switch that is generating concerns over data security, installation costs, and the ability to secure retailers. Modifying all units with a cellular modem is critical to alleviating these concerns and to facilitating efficient and transparent business relationships with retailers. Further, delivery of data communications through cellular broadband is a more cost effective approach for project implementation and for ongoing operations and maintenance of the devices.

Staff recommends modifying all sixty-nine devices manufactured by the primary vendor INIT to include an internal cellular modem. The estimated cost of the modification is ninety-two thousand dollars (\$92,000). Although the necessity of a retail network data communications strategy was identified in the design phase, a decision on these issues was deferred in order to study the technical nuances and evaluate the retail business environment. The recommended modification is not itemized in the Project Budget and would need to be financed from project contingency.

Project contingency stands at \$639,308. The proposed expense would reduce contingency to \$547,308; this represents 3.9 percent of the total project budget, or 8.1 percent of the unspent budget. Staff believes this contingency is satisfactory given the stage of the project life cycle. Most of project capital is locked up in a fixed price contract with INIT; much of the contracted hardware/software is delivered and installed; and test results to date have been very positive. At this point in time, the only significant anticipated contingency need is not for third party contractors/consultants but for temporary staffing to support transit agency roll out. An estimate for this need is expected in March. The Consortium Executive Committee supports this proposed change order.

Approved by:

Mike McKeever  
Chief Executive Officer

MM:RM:LSH:gg

Key Staff: Kirk Trost, Chief Operating Officer, (916) 340-6236  
Matt Carpenter, Director of Transportation Services, (916) 340-6276  
Robert McCrary, Senior Planner, (916) 340-6238



## Transportation Committee

February 27, 2014

### SACOG Six-County Regional Active Transportation Program Guidelines

**Issue:** SACOG is working with the El Dorado County Transportation Commission (EDCTC) and the Placer County Transportation Planning Agency (PCTPA) on a new six-county regional active transportation program.

**Recommendation:** None, this item is for information and discussion only.

**Discussion:** Pursuant to the passage of Senate Bill (SB) 99, the CTC has developed draft guidelines for the Active Transportation Program (ATP). Beginning in October 2013, CTC conducted extensive outreach to develop the guidelines, utilizing public work group meetings, subgroups, and public hearings. The ATP combines many federal and state funding streams previously used for bicycle, pedestrian, safety, and other related purposes into one funding stream with broad eligibilities. At the February Transportation Committee, staff introduced the ATP with an overview of the draft statewide guidelines.

The purpose of the ATP is to accomplish the following goals:

- Increase the proportion of trips accomplished by biking and walking;
- Increase the safety and mobility of non-motorized users;
- Advance the active transportation efforts of regional agencies to achieve greenhouse gas reduction goals as established pursuant to SB 375 (C728, §2008) and SB 391 (C585, §2009);
- Enhance public health, including reduction of childhood obesity, through the use of programs including but not limited to projects eligible for Safe Routes to School Program funding;
- Ensure that disadvantaged communities fully share in the benefits of the program; and
- Provide a broad spectrum of projects to benefit many types of active transportation users.

The fund estimate for the ATP approximates that \$179,550,000 will be available through a statewide competitive funding program that is anticipated to start with a call for projects on March 21 and applications due on May 21. Prescribed within the guidelines are dates and actions that Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) can take if they choose to conduct a supplemental MPO-specific call for projects. SACOG's six-county regional share is approximately \$9,600,000 for programming in state fiscal years 14/15-15/16. Projects unsuccessful at the statewide level will be eligible to compete in the supplemental MPO specific call.

Staff is seeking input on conducting a supplemental MPO-specific call for projects and utilizing the option to customize the statewide ATP guidelines and scoring criteria to best meet regional needs for a six-county MPO program. Any modifications to the state guidelines and scoring criteria by MPOs are subject to CTC approval or rejection. Staff has been collaborating with our El Dorado and Placer Regional Transportation

Planning Agency partners on the guidelines for the SACOG regional ATP program. Additionally, staff is reviewing input received from a Regional Planning Partnership meeting on February 26 and will participate in a Safe Routes to School Partnership meeting on February 28 that may provide other input for consideration.

Following the February coordination meetings, an initial draft of guidelines for the SACOG regional ATP program will be sent to committee members in advance of the March 6 meeting. Direction from the Transportation Committee in March will inform a final staff recommendation for April Board action on the regional ATP program guidelines.

Approved by:

Mike McKeever  
Chief Executive Officer

MM:RDO:LSH:gg

Key Staff: Matt Carpenter, Director of Transportation Services, (916) 340-6276  
Renée DeVere-Oki, Team Manager of Programming and Project Delivery, (916) 340-6219  
Lacey Symons-Holtzen, Team Manager of Active Transportation, (916) 340-6212

1400202



## Transportation Committee

**Item #14-3-9  
Receive & File**

February 27, 2014

### **Transportation Committee Planning Calendar Update**

**Issue:** What items can the Transportation Committee expect to review for calendar year 2014?

**Recommendation:** None; this item is for information only. There will not be a staff presentation.

**Discussion:** Attached is a draft calendar of items for 2014.

MC:gg  
Attachment

Key Staff: Matt Carpenter, Director of Transportation Services, (916) 340-6276

1400102

## DRAFT Transportation Committee Planning Calendar 2014

<b>January (to Strategic Planning Committee)</b>	
1	Unmet Transit Needs Final Public Hearing
2	Caltrans Planning Grants Applications
<b>February</b>	
1	Unmet Transit Needs Findings
2	Programming Recommendations for FFY 2014/2015 FTA Section 5307 and 5339 Funds
3	MTP/SCS Update
	Outreach Update
	Inventory of Adopted and Proposed Land Use Plans
4	Active Transportation Program State Guidelines
5	Elk Grove SRTP Update
6	Receive & File: Cap-to-Cap 2014
7	Receive & File: Transportation Committee Charge
<b>March</b>	
1	Proposition 1B Transit System Safety, Security, and Disaster Response Bond Account
2	FTA 5311 Program of Projects
3	Project Tracker Contract
4	MTP/SCS Update
	Scenario Framework
	Outreach Update
	Transit Needs Assessment
5	Programming Recommendations for FFY 2014/2015 FTA Section 5307 and 5339 Funds
6	Connect Card Change Order
7	Active Transportation Policy Framework
<b>April</b>	
1	Programming Recommendations for FTA Section 5310 (Elderly & Disabled Transportation)
2	Draft CVRS (SAFE) Strategic Plan
3	Draft CVRS (SAFE) Bylaw Modifications
4	Transportation Funding & Legislation Update
5	Connect Card Project Update
6	May Is Bike Month
7	SRTP Updates
8	SAFE Conflict of Interest Code Amendments
9	MTP/SCS Update

## DRAFT Transportation Committee Planning Calendar 2014

<b>May</b>	
1	Funding of Transit Projects with FTA 5307 & 5339 Apportionments
2	Final CVRS (SAFE) Strategic Plan
3	Final CVRS (SAFE) Bylaw Modifications
4	Draft CVRS (SAFE) Budget
5	Annual CVRS (SAFE) Statistics
6	May is Bike Month Update
7	MTP/SCS Update
<b>June</b>	
1	Flexible Funds Programming Round Calendar
2	FTA 5307, 5337, & 5339 Allocations
3	Final CVRS (SAFE) Budget
4	Development of TCMs for Ozone State Implementation Plan
5	Draft Public Participation Plan Annual Amendment
6	May Is Bike Month Results
7	MTP/SCS Update
<b>July — No Committee Meeting</b>	
<b>August</b>	
1	MTIP Adoption, MTP/SCS Amendment, and Air Quality Conformity Analysis Approval
2	Final Public Participation Plan Annual Amendment
3	MTP/SCS Update
<b>September</b>	
1	Funding of Transit Projects Using Proposition 1B Transit – Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement, and Service Enhancement Account (PTMISEA) Funds
2	Caltrans Grant Awards Update
3	Project Delivery Plan Update
4	TDM Funding Guidelines
5	MTP/SCS Update
<b>October</b>	
1	SACOG Salutes
2	Connect Card Update
3	MTP/SCS Update

## DRAFT Transportation Committee Planning Calendar 2014

November	
1	Project Delivery Plan Results
2	Receive & File: Use of Delegated Authority for MTIP Amendments
3	MTP/SCS Update
December	
1	Proposition 1B Fund Distribution
2	SACOG Salutes
3	MTP/SCS Update
Varies	
	MTIP Amendments
	Caltrans & Other Grants
	PTMISEA Funding
	SECAT
	Connect Card Contract Amendments