

Sacramento Transportation & Air Quality Collaborative

Final Report

Volume III: Supplemental Text for Agreements

December 2005



SPONSORING AGENCIES

City of Citrus Heights
City of Elk Grove
City of Folsom
City of Rancho Cordova
City of Sacramento
County of Sacramento
Sacramento Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD)
Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG)
Sacramento Regional Transit District (RTD)
Sacramento Transportation Authority (STA)
State of California, Department of Transportation (Caltrans)

FOR ADDITIONAL COPIES OR MORE INFORMATION

Contact Us:

Sacramento Transportation Authority
901 F Street, Suite 210
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 323-0080

Website: <http://www.sactaqc.org>

E-Mail: Info@sacta.org

Sacramento Transportation & Air Quality Collaborative

Final Report

*Volume III:
Supplemental Text for Agreements*

December 2005

READERS GUIDE TO THE FINAL REPORT

Supplemental Text for Agreements is one volume of the Final Report. The Final Report consists of four volumes:

- *Volume I: Agreements and Recommendations*
- *Volume II: Transportation Best Practices*
 - *Best Practices for Complete Streets*
 - *Best Practices for Public Transportation*
 - *Best Practices for Bicycle Master Planning and Design*
 - *Best Practices for Pedestrian Master Planning and Design*
 - *Best Practices for Universal Design*
- *Volume III: Supplemental Text for Agreements*
- *Volume IV: Stakeholder Comments & Staff Summary of Unresolved Issues*

The reader is advised that the policy matters not addressed in Volumes I through III are likely to be as important to many Collaborative members as those that are addressed.

All of the Collaborative's products, from the early education phase through the Final Report, including those mentioned in this document, can be found on the Collaborative's website: <http://www.sactaqc.org>.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword	V
Supplemental Text	
Urban Form.....	1
Infill & Reurbanization.....	11
Funding.....	32

FOREWARD

Three sections of *Volume 1: Agreements and Recommendations* were condensed to the key policy points. This was done to keep the agreements to a reasonable length for both Collaborative participants that were reading and approving the documents, as well as for subsequent readers.

Volume III provides the full text of these documents, including additional background information and details on the associated sections of the *Agreements and Recommendations*.

These longer documents were prepared and approved by the respective teams of Collaborative participants that were responsible for final negotiations on that subject. Each team included broad representation of business, the environment, community groups, neighborhoods, cities, the County, and other public agencies.

The sections of *Volume III*, and the teams that approved them, are as follows:

- Infill and Reurbanization (Land Use team);
- Urban Form of Development (Land Use team); and,
- Funding (Funding team).

Each section was negotiated and written separately, and therefore some differences exist in the formatting and organization.

URBAN FORM OF DEVELOPMENT

Urban form is all about the shape of our cities and unincorporated areas, not simply in terms of appearance, but more importantly in terms of the defining characteristics: how they are designed and structured, where development occurs, what type of developments are likely to be built, what types of public and green spaces are available, and how all the areas are connected to one another.

The type of urban form can influence travel outcomes, especially vehicle miles traveled, vehicle trips, and non-auto mode usage.

Goals

- **Achieve efficient land use patterns through an evolving Urban Form that benefits the transportation system and improves air quality through reduced vehicle trips, reduced vehicle miles traveled, and increased alternate mode usage.**
- **Promote an Urban Form of Development, consistent with the Collaborative's core values of Safe, Healthy, & Livable Communities, Economic Vitality, Social Equity, and Environmental Protection and Sustainability, through encouraging local government action in support of the following eight strategies.**

Urban Form Strategies

The following eight strategies are directly supportive of the Goals listed above. These strategies are consistent with and mirror the Blueprint Principles adopted by SACOG. The Collaborative recommends that these strategies be applied to Greenfield development as well as Infill and Reurbanization:

1. Compact Urban Form
2. Infill & Reurbanization
3. Housing Choice & Diversity
4. Mixed Land Use
5. Land Use Balance
6. Quality Site Layout & Building Design
7. Green & Public Spaces
8. Neighborhood & Community Circulation

Urban Form Policies

For each of the eight Urban Form strategies listed above, the text below provides policy actions agreed to by the Collaborative participants for consideration by local governments. These actions, particularly when used in combination, can guide future development to benefit the transportation system and air quality.

As public policy discussions occur throughout the countywide area—particularly with regard to implementation—the Collaborative recommends that those future discussions consider the following four factors:

- Flexibility—the need to implement policies based upon the specific circumstances of an individual jurisdiction including its location, its existing development patterns and transportation system, and its ability to adapt to a newly emerging urban form over time;
- Cost—concerns that the cost of implementing the policy should not fall unfairly on one segment of the community;
- Market efficiency—the belief that in some circumstances it is preferable to allow the marketplace to decide the best (most efficient) solution, rather than rely on pre-set policies;
- Timeframe –the recognition that some policies may be more difficult to implement in the short-term, under current conditions; however, as conditions change over time, these policies will be more appropriate for the changed circumstances, or may be able to be more rigorously implemented.

STRATEGY 1: COMPACT URBAN FORM

A. Background on Compact Urban Form

While most travel projections conclude that the automobile will continue to be the predominant form of travel in the Sacramento region for the foreseeable future, significant reductions in projected vehicle miles traveled and vehicle trips can be accomplished by fostering development at densities/ intensities that are higher on average than what current standards provide. Creating environments that are more compactly built and use space in an efficient but aesthetic manner can encourage more walking, biking, and public transit use, and shorten auto trips.

Compact development is characterized by increasingly higher densities compared to typical densities of today's projects, often with mixed uses, laid out in a smaller scale, more finely-grained pattern, supporting transit, bicycling, and pedestrian modes of travel.

B. Compact Urban Form Agreements for Consideration by Local Governments

The Collaborative recommends that local jurisdictions:

- 1. Establish target minimum densities for development around transit stations and transit centers / trunk lines:** Place new high density context-sensitive development in close proximity to existing and reasonably assured planned transit routes to help foster a greater share of trips by transit and aid transit operations financially by boosting ridership. A target is a goal to strive toward.
- 2. Establish and update targets for overall average density of growth for countywide area:** Encourage local governments countywide to work together to

develop and periodically update targets for overall average density of growth for the urbanized area in Sacramento County to increase countywide overall average density.

3. **Develop and periodically update targets for overall average density of growth for sub-areas throughout the countywide area:** Encourage local governments countywide to work together to develop and periodically update targets for overall average density of growth for sub-areas in Sacramento County.
4. **Promote flexibility in the application of parking standards for compact development:** Creative parking solutions recognize opportunities for shared parking and situations where reduced parking ratios are appropriate over time.
5. **Educate the public:** Pursue a public education program regarding the amenities, benefits and opportunities associated with denser development.
6. **Target a portion of new jobs and housing to be located near transit:** Where high levels of transit service exist, local jurisdictions should strive for a high proportion of new jobs and housing to be located near transit. Jurisdictions may consider growing employment centers and new higher density neighborhoods as potential locations for new or improved transit service.

STRATEGY 2: INFILL AND REURBANIZATION

The agreements among Collaborative participants on Infill and Reurbanization are extensive, and thus a separate section is devoted to this Urban Form strategy.

STRATEGY 3: HOUSING CHOICE & DIVERSITY

A. Background on Housing Choice & Diversity

Population growth trends and the projected demographics changes of the region indicate that Sacramento will need to provide an adequate residential land supply to accommodate a variety of housing types and households of all income levels and sizes. Land will be needed for a variety of single family, multi-family, detached, attached, rental, ownership, and executive, large, and small housing units. By providing a diversity of housing options, more people will have a choice.

The issue of housing choice is of special concern for the moderate and low income people for whom finding housing, especially housing close to work, is challenging. Spatial mismatch between jobs and housing for low income workers is especially problematic because this population is more transit dependent and challenged by long commutes between their job sites and available affordable housing.

The issue of housing is also of special concern for businesses attempting to attract employees. These businesses need some quantity of executive housing and housing that provides the housing types demanded by their employees.

In providing a diverse housing stock care must be exercised to ensure that other land use goals are not compromised. This is especially important when considering agricultural residential land uses), since relatively small amounts of this land uses can contribute significantly to increasing trip length with the resulting adverse effects on traffic and air quality, and the cumulative loss of critical open space and agricultural lands.

B. Housing Choice and Diversity Agreements for Consideration by Local Governments

The Collaborative recommends that local jurisdictions:

- 1. Pursue an adequate, geographically balanced and integrated supply of a variety of housing types and sizes to accommodate the full-range of income levels:** Local jurisdictions within the countywide area should collaborate to provide a variety of housing options for all income levels to reduce travel distances between home, work, school, recreation, community services, and transit services.
- 2. Establish policies to support building a variety of housing product types:** This includes General Plan and Zoning Ordinance support for mixed use and flexible densities to build more affordable for-sale small lot single family homes, attached condos, and rental products that are currently under-provided in today's market.
- 3. Agree that there needs to be a broad range of funding sources to support the building of low income housing.**
 - Leverage funding sources to ensure that adequate financing (both public and traditional private financing) is available to construct affordable housing units.
 - Seek creative funding strategies such as public-private partnerships.
- 4. Design new employment centers to be accessible by transit, biking, and walking:** This approach will enhance access to local job opportunities for low income workers.

C. Potential Disagreement on Housing Choice and Diversity

The members of the Collaborative were not able to reach agreement on the issue of inclusionary zoning as a strategy to provide for increased production of affordable housing. (See Volume 3.)

STRATEGY 4: MIXED LAND USE

A. Background on Mixed Use

Mixed use is the placement of different types of land uses (jobs, housing, retail, recreation, services, etc.) in close proximity to one another – either in the same structure or within walking distance. Mixed land uses can occur at the parcel scale and the neighborhood scale.

Building homes and shops, community centers, entertainment, office and even light industrial uses near each other can create active, vital neighborhoods. This mixture of uses can be either in a vertical arrangement (mixed in one building) or horizontal (with a combination of uses in close proximity). These types of projects function as local activity centers, contributing to a sense of community, where people tend to walk or bike to destinations and interact more with each other. Separated land uses, on the other hand, lead to the need to travel more by auto because of the distance between uses.

B. Agreements on Mixed Use for Consideration by Local Governments

The Collaborative recommends that local jurisdictions:

- 1. Place retail services, schools, and entertainment in close proximity and with direct access to housing.** This will create travel benefits, including reducing vehicle trips and vehicle miles traveled as well as creating opportunities for biking and walking.
- 2. Designate mixed use activity centers:** Support the designation of specific sites and corridors for targeted mixed use activity centers.
- 3. Adopt zoning code changes to promote mixed use development:** Mixed use corridor zoning overlays and form-based codes are two ways this can be done. A zoning overlay can provide special consideration for certain uses that may be inconsistent with the requirements of the underlying zone, and provides flexibility of standards to accommodate new forms of development. A form based code is a land development regulatory tool that places primary emphasis on the physical form of the built environment with the end goal of creating a specific type of “place”. Such a code would typically specify bulk, height and setback requirements of structures but would not regulate their use.
- 4. Create complete neighborhoods by providing neighborhood-scale facilities within the neighborhood (elementary schools, neighborhood parks, neighborhood retail.**
- 5. Provide a wider range of smaller-scale retail opportunities in mixed use developments** to take advantage of the transportation benefits.

STRATEGY 5: LAND USE BALANCE

A. Background on Land Use Balance

Land Use Balance is a mix of uses at the community or sub-regional scale. Land Use Balance is defined as the mix of jobs, housing, retail, recreation, services, etc. to reduce vehicle-miles-traveled and vehicle trips. Land use balance refers to areas smaller than a region or county, but larger than a neighborhood or project.

If jobs, housing and retail are located proximate to one another, it increases the likelihood that some people will live and work in the same community. INDEX and PLACE3S modeling efforts undertaken by the Collaborative's Visioning Working Group identified decreases in vehicle miles traveled (15%) and vehicle trips (3%), and increased non-auto mode usage, by employing balanced land use strategies. The largest reduction in trips is expected to result from non commute trips (home to retail and home to recreation) but with better land use balance and more housing diversity, some benefits to the number and length of commute trips would also be expected.

However, there are key challenges associated with trying to achieve a land use balance. People change jobs frequently but are less apt to change their residences. Two-worker households have become the norm with commuting from one community to another; this makes it more difficult to live near where we work. People with children frequently base their neighborhood location decisions on school quality rather than job location. Wage levels of jobs may not correspond with the ability to afford housing in the same community where they work.

B. Agreements on Land Use Balance for Consideration by Local Governments

The Collaborative recommends that local jurisdictions:

- 1. Pursue strategies to attract housing developments if a sub-area has a jobs/housing imbalance in favor of employment** (i.e., not enough housing).
- 2. Make land use decisions to encourage job growth in sub-areas which have an abundant supply of housing.** However, since the market forces which determine where major employment centers will be located are often beyond the ability of local governments to affect, job-poor sub-areas should at least assure that there is adequate local-serving retail development within their boundaries.

C. Potential Disagreement on Land Use Balance

(69% of Environmentalists either agreed or agreed with qualifications; 25% disagreed and 13% were unsure. 69% of the LCP either agree or agreed with qualifications; 13% disagreed and 19% were unsure.)

- 1. Jobs-Housing Ratio:** Encourage each sub-area throughout the countywide area to strive for a jobs/housing balance where the jobs/housing ratio for that community is in the range of 1.0 – 1.5 jobs/housing ratio. LU-13

Those who “disagreed” or were “unsure” stressed that the issue of land use balance is too complicated to be reduced to a simple target for a jobs/housing ratio. They indicated that the location of jobs and housing alone, without consideration of the income potential of jobs or the price of housing would not result in an effective policy. They expressed concern that targeting a jobs/housing ratio without consideration of these and other factors could potentially result in unintended consequences that would not benefit traffic or air quality. They felt that the more important issues are mixed use, access to amenities and services, and spatial mismatch of job

type with affordable housing types. They suggested that the jobs/housing issue would better be addressed at the regional or sub-regional level, not at the community level.

STRATEGY 6: QUALITY SITE LAYOUT & BUILDING DESIGN

A. Background on Quality Site Layout & Building Design

Neighborhoods are more likely to welcome denser products if the building provides high quality design. The details of a land use development are all factors that can influence the attractiveness of living in a compact development, a sense of safety, and the ease of using non-auto modes of transportation such as walking and biking.

A key feature of development that contributes to its effectiveness of denser urban form is the special attention that is given to site design such as the location of buildings and their orientation to the street, setbacks, and facades; placement of garages and sidewalks; landscaping; the architectural design (elevations, building materials, massing) of the structures; the careful placement of parking (usually behind or at the side of structures), direct and well-located pedestrian and bicycle access; a smaller, more human scale of development; and well-placed, high quality open spaces integrated within the project to create a sense of openness.

B. Agreement on Quality Site Layout & Building Design for Consideration by Local Governments

The Collaborative recommends that local jurisdictions:

- 1. Prepare design guidelines for all major land use types. Higher density and infill development require special attention to high quality design.** Local governments should ensure that development will be aesthetic, utilize quality building materials, and generally be viewed as contributing to the quality of life for the neighborhood and surrounding community by adopting design guidelines. These design guidelines need to balance the need for context-sensitive design that is customized to the neighborhood with the predictability needed for neighborhoods, developers and local government.
- 2. Link the approval of higher density development with requirements for supportive amenities such as green space, special architectural features, and quality building materials.** Higher density developments will not be successful in the long run if they do not result in places where people desire to live. The inclusion of amenities to enhance the attractiveness of higher density developments should be required for all projects.

STRATEGY 7: GREEN AND PUBLIC SPACES

A. Background on Green and Public Spaces

Public space is an essential component of quality of life. Green spaces and gathering places – accessible to the general public -- provide places for people who live in compact developments to enjoy the outdoors. As higher density development occurs, particularly in existing urban areas, it will be important to provide quality green spaces and public spaces for the surrounding residents.

Green spaces include parks, greenbelts, detention basins, and natural areas within the urban fabric that either complement the development or are integrated into the development. Public spaces are outdoor gathering places (including plazas and courtyards) within the built environment that provide a “sense of place” and are accessible to the general public.

B. Agreements on Green & Public Spaces for Consideration by Local Governments

The Collaborative recommends that local jurisdictions:

1. **Evaluate the adequacy of existing park facilities (acreage and quality) as higher density development occurs.** Increased population within a given area which results from higher density development will increase the demand for park space. Where it is not feasible to obtain additional acreage, quality improvements to the existing facilities can result in improved recreational opportunities for residents.
2. **Place the majority of new housing units within walking distance of green space.** In higher density developments, residents will have less private open space (i.e. back yards). Thus, providing green space in proximity to housing is increasingly important.
3. **Use of micro-parks in infill areas and internal green spaces within multi-family projects.** This approach will help satisfy the recreational needs of project residents and will be an amenity to the project.
4. **Use greenbelt corridors that serve as off-street bicycle & pedestrian circulation.** This approach will provide both recreational and transportation benefits to residents of the area.

STRATEGY 8: NEIGHBORHOOD AND COMMUNITY CIRCULATION

A. Background on Neighborhood and Community Circulation

The manner in which the neighborhood and community circulation system are designed is an important component of urban form that, if done correctly, can promote transportation efficiencies. The design of the local circulation system significantly affects the degree to which residents and employees in a neighborhood are able to satisfy their travel needs through some form other than

the private automobile. The best designs of surface transportation facilities within a community or neighborhood provide for the multi-modal movement of people, goods, and services.

B. Agreements on Neighborhood and Community Circulation for Consideration by Local Governments

The Collaborative's Transportation Team has developed a series of "best practice" toolkits (see Volume II) that local jurisdictions may refer to in the planning of new development, in the entitlement process, and in the planning and design of new transportation facilities:

- *Best Practices for Bicycle Master Planning and Design,*
- *Best Practices for Pedestrian Master Planning and Design,*
- *Best Practices for Universal Design,*
- *Best Practices for Complete Streets, and*
- *Best Practices for Public Transportation.*

Using these and other sources as possible references, the Collaborative recommends that local jurisdictions:

1. **Walkable and Bikeable Communities:** Develop local policies and guidelines that will result in the design of neighborhood and community circulation systems that are walkable and bikeable.
2. **Assessment Tools:** Support the development of tools that can assess how proposed neighborhood and community circulation systems can support the Urban Form Strategies discussed above and the Blueprint Principles.
3. **Greenbelts:** Plan off-street trails, especially in new communities, as a circulation form to accommodate/encourage bicycling and walking.
4. **Create Performance Standards to Minimize Adverse Impacts of Automobile Traffic:** Develop performance standards for the street system in new neighborhoods to minimize speeding and undesirable cut-through traffic on residential streets.
5. **Traffic Calming:** Use traffic calming within new and existing developments to minimize speeding and undesirable cut-through traffic on residential streets. Best Practices for Complete Streets (see Volume II) provides some suggestions on traffic calming features that can be built-into street designs, but it is not intended to address the broader topic of traffic calming for which guidance is available from several other documents (there is a footnote citation to a primary source). Traffic calming measures are largely intended to address unforeseen problems that arise after roadways are constructed. While traffic calming can be included in the initial design of streets, the specific treatments are a function of very localized circumstances.
6. **Redundant routes:** The design of street networks should provide people and goods with multiple/redundant means of reaching destinations within local communities and the region.
7. **Location of Facilities:** Locate large regional and community facilities, such as large-capacity churches and regional-scale parks, with their primary access on

arterial streets and/or thoroughfares. Secondary access should also be provided to adjacent residential neighborhoods and should be designed to avoid adverse traffic impacts to the neighborhood.

REMOVING THE BARRIERS & CREATING INCENTIVES FOR INFILL & REURBANIZATION

ORGANIZATION OF THIS PAPER

Section	Page
Introduction	13
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Goals ➤ Definition ➤ Context: Importance of Infill & Reurbanization ➤ Barriers to Infill and Reurbanization ➤ Major Strategies for Infill & Reurbanization 	
I. Vision and Planning Documents to Support Infill	15
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Prepare Vision ➤ Prepare Plans that Implement the Vision ➤ Maintain Currency of Vision and Plans ➤ Create Supportive Plans & Zoning ➤ Develop a Conceptual Level Countywide Design Principles 	
II. Identify Potential Infill Sites Consistent with Community Visions	18
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Ensure Land Supply ➤ Focusing Resources on Target Infill Areas ➤ Prioritizing Infill Investments using Criteria ➤ Establish Focused Public Investment Areas ➤ Respect the Existing Context ➤ Promote Cooperation ➤ Early Consultation between Project Sponsors and the Community 	
III. Engage the Community: Education / Outreach: Community and Decision Maker Support to Gain Community Support	21
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Multi-Interest Expertise ➤ More Emphasis on Educating the Larger Community ➤ Community Input for Inventory Phase ➤ Utilize Planning Academy ➤ Create Ombudsman Role ➤ Pilot Project ➤ Utilize Property & Business Improvement Districts ➤ Organize Small Meetings between Developers and Key Neighborhood Leaders ➤ Require Developers to Meet with Neighbors ➤ Provide for Community Notification and Comment – Even for “By Right” Projects ➤ Encourage Community Development Corporations ➤ Work with the Development Community ➤ Work with Developers that have a History / Track Record of Good Infill Development Projects 	
IV. Redesign the Regulatory Process	24
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Prepared Tiered Environmental Documents 	

- Permit Streamlining
- Expedited Permitting
- “By Right” and Scalable Review
- Flexible Standards
- Revise Zoning Codes
- Appeals Should Meet Merit Test
- Early Consultation
- Pre-Approved Prototypes
- Special CEQA Legislation
- Reform Construction Defect Liability Laws
- 3-5 Year Supply of Available Building Sites
- Modified Level of Service Standards
- Modify Parking Requirements in Infill Areas – Consistent with Blueprint Principles

V. Financial and Other Incentives for Priority Infill and Reurbanization Sites 29

- Provide Funding for Development of Infill Master Plans
- Focus Capital Improvements for Public Infrastructure
- Establish Adequate Replacement Policies and Reserves
- Create a Housing Incentive Program
- Create a County-wide Housing Trust Fund
- Assist Communities in Establishing Improvement Districts
- Promote Location Efficient Mortgages
- Reduce Fees in Target Growth Areas
- Consider Greenfield Fees
- Expand the SACOG Community Design Program
- Leverage Funding

VI. Toxics / Brownfield Clean-Up 31

- Brownfield Coordinator
- Low Interest Loans
- Local Government Can Conduct Cleanup Activities Directly

INTRODUCTION

A. Goals

1. **Accommodate an Increasing Amount of the Countywide Area's New Growth through Infill and Reurbanization**, recognizing that this form of urban development reduces overall Vehicle Miles Traveled and Vehicle Trips.
2. **Emphasize Residential Infill and Reurbanization** because the countywide area does not have a sufficient supply of land designated for residential development, and has an oversupply of lands designated for certain non-residential uses (e.g., retail and light industrial).
3. **Develop Support for Infill & Reurbanization by Developing Public Transparency and trustworthiness.** Involve the community beginning early in the process and through the final decision making and implementation.
4. **Utilize Infill & Reurbanization to Create Complete Communities** that provide a full complement of residential, jobs, retail, and services in the community.
5. **Revitalize and Improve the Quality of Life in Existing Neighborhoods** through focused public and private investment in infrastructure and civic facilities.

B. Definitions

The commonly used term "Infill" actually comprises a broad spectrum of types of development.

Infill is the reuse, redevelopment, or building on *vacant land in an area surrounded by existing development*. Infill can range from a single dwelling unit on a residential lot to a more intensive multiple family complex.

Reurbanization is reuse, renovation, or demolition of an *existing building and new construction on the same site*. Reurbanization can range from a single building to a more comprehensive development (e.g., UP railyards). When the previous use of the property involved some toxic materials (e.g., gas stations, dry cleaners, railyards, etc.), the development is known as *Brownfield*.

Greenfield (*not a type of infill*) is development on vacant land not surrounded by existing development.

It should be noted that the SACOG Blueprint uses a different definition of infill and reurbanization. The SACOG definition includes buildout of existing planned areas. Thus, while the SACOG Blueprint identifies 61% of employment growth and 46% of housing growth as infill & reurbanization, the more traditional definition used in this paper would result in infill and reurbanization accounting for only about 10-15% of total growth.

Each reurbanization or infill site has different circumstances that create a need for a tailored strategy. The concept of reurbanization and infill has also been evolving in the past few years. For example, the focus had been on trying to build more density throughout the countywide area, whereas today's trend targets market-driven opportunities.

C. Importance of Infill and Reurbanization

Infill development is a key strategy consistent with the Collaborative's purpose (Transportation, Air Quality, and Related Land Use & Economic Vitality). Infill and reurbanization – when designed in accord with the SACOG Blueprint and Urban Form Principles endorsed by the Collaborative can:

- Reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled and Vehicle Trips (compared to comparable development in greenfield areas);
- Accommodate about 10-15% of projected regional growth (Source: SACOG Blueprint), thereby limiting outward expansion;
- Promote bicycling and walking as a more viable option as a means of access;
- Provide mobility options for the non-driving population;
- Reduce the consumption of land resources; help preserve agricultural and open space resources; and
- Remove blighted areas/structures and provide reinvestment in existing neighborhoods.

D. Barriers to Infill and Reurbanization

The key challenges and barriers to infill, for which strategies need to be developed include:

- Land Constraints: including size, shape, fractured ownership patterns, and inadequate space for required parking
- Lack of Community Support
- Regulatory Process & Requirements which can cause delay and uncertainty
- Marketability: especially due to perceptions of poor public safety and poor quality of schools
- Infrastructure: especially upgrades or replacement of aged facilities
- Financing: inadequate funding for planning and implementation of infill and reurbanization projects
- Brownfield/Toxic sites

In essence, unless these barriers and challenges can be successfully addressed, infill development will not be a viable strategy for improving transportation and air quality in the Sacramento countywide area.

E. Major Strategies for Infill and Reurbanization

The major elements of the Collaborative's Infill and Reurbanization strategy are summarized below. The comprehensive package of strategies are likely to be successful when the strategies

are accomplished simultaneously so as to build *momentum*, and when focused on specific areas to create *critical mass*.

1. Identify potential infill and reurbanization sites **consistent with community visions** for rehabilitation and reuse that contribute positively to the surrounding area and assist in meeting neighborhood and other local agency goals, including improving the rate of home ownership while maintaining or increasing property values.
2. **Revise/Prepare municipal planning documents** (including the General Plan, Community or Specific Plans, and Precise Plans for infill areas) and ordinances (including the Zoning Code and Subdivision Ordinance) to support residential infill development goals.
3. **Engage the community** to ensure new residential infill development addresses neighborhood concerns and to gain greater acceptance and support for infill development, including the preparation of Design Guidelines that assure high quality context-appropriate development.
4. **Redesign regulatory processes** and create more flexible development standards for residential infill development.
5. **Provide Funding for Infrastructure & Public Facilities** to accommodate infill growth. These needs are difficult to accommodate on an individual project basis.
6. **Provide focused incentives** and project assistance for the development of residential infill sites, including fee adjustments/waivers, public funding of infrastructure, and cost avoidance strategies.
7. **Seek New Funding** such as grants and redevelopment property tax increment.
8. **Specifically address Toxics / Brownfield Sites:** Utilize staff expertise, low interest loans, and direct intervention to assist the development community in readying infill sites.

STRATEGY 1: VISION & PLANNING DOCUMENTS TO SUPPORT INFILL

- A. **Prepare Visions:** Each jurisdiction should engage existing residents and businesses in developing a vision for infill potential. The vision should include an understanding of the role of infill and reurbanization toward meeting the growth needs of the community; infill and reurbanization can accommodate growth within the existing urban footprint rather than relying exclusively on greenfield development. However, infill often means higher density and increased local traffic. Current local residents would be more likely to embrace increased density and traffic as a trade-off for local walkability, urban services (parks, schools, infrastructure), improved property values and economic vitality.
- B. **Prepare Plans that Implement the Vision:** Each jurisdiction which has significant infill potential should undertake planning efforts to help establish a comprehensive framework for coordinating infill development. The planning efforts include general plans, community or area plans, specific plans, etc. Each of the planning phases should thoroughly involve all aspects of the affected communities and should follow the principles identified in the chapter on Community Engagement.

1. **General Plan:** Include strong policies in General Plans that encourage infill with implementing actions to modify ordinances to accommodate infill. General Plans should identify *why* infill is needed, *where* are the targeted sites for “areas of opportunity” or “areas of commitment”, and *what* the infill will look like.
 2. **Community Plans:** Prepare community or specific plans to follow through on the vision, followed by guidelines and standards to create certainty in the community regarding quality of projects. This results in better projects and increases the certainty of development. However, community plan updates are time consuming, expensive and may be too general to address the concerns of a particular neighborhood.
 3. **Recommendations:** To effectively use General Plans and Community Plans, the Collaborative recommends that local governments:
 - a. Identify areas within the jurisdiction of substantial infill potential well in advance of development.
 - b. Initiate the planning process for this area.
 - c. Identify key stakeholders and hold public workshops and design charrettes to involve the public in establishing a vision for the area.
 - d. Formally adopt the Specific Plan as a General Plan amendment, including zoning changes and urban design guidelines to ensure that development within the designated area produces a highly livable, attractive urban environment.
 - e. Use redevelopment strategies to acquire land, improve infrastructure, and add amenities to the designated area, if appropriate,
 - f. Actively recruit and assist developers to bring this infill vision into reality.
 - g. Implement the vision, by identifying funding for planning, community engagement, and improvement of civic infrastructure (parks, schools, streets, underground utilities, etc.).
 - h. Identify and promote transit supportive opportunities in the plan.
- C. **Maintain Vision and Plans** to retain flexibility and reflect the dynamic nature of market realities and community expectations. Plans should be ready to accommodate infill growth when the market conditions are ripe for development.
- Pre-plan for re-use of outmoded sites or blighted sites.
 - Non-marketable parcels may need to be rezoned to a use that is supportable by the market.
 - Local governments should undertake the demographic and market study research to identify product types that would meet the future needs of current residents and future residents.
- D. **Create Supportive Plans & Zoning to Achieve Goals.** Policies and zoning regulations should support infill and include a clear articulation of intent that reinforces the provisions in the comprehensive plan. There are many zoning options available, including changing an existing zone, or creating a new zone, or an overlay zone. An overlay zone allows jurisdictions to target particular areas for infill without rewriting entire zoning categories. Parcels affected by an overlay zone are subject to the rules of the underlying zone, in addition to the rules of the overlay zone. In general, a zoning overlay can provide special consideration for certain uses that may be inconsistent with the requirements of the

underlying zone, and provides flexibility of standards to accommodate new forms of development. The overlay may modify or eliminate existing regulations, or it may introduce new regulations, depending on local preference. Items 1-4 below are ways of creative supportive plans and zoning:

- 1) **“Transitional Overlay Zones”** (e.g., Citrus Heights) along selected thoroughfares to allow residential parcels to be converted to light-duty commercial (where residential uses have become less compatible).
- 2) Designate **special planning areas** with flexible zoning to provide greater range of uses, subject to performance standards. Develop new zoning categories and codes for mixed use that are better tailored to meeting the challenges.
- 3) **Create Specific Plans** that identify specific site densities, but remain flexible on project design issues.
- 4) **Form Based Codes:** Form based codes specify bulk, height and setback requirements and do not regulate use.

- E. **Develop Conceptual Level Countywide Design Principles:** Reduce design review uncertainties by establishing clear “Context Sensitive” design guidelines -- often in conjunction with Specific Plans -- that can let developers, neighbors, planners, and design review committees know what features are expected. A commonality of principles between jurisdictions creates a more expeditious development environment, as the rules of engagement are made clearer. At this time, each of the local jurisdictions – with the exception of the County – has adopted design guidelines.

Infill sometimes is not accepted in neighborhoods due to incompatible design and density. Each jurisdiction should develop design principles for infill, urban design guidelines tailored for infill development in particular areas or citywide. It is possible to require good design and create a “sense of place” without necessarily increasing costs to developers, especially those providing more affordable housing. These guidelines can clarify for developers, planners, and design review committees characteristics that the city requires or desires for infill development projects. Cities should include easy-to-understand graphics and photographs showing desirable building types and site planning goals. Design principles might include the following:

- 1) **Relate buildings to the street.** Infill projects should try to create an attractive street frontage that will be pleasant for pedestrians and neighbors. Having entrances directly on the street is one main strategy. Having restaurants, cafes, or shops along the street is another, for locations that can support this kind of commercial activity. Infill development in residential areas should place porches and entrances in front rather than large garages.
- 2) **Keep front setbacks small and building fronts close to the street** to create a pedestrian-oriented street environment. Downtown infill buildings should help create a solid street front.
- 3) **Ensure that building facades have variety and interest.** Avoid blank walls or long, uniform building fronts. Even if projects are large, break up the facades so that they give the impression of smaller scaled buildings.
- 4) Generally, **place parking out of sight**, behind or underneath infill buildings, with only a row or two in front, although the parking design should be respectful of adjacent uses.
- 5) **Neighborhood Completeness:**

- a. Provide a range of outdoor spaces for residents of higher-density infill housing. Some areas should be entirely private, such as small patios or balconies. Other spaces should be semi-private, such as courtyards, gardens, pools, or rooftop decks. And still other outdoor spaces can be public, such as pocket parks, plazas, playgrounds, or community gardens.
 - b. Create a pedestrian-friendly environment by add wide sidewalks, street trees, benches, mini-parks, or plazas to help.
- 6) **Neighborhood Context:** Fit the building to the neighborhood context – where there is a well established and vital residential neighborhood. New buildings don't need to exactly match neighboring buildings in terms of size or design. But they can include design details that help link them to the pre-existing context, and their height can be “stepped down” to match lower surrounding development at one side of a lot.
 - 7) **Maintain Affordability:** Care should be taken, however, to make sure design guidelines do not inadvertently add costs that will reduce housing affordability.
 - 8) **Transit Orientation:** Orient development to transit with emphasis on pedestrian connections to bus stops, transit stations, etc. Provide park and ride spaces, or shared parking spaces for transit users.

CHAPTER 2: IDENTIFY POTENTIAL INFILL SITES CONSISTENT WITH COMMUNITY VISIONS

Issue: Only a small percentage of the regional growth is currently in being accommodated within infill areas, but there is plenty of potential capacity. The SACOG Blueprint Preferred Scenario identifies 61% of the employment growth and 46% of the housing growth in Sacramento County would be accomplished through infill and reurbanization. (The Blueprint identifies a lesser percentage for infill and reurbanization at the regional level.) The more traditional definition of infill and reurbanization used in this paper results in about 10-15% of total growth in Sacramento County accomplished through infill and reurbanization.

This section suggests strategies for achieving an aggressive quantity of infill and reurbanization:

- A. **Ensure Land Supply:** Local governments can ensure that land is available for infill development by taking the following steps:
 - 1. **Inventory:** All jurisdictions will conduct an inventory of potential infill and reurbanization opportunities. This inventory will include, at a minimum, parcel number, size, existing zoning and general plan designation, plus a list of potential constraints. Likely infill parcels include those for which the assessed property tax valuation of the land exceeds that of buildings, those where buildings only cover a small fraction of the site, and downtown buildings that are one-story or have low floor area ratios, and lower intensity uses near light rail stations. As a starting point, utilize the sites identified by SACOG in the Blueprint scenarios. Some key examples for infill and reurbanization in the Sacramento countywide area include:

- Downtown Sacramento is experiencing a renaissance in terms of urban residential opportunities, including: Metro Square (27th & H), Fremont Mews (15th & Q), Fremont Building (16th & P), Capitol Lofts (12th & R). A recent inventory identified 4000 vacant lots within the City, capable of supporting about 60,000 dwelling units.
 - The revised noise and safety contours surrounding McClellan AFB opened up development opportunities on previously skipped over parcels.
 - Citrus Heights is building its Stock Ranch residential development and is increasing its retail opportunities on infill sites.
 - Rancho Cordova is developing a town center plan along Folsom Boulevard, adjacent to light rail stations.
2. **Adequate Zoned Lands:** Examine land zoned for commercial or industrial development to see whether this can be utilized for housing or mixed-use development. Currently many Sacramento local governments have over-zoned for commercial development, while seriously under-producing housing (especially affordable housing). In some instances, this may require rezoning the sites from industrial to residential. In other instances, the zoning ordinance itself can be modified to allow residential / mixed uses. It should be noted, however, that developer and community opposition may be encountered, especially with existing uses afraid of becoming rezoned as non-conforming uses.
 3. **Assemblage of Land:** With Redevelopment Project Areas, aggregate or remap parcels to accommodate new projects. Outside of redevelopment areas, jurisdictions can acquire surplus lands from school districts and other governmental agencies and make that land available for housing development or community amenities that support housing development.
- B. **Focus Resources on Target Infill Areas:** Designate potential infill / reurbanization areas for focused private/ public/ community resources. This offers the opportunity to leverage resources, pilot projects, and targets. Prioritize funding of public infrastructure and specific plans on transportation corridors with significant infill opportunities. Focus limited community resources to make targeted neighborhoods fully ready for infill development. Strive for a critical mass of public investment to engender private investor confidence. Local jurisdictions can set the stage for infill development by using a focused public investment strategy to direct growth to target infill areas. Such focused public investment can fill the gaps where basic infrastructure is missing or needs upgrading. In addition, directing desirable amenities such as parks or libraries to these areas can bolster investor confidence in the market potential and stimulate surrounding private investment. Focusing public investment to assure fully-served neighborhoods is more effective than a dispersed (something-for-everyone) investment approach.
- C. **Prioritize Infill Investments using Criteria:** The local agencies can each develop their own priority infill and corridor revitalization project lists. Funding opportunities would be linked to these priorities. When prioritizing how to target infill development, the following additional criteria can be generally applied as a screen. In all likelihood, however, the sites are vacant precisely because some of these criteria are absent:

Ideal Location Criteria:

- Infill projects along transportation corridors that are in need of reurbanization are likely to be less politically difficult than vacant lots within existing residential neighborhoods. Reurbanization along transportation corridors provides good access to transportation facilities and provides options for a higher concentration of people.
- Transit-Oriented Development, located near major transit stops, especially Light Rail Transit station areas (e.g., ¼ mile radius).
- Higher education school campuses (e.g., ¼ - ½ mile radius).
- Job centers / large employment centers.
- Re-use of large reclaimed sites (e.g., military facilities, old shopping centers, canneries, rail yards, brownfields).
- Areas of city centers (e.g., Rancho Cordova and City of Sacramento downtowns).
- Redevelopment project areas where mechanisms are in place to leverage public funds and intensity.
- Communities that have self-identified target areas for infill development.

Ideal Contextual Criteria:

- Viable market area
- Compatible, well-maintained surrounding properties (except where the project site is designed as a catalyst project for redevelopment).
- Receptive local government
- Minimal environmental problems (except for brownfield sites with a viable plan for toxic clean-up).
- Workable land development regulations
- Adequate public services

Ideal Property Criteria:

- For sale at realistic price
- Sufficient size for intended use
- Perceived market for intended use(s)
- Adequate utilities in place, requiring only modest upgrades, or available public funding for utility upgrades.
- Street frontage
- Regularly shaped developable parcels
- No major topographic, drainage, or subsoil problems
- Appropriate zoning
- Potential development profitability compared to alternative sites

D. **Respect the existing context:** Recognize where the best opportunities exist for infill development that reinforces community objectives for future growth. Appeal to new

residents and acceptance by existing residents will be enhanced if the new development respects and complements the existing context. It should also contribute in some way to the functioning and the desirability of the neighborhood. To attract residents who will live in infill housing, infill design must address their needs—for affordable housing, security, convenient access, services and other qualities. Infill development should fill the existing gaps in the neighborhood and allow the neighborhood to feel that the development enriches their neighborhood. The Collaborative did not address the issue of gentrification – the concern that existing residents – especially seniors, low-income workers, disabled, etc. – would be displaced by reurbanization; this issue is discussed in more detail in the Unresolved Issues section.

- E. **Promote partnerships** between public officials, representatives from neighborhood organizations, non-profits, private developers and financial institutions to work towards a shared vision for specific neighborhoods.
- F. **Early Consultation between Project Sponsors and the Community:** Provide notification to neighborhoods about upcoming projects. Foster communication between neighborhood and project sponsors / developer at early stages.

CHAPTER 3: GAIN COMMUNITY SUPPORT

Issue: One of the preeminent obstacles to infill development—and the single biggest concern of many developers—is community opposition. When a neighborhood opposes a project, the permitting process can take more time. A lengthy permitting process is costly to developers.

Neighbors often raise the following concerns:

- *affordable housing projects may lower property values,*
- *new development may create parking and traffic congestion problems*
- *impacts on school and park facilities or other services,*
- *impacts on the storm drainage system, or*
- *new development may be out of context with the existing neighborhood).*

There are inherent trade-offs between trying to preserve the status quo in a neighborhood and reinvestment strategies that increase the density. Some neighborhoods would like to receive the infrastructure investments, but would oppose the increase in density. If we are to ask people to accept, and even welcome, more density in their neighborhoods, we must also protect the interests that urban residents have in clean air, reasonable traffic, urban green spaces, public safety, and other factors that contribute to the quality of their lives. Strategies that can be used to engage the community to alleviate their issues are to address community concerns, yet must also balance the need for timely processing of good development proposals:

GENERAL

- A. **Create Multi-Interest Advisory Group:** Create a coalition of individuals and organizations with multiple perspectives to solve problems, educate and testify to decision-makers and neighborhoods regarding infill projects.

- B. More Emphasis on Educating the larger community**, including community/ neighborhood associations on why infill projects provide benefits. (Public education/buy-in would help build support for infill projects and help provide citizen support for infill projects.) Don't limit education and project review to the immediate surrounding parcels.
- 1) The community needs education about how the regulatory process works, and the respective roles of the Boards, staff, developers, and neighborhoods. The public needs to understand what can be changed and what is fixed by State law or local ordinance.
 - 2) The community needs education about why infill projects provide benefits. More focus could be placed on community acceptance / participation & involvement. When positive examples and experiences are presented to the community, then the process is likely to be easier. Community acceptance then drives greater receptivity to regulatory and policy reform.
 - 3) Awareness, Participation & Education: The community needs some control of what & how it gets built; inclusive process.
 - 4) Organized community groups should receive special attention, as they can provide a bridge to the neighborhoods.
 - 5) Political support for infill begins with the recognition by the public that communities within urban growth areas have an obligation and opportunity to accept infill and higher densities in exchange for preservation of rural and resource areas in the region.
 - 6) A communications program must:
 - a. **Engage elected and civic leaders:** Within most communities, there is no natural constituency for new housing. The role of elected and civic leaders includes representation of the housing needs of future generations.
 - b. **Engage All Elements of the Community:** For the vision to be meaningful, it must involve the broadest spectrum of the community. However, most citizens remain minimally engaged in local affairs until they perceive a threat. Bring the General Plan visioning process to the community level. Make resources available to the community to make the process understandable. Be transparent and trustworthy in community participation. Visioning must include citizens who have an interest in the future of their community but who are not actively involved.
 - The City of Sacramento process for the General Plan involves town hall meetings. What do people care about? What do they like? The process aims to explain how the community input relates to the vision.
 - The Rancho Cordova General Plan process utilizes surveys – monthly meetings with great turnout.
 - The SACOG Blueprint involved thousands of people – who got to work with something tangible. People saw the benefits of infill development.
 - c. **Be Continual & Persistent:** Shifting consumer preferences and neighborhood attitudes requires a sales program to create a cultural change; this requires consistent messages, delivered often, over a long period of time.
 - d. **Be Specific:** Visions and big pictures are a necessary starting point, but citizens must understand the specific types of housing being proposed. This involves understanding the physical forms, markets, and anticipated impacts.

- e. **Transparent Public Noticing:** Make the public noticing more user-friendly. Define the terms. Use the internet to provide detailed project information including site plans, staff contacts, upcoming meetings, etc.
- C. **Seek Community Input for Inventory Phase:** Utilize the infill inventory process as an opportunity for community input in prioritizing potential infill locations.
- D. **Utilize Citizen Training Programs** (e.g., Planning Academy in City of Sacramento and REACH in Citrus Heights) to prepare the broader community for informed civic engagement and participation in public decision making on infill and reurbanization issues. Graduates of these training programs often become strategic leaders in their community that could help the neighborhoods work through the development issues. The public needs to understand how to constructively review projects and understand how their input could be utilized during the development review process.
- E. **Create Ombudsman Role:** Utilize a community ombudsman whose role is to outreach and help facilitate communication between government and the community. The ombudsman could provide Mediation for developments, governments and neighborhoods in conflict – consider use of neutral 3rd parties. Look at successful citizen input strategies (e.g., Utilize template of North Highlands advisory committee to SHRA)
- F. **Implement Pilot Projects** as a way of demonstrating the potential of a new infill product or as an introduction of infill development to a new location. Select a demonstration project (pull out all the stops) to create an award-winning infill project. Public perceptions of infill development are often based on past product design and poor management. Success / good examples of infill will counter criticisms of higher density products.
- G. **Foster the Development of Property & Business Improvement Districts --** organizations or property owners and businesses -- that have organized to promote the economic vitality in their area. Examples of PBID's include Sunrise MarketPlace, Fulton Avenue (median improvements), and Florin Road Partnership.

PROJECT-SPECIFIC

- H. **Organize small meetings between developers and key neighborhood leaders** to develop buy-in before holding general public meetings or workshops.
- I. **Define Standardized Procedures for Obtaining Public Input.** Local jurisdictions should provide guidance to developers in terms of basic steps for engaging the public.
- J. **Encourage Developers to Submit a Public Engagement Plan with their Project Applications** to engage the community at various phases of the project and that provides a mechanism to follow-through on commitments made to the community. This Civic Engagement Plan would be a tailored and more detailed plan that conforms to the adopted standardized procedures for obtaining public input defined above. (See the Collaborative's Civic Engagement Recommendations). {It may be useful to provide professionally trained mediators to assist local planning agency staff in achieving compromises between neighborhoods and developers}.
- K. **Provide for community notification and comment for standards-based projects.** While streamlining of the process is necessary, neighborhoods want to be kept informed

of all projects. Staff should explain to the neighborhood that the project must be approved by right if it meets all applicable standards, but the public can be provided with the opportunity to comment on the project.

- L. **Educate the development community** to target the housing needs of smaller "non-traditional" family households (such as empty-nesters, single parent households, or childless couples) that are more likely to be attracted to infill and reurbanization housing products. Developer education would help developers understand the perspectives and needs of the community. This education might include effective neighborhood outreach techniques. Also, the program of outreach would best be administered by a neutral and independent 3rd party.

CHAPTER 4: REDESIGN THE REGULATORY PROCESS

Issue: The current regulatory process was not designed for infill projects. Lengthy and often difficult permitting processes can work against infill development. These procedures can require expensive studies or project redesign, and related delays can increase finance costs for developers. Further, developers often face additional risk and cost associated with unclear approval requirements.

Most existing zoning codes are geared toward new greenfield development and not towards infill or mixed use developments. As a consequence, new infill projects must then be shepherded through the system by using special use permits or other devices that allow for exceptions to the zoning codes. This special treatment causes delay.

Much of the problem stems from a lack of clear commitment to the goals of infill development. If we want infill and mixed use developments, then we have to have a zoning code that specifically permits it. If we want higher density, then we have to clearly state that policy choice and set standards for its implementation.

- A. **Prepare Tiered Environmental Documents:** Reduce environmental review requirements for individual infill projects by preparing EIRs on Specific Plans for infill areas. The Master EIR should address the environmental effects of the relevant specific plan, including area-wide and cumulative impacts related to traffic, air quality, infrastructure, and public services. Environmental Impact Reports (EIRs), prepared along with Specific Plans, can take environmental review burdens off individual projects by addressing the cumulative effects of multiple projects in geographic proximity. State law allows such "Tiered EIRs" under a 1979 amendment to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Developers then do not have to prepare time-consuming environmental documents and face a reduced threat of CEQA litigation.
- B. **Streamline the Permitting Process:** There are a variety of actions that local jurisdictions can take to improve their development review processes.
 - 1) **Adopt clear procedures for review**, to eliminate uncertainty about what both the city and developers should expect.
 - 2) **Coordinate Interagency Reviews** to ensure efficiency and consistency. Reviewers of development proposals should possess a comfortable degree of certainty regarding the latitude they can apply to the project. By making the

approval process easier, more efficient, and more clearly defined, developers will be less hesitant to embark upon infill projects.

- 3) **Conduct Staff and Commissioner Training** to be sure everyone is up-to date on guidelines, requirements, and procedures. The jurisdiction should foster greater understanding of the goals of housing innovation and provide the training necessary to ensure smooth permit processing.
- 4) **Shepherd Projects:** Assign specific staff to shepherd each infill project through the approvals process -- managing any given infill project from start to completion.
- 5) **Set a time limit on permit processing**, requiring staffs to process applications within a set period of time (provided that the application is responsive to required elements).

C. **Achieve Certainty through Standards-Based Development**, provided that local agencies also conduct aggressive outreach on developing the standards, help citizens understand their roles in reviewing development proposals roles, allow public review & comment (as identified in Chapter 3 of this document), and establish realistic life spans for neighborhood plans on which the by standards were derived (as identified below) This approach shifts the emphasis toward aggressive civic engagement at the planning stages, with lesser emphasis on public hearings at the project level. The Collaborative recommends that local agencies establish pilot projects to evaluate the results of this shift of emphasis:

Definitions: Levels of Project Review: There are generally two levels of development project review:

- **Ministerial review** provides for staff-level review of the proposed project relative to applicable standards. Staff has some leeway on height, site placement, and design. Submittal of technical studies may be required. No public hearings are required, and ministerial projects are statutorily exempt from CEQA review. Density and land use type after often prescribed by the zoning codes and standards.
- **Discretionary Review** provides for formal public hearings and CEQA review. Discretionary review applies when the project does not meet all applicable standards or zoning, or requires a conditional use permit.

- 1) **Develop Standards for Infill & Reurbanization Development:** Most zoning codes are not geared for infill and reurbanization development conditions. As a result, most projects require discretionary review – resulting in hearings, delays, extra costs, and uncertainty. The Collaborative recommends developing standards – tailored to the specific neighborhoods, the applicable land use zones, and the applicable uses. These standards need to be developed with the full engagement by the community. Once the standards are adopted, then a project proposal that is consistent with those standards should be approved at the staff-level (ministerial), after consultation with affected communities.
- 2) **Provide equal treatment for projects consistent with adopted standards:** Once a community planning process has adopted standards, each land use should utilize the same basic approval process. For example, multi-family

projects should not be subjected to a more cumbersome process than the approval process for single family housing projects.

- A new State law, effective January 1, 2004, requires ministerial approval of apartment projects with fewer than 100 units that are appropriately zoned; this does not, however, preclude design review or waive development standards (height, setback, parking, etc.)

3) **Regularly update the applicable standards and requirements** to stay current with the emergent needs of the community by establishing a realistic lifespan for Neighborhood Plans or Special Planning Areas: In order to justify the time and expense of preparing neighborhood plans, there must be some assurances that the plan will be valid for some reasonable period of time. On the other hand, if conditions significantly change, then the plan may not be responsive to the changed conditions.

- Establish a 5-Year Minimum Lifespan of Neighborhood Plans
- Conduct a Formal Review of whether the Plan is Deemed Current for a 2-3Year Extension, provided that the project area and surrounding areas have not experienced any major changes in land uses and traffic circulation
- The maximum lifespan for a neighborhood plan is 10 years.

D. **Create Flexible Standards:** Redesign regulatory processes and create more flexible development standards for infill development— effective infill programs address regulatory process, including reduced regulatory requirements for residential infill development.

E. **Revise Zoning Codes to Meet the Flexibility Needs of Infill and Reurbanization Projects**

- 1) Designate **special planning areas** with flexible zoning to provide greater range of uses, subject to performance standards. Develop new zoning categories and codes for mixed use that are better tailored to meeting the challenges.
- 2) **Form Based Zoning Codes:** Local jurisdictions should consider adopting form-based codes for infill areas. Form based zoning code is a land development regulatory tool that places primary emphasis on the physical form of the built environment with the end goal of producing a specific type of “place”. In contrast, <http://www.farmersbranch.info/Planning/form based codes image.html> conventional (Euclidian) zoning strictly controls land-use, through abstract regulatory statistics, which can result in very different physical environments. The base principle of form-based coding is that design is more important than use. Simple and clear graphic prescriptions for building height, how a building is placed on site, and building elements (such as location of windows, doors, etc) are used to control development. Land-use is not ignored, but regulated using broad parameters that can better respond to market economics, while also prohibiting undesirable uses. The form-based code can actually streamline the development review process because it provides clear parameters, based on a Conceptual Master Plan. A good website resource is <http://www.formbasedcodes.org/>

- F. **Encourage Early Consultation between Project Proponents, Staff, and Affected Community:** Carry out pre-application reviews with developers concerning potential projects. Each jurisdiction with significant infill and reurbanization potential would offer informal pre-application meetings with prospective developers to provide guidance in terms of city requirements, identify potential issues, and discuss the future process for development. There is value in early consultation between project developers and the community; this consultation is more valuable when the developers are responsive to issues raised. Provide notification of neighborhoods about upcoming projects; foster communication between neighborhood and property owners at early stages. Attempt to flesh out the fear – get to people’s real concerns. If developers make commitments, there should also be builder accountability to provide neighborhood outreach.
- G. **Pre-Approve Prototypes for Infill Housing:** For jurisdictions with substantial infill activity, develop pre-approved house plans for single-family infill development, which can expedite the approval process and reduce processing costs. Local agencies could commission prototypical house plans for common lot sizes found in infill areas that meet the agency’s design standards. The house plans will be pre-approved through the design review and plan check processes and can be purchased at a discounted rate for property owners who wish to use them.
- o Re-use of house plans—Adopt a fee structure that allows Infill developers who have previously approved plans that have already been through the design review and plan check processes and wish to use the same house plan more than once can do so at a substantially reduced cost. The City of Sacramento anticipates adopting this program in August 2005.
- H. **Support Select Reforms of CEQA State Legislation:** Section 15332 of the State CEQA Guidelines needs to be modified to allow the exemption for urbanized areas in unincorporated Sacramento County consistent with the other existing provisions of the section. Section 15332 currently provides a categorical exemption for infill development of projects that are consistent with applicable plans, occurs within city limits on a project site of no more than five acres, has no habitat value, would not result in any significant effects relating to traffic, noise, air quality or water quality, and can be adequately served by all required utilities and public services.. Section 15332 of the State CEQA Guidelines currently provides a categorical exemption for infill development of projects with the following characteristics:
- i. The project is consistent with the applicable general plan designation, general plan policies, and zoning designation and regulations.
 - ii. The proposed development occurs within city limits on a project site of no more than five acres substantially surrounded by urban uses.
 - iii. The project site has no value as a habitat for endangered, rare or threatened species.
 - iv. Approval of this project would not result in any significant effects relating to traffic, noise, air quality or water quality.
 - v. The site can be adequately served by all required utilities and public services.

- I. **Define CEQA Thresholds of Significance at the Local Level:** Each local agency should adopt thresholds of significance that define “significant impacts” against which projects can be evaluated for their impact on the environment. Specifically, standards for traffic, noise, and air quality should be identified during the General Plan process.
- J. **Maintain a Supply of Available Building Sites:** The creation of a supply of available infill and reurbanization building sites can help ensure an adequate supply of land to accommodate housing demand in Sacramento County. This would mean that there are sufficient infill development sites zoned for housing that can be readily available when market conditions are ripe for infill development. However, the Collaborative does not recommend the notion of a continuous 3-5 year countywide supply of infill and reurbanization building sites, because reuse, infill, and reurbanization is difficult to predict. Rather, the Collaborative recommends – as identified elsewhere in this paper – relying on a comprehensive infill strategy that includes detailed neighborhood plans, a flexible regulatory framework, preparation of master environmental documents, and infrastructure investments by local governments.
- K. **Modify Level of Service (LOS) Standards:** Level of Service refers to the expected volume of traffic on a road relative to its rated capacity. Modified LOS Standards are needed for Infill because it is not always feasible or advisable to “improve” roads in developed areas. Instead, local jurisdictions can provide trade-offs (accepting a lower LOS, while improving mobility for other modes, or providing community enhancements such as better parks, schools, retail opportunities, etc.). Local governments should examine (and adopt) more appropriate level-of-service standards within designated infill areas. As traffic volumes increase, the Level Of Service is reduced. Some jurisdictions have a “Level of Service C” requirement for the flow of traffic. This level is artificially high, requires traffic studies that only document future volumes of cars, and encourages expensive mitigations. Many cities have “D” or “E” as acceptable levels of service. Level-of-service standards should be established at the minimum amount and quality of public facilities and services that must be provided to satisfy community needs. Transportation service level standards should recognize overall mobility – including non-automobile forms of transportation (ped, bike, transit) -- and consider the regional benefits of reduced VMT & VT.
1. The traditional, uniformly applied transportation level-of-service standards may tend to defeat Growth Management objectives for directing growth to existing developed areas. Traditional transportation level-of-service standards measuring capacity have focused on the speed of automobile movement. As a rule, traffic will be more congested and slower within higher density urban areas than in rural areas, making automobile-oriented uniform standards more difficult to meet in infill areas.
 2. Although roads may be more congested in urban areas, overall mobility may still be adequate where transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities meet some of the circulation needs. In addition, a greater level of roadway congestion and delay may be acceptable in close-in urban areas (where residents may face shorter trips for work or shopping).
 3. If Level of Service is reduced without preparing a master plan, however, then jurisdictions cannot require project mitigation costs associated with traffic.

- L. **Each Jurisdiction Should Re-Evaluate Its Parking Standards** for new housing and commercial projects to determine the appropriate parking ratios. In establishing the parking standards, provide flexibility in the ordinance that recognizes the site characteristics and land uses to determine an appropriate parking ratio.
1. Examples of Site Characteristics that Affect the Parking Needs:
 - Existing adjacent neighborhoods may be impacted unless adequate parking is provided
 - Merchants need to provide adequate parking for their auto-dependent customers
 - Residents of the proposed development want adequate parking for their vehicles, and for their guests
 - Too much parking, especially near transit, contributes to an under-utilization of land
 - Proximity to transit stations may reduce the need for automobile usage
 - Mixed use areas have more non-auto options.
 - Unrealistically high parking requirements can substantially increase the development costs of urban projects, especially where land costs necessitate structured parking. .
 2. Examples of Strategies to Meet Parking Needs:
 - Allow some credit for available on-street parking
 - Establish parking caps on neighborhood/community (not downtown) where land values are not sufficiently high to prevent poor land utilization
 - Cross-utilization of parking (joint use of parking spaces) – commercial by day, housing by night
 - Allow the market place to fix the problem – especially in heavily urbanized areas, allow some parking waivers
 - Consider parking assessment districts for commercial corridors, in-lieu of requiring each parcel to provide its own parking on-site

CHAPTER 5: FINANCIAL AND OTHER INCENTIVES FOR PRIORITY INFILL AND REURBANIZATION SITES

Issue: Infill development carries higher risks to developers relative to more conventional products in Greenfield areas. Without adequate parks, schools, sewer and water systems, street, traffic and parking improvements, etc., it is difficult to entice market-oriented developers to invest. In addition, deterioration of local service levels and infrastructure are the most common arguments adjacent residents make against new projects. Developers are often asked to bear the burden of replacing old or inadequate infrastructure for the surrounding community. Infill projects may be required to construct standard infrastructure (such as sidewalks, drainage, street sections, etc.) even when the surrounding development does not have standard infrastructure, resulting in

piecemeal improvements. And, the costs of installing facilities in infill areas may then actually exceed costs in outlying areas.

The risk of infill development can be reduced by provide incentives to targeted areas. Individual developers should not have to bear the sole responsibility for fixing the existing infrastructure deficiencies in a community. Public investment in backbone infrastructure is necessary to support the infill development.

- A. **Provide funding to Support Infill and Reurbanization**, including the development of Infill and Reurbanization Master Plans, infrastructure financing plans, and development guidelines, rezoning vacant inappropriately zoned properties, infrastructure upgrades & development, brownfield clean-up, and as a means of underwriting the costs of processing applications for variances for infill projects. With infill projects, there is uncertainty about the potential cost of infrastructure. As an example, the 65th Street Light Rail area plan conducted up-front analyses including engineering and financing and marketing studies, viability, etc.
- B. **Focus capital improvements for public infrastructure** on areas targeted for infill and redevelopment. These public investments would reduce development costs and costs of end-products, compared to current policies which generally require private investment in infrastructure. This approach provides the foundation for development by constructing the backbone infrastructure necessary to leverage private investment in housing products. Public policies should be designed to promote infill development slightly in advance of when the market is fully ripe.
- C. **Create a Housing Incentive Program** for specific transit corridors and stations. A Housing Incentive Program is a dedicated local funding source to provide incentives for infrastructure projects that meet higher density goals. (The San Francisco Bay Area Metropolitan Transportation Commission has established a Housing Incentive Program.)
- D. **Assist Communities in Establishing Improvement Districts:** Residential Assessment Districts and Commercial Business Improvement Districts can be utilized to finance area-wide infrastructure improvements (e.g., street lighting, drainage, etc.)
- E. **Promote Location Efficient Mortgages** that lower the qualifying incomes for purchase of a home, in recognition of the fact that transportation expenses for the household may be reduced by proximity to transit and places to walk. This permits a higher quality infill product by allowing a purchaser to qualify for higher cost housing.
- F. **Consider Development Impact Fees That Reflect the Actual Cost of Extending a Service to a Given Location** rather than on a less equitable average cost basis. Lower fees could be charged in close-in target infill areas which are less expensive to serve.
- G. **Reduce plan check fees** when utilizing a pre-approved house plan, recognizing the lower cost of reviewing these plans.
- H. **Waive or reduce infrastructure fees** (i.e., transportation impact fees) when infrastructure is already in place and adequate.
- I. **Explore Ways to Expand the SACOG Community Design Program:** These funds can be used to provide infrastructure necessary to attract private investment in development projects.

- J. **Leverage Funding:** Look for opportunities to leverage funding for projects that meet the goals of other agencies (such as SACOG) which have funding available for infill in its Community Design programs.

CHAPTER 6: TOXICS/BROWNFIELD CLEAN-UP

Issue: “Brownfields” problems—having to do with toxic contamination of previously used sites—are common in most older cities. Environmental contamination can be caused by industrial facilities, utility substations, paint shops, or leaky tanks at gas stations. At their worst, such problems require expensive cleanups and site restoration before development, making infill projects financially infeasible. Brownfield problems also raise litigation risks for developers, since under federal law, liability for these sites remains “strict, joint, and several”—meaning that any past or present owner of the site can be compelled to pay for cleanup.

- A. **Encourage Property Owners and Developers to Utilize the County’s Business Environmental Resources Commission (BERC)** for technical assistance in preparing brownfield sites for reurbanization. (www.SACBERC.org). BERC can provide assistance by:
- Acting as a neutral 3rd party to help resolve issues between the business community and regulatory agencies
 - Helping to obtain cleanup funding
- B. **Offer assistance to BERC staff** to map toxics problems throughout the countywide area. Local agencies should prioritize infill sites for clean-up and re-use.
- C. **Provide Low Interest Loans** to developers for site assessment and for toxic cleanup on key infill sites on the priority list.
- D. **Conduct Cleanup Activities Directly.** The use of local jurisdiction resources / assistance is especially warranted in cases where city groundwater is threatened, a property is severely blighted, or the reuse of the site would enhance “neighborhood completeness”.
- The Polanco Act allows redevelopment areas to clean-up contaminated properties and bill or create a lien on the property.
 - New legislation is needed that extends this practice to areas outside of formally established redevelopment areas.
 - In recent years a variety of programs has been put in place at state and federal levels to assist with brownfields cleanup. For example, the Brownfields National Partnership sponsored by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development and other agencies offers financial and technical assistance to agencies or developers doing brownfields cleanup. Also, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has funded cities to run pilot programs demonstrating creative brownfields solutions.

For additional resource information on Infill see the Collaborative Land Use Literature website:
<http://www.sactaqc.org/Resources/Literature/LU-Density.htm>

FUNDING

INTRODUCTION

In order to adequately address the long-term transportation and air quality needs of the Sacramento countywide area, additional revenues are needed.

- With respect to the transportation system, funding deficits are projected for construction, maintenance, and operation of every mode of transportation;
- With respect to air quality, significant new funding is required to achieve the new 8-hour ozone standard by 2018¹; and,
- Revenues are needed to implement the Land Use Agreements and Recommendations of this document, which are consistent with and supportive of SACOG's Blueprint Growth Principles.

Given the size of the revenue needs, the funds will have to come from multiple sources.

The focus of this funding agreement is twelve separate funding mechanisms/programs (tools) that form a "toolbox" to fund long-term transportation, air quality, and related programs in the Sacramento countywide area and the region.

- A key factor in defining the scope of the funding strategy is that the investment required for the transportation system could vary greatly depending on the kind and location of growth, as demonstrated by SACOG Blueprint studies.
- Inclusion of a specific tool within this toolkit does not necessarily represent unequivocal support amongst all participants in the Collaborative for that tool; however, all participants recognized that a combination of new funding streams will be necessary to close the gaps between available revenues and priority needs.
- Not every funding source is appropriate in every application. Some funding tools might be used multiple times in the years and decades to come, and others might not ever be needed or supported.
- Funding increases should be implemented in small phases and in the context of mechanisms that provide accountability in terms of implementation.
- These twelve mechanisms could be implemented on geographic scales ranging from a single neighborhood or commercial district to a multi-county area that would include the Sacramento countywide area.
- The tools in this toolbox are not an exhaustive list of all possible funding sources.
- Some of these sources are more likely to be practical in the near-term while others are more likely to be applied in the long-term.

¹ The exact level of need is not known at this time. See page 54.

List of Funding Tools

Public agencies and other interested parties should strongly consider the following tools when pursuing new revenues for priority programs and projects

Use Fuel Sales Tax Revenues for Transportation Purposes (Proposition 42)
Obtain a Greater Share of Federal & State Funding
Increase the DMV Air Quality Surcharge
Increase the Gas Tax for Local Transportation Improvements
Provide an Expanded Menu of Parcel-Based Assessment Programs
Implement an Additional Sales Tax Increment
Implement a Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Surcharge
Implement New Vehicle Weight Fees
Implement Tolling on New Facilities
Implement Parking Districts
Implement a Real Estate Title Transfer Fee
Implement a DMV Transportation Surcharge

Funding mechanisms have intended and unintended impacts other than simply providing sufficient revenues for priority programs. Funding mechanisms have impacts on individuals. Some more than others are typically considered “regressive” and have greater impacts on lower-

income users of the transportation system. Also, many funding mechanisms tend to influence the decisions of individuals by providing financial incentives and disincentives.

In reaching this agreement these considerations were acknowledged, but the purpose of this toolkit is to provide a series of funding mechanisms that should be considered by public agencies and other interested parties when pursuing new revenues for priority programs and projects.

FUNDING GOALS

The following goals are designed to produce an optimum funding strategy -- funding that is adequate, equitable and sustainable -- for the Sacramento countywide area.

- a. Recognition that the present level of transportation funding is insufficient to meet current needs.
- b. Increased efficiencies and accountability in all transportation and air quality programs.
- c. Generation of significant revenues – either from existing funding sources or new funding mechanisms – to fund priority programs, including air quality improvement and other non-transportation related elements.
- d. Generation of revenues from future transportation funding programs based as much as possible on system use – including roads - and promoting fairness in terms of who pays (e.g., the application of user fees that directly relate to the cost of providing service). In recognition of the disproportionate impact of costs to low-income residents, lifeline transit services, with acceptable productivity standards, are an exception to this funding goal.
- e. Recognition that transportation investments should lead to improvements both in the transportation system as well as the local communities where they occur. Improvements to local communities could include items such as economic development, mobility and/or air quality improvements.
- f. Where transportation pricing (e.g., tolling, vehicle miles traveled surcharge, parking charges, etc.) is applied in the future, consideration for using portions of the revenues for construction (e.g., including debt service), maintenance, operations, future expansion of the facility being priced, and mitigation measures identified during the CEQA process.
- g. Preservation and maintenance costs of the transportation system spread across existing and new system users; new development assuming costs of system expansion relative to its impact on the need for new facilities and services.

SUMMARY OF FUNDING TOOLKIT GOALS & RECOMMENDATIONS

Use Fuel Sales Tax Revenues for Transportation Purposes (Proposition 42)

Program Goal: Support increased restrictions on the ability to use funds derived from the use sales tax on gas for other than transportation purposes.

- Support a “smaller loophole” provision for the State Legislature and the Governor.

Obtain a Greater Share of Federal & State Funding

Program Goal: Pursue measures allowing the region to obtain a greater share of Federal and State funding to be used for high priority transportation, air quality, or land use projects.

- Develop a regional program that identifies priority projects for Federal discretionary funds while maintaining flexibility for local jurisdictions to continue their individual efforts to fund local projects.
- Develop regional support for a request to Federal legislators to increase the minimum guarantee of return on transportation funds to individual states to 95 percent.

Increase the DMV Air Quality Surcharge

Program Goal: Support an increase in the \$6 DMV air quality surcharge for Sacramento County to fund needed air quality measures as identified in the State Implementation Plan (SIP).

- Establish a sunset clause that acknowledges that revenues will decline over time as air quality attainment is reached.
- Collect through DMV fees for Sacramento County, and dedicate to air quality measure uses.
- Consider surcharge that varies, by type of vehicle, based on level of emissions.

Increase the Gas Tax for Local Transportation Improvements

Program Goal #1: Support local incremental increases in the State gas tax.

- Implement measures at either the countywide or multi-county level, allowing local control of expenditures, and support necessary State legislation.
- Implement increases in small 3 or 4-cent increments.
- Identify the programs and/or projects that will be funded by the increase via an expenditure plan.

Program Goal #2: Support mechanisms to adjust Federal and State gas tax levels to keep up with increasing program needs.

- Explore indexing and other alternatives that allow for the Federal and Statewide gas taxes to keep up with needs.

Provide an Expanded Menu of Parcel-Based Assessment Programs

Program Goal: Pursue expanded use of parcel-based assessments.

- Develop a menu-based system for businesses and residences to consider for a range of transportation programs/services including increased road maintenance, transit shuttles, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, etc.

Implement an Additional Sales Tax Increment

Program Goal: Pursue an increase in the local sales tax to be used for eligible projects and programs as identified in the expenditure plan.

- Develop a Sacramento countywide measure that would be part of a multi-county program.
- Develop a measure that would increase Sacramento County's sales tax by no more than ¼ cent.

Implement a Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Surcharge

Program Goal: Support implementation of a VMT surcharge on a statewide basis to be used for any eligible transportation, air quality or land use project or program identified in the expenditure plan.

- Collect through a DMV vehicle registration surcharge, at the pump, or by some other means.
- If the surcharge is applied through DMV registrations, consider a low fee (1 cent per mile annually, about \$100 for the first 10,000 miles traveled) that increases in a stepped fashion as mileage increases.
- Consider linking to an emissions surcharge.

Implement New Vehicle Weight Fees

Program Goal: Pursue new weight-based fees for vehicles.

- Develop a new fee for non-commercial vehicles initially.
- Develop an increase in the commercial weight fees at a later time.
- Use the revenues for road maintenance.

Implement Tolling on New Facilities

Program Goal: Support limited application of tolling and High Occupancy Toll (HOT) lanes, initially as pilot projects.

- Support adoption of a “Pricing First” policy in the region for new facilities.
- Provide alternative modes in the corridor so there is an option to the toll.
- Use funds to pay for facility construction/operation as well as the provision of alternative modes in the corridor.
- Facilities to consider for pricing include State highways, new routes, river crossings, and major arterials.

Implement Parking Districts²

Program Goal: Support limited application of parking districts, initially as pilot projects.

- Identify commercial districts that would provide enhanced transit and pedestrian facilities. Support reduced parking standards and implementation of parking charges initially for on-street parking and in public parking facilities.
- Use revenues to pay for parking facilities, pedestrian or bicycle facilities, street lighting, and enhanced transit service.

Implement a Real Estate Title Transfer Fee³

Program Goal: Pursue a real estate title transfer fee for transportation purposes including enhanced road maintenance.

- Develop a multi-county measure.
- Use the revenues for road maintenance.

Implement a DMV Transportation Surcharge

Program Goal: Support implementation of a DMV surcharge for transportation purposes.

- Support state legislation that would allow the Sacramento Transportation Authority to implement a per vehicle surcharge.

CONTEXT

² The term district refers to a geographic area that might have specific parking policies, not a legally created “special district.”

³ Real Estate Title Transfer Fees were considered a low priority in comparison to the other 11 funding sources.

Transportation revenues have historically lagged the growth in population, congestion, vehicle miles traveled and personal income in California. The relative purchasing power (i.e., the value when adjusted for inflation) of state gas tax revenues has actually declined since 1970. Only since the advent of local transportation sales taxes have statewide transportation revenues in California been above the 1970 purchasing level (i.e., about 20% above the 1970 level). From 1972 to 1996, real spending on roads and highways in the U.S. increased by approximately 28 percent. By comparison, the number of vehicle miles traveled in California has increased by 170% in relative terms since 1970. In 2001, 45 of the 50 states in the U.S. had higher gas tax revenues per capita than California (\$92.90 per capita annually).

- a. Many transportation funding programs have restrictions over their use, despite attempts to make these programs more flexible. For instance, the State Constitution prohibits the use of funds generated from the state gas tax for transit operations and maintenance.
- b. A large share of transportation funding now goes to operate and maintain the existing transportation system (i.e. road maintenance, transit operations and maintenance). SACOG's long-range plan calls for approximately half of the region's \$14.4 billion in transportation spending planned through the year 2025 to be used for the operation and maintenance of the existing system.

As a result of the decline in spending, significant maintenance backlogs or deficiencies for roadway, transit, pedestrian, bicycle, and ADA facilities have developed. Examples of the scale of the backlogs are provided below. These illustrations only begin to hint at the true backlogs, as they do not cover all transportation systems or all jurisdictions.

- a. There is a significant backlog in road maintenance that grows every year, as available funds do not meet the needs, according to local jurisdictions in the Sacramento countywide area. Based on Pavement Management Systems maintained by the local agencies, there is a current maintenance backlog of approximately \$300 million and an annual funding shortfall approaching \$100 million: over \$2 billion through the life of the MTP.
- b. There is a significant backlog in transit system preservation (i.e., replacement of the bus and light rail vehicle fleet, reconstruction of the light rail track, and rehabilitation of maintenance facilities) that grows every year as available funds fail to meet existing needs. Regional Transit estimates a funding shortfall of approximately \$115 million through 2015.
- c. Significant new funding is required to achieve the new 8-hour ozone standard by 2018.⁴
- d. The County of Sacramento's Draft Pedestrian Master Plan alone identifies nearly \$400 million in pedestrian infrastructure needs, and that is only for the unincorporated area.

⁴ The exact level of need is not known at this time. See page 54.

Again, these figures are intended to illustrate examples of the problem.

PROJECTED LEVEL OF REVENUE

The funding mechanisms with the highest revenue potential include:

- The use of all fuel sales tax revenue;LUues for transportation purposes (implementation of Prop. 42),
- An increase in the gas tax for local transportation improvements,
- An increase in the sales tax,
- Tolling on new facilities, and
- An increase in the DMV air quality surcharge.

The remaining funding mechanisms are expected to generate low to moderate levels of new revenues. A summary of each of the twelve funding programs is provided in the following table.

For mechanisms where it is proposed that new funds could be used for “transportation” projects, the intent is that the funds could be applied to a broad range of motorized and non-motorized programs (i.e., including eligible capital costs as well as operating and maintenance costs).

Summary of Funding Toolbox	
FUNDING MECHANISM	RANGE OF REVENUE GENERATED
<i>Support for On-Going Efforts and Initiatives</i>	
Use Fuel Sales Tax Revenues for Transportation Purposes (Proposition 42)	Greater than \$50 million annually
Obtain a Greater Share of Federal & State Funding	\$5-10 million annually
<i>Expansion of Existing Programs</i>	
Increase the DMV Air Quality Surcharge	\$20-50 million annually
Increase the Gas Tax for Local Transportation Improvements	Greater than \$50 million annually
Provided an Expanded Menu of Parcel-Based Assessment Programs	\$5-10 million annually
Implement an Additional Sales Tax Increment	Greater than \$50 million annually
<i>New Initiatives</i>	
Implement a Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Surcharge	\$1-10 million annually
Implement a new Vehicle Weight Fee	\$1-10 million annually
Implement Tolling on New Facilities	Greater than \$50 million annually
Implement Parking Districts	\$1-10 million annually
Implement a Real Estate Title Transfer Fee	\$1-10 million annually
Implement a DMV Transportation Surcharge	\$5-10 million annually

DISCUSSION OF FUNDING PROGRAMS

Additional details of each of the twelve funding programs are provided in a series of tables that provide a discussion organized around seven key characteristics.

- Illustrative Applications
- Proposed Use of Funds
- Revenue Potential
- Pros & Cons
- Implementation Issues
- Equity Issues
- Geographic Issues

For mechanisms where it is proposed that new funds could be used for “transportation” projects, the intent is that the funds could be applied to a broad range of motorized and non-motorized programs, including eligible capital, operating, and maintenance costs.

Use Fuel Sale Tax Revenues for Transportation Purposes (Proposition 42)

ILLUSTRATIVE APPLICATIONS	All revenue derived from gasoline and diesel fuel sales tax revenues should be allocated for specified transportation purposes, including highways, streets and roads, and transit improvements, as directed by the voters when they passed Proposition 42 in 2002.
PROPOSED USE OF FUNDS	Proposition 42 required, effective July 1, 2003, existing revenues resulting from state sales and use taxes on the sale of motor vehicle fuel be used for transportation purposes as provided by law (i.e., for projects listed in the Transportation Congestion Relief Plan) until June 30, 2008. It required, effective July 1, 2008, that existing revenues resulting from state sales and use taxes be used for public transit and mass transportation; city and county street and road repairs and improvements; and state highway improvements.
REVENUE POTENTIAL	<p>The Legislative Analyst projected that Proposition 42, starting in 2008-09, would generate about \$1.4 billion in gasoline sales tax revenues statewide, increasing annually thereafter.</p> <p>As such, this program is estimated to generate more than \$50 million annually in new funds for agencies in the Sacramento countywide area.</p>
PROS & CONS	<p>Pros</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This funding source generates a high level of revenue. ▪ Gasoline and diesel fuel sales taxes are effectively a transportation user fee. <p>Cons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Further restrictions on the “loophole” provision in Proposition 42 will limit the flexibility of the State Legislature and Governor in developing future budgets, which could reduce funding for health, education and welfare programs.
IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES	The State Legislature and Governor are considering placing an initiative on the ballot that would place further restrictions on the “loophole” provision in Proposition 42 that allows for the revenues to be used for General Fund purposes when a fiscal emergency is declared.
EQUITY ISSUES	This program could result in reduced funding for health, education and welfare programs.
GEOGRAPHIC ISSUES	This program would be applied on a statewide basis.

Obtain a Greater Share of Federal & State Funding

<p>ILLUSTRATIVE APPLICATIONS</p>	<p>Support implementation of a multi-year priority list of projects, by SACOG, to foster the development of consensus by local jurisdictions. This document would form the basis for requests to obtain federal and state funds while maintaining flexibility for local jurisdictions to continue their individual efforts to fund local projects.</p> <p>Currently, federal legislation requires that individual states receive a minimum return of 90.5 percent of funds generated from the federal fuel tax in their state. California has been a “donor” state when it comes to federal highway funds for many years. Congress has considered increasing the minimum return rate to 95 percent. Recent federal legislation (Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users, or SAFETEA-LU) provides for an increase in the minimum return rate to 92 percent for fiscal years 2008 and 2009.</p>
<p>PROPOSED USE OF FUNDS</p>	<p>The additional funds generated by the development of a regional multi-year priority list would be used for additional projects that are eligible.</p> <p>Additional funds generated by an increase in the federal minimum return rate would be used for any eligible transportation, air quality or land use project or program.</p>
<p>REVENUE POTENTIAL</p>	<p>Federal funds contribute approximately \$2.6 billion annually to the state’s transportation program. An increase in the federal minimum return rate would generate an additional \$130 million in revenue statewide.</p> <p>As such, this program is estimated to generate in the range of \$5 to \$10 million annually in new funds for agencies in the Sacramento countywide area.</p>
<p>PROS & CONS</p>	<p>Pros</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Enhanced regional cooperation in the process of seeking federal and state funds can result in an increase in the level of discretionary funding that is awarded to the region. <p>Cons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ None
<p>IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES</p>	<p>Implementation of an increase in the federal minimum return rate would require the passage of federal legislation.</p> <p>Implementation of a multi-year priority list of projects for the region would require approval by the SACOG Board.</p>
<p>EQUITY ISSUES</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>GEOGRAPHIC ISSUES</p>	<p>The increase in the minimum return rate would be applied on a national basis and the multi-year priority plan on a regional basis.</p>

Increase the DMV Air Quality Surcharge

ILLUSTRATIVE APPLICATIONS	This program would increase the existing \$6 per auto surcharge paid annually as part of vehicle registrations in Sacramento County, to fund needed air quality measures as identified in the State Implementation Plan.
PROPOSED USE OF FUNDS	The funds generated through this program would be used exclusively to implement air quality measures required to meet the federal air quality attainment standards.
REVENUE POTENTIAL	<p>Every dollar increase in the surcharge generates approximately \$1 million annually in revenue for the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District. An increase in the range of \$20 to \$50 annually is anticipated to achieve the clean air standards. This range of potential increase is illustrative. It was calculated based upon the range of funding that might be needed to fully fund attainment of the 8-hour ozone standard using only voluntary, incentive-based measures. This illustration is not based upon a specific proposal by any individual or organization.</p> <p>As such, this program is estimated to generate in the range of \$20 to \$50 million annually in new funds for the Air District.</p>
PROS & CONS	<p>Pros</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The DMV surcharge is the only current program, other than Measure A, that generates significant revenue for the Air District <p>Cons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increases in the DMV air quality surcharge are expected to be challenging.
IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES	Implementation of an increase in the DMV air quality surcharge would require the passage of state legislation.
EQUITY ISSUES	This program would increase the cost of auto operating costs for low-income persons.
GEOGRAPHIC ISSUES	This program would be applied on a countywide basis.

Increase the Gas Tax for Local Transportation Improvements

ILLUSTRATIVE APPLICATIONS	<p>A regional or sub-regional (i.e., multi-county) program would be implemented that would place small 3 or 4 cent incremental increases in the gas tax before the voters for a defined expenditure plan. Revenues generated by the gas tax increment would be controlled locally a multi-jurisdictional body.</p> <p>Support mechanisms to adjust federal and state gas tax levels to keep up with increasing program needs. This could include some form of indexing or other mechanisms.</p>
PROPOSED USE OF FUNDS	<p>Additional funds generated by an increase in the gas tax would be used for any eligible transportation project or program identified in the expenditure plan.</p>
REVENUE POTENTIAL	<p>Every 5-cent increase in the gas tax generates approximately \$25 million annually in revenue for the Sacramento countywide area.</p> <p>As such, several incremental increases in the gas tax are estimated to generate more than \$50 million annually for agencies in the Sacramento countywide area.</p>
PROS & CONS	<p>Pros</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This funding source generates a high level of revenue. ▪ The gas tax is a transportation user fee. <p>Cons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increases in the gas tax have become increasing difficult in California over the past three decades. A statewide increase has not occurred in 15 years.
IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES	<p>Implementation of an additional increment of the gas tax, on a regional basis, would require the passage of state legislation. In order to use funds generated by an increase in the gas tax for such purposes as transit operations and maintenance, the prohibition against such uses in the State Constitution would have to be addressed.</p> <p>Implementation of mechanisms to adjust federal and state gas tax levels to keep up with increasing program needs would require the passage of federal or state legislation.</p>
EQUITY ISSUES	<p>This program would increase the cost of auto operating costs for low-income persons.</p>
GEOGRAPHIC ISSUES	<p>The local gas tax increase would be applied on a multi-county basis.</p> <p>The adjustments to the federal and state gas tax would be applied on a federal or state level.</p>

Provide an Expanded Menu of Parcel-Based Assessment Programs

ILLUSTRATIVE APPLICATIONS	This program would develop a menu-based system for businesses and residences to raise revenues through a range of parcel-based assessment mechanisms to fund a range of local transportation programs and services.
PROPOSED USE OF FUNDS	Additional funds generated by parcel-based assessments would be used for specific programs identified by property owners that could include improved road maintenance, transit shuttles, pedestrian and bicycle facilities.
REVENUE POTENTIAL	<p>The level of funding currently generated through parcel-based assessment ranges from relatively small amounts for local assessment or improvement districts to large amounts generated by Community Facility Districts that finance capital projects for new development.</p> <p>This program is estimated to generate in the range of \$5 to \$10 million annually in new funds for agencies in the Sacramento countywide area.</p>
PROS & CONS	<p>Pros</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Parcel-based assessments are a proven mechanism for raising funds on a local basis for capital improvements and ongoing programs. ▪ Funds generated by this program would be specified in the plan that is voted on by property owners. <p>Cons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Parcel-based assessments are not a transportation user fee.
IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES	Implementation of parcel-based assessments requires a vote of the property owners in the district.
EQUITY ISSUES	Flat fees can be considered regressive.
GEOGRAPHIC ISSUES	This program would be applied on a neighborhood or commercial district level.

Implement an Additional Sales Tax Increment

ILLUSTRATIVE APPLICATIONS	This program would raise the sales tax on a multi-county basis to fund a range of local transportation programs and services. Another approach is increasing the ¼ cent state sales tax (i.e., TDA funds) that is presently allocated for transit purposes.
PROPOSED USE OF FUNDS	Additional funds generated by an increase in the sales tax would be used for any eligible transportation, air quality or land use project or program identified in the expenditure plan.
POTENTIAL	A ¼ cent increase in the sales tax is estimated to generate approximately \$50 million annually in revenue for the Sacramento countywide area.
PROS & CONS	<p>Pros</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sales tax programs are a proven mechanism for raising funds on a local basis for capital improvements and ongoing programs. ▪ Funds generated by this program would be specified in an expenditure plan that is decided by the voters. ▪ Sales tax programs are one of the few revenue sources that can be used to fund increased transit service. <p>Cons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The sales tax mechanism is not a transportation user fee.
IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES	Implementation of a sale tax increase requires a 2/3 vote of residents in multiple counties if the funds are dedicated to transportation (i.e., a special tax) or a 50% vote threshold if the use is not explicitly designated (i.e., a general tax). Implementation of an increase in the ¼ cent sales tax (i.e., TDA funds) would require the passage of state legislation.
EQUITY ISSUES	Equity issues have been raised about the long-term use of the general sales tax as a revenue mechanism for transportation purposes.
GEOGRAPHIC ISSUES	<p>The sales tax program would be applied on a multi-county basis.</p> <p>An increase in the ¼ cent state sales tax (i.e., TDA funds) would be done on a statewide basis. State legislation is being considered that would allow an increase of this tax on a countywide level based on a local vote.</p>

Implement a Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Surcharge

ILLUSTRATIVE APPLICATIONS	This program would institute a VMT surcharge that could be collected through the DMV, at the pump, or some other means. This program could be merged with an emissions fee program that would provide reduced fees for low emission vehicles.
PROPOSED USE OF FUNDS	Additional funds generated by a VMT surcharge would be used for any eligible transportation, air quality or land use project or program.
REVENUE POTENTIAL	<p>It is difficult to project what level of additional revenue would be generated by a VMT surcharge, as it would be dependent upon whether the program is designed to be revenue-neutral (i.e., would generate no additional revenue) or would provide for some increase in revenue over time.</p> <p>Initially, it is anticipated that a VMT surcharge would allow for a modest increase in revenues and generate approximately \$1 to \$10 million annually for agencies in the Sacramento countywide area.</p>
PROS & CONS	<p>Pros</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The VMT surcharge is a transportation user fee. ▪ The VMT surcharge is a pricing mechanism that would have an impact on the level of travel. <p>Cons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Passage of state legislation to authorize a VMT surcharge is expected to be challenging.
IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES	<p>Implementation of a VMT surcharge would require the passage of state legislation.</p> <p>If applied through DMV registrations, consider a low fee (1 cent per mile per year, \$100 for the first 10,000 miles traveled) that increases in a stepped fashion as mileage increases.</p>
EQUITY ISSUES	Equity issues have been raised about the use of the VMT surcharge as a revenue mechanism for transportation purposes.
GEOGRAPHIC ISSUES	This program would be applied on a statewide basis.

Implement New Vehicle Weight Fees

ILLUSTRATIVE APPLICATIONS	<p>This program would institute a new weight-based fee for vehicles, with higher fees for higher weight vehicles. This fee could be collected through the DMV, at the pump, or some other means.</p> <p>Initially, a new fee would be applied to non-commercial vehicles. Increases in existing weight fees for commercial vehicles would occur at a later time.</p>
PROPOSED USE OF FUNDS	<p>Additional funds generated by a weight fee for vehicles would be used for road maintenance.</p>
REVENUE POTENTIAL	<p>It is difficult to project what level of additional revenue would be generated by a weight fee for vehicles, as it would be dependent on the level of fees that would be approved by the legislature.</p> <p>Initially, it is anticipated that a weight fee for vehicles would allow for a modest increase in revenues and generate approximately \$1 to \$10 million annually for agencies in the Sacramento countywide area.</p>
PROS & CONS	<p>Pros</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Implementation of this funding mechanism may discourage the purchase of larger vehicles with lower mileage ratings, thereby resulting in lower overall fuel consumption and reduced auto emissions. <p>Cons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Passage of state legislation to authorize a weight fee for vehicles is expected to be challenging.
IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES	<p>Implementation of a weight fee for vehicles would require the passage of state legislation.</p>
EQUITY ISSUES	<p>None</p>
GEOGRAPHIC ISSUES	<p>This program would be applied on a statewide basis.</p>

Implement Tolling on New Facilities

<p>ILLUSTRATIVE APPLICATIONS</p>	<p>This program would institute tolls on major new facilities either in the form of fully tolled lanes or high-occupancy-toll (HOT) lanes.</p> <p>Examples of new facilities where tolling could be considered in the region include the Connector Project and Placer Parkway. HOT lanes could be considered for planned HOV lane facilities such as the I-80 from Davis across the Yolo Causeway.</p>
<p>PROPOSED USE OF FUNDS</p>	<p>Additional funds generated by tolls could be used for the capital, operating and/or maintenance costs for the new facility; the provision of alternative transit service in the corridor; and/or mitigation measures identified in a California Environmental Quality Act document.</p>
<p>REVENUE POTENTIAL</p>	<p>Tolls have generated significant revenues when applied in appropriate corridors in the U.S.</p> <p>It is anticipated that tolls, if applied on several facilities, would generate more than \$50 million annually for agencies in the Sacramento countywide area.</p>
<p>PROS & CONS</p>	<p>Pros</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This funding source generates a high level of revenue. ▪ Tolls are a transportation user fee. ▪ Tolls are a pricing mechanism that would have an impact on the level of travel. ▪ Tolls capture revenues from “through trips” generated by interstate trucks, tourists, and other non-local travelers on the highway system. <p>Cons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Obtaining support to implement tolling is expected to be challenging.
<p>IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES</p>	<p>Implementation of tolling would require the passage of state legislation.</p>
<p>EQUITY ISSUES</p>	<p>Equity issues have been raised about the use of tolls as a revenue mechanism for transportation purposes. The use of toll revenues for the provision of alternative transit service in the corridor has addressed some of these issues.</p>
<p>GEOGRAPHIC ISSUES</p>	<p>This program would be applied on a multi-county basis.</p>

Implement Parking Districts⁵

ILLUSTRATIVE APPLICATIONS	This program would provide for a limited application of parking districts, initially as pilot projects. The commercial districts would provide enhanced transit and pedestrian facilities, reduced parking standards, and the implementation of parking charges initially for on-street parking and in public parking facilities.
PROPOSED USE OF FUNDS	Additional funds generated by parking charges would be used to pay for parking facilities, pedestrian or bicycle facilities, street lighting, and enhanced transit service.
REVENUE POTENTIAL	<p>It is difficult to project what level of additional revenue would be generated by parking charges, as it would be dependent on the level of fees that were established.</p> <p>Initially, it is anticipated that parking charges would allow for a modest increase in revenues and generate approximately \$1 to \$10 million annually for agencies in the Sacramento countywide area.</p>
PROS & CONS	<p>Pros</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Parking charges are a transportation user fee. ▪ Parking charges are a pricing mechanism that would have an impact on the level of travel. ▪ Reduce the impact to on-street parking that occurs when long-term parkers move their cars every two hours. <p>Cons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Obtaining support to implement parking charges is expected to be challenging.
IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES	Implementation of a parking district would require approval by the local City Council.
EQUITY ISSUES	None
GEOGRAPHIC ISSUES	This program would be applied on a local basis.

⁵ The term district refers to a geographic area that might have specific parking policies, not a legally created “special district.”

Implement a Real Estate Title Transfer Fee

ILLUSTRATIVE APPLICATIONS	This program would institute a real estate title transfer fee for transportation purposes including road maintenance. It should be considered on a multi-county basis.
PROPOSED USE OF FUNDS	Additional funds generated by a real estate title transfer fee would be used for any eligible transportation project or program including enhanced road maintenance.
REVENUE POTENTIAL	<p>It is difficult to project what level of additional revenue would be generated by a real estate title transfer fee, as it would be dependent on the level of fees that were established.</p> <p>Initially, it is anticipated that these fees would allow for a modest increase in revenues and generate approximately \$1 to \$10 million annually for agencies in the Sacramento countywide area.</p>
PROS & CONS	<p>Pros</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Although not used previously for transportation purposes, real estate title transfer fees are a proven mechanism for raising funds on a local basis. <p>Cons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The real estate title transfer fee is not a transportation user fee. ▪ Obtaining support to implement parking charges is expected to be challenging.
IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES	Implementation of a real estate title transfer fee for transportation purposes would have to be approved by each local Board of Supervisors and City Council.
EQUITY ISSUES	None
GEOGRAPHIC ISSUES	This program would be applied on a multi-county basis.

Implement a DMV Transportation Surcharge

ILLUSTRATIVE APPLICATIONS	This program would implement a new per auto surcharge paid annually through the DMV for transportation measures in Sacramento County.
PROPOSED USE OF FUNDS	The funds generated through this program would be used for any eligible transportation project or program.
REVENUE POTENTIAL	<p>Every dollar increase in the surcharge generates approximately \$1 million annually in revenue.</p> <p>As such, for a \$5 increase, this program is estimated to generate approximately \$5 million annually in new funds.</p>
PROS & CONS	<p>Pros</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The DMV surcharge is a transportation user fee. <p>Cons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Implementation of a new DMV surcharge is expected to be challenging.
IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES	Implementation of an increase in the DMV surcharge would require the passage of state legislation.
EQUITY ISSUES	This program would increase auto operating costs for low-income persons.
GEOGRAPHIC ISSUES	This program would be applied on a countywide basis.

FUNDING NEEDS FOR AIR QUALITY PROGRAMS

Attaining the 8-Hour Ozone Standard

Technology in and of itself will not allow this region to reach attainment of the health-based 8-hour air quality standard by the designated attainment date. In addition to technological advances, attaining, and maintaining, air quality standards will require four areas of emphasis:

- Incentive-based voluntary programs that require significant subsidy;
- Regulatory programs;
- Provision of more transportation choices; and,
- Public awareness including providing information to support informed choices.

This 4-pronged approach applies not only to achieving the 8-hour ozone standard, but other future standards that might be developed for ozone or other pollutants.

The Collaborative agrees that significant new funding is required to achieve the new 8-hour ozone standard by 2018. The exact level of need is not known at this time⁶. This funding deficit is based upon agreement that the following key elements represent the necessary strategy for achieving the 8-hour standard:

- The focus must be on strategies which reduce overall vehicle emissions;
- The plan for attainment must rely heavily on voluntary, incentive-based measures;
- The amount of funding required to reach attainment of air quality standards may vary depending on the kind and location of growth;
- Funding for air quality improvements should continue to be allocated to implementing the most cost-effective measures;
- Periodic review of progress towards attainment, and review of rules, strategies, and programs, with mid-course adjustments being made if necessary, to ensure that attainment is achieved as quickly and as cost effectively as possible.

Public Awareness Measures

Public awareness of the current air quality challenges, and impacts to public health, must be maintained at a high level. Choices for individual action represent a necessary, cost-effective compliment to other air quality improvement strategies. The following public awareness and

⁶ The Sacramento Air Quality Management District currently administers a voluntary, incentive-based program to reduce NOx emissions. Based on the cost-per-ton of NOx emission reductions under the current voluntary, incentive-based programs, and assuming today's conditions would continue, the Air District estimates that it would cost between \$100 million and \$300 million to reduce NOx emissions by 16 daily tons and between \$400 million and \$600 million to reduce NOx emissions by 24 daily tons. The Collaborative did not analyze or fully discuss these numbers.

information programs are relatively inexpensive, and cost effective, when compared to the costs of providing incentives, and the public and private costs of regulation.

- The Spare the Air Program is an effective public communication tool that should be funded and enhanced. An important component of the Spare the Air Program is encouraging employers to provide employees with incentives to use public transit services and/or “work at home” on Spare the Air days.
- Expanding the availability of real time traffic information, and improving tools to access it, is strongly supported.

This page left blank intentionally

Project Staff

Cheryl Creson, Director 2001-2003

Matt Boyer, Director 2004-2005

Scot Mende, Deputy Director

Katie Eastham, Project Staff

Bonnie Feldman, Executive Secretary 2001-2003

Shelly Cristiani, Executive Secretary 2003-2004

Consultants

Steve Brown, Fehr & Peers Associates, Inc.

Bob Grandy, Fehr & Peers Associates, Inc.

Tom Hutchings, Consultant

John Long, DKS Associates

Susan Sherry, Center for Collaborative Policy, Sacramento State

Sue Woods, Center for Collaborative Policy, Sacramento State