HEATHER FARGO
Mayor
RAY TRETHEWAY
LAUREN HAMMOND
Council District 1
SANDY SHEEDY
Council District 5
KEVIN McCARTY
Council District 2
Council District 6
STEVE COHN
ROBBIE WATERS
Council District 3
ROBERT KING FONG
Council District 4
BONNIE PANNELL
Council District 8

RAY KERRIDGE<br>Interim City Manager<br>MARTY HANNEMAN<br>Assistant City Manager<br>CASSANDRA JENNINGS<br>Assistant City Manager<br>GUS VINA Assistant City Manager

## COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

WILLIAM DEAN
Council District 1
VACANT
Council District 2
D. ARON LIVINGSTON

Council District 3
JOHN S. HENRIKSON
Council District 4

VACANT
Mayoral Appointee
BEVERLY TAYLOR
Sacramento Area
Bicycle Advocates
MICHAEL FAUST
American Lung Association
VACANT
Council District 8

Prepared by
FRAN HALBAKKEN
Interim Director
Department of Transportation

## TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP

JD BAMFIELD
HECTOR BARRON
KATE BINNING
PAUL BLUMBERG
ED COX
DAVID CULLIVAN
ANGIE LOUIE FONG
ANIS GOBRIL

RITE GOOLKASIAN
FEDOLIA HARRIS
SAED HASAN
KEVIN LOVE
CHERISSE KNAPP
RYAN MOORE
CHRIS PAHULE

DEAN PECKHAM
WANDA POWERS
CAROL SHEARLY
SALAM SHEHADEH
NICHOLAS THEOCHARIDES
SCOTT TOBEY
SUZAN TOBIN JERRY WAY
Introduction ..... i
Major Street Improvements Program ..... A-1
Major Street Projects: Table A-1 ..... A-7
Major Street Projects Description: Table A-2 ..... A-8
Major Street Projects Map: Figure A-1 ..... A-12
Street Maintenance Program ..... B-1
Non-Residential Street Resurfacing: Table B-1 ..... B-5
Residential Street Resurfacing: Table B-2 ..... B-6
Street Reconstruction Program ..... C-1
Street Reconstruction Projects: Table C-1 ..... C-4
Street Reconstruction Projects Map: Figure C-1 ..... C-6
Traffic Signals Program ..... D-1
Traffic Signals Projects: Table D-1 ..... D-9
Traffic Signal Projects Map: Figure D-1 ..... D-11
Alternate Modes Program ..... E-1
On-Street Bikeways Projects: Table E-1 ..... E-11
Off-Street Bikeways Projects: Table E-2 ..... E-13
Bike/Ped Bridge Projects: Table E-3 ..... E-15
On-Street Bikeways Projects Map: Figure E-1 ..... E-18
Off-Street Bikeways Projects Map: Figure E-2 ..... E-19
Bike/Ped Bridge Projects Map: Figure E-3 ..... E-20
Bridge Replacement \& Rehabilitation Program ..... F-1
Bridge Replacement \& Rehabilitation Projects: Table F-1 ..... F-6
Bridge Replacement \& Rehabilitation Projects Map: Figure F-1 ..... F-8
Streetscape Enhancement Program ..... G-1
Commercial Corridor Projects: Table G-1 ..... G-9
Other Corridor Projects: Table G-2 ..... G-10
Commercial Corridor Projects Map: Figure G-1 ..... G-11
Other Corridor Projects Map: Figure G-2 ..... G-12
Sidewalks to Schools Program ..... H-1
Sidewalks to Schools Projects: Table H-1 ..... H-4
Sidewalks to Schools Projects Map: Figure H-1 ..... H-7
Speed Humps ..... I-1
Speed Humps: Table I-1 ..... I-6
Speed Humps Map: Figure I-1 ..... I-15
Train Horn Quiet Zones ..... J-1
Train Horn Quiet Zones: Table J-1 ..... J-3

## PAGE \#'S

Train Horn Quiet Zones Map ..... J-5
Development Driven Introduction. ..... K-1
Jacinto Creek Planning Area ..... K-2
Jacinto Creek Planning Area: Table K-1 ..... K-3
Jacinto Creek Planning Area: Table K-2 ..... K4
Jacinto Creek Planning Area Map: Figure K-1 ..... K-5
North Natomas ..... L-1
North Natomas Map: Figure L-1 ..... L-1
North Natomas: Table L-1 ..... L-2
North Natomas: Table L-2 ..... L-3
Richards Boulevard/Railyard Area ..... M-1
Richards Boulevard/Railyard Area: Table M-1 ..... M-2
Richards Boulevard/Railyard Area: Table M-2 ..... M-2
Richards Boulevard/Railyard Area: Table M-3 ..... M-3
Richards Boulevard/Railyard Area: Table M-4 ..... M-4
Granite Regional Park ..... $\mathrm{N}-1$
Granite Regional Park: Table N-1 ..... $\mathrm{N}-2$
Granite Regional Park Map: Figure N-1 ..... N-3
South Natomas ..... O-1
South Natomas: Table O-1 ..... O-2
South Natomas Map: Figure O-1 ..... O-3
Delta Shores ..... P-1
Delta Shores Map: Figure P-1 ..... P-1

## INTRODUCTION

## BACKGROUND

The Transportation Programming Guide (TPG) is a comprehensive document that prioritizes the City of Sacramento's transportation programs and projects. Ten transportation program areas are identified:

- Major Street Improvements
- Street Maintenance
- Street Reconstruction
- Traffic Signals
- Alternate Modes
- Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation
- Streetscape Enhancement
- Sidewalks to Schools
- Speed Humps
- Train Horn Quiet Zones (added this year)

The Transportation Programming Guide also summarizes development driven projects in the following areas:

- Jacinto Creek Planning Area
- North Natomas
- Richards Boulevard/Railyard Area
- Granite Regional Park
- South Natomas
- Delta Shores (added this year)

Although projects are prioritized within the nine program areas, this document is a guide identifying the relative transportation merit of the individual projects evaluated. It may occasionally be appropriate to take projects out of order because of funding source availability, project feasibility or deliverability, physical constraints, and/or partnerships with other agencies or groups.

## CITY AND COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP

During development of the Year 2006 Transportation Programming Guide, City staff worked with a Council-appointed Community Advisory Committee. This committee was comprised of members who represent:

- The Mayor
- Each of the Councilmembers
- The Sacramento Area Bicycle Advocates; and
- The American Lung Association

City staff also conducted an outreach program, which intended to maximize the opportunity for
community input throughout the development of the Transportation Programming Guide. The outreach process was comprised of several tasks that are listed below:

- Meeting with Councilmembers: These meetings provided for the opportunity for Councilmembers to provide input, review draft deliverables, and hear highlights of input received from the community.
- Interactive Website: The Transportation Programming Guide web page was frequently updated to allow input from the community and to provide draft deliverables for public review.
- Press Announcements: Press announcements were used to announce the kickoff of the Transportation Programming Guide, availability of deliverables and review periods, and meeting dates.
- Presentations to BAC \& Planning Commission: Presentations were given to the Bicycle Advisory Committee and the Planning Commission for input.
- Presentations/Announcements to Neighborhood Service Area (NSA) Leadership Meetings: With the assistance of the NSA directors, presentations were given to the NSA Leadership. Announcements were made at these meetings regarding availability of deliverables and review periods and meetings dates.
- Public Open House: A public open house was held early in the process in June, 2005. The purpose of the open houss was to educate the public on the TPG and solicit input from the community.


## DEVELOPMENT OF THE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMMING GUIDE

City staff, working with the Community Advisory Committee and incorporating input received through the outreach program, made some minor modifications to the previous years' criteria. The criteria modifications were approved by the City Council on August 23, 2005.

The Train Horn Quiet Zone Program is a new section that is added to this year's Transportation Programming Guide. This section prioritizes railroad crossings where improvements are needed in order to apply to the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) for a "Quiet Zone". A "Quiet Zone" is an area where locomotive horns would not be routinely sounded. The Train Horn Quiet Zone Program of the Transportation Programming Guide was approved by City Council on August 23, 2005.

Project ideas were solicited from Mayor and City Council, the Planning Commission, City staff, Community Advisory Committee, the general public, City Manager's Office and Neighborhood Services. Staff screened project suggestions for eligibility and applied the Council-approved criteria to score and rank eligible projects. The scored and ranked project lists were reviewed by City staff and the Community Advisory Committee to ensure that the criteria were applied correctly. The scored and ranked lists were approved by City Council on November 1, 2005.

## MAJOR STREET IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM

## INTRODUCTION

The City of Sacramento's Major Streets carry the majority of City traffic. These streets include:
Expressways: Expressways are designed for relatively long distance through movement. They have limited access with few cross streets. All cross street intersections are signalized. Residential driveways are prohibited, but limited non-residential driveways are allowed based upon driveway spacing. Expressways have moderate to high speeds with moderate to high volumes on eight or less travel lanes.

Arterials: $\quad$ The arterial street system is used to provide a high level of mobility for travel through the region and within and between adjacent sub-areas of the city. The arterial streets have moderate speeds with moderate to high volumes on six or less travel lanes. Six lane arterials, (major arterials), provide intra-city transportation and inter-region transportation for large volumes of vehicles while providing access to abutting properties. Four lane arterials, (minor arterials), connect major facilities, but provide more access than a six lane arterial. Principal land-uses served by arterials are central business districts, community shopping centers, community colleges, large industrial plants, high schools, large office complexes, community hospitals, clinics, golf courses, and fire stations.

Collectors: The collector system is deployed throughout the entire city to provide mobility between neighborhoods or from neighborhoods to the arterial system. An adequate collector system is needed to ensure these localized movements do not occur on principal routes or major arterials. Land is directly accessible with emphasis on collection and distribution trips within an arterial grid. Collector streets have low speeds, low to moderate volumes on two or three lanes. Principal land-uses served are elementary schools, smaller industries and warehouse facilities, neighborhood shopping centers, small office buildings including clinics, neighborhood parks residential uses, and community service uses.

Major Street projects generally have a minimum construction cost of $\$ 1$ million and represent projects of regional transportation significance. Typical Major Street Improvement Program projects include:

- Roadway Widening
- Extensions/Connections
- Grade Separations
- Interchange/Intersection Construction or Modification

These improvements are planned to close gaps in the City's circulation network, relieve congestion, improve safety, and/or provide for the efficient movement of people, services, and goods.

## GOALS AND POLICIES

The Major Street Improvements Program is consistent with the following City of Sacramento General Plan (adopted January 19, 1988, reflects City Council Amendments through September 2000) goals and policies:

## Goals:

1. Create a street system which will ensure the safe and efficient movement of people and goods within and through communities, and to other areas in the City and region.

## Policy:

- Explore actions which allow for the prioritization, planning, and construction of new facilities.

2. Create and maintain a street system that protects residential neighborhoods from unnecessary levels of traffic.

## Policy:

- Continue, wherever possible, to design streets and to approve development application in such a manner as to eliminate high traffic flows and parking problems within residential neighborhoods.

3. Work toward achieving an overall Level of Service $C^{1}$ on the City's local and major street system.

## Policies:

- Work toward the most efficient use of the City's existing street system.
- Explore alternative transportation modes that will lead to a decrease in demand of the City's surface street system.

4. Increase the capacity of the transportation system.

## Policy:

- Support programs that improve traffic flow.
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## PROJECT LIST DEVELOPMENT

## Eligibility Criteria

Projects on Major Streets are considered if they support the previously identified goals, and one or more of the following conditions exist:

Roadway Widening:

Extensions/Connections:

Grade Separations:

Interchange Construction:

Interchange Modification:

If the existing volume on a street exceeds $80 \%$ of the street's capacity (i.e., the Level of Service is below C), lanes are of substandard width, or widening is needed to serve anticipated development.

If extending a major street or connecting two major streets will close a gap, improve traffic circulation, or relieve congestion on other streets that have a service level below C (i.e., LOS D, E, or F).

If the existing service level is below C , or there are problems with conflicts between vehicular traffic and/or rail traffic.

If an interchange is needed to serve development or to relieve congestion at a nearby interchange with an existing service level below C.

If the existing service level at the over-crossing, at the ramp intersections, or on the ramps is below C , or if a partial interchange exists and the modification will upgrade it to a full interchange.

## Project Identification

A total of forty projects were evaluated in the Major Street section. The majority of the projects were previously identified in the 2005 TPG:

| Type of Major Street Improvement | Number of Projects |
| :--- | :---: |
| Roadway Widening | 19 |
| Extension/Connection | 7 |
| Grade Separation | 0 |
| Interchange Construction/Modification | 9 |
| Extension and Interchange Construction/Modification | 2 |
| Other | 3 |

## PROJECT RANKING PROCESS

Eligible projects are scored and ranked using nine criteria: Congestion, Public Safety, Economic Development, Infill Development, Cost (to the City), Deliverability/Readiness, Volume, Gap Closure, and Alternative Modes. If the roadway segment or intersection has not yet been built, then the criteria are applied to the facility that will receive the most benefit from the project. The maximum possible score is 100 points, which are assigned for the nine criteria as described below.

## 1. Congestion

(Max. Points: 20)
Existing and future (Year 2025) congestion are determined for each project by calculating the volume to capacity ratio (V/C), which is the ratio of the average daily traffic (ADT) to the theoretical maximum ADT the facility can carry. The ratios are then compared to the highest V/C of all the Major Street projects being evaluated, as follows:

Existing V/C of Project
Highest Existing V/C of Projects Considered
Year 2025 V/C of Project
Highest Year 2025 V/C of Projects Considered

## 2. Public Safety

X $12=$ $\qquad$

X $8=$ $\qquad$

The accident rate of the project is compared to the highest accident rate of all the Major Street projects being evaluated. The accident rate used is the average rate for the three latest years for which accident data is available. Points are assigned as follows:
3 Year Average Accident Rate ${ }^{2}$ of Project

X $\quad 20=$ $\qquad$ Highest Accident Rate of Projects Considered

## 3. Economic Development

(Max. Points: 10)

- Is the project within the Economic Development Strategy?:
- Does the project fall within one of the nineteen (19) Neighborhood Commercial Revitalization Areas?
- Is the project located within one of the twenty-seven (27) Key Development Opportunity Areas or Sites?
- Is the project located in either the Merged Downtown or SP/Richards Redevelopment Area?
If Yes on any of the above (5 points) $\qquad$
- Is the project located in a Business Improvement District (BID) or Property-Based Improvement District (PBID)?
$\qquad$

2 The accident Rate is the annual number of accidents per 1 million vehicle miles. Accident Rate $=$ Accidents $\times 10^{6} /($ ADT $x$ segment miles x 365)

## 4. Infill Development

(Max. Points: 15)

- Is the project in one of the Infill Areas as defined in the City of Sacramento Infill Strategy adopted on May 14, 2002. This document defines infill in four categories:
(Maximum Points 10)
- Target Residential Area ___Yes (10 points) $\qquad$ No (0 points)
- Central City Area $\qquad$ Yes (10 points) $\qquad$ No (0 points)
- Neighborhood Commercial Revitalization Area $\qquad$ Yes (5 points) _No (0 points)
- Transit Station Area $\qquad$ Yes (10 points) $\qquad$ No (0 points)
- Is the project in a City Redevelopment Area excluding the Merged Downtown or SP/Richards Area or in a Community Development Block Grant eligible area?
$\qquad$ Yes (5 points) $\qquad$ No (0 points)

5. Cost
(Max Points: 5)
Points are assigned inversely proportionally to the cost of the project as follows:

## Lowest Cost Project <br> Project Cost

X $5=$ $\qquad$
(Max. Points 5)

Projects are scored based on whether critical milestones have been completed, as detailed below:

- $\quad$ Has the Environmental Determination been approved?
__ Yes (3 points) __ No (0 points)
- Has a Project Study Report or a Feasibility Study been approved or completed with a result that the project is feasible?
__ Yes (3 points) No (0 points)

7. Volume
(Max. Points: 7)
Existing volumes on the candidate roadways are evaluated, with the higher volume streets receiving more points:

$$
\frac{\text { Existing ADT of Project }}{\text { Highest Existing ADT of Projects Considered }}
$$

## 8. Gap Closure

(Max Points: 8)

## Freeway Interchanges

1 point given for each freeway interchange ramp added by project

## Roadway Extension

5 points given to projects that either close a gap or connect missing links in a route 3 points given to projects that will close a bicycle facility gap
3 points given to projects that will reduce vehicle travel through a residential neighborhood

## 9. Alternate Modes

(Max Points: 10)
4 points given for streets identified as a designated Class 2 or 3 bikeway (existing or proposed) in the City/County Bikeway Master Plan
4 points given if the project is on a bus route
4 points given if the project adds sidewalk where there currently is none
6 points given if the project improves access to a LRT station or to a commuter rail station for pedestrians, bicyclists, vehicles or buses

## SUMMARY

The Major Street Improvement priority listing is presented in Table A-1 and Table A-2. Figure A1 shows the approximate location of these projects.

Three new projects were added to this year's list. These projects are Main Ave Extension, from west of Marysville Boulevard to Rio Linda Boulevard, West El Camino Ave/I-80 Interchange Improvements, and Elkhorn Blvd/Hwy 99 Interchange Improvements.

Northgate Boulevard/Garden Highway Intersection Improvements project was deleted from this year's Major Streets Improvement list that was in the previous list. This project is under construction.
TABLE A-1

| 2006 | $2005{ }^{(1)}$ | Council | MAJOR STREET PROJECT | Planning Level <br> Project Cost | Congestion Score | Pub Safe <br> Score | Econ Dev Score | Infill <br> Score | Cost Score | Deliv/Ready Score | Volume <br> Score | Gap Close Score | Alt. Modes Score | TOTAL SCORE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rank | Rank | District | Maximum Points in Scoring Category: |  | 20.0 | 20.0 | 10 | 15 | 5.0 | 5 | 7.0 | 8 | 10 | 100 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | Richards Blvd/I-5 Interchange Improvements | 45,000,000 | 11.4 | 17.3 | 10 | 15 | 0.1 | 0 | 3.2 | 0 | 8 | 65.0 |
| 2 | 3 | 1 | Railyards Access Road | 15,000,000 | 11.2 | 15.0 | 10 | 15 | 0.4 | 0 | 3.4 | 0 | 6 | 61.0 |
| 3 | 2 | 3,6 | Folsom Blvd Widening from 65th St to Power Inn Rd | 38,000,000 | 15.7 | 8.4 | 5 | 15 | 0.2 | 3 | 2.6 | 0 | 10 | 59.9 |
| 4 | 4 | 1 | Richards Blvd/SR 160 Interchange Improvements | 36,000,000 | 10.2 | 14.2 | 10 | 15 | 0.2 | 0 | 3.3 | 0 | 4 | 56.9 |
| 5 | 5 | 7 | Cosumnes River Blvd Extension and Interchange at I-5 - Franklin Blvd to I-5 | 79,000,000 | 11.0 | 10.0 | 5 | 5 | 0.1 | 3 | 4.0 | 8 | 10 | 56.1 |
| 6 | 6 | 3,6 | Jed Smith Realignment and Ramona Ave Extension to Folsom Blvd and 14th Ave | 10,000,000 | 13.5 | 14.6 | 0 | 5 | 0.6 | 3 | 5.5 | 5 | 8 | 55.2 |
| 7 | 8 | 6 | SR 16 Realignment - Watt Ave to Power Inn Rd at 14th Ave | 18,000,000 | 13.5 | 14.6 | 5 | 5 | 0.3 | 3 | 5.5 | 0 | 8 | 55.0 |
| 8 | 7 | 1 | Gateway Blvd Extension and North 12th St/North B St Intersection Improvements | 30,000,000 | 7.9 | 14.7 | 5 | 15 | 0.2 | 0 | 3.1 | 5 | 4 | 54.9 |
| 9 | 9 | 2 | Silver Eagle Rd Widening - Norwood Ave to Mabel Ave | 2,000,000 | 11.4 | 11.2 | 0 | 15 | 3.0 | 0 | 1.8 | 0 | 10 | 52.4 |
| 10 | 10 | 1,3 | Sutter's Landing Parkway | 100,000,000 | 9.7 | 8.7 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 4.6 | 5 | 4 | 52.1 |
| 11 | New | 2 | Main Ave Extension - from west of Marysville Blvd to Rio Linda Blvd | 1,750,000 | 6.1 | 13.6 | 0 | 10 | 3.4 | 0 | 1.5 | 8 | 8 | 50.7 |
| 12 | 13 | 2 | Main Ave Widening - Norwood Ave to Rio Linda Blvd | 7,000,000 | 5.7 | 20.0 | 0 | 15 | 0.9 | 0 | 0.8 | 0 | 8 | 50.4 |
| 13 | 11 | 1 | Richards Blvd Widening - I-5 to North 7th St | 20,000,000 | 11.6 | 6.2 | 10 | 10 | 0.3 | 0 | 4.2 | 0 | 8 | 50.3 |
| 14 | 14 | 1 | Garden Hwy Widening - Arden-Garden Connector to I-5 | 35,000,000 | 15.7 | 5.6 | 0 | 15 | 0.2 | 0 | 3.0 | 0 | 8 | 47.5 |
| 15 | 19 | 2 | Rio Linda Blvd and Main Ave Intersection Improvements | 1,200,000 | 9.2 | 16.9 | 0 | 5 | 5.0 | 0 | 1.2 | 0 | 10 | 47.4 |
| 16 | 20 | 6 | 4th Ave Extension from 65th St. to Ramona Ave | 25,000,000 | 5.1 | 8.5 | 0 | 15 | 0.2 | 3 | 0.5 | 5 | 8 | 45.4 |
| 17 | 16 | 2 | Bell Ave Widening - Norwood Ave to Raley Blvd | 20,000,000 | 7.2 | 10.6 | 0 | 15 | 0.3 | 0 | 1.5 | 0 | 10 | 44.5 |
| 18 | 15 | 1 | Northgate Blvd/I-80 Interchange Improvements | 10,000,000 | 9.1 | 7.8 | 5 | 10 | 0.6 | 0 | 3.7 | 0 | 8 | 44.3 |
| 19 | 25 | 6 | South Watt Ave Widening - Elder Creek Rd to Fruitridge Rd | 20,000,000 | 16.9 | 5.8 | 5 | 5 | 0.3 | 0 | 2.2 | 0 | 8 | 43.2 |
| 20 | 16 | 6 | Power Inn Rd Widening - 14th Ave to Fruitridge Rd | 25,000,000 | 11.9 | 8.3 | 5 | 5 | 0.2 | 0 | 4.0 | 0 | 8 | 42.4 |
| 21 | 24 | 2,3 | Roseville Rd Widening - Connie Drive to the City Limits | 4,000,000 | 12.0 | 2.9 | 0 | 15 | 1.5 | 0 | 2.4 | 0 | 8 | 41.8 |
| 22 | 18 | 2 | Exposition Blvd/SR 160 Interchange | 35,000,000 | 10.4 | 7.8 | 0 | 15 | 0.2 | 0 | 1.3 | 3 | 4 | 41.7 |
| 23 | 21 | 3 | Arden Way/Arden Fair Mall Access Improvements - SR51 to Ethan Way | 4,000,000 | 9.3 | 13.8 | 5 | 0 | 1.5 | 0 | 7.0 | 0 | 4 | 40.6 |
| 24 | 22 | 1 | 7th St Widening - Downtown to Richards Blvd | 25,000,000 | 9.1 | 0.0 | 10 | 10 | 0.2 | 0 | 0.9 | 0 | 10 | 40.2 |
| 25 | 23 | 1 | 6th St Northerly Extension - G St to North 5th St at Richards | 47,000,000 | 9.1 | 0.0 | 10 | 10 | 0.1 | 0 | 0.9 | 0 | 10 | 40.1 |
| 26 | 30 | 6 | Fruitridge Rd Widening - Florin Perkins Rd to South Watt Ave | 8,000,000 | 10.9 | 6.3 | 5 | 5 | 0.8 | 0 | 1.8 | 0 | 8 | 37.9 |
| 27 | 29 | 6 | Florin-Perkins Rd Widening - Folsom Blvd to Fruitridge Rd | 12,000,000 | 7.3 | 5.4 | 5 | 5 | 0.5 | 0 | 3.2 | 0 | 10 | 36.4 |
| 28 | 26 | 1 | West El Camino Ave/I-5 Interchange Improvements | 25,000,000 | 16.7 | 6.1 | 0 | 0 | 0.2 | 0 | 3.3 | 2 | 8 | 36.3 |
| 29 | 33 | 6 | Elder Creek Rd Widening - Power Inn Rd to South Watt Ave | 13,000,000 | 6.6 | 9.1 | 5 | 5 | 0.5 | 0 | 1.8 | 0 | 8 | 36.0 |
| 30 | 32 | 8 | State Route 99/Sheldon Rd Interchange | 38,000,000 | 13.7 | 10.9 | 0 | 0 | 0.2 | 3 | 2.1 | 2 | 4 | 35.8 |
| 31 | 28 | 1 | Northgate Blvd/SR 160 Interchange Improvements | 22,000,000 | 8.4 | 8.6 | 0 | 5 | 0.3 | 3 | 3.3 | 2 | 4 | 34.6 |
| 32 | 27 | 8 | Cosumnes River Blvd Widening - Bruceville Rd to Center Pkwy | 10,000,000 | 14.5 | 6.6 | 0 | 0 | 0.6 | 0 | 2.7 | 0 | 10 | 34.5 |
| 33 | 31 | 7 | Cosumnes River Blvd Widening - Franklin Blvd to Center Pkwy | 10,000,000 | 9.7 | 6.6 | 0 | 5 | 0.6 | 0 | 1.7 | 0 | 10 | 33.6 |
| 34 | 35 | 8 | Sheldon Rd Widening - Bruceville Rd to Hwy 99 | 5,000,000 | 14.9 | 5.5 | 0 | 5 | 1.2 | 0 | 2.8 | 0 | 4 | 33.5 |
| 35 | New | 1 | West El Camino Ave/I-80 Interchange Improvements | 20,000,000 | 12.3 | 11.8 | 0 | 0 | 0.3 | 0 | 1.9 | 0 | 4 | 30.2 |
| 36 | 35 | 2 | Raley Blvd Widening - Santa Ana Ave to Ascot Ave | 25,000,000 | 7.2 | 6.9 | 0 | 5 | 0.2 | 0 | 1.5 | 0 | 8 | 28.9 |
| 37 | 37 | 2 | Bell Ave Widening - Raley Blvd to Winters St | 12,000,000 | 7.4 | 4.0 | 0 | 5 | 0.5 | 0 | 1.5 | 0 | 10 | 28.3 |
| 38 | 34 | 3 | Arden Way/Capitol City Freeway Interchange Improvements | 19,500,000 | 7.7 | 9.7 | 0 | 0 | 0.3 | 0 | 4.7 | 0 | 4 | 26.3 |
| 39 | New | 1 | Elkhorn Blvd/Hwy 99 Interchange Improvements | 30,000,000 | 11.3 | 3.0 | 0 | 0 | 0.2 | 0 | 2.0 | 0 | 4 | 20.5 |
| 40 | 38 | 6 | Kiefer Blvd Widening - Florin Perkins Rd to South Watt Ave | 4,000,000 | 4.3 | 5.0 | 0 | 0 | 1.5 | 0 | 0.8 | 0 | 8 | 19.5 |

[^1]TABLE A-2

| 2006 rank | Project Name | Description/Limits | Notes | Planning Level Project Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Richards Blvd//-5 Interchange Improvements | Improve capacity and operations of the Richards Boulevard / I-5 Interchange by modifying ramp widths, length and interface with the local street grid. | NEATS Project ID \#8 | 45,000,000 |
| 2 | Railyards Access Road | Modify Jibboom Street and Bercut Drive to provide north-south access between Richards Boulevard and the proposed Gateway Boulevard Extension project on the west side of the railyards. | NEATS Project ID \#3 | 15,000,000 |
| 3 | Folsom Blvd Widening from 65th St to Power Inn Rd | Widen Folsom Boulevard to four lanes and a two-way left turn between Power Inn Road and $65^{\text {th }}$ Street. Provide sidewalks and bike lanes in both directions. | SEATS Phase I | 38,000,000 |
| 4 | Richards Blvd/North 12th Street/North 16th Street (State Route 160) Interchange Improvements | Interchange improvements at Richards Boulevard and North 12th Street/North 16th Street |  | 36,000,000 |
| 5 | Cosumnes River Blvd Extension and Interchange at I-5 - Franklin Blvd to I5 | Extend Cosumnes River Boulevard as a four-lane roadway from Franklin Boulevard to 24th Street, as a six-lane roadway from 24th Street to I-5 Interchange, and as a fourlane from the I-5 Interchange to Freeport Boulevard. Construct an interchange at I-5. Project includes a grade separation at the UPRR and bike lanes and sidewalks in both directions. | City may initially construct a two-lane facility. Widening to four and six lanes will be subsequently completed by developers | 79,000,000 |
| 6 | Jed Smith Realignment and Ramona Ave Extension to Folsom Blvd and 14th Ave | Realign Jed Smith from CSUS to Folsom Boulevard and extend Ramona Avenue as a two-lane roadway from Folsom Boulevard to $14^{\mathrm{h}}$ Avenue. | SEATS Phase I | 10,000,000 |
| 7 | SR 16 Realignment - Watt Ave to Power Inn Rd at 14th Ave | Realign Jackson Road as a four-lane roadway from Watt Avenue to Power Inn Road. Provide sidewalks and bike lanes in both directions. | SEATS Phase I | 18,000,000 |
| 8 | Gateway Blvd Extension and North 12th St/North B St Intersection Improvements | Construct a collector from the intersection of North B/12 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street southwest to an intersection with the proposed Railyards Access Road. Provide sidewalks and bike lanes in both directions. Construct intersection re-configuration at the intersection of North B Street, North $12^{\text {th }}$ Street, and Gateway Boulevard. | NEATS Project ID \#5 \& ID \#6. | 30,000,000 |
| 9 | Silver Eagle Rd Widening - Norwood to Mabel | Widen Silver Eagle Road to 3-lanes including a two-way left turn lane. |  | 2,000,000 |
| 10 | Sutter's Landing Parkway - Richards Blvd to Capital City Freeway and Interchange at Capital City Freeway (Requires Richards Blvd/SR 160 IC) | Construct a four-lane arterial on new alignment between SR 160 and Capital City Freeway, a distance of 1.6 miles. Provide sidewalks and bike lanes in both directions and provide a grade separation with the railroad. Construct a full interchange at the connection with SR 51. Requires the Richards Boulevard/SR 160 Interchange. | This project was scored assuming the interchange at Richards Blvd. and State Route 160 is constructed separately. | 100,000,000 |
| 11 | Main Ave Extension - from west of Marysville Blvd to Rio Linda Blvd | Main Avenue goes westerly from Marysville Boulevard approximately 700' and then dead ends. This project will extend Main Avenue as a two lane roadway another 1200' to intersect with Rio Linda Boulevard, and will construct improvements on the existing 700' roadway west of Marysville Boulevard. |  | 1,750,000 |
| 12 | Main Ave Widening - Norwood Ave to Rio Linda Blvd | Widen Main Avenue between Norwood Avenue and Rio Linda Boulevard to four lanes. The project includes bike lanes and sidewalks in both directions. |  | 7,000,000 |
| 13 | Richards Blvd Widening - Bercut Drive to North 7th St | Widen Richards Boulevard to six lanes from Bercut Drive to North 7th Street. Provide sidewalks and bike lanes in both directions. |  | 20,000,000 |

TABLE A-2

| 2006 rank | Project Name | Description/Limits | Notes | Planning Level Project Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14 | Garden Hwy Widening - ArdenGarden Connector to I-5 | Widen Garden Highway from two lanes to four lanes between the western terminus of the Arden Garden Connector project to a point 300 feet east of the I-5 ramps, a total distance of 1.25 miles. Provide sidewalks and bike lanes in both directions |  | 35,000,000 |
| 15 | Rio Linda and Main Intersection Improvements | Traffic Signal installation and intersection re-configuration at Rio Linda Boulevard and Main Avenue. This would require widening the bridge on Rio Linda, south of the intersection. |  | 1,000,000 |
| 16 | 4th Ave Extension from 65th St. to Ramona Ave | Extend $4^{\text {th }}$ Avenue from $65^{\text {th }}$ Street to Ramona Avenue. Provide sidewalks and bike lanes in both directions. | Project re-evaluated in light of 65th Street South Transit Village Study | 25,000,000 |
| 17 | Bell Ave Widening - Norwood Ave to Raley Blvd | Widening Bell Avenue to 4-lanes plus a two-way left turn lane from Norwood Avenue and Raley Boulevard. Provide sidewalks and bike lanes in both directions. |  | 25,000,000 |
| 18 | Northgate Blvd/I-80 Interchange Improvements | Add a lane to the eastbound Northgate off-ramp; and an auxiliary lane to the westbound on-ramp; and extend the westbound off-ramp to improve operation and safety. |  | 10,000,000 |
| 19 | South Watt Ave Widening - Elder Creek Rd to Fruitridge Rd | Widen South Watt between Elder Creek Road and Fruitridge Road to 6-lanes.Include bike lanes and sidewalks. | SEATS Phase II | 20,000,000 |
| 20 | Power Inn Rd Widening - 14th Ave to Fruitridge Rd | Power Inn Road between $14^{\text {th }}$ Avenue and Fruitridge Road is currently a four-lane roadway with a two-way left-turn lane. This project, which is in an industrial area with considerable truck traffic, will widen the segment to six lanes. Includes bike lanes and sidewalks in both directions. | SEATS Phase II | 20,000,000 |
| 21 | Roseville Rd Widening - Connie Drive to the City Limits | This project will widen Roseville Road to four lanes between Connie Drive to the City Limits. This project includes bike lanes and sidewalks in both directions. |  | 4,000,000 |
| 22 | Exposition Blvd/SR 160 Interchange | Construct a split diamond interchange on SR 160 at Exposition Boulevard. Provides sidewalks and bike lanes. | NEATS Project ID \#7 | 35,000,000 |
| 23 | Arden Way/Arden Fair Mall Access Improvements - Capital City Freeway to Ethan Way | The project is intended to improve access to and from Arden Fair Mall, improve traffic operations on Arden Way, and relieve congestion at the Business 80 interchange. |  | 4,000,000 |
| 24 | 7th St Widening - Downtown to Richards Blvd | Widen Phase I of $7^{\text {th }}$ Street Extension to 4 lanes from E Street, through the railyards site, to Richards Boulevard. Includes bike lanes and sidewalks in both directions. | NEATS Project \#1, Phase 1, the 7th Street Extension as a 2 lane road was completed in early 2004. | 25,000,000 |
| 25 | 6th St Northerly Extension - G St to North 5th St at Richards Blvd | Extend 6th Street north from G Street to Richards Boulevard at North 5th Street. | Part of Richards/Railyard Development | 47,000,000 |
| 26 | Fruitridge Rd Widening - Florin Perkins Rd to South Watt Ave | Widen Fruitridge between Florin-Perkins Road and South Watt Avenue to 4-lanes. Include bike lanes and sidewalks | SEATS Phase II | 12,000,000 |
| 27 | Florin-Perkins Rd Widening - Folsom Blvd to Fruitridge Rd | This project will widen Florin Perkins between Folsom Boulevard and Fruitridge Road to six lanes. Includes bike lanes and sidewalks . | SEATS Phase II | 22,000,000 |

TABLE A-2

| Namminctere |
| :---: |

25,000,000 $\square$

 1 \begin{tabular}{|c||}
\hline $38,000,000$ <br>
\hline $10,000,000$ <br>
\hline $8,000,000$ <br>
\hline $10,000,000$ <br>
\hline

 

\hline $5,000,000$ <br>
\hline $20,000,000$ <br>
\hline $25,000,000$ <br>
\hline $12,000,000$ <br>
\hline
\end{tabular}

| $19,500,000$ |
| :---: |
|  |
| $30,000,000$ |
| $4,000,000$ |

## Description/Limits
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$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Description/Limits } \\
& \hline \text { ramn and southbound exit ramn at the West F }
\end{aligned}
$$

| 2006 rank | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Nest El Camino Ave/I-5 Interchange }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{l}\text { Construct a northbound entrance ramp and southbound exit ramp at the West El } \\ \text { Camino Avenue/I-5 Interchange. Modify the NB I-5 to I-80 ramp to accommodate }\end{array}$ |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 28 | $\begin{array}{l}\text { West } \\ \text { Improvements }\end{array}$ |  | proposed interchange ramps. Due to interchange spacing constraints, Northbound I-5 traffic entering at El Camino Avenue will not have access to the eastbound I-80 Ramp

This is a City of Elk Grove project. Only the
northwest corner of the project is located northwest corner of the project is located
within the City of Sacramento city limits.
within the City of Sacramento city limits.

| - |  |
| :--- | :--- |

$\square$

$+$
Florin Road/South Watt Avenue. This segment of roadway is approximately two miles long, and varies in width. The proposed project would improve the entire segment to four lanes.
This project will make improvements to the existing Highway 99 and Sheldon Road Interchange.

| $\begin{array}{l}\text { Construct eastbound entrance ramp and westbound exit ramps at Northgate } \\ \text { Boulevard/SR 160. }\end{array}$ |
| :--- |
| Widen Cosumnes River Boulevard to four lanes between Center Parkway to | Wraville R Inlude bike/pedestrian improvements.

FIGURE A-1
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## STREET MAINTENANCE PROGRAM

## INTRODUCTION

Street Maintenance is routine work performed to keep the pavement in a condition as close as possible to its newly constructed condition. This results in a cost effective use of limited available funds, and provides maximum benefit to the traveling public by enhancing safety of the roadway and improving ride comfort of the road surface.

Street maintenance can be divided into three strategies: maintenance, rehabilitation and transition. Maintenance activities are comprised of crack sealing and patching potholes and are used to repair damage to a street immediately so as to minimize any long-term structural damage that might occur. Rehabilitation activities include several types of resurfacing, which are described below. All of these resurfacing treatments are used to extend the life of a street. The appropriate resurfacing treatment for a roadway depends on the existing pavement condition. If the existing pavement condition is extremely poor then the street may need to be reconstructed. It is more cost effective to resurface a street before pavement deterioration becomes severe than to reconstruct it. The cost to reconstruct a street is significantly higher and can be upwards of $\$ 55.00$ per square yard. There is currently a significant backlog of street segments identified in the reconstruction section of this Transportation Programming Guide. Street Maintenance Operations has developed transition strategies to improve the roadway condition of these streets to a level that makes it cost effective to apply one of our rehabilitation activities. This new transition strategy was used extensively in the Downtown area in 2002 and 2003.

## Rehabilitation Activities

Overlay: An overlay is the highest form of street maintenance and involves the placement of a new layer of asphalt, approximately one and a half to three and half inches thick, on the street. The construction cost to overlay a street is approximately $\$ 17.00$ per square yard depending upon the thickness required. Properly maintained, an overlay can extend the life of the street by twenty to twenty five years although heavily used streets may require more frequent overlays.

Ultra Thin Wearing Surface: An Ultra thin wearing surface has been used throughout California including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) as a cost effective and long lasting rehabilitation strategy. Similar to an overlay, some of the existing surface may be grinded away and then an ultra thin (less than one inch) wearing surfaced is paved over the street and may extend the life of the road by as much as twenty years. The construction cost for this treatment is approximately $\$ 14.00$ per square yard, which includes the required preparation work.

Cape Seal: A Cape Seal consists of a chip seal followed by a slurry seal. This process gives the strength of a chip seal with the added benefit of a smoother riding surface; therefore it is used more frequently than a chip seal. The construction cost to cape seal a street including any required preparation work is approximately $\$ 3.50$ per square yard. Cape sealing can extend the life of a street by nine to twelve years.

Chip Seal: A chip seal involves the application of liquid asphalt followed by placement of small rock chips on the existing pavement. The construction cost to chip seal a street including any required preparation work is approximately $\$ 2.50$ per square yard. This treatment adds strength to
the existing pavement and can extend the life of the street by eight to ten years. Chip Seals are rarely used in the City of Sacramento.

Slurry Seal: A slurry seal is a blend of oil and small aggregate that is applied to the streets. Slurry seal is a preventive maintenance procedure. The construction cost to slurry seal a street including any required preparation work is approximately $\$ 1.50$ per square yard. Slurry sealing can extend the life of a street by five to seven years.

## GOALS AND POLICIES

The Street Maintenance Program is consistent with the following City of Sacramento 1986 General Plan goals and policies

## Goals:

1. Maintain the quality of the City street system in the most cost-effective manner.

## Policy:

Continue to identify streets that are in need of major upgrading, and develop a priority listing for their inclusion in the Capital Improvement Program.
2. Update the City's Pavement Management Application (PMA) which prioritizes street sealing and overlay maintenance work and establish a link between the Geographical Information System (GIS) for mapping capabilities.

## Policies:

Perform sealing of streets currently in good condition to delay the need for more costly street overlays.

Perform street overlays and ultra thin wearing surface treatments to avoid street reconstruction costs.

## PROJECT LIST DEVELOPMENT

## Pavement Management Application Update

The City performed an inventory of the entire road network, in segments of one hundred (100) foot increments, during the spring and summer of 1999 and again in 2002.

Thirteen different distress and roughness data were collected. Each distress was measured with three severity levels and five density levels. The roughness was collected using five levels.

Structural data was collected from record drawings, soil core samples and road condition observations. Traffic data were obtained from the city's Traffic Engineering Division. Other information included in the inventory was the age, location, and maintenance history of the roadway, council districts, curb shoulder and pavement types and street functional classifications.

## Performance Indicators

All of this data was converted to three performance indicators that make up the street segment's overall condition number or Pavement Quality Index (PQI). These indicators are Ride Comfort Index (RCI), Surface Distress Index (SDI) and Structural Adequacy Index (SAI).

## PROJECT RANKING PROCESS

The needs list is developed using the SuperPMA computer program. The analytical routines unique to the SuperPMA allow the City to better assess the whole street network objectively. They also allow the city to develop a rehabilitation program that maintains every street at the most cost-effective point.

Street Maintenance Services is continuing to develop a ten-year rehabilitation cycle that will include every street in the City of Sacramento. This cycle is important to provide a gauge to determine if funding is keeping up with or falling behind the goal of providing maintenance at the most cost-effective point.

## SUMMARY

The projects listed on the following tables are designed to give information on streets in the City that are scheduled for rehabilitation and maintenance work in the next few years but are subject to budget constraints. Additional information provided includes the council district, and approximate size in square yards for each project.

There are 2,936 lane miles of paved roadway within the City of Sacramento, which equates to a little over 26 million square yards. Since 1996 the City has used the ITX / Stanley Super Pavement Management Application (PMA), one of the most powerful systems of its kind in the country, to assess, evaluate, and recommend our most cost effective street maintenance strategies. The system was original designed using a national pavement deterioration model or curves for forecasting needs, which reflected maintenance needs for every street about every 12 years. In 1996 the entire City street system was inventoried, assessed, and that data was plotted. In 1999 and in 2002 the inventory and assessment was conducted again and the data plotted. The new data helped establish pavement deterioration rate curves specific to Sacramento. Our PMA now reflects Sacramento specific pavement deterioration curves. These curves show that the most costeffective maintenance would require some level of maintenance every seven to ten years instead of every 12 years as originally indicated.

We currently have a ten-year street maintenance plan that addresses approximately 2.6 million square yards of paved roadway annually. However there are areas of the city not included in this plan where maintenance was deferred for several years because of conflicts with other projects. More costly maintenance strategies are now required to actually move these streets into the tenyear cycle. The annual cost today for delivering a ten-year street maintenance plan, without addressing these backlog streets, is approximately $\$ 10$ million.

Funding for this level of maintenance is problematic. Funding for a seven-year maintenance cycle is not currently realistic. We believe that the first step in enhancing our street infrastructure to begin to meet our City Council's goals is to have a ten-year plan that addresses all city streets. Additional fund sources need to be identified. AB2928 is a new funding source that is being used to address these backlog streets. However this funding was recently suspended by the Governor and not expected to be available in the near future.

The non-residential streets planned for resurfacing over the next two to three years are presented in Table B-1 based on the needs assessment of the PMA and anticipated funding. Table B-2 represents the local and residential streets planned for resurfacing in the next two to three years based on the needs assessment of the PMA. Conflicts with other agencies and funding availability often times cause significant schedule changes to occur in the order that streets will be addressed.
TABLE B-1

| Planned Year | Council District | Street Name | Limits | Length | Square Yards |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2006 | 1 | Elkhorn Blvd | HWY 99 to Northborough | 6,810 | 30,266 |
| 2006 | 1 | Del Paso Road | Town Center Drive to Truxel Road | 2,765 | 42,396 |
| 2006 | 1 | 4th Street | NSt to P St | 843 | 4,215 |
| 2006 | 2 | Winters St | I-80 to Bell Ave | 3,316 | 19,159 |
| 2006 | 2 | Sully St | Main Ave to North End | 1333 | 2806 |
| 2006 | 3 | Marconi Cir S Leg | Marconi to Auburn | 400 | 2,667 |
| 2006 | 3 | Auburn Blvd | Marconi Cir S Leg to 300' north of Mar | 850 | 3,685 |
| 2006 | 4 | 6th Street | X Street to Broadway | 398 | 1,769 |
| 2006 | 4 | X Street | 5th St to Riverside | 2,637 | 13,185 |
| 2006 | 8 | Bruceville Rd | Alpine Frost to Wyndham Dr | 3,387 | 22,580 |
| 2006 | 7 \& 8 | Intersection | Franklin B1 \& Mack Road | 1,100 | 12,000 |
| 2006 | 7 | Pocket Rd | (WB) Greenhaven to Windbridge | 7,571 | 25,237 |
| 2006 | 4 | Broadway | Front St to West End | 1,177 | 4,316 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2007 | 1 | Elkhorn Blvd | Northborough to City Limit | 8,765 | 38,956 |
| 2007 | 2 | Norwood Ave | Jessie Ave to Main Ave | 3,955 | 24,618 |
| 2007 | 2 \& 3 | Roseville Rd | Marconi Cir to City Limit | 7,697 | 25,190 |
| 2007 | 3 | Marconi Cir N Leg | Marconi to Auburn | 1,491 | 6,981 |
| 2007 | 3 | H Street | 56th to east end | 2,452 | 7,000 |
| 2007 | 4 | X Street | Riverside to 21st St | 3,880 | 19,400 |
| 2007 | 5 | Fruitridge Rd | RR Track to Franklin Blvd | 2,295 | 15,142 |
| 2007 | 7 | Gloria Dr | Rush River to Rivergate | 1,932 | 9,660 |
| 2007 | 7 | Pocket Rd | (EB) Greenhaven to Windbridge | 7,571 | 25,237 |
| 2007 | 7 | S. Land Park Dr | Windbridge to Greenhaven | 2,624 | 13,120 |
| 2007 | 8 | Franklin Blvd | Brookfield to Mack Rd | 3,020 | 19,700 |


| Recommended Year | Council District | STREET NAME | AREA (SY) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2006 | 2 | Residential area bounded by : Arden Wy to the north, State Route 160 to the south,Royal Oaks to the east, and Globe Ave / Del Paso Blvd to the west. | 92,713 |
| 2006 | 2 | Residential area bounded by : Patio Ave to the north, Columbus Ave to the south, Northgate Blvd to the west, and East Levee Rd to the east. | 101,203 |
| 2006 | 3 | Residential area bounded by : J St to the north, Folsom Blvd to the south, 58th St to the east, and 51st St to the west. | 63,095 |
| 2006 | 4 | Residential area bounded by : Cordano Wy / 7th Ave to the north, 13th Ave to the south, Freeport Blvd to the east and Land Park Dr to the west. | 68,530 |
| 2006 | 4 | Residential area bounded by : Bidwell Wy to the north, 12th Ave to the south, UPRR to the east, and Freeport Blvd to the west. | 28,853 |
| 2006 | 4 | Residential area bounded by : San Mateo Wy to the north, Sutterville Rd to the south, and Riverside Blvd to the west. | 7,324 |
| 2006 | 5 | Residential area bounded by : Sutterville Rd to the north, Haldis Wy to the south, 24th St to the east, and Freeport Blvd / 22nd St / 23rd St to the west. | 85,377 |
| 2006 | 6 | Residential area bounded by:14th Ave to the north, 21st Ave to the south, West Railroad Ave / Lacam Cr to the east, and 66th St to the west. | 84,821 |
| 2006 | 7 | Residential area bounded by : Honey Wy to the north, Pocket Rd to the south, Ambrose Wy to the east, and Windbridge Dr to the west. | 11,988 |
| 2006 | 7 | Residential area bounded by : Pocket Rd to the north, Dutra Bend Dr to the south, Greenhaven Dr / Sleepy River Wy to the east, and Chicory Bend Ct to the west. | 34,989 |
| 2006 | 7 | Residential area bounded by : Spruce Tree Cr to the north, Alder Tree Wy to the south, Maple Tree Wy to the east and Greenhaven Dr to the west. | 19,135 |
| 2006 | 7 | Residential area bounded by : Windbridge Dr to the northwest, Rush River to the south, and Greenhaven Dr to the east. | 87,817 |
| 2006 | 8 | Residential area bounded by : Florin Rd to the north, Meadowview Rd to the south, UPRR to the east, and 24th St to the west. | 153,263 |
| 2006 | 8 | Residential area bounded by : East Parkway to the north, Mack Rd to the south, Tangerine Ave to the east, and Franklin Blyd to the west. | 68,488 |
| 2006 | 8 | Residential area bounded by : Starstone Wy to the north, Mack Rd to the south, Valley Wind Wy / Deer creek Dr to the east and G Parkway to the west. | 87,232 |
|  |  | Total Area | 994,828 |

TABLE B-2

| Recommended Year | Council District | STREET NAME | AREA (SY) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2007 | 1 | Residential area bounded by : North Freeway Blvd to the North, Northgate Bl to the East, San Juan Rd to the South, Truxel Rd to the West | 154,047 |
| 2007 | 1 | Residential area bounded by : San Juan Rd to the North, Truxel Rd to the East, West El Camino Av to the Soth, I-5 to the West | 237,234 |
| 2007 | 2 | Residential area bounded by : Diamond Av to the North, Marysville Bl to the East, El Camino Av to the South, Rio Linda Bl to the West | 128,134 |
| 2007 | 2 | Residential area bounded by : Alii Wy to the North, Sully St to the East, I-80 to the South, Pell Dr to the West | 247,816 |
| 2007 | $1 \& 3$ | Residential area bounded by : A St to the North, N 16th to the East, J St to the South, 9th St to the West | 118,045 |
| 2007 | 4 | Residential area bounded by : R St to the North, 10th St to the East, Broadway to the South, Front St to the West | 172,933 |
| 2007 | 7 | Residential area bounded by : Pocket Rd the the north, I-5 to the east, City Boundary to the south, Green haven to the West | 54,475 |
| 2007 | 7 | Residential area bounded by: Mack Rd to the North, Franklin Bl to the East, City Boundary to the South, Deer Run Wy to the West | 191,934 |
| 2007 | 8 | Residential area bounded by : Florin Rd to the North,24th St to the East, Meadowview Rd to the South, 21st St to the West | 198,489 |
|  |  | Total Area | 1,503,107 |

This list represents the proposed streets for residential seals and are subject to change based upon conflicts and funding.

## STREET RECONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

## INTRODUCTION

Street reconstruction involves removing and replacing all asphalt concrete and aggregate base on a roadway segment and placing new striping and pavement markings. A street reconstruction project may also include removing and replacing or constructing new curb, gutter, and sidewalk. It may also include traffic control improvements, adding streetlights, and drainage improvements. Water and sewer improvements may be completed in conjunction with a street reconstruction project, although they are not integral to the roadway.

Street reconstruction is required when a street has deteriorated to the degree that the maintenance and rehabilitation activities that are included in the Street Maintenance Program are no longer effective. An inventory of the entire City of Sacramento street system, performed in the summer of 1999 and in 2002 using the Super Pavement Management Application (Super PMA), identified a backlog of streets in need of reconstruction.

## GOAL AND POLICY

The Street Reconstruction Program is consistent with the following City of Sacramento General Plan (adopted January 19, 1988, reflects City Council Amendments through September 2000) goals and policies:

## Goal:

Maintain the quality of the City's street system.

## Policy:

- Continue to identify streets that are in need of major upgrading, and develop a priority listing for their inclusion in the Capital Improvement Program.


## PROJECT LIST DEVELOPMENT

The Street Reconstruction list is assessed through the Super PMA computer program. The Super PMA maintains information on the street's characteristics and condition. The Super PMA evaluates the information from the Pavement Condition Survey completed in 1999 and subsequent tests to determine the Pavement Quality Index (PQI) for all street segments in the City roadway network. An explanation of the Pavement Quality Index can be found in the Street Maintenance Section of this Document.

## Eligibility Criteria

Street segments with a PQI of 4 or below, and that have no other rehabilitation strategies available, may be deemed beyond rehabilitation and are considered for reconstruction.

## PROJECT RANKING PROCESS

Street reconstruction projects are scored and ranked using four criteria: Cost Effectiveness, Alternate Modes, Economic Development, and Infill Development. The maximum possible score is 100 points. Criteria used to prioritize reconstruction projects are as follows:

## 1. Cost Effectiveness

(Max Points: 50)
The cost-effectiveness of the project is calculated by multiplying the average daily traffic (ADT) count of the segment by the length of the segment and dividing by the project cost. The cost-effectiveness scores are then compared to the highest cost-effectiveness of all the Street Reconstruction projects being evaluated, as follows:
$\underline{\text { ADT } \times \text { Length }}$
$=\quad$ Cost Effectiveness

City Cost*
Cost Effectiveness of Project
Highest Cost Effectiveness of
Projects Considered
2. Alternate Modes
(Max Points: 20)
10 points given for streets that have an existing or planned Class 2 or Class 3 bicycle facility
10 points given for streets on a RT bus route or Light Rail Route

## 3. Economic Development

(Max Points: 15)

- Is the project within the Economic Development Strategy?:
- Does the project fall within one of the nineteen (19) Neighborhood Commercial Revitalization Area?
- Is the project located within one of the twenty-seven (27) Key Development Opportunity Areas or Sites?
- Is the project located in either the Merged Downtown or SP/Richards Redevelopment Area?
If Yes on any of the above ( 10 points) $\qquad$
- Is the project located in a Business Improvement District (BID) or Property-Based Improvement District (PBID)?

Yes (5 points) $\qquad$ No (0 points)

- Is the project in one of the Infill Areas as defined in the City of Sacramento Infill Strategy adopted on May 14, 2002. This document defines infill in four categories:
(Maximum Points 10)
- Target Residential Area ___ Yes (10 points) ___ No (0 points)
- Central City Area Yes (10 points) No (0 points)
- Neighborhood Commercial Revitalization Area $\qquad$ Yes (5 points) No (0 points)
- Transit Station Area $\qquad$ Yes (10 points) $\qquad$ No (0 points)
- Is the project in a City Redevelopment Area excluding the Merged Downtown or SP/Richards Area or in a Community Development Block Grant eligible area?
$\qquad$ Yes (5 points) $\qquad$ No (0 points)


## SUMMARY

The Street Reconstruction Priority listing is presented in Table C-1. The approximate location of the top ranked 27 projects are depicted in Figure C-1

There were no projects added to this year's list.
There were two projects deleted from this year's Street Reconstruction list that were in the previous list. These projects are South Land Park Drive from Sutterville Road to Moss Drive, and $37^{\text {th }}$ Street from S Street to T Street. Both of these projects are fully funded for construction.
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FIGURE C-1


## TRAFFIC SIGNALS PROGRAM

## INTRODUCTION

Traffic signals determine who has the right-of-way at an intersection or crossing. They facilitate orderly traffic flow, allow pedestrians to cross, and provide cross-street traffic a chance to cross or enter an intersection. When installed at appropriate locations, traffic signals can increase the capacity of an intersection, reduce the frequency of collisions, and provide better minor street access. Because traffic signals are expensive to install (approximately $\$ 350,000$ per signal) and may induce safety problems if not appropriately placed, the City only installs signals where they will clearly improve safety and make the intersection operate more efficiently. The City typically constructs one or two traffic signals per year through the Capital Improvement Program.

## GOALS AND POLICIES

The Traffic Signals Program is consistent with the following City of Sacramento General Plan (adopted January 19, 1988, reflects City Council Amendments through March 2004) goals and policies.

## Goals:

1. Create a safe, efficient surface transportation network for the movement of people and goods.

## Policy:

- Install traffic signals, when appropriate, to improve safety and increase the efficiency of intersections within the City.

2. Maintain a desirable quality of life, including good air quality, while supporting planned land use and population growth.

## Policy:

- Install traffic signals, when appropriate, to improve air quality by reducing delay at intersections.

3. Work toward achieving an overall Level of Service C on the City's local and major street systems.

## Policy:

- Install traffic signals to make more efficient use of the City's existing street system.

4. Increase the capacity of the transportation system.

## Policy:

- Support programs that improve traffic flow.


## PROJECT LIST DEVELOPMENT

## Eligibility Criteria

The Traffic Signal Priority List procedure involves three phases. Project eligibility is determined during Phases I and II, as presented below:

## Phase I

In Phase I, the following data are collected for any location which has been suggested as a candidate for a traffic signal:

Collisions: A listing of the most recent three calendar years of reported collision history is compiled. Collisions types that are correctable with a signal are notated.

Traffic Volumes:

Pedestrian/Bicycle:

Existing Controls:
Twenty-four hour volume counts with an hourly listing of each approach direction are obtained for the combined minor street volumes, the combined major street approach volumes, and a total for the entire intersection. Peak hour (am and pm) traffic volumes by manual count for the turning and through movements are typically obtained.

As part of the peak hour vehicular movement counts, pedestrian and bicycle data are collected. If the pedestrian and bicycle peak hour differs from the vehicular peak hour, a separate manual count is conducted.

The current type of control (i.e., two-way stop, an all-way stop, etc.) is recorded.

The above data is collected to screen eligible projects. In addition, information on topographic/geometric features, land use, and visibility is also collected and considered when making recommendations on eligible traffic signal locations.

## Phase II

In Phase II, the information from Phase I is used to determine which locations meet one or more of the following eleven Caltrans traffic signal warrants:

Warrant-1
Minimum
Vehicle Volume

Warrant-2<br>Interruption of Continuous Traffic

Warrant-3
Minimum
Pedestrian
Volume

Warrant-4
School Areas

Warrant-5
Progressive
Movement

Warrant-6
Collision Experience

Warrant-7
Systems
Warrant

This warrant is satisfied when the volume of intersecting traffic (from the minor street as compared to the total traffic) is the principal reason for consideration of a traffic signal. For most urban locations, a minimum of 600 vehicles per hour for the heaviest eight hours must approach the intersection from the major street, and for the same 8 -hour period a minimum of 200 vehicles per hour must approach the intersection from the minor street.

This warrant is satisfied when the traffic volume on the major street impacts the minor street by creating a hazard for traffic entering the major street. For most urban locations, a minimum of 900 vehicles per hour for the heaviest eight hours must approach the intersection from the major street, and for the same eight-hour period a minimum of 100 vehicles per hour must approach the intersection from the minor street.

This warrant is satisfied when there is a minimum of 100 pedestrians per hour for four hours or a minimum of 190 pedestrians in one hour crossing the major street at regular or mid-block locations. Acceptable gaps in traffic and the distance to nearby signals are factors that are also considered in determining whether or not a signal is appropriate.

This warrant is satisfied when there is a minimum of 100 pedestrians per hour for two hours and a minimum of 500 vehicles per hour for the same two hours in the vicinity of a school. It may also be appropriate where it is necessary to extend or create adequate crossing gaps in the flow of traffic on roadways in suggested school route areas.

This warrant is satisfied when the distance to the nearest signalized intersection is greater than 1,000 feet, and progressive movement control requires the installation of a traffic signal where one would not otherwise be warranted. The signal will provide proper vehicle platooning and speed control. Factors considered include whether or not the streets are one-way or two-way, the operation of adjacent signals, and travel speeds.

This warrant is satisfied when five or more collisions in a year, correctable by traffic signal control, are reported, and other less restrictive remedies have failed to reduce the number of collisions; where the traffic volumes of warrants one and two are $80 \%$ fulfilled; and where such a signal would not seriously disrupt progressive traffic flow.

A traffic signal installation may be warranted to encourage concentration and organization of traffic flow networks where there are two major routes meeting specific volume and functional characteristics. This warrant is satisfied when there is a minimum of 1000 vehicles during any one hour of the day and both streets meet a requirement of being a major route through the City.

Warrant-8
Combination of
Warrants

Warrant-9
Four Hour Warrant

Warrant-10
Peak Hour
Delay

Warrant-11
Peak Hour
Volume

This warrant is satisfied when warrants one and two are satisfied to the extent of $80 \%$ or more of the stated numerical values.

This warrant is satisfied for most urban areas when for four or more hours, the minor street approach volumes exceed 200 vehicles per hour and the major street approach volume exceeds 800 vehicles per hour during the same four hours.

This warrant is satisfied when the minor street approach volume is at least 150 vehicles and the total volume of intersection approaches are 800 vehicles per hour. The number of lanes and the type of geometric configuration (4-legged or "T" intersection) is also considered in determining whether or not minor street traffic suffers delay during the peak hour.

This warrant is satisfied for most urban areas when the minor street approach volume exceeds 200 vehicles in an hour and the major street approach volume exceeds 1,250 vehicles for the same hour. It is somewhat similar to warrant nine (four hour volumes), and recognizes minor streets that suffer delay in entering or crossing major streets.

## Project Identification

Each year, the City evaluates approximately 20 new locations for traffic signals. New locations are added to the list through traffic investigations, collision analysis, resident requests, development projects, Councilmember requests, etc. For existing traffic signal priority list locations, new data is gathered and the location is re-evaluated approximately every four years.

The installation of a traffic signal needs to be carefully evaluated because unwarranted installation may cause an increase in the number of certain types of collisions, such as rear end collisions. When a signal warrant is met, it indicates that the potential for increased congestion or an increase in collisions attributed to a traffic signal is less than for existing conditions (without a signal).

## PROJECT RANKING PROCESS

## Phase III

Once a location is determined eligible for a traffic signal by meeting one or more of the Caltrans warrants, the following criteria are applied to rank the eligible locations (there is no maximum score). In the case of a tied score, the locations are ranked in order first by the Collisions score, then by the Pedestrian/Bicycles score, the Peak Hour Traffic Volumes score, the Special Conditions score, Average Daily Traffic (ADT) Volumes score, and the Speed score.

1. Collisions
(Max Points: No limit)
Points are assigned for each reported collision that occurred at the intersection during the previous three years that was susceptible to correction by signalization, as follows:

| Type of Collision | Points Per Occurrence |
| :--- | :---: |
| Fatal | 48 |
| Injury | 24 |
| Property Damage Only | 12 |

The total points for the previous three years are divided by three to determine a yearly average that is then assigned to the proposed signal location.

## 2. Pedestrians/Bicycles

(Max. Points: 30)
A maximum of ten pedestrian points are assigned for each of the following:
(A) Pedestrians (General)
(Max. Points: 10)
Points are assigned based on the number of pedestrians crossing the higher volume street during the four highest traffic hours, as presented below:

| $\frac{\text { Pedestrians }}{\geq 100}$ | $\frac{\text { Points }}{}$ | $\frac{\text { Pedestrians }}{}$ | $\frac{\text { Points }}{40-49}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $90-99$ | 9 | $30-39$ | 4 |
| $80-89$ | 8 | $20-29$ | 3 |
| $70-79$ | 7 | $10-19$ | 2 |
| $60-69$ | 6 | $0-9$ | 1 |
| $50-59$ | 5 |  | 0 |

(B) Pedestrians (Schools)
(Max. Points: 10)
If the school warrant (Caltrans School Warrant \#4) is met, 10 points are assigned.
(C) Bicycles
(Max. Points: 10)
If the location is identified in the City/County Bikeway Master Plan, 10 points are assigned.

## 3. Average Daily Traffic (ADT) Volumes <br> (Max. Points: 10)

Points are assigned based on a comparison of the average daily traffic (ADT) volumes on the intersecting streets, as presented below:

MAIN STREET ADT

| SIDE STREET ADT | $<2,000$ | $2,001-$ <br> 5,000 | $5,001-$ <br> 10,000 | $10,001-$ <br> 15,000 | $15,001-$ <br> 20,000 | $>20,000$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $<2,000$ | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| $2,001-5,000$ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| $5,001-10,000$ | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| $10,001-15,000$ | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| $15,001-20,000$ | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| $>20,000$ | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |

4. Peak Hour Traffic Volumes
(Max. Points: 10)
Points are assigned based on a comparison of side street traffic volume to main street traffic volume during the peak hour, as presented below:

SIDE STREET PEAK HOUR VOLUME

| MAIN STREET <br> PEAK HOUR VOLUME | $<100$ | $101-200$ | $201-300$ | $301-400$ | $>400$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $<400$ | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| $400-600$ | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| $601-800$ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| $801-1,000$ | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| $1,001-1,200$ | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| $1,201-1,400$ | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| $1,401-1,600$ | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| $>1,601$ | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |

## 5. Speed

(Max. Points: 5)
Points are assigned in this category to account for the difficulty that motorists may have judging gaps in traffic on high-speed streets. More points are assigned for the higherspeed streets, as presented below:

| Posted Speed $(\mathrm{mph})$ | $\frac{\text { Points }}{5}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| $50+$ | 5 |
| $40-49$ | 4 |
| $35-39$ | 3 |
| $30-34$ | 2 |
| $25-29$ | 1 |
| $<25$ | 0 |

6. Special Conditions
(Max. Points: 5)
Points are added based on special conditions related to the benefits or drawbacks of signalizing an intersection as determined by the City Traffic Engineer. Although the sum of the three categories below may total more than five points for a candidate location, no more than five points are assigned.
(A) Activity Centers
(Max. Points: 3)
One point is assigned for each of the following activity centers that generate pedestrian or emergency vehicle traffic and are within 1,000 feet of the candidate traffic signal location:

- School
- Park
- Library
- Employment
- Stadium
- Arena
- Senior Center
- Commercial Center
- Fire Station
- Rail Line
- Hospital
- High Density Residential
(B) Rail Crossing
(Max. Points: 2)
Up to two points may be assigned if a rail crossing that would benefit from adjacent traffic signal pre-empt operation is within 1,000 feet.
(C) Other Safety Concerns

Two points are assigned when restricted sight distance is a concern, or there is a favorable condition for signal coordination.

## SUMMARY

Table D-1 presents the final point total and ranking of the traffic signal projects. Figure D-1 shows the approximate locations of the projects.

There were no new projects added to this year's traffic signal list.
There were three projects deleted from this year's Traffic Signal list that were in the previous list. These projects and reasons for their deletion are as follows:

- 24th Street/Hogan Drive/48th Avenue. This project is in design.
- Q Street $/ 4^{\text {th }}$ Street. This project is complete.
- Bell Avenue/ Taylor Street. This project is complete.

| $\begin{aligned} & 2006 \\ & \text { Rank } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2005 \\ & \text { Rank } \end{aligned}$ | Council District | Main Street | Side Street | Notes | Collisions Score | Ped/Bike Score | ADT <br> Score | Peak Hour Traffic Score | Speed <br> Score | Special Conditions Score | Total <br> Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Maximum Points in Scoring Category: |  |  | No Max. | 30 | 10 | 10 | 5 | 5 |  |
| 1 | 1 | 3 | K Street | 23rd Street | 1 | 108 | 10 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 125 |
| 2 | 3 | 6 | Fruitridge Road | Bradford Dr/Wilkinson St |  | 72 | 15 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 101 |
| 3 | 4 | 2 | El Camino Avenue | Boxwood Street |  | 68 | 12 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 96 |
| 4 | 6 | 1 | Northgate Boulevard | Sotano Drive/Wisconsin Avenue | 4 | 64 | 15 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 96 |
| 5 | 8 | 4 | W Street | 6th Street |  | 64 | 12 | 3 | 7 | 3 | 1 | 90 |
| 6 | 12 | 2 | El Camino Avenue | Colfax Street |  | 64 | 10 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 84 |
| 7 | 7 | 3 | P Street | 24th Street |  | 44 | 16 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 71 |
| 8 | 9 | 6 | Stockton Boulevard | Dias Avenue | 4 | 44 | 12 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 71 |
| 9 | 10 | 2 | Rio Linda Boulevard | South Avenue |  | 44 | 10 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 65 |
| 10 | 13 | 3 | H Street | 13th Street |  | 40 | 12 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 63 |
| 11 | 17 | 1 | Truxel Road | Millcreek Dr/Waterwheel Drive |  | 36 | 10 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 60 |
| 12 | 11 | 4 | Freeport Boulevard | Belleau Wood Ln/Bing Maloney Driveway | 4 | 36 | 10 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 60 |
| 13 | 20 | 2 | Norwood Avenue | Ford Road |  | 36 | 12 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 59 |
| 14 | 34 | 3 | Q Street | 24th Street |  | 32 | 16 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 58 |
| 15 | 19 | 4 | Freeport Boulevard | Claudia Drive |  | 24 | 16 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 58 |
| 16 | 24 | 6 | Broadway | 53rd Street |  | 32 | 13 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 57 |
| 17 | 14 | 5 | 24th Street | 53rd Avenue | 4 | 24 | 15 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 57 |
| 18 | 25 | 5 | Fruitridge Road | 58th Street |  | 28 | 12 | 5 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 56 |
| 19 | 5 | 6 | Power Inn Road | Belvedere Avenue | 2 | 24 | 11 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 52 |
| 20 | 18 | 2 | Rio Linda Boulevard | Jessie Avenue |  | 40 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 51 |
| 21 | 16 | 2 | Rio Linda Boulevard | Lampasas Avenue |  | 32 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 50 |
| 22 | 29 | 5 | Broadway | 42nd Street | 4 | 28 | 10 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 50 |
| 23 | 26 | 6 | Florin Perkins Road | 24th Avenue | 4 | 24 | 10 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 50 |
| 24 | 31 | 5 | 47th Avenue | 27th Street/Otto Circle | 3,4 | 20 | 10 | 6 | 8 | 4 | 2 | 50 |
| 25 | 32 | 7 | Center Parkway | Arroyo Vista Drive |  | 28 | 10 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 49 |
| 26 | 15 | 5 | 34th Street | Y Street |  | 16 | 23 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 48 |
| 27 | 22 | 7 | Mack Road | Summersdale Drive |  | 20 | 10 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 47 |
| 28 | 27 | 8 | Center Parkway | Tangerine Avenue | 4 | 16 | 17 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 47 |
| 29 | 28 | 6 | Fruitridge Road | South Watt Avenue | 4 | 16 | 10 | 7 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 47 |
| 30 | 23 | 6 | Power Inn Road | Alpine Avenue |  | 16 | 12 | 6 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 46 |
| 31 | 36 | 3 | Capitol Avenue | 24th Street |  | 20 | 14 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 44 |
| 32 | 46 | 2 | Norwood Avenue | Fairbanks Avenue | 4 | 20 | 12 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 44 |
| 33 | 21 | 1 | Azevedo Drive | Bannon Creek Drive |  | 8 | 22 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 42 |
| 34 | 38 | 6 | 14th Avenue | 73rd Street |  | 20 | 10 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 41 |
| 35 | 39 | 2 | Rio Linda Boulevard | Arcade Boulevard | 4 | 16 | 10 | 5 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 41 |
| 36 | 49 | 7 | Center Parkway | Bamford Drive (S) |  | 12 | 15 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 38 |
| 37 | 55 | 1 | West El Camino Avenue | I-80 E/B Ramp |  | 16 | 10 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 37 |
| 38 | 58 | 2 | Silver Eagle Road | Mabel Street |  | 12 | 12 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 35 |

1) Adjacent signal modifications made in 2005. Continue to monitor.
2) 14th and Power Inn has a signal close to this location. Spillback may occur
3) When locations' scores are tied, they are ranked first by the Collisions score, then by the Ped/Bike score.
TABLE D-1

| $\begin{aligned} & 2006 \\ & \text { Rank } \end{aligned}$ | 2005 <br> Rank | Council District | Main Street | Side Street | Notes | Collisions Score | Ped/Bike Score | ADT <br> Score | Peak Hour Traffic Score | Speed <br> Score | Special Conditions Score | Total <br> Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Maximum Points in Scoring Category: |  |  | No Max. | 30 | 10 | 10 | 5 | 5 |  |
| 39 | 40 | 2 | Rio Linda Boulevard | Acacia Avenue |  | 12 | 12 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 35 |
| 40 | 53 | 6 | 65th Expressway | Jansen Drive | 4 | 8 | 10 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 35 |
| 41 | 37 | 7 | Valley Hi Drive | Wyndham Drive |  | 4 | 15 | 5 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 34 |
| 42 | 30 | 1 | Azevedo Drive | Pebblewood Drive | 4 | 0 | 25 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 34 |
| 43 | 43 | 6 | Business Drive | 14th Avenue |  | 12 | 10 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 33 |
| 44 | 47 | 4 | Freeport Boulevard | 10th Avenue |  | 0 | 17 | 4 | 7 | 3 | 1 | 32 |
| 45 | 48 | 3 | Munroe Street | Latham Drive |  | 0 | 15 | 5 | 8 | 3 | 1 | 32 |
| 46 | 52 | 7 | Riverside Boulevard | Shoreside Drive (S) |  | 8 | 10 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 30 |
| 47 | 33 | 3 | Campus Commons Drive | University Avenue | 4 | 0 | 20 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 30 |
| 48 | 44 | 2 | Norwood Avenue | Lampasas Avenue |  | 8 | 15 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 28 |
| 49 | 56 | 7 | Riverside Boulevard | Park Riviera Drive (south leg) | 4 | 4 | 11 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 28 |
| 50 | 64 | 1 | West El Camino Avenue | Erin Drive | 4 | 4 | 10 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 28 |
| 51 | 66 | 5 | Franklin Boulevard | Turnbridge Drive | 4 | 0 | 11 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 28 |
| 52 | 57 | 2 | Connie Drive | Roseville Road | 4 | 0 | 10 | 5 | 7 | 5 | 1 | 28 |
| 53 | 41 | 3 | H Street | 48th Street |  | 8 | 10 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 27 |
| 54 | 70 | 2 | Rio Linda Boulevard | Carmelita Avenue |  | 16 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 26 |
| 55 | 68 | 4 | Land Park Drive | 10th Avenue | 4 | 8 | 10 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 26 |
| 56 | 69 | 4 | Land Park Drive | 8th Avenue | 4 | 8 | 10 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 26 |
| 57 | 50 | 4 | Greenhaven Drive | Gloria Drive | 4 | 0 | 15 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 26 |
| 58 | 51 | 2 | Rio Linda Boulevard | Ford Road |  | 12 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 25 |
| 59 | 61 | 7 | Pocket Road | East Shore Drive | 4 | 0 | 15 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 25 |
| 60 | 54 | 4 | South Land Park Drive | 35th Avenue | 4 | 0 | 11 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 25 |
| 61 | 35 | 7 | Center Parkway | CRC Driveway | 4 | 0 | 10 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 25 |
| 62 | 45 | 8 | Franklin Boulevard | Boyce Drive | 4 | 0 | 10 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 25 |
| 63 | 63 | 3 | H Street | 42nd Street/Mission Way |  | 0 | 11 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 24 |
| 64 | 71 | 8 | Bruceville Road | Kaiser Driveway (N) | 4 | 0 | 10 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 24 |
| 65 | 73 | 2 | Marysville Boulevard | Dry Creek Road |  | 4 | 10 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 22 |
| 65 | 72 | 7 | Pocket Road | West Shore Drive |  | 4 | 10 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 22 |
| 67 | 67 | 2 | Bell Avenue | Marysville Boulevard | 4 | 0 | 12 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 22 |
| 68 | 60 | 7 | Ehrhardt Avenue | Carlin Avenue |  | 0 | 15 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 20 |
| 69 | 62 | 4 | Riverside Boulevard | 2nd Avenue |  | 0 | 12 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 19 |
| 70 | 42 | 1 | Northgate Boulevard | Del Paso Boulevard/160 ramp |  | 4 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 15 |
| 71 | 75 | 3 | Del Paso Boulevard | Palo Verde Avenue |  | 4 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 13 |
| 72 | 74 | 8 | Jacinto Avenue | Port Haywood Way |  | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 10 |

1) Adjacent signal modifications made in 2005. Continue to monitor.
2) 14th and Power Inn has a signal close to this location. Spillback may occur.
3) To be installed by Regional Transit.
4) When locations' scores are tied, they are ranked first by the Collisions score, then by the Ped/Bike score.
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## ALTERNATE MODES PROGRAM

## INTRODUCTION

Facilities for bicycles and pedestrians are an integral part of the transportation system. Given the City's mild climate and flat terrain, bicycling and walking are viable and important transportation mode.

The Caltrans Design Manual, Chapter 1000 (a City Standard adopted by reference in the Bicycle Master Plan) specifies three classifications of bikeways:

Class I Bikeways:

Class II Bikeways

Bike/Pedestrian Bridges

Bike trails or bike paths are separated from vehicular traffic and are for the exclusive use of bicyclists and pedestrians. Cross traffic by motorists is minimized. Bike trails adjacent to roads are separated by physical space (minimum five feet) or barriers such as fences or dense shrubs.

Bike lanes are one-way lanes established within the street for preferential use by bicycles. Bicyclists are required to travel in the same direction as the automobile traffic. Class II bikeways are onstreet facilities designated with signs, striped lanes, and pavement legends.

Special consideration is given to criteria for bicycle/pedestrian bridges. Within this section of the TPG, the term "bridges" refers to a stand-alone bike and pedestrian overcrossing or undercrossing including associated approaches.

## GOALS AND POLICIES

The Bikeways Program is consistent with the following City of Sacramento General Plan (adopted January 19, 1988, reflects City Council Amendments through September 2000) and City/County 2010 Bikeway Master Plan goals and policies:

## Goals:

1. Develop bicycling as a major transportation and recreational mode. (City of Sacramento General Plan adopted January 19, 1988, reflects City Council Amendments through September 2000).

## Policies:

- Develop bikeways in a coordinated manner with the County and other agencies to facilitate commuting to and from major trip generators.
- Maintain public bikeways in a manner that promotes their use, by developing a continuous repair and maintenance program.

2. Work toward achieving the goal of a Level of Service C on the City's local and major street systems. (City of Sacramento General Plan adopted January 19, 1988, reflects City Council Amendments through September 2000).

## Policy:

- Explore alternative transportation modes that will lead to a decrease in vehicular demand of the City's surface street system.

3. Develop and maintain a coordinated approach by City/County and other agencies to implement the plan (2010 Bikeway Master Plan) as funding becomes available or as development occurs. (2010 Bikeway Master Plan)

## Policy:

- Integrate efforts of Planning, Recreation, Public Works, and other departments of City and County government and other agencies that are involved in planning, construction or operational elements of the bikeway system.

4. Achieve the highest possible level of safety and security for cyclists. (2010 Bikeway Master Plan)

## Policy:

- Provide a network of safe and convenient bikeways.

5. Develop a bikeway system that incorporates aesthetics and the historical characteristics of the Sacramento area. (2010 Bicycle Master Plan)

## Policy:

- Bikeways should take full advantage of the beauty and natural features of the Sacramento area by blending with the terrain and topography.


## PROJECT LIST DEVELOPMENT

The 2010 Bikeway Master Plan was used to develop an initial list of projects, which was then reviewed by the Transportation Programming Guide Community Advisory Committee and City staff. Projects were solicited from the Bicycle Advisory Committee, the Community Advisory Committee, and through the TPG public outreach.

## PROJECT RANKING PROCESS: FOR ON-STREET AND OFF-STREET

The Bicycle Advisory Committee, with input by the Community Advisory Committee, developed the scoring and ranking criteria. There are eight scoring criteria categories for evaluating bikeway projects:

- Links to Activity Centers and Infill Areas (employment/residential/recreation)
- Barrier Elimination (reduction in cycling distance)
- Traffic Characteristics (volume/speed/lane width)
- Right-of-Way/Cost
- Linkage to Transportation System
- Travel Continuity
- Geographic Distribution
- Recreation Potential
(ownership and land use)
(i.e., bus, LRT, train etc.)
(stops per mile)
(spacing between bikeways)
(proximity to parks/open space)

Eligible projects are scored and ranked using the eight criteria outlined below. The maximum score is 100 points.

1. Linkage to Activity Centers and Infill Areas
(Max. Points: 20)

- Points are assigned for projects that are adjacent to, or provide access to, activity centers:

| Activity Center | Points |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| Public Colleges/Universities | 20 |  |
| per facility |  |  |
| Schools/Parks/Libraries/Community Centers | 10 |  |
| per facility |  |  |
| Commercial Centers | 5 |  |
| Employment Centers | 5 | per 100 employees |
| High Density Residential | 5 | per site |

- 5 points are assigned if the project is located in one of the following "infill" areas as defined by the City of Sacramento Infill Strategy adopted on May 14, 2002:
- Target Residential Areas
- Central City Areas
- Commercial Corridors
- Transit Areas

Note: Commercial Centers $=$ Commercial sites containing a minimum of 40,000 square feet Employment Centers $=$ Non-residential sites containing a minimum of 100 employees High Density Residential = A common project site containing 20 dwelling units per acre and a minimum of 100 dwelling units
2. Barrier Elimination

Points are assigned based on the reduced distance the cyclists would travel with the project in place.

| $\underline{\text { Distance }(\text { miles })}$ | Points |
| :--- | :---: |
| Less than 0.25 | 0 |
| $0.25-0.5$ | 2 |
| $.6-1.0$ | 4 |
| $1.1-1.5$ | 6 |
| $1.6-2.0$ | 10 |
| More than 2.0 | 15 |

3. Traffic Characteristics
(Max. Points: 15)

## Bike Trails (Off-Street Bikeways)

Trails are separated from motorized traffic; therefore, they receive full 15 points.
Bike Lanes/Routes (On-Street Bikeways)
Points for Traffic Characteristics were given on the basis of whether the proposed project is a Class 2 or Class 3 facility using the point system below. Projects on major streets were classified as Class 2 facilities for scoring purposes only. The feasibility of each Class 2 facility has not been evaluated and will be determined in the scoping/funding process.

Points are assigned based on existing curb lane width, average daily traffic (ADT) volume, and posted speed limit.

## (A) Class 2

1) Volume

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \quad \stackrel{\mathrm{ADT}}{>40,000} \\
& 30,001-40,000 \\
& 20,001-30,000 \\
& 10,001-20,000 \\
& 3,000-10,000 \\
& <3,000
\end{aligned}
$$

Points
5
4
3
2
1
0 (Class 3 Recommended)
2) Speed:

| Speed | Points |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\geq 50$ | 5 |
| 45 | 4 |
| 40 | 3 |
| 35 | 2 |

3) High existing usage: Five points are assigned if bicycle counts on the candidate bikeway segment indicate 25 or more bikes per hour.

## (B) Class 3

1) Volume: $\underline{\mathrm{ADT}}$

$$
>20,000
$$

$$
10,001-20,000
$$

$$
5,001-10,000
$$

$$
3,001-5,000
$$

$$
\begin{equation*}
1,001-3,000 \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

$$
<1,000
$$

2) Speed:

$$
\frac{\text { Speed }}{>35}
$$

$$
35
$$

$$
30
$$

$$
25
$$

$$
20
$$

$$
\leq 15
$$

Points
0
1
2
35
$\frac{\text { Points }}{0}$123

$$
4
$$

$$
5
$$

3) High existing usage: Five points are assigned if bicycle counts on the candidate bikeway segment indicate 25 or more bikes per hour.

## 4. Right-of-Way/Cost

Land Ownership Factors
City Owned 7
Public (non-City) 4
Private 0
5. Linkage to Transportation System
(Max. Points: 10)
(A) Links to other bikeways........................................................................................................................................................................................... 5
One point is assigned for each existing or planned bikeway to which the
candidate bikeway will connect.

Five points are assigned for a connection with another transportation mode that accommodates bicycles by carrying them or providing secure parking. Other modes include light rail stations, buses with bike racks, AMTRAK station, Sacramento International Airport, and park and ride lots.
6. Travel Continuity
(Max. Points: 10)
Points are assigned based on the number of stops per mile along the route.

| Stops Per Miles |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Points |
| $1-4$ | 10 |
| $5-9$ | 7 |
| $>10$ | 5 |
|  | 0 |

7. Geographic Distribution
(Max. Points: 5)
Points are assigned based on the candidate bikeway's distance from the nearest parallel existing route at the closest point:

| Distance (miles) | Points |
| :---: | :---: |
| $0-.5$ | 1 |
| $.6-1.0$ | 2 |
| $1.1-1.5$ | 3 |
| $1.6-2.0$ | 4 |
| $>2.0$ | 5 |

## 8. Recreational Potential

(Max. Points: 10)

|  | Points |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (A) Does the bikeway have scenic views? | $\frac{\text { Yes }}{2}$ | $\frac{\text { No }}{0}$ |  |
| (B) Does the bikeway have shaded portions? | 2 | 0 |  |
| (C) Does the bikeway have low slopes? | 2 | 0 |  |
| (D) Is the bikeway greater than two miles long? | 2 | 0 |  |
| (E) Is there existing street lighting? | 2 | 0 |  |

B1. Population
(Max. Points: 20)
Points are assigned based on population density within 2 miles:
One point for every multiple of 750 persons per square mile.
(population density of $750=1$ point, density of $1500=2$ points...density equal to or greater than $15,000=20$ points)

One point for every multiple of 1000 jobs per square mile.
(job density of $1000=1$ point, density of $2000=2$ points...density of 5,000 or greater $=5$ points)

B2. Link to Activity Centers and Infill Areas
(Max. Points: 20)

- Activity Center
- Public Colleges/Universities
- Schools/Parks/Libraries/Community Centers
- Commercial Center

Points
20 per facility
5 per facility
5 per facility

- 5 points are assigned if the project is located in one of the following "infill" areas as defined by the City of Sacramento Infill Strategy adopted on May 14, 2002:
- Target Residential Areas
- Central City Areas
- Commercial Corridors
- Transit Areas

Note: Commercial Centers $=$ Commercial sites containing a minimum of 40,000 square feet

## B3. Barrier Elimination

(Max. Points: 40)
Points are assigned based on the reduced distance the pedestrian or bicyclist cyclists would travel with the project in place.

| Distance (miles) | Points |
| :---: | :---: |
| Less than 0.25 | 0 |
| 0.25-0.5 | 5 |
| . $5-1.0$ | 10 |
| $1-2$ | 20 |
| 2-3 | 30 |
| Greater than 3 | 40 |

## B4. Type of Crossing

Bridges that cross waterways, freeways and mainline railways receive 5 points. Bridges that cross expressways with ADT's $>20,000$ receive 3 points.
Bridges over streets with ADT's less than 20,000 and greater than 10,000 receive 2 points.

B5. Right-of-Way/Cost
(Max. Points: 5)

| Land Ownership Factors |  |  | Land Modification Factors |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| City Owned |  | Unused/Vacant Land | 2 |  |
| Public (non-City) | 2 |  | Relocatable Use | 1 |
| Private | 0 |  | Non-Relocatable | 0 |

## B6. Linkage to Transportation System

(Max. Points: 5)
Does it have existing bikeways
or walkways on both ends leading to it
or
Will it require bikeway or walkway construction greater than 1000 feet at one end
or
Will require bikeway or walkway construction greater than 2000 feet at both ends 1 point

5 points

3 points

B7. Travel Continuity
(Max. Points: 5)
Points are assigned based on the number of interruptions per mile along the route.

| Design speed on bridges |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| $>10 \mathrm{mph}$ |  |
| $5-10 \mathrm{mph}$ | 3 |
| $<5 \mathrm{mph}$ | 0 |

## SUMMARY

## On-street

The Alternate Modes - On-street Priority listing is presented in Table E-1. The approximate location of the projects are depicted in Figure E-1

A total of five projects were added to this year's list. These projects are:

- San Juan Road between Rosin Boulevard and Northgate Boulevard.
- J Street between 55th Street and Carlson Drive.
- San Juan Road between East Commerce Way and Azevedo Drive.
- Los Robles Boulevard between Marysville Boulevard and Del Paso Boulevard.
- Canterbury Road between Slobe Avenue and Frontage Road.

There were no projects deleted from last year's list.
One project description was modified: the northern project limit for Freeport Boulevard was changed from Vallejo to $4^{\text {th }}$ Avenue.

## Off-street

The Alternate Modes - Off-street Priority listing is presented in Table E-2. The approximate locations of the top ranked 27 projects are depicted in Figure E-2.

A total of nine projects were added to this year's list. These projects are:

- Steelhead Creek Bike Trail (Ueda Parkway)
- Arcade Creek Bike Trail (Ueda Parkway)
- Jefferson Lofts Bike Trail
- Robla Creek Bike Trail (Ueda Parkway)
- Sacramento River Bike Trail (Miller Park)
- Lanatt Way Access Trail
- Sacramento River Parkway (Upper Pocket)
- Sacramento River Parkway (Little Pocket)
- Roanoke Ave Access Trail.

There were no projects deleted from last year's list.
A total of seven project descriptions were modified:

- The northern project limit for Ninos Parkway Bike Trail was changed from Rosin to B-Drain Canal.
- The western project limit for Two Rivers Bike Trail (east) was changed from Jibboom Street to Sacramento Northern Bike Trail.
- The southern limit for Del Rio Bike Trail was changed from the City limits to the Freeport Reservoir.
- The description for Haggin Oaks Golf Course East was modified to delete the word "East."
- The mileage for the North Natomas Regional Park Bike Trails was modified from 2.0 miles to 2.4 miles.
- The mileage for the I-5 Bike Trail System was modified from 7.34 miles to 7.2 miles.
- The description for Sacramento River Parkway was modified to add the parenthetic note "(Middle Pocket)."


## Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridges

The Alternate Modes - Bike/Pedestrian Bridge Priority listing is presented in Table E-3. The approximate locations of the top ranked 27 projects are depicted in Figure E-3.

A total of ten projects were added to this year's list. These projects are:

- Garden Highway to West Sacramento Bridge
- State Route 99 at Calvine Bridge
- Two Rivers Trail Bridge
- Canterbury Road Bridge
- Southern Pacific Railyards Underpass
- Pilgrim Court Bridge
- California Indian Heritage Center Bridge
- Land Park I-5 Bridge
- Del Paso Boulevard Bridge
- Main Avenue Low Flow Bridge

There were two projects deleted from the list because they have been constructed. These projects are:

- North Bend Dr. at East Drain Canal.
- H Drive and East Drain.

| $\begin{aligned} & 2006 \\ & \text { Rank } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2005{ }^{(1)} \\ \text { Rank } \end{gathered}$ | Council <br> District | ON-STREET BIKEWAYS |  | Activity Centers | Barrier Elim. | Traffic Char. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ROW/ } \\ & \text { Cost } \end{aligned}$ | Link to transp. System | Travel Cont. | Geog. Dist. | Rec Poten. | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Maximum Points in Scoring Category: |  | 20 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 10 | 5 | 10 | 100 |
|  |  |  | Project Description | Miles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 1 | 4,7,8 | Freeport Blvd South: Freeport Blvd between Meadowview Rd and City Limits | 1.1 | 15 | 15 | 6 | 15 | 4 | 10 | 5 | 6 | 76 |
| 1 | 1 | 2 | Bell Avenue East: Bell Ave. between Rio Linda Blvd. and Winters St | 2.0 | 20 | 15 | 4 | 11 | 10 | 7 | 5 | 4 | 76 |
| 3 | 3 | 5 | Franklin Blvd: Franklin Blvd between 2nd Ave and Fruitridge Rd | 2.1 | 20 | 4 | 9 | 11 | 10 | 7 | 3 | 8 | 72 |
| 4 | New | 1 | San Juan Road East: San Juan Road between Rosin Boulevard and Northgate Boulevard | 1.0 | 20 | 4 | 8 | 15 | 10 | 7 | 3 | 4 | 71 |
| 4 | 4 | 2,3 | Roseville Road: Roseville Rd. between Auburn Blvd. and City Limits | 1.6 | 15 | 15 | 5 | 11 | 8 | 10 | 1 | 6 | 71 |
| 6 | New | 3 | J Street: J Street between 55th Street and Carlson Drive | 0.5 | 20 | 0 | 11 | 15 | 10 | 10 | 1 | 2 | 69 |
| 6 | 5 | 4 | 43rd Avenue: 43rd Ave. between Greenhaven Dr. and 14th St.; Blair Ave. between 14th St. and Freeport Blvd | 1.4 | 20 | 6 | 5 | 15 | 10 | 7 | 2 | 4 | 69 |
| 8 | New | 1 | San Juan Road West: San Juan Road between East Commerce Way and Azevedo Drive | 0.4 | 10 | 10 | 5 | 15 | 10 | 10 | 3 | 4 | 67 |
| 8 | 6 | 3,6 | 65th Street: 65th St. between Q St. and 14th Ave | 0.9 | 20 | 4 | 7 | 15 | 10 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 67 |
| 9 | 7 | 4 | Freeport Blvd: Freeport Blvd between 4th Ave and 14th Ave. ${ }^{(2)}$ | 1.1 | 20 | 4 | 8 | 11 | 10 | 5 | 2 | 6 | 66 |
| 9 | 7 | 3,6 | Redding Avenue: Redding Ave between 14th Ave and Folsom Blvd | 1.0 | 15 | 4 | 7 | 15 | 8 | 10 | 5 | 2 | 66 |
| 9 | 7 | 1 | Bannon Creek Drive: Bannon Creek Dr between Azevedo Dr and Truxel Rd | 0.4 | 20 | 2 | 9 | 15 | 8 | 7 | 1 | 4 | 66 |
| 9 | 7 | 4 | Seamas Avenue: Seamas Ave between Peidmont and S Land Park Dr.. | 0.9 | 20 | 6 | 2 | 15 | 9 | 7 | 1 | 6 | 66 |
| 9 | 7 | 4 | South Land Park Drive: S Land Park Dr between 35th Ave and Seamas Ave | 0.7 | 15 | 6 | 3 | 15 | 9 | 10 | 2 | 6 | 66 |
| 9 | 7 | 7,8 | Banford Dr./Bruceville Rd.: Banford Dr between Center Parkway and Valley Hi Dr; Bruceville Rd between Valley Hi Dr and Wyndham Dr | 1.0 | 20 | 4 | 5 | 15 | 10 | 7 | 1 | 4 | 66 |
| 9 | 7 | 8 | 29th Street: 29th St between Meadowview and Florin Road | 1.1 | 20 | 4 | 5 | 15 | 8 | 7 | 1 | 6 | 66 |
| 16 | 14 | 4 | S. Land Park Drive: S. Land Park Dr. between Sutterville Rd and Seamas Ave | 1.4 | 20 | 4 | 2 | 11 | 10 | 10 | 2 | 6 | 65 |
| 17 | 15 | 3 | H Street East: H St between 55th St and Camelia Wy | 0.5 | 20 | 2 | 8 | 15 | 9 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 64 |
| 17 | 15 | 5,6 | 8th Avenue/San Joaquin: 8th Ave and San Joaquin St between Stockton Blvd and Southern Pacific RR tracks | 1.9 | 20 | 2 | 7 | 15 | 10 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 64 |
| 19 | 17 | 8 | Brookfield Drive: Brookfield Dr between Mack Rd and Tangerine Ave | 1.0 | 15 | 6 | 6 | 15 | 9 | 7 | 1 | 4 | 63 |
| 19 | 17 | 1 | Pebblewood Drive: Pebblewood Dr between Azevedo Dr and Montview Wy | 1.4 | 15 | 4 | 6 | 15 | 10 | 7 | 2 | 4 | 63 |

[^2]${ }^{(2)}$ Project description modified from previous year

| $\begin{aligned} & 2006 \\ & \text { Rank } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2005^{(1)} \\ \text { Rank } \end{gathered}$ | Council District | ON-STREET BIKEWAYS |  | Activity Centers | Barrier Elim. | Traffic Char. | $\begin{gathered} \text { ROW/ } \\ \text { Cost } \end{gathered}$ | Link to transp. System | Trave Cont. | Geog. Dist. | Rec Poten. | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Maximum Points in Scoring Category: |  | 20 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 10 | 5 | 10 | 100 |
| 21 | 19 | 3 | Del Paso Blvd East: Del Paso Blvd between Arcade Blvd and Dayton St | 0.7 | 5 | 10 | 4 | 15 | 9 | 10 | 3 | 6 | 62 |
| 22 | 20 | 2 | Norwood Avenue: Norwood Ave. between Main Ave and Grace Ave | 0.2 | 15 | 4 | 4 | 15 | 8 | 10 | 3 | 2 | 61 |
| 23 | 21 | 4 | V Street: V St. between 8th St. and 18th St.. | 0.8 | 20 | 0 | 8 | 15 | 5 | 7 | 1 | 4 | 60 |
| 23 | 21 | 3 | McKinley Blvd: McKinley Blvd between 33rd St and Elvas Ave | 0.8 | 20 | 0 | 4 | 15 | 7 | 7 | 1 | 6 | 60 |
| 23 | 21 | 8 | Amhearst Street: Amhearst St between Florin Rd and Meadowview Rd | 1.1 | 10 | 2 | 6 | 15 | 10 | 10 | 1 | 6 | 60 |
| 26 | 24 | 4 | Havenhurst/56th Avenue: Havenhurst Dr. between Greenhaven Dr. and Greenhaven Dr.; 56th Avenue between Havenhurst Dr. and S. Land Park Dr.. | 1.0 | 10 | 4 | 9 | 15 | 8 | 7 | 2 | 4 | 59 |
| 27 | 25 | 1 | Capitol Mall: Capitol Mall between Front St and 10th St | 0.7 | 20 | 0 | 8 | 11 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 57 |
| 27 | 25 | 4 | Golden Oak/Alma Vista: Golden Oak Ave between S. Land Park Dr and Pocket Rd | 0.7 | 10 | 4 | 9 | 15 | 7 | 7 | 1 | 4 | 57 |
| 27 | 25 | 4 | Gloria Drive: Gloria Dr. between 43rd Ave and Greenhaven Dr | 0.7 | 15 | 2 | 4 | 15 | 8 | 10 | 1 | 2 | 57 |
| 27 | 25 | 1 | Venture Oaks Wy: Venture Oaks Wy between Gateway Oaks Dr. and Gateway Oaks Dr | 0.5 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 7 | 10 | 1 | 4 | 57 |
| 27 | 25 | 2 | Main Avenue: Main Ave. between Pell Dr. and Rio Linda Blvd | 1.6 | 5 | 10 | 5 | 15 | 10 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 57 |
| 32 | 30 | 4,7 | Pocket/Meadowview Road: Pocket/Meadowview Rd between Greenhaven Dr and Freeport Blvd | 0.6 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 15 | 8 | 10 | 5 | 2 | 56 |
| 33 | 31 | 4 | South Land Park Bikeways: 13th St. between 35th Ave. and S. Land Park Dr; 35th Avenue between S. Land Park Dr and Freeport Blvd | 1.7 | 15 | 2 | 3 | 15 | 9 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 55 |
| 33 | 31 | 3 | H Street West: H Street between Alhambra Blvd. and 33rd St | 0.2 | 15 | 0 | 8 | 11 | 4 | 10 | 1 | 6 | 55 |
| 33 | New | 2 | Los Robles BIvd.: Los Robles Boulevard between Marysville Boulevard and Del Paso Boulevard | 0.7 | 10 | 2 | 8 | 15 | 4 | 7 | 1 | 8 | 55 |
| 36 | 33 | 1 | Shady Arbor Drive: Shady Arbor Dr. between West River Dr. and dead end | 0.3 | 10 | 2 | 10 | 15 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 4 | 54 |
| 37 | 34 | 8 | Center Parkway: Center Parkway between Newport Cove Wy and Sheldon Rd | 1.1 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 15 | 8 | 10 | 1 | 6 | 53 |
| 37 | 34 | 1 | Oak Harbor Drive: Oak Harbor Dr between River Plaza Dr and Gateway Oaks Dr | 0.1 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 15 | 7 | 10 | 1 | 6 | 53 |
| 39 | 36 | 2 | Bell Avenue West: Bell Av. between Norwood Ave and Bollanbacher Ave | 0.6 | 10 | 2 | 10 | 7 | 6 | 10 | 5 | 2 | 52 |
| 40 | 37 | 2 | Grand Avenue: Grand Ave between Marysville Blvd and Winters St | 1.0 | 10 | 2 | 3 | 15 | 8 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 51 |
| 41 | 38 | 4,7 | Havenside Drive: Havenside Dr. between Riverside Blvd. and Florin Rd.. | 0.5 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 15 | 8 | 10 | 1 | 4 | 50 |

TABLE E-1

| $\begin{aligned} & 2006 \\ & \text { Rank } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2005^{(1)} \\ \text { Rank } \end{gathered}$ | Council District | ON-STREET BIKEWAYS |  | Activity Centers | Barrier Elim. | Traffic Char. | $\begin{gathered} \text { ROW/ } \\ \text { Cost } \end{gathered}$ | Link to transp. System | Travel Cont. | Geog. Dist. | Rec Poten. | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Maximum Points in Scoring Category: |  | 20 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 10 | 5 | 10 | 100 |
| 41 | 38 | 2,3 | Del Paso Blvd : Del Paso Blvd between Eleanor Ave and Arcade Blvd | 1.2 | 10 | 2 | 3 | 11 | 8 | 10 | 2 | 4 | 50 |
| 43 | 40 | 6 | Cucamonga Avenue: Cucamonga Ave between Ramona Ave and Power Inn Rd | 0.3 | 5 | 2 | 8 | 15 | 3 | 10 | 1 | 4 | 48 |
| 44 | 41 | 1 | West El Camino Avenue: W. El Camino Blvd between Gateway Oaks and I-5. | 0.4 | 10 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 8 | 10 | 1 | 2 | 47 |
| 45 | 42 | 6 | Ramona Avenue: North-South segment on Ramona between LRT tracks and easterly bend. | 0.6 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 15 | 3 | 10 | 1 | 4 | 42 |
| 46 | 43 | 7 | Pocket Road: Pocket Rd between Park Riviera Wy and Riverside Blvd | 0.8 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 15 | 7 | 10 | 1 | 4 | 40 |
| 47 | 44 | 2 | Grove Avenue: Grove Ave between Lampasas Ave and Arden Wy | 0.6 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 9 | 7 | 1 | 4 | 33 |
| 48 | New | 2 | Canterbury Road: Canterbury Road between Slobe Avenue and Frontage Road | 0.4 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 8 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 31 |


| $\begin{aligned} & 2006 \\ & \text { Rank } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2005{ }^{(1)} \\ \text { Rank } \end{gathered}$ | Council District | OFF-STREET BIKEWAYS |  | Activity Centers | Barrier Elim. | Traffic Char. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ROW/ } \\ & \text { Cost } \end{aligned}$ | Link to transp. <br> System | Travel Cont. | Geog. Dist. | Rec Poten. | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Maximum Points in Scoring Category: |  | 20 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 10 | 5 | 10 | 100 |
|  |  |  | Project Description | Miles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 1 | 7,8 | South Sacramento Parkway (west) - Bike trail along the South City Limits from the Bill Conlin Park to Meadowview Park. Distance of 0.52 miles. | 0.5 | 10 | 15 | 15 | 12 | 10 | 10 | 3 | 4 | 79 |
| 2 | 2 | 1 | Ninos Parkway Bike Trail - Bike trail in Ninos Parkway from West El Camino Ave to B Drain Canal. Distance of 1.6 miles. ${ }^{(2)}$ | 1.6 | 20 | 4 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 7 | 1 | 6 | 78 |
| 3 | 3 | 7,8 | South Sacramento Parkway (east) - Bike trail along the South City Limits from the Meadowview Park to Franklin Blvd. Distance of 3.83 miles. | 3.8 | 20 | 4 | 15 | 8 | 10 | 10 | 3 | 6 | 76 |
| 4 | 4 | 1,3 | Two Rivers Bike Trail (east)- Bike trail along the south levee of the American River from Sacramento Northern Trail to Sutter's Landing Park site. Distance of 0.9 miles. ${ }^{(2)}$ | 0.9 | 20 | 10 | 15 | 8 | 10 | 7 | 1 | 4 | 75 |
| 5 | 5 | 4,7,8 | Del Rio Bike Trail - Bike trail along the SPRR right-of-way from Sutterville Rd. to the Freeport Reservoir. Distance of 4.8 miles ${ }^{(2)}$ | 4.8 | 20 | 2 | 15 | 12 | 10 | 7 | 1 | 6 | 73 |
| 6 | 6 | 3 | Sutter's Landing East - Bike trail from Sutter's landing bridge along the American River to H St. Distance of 2.05 miles | 2.1 | 20 | 4 | 15 | 8 | 10 | 10 | 1 | 4 | 72 |
| 7 | 7 | 1 | East Drainage Canal - Bike trail on the east sides of the East Drain Canal from the C1 Canal to Truxel Rd. Distance of 0.69 miles. | 0.7 | 20 | 2 | 15 | 8 | 8 | 10 | 5 | 2 | 70 |
| 7 | 7 | 2 | Haggin Oaks Golf Course - Bike trail from Fulton Ave to Longview Dr. ${ }^{(2)}$ | 0.3 | 15 | 10 | 15 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 5 | 4 | 70 |
| 9 | New | 2 | Steelhead Creek Bike Trail (Ueda Parkway) - Bike trail along Steelhead Creek from Arcade Creek to Main Avenue. Distance of 2.5 miles | 2.5 | 15 | 6 | 15 | 12 | 4 | 10 | 1 | 6 | 69 |
| 10 | New | 2 | Arcade Creek Bike Trail (Ueda Parkway) - Bike trail along Arcade Creek from Steelhead Creek to Hagginwood Park. Distance of 1.8 miles | 1.8 | 20 | 4 | 15 | 12 | 5 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 66 |
| 10 | 9 | 2,3 | Arcade Creek East - Bike trail along Arcade Creek from Haginwood Park Through Del Paso Park to Auburn Blvd. Distance of 4.08 miles. | 4.1 | 20 | 2 | 15 | 8 | 5 | 7 | 1 | 8 | 66 |
| 10 | 9 | 3,6 | Folsom LRT Trail East - Bike trail along the Folsom Light Rail Line between 65th St. and Watt Ave. Distance of 2.73 miles. | 2.7 | 20 | 0 | 15 | 4 | 10 | 10 | 1 | 6 | 66 |
| 10 | 9 | 1 | Natomas Marketplace Bike Trail - Bike trail along north side of drainage canal along I80 from Gateway Park Dr to San Juan Road. Distance of 1.02 miles. | 1.0 | 15 | 2 | 15 | 12 | 7 | 10 | 1 | 4 | 66 |
| 14 | 12 | 5 | UPRR Phase I - Bike trail through the UPRR yards from Sacramento City College to Vallejo Way and SCC to 10th Ave. Distance of 0.82 miles. | 0.8 | 20 | 2 | 15 | 4 | 10 | 10 | 1 | 2 | 64 |
| 15 | 13 | 5,7,8 | UPRR Phase II - Bike trail along the UPRR right-of-way from Sacramento City College to Morrision Creek. Distance of 5.01 miles. | 5.0 | 20 | 2 | 15 | 4 | 10 | 7 | 1 | 4 | 63 |
| 16 | 14 | 1 | North Natomas Regional Park Bike Trails - Network of bike trails within the North Natomas Regional Park. Distance of 2.4 miles. ${ }^{(2)}$ | 2.4 | 5 | 4 | 15 | 15 | 9 | 7 | 1 | 6 | 62 |
| 16 | 14 | 3,6 | U.P. Tracks (old SP east/west mainline) - CSUS to Power Inn Road | 2.5 | 20 | 2 | 15 | 4 | 9 | 7 | 1 | 4 | 62 |
| 18 | 16 | 8 | Laguna Creek South Trail - Bike trail along the south side of Laguna Creek from the existing bridge eastward to the City limits. Distance of 0.26 miles | 0.3 | 10 | 4 | 15 | 15 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 4 | 61 |
| 18 | New | 6 | Jefferson Lofts Bike Trail - Bike trail near Jefferson Lofts from Redding Avenue to former S.P. Railroad. Distance of 0.25 miles | 0.3 | 20 | 2 | 15 | 8 | 3 | 10 | 1 | 2 | 61 |
| 20 | New | 2 | Robla Creek Bike Trail (Ueda Parkway) - Bike trail along Robla Creek from Main Avenue to Sacramento Northern Bike Trial. Distance of 1.7 miles | 1.7 | 10 | 4 | 15 | 12 | 5 | 10 | 1 | 2 | 59 |
|  |  | New" I <br> roject | dicates new project added this year. scription modified from previous year. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| $\begin{aligned} & 2006 \\ & \text { Rank } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2005{ }^{(1)} \\ \text { Rank } \end{gathered}$ | Council District | OFF-STREET BIKEWAYS |  | Activity Centers | Barrier Elim. | Traffic Char. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ROW/ } \\ & \text { Cost } \end{aligned}$ | Link to transp. <br> System | Travel Cont. | Geog. Dist. | Rec Poten. | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Maximum Points in Scoring Category; |  | 20 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 10 | 5 | 10 | 100 |
|  |  |  | Project Description | Miles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20 | 17 | 8 | Center Parkway Extension - Bike trail on the west side of Center Parkway from Jacinto Park to Sheldon Rd. Distance of 0.28 miles. | 0.3 | 10 | 0 | 15 | 15 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 6 | 59 |
| 20 | 17 | 1 | Airport Rd. Trail - Bike trail along the current alignment of Aiport Rd. between San Juan Rd. and Arena Blvd. Distance of 1.24 miles. | 1.2 | 15 | 6 | 15 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 5 | 2 | 59 |
| 20 | 17 | 4,8 | Mangan Park - Bike trail south of Mangan Park in Executive Airport right-of-way from 24th St to Freeport Blvd. Distance of 0.58 miles. | 0.6 | 15 | 0 | 15 | 15 | 3 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 59 |
| 24 | New | 4 | Sacramento River Bike Trail (Miller Park) - Bike trail along the Sacramento River from Broadway to Front Street. Distance of 0.2 miles | 0.2 | 10 | 0 | 15 | 12 | 4 | 10 | 1 | 6 | 58 |
| 24 | 20 | 7 | Pocket Canal Phase V - Bike trail on the west and south sides of the Pocket Canal from Gloria Dr. to Havenside Dr. Distance of 0.79 miles. | 0.8 | 20 | 0 | 15 | 8 | 5 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 58 |
| 24 | 20 | 2,3 | Haggin Oaks Golf Course West - Bike trail from Connie Dr. to Arcade Creek. Distance of 0.81 miles. | 0.8 | 15 | 0 | 15 | 11 | 0 | 10 | 1 | 6 | 58 |
| 27 | 21 | 1 | Airport Rd. Access Trail - East-west bike trail connecting Airport Rd trial to Truxel Rd. Distance of 0.58 miles. | 0.6 | 15 | 0 | 15 | 8 | 9 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 57 |
| 27 | New | 3 | Lanatt Way Access Trail - Bike trail from Lanatt Way to Sutter's Landing Park. Distance of 0.40 miles. | 0.4 | 10 | 15 | 15 | 4 | 2 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 57 |
| 29 | 22 | 1 | Whitter Ranch Bike Trail - North-south bike trail along east edge of Whitter Ranch from Natomas Crossing to San Juan Road. Distance of 0.4 miles. | 0.4 | 10 | 0 | 15 | 12 | 4 | 10 | 1 | 4 | 56 |
| 29 | 22 | 2,3 | U.P. Tracks (old SP east/west mainline) - Sacramento to Roseville | 5.0 | 10 | 0 | 15 | 4 | 8 | 10 | 5 | 4 | 56 |
| 31 | 24 | 1 | Shady Arbor Trail - Bike trail though Shady Arbor Neighborhood Park between Shady Arbor Court and Barandas Dr. Distance of 0.08 miles. | 0.1 | 10 | 0 | 15 | 15 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 2 | 55 |
| 31 | 24 | 1 | Riverfront Master Plan Trails - Bike trail system upgrades and enhancements between R St and I St along the Sacramento River. | 2.0 | 15 | 0 | 15 | 4 | 4 | 10 | 1 | 6 | 55 |
| 33 | 26 | 8 | Laguna Tower - Bike trail along the Laguna Creek tower easement from Laguna Creek to the south City limits. Distance of 0.31 miles. | 0.3 | 10 | 10 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5 | 4 | 54 |
| 33 | 26 | 3 | Folsom LRT Trail West - Bike trail along the Folsom Light Rail Line between Alhambra Blvd. and 65th St. Distance of 2.37 miles. | 2.4 | 15 | 2 | 15 | 0 | 10 | 7 | 1 | 4 | 54 |
| 33 | New | 4,7 | Sacramento River Parkway (Upper Pocket) - Bike trail on the Sacramento River levee from Clipper Way to Arabella Way. Distance of 2.0 miles | 2.0 | 10 | 0 | 15 | 8 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 8 | 54 |
| 33 | New | 4 | Sacramento River Parkway (Little Pocket) - Bike trail on the Sacramento River levee from Captain's Table to trailhead at 35th Avenue. Distance of 1.6 miles | 1.6 | 10 | 0 | 15 | 8 | 4 | 10 | 1 | 6 | 54 |
| 37 | 28 | 1 | Ninos Bike Trail Extension - Bike trail connecting the Ninos Bike Trail at the northern limits to the Ninos Parkway Bridge. Distance of 0.38 miles. | 0.4 | 0 | 10 | 15 | 8 | 7 | 10 | 1 | 2 | 53 |
| 37 | 28 | 1 | SP Railyards - Bike trail through the SP railyards from E St. to the Sacramento River Bike Trail. Distance of 0.55 miles. | 0.6 | 10 | 2 | 15 | 4 | 10 | 7 | 1 | 4 | 53 |
| 39 | 30 | 1 | I-5 Bike Trail System - Bike trails along both sides of Interstate 5 from Hwy 99 interchange to the San Juan Road. Distance of 7.2 miles. ${ }^{(2)}$ | 7.2 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 12 | 10 | 7 | 1 | 4 | 51 |
| 40 | 31 | 7,8 | Morrison Creek - Bike trail along Morrison Creek from Mack Rd. to 53rd Ave. Distance of 2.17 miles. | 2.2 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 15 | 5 | 7 | 2 | 4 | 50 |

[^3]YEAR 2006 - ALTERNATE MODES - OFF-STREET BIKE TRAILS

| $\begin{aligned} & 2006 \\ & \text { Rank } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20055^{(1)} \\ \text { Rank } \end{gathered}$ | Council District | OFF-STREET BIKEWAYS |  | Activity Centers | Barrier <br> Elim. | Traffic Char. | $\begin{gathered} \text { ROW/ } \\ \text { Cost } \end{gathered}$ | Link to transp. System | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Travel } \\ & \text { Cont. } \end{aligned}$ | Geog. Dist. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Rec } \\ \text { Poten. } \end{gathered}$ | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Maximum Points in Scoring Category: |  | 20 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 10 | 5 | 10 | 100 |
|  |  |  | Project Description | Miles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 41 | 32 | 1 | San Juan Access Trail - Bike trail on the north and south sides of San Juan Rd. at the I-5 underpass. Distance of 0.57 miles. | 0.6 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 11 | 4 | 10 | 4 | 4 | 48 |
| 41 | 32 | 1 | I-5 South Natomas Bike Trail - North-south bike trail along east edge of I-5 from San Juan Rd to West El Camino Ave. Distance of 1.22 miles. | 1.2 | 10 | 0 | 15 | 8 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 2 | 48 |
| 43 | 34 | 1 | Arena Access Trail - East-west bike trail between East Commerce Way to Del Paso Rd overpass. Distance of 0.68 miles. | 0.7 | 5 | 2 | 15 | 8 | 4 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 46 |
| 43 | 34 | 3 | Elvas Bike Trail - Bike trail on the northeast side of the Elvas Ave. from 36th Way to F St. Distance of 1.17 mile. | 1.2 | 5 | 0 | 15 | 4 | 7 | 10 | 1 | 4 | 46 |
| 45 | 36 | 1 | C-1 Canal - Bike trail along the C-1 canal from the Natomas East Main Drain Canal to the East Drainage Canal. Distance of 0.97 miles. | 1.0 | 5 | 2 | 15 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 5 | 2 | 45 |
| 45 | 36 | 1 | West Canal West - Bike trail on the west side of the West Canal within the city limits. Distance of 0.34 miles. | 0.3 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 15 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 2 | 45 |
| 45 | 36 | 7 | Sacramento River Parkway (Middle Pocket) - Bike trail on the Sacramento River levee from the Garcia Bend Park to Arabella Way. Distance of 1.9 miles. ${ }^{(2)}$ | 1.9 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 8 | 5 | 10 | 1 | 4 | 45 |
| 48 | 39 | 6 | 4th Ave. Bike Trail - East-West bike trail extending from 4th Ave from Redding Ave. to Ramona Ave. Distance of .53 miles. | 0.5 | 10 | 4 | 15 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 2 | 44 |
| 49 | New | 2 | Roanoke Ave Access Trail - Bike trail from Avenue to Winters Street. Distance of 200 feet. | 0.0 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 15 | 0 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 43 |
| 50 | 40 | 6 | Cal Central Traction RR Trail - Bike trail along the Cal Central Traction RR Right of Way from Power Inn Rd. to the City limits. Distance of 2.85 miles | 2.9 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 4 | 9 | 7 | 1 | 4 | 42 |
| 51 | 41 | 6 | Ramona Ave. Bike Trail - North-South bike trail extending from Ramona Ave to 14th Ave. Distance of .25 miles. | 0.3 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 2 | 30 |

${ }^{(1)}$ "New" Indicates new project added this year.
${ }^{(2)}$ Project description modified from previous year.
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TABLE E-2
TABLE E-3

| $\begin{gathered} 2006 \\ \text { RANK } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2005{ }^{(1)} \\ & \text { RANK } \end{aligned}$ | Council District | BIKE/PED BRIDGE PROJECTS | POPULATION ${ }^{(2)}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { ACTIVITY } \\ \text { CENTER } \\ \text { SCORE } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { BARRIER } \\ \text { ELIM. } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { CROSSING } \\ \text { TYPE } \end{gathered}$ | ROW/COST | TRANSP <br> SYSTEM | $\begin{gathered} \text { TRAVEL } \\ \text { CONTINUITY } \end{gathered}$ | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Maximum Points in Scoring Category: | 20 | 20 | 40 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 100 |
| 1 | 1 | 3 | Sutter Landing Bridge - Provides Bike/Ped. Connection over the American River between the American River Parkway and Sutter Landing Park | 12 | 15 | 40 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 80 |
| 2 | 2 | 1 | Discovery Park - Provides Bike/Ped. Connection over the American River for an all weather connection between Natomas and downtown (LRT Bridge alignment). | 11 | 10 | 30 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 70 |
| 3 | 3 | 1 | River Plaza Dr at main Drain Canal - Provides Bike/Ped. crossing over Main Drain Canal connecting River Plaza Dr | 8 | 5 | 30 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 62 |
| 3 | New | 1 | Garden Highway to West Sacramento - Provides a Bike/Ped Crossing of Sacramento River from Garden highway to West Sacramento. | 10 | 0 | 40 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 62 |
| 5 | 4 | 1 | B-Drain, south of Rosin Blvd - Provides Bike/Ped. over B Drain connecting bike trail near future Rosin Blvd to neighborhood south of drain | 6 | 5 | 30 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 56 |
| 6 | 6 | 3 | Glenn Hall Park Bridge - Provides Bike/Ped. Connection over the American River between the American River Parkway and the Riverpark neighborhood. | 10 | 10 | 20 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 55 |
| 6 | 6 | 5 | UPRY Bridge at SCC LRT Station - Provides a Bike/Ped bridge over UP Railroad at Sacramento City College LRT Station | 13 | 20 | 10 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 55 |
| 8 | 8 | 1 | Downtown Natomas Airport Joint Use Bridge Provides Bike/Ped over American River in line with Truxel Rd. | 11 | 15 | 10 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 53 |
| 8 | 10 | 1 | Richards Boulevard Bike/Ped Bridge - Provides Bike/Ped over Sacramento River west of Richards Boulevard. | 11 | 15 | 10 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 53 |
| 8 | 12 | 6 | Bridge at Redding to Folsom - Provides Bike/Ped. Connection under Railroad mainline connecting Redding Avenue to Folsom Boulevard. | 11 | 20 | 10 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 53 |
| 11 | 5 | 1 | San Juan Rd at I-80 - Provides a Bike/Ped Bridge over I-80 aligned with San Juan Rd | 5 | 10 | 20 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 52 |
| 12 | 8 | 1 | I-80 Bridge(N to S. Natomas) - Provides Bike/Ped. Connection over I-80 at the WAPA Corridor between North \& South Natomas. | 6 | 10 | 20 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 51 |
| 13 | New | 3 | Guy West Bridge Maintenance (painting) | 10 | 20 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 50 |
| 14 | New | 8 | State Route 99 at Calvine Bridge - Provides a Bike/Ped Crossing of State Route 99 north of Calvine Road. | 6 | 0 | 30 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 49 |

${ }^{(1)}$ "New" Indicates new project added this year.
${ }^{(2)}$ Population scores adjusted to 2005 projections
YEAR 2006 - ALTERNATE MODES - BIKE/PED BRIDGES
TABLE E-3

| $\begin{gathered} 2006 \\ \text { RANK } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2005{ }^{(1)} \\ & \text { RANK } \end{aligned}$ | Council District | BIKE/PED BRIDGE PROJECTS | POPULATION ${ }^{(2)}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { ACTIVITY } \\ \text { CENTER } \\ \text { SCORE } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BARRIER } \\ & \text { ELIM. } \end{aligned}$ | CROSSING <br> TYPE | ROW/COST | TRANSP <br> SYSTEM | $\begin{gathered} \text { TRAVEL } \\ \text { CONTINUITY } \end{gathered}$ | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Maximum Points in Scoring Category: | 20 | 20 | 40 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 100 |
| 14 | 13 | 4 | Pioneer Bridge - Provides Bike/Ped. Connection over Sacramento River by suspending below the Pioneer Bridge (Capitol City Freeway). | 12 | 10 | 10 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 49 |
| 14 | 13 | 1 | I Street Bridge - Provides Bike Ped deck at railroad level over Sacramento River. | 12 | 15 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 49 |
| 14 | 16 | 3 | H Street Bridge - Provides Bike/Ped. Path on the north side of the H Street bridge. | 10 | 20 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 49 |
| 18 | 11 | 1 | I-80 Bridge(N to S. Natomas) - Provides Bike/Ped. connection over I-80 near Bannon Creek between North \& South Natomas. | 5 | 10 | 20 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 48 |
| 18 | 13 | 2 | Haggin Oaks Crossing - Provides Bike/Ped. Connection over railroad tracks and Arcade Creek connecting north Sacramento to Haggin Oaks Bike Trail. | 7 | 5 | 20 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 48 |
| 20 | New | 1 | Two Rivers Trail Bridge - Provides a Bike/Ped Crossing of North12th/North 16th Streets along the south bank of the American River Parkway. | 12 | 10 | 10 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 46 |
| 20 | 16 | 1 | South of El Camino at Main Drain Canal - Provides Bike/Ped. crossing over Main Drain Canal at Bike trail south of A-1 Market | 7 | 15 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 46 |
| 22 | 16 | 1 | Northgate Boulevard at C1 Canal - Provides Bike/Ped. Crossing of Northgate Boulevard at the C1 Canal in North Natomas. | 3 | 10 | 20 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 44 |
| 22 | 19 | Co. | National Dr at C1 Canal - Provides Bike/Ped. Crossing of C1 Canal at National Dr in North Natomas. | 4 | 5 | 20 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 44 |
| 22 | 21 | 1 | Gateway Park Boulevard at C1 Canal - Provides Bike/Ped. Crossing of C1 Canal at Gateway Park Boulevard in North Natomas. | 4 | 5 | 20 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 44 |
| 25 | 19 | 1 | I-80 Bridge(N to S. Natomas) - Provides Bike/Ped. Connection over I-80 at the West Canal between North \& South Natomas. | 5 | 10 | 10 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 43 |
| 26 | New | 2 | Canterbury Road Bridge - Provides Bike/Ped. expansion over State Route 160 at Canterbury Road | 13 | 5 | 10 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 42 |
| 26 | 22 | 4 | R Street/Garden Street Bridge - Provides Bike Ped Connection over Sacramento River at R Street. | 12 | 10 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 42 |
| 28 | New | 1 | Southern Pacific Railyards Underpass - Provides Bike/Ped. expansion under Railroad mainline at SP Railyards site | 20 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 40 |

${ }^{(1)}$ "New" Indicates new project added this year.
${ }^{(2)}$ Population scores adjusted to 2005 projections
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TABLE E-3

| $\begin{gathered} 2006 \\ \text { RANK } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2005{ }^{(1)} \\ & \text { RANK } \end{aligned}$ | Council District | BIKE/PED BRIDGE PROJECTS | POPULATION ${ }^{(2)}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { ACTIVITY } \\ \text { CENTER } \\ \text { SCORE } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BARRIER } \\ & \text { ELIM. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { CROSSING } \\ \text { TYPE } \end{gathered}$ | ROW/COST | TRANSP <br> SYSTEM | $\begin{gathered} \text { TRAVEL } \\ \text { CONTINUITY } \end{gathered}$ | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Maximum Points in Scoring Category: | 20 | 20 | 40 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 100 |
| 29 | New | 2 | Pilgrim Court Bridge - Provides a Bike/Ped Crossing of Arcade Creek at Pilgrim Court between Los Robles Boulevard and Del Paso Boulevard. | 9 | 0 | 10 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 39 |
| 29 | 26 | 1 | I-5 Bridge in S. Natomas - Provides Bike/Ped. connection over I-5 between West El Camino Ave and Garden Highway. | 10 | 5 | 10 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 39 |
| 31 | 23 | 1 | East Drain at Sump 20- Provides Bike/Ped. Connection over East Drain Canal near Sump 20 in North Natomas. | 5 | 10 | 10 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 38 |
| 31 | New | 1 | California Indian Heritage Center Bridge Provides a Bike/Ped Crossing of American River adjacent to north 12th Street. | 12 | 10 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 38 |
| 31 | 24 | 1 | I-80 Bridge East of Truxel Interchange - Provides Bike/Ped over I-80 in line with Truxel Rd. Potential joint-use with LRT crossing. | 6 | 10 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 38 |
| 31 | 24 | 1 | Town Center Pedestrian Bridge - Provides Ped. Connection over Del Paso Boulevard at the Town Center in NorthNatomas. | 1 | 20 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 38 |
| 35 | New | 4 | Land Park I-5 Bridge - Provides a bike/ped crossing of Interstate 5 by expanding the Land Park Railroad Bridge. | 10 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 37 |
| 35 | 27 | 1 | San Juan Ave at Ninos Parkway - Provides Bike/Ped. bike trail crossing at San Juan Ave at Ninos Parkway (may be at-grade) | 9 | 10 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 37 |
| 37 | 28 | 1 | West El Camino near Main Drain - Provides Bike/Ped. crossing at West El Camino near Main Drain Canal | 8 | 10 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 35 |
| 38 | 28 | 1 | Del Paso at West Canal - Provides Bike/Ped. Crossing of Del Paso Road at the West Canal in North Natomas. | 1 | 0 | 20 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 34 |
| 38 | 30 | 1 | West El Camino Ave at Ninos Parkway - Provides Bike/Ped. bike trail crossing at West El Camino at Ninos Parkway (may be at-grade) | 11 | 10 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 34 |
| 40 | New | 1,2 | Del Paso Boulevard Bridge - Provides a Bike/Ped Crossing of Del Paso Boulevard at the floodgates along the north bank of the American River Parkway. | 12 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 33 |
| 41 | 33 | 1 | San Juan Crossing at West Canal - Provides Bike/Ped. crossing of San Juan at the West Canal in North Natomas. | 4 | 10 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 32 |

${ }^{(1)}$ "New" Indicates new project added this year.
${ }^{\text {2) }}$ Population scores adjusted to 2005 projections.
TABLE E-3

| $\begin{gathered} 2006 \\ \text { RANK } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{2 0 0 5}^{(1)} \\ & \text { RANK } \end{aligned}$ | Council District | BIKE/PED BRIDGE PROJECTS | POPULATION ${ }^{(2)}$ | ACTIVITY <br> CENTER SCORE | BARRIER ELIM. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CROSSING } \\ & \text { TYPE } \end{aligned}$ | ROW/COST | TRANSP <br> SYSTEM | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \text { TRAVEL } \\ \text { CONTINUITY } \end{array}$ | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Maximum Points in Scoring Category: | 20 | 20 | 40 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 100 |
| 42 | 30 | 1 | Del Paso Rd at East Drain - Provides Bike/Ped. Connection over Del Paso Rd at the East Drain Canal in North Natomas. | 2 | 10 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 31 |
| 42 | 33 | 1 | Arena Blvd. At East Drain - Provides Bike/Ped. Connection over Arena Boulevard at the East Drain Canal in North Natomas. | 3 | 10 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 31 |
| 44 | 36 | 1 | Saint Hilarion Crossing at West Canal - Provides Bike/Ped. crossing of Saint Hilarion Boulevard in North Natomas. | 3 | 10 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 29 |
| 45 | New | 1,2 | Main Avenue Low Flow Bridge - Provides a low flow bike/ped crossing of Steelhead Creek in the vicinity of Main Avenue Bridge. | 3 | 0 | 10 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 26 |
| 45 | 37 | 1 | West Canal Crossing at El CentroRd - Provides Bike/Ped. connection over West Canal at El Centro Rd in North Natomas. | 2 | 0 | 10 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 26 |
| 47 | 38 | 1 | El Centro Rd at West Canal - Provides Bike/Ped. crossing of El Centro Rd at the West Canal in North Natomas. | 2 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 19 |

${ }^{(1)}$ "New" Indicates new project added this year.
${ }^{(2)}$ Population scores adjusted to 2005 projections.
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## BRIDGE REPLACEMENT AND REHABILITATION PROGRAM

## INTRODUCTION

An integral element of the City's transportation infrastructure is a network of bridges designed to carry vehicular, railroad, light rail, pedestrian, and bicycle traffic across approximately 30 canals and waterways in Sacramento. These bridges enable essential activities, such as commerce, transportation and emergency services to take place in an efficient and economical manner.

There are 142 bridges within the City limits. Of these, 107 are primarily vehicular bridges, 9 are railroad bridges, and the remaining 26 are bikeway and pedestrian bridges. It is estimated that there are close to $2,000,000$ vehicle trips made across City bridges each day.

Routine maintenance of the City's bridges is performed by City operations and maintenance staff. Maintenance tasks are identified through a combination of visual inspections performed by City staff and more in-depth, formal, inspections performed under the direction of Caltrans staff. The results of the Caltrans inspections are forwarded to the City for information and, when appropriate, corrective action is taken.

Since the majority of the City's bridges are constructed of reinforced concrete, which requires little or no maintenance, structure upkeep costs are minimal. However, the cost for capital improvement projects needed to upgrade or replace existing structures represents a continuing major investment in the City's bridge infrastructure.

The City's bridge replacement and rehabilitation program was designed to identify and prioritize needed improvements to the City's existing bridge inventory. (New bridge construction projects are prioritized along with major street projects since they are integral to new roadways.) Rehabilitation projects can consist of large-scale maintenance projects (such as the painting of steel structures) or repairing and upgrading the structural, service, and functional elements of an existing structure. Typically, if the cost of the needed improvements is greater than fifty percent ( $50 \%$ ) of the cost of a new structure, and the remaining life expectancy of the existing structure is short, the structure is considered eligible for replacement.

## GOAL AND POLICIES

The Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation Program is consistent with the following City of Sacramento General Plan (adopted January 19, 1988, reflects City Council Amendments through September 2000) goal and policies:

## Goal:

1. Provide the necessary infrastructure to link the City's existing transportation network across natural and other physical barriers in a safe, efficient, and economical manner.

## Policies:

- Identify and prioritize candidate bridge replacement and rehabilitation projects, taking into account safety, service, and life-cycle costs.
- Plan and develop improvements to the City's existing bridge infrastructure in a coordinated manner with other public agencies in order to meet the program goal on a regional basis.
- Plan and develop improvements to the City's existing bridge infrastructure in a way that recognizes and addresses the need for a multi-modal transportation system.

Continue to develop a comprehensive bridge infrastructure inventory and maintenance program.

## PROJECT LIST DEVELOPMENT

## Eligibility Criteria

The Sufficiency Rating assigned by Caltrans is a numeric value that indicates the sufficiency of a bridge to remain in service. Sufficiency Ratings range from zero to 100, with zero representing an entirely insufficient or deficient bridge, and 100 representing an entirely sufficient bridge. Structures that are assigned a Sufficiency Rating of 80 or less are considered eligible for replacement or rehabilitation.

## Project Identification

Caltrans inspects and assigns Sufficiency Ratings to all structures in the City's inventory which carry vehicular traffic or cross a route carrying vehicular traffic and are a minimum of 20 feet in length. Sufficiency Ratings are established by using federal bridge inspection and appraisal guidelines, and represent a weighted analysis of a bridges structural adequacy and safety, serviceability and functional obsolescence, and essentialness for public use. In addition to the sufficiency rating, Caltrans assigns a status flag indicating whether a bridge is Structurally Deficient (SD) or Functionally Obsolete (FO) The SD/FO status of a bridge is determined through the results of the structural inspections and appraisals performed by Caltrans in accordance with item 9 of the Federal - Aid Policy Guide for Title 23, CFR 650.

Candidate bridge replacement and rehabilitation projects are identified by reviewing the Sufficiency Ratings and the SD/FO Status Flags assigned to the structures by Caltrans. City bridges that are not inspected by Caltrans are reviewed periodically and, if known deficiencies exist, are added to the candidate list. All of the bridges in the Year 2005 Transportation Programming Guide are inspected by Caltrans.

## PROJECT RANKING PROCESS

Eligible projects are ranked in order of priority based on a deficiency rating system. The higher the total deficiency points assigned to a candidate project, the higher the project is ranked on the list. The ranking consists of assigning deficiency points to each of three major categories. The three categories and their weighting with respect to a maximum deficiency point total of 100 are listed below:

## 1. Structural Deficiency

(Max. Points: 50)
Points $=50$ (If the Sufficiency Rating $\leq 50$ and the structure is flagged as Structurally Deficient (SD) or Functionally Obsolete (FO).
Points $=25$ (If the Sufficiency Rating $\leq 80$ and the structure is flagged as Structurally Deficient (SD) or Functionally Obsolete (FO).

Bridges rated Structurally Deficient (SD) or Functionally Obsolete (FO) with a Sufficiency Rating (SR) $\leq 50$ are eligible candidates for replacement under the State of California, Highway Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation Program (HBRRP). Bridges rated Structurally Deficient (SD) or Functionally Obsolete (FO) with a Sufficiency Rating $(\mathrm{SR}) \leq 80$ are eligible for rehabilitation under this program.

## 2. Service Deficiency

(Max. Points: 20)
The service deficiency of a bridge is determined by comparing the type of facilities it provides to those which are desired. The three types of facilities considered are vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian. The cumulative score in the service deficiency category has a range from 0 to 20 , with 20 reflecting a high degree of deficiency.

## Vehicular Facilities

(Max. Points: 10)
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Points }=10 & (\text { If V/C }>0.8(\text { below Level of Service C) }) \\ \text { Points }=0 & (\text { If V/C } \leq 0.8(\text { Level of Service } C \text { or better }))\end{array}$
Service deficiencies in the vehicular facilities of a structure are determined by evaluating the volume to capacity ratio (V/C) of the roadway segment between the two intersections nearest to the structure.

## Bicycle Facilities

(Max. Points: 10)
Points $=10$ (If Class II Bike routes ${ }^{1}$ have a gap across or are detoured around the bridge)

1 A Class II Bike route is an on-street route with striped bike lanes.

A gap across the structure exists when bike lanes on either the structure and its approaches are absent for an existing Class II Bike route. A gap also exists if the travel lane closest to the curb is less than 15 feet for bridges that are not included in the 2010 Bikeway Master Plan (BMP).

Pedestrian Facilities
(Max. Points: 10)
Points $=10$ (If there are sidewalk gaps across the bridge)

A gap across the structure exists if sidewalks are absent from the structure or its approaches in either direction of travel.

## 3. Functional Deficiency

(Max. Points: 30)

The functional deficiency of a bridge is determined by evaluating the adequacy of its facilities. The factors used to determine and rate functional deficiency are summarized below.

## Accident Rate

(Max. Points: 10)

The accident rate of the bridge is compared to the highest accident rate of all the bridges being evaluated. The accident rate used is the average rate for the three latest years for which accident data is available. Points are assigned as follows:

| 3 Year Average Accident Rate ${ }^{2}$ of Project X <br> Highest Accident Rate of Projects Considered  <br> Deck Geometry  <br> (Max. Points: 10)  (10= |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |

The deck geometry adequacy is evaluated based on the geometric features of a structure with respect to minimum vehicle lane width, bike lane width, sidewalk width, and horizontal and vertical clearances ${ }^{3 .}$ Deficiency points are assigned to a structure that does not meet certain minimum criteria, as follows:

- 1 point per foot short for each vehicle lane width less than 11 feet
- 2 points per foot short for each bike lane less than 5 feet
- 2 points per foot short for each sidewalk width less than 4 feet
- 1 point per foot short of horizontal clearance less than 3 feet
- 1 point per inch short of overhead clearance less than 14 feet

[^4]Deficiency points are totaled for each structure and normalized, as follows:
Points $=($ point total of project/highest point total of all candidate projects $) \times 10$

## Waterway Adequacy

(Max. Points: 10)
Points $=10$ (If bridge has a score $\leq 3$ for Caltrans Item 71)
Points $=0$ (If bridge has a score $>3$ for Caltrans Item 71)
The Waterway Adequacy (Caltrans Item 71) is based on the frequency of floodwater overtopping the structure and approaches, and the significance of the resulting traffic delays. The Waterway Adequacy appraisal rating is reported on a scale of 0 (bridge closed) to 9 (superior to present desirable criteria). The City's rating system assigns waterway adequacy points to only those structures with a code of 3 (requiring high priority of corrective action) or less.

## SUMMARY

Table F-1 presents the final point total and relative deficiency ranking for all thirty-seven bridge rehabilitation and replacement projects, along with the ratings given for each of the three major evaluation categories. The table also lists the identified deficiencies for each structure. Figure F-1 depicts the approximate location of each of the thirty-eight bridge projects.

There were no projects added to this year's list.
The Bridge Road at Arcade Creek bridge has been deleted. This project is under construction.
TABLE F-1

| 2006 Rank | 2005 Rank | Council District | Bridge No. | Bridge Name | Structural Deficiency Rating | Service Deficiency Score | Functional Deficiency Score | $\begin{gathered} \text { Deficiency } \\ \text { Total } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | 50 | 20 | 30 | 100 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 24C0006 | JIBBOOM ST @ UP RR YARD | 50 | 20 | 8.8 | 78.8 |
| 2 | 2 | 2 | 24 C 0003 | ROSEVILLE RD@ ARCADE CREEK | 50 | 20 | 6.4 | 76.4 |
| 3 | 3 | 1 | 24 C 0002 | EL CAMINO AVE @ NATOMAS E. MAIN DRN CANAL | 50 | 20 | 3.1 | 73.1 |
| 4 | 5 | 3 | 24 C 0076 | H STREET @ AMERICAN RIVER | 25 | 20 | 10.4 | 55.4 |
| 5 | 7 | 2 | 24C0080 | NORWOOD AVE @ ARCADE CREEK | 25 | 20 | 2.3 | 47.3 |
| 6 | 6 | 1 | 24C0364L | ON I STREET @ I STREET VIADUCT | 25 | 10 | 12.2 | 47.2 |
| 7 | 8 | 2 | 24C0129 | RIO LINDA BLVD@ MAGPIE CREEK | 25 | 10 | 4.3 | 39.3 |
| 8 | 9 | 3 | 24C0143L | HOWE AVE @ UNIVERSITY AVE | 25 | 10 | 4.1 | 39.1 |
| 9 | 10 | 6 | 24C0142L | HOWE AVE @ LA RIVIERA DR | 25 | 10 | 3.8 | 38.8 |
| 10 | 10 | 6 | 24C0142R | HOWE AVE @ LA RIVIERA DR | 25 | 10 | 3.6 | 38.6 |
| 11 | 12 | 2 | 24C0081 | AUBURN BLVD@ ARCADE CREEK | 25 | 10 | 3.1 | 38.1 |
| 12 | 13 | 5 | 24C0300 | SUTTERVILLE ROAD @ UP RR, BNSF RY \& 24TH ST | 25 | 10 | 1.0 | 36.0 |
| 13 | 14 | 4 | 24C0289 | 56TH AVE @ SOUTH SACRAMENTO DRAIN | 25 | 10 | 0.0 | 35.0 |
| 14 | 15 | 7 | 24C0122 | POCKET RD @ DOUGLAS DRAIN | 25 | 0 | 0.0 | 25.0 |
| 15 | 17 | 3 | 24 C 0254 | VERANO ST @ ARCADE CREEK | 0 | 10 | 10.3 | 20.3 |
| 16 | 16 | 8 | 24C0093 | LA MANCHA WAY @ ELDER CREEK | 0 | 20 | 0.0 | 20.0 |
| 17 | 19 | 1 | 24C0099 | NORTHGATE BLVD @ NATOMAS E MAIN DRN CANAL | 0 | 10 | 6.5 | 16.5 |
| 18 | 18 | 3 | 24C0069 | ELVAS AVE @ H ST | 0 | 10 | 5.6 | 15.6 |
| 19 | 20 | 2 | 24C0177 | WATT AVE @ ARCADE CREEK | 0 | 10 | 5.4 | 15.4 |
| 20 | 30 | 8 | 24C0209 | FLORIN RD FRONTAGE @ ANDERSON DRAIN | 0 | 0 | 15.0 | 15.0 |
| 21 | 21 | 3,6 | 24C0107L | HOWE AVE @ AMERICAN RIVER | 0 | 10 | 3.7 | 13.7 |
| 22 | 22 | 3 | 24C0143R | HOWE AVE @ UNIVERSITY AVE | 0 | 10 | 3.2 | 13.2 |
| 23 | 22 | 3,6 | 24C0107R | HOWE AVE @ AMERICAN RIVER | 0 | 10 | 3.1 | 13.1 |
| 24 | 24 | 8 | 24C0091 | STOCKTON BLVD @ UNION HOUSE CREEK | 0 | 10 | 1.5 | 11.5 |
| 25 | 26 | 2,3 | 24C0353 | ARDEN WAY @ UP,BNSF,AMTRAK,SCRTD LRT | 0 | 10 | 0.4 | 10.4 |

TABLE F-1

| 2006 Rank | 2005 Rank | Council District | Bridge No. | Bridge Name | Structural Deficiency Rating | Service <br> Deficiency Score | $\begin{gathered} \text { Functional } \\ \text { Deficiency Score } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Deficiency } \\ \text { Total } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | 50 | 20 | 30 | 100 |
| 26 | 25 | 8 | 24C0252 | MACK ROAD @ MORRISON CREEK | 0 | 10 | 0.3 | 10.3 |
| 26 | 27 | 6 | 24C0118 | FLORIN PERKINS RD @ MORRISON CREEK | 0 | 10 | 0.3 | 10.3 |
| 28 | 28 | 2,3 | 24 C 0253 | MARYSVILLE BLVD @ ARCADE CREEK | 0 | 10 | 0.2 | 10.2 |
| 29 | 29 | 6 | 24C0245 | ELDER CREEK RD @ MORRISON CREEK | 0 | 0 | 8.4 | 8.4 |
| 30 | 31 | 5 | 24C0295 | EXECTVE AIRPT RD @ EXECUTIVE DRAIN | 0 | 0 | 2.5 | 2.5 |
| 30 | 31 | 2 | 24C0127 | RIO LINDA BLVD @ HAGGINWOOD CREEK | 0 | 0 | 2.5 | 2.5 |
| 32 | 33 | 6 | 24C0097 | STOCKTON BLVD @ MORRISON CREEK | 0 | 0 | 2.3 | 2.3 |
| 32 | 34 | 7,8 | 24C0299 | CENTER PARKWAY @ STRAWBERRY CREEK | 0 | 0 | 2.3 | 2.3 |
| 32 | 35 | 6 | 24C0096 | STOCKTON BLVD @ MORRISON CREEK TRIBUTARY | 0 | 0 | 2.3 | 2.3 |
| 35 | 36 | 7 | 24C0292 | GLORIA DRIVE @ MAIN CANAL | 0 | 0 | 1.4 | 1.4 |
| 36 | 37 | 8 | 24C0114 | FRANKLIN BLVD @ NORTH FORK ELDER CREEK | 0 | 0 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| 37 | 38 | 1 | 24 CO 78 | K STREET @ K STREET AT HOLIDAY GARAGE | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

FIGURE F-1


Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation F-8

## STREETSCAPE ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM

## INTRODUCTION

## Corridor Landscaping

In 1987, the City Council adopted a policy of landscaping public right-of-way areas including street medians, curbside planter strips, embankments, surplus right-of-way, and setback areas, as new streets are constructed. Prior to that time, landscaping was not routinely planted at the time streets were constructed or widened. Consequently, there are existing areas within the right-of-way that are not landscaped, most of which are medians. There are also many streets in the city where medians were not constructed as part of the original roadway.

To improve both the aesthetics and the travel experience on the City's streets, the City of Sacramento formally established the Streetscape Enhancement Program in FY 99/00. The program will fund the planning, engineering, and construction of landscaped medians, curbside planter strips, and gateway features on the City's commercial and neighborhood corridors. The Streetscape Enhancements Program includes two sections:

1. Commercial Corridors
2. Other Corridors

The Streetscape Enhancement section of the Transportation Programming Guide will define the two program elements listed above, identify current streetscape projects and future needs, define eligible enhancements, present criteria for prioritizing projects, present the scoring and ranking process, and establish a priority list of projects for the enhancement programs.

In May 2000, City Council adopted streetscape standards for new right-of-way landscaping. The City also has design guideline practices for new street lighting.

## GOALS AND POLICIES

The Streetscape Enhancement Program is consistent with the following City of Sacramento General Plan (adopted January 19, 1988, reflects City Council Amendments through September 2000) goals and policies:

## Goal:

1. Create a street system, which will ensure the safe and efficient movement of people and goods within and through communities and to other areas in the City and region.

## Policy 1

- Update the City's street design standards.

New street standards were approved by City Council on February 24, 2004. The street standards include medians and curbside planter strips for implementation on specific
street classifications that have adequate right-of-way. The street standards provide design policy for implementation of the Streetscape Enhancement Program.

## Policy 2

- Explore actions, which allow for the prioritization, planning and construction of new facilities.


## Policy 3

- Through the community, specific and redevelopment planning process, identify major street improvements for inclusion in the Capital Improvement Program.


## Goal:

1. Maintain the quality of the City's street system.

## Policy 1

- Continue to identify streets that are in need of major upgrading and develop a priority listing for their inclusion in the Capital Improvements Program.


## Policy 2

- Target street improvements to areas that are in identified revitalization areas.

The Streetscape Enhancement Program is also consistent with the following City of Sacramento Economic Development Strategy approved by City Council in April, 2000, which established a framework for determining economic development priorities

## Policies:

- Strengthen the linkages between healthy neighborhoods and viable neighborhood commercial corridors.
- Improve the coordination of human and financial resources to maximize economic growth.

The Council has established the following program goals:

- To improve the safety and convenience of pedestrians and bicyclists; and
- To construct and maintain equitably distributed street landscaping throughout the City.


## COMMERCIAL CORRIDOR PROGRAM

The eligible commercial corridors are those identified in the Economic Development Strategy Framework, approved by the City Council in April 2000. The following corridors, within the identified boundaries, are eligible for the Streetscape Enhancement Commercial Corridor program:

1. 12th Street (UPRR to I Street)
2. 16th Street (Elvas to Broadway)
3. 65th Street
4. Broadway West (Miller Park to Alhambra)
5. Broadway East (Alhambra to Stockton Boulevard)
6. Del Paso Boulevard (Acoma to Marysville Boulevard)
7. Florin Road (Franklin Boulevard to 24th Street)
8. Folsom Boulevard West (Alhambra to UPRR Overcrossing)
9. Folsom Boulevard East(UPRR Overcrossing to Watt Avenue)
10. Franklin Boulevard (Sutterville to Fruitridge)
11. Freeport Boulevard (2nd Avenue to City Limits, excluding William Land Park)
12. Fruitridge Road (65th Street to Power Inn Road)
13. Mack Road (Center Parkway to Highway 99)
14. Marysville Boulevard (Roanoake Avenue to Arcade Creek)
15. Midtown BDA (16th to 29th Street, J to L Streets)
16. Northgate Boulevard (Garden Highway to I-80)
17. R Street Corridor (3rd Street to 17th Street)
18. Richards Boulevard (12th Street to Jibboom)
19. Stockton Boulevard (X Street to Riza)

## Eligible Enhancements

The following improvements may be considered under the Commercial Corridors Program:

- In-fill street lighting to satisfy design guideline practices (lighting above the design guideline practices is to be paid for by property owners)
- New landscaped medians
- Landscaping existing medians
- New curbside planter strips
- Landscaping existing planter strips
- Irrigation for landscaping
- Sidewalks where missing or lacking adequate width
- Bicycle lane striping and signage where consistent with Bicycle Master Plan (on-street bicycle funding will be primary funding source)
- Stamped crosswalks or other types of crosswalk delineation
- Pedestrian bulbs
- Signage/banners
- Trash receptacles/enclosures


## OTHER CORRIDOR PROGRAM

The corridors eligible for streetscape enhancement under the Other Corridors program include all the streets that are not identified in the Economic Development Strategy Framework. Landscaped medians and curbside planter strips are included on streets that have cross sections consistent with the City of Sacramento's adopted Street Standards.

## Eligible Enhancements

The following improvements may be considered under the Other Corridors Program:

- In-fill street lighting to satisfy design guideline practices (lighting above the design guideline practices is to be paid for by property owners)
- New landscaped medians
- Landscaping existing medians
- New curbside planter strips
- Landscaping existing curbside planter strips
- Irrigation for landscaping
- Sidewalks where missing or lacking adequate width
- Bicycle lane striping and signage where consistent with Bicycle Master Plan (on-street bicycle funding will be primary funding source)
- Stamped crosswalks or other types of crosswalk delineation
- Pedestrian bulbs
- Signage/banners
- Trash receptacles/enclosures


## PROJECT RANKING PROCESS

The targeted commercial corridors are largely older corridors that were constructed without landscaped medians or curbside planter strips. Many of the corridors are wide enough to accommodate both medians and planter strips. Other corridors will accommodate either medians or planter strips, but not both.

The existing right-of-way for streets that fall into the Other Corridor category will generally accommodate either a planted median or curbside planter strips. This type of street typically provides for parking and bicycle lanes within the right-of-way. Priority is given to corridors for which planning or engineering investments have already been made.

Streetscape enhancements benefit walking and bicycling by improving the maneuverability and connectivity to adjacent land uses. Priority is given to projects that help bring a balance of transportation modes.

In accordance with adopted City policy, priority is also given to corridors within the Economic Development Strategy and Infill Strategy. The criteria recognizes targeted corridors that have already been deemed "blighted" and in the most serious need of attention.

Special consideration is also given to corridors where streetscape planning and/or engineering investments have already been made.

The maximum possible score is 100 points, assigned as follows:

## 1. Project Readiness (scoring is not cumulative)

(Max. points: 20)
Scoring based on current project phase at time all projects are scored and ranked. Points given for highest project phase, phases are not cumulative. Master Plans and Urban Design Plans are complete when they have been accepted by City Council.

Project phase
Construction documents complete
Construction documents in progress
Master Plan complete
Master Plan in progress
Urban Design Plan complete
Urban Design Plan in progress

Assigned points
20
17
14
11
8
5

## 2. Traffic volume

(Max. points: 10)
Many of the older commercial corridors were designed to move traffic volumes, without consideration for aesthetics or pedestrian comfort. Streetscape enhancements will provide traffic calming benefits, improve the pedestrian experience, and bring more foot traffic to local businesses. Scoring is based on average daily traffic (ADT) measured for the length of the corridor. Streets with the highest traffic volumes receive the highest points.

| Average Daily Traffic (vehicles/day) | Assigned points |
| :--- | :---: |
| $40,000+$ | 10 |
| $35,000+$ | 9 |
| Average Daily Traffic (vehicles/day) | Assigned points |
| $30,000+$ | 7 |
| $25,000+$ | 6 |
| $20,000+$ | 4 |
| $15,000+$ | 3 |
| $10,000+$ | 1 |

## 3. Economic Development

- Is the project within the Economic Development Strategy?:
- Is the project located within one of the twenty-seven (27) Key Development Opportunity Areas or Sites?
- Is the project located in either the Merged Downtown or SP/Richards Redevelopment Area?
If Yes on any of the above (10 points) $\qquad$
- Is the project located in a Business Improvement District (BID) or PropertyBased Improvement District (PBID)?
$\qquad$ Yes (5 points) $\qquad$ No (0 points)


## 4. Infill Development

(Max Points: 15)

- Is the project in one of the Infill Areas as defined in the City of Sacramento Infill Strategy adopted on May 14, 2002?:
- Target Residential
- Central City Area
- Transit Station Area

If Yes on any of the above (10 points) $\qquad$
Note: Neighborhood Commercial Corridors Infill Areas are not included in this criterion since this section includes only projects that are on these corridors.

- Is the project in a City Redevelopment Area excluding the Merged Downtown or SP/Richards Area or in a Community Development Block Grant eligible area?
$\qquad$

5. Current appearance
(Max Points: 10)
Priority is given to streets that have existing medians or planter areas that need to be landscaped and irrigated over those that do not have existing medians or planter areas. More enhancements can be achieved with a lower investment on those streets that need only landscaping and irrigation. Scoring is based on the predominant condition observed for the length of the corridor.

## Current condition Assigned points

Existing median or curbside planter - not landscaped
Existing median or curbside planter - landscaping in poor condition
No existing median or curbside planter or concrete median

Points are assigned for projects that are adjacent to, or provide access to, activity centers:

Activity Center
Public Colleges/Universities
Schools/Parks/Libraries/Community Centers
Commercial Centers
Employment Centers
High Density Residential

Points
8 per facility
4 per facility
4 per center
4 per 100 employees
4 per site

## 7. Alternate Modes

(Max Points: 15)
6 points given for streets identified as a designated Class 2 or 3 bikeway (existing or proposed) in the City/County Bikeway Master Plan
6 points given if the project is on a bus route
9 points given if the project improves access to a LRT station for pedestrians, bicyclists, vehicles or buses

## SUMMARY

## Commercial Corridors

There were no new projects added to the list.
The following projects were deleted:

- Del Paso Blvd Phase I (Arden Wy to El Camino Ave). This project is constructed.
- 'Stockton Blvd Phase III (El Paraiso to Riza Ave). This project is fully funded.


## Other Corridors

A total of nine new projects were added to this year's list. These projects are:

- Arden Way, from Royale Oaks Drive to Evergreen Street
- Martin Luther King Boulevard, from Broadway to Fruitridge Road
- Valley Hi Drive, from Wyndham Way to Bamford Drive
- Franklin Boulevard, between Florin Road and Brookfield Drive
- Freeport Boulevard, from Interstate 5 Bridge to City limits
- Howe Avenue Southbound, from American River Drive to American River Bridge
- Franklin Boulevard, from Mack Road and Calvine Road
- El Camino Avenue, between (Capital City Freeway (Business 80) to Ethan Way
- Natomas Crossing Drive median landscaping between Cashaw Way and Innovator Drive

There were no projects deleted from the list.
Table G-1 presents the final point total and ranking of the eighteen commercial corridors, streetscape enhancement projects. Figure G-1 shows the approximate location of these projects.

Table G-2 presents the final point total and ranking of the thirty-six other corridor streetscape enhancement projects. Figure G-2 shows the approximate locations of the projects.
TABLE G-1

| $\begin{aligned} & 2006 \\ & \text { Rank } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2005 \\ & \text { Rank } \end{aligned}$ | Council District | Project Name | Status | Project Readiness Score | Volume Score | Econ. Dev. Score | Infill <br> Score | Current Condition Score | Activity <br> Center <br> Score | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { Alternate } \\ \text { Modes } \\ \text { Score } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Total Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Maximum Points in Scoring Catagory: |  | 20 | 10 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 15 | 15 | 100 |
| 1 | 3 | 6 | Folsom Blvd (Howe Ave - Watt Ave) | Master Plan in Progress | 11 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 3 | 15 | 15 | 74 |
| 2 | 10 | 3,6 | 65th St (Folsom Blvd to Broadway) | Master Plan in Progress | 11 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 3 | 15 | 15 | 73 |
| 3 | 2 | 4 | Broadway (Miller Park to Alhambra Blvd) | Urban Design Complete | 8 | 4 | 10 | 15 | 3 | 15 | 15 | 70 |
| 3 | 3 | 2 | Del Paso Blvd Phase II(Hwy 160 to Lampasas Ave) | Master Plan Complete | 14 | 1 | 10 | 15 | 7 | 8 | 15 | 70 |
| 5 | 7 | 1 | Northgate Blvd (Garden Highway to Rosin Ct ) | Master Plan in Progress | 11 | 4 | 0 | 15 | 7 | 15 | 12 | 64 |
| 5 | 7 | 5 | Franklin Blvd (Sutterville Rd to Florin Rd) | Master Plan Complete | 14 | 3 | 5 | 15 | 3 | 12 | 12 | 64 |
| 7 | 9 | 1,3,4 | R St Corridor | Master Plan in Progress | 11 | 0 | 10 | 15 | 3 | 15 | 9 | 63 |
| 8 | 10 | 5 | Broadway (37th Ave to Stockton Blvd) | Construction Docs in Progress | 17 | 3 | 0 | 15 | 3 | 12 | 12 | 62 |
| 9 | 11 | 6 | Fruitridge Rd, 65th St to Power Inn Rd | Master Plan Complete | 14 | 4 | 0 | 15 | 3 | 12 | 12 | 60 |
| 10 | 12 | 1,3,4 | 16 St (C St to Broadway) | Urban Design Complete | 8 | 4 | 0 | 15 | 7 | 15 | 9 | 58 |
| 10 | 12 | 1 | Richards Blvd (16th St to Jibboom St) |  | 0 | 3 | 15 | 10 | 3 | 15 | 12 | 58 |
| 12 | 14 | 4,5,8 | Freeport Blvd (Broadway to I-5) | Master Plan Complete | 14 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 15 | 12 | 56 |
| 13 | 15 | 2 | Marysville Blvd Phase III and IV (Arcade Creek to I-80) |  | 0 | 6 | 0 | 15 | 3 | 12 | 12 | 48 |
| 14 | 15 | 1 | 12th St/Alkali Flat |  | 0 | 1 | 10 | 15 | 7 | 4 | 9 | 46 |
| 15 | 17 | 3,6 | Folsom Blvd (33rd St to Howe Ave) |  | 0 | 4 | 10 | 0 | 3 | 15 | 12 | 44 |
| 16 | 18 | 4 | 15th \& 16th St (between W/X Freeway to Broadway) |  | 0 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 8 | 6 | 30 |

TABLE G-2


FIGURE G-1


FIGURE G-2


## STREETSCAPE ENHANCEMENTS - OTHER CORRIDORS

## SIDEWALKS TO SCHOOLS PROGRAM

## INTRODUCTION

Sidewalks provide pedestrians some degree of safety from vehicles on the road. This is especially true for locations around schools. Safety considerations are a primary concern when parents and children make the decision whether children should walk (or be driven) to school. During arrival and departure times, schools are very congested places with many different and potentially conflicting transportation modes: cars, buses, pedestrians, and bicyclists. The bicyclist and pedestrians are almost exclusively school-age children who lack the experience and sophistication to deal with this complex, congested situation. Sidewalks provide school-age children with a safe refuge, and consequent protection from a myriad of vehicular conflicts.

The construction of sidewalks to schools provide a safer route for school children, resulting in both children and parents feeling more comfortable about children walking to school. This will result in an increase in walking as a mode of transportation, and corresponding decrease in vehicular trips.

Shifting from vehicular to walking school trips will result in reducing the number of vehicular pedestrian conflicts and decreasing the number of vehicle miles driven. Providing sidewalks on walking routes to schools will increase the safety of children walking to school as well as furthering the federal mandate to improve air quality and the City Council's desire to conserve energy and reduce overall capitol improvement costs.

This section of the Transportation Programming Guide prioritizes the need for sidewalks surrounding schools to facilitate students safely walking to school and thus reducing the number of vehicular trips.

## GOAL AND POLICY

Construction of new sidewalks is consistent with the following City of Sacramento General Plan (adopted January 19, 1988, reflects City Council Amendments through September 2000) goal and policies:

## Goals:

1. Increase the use of the pedestrian mode as a mode of choice for all areas of the City.

## Policy:

- Require new subdivisions and planning unit developments to have safe pedestrian walkways that provide direct links between streets and major destinations such as bus stops, schools, parks, and shopping centers.

2. Work towards achieving an overall Level of Service C on the City's local and major street systems.

## Policy:

- Explore alternative transportation modes that will lead to a decrease in vehicular demand of the City's surface street system.


## PROJECT RANKING PROCESS

## 1. Average Daily Traffic (ADT)

(Max. Points: 10)
ADT on adjacent street:
Highest ADT on adjacent streets of all sidewalk projects considered
X 10
2. Number of Students
(Max. Points: 25)
The number of students enrolled at the school associated with the project is compared to the highest number of students enrolled in any of the schools being evaluated. Since high schools normally have a significantly larger student enrollment, the number of enrolled students for high schools is divided by two. Points are assigned as follows:

Number of Students at School ( $1 / 2$ if High School)
Highest Number of Students at School of all sidewalk projects considered
X 25

## 3. Posted Speed Limit

(Max. Points: 10)

## Posted Speed Limit

25
30
35
$>35$

## 4. Existing Condition

Condition
No Sidewalk
Sidewalk with the following conditions:
$<4$ feet in width 8

Without planter strip 8
Without vertical curb 8
Impassible 5

- Is the project in one of the Infill Areas as defined in the City of Sacramento Infill Strategy adopted on May 14, 2002. This document defines infill in four categories:
- Target Residential Area
- Central City Area)
- Neighborhood Commercial Revitalization Area
- Transit Station Area

If Yes on any of the above (5 points) $\qquad$

- Is the project in a City Redevelopment Area excluding the Merged Downtown or SP/Richards Area or in a Community Development Block Grant eligible area?
$\qquad$


## 9. Car/Pedestrian Collisions

(Max Points: 10)
5 points are assigned for each reported collision involving a pedestrian that occurred during the previous three years along the street segment being evaluated.

## SUMMARY

The Sidewalks to Schools priority listing is presented in Table H-1.
Figure $\mathrm{H}-1$ depicts the approximate location of the top 25 ranked sidewalk projects.
There were no new projects added to the list.
There was one project deleted. The Barbara Comstock Morse School project on Bruceville Road south of Jacinto will be constructed in association with the Bruceville Road Widening project.
TABLE H-1


|  | in | ㅇ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | - | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | in | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | - | in | $\bigcirc$ | - | - | - | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | in | - | - | - | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | $\bigcirc$ | - | $\bigcirc$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | - | 앙 | $\bigcirc$ | - | $\bigcirc$ | in | in | in | in | $\bigcirc$ | in | 앙 | $\bigcirc$ | in | in | in | in | in | in | $\bigcirc$ | in | 앙 | 안 | in | in | in | in | in | in | in |


|  | m | $\cdots$ | n | $\cdots$ | $\infty$ | m | $\cdots$ | $\infty$ | $m$ | m | $\cdots$ | $\infty$ | m | m | m | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | m | m | m | $\infty$ | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | m | $\cdots$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

TABLE H-1

|  | $\stackrel{\text { - }}{\text { in }}$ | $\stackrel{\%}{8}$ | ¢ | $\stackrel{\text { \% }}{\substack{\text { ¢ }}}$ | ¢ | $\stackrel{\text { ¢ }}{\text { ¢ }}$ | \% | $\stackrel{+}{\dot{+}}$ | - | $\stackrel{\square}{2}$ | ¢ | $\stackrel{\circ}{\text { c }}$ | $\stackrel{+}{\text { ¢ }}$ | $\stackrel{9}{m}$ | $\stackrel{\square}{0}$ | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{m}}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{2}$ | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\lambda}$ | $\underset{\sim}{\infty} \mid$ | No | $\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\dot{\omega}}$ | 令 | $\stackrel{\ominus}{\text { ¢ }}$ | $\stackrel{\text { ci}}{\text { N }}$ | $\stackrel{0}{\dot{~}}$ | $\underset{\sim}{7}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{7}$ | N | $\stackrel{\square}{4}$ | ה̀ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | in | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | 0 | 0 | - | $\bigcirc$ | - | $\bigcirc$ | - | - | in | n | $\bigcirc$ | in | - | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | - | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | - | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
|  | ㅇ | in | $\bigcirc$ | in | in | - | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | ㅇ | $\bigcirc$ | - | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | in | $\bigcirc$ | - | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | in | i | in | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | in | in | in | n | $\bigcirc$ |
|  | $\infty$ | m | $\infty$ | $\cdots$ | m | m | m | $\infty$ | - | m | m | m | $\infty$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\infty$ | $\infty$ | $\infty$ | $\infty$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\infty$ | $\infty$ | $\infty$ | $\infty$ | $\infty$ | $\infty$ | $\infty$ | $\infty$ | $\infty$ | $\infty$ | $\infty$ |



| $\begin{gathered} 2006 \\ \text { RANK } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2005 \\ \text { RANK } \end{gathered}$ | Council District | SCHOOL NAME |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 31 | 17 | 6 | Earl Warren Elementarty School |
| 32 | 33 | 2 | Robla Elementary School |
| 33 | 34 | 2 | Grant Union High School |
| 34 | 35 | 2 | Bell Ave Elementary School |
| 35 | 21 | 2 | Woodlake Elementary School |
| 36 | 37 | 4 | John Cabrillo Elementary School |
| 37 | 38 | 2 | Woodlake Elementary School |
| 38 | 39 | 2 | Grant Union High School |
| 39 | 40 | 1 | Jefferson Park Elementary School |
| 40 | 41 | 5 | All Hallows Elementary School |
| 41 | 42 | 5 | All Hallows Elementary School |
| 42 | 43 | 5 | All Hallows Elementary School |
| 43 | 44 | 3 | Saint Francis Girls High School |
| 44 | 45 | 5 | Sacramento High School |
| 45 | 46 | 4 | John Cabrillo Elementary School |
| 46 | 46 | 4 | Caroline Wenzel Elementary School |
| 47 | 48 | 2 | Taylor St Elementary School |
| 48 | 51 | 2 | Northwood Elementary School |
| 49 | 53 | 5 | Sacramento High School |
| 50 | 55 | 3 | Michael J. Castori Elementary School |
| 51 | 54 | 2 | Michael J. Castori Elementary School |
| 52 | 58 | 3 | DW Babcock Elementary School |
| 53 | 56 | 5 | Sacramento High School |
| 54 | 57 | 5 | Collis P. Hunginton Elementary School |
| 55 | 59 | 8 | John Sloat Elementary School |
| 56 | 49 | 6 | Earl Warren Elementary School |
| 57 | 49 | 6 | Earl Warren Elementary School |
| 58 | 60 | 2 | Harmon Johnson Elementary School |
| 59 | 61 | 2 | Harmon Johnson Elementary School |
| 60 | 62 | 6 | Tahoe Elementary School |

TABLE H-1

| $\begin{gathered} { }_{\text {RANK }}^{2006} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2005 \\ \text { RANK } \end{gathered}$ | Council District | SCHOOL NAME | St Name | SEGMENT | Volume Score | Number of Students Score | Posted Speed Score | Existing Condition Score | $\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{l} \text { Infill } \\ \text { Score } \\ \hline \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Car/Ped Collisions } \\ \text { Score } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Final } \\ & \text { Score } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Maximum Points in Scoring Category: |  | 10 | 25 | 10 | 35 | 10 | 10 | 100 |
| 61 | 51 | 4 | Sam Brannan Middle School | Elmer Wy | Casilada Wy to bend @ Elmer Wy | 0.3 | 22.3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22.6 |
| 62 | 63 | 4 | Jedediah Smith Elementary School | McClatchy Wy | 5th St to Jedediah Smith School | 0.2 | 8.3 | 0 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 21.5 |
| 63 | 64 | 5 | Hollywood Park Elementary School | Harte Wy/Shielah Wy | gates of Leonard Da Vinci School to Hollywood Park Elementary | 0.3 | 8.1 | 0 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 21.4 |
| 64 | 65 | 5 | Hollywood Park Elementary School | 24th Ave | 22nd St to Hollywood Park Elementary School | 0.1 | 8.1 | 0 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 21.2 |
| 65 | 66 | 6 | Tahoe Elementary School | 60th St | Broadway (intersection) | 4.4 | 8.7 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 21.1 |
| 66 | 66 | 2 | Woodlake Elementary School | Woodlake Dr, gaps both sides |  | 0.2 | 7.9 | 0 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 21.1 |
| 67 | 68 | 4 | Crocker Riverside Elmentary School | Riverside Blvd | Robertson Wy to St light | 3.7 | 9.6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19.3 |
| 68 | 69 | 2 | Pacific West High School | North Ave $\mathrm{n} /$ /ide, s/side no sw | Pinell St to Dayton St | 0.8 | 2.2 | 3 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 19.1 |
| 69 | 70 | 4 | William Land Elementary School | 11 th St | U St to V St | 1.1 | 7.1 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 18.2 |
| 70 | 73 | 4 | William Land Elementary School | V St | 11th St to 12th St | 0.3 | 7.1 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 17.4 |
| 71 | 71 | 4 | William Land Elementary School | 12th St | U St to V St | 0.3 | 7.1 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 17.4 |
| 72 | 71 | 4 | William Land Elementary School | U St | 11th St to 12th St | 0.3 | 7.1 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 17.4 |
| 73 | 74 | 2 | Woodlake Elementary School | Southgate Rd | end of school grounds to in front of office | 0.4 | 7.9 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 16.3 |
| 74 | 75 | 6 | Tahoe Elementary School | 59th St | Broadway (intersecton) | 4.5 | 8.7 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16.2 |

Sidewalks to Schools Program H-6

FIGURE H-1


## SPEED HUMP PROGRAM

## INTRODUCTION:

The City of Sacramento began constructing undulations in 1980 in response to neighborhood speeding issues. In the mid-1990's, the program was modified and became known as the Speed Hump Program. The first speed humps were installed in 1996.

Speed humps are designed to enhance public safety by reducing vehicular speeds and cutthrough traffic on local residential and minor collector streets. Speed humps are used on residential streets that qualify for the Program and where other methods of slowing traffic have not been effective.

Speed humps are 12 feet wide and between $31 / 4$ and $3 \frac{3}{4}$ inches high, slightly raised "mounds" in the pavement, which extend across the roadway. Speed humps have evolved from extensive research and testing. They have been found to be effective at reducing speeds and discouraging cut-through (i.e., non-local) traffic. They have been installed on streets in Sacramento since 1996. Speed humps are not installed on emergency response or bus routes.

As an alternative to speed humps, speed lumps have been approved by the Fire Department for use on most emergency response routes and by Sacramento Regional Transit for use on bus routes. Speed lumps are asphalt mounds, parabolic in shape, covering 12 feet of street with a height between $31 / 4$ and $3 \frac{3}{4}$ inches. The center mound or lump, has a width of $51 / 2$ feet to accommodate the wheelbase of fire trucks and buses. The lumps adjacent to the center lump vary in width to accommodate the street width.

In addition, the City has also implemented speed tables, which are similar to humps but incorporate a 10 -foot flat surface in the middle and cover a total of 22 feet of street, with a height between $31 / 4$ and $33 / 4$ inches. Speed tables have been installed on streets in Sacramento as part of the Neighborhood Traffic Management Program (NTMP). Speed tables have been approved by the Fire Department for use on emergency response routes and by Sacramento Regional Transit for use on bus routes.

For simplicity in this document, the term "speed hump" will refer not only to the traditional speed hump, but also the modified hump designs described above as a speed lump or speed table.

The City of Sacramento has three types of speed hump categories: Residential, Parks and Schools, and Bypass. A list of streets that have qualified for speed humps within these categories is produced each year for the Transportation Programming Guide (TPG). This list ranks streets by Council District citywide as described in subsequent sections. The definition of each category is as follows:

- Residential - focused on reducing vehicular speed on residential streets,
- Parks and Schools - focused on reducing vehicular speed on streets which include park and/or school frontage, and
- Bypass - focused on reducing cut-through traffic volumes on residential streets.

Note: Speed humps are not always the best solution for residential street traffic problems. Under a separate program called the Neighborhood Traffic Management Program (NTMP), the Department of Transportation staff meets with neighborhood residents to develop and implement a community-based traffic calming plan for the entire neighborhood. Implemented in 1996, the NTMP considers traffic calming measures including speed humps, traffic circles, pedestrian islands, diverters, textured crosswalks, and chokers. For more information of the NTMP, please visit the Department of Transportation website at www.cityofsacramento.org/transportation or call $916-808-8300$. The Program is initiated by public request and submittal of a Community Action Request form, which requires signatures from ten residents. The Program is offered on a first come-first served basis.

## GOAL AND POLICY:

The Speed Hump Program is consistent with the following goal and policy of the City of Sacramento General Plan (adopted January 19, 1988, reflects City Council Amendments through 2000):

## Goal:

1. Create and maintain a street system, which protects residential neighborhoods from
unnecessary levels of traffic and/or excessive speeds.

## Policy:

- Continue wherever possible to design streets and approve development applications in such a manner as to eliminate high traffic flows, excessive speeds, and/or parking problems within residential neighborhoods.

More detail regarding Speed Hump Program Guidelines, adopted by City Council and last amended in January 2004, is available on the Department of Transportation website at www.cityofsacramento.org/transportation.

## PROJECT LIST DEVELOPMENT

## Eligibility Criteria

A street qualifies for the installation of Residential, Parks and Schools, or Bypass speed humps when the following minimum criteria are met.

## Residential

- The segment is a minimum of 750 feet in length between traffic controls, four-way intersections, and/or curves with less than a 250 -foot radius.
- The speed limit is 30 mph or less.
- Street frontage is at least $75 \%$ residential.
- The street is not part of the Regional Transit bus network. ${ }^{1}$
- The street is not identified as an emergency response route by the Fire Department. ${ }^{1}$
- The 85 th percentile speed must be a minimum of 5 mph over the speed limit.
- Two-thirds majority of residents that vote are in favor of the installation of speed humps. ${ }^{2}$ A minimum $25 \%$ return rate is required.


## Parks and Schools

- The segment is a minimum of 500 feet in length between traffic controls, four-way intersections, and/or curves with less than a 250 -foot radius.
- The speed limit is 30 mph or less.
- Street frontage is adjacent to a school ${ }^{3}$ or park.
- The street is not part of the Regional Transit bus network. ${ }^{1}$
- The street is not identified as an emergency response route by the Fire Department. ${ }^{1}$
- The 85 th percentile speed must be a minimum of 5 mph over the speed limit.
- Two-thirds majority of residents that vote are in favor of the installation of speed humps. ${ }^{4}$ A minimum $25 \%$ return rate is required.


## Bypass

- The segment is a minimum of 500 feet in length between traffic controls, four-way intersections, and/or curves with less than a 250 -foot radius.
- The speed limit is 30 mph or less.
- Street frontage is at least $75 \%$ residential.
- The street is not part of the Regional Transit bus network. ${ }^{1}$
- The street is not identified as an emergency response route by the Fire Department. ${ }^{1}$
- Average daily traffic (ADT) is at least 500 vehicles.
- The street(s) serve to bypass ${ }^{5}$ major streets with a four-way stop, a signalized intersection, or another street with speed humps.

[^5]- Two-thirds majority of residents that vote are in favor of the installation of speed humps. ${ }^{2}$ A minimum $25 \%$ return rate is required.


## Project Identification

In order for a street to be studied for speed humps, a petition signed by residents from ten households on the affected street segment must first be submitted. Petitions are available from the Traffic Engineering Section at 916-808-8300. A street segment qualifies for the installation of speed humps when the results of a traffic investigation demonstrate that the criteria, which are presented in this document, are met.

## PROJECT RANKING PROCESS

Streets which meet the minimum criteria, as specified previously, are scored and ranked using the following criteria:

## Residential

1. Volume
(Max. Points: No Limit)
Points $=$ Average Daily Traffic Volume $/ 50$
2. Frontage
(Max. Points: No Limit)
Points $=(\#$ of residential units fronting the street $)+($ apartment frontage $/ 25$ feet $)$
3. Speed
(Max. Points: No Limit)
Points $=5$ points for every mile per hour that the 85 th percentile speed of traffic exceeds the speed limit.

## Parks and Schools

1. Volume
(Max. Points: No Limit)
Points $=$ Average Daily Traffic Volume $/ 50$
2. Frontage
(Max. Points: No Limit)
Points $=(\#$ of residential units fronting the street $)+($ lineal feet of apartment frontage $/ 25$ feet $)$

+ (lineal feet of school frontage $/ 25$ feet $)+$ (lineal feet of park frontage $/ 25$ feet $)+$ (lineal feet of playground frontage / 25 feet)

3. Speed
(Max. Points: No Limit)

5 To be considered a "bypass" location, the ADT must be at least $50 \%$ higher than the volume that would be expected using the following trip generation rates: 10/trips/day/single family residential (SFR) unit, 6 trips/day/multi family residential (MFR) unit. Land uses that do not front the bypass location, itself, but which could reasonably be expected to use the bypass street(s) should be considered when determining the expected volume.

Points $=5$ points for every mile per hour that the 85 th percentile speed of traffic exceeds the speed limit.

## Bypass

1. Volume $\underset{\text { Points }=\text { Average Daily Traffic Volume } / 50}{\text { ( }}$
2. Frontage
(Max. Points: No Limit)
Points = Average Daily Traffic Volume / 50
(Max. Points: No Limit)
Points $=(\#$ of residential units fronting the street $)+($ apartment frontage $/ 25$ feet $)$

## 3. Bypass Volume

(Max. Points: No Limit)
Points = Daily Bypass Volume / 10

## SUMMARY

Residents may request speed humps for their street by submitting a completed petition at any time during the year. The street segment is then evaluated and ranked according to the Program criteria. Newly ranked streets are added to the speed hump list and re-ranked for the next Transportation Programming Guide (TPG) cycle. The addition of new streets will result in a new ranking for streets already on the speed hump list.

Once a year, based on program funding, residents on the top ranked streets in each Council District are balloted to determine if the street will receive speed humps. Generally, the top two streets on the Parks/Schools list are also balloted. A second balloting cycle may be held if Program funds are available.

Streets that achieve the minimum balloted return rate of $25 \%$ and two-thirds favorable vote, receive their speed humps generally in the fall of the same year they are balloted.

Many of the streets on the Speed Hump list ( $28 \%$ or 38 of 134 streets) are also in a neighborhood that has applied for the City's Neighborhood Traffic Management Program (NTMP). This program takes into consideration the traffic concerns of an entire neighborhood rather than one street as the Speed Hump Program does. Depending on the ranking of a street, speed humps may be installed sooner as part of the NTMP traffic calming plan if approved by the neighborhood.

Additionally, if a street involved in a NTMP project does not implement humps as part of the traffic calming plan for the neighborhood, that street may not be considered for further traffic calming measures such as speed humps for a minimum of one-year after the NTMP project has been closed. After that time, residents on any street may request speed humps through the Speed Hump Program.

At the time of the printing of this TPG, there were 134 streets on the Speed Hump List (see Table I-1). A map showing the locations of the 5 highest ranked streets per Council District and the Parks and School locations is shown as Figure I-1.
TABLE I-1

| $\begin{gathered} \hline 2006 \\ \text { RANK } \end{gathered}$ | DISTRICT | MAJOR STREET | BOUNDARY STREET | BOUNDARY STREET | TYPE | VOLUME POINTS | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \hline 85 \mathrm{TH} \% \\ & \text { SPEED } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \hline \text { SPEED } \\ & \text { LIMIT } \end{aligned}$ | FRONTAGE <br> POINTS | TOTAL POINTS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COUNCIL DISTRICT 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 1 | DANBROOK DR | CLUB CENTER DR | ANTELL DR | RESID | 33.26 | 35 | 25 | 11 | 94.26 |
| 2 | 1 | WINDSONG ST ( N ) | WINDSONG ST (W) | WINDSONG ST (E) | RESID | 16.68 | 30 | 25 | 49 | 90.68 |
| 3 | 1 | OSUNA WY ${ }^{2}$ | AZEVEDO DR | LEJANO WY | RESID | 7.64 | 31 | 25 | 43 | 80.64 |
| 4 | 1 | THELMA AV | HAWK AV | El CAMINO AV | RESID | 19.96 | 32 | 25 | 17.08 | 72.04 |
| 5 | 1 | WISCONSIN AV | NORTHGATE BL | NATOMA ST | RESID | 7.84 | 31 | 25 | 32 | 69.84 |
| 6 | 1 | AZUSA ST | MORELL ST | END (w) | RESID | 6.42 | 30 | 25 | 38 | 69.42 |
| 7 | 1 | INNOVATOR DR ${ }^{2}$ | IOLITE WY | DRUSY AV | RESID | 9.18 | 30 | 25 | 34 | 68.18 |
| 8 | 1 | WEISE WY | ERIN DR | FAIRWEATHER DR | RESID | 7.16 | 31 | 25 | 30 | 67.16 |
| 9 | 1 | TENAYA AV | NORTHGATE BL | NATOMA ST | RESID | 6.32 | 31 | 25 | 29 | 65.32 |
| 10 | 1 | PEBBLESTONE WY | TRUXEL RD | STONECREEK DR | RESID | 12.9 | 31 | 25 | 21 | 63.9 |
| 11 | 1 | WILSON AV | NORTHGATE BL | NORTHGLEN ST | RESID | 9.5 | 31.33 | 25 | 22 | 63.15 |
| 12 | 1 | WOODRIDGE OAK WY ${ }^{1}$ | TRUXEL RD | STONECREEK DR | RESID | 6.36 | 29 | 25 | 31 | 57.36 |
| 13 | 1 | BROADLAND ST ${ }^{1,2}$ | CITRINE WY | TANZANITE CT | RESID | 5.28 | 29 | 25 | 31 | 56.28 |
| 14 | 1 | GREENLEA AV ${ }^{1}$ | REINER WY | THELMA AVE | RESID | 3.56 | 28 | 25 | 37 | 55.56 |
| 15 | 1 | LEJANO WY ${ }^{1,2}$ | OSUNA WY | AZEVEDO DR | RESID | 7.38 | 29 | 25 | 26 | 53.38 |
| 16 | 1 | WIESE WY ${ }^{1}$ | ERIN DR | MENDEL WY | RESID | 10.08 | 29 | 25 | 23 | 53.08 |
| 17 | 1 | RUDGER WY ${ }^{1}$ | ERIN DR | MENDEL WY | RESID | 5.6 | 29 | 25 | 27 | 52.6 |
| 18 | 1 | ROCKYBEND DR ${ }^{1,2}$ | PEBBLEWOOD DR | TRUXEL RD | RESID | 4.72 | 29 | 25 | 27 | 51.72 |
| 19 | 1 | HAGGIN AV ${ }^{1}$ | NORCROSS DR | NORMINGTON DR | RESID | 5.94 | 28 | 25 | 20 | 40.94 | 85th percentile speed is less than 5 mph over the posted speed and therefore location does not qualify for humps. However, these streets are included on the Speed Hump Program list for monitoring purposes. ${ }^{2}$ Located in Neighborhood Traffic Management Program (NTMP) area. has voted not to have a speed hump at this location.

Shaded cells indicate new locations since the publication of the 2005 TPC
TABLE I-1

| $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline 2006 \\ \text { RANK } \end{gathered}$ | DISTRICT | MAJOR STREET | BOUNDARY STREET | BOUNDARY STREET | TYPE | $\begin{array}{l\|} \hline \text { VOLUME } \\ \text { POINTS } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \hline \text { 85TH\% } \\ & \text { SPEED } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \hline \text { SPEED } \\ & \text { LIMIT } \end{aligned}$ | FRONTAGE <br> POINTS | TOTAL POINTS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COUNCIL DISTRICT 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 2 | GRAVES AV | MABEL ST | BOZEMAN ST | RESID | 8.5 | 34.03 | 25 | 32 | 85.65 |
| 2 | 2 | JESSIE AV | RIO LINDA BL | MAY ST | RESID | 13 | 36 | 25 | 15 | 83 |
| 3 | 2 | PINELL ST ${ }^{1,2}$ | GRAND AV | SOUTH AV | RESID | 21.58 | 34 | 30 | 40 | 81.58 |
| 4 | 2 | GRACE AV | BETHESDA CT | BOLLENBACHER AV | RESID | 6.9 | 33 | 25 | 33 | 79.9 |
| 5 | 2 | ROOD AV | DRY CREEK RD | ACME AV | RESID | 8.98 | 34 | 25 | 25 | 78.98 |
| 6 | 2 | PINEDALE AV | SULLY ST | RIO LINDA BL | RESID | 12.34 | 30 | 25 | 38 | 75.34 |
| 7 | 2 | RIVERA $\mathrm{DR}^{2}$ | RIO LINDA BL | MAY ST | RESID | 15.94 | 31.5 | 25 | 25 | 73.44 |
| 8 | 2 | MAY ST | JESSIE AV | BELL AVE | RESID | 11.08 | 34 | 25 | 17 | 73.08 |
| 9 | 2 | GRACE AV ${ }^{2}$ | NORWOOD AV | SEAWIND DR. | RESID | 11.44 | 33.8 | 25 | 15 | 70.44 |
| 10 | 2 | BOLLENBACHER AV | KELTON WA | LOVELAND AV | RESID | 9.66 | 32 | 25 | 24 | 68.66 |
| 11 | 2 | STANDRICH ST | GUNNISON AV | BELL AV | RESID | 14.98 | 32 | 25 | 16 | 65.98 |
| 12 | 2 | LAS PALMAS AV ${ }^{2}$ | BRANCH ST | DEL PASO BL | RESID | 10.08 | 32.23 | 25 | 12 | 58.23 |
| 13 | 2 | TAILWIND DR ${ }^{1,2,3}$ | BAYWIND DR | CROSSWIND DR | RESID | 5.2 | 28.44 | 25 | 31 | 53.4 |
| 14 | 2 | WIND CREEK DR ${ }^{1}$ | HUNTER CREEK DR | WIND CREEK DR | RESID | 6.32 | 28.77 | 25 | 21 | 46.17 |
| 15 | 2 | BRECKENRIDGE WY ${ }^{1}$ | BOLLENBACHER AV | GUNNISON AVE | RESID | 3.62 | 28 | 25 | 25 | 43.62 |
| 16 | 2 | CALLECITA ST ${ }^{1}$ | ARCADE BL | SONOMA AV | RESID | 5.5 | 28 | 25 | 23 | 43.5 |
| 17 | 2 | CROSSWIND DR ${ }^{1,2}$ | TIDEWIND DR. | TAILWIND DR. | RESID | 2.18 | 28.07 | 25 | 25 | 42.53 |
| 18 | 2 | CANTERBURY RD | WOODLAKE DR | SOUTHGATE RD | BYPASS | 12.88 | 28 | 25 | 8 | 32.88 | ${ }^{1} 85$ th percentile speed is less than 5 mph over the posted speed and therefore location does not qualify for humps. However, these streets are included on the Speed Hump Program list for monitoring purposes.

${ }^{2}$ Located in Neighborhood Traffic Management Program (NTMP) area.
Since the approval of this list by the City Council on November 1, 2005, the neighborhood residents, as part on the NTMP process, has voted not to have a speed hump at this location.
Shaded cells indicate new locations since the publication of the 2005 TPG
TABLE I-1

| $\begin{gathered} \hline 2006 \\ \text { RANK } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | DISTRICT | MAJOR STREET | BOUNDARY STREET | BOUNDARY STREET | TYPE | VOLUME POINTS | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 85TH\% } \\ & \text { SPEED } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SPEED } \\ & \text { LIMIT } \end{aligned}$ | FRONTAGE POINTS | TOTAL POINTS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COUNCIL DISTRICT 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 3 | $51 \mathrm{ST} \mathrm{ST}{ }^{1}$ | H ST | J ST | RESID | 21.22 | 29 | 25 | 29 | 70.22 |
| 2 | 3 | $41 \mathrm{ST} \mathrm{ST}^{1}$ | H ST | J ST | RESID | 13.62 | 29 | 25 | 30 | 63.62 |
| 3 | 3 | 52 $\mathrm{ND} \mathrm{ST}^{1,2}$ | FOLSOM BL | Q ST | RESID | 17.62 | 28 | 25 | 29 | 61.62 |
| 4 | 3 | ELDREDGE AV | DEL PASO BL | JUDAH ST | RESID | 5.76 | 31 | 25 | 21 | 56.76 |
| 5 | 3 | 42ND ST ${ }^{1}$ | H ST | J ST | RESID | 8.98 | 28 | 25 | 29 | 52.98 |
| 6 | 3 | 42ND ST ${ }^{1}$ | F ST | H ST | RESID | 12.88 | 28 | 25 | 25 | 52.88 |
| 7 | 3 | $48 \mathrm{TH} \mathrm{ST}{ }^{1}$ | H ST | J ST | RESID | 17.28 | 28 | 25 | 19 | 51.28 |

COUNCIL DISTRICT 4

| $\mathbf{1}$ | 4 | SWANSTON DR $^{2}$ | SANTA BUENA WY | MUIR WY | RESID | 6.4 | 31 | 25 | 39 |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | 4 | SANTA BUENA WY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 85th percentile speed is less than 5 mph over the posted speed and therefore location does not qualify for humps. However, these streets are included on the Speed Hump Program list for monitoring purposes. ${ }^{2}$ Located in Neighborhood Traffic Management Program (NTMP) area.

## YEAR 2006 - SPEED HUMP PROGRAM

 has voted not to have a speed hump at this location.Shaded cells indicate new locations since the publication of the 2005 TPG
TABLE I-1

| $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline 2006 \\ \text { RANK } \end{gathered}$ | DISTRICT | MAJOR STREET | BOUNDARY STREET | BOUNDARY STREET | TYPE | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \hline \text { VOLUME } \\ & \text { POINTS } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 85TH\% SPEED | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \hline \text { SPEED } \\ & \text { LIMIT } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline \text { FRONTAGE } \\ \text { POINTS } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | TOTAL POINTS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12 | 4 | MC CLATCHY WY ${ }^{1}$ | MUIR WY | FREEMONT WY | RESID | 9.44 | 29 | 25 | 24.82 | 54.26 |
| 13 | 4 | THEO WY | EUCLID AVE | W CURVE | RESID | 3.86 | 30 | 25 | 25 | 53.86 |
| 14 | 4 | MEER WY ${ }^{1}$ | BABICH WY | FREEPORT BL | BYPASS | 13.1 | 28 | 25 | 17 | 47.1 |
| 15 | 4 | BABICH AV ${ }^{1}$ | SUTTERVILLE RD | END | BYPASS | 13.1 | 28 | 25 | 17 | 47.1 |
| 16 | 4 | REGINA WY ${ }^{1,3}$ | MARKHAM WY | VALLEJO WY | RESID | 6.42 | 28 | 25 | 17 | 38.42 |
| 17 | 4 | $23 \mathrm{RD} \mathrm{ST}^{1,2}$ | 12TH AV | 8TH AV | RESID | 3.56 | 28 | 25 | 19 | 37.56 |

[^6]
## YEAR 2006 - SPEED HUMP PROGRAM

TABLE I-1

| $\begin{gathered} \hline 2006 \\ \text { RANK } \end{gathered}$ | DISTRICT | MAJOR STREET | BOUNDARY STREET | BOUNDARY STREET | TYPE | VOLUME POINTS | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \hline \mathbf{8 5 T H} \% \\ & \text { SPEED } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \hline \text { SPEED } \\ & \text { LIMIT } \end{aligned}$ | FRONTAGE <br> POINTS | TOTAL POINTS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 13 | 5 | $43 \mathrm{RD} \mathrm{ST}^{1,2}$ | 2ND AV | 4TH AVE | RESID | 10.54 | 29 | 25 | 28 | 58.54 |
| 14 | 5 | $10 \mathrm{TH} \mathrm{AV}^{1,2}$ | FRANKLIN BL | EAST CURTIS DR | RESID | 7.82 | 29.46 | 25 | 28 | 58.12 |
| 15 | 5 | $42 \mathrm{ND} \mathrm{ST}{ }^{1}$ | 2ND AV | 4TH AV | RESID | 10.08 | 29 | 25 | 25 | 55.08 |
| 16 | 5 | SAMPSON BL ${ }^{1}$ | MC GLASHEN ST | FRUITRIDGE RD | RESID | 3.58 | 28.4 | 25 | 29 | 49.58 |
| 17 | 5 | CUTTER WAY ${ }^{1,2}$ | 10TH AV | 12 TH AV | RESID | 6.3 | 28 | 25 | 21 | 42.3 |
| 18 | 5 | $32 \mathrm{ND} \mathrm{ST}{ }^{1}$ | 6 TH AV | 10TH AV | RESID | 5 | 28 | 25 | 13 | 33 |
| 19 | 5 | DEEBLE ST ${ }^{1}$ | 24TH AV | 21ST AV | RESID | 7.86 | 28 | 25 | 10 | 32.86 |

## COUNCIL DISTRICT 6

| $\mathbf{1}$ | 6 | TIERRA WOOD WY | BRIDLE TRAIL WY | TIERRA GREEN WY | RESID | 9.92 | 30 | 25 | 38 |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | 6 | CLIFFWOOD WY | TERILYN ST | CHIPLAY ST | RESID | 13.48 | 30 | 25 |  |

[^7]YEAR 2006 - SPEED HUMP PROGRAM
TABLE I-1

| $\begin{gathered} \hline 2006 \\ \text { RANK } \end{gathered}$ | DISTRICT | MAJOR STREET | BOUNDARY STREET | BOUNDARY STREET | TYPE | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { VOLUME } \\ & \text { POINTS } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \hline \text { 85TH\% } \\ & \text { SPEED } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \hline \text { SPEED } \\ & \text { LIMIT } \end{aligned}$ | FRONTAGE POINTS | TOTAL POINTS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COUNCIL DISTRICT 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 8 | AMHERST ST ${ }^{2}$ | JANRICK AVE | CELEBRITY ST | RESID | 49.34 | 33 | 25 | 41 | 130.34 |
| 2 | 8 | $69 \mathrm{TH} \mathrm{AV}{ }^{2}$ | CANDLEWOOD WY | SYLVIA WY | RESID | 21.88 | 35 | 25 | 31.6 | 103.48 |
| 3 | 8 | AMHERST ST ${ }^{2}$ | CELEBRITY ST | LYTEL ST | RESID | 49.34 | 33 | 25 | 14 | 103.34 |
| 4 | 8 | HENRIETTA DR ${ }^{2}$ | MEADOWVIEW RD | MATSON DR | RESID | 25.04 | 36 | 25 | 21 | 101.04 |
| 5 | 8 | 65 TH AV | 21ST ST | TAMOSHANTER WY | RESID | 19.72 | 34 | 25 | 26 | 90.72 |
| 6 | 8 | LOMA VERDE WY ${ }^{2}$ | 69 TH AV | 29TH ST | RESID | 23.58 | 33 | 25 | 26 | 89.58 |
| 7 | 8 | MANORSIDE DR ${ }^{2}$ | MEADOWVIEW RD | 71 ST AV | RESID | 19.14 | 32 | 25 | 32 | 86.14 |
| 8 | 8 | DEER CREEK DR | DEER HILL DR | EAST ELBOW | RESID | 29.7 | 30 | 25 | 28 | 82.7 |
| 9 | 8 | 67 TH AV | TAMOSHANTER WY | EAST 90 DEGREE | RESID | 5.78 | 32 | 25 | 36 | 76.78 |
| 10 | 8 | STOCKDALE ST | 65 TH AV | 68 TH AV | RESID | 7.44 | 32 | 25 | 31 | 73.44 |
| 11 | 8 | ONEIL WY | 19TH ST | 21ST ST | RESID | 7.12 | 33 | 25 | 26 | 73.12 |
| 12 | 8 | COTTONTAIL WY | MANDY DR | ELBOW | RESID | 5.32 | 32.34 | 25 | 31 | 73.02 |
| 13 | 8 | ANOKA AV ${ }^{2}$ | 18TH ST | AMHERST ST | RESID | 7.72 | 30 | 25 | 39 | 71.72 |
| 14 | 8 | ONEIL WY | TAMOSHANTER WY | 21ST ST | RESID | 8.24 | 31 | 25 | 33 | 71.24 |
| 15 | 8 | DEER CREEK DR | ARMADALE WY | N ELBOW | RESID | 27.56 | 30 | 25 | 18 | 70.56 |
| 16 | 8 | RED DEER WY | DEER CREEK DR | DEER GLEN WY | RESID | 18.7 | 32 | 25 | 14 | 67.7 |
| 17 | 8 | BENBOW ST | 65 TH AV | 68 TH AV | RESID | 6.08 | 31 | 25 | 31 | 67.08 |
| 18 | 8 | CASA LINDA DR ${ }^{2}$ | FLORES WAY | TWILIGHT DR | RESID | 11.06 | 32 | 25 | 20 | 66.06 |
| 19 | 8 | WAKEFIELD WY ${ }^{2}$ | CROMWELL WY | 17TH ST | RESID | 5.38 | 33 | 25 | 20 | 65.38 |

${ }^{1} 85$ th percentile speed is less than 5 mph over the posted speed and therefore location does not qualify for humps. However, these streets are included on the Speed Hump Program list for monitoring purposes. ${ }^{2}$ Located in Neighborhood Traffic Management Program (NTMP) area.
TABLE I-1

| $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline 2006 \\ \text { RANK } \end{gathered}$ | DISTRICT | MAJOR STREET | BOUNDARY STREET | BOUNDARY STREET | TYPE | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { VOLUME } \\ & \text { POINTS } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \hline \text { 85TH\% } \\ & \text { SPEED } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \hline \text { SPEED } \\ & \text { LIMIT } \end{aligned}$ | FRONTAGE <br> POINTS | TOTAL POINTS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20 | 8 | PIERRE AV ${ }^{2}$ | 22ND ST | 23RD ST | RESID | 6.62 | 30.79 | 25 | 28 | 63.57 |
| 21 | 8 | SPRINGMAN ST | 65 TH AV | GARDENDALE RD | RESID | 7.16 | 29.73 | 25 | 32 | 62.81 |
| 22 | 8 | SUNNYFIELD WY | HERMITAGE WY | ELBOW | RESID | 10.18 | 30 | 25 | 26 | 61.18 |
| 23 | 8 | WINKLEY WY | WEST ELBOW | PERMAR ST | RESID | 6.86 | 31 | 25 | 24 | 60.86 |
| 24 | 8 | SKELTON WY ${ }^{1}$ | KIRK WAY | N ELBOW | RESID | 5.08 | 29 | 25 | 34 | 59.08 |
| 25 | 8 | LA CASTANA WY | LA SOMBRA WY | LA ALMENDRA WY | RESID | 3.94 | 30 | 25 | 30 | 58.94 |
| 26 | 8 | TILDEN WY ${ }^{1}$ | 21ST ST | 68TH AV | RESID | 4.9 | 28 | 25 | 39 | 58.9 |
| 27 | 8 | CULPEPPER DR ${ }^{1,2}$ | JACINTO AV | EAST ELBOW | RESID | 17.72 | 28 | 25 | 26 | 58.72 |
| 28 | 8 | $69 \mathrm{TH} \mathrm{AV}{ }^{2}$ | AMHERST ST | SCHREINER ST | RESID | 7.14 | 31 | 25 | 20 | 57.14 |
| 29 | 8 | SCHREINER ST ${ }^{2}$ | CARELLA DR | 69 TH AV | RESID | 6.26 | 31 | 25 | 20 | 56.26 |
| 30 | 8 | WAKEFIELD WY ${ }^{1,2}$ | CROMWELL WY | 63 RD AV | RESID | 6.68 | 29 | 25 | 29 | 55.68 |
| 31 | 8 | CADJEW AV ${ }^{2}$ | TEEKAY WY | ELBOW | RESID | 4.72 | 29.83 | 25 | 26 | 54.87 |
| 32 | 8 | KIRK WY | COLLINGWOOD WY | THAMOSHANTER WY | RESID | 9.6 | 30 | 25 | 20 | 54.6 |
| 33 | 8 | BALFOUR WY ${ }^{1}$ | 68 TH AV | POIRIER WY | RESID | 10.18 | 29 | 25 | 23 | 53.18 |
| 34 | 8 | $18 \mathrm{TH} \mathrm{ST}{ }^{1}$ | MATSON WY | KIRK WY | RESID | 4.58 | 29.07 | 25 | 28 | 52.93 |
| 35 | 8 | KIRK WY | 21ST ST | COLLINGWOOD ST | RESID | 9.6 | 30 | 25 | 18 | 52.6 |
| 36 | 8 | HOLLYBROOK DR ${ }^{1}$ | FALMOUTH WY | PORT HAYWOOD WY |  | 4.34 | 28 | 25 | 29 | 48.34 |
| 37 | 8 | 22 $\mathrm{ND} \mathrm{ST}^{1}$ | 65 TH AV | 67TH AV | RESID | 3.58 | 29 | 25 | 24 | 47.58 |
| 38 | 8 | $25 \mathrm{TH} \mathrm{ST}{ }^{2}$ | TEEKAY WY | LARAMORE WY | RESID | 1.88 | 30 | 25 | 18 | 44.88 |
| 39 | 8 | SAMOS WY ${ }^{1}$ | WEST END | MACK RD | RESID | 5.7 | 28 | 25 | 22 | 42.7 | 85th percentile speed is less than 5 mph over the posted speed and therefore location does not qualify for humps.

[^8]TABLE I-1

| $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline 2006 \\ \text { RANK } \end{gathered}$ | DISTRICT | MAJOR STREET | BOUNDARY STREET | BOUNDARY STREET | TYPE | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \hline \text { VOLUME } \\ & \text { POINTS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \hline 85 \mathrm{TH} \% \\ & \text { SPEED } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \hline \text { SPEED } \\ & \text { LIMIT } \end{aligned}$ | FRONTAGE POINTS | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 40 | 8 | HERMES CR ${ }^{1}$ | MARATHON CT | EAST ELBOW | RESID | 2.76 | 28 | 25 | 24 | 41.76 |


| 1 | 1 | CREST DR | DANBROOK DR | KANE AVE | PK\&SCH | 60.5 | 38 | 25 | 74.84 | 200.34 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 1 | UNITY POINT AV | WEST RIVER DR | UNITY CR | PK\&SCH | 6.46 | 31 | 25 | 63.28 | 99.74 |
| 3 | 3 | RAY ST | SILICA AV | BOWLING GREEN DR | PK\&SCH | 15.92 | 32 | 25 | 21.44 | 72.36 |
| 4 | 8 | 32 ND ST | LOMA VERDE WY | TORRANCE AV | PK\&SCH | 9.36 | 30 | 25 | 26.68 | 61.04 |
| 5 | 1 | WINDSONG ST ${ }^{1}$ | WINDCATCHER CT | GOOSE HAVEN CT | PK\&SCH | 5.28 | 26 | 25 | 48.52 | 58.8 |
| 6 | 1 | BAINES AV ${ }^{1}$ (re-evaluating) | CURVE (NORTH) | NORTH BEND DR | PK\&SCH | 8.88 | 29 | 25 | 29.48 | 58.36 |

85th percentile speed is less than 5 mph over the posted speed and therefore location does not qualify for humps.
However, these streets are included on the Speed Hump Program list for monitoring purposes.
${ }^{2}$ Located in Neighborhood Traffic Management Program (NTMP) area.
YEAR 2006 - SPEED HUMP PROGRAM
has voted not to have a speed hump at this location.
Shaded cells indicate new locations since the publication of the 2005 TPG

Speed Hump Program I-14

FIGURE I-1
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## TRAIN HORN QUIET ZONES PROGRAM

## INTROUDCTION

On April 27, 2005, the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) published an interim final rule that requires locomotive horns be sounded while trains approach and enter public highway-rail grade crossings. The final rule contained an exception to the above requirement in circumstances in which there is not a significant risk of loss of life or serious personal injury, use of the locomotive horn is impractical, or safety measures fully compensate for the absence of the warning provided by the locomotive horn. Communities that qualify for this exception may create "quiet zones" within which locomotive horns would not be routinely sounded. Applying for quiet zones would require the City, at certain instances, to fund and implement certain improvements at railroad crossings.

On April 132004 and on July 27, 2004 were directed by City Council to consider evaluation criteria reflecting train horn impacts on residential areas giving priority for areas that are impacted the most.

## GOAL AND POLICY

The Train Horn Quiet Zones Program is consistent with the following City of Sacramento General Plan (adopted January 19, 1988, reflects City Council Amendments through September 2000) goals and policies:

## Overall Goal:

Protect the public from detrimental sources that are within the City's ability and responsibility to regulate.

## Goal:

Reduce noise levels in areas where noise exposure presently exceeds the standards set fourth in the general plan.

## Policy

Encourage the incorporation of the latest noise control technologies in all projects.

## PROJECT LIST DEVELOPMENT

## Eligibility Criteria

Crossings that are subject to the applicability of the Train Horn Rule are the only crossings that are considered for the Train Horn Quiet Zones. Railroad spurs are not included in the list of crossings. The Train Horn Rule does not apply to railroads exclusively operating freight trains on tracks which are not part of the general railroad system; passenger railroads that operate only on tracks which are not part of the general railroad system of transportation and which operate at a maximum speed of 15 mph ; and rapid transit
operations within an urban area that are not connected to the general railroad system of transportation.

## PROJECT RANKING PROCESS

Train Horn Quiet Zones are ranked using one criteria: Person Sounding (PS).
The PS is an objective criterion to measure the relative impact on the affected population. The PS is calculated for each crossing by multiplying the Number of Trains by Persons. There is no maximum score.

Number of Trains: The daily number of trains that crosses over a specific crossing.
Persons: Number of people who lives within 1.5 miles from specific crossing.
TABLE J-1
YEAR 2006-TRAIN HORN QUIET ZONES RANKED LIST

| 2006 Rank | Council District | Street | Line | Soundings | Persons | Person Sounding |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 3 | 28th St | Line 4 | 42 | 47193 | 1982106 |
| 2 | 3 | 20th St | Line 3 | 42 | 46269 | 1943298 |
| 3 | 1,2 | Main Ave | Line 1 N C | 23 | 80679 | 1855617 |
| 4 | 1,2 | West El Camino Ave | Line 1 N C | 23 | 52452 | 1206396 |
| 5 | 1,2 | Bicycle Path | Line 1 N C | 23 | 48889 | 1124447 |
| 6 | 3 | Q St | Line 1 S C | 12 | 64050 | 768600 |
| 7 | 4 | V St | Line 1 S C | 12 | 63933 | 767196 |
| 8 | 4 | S St | Line 1 S C | 12 | 62919 | 755028 |
| 9 | 4 | T St | Line 1 S C | 12 | 62919 | 755028 |
| 10 | 4 | W St | Line 1 S C | 12 | 62609 | 751308 |
| 11 | 4 | 20th St - Broadway | Line 1 S C | 12 | 62084 | 745008 |
| 12 | 3 | P St | Line 1 S C | 12 | 62063 | 744756 |
| 13 | 8 | Meadowview Rd | Line 1 S C | 12 | 60094 | 721128 |
| 14 | 4,5 | 21st St | Line 1 S C | 12 | 59976 | 719712 |
| 15 | 4 | X St | Line 1 S C | 12 | 58793 | 705516 |
| 16 | 4 | Second Ave | Line 1 S C | 12 | 58766 | 705192 |
| 17 | 3 | O St | Line 1 S C | 12 | 58610 | 703320 |
| 18 | 3 | N St | Line 1 S C | 12 | 57133 | 685596 |
| 19 | 3 | Capitol Ave - M St | Line 1 S C | 12 | 55700 | 668400 |
| 20 | 3 | Private Crossing East 20th St, N. C St | Line 4 to 1 | 14 | 46269 | 647766 |
| 21 | 3 | K St | Line 1 S C | 12 | 53654 | 643848 |
| 22 | 5,8 | Florin Rd | Line 1 S C | 12 | 53590 | 643080 |
| 23 | 3 | L St | Line 1 S C | 12 | 52936 | 635232 |
| 24 | 3 | I St | Line 1 S C | 12 | 52051 | 624612 |
| 25 | 3 | J St | Line 1 S C | 12 | 51924 | 623088 |
| 26 | 3 | H St | Line 1 S C | 12 | 48975 | 587700 |
| 27 | 5 | 47th Ave | Line 1 S C | 12 | 48709 | 584508 |
| 28 | 3 | G St | Line 1 S C | 12 | 48401 | 580812 |
| 29 | 5 | Fruitridge Rd | Line 1 S C | 12 | 46062 | 552744 |

TABLE J-1

| 2006 Rank | Council District | Street | Line | Soundings | Persons | Person Sounding |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| 30 | 3 | D St | Line 1 S C | 12 | 45874 | 550488 |
| 31 | 3 | F St | Line 1 S C | 12 | 45790 | 549480 |
| 32 | 5 | 26th Ave | Line 1 S C | 12 | 45646 | 547752 |
| 33 | 3 | C St | Line 1 S C | 12 | 45323 | 543876 |
| 34 | 3 | E St | Line 1 S C | 12 | 44015 | 528180 |
| 35 | 6 | 14th Ave | Line 2 | 12 | 41417 | 497004 |
| 36 | 6 | Power Inn Rd | Line 2 | 12 | 36318 | 435816 |
| 37 | 6 | Fruitridge Rd | Line 2 | 12 | 31748 | 380976 |
| 38 | 6 | Elder Creek Rd | Line 2 | 12 | 25538 | 306456 |
| 39 | 6 | Jackson | Line 5 | 2 | 25481 | 50962 |
| 40 | 6 | Kiefer | Line 5 | 2 | 21685 | 43370 |
| 41 | 6 | Florin Perkins Rd | Line 6 | 1 | 19004 | 19004 |
| 42 | 6 | Fruitridge Rd | Line 6 | 1 | 12480 | 12480 |

## RAILROAD LINES CROSSINGS NEW QUIET ZONES


19 TOTAL
CROSSINGS IN CENTRAL CITY FROM C ST TO W ST

$\$^{N}$
MEADOW VIEW RD

RAIL LINE LEGEND
Rail line 1, north of C Street Rail line 1, south of C Street
Rail line 2
Rail line 3
Rail line 4
Rail line 5
Rail line 6

## DEVELOPMENT DRIVEN

## INTRODUCTION:

The projects presented in the ten program areas of the 2006 Transportation Programming Guide are not fully funded; therefore, they are prioritized so available public funds can be programmed consistently with City transportation priorities. However, there are also many projects in the City that are fully funded or have funding mechanisms in place; many of these are funded primarily from non-public sources. These projects are an integral part of the City's overall transportation system, and their inclusion in this document helps provide a more comprehensive picture of the City's transportation needs. Planned projects are presented below for the following areas:

- Jacinto Creek Planning Area (JCPA)
- North Natomas
- Richards Boulevard/Railyards Area
- Granite Regional Park
- South Natomas
- Delta Shores (added this year)

In addition to these projects, public improvements such as traffic signals or intersection modifications may be required as a condition of approval for other privately funded development projects.

## JACINTO CREEK PLANNING AREA (JCPA)

## Summary Of Capital And Developer Improvements

This section of the Transportation Programming Guide will summarize a variety of improvements being constructed in the JCPA. The JCPA is bounded by Highway 99 on the east, Sheldon Road on the south, Bruceville Road on the west, and approximately 600 feet north of Shasta Road on the north. Most of the improvements are drainage facilities and are funded by private landowners. A portion of the improvements are roadway facilities that are funded as part of the CIP and developer funded. Much of the public improvements in the JCPA are funded by three (3) impact fees. They are the JCPA Public Facility Fee (PFF), the Drainage Fee and Channel Fee that fund improvements for roads, drainage and water distribution facilities.

The Public Facility Fee (PFF), Drainage and Channel fees were established with the adoption of the JCPA Financing Plan. The plan was first approved in 1997, was updated in 2004 to reflect increases to the cost of widening Bruceville Road. The JCPA area includes nearly the entire Jacinto Creek Community Plan. The updated finance plan funds approximately $\$ 12,050,000$ in public improvement facilities attributable to the JCPA finance area alone. Projects include water distribution lines, drainage facilities, and transportation improvements a portion of the widening of Bruceville Road and half the cost of a signal along Sheldon Road.

The PFF portion of the fees provides for a portion of the total cost of the roadway widening, including intersection improvements and signalization with funding sources identified from a combination of Mello-Roos CFD revenues, Sacramento County Laguna Roadway fees, City major street construction taxes and developer frontage improvements. As well, the PFF allows for reimbursement for developer funded water distribution systems. Payment of the PFF fee is required of all private development projects in the JCPA. Funding of transportation projects require the utilization of both existing and new funding sources. The impact fee is structured to utilize existing fee and bond funding sources to the extent possible; to insure that basic infrastructure is in place when needed for the development; the cost of major infrastructure is distributed equally among the property owners; and each developer pays a fair-share for necessary infrastructure.

## Overview of the Public Facility Fee

The JCPA Financing Plan was established with the adoption of the JCPA Financing Plan. The plan was approved in 1997 and was updated in 2004 to reflect cost increases to the widening of Bruceville Road.

The PFF will ultimately fund $\$ 4.3$ million dollars in public roadway improvements. These improvements include:

- Major Roadway Widening
- Signals

Payment of the PFF is required of all private development projects in the JCPA. The impact fee is structured to ensure:

- Basic infrastructure is in place when needed for development;
- The costs of major infrastructure is distributed fairly among the property owners;
- Each developer pays a fair-share for necessary infrastructure.


## Provision of Infrastructure through the Public Facility Fee

Improvements funded by the PFF are constructed in several ways. Improvements may have been or will be built by the City, using PFF revenues and other available sources, or by private developers as part of their development project(s). Private landowners may construct roadway improvements included in the PFF program for which they will be reimbursed. The major road segments will be built by the City, however due to the timing of development, developers may construct some portions of the roadway project.

## Improvements Funded by the Public Facility Fee

Transportation improvements in the JCPA have been constructed as needed to accommodate build-out of the community plan area. Most of the transportation improvements have already been completed. Criteria used to prioritize improvements to be constructed with the PFF are shown in Table J-1. These criteria are listed in no particular order.

TABLE K-1

| PUBLIC FACILITY FEE PROJECT SELECTION CRITERIA |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| $\bullet$ | Accommodate traffic growth | $\bullet \quad$ Feedback from Council and City offices |
| $\bullet$ | Community feedback |  |
| $\bullet$ | Available funding | • Close a gap in transportation network |

The PFF has been used to fund transportation improvements and other public facilities. The CIP includes several improvements funded (in whole or in part) by the PFF, including roadway widening and water distribution. A summary of costs of the transportation projects is shown in Table J-2. As the table indicates, the major transportation improvement projects within the Jacinto Creek Planning Area that are yet to be completed are either currently under construction or will be constructed in 2006. When all the listed Jacinto Creek Planning Area transportation projects are constructed, this section will be deleted from the Transportation Programming Guide.
TABLE K-2

| REF\# | PROJECT | DESCRIPTION | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DELIVERY } \\ & \text { YEAR } \end{aligned}$ | WORK PERFORMED BY | ESTIMATED COST $\$ 1,000^{(\mathbf{1})}$ | CITY FUNDS REQUIRED |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Sheldon Road Widening | Widen Sheldon Road between Bruceville Road and Highway 99 from 2 to 6 lanes (lanes 5 \& 6 provided by developer) | 2006 | Elk Grove/ Developer | \$3,600 | No |
| 2 | Bruceville Road Widening | Widen Bruceville Road between Cosumnes Road and Sheldon Road to 4 lanes out to 6 lanes by developer | Under Construction | City/ <br> Developer | \$7,000 | Yes |
| 3 | Sheldon Road / New Project Roadway Signal | Signalize the intersection of Sheldon Road and New Project Roadway (between Bruceville Road and Road B, known as Whitehouse Road) | Complete | Developer | \$310 | No |
| 4 | Bruceville Road / <br> Damascus Drive Signal | Signalize the intersection of Bruceville Road and Damascus Drive | Under Construction | City | \$275 | Yes |
| 5 | Bruceville Road / Jacinto Road Signal | Signalize the intersection of Bruceville Road and Jacinto Road | 2006 | City | \$275 | Yes |
| 6 | Bruceville Road / Calvine Road Signal | Signalize the intersection of Bruceville Road and Calvine Road | 2006 | City | \$275 | Yes |
| 7 | Bruceville Road / Cosumnes College East Entrance Signal | Signalize the intersection of Bruceville Road and Cosumnes College East Entrance | 2006 | City | \$275 | No |

FIGURE K-1


## NORTH NATOMAS

This section will summarize transportation projects needed to support development activity in North Natomas. Some of the improvements are funded as part of City's Capitol Improvement Program while others are being built by private landowners. A number of transportation improvements in North Natomas will be funded by the North Natomas Public Facility Fee.

The Public Facility Fee (PFF) was established with the adoption of the North Natomas Financing Plan. The plan was first approved in 1994, and was updated in 2005. The PFF area includes nearly the entire North Natomas Community Plan, as shown in Figure K-1. The PFF will ultimately fund approximately $\$ 121$ million in transportation system improvements. Payment of the PFF is required of all private development projects in North Natomas. The fee is structured to insure that basic infrastructure is in place when needed for the development, the cost of major infrastructure is distributed equally among the property owners, and each developer pays a fair-share for necessary infrastructure.

Figure L-1: Public Facility Fee Area
Improvements funded by the Public Facility Fee


The PFF will fund a variety of transportation improvements. These improvements are needed to accommodate build-out of the community plan area, promote the use of alternate travel modes, and provide recreational opportunities. The planned improvements include:

- Off-street Bikeways
- Freeway improvements
- Traffic signals
- Road \& Freeway Landscaping
- Shuttle Busses
- Major Roads
- Bridges


## Provision of Infrastructure Through the Public Facility Fee

Improvements funded by the PFF may be constructed in several ways. Improvements may be built by the City, using PFF revenues, by private developers as part of their development project(s) or through establishment of Community Facility Districts and/or Assessment Districts. Private landowners that construct improvements included in the PFF program will be reimbursed for the costs of those improvements.

## Transportation Improvements in North Natomas

Improvements in North Natomas will be constructed as needed to accommodate build-out of the community plan area. These improvements will be built over the next 30 years and in response to development activity. A number of factors are considered in estimating the relative timing of improvement projects. These considerations for North Natomas are shown in Table K-1 (listed in no particular order except for safety).

TABLE L-1

| PUBLIC FACILITY FEE PROJECT SELECTION CONSIDERATIONS |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\bullet$ | Public safety | $\bullet$ |
| $\bullet$ | Support economic development |  |
| $\bullet$Close a gap in transportation <br> network | $\bullet$ | Aesthetics and livability |
| $\bullet$ | Environmental mitigation | $\bullet$ |
| $\bullet$ | Accommodate traffic growth | $\bullet$ |
| $\bullet$ | Available funding | $\bullet$ |

Table K-2 lists all of the major transportation improvements currently planned for North Natomas. Costs shown are total cost and include the North Natomas PFF.

## TABLE L-2

| North Natomas - Major Transportation Projects |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Description | Location \& Description | Cost | City Funds Req'd? |
| Freeway Improvements |  |  |  |
| Truxel Interchange | Overcrossing \& Auxiliary Lanes between Truxel \& Northgate | \$19,115,000 | Yes |
| Arena Interchange | New Interchange, Auxiliary Lane I-5 @ Del Paso to I80, 4-Exit Lanes, I-80 to Arena B1 $2^{\text {nd }}$ Auxiliary Lane | \$20,622,905 | Yes |
| Northgate Interchange | Improve WB Off Ramp | \$4,281,000 | Yes |
| Del Paso Interchange | Auxiliary Lane @ SB Loop on Ramp | \$867,000 | Yes |
| I-80/I-5 Interchange | Ramp for EB to NB Traffic | \$17,121,000 | Yes |
| Elkhorn/SR99 Interchange | Widen Existing Interchange | \$11,909,000 | Yes |
| W El Camino /I-80 Interchange | Widen Existing Interchange | \$8,195,000 | Yes |
| I-80@ Northgate to 1-5 | HOV/Mainline Lane | \$5,707,000 | Yes |
| I-5 @ Del Paso to I-80 | HOV/Mainline Lane | \$5,707,000 | Yes |
| 99 @ Elkhorn to I-5 | HOV/Mainline Lane | \$1,141,000 | Yes |
| I-5 @ 99 Junction to Del Paso NB | HOV/Mainline Lane | \$857,000 | Yes |
| I-80@ I-5 to W. El Camino | HOV/Mainline Lane | \$2,283,000 | Yes |
| Snowy Egret Way OC | New Freeway over crossing south of Del Paso Rd | \$3,397,000 | Yes |
| Natomas Crossing OC | New Freeway over crossing south of Arena Boulevard | \$2,103,000 | Yes |
| El Centro OC | New freeway overdressing north of Del Paso Road | \$2,103,000 | Yes |
| Meister Way OC | New freeway overdressing south of Elkhorn Boulevard | \$3,397,000 | Yes |
| Freeway Landscaping |  |  |  |
| Freeway Landscaping | Landscaping along freeways | \$7,431,490 | No |
| Subtotal - Freeways |  | \$116,237,395 |  |
| Major Roads |  |  |  |
| Snowy Egret Way | New 4-lane south of Del Paso Rd, El Centro Rd to E. Commerce Way | \$2,855,664 | Yes |
| Club Center Dr. | 4-lanes, Natomas Bl to Danbrook Dr. | \$499,512 | Yes |
| Del Paso Road | 4 lanes, City Limit on West to El Centro Rd | \$3,776,927 | Yes |
| Del Paso Road | 6-lanes, El Centro Rd to I-5 | \$989,408 | Yes |
| Del Paso Road - North Side | 6-lanes, NB I-5 Off-ramp to Truxel Rd | \$6,059,512 | Yes |
| Del Paso Road | 6-lanes, Truxel Rd to East Drain Canal | \$1,831,288 | Yes |
| Del Paso Road - North Side | 6-lanes, East Drain Canal to 300' West of City Limit on East | \$2,376,666 | Yes |
| Del Paso Road - North Side | 6-lanes, 300' West of City Limit on East to City Limit on East | \$161,466 | Yes |
| Del Paso Road - South Side | 6-lanes, East Drain Canal to City Limit on East | \$415,358 | Yes |
| East Commerce Way | 4-lanes, Elkhorn Bl to Club Center Dr | \$5,666,417 | Yes |
| East Commerce Way | 6-lanes, Club Center Dr to Del Paso Rd | \$8,248,984 | Yes |


| North Natomas - Major Transportation Projects |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Description | Location \& Description | Cost | City Funds Req'd? |
| East Commerce Way | 6-lanes, Arena Bl to Natomas Crossing Dr. | \$3,374,405 | Yes |
| East Commerce Way | 4-lanes, Natomas Crossing Dr to San Juan Rd | \$3,104,862 | Yes |
| El Centro Road | 4-lanes, Del Paso Rd to Arena Bl | \$5,768,050 | Yes |
| El Centro Road | 4-lanes, Arena Bl to San Juan Rd | \$6,854,679 | Yes |
| Elkhorn B1 | 6-lanes, SR-99 to City Limit on East | \$16,071,912 | Yes |
| Gateway Park Bl | 4-lanes, Del Paso Rd to Arena Bl | \$3,437,703 | Yes |
| Gateway Park B1 (Half-Section) | 4-lanes, Arena Bl to Truxel Road | \$1,554,509 | Yes |
| Natomas Crossing Dr | 2+ lanes, Duckhorn Dr to El Centro Road | \$4,340,716 | Yes |
| Natomas Crossing Dr | 4-lanes, Truxel Road to Innovator Dr | \$549,153 | Yes |
| Arena B1 | 4-lanes, El Centro Road to Duckhorn Dr | \$1,541,793 | Yes |
| Arena B1 | 6-lanes, Duckhorn Dr to I-5 | \$257,075 | Yes |
| Arena Bl | 8-lanes, I-5 to East Commerce Way | \$257,075 | Yes |
| Natomas Bl | 4-lanes, Elkhorn Bl to 650' North of Club Center Dr | \$2,346,593 | Yes |
| Natomas B1 - Frontage Improvements | 4-lanes, Elkhorn Bl to 650' North of Club Center Dr | \$2,243,299 | Yes |
| Natomas Bl | 4-lanes, 650' North of Club Center Dr to Club Center Dr | \$372,004 | Yes |
| Natomas Bl - Frontage Improvements | 4-lanes, 650' North of Club Center Dr to Club Center Dr | \$155,385 | Yes |
| Natomas Bl - Frontage Improvements | 6-lanes, Club Center Dr to North Park Dr | \$485,355 | Yes |
| Natomas B1 | 6-lanes, North Park Dr to Del Paso Road | \$3,312,157 | Yes |
| Natomas Bl - Frontage Improvements | 6-lanes, North Park Dr to 600' North of Del Paso Road | \$1,488,855 | Yes |
| New Market Dr | 2-lanes, Natomas Bl to LRT Station | \$2,052,131 | Yes |
| New Market Dr | 2-lanes, At LRT Station | \$332,569 | Yes |
| New Market Dr | 2-lanes, LRT Station to Town Center Dr | \$553,894 | Yes |
| San Juan Road - South | 1-lane, El Centro Road to 1600' East of El Centro Road | \$424,591 | Yes |
| Northborough Dr - Section 1 | 2-lanes, 1350' N of New Market Dr to Regional Park Commuter St | \$1,732,901 | Yes |
| Northborough Dr - Section 2 | 2-lanes, New Market Dr to 1350' N of New Market Dr | \$1,132,488 | Yes |
| Regional Park Commuter St | 2-lanes, Northborough Dr to Natomas Bl | \$2,926,889 | Yes |
| Library St | 2-lanes, Del Paso Road to New Market Dr | \$1,008,928 | Yes |
| El Centro Road | 6-lanes, Del Paso Road to Bayou Road | \$2,243,063 | Yes |
| Interstate 5 | Interstate 5 Water Main Crossing | \$1,348,215 | Yes |
| Gateway Park B1 | 6-lanes, Truxel Road to N. Freeway B1 | \$805,282 | Yes |
| N. Freeway Bl | 6-lanes, Gateway Park B1 to West Promenade Circle | \$995,997 | Yes |
| N. Freeway Bl | 4-lanes, West Promenade Circle to East Promenade Circle | \$1,262,225 | Yes |
| Natomas Crossing Dr | 4-lanes, I-5 to East Commerce Way | \$77,875 | Yes |
| Landscaping at East Drain Canal | Natomas Bl | \$108,849 | Yes |
| Del Paso Road - South Side | 6-lanes, East Ramp of Interstate-5 and Truxel Road | \$4,608,758 | Yes |


| North Natomas - Major Transportation Projects |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Description | Location \& Description | Cost | City Funds Req'd? |
| East Commerce Way | 6-lanes, Del Paso Road and Arena Bl | \$4,926,261 | Yes |
| East Commerce Way | 6-lanes, Del Paso Road to Arena B1 | \$1,285,375 | Yes |
| Gateway Park Bl (Half-Section Built) | 4-lanes, Arena Bl and Truxel Road | \$1,106,789 | Yes |
| Arena B1 | 6-lanes, East Commerce Way and City Limit on East | \$4,507,393 | Yes |
| Arena Bl | 6-lanes, East Commerce Way to City Limit on East | \$1,413,913 | Yes |
| Truxel Road | 8-lanes, Del Paso Road and Gateway Park B1 | \$8,712,753 | Yes |
| Truxel Road | 8-lanes, Del Paso Road to Gateway Park Bl (minus 1900 ') | \$1,439,620 | Yes |
| Natomas Crossing Dr | 4-lanes, Duckhorn Dr to I-5 | \$199,345 | Yes |
| Subtotal - Major Roads |  | \$135,602,886 | Yes |
| Signals |  |  |  |
| 55 Signals, 14 will include PFF funding | Various Locations in North Natomas | \$10,607,923 | No |
| Bridges |  |  |  |
| Bridge Cross Dr @ East Drain | Roadway Crossing @ East Drain | \$666,725 | No |
| Club Center Dr @ East Drain | Roadway Crossing @ East Drain | \$1,116,424 | No |
| North Bend Dr @ East Drain | Roadway Crossing @ East Drain | \$657,849 | No |
| Terracina Dr @ East Drain | Roadway Crossing @ East Drain | \$697,453 | No |
| Del Paso Road @ East Drain | Widen Crossing on westbound side | \$1,367,007 | No |
| Elkhorn Blvd @ East Drain | Roadway Crossing @ East Drain | \$1,367,007 | No |
| Gateway Park Blvd @ C-1 Canal | Roadway Crossing @ C-1 Canal | \$1,032,230 | No |
| El Centro Road @ West Drain | Roadway Crossing @ West Drain | \$1,032,230 | No |
| San Juan Road @ West Drain | Roadway Crossing @ West Drain | \$697,453 | No |
| Natomas Crossing Dr @ West Drain | Roadway Crossing @ West Drain | \$1,032,230 | No |
| Subtotal - Bridges |  | \$9,666,608 |  |
| Alternate Mode Facilities |  |  |  |
| Off-street Bikeway Crossings | Crossings of freeway, canals and streets, various locations | \$9,829,270 | Yes |
| Off-Street Bikeways | Various | \$5,371,790 | No |
| Shuttle Buses (10) | Local Shuttles | \$1,205,852 | No |
| Subtotal - Alternate Modes |  | \$16,406,912 |  |
| Total North Natomas Major Transportation Projects |  | \$288,521,724 |  |

## RICHARDS BOULEVARD/RAILYARDS AREA

## INTRODUCTION

This section of the Transportation Programming Guide will summarize a variety of improvements being constructed in the Richards Boulevard and Railyards planning districts. Some of the improvements are funded as part of the City's Capital Improvement Program, while others will be built by private landowners. A number of the public improvements in the Richards Boulevard and Railyards areas will be funded by the Railyards/Richards Boulevard/Downtown Area transportation fee program.

The Railyards/Richards Boulevard Area Infrastructure Finance Plan was adopted on September 30, 1997 (Resolution 97-557). The Plan established a method for funding the public facilities identified in the Railyards/Richards Boulevard Area Facility Element, and the fee program is composed of both a transportation impact and a public facility fee. The public facilities fee, which covers facilities such as new fire and police stations, parks, schools, etc. is not discussed in this section. The total cost of the Railyards/Richards Boulevard Area infrastructure plan was estimated at $\$ 519$ million, and the Facility Plan calls for build out of the areas over a 35 -year period (although build out will likely occur over a long period of time).

The City is anticipating major amendments to the adopted Facility Elements that will amend the list of Stage One, or 15-year transportation projects to be funded through the fee program. The proposed amendments are the result of 1) recommendations contained in the North Central Business District Access Study, 2) the pending development application to be submitted by the selected Railyards developer, and 3) the Sacramento Intermodal Transportation Facility Study. Amendment to the Facility Element will likely commence in 2006, but likely not be completed until 2007. The Finance Plan will be updated concurrent with the Railyards/Richards Boulevard Area community plan amendment process.

## Overview of the Transportation Facility Fee

The $\$ 135.6$ million in Transportation Impact Fees anticipated to be collected over the build out of the plan will fund the following categories of transportation improvements

- Construction of new arterial roadways
- Major arterial roadway widening
- Freeway improvements
- Rail/Transit improvements (intermodal station, light rail)

Payment of the Transportation Impact Fee is required of all private new construction projects in the Railyards, Richards Boulevard, and Downtown benefit districts. The structure of the fee is intended to ensure that:

1. Existing development does not pay the fee.
2. Tenant improvements or changes in ownership do not trigger payment of fees.
3. All new development that will impact the transportation system and benefit from the improvements will be required to pay the fee.
4. Some exemptions from the fee program have been incorporated to promote adaptive reuse of federal, state, or locally listed historic structures.

The fee program assigns the following transportation impact fees to new development:

TABLE M-1

| Area Transportation Fee | Office <br> Per sq. ft. | Hotel <br> Per Room | Industrial <br> Per sq. ft | Residential <br> Per unit | Retail <br> Per sq. ft. |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Railyards Area | $\$ 5.29$ | $\$ 3,248$ | $\mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{A}$ | $\$ 2,784$ | $\$ 5.83$ |
| Richards Boulevard Area | $\$ 5.51$ | $\$ 1,523$ | $\$ 2.00$ | $\$ 2,900$ | $\$ 6.07$ |
| Downtown Area | $\$ 1.13$ | $\$ 295$ | $\$ 0.41$ | $\$ 594$ | $\$ 1.24$ |

## Provision of Infrastructure Through the Transportation Facility Fee

Improvements funded by the fee program may be constructed in several ways. Improvements may be built by the City, using fee revenues and other available resources, or by private developers as part of their development projects. Private landowners may construct roadway improvements included in the fee program for which they will be reimbursed.

## Improvements Funded by the Public Facility Fee

Improvements in the Railyards/Richards Boulevard Area will be constructed as needed to accommodate build-out of the community plan area. Generally, the construction of infrastructure has been identified to occur in three phases tied to various levels of development. The selection of projects has been accomplished through input from a number of sources, as outlined in the following table:

TABLE M-2

| Transportation Facility Fee Project Selection Criteria |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Based on: | Identified through: |
| Accommodation of traffic growth | North-East Area Transportation Study Working Group |
| Available funding | Capitol Station District Board of Directors |
| Gaps in transportation network | Feedback from Council and City offices |
| Promotion/catalyst of development | $7^{\text {th }}$ Street Task Force |
| Leverage of public funding | North Central Business Access Study |
|  | Railyards/Richards Blvd Finance Plan Working Group |

## Five Year List of Projects

The following is a list of projects anticipated to be funded partially or wholly from private development, and utilize the transportation impact fees. The improvements are seen as necessary "catalyst" to allow the first phase of private development to occur. Since there are
insufficient redevelopment tax increment, or private capital resources, the fee program will play a minor role in achieving the initial transportation improvements in the next five years.

TABLE M-3

| Five Year Project List |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project | Description | Responsible Entity | Projected Delivery Year |
| Arterial Roadways |  |  |  |
| $5{ }^{\text {th }}$ Street Extension | 2-lane roadway from H to Gateway Boulevard. | Development Driven | 2010 |
| $6^{\text {th }}$ Street Extension | 4-lane roadway north from G Street to Richards Boulevard at North 5th Street. | Development Driven | 2010 |
| $7{ }^{\text {th }}$ Street Extension Phase II | Expand $7^{\text {h }}$ Street to four lane roadway (D Street to Richards Boulevard) and accommodate DNA light rail extension | Development /Regional Transit Driven | 2010 |
| H Street Extension | Construct 4 lane street between $2^{\text {nd }}$ Street and $5^{\text {th }}$ Street | Development Driven | 2010 |
| Freeways |  |  |  |
| Richards Blvd./North $16^{\text {th }} \mathrm{St}$ | Create at-grade signalized intersection | City | 2006 |
| I-5/Richards Boulevard Interchange Improvements | P.S.R., Environmental, and Design | City | 2010 |
| I-5/I Street ramp reconstruction (West Sacramento access) | Reconstruct I-5 on-ramp at $3^{\text {rd }} /$ I Street intersection | City | 2010 |
| Railyards Access Road | Create roadway connection from I-5 / Richards to Railroad Technology Museum | City / Developer | 2010 |
| Collector Roads |  |  |  |
| G Street ( $5^{\text {th }}-7^{\text {th }}$ St) Extension | Extend G Street once rail mainline track relocated | Development Driven | 2010 |
| North $7^{\text {h }}$ Street Widening (N. of Richards Blvd). | Widen $7^{\text {th }}$ Street to four lanes north of Richards Blvd (Cannery Development Project) | Development Driven | 2010 |
| North $10^{\text {th }}$ Street Reconstruction | Reconstruct N. $10^{\text {th }}$ north of N. B St to Richards Blvd. | City | 2010 |
| North B Street Reconstruction | Reconstruct from North $7^{\text {th }}$ to North $10^{\text {th }}$ Street | City | 2005 |
| F Street ( $6^{\text {th }}-7^{\text {th }}$ Street) Extension | Extend F St. as transit serving roadway to the SITF | Development Driven | 2010 |
| New Street | From N. $5^{\text {th }}$ to N. $10^{\text {th }}$ Street (Cannery and Continental Plaza developments) | Development Driven | 2008 |
| Vine Street | From N. $10^{\text {th }}$ Street to North $5^{\text {th }}$ | Developer | 2008 |
| Riverfront Drive | From N. $5^{\text {th }}$ to N. $7^{\text {th }}$ Street (Cannery Development Project | Development Driven | 2008 |
| Transit Facilities |  |  |  |
| Mainline rail relocation improvements associate with rail track relocation | Grade separated pedestrian crossings under rail tracks | Developer/ U.P.R.R. | 2010 |

## Five to Ten Year Project List

The five to ten year project list represents improvements that are largely driven by the level of private development.

TABLE M-4

| Five to Ten Year Project List |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project | Description | Responsible Entity | Projected Delivery Year |
| Arterial Roadways |  |  |  |
| Gateway Blvd. <br> Phase 1: Jibboom Street to North <br> $7^{\text {th }}$ Street <br> Phase 2: North $7^{\text {th }}$ Street to North $12^{\text {th }}$ Street | Construct a collector from the intersection of North B/12th Street southwest to an intersection with Railyards Access Road. | Development Driven | 2012 |
| Freeways |  |  |  |
| I-5/Richards Blvd (Phase II) | Expanded Interchange | City | 2012 |
| Collector Roads |  |  |  |
| 5th Street (N. of Richards) | Widen $5^{\text {th }}$ Street | Development Driven | 2010 |
| Riverfront Drive. | Extension from $5^{\text {th }}$ to Dreher St. | Development Driven | 2012 |
| N. $10^{\text {th }} \mathrm{St}$. | Widen N. $10^{\text {th }}$ north of Richards Blvd. | Development Driven | 2012 |
| Transit Facilities |  |  |  |
| Sacramento Intermodal Transportation Facility | Construct Phase I passenger rail and intercity rail facility | City | 2012 |
| Downtown / Natomas / Airport LRT Extension | Extend LRT north from $7^{\text {th }}$ and K to Richards Blvd. | Regional Transit | 2012 |

NOTE: Project delivery years and project scopes are conceptual and will likely be updated.

## Major Improvements to be Provided by Landowners

Private land owners must provide basic infrastructure needed to support each development. The extent, cost, timing, and location of those improvements cannot be specifically determined at this time. However, it is possible to reasonably forecast improvements based on the locations and nature of approved planned development, the trend in housing construction, and the new projects currently being reviewed by staff.

Anticipated development includes the following:

## Railyards Planning Area

- New Millennia mixed-use development
- Construction of new north-south access when mainline rail tracks are relocated
- State Railroad Technology Museum in the Historic Shops buildings
- Sacramento Intermodal Transportation Facility
- Folsom Light Rail (LRT) Extension
- The Downtown/Natomas/Airport light rail extension


## Richards Boulevard Area

- Construction of new streets as part of various private development projects related to approved and pending entitlement applications, including:
- North Town Planned Unit Development
- Discovery Center Office Park
- Continental Plaza Office Park
- Jibboom Street Power Station Building Redevelopment
- State Printing Plant site redevelopment

It is possible, and in some cases likely, that private landowners will opt to provide some of the improvements noted in the 5 year TPG before they are programmed for construction by the City.

## GRANITE REGIONAL PARK

## Planned Unit Development (PUD)

This section will summarize transportation projects needed to support development activity in the Granite Regional Park PUD. Development fees paid by the PUD and the City's Capital Improvement Program fund the improvements.

## Transportation Improvements in Granite Park

Improvements in the Granite PUD will be constructed as needed to accommodate development activity over the next 30 years. The timing of specific improvement projects required in response to development activity is defined in the mitigation-monitoring plan for the PUD.

Table M-1 indicates the projects to be built by the City and private developers to be constructed pending available funding.
YEAR 2006 GRANITE REGIONAL PARK TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS

|  | $\stackrel{\infty}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\square}{9}$ | 앙 | 알 |  | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | $\stackrel{\sim}{\sim}$ | 알 | 알 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 会 | $\begin{aligned} & 8 \\ & 8 \\ & 8 \\ & 6 \\ & \stackrel{8}{6} \\ & \vdots \end{aligned}$ | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 8 I W W | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ò } \\ & \underset{n}{n} \\ & \tilde{\sim} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8 \\ & 8 \\ & 8 \\ & 0 \\ & \cdots \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 8 | 8 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O} \\ & \infty \\ & \text { in } \\ & \underset{\sim}{6} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8 \\ & 8 \\ & \stackrel{8}{6} \\ & \frac{1}{\infty} \end{aligned}$ | $\frac{\infty}{\frac{\infty}{n}} \frac{\infty}{\infty}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \tilde{n} \\ & \underset{\sim}{2} \\ & \underset{\theta}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & n \\ & \tilde{n} \\ & \underset{8}{2} \\ & \infty \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8 \\ & 8 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & n \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8 \\ & 8 \\ & 0 \\ & \frac{1}{6} \\ & 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8 \\ & \text { ob } \\ & \text { in } \\ & \text { H } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \infty \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 8 \\ & 8 \\ & \text { it } \\ & \text { i } \\ & \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8 \\ & 8 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \infty \end{aligned}$ | $\frac{\infty}{\frac{2}{n}} \frac{\stackrel{n}{n}}{n}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & n \\ & \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \infty \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \stackrel{0}{n} \\ & \underset{N}{n} \\ & \infty \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8 \\ & \underset{O}{8} \\ & \dot{+} \\ & \tilde{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8 \\ & 8 \\ & \underset{I}{n} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8 \\ & 8 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \infty \end{aligned}$ | 8 <br> 8 <br> 8 <br> 0 <br> 0 |
|  | i | $\begin{aligned} & \ddot{\partial} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \vdots \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \dot{\ddot{0}} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \dot{0} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \ddot{0} \\ & \frac{0}{0} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | B | 灾 | 心 | 灾 | $\begin{aligned} & \ddot{0} \\ & 0 . \\ & 0 . \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{U}{0} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \text { On } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { E } \\ & .0 . \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \tilde{0} \\ & .0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \vdots \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \tilde{0} \\ & .0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \tilde{0} \\ & .0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \vdots \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \tilde{0} \\ & .0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \vdots \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { \# } \\ & \stackrel{\pi}{\mathscr{\sim}} \end{aligned}$ | － | $\sim$ | m | $\checkmark$ | in | $\bigcirc$ | － | $\infty$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |

# Granite Regional Park Development Area Transportation Projects 
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## SOUTH NATOMAS

This section will summarize transportation projects planned for South Natomas. South Natomas is bounded by Garden Highway to the south, Interstate 80 on the west and north, and the Natomas East Main Drainage Canal on the east. The City Council has approved two funding programs for South Natomas: the South Natomas Community Infrastructure Fund (SNCIF) and the South Natomas Facilities Benefit Assessment District (FBA).

## South Natomas Community Infrastructure Fund (SNCIF)

The South Natomas Community Infrastructure Fund (SNCIF) was established in 1983 through development agreements for three properties adjacent to Interstate 5: Metropolitan Center, Gateway Center and Corporate Center. This program established special fees paid by developers for construction of various capital improvements to partially mitigate the impact of new commercial construction within the South Natomas area. The SNCIF development agreements expired in 1993. New development in these areas now requires payment of SNCIF fees at the FBA rate.

## South Natomas Facilities Benefit Assessment (FBA) District

The South Natomas Facilities Benefit Assessment (FBA) District was formed in 1990. All undeveloped or underdeveloped property within the South Natomas Community Plan area was included in the district, with the exception of property subject to the South Natomas development agreements. Fees are paid by developers and collected when building permits are issued.

The purpose of the FBA District was to provide funding for infrastructure needs and community enhancements within the South Natomas Community Plan area. At the time of district formation, the City Council adopted a list of twenty-one specific projects to be paid with FBA funds. This program will ultimately fund $\$ 16.0$ million dollars in transportation improvements. The remaining eleven project locations and descriptions are referenced in Table N-1.

## Overview of the South Natomas Community Financing Plan

The transportation projects, which are being proposed for FBA and SNCIF funding, are basic assumptions of the 1988 South Natomas Community Plan. The environmental analysis for buildout of the area was done, assuming that all these transportation projects were constructed.

Future development in South Natomas will generate the need for new transportation systems as well as improvement of existing facilities to serve the additional growth of the community. FBA and SCNIF funding will partially or completely provide a freeway interchange, major roadway modifications, traffic signals, bridges, and portions of the bicycle system. In addition, other traffic signals and the over-width center portion of several major roads will be constructed using funding sources other than the FBA.

Portions of the needed public facilities will be constructed as part of the subdivision process by private development. The remaining portion of needed public facilities could be financed by the following alternative methods: Facilities Benefit Assessment (FBA), Acquisition Assessment Districts, Lighting and Landscaping Act District, Mello Roos, Fee Exactions, Developer Construction, and Major Street Construction Tax.
YEAR 2006 REMAINING SOUTH NATOMAS TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS

| Ref \# | Category | Project | Description | Who Will Accomplish? | Estimated Cost (1) | SNCIF Contribution | FBA Contribution | Some City <br> Funds Required |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Alternate Modes | Bikeway System | The South Natomas Community Plan includes off-street bike trails, on-street bikeways and bike/pedestrian bridges. The facilities not yet constructed are included in the Alternate Modes Section of this document. | City |  | \$0 | \$2,000,000 | no |
| 2 | Delay Reduction | All Weather Northgate Blvd | The Northgate All Weather project was redefined as improvements at the Northgate Boulevard/Garden Highway intersection and is partially funded. | City | \$3,600,000 | \$303,100 | \$1,930,000 | yes |
| 3 | Safety | West El Camino Signal at Fire Station | Construction of traffic signals at the intersection of West El Camino at Fire Station adjacent to Main Drain Canal | City | \$375,000 | \$8,700 | \$55,500 | no |
| 4 | Connectivity | River Plaza Drive Bridge | Construction of a four (4) lane conventional concrete bridge on River Plaza Drive over the Main Drainage Canal. | City | \$6,000,000 | \$84,100 | \$535,100 | no |
| 5 | Access | Gateway Oaks Drive West | Construct 2900 feet of the center portion of Gateway Oaks Dr on the west side of Main Drainage Canal | Developer | \$2,100,000 | \$0 | \$0 | no |
| 6 | Access | Gateway Oaks Drive Bridge | Construction of a four vehicular bridge on Gateway Oaks Dr over the Main Drainage Canal. | City | \$7,000,000 | \$56,000 | \$356,800 | no |
| 7 | Delay Reduction | West El Camino/I-80 Ramp Signal | Construct traffic signals at West El Camino and I-80 ramps | City | \$375,000 | \$0 | \$0 | no |
| 8 | Access | Fong Ranch Road | Construct 7500 ft of the center portion of Fong Ranch Road between Truxel Rd and WAPA Corridor. | Developer | \$4,800,000 | \$0 | \$0 | no |
| 9 | Access | Fong Ranch Road Bridge | Construct a four (4) lane conventional concrete bridge over an RD-1000 canal, south of I-80 | Developer | \$7,000,000 | \$24,400 | \$155,600 | no |
| 10 | Delay Reduction | Garden Highway Widening | Widen Garden Highway to four lanes between I5 and Northgate Blvd. | City | $\begin{gathered} \$ 35,000,00 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | \$282,800 | \$1,800,300 | no |

Costs are rough order of magnitude and will require updating
South Natomas Major Transportation Projects
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## DELTA SHORES

Delta Shores is a one thousand (approximate) acre development area in the south end of the City. The site is located along both sides of Interstate 5 near the future Cosumnes Boulevard/ Interstate 5 interchange. The owner will likely be submitting an application for land use entitlements in the next six months to a year. Necessary major transportation improvements will likely include, the Cosumnes Boulevard / Interstate 5 interchange and extension, and the extension of 24th Street. Approximate locations of these projects are depicted in figure P-1. Other likely public improvements will include other street segments, signals, and bridges, drainage and other utility facilities, and regional, community, and neighborhood parks development. These improvements will be added to the Transportation Programming Guide and Capital Improvement Program as appropriate.

FIGURE P-1

## DELTA SHORES AREA <br> MAJOR TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS




[^0]:    1 Level of Service (LOS) is a term used to describe the quality of traffic operations on roadways and at intersections. Letters ranging from A to F denote levels of service, with A describing free-flowing conditions and F describing congested conditions. The City of Sacramento General Plan (adopted January 19, 1988, reflects City Council Amendments through September 2000) has adopted a service level standard of C for both roadways and intersections.

[^1]:    (1) "New" Indicates new project added this year.
    Shaded cells are Development Driven projects.

[^2]:    ${ }^{(1)}$ "New" Indicates new project added this year.

[^3]:    ${ }^{(1)}$ "New" Indicates new project added this year.

[^4]:    2 The accident Rate is the annual number of accidents per 1 million vehicle miles. Accident Rate $=$ Accidents x $10^{6} /($ ADT $\times$ segment miles x 365 )

    Horizontal clearance is measured from the edge of the travel lane to the nearest obstruction, such as an abutment, column, or bridge rail.

[^5]:    1 Speed humps will not be approved on Regional Transit bus routes and emergency response routes, although speed lumps and/or speed tables may be approved on these streets by RT and the Fire Department.
    2 One vote per household is allowed; voter(s) must reside at the household (whether they are owners or tenants), as they are the primary users of the street being considered for speed humps.
    3 Preschool, day care school, elementary, middle or high school.
    4 One vote per household is allowed; voter(s) must reside at the household (whether they be owner or tenants,), as they are the primary users of the street being considered for speed humps. If the balloting of residents on the Parks and Schools streets does not demonstrate a two-thirds majority favoring the installation of speed humps, the City Council member representing the district in which the street is located may override the ballot results.

[^6]:    COUNCIL DISTRICT 5

    | 1 | 5 | 44TH ST | 8TH AVE | 12TH AVE | RESID | 33.34 | 30 | 25 | 34 | 92.34 |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    | 2 | 5 | 6TH AVE | 33RD ST | 37TH ST | RESID | 15.38 | 31 | 25 | 42 | 87.38 |
    | 3 | 5 | 23RD ST | 24 TH AV | IRVIN WY | RESID | 11.84 | 31 | 25 | 31 | 72.84 |
    | 4 | 5 | EDNA ST | 24 TH ST | 26TH ST | RESID | 7.36 | 32 | 25 | 29 | 71.36 |
    | 5 | 5 | 28 TH ST | 26 TH AV | 29 TH AV | RESID | 24 | 31 | 25 | 16 | 70 |
    | 6 | 5 | PORTOLA WY ${ }^{2}$ | 26TH ST | FRANKLIN BL | RESID | 7.2 | 30 | 25 | 37 | 69.2 |
    | 7 | 5 | JEFFERY AV | SUTTERVILLE RD | WILMINGTON AV | RESID | 7.36 | 30 | 25 | 36 | 68.36 |
    | 8 | 5 | DANA WY ${ }^{2}$ | MURIETA WY | IRVIN WY | RESID | 8.42 | 31.54 | 25 | 26 | 67.12 |
    | 9 | 5 | KNIGHT WY ${ }^{2}$ | MURIETA WY | 24 THST | RESID | 9.5 | 30 | 25 | 31 | 65.5 |
    | 10 | 5 | $7 \mathrm{TH} \mathrm{AV}^{1}$ | 33RD ST | 37TH ST | RESID | 8.58 | 28 | 25 | 40 | 63.58 |
    | 11 | 5 | HOOKE WY ${ }^{2}$ | 24 TH ST | IRVIN WY | RESID | 6.66 | 30 | 25 | 31 | 62.66 |
    | 12 | 5 | 39 TH AV | 24 TH ST | 26TH ST | RESID | 6.52 | 30 | 25 | 30 | 61.52 | 85th percentile speed is less than 5 mph over the posted speed and therefore location does not qualify for humps. However, these streets are included on the Speed Hump Program list for monitoring purposes. ${ }^{2}$ Located in Neighborhood Traffic Management Program (NTMP) area. has voted not to have a speed hump at this location.

    Shaded cells indicate new locations since the publication of the 2005 TPG

[^7]:    COUNCIL DISTRICT 7

    | 1 | 7 | SEA FOREST WY ${ }^{1}$ | DEERLAKE DR | ELBOW | RESID | 11.48 | 29 | 25 | 32 | 63.48 |
    | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
    | 2 | 7 | MONAGHAN CR ${ }^{1}$ | EAST ELBOW | RICHION DR | RESID | 6.2 | 29 | 25 | 27 | 53.2 |
    | 3 | 7 | LA SOLANA WY | VALLEY HI DR | TORRENTA WY | RESID | 7.8 | 31 | 25 | 15 | 52.8 |
    | 4 | 7 | LINDBROOK WY ${ }^{1}$ | GRANDSTAFF DR | EAST ELBOW | RESID | 12.32 | 28 | 25 | 23 | 50.32 |
    | 5 | 7 | SHAW RIVER WY ${ }^{1}$ | GLORIA DR | RUSH RIVER DR | RESID | 4.04 | 28 | 25 | 27 | 46.04 |
    | 6 | 7 | ORENZA WY ${ }^{1}$ | MONTRIL WY | SAN SEBASTIAN WY | RESID | 9.32 | 29 | 25 | 11 | 40.32 | 85th percentile speed is less than 5 mph over the posted speed and therefore location does not qualify for humps. However, these streets are included on the Speed Hump Program list for monitoring purposes.

    ${ }^{2}$ Located in Neighborhood Traffic Management Program (NTMP) area. has voted not to have a speed hump at this location.

    Shaded cells indicate new locations since the publication of the 2005 TPG

[^8]:    Shaded cells indicate new locations since the publication of the 2005 TPG

