S A C O G

Item #07-1-10

SACOG Board of Directors

Workshop

January 11, 2007

Metropolitan Transportation Plan Exercise

Issue: Continuation of Board workshop on MTP from December meeting

Recommendation: None. This is a discussion item

Committee Action/Discussion: Chair Fargo and incoming Chair Dupray have agreed that the Board input exercise using laptop computers should continue through the final eight corridors. The Board test-ran this method of input at the December meeting for the Southern Sacramento corridor. We will significantly speed up the exercise in order to assure that we make it through the final eight corridors in a timely fashion. This broad-based information from the entire Board is extremely useful to staff as it prepares to bring the framework for a draft plan forward soon for the Board's consideration.

We will work our way through the remaining eight corridors in the following order:

- Yolo-Sacramento Counties
- Sutter-Yuba Counties
- Northern Sacramento County
- Eastern I-80
- Highway 65 and South Placer County
- Eastern Sacramento County
- U.S. 50 Corridor
- Elk Grove-Rancho Cordova-El Dorado

For each corridor Board members will be asked individually to answer the following questions:

a. What aspects of the 3 scenarios presented Nov. 16 do you like the most?
b. Are there any additional ideas not included in the scenarios you think should be considered?
c. Is there any additional information on costs and/or benefits of the scenarios that you would like staff to provide the Board?

I am attaching the series of 1-page summaries of public input and key technical information for each corridor that we handed out at the December Board meeting. Hopefully you will find this information useful as you develop your comments on each corridor.

We expect the entire exercise to take just a little over one hour, and we have purposely tried to keep the remainder of the agenda light in order to provide time for this and get the Board out before noon (possibly significantly sooner).

Approved by:

Mike McKeever
Executive Director

MM:rt
Attachments

Key Staff: Pete Hathaway, Director of Transportation Planning, (916) 340-6235

Yolo-Sacramento Counties Corridor

Synthesis of Citizen Input and Technical Information

November 16, 2006, TALL Order Forum

Table Preferences

Preference	Scenarios 1	Scenarios 2	Scenarios 3	Total # of Tables that Completed this Corridor
Target Areas:				
Davis Workshop	9%	23%	68%	22
Downtown Sacramento Workshop	37%	37%	26%	46
Total for Target Area Workshops	28%	32%	40%	68
Regionwide	**30%**	**38%**	**32%**	**146**

Comment on citizen input:

Citizens at the Davis site had a clear preference for Scenario 3, while the tables at Memorial in Sacramento were fairly evenly split between the three alternatives, with a tie between Scenarios 1 and 2. The regionwide tally was also pretty evenly split between the three, with Scenario 2 in the lead, but with only 38%.

Key comparison features between scenarios:

- Scenario 1 (new mixed flow "regular" freeway lanes) and Scenario 3 (new carpool lanes) provide more capacity on Interstate 80, while Scenario 2 does not expand freeway capacity
- Scenario 2 adds a rail stop in West Sacramento and increases existing service to trains every 30 minutes during morning and evening peak periods.
- Scenario 1 adds a significant streetcar system linking the West Capitol Avenue and Southport areas of West Sacramento to downtown Sacramento, while Scenario 3 has what might be termed a "starter" streetcar connection.
- All three have the same new bridges across the Sacramento River (Broadway, Ship Canal, R street bike/pedestrian), while Scenario 1 also rebuilds the I Street bridge.

Performance considerations:

All three perform well and fairly alike on vehicle hours, vehicle miles, and transit ridership. Scenario 3 provides more congestion reduction than Scenario 1 (9.8% reduction from today, compared to 1% reduction). Scenario 2 more than doubles congestion per household from today. The congested VMT is dominated by the Interstate 80 causeway traffic. The high congested VMT in Scenario 2 is primarily due to no lane additions to the freeway.

The share of trips by transit is relatively similar for all alternatives, even though there is a variation in the types of transit service. Scenario 2 has a regional rail emphasis, Scenario 1 has a streetcar emphasis in West Sacramento, and Scenario 3 has more express bus as its emphasis.

Cost/feasibility considerations:

Scenario 1 is $236 million more expensive than Scenario 2 and $180 million more expensive than Scenario 3, largely due to an estimated $150 million expansion to I-80 (including Causeway bike bridge replacement) and $125 million streetcar line between downtown Sacramento and West Sacramento.

Sutter-Yuba Counties Corridor

Synthesis of Citizen Input and Technical Information

November 16, 2006, TALL Order Forum

Table Preferences

Preference	Scenarios 1	Scenarios 2	Scenarios 3	Total # of Tables that Completed this Corridor
Target Areas:				
Yuba City Workshop	8%	15%	77%	13
Total for Target Area Workshops	8%	15%	77%	13
Regionwide	**41%**	**18%**	**42%**	**96**

Comment on citizen input:

The tables at the Yuba City workshop voted strongly for Scenario 3, while the regionwide numbers were more divided, showing a slight preference for Scenario 3 over Scenario 1.

Key differences between Scenarios 3 and 1:

Scenario 3:

- Adds a new 4-lane bridge from Bogue to Erle Road, and rebuilds and widens the 5th street bridge to 4 lanes.
- Adds 2 lane bypass east of Wheatland on Highway 65
- Adds 2 lane bypass east of Marysville, connecting Highway 65 to Highway 70

Scenario 1:

- Rebuilds and widens the 5th street bridge to 6 lanes
- Widens the 10th street bridge to 6 lanes
- Widens Highway 65 through Wheatland to 4 lanes

Performance considerations:

Scenario 3 increases vehicle hours of travel slightly less than Scenario 1, but Scenario 1 has a lower increase in vehicle miles of travel, more transit ridership, and quite a bit less congestion than Scenario 3.

The high **percentage** increase in congested VMT is mostly due to the very small amount of congestion faced by residents today. In all alternatives, the average resident will still have less congestion than the regional average. Another factor in the large increase in congestion is that the long distance commuters to Sacramento and Placer counties will have most of their congestion in these other counties, not in Yuba and Sutter counties.

Cost/feasibility considerations:

Scenario 3 costs about twice as much as Scenario 2, or $215 million more. The increased costs are largely associated with the Goldsfield Parkway/Marysville Bypass ($90 million) and the new bridge connecting Yuba City and Marysville across the Feather River ($200 million). The environmental issues associated with both of these projects are likely to be substantial.

Northern Sacramento Corridor

Synthesis of Citizen Input and Technical Information

November 16, 2006, TALL Order Forum

Table Preferences

Preference	Scenarios 1	Scenarios 2	Scenarios 3	Total # of Tables that Completed this Corridor
Target Areas:				
Natomas Workshop	31%	38%	31%	16
Downtown Sacramento Workshop	30%	44%	26%	50
Total for Target Area Workshops	30%	42%	27%	66
Regionwide	**25%**	**49%**	**26%**	**161**

Comment on citizen input:

The results at the Natomas workshop tell the story for this corridor, with close to a third of the tables supporting each of the 3 Scenarios as their top pick. There was more clear cut support for Scenario 2 at the downtown Sacramento workshop and for the combined regionwide tally, but still less than 50% of the tables in both samples.

Key comparisons between scenarios:

Light rail:

- Scenario 1 extends the train to the American River, builds a bridge over the river, and then connects to a BRT route through Natomas and to the airport
- Scenario 2 extends the train all the way to the airport
- Scenario 3 extends the train to Natomas Town Center, connecting to the airport via bus

The new bridge in Scenario 1 is an auto as well as a transit bridge (transit only in the other two scenarios)

Carpool lanes:

- All three scenarios have carpool lanes on Interstate 80 from Interstate 5 east
- Scenario 1 also has carpool lanes from the interchange of Interstates 80/I-5 south to downtown Sacramento
- Scenario 3 has carpool lanes from downtown Sacramento to the airport on Interstate 5, and on Highways 99/70 going north.

Performance considerations:

The share of trips by transit is relatively similar for all alternatives, even though there is a variation in the types of transit service. Scenario 2 has a light rail emphasis, Scenario 1 has regular bus service as its emphasis, and Scenario 3 has a mix of light rail (to Natomas) and bus (continuing to the airport) as its emphasis. Performance on the other travel metrics is also similar. Scenario 3 does slightly better on congestion relief, Scenario 1 slightly better on vehicle hours of travel, and Scenario 2 slightly better on vehicle miles traveled. Scenario 2 is the most expensive, Scenario 1 the least, and Scenario 3 in the middle.

Cost/feasibility considerations:

Due largely to the $800 million capital cost of extending the light rail all the way from downtown to the international airport, Scenario 2 is nearly 45% more expensive than Scenario 1 with its $82 million (capital only) extension to Richards Boulevard and 20% higher than Scenario 3 with its $500 million light rail line between downtown and Natomas Town Center. Although the $200 million I-80 carpool extension between I-5 and Watt Avenue are common to all three scenarios, carpool lanes on I-5 further distinguish the scenarios. Scenario 3 has the longest I-5 carpool extension, a $120 million improvement between downtown and the international airport, while #2 has a shorter $50 million I-5 carpool extension between downtown Sacramento and the I-80/I-5 interchange.

Eastern I-80 Corridor

Synthesis of Citizen Input and Technical Information

November 16, 2006, TALL Order Forum

Table Preferences

Preference	Scenarios 1	Scenarios 2	Scenarios 3	Total # of Tables that Completed this Corridor
Target Areas:				
Rocklin Workshop	40%	55%	5%	20
Natomas Workshop	56%	44%	0%	16
Total for Target Area Workshops	47%	50%	3%	36
Regionwide	**45%**	**50%**	**5%**	**155**

Comment on citizen input:

The citizens are closely divided between Scenarios 1 and 2, with virtually no support for Scenario 3. The average of the target area tables and the regionwide tables narrowly supported Scenario 2.

Key differences between Scenarios 2 and 1:

Scenario 2 includes:

- A new rail line and enough Capitol Corridor commuter rail to provide trains every 30 minutes in the peak morning and afternoon periods

Scenario 1 includes:

- Two streetcar lines in (a) southwest Placer County down Watt Avenue to the existing terminus of the light rail line at Watt and I-80 and (b) central Roseville to the Galleria Mall area.
- A new mixed flow (regular) freeway lane on I-80 in each direction from County line to Highway 65

Key similarities in Scenarios 2 and 1:

Carpool lanes from Watt Avenue west to Interstate 5, and from the county line east to Highway 65
Expanded Roseville Road to provide parallel capacity to Interstate 80.

Performance considerations:

Scenario 1 performs somewhat better than Scenario 2 on vehicle hours, vehicle miles, and transit ridership. It performs quite a bit better than Scenario 2 on reducing congestion (13.1% reduction compared to 4.3%). The addition of the mixed flow lanes to Interstate 80 accounts for a large part of the congestion reduction in Scenario 1 as compared to Scenario 2.

Cost/feasibility considerations:

Scenario 2 is more expensive than Scenario 1 (about $300 million more), largely due to the investment in a new rail line adjacent to the existing Union Pacific/Capitol Corridor that provides commuter rail service ($640 million total capital + operating). The streetcar in Scenario 1 with an estimated expense of $180 million (for capital and operating) is the most expensive feature unique to Scenario 1.

Highway 65 and South Placer County Corridor

Synthesis of Citizen Input and Technical Information

November 16, 2006, TALL Order Forum

Table Preferences

Preference	Scenarios 1	Scenarios 2	Scenarios 3	Total # of Tables that Completed this Corridor
Target Areas:				
Rocklin Workshop	40%	10%	50%	20
Yuba City Workshop	15%	54%	31%	13
Total for Target Area Workshops	30%	27%	42%	33
Regionwide	**53%**	**28%**	**20%**	**112**

Comment on citizen input:

Opinions in this corridor are quite divided. The average of the two target area sites favors Scenario 3 (with Rocklin, the most directly affected area, having a slight preference for Scenario 3 over Scenario 1, and Yuba City tables fairly decisively preferring Scenario 2). Regionwide, the preference was for Scenario 1. This corridor has one of the most divided preference patterns of any of the 9 corridors.

Key differences between scenarios:

Placer Parkway

- Scenario 1 is a 4 lane expressway with a southerly alignment
- Scenario 2 is a 4 lane expressway with a northerly alignment
- Scenario 3 starts as a 6 lane freeway from Highway 65 to North Watt and then extends east to Highways 99/70 as a 4 lane expressway

Transit

- Scenario 1 has a streetcar from Watt and Baseline south to the existing Interstate 80/Watt light rail stop
- Scenario 1 has the most extensive BRT network, with Scenario 2 the least and Scenario 3 in between; Scenario 3 also has a good deal of express buses, running in the Interstate 80 carpool lanes

Lincoln bypass

- In Scenarios 1 and 2, it is a 4 lane expressway
- In Scenario 3, it is a 4 lane freeway with interchanges

Arterials

- Scenario 1 places more emphasis on building an arterial grid system, while Scenarios 2 and 3 place more emphasis on freeway expansions

Performance considerations:

Scenario 1 is the only alternative that reduces congestion per household from today, down a significant 9.8%. Scenarios 2 and 3 increase congestion per household slightly from today. Congestion relief is not always related to the amount of freeway lanes. Scenario 3 has more freeway lanes on the Lincoln Bypass and the Placer Parkway; yet, Scenario 1 with an emphasis on arterials, has more congestion relief.

The three perform fairly similarly on vehicle hours of travel and vehicle miles of travel, with Scenario 1 again outperforming the other two. The share of trips by transit is relatively similar for all Scenarios, even though there is a variation in the types of transit service. Scenario 2 has a regional rail emphasis (illustrated in the Interstate 80 corridor scenarios, not here), Scenario 1 has a streetcar and BRT emphasis, and Scenario 3 has more express bus.

Cost/Feasibility considerations:

Scenario 3 is $470 million more than Scenario 1 and $700 million more than Scenario 2 due to the freeway treatments of the estimated $650 million Placer Parkway and $360 million Lincoln Bypass.

Eastern Sacramento Corridor

Synthesis of Citizen Input and Technical Information

November 16, 2006, TALL Order Forum

Table Preferences

Preference	Scenarios 1	Scenarios 2	Scenarios 3	Total # of Tables that Completed this Corridor
Target Areas:				
Folsom Workshop	73%	27%	0%	26
Rocklin Workshop	57%	43%	0%	14
Downtown Sacramento Workshop	66%	21%	13%	47
Total for Target Area Workshops	67%	26%	7%	87
Regionwide	**68%**	**21%**	**11%**	**145**

Comment on citizen input:

There is agreement for Scenario 1 at each of the three target sites for this corridor as well as the regionwide participants. The only target site with a strong second place choice is Rocklin, where 43% of the tables voted for Scenario 2.

Key unique features of Scenario 1:

- Hazel Avenue is expanded to 6 lanes to Placer County, connecting to an expanded Sierra College Boulevard
- Significant BRT system on major north-south and east-west arterials
- Hazel Avenue Bridge widened to 6 lanes

Performance considerations:

Scenario 1 produces more congestion relief than Scenarios 2 or 3 (largely due to the Hazel Avenue improvements), and somewhat better performance on vehicle hours, vehicle miles, and transit ridership. All three scenarios can attribute some of the increased transit ridership to matching increased service to development that occurs on some of the older corridors in the area.

Cost/feasibility considerations:

Scenario 2 costs nearly the same as Scenario 1, while Scenario 3 is the most expensive. The $150 million higher cost for Scenario 1 is due to significantly higher levels of local bus service, $130 million in improvements to Hazel Avenue between Highway 50 and Placer County, and the north-south and east-west BRT lines in the area.

U.S. 50 Corridor

Synthesis of Citizen Input and Technical Information

November 16, 2006, TALL Order Forum

Table Preferences

Preference	Scenarios 1	Scenarios 2	Scenarios 3	Total # of Tables that Completed this Corridor
Target Areas:				
Placerville Workshop	62%	15%	23%	13
Folsom Workshop	70%	7%	22%	27
Downtown Sacramento Workshop	85%	11%	4%	54
Total for Target Area Workshops	78%	11%	12%	94
Regionwide	**71%**	**17%**	**12%**	**167**

Comment on citizen input:

There is strong agreement at all three "target" sites that Scenario 1 is the preferred scenario, and regionwide the participants reached the same conclusion.

Key unique features of Scenario 1:

- New auxiliary lanes from El Dorado Hills to Shingle Springs and various locations from Mather Field Road to Howe Avenue.
- Streetcar in Rancho Cordova – small number of boardings
- Light rail frequencies increased to 10 minutes from 15 minutes in peak and double-tracked line from Sunrise to City of Folsom
- No new carpool lanes

Performance considerations:

Scenario 1 performs the same as Scenarios 2 and 3 on vehicle miles of travel and transit ridership, it performs a little better than the other two on vehicle hours of travel, and quite a bit better on congestion per household (although congestion per household still rises from today by 23.8%, compared to 35.9% and 35.7% for the other two). Most of the freeway congestion reduction in Scenario 1 is in the two sections of the U.S. 50 corridor, between Sunrise and Power Inn and in El Dorado County. A significant share of the increased transit trips are the result of improved local bus service complementing the additions to the "backbone" light rail system additions.

Different types of projects on U.S. 50 serve different users of the freeway. HOV lanes help long distance carpool trips, while auxiliary lanes help short distance trips along the corridor.

Cost/feasibility considerations:

Scenario 1 costs about the same as Scenario 3, but $210.5 more than Scenario 2, primarily from the $150 million in auxiliary lanes, $85 million for double-tracking the light rail line to Folsom and the $120 million for the Rancho Cordova streetcar. Sacramento County's Measure A has $100 million for carpool lanes on U. S. 50, and there are no new carpool lanes in Scenario 1.

Elk Grove-Rancho Cordova-El Dorado Corridor

Synthesis of Citizen Input and Technical Information

November 16, 2006, TALL Order Forum

Table Preferences

Preference	Scenarios 1	Scenarios 2	Scenarios 3	Total # of Tables that Completed this Corridor
Target Areas:				
Elk Grove Workshop	38%	56%	6%	16
Folsom Workshop	12%	84%	4%	25
Placerville Workshop	0%	100%	0%	14
Total for Target Area Workshops	16%	80%	4%	55
Regionwide	**33%**	**57%**	**10%**	**137**

Comment on citizen input:

All three target areas supported Scenario 2, as did the regionwide total. The target areas on the east strongly very strongly supported Scenario 2 (clearer results than any other workshop-corridor combination), while the opinions were much more closely divided between Scenarios 1 and 2 in Elk Grove. While the regionwide numbers also support Scenario 2, the opinion is more evenly divided, and if you isolate the opinions at the five sites not in the directly affected target areas, the opinions were virtually tied between Scenarios 1 (43%) and 2 (42%).

Key unique features of Scenario 2:

- Grantline and White Rock Road become 6-lanes end-to-end
- Grantline bypass around town of Sheldon
- New bypass road from White Rock in Sacramento County to Latrobe in El Dorado County
- Less investment in new arterial lanes

Performance considerations:

Scenario 2 does not perform quite as well as Scenarios 1 or 3 on vehicle hours traveled, vehicle miles traveled, or transit ridership. Scenario 2 performs quite a bit worse than Scenario 1 on congestion miles (increasing congestion from today by 2.5%, while Scenario 1 reduces congestion by 4%). Most of the congestion difference in this corridor is related to the amount and location of arterial improvements. The congestion improvement on Grant Line Road is more than offset by the increased congestion on South Watt/Elk Grove-Florin.

Most of the trips in this corridor are headed to jobs in Rancho Cordova, from southern Sacramento and Elk Grove in the west and eastern Sacramento County and El Dorado County in the west. Less than 10% of the trips travel end-to-end (i.e., Elk Grove to El Dorado County or vice versa). Note that in the eastern portion of the corridor, White Rock Road and International Drive (in Rancho Cordova) have the same 6-lane capacity in Scenario 1 as they do in Scenario 2.

Cost/Feasibility Considerations:

Scenario 2 is the most expensive of the scenarios (approximately $24.5 million more than #1 or $162.5 million more than Scenario 3), largely due to $294 million towards a complete 6-lane expansion of White Rock and Grant Line with a bypass of Sheldon and the $115 million bypass road from White Rock in Sacramento County to Latrobe. The bypass road, in particular, may trigger many environmental issues.

Southern Sacramento Corridor

Synthesis of Citizen Input and Technical Information

November 16, 2006, TALL Order Forum

Table Preferences

Preference	Scenarios 1	Scenarios 2	Scenarios 3	Total # of Tables that Completed this Corridor
Target Areas:				
Elk Grove Workshop	59%	18%	24%	17
Downtown Sacramento Workshop	68%	14%	18%	50
Total for Target Area Workshops	66%	15%	19%	67
Regionwide	**56%**	**19%**	**25%**	**141**

Comment on citizen input:

The citizens at the workshops agreed more clearly on their preferred approach in this corridor than any other corridor, with strong majorities supporting Scenario 1 at both Elk Grove and downtown Sacramento, and no strong support for a second choice.

Key unique features of Scenario 1:

Light rail: frequencies increased from every 15 minutes in peak to every 10 minutes
Auxiliary lanes added to Interstate 5 from Pocket to Cosumnes and on Highway 99 from Florin to Calvine
No new carpool lanes

Performance considerations:

Scenario 1 performs slightly better than Scenarios 2 and 3 on vehicle hours, vehicle miles, and transit mode share. Scenario 1 reduces congestion per household from today (-7%), but not by as much as Scenario 2 (-12.7%) and Scenario 3 (-15.5%).

Most of the congestion difference in this corridor is on the freeways, but more freeway lanes is not always the cause. Scenario 2 has more HOV lanes than Scenario 3 but has less congestion impact. In this corridor, balancing the commute load to downtown Sacramento is achieved with improvements to I-5 and Highway 99 plus improved transit. The location of some road widenings may increase capacity but encourage more out-of-the-way travel.

The share of trips by transit in some corridors is largely determined by the number of buses and/or rail vehicles provided. The difference across scenarios reflects the amount of service provided. This corridor is one of those corridors.

Cost/feasibility considerations:

Scenario 1 total costs are higher than the other two scenarios due to significantly more local bus service and freeway auxiliary lane improvements to both I-5 and SR 99 that total $85 million. Scenarios 2 and 3 include carpool lanes south from downtown on I-5 with the longest carpool extension – a $150 million project in Scenario 2