



## Regional Planning Partnership

May 17, 2007

### “Vision” Element of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan 2035

**Issue:** What should be the priorities for the “vision” element of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan 2035 (MTP 2035)?

**Recommendation:** SACOG seeks Partnership suggestions and comments on the plan’s “vision” project priorities in Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo and Yuba counties; Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs) in El Dorado and Placer counties will identify “vision” project priorities from their recently adopted long-range transportation plans.

**Discussion:** The “financially constrained” MTP can only include projects backed by revenues reasonably expected to be available during the planning period. These projects, however, do not necessarily represent the complete picture, or “vision,” of where the Board and partner agencies would like to go with the region’s transportation investments. A “vision” element offers the opportunity to include projects that improve the performance of the plan, but would not be affordable until additional funding (from new sources that might reasonably be considered) can be brought to bear.

Attachment A provides the three different approaches staff explored for establishing the “vision” element budget. Based on the calculations, a “10% increase” budget level was recommended by the Transportation Committee because it generally falls between the low and high levels of each approach without limiting the discretion of agencies who later propose transportation sales taxes or development impact fee increases (or other revenue sources). Board approval to this approach will be sought at the June meeting.

In addition to a proposed budget, staff intends to present a package of “vision” projects for consideration at the June Board meeting. Projects will be offered for each county and will reflect the priorities from SACOG’s regional transportation planning agency partners in El Dorado and Placer counties. Potential “vision” projects for consideration and comment by the Partnership include:

- Increased transit operating funds to expand bus services sooner;
- Increased road maintenance funding to cut down the rolling backlog of deferred maintenance;
- Completion of capital projects not fully fundable in the “revenue constrained” plan, including the full-build Downtown-Natomas-Airport rail extension, carpool lane extensions on I-5 and US 50, and upgrade of the Lincoln Bypass and Placer Parkway to freeways with interchanges.
- A corridor mobility fund to improve key intersections and fund community investments such as multi-modal complete streets and safety projects.

MC:ts  
Attachment

Key Staff: Pete Hathaway, Director of Transportation Planning, (916) 340-6235  
Jason Crow, Senior Planner, (916) 340-6219  
Matt Carpenter, Senior Planner, (916) 340-6276

**Attachment A: MTP "Vision" Budget: Calculations from Three Approaches**

County	POPULATION SHARE OF TOTAL REVENUES APPROACH					TRANSPORTATION SALES TAX APPROACH		DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE APPROACH	
	% Share of Region (average for 2008-2035)	Population Share of Total Revenue (\$000)	5% Increase in Population Share of Revenues (\$000)	10% Increase in Population Share of Revenues (\$000)	15% Increase in Population Share of Revenues (\$000)	additional 1/4 cent sales tax (\$000)	additional 1/2 cent sales tax (\$000)	\$5k/unit increase (\$000)	\$10k/unit increase (\$000)
El Dorado	7.0%	\$ 2,901,688	\$ 145,084	\$ 290,169	\$ 435,253	\$ 128,200	\$ 256,400	\$ 113,761	\$ 227,522
Placer	16.5%	\$ 6,857,435	\$ 342,872	\$ 685,744	\$ 1,028,615	\$ 744,200	\$ 1,488,400	\$ 492,913	\$ 985,826
Sacramento	60.8%	\$ 25,184,148	\$ 1,259,207	\$ 2,518,415	\$ 3,777,622	\$ 1,891,500	\$ 3,783,000	\$ 1,281,953	\$ 2,563,906
Sutter	3.6%	\$ 1,497,868	\$ 74,893	\$ 149,787	\$ 224,680	\$ 108,450	\$ 216,900	\$ 91,657	\$ 183,314
Yolo	8.2%	\$ 3,393,467	\$ 169,673	\$ 339,347	\$ 509,020	\$ 214,100	\$ 428,200	\$ 198,978	\$ 397,956
Yuba	3.9%	\$ 1,605,393	\$ 80,270	\$ 160,539	\$ 240,809	\$ 38,100	\$ 76,200	\$ 128,750	\$ 257,500
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>\$41,440,000</b>	<b>\$2,072,000</b>	<b>\$4,144,000</b>	<b>\$6,216,000</b>	<b>\$3,124,550</b>	<b>\$6,249,100</b>	<b>\$2,308,012</b>	<b>\$4,616,024</b>

## **ATTACHMENT B: POTENTIAL MTP 2035 “VISION” ELEMENT PROJECTS BY COUNTY**

### **El Dorado County**

- Increasing transit operating funds to expand bus services earlier;
- Increasing road maintenance funds to avoid significant deferece in late years of the plan;
- Completing US 50 operational improvements, including the full Camino project east of Placerville;
- Creating a corridor mobility fund to improve key intersections and fund community investments such as multi-modal complete streets and safety projects.

### **Placer County**

- Increasing transit operating funds to expand bus services earlier;
- Increasing road maintenance funds to avoid significant deferece in late years of the plan;
- Extending carpool lanes on Highway 65 from Blue Oaks to Lincoln;
- I-80 operational improvements east of Highway 65 to Auburn;
- Upgrading the Lincoln Bypass from expressway to a freeway with interchanges;
- Upgrading the Placer Parkway from an expressway to a freeway with interchanges;
- Providing commuter rail to connect Placer, Sacramento and Yolo counties in addition to the increased Capitol Corridor service in the “financially constrained” draft plan;
- Creating a corridor mobility fund to improve key intersections and fund community investments such as multi-modal complete streets and safety projects.

### **Sacramento County**

- Increasing transit operating funds to expand bus services earlier;
- Increasing road maintenance funds to avoid significant deferece in late years of the plan;
- Extending carpool lanes on I-5 (Cosumnes River Boulevard to Elk Grove Boulevard);
- Extending carpool lanes on US 50 (Watt to Downtown Sacramento);
- Providing commuter rail to connect Placer, Sacramento and Yolo counties in addition to the increased Capitol Corridor service in the “financially constrained” draft plan;
- Completing the “full-build” Downtown-Natomas-Airport rail extension (all double-track) from the “starter line” (68% single-track) in the “financially constrained” draft plan;
- Creating a corridor mobility fund to improve key intersections and fund community investments such as multi-modal complete streets and safety projects.

### **Sutter County**

- Increasing transit operating funds to expand bus services earlier;
- Increasing road maintenance funds to avoid significant deferece in late years of the plan;
- Building a new Feather River Bridge connecting Marysville and Yuba City;
- Building an urban interchange at the intersection of Highway 20 & Highway 99;
- Creating a corridor mobility fund to improve key intersections and fund community investments such as multi-modal complete streets and safety projects.

### **Yolo County**

- Increasing transit operating funds to expand bus services earlier;
- Increasing road maintenance funds to avoid significant deferece in late years of the plan;
- Extending I-5 carpool lanes between the Sacramento International Airport and Woodland
- Providing commuter rail to connect Placer, Sacramento and Yolo counties in addition to the increased Capitol Corridor service in the “financially constrained” draft plan;
- Creating a corridor mobility fund to improve key intersections and fund community investments such as multi-modal complete streets and safety projects.

### **Yuba County**

- Increasing transit operating funds to expand bus services earlier;
- Increasing road maintenance funds to avoid significant deferece in late years of the plan;
- Building a new Feather River Bridge connecting Marysville and Yuba City;
- Additional operational improvements for Highway 65 and Highway 70 through Marysville;
- Creating a corridor mobility fund to improve key intersections and fund community investments such as multi-modal complete streets and safety projects.