

***Comment received after official close of comment period**

Matt Carpenter, Manager of Transportation Planning
(SACOG) Sacramento Area Council of Governments
1415 L Street, Suite 300
Phone 340-6276 FAX 321-9551
Sacramento, CA 95814
mcarpenter@sacog.org eircomments@sacog.org

SUBJECT: COMMENTS ON THE 2035 METROPLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN/MTP.

Dear Mr. Carpenter,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the MTP.

I was disappointed I was not notified when the documents were released for the comment period. As a result, I very much appreciate your time and conversations with me in reference to my NOP comments. This is my written follow-up to our conversations and to try to focus on some of my main comments. Please reference my NOP comments that we discussed on the phone in your efforts to include my comments. The comments below are limited due to time constraints and some recap my written NOP comments.

My NOP comments expressed the need for expanded use of freeways/highways along with increased use of mass transit including Rail and Light Rail.

50-1 RAIL:
It is unfortunate a Regional Rail proposal is on hold due to a lack of response from the Union Pacific Railroad. Please include any recent correspondence with UP in the MTP. With this information, maybe calls to UP from the public can put added pressure on UP to help develop the needed mass transit option.
Please process an amendment to the MTP and EIR if and when this occurs.

50-2 LT. RAIL:
I would like additional Lt. Rail routes added to the MTP in the long term.
Theses routes could include a connection with the DNA and Sacramento route on possibly SR 70/99 and/or I-5 to either Riego/Base Line Road and/or the New Placer Parkway and then coming further into the Roseville/Placer County area. Currently there are several universities (one with over potentially 25,000 students) in this Roseville/Placer county area. Now is the time to try to add Lt. Rail to this corridor. Lt. Rail is and will be badly needed as an option to the Sacramento and Sac Airport area.
The Lt. Rail should also continue up Highway 80 and up Watt Avenue, I recognize this does seem like impossibility. The above suggested Lt. Rail route to the Roseville/Placer

50-2
cont.

County area could appear to be the same impossibility as the I-80/ Watt Ave suggested route if not planned for now and included in the MTP 2035.

I understand Lt. Rail is not the most cost effective under-taking, however the MTP policies and strategies in Chapter 5 should be revised to allow for this long-term effort. This should be considered as a future transportation circulation option. See below for my comment to help protect set asides and/or right of way/row protections “now” for use in the future

50-3

Please note, I recognize the need for BRT as a mass transit option. I also understand the frustrations with the funding limitations, however BRT (rail on wheels as it is known locally) is not Lt. Rail and Lt. Rail will be need in the future. Currently there are no bus routes offered from Roseville/Placer County to the Sac Airport. Additionally, the Roseville buses do not allow for luggage and the Placer County buses allow for 2 pieces of luggage if you can board with the 2 pieces at the same time and keep them under your control while on the bus (however, they do not go to the Airport).

50-4

An option for rail or light rail might be to incorporate larger set asides or right of ways/ROW into the expanded highway systems that can be protected when funding finally becomes available to actually add Rail or Light Rail.

FUNDING:

50-5

Can SACOG be a lead agency for a project or develop binding mitigation fees? (This seems extremely important when addressing how matching funds can be achieved on projects that connect jurisdictions that are being planned). My concern is that strong cooperation between jurisdictions is achieved.

50-6

Adequate transportation impact fees on new development for the various projects in the MTP needs to be developed and identified. This should include adequate State Highway Impact Fees and potential mass transit needs. Also, increases to fund new proposed transportation fees become a possibility when existing approved projects come back to amend their projects and/or their development agreements. The jurisdictions should be encouraged to apply new MTP fees or locally apply fees identified in the MTP process.

Please Create Policies that:

50-7

New Development pays their own way for improvements needed for their projects and for their share of regional transportation projects driven by their new growth demands.

The current level of service shall not be degraded but improved. We should not tolerate a level of service F.

50-7
cont.

Needed land routes and/or transportation infrastructure to serve the region shall be required to be in place at the same time new development occurs.

Adequate transportation fees will be required of new development.

A State Highway Impact Fee shall be required for all new development. This is being done in El Dorado County.

CONCLUSION:

Again, a special thanks to Matt Carpenter for the opportunity to provide these comments and to the SACOG Board for considering my comments during the MTP Review Period. Please notify me on future public comments documents related to the MTP and the environmental review.

Sincerely,

Jan McKinsey
8085 Stagecoach Circle
Roseville, Ca 95747
(916 783-9211)

(These comments were provided by email).
(file: MTP)