

How should transportation system maintenance and preservation needs be addressed in the 2016 MTP/SCS update?

Possible Range of Investment Strategies:	A. Implement 2012 MTP/SCS	B. Assume continued slow economic recovery constrains ability to implement the 2012 MTP/SCS	C. Achieve a state of good repair (SGR) for transit and local roads within the 20 year planning horizon for the MTP/SCS	D. Achieve a state of good repair (SGR) for transit and local roads in the first 10 years of the MTP/SCS
Summary of assumptions informing each investment strategy:	Current MTP/SCS Budget (2014-2035) excluding Caltrans maintenance expenditures on the state highway system.	Project forward trends from 2008-2013 that suggest challenges to reaching current MTP/SCS performance targets.	Emphasis on new revenue sources in the long-term to pay for increased expenditures on state-of-good repair projects.	Emphasis on shift in prioritization of flexible dollars toward state of good repair projects and away from road capacity expansion, particularly in the near-term.
	Only new revenue is 1/2 sales tax equivalent in Sac County.	Recent service and farebox recovery declines continue, settling at 20% (state minimum requirement).	Less emphasis on shifting funding from road capacity expansion. Funding that does shift from road capacity occurs later in the plan.	Fewer options for new revenues in near-term.
	Increased share of funding towards State of Good Repair compared to prior plans.	No new revenues (e.g. Measure B), based on recent polling that does not demonstrate near-term support.	Higher cost reflects increasing backlog of maintenance projects and further deterioration of roadways in near term as a result of delays in investing in maintenance and rehabilitation projects.	
	Increased farebox recovery (38%) from productive services and more supportive land uses over time.	Slower growth, leading to fewer development related fees, sales and fuel taxes and less funding available for road capacity projects.		
Total cost to implement each investment strategy:	\$24 Billion	\$20.3 Billion	\$34.5 Billion	\$25.7 Billion
Breakdown of costs into expenditures for each investment strategy:	Local Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation \$5.8	↓ \$4.7	↑ \$17.8	↑ \$9.9
	Transit M&O \$6.3	↓ \$4.8	\$6.3	\$6.3
	Transit Capital Preservation \$1.1	↓ \$0.9	↑ \$1.4	↑ \$1.4
	Transit Capital Expansion \$1.8	↓ \$1.1	\$1.8	\$1.8
	Active Transportation \$2.7	↓ \$2.5	↑ \$3.0	↑ \$3.0
	Road Capacity Expansion \$6.3	↓ \$5.3	↓ \$4.2	↓ \$3.3
State of good repair (SGR) strategies used to achieve goals of each investment strategy:	Dedicate 25% of RSTP to SGR \$0.5	Dedicate 25% of RSTP to SGR \$0.5	Dedicate 50% of regional funding to SGR \$1.3	Dedicate 100% regional funding to SGR \$2.6
	Dedicate 70% of Measure A to SGR \$1.5	Dedicate 70% of Measure A to SGR \$1.5	Dedicate 80% of Measure A to SGR \$1.8	Dedicate 100% of Measure A to SGR \$2.2
	Measure B \$2.2	Measure B Ø	Measure B \$2.2	Measure B \$2.2
	Farebox Recovery (14% increase from 2008) \$0.6	Farebox (4% decrease from 2008) (\$0.3)	Increased Farebox (38% by 2035) \$0.6	Increased Farebox (38% by 2035) \$0.6
			Shift Local Discretionary Dollars to SGR \$0.3	Shift Local Discretionary Dollars to SGR \$0.6
		New Local, State, or Federal Revenues \$10.5	New Local, State, or Federal Revenues \$1.7	
Funding shortfall after implementing each state of good repair strategy:	Local Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation (\$12.0)	Local Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation (\$13.5)	Local Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation -	Local Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation -
	Transit M&O -	Transit M&O (\$1.5)	Transit M&O -	Transit M&O -
	Transit Capital Preservation (\$0.3)	Transit Capital Preservation (\$0.5)	Transit Capital Preservation -	Transit Capital Preservation -
	Transit Capital Expansion -	Transit Capital Expansion (\$0.7)	Transit Capital Expansion -	Transit Capital Expansion -
	Active Transportation (\$0.3)	Active Transportation (\$0.3)	Active Transportation -	Active Transportation -
	Road Capacity Expansion -	Road Capacity Expansion (\$1.0)	Road Capacity Expansion (\$2.1)	Road Capacity Expansion (\$3.0)
Likely effects to the MTP/SCS of implementing each investment strategy:	Pavement conditions deteriorating to poor (PCI<50) and failed (PCI<25) condition in some communities throughout the region	Wider spread deterioration of roadways into poor and failed pavement conditions	Near term (first 10 years) deterioration of roadways. Roads recover to good or excellent condition (PCI>80) by end of plan, but at significantly higher cost and dependent on new revenues.	Roads recover to good or excellent condition (PCI>80) in the first 10 years of the plan and only require routine preventive maintenance and occasional major repair thereafter.
	Deteriorating transit stops, stations, vehicles and other facilities and higher annual maintenance and rehabilitation costs leading to increased backlog of preservation projects	Wider spread deterioration of transit assets	Near term (first 10 years) deterioration of transit assets, followed by recovery and improved conditions in the second half of the plan.	Faster recovery of transit service and improved station and facility conditions.
	Increased transit productivity late in the plan accompanied by modest increases in mode share, and provides opportunities for significant transit oriented development and infill.	Delayed recovery of transit services makes infill development challenging.	Similar transit performance to current MTP with opportunities for TOD and infill. Improved road conditions benefit transit as well as motorists.	Similar transit performance to current MTP with opportunities for TOD and infill. Improved road conditions benefit transit as well as motorists.
	Bike and walk travel supported through a network of local and regional bike and walkways and complete streets improvements	Additional financial constraints make implementing complete streets and bicycle and pedestrian improvements more challenging	Additional investment in bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure creates a robust and connected network of walking and biking options.	Additional investment in bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure creates a robust and connected network of walking and biking options. Potential for additional complete streets investment early in the plan as part of major rehabilitation and maintenance efforts.
	Decreased rate of growth of congestion from fixing bottlenecks and providing operational improvements	Reduced road capital budget results in likely delay in bottleneck relief projects and higher growth in congestion	Fewer road capital resources available during planning period to address bottlenecks and increasing demand resulting in higher congestion growth rates.	Significantly reduced road capital budget resulting in likely much higher congestion growth rates.