June 19, 2015

Lacey Symons-Holtzen, Active Transportation Team Manager
Sacramento Area Council of Governments
1415 L Street, Suite 300
Sacramento, CA 95814

Subject: Six-County Regional ATP Cycle 2 & BPFP 2015
Project: Folsom Cottage Sidewalk Infill Project

Dear Ms. Symons-Holtzen:

The County of Sacramento is pleased to submit its application to the Six-County Regional Active Transportation Program Cycle 2 & Four-County Regional Bicycle & Pedestrian Funding Program requesting $1,485,000 to design and construct pedestrian improvements on Folsom Blvd., east and west of Butterfield Way and on Cottage Way between Fulton Ave. and Watt Ave. The project was officially endorsed by the Sacramento County Board of Supervisors on May 5, 2015.

Mr. Refugio Razo, Senior Civil Engineer with SacDOT, will manage the Federal Aid funding for this project. Mr. Razo’s phone is (916) 874-6074 and his email is razor@saccounty.net. Mr. Ron Vicari, Principal Civil Engineer with SacDOT will be the Project Manager. Mr. Vicari can be contacted at (916) 874-5164 and vicarir@saccounty.net.

Thank you for your consideration of funding this important ATP and BPFP project. We believe this project will be a valuable investment for the Arden Arcade and Butterfield Station communities, and will also help accomplish the long-term vision for establishing healthy active modes of transportation.

Sincerely,

Michael J. Penrose, Director
Department of Transportation
Six-County Regional Active Transportation Program Cycle 2 & Four-County Regional Bicycle & Pedestrian Funding Program

Joint Application O. Sections I-V

Please read the Application Instructions at http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/atp/index.html and http://www.sacog.org/regionalfunding/fundingprograms_bikeped-overview.cfm prior to filling out this application.
Note: Please note that these materials constitute the release of the call for projects for the Regional ATP. The framework, which dictates all application materials related to the Regional Active Transportation Program, was adopted by the California Transportation Commission on May 28, 2015, marking the formal release of the Regional ATP call for projects. All materials are available online at:

http://www.sacog.org/regionalfunding/fundingprograms_bikeped-overview.cfm
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I. Project Sponsor Information

(Please read the Caltrans “ATP instructions” and the SACOG “Program and Application Guidelines” documents prior to responding to the questions in this application.)

**PROJECT SPONSOR:** This agency must enter into a Master Agreement with Caltrans and will be financially and contractually responsible for the delivery of the project within all pertinent Federal and State funding requirements.

**PROJECT SPONSOR’S NAME:**
County of Sacramento

**PROJECT SPONSOR’S ADDRESS:**
4111 Branch Center Rd Sac, CA 95827

**PROJECT SPONSOR’S CONTACT PERSON:**
Ron E. Vicari II

**CONTACT PERSON’S TITLE:**
Principal Civil Engineer

**CONTACT PERSON’S PHONE NUMBER:**
916-874-5164

**CONTACT PERSON’S EMAIL ADDRESS:**
vicarir@saccounty.net
II. Project Information

1. **Project is applying for (check all that apply):**
   - Regional Bicycle & Pedestrian Program (4-county)
   - Regional Active Transportation Program (6-county)

2. **Application number:** 1 out of 4 applications (ranked by project sponsor priority)

3. **Project Name**  (To be used in the CTC project list)

Folsom Cottage Sidewalk Infill Project

4. **Project Location**  (Include a map in the Appendix)

   Along the north side of Folsom Blvd. east and west of Butterfield Way adjacent to the Butterfield LRT Station. Along the north side of Cottage Way between Fulton and Watt Avenues.

   **Project Coordinates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latitude</th>
<th>Longitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38.570466</td>
<td>-121.341203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.603329</td>
<td>-121.392257</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **Project Description/Scope:**

   a. **What is the full project description and scope for the project applying for funds?**

      The Folsom Cottage Sidewalk Infill project will construct sidewalks to complete the sidewalk network along Cottage Way, from Watt Ave. to Fulton Ave., and along Folsom Blvd., from Watt Ave. to Sunrise Blvd., both in eastern Sacramento County. Please see the Location Map (Attachment 1, page 9)

      Folsom Blvd. is a major east-west arterial that runs from downtown Sacramento through unincorporated Sacramento County, Rancho Cordova and east to the City of Folsom. Running parallel to Folsom Blvd. is Highway 50 and Regional Transit’s Light Rail (Gold Line). The train tracks are immediately adjacent to Folsom Blvd. on the south side. The north side of Folsom Blvd. is primarily business, commercial and retail located in tired strip malls. North of the businesses are residential neighborhoods and the American River Parkway and Bike Trail. Sacramento County and Rancho Cordova are both working to transition Folsom Blvd. away from a major auto centric commercial corridor and into a complete street with mixed use developments. The five major transit stations (including the Butterfield Station) along this portion of the light rail system are slated to become Transit Oriented Developments (TOD). Rancho Cordova has nearly completed the construction of the infrastructure necessary for Folsom Blvd. to be a complete street. The complete streets plan for the County portion is nearly done.

      The sidewalk gap that this project will construct is located on the north side of Folsom Blvd., east and west of Butterfield Way adjacent to the Butterfield Light Rail Station. The project will provide for an uninterrupted, complete sidewalk network for five miles along the north side of Folsom Blvd. between Watt Ave. and Sunrise Ave. Construction of this separated sidewalk with landscaping is the first infrastructure project to support the transition of this area to a TOD.

      Cottage Way is a collector street located in the Arden Arcade community of Sacramento.
County. The Cottage project area is bounded by four major four-lane arterials – El Camino Ave., Watt Ave., Alta Arden/ Arden Way and Fulton Ave.

To increase active transportation in the area and improve safety on Cottage Way, the County recently was awarded a HSIP grant to construct the road diet project on Cottage Way from Fulton Ave. to Watt Ave. Cottage Way is currently a four lane road with no bike lanes. The road diet project will remove a travel lane in each direction; construct a shared center turn lane and construct bike lanes on Cottage Way between Fulton Ave. and Watt Ave. The construction of sidewalks along this section is needed to complete the transition of Cottage Way into an active transportation corridor. The sidewalk gap that this project will construct is located on the north side of Cottage Way near Fulton Ave. and on the north side from Cottage Park to Butano Dr.

b. Is there a usable partial scope of the project? Describe the scope and cost estimate.

Click here to enter text:

6. Project Type:

% of project that is Infrastructure (I): .................................................. 100 %  $ 1,685,000
% of project that is Non-Infrastructure (NI): ........................................... ____ %  $ __________

( % based on Project Cost. “I” plus “NI” % must equal 100% for all applications. “Plan” applications are 100% NI.)

Development of a Plan in a Disadvantaged Community: Yes/No:

(Check all Plan types that apply):
☐ Bicycle Plan
☐ Pedestrian Plan
☐ Safe Routes to School Plan
☐ Active Transportation Plan (Must meet CTC Guidelines)

Indicate any of the following plans that your agency currently has:
☒ Bicycle Plan  ☒ Pedestrian Plan  ☒ Safe Routes to School Plan  ☐ Active Transportation Plan

Safe Routes to School Project: (Yes/No)

Does the project involve more than one school: (Yes/No)

If the project involves more than one school: 1) Insert “Multiple Schools” in the School Name, School Address, and distance from school; 2) Fill in the student information based on the total project; and 3) Include an attachment to the application which clearly summarizes the following school information and the school official signature and person to contact for each school.

School name: __________________________________________________________
School address: _________________________________________________________
Project distance from school _______________________________________________
District name: __________________________________________________________
District address: _________________________________________________________
Co.-Dist.-School Code: ___________________________________________________
Total student enrollment: _________________________________________________
% of students that currently walk or bike to school% __________________________
Approx. # of students living along route proposed for improvement:___________________

A map must be attached to the application which clearly shows the limits of the following elements:
1) the student enrollment area
2) the project improvements.

7. Project Funding Request:

Project funding request: $ 1,485,000
Project matching funds: $ 200,000
TOTAL PROJECT COST: $ 1,685,000

8. Project Programming Request (PPR) and Cost & Schedule Summary:

Please include Excel versions of the completed PPR and the Cost & Schedule Summary with your electronic application submittal. (Project status and expected delivery schedule.)

Enter the expected milestone date or enter “Completed” for all milestones already complete prior to submitting the application for ATP funding. The project sponsor must use standard timeframes for CTC Allocations, FHWA E76 Approvals, and Caltrans processing for all project phases and milestones. The project sponsor is responsible for meeting all CTC delivery requirements or their ATP funding may be forfeited. The project status and expected delivery schedule must assume use of federal funding.

9. Current state of the project area:

For infrastructure projects:

a. Are there existing bike/ped facilities?

Folsom Blvd.: Existing Bike Lanes on the north and south sides of the street; sidewalks are on the north side of the street except in the location of the project.
Cottage Way: There are bike lanes and sidewalks on the north and south sides of Cottage except in the location of the project.

b. If the project is adjacent to a roadway, what is the posted speed limit?

Folsom Blvd. has a posted speed of 45 mph
Cottage Way has a posted speed of 35 mph

c. If the project is adjacent to a roadway, what are the daily traffic volumes? Peak hour traffic volumes?

On Folsom Blvd the daily traffic volume is 20,500 vehicles per day with a peak hour of 2041 vehicles.
On Cottage Way the daily traffic volume is 7,591 vehicles per day with a peak hour of 608 vehicles.

d. Are there any projects near the project area anticipated for construction in the immediate future (next four years)?
On Folsom Blvd.: Approximately one mile west of the project site, the City of Rancho Cordova will be constructing complete street improvements to include separated sidewalks, medians and landscaping. Construction of the infill sidewalks by the County will complete the sidewalks on the north side of Folsom Blvd from Watt Ave to Sunrise Blvd.

The County received a Cycle 6 HSIP grant to construct the road diet project on Cottage Way from Fulton Ave. to Watt Ave. This project will reduce the travel lanes on Cottage from four lanes to two lanes and add a center turn lane and bike lanes. Construction of the infill sidewalks by the County will complete this first County Road Diet project and complete the infrastructure necessary to create this active transportation corridor.

For non-infrastructure projects:

a. What other plans or programs are currently in place within the project area, or recently concluded?
   Click here to enter text:

b. Are there any plans or programs in or near the project area anticipated to begin in the immediate future (next four years)?
   Click here to enter text:
III. Screening Criteria

1. Explain how this project is consistent with the EDCTC Regional Transportation Plan, PCTPA Regional Transportation Plan, or the SACOG Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS). (Please only answer the option most applicable to your project.)

A. Infrastructure Project is a planned project included in the SACOG Regional Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Trails Master Plan, MTP/SCS, and/or the Regional Transportation Plan of EDCTC or PCTPA. Provide the project name and number (if available) and the applicable document title and page number.

SACOG's Regional Transportation Plan (MTP/SCS) was adopted in April 2012. The MTP/SCS calls for expending $3.2 billion from all funding sources for bicycle and pedestrian projects in the region in the next 20 years. An appendix to the MTP/SCS is the Regional Bicycle, Pedestrian and Trails Master Plan. One of the goals of the Master Plan is to: "Create a comprehensive regional bicycling and walking network within and between communities with strong current and future demand." SACOG's Regional Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Trails Master Plan April 2015: "... envisions a complete transportation system that supports healthy living and active communities where bicycling and walking are viable and popular travel choices in a comprehensive, safe, and convenient network."

The proposed project will eliminate gaps in the pedestrian network near the existing Butterfield Light Rail Station and along Cottage Way. The Folsom Cottage Sidewalk Infill project is consistent with regional priorities to improve safety and mobility for bicyclists and pedestrians through complete streets.

The Folsom Cottage Sidewalk Infill project is listed in the Regional Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Trails Master Plan as part of several different projects.

Project 31293; Page 133; Sidewalks Folsom Blvd.: Both sides (except City of Rancho Cordova) starting 1,500 feet west of Watt Avenue to City of Rancho Cordova near Bradshaw Rd/Paseo Rio Way

Project 31240; Page 132; Sidewalks Cottage Way: Both sides from Cortez Lane to Weldon Way

Project 31354; Page 134; Sidewalks Cottage Way: Both sides from Weldon Way to Butano Dr.

B. If your infrastructure project is not included as described above, please explain any special circumstances that precluded it from being included in the applicable Regional Transportation Plan. 

Click here to enter text:

C. Non-Infrastructure Project meets at least one of two eligibility requirements:

1) Encourage biking and walking through public information, education, training, and awareness, 

Click here to enter text: 

or

2) Perform studies and develop plans that support one or more of the project performance outcomes of the program.

Click here to enter text:

2. Project is identified in the project sponsor’s Statement of Intent to Apply correspondence. Please include a copy of the letter in the application Appendix.
3. Project is ready for inclusion into the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program, with project scope and cost.

Yes ☒ No ☐

a. Please include an appropriate project description per the below guidelines:

   \[
   \text{[(Location:) + (Limits) + (;) + (Improvement)]}
   \]

   Example: In Bakersfield: Between 1st Street and Pine Boulevard; fill in sidewalk gaps and add a protected bike lane.

In eastern Sacramento County, along the north side of Folsom Blvd. east and west of Butterfield Way and along Cottage Way from Fulton to Watt: Construct sidewalks where there are gaps in the facilities.

4. Project is eligible for appropriate funding sources. (i.e. ATP for ATP-only applications; CMAQ, RSTP, and STIP for BPFP-only applications; ATP, CMAQ, RSTP, and STIP for applications to both programs)

Yes ☒ No ☐

5. Project meets the minimum dollar amount for an infrastructure or non-infrastructure project and includes at least an 11.47% local match; local match requirements apply to all project categories.

   A. Infrastructure project minimum total cost is $282,390 ($250,000 funding request + $32,390 local match).

      Yes ☒ No ☐

   B. Non-Infrastructure project minimum total cost is $56,478 ($50,000 funding request + $6,478 local match).

      Yes ☐ No ☐

6. Project proposal culminated from a community-based public participation process.

   Yes ☒ No ☐

   A. Is the total project cost over $1 Million? Yes ☒ No ☐

      If yes: Is the project prioritized in an adopted city or county bicycle transportation plan, pedestrian plan, safe routes to school plan, active transportation plan, trail plan, circulation element of a general plan, or other publicly approved plan that incorporated elements of an active transportation plan?

      Yes ☒ No ☐

      List the plan and project number or page number to demonstrate project priority:
      County of Sacramento Pedestrian Master Plan (PMP), Page 18, High Priority Pedestrian Projects - Arden Arcade
7. Project demonstrates coordination with the California Conservation Corps (CCC) or a certified community conservation corps. (Applies to infrastructure and non-infrastructure projects applying to the Regional ATP.)

The applicant must send the following information to the CCC and CALCC prior to application submittal to SACOG:

- Project Description
- Detailed Estimate
- Project Schedule
- Project Map
- Preliminary Plan

The corps agencies can be contacted at:

**California Conservation Corps representative:**
Name: Wei Hsieh  
Email: atp@ccc.ca.gov  
Phone: (916) 341-3154

**Community Conservation Corps representative:**
Name: Danielle Lynch  
Email: inquiry@atpcommunitycorps.org  
Phone: (916) 426-9170

A. The applicant has coordinated with the CCC to identify how a state conservation corps can be a partner of the project. Yes [ ] No [ ]
   - Please include a copy of the correspondence in the application Appendix.

   See Attachment 3, page 15.

B. The applicant has coordinated with a representative from the California Association of Local Conservation Corps (CALCC) to identify how a certified community conservation corps can be a partner of the project. Yes [ ] No [ ]
   - Please include a copy of the correspondence in the application Appendix.

   See Attachment 3, page 17.

C. The applicant intends to utilize the CCC or a certified community conservation corps on all items where participation is indicated? Yes [ ] No [ ]

I have coordinated with a representative of the CCC; and the following are project items that they are qualified to partner on:

Click here to enter text:

I have coordinated with a representative of the CALCC; and the following are project items that they are qualified to partner on:

- Clearing and Grubbing

*If the applicant has indicated intended use of the CCC or CALCC in the approved application, a copy of the agreement between the implementing agency and the CCC or CALCC must be provided by the implementing agency, and will be incorporated as part of the original*
application, prior to request for authorization of funds for construction.

Or

D. Did the CCC and a certified community conservation corps indicate they cannot participate in the project?  Yes ☐  No ☐

Or

E. The project sponsor is electing to provide demonstration of the cost-effectiveness clause 23 CFR 635.204 and provide the relevant documentation. (include in Appendix) Yes ☐  No ☐

8. **Project is not part of developer-funded basic good practices in a new development.**
   See the Federal Highway Administration’s guidance for more background on basic good practices.  
   http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle_pedestrian/guidance/design_guidance/design.cfm

   Yes ☒  No ☐

   If applicable, please explain how the project falls outside of developer-funded basic good practices (100 words or less).

   Click here to enter text: This Project is not part of developer-funded basic good practices in a new development.
IV. Narrative Questions (Sections 1-6)

20 pages maximum, 12 point font
(ATP: 0-95 points total; BPFP: 0-83 points total)

1. Increasing Walking & Biking
   (ATP: 0-30 points; BPFP: 0-44 points)

Note: In relation to the State ATP, the Regional ATP places additional emphasis on clearly demonstrating how well the project supports improving access to transit services, increasing access to schools, and eliminating gaps or barriers in the bicycle/pedestrian network. In each of your responses, be sure to describe the current and projected types and numbers/rates of users.

A. Schools/Students

Describe the potential for increased walking and bicycling, especially among students, including the identification of walking and bicycling routes to and from schools. Please include any relevant walk audit, needs assessment, or other supporting materials.
   (ATP: 0-10 points; BPFP: 0-11 points)

Cottage Elementary School is located just north of Cottage Park. The school has an enrollment of 422 students and 78.1 percent received Free or Reduced Price Meals (FRPM) making this a disadvantaged school community. Based on census data approximately 70 students live in the area bounded by Cottage Way, Morse Ave., Watt Ave. and Alta Arden; and Trimble Way and Kincaid Way north of Cottage Way. Those students would benefit from the sidewalk construction on the east side of the Cottage project area. Approximately 150 students live west of Fulton Ave. and attend Cottage Elementary. These students will benefit from the sidewalk construction on Cottage Way near Fulton Ave. The completing of the sidewalk network will allow more of these children to walk or bike to school.

Not just students will use the Cottage Way improvements. There are 4,700 people in the census tract that includes these improvements, of which Cottage Way bisects. There are an additional 4,700 people directly west of the project and 4,800 directly east of the project. All of these people are potential users of this project as they have a need to receive services at Kaiser Hospital; visit Cottage Park and Swimming Pool; get to the retail and commercial businesses along Fulton Ave. and at the corner of Watt Ave. and El Camino Ave.; or they might work at Kaiser, U.S. Reclamation Bureau or the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service that are located along Cottage Way. With the completion of the sidewalk infill, people will have a two mile long Active Transportation Corridor on Cottage Way from Watt Ave. to Howe Ave.

The construction of the separated sidewalk in the Folsom project area will encourage the 3000 people living immediately north of the project to walk to the numerous businesses, retail shops and public library along Folsom Blvd. as they will now be able to easily and safely walk on Folsom Blvd. to these destinations.

B. Transit Services

Describe the potential for increased walking and bicycling access to and from transit services, including transit stops and transfer centers. If a pedestrian project, is it located within one-half mile radius of transit stops? If a bicycle project, is it located within a 3 mile radius of transit services?
   (ATP: 0-10 points; BPFP: 0-11 points)
The Transit Area Enhancements Plan was a joint effort of the County, the City of Rancho Cordova, and SACOG to study and support transit oriented development in five transit priority areas along Regional Transit's Gold Line, including the Butterfield Station. The plan identifies specific projects and programs that improve transit center access and pedestrian and bicycle safety to support the development of more complete communities. These strategies include solutions for the "first mile" (access from home to transit) and "last mile" (access from transit to work, school, and other destinations).

Butterfield Station is located on the south side of Folsom Blvd. between Mayhew Road and Bradshaw Road. There are segments of missing sidewalk on the north side of Folsom Blvd. between Mayhew Road and Bradshaw Road, making pedestrian access to the station difficult. The station is served by the Gold Line, which travels between the Folsom Historic District and Sacramento Valley Station. The Butterfield Station also has three bus lines serving it.

The station directly accesses the State of California Franchise Tax Board Sacramento Campus, which has approximately 5,000 employees. There are approximately 3,000 residents within one half mile of this transit station. If people can walk to transit they are more likely to use transit. Once people get into their vehicle, they are more likely to drive to their final destination instead of driving to a transit station, parking and then getting onto transit.

When the 3,000 residents can reach the transit station safely, the LRT and bus system serving the station will allow them to reach CSUS; several community colleges; two major jobs centers (downtown Sacramento and Rancho Cordova); and regional malls. Over the next 20 years the redevelopment of the area into a TOD will add an additional 5,466 potential users of the project.

The Cottage project area currently has some of the best transit service in suburban eastern Sacramento County due to its proximity to the Kaiser Hospital facility. Four bus lines serve the corner of Cottage Way and Morse Ave. in the heart of the Cottage project area. An additional three bus lines are within a half mile of Cottage Way and Morse. These bus lines allow people to reach the Watt/I-80, Arden/Del Paso, University/65th and Watt/Manlove LRT Stations. Additionally, these lines serve Watt Ave., Fulton Ave., El Camino Ave. and Arden Way, major commercial corridors in eastern Sacramento County.

C. **Barrier Removal and Gap Closure**

Describe how the project removes a barrier, closes a gap, or otherwise completes a facility related to non-motorized mobility. Include a description of the existing barriers and/or gaps, how the barriers and gaps within the existing facility discourage walking or biking, and how non-motorized mobility will be effectively addressed upon project completion.

**(ATP: 0-10 points; BPFP: 0-22 points)**

The Folsom Cottage Sidewalk Infill Project closes a gap in the sidewalk on two streets and completes the sidewalk network in both areas.

There are two sections of Folsom Blvd. totaling approximately 950 linear feet without sidewalks. No sidewalks on this high speed, high volume roadway constitutes a barrier to pedestrians walking to destinations along Folsom Blvd. and to the Butterfield Station. Constructing a landscaped, separated sidewalk will eliminate the barrier and allow people to walk.
There are also two sections on Cottage Way totaling approximately 1,050 linear feet without sidewalks. Construction of this sidewalk infill project along with the Road Diet project will add bike lanes and sidewalks closing the gaps in the bike and pedestrian network. With these barriers to walking and biking removed, parents will allow their students to bike or walk to school and other residents and visitors to the area will have the facilities necessary to use active transportation and transit to get around. See photos, Attachment 2, page 10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Performance (sum of sub-scores)</th>
<th>ATP Points</th>
<th>BPFP Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projects with significant potential</td>
<td>21 to 30 points</td>
<td>30-44 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects with moderate potential</td>
<td>11 to 20 points</td>
<td>16-29 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects with minimal potential</td>
<td>1 to 10 points</td>
<td>1-15 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects with no potential</td>
<td>0 points</td>
<td>0 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Improving Safety for Bicyclists & Pedestrians
   (ATP: 0-25 points, BPFP: 0-19 points)
   
   Note: In relation to the State ATP, the Regional ATP places additional emphasis on providing data that demonstrates the benefits this project will have on reducing walking/bicycling fatalities and injuries. Please describe the potential for reducing the number and/or rate of pedestrian and bicyclist fatalities and injuries, including the identification of safety hazards for pedestrains and bicyclists.

   A. History of Collisions
   
   Describe the plan/program influence area or project location’s history of collisions (both the number of collisions and the rate of collisions in relation to the population around the area, and/or the number of people biking or walking exposed to the risk of collision) resulting in fatalities and injuries to non-motorized users and the source(s) of data used (e.g. collision reports, community observation, surveys, audits).
   
   (ATP: 0-10 points; BPFP: 0-4 points)

   The 2007 Sacramento County Pedestrian Master Plan states that in the unincorporated County the average number of pedestrian fatalities is 12 per year and the average number of pedestrian injuries is 210 per year. Almost one-third of all pedestrian collisions in unincorporated County involve children under 14 years of age.

   The Master Plan evaluated 27 major arterial corridors in Sacramento County for Collisions, Fatalities, Casualties, and Collisions and Fatalities per Mile (data from SWITRS, 1996-2001). The rankings for the major arterials surrounding the Cottage project area as well as Folsom Blvd. are as follows:

   • Folsom Blvd. has the highest number of fatalities and it is number two in casualties.
   • Watt Ave. has the highest number of collisions and casualties
   • Fulton Ave. has the second highest fatalities per mile and collisions per mile
   • El Camino Ave. has the third highest fatalities per mile
   • Arden Way is in the top ten for number of collisions, fatalities and casualties

   While these results include all accidents, not just bike and pedestrian, clearly encouraging more people to use the Cottage Way Active Transportation Corridor for biking and walking will reduce the number of fatalities and injuries on the high volume, high speed corridors surrounding Cottage Way.
Specifically for the Folsom project area, there has been one pedestrian-vehicle accident resulting in a fatality and one accident resulting in an injury in the last five years.

Specifically for the Cottage project area, there have been two pedestrian-vehicle accidents resulting in injuries in the last five years. The combination of this sidewalk infill project and the Road Diet Project will slow vehicle speeds on Cottage Way making it safer for all road users. In the last ten years there have been a total of 70 injury accidents on this segment of Cottage Way; nine of which have involved a bicyclist or pedestrian.

B. Community Need
Please describe the need for the project and provide an analysis of the project’s benefit to your community and the region. Qualitative benefits can be measured using various factors. Factors to discuss, as applicable, include: accident reduction, existing and projected usage/ridership/productivity, increase or decrease in ADT, life cycle cost reduction, VMT decrease, pavement quality index, congestion relief (idle reduction, stop and go reduction, and travel time decrease), reduced operating or maintenance costs, etc.

Creating an Active Transportation Corridor and improving safety on Cottage Way was requested by the residents in 2006. See Letter from Residents, Attachment 4, page 18. The residents noted that this section of Cottage Way is unsafe for bicyclists and pedestrians, especially the students travelling to and from Cottage Elementary School. While the posted speed limit is 35 mph, the 85th percentile speed is 41 mph. The Road Diet will reduce the speed on Cottage Way making it safer for all users. The Active Transportation Corridor on Cottage Way from Howe Ave. to Watt Ave. will promote active modes through providing a safe alternative route to major arterials surrounding Cottage Way, and will help reduce the number of accidents/ injuries.

The community within the Folsom project area has a need for sidewalks to access the Butterfield Station, the library and shops and businesses along Folsom Blvd. The sidewalk project is the first phase of the infrastructure needed to convert this area into a TOD.

C. Safety Hazards
Describe how the project/program/plan will remedy (one or more) potential safety hazards that contribute to pedestrian and/or bicyclist injuries or fatalities (discussed in A and B above); including but not limited to the following possible areas; include a description of the existing facility, how the incomplete facility discourages walking or biking, and how the completed facility will be better utilized upon project completion.

- Reduces speed or volume of motor vehicles in the proximity of non-motorized users.
- Improves sight distance and visibility between motorized and non-motorized users.
- Eliminates potential conflict points between motorized and non-motorized users, including creating physical separation between motorized and non-motorized users.
- Improves compliance with local traffic laws for both motorized and non-motorized users.
- Addresses inadequate traffic control devices.
- Eliminates or reduces behaviors that lead to collisions involving non-motorized users.
- Addresses inadequate or unsafe traffic control devices, bicycle facilities, trails, crosswalks and/or sidewalks.

This project primarily addresses “inadequate or unsafe traffic control devices, bicycle facilities, trails, crosswalks and/or sidewalks”. Walking in the roadway or bike lanes is inherently unsafe
as it causes conflicts between the different modes of travel which involve different speeds. When all users are in their defined space travel is more predictable and safer.

When this project along with the Cottage Way Road Diet project (reducing travel lanes from four to two, adding bike lanes and sidewalks) are complete, vehicle speeds will be slower, and people will be able to walk or bike to the transit stops or to their final destination.

In the Folsom Blvd. project area, the separated sidewalk will put more distance between pedestrians and this high speed (posted speed 45 mph) and high volume (greater than 20,000 ADT) roadway. The lack of any sidewalk deters people from walking to their destination; the separated sidewalk will encourage people to walk to their destination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Performance</th>
<th>ATP Points</th>
<th>BPFP Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projects with significant potential</td>
<td>16 to 25 points</td>
<td>12-19 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects with moderate potential</td>
<td>8 to 15 points</td>
<td>6-11 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects with minimal potential</td>
<td>1 to 7 points</td>
<td>1-5 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects with no potential</td>
<td>0 points</td>
<td>0 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Supporting greenhouse gas reduction goals & linking to MTP/SCS**
   *(ATP: 0-10 points; BPFP: 0-21 points)*

Describe how the project advances the active transportation efforts of SACOG to achieve greenhouse gas reduction goals while improving health and sustainability as established pursuant to **58375** and **58391**, and supports implementation of the 2012 MTP/SCS. Figure 7.7 of the 2012 MTP/SCS (“Greenhouse Gas Emissions per Capita from On-Road Sources”, page 179) may be used to demonstrate your project’s potential to support greenhouse gas reduction goals; if you already completed a project-specific GHG analysis for this project, please describe the methodology used and the results of the analysis.

**A. Supportive Development Efforts**

Please describe how the project supports land use and economic development efforts in alignment with MTP/SCS performance goals and the land use vision for the area, as described in the SCS, or the local general and/or specific plan.

*(ATP: 0-5 points; BPFP: 0-5 points)*

1. Please describe the project’s Community Type (i.e. development context) as described in the MTP/SCS for 2035 (i.e. Centers and Corridors, Established Communities, Developing Communities, Rural Residential Communities, or Lands Not Identified for Development—definitions of the Community Types can be found in Chapter 3 of the MTP/SCS for 2035: [http://sacog.org/mtpscs/mtpscs/](http://sacog.org/mtpscs/mtpscs/)). Next, please describe the amount of development and type of uses that are expected to be built over the next 20 years for that Community Type in your jurisdiction (reference Appendix E-3 of the 2012 MTP/SCS). If your project is located in the Community Type of “Lands Not Identified for Development” or there is insufficient information in the 2012 MTP/SCS Appendix E-3 for your project plan area, please describe the project’s development context using the applicable local land use plan.

Both the Folsom Blvd and Cottage Way project areas are included in the Center and Corridor Community Type. Center and Corridor Communities typically have a more compact development pattern, a greater mix of uses, and a wider variety of transportation infrastructure than the rest of the region. These communities are typically identified in local plans as downtowns, commercial corridors, rail station areas, central business districts, town...
centers, rail station areas, or other high-density destinations. Some have frequent transit service, either bus or rail, and all have pedestrian and bicycling infrastructure that is more supportive of walking and bicycling than other Community Types.

The Cottage project area is bounded on either end by the Fulton Ave. and Watt Ave. commercial corridors. Kaiser Hospital is located on the corner of Morse Ave. and Cottage Way. Various federal agencies have campuses along Cottage Way. Cottage Park and Cottage Elementary School are located on Cottage Way. The balance of the land uses are single and multi-family residential. See Attachment 5, page 19.

The Folsom project area is part of the Butterfield Station Area which contains a mixture of land uses. As shown in Attachment 6, page 20, the State Franchise Tax Board (FTB) campus is located directly south of the light rail station. The 86.4-acre campus employs over 5,000 people, has over 1.8 million square feet of office space and over 40 acres of surface parking capable of accommodating almost 3,800 vehicles.

The land use on the north side of Folsom Blvd. west of Butterfield Way is generally residential, largely single-family, but with a mixture of multifamily housing units included at the intersection of Folsom Blvd. and Butterfield Way. There are two large vacant parcels north of Folsom Blvd.

Between Butterfield Way and Bradshaw Road, land uses include a recently renovated (2007) neighborhood strip commercial development on the northeast corner of Folsom Blvd. and Bradshaw Road, some light industrial buildings, two motels, a church, and related facilities. The southwest corner of Folsom Blvd. and Bradshaw Road is occupied by light industrial buildings and warehouses, including a public storage facility, an ancillary FTB office/warehouse site, and the last operational drive-in movie theater in Sacramento County. The drive-in theater alone occupies 37 acres.

SACOG’s 2012 MTP/SCS projections anticipate notable housing growth from 2008 to 2035, with 1,600 net new housing units constructed in order to house 5,466 net new residents. The station area’s population is projected to increase by 6.9 percent on average each year and the housing supply is expected to increase by an average of 3.3 percent each year. The most likely site for new housing development is the vacant property directly north from the station that is currently zoned office.

According to SACOG 2012 MTP/SCS estimates, total station area employment is expected to grow by 1.6 percent annually from 2008 to 2035, which will result in 3,337 new jobs by 2035. More than 80 percent of that job growth is projected to be in new office employment resulting from the redevelopment of the business park east of the Franchise Tax Board complex. In addition, retail employment is expected to increase by 536 jobs.

By 2035, the MTP/SCS forecasts that unincorporated Sacramento County will continue to be the most urbanized County in the region. Within the existing urban core, new growth will occur through limited infill and redevelopment in Center and Corridor Communities. By 2035, the MTP/SCS forecasts 23,687 new housing units and 30,241 new employees within Center and Corridor Communities out of a potential build out capacity of 39,101 new housing units and 53,216 new employees. This new growth will take the form of medium- to high-density residential, commercial, office, and public uses.
New housing will be predominantly medium-high and high density. The vast majority, 84 percent, of the housing growth in Centers and Corridors is projected for three general areas: light rail stops (including the Butterfield Station), west of the northern Watt Ave. area surrounding the McClellan employment center, and in transportation corridors (Stockton, Franklin, and Florin) in southern Sacramento County. The remaining 16 percent of the forecasted housing (3852 units) will be spread among seven other corridor segments throughout the county, including Watt Ave. and Fulton Ave.

2. Describe how the project, in this Community Type, will support biking and walking in place of vehicle trips. (e.g. the project connects a multifamily housing development to a school or shopping center where no such connection previously existed.)

The Community Type of Centers and Corridors is intended by its mix of land uses and housing types to allow people to easily and safely move around using active means. This will reduce vehicles miles traveled and GHG emissions by replacing short trips with biking and walking and longer trips with transit in conjunction with biking and walking. The most basic form of transportation is walking. Yet people won’t walk any distance if it isn’t safe and convenient. The construction of sidewalks along Cottage Way and Folsom Blvd. closes gaps in network allowing more people to utilize walking as a means of transportation.

The sidewalks on Folsom Blvd. will connect residents to the north, east and west with the Butterfield LRT Station. Once at the station, universities, job centers, retail malls and even the bay area become conveniently available without driving. The sidewalk connects residents to the east and west with the commercial establishments on Folsom Blvd. Construction of the sidewalk also allows residents to walk along Folsom Blvd. and then into the neighborhood to reach the American River Parkway and Bike Trail.

The sidewalks on Cottage Way will connect residents with Regional Transit bus lines on Cottage Way and Fulton Ave. With these bus lines residents can get to four different LRT Stations, American River College, CSUS, Arden Fair Mall and the north Watt Ave. area. The sidewalk will allow students to walk to Cottage Elementary and residents to walk to Kaiser Hospital and Medical Facility. The sidewalk will connect residents to the shopping area at Watt Ave. and El Camino Ave., shopping on Fulton Ave. and Arden Way, all within a half mile.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Performance</th>
<th>ATP Points</th>
<th>BPFP Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant exceptionally describes the project’s Community Type (or development context) and supportive development efforts, and the ability of those efforts to support biking and walking in place of vehicle trips.</td>
<td>5 points</td>
<td>5 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant adequately describes the project’s Community Type (or development context) and supportive development efforts, and the ability of those efforts to support biking and walking in place of vehicle trips.</td>
<td>2-4 points</td>
<td>2-4 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant minimally describes the project’s Community Type (or development context) and supportive development efforts, and the ability of those efforts to support biking and walking in place of vehicle trips.</td>
<td>1 point</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant does not describe the project’s Community Type (or development context) or supportive development, nor the ability to support biking and walking in place of vehicle trips.</td>
<td>0 points</td>
<td>0 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Placemaking
Describe/explain the project’s role in a placemaking strategy for the future land use and transportation vision for the area it is located, as described in the MTP/SCS and/or the local general/specific plan. Placemaking is defined as a combination of strategies (e.g. zoning, context-sensitive design standards, planned infrastructure, etc.) that lead to a built environment where walking and biking can become a primary mode for shorter distance trips. (BPFP:0-5 points)

Providing appropriate infrastructure is the most basic strategy of any placemaking and providing a sidewalk where there is none is the most basic of infrastructure for any place that strives to become more pedestrian and bike friendly. Completing the sidewalk network along Cottage Way and Folsom Blvd. achieves this most basic goal. While the communities and the vision for these two corridors are different they both require sidewalks as a starting point.

Cottage Way is an east west collector with lower volumes than the east west arterials to the north and south of Cottage Way. This makes Cottage Way a good candidate to become an active transportation corridor in the Arden Arcade area of Sacramento County. The County is constructing its first road diet project that will reduce the travel lanes and add bike lanes on Cottage Way. As the funding for the Cottage Way Road Diet Project was from Highway Safety funds, it was not possible to include the necessary sidewalk infrastructure as the project would not have qualified for funding with the lower cost benefit ratio. However, without the sidewalks the vision for the area as an active transportation corridor cannot be realized.

The County’s vision for the Butterfield Station Area is for it to become a TOD. This sidewalk project completes one of the most requested immediate improvements the residents requested in the public meetings. A detached sidewalk with landscaping will be constructed in keeping with the Folsom Blvd. improvements constructed to the east by the City of Rancho Cordova and the draft County Folsom Blvd. Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Performance</th>
<th>ATP Points</th>
<th>BPFP Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant exceptionally described the project’s role as a placemaking strategy.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4-5 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant adequately described the project’s role as a placemaking strategy.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2-3 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant minimally described the project’s role as a placemaking strategy.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant did not describe the project’s role as a placemaking strategy.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Reducing or shortening vehicle trips
Building on your responses in sections A and B, describe the project’s potential to reduce the number (i.e. replace) of or shorten vehicle miles traveled (VMT), particularly trips serving utilitarian purposes (e.g. trips to school, work, services, shopping). The resource map “2012 MTP/SCS Vehicle Miles Traveled Per Capita” (available on http://www.sacog.org/regionalfunding/fundingprograms_bikeped-overview.cfm) illustrates average VMT per capita throughout the region by 2035 and may be used to support a description of your project’s potential to achieve VMT reductions in your community; alternatively, you may use information from approved local plans or other applicable documents to support a description of how your project will support reduced VMT. (ATP: 0-5 points; BPFP: 0-11 points)

The Cottage Way project area currently has some of the best transit service in suburban eastern Sacramento County due to its proximity to the Kaiser Hospital facility and Watt Ave., a major
north south transportation corridor. In addition, by 2035 bus rapid transit will be constructed on Watt Ave. Construction of the sidewalk improvements, in conjunction with the road diet and bike lanes, will result in a decrease in the number of vehicle trips as more people will be able to walk or bike to their destination or to the transit lines serving the area to reach destinations further away.

The construction of the separated sidewalk in the Folsom project area will encourage people to walk to the numerous businesses along Folsom Blvd. It will also encourage people to use the Transit options available at the Butterfield station. Once people get into their vehicle they are more likely to just drive to their final destination instead of driving to the transit station. However, if it is convenient and safe to walk to the transit station they are more likely to take transit to their final destination.

The VMT per capita in 2008 in the Cottage Way project area was 9.1 to 14.5 and in the Folsom Blvd. project area was 14.5 to 19.3. Both areas were below the region’s average of 24.8. The GHG emissions per capita in 2035 are projected to be lower than the region’s mean of 19.4 for both project areas. The reduction in VMT because of the construction of the sidewalks will reduce GHG emissions helping the region meet its SB375 targets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Performance</th>
<th>ATP Points</th>
<th>BPFP Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project demonstrates significant potential to replace or shorten VMT in the region.</td>
<td>4-5 points</td>
<td>8-11 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project demonstrates moderate potential to replace or shorten VMT in the region.</td>
<td>2-3 points</td>
<td>4-7 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project demonstrates minimal potential to replace or shorten VMT in the region.</td>
<td>1 point</td>
<td>1-3 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project demonstrates no potential to replace or shorten VMT in the region.</td>
<td>0 points</td>
<td>0 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Cost effectiveness
(Total ATP: 0-10 points, BPFP: 0-4 points + Other Considerations)

Note: In relation to the State ATP, the Regional ATP emphasizes cost-effectiveness as a way of determining the appropriate facility improvement or project given the needs of the intended users, how well it is expected to perform, what other financial support (i.e. match) is pledged, and how it minimizes construction or operating costs.

A. Context Sensitive Design
Describe how the project design is appropriate for the community and surrounding environment.
(ATP: 0-5 points; BPFP: 0-4 points)

The project section of Folsom Blvd. is a four lane road with a center turn lane and bike lanes. On the south side of the roadway are the light rail tracks. The north side has attached sidewalk with the exception of approximately 950 feet in two different locations. Folsom Blvd., in this section, is a major east west arterial with a posted speed of 45 mph and a daily traffic volume of 20,500.

It was determined that matching the existing attached sidewalk would not be appropriate for today’s roadway standards given the speed and volume on the Folsom Blvd. The intent of this area to become a transit oriented development which includes providing the appropriate infrastructure to ensure that people want to walk. Therefore a separated sidewalk with a landscaped area was selected as the most appropriate design for this project area.
The project section of Cottage Way is currently a four lane road with no bike lanes. There are attached sidewalks on both sides of the roadway with the exception of approximately 1,050 feet in two different locations on the north side of Cottage Way. After construction of the Cottage Way Road Diet project, Cottage Way will be a two lane road with a center turn lane and bike lanes and sidewalks. Cottage Way is an east west collector with a posted speed of 35 mph and a daily traffic volume of 7,600.

Since the road diet project is not changing the existing sidewalks and the traffic speeds and volumes are lower, it was determined that the appropriate design for this project was to match the existing attached sidewalks.

**B. Describe Alternatives**

Describe the alternatives that were considered and how the ATP-related benefits vs. project-costs varied between them. Explain why the final proposed alternative is considered to have the highest Benefit to Cost Ratio (B/C) with respect to the ATP purpose of “increased use of active modes of transportation”. *(ATP: 0-3 points; BPFP: Part of Other Considerations)*

Besides the “Do Nothing” alternative, for each project area the alternatives considered were whether the sidewalk should be attached or detached with landscaping. Clearly the Do Nothing alternative does not provide any ATP related benefits and doesn’t help increase pedestrian travel leading to a healthier population and reduction in VMT and GHG emissions.

As outlined above, it was determined that to get most number of people using the sidewalk on Folsom Blvd. it is necessary to separate the sidewalk and have a landscaped area between the pedestrians and the vehicles. This configuration provides the most comfort to pedestrians, thereby increasing the number of pedestrians using the facility.

The sidewalk infill on Cottage Way in conjunction with the Road Diet and installation of bike lanes were all necessary in order to provide an active transportation corridor. The combination of these projects will have many ATP related benefits, but due to cost considerations it was necessary to break this project up. The sidewalk infill will complete this active transportation corridor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Performance</th>
<th>ATP Points</th>
<th>BPFP Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant considers alternatives and exceptionally justifies the project nominated.</td>
<td>7 to 8 points</td>
<td>4 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant considers alternatives and adequately justifies the project nominated.</td>
<td>3 to 4 points</td>
<td>2 to 3 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant considers alternatives and minimally justifies the project nominated.</td>
<td>1 to 2 points</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant did not consider alternatives or justify the project nominated.</td>
<td>0 points</td>
<td>0 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C. Calculation**

Use the ATP Benefit/Cost Tool, provided by Caltrans, to calculate the ratio of the benefits of the project relative to both the total project cost and ATP funds requested. After calculating the Benefit/Cost ratios for the project, please provide constructive feedback on the tool. *(ATP: 0-2 points; BPFP: Part of Other Considerations)*
The Tool is available at http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/ttp/offices/eab/atp.html .

*Benefits must directly relate to the goals of the Active Transportation Program.

The Cost/Benefit tool was used to calculate the project B/C ratio. This project yields a B/C ratio of 5.4. The results and input tables are included in Attachment 7, page 21.

Feedback:
For crash data, the instructions do not indicate if the crash data should only include pedestrian and bicycle related crashes, or all crashes. Please be more specific. For our analysis, only the pedestrian fatalities and injuries within the last five years were included.

### Project Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Performance</th>
<th>ATP Points</th>
<th>BPFP Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant demonstrated that the values inputted into the B/C Tool are appropriate, provided documentation of the output B/C value calculated by the Tool, and provided constructive feedback for CTC’s and Caltrans’ consideration.</td>
<td>1-2 points</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant did not use the B/C Tool appropriately, provide documentation of the output B/C value calculated by the Tool, or provide constructive feedback for CTC’s and Caltrans’ consideration.</td>
<td>0 points</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **Improved Public Health**  
*(ATP: 0-10 points)*

A. **Current Health Data**  
*Describe current health-related data available for the targeted users of the project. (ATP: 0-3 points)*

The construction of this sidewalk gap closure on Folsom Blvd. along this commercial corridor adjacent to a light rail station and along this mixed use corridor will increase daily active travel and the use of public transit. Both of these activities will improve public health: One on the individual level and the other on the community level.

The health status of the users near this project can be ascertained by research using the Ask California Health Interview Survey (CHIS) Neighborhood Edition. The zip codes on either side of the Folsom Blvd. project area (95670 and 95826) were used because there was insufficient data to report for the project zip code of 95827. The zip code 95670 is located within the City of Rancho Cordova and includes census tract 90.06 which is adjacent to the project and is a disadvantaged community based on income and the CalEnviroScreen 2.0. See Attachment 8, page 23.

The Cottage Way project area is completely located within the zip code 95825 and census tract 56.01, which is a disadvantaged community based on income and Free and Reduced Price Meals at Cottage Elementary School. See map showing the disadvantaged area. See Attachment 9, page 24.

The combined proximity of both Folsom Blvd. and Cottage Way to the Butterfield Station, Regional Transit Bus Lines 22, 23 26, 29, 80, 82, 84 and the entire Regional Transit Light Rail and Bus System, allows for this project to benefit a much larger community. In addition the
Folsom Blvd. project area is within a quarter mile of the American River Bike Trail. Therefore health status data for the entire County is also presented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>95826</th>
<th>95670</th>
<th>95825 Sacramento County</th>
<th>California</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diagnosed with Asthma; 18 and Older</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>15.90%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Mass Index Greater Than 30; 18 and Older</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>26.20%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walked at Least 150 Minutes per Week; 18 and Older</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>34.60%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The community that will benefit from this project has more incidences of asthma than the state average and does not get a sufficient amount of exercise leading to a greater amount of obesity.

B. Potential for Improvement
Describe how you expect your project to enhance public health. *(ATP: 0-7 points)*

The Folsom Blvd. project area is part of a larger project to create a TOD at each of the LRT Stations in eastern Sacramento County. An initial required piece of infrastructure to support the TOD is construction of sidewalks on major roadways surrounding the Butterfield Station. With the construction of this project people will be able to walk to and from the residential neighborhoods to the commercial destinations along Folsom Blvd. and to and from the Butterfield LRT station for longer commute trips. Currently residents are more likely to drive to these destinations as walking along Folsom Blvd. without a sidewalk is considered unsafe and unpleasant by most people.

The Cottage Way project area is also part of a larger project to convert Cottage Way from Fulton Avenue to Watt Ave. into an Active Transportation Corridor. The road diet project will slow the speeds on Cottage Way and add bike lanes. Adding sidewalks will allow people to walk to school, Kaiser Hospital, and retail establishments on Fulton and Watt Ave.

Projects that lead to more walking and physically active travel are critical to our community's future well-being. Physical activity is a protective factor for health. For thousands of years, human beings were physically active every day. Through technology, we have engineered most physical activity out of our lives, so that our everyday habits involve less and less physical activity. Today most people lead sedentary, physically inactive lives, and as a result, there have been dramatic changes in the health of Americans over the past few decades. More than two-thirds of American adults are overweight. Rates continue to increase for diseases associated with a sedentary lifestyle, such as diabetes, heart disease, cancer, and high blood pressure.

Tremendous costs are associated with the vastly expanded delivery of health care services that are needed to care for these health conditions that have become so prevalent. Obesity alone now accounts for 21 percent of national health care costs. These high health care expenditures are made for conditions that can be prevented with a moderate amount of regular exercise such as walking or biking. To protect against most chronic conditions only 30 minutes a day of moderate activity at least five days a week is needed, according to the Centers for Disease Control. This activity can be as simple as walking. But most Americans do not move that much. In fact, the most recent national survey revealed that 38 percent of Americans do not walk for even ten
minutes a day.

Part of the reason that people don't walk and bike as much as they used to is that the environment has changed. Development patterns have been focused on facilitating the movement of automobiles and making driving a part of everyday life, creating neighborhoods and communities in which everything is spread out. These great distances between the elements of everyday life force people to use vehicles to get to all the places they need to go each day.

In Sacramento County, only 37 percent of adults are moderately active 30 minutes a day, according to the CHIS. In addition, most roadways in the county were designed with the goal of moving vehicles quickly. Because of the high vehicle speeds, the roads are not accommodating for pedestrians and bicyclists. The roads are perceived as so unsafe that people use vehicles for travel even when the distances are short. In fact, a national study found that 25 percent of all car trips are less than one mile. One mile corresponds to a 20 minute walk; two-thirds of the 30 minutes of physical activity per day typically recommended by physicians. High levels of vehicle traffic lead to more collisions, causing injuries and deaths. Despite many advances in vehicle and road safety design, automobile crashes are so common today that they are the leading cause of death of children aged 1-24.

Other health problems caused by an environment focused on the use of cars for all transportation needs include the many health conditions that result from breathing polluted air. Automobiles in the Sacramento region generate 70 percent of the air pollution. The Sacramento Valley air basin is among the top ten most polluted in the nation. Vehicle emissions contain particulate matter of various kinds. Long-term exposure to particulate matter can cause premature death from heart and lung disease, and can exacerbate asthma. This is particularly a problem for the disadvantaged community and all residents adjacent to the project as their incidences of asthma are nearly thirty percent higher than the statewide average. Construction of the sidewalk improvements will result in a decrease in the number of vehicle trips as more people will be able to walk to destinations and transit. Promoting active transportation choices along with reducing the amount of vehicles on the road will be a great benefit to this community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Performance</th>
<th>ATP Points</th>
<th>BPFP Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant exceptionally described the targeted users and how the project will enhance public health</td>
<td>7 to 10 points</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant adequately described the targeted users and how the project will enhance public health</td>
<td>4 to 6 points</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant minimally described the targeted users and how the project will enhance public health</td>
<td>1 to 3 points</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant did not describe the targeted users or how the project will enhance public health</td>
<td>0 points</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Benefit to Disadvantaged Communities
   (ATP: 0-10 points)

   A. Disadvantaged Community Details (ATP screening for DAC points)
      Please include a map with your project’s location in the Appendix to demonstrate the project is located in or near a Disadvantaged Community.
I. Is the project located in a disadvantaged community? Yes ☑ No ☐

See maps Attachments 8 and 9, pages 23 and 24

II. Does the project significantly benefit a disadvantaged community? Yes ☑ No ☐

a. Which criteria does the project meet? (Answer all that apply)

- Median household income for the community benefited by the project: $ \text{37,597}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disadvantaged Community Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cottage Way Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento Census Tracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalEnviroScreen Percentile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- California Communities Environmental Health Screen Tool (CalEnviroScreen) score for the community benefited by the project: 81-85 %

- For projects that benefit public school students, percentage of students eligible for the Free or Reduced Price Meals Programs: 78.1 %

b. Should the community benefitting from the project be considered disadvantaged based on criteria not specified in the program guidelines? If so, provide data for all criteria above and a quantitative assessment of why the community should be considered disadvantaged.

- Provide median household income (option 1), the CalEnviroScreen 2.0 score (option 2), and if applicable, the percentage of students eligible for Free and Reduced Meal Programs (option 3)
- Provide ADDITIONAL data that demonstrates that the community benefiting from the project/program/plan is disadvantaged
- Provide an explanation for why this additional data demonstrates that the community is disadvantaged
B. Benefits to Disadvantaged Communities

I. For proposals located within a disadvantaged community: What percent of the funds requested will be expended in the disadvantaged community? 50% Explain how this percent was calculated.

(ATP: 0-5 points)

The project cost estimate was split based on improvements in each area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Performance</th>
<th>ATP Points</th>
<th>BPFP Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80% to 100% of project funding benefits the disadvantaged community</td>
<td>5 points</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60% to 79% of project funding benefits the disadvantaged community</td>
<td>4 points</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40% to 59% of project funding benefits the disadvantaged community</td>
<td>3 points</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% to 39% of project funding benefits the disadvantaged community</td>
<td>2 points</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1% to 19% of project funding benefits the disadvantaged community</td>
<td>1 point</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Describe how the project/program/plan provides (for plans: will provide) a direct, meaningful, and assured benefit to members of the disadvantaged community. Define what direct, meaningful, and assured benefit means for your proposed project/program/plan, how this benefit will be achieved, and who will receive this benefit.

(ATP: 0-5 points)

Disadvantaged communities tend to rely on public transit and active transportation modes of travel because there isn't sufficient income in the household to support the expenses of a vehicle. Disadvantaged communities tend to have poorer health outcomes because it can be hard for them to access medical services and healthier food safely and conveniently within their neighborhood. Constructing sidewalks near transit stops and a LRT station allows the residents to safely walk to needed services or transit which will allow them to get to access the community at large. Providing access to services also makes it easier for the residents to find and commute to jobs. Construction of sidewalks in these disadvantaged communities also allows the residents to walk for exercise and improve their health.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Performance</th>
<th>ATP Points</th>
<th>BPFP Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project clearly and significantly addresses health, safety, and/or infrastructure challenges in the disadvantaged community</td>
<td>5 points</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project adequately addresses health, safety, and/or infrastructure challenges in the disadvantaged community</td>
<td>3 points</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project minimally addresses health, safety, and/or infrastructure challenges in the disadvantaged community</td>
<td>1 point</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V. Other Considerations

2 pages maximum, 12 point font
(ATP: 0-10 points BPFP: 0-12 points)

A. Applicant’s Performance on Past Grants

1. Describe how your agency intends to deliver this project on time and within budget. If your agency has had difficulty delivering past grant or federal aid projects during the past five years, then also describe what changes your agency will take in order to deliver this project.

Sacramento County Department of Transportation has a good record in delivering numerous federally and state funded TE, SR2S, HSIP and bicycle and pedestrian projects. A list of past successfully delivered projects is provided in Attachment 10, Page 25

During the past five years there have not been any failures. In the County’s entire history of receiving grant funding, the commitment to the successful delivery of all projects has always been there. In a jurisdiction with substantial infrastructure needs only the highest priority projects are submitted for funding. Sacramento County is committed to maintaining a good track record in delivering all these high priority projects.

2. Describe one of your agency’s prior experiences allocating a project though the California Transportation Commission.

SacDOT has significant experience in allocating project funds for all phases of work, primarily, for Con and CE through various programs governed by the CTC. In the last few years, SacDOT has allocated funds from the CTC in the amount of approximately $75 million (e.g., Proposition 1B Corridor Mobility Improvement Account program, State Route 99 Corridor Program as well as STIP, STIP-TE, State ATP, and Regional ATP). SacDOT works closely with SACOG after projects have been nominated for inclusion in a program governed by the CTC. Once projects are programmed, SacDOT prepares and submits allocation requests to the Caltrans District 3 to begin the process of implementing projects in accordance with the timely use of funds requirements as established by statute, adopted CTC guidelines, and Chapter 23 of the Local Assistance Program Guidelines.

SacDOT recently used CTC funding with the interchange improvement project on Highway 50, at Watt Ave. This was a complex project involving substantial coordination with numerous federal, state and local agencies. The project is complete and considered successful in terms of budget and schedule management. This interchange project also won a bike/pedestrian award for innovation.

B. Project Readiness

To demonstrate project readiness and ability to move forward on a timely schedule (i.e. clear schedule, cost, and partnerships to deliver the project), please fill out the Cost and Schedule Summary & the Project Programming Request, both in Excel, available at:

http://www.sacog.org/regionalfunding/fundingprograms_bikeped-overview.cfm

C. Community and Stakeholder Support

1. Describe the community based public participation process that culminated in the project proposal or plan, such as noticed meetings/public hearings, consultation with stakeholders, etc.

The planning for Folsom Blvd. project area TOD (of which this sidewalk project is one component) has taken place over the last ten years and has involved many layers of planning and public participation. Each of these different planning processes has engaged agencies at the local and regional level as well as
businesses, residents, and community groups.

The various TOD and station enhancement studies included input from the Sacramento Regional Transit, SACOG, the City of Rancho Cordova, Sacramento Area Bicycle Advocates, WALK Sacramento, and the residents and business owners surrounding the stations. See Attachment 11, page 27.

The PMP approved in 2007 and the Bicycle Master Plan (BMP) approved in 2011 were both developed with extensive public input including: ADA Community Advisory Group; Technical Advisory Community; Outreach to Persons with Visual Impairments; and Community Planning Advisory Councils. The PMP and BMP held public workshops, received input from the Advisory Groups, conducted surveys, issued press releases, participated in community events and used a website to engage the public and receive input on the project. See Attachment 12, page 31.

Both project areas are listed as priority Pedestrian Districts in the PMP and are identified in BMP as needing Class 2 bike lanes.

2. Describe the local participation process that resulted in the identification and prioritization of the project.

As part of the Folsom Blvd. Project area, TOD and Master Plan outreach at each station workshop generally included a walking audit, presentations by the project team and table exercises where guests were asked to provide input, feedback and priorities.

A survey was included on the website to allow the public to provide feedback on improvements they would like to see along the corridor. The top two strategy priorities from the survey were Aesthetics and Safety, and Safe and Vibrant Streets. The elimination of this sidewalk gap was specifically mentioned in the Public Workshop for the Butterfield Station. This project directly meets a request from the community to close this gap to allow continuous access along the north side of Folsom Blvd.

Projects in the BMP and PMP were prioritized based on criteria that received input from the community. Additionally the residents of the Cottage Way neighborhood specifically requested the Road Diet project.

3. Attach any relevant notices and materials associated with the public outreach identifying support for this project.

D. Cost Effectiveness

Refer to Narrative Question 4 for consideration of Regional BPFP points awarded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Performance</th>
<th>ATP Points</th>
<th>BPFP Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant demonstrated complete adherence with identified criteria: excellent prior grant performance, immediate project readiness and a timely schedule, and strong stakeholder support</td>
<td>7 to 10 points</td>
<td>9 to 12 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant adequately demonstrated adherence with identified criteria: adequate prior grant performance, good project readiness and a timely schedule, and some stakeholder support</td>
<td>4 to 6 points</td>
<td>5 to 8 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant minimally met the criteria of this section: poor prior grant performance, poor project readiness, and weak or no stakeholder support</td>
<td>1 to 3 points</td>
<td>1 to 4 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant did not describe how the project met the criteria of this section</td>
<td>0 points</td>
<td>0 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VI. Project Application Checklist

☒ **Eligibility:** Potential applicants may check with the contacts identified for SACOG, EDCTC (for project sponsors in El Dorado County), or PCTPA (for projects in Placer County) regarding the eligibility of their project or their eligibility as an applicant (project sponsor) for federal transportation funding.

☒ **Program Schedule:** Review the program schedule (Section 1: Reference Information) in the Guidelines for important dates.

☒ **Application contents:** Review pages for all needed elements. Review the section of the Guidelines on Project Evaluation (Part G) and check that the application contains all information necessary. Page limits are listed in Part I.
  
  ▪ **Cover letter with a wet signature**
  ▪ **Completed Application—Part O**
    • Project Sponsor Information—Section I
    • Project Information—Section II
    • Screening Criteria—Section III
    • Other Considerations—Section V
    • Narrative Questions—Section IV
  ▪ **Complete Appendix—in order**
    a. Copy of Statement of Intent to Apply correspondence (due June 5, 2015) —Part K
    b. Cost & Schedule Summary (Excel)— Part L
    c. Project Programming Request (Excel)— Part M
    d. Engineer’s Estimate (Excel)—Part N
    e. Emissions Benefit Calculations for CMAQ (BPFP Applicants)—Part P
    f. Map(s) of project location—**or included in Narrative**
    g. Photographs of project location—**or included in Narrative**
    h. Copy of CCC & CALCC Correspondence
    i. Any additional exhibits
    j. Partner Support Letters (if project is co-sponsored)
    k. Miscellaneous – Any other information in support of your project

☒ **Implementation Requirements:** Review the Implementation section in the Guidelines (Part J) and evaluate your ability to meet all federal and SACOG requirements, including providing local matching funds of at least 11.47 percent of the total project cost and following SACOG’s “Use it or Lose It” policy.

☒ **Submittal Deadline:** Please submit one (1) signed original, five (5) color copies of the complete grant application no later than 1:00 p.m. on Friday, June 19, 2015, to:
  
  Lacey Symons-Holtzen, Active Transportation Team Manager
  Sacramento Area Council of Governments
  1415 L Street, Suite 300
  Sacramento, CA 95814
E-mailed applications are not acceptable. This deadline will be strictly enforced. Please refer to Part I and Part J for additional information. Failure to submit all required parts of the application may result in the application being screened out of the competition.

☒ Electronic File Submittal: Submit one (1) USB or compact disc with a PDF file of all the application contents no later than 1:00 p.m. on Friday, June 19, 2015.

Include electronic versions of your Engineer’s Estimate, Cost & Schedule Summary, and PPR (in Excel) in the electronic submittal. The additional materials may be scanned into a PDF file, such as maps, graphics, etc. If a Project Study Report (PSR) or equivalent is complete, please submit a PDF of the PSR on the USB or compact disc. Please do not include a complete Master Plan or other local planning document.
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Appendix
Folsom Cottage Sidewalk Infill Project

- Part K - Copy of Statement of Intent to Apply Pg 1-2
- Part L - Cost & Schedule Summary Pg 3
- Part M - Project Programming Request Pg 4-5
- Part N - Engineer's Estimate Pg 6-7
- Part P - Emissions Benefit Calc. for CMAQ (BPFP Applicants) Pg 8
- Attachment 1 - Maps of Project Location Pg 9
- Attachment 2 - Photographs of Project Location Pg 10-14
- Attachment 3 - Copy of CCC & CALCC Correspondence Pg 15-17
- Attachment 4 - Letter From Neighbor Pg 18
- Attachment 5 - Cottage Way Destinations Map Pg 19
- Attachment 6 - Butterfield Land Use Plan Maps Pg 20
- Attachment 7 - ATP Benefit Cost Tool Pg 21-22
- Attachment 8 - Cottage Way & Folsom Blvd. CalEnviro Map Pg 23
- Attachment 9 - Income Disadvantaged Area Map Pg 24
- Attachment 10 - Approved Project Funding History Pg 25-26
- Attachment 11 - Folsom Blvd. Workshop Pg 27-30
- Attachment 12 - SCBMP Public Workshop Results Pg 31-39
Part K Statement of Intent to Apply

From: Vicari, Ron
Sent: Wednesday, May 06, 2015 3:59 PM
To: Lacey Symons-Holtzen; Greg Chew
Cc: Irving, Bill; Raygani, Angie; Razo, Refugio; Shoeman, Dan; Yee, Heather; Victoria Cacciatore
Subject: RE: Sacramento County Intent Letter For 2015 Flexible Funding

Yes, That is correct.

From: Lacey Symons-Holtzen [mailto:LSymons-Holtzen@sacog.org]
Sent: Wednesday, May 06, 2015 3:45 PM
To: Vicari, Ron; Greg Chew
Cc: Irving, Bill; Raygani, Angie; Razo, Refugio; Shoeman, Dan; Yee, Heather; Victoria Cacciatore
Subject: RE: Sacramento County Intent Letter For 2015 Flexible Funding

Hi Ron—thank you for sending the Statement of Intent to Apply. Please note that projects applying to the State ATP are eligible to apply for the Regional ATP & BPFP, not Community Design. So, to be clear, Sac County is planning to submit two projects to the Community Design program, and four projects to the Bike & Ped/ATP programs, correct?

Also, thank you for nominating such an excellent candidate to sit on the Active Transportation Working Group. 😊 We’ll add your name to the list of nominations and let you know early June.

Lacey Symons-Holtzen, PMP
SACOG
1415 L Street STE 300
Sacramento, CA 95814
Log your miles at MayisBikeMonth.com

From: Vicari, Ron [mailto:vicarir@SacCounty.NET]
Sent: Wednesday, May 06, 2015 3:06 PM
To: Lacey Symons-Holtzen; Greg Chew
Cc: Irving, Bill; Raygani, Angie; Razo, Refugio; Shoeman, Dan; Yee, Heather
Subject: FW: Sacramento County Intent Letter For 2015 Flexible Funding

Hello Lacey,

Thank you and your team for the great information that you presented this morning at the workshop, it was very helpful.

As requested, we are forwarding the following list of project candidates that Sacramento County DOT intends to submit under the Regional ATP and/or Bike-Ped Flexible Funding Programs, as noted below.

**SACOG Community Design, SACOG Bicycle/Pedestrian and ATP – 2015-16 Project Candidates**
Community Design and ATP (State & Regional)

- Fair Oaks Boulevard Improvements, Phase 3, Marconi Avenue to North Avenue (Construction). Approx. Total Project Cost: $7 million, (recommended request $2.4 million for construction).
- Greenback Lane Complete Street Improvements, Phase 1, from 1,000’ west of Main Avenue to Folsom City limits (Design, R/W, Construction). Approx. Total Project Cost: $2.0 million.

Bicycle/Pedestrian and ATP (State & Regional)

- Cottage Way Sidewalk Infill, between Fulton Avenue and Watt Avenue (Design, R/W & Construction) Approx. Total Project Cost: $750,000.
- Hazel Avenue Sidewalks @ Orangevale Public Library, Oak Avenue to Central Avenue (Design, R/W, Construction). Approx. Total Project Cost: $1.5 million.
- Power Inn Road Sidewalk Infill, Loucreta Dr. to Florin Road (Design, R/W, Construction). Approx. Total Project Cost: $1.5 million (This Project may also be eligible under HSIP)

If you have any questions, or need additional information please let me know.

Also please reply to this email as our confirmation of your receiving this required “Letter of Intent”.

As a side note, I would like to be on the panel for the review and prioritization for ATP/Bike PED. The County would also like to have a representative on the community design panel.

Thank you,

Ron E. Vicari II
Principal Civil Engineer
Cell 916-591-2257
Basic Tool: Cost and Schedule Summary
For use with Community Design, Regional ATP and Regional BFPF applicants only
Fill in BLUE SECTIONS where appropriate. Edit the formula cells at your own risk.

Project Sponsor
County of Sacramento

Project Title
Folsom Cottage Sidewalk Infill Project

Project Description (scope and limits)
Construct sidewalks in the existing gaps on the north side of Folsom Blvd. east and west of Butterfield Way and on Cottage Way on the north side between Fulton Ave and Watt Ave

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUMMARY</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Requests</th>
<th>Applicant Comment Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-capital Activities</td>
<td>Jan-00</td>
<td>Jan-00</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental &amp; Design</td>
<td>Apr-16</td>
<td>Oct-17</td>
<td>$265,000</td>
<td>$191,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>Sep-16</td>
<td>Sep-17</td>
<td>$202,000</td>
<td>$202,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Dec-17</td>
<td>Feb-18</td>
<td>$1,218,000</td>
<td>$1,092,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>Apr-16</td>
<td>Feb-18</td>
<td>$1,685,000</td>
<td>$1,485,000</td>
<td>88.13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ENVIRONMENTAL & DESIGN
Authorization to Proceed
Mar-16
NEPA CEQA

Environmental Document Type
CE Cat Ex

Environmental Decision Type
CE Cat Ex

Environmental Clearance
Apr-16 Aug-16

Final Design (Plans, Specs, & Est)
Jul-16 Oct-17

Totals Apr-16 Oct-17

RIGHT-OF-WAY
Authorization to Proceed
Sep-16 Nov-16

Need ROW Acquisition?
yes Sep-17

Need Utilities Relocation?
no

Totals Sep-16 Sep-17

CONSTRUCTION
Authorization to Proceed
Dec-17 Feb-18

Totals Dec-17 Feb-18
## Project Information:

**Project Title:** Folsom Cottage Sidewalk Infill  
**District:** 03  
**County:** SAC  
**Route:** Folsom/Cottage

## Funding Information:

### DO NOT FILL IN ANY SHADED AREAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W</td>
<td>202</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>1,218</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>393</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,685</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ATP Funds

#### Infrastructure Cycle 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td>191</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>202</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>1,092</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>393</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,485</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Non-infrastructure Cycle 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Plan Cycle 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Previous Cycle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Future Cycles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Project Title:** Folsom Cottage Sidewalk Infill  
**District:** 03  
**County:** SAC  
**Route:** Folsom/Cottage  
**Project ID:**  
**PPNO:**  

---

**Funding Information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior 14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

---

**Fund No. 2:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior 14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Funding Agency:** Sac County  
**Notes:**

---

**Fund No. 3:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior 14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fund No. 4:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior 14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fund No. 5:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior 14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fund No. 6:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior 14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Unit Price</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Participating Costs</td>
<td>Non-Part Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CLEARING AND GRUBBING</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>WPCP PREPARATION</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>WATER POLLUTION CONTROL</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ROADWAY EXCAVATION</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>1,385</td>
<td>$110</td>
<td>$152,350</td>
<td>$152,350</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>AGGREGATE BASE - CLASS 2</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>$65</td>
<td>$58,565</td>
<td>$58,565</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>TYPE A ASPHALT CONCRETE</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>$130</td>
<td>$61,750</td>
<td>$61,750</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>TYPE 2 CURB &amp; GUTTER</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>1,080</td>
<td>$35</td>
<td>$37,800</td>
<td>$37,800</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>TYPE 1A CURB &amp; GUTTER</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>1,080</td>
<td>$35</td>
<td>$37,800</td>
<td>$37,800</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>PCC SIDEWALK</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>9,625</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$192,500</td>
<td>$192,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>TYPE A6 DRIVEWAY</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>1,160</td>
<td>$21</td>
<td>$24,360</td>
<td>$24,360</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>MODIFY PLANTER</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>RELOCATE CHAIN LINK FENCE</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>RELOCATE BARBED WIRE &amp; MESH FENCE</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>$18</td>
<td>$12,600</td>
<td>$12,600</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>DECORATIVE BRICK WALL AND SIGN</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$60</td>
<td>$9,600</td>
<td>$9,600</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>REMOVE TYPE C DI</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,150</td>
<td>$1,150</td>
<td>$1,150</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>UNDER SIDEWALK DRAINS</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>TYPE B DI</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>TYPE G DI</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>12&quot; PVC CL 900</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>$140</td>
<td>$21,700</td>
<td>$21,700</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>12&quot; RCP Pipe, Class IV</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$19,500</td>
<td>$19,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>TYPE 3 CURB</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>1,245</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>$31,125</td>
<td>$31,125</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>STREET LIGHT TYPE A (COTTAGE)</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>STREET LIGHTING (FOLSOM)</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>RAISE STREET LIGHT TO GRADE</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>ADJUST EXISTING MANHOLE TO GRADE</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>DETECTABLE WARNING SURFACE</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>SIGNS AND STRIPING</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>LANDSCAPING</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$65,660</td>
<td>$65,660</td>
<td>$65,660</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>REMOVE TREE</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$700</td>
<td>$4,200</td>
<td>$4,200</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONSTRUCTION SUBTOTAL: $961,660
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONTINGENCY 10%</strong></td>
<td>$96,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONSTRUCTION TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$1,057,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction Engineering</strong></td>
<td>$158,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Soft Costs:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td>$190,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental and Permits</td>
<td>$74,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOT Design Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Right-of-way</strong></td>
<td>$202,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$1,683,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current status of project: PSR
RIDESHARING AND PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES

County: Sacramento

Federal Number:  

Approval Date:  

Caltrans DIST-EA:  

Short Description: Folsom Cottage Sidewalk Infill Project

Project Scope: Sidewalk Infill

Project Sponsor: SacDOT 

Private Agency: No

CMAQ Funding: $1,485,000

Local Match: $200,000

Capital Recovery Factor: 0.07

Project Analysis Period: 20 years

Auto Trips Eliminated (T): 4,221 trips (one-way) per week

Length of auto trips eliminated (L): 1.00 miles in one direction of trip

Weeks of operation per year (W): 50 weeks

Adjustment (A) for auto access trips to transit, vanpools and carpools: 1.00 adjustment factor

Annual Auto Trips Reduced: 211,050 annual trips

Annual Auto VMT Reduced: 211,050 annual miles

**EMISSION FACTORS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMISSION FACTORS</th>
<th>Auto Trip End Factors</th>
<th>Auto VMT Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROG</td>
<td>1.719 grams per trip</td>
<td>0.470 grams per mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOx</td>
<td>0.721</td>
<td>0.602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM10</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.218</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EMISSION REDUCTIONS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMISSION REDUCTIONS</th>
<th>Pounds per Year</th>
<th>Kilograms per Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROG:</td>
<td>1,018</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOx:</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM10:</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,740</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COST-EFFECTIVENESS OF:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CMAQ Funds:</th>
<th>$57.35 per pound</th>
<th>$114,700 per ton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Funding Sources:</td>
<td>$65.07 per pound</td>
<td>$130,147 per ton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Folsom Blvd.: East and West of Butterfield Way
Cottage Way: Fulton Ave. to Hacienda Way
Cottage Way: Morse Ave. to Butano Dr.
Hi Bill,

Thanks for reaching out to the CCC. We are unable to participate in this ATP project. Please include this email correspondence with your application as proof that you contacted us.

Best regards,

Melanie Wallace
Region I Analyst
California Conservation Corps
T (916)341-3153
F (877)834-4177
1719 24th Street
Sacramento, CA 95816
melanie.wallace@ccc.ca.gov

We will decline participation in this project.

Hi Rod, Carie,

This is for the Regional ATP Program cycle. Can you please review the attached ATP project information and let me know if you are able to potentially participate in this project by Monday, June 8th. If you are, please list what type of work your center would be able to complete. Feel free to contact them directly if you need more project information.

Thank you,

Wei Hsieh, Manager
Programs & Operations Division
California Conservation Corps
Attn: Wei Hsieh (CCC) and Danielle Lynch (CALCC)
As per ATP funding guidelines, the Sacramento Department of Transportation (SacDOT) is applying for ATP Regional funding for a sidewalk infill project as noted below. Please review and let us know if either the CCC or CALCCC would be interested in participating in this infrastructure project:

Application No.: 03-Sacramento County-04
Project Title: Sacramento County – Folsom Blvd & Cottage Way Sidewalk Infill Project
Description: Approximately 2,400’ of streetscape improvements including sidewalk infill including curb, gutter, drainage along Cottage Way and Folsom Blvd in Sacramento County.
Project Estimate: See attached for each street segment
Project Schedule:
Environmental & Design: 7/2016-12/2017
Infrastructure Construction: 5/2018-9/2018
Project Map and Drawings: See attached
Please let me know if you have any interest in participating in the infrastructure construction project.
Bill Irving, PE
Associate Civil Engineer
Sacramento County DOT
916-874-7640
From: Active Transportation Program [mailto:inquiry@atpcommunitycorps.org]
Sent: Wednesday, June 10, 2015 3:32 PM
To: Irving. Bill
Cc: atp@ccc.ca.gov; Vicari. Ron
Subject: Re: CCC & CALCC Invitation to participate in SacDOT ATP Regional Project

Hi Bill,

Thank you for contacting the Local Conservation Corps. Baldeo Singh of the Sacramento Regional Conservation Corps has responded with the ability to partner and provide labor on clearing and grubbing work for this project. Please include this email as proof that you reached out to the Local Corps. Feel free to contact Baldeo (bsingh@saccorps.org) directly if your project receives funding.

Thank you

Danielle

On Thu, Jun 4, 2015 at 2:10 PM, Irving. Bill <irvingb@saccounty.net> wrote:

Attn: Wei Hsieh (CCC) and Danielle Lynch (CALCC)

As per ATP funding guidelines, the Sacramento Department of Transportation (SacDOT) is applying for ATP Regional funding for a sidewalk infill project as noted below. Please review and let us know if either the CCC or CALCCC would be interested in participating in this infrastructure project:

Application No.: 03-Sacramento County-04

Project Title: Sacramento County – Folsom Blvd & Cottage Way Sidewalk Infill Project

Description: Approximately 2,400’ of streetscape improvements including sidewalk infill including curb, gutter, drainage along Cottage Way and Folsom Blvd in Sacramento County.

Project Estimate: See attached for each street segment

Project Schedule:
Environmental & Design: 7/2016-12/2017
Infrastructure Construction: 5/2018-9/2018
Project Map and Drawings: See attached

Please let me know if you have any interest in participating in the infrastructure construction project.

Bill Irving, PE
Associate Civil Engineer
Sacramento County DOT
916-874-7640
To:  Cottage Creek Neighborhood Association Meeting  
Wednesday, January 18, 2006  

From: Allan Desin (and other residents on Trimble Way north of Cottage Way)  
2130 Trimble Way  
Sacramento, Ca. 95825  

Phone: 359 0427  

Subject: Cottage Way traffic suggestion  

Over the last many years we have continued to see an erosion of the safe driving habits of drivers who use Cottage Way, between Watt and Fulton.  

We note that Cottage Way between Fulton and Howe is a three lane street with the center lane reserved for left turns or merging from a side street. There is also a bicycle lane in both directions. We further note that there is no school, no convalescent hospital and no full service hospital (including Emergency Services) on this section of Cottage Way.  

With respect to the Cottage Way section between Watt and Fulton, there is no sidewalk. It is quite dangerous for both pedestrians - primarily school children going to and from Cottage School across Cottage Park - and cyclists going either direction. Drivers from streets that cross Cottage Way, such as Kincaid, Trimble, Weldon and Landon, are put in a very dangerous situation if they are turning left onto Cottage as few cars and trucks honor the current 35 mile speed limit. Left turns into the Kaiser parking lot East of Morse frequently cause squealing of brakes as drivers are hurrying (we really mean speeding) to make the signal to turn left onto Morse.  

It is suggested that the Cottage Neighborhood Association sponsor a request to the County Supervisors to change the section of Cottage Way between Watt and Fulton into a 3 lane street with the provision that the additional width be used for bicycle/pedestrian lanes with a white line separating the cars from the pedestrians and bicyclists. This would then make Cottage a consistent through street all the way from Watt to Howe. It would also make it a safer street for children going to school and for Senior Citizens, such as myself.”  

Respectfully,  

Allan & Diane Desin  
(Resident on Trimble Way since 1963)  

Timothy & Dana Dickison  
(Tim a resident since 1963)  

Skip & Nancy Campbell  

Terry & Sue Seviour
Butterfield Station
Existing Land Use Plan
### 20 Year Invest Summary Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Costs</td>
<td>$1,685,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Present Cost</td>
<td>$1,620,192.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Benefits</td>
<td>$11,691,597.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Present Benefit</td>
<td>$7,743,105.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit-Cost Ratio</td>
<td>4.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 20 Year Itemized Savings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>$201,364.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>$69,342.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational</td>
<td>$77,821.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas &amp; Emissions</td>
<td>$5,527.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>$11,337,541.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funds Requested</td>
<td>$1,485,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Present Cost of Funds Requested</td>
<td>$1,427,884.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit Cost Ratio</td>
<td>5.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Project Name:** Folsom Cottage Sidewalk Infill  
**Project Location:** Sac County, Folsom Blvd and Cottage Way

### Bike Projects (Daily Person Trips for All Users) (Box1A)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Without Project</th>
<th>With Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Forecast (1 Yr after completion)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Commuters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Recreational Users</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Trips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Daily Trips (estimate)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1 YR after completion) (actual)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project Costs (Box 1D)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-SR2S Infrastructure Project Cost</th>
<th>SR2S Infrastructure Project Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Without Project</td>
<td>$1,685,000</td>
<td>$1,485,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Project</td>
<td>$1,685,000</td>
<td>$1,485,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ATP Requested Funds (Box 1E)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-SR2S Infrastructure</th>
<th>SR2S Infrastructure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Without Project</td>
<td>$1,485,000</td>
<td>$1,485,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With Project</td>
<td>$1,485,000</td>
<td>$1,485,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Crash Data (Box 1F)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Last 5 Yrs</th>
<th>Annual Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatal Crashes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injury Crashes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SAFETY COUNTERMEASURES (Improvements) (Box 1G) (Capitalized)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Y or N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian countdown signal heads</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian crossing</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance stop bar before crosswalk</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install overpass/underpass</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raised medians/refuge islands</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian crossing (new signs and markings only)</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian crossing (safety features/curb extensions)</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian signals</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike lanes</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk/pathway (to avoid walking along roadway)</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian crossing (with enhanced safety features)</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian crossing</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reduction factor countermeasures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Pedestrian Projects (Daily Person Trips for All Users) (Box 1B)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Without Project</th>
<th>With Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forecast (1 YR after project completion)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing step counts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(600 steps=0.3mi=1 trip)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing miles walked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project Information - Non SR2S Infrastructure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bike Class I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bike Class Type</td>
<td>Bike Class II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Safe Routes to School (SR2S) (Box 1C)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of student enrollment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate no. of students living along school route proposed for improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of students that currently walk or bike to school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected percentage of students that will walk or bike to school after the project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Folsom Ave & Cottage Way Sidewalk Infill
CalEnviroScreen 2.0 Zones
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### HSIP Cycle 6 - Program Release Date 11-14-13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unique Project ID</th>
<th>Original Application ID</th>
<th>MPO</th>
<th>Location of Work</th>
<th>Description of Work</th>
<th>Project Cost</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>B/C Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HSIP6-03-016</td>
<td>03-Sacramento County-2</td>
<td>SACOG</td>
<td>On Cottage Way between Cortez Lane and Watt Ave</td>
<td>Install bike lanes, a &quot;road diet&quot; (reduce travel lanes from 4 to 3), and modify intersections</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>$630,000</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSIP6-03-017</td>
<td>03-Sacramento County-4</td>
<td>SACOG</td>
<td>Various locations throughout Sacramento County</td>
<td>Construct sidewalks, curb ramps, curbs and gutters</td>
<td>$1,488,200</td>
<td>$1,339,200</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSIP6-03-018</td>
<td>03-Sacramento County-5</td>
<td>SACOG</td>
<td>Various locations throughout Sacramento County</td>
<td>Construct sidewalks, curb ramps, curbs and gutters</td>
<td>$1,570,100</td>
<td>$1,413,000</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSIP6-03-019</td>
<td>03-Sacramento County-6</td>
<td>SACOG</td>
<td>32 intersections throughout Sacramento County</td>
<td>Upgrade traffic signals</td>
<td>$1,060,900</td>
<td>$954,700</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HSIP Cycle 5 - Program Release Date 10-19-12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unique Project ID</th>
<th>Original Application ID</th>
<th>MPO</th>
<th>Location of Work</th>
<th>Description of Work</th>
<th>Project Cost</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>B/C Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HSIP5-03-019</td>
<td></td>
<td>SACOG</td>
<td>Fair Oaks Blvd. between Day Dr. and Arden Way</td>
<td>Install sidewalks, curb ramps, curbs and gutter</td>
<td>$758,700</td>
<td>$682,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSIP5-03-020</td>
<td></td>
<td>SACOG</td>
<td>Howe Ave. between El Camino Ave. and Shaw St.</td>
<td>Construct sidewalks, curb ramps, curbs and gutter; install mid-block signalized crosswalk</td>
<td>$876,500</td>
<td>$788,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSIP5-03-021</td>
<td></td>
<td>SACOG</td>
<td>Ten (10) signalized intersections throughout the city</td>
<td>Provide advanced &quot;dilemma zone&quot; protection for the high speed main street approaches at ten existing signalized intersections.</td>
<td>$313,800</td>
<td>$282,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HSIP Cycle 4 - Program Release Date 2-23-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unique Project ID</th>
<th>Original Application ID</th>
<th>MPO</th>
<th>Location of Work</th>
<th>Description of Work</th>
<th>Project Cost</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>B/C Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HSIP4-03-004</td>
<td></td>
<td>SACOG</td>
<td>Fair Oaks Blvd. between San Ramon Way and Eastern Ave.</td>
<td>Install median barrier</td>
<td>$758,700</td>
<td>$682,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Approved Safe Routes To School Funding

#### State-legislated Safe Routes To School (SR2S) Program (90% Funded)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State (SR2S)</th>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>Project Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
<th>SR2S Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cycle 9 2010/11</td>
<td>Mary A. Deierding ES</td>
<td>Panama Ave. to the south of Stanley Ave.</td>
<td>Construct curb, gutter, and sidewalks; install crosswalk striping</td>
<td>$484,100</td>
<td>$435,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle 10 2011/13</td>
<td>Howe Ave ES</td>
<td>Howe Ave. between El Camino Ave. and Red Robin Ln</td>
<td>Construct 5' sidewalks, curb and gutter, and curb ramps</td>
<td>$498,800</td>
<td>$448,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Federal Safe Routes To School (SRTS) Program (100% Funded)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State (SR2S)</th>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>Project Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cycle 3 2011</td>
<td>Anna Kirchgater ES</td>
<td>Stevenson Ave. from the southeast corner of Anna Kirchgater ES to the existing sidewalk near Marjon Way</td>
<td>Construct sidewalk, curb, gutter, and curb ramps</td>
<td>$768,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Active Transportation Program (ATP), Cycle 1, Grant Applications

1. Howe Avenue Bike & Pedestrian Improvement Project:
   Total Grant Award: $1,853,000 (no match required)
   Construction is expected to be complete by December 2016.
   This ATP grant award will fund the northerly 1,100’ of improvements, and combine with two previously awarded grants (SRTS and HSIP) to fund the entire Road Diet solution of Howe Avenue between El Camino Avenue and Marconi Avenue.

2. El Camino Ave Phase 2, Street and Sidewalk Improvements:
   Total Project cost $2,628,800. The total grant award was $1,691,800, with County matching and other funds totaling $937,000.
   Construction scheduled for summer 2015.
   The Project includes the construction of Class II bicycle & pedestrian facilities and improvements on El Camino Ave from Watt Avenue to Vera Way.
Community Meeting
on Improving Access to Transit along Folsom Boulevard

Join us at a community meeting to get an overview of results from all of the Plan Folsom Blvd. workshops over the past year. See what’s in store for the future to improve pedestrian and bicycle access to light rail stations, employment, shopping, residences and the American River Parkway. Help prioritize implementation of future improvements, and learn how to stay engaged in creating a better future for our communities along Folsom Boulevard from Watt/Manlove to Hazel.

Folsom Boulevard’s Future: What We Learned

Wednesday, February 13 6:00-8:00 p.m.

Rancho Cordova City Hall
American River Room
2729 Prospect Park Drive

Join us & bring your neighbors!
■ Light dinner will be provided

Sign up to receive more info: PlanFolsomBlvd.org
www.planfolsomblvd.org

Name______________________ Email Address: _______________________

Home Zip Code ______________ Work Zip Code______________________

**Topic: Where do we need better walking and bicycle facilities?**
Host: Walk Sacramento, Sacramento Area Bicycle Advocates, Local Government Commission

___ I would like to be informed of local planning efforts
___ I would like to lead a planning effort for ______
___ I would volunteer to be part of a “Walking School Bus,” if SCUSD transportation is eliminated.

**Topic: How can we support our restored transit service and transit supportive land use decisions?**
Host: Regional Transit & ULI – Transit Renewal and ULI TOD guidelines

___ I will try riding transit
___ I would like to learn more about transit renewal schedule
___ I would like to learn more about TOD plans

**Topic:**
Host: Stonebridge Properties

**Topic:** Watt Ave / US 50 Multi-modal Interchange
Host: Sacramento County Department of Transportation

___ I would like to learn more about this project. Please put me on your contact list for updates.
___ I would like to learn more about future transportation projects in my community.
___ I will try walking or riding my bike after the improvements are completed.

**Topic:** Park Prescriptions and Community Recreation Programs
Host: Cordova Recreation and Parks District, Sac Co Health Department & American Association of Retried Persons – Recreation to promote health

___ I am interested in joining a walking group in a nearby park.
___ I would be willing to lead a walking group in a nearby park.
___ I would volunteer time to help at a community center if there was one available in my community.

**Topic:**
Host: UC Davis Center for Regional Change & Sierra Health – Equity and growth

**Topic:**
Host: Valley Vision Next Economy and Franchise Tax Board

**Topic:**
Host: Neighborhood Associations

Topic:
Host: Sacramento County Sheriff

**Topic: Survey on Community Priorities**
Host: Sacramento Area Council of Governments
Folsom Blvd. and Butterfield LRT Station Outreach Photos

Mix Uses, but Not Necessarily in the Same Place

- The creation of an attractive community does not require that uses be mixed on the same site, or even at the same station.

- A transit corridor that offers an advantageous mix of uses, however, can be used to integrate a number of separate activity nodes, particularly when the various uses are close together, easily accessible, and support each other.
APPENDIX A: PUBLIC WORKSHOP RESULTS

The Project Team held four public workshops during February and March 2003 in different locations of Sacramento County. The goals of the public workshops were to provide some background information to attendees and to gather input regarding bicycling destinations, bicycling and commuting routes, difficult connections, and potential bicycle improvements. Dates and locations of the public workshops were as follows:

- February 14 – North Highlands
- February 20 – Arden Arcade/Carmichael
- February 21 – Rosemont
- March 19 – Fair Oaks

Marketing for the public workshops included posting notices on the Bike Master Plan’s Web site and the County’s homepage, distributing flyers at county bike shops and at the AMGEN Tour of California, postings on various bicycling listservs, and providing the information to various agencies and organizations. Agencies and organizations included Sacramento Bike Hikers, Sacramento Area Bicycle Advocates (included in their newsletter), local Transportation Management Associations, public libraries, law enforcement (CHP, County’s Sheriff Department), City of Sacramento’s Bike Unit, neighboring jurisdictions, Environmental Council of Sacramento, Sacramento Bicycle Kitchen, Educational Institutions, non-profit organizations (WALK Sacramento, the Sacramento Transportation Equity Network), and health institutions (UC Davis Medical Center). Advertisements were also placed in the Sacramento Bee.

Nine people attended the North Highlands workshop, 24 attended the Arden/Arcade workshop, 19 attended the Rosemont workshop, and 22 attended the Fair Oaks workshop. Each workshop followed the same format: the Project Team presented an overview of the Bicycle Master Plan, and then participants divided into groups of six to eight people, each with a facilitator. The groups then marked up large-scale plotted maps of the County with the following information:

- Destinations in the county, including bicycle paths
- Bicycling commute routes
- Barriers or difficult connections
- Recommended improvements

More than 350 comments were collected from the four meetings’ maps. Participants identified 180 difficult connections and proposed 138 connections/improvements. In addition to the maps, workshop attendees provided an additional 75 comments on cards.

The Project Team organized the notes into 10 categories (see Table A-1). As the table shows, the public had detailed insight for their vision for bicycling in Sacramento County. Most comments were regarding proposed routes or difficult connections. The majority of these routes are along major County arterials. Comments regarding improving these roadways and finding alternative routes for bicyclists were raised numerous times.
TABLE A-1: FIRST PUBLIC WORKSHOP COMMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – Bike Parking</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – Bike Routes/Lanes</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – Bridge</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – Difficult Connection</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – Education</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – Enforcement</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 – Maintenance</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 – No bicycle detection</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 – Signage</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 – Trail</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure A-1 shows facilities marked on the maps at the public workshops and the relevant existing conditions or improvement recommendation. The map was used in the proposed bicycle facilities evaluation.

As noted from the additional comments received at the meetings, members of the public found the workshops fun and interesting. Also, attendees realized that many of the workshops’ participants had the same concerns for difficult connections and improving the county’s bicycling connections.

E-MAIL COMMENTS

The Sacramento County Bicycle Master Plan’s public input effort also included an e-mail address for comments. This e-mail address was advertised on the workshops’ marketing flyers, posted during the workshops’ presentations, and provided on the project Web site. As a result, over 20 individuals sent e-mails, providing 86 additional comments. Table A-2 shows the categorization of these comments. Frequent comments included proposed routes/lanes, maintenance locations, and proposed trail locations. Maintenance refers to locations with cracks in the road or where pavement needs repaving. Roadways should be well maintained for bicycle use, especially along marked routes.
### TABLE A-2: E-MAIL COMMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – Bike Parking</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – Bike Routes/Lanes</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – Bridge</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – Difficult Connection</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – Education</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – Enforcement</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 – Maintenance</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 – No bicycle detection</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 – Signage</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 – Trail</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>86</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### USER SURVEY RESULTS

Part of the public input process for the Bicycle Master Plan was a survey to gather bicycle use and preferences in the county. The survey was available online between January 22, 2008 and March 24, 2008. A copy of the survey is included in Figure A-2. Advertising for the electronic version of the survey occurred on the project’s Web site and in Sacramento Area Bicycle Advocates’ newsletter, and the URL for the survey was included on all of the public workshops marketing materials. Hard copies of the surveys were provided at all of the public workshops.

This Appendix includes charts of the surveys’ results. The survey netted 528 responses from 58 ZIP codes. Figure A-3 in shows the number of respondents from each ZIP code who participated in the survey. Below are some of the surveys’ results.

- The majority of survey respondents ride their bike for exercise and pleasure, followed by using their bike to commute to and from work (Figure A-4).
- Many respondents of the survey have an intermediate or high level of bicycling experience.
- The majority of respondents ride three to five days a week (Figure A-5).
- The largest deterrents to bicycling include a lack of bicycling facilities, cars driving too fast, and drivers not sharing the road (Figure A-6).
- The majority of survey respondents prefer off-street bicycle paths to all other bicycle facilities (Figure A-7).
Figure A-2: Bicycle User Survey

Bicycle User Survey
Sacramento County Bicycle Master Plan

Sacramento County is currently updating the Bicycle Master Plan and we need your input! The goal of the plan is to make the county a more enjoyable place for you and your family to bike for recreation, to school, or to work. Filling out this survey will help us create a plan that meets your needs and desires. If you have additional information to share or questions about the process, feel free to contact Sacramento County through the contact information below. You can also link to the survey via the project website at: http://saccountybikeplan.webexone.com

TELL US ABOUT BICYCLING IN SACRAMENTO COUNTY

Why and where do you bike? (check all that apply)
☐ For exercise/ health reasons
☐ For pleasure
☐ For shopping/ errands
☐ To get to work
☐ To get to school
☐ To get to transit
☐ I don't bike
☐ Other (describe) ____________________________

What prevents you from biking more often?
☐ Destinations are too far away
☐ Too many cars / cars drive too fast
☐ Drivers don't share the road
☐ I travel with small children
☐ No bike paths, lanes or bike routes
☐ I have to carry things
☐ Not enough time
☐ Insufficient lighting
☐ Bikeways/roads in poor condition
☐ Weather
☐ Other (describe) ____________________________

How many days per week do you ride? _____

What is your zip code?________________________

What is the average distance of your rides (one-way)?
☐ Under 2 miles
☐ 2-5 miles
☐ 6-10 miles
☐ 11-24 miles
☐ 25 and above

Where are your favorite places or routes to bike? Please be specific.
__________________________________________
__________________________________________
__________________________________________
__________________________________________
__________________________________________
__________________________________________

Where are the most difficult places for you to bike and why? Where would you ride if you could and what prevents you from riding there?
__________________________________________
__________________________________________
__________________________________________
__________________________________________

Please rank your preference for bicycle facilities, on a scale of 1 to 4 (1 being most preferred and 4 being least preferred)

Off-street paved bike paths _____
On-street bike lanes _____
Bike routes _____
Unpaved trails or dirt paths _____

What can be done to encourage you to bike more in Sacramento County?
__________________________________________
__________________________________________
__________________________________________
__________________________________________

Email surveys and additional comments to: comments@saccountybikeplan.com
Mail surveys to: Alta Planning + Design
2500 9th Street, Suite 212
Berkeley, CA 94710

For more information, please visit the project website at: http://saccountybikeplan.webexone.com
Figure A-4 - Why and Where Do You Bike?

Figure A-5 - How Many Days Per Week Do You Ride?
WHAT PREVENTS YOU FROM BIKING MORE OFTEN?

- Destinations are too Far Away
- Too Many Cars/Cars Drive too Fast
- Drivers Do Not Share the Road
- I Travel With Small Children
- No Bike Paths, Lanes or Bike Routes
- I Have to Carry Things
- Not Enough Time
- Insufficient Lighting
- Bikeways/Roads in Poor Conditions
- Weather
- Other

Percent of Respondents
(Respondents Could Choose Multiple Answers)