August 22, 2011

Ms. Lacey Symons, Bicycle and Pedestrian Coordinator
Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG)
1415 L Street, Suite 300
Sacramento, California 95814

SUBJECT: SACOG 2011 BICYCLE & PEDESTRIAN FUNDING PROGRAM – CITY OF SACRAMENTO CITY COLLEGE PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE OVERCROSSING

Dear Ms. Symons:

Please find enclosed the City of Sacramento’s application for the Sacramento Area Council of Government’s (SACOG’s) 2011 Bike & Pedestrian Funding Program for the City College Pedestrian and Bicycle Overcrossing. By the City Manager’s designation, I am acknowledging that this application is officially authorized by the jurisdiction.

The City College Pedestrian and Bicycle Overcrossing is an important part of our transportation system that serves both bicyclists and pedestrians. It is the embodiment of an appropriate and thoughtful public investment in transit oriented development that will be appreciated for years to come. We hope that you will find this to be a competitive project and partner with us in funding this vital transportation project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Jerry Way, Director
City of Sacramento
Department of Transportation

Enclosures
### P. Project Application

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Project Title</strong></th>
<th>Sacramento City College Pedestrian and Bicycle Overcrossing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SACOG ID number (if available)</strong></td>
<td>MTIP: SAC 24461 SACOG BP&amp;T MP: 3028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PPNO and/or EA number (if applicable)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal ID number (if applicable)</strong></td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Responsible Project Manager/Contact** | Ryan Moore  
Supervising Engineer  
915 I Street, Room 2000  
916-808-8279  
rmoore@cityofsacramento.org |
| **Co-sponsor/Partner Agencies** | None |
| **Project Location** | In the City of Sacramento, north of Sutterville Road and 24th Street and adjacent to the Sacramento City College Light Rail Station. (See map on page 4) |
| **Project Scope/ Description (250 word limit)** | The City of Sacramento proposes to construct a new pedestrian and bicycle overcrossing of the UPRR Right of Way between the Sacramento City College Campus and the Curtis Park Village Development. The project will provide a viable and pleasant alternative to automotive travel for pedestrian and bicycle commuters as well as recreational users. Among the many benefits of this project, the new overcrossing will:  
- Provide safe and pleasant access for pedestrians and cyclists across the UPRR tracks  
- Provide convenient access to light rail for current and future residents of Curtis Park  
- Provide neighborhood connectivity  
- Fill a gap in the regional bikeway network  
- Provide safe and convenient access for the disabled community  
- Provide a distinctive architectural enhancement for the area  
- Compliment a planned $10,000,000 retrofit of Hughes Stadium on the City College Campus  
- Provide a more direct and safe route for pedestrian traffic to/from C.K. McClatchy High School and other schools in the area. |
- Allow the Curtis Park Village development to realize its potential as one of the region’s most significant Transit Oriented Developments

| Project Schedule (estimated month and year): |  
| 1. Start environmental/preliminary engineering | 1. Completed  
| 2. Final ED approved - Start engineering/design | 2. Completed  
| Total Project Cost (Part Q) | $9,715,000  
| Total Funding Request | $2,963,175  
| Funding committed from other sources |  
| 1. Environmental/preliminary engineering | 1. $400,000 SACOG Community Design  
| 2. Engineering/design | $100,000 Local match from TDA  
| 3. R/W acquisition & utilities | 2. $1,700,000 Proposition 1B and TDA  
| 4. Construction/procurement | 3. R/W donations not yet secured pending construction grant applications  
| TOTAL | 4. Construction funds not yet secured pending grant applications  
| Describe any other potential funding sources | Total: $2,200,000 from other sources  
| Other Potential Funding Sources: |  
| Real estate contributions, TDA and Measure A. |  

<p>| Can you build a usable partial stage of this project? If so, describe scope and cost. | No. Because the scope of work is a bridge, it is not possible to build only a single phase. For instance, it would not be possible to construct only the approaches and not the main span. Likewise, it would not be practical to acquire right of way and then not construct the project due to the fact that without a bridge project, none of the real estate donors (RT, Los Rios Community College District, nor Petrovich Development) would have any impetus to donate the property. Nor would the City have any reason to acquire easements to the property. Consequently, the project requires the full amount. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Have you identified any significant and reasonably likely risks to the project?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Describe:</strong> (150 words maximum total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Risks that would change scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Risks that would change schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Risks that would change cost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Risks that would change scope:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential scope changing risks were identified during the feasibility study. The current project has been structured to minimize those risks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Risks that would change schedule:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The risks that would change schedule would be coordination of the federal programming year, delays associated with authorization and obligation of funds, and review time by Union Pacific Railroad.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Risks that would change cost:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As the City of Sacramento standard practice, project cost estimates include acceptable contingency and escalation. There are no inordinate cost increases expected.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Project Study Report</strong> or equivalent completion date (if PSR completed, attach electronic file to CD of application packet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>See feasibility report included in the CD.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Environmental Justice:</strong> Include your brief response to the following: What kind of outreach to the community and to other stakeholders do you plan to undertake? Will low-income or minority members of the community be given an opportunity to fully participate in this outreach? Evaluate the benefits and burdens of this project with regard to low income and minority members of the community. (150 word limit)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During the development of this project, the City of Sacramento held 3 community meetings on the proposed project to gather input to ensure the project meets the needs of the community. Formal project updates were also presented to the City County Bicycle Advisory Committee (SacBAC). The outreach conducted was made available to all income levels and minorities in the community. In addition, the City operates an interpreter service that allows citizens to have an opportunity to provide their input on projects using their own language. The purpose of this project is to integrate a bicycle and pedestrian connection into Sacramento’s south central neighborhoods, thereby providing key connections to them. This project provides better access to the existing Light Rail transit system and the local community college. This project does not place any burdens on low income citizens in the community. It actually benefits people who cannot afford to drive an automobile, especially residents of south central Sacramento which has areas of lower income neighborhoods.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TE Eligible Projects:** Will you be working with a community conservation corps or the California Conservation Corps (yes/no)? Please explain (50 word limit).

Yes. Aspects involving the landscaping materials can be performed by the California Conservation Corps.
Q. **COST AND SCHEDULE SUMMARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Cost Estimate</th>
<th>Amount Requested</th>
<th>Month/Year Funding Requested</th>
<th>For SACOG Use Only</th>
<th>For SACOG Use Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-capital Staff Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-capital Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(maps, brochures, racks, printing, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility Studies</td>
<td>$400,000*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>$100,000*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering/Design</td>
<td>$1,700,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Construction Management</td>
<td>$7,815,000</td>
<td>$2,963,175</td>
<td>July 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$9,715,000</td>
<td><strong>$2,963,175</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Prior Project, omitted from total project cost*
## R. Engineer's Estimate

**PROJECT NAME:** Sacramento City College Pedestrian/Bicycle Overcrossing  
**SPONSOR:** City of Sacramento

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO.</th>
<th>ITEM DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>AMOUNT ($)</th>
<th>PARTICIPATING COSTS</th>
<th>NON-PARTICIPATING COSTS</th>
<th>STIP-T&amp;E Eligible</th>
<th>RSTP Eligible</th>
<th>CMAQ Eligible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mobilization</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$470,000</td>
<td>$470,000</td>
<td>$470,000</td>
<td>$470,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Clearing and Grubbing</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Construction Site Management</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Progress Schedule (Critical Path Method)</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Roadway Excavation</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>1015</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$30,450</td>
<td>$30,450</td>
<td>$30,450</td>
<td>30,450</td>
<td>30,450</td>
<td>30,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Aggregate Base, Class 2</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>$65</td>
<td>$13,325</td>
<td>$13,325</td>
<td>$13,325</td>
<td>13,325</td>
<td>13,325</td>
<td>13,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Hot Mix Asphalt, Type A</td>
<td>TON</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>$90</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>13,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>PeDESTRIAN RAILING</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>1780</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$267,000</td>
<td>$267,000</td>
<td>$267,000</td>
<td>267,000</td>
<td>267,000</td>
<td>267,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Eligible costs are indicated for STIP-T&E, RSTP, and CMAQ.
- Costs are subject to funding availability and may vary.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARCHITECTURAL TREATMENT</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Stair</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>$260</td>
<td>$416,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Stair</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>$260</td>
<td>$351,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure Excavation (Bridge)</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td>$5,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure Backfill (Bridge)</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$3,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48&quot; Cast-In-Drilled-Hole Concrete Piling</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$84,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Concrete, Bridge Footing</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$12,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Concrete, Bridge - Substructure</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>$660</td>
<td>$48,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Concrete, Bridge - Deck</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>$660</td>
<td>$25,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansion Joint Assembly</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Finish for Columns</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$19,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar Reinforcing Steel (Bridge)</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>83000</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$83,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furnish Structural Steel (Bridge)</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>88000</td>
<td>$4</td>
<td>$352,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erect Structural Steel (Main Bridge)</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deck Cable Assemblies</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>4040</td>
<td>$35</td>
<td>$141,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal Deck</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>2088</td>
<td>$8</td>
<td>$16,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Steel Deck Edge Forms</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean and Paint Structural Steel (Main Bridge)</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Metal (Bridge Deck Drainage System)</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Bridge Railing/Fence</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$52,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,396,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency (20%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,079,257</td>
<td>$1,079,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Relocation Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$690,000</td>
<td>$690,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management/Contract Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$650,000</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PROJECT COST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,015,541</td>
<td>$7,935,541</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Participating Costs                             |      |          | 7,935,541 |
| Maximum Federal Funds (88.53%)                        |      |          | 7,025,334 |

Please circle current status of project:
- Feasibility Study
- PSR
- Environmental
- 30% Design
- 60% Design
- 90% Design
- 100% Design

Footnote 1:
The total project cost shown excludes $1.7 million of locally funds for engineering design, because the City of Sacramento does not seek federal aid for the PE phase.
The total project cost including those PE costs is $9,715,000.
S. BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN PROGRAM SPECIFIC QUESTIONS

Project Screening for Capital Projects

Please respond yes/no (if no, please explain):

1. Is this project included in the Regional Bicycle, Pedestrian, & Trails Master Plan as a planned project? Yes, it is project number 3028

2. Is this project ready for inclusion into the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program, with project scope and cost? Yes, it is project number SAC24461

Capital Project Performance Outcomes

Please describe how the project supports one or more of the performance outcomes for the programming round. (Half page per item, maximum)

1. Eliminates barriers

   The single biggest impediment to pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the area is the Union Pacific Railroad right-of-way, which runs north and south throughout the City. In the 7 mile stretch of railroad right-of-way between downtown and the southern City limits, there are only 8 locations for east/west traffic to cross the tracks, and only 5 of those have on-street bicycle facilities. The 1.7 mile section between the at-grade crossings at Freeport Boulevard and 26th Avenue is the heart of the area with respect to alternate modes travel. The only crossing for any mode in this section is the Sutterville Road overcrossing, which is a high speed arterial lacking bike lanes and accessible pedestrian facilities. The City of Sacramento seeks to fill this deficiency with the construction of the City College POC.
2. Closes gaps

As envisioned, the bridge would connect the Sacramento Regional Transit’s (RT) City College Light Rail Station on Sacramento City College Campus on the west to the site of the Curtis Park Village development project on the east. At a larger scale, this bridge will connect the communities around both Land Park and Curtis Park and the various activity centers associated with them.

3. Connects to/within activity centers

Situated immediately south of downtown Sacramento, Curtis Park and Land Park are two of the City’s most well established and historically significant neighborhoods. The proposed overcrossing will provide an integrated connection to all of the activity centers in the area,
including many of the City’s most well-known landmarks and destinations such as Land Park, the Sacramento Zoo, Fairy Tale Town, Sierra 2 Community Center, Sacramento City College, Hughes Stadium, and notably, the proposed Curtis Park Village development project just east of the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) tracks.

Curtis Park Village is a mixed use infill development project that has invested millions of private dollars in the remediation of an aged railroad maintenance yard and reclaimed it for the purposes of developing it into one of the largest urban infill projects in the region: a project that embodies the phrase “Smart Growth”. The development project will provide a mix of single and multi-family residential, commercial, and retail uses which will serve as a model for the implementation of the type of development envisioned by SACOG’s Blueprint project.

4. **Increases the number of bicycle and walking trips (reduces Vehicles Miles Traveled)**

The City College bicycle and pedestrian overcrossing project will take advantage of the fact that it is located in one of the most pedestrian oriented settings within the City of Sacramento. Only minutes on foot from both Curtis Park and Land Park and the associated neighborhoods, the bridge builds on alternative mode synergy which already exists in the area. Also, by virtue of the location of the western landing, the new bridge will enjoy a symbiotic relationship with the Light Rail station which will encourage transit usage for residents of Curtis Park Village, as well as consumers from outside the area who may wish to patronize the new retail and commercial establishments within Curtis Park Village. Finally, the project will benefit and be benefitted by its proximity to Hughes Stadium on the Sacramento City College Campus. The Los Rios Community College District is currently in the process of preliminary design for a $10.3 million retrofit of Hughes Stadium. The goal
of the stadium retrofit is to attract and host many of California’s premiere sporting events. The new bridge will serve to enhance access to the venue during these events.

5. **Improves safety/security for bicyclists and pedestrians**

The strategic location of the project is ideal for promoting alternatives to travel via single occupancy vehicle. As an exclusively bicycle/pedestrian facility, the bridge provides a comfortable and pleasant experience for users who wish to travel between Curtis Park and Land Park.

The alternative to the proposed bridge is to use Sutterville Road overcrossing to the south, which is not very friendly to pedestrians and bicyclists. Traffic on Sutterville Road is heavy with approximately 24,000 to 27,000 vehicles per day. Eighty-five percent of these vehicles are travelling at 39.7 miles per hour. Because of the presence of pedestrians in the vicinity of Sacramento City College, the posted speed is set at 35 miles per hour even though the prevailing speed is higher. The running slopes of the sidewalk on the overcrossing are too steep to comply with accessibility standards, making it very difficult for persons with disabilities. The street does not have bike lanes either. While there is a future plan to put bike lane stripes on the overcrossing, there is insufficient room to the east to continue the bike lanes on Sutterville Road.

**Selection Considerations**

1. **Goals**

Please briefly describe how the project supports additional capital or non-capital goals, and how well. Please refer to Part F. (Half page per goal, maximum)

# 2. Provide connections to regional and local public transit systems, at stops, stations, and terminals:

**The proposed project connects directly to the City College Light Rail Station.**

# 3. Provide connections within, through, or to regional and local activity centers such as schools, libraries, community centers, colleges, universities, hospitals, medical offices, senior residences, parks, athletic facilities, government services, employment centers, and high-density residential or mixed-use areas:

**The proposed project connects directly to the community college, athletic facilities, parks and planned mixed use development.**

# 4. Fill in gaps on existing, planned, or proposed bicycle or pedestrian routes, including intercommunity routes:

**The proposed project is compliant with the bikeway master plan which calls for a railroad crossing to the east of the Sacramento City College campus.**

# 5. Provide bicycle and pedestrian access across barriers such as arterial roads, highways, freeways, rivers, canals, creeks, and railroads:

**The proposed project is a railroad overcrossing in an area that is significantly bisected by the railroad right of way.**
6. Improve the time convenience of walking and bicycling, for example with shortcuts or special facilities such as bike/pedestrian boulevards:

In addition to providing access over the Union Pacific Railroad right of way, the proposed project will provide a path that connects with 12th Avenue so that east-west pedestrian and bicycle traffic would not need to go through the College Campus.

7. Improve the safety and security of walking and bicycling:

The proposed project provides an automobile free crossing, which is in contrast with the existing Sutterville Road overcrossing which has fast moving and heavy traffic.

8. Provide an aesthetic, pleasant, or more comfortable biking or walking experience:

The proposed project will be an aesthetically pleasing tied-arch design, in a quieter, less frantic environment and offering a place to have views of the buildings on the Sacramento City College campus as well as the future buildings of the Curtis Park Village development.

10. Complement projects funded with other regional or state sources such as the Community Design or Safe Routes to School programs, thereby improving bicycle and/or pedestrian access provided by those programs:

The proposed project is an existing SACOG Community Design project for the feasibility and environmental documentation. Additional funding from the Community Design program is being sought for the construction.

2. Project Benefit Estimate

Please provide a quantitative and/or qualitative benefit analysis.

a. Quantifiable Benefits Methodology

\[
\text{Estimate of Existing Usage} = x \quad \text{(Can be zero)}
\]
\[
\text{Estimate of Increase in Usage} = y \quad \text{(Can be zero)}
\]
\[
\text{Length of Project (miles)} = a
\]
\[
\text{Quantifiable Benefits} = (x \cdot (a/10 \text{ mph}) \cdot ($5/\text{hr})) + (y \cdot (a/10 \text{ mph}) \cdot ($10/\text{hr}))
\]
\[
= \text{$ benefits}
\]

\[
\text{Estimate of Existing Usage} = x = 0
\]

Annual Average Daily Traffic (ADT) for the nearest travel way = 24,000 (Sutterville Rd.)

\[
\text{Estimate of Increase in Usage} = y = 126,000 \text{ bicyclists per year (based on number of trips induced)} \cdot (24,000)(2.1\%)(250)
\]

\[
\text{Length of Project (miles)} = a = \text{length of travel reduced} = 0.7 \text{ miles}
\]

\[
\text{Quantifiable Benefits} = (x \cdot (a/10 \text{ mph}) \cdot ($5/\text{hr})) + (y \cdot (a/10 \text{ mph}) \cdot ($10/\text{hr}))
\]
\[
= 0 + (126,000 \cdot (0.7/10 \text{ mph}) \cdot ($10/\text{hr}))
\]
\[
= \text{$88,200 annually}
\]
b. **Qualitative Benefits Methodology**

In one or two paragraphs, please describe benefits to the project that are not measured by the dollar figure above. 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.

This proposed project will encourage walking and bicycling. The existing conditions on Sutterville Road are not desirable for most pedestrians and bicyclists. Combined with the long distances currently involved, this problem is even more pronounced for walking trips. With the new overcrossing there will be better connectivity to access the college campus, light rail station and the future development of Curtis Park Village. When considering the future connections that are being studied, even more travel would be expected as people would use this overcrossing to go to major activity centers in the Land Park and Curtis Park neighborhoods.

Beyond the community needs, this project will also have regional significance. These connections would provide for major east-west travel in the urban core area.

For safety projects, other methods of demonstrating benefits can be found at:

http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/hsip/resources/fhwasa09029/sec4.cfm

or

http://onlinemanuals.txdot.gov/txdotmanuals/hsi/using_the_safety_improvement_index.htm

3. **Commitment to Project**

Please briefly describe your agency’s commitment to implement the project. Examples may include governing body approval, approved plan, engineering drawings completed, NEPA/CEQA completion, etc. (Half page maximum)

The City of Sacramento’s commitment to this project is evident through the various actions taken by the Sacramento City Council to support not only this project, but also the Curtis Park Village Development project.

- The Sacramento City Council has approved the project CEQA document, as well as the allocation of $1,700,000 for the design phase of the project.
- The City has received NEPA clearance for bridge construction.
- The overcrossing has been adopted into the City’s Bikeway Master Plan.
- The City has approved a final EIR and granted entitlements for the Curtis Park Village development project.
- The City has submitted a successful application to the State of California for Proposition 1c funds for transit oriented development and brownfield clean-
up, which has secured $13 million toward the development of Curtis Park Village.

- The City will independently fund the construction of a route from the proposed overcrossing to 12th Avenue, thus providing access to Freeport Boulevard, thereby reducing the bicycle and pedestrian through-traffic on the Sacramento City College campus.

Other Considerations

Below are other considerations that will used to make funding recommendations to the Board. If other considerations relevant to the project are not already addressed earlier in the application, please briefly provide appropriate information. (One page maximum)

- Analysis of Parts P, Q, R (e.g. project eligibility for federal funds and fund types, schedule, cost, work with conservation corps, risk to project, etc.)
- Project’s air quality benefits
- Application follows Content (Part N) and Format (Part O) requirements
- Agency’s historical performance in delivering federal aid projects (i.e. following federal rules, STIP guidelines, delivery timeliness, etc.).
- Projects are not serving primarily recreational trips or equestrians, and are not part of developer-funded basic good practices (see footnote 1).
- Capital projects that support Blueprint implementation will be given priority over non-capital projects and programs, although up to 10 percent of the funding in a round may be used for non-capital projects.
- The project is closely related to local activity center/compact development area, and identified in the local general plan that will be implemented soon but is beyond what is required of the developer to pay for.
- A bicycle or pedestrian project located in an undeveloped area that connects two developed areas with good circulation, particularly in areas with land use planning consistent with Blueprint principles.
- Projects that benefit both public transit or roadways and bicycling/walking may be funded partially from this funding source with the expectation that transit or roadway funding sources will pay for the remainder.
- The same type of program or project has been implemented successfully elsewhere.
- For inter-community projects, priority given to those proposals offering evidence of strong support by all local jurisdictions where the project is located.

See Miscellaneous Items
MAPS AND EXHIBITS

View from Hughes Stadium

View from Light Rail Station
MAPS AND EXHIBITS

The overall project cost breakdown for the City College POC project is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preliminary Engineering Phase</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Fund Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility Study</td>
<td>$400,000*</td>
<td>SACOG Community Design (Round 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
<td>$100,000*</td>
<td>SACOG Community Design (Round 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPRR Costs</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>Proposition 1B Funds/Local Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Design</td>
<td>$1,650,000</td>
<td>Proposition 1B Funds/Local Funds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Right of Way Phase</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Fund Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way Engineering</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>Proposition 1B Funds/Local Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way Acquisition</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>Proposed: SACOG 2011 programming/Pvt. Donation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Phase</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Fund Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utility Relocation</td>
<td>$690,000</td>
<td>Proposed: SACOG 2011 programming/Local Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$6,475,000</td>
<td>Proposed: SACOG 2011 programming/Local Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
<td>Proposed: SACOG 2011 programming/Local Funds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Separate project, omitted from total project cost

Total $9,715,000

Omits non-participating costs (design phase)
**MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS**

**Project Funding**
In addition to the request in this application, the City of Sacramento is requesting the maximum allowable amount under the Community Design program, $4,000,000.

The City will also be applying the dollar value from the donations of real estate on the City College campus as well as the Curtis Park Village land to the local match on the project through the Flexible match program (outlined in section 3.9 of the Local Assistance Procedures Manual and Chapter 6 of the FHWA Project Development Guide for R/W Projects). While the exact value of the donation must be determined by an appraisal, the preliminary estimate is that the total value of the real estate donations is approximately $50,000. Currently, the real estate dedication on the Curtis Park Village side of the project has been conditioned as part of the project entitlements.

It is noteworthy that of the total project cost, approximately 28%, or $2,746,000 have come from, or are proposed to come from, locally controlled sources (including non-participating design costs). This constitutes a sizeable investment in the project by the City of Sacramento.

**Project Timeline**
Pending the availability of funding, the current delivery schedule for the City College POC will dovetail perfectly with the development of Curtis Park Village, which is expected to break ground in 2013. The schedule for delivery of the Overcrossing is as follows:

- **Design Phase:**
  - Complete in Mid 2012
  - $1.45M Prop 1B
  - $250K local funds

- **Right of Way Phase:**
  - Complete in early 2013
  - $50K real estate donation
  - $150K Community Design

- **Construction Phase:**
  - Complete in late 2014
  - $900K local funds
  - $4M Community Design
  - $2.9M Bike/Ped Program

The City of Sacramento feels very confident that the project is deliverable on the proposed timeframe, as many of the time consuming tasks which are normally culprits for schedule delays have already been completed or substantially completed.
PART T: EMISSIONS CALCULATIONS FOR CMAQ FUNDING

The project is located within the City of Sacramento, which is a Capital City with a population of 456,394.

The Sacramento City College Pedestrian and Bicycle Overcrossing project will connect the Sacramento City College Light Rail Station to the future Curtis Park Village.

The constructed portion is 0.3 miles.

Inputs to Calculate Cost-Effectiveness:

Funding Dollars (Funding): $2,963,175

Effectiveness Period (Life): 20 years (Class 1)

Days (D): 250 days

Average Length (L) of bicycle trips: 1.8 miles (default)

Annual Average Daily Traffic (ADT): 24,000 trips

Adjustment (A) on ADT for auto trips replaced by bike trips: 0.020 (>1 & <2 mi, Class 1)

Credit (C) for Activity Centers near the project: 0.002 (>3 & <7 w/in 1/4 mi.)

Emission Factors
(From Table 3, Average Auto Emission Factors, March 2010, CARB for a 20 year life):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Auto Trip End Factor</th>
<th>Auto VMT Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROG Factor</td>
<td>0.488 grams/trip</td>
<td>0.180 grams/mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOx Factor</td>
<td>0.260 grams/trip</td>
<td>0.189 grams/mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM10 Factor</td>
<td>0.009 grams/trip</td>
<td>0.222 grams/mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>3.862 grams/trip</td>
<td>2.044 grams/mile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Calculations:

Annual Auto Trip Reduced = (D) * (ADT) * (A + C)

= (250) * (24,000) * (0.020 + 0.002) = 132,000 trips/year

Annual Auto VMT Reduced = (Auto Trips Reduced) * (L)

= (132,000) * (1.8) = 237,600 miles/year
Annual Emission Reductions (ROG, NOx and PM10) in lbs. per year:

\[
\text{Annual Emission Reductions} = \left[ (\text{Annual Auto Trips Reduced}) \times (\text{Auto Trips End Factor}) + (\text{Annual Auto VMT Reduced}) \times (\text{Auto VMT Factor}) \right] / 454
\]

- **ROG:** \[
\frac{[(132,000) \times 0.488] + [(237,600) \times 0.180]}{454} = 236.09 \text{ lbs. per year}
\]

- **NOx:** \[
\frac{[(132,000) \times 0.260] + [(237,600) \times 0.189]}{454} = 174.51 \text{ lbs. per year}
\]

- **PM10:** \[
\frac{[(132,000) \times 0.009] + [(237,600) \times 0.222]}{454} = 118.8 \text{ lbs. per year}
\]

**Total:** 529.40 lbs. per year

Cost-Effectiveness of Funding Dollars: \(\frac{\text{CRF} \times \text{Funding}}{\text{ROG} + \text{NOx} + \text{PM10}}\)

**Capital Recovery Factor (CRF):** \[
\text{CRF} = \frac{(1+i)^n - 1}{i}\]

\[
\text{where:} \quad i = \text{discount rate (Assume 3\%)} = 0.03 \\
\text{n = project life, 20 years} = 20
\]

\[
\text{CRF} = \frac{(1+0.03)^{20} - 0.03}{(1+0.03)^{20} - 1} = 0.067
\]

**Cost Effectiveness of Funding Dollars**

\[
= (0.067 \times 2,963,175) / (529.40) = \$376.23 \text{ per lb.}
\]

FOR CMAQ PROJECTS ONLY:

Annual Emission Reductions (ROG, NOx and PM10) in kg/day:

**For ROG:**

\[
\text{Lbs. reduced per year} = \frac{236.09 \times 2.2 \times 365}{2.2 \times 365} = 0.294 \text{ kg/day ROG}
\]

**For NOx:**

\[
\text{Lbs. reduced per year} = \frac{174.51 \times 2.2 \times 365}{2.2 \times 365} = 0.217 \text{ kg/day NOx}
\]

**For PM10:**

\[
\text{Lbs. reduced per year} = \frac{118.8 \times 2.2 \times 365}{2.2 \times 365} = 0.148 \text{ kg/day PM10}
\]