



CITY OF SACRAMENTO

CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE
RECEIVED
JAN 28 1981

DEPARTMENT OF ENGINEERING
915 I STREET SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814
CITY HALL ROOM 207 TELEPHONE (916) 449-5281

R. H. PARKER
CITY ENGINEER
J. F. VAROZZA
ASSISTANT CITY ENGINEER

January 28, 1981

City Council
Sacramento, California

Honorable Members in Session:

SUBJECT: Criteria for the 1981 Transportation
Improvement Program (TIP)

SUMMARY:

This report recommends the criteria to be used by the Sacramento Area Council of Governments in developing the 1981 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and recommends written support to SACOG for those projects contained in the 1980 TIP which were within City jurisdiction.

BACKGROUND:

The attached communication from the Sacramento Area Council of Governments request that the City of Sacramento indicate what criteria should be used in developing the Regional TIP and suggest that projects in the City's jurisdiction, that were in the 1980 Regional TIP, be given our written support. The SACOG letter points out that there will be a deficit of between 760 million and 2.4 billion over the five year period of the TIP and that because of the projected deficit, the California Transportation Commission (CTC) has estimated that almost all types of funding will be held constant at the 1981-82 level for the next five years. The letter also states that it is expected that the 1981-82 TIP will be funded, but that for ensuing years (1982-86) there will only be enough money for essential maintenance, safety and rehabilitation projects. Most operational improvements and all new facilities programmed after 1982 will be delayed or deleted unless additional transportation funding can be found. It is important that we identify our highest priority projects so that possible cost cutting by the State will not delete the more important projects.

The criteria adopted by SACOG and used to evaluate projects for the 1980 TIP are as follows:

Safety of the transportation system is important.

Prior commitments and agreements made between member cities and/or counties and the State should be honored and those projects completed first.

APPROVED
BY THE CITY COUNCIL

FEB 3 1981

OFFICE OF THE
CITY CLERK

Projects shall be judged as to whether they help attain air quality standards.

Projects shall be judged for their benefit or disbenefit in affecting the economics of a member city or county and of the Region.

The SACOG requested that the City indicate which criteria SACOG should use in developing the Regional 1981 TIP. The City staff believes the same criteria should be used in the 1981 TIP as was used last year with the addition that the type of funding for the projects should also be considered. The City was also requested to give written support for projects within our jurisdiction that were included in the 1980 Regional TIP, which we feel should be kept in or added to. Those projects in the 1980 TIP are outlined below placed in priority order by the City Staff.

Project No.	Improvement Type	Location Limits	Fiscal Year			
			81	82	83	84
C-53	Rev. interchange on Rte. 99	Mack Rd. Int., FAU CANDIDATE	X			
C-22	Highway planting, scenic corridor on Rte. 5	Garden Hwy, to junction 880		X		
C-19	School noise attenuation on Rte. 5	Jedediah Smith Elm School		X		
C-44	Sound wall barriers on Rte. 99	47th Ave. to Broadway undercrossing		X		
C-18	Sound barrier walls on Rte. 80	F Street to C Street				X

FINANCIAL:

There is no direct financial impact to the City of Sacramento in this recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the City Council direct the staff to forward to SACOG the criteria as set forth above for the evaluation of the 1981 TIP, and that those projects in the 1980 TIP within City jurisdiction be forwarded to SACOG in priority order as recommended by staff.

Recommendation Approved:

Walter J. Slize
Walter J. Slize, City Manager

Respectfully submitted,
John F. Parker
R. H. PARKER
City Engineer

Sacramento Regional Area Planning Commission



Suite 300, 800 "H" Street, Sacramento, California 95814
(Mailing Address: P.O. Box 808, Sacramento, California 95804)
(916) 441-5930

COMMISSIONERS

January 6, 1981

Joseph E. (Ted) Shedy
(Chairman)
Supervisor
Sacramento County

Lawrence Mark
(Vice Chairman)
Councilman, City of
Yuba City

Robert N. Black
Supervisor
Yolo County

George Deveraux
Supervisor
Yuba County

Wilbur Green
Supervisor
Sutter County

Ronald A. Haedicke
Councilman, City of
Marysville

William D. Kopper
Mayor Pro Tem, City of
Davis

Lynn Robie
Councilwoman, City of
Sacramento

Richard Roccucci
Councilman, City of
Roseville

Fred V. Scheidegger
Vice Mayor, City of
Folsom

James A. Barnes
(Executive Director)

JURISDICTIONS

City of Lincoln
City of Roseville
Sacramento County
City of Sacramento
City of Folsom
City of Galt
City of Isleton
Sutter County
City of Live Oak
City of Yuba City
Yolo County
City of Davis
City of Winters
City of Woodland
Yuba County
City of Marysville
City of Wheatland

Honorable Chairpersons and
Supervisors of Member Counties

Honorable Mayors and Councilmembers
of Member Cities

Members in Session:

I. Background

Each year, the Sacramento Regional Area Planning Commission must update its Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) as required by State law and federal regulations. The total cost of projects adopted into the TIP will be limited by our "share" of State Highway Account financing for the next five years.

Unfortunately, funding for this year's TIP is severely reduced from that for last year's. Diminishing revenues and escalating costs have contributed to a huge projected deficit on the State level. Various State agencies have estimated that over the five year period of the TIP, the deficit will range between \$760 million and \$2.4 billion. The California Transportation Commission (CTC) has estimated that because of the projected deficit, almost all types of funding will be held constant at the 1981-82 level for the next five years.

The CTC fund estimate will be a constraint upon the program which we develop during the 1981 cycle of Regional TIP development. The impact of this constrained financing estimate for the Sacramento Regional TIP will be to force the elimination or adjustment of a number of projects currently programmed for development and to prevent the addition of new projects in the last year of the new program.

Because of the projected deficit, the CTC, along with CALTRANS, is searching for ways to trim spending by CALTRANS and to bring in new revenue for use in transportation. The

Honorable Chairpersons and
Supervisors of Member Counties
Honorable Mayors and Councilmembers
of Member Cities
January 6, 1981
Page Two

CTC expects the funding picture to change over the next year as cost-cutting solutions are found and/or new revenues become available. In the meantime, however, the CTC foresees large cuts in the State TIP program. It is expected that the FY 1981-82 TIP program will be funded, but that for ensuing years (1982-86) there will only be enough money for essential maintenance, safety and rehabilitation projects. Most operational improvements and all new facilities programmed after 1982 will be delayed or deleted unless additional transportation money can be found.

Because of the limited number of projects which can be funded, it is important that we as a region, identify our highest priority projects. All projects in our adopted 1980 TIP should be placed in priority order so that cost-cutting by the State will not delete the most important projects. Also, new projects must be placed in priority order (just in case more funding does materialize) and any desired substitutions or deletions of projects should also be taken into account.

In selecting projects for the upcoming TIP program, some criteria must be used to evaluate projects so that they may be placed in priority order. The criteria adopted by the Commission with local input and used to evaluate projects for last year's TIP (1980-81) are listed below:

- Safety of the transportation system is important.
- Prior commitments and agreements made between member cities and/or counties and the State should be honored and those projects completed first.
- Projects shall be judged as to whether they help attain air quality standards.
- Projects shall be judged for their benefit or disbenefit in affecting the economics of a member city or county and of the Region.

These criteria as adopted by the Commission shall apply differently between the urbanized area and the more rural areas. Additional criteria you may wish to consider for this year's TIP include:

Honorable Chairpersons and
Supervisors of Member Counties
Honorable Mayors and Councilmembers
of Member Cities
January 6, 1981
Page Three

- Type of project (rehabilitation, operational improvement, new facilities, etc).
- Type of funding for project (competition for some funds is more fierce than for others and/or there is less money available).
- Subprogram categories which the CTC does not consider to be of high priority, such as:
 - sound walls
 - bicycle lanes
 - landscaping

II. Action Requested

The Commission requests that you indicate which criteria you think the Commission should use this year in developing the Regional TIP. Also, projects which your jurisdiction thinks should be kept in, added to, or deleted from the 1980 Regional TIP should be given your written support. In addition, any new proposed projects should be accompanied by the proper documentation (please see attachment). Your responses to the criteria and requests for new projects should be sent to SACOG staff (c/o Robert Chung) by February 6, 1981.

Your responses will be used at a February workshop to inform the Board of the desires of member cities and counties. Also, the workshop will cover the problems facing us in developing this year's TIP.

Should you have questions, please call Robert Chung of the Commission staff at (916) 441-5930.

Sincerely,



JOSEPH E. SHEEDY
Chairman

JES:PVB:lr
cc: All Planning Directors
All Public Works Directors

Attachment

20. Air basin (if applicable): _____ Nonattainment area (yes/no)? _____

21. Air Quality Maintenance Plan project (yes/no)? _____

22. Travel impacts compared with the no-project alternative (local Caltrans Districts can assist you with definitions of these terms and access to their existing data):

a. System compatibility:

b. Safety: (1) Project safety index _____

(2) 1978 Accident Data*	Fatal	Injury	Property Damage Only	Total
-------------------------	-------	--------	----------------------	-------

- . Number
- . Rate per million vehicle miles
- . Statewide rate

c. Capacity and delay:

(1) Delay index _____

(2) Current level of service _____

(3) Existing capacity adequacy of _____, at level of service _____

(4) 1978 average annual daily traffic _____

(5) Project design capacity _____, at level of service _____

23. TSM project? _____ (yes/no). If yes, is it: (a) ramp metering: _____

(b) bypass lanes: _____ (c) freeway to freeway metering: _____

(d) widenings for HOV lanes or express lanes: _____ (e) widenings - congestion reduction: _____ (f) fringe parking (Park and Pool, Park and Ride): _____

(g) computerized traffic control (UCT's): _____

(h) signalization (signal modification): _____ (i) ridesharing: _____

(j) other: _____

24. Other:

*Indicate whether information is statistically significant. See safety index instructions.