

## This page is left blank.



December 1, 2021

Mitch Weiss, Executive Director California Transportation Commission 1120 N Street, Mail Station 52 Sacramento, CA 95814 SANDY AMARA City of Auburn TRINITY BURRUSS City of Colfax PAUL JOINER City of Lincoln BRIAN BAKER Town of Loomis KEN BROADWAY City of Rocklin BRUCE HOUDESHELDT City of Roseville JIM HOLMES SUZANNE JONES Placer County DAN WILKINS Citizen Representative MIKE LUKEN Executive Director

Re: PCTPA 2022 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP)

Dear Mr. Weiss:

The Board of Directors for the Placer County Transportation Planning Agency (PCTPA) adopted at the December 1, 2021 meeting the 2022 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) for submittal to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) as part of the development of the 2022 State Transportation Improvement Program. The 2022 RTIP is enclosed, including a copy of the Board of Directors resolution.

Individual STIP Project Programming Request forms are included as an attachment for the PCTPA 2022 RTIP projects. The following transportation projects and recommendations comprise our 2022 RTIP and ITIP submittal.

## Regional Transportation Improvement Program

### Planning, Programming, and Monitoring

The PCTPA requests the CTC program Regional Choice funds to PCTPA for planning, programming, and monitoring of the county's RTIP program as follows:

- FY 2022/23 \$144,000
- FY 2023/24 \$144,000
- FY 2024/25 \$144,000
- FY 2025/26 \$144,000
- FY 2026/27 \$144,000

#### **Interregional Transportation Improvement Program**

No ITIP funding requests are proposed.

### RTIP / RTP Consistency

The attached 2022 RTIP was completed using the template developed by the Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPA) group. The report provides an analysis of both quantitative and qualitative performance indicators and measures that indicate how the PCTPA 2022 RTIP is consistent with the goals established in the adopted 2040 RTP (<a href="http://pctpa.net/rtp2040/">http://pctpa.net/rtp2040/</a>).

Mitch Weiss, Executive Director PCTPA 2022 RTIP Page 2

The projects are also consistent with the Sacramento Area of Governments (SACOG) adopted 2020 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy.

Should you have any questions or require additional information, please contact me at (530) 823-4030, or Rick Carter of my staff at (530) 823-4033.

Sincerely,

Michael W. Luken Executive Director

#### **Enclosures:**

1. PCTPA 2022 RTIP

C: Teresa Favila, Deputy Director of Programming, California Transportation Commission (via email)

Amarjeet Benipal, District 3 Director, Caltrans (via email) James R. Anderson, Chief of Financial Programming, Caltrans Rambabu Bavirisetty, Chief of Office of STIP, Caltrans (via email) Rick Carter, PCTPA

## PLACER COUNTY TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCY (PCTPA)

# 2022 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (2022 RTIP)

## **Table of Contents**

	Page Nu	<u>ımber</u>
	Cover Letter	
A.	Overview and Schedule	
	Section 1. Executive Summary	5
	Section 2. General Information	5
	Section 3. Background of Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP)	6
	Section 4. Completion of Prior RTIP Projects	6
	Section 5. RTIP Outreach and Participation	7
В.	2022 STIP Regional Funding Request	
	Section 6. 2022 STIP Regional Share and Request for Programming	8
	Section 7. Overview of Other Funding Included in Delivery of RTIP Projects	8
	Section 8. Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP) Funding/Needs.	8
	Section 9. Multi-Modal Corridors - Projects Planned Within the Corridor	10
	Section 10. Highways to Bouelvards Conversion Pilot Program	10
C.	Relationship of RTIP to RTP/SCS/APS and Benefits of RTIP	
	Section 11. Regional Level Performance Evaluation	11
	Section 12. Regional and Statewide Benefits of RTIP	12
D.	Performance and Effectiveness of RTIP	
	Section 13. Evaluation of the Cost Effectiveness of RTIP	12
	Section 14. Project Specific Evaluation	13
E.	Detailed Project Information	
	Section 15. Overview of Projects Programmed with RIP Funding	13
F.	<u>Appendices</u>	
	Section 16. Project Programming Request (PPR) Forms	14
	Section 17. Board Resolution or Documentation of 2022 RTIP Approval	21

## This page is left blank.

## A. Overview and Schedule

## **Section 1. Executive Summary**

The Board of Directors for the Placer County Transportation Planning Agency (PCTPA) adopted at the December 1, 2021 meeting the 2022 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) for submittal to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) as part of the development of the 2022 State Transportation Improvement Program.

#### **Section 2. General Information**

Insert contact information in the text fields below.

- Regional Agency Name

Placer County Transportation Planning Agency (PCTPA)

- Agency website links for Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) and Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

Regional Agency Website Link: https://pctpa.net

RTIP document link: https://pctpa.net/regional-planning/

RTP link: https://pctpa.net/rtp2040/

- Regional Agency Executive Director/Chief Executive Officer Contact Information

Name Mike Luken

Title Executive DirectorEmail mluken@pctpa.netTelephone 530-823-4030

- RTIP Manager Staff Contact Information

Name Rick Carter, PE Title Deputy Executive Director

Address 299 Nevada Street

City/State Auburn, CA

Zip Code 95603

Email RCarter@pctpa.net

Telephone 530-823-4033 Fax

- California Transportation Commission (CTC) Staff Contact Information

Name Teresa Favila Title Deputy Director

Address 1120 N Street
City/State Sacramento, CA

Zip Code 95814

Email teresa.favila@catc.ca.gov

Telephone 916-653-2064 Fax 916-653-2134

## Section 3. Background of Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP)

#### A. What is the Regional Transportation Improvement Program?

The Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) is a program of highway, local road, transit and active transportation projects that a region plans to fund with State and Federal revenue programmed by the California Transportation Commission in the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). The RTIP is developed biennially by the regions and is due to the Commission by December 15 of every odd numbered year. The program of projects in the RTIP is a subset of projects in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), a federally mandated master transportation plan which guides a region's transportation investments over a 20 to 25 year period. The RTP is based on all reasonably anticipated funding, including federal, state and local sources. Updated every 4 to 5 years, the RTP is developed through an extensive public participation process in the region and reflects the unique mobility, sustainability, and air quality needs of each region.

## B. Regional Agency's Historical and Current Approach to developing the RTIP

As part of developing the adopted 2040 RTP (December 2019), PCTPA developed both quantitative and qualitative performance measures. The RTP is directly linked to the PCTPA RTIP in that the projects identified as part of the RTIP are also included in the funding constrained RTP.

PCTPA has a history of successful collaboration with Caltrans and local agencies to deliver regional transportation projects, including the \$325 million Highway 65 Lincoln Bypass in 2012, the largest transportation project in Placer County history. The Highway 65 Lincoln Bypass was delivered using both RTIP and ITIP funding, as well as other funding sources.

Measure M was placed on the November 2016 ballot in Placer County for a countywide transportation sales tax measure. The ½ cent sales tax measure received 64 percent support, just shy of the 2/3 majority needed to pass. The sales tax was estimated to generate \$1.6 billion over 30 years to be used for transportation projects in Placer County, including the proposed Interstate 80/State Route 65 interchange reconfiguration. PCTPA considered placing a sales tax measure on the 2020 ballot by put these plans on hold due to the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic. PCTPA is now looking at a placing a transportation sales tax measure on the 2022 or 2024 ballot.

#### Section 4. Completion of Prior RTIP Projects (Required per Section 68)

The last project completed in Placer County using STIP funding was Phase 1 of the Highway 65 Lincoln Bypass, which was completed in 2012. Significant STIP funding was advanced to complete the Lincoln Bypass that resulted in a project with significant benefits to the public but also resulted in an overdrawn balance of approximately \$15.8 million in fiscal year 2026-27 for Placer County's regional choice STIP funding. Without additional funding available, there were no projects completed in Placer County using STIP funding between adoption of the 2020 RTIP and the current 2022 RTIP.

### **Section 5. RTIP Outreach and Participation**

Insert dates below – Regional agencies can add rows to the schedule – Rows included below should remain for consistency.

#### A. RTIP Development and Approval Schedule

Action	Date
CTC adopts Fund Estimate and Guidelines	August 18, 2021
Caltrans identifies State Highway Needs	September 15, 20121
Caltrans submits draft ITIP	October 15, 2021
CTC ITIP Hearing, North	November 1, 2021
CTC ITIP Hearing, South	November 8, 2021
Regional Agency adopts 2022 RTIP	December 1, 2021
Regions submit RTIP to CTC (postmark by)	December 15, 2021
Caltrans submits ITIP to CTC	December 15, 2021
CTC STIP Hearing, North	January 27, 2022
CTC STIP Hearing, South	February 3, 2022
CTC publishes staff recommendations	February 28, 2022
CTC Adopts 2020 STIP	March 23-24, 2022

### B. Public Participation/Project Selection Process

PCTPA actively solicits the participation of the general public as part of its ongoing transportation planning work. PCTPA includes outreach to Native American tribal governments, specifically, the United Auburn Indian Community. The adopted Placer County 2040 Regional Transportation Plan (December 4, 2019) Appendix B contains Interagency and Public Involvement Process. The outreach efforts for the Placer County 2040 RTP was a multipronged approach. PCTPA coordinated with SACOG on interagency consultation and coordination to identify project lists and future land use forecasts used in the evaluation of their Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) scenarios. Residents, civic groups, and the private sector were engaged statistically valid phone polling, a pop-up workshop at the Sierra College Campus in Rocklin, and a series of three on-line surveys. The on-line surveys built upon the success of recent online outreach efforts and engaged over 2,300 residents. Past RTP updates that utilized in-person presentations and workshops had relatively low turnout for such a high investment in resources. The surveys provided a wealth of feedback for use far beyond the RTP. There were two key takeaways from the responders that were incorporated into the RTP. First, highways and congestion are a top priority. Throughout the surveys, Placer County's community made clear that traffic is a concern and the RTP's section on Regionally Significant Roadway Projects highlights how those concerns can be alleviated. This desire to alleviate congestion to improve quality of life has been a consistent theme through multiple RTP update processes. The second takeaway is that transportation funding is confusing. Particularly in the second survey. responders indicated that they didn't understand what the various taxes fund, reinforcing PCTPA's work to educate and inform the community on the complexities of transportation

funding. The RTP's financial element breaks down these revenue sources, providing some clarity for the community.

### C. Consultation with Caltrans District (Required per Section 17)

Caltrans District: 3

Pursuant to the STIP Guidelines, Caltrans submits a list of projects to each RTPA for inclusion in their respective RTIPs for the 2020 STIP. Since PCTPA does not have programming capacity, Caltrans has no requests for the PCTPA 2020 RTIP.

## B. 2022 STIP Regional Funding Request

## Section 6. 2022 STIP Regional Share and Request for Programming

### A. 2022 Regional Fund Share Per 2022 STIP Fund Estimate

Insert your agency's target share per the STIP Fund Estimate in the text field below. COVID Relief shares should be listed separately from traditional STIP shares as they are being tracked separately.

Our target share in the 2022 STIP is \$0. Significant STIP funding was advanced to complete the Lincoln Bypass that resulted in a project with significant benefits to the public but also resulted in an overdrawn balance of approximately \$15.8 million in fiscal year 2026-27 for Placer County's regional choice STIP funding.

### B. Summary of Requested Programming

No projects are proposed for programming as part of the 2022 STIP.

## <u>Section 7. Overview of Other Funding Included With Delivery of Regional Improvement Program (RIP) Projects</u>

No projects are proposed for programming as part of the 2022 STIP.

### Section 8. Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP) Funding and Needs

The purpose of the Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP) is to improve interregional mobility for people and goods in the State of California. As an interregional program, the ITIP is focused on increasing the throughput for highway and rail corridors of strategic importance outside the urbanized areas of the state. A sound transportation network between and connecting urbanized areas ports and borders is vital to the state's economic vitality. The ITIP is prepared in accordance with Government Code Section 14526, Streets and Highways Code Section 164 and the STIP Guidelines. The ITIP is a five-year program managed by Caltrans and funded with 25% of new STIP revenues in each cycle. Developed in cooperation with regional

transportation planning agencies to ensure an integrated transportation program, the ITIP promotes the goal of improving interregional mobility and connectivity across California.

If requesting ITIP funding, provide narrative on your request in the text field below. Or state that no ITIP funding was requested.

PCTPA is not currently requesting ITIP funding for projects as part of the 2022 STIP

PCTPA was asked to include a discussion of what the region believes are the most significant interregional highway and intercity rail needs within the region. Although the region has many needs, below are the highest priority projects.

### **Interregional Highway Needs:**

I-80 and SR65 are the two highest traveled routes in Placer County. I-80 is the main state highway traversing east/west through the County and supports interregional and regional commuting and recreational travel, and national freight movement. SR65 carries traffic between I-80 and rapidly growing communities to the north. Both routes experience significant congestion during peak hours that increases travel times resulting in added pollution and GHG emissions. On-time performance of transit routes in South Placer are challenged both on the mainline and as the mainline is congested it causes significant congestion slowing transit routes on major arterials in Roseville, Rocklin and Lincoln. The most significant immediate needs for these routes include the \$270 million reconstruction of the 80/65 Interchange and the \$115 million multi-phased widening, future managed lanes and operational improvements to SR 65. The I-80/65 Interchange currently lacks funding to start preliminary engineering. Phase 1 of the SR 65 widening is designed but an \$18 million funding shortfall is delaying construction. Additionally, a feasibility analysis for managed lanes on I-80 from the 80/65 Interchange to the western county line is needed explore how managed lanes may benefit the corridor.

Needs on other state routes include \$500 million in multi-phased corridor improvements on SR 89 and SR 267 to encourage increased transit use, reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT), and create a more reliable travel experience for residents and the high volume of visitors in the Resort Triangle area of Lake Tahoe (Kings Beach, Tahoe City and the Town of Truckee). Needed improvements on these routes include transit signal priority modifications, transit queue jumps, and reversible bus-only lanes. The roughly \$10 million first phase will include transit signal prioritization but it is currently unfunded.

#### **Intercity Rail Needs:**

The UPRR line parallels I-80 throughout Placer County and serves as a transcontinental rail route accommodating freight and passenger services. The J. R. Davis Yard, located in the City of Roseville in Placer County, is the largest classification yard on the West Coast. Approximately 98 percent of all UPRR traffic in Northern California is moved through this yard. The Capitol Corridor intercity passenger rail service runs daily service between Auburn to San Jose, through Sacramento and the East Bay. Because of the heavy freight use, only 1 round trip per day operates between Placer County and Sacramento. The most significant need is the addition of 17.8 miles of track between Roseville and Sacramento, as identified in the California

State Rail Plan, to expand intercity passenger rail service to Placer County to 10 round trips a day. The \$170 million Phase 1 project will construct 6.8 miles of track to accommodate 2 additional round trips but currently has a \$60 million funding gap which is delaying construction. The Phase 2 project is estimated at \$295 million.

Longer term needs include track and station improvements between Auburn and Reno to provide Capitol Corridor intercity passenger rail service connecting the Bay Area, Sacramento and the Lake Tahoe/Reno/Sparks area, as envisioned in the California and Nevada State Rail Plans. The Lake Tahoe/Reno area is a high-volume tourist destination for both the Sacramento Valley and Bay Area communities and major economic driver for Placer County. Feasibility studies are needed to define the needed capital infrastructure and associated costs.

### Section 9. Projects Planned Within Multi-Modal Corridors

No projects are proposed for programming as part of the 2022 STIP.

## Section 10. Highways to Boulevards Conversion Pilot Program

PCTPA has identified state routes within the region that might be potential candidates for a highways to boulevards conversion pilot program. Because there are no guideline for a potential program at this time, this discussion covers a range of needs where state highways divide existing communities. Although no locations have been identified for removal of freeways or relinquishment of the highway to the local agency, other needs have been identified.

Within the Placer County Transportation Planning Area, a section of SR 49 in the City of Auburn (PM 2.3 to 7.5) is a barrier to multimodal travel across the community due to the lack of contiguous bicycle and pedestrian facilities on the state highway. The highway serves as a primary corridor within Auburn, but the lack of contiguous bicycle and pedestrian facilities inhibits the use of these modes due to the speeds and traffic volume on SR 49.

There are numerous locations within the urbanized areas where the I-80 and SR65 freeways act as a physical barrier dividing the community. A noted above, SR 49 also divides the community of Auburn and inhibits alternate modes. The following locations have been identified for pedestrian and bicycle overcrossings to provide connectivity across the freeway or highway but lack funding:

I-80 near Cirby Way

I-80 near Rocklin Rd/ Sierra College

SR 49 north of Bell Rd

SR 49 near Palm Ave.

SR65 near Blue Oaks Blvd

SR65 near Galleria Blvd

## C. Relationship of RTIP to RTP/SCS/APS and Benefits of RTIP

### Section 11. Regional Level Performance Evaluation (per Section 19A of the guidelines)

In 2008, the California legislature adopted SB 375. SB 375 requires the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to set performance targets for passenger vehicle emissions in each of 18 Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) in the state for 2020 and 2035, requires an Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) to include a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) that integrates the land use and transportation components, and amends CEQA to provide incentives for residential and residential mixed use projects that help to implement an MTP/SCS that meets the CARB targets.

CARB initially set reduction targets for the Sacramento region of 7 and 16 percent per capita GHG reduction by 2020 and 2035, respectively. In 2019, CARB increased the 2035 reduction target to 19 percent per capita GHG reduction. SACOG, which covers a six County region including Placer County, adopted the 2020 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy on November 18, 2019, which incorporated the 2040 Placer County RTP adopted on December 4, 2019.

The 2040 Placer County RTP provides a starting place to work toward Placer County's responsibility to address regional GHG targets; and is in alignment with the principles of AB 32 and SB 375. The 2040 RTP contains many goals and policies to reduce vehicle trips and improve air quality. The goal areas containing the most explicit policies relating to GHGs are: Pedestrian, Bicycle, and Low Speed Vehicles (NEVs), Transportation Systems Management, and Integrated Land Use, Air Quality, & Transportation Planning. The Action Element also contains action plans that are intended to further the RTP's air quality-related goals and policies. The action plans include both short-term and long-term steps for each transportation mode. PCTPA works closely with SACOG to reduce GHG emissions through the MTP/SCS planning process.

## A. Regional Level Performance Indicators and Measures (per Appendix B of the STIP Guidelines).

Performance measures below are based on available data from the 2040 Placer County RTP adopted in December 2019.

Table B1 Evaluation – Regional Level Performance Indicators and Measures									
Goal	Indicator/Measure	Current System Performance (Baseline)	Projected System Performance (indicate timeframe)						
Congestion Reduction	Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per capita.	27.55	25.30						
	Percent of congested VMT (at or below 35 mph)	1.17%	0.96%						

	Commute mode share	Automobile - 92.3%	Automobile – 91.4%
	(travel to work or school)	Transit - 0.3%	Transit - 0.6%
		Bike/Walk - 6.4%	Bike/Walk – 7.1%
		Other – 1.0%	Other – 0.9%
Infrastructure Condition	Percent of distressed state highway lane-miles	N/A	N/A
	Pavement Condition Index (local streets and roads)	68	N/A
	Percent of highway bridges by deck area classified in Poor condition	23%	N/A
	Percent of transit assets that have surpassed the FTA useful life period	48%	N/A
System Reliability	Highway Buffer Index (the extra time cushion that most travelers add to their average travel time when planning trips to ensure ontime arrival)	N/A	N/A
	Accessibility and on-time performance for rail and transit	N/A	N/A
Safety	Fatalities and serious injuries per capita	0.55 per 1,000 capita	N/A
	Fatalities and serious injuries per VMT	19.95 per 1,000 VMT	N/A
Economic Vitality	Percent of housing and jobs within 0.5 miles of transit stops with frequent transit service	12% Housing 23% Jobs	14% Housing 22% Jobs
	Mean commute travel time (to work or school)	18.7 minutes (Year 2008)	18.4 minutes
	Farebox recovery ratio	18.6	N/A
Environmental Sustainability	Change in acres of agricultural land	156,366 acres	146,193 acres
	CO <sub>2</sub> emissions reduction per capita		

## Section 12. Regional and Statewide Benefits of RTIP

No projects are proposed for programming as part of the 2022 STIP.

## D. Performance and Effectiveness of RTIP

### Section 13. Evaluation of Cost Effectiveness of RTIP (Required per Section 19)

With completion of the Lincoln Bypass in 2012, the current RTIP does not include any new projects due to an overdrawn balance of approximately \$15.8 million in fiscal year 2026-27 for Placer County's regional choice STIP funding.

## Section 14. Project Specific Evaluation (Required per Section 19D)

PCTPA is not submitting any new RTIP projects for the 2022 STIP.

## E. <u>Detailed Project Information</u>

## Section 15. Overview of Projects Programmed with RIP Funding

PCTPA is not submitting any new projects for RIP funding in the 2020 STIP.

PCTPA is proposing to program \$723,000 of Planning, Programming, and Monitoring (PPM) for FY 2020/21 through FY 2024/25.

## F. Appendices

**Section 16. Projects Programming Request Forms** 

Section 17. Board Resolution or Documentation of 2022 RTIP Approval

## <u>Appendix</u>

Section 16. Projects Programming Request Forms

PRG-0010 (REV 08/2020)

PPR ID ePPR-6158-2022-0002 v0

Amendment (Existing	ng Project) YES	⊠ NO			Date 11/08/2021 17:09:23
Programs	LPP-C LPP-	F SCCP	☐ TCEP 🛛 ST	TP Other	
District	EA	Project ID	PPNO	Nomina	ating Agency
03		0320000208	0L11	Placer County Trans	portation Planning Agency
County	Route	PM Back	PM Ahead	Co-Nom	inating Agency
Placer					
				MPO A	Element 2
-				SACOG	Local Assistance
raku - raku P	roject Manager/Cont	act 💯 💮 🛰 🗷	Phone	Ema	nil Address
	Rick Carter		530-823-4033	rcarte	@pctpa.net
Project Title	in a series of the				
Planning, Programm	ning and Monitoring				
Location (Project Lir	mits), Description (Sc	cope of Work)			A SANCE OF A SANCE OF A SANCE
Planning, Programm					

Component		Implementing Agency							
PA&ED	Placer Count	Placer County Transportation Planning Agency							
PS&E	Placer Count	Placer County Transportation Planning Agency							
Right of Way	Placer Count	Placer County Transportation Planning Agency							
Construction	Placer Count	y Transportation Planning	Agency						
Legislative Districts									
Assembly:	1,5,6	Senate:	1,4	Congressional:	1,4				
Project Milestone		akimin, majalan <mark>aki</mark> nsa	Salas Sen Awar.	Existing * ***	Proposed				
Project Study Report A	pproved				DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPERTY OF				
Begin Environmental (F	PA&ED) Phase	18 JA - 14 JA							
Circulate Draft Environ	mental Documer								
Draft Project Report				Bright British - Bris					
End Environmental Pha	ase (PA&ED Mile	estone)							
Begin Design (PS&E) F	Phase								
End Design Phase (Re	ady to List for Ad	Ivertisement Milestone)							
Begin Right of Way Pha	ase								
End Right of Way Phas	e (Right of Way								
Begin Construction Pha	ase (Contract Aw	.4							
End Construction Phas	e (Construction	Contract Acceptance Mile	stone)						
Begin Closeout Phase									
End Closeout Phase (C	loseout Report)								

PRG-0010 (REV 08/2020)

PPR ID ePPR-6158-2022-0002 v0

Date 11/08/2021 17:09:23 Purpose and Need For planning, programming, and monitoring of Placer County's RTIP program. No Reversible Lane Analysis NHS Improvements ☐ YES ☒ NO Roadway Class NA YES ☐ YES ⊠ NO Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions TYES NO Inc. Sustainable Communities Strategy Goals **Project Outputs** Outputs Category Unit Total

PRG-0010 (REV 08/2020)

PPR ID ePPR-6158-2022-0002 v0

Date 11/08/2021 17:09:23

Additional Information

PRG-0010 (REV 08/2020)

PPR ID ePPR-6158-2022-0002 v0

Performance Indicators and Measures									
Measure	Required For	Indicator/Measure	Unit	Build	Future No Build	Change			
				Add - Village					

PRG-0010 (REV 08/2020)

PPR ID ePPR-6158-2022-0002 v0

District	County	Route	EA	Project ID	PPNO
03	Placer			0320000208	0L11

Planning, Programming and Monitoring

		Exis	sting Total F	Project Cos	t (\$1,000s)				
Component	Prior	22-23	23-24	24-25	25-26	26-27	27-28+	Total	Implementing Agency
E&P (PA&ED)		1.11.156			37.43			1 1 1 20	Placer County Transportation Planni
PS&E		1.			140 100	141	The second		Placer County Transportation Planni
R/W SUP (CT)	7 mi= 1, y-	A	765	13-11-	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	To the first	with the first	34	Placer County Transportation Planni
CON SUP (CT)	T. 25.75		3 (8.3)		Y	description of	149 (4)	y see	Placer County Transportation Planni
R/W	-1.40%-1.74.6	4 19 19	1342 5	W. 1. 1.	348	25-4-31			Placer County Transportation Planni
CON	2,634	144	144	146	1430,0000	44 144 144 1	= y € = .	3,068	Placer County Transportation Planni
TOTAL	2,634	144	144	1146	4 16		4.9	3,068	
		Prop	osed Total	Project Cos	st (\$1,000s)	)			Notes
E&P (PA&ED)	July 18 years	*:: ×: ;:	42 62	9 7 . 11	i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	11110 4x 9	in year	protection to	
PS&E	8 W. L.	11.4 第1.4 多	1.5	At Minister	71.1341.41	A HEAT	Engraphics!		1
R/W SUP (CT)	. 43255	NEDA	JANE 1988	Hilas with	To the production	i de Antagranto y	9341 TO		1
CON SUP (CT)		-9.4.	3 1 - 1	- Altria	1000 - 144.1	F887 1.200	NAME OF STREET	1997 1 3 32 3	
R/W	35 1 000	Total Service	11.4.	111444	and a	Taxing	11 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	2.14	
CON	2,634	144	144	144	144	144	1000 110	3,354	
TOTAL	2,634	144	144	144	144	144		3,354	
Fund #1:	RIP - State	Cash (Co	mmitted)						Program Code
			Existing Fu	unding (\$1,	000s)				20.30,600.670
Component	Prior	22-23	23-24	24-25	25-26	26-27	27-28+	Total	Funding Agency
E&P (PA&ED)	2		. 63541 A	A 40 . 40	Con Sec	11.00.00	1000	i en	Placer County Transportation Planning
PS&E	1912 1 Miles	3 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1	Service of	Attaches to the	32 k s 14	3	is they	4	\$57 CON voted 07/16/98
R/W SUP (CT)	13 4 8 8 8	Large Cat	ar jaka	Distriction in	12 Feb.	N	1. 1.44	40	\$52 CON voted 08/02/99
CON SUP (CT)		P. China C	is say	413.00	3-1.	HVX T		y 1, - 84	\$28 CON voted 02/23/00 \$110 CON voted 07/01/01
R/W	14, 14	B. J. P. L.	( m = m	1	14 71			The roll repl	\$53 CON voted 09/23/02
CON	2,634	144	144	146	45 844.	med Hard	1 71-800.2	3,068	\$40 CON voted 02/26/04
TOTAL	2,634	144	144	146	T a		on William	3,068	\$75 CON voted 03/03/05
			Proposed F	unding (\$1	,000s)				\$75 CON voted 08/18/05 Notes
E&P (PA&ED)								E A TAN	
PS&E								3	
R/W SUP (CT)								289	
CON SUP (CT)									
R/W								1,111,94	
	0.004	444	444	111					
CON	2,634	144	144	144	i			3,066	

PRG-0010 (REV 08/2020)

PPR ID ePPR-6158-2022-0002 v0

Fund #2:	RIP - State	e Cash (Co	mmitted)						Program Code
	<u> </u>		Existing F	unding (\$1,	000s)				
Component	Prior	22-23	23-24	24-25	25-26	26-27	27-28+	Total	Funding Agency
E&P (PA&ED)									Placer County Transportation Plannin
PS&E									
R/W SUP (CT)			180	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1					
CON SUP (CT)	5 75				-N	7.1			
R/W	3.34	3.1		1177 3			He TH	3.4	8
CON		1.8%	yt áv		William Sen				
TOTAL		The second						7 w	
		,	Proposed F	unding (\$1	,000s)		20		Notes
E&P (PA&ED)								4.4.47	
PS&E								24	
R/W SUP (CT)									
CON SUP (CT)								H WA	
R/W									
CON					144	144		288	
TOTAL		John Week		1985	144	144		288	

## STATE OF CALIFORNIA • DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

PPR ID

PROJECT PROG PRG-0010 (REV 08/2020)	SRAMMING REQUEST (P	PR)		ePPR-6158-2022-	0002 V0
	Complete thi	s page for amendments on	ly	Date 11/08/2021	17:09:23
District	County	Route	EA	Project ID	PPNO
03	Placer			0320000208	0L11
SECTION 1 - All Proje	cts				
Project Background					
or planning, programi	ming, and monitoring of Placer Cou	my o trim programm			
Programming Change The CTC has provided	to PCTPA \$720,000 in programmii	ng capacity for FY 2022/23,	through 2026/27. F	PCTPA is proposing to spre	ad the
orogramming capacity vill be reduced.	over the five year period, with \$144	1,000 in each year. \$146,000	is currently progra	MIMBO IN FT 2024/25 50 01	is amount
		The second secon			
Reason for Proposed	Change amount of allowable funds toward				
If proposed change wi cost increase will be fu	Il delay one or more components, o	slearly explain 1) reason for th	ne delay, 2) cost in	crease related to the delay	, and 3) ho
N/A					
0" 0" 15 115					
Other Significant Infor	nation				
OFOTION 2 For CD4	Drainet Only				
SECTION 2 - For SB1 Project Amendment R	equest (Please follow the individua	I SB1 program guidelines for	specific criteria)		
N/A			<u> </u>		
Approvals					
			harra haan ahtalaa	d tartha proposing of this	amonda

I hereby certify that the above information is complete and accurate and all approvals have been obtained for the processing of this amendment request.

	Name (Print or Type)		Signature		Title	Date
Rick o	CARTER	Recha	1 also	DEPUTY	EXEC. DIR.	11/8/2021
OFOTION	All Duciento					

## SECTION 3 - All Projects

Attachments

- 1) Concurrence from Implementing Agency and/or Regional Transportation Planning Agency
- 2) Project Location Map

## <u>Appendix</u>

Section 17. Board Resolution or Documentation of 2022 RTIP Approval

## PLACER COUNTY TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCY

# IN THE MATTER OF: THE 2022 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (RTIP)

**RESOLUTION NO. 21-46** 

The following resolution was duly passed by the Placer County Transportation Planning Agency at a regular meeting held December 1, 2021 by the following vote on roll call:

AYES: Amara, Baker, Broadway, Burruss, Holmes, Houdesheldt, Joiner, Jones, Wilkins

NOES: None

ABSENT: None

WHEREAS, pursuant to California Government Code, Title 7.91, Section 67910, the Placer County Transportation Planning Agency (PCTPA) was created as a local area planning agency to provide regional transportation planning for the area of Placer County, exclusive of the Lake Tahoe Basin; and

WHEREAS, California Government Code Section 29532.1c identifies PCTPA as the designated regional transportation planning agency for Placer County, exclusive of the Lake Tahoe Basin; and

WHEREAS, it is the intent and policy of PCTPA to improve and maximize the efficiency of transportation services in Placer County; and

WHEREAS, the PCTPA has reviewed funding policies and considered comment received from its member jurisdictions on their transportation needs and priority projects; and

WHEREAS, PCTPA places the highest emphasis on delivering needed projects as quickly and cost effectively as possible; and

WHEREAS, State law requires the adoption of a Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) by each regional transportation planning agency every two years, to be adopted by the California Transportation Commission (CTC) into the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP);

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT** the Placer County Transportation Planning Agency hereby submits the following projects and recommendations for the Placer County 2022 Regional Transportation Improvement Program to the California Transportation Commission.

## Regional Transportation Improvement Program

## Planning, Programming, and Monitoring

The PCTPA requests the CTC program Regional Choice funds to PCTPA for planning, programming, and monitoring of the county's RTIP program as follows:

FY 2022/23 - \$144,000

FY 2023/24 - \$144,000

FY 2024/25 - \$144,000

FY 2025/26 - \$144,000

FY 2026/27 - \$144,000

## **Interregional Transportation Improvement Program**

No ITIP funding requests are proposed.

Paul Joiner, Chair

Placer County Transportation Planning Agency

Mike Luken, Executive Director

Soly Sabol Board Secretary