

Comprehensive Implementation



South Yuba Transportation Improvement Authority



SUBMITTED TO:

Mike Lee CDSA Director Yuba County Department of Public Works 915 8th Street, Suite 125 Marysville, CA 95901

> APPROVED: August 03, 2021



Elizabeth B. Diamond, PE 110 Blue Ravine Road, Suite 200 Folsom, CA 95630 (916) 858-0642 Idiamond@dokkenengineering.com



Executive Summary

Purpose of Study

The South Yuba Transportation Improvement Authority (SYTIA) has initiated this Comprehensive Implementation Strategy (CIS) Report to begin advancing the projects include their adopted Traffic Impact Fee program, specifically; an expressway east of Wheatland, a new freeway interchange in the vicinity of South Beale Road, a new connector road between South Beale at SR 65 and Plumas Lake Blvd at Highway 70, and an ultimate realignment of SR 65 to the east of Wheatland (commonly referred to as the Wheatland Bypass). The Study was initiated to refine project scopes, identify potential impacts and develop costs in order to best strategize how to move each project forward and leverage the capital generated by SYTIA's TIF program.

Outcomes of Study

A range of viable alternatives was looked at for each project and the total cost of each project was estimated at:

- East Wheatland Expressway \$91,900,000
- SR 65/South Beale Road Interchange with Extension to Forty Mile Rd- \$115,200,000
- Plumas Lake Boulevard Extension/SR 70 Southbound Loop On-ramp \$43,900,000
- SR 65 Realignment \$369,600,000

SYTIA faces some challenges with funding as the CIS focuses on four road expansion projects, in a funding environment that increasingly prioritizes alternative modes of transportation like transit, bikes, and pedestrian facilities. For this reason, a Funding Strategy was developed which identifies potential funding sources and ways to attract and leverage funds based on key project benefits. Figure i shows an overview of each project. The overview shows just one potential alternative for each project.



Figure i – Projects Overview



The study is not intended to preclude additional refinements and alternatives from consideration, but to help focus the discussion of how these projects can be advanced.

Project costs have been broken down into delivery phases, i.e., Preliminary Design, Environmental Clearance/Project Approval, Final Design, Right of Way Acquisitions, Permits & Mitigation and Construction. This will allow the SYTIA to work toward budgeting funds for the next project steps as appropriate.

Information on available funding sources and an assessment of their applicability for each project is also provided. Getting projects ready for construction is the best way to be competitive for regional, state, and federal funding. Community support for projects, and not having the projects compete against each other, also results in the best chance for success in obtaining grant funds.

In the process of developing the funding strategy it was agreed that SYTIA should pursue a Federal earmark for the South Beale Road/SR 65 Interchange and prioritize funding for the East Wheatland Bypass PSR through a different discretionary program. The earmark request was submitted in May of 2021, but unfortunately the project did not make the list of funded projects in the current Surface Transportation Bill.

Recommendations

SYTIA should utilize capital acquired from the TIF Program to advance the early delivery phases of projects since getting projects closer to construction is the best way to make them competitive for regional, state, and federal funding.

The first phase of both the East Wheatland Bypass and the SR 65/South Beale Road Interchange with Extension to Forty Mile Road projects should be funded with TIF funds so they can begin to advance through the project delivery process. For each this is completion of an individual Project Study Report or equivalent.

The SR 70/ Plumas Extension/SR 70 Onramp project is currently completing the design phase. Being closest to construction, which makes it most competitive for grant funds, SYTIA should work to get this project programmed into the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Plan (MTIP) so it is eligible for right of way and/or construction grant funding. SYTIA should also consider funding the right of way phase, or a portion of it, to keep the project moving forward.

SYTIA should work with the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) to get the East Wheatland Expressway and SR 65/South Beale Road Interchange with Extension to Forty Mile Road amended into the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Plan (MTIP), making them also eligible for funding opportunities. For early project delivery phases this is a fairly streamlined administrative process; unlike right of way or construction phase work which must be added by formal amendment.

SYTIA should continue to monitor grant programs for eligibility and opportunity; and remain flexible and ready to highlight different aspects of a project to meet the requirements of available funding sources.

Approval of CIS

The Draft CIS was shared with and presented to the SYTIA Board at their August 3, 2021, at which time they approved it without revision. This August 2021 edition constitutes the final report.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	Background	1
1.1.	SYTIA Purpose and Goals	1
1.2.	Traffic Impact Fee Program	1
1.3.	Included Projects	2
1.4.	Necessity for Comprehensive Implementation Strategy	3
1.5.	Comprehensive Implementation Strategy Goals	3
2.0	Project Scoping	4
2.1.	Stakeholder Outreach	4
2.2.	Independent Utility	5
2.3.	Project Alternatives	5
2.4.	Traffic Analysis Summary	13
3.0	Cost Estimates	14
3.1.	Estimation Methodology	14
3.2.	Project Assumptions	15
3.3.	Cost Estimate Summaries	17
4.0	Funding Strategies	21
4.1.	Overall Funding Outlook: Opportunities and Challenges	21
4.2.	Funding Sources	21
4.3.	Funding Source Assessment	24
4.4.	Supporting Strategies	24
4.5.	Funding Application Target/Approach by Project	26
4.6.	Funding Strategy Implementation Example	28
5.0	Project Development Process	29
6.0	Attachments	31
Attack	hment A: Traffic Memorandum	
Attacl	hment C. Environmental Costs Backup	

- Attachment D: Right of Way Costs Backup
- Attachment E: Cost Accumulation Worksheet
- Attachment F: Funding Assessment
- Attachment G: Sample Project Information Sheet



1.0 Background

1.1. SYTIA Purpose and Goals

The South Yuba Transportation Improvement Authority, SYTIA was formed by a Joint Powers Authority between Yuba County and City of Wheatland in order to consider, evaluate, construct, and make associated decisions regarding proposed transportation improvements located in the southern portion of the County and within the limits of the City.

While the Authority can consider any improvements in the area, the entity was initially formed to address a few specific area projects; the East Wheatland Expressway, a new freeway interchange in the vicinity of South Beale Road, a new connector road between South Beale at SR 65 and Plumas Lake Blvd at Highway 70, and an ultimate realignment of SR 65 to the East of Wheatland (commonly referred to as the Wheatland Bypass).

1.2. Traffic Impact Fee Program

The SYTIA Board took action beginning in 2018 to establish a local revenue source to share in the costs of the planned projects attributable to new development. SYTIA contracted an Impact Fee Study to determine what the potential revenue stream would be from projected development in the area. The Traffic Impact Fee (TIF) was approved on June 4, 2019.

A summary of the Impact Fee Study and Fee Program is:

- The SYTIA Traffic Impact Fee applies to all new development in the unincorporated areas of the County south of the Yuba River as well as within the boundaries of the City of Wheatland. The Area covered by the Traffic Impact Fee Program is shown below in Figure 1.1.
- The Fee is calculated based on the daily p.m. peak hour traffic trips generated by the new development, with a new single-family home generating one p.m. peak hour trip.
- Fee rates for non-residential uses are converted from p.m. peak hour to equivalent square footage based on the type of non-residential use.



Figure 1.1 SYTIA TIF Area

- The Study estimated that new development in the area covered by the Fee Program will generate 35,363 new daily p.m. peak hour traffic trips.
- The Study estimated the total cost of the proposed projects at \$250,000,000 (in 2010 dollars), of which \$100,000,000 (2010 dollars) would be covered by the TIF program.
- The resulting fee was established at \$2,828 per p.m. peak hour trip (\$100M/35,363 trips).



1.3. Included Projects

East Wheatland Expressway

The East Wheatland Expressway would construct a new local high-speed two-lane road connecting Spenceville Road east of Wheatland to SR 65 at Riosa Road in Placer County. The Expressway would include an overcrossing of SR 65 and the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) as well as a structure across Bear River. The intersections at Spenceville Rd and Riosa Rd would have lighting, but full signalization would occur when triggered by development.

Wheatland is a growing City with plans for further development. Currently SR 65 transitions from a freeway outside of the City limits to a local highway with signals and local intersections through downtown Wheatland. Further local development will result in congestion throughout the urban center of Wheatland as well as back-ups along SR 65. A bypass route would reduce traffic on SR 65, provide access to growing job opportunities, improve safety, and ultimately would be converted to a portion of the re-aligned SR 65.

SR 65/S. Beale Rd Interchange with Extension to Forty Mile Rd

The existing SR 65/South Beale Road intersection is currently unsignalized and adjacent to an at-grade railroad crossing. This intersection is located on a portion of SR 65 where the facility transitions from a four-lane freeway to the north to a two-lane highway to the south. The proposed project includes a SR 65/South Beale Road interchange, a South Beale Road overcrossing of UPRR to the east of SR 65, and a connection to Forty Mile Road to the west.

The project will improve safety by removing an unsignalized intersection and an at-grade crossing of a welltrafficked freight line. The interchange will also improve access to Beale Air Force Base, as well as access to a voter-approved sports and entertainment zone and the Eston Yumeka Maidu Tribe's Hotel & Gaming facility to the west.

Plumas Lake Boulevard Extension/SR 70 Southbound Loop On-Ramp

This project is Phase 2 of the SR 70/Plumas Lake Boulevard interchange project. The SR 70/Plumas Lake Boulevard interchange currently provides access to and from the west. To travel east from SR 70, drivers must first travel west on Plumas Lake Boulevard, then north on River Oaks Boulevard, and finally east on Algodon Road to Plumas Arboga Road. Algodon Road passes under SR 70 and includes an at-grade railroad crossing of the UPRR tracks. Phase 2 of the SR 70 interchange will construct the southbound loop on-ramp to SR 70 and extend Plumas Lake Boulevard to the east including a grade separation over the railroad, Old Marysville Road, and a canal before intersecting Plumas Arboga Road. The at-grade railroad crossing at Algodon Road will be closed.

This project will complete the Plumas Lake Blvd interchange and significantly improve circulation, getting rid of the circuitous routes that vehicles currently travel. The project is currently in the Final Design Phase and is funded through that phase.

SR 65 Realignment

Both the SR 65/South Beale Road Interchange and the East Wheatland Expressway will provide the north and south ends of a future SR 65 alignment bypassing downtown Wheatland. They have independent utility, providing needed improvements in the near term, and can be advanced without precluding an ultimate realignment of SR 65 east of its current route. The SR 65 Realignment project would be the final link connecting the two ends of the bypass, while continuing to provide local access.



1.4. Necessity for Comprehensive Implementation Strategy

The SYTIA Impact Fees will raise funds toward each of these projects but will not fund them in their entirety. A Comprehensive Implementation Strategy (CIS) is therefore needed to identify and use available funds in the best way to attract and leverage additional regional, state, and federal funds to advance the projects.

Currently transportation funding is in a very constrained environment. SYTIA will need to be very strategic in how revenue sources are pursued. Certain types of projects are much more 'attractive' than others, so finding funding sources is about highlighting certain elements of a project and in essence 'marketing' the project to the right groups. For example, growth projects are not currently attractive, instead highlighting such things as improved safety, access to jobs and educations, as well as access to the National Defense System, will make projects more competitive.

Section 4.0 Funding Strategies provides detailed information on funding opportunities.

1.5. Comprehensive Implementation Strategy Goals

The first step when beginning the CIS was to develop clear and concise goals for what it should focus on and deliver. The following goals were developed and presented to the SYTIA Board for concurrence at their meeting on February 2, 2021.

- Create a long-term implementation plan that preserves a viable easterly realignment of SR 65
- Develop near term projects with independent utility
- Establish a second access to the Sports-Entertainment Complex from SR 65
- Establish a local road connection from Riosa Road to Spenceville Road diverting traffic from SR 65 in Wheatland
- Create an implementation plan to complete the State Route 70/Plumas Lake Blvd interchange and connection to Plumas Arboga Road
- Consider opportunities to highlight or add project features to attract and leverage funding from additional sources
- Synchronize planned projects in the CIS, Caltrans SHOPP, Caltrans Minor Project Program, and from local developers
- Work closely with regional partners to ensure infrastructure improvements are consistent with and included in the SACOG MTP/SCS
- Develop a delivery outline with cost, funding, and prioritization recommendations for the projects in the SYTIA program



2.0 Project Scoping

For most of the SYTIA projects, only general project descriptions based on various agency planning documents were available. These documents include the Yuba County and City of Wheatland General Plans, supporting technical studies, a 2000 Project Study Report for the Wheatland Bypass and the 2005 Project Report for the Route 70/Plumas Lake Blvd Interchange. The CIS development team further studied each project to better define project features, potential alignments and alternatives that meet roadway standards. This allowed more detailed discussion of impacts and cost. Decision makers can then determine how best to budget available funds to advance each project. This section provides information on how the project scopes were refined and various alternatives to be considered. It is not intended to preclude additional refinements and alternatives from consideration, but to help focus the discussion of how these projects can be advanced.

2.1. Stakeholder Outreach

Stakeholder outreach is a process that involves seeking out individuals/companies/organizations that will be or believe they will be affected by the proposal of a project. The outreach is aimed at establishing a dialogue and/or relationship with the stakeholders in order to:

- uncover information which may shape the design of the project;
- establish ownership of the proposed projects for the stakeholders, creating future proponents of the projects; and
- lessen chances of future project delays.

The SYTIA projects are large in scope and will encompass many stakeholders, including but not limited to:

- o Caltrans
- o Union Pacific Railroad
- o Placer County
- o Yuba County
- o City of Wheatland
- o Placer County Transportation Planning Agency
- o Beale Air Force Base (AFB)
- Hard Rock Hotel and Casino
- o Wheatland Toyota Amphitheatre
- o Local Residents
- Local Agriculture (farms and orchards)

The CIS development team initiated stakeholder outreach focused on the major goals of the CIS and project concepts, rather than detailed outreach for each project. Meetings were held with representative of Caltrans and Beale Air Force Base. An opportunity for input was also provided at the SYTIA Board's meeting held on February 2, 2021. A summary of key input included:

- A Route Adoption process is long and costly and could delay advancing associated or component projects that on their own have independent utility. Without sight of full funding, it's best to delay Route Adoption.
- Planning new routes with increased VMT is not an area that Caltrans is being directed to focus on with public funds.
- Caltrans advised building facilities to meet State Standards (if planned for future Route Adoption) with a 350' width of right of way.
- Caltrans would take the lead on a future SR 65 realignment project/process
- South Beale Road is the main commercial access for Beale AFB transportation. The main gate at Schnider Road is currently closed and the Wheatland gate at South Beale will become the main gate.



- Direct access to SR 65 from South Beale Road is important to Beale AFB.
- Traffic from Beale AFB headed to southbound SR 65 would gravitate toward the East Wheatland Expressway, using either Spenceville Road or Jasper Lane.
- City of Wheatland is planning for future growth to provide additional base housing.

Additional stakeholder outreach will occur as part of the development process for each project, which is discussed in Section 5 *Project Development Process*.

2.2. Independent Utility

It is important that each of the studied projects have Independent Utility. A project with Independent Utility means that the project is singular and complete. It is considered fully functional and beneficial in the absence of any other projects or phases. Portions of a larger phased development project (such as realigning SR 65) can be considered as having independent utility if they would be constructed even if other phases of the overall project are never built. This is a key factor for the CIS projects, as without independent utility, the bypass, and two interchange projects would need to be studied, approved, and funded as part of the future realignment of SR 65. Bundling all the projects into one would make funding and approval a difficult and lengthy process, leaving the area without these key individual projects for many years.

Fortunately, each of the CIS projects possesses Independent Utility. The East Wheatland Expressway, SR 65/S. Beale Interchange, and Plumas/SR 70 projects can all be constructed and will stand alone independently of each other. The future SR 65 realignment would be constructed to connect the Expressway and S. Beale Interchange. Each project has its own unique need and justification as described above in Section 1.3 *Included Projects*.

2.3. **Project Alternatives**

As part of the CIS, a range of potential alternatives were studied to demonstrate each project's feasibility and how they could be delivered independently yet in concert with each other. The more advanced concept designs also allowed the first steps in assessing project impacts and costs. This will assist the agencies in discussions of how and when each project can be advanced.

Figures 2.1-2.4 show the four SYTIA Projects and potential configurations. The alternatives presented are intended to show what could work and to use this information in developing project costs for budgeting purposed. It is not intended to limit alternatives from consideration during the individual project approval processes. Additional alternatives may be considered as part of the development process for each project. Each of the alternatives are then reviewed against the Purpose and Need statement for each project, which is also developed as part of the project approval process. Chapter 5-Project Development Process provides additional information regarding project approval steps.

Following is a detailed description of the projects and currently developed alternatives. Section 3.2 Project Assumptions discusses more detailed design assumptions used for cost estimations of specific alternatives.











East Wheatland Expressway

Three different alternatives were studied for the Expressway. All three alternatives share the following similarities: the road connects Riosa Road to Spenceville Road east of Wheatland. Each alternative includes structures over SR 65/UPRR and over Bear River. Intersections at Spenceville and Riosa Road will include lighting, but signals will be delayed until the ultimate realignment or whenever deemed necessary by growing traffic volumes. Each includes a signalized intersection at Spenceville Road to align the new expressway with Jasper Lane. The differences in the alternatives are as follows:

Option 1	Option 2	Option 3
Provides the most area for commercial development between the new road and SR 65 to the east. Could accommodate a major commercial center similar to "Lincoln Crossing"	Provides a small amount of area for commercial development between the new road and SR 65 to the east. Not enough for a large commercial development but perhaps some small establishments.	Puts the majority of the Expressway to the east of SR 65. Provides no area for commercial development between the new road and SR 65 to the east.
Shortest structure over SR 65 and UPRR.	Longest structure over SR 65 and UPRR as the alignment crosses SR 65 at a high skew	Structure length falls in the middle of the 3 options
	Provides a longer straightaway approaching Riosa Road Intersection	Intersection at Riosa Road intersects at same location SR 65 intersects Riosa Road. This would make through traffic from SR 65 to the expressway more direct, while downtown traffic would divert.

Environmental and Right of Way Considerations

The expressway will be constructed through land consisting mostly of agricultural fields. The Bear River waterway will be crossed and there will likely be some riparian impacts. According to preliminary research there may be vernal pool habitat near the south end of the project.

The expressway will cross not only privately held property, but railroad right-of-way, public utility lands, and irrigation district canals. The crossing of UPRR will require an easement from the railroad. The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) will need to approve the crossing and the City of Wheatland will need to enter into a maintenance agreement with UPRR.

SR 65/S. Beale Rd Interchange with Extension to Forty Mile Rd

A North, Central, and Northwest layout for the interchange location were studied. Each interchange location includes an extension to Forty Mile Road. The North and Central layouts include various options for where that extension could fall.

Northwest	North	Central
The extension to Forty Mile Rd would be constructed along Morrison Rd	Four options were studied to extend to Forty Mile Rd	Three options were studied to extend to Forty Mile Rd
Local roads would be cul-de-saced as necessary	Local roads would be cul-de-saced as necessary	Local roads would be cul-de-saced as necessary
	Existing Rancho Rd intersection would be moved from SR 65 to intersect directly to S Beale Rd just east of the intersection.	Would present the greatest environmental impacts with interchange location so close to wetlands of Best Slough

Environmental and Right of Way Considerations

The new interchange will impact a significant footprint adjacent to SR 65 and consists mostly of rural farmlands. Best Slough runs just south of South Beale. The Northwest and North location avoid the slough and associated wetlands to the extent possible, while the Central location would impact the wetlands.

All alternatives would contact railroad right of way as well as privately owned lands. The crossing of UPRR will require an easement from the railroad. The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) will need to approve the crossing and Yuba County will need to enter into a maintenance agreement with UPRR.

Plumas Lake Boulevard Extension/SR 70 Southbound Loop On-Ramp

The SR 70 interchange and Plumas Lake Blvd extension project has already gone through project approval, preliminary design, and is currently in final design. As such, no further alternatives were studied as part of the CIS. The project will complete the east side of the interchange by connecting Plumas Lake Blvd to Plumas Arboga Rd, including an overcrossing of UPRR and Old Marysville Rd. The project will also add a southbound SR 70 loop on-ramp.

Environmental and Right of Way Considerations

The interchange improvements include an overcrossing of the UPRR, which will require an easement from the railroad. The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) will need to approve the crossing. The County of Yuba will need to enter into a maintenance agreement with UPRR.

SR 65 Realignment

The SR 65 Realignment will connect the East Wheatland Expressway to the SR 65/South Beale Road Interchange taking SR 65 east of Wheatland. Necessary provisions would be made to allow for local access. A route adoption would need to be completed to transfer the local road expressway to Caltrans as SR 65.

City of Wheatland's 2006 General Plan mentioned both west and east alignments for the SR 65 realignment. A Caltrans PSR completed in 2000 also included east and west options; however, the west alignment was not acceptable due to impacts to prime farmland. The Wheatland City Council voted to consider only alignments to the east of existing SR 65.

Environmental and Right of Way Considerations

Realigning SR 65 will be a major project that will impact many properties of various use, regardless of the exact alignment chosen. Rural homes, agricultural lands, irrigation canals, and railroad right of way all will be affected by the project. Railroad crossings will require the same approvals and maintenance agreements discussed above.

Preliminary research shows potential vernal pool and wetland habitat as well as California Garter Snake habitat. Further studies may find additional impacts. These items would be studied in more detail as part of the Route Adoption process.

2.4. Traffic Analysis Summary

A Traffic Memorandum for the CIS projects was prepared by Fehr & Peers and finalized on June 1, 2021, and is included as Attachment A. The traffic analysis was done to help shape the project alternatives as well as to study the relationship between the projects and future development.

The planning level traffic assessment evaluated the following three projects:

- SR 70/Plumas Lake Boulevard Interchange Phase 2
- SR 65/South Beale Road Interchange and Extension to Forty Mile Road
- East Wheatland Expressway

The second phase of the SR 70/Plumas Lake Boulevard interchange will shift some traffic from parallel facilities to the north. The new connection to the east will improve network efficiency by reducing out-of-direction travel, thereby reducing vehicle miles traveled (VMT). The project will improve safety with improved roadways and intersections and by closing an at-grade railroad crossing.

Constructing an interchange on SR 65 at South Beale Road and a connection to Forty Mile Road will shift traffic from parallel facilities to the north. The new connection to Forty Mile Road will improve network efficiency by reducing out-of-direction travel, thereby reducing VMT. The project will improve safety by replacing at grade intersections at Rancho Road/Morrison Road and South Beale Road with an interchange and by closing an at-grade railroad crossing.

The current configuration of SR 65 through Wheatland limits the residential development potential of Wheatland. A bypass route around Wheatland will improve the commute times and proximity to employment centers, thereby increasing the potential for residential development in the city. The East Wheatland Expressway will shift traffic from a congested SR 65 at the Placer County line to serve planned development east of downtown Wheatland. The new connection will improve network efficiency by reducing out-of-direction travel, thereby reducing VMT. The project will improve safety by shifting traffic from the congested SR 65 and improving the Spenceville Road/Jasper Lane intersection.

The SR 65/South Beale Road Interchange will address operational and safety deficiencies of the existing SR 65 facility. Additionally, the project will improve network efficiency by reducing out-of-direction travel between the

traffic generators on Forty Mile Road (casino and amphitheater) and SR 65. It may also serve as a catalyst to encourage new development in the Highway 65 Employment Center and Entertainment District.

The East Wheatland Expressway will provide operational improvements, but most of its benefits will occur when planned developments east of downtown Wheatland are constructed. The safety benefits of the project also rely on the traffic diversion effect that will not occur until planned development occurs. The timing of planned development east of downtown Wheatland will directly influence the operational benefits provided by the East Wheatland Expressway. Although 21,000 vehicles per day are forecast to use this roadway under cumulative conditions, it would serve less than 2,000 vehicles per day if it were built in the very near future prior to new land development coming online. Likewise, while the traffic analysis shows sizeable traffic volumes on County roadways approaching the SR 65/South Beale Road interchange, usage would be much lower in the near-term if construction occurred prior to new land development occurring. Hence, the timing of land development would appear to be a critical factor in terms of prioritizing these projects. The reverse is also true in that the accessibility benefits to the geographic areas served by each improvement could also be an important consideration.

3.0 Cost Estimates

Order of magnitude construction cost estimates were developed for each project, together with estimated environmental, right of way and project delivery costs. This will assist SYTIA in planning and budgeting early activities to advance the projects, as well as developing funding for later steps. Methodology, project assumptions and cost summaries are provided below.

3.1. Estimation Methodology

Roadway

Roadway estimates were calculated using pavement square footage of proposed projects and square footage costs. Square footage prices were developed by gathering roadway square foot areas from similar and nearby completed projects along with their bid costs. Roadway square footage prices include pavement section, earthwork, barriers/railings, signing & striping, drainage, and erosion control. Roadway square footages do not include structural elements (bridges, culverts, retaining walls, etc.). Costs for signals, lighting, and utility work are included as lump sum estimations based on perceived complexities. Soundwalls and Landscaping were not included in the cost estimates. Additional details on the roadway cost estimates can be found in Attachment B.

Structures

Structure Estimates were developed by locating each location expected to require a culvert or bridge along the selected alignments. Each location was analyzed using aerial photos to estimate necessary length as well as required vertical clearances and abutment embankment slopes. For example, the structures crossing over the railroad would require a minimum vertical clearance of 23.5 feet. Toes of abutment embankment were then placed just outside railroad right of way (pulled from parcel maps) and traced back at standard embankment slopes to arrive at a minimum structure length. This length was then compared to the aerial photos to check for other items to be spanned (such as canals). Structure types and span lengths were determined by studying aerials and using structural experience with guidance from Caltrans "depth-to-span ratios". With structure type, length and width; the structures were estimated based on square footage costs listed in *Comparative Bridge Costs* from Caltrans' *Bridge Design Aids*. Additional details on the structure cost estimates can be found in Attachment B.

Environmental

Environmental Mitigation and Permitting costs were based on preliminary research of aerials and online databases such as *EcoAtlas*, together with specific project assumptions. The mapping used to estimate environmental costs is included in Attachment C.

Right of Way

Right of Way costs were based on average square footage land values (determined from local comparables) and damages (pulled from online databases such as UC Davis' Agricultural Database). Costs include considerations for relocation, unusable remnants, and full takes. Areas of acquisition were developed using assumed right of way widths (discussed below), an estimation of necessary construction easements, and parcel maps. Each affected parcel was studied to determine classification of acquisition, land use, improvements to parcel, and damages to parcel. Also considered were the right of way delivery costs including, appraisals and plat and legal preparation. Attachment D shows the mapping that the right of way costs were based on, note that while one project alternative had to be chosen to develop costs this does not indicate a preference for any one alternative over another.

Contingencies

A Contingency allowance of 25% was added to each subset of the costs estimates to account for future changes to and refinement of project design, changes to existing land improvements or development, unknown project complexities that may be discovered during focused design (such as historic structures located, environmental hazards uncovered, unsuitable foundation material, etc.) and potential mitigation costs such as soundwalls.

3.2. Project Assumptions

East Wheatland Expressway

Estimates are based on the Option 1 Alternative. Option 1 is similar in length to other alternatives, will be middleof-the-pack for ROW costs, and provides good opportunity for commercial development adjacent to SR 65.

ASSUMED PROJECT CRITERIA										
Proposed Cross Section	Structures	Right of Way	Other							
 One travel lane in each direction 10' shoulders, 12' lanes 4:1 side slopes (to meet future Caltrans standards) 3' Aggregate Base shoulder backing Turn lanes at intersections 	 SR65/UPRR crossing and Bear River crossing: 44' clear width plus width for standard barriers Structures would be built on plane (2%) to match ultimate SR 65 southbound roadway section These two structures would be ultimate southbound structures for future SR 65 alignment 	 Where the alignment will become SR 65 in the future, right of way width will be as requested by Caltrans - 350' on center Where alignment will remain a local arterial right of way width will be 84' on center, per Wheatland Standards 	 The length coinciding with ultimate SR 65 is assumed built in same location as the ultimate southbound side of SR 65. Allows for improved staging in the future Can re-use portions of Expressway pavement section coinciding with SR 65 ultimate alignment. Portions of pavement section will need to be rebuilt to convert from a 2% crowned section to 2% on-plane (or supered through curves). Intersection lighting at Riosa Road and Spenceville Road. Signals deferred to the ultimate realignment per traffic analysis, unless triggered sooner by development. 							

SR 65/S. Beale Rd Interchange with Extension to Forty Mile Rd

Estimates will be based on the North Alternative - Option B. Option B provides good service to the Measure R Development area and develops Morrison Road. The other alternatives have more costly ROW and habitat impacts. North Option B requires a similar amount of local roadway connection work as the other alternatives. This option assumes a spread diamond (L-2) layout.

ASSUMED PROJECT CRITERIA								
Proposed Cross Section	Structure Widths	Right of Way	Other					
LOCAL ROADS Morrison Rd, West of SR 65 (through future Measure R development area) Cross Section: 8' shoulders, 2-12' lanes w/ 12' two-way-left-turn (total 52' pavement width) 3:1 side slopes and 3' Aggregate Base shoulder backing S Beale Rd, East of SR 65 Cross Section: 8' shoulders, 2-12' lanes (total 40' pavement width) 3:1 slopes and 3' Aggregate Base shoulder backing Local Road Connections Extending Bradshaw Road: Cross Section: (local road standards for Yuba County) 18' roadway width, 3' Aggregate Base shoulder backing, 3:1 side slopes	 SR 65 crossing and UPRR crossing: 40' clear roadway width plus width for standard barriers (Morrison Road will widen West of SR 65 Overcrossing) Two Irrigation Canal Crossings along Morrison Road 52' clear roadway width plus standard barriers 	 City/County Standards Morrison Road – 84' on center Local Rd Connections (Bradshaw) – 60' on center SR 65 – 350' on center 	 Signal and lighting at Forty Mile Road/Morrison Road Rancho Road connection to SR 65 would be moved north to connect directly to S. Beale Road as the current intersection location is too close to S. Beale Interchange ramp diverge point. S. Beale Road would no longer connect to SR 65, with traffic shifted to a new railroad overcrossing 					

Plumas Lake Boulevard Extension/SR 70 Southbound Loop On-Ramp

This project was in the Final Design stage while compiling this report. Costs estimates were prepared using standard methods and protocols for publicly funded projects. Quantities were based on an item list and item costs and were prepared by TY Lin who is preparing the final design.

SR 65 Realignment

Realigns existing SR 65 to connect the SR 65/S. Beale Rd Interchange to the East Wheatland Expressway. Route Adoption required (with Environmental Clearance) to realign SR 65. This option assumes L-2 spread diamond layouts.

	ASSUMED P	ROJECT CRITERIA	
Proposed Cross Section	Structure Widths	Right of Way	Other
 Use same cross section (i.e., thicknesses of HMA, AB, ASB) as existing "newer" portions of SR 65 south of Sheridan (from Lincoln Bypass project). 78' Median Northbound & Southbound Roadways (each): 5' left shoulder, 2-12' lanes, 10' right shoulder 4:1 side slopes 	 Structures Grade Separations at Spenceville Road and Riosa Road Interchanges : 40' clear width (12' lanes & 8' shoulders) plus width for standard barriers UPRR/Old 65 (SR 65 Structure): Dual Structures, 39' clear width each (5' Shld, 2- 12' Lanes, 10' Shld) plus width for standard barriers. Jasper Road Crossing: 40' clear roadway width (12' lanes & 8' shoulders) plus width for standard barriers Over Crossings of Dry Creek and Grasshopper Slough just south of Spenceville Road. Match roadway clear width plus standard barriers. 	 350' on center along proposed realignment 	 Convert portion of what will be the existing East Wheatland Expressway to the southbound lanes of new SR 65 and terminate remainders appropriately for local roads. Interchanges at Riosa Road and Spenceville Road Lump Sum interchange cost based on recent local interchange projects Allotment for one interchange midway between Spenceville Road Interchanges Signals and Lighting at: Old 65/Sheridan, Old 65/Riosa Rd Signals at SR 65/Riosa Rd, and SR 65/Spenceville Rd Local Road Continuity Connection of old SR 65 to Morrison Road: 40' clear width (12' lanes & 8' shoulders) and 60' right of way on center Structure over Best Slough: match roadway width plus standard barriers

3.3. Cost Estimate Summaries

Estimated costs for each project are shown in Table 3.1, with each broken down by Project Development Phase. Table 3.2 provides a total by project and combined total. Costs are shown distributed over the next five fiscal years based on desired need to meet typical project delivery time frames which assume no funding constraints. Given SYTIA's funding outlook, time frames will be much longer. Backup information can be found in Attachment E - Cost Accumulation Worksheet.

Table 3.1

Cost Estimate Summary by Project Fiscal Year 21/22 through 25/26 (Based on Need and Unconstrained Funding)

Costs are in 2022 Dollars

Project

East Wheatland Expressway

Cost Estimate by Phase	Prior	21/22	22/23	23/24	24/25	25/26	Future	Total
Preliminary Design/PSR	\$0	\$600,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$600,000
Environmental Clearance/ Project Approval	\$0	\$0	\$1,200,000	\$600,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,800,000
Final Design	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,500,000	\$3,500,000	\$200,000	\$0	\$7,200,000
Right of Way Acquisitions	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,500,000	\$3,300,000	\$5,800,000
Permitting & Mitigation	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$7,500,000	\$7,500,000
Construction	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$60,000,000	\$60,000,000
Construction Support	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$9,000,000	\$9,000,000
Totals	\$0	\$600,000	\$1,200,000	\$4,100,000	\$3,500,000	\$2,700,000	\$79,800,000	\$91,900,000

SR 65/S. Beale Rd Interchange with Extension to Forty Mile Road

Cost Estimate by Phase	Prior	21/22	22/23	23/24	24/25	25/26	Future	Total
Preliminary Design/PSR	\$0	\$850,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$850,000
Environmental Clearance/ Project Approval	\$0	\$0	\$1,700,000	\$800,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,500,000
Final Design	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,500,000	\$4,500,000	\$800,000	\$0	\$9,800,000
Right of Way Acquisitions	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,500,000	\$1,400,000	\$3,900,000
Permitting & Mitigation	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,300,000	\$4,300,000
Construction	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$81,600,000	\$81,600,000
Construction Support	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$12,250,000	\$12,250,000
Totals	\$0	\$850,000	\$1,700,000	\$5,300,000	\$4,500,000	\$3,300,000	\$99,550,000	\$115,200,000

Table 3.1 (Continued)

Cost Estimate Summary by Project

Fiscal Year 21/22 through 25/26 (Based on Need and Unconstrained Funding)

Costs are in 2022 Dollars

Project

Plumas Lake Blvd Extension & SR 70 SB Loop On-Ramp

Cost Estimate by Phase	Prior	21/22	22/23	23/24	24/25	25/26	Future	Total
Preliminary Design/PSR	Funded	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	Funded
Environmental Clearance/ Project Approval	Funded	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	Funded
Final Design	Funded	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	Funded
Right of Way Acquisitions	\$0	\$0	\$4,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,000,000
Permitting & Mitigation	\$0	\$0		\$500,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$500,000
Construction	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$20,000,000	\$14,200,000	\$0	\$0	\$34,200,000
Construction Support	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,600,000	\$2,600,000	\$0	\$0	\$5,200,000
Totals	\$0	\$0	\$4,000,000	\$23,100,000	\$16,800,000	\$0	\$0	\$43,900,000

SR 65 Realignment

Cost Estimate by Phase	Prior	21/22	22/23	23/24	24/25	25/26	Future	Total
Preliminary Design/PSR	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,600,000	\$2,600,000
Environmental Clearance/ Project Approval	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$7,800,000	\$7,800,000
Final Design	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$30,900,000	\$30,900,000
Right of Way Acquisitions	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$25,500,000	\$25,500,000
Permitting & Mitigation	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$6,600,000	\$6,600,000
Construction	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$257,500,000	\$257,500,000
Construction Support	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$38,700,000	\$38,700,000
Totals	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$369,600,000	\$369,600,000

Table 3.2

Total Project Cost by Year Fiscal Year 21/22 through 25/26 (Based on Need and Unconstrained Funding)

Costs are in 2022 Dollars

Project	21/22	22/23	23/24	24/25	25/26	Future	Total
East Wheatland Expressway	\$600,000	\$1,200,000	\$4,100,000	\$3,500,000	\$2,700,000	\$79,800,000	\$91,900,000
South Beale Rd/SR 65	\$850,000	\$1,700,000	\$5,300,000	\$4,500,000	\$3,300,000	\$99,550,000	\$115,200,000
Plumas Lake Ext./SR 70	\$0	\$4,000,000	\$23,100,000	\$16,800,000	\$0	\$0	\$43,900,000
Subtotal w/out SR 65 Realignment	\$1,450,000	\$6,900,000	\$32,500,000	\$24,800,000	\$6,000,000	\$179,350,000	\$251,000,000
SR 65 Realignment	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$369,600,000	\$369,600,000
Totals	\$1,450,000	\$6,900,000	\$32,500,000	\$24,800,000	\$6,000,000	\$548,050,000	\$620,600,000

4.0 Funding Strategies

SYTIA faces a major challenge in attracting discretionary funds, as road capacity increasing projects like the two interchanges and two road projects in the project list, have fallen out of favor in Federal and State programs. An approach which is strategic, realistic, and persistent presents the best chance for funding success.

4.1. Overall Funding Outlook: Opportunities and Challenges

After a very long lull, there is finally action at both a State and Federal level to increase transportation funding.

In California, the passage of SB 1 in 2017 directs \$5.4 billion annually towards a host of programs improving state and local road maintenance, transit agency support, bridge maintenance, bicycle and pedestrian programs, and goods movement, with smaller amounts directed at matching local transportation funds, planning, and freeway service patrols.

While no legislation has been enacted as yet on the Federal level, there is energized discussion behind a major infrastructure package that could be enacted before the end of 2021. The current proposals range widely, with price tags from \$600 billion to \$2 trillion. The good news is that funding for transportation, along with water systems and broadband, is the common thread to all the proposals; the negotiations appear to be centered around the inclusion of housing, job training, and care for the elderly and disabled as part of the bill. The larger challenge is that the transportation portion of the Federal bill also appears to be focused on road and bridge maintenance, electric vehicles, and alternative transportation, rather than new roadways or interchanges.

The long drought in transportation funding means a tremendous backlog of needs. That means competition for available funds remains extremely high, and discretionary funding is an uphill battle. It is particularly challenging for rural and urbanizing areas like Yuba County without the magnitude of matching funds or high traffic congestion figures, relative to urban areas, to motivate decision makers.

Truly, the biggest challenge is that SYTIA focuses on four road expansion projects, in a funding environment that increasingly prioritizes alternative modes like transit, bikes, and pedestrian facilities.

The primary reason for this shift is Federal and State air quality and emission standards targeted to reduce greenhouse gases. California has adopted stringent air quality standards in a quest to reduce emissions to 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030, and 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050, which are far more stringent than Federal requirements. Yuba County, along with the greater Sacramento area, is in non-attainment for Ozone and PM10, which are emitted primarily through transportation. Projects that accommodate increases to vehicular traffic, such as those in SYTIA, have a negative impact to air quality, so they must be more than offset by projects that improve air quality for the overall program to meet these State goals.

For those reasons, road expansion projects are not eligible for most of the State programs. Moreover, in California, most Federal transportation funding programs are administered and distributed through State and regional entities, which for Yuba County means the California Transportation Commission, Caltrans, and the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG). These funds are then subject to State and regional priorities that also favor alternative transportation to meet regional air quality conformity and vehicle miles of travel (VMT) reduction targets.

4.2. Funding Sources

A summary of the currently available funding sources from Federal, State, Regional, and Local sources is provided in the following Table 4.1. A detailed description of these funding sources, including requirements and assessment, is included as Attachment F.

Funding Source	SR 70/Plumas Lake Blvd		70/PlumasSR 65/S.Lake BlvdIC w/ Ext		SR 65/S. Beale Rd East Wheatland IC w/ Ext to 40 Mi. Expressway		SR Realig	SR 65 Realignment Next Round Date		Eligible Phases	Notes
U U	Eligible?	Likely?	Eligible?	Likely?	Eligible?	Likely?	Eligible?	Likely?		5	
FEDERAL											
BUILD Program									2022	All	High cost to put together application. Nationally competitive. Odds improve with large match and construction phase.
Defense Access Road (DAR)									Continuous	All	Requests made through base commander. Submitted for S. Beale Rd/SR 65 IC.
Federal Lands Access (FLAP)									Likely 2024/25	All	Each state has its own program.
Congressmember Designated Projects/Earmarks									Unknown	All	Earmarks are adopted as part of Federal transportation bills.
STATE											
Solutions for Congested Corridors (SCCP)									2022	Design, R/W, construction	Requires comprehensive corridor plan for eligibility.
Trade Corridor Enhancement (TCEP)									2023	All	Programming is by goods movement corridors.
Local Partnership Program (LPP)									2022	Construction	Matching for local fees/taxes
Active Transportation (ATP)									2023	Construction	Project elements that improve pedestrian/bicycle access and safety are eligible. Preconstruction may be funded in limited circumstances.
Interregional Transportation Improvement (ITIP)									2022	All	Project must be in State ITSP.
Highway Bridge Program (HBP)									Continuous	All	Project elements that replace/rehab bridges are eligible.
Section 130 Grade Crossing Elimination									2022	All	Project elements that close roads with at-grade rail crossings.
Section 190 Grade Separation									2022	All	Project elements that construct rail grade separations.

Eligible	
	Yes
	Not currently, but could become eligible with either additional work or in eligible phases
	No

Likely	
	Promising
	Possibly
	Unlikely
	N/A - it is not recommended to pursue discretionary funding for SR 65 Realignment until other
	projects are in or near construction

Table 4.1 - Federal, State, Regional, and Local Funding Sources

Funding Source	SR 70/Plumas Lake Blvd		SR 65/S. Beale Rd IC w/ Ext to 40 Mi.		East Wheatland Expressway		SR 65 Realignment		Next Round Date	Eligible Phases	
	Eligible?	Likely?	Eligible?	Likely?	Eligible?	Likely?	Eligible?	Likely?			
REGIONAL											
Maintenance/Modernization									2023-24	All	Project elements that address
Transformative									2023-24	All	Must be in MTP and MTIP
Community Design									2023-24	All	Project elements that enhance
Active Transportation (ATP)									2023	Construction	Project elements that improv Preconstruction may be fund
LOCAL					·						
SYTIA Fee Program									Continuous	All	Local discretion within progra attractive for discretionary fu
Measure D									Continuous	All	Local discretion within progra attractive for discretionary fu
Direct/In-kind Contributions									Continuous	All	Could be negotiated as part of action.

Eligible	
	Yes
	Not currently, but could become eligible with either additional work or in eligible phases
	No

Likely	
	Promising
	Possibly
	Unlikely
	N/A - it is not recommended to pursue discretionary funding for SR 65 Realignment until other
	projects are in or near construction

Table 4.1 con't - Federal, State, Regional, and Local Funding Sources

Notes

s rehab/safety on existing facilities and are less than \$5M

ce Blueprint friendly development

ve pedestrian/bicycle access and safety are eligible. led in limited circumstances.

am rules. Early use for pre-construction makes projects more unds.

am rules. Early use for pre-construction makes projects more unds.

of development agreements or other discretionary local

4.3. Funding Source Assessment

Each of the SYTIA projects has unique local importance. Funding agencies, however, have their own priorities and goals in administering very competitive programs. SYTIA has an even greater challenge in light of Federal and State policies and requirements that do not favor the road and interchange projects that make up the program.

Therefore, the more SYTIA can frame project applications to meet the needs of the funding entities, the better chance of funding success. This requires three concurrent actions from SYTIA:

- 1) <u>Make projects most competitive by focusing locally controlled money on pre-construction</u>. Projects that have already completed Project Study Reports or better yet, have received environmental clearances, have an increased chance of funding both because they have identified or cleared many major issues that affect cost, scope, and schedule. Local funding also provides concrete evidence of commitment to the project.
- 2) <u>Meet with funding agencies.</u> Finding out directly from the staff how they do the analysis of the applications and make recommendations is key to determine how best to frame SYTIA projects in funding applications. A detailed list of actions to support project application success is shown below under Funding Application Support Strategies.
- 3) **Don't put SYTIA projects in competition with each other.** While over the long term, the same funding source may be pursued for different projects, it is strongly recommended that SYTIA not submit more than one project per source per cycle. A separate funding track is recommended for each project, with a detailed list of funding sources and suggested argument/approach shown below under Funding Application Targets/Approach by Project.

4.4. Supporting Strategies

Immediate

- It is highly recommended that SYTIA work with SACOG, PCTPA, and Caltrans to designate SR 65 as a Strategic Interregional Corridor in the 2021 update of the Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan (ITSP). While it is unlikely Caltrans will change policies to allow interchange funding, an ITSP designation will allow the East Wheatland Expressway and SR 65 Realignment to be eligible for future ITIP consideration.
- Make the projects eligible for the funding sought. Focus on getting next phase of effort into Metropolitan Transportation Plan and Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) as soon as possible.

Short Term/Ongoing

- Brief the funding agencies, elected officials, and key influencers about the projects and vision for SYTIA well ahead of the programming decisions. This assures a familiarity with the individual projects to be submitted with a personal touch that can't be obtained from dry documents. These funding agencies can also offer important advice about how to make projects more competitive for funding. Those briefings may include:
 - SACOG staff
 - California Transportation Commission staff and Commissioner Rocky Davis
 - California Public Utilities Commission staff
 - Union Pacific Railroad

- Federal representatives/staff
 - Senators Feinstein and Padilla
 - Congressmembers Garamendi, LaMalfa, and McClintock
- State representatives/staff
 - Senator Nielsen
 - Assembly members Gallagher and Kiley

- Use project information sheets as part of these briefings as a high level, high impact overview of the project. A sample Project Information Sheet prepared for the Federal earmark proposal for the South Beale Road/SR 65 IC is shown in Attachment G.
- Make sure the public knows the intent and plans for these projects, and address issues immediately. Active controversy will kill the possibility of discretionary funding.
- Find project champions, particularly local electees, that are willing to discuss the project with funding agencies, influencers, and other elected officials. Representation on the SACOG Board is particularly important to this effort. Both Yuba County and the City of Wheatland have seats, which gives the opportunity to bring up, as appropriate, the importance of these projects as part of the funding discussions.

Continuity of Board membership is also important as the learning curve for SACOG Board members is steep, and greater longevity can often translate to greater insight to the process, resulting in greater effectiveness.

- Be flexible and ready to reframe a project to meet the requirements of the funding source. For example, the same project can be framed to emphasize the benefit to interregional goods movement for State Trade Corridor Enhancement Program (TCEP) funds, while highlighting the safety and economic improvement for a SACOG Regional Transformative application.
- Be persistent. Follow up with funding agency staff on applications to make sure it has been received and if there are any questions. If an application is not funded, meet with the staff and/or decision makers for a debrief to understand why.
- Keep in regular touch with Federal and State representatives to update them on the projects. These people are resources that can provide alerts to funding opportunities and give assistance if problems arise with regulatory agencies.

<u>Keep in Mind</u>

- A long term strategy cannot be too specific as the transportation funding is constantly evolving and will look different in 10 years.
- Funding for larger projects, such as those in SYTIA, rarely comes from a single source. As transportation funding programs evolve, so must the funding strategies, as a way to take maximum advantage of those changes to funding sources.

4.5. Funding Application Target/Approach by Project

Plumas Lake Blvd Extension/SR 70 Southbound Loop On-Ramp

Next Funding Needed: Estimated \$43.8M for right of way and construction

Targeted Funding Sources: This is the only project in SYTIA eligible for construction only funding sources. Best sources are a mix of:

- ✓ Regional Program: Transformative
- ✓ Trade Corridor Enhancement Program
- ✓ Local Partnership Planning
- ✓ Active Transportation Program (for included bikeway and pedestrian facilities)
- ✓ Section 130 Highway Grade Crossing Elimination (for included grade crossing closure)
- ✓ Measure D
- ✓ SYTIA Impact Fees

Best Arguments: Economic development/jobs growth in economically disadvantaged area; access to workforce housing, goods movement, safety.

East Wheatland Expressway and SR 65/South Beale Road Interchange with Extension to Forty Mile Road

These two projects are in the same status, as no funding has yet been secured and are of equal priority to SYTIA.

Funding for pre-construction, particularly on road capacity projects like these, is notoriously difficult. It should be the emphasis of SYTIA to use locally controlled funds, including developer impact fees and Measure D, to leverage funds and move these projects towards construction to make them eligible for more diverse funding sources. Having the projects compete against each other for the same funding type in the same funding cycle should also be avoided.

East Wheatland Expressway

Next Funding Needed: Estimated \$600K for PSR; \$1.2M for environmental clearance; \$7.2M for final design.

Targeted Funding Sources: Best sources are a mix of:

- ✓ Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (assuming future designation in ITSP)
- ✓ Regional Program: Transformative
- ✓ Community Design Program
- ✓ Active Transportation Program (for included bikeway and pedestrian facilities)
- ✓ Section 190 Grade Separation Program (for railroad overcrossing)
- ✓ Union Pacific funds (for required railroad funded Grade Separation match)
- ✓ Defense Access Program
- ✓ Federal Lands Access Program
- ✓ Measure D
- ✓ SYTIA Impact Fees

Best Arguments: Economic development/jobs growth in economically disadvantaged area; interregional connectivity; access to workforce housing; access to Beale Air Force Base; removal of state highway through a traditional downtown; improve alternate modes of transportation; safety.

SR 65/South Beale Road Interchange with Extension to Forty Mile Road

Next Funding Needed: Estimated \$850K for PSR; \$2.5M for environmental clearance; \$9.8M for final design.

Targeted Funding Sources: Best sources are a mix of:

- ✓ Federal Earmark
- ✓ Defense Access Road Program
- ✓ Federal Lands Access Program
- ✓ Trade Corridor Enhancement Program
- ✓ Measure D
- ✓ SYTIA Impact Fees

Best Arguments: Access to Beale Air Force Base and tribal lands; economic development/jobs growth in economically disadvantaged area; goods movement; safety.

SR 65 Realignment

It is expected that the SR 65 Realignment will be the last of the four SYTIA projects to move forward and likely many years in the future. The funding sources noted below are based on current programs, without speculation as to if or how those programs might be active by the time this project is ready to move forward.

Next Funding Needed: Estimated \$2.6M for PSR; \$7.8M for environmental clearance; \$30.9M for final design.

Targeted Funding Sources: Best sources are a mix of:

- ✓ Federal Earmark
- ✓ Federal Lands Access Program
- ✓ Defense Access Road Program
- ✓ Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (assuming future designation in ITSP)
- ✓ Regional Program: Transformative
- ✓ Community Design Program
- ✓ Active Transportation Program (for included bikeway and pedestrian facilities)
- ✓ Section 190 Grade Separation Program (for railroad overcrossing)
- ✓ Union Pacific funds (for required railroad funded Grade Separation match)
- ✓ Measure D
- ✓ SYTIA Impact Fees

Best Arguments: Economic development/jobs growth in economically disadvantaged area; goods movement; interregional connectivity; removal of state highway through a traditional downtown; safety.

4.6. Funding Strategy Implementation Example

During the development of the funding strategy, the opportunity came up to submit an application for a potential Federal earmark. Unfortunately, this opportunity had an extremely short turnaround, which limited the amount of coordination time between SYTIA members.

The first step was a review of the projects and phases included in SYTIA to determine which had the best chance for success in an earmark request. The recommendation to pursue the South Beale Road/SR 65 Interchange with Extension to Forty Mile Road was based on the following considerations:

• Generally, later money, particularly for construction, is most attractive to Federal help. Three of the SYTIA projects have not started. The Plumas Lake Blvd/SR 70 IC is completing the design phase and is furthest along of the SYTIA projects, which made it a top consideration. However, it did not meet eligibility requirements.

In conferring with SACOG, they confirmed the project is not currently listed in the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) and would not be able to be added until the next update, which could be two years from now. Essentially, if SYTIA received an earmark for this project, the funds could not be spent, so it was eliminated.

- Both the South Beale Road/SR 65 IC and East Wheatland Parkway which under SACOG's Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) are considered two different phases of the same project are both in need of funding for the first step of development, which is the Project Study Report (PSR). SACOG has noted that either project could be amended into the MTIP within a month via administrative amendment. This option is available because the funding is for preconstruction only, rather than right of way or construction. So both pass that test.
- While there are good arguments for both projects, the priorities of the funding entity are a determining factor. In this case, what would be the project that is most important from a Federal point of view? The improvement to the direct access to Beale Air Force Base, a Federal facility, gives the South Beale Road/SR 65 IC a slightly better argument. A bonus to SYTIA is that the funding requested for this PSR would be slightly more money than the estimated cost for the East Wheatland Parkway PSR (\$850K vs. \$600K), which maximizes the leverage to SYTIA.
- The best approach to an admitted long-shot for funding is to present a united front. Funding entities do not want to get in the middle of a local dispute by choosing one project over the other, and faced with a controversy would likely eliminate both projects from further consideration. Both projects are of highest importance to SYTIA members, so rather than prioritizing one over the other, the best track to obtain discretionary funding for both is to pursue different funding sources for each.
- The resulting recommendation was that SYTIA pursue the Federal earmark for the SR 65/South Beale Rd Interchange and prioritize funding for the East Wheatland Bypass PSR through a different discretionary program. The earmark request was submitted in May of 2021, but unfortunately the project did not make the list of funded projects in the current Surface Transportation Bill.

5.0 **Project Development Process**

The Project Development Process (PDP) begins with conceptual studies of a potential project and spans to the completion of Construction. The steps in the PDP are tied to requirements of state and federal environmental laws as well as the requirements of the facility owners and/or funding sources being utilized. Various Elements of the PDP will be largely similar across the various CIS projects, but key differences do exist.

Preliminary Design/PSR

The preliminary design process begins with a purpose and need statement for a project that meets state and regional goals and objectives. During this phase of Project Development, a level of preliminary design is completed to develop project alternatives and their impacts as well as costs and an estimated schedule. The purpose and need statement is then used as a measure for each alternative, and the number of alternatives is reduced for advancement to the next phase. The result of this stage is the completion of a Project Initiation Document (PID), which for projects impacting a State Highway is typically a Project Study Report (PSR).

Environmental Clearance/Project Approval

The PSR is then used to begin more detailed designs and studies of alternatives to be considered for approval in the Environmental Clearance/Project Approval phase (known as PA&ED). The studies done in this phase can include but are not limited to, air, noise, water, wetlands, historical and cultural, wildlife and plants, and visual aspects. Social, economic, and land-use issues are also addressed, along with any specific concerns like hazardous wastes. A community outreach plan will be developed during this step as a requirement to the circulation of the environmental document. Once all studies are complete the Draft Environmental Document (ED) will be submitted to SYTIA and the appropriate lead and responsible agencies.

A California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) compatible ED is necessary for any project requiring state/local approval. A National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) document is necessary when projects receive federal funding. Under the NEPA process,

PERMITTING AND MITIGATION

Products of Phase: All Regulatory Agency Permits and/or Agreements

CONSTRUCTION

Products of Phase: Bidder Package, Award of Construction Contract

CONSTRUCTION SUPPORT

Products of Phase: Quality Assurance of Construction

Caltrans acts as the lead agency through a memorandum of understanding with Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). For project on a State Highway, Caltans is typically the lead CEQA agency, buts this can vary depending on the level of work on and off the highway.

While the Draft ED is in review it will also be made public and opportunity for review and input will be made. During this stage, necessary project permits and agreements will also be determined. The result of this step is the approval of the Environmental Document.

In the case of a project requiring a Route Adoption (such as the future SR 65 Realignment), the ED is also reviewed and approved by the California Transportation Commission (CTC) at which time a Route Adoption Book Item is placed on the CTC's agenda.

Final Design

Environmental Clearance allows the approved project alternative to move forward to final design and right of way activities. During this stage, project designers will obtain additional mapping and utility information necessary to fully design the project. Project Plans, Specifications, and Estimates will be prepared for Bidding. Utility conflicts will be identified and relocation agreements with effected utilities executed. Other documents required for Bidding will be prepared such as the Information Handout, Notice to Bidders, and Resident Engineer Pending File. Engineers will prepare Right of Way mapping.

Right of Way Acquisition

The geometric base map prepared during final design is used to order title reports and prepare appraisal maps. The appraisal maps indicate the sizes of the partial or full parcel acquisitions and remainders and show engineering details that may affect property appraisal values, such as fences, gates, water wells, and driveways. After appraisal maps are certified and the appraisal process is initiated, the fair market values of required acquisitions are established, then offers are made to parcel owners, negotiations begin, and hopefully a negotiated sale is concluded. Full Right of Way clearance must be complete prior to the start of Construction. In the case of full acquisitions, this typically entails:

- Issuing a 90-day relocation notice to the property owners to vacate their property.
- Initiating and implementing sale of buildings or structures.
- Performing demolition and clearance contracts, as necessary.

In some cases, it is necessary to enter into Condemnation on one of more parcels where an agreement could not be made with a property owner. Condemnation of property through eminent domain is initiated through a Resolution of Necessity, approved by the implementing agency for the particular project. Condemnation can be a long and costly process. For this reason, the community and stakeholder outreach portions of the process are very important.

Permitting and Mitigation

This step is initiated with the Draft Environmental Document with the identification of which permits and mitigations will be required. Application for the permits, or in some cases agreements, then takes place concurrently with the Right of Way Acquisition phase. Many permits and/or impacts will require mitigation, (whether it be fees paid to a mitigation bank, replanting, monitoring during construction, etc.). These mitigations will be paid prior to construction, included in the project construction package, or handled by other agreements. Encroachment Permits for work in the various rights of way will also be secured.

Construction

After the above phases are complete, but before construction can begin, an implementing agency for construction must be determined, typically either Caltrans or the City or County in which the project lies. A Cooperative Agreement for the construction is developed, to detail the roles and responsibilities. A bid package including the project plans, specifications, estimate, and bidder instructions will be prepared and advertised to bidders. Once bidding is complete and the Contractor is awarded the construction contract, construction of the project will begin. If Caltrans is the implementing agency for construction, and depending on funding type, additional steps involving the CTC will be required.

Construction Support

SYTIA may choose to contract with a consultant for Construction Support during the construction of the project. Construction Support includes fielding all requests for information from the Contractor, providing construction inspection, testing, and quality assurance.

Additional detailed discussion about the project delivery process can be found in the Caltrans Project Development Procedures Manual (PDPM) and the Local Assistance Procedures Manual (LAPM) for projects on State Highways.

6.0 Attachments

Attachment A: Traffic MemorandumAttachment B: Roadway and Structures BackupAttachment C: Environmental Costs BackupAttachment D: Right of Way Costs BackupAttachment E: Cost Accumulation WorksheetAttachment F: Funding Assessment

Attachment G: Sample Project Information Sheet

FEHR PEERS

Memorandum

Subject:	SYTIA CIS Projects Assessment
From:	Dave Stanek, Fehr & Peers
To:	Liz Diamond, Dokken Engineering
Date:	June 1, 2021

RS20-3955

Fehr & Peers has prepared a planning level assessment of the projects proposed to be included in the Comprehensive Implementation Strategy (CIS) being prepared for the South Yuba Transportation Improvement Authority (SYTIA). This assessment provides daily volume forecasts for the project area and county-wide roadway network performance measures for cumulative conditions.

Project Descriptions

Planned improvements in south Yuba County have been divided into the following four projects (see **Figure 1**).

- 1. State Route (SR) 70/Plumas Lake Boulevard Interchange Phase 2
- 2. SR 65/South Beale Road Interchange and Connection to Forty Mile Road
- 3. East Wheatland Expressway
- 4. SR 65 Realignment

The components of these projects are described below.

The SR 70/Plumas Lake Boulevard interchange currently provides access to and from the west. To travel east from SR 70, drivers must first travel west on Plumas Lake Boulevard, then north on River Oaks Boulevard, and finally east on Algodon Road to Plumas Arboga Road. Algodon Road passes under SR 70 and has an at-grade railroad crossing. Phase 2 of the SR 70 interchange will construct the southbound loop on-ramp and extend Plumas Lake Boulevard to the east including a grade separation over the railroad, Old Marysville Road, and a canal before intersecting Plumas Arboga Road. The at-grade railroad crossing at Algodon Road will be closed.

The existing SR 65/South Beale Road intersection is currently unsignalized and adjacent to an at-grade railroad crossing. This intersection is located on a portion of SR 65 in which the facility transitions from a


four-lane freeway to the north to a two-lane highway to the south. The proposed project has several options, but all would have the following components: a SR 65/South Beale Road interchange, a South Beale Road overcrossing at the railroad, and a connection between the interchange and Forty Mile Road. In the option shown in **Figure 1**, SR 65 would be realigned to the west, the South Beale Road interchange would be located at Morrison Road, and Morrison Road would be extended west to Forty Mile Road.

The East Wheatland Expressway would be a new high-speed two-lane roadway connecting Spenceville Road east of Wheatland to SR 65 at Riosa Road in Placer County. All three options under consideration would construct an overcrossing at the railroad east of SR 65 and intersect Spenceville Road at or just east of Jasper Lane.

Both the SR 65/South Beale Road interchange and the East Wheatland Expressway would provide the north and south ends of the proposed Wheatland Bypass, which is planned to ultimately provide an SR 65 freeway between Yuba and Placer Counties. The SR 65 Realignment would be the final link that would connect the two ends of the bypass. It would extend from the existing SR 65 near Oakley Lane to Spenceville Road near Jasper Lane. The CIS plans for the SR 65 Realignment to occur after the first three projects have been completed. As a result, this planning level traffic analysis focuses on those three projects.

Methodology

To evaluate the three improvement projects, the Yuba County travel demand forecasting model was used. This model provides a detailed roadway network for the study area and has the planned land uses from the approved General Plan. The model was used to generate the daily volume forecasts for roadways adjacent to the project areas. The scenarios without and with the projects were modeled to determine the change in traffic volume. Additionally, model-wide statistics for vehicle miles traveled (VMT), vehicle hours of travel (VHT), and vehicle hours of delay (VHD) are reported to provide an assessment of how the project affects transportation network efficiency.

The 2030 Yuba County General Plan contemplates a considerable level of growth within the County. Whereas the Department of Finance¹ projects that Yuba County will add 21,463 persons between 2019 and 2040 (i.e., 7,557 new units at 2.84 persons per household per the US Census), the General Plan contemplates 30,000 to 40,000 new dwelling units and 50,000 to 67,000 new jobs². Thus, forecasts from the Yuba County 2030 Travel Demand Model, which are derived from this land use growth, represent conditions well beyond 2040. The model includes the planned development of the Highway 65 Employment Center and Entertainment District along Forty Mile Road and SR 65. Within Wheatland, it includes the Johnson Rancho and Hop Farm project, which would be located east of downtown and

¹ Source: <u>https://www.dof.ca.gov/Forecasting/Demographics/projections/</u>

² Source: <u>https://www.yuba.org/Yuba%20County/Community%20Development/Planning/General%20Plan/2030%20General%20Plan%20Final%20-%20Complete.pdf</u>



primarily south of Spenceville Road. According to the City's website, it would consist of 14,400 dwelling units, 400 acres of retail and employment, schools, parks, and open space. General Plan land uses, prezoning, and design guidelines for the project were approved by the City of Wheatland City Council in 2012. Annexation was approved by Yuba LAFCO in 2014.

Figure 2 shows existing and cumulative daily volumes in the project area. The existing volumes on the state highway system are from the Caltrans traffic census program (<u>https://dot.ca.gov/programs/traffic-operations/census</u>). For local streets, the daily volume is estimated from peak hour traffic counts collected under previous traffic studies such as the Recology Ostrom Road Landfill EIR. The forecasted cumulative conditions volumes are without the proposed improvement projects.

Due to planned development throughout Yuba County, study area traffic volumes are expected to grow substantially. The model predicts that daily volumes will triple on SR 70 and grow by 2.5 to 2.8 times on SR 65. Growth rates for the local roads that would serve these development areas would grow by more than three times. For example, Forty Mile Road south of SR 65 would increase from about 4,000 to 20,000 vehicles per day, and Spenceville Road west of Jasper Lane would increase from 4,500 to about 20,000 vehicles per day.

Table 1 shows the modeling scenarios that were prepared to compare the traffic effect of the three improvement projects under cumulative conditions. Scenario 1 is the baseline condition that does not include any of the three project improvements. Scenario 2 adds the SR 70/Plumas Lake Boulevard Interchange Phase 2 project so that the effect of the project can be determined by comparing with Scenario 1. Given that the Phase 2 project is the farthest along in the project development process, this project was included in the model when evaluating the other two projects. Scenario 3 provides the changes for the SR 65 corridor with the SR 65/South Beale Road Interchange, and Scenario 4 provides the changes with the East Wheatland Expressway. Scenario 5 looks at the changes with all three project improvements in place.

	Scenario					
Project	1	2	3	4	5	
SR 70/Plumas Lake Blvd Interchange Phase 2		Х	Х	Х	Х	
SR 65/South Beale Road Interchange			Х		Х	
East Wheatland Expressway				Х	Х	

Table 1: Assessment Scenarios

Source: Fehr & Peers (2021)

SYTIA CIS Projects Assessment June 1, 2021 Page 4 of 8



Traffic Volume Forecasts

SR 70/Plumas Lake Boulevard Interchange Phase 2

Figure 3 shows the cumulative year daily volume forecasts for roads in and around the SR 70/Plumas Lake Boulevard interchange. With the Plumas Lake Boulevard extension, the volume on Plumas-Arboga Road to the east would increase from about 20,000 vehicles per day under Scenario 1 to 24,000 vehicles per day under Scenario 2. Daily volumes on SR 70 north of the interchange would decrease by about 3,000 vehicles per day, but the volume to the south would stay about the same. So, the extension is providing a quicker travel time to and from the east and diverting traffic from McGowan Parkway, the next parallel east-west road to the north.

Daily volumes on SR 65 near South Beale Road would have a small change with the extension (400 vehicles per day).

SR 65/South Beale Road Interchange

Figure 4 shows the cumulative year daily volume forecasts for roads in and around the SR 65/South Beale Road intersection under Scenarios 2, 3, and 5. East of the interchange, South Beale Road volume would increase to near 20,000 vehicles per day, which may need four lanes to Bradshaw Road to provide acceptable operations. Although the western connection to Forty Mile Road would increase Morrison Road daily volume by 4,000 vehicles per day, the volume would be less than 10,000 vehicles per day, so a two-lane road would be sufficient. Given the daily volume on South Beale Road, a diamond interchange (only four ramps) at SR 65 would provide adequate operational conditions. The project would reduce demand for Forty Mile Road south of SR 65 and SR 65 between South Beale Road and Forty Mile Road. The model shows only a small decrease of about 300 vehicles per day for Dairy Road, the closest parallel road south of the new Morrison Road connection.

Outside of the immediate interchange area, traffic volume changes would be small. For SR 65 south of South Beale Road, the daily volume would be almost the same, an increase of 100 vehicles per day. To the west, Plumas Arboga Road would increase by about 700 vehicles per day, while SR 65 north of Forty Mile Road would decrease by about 600 vehicles per day. These changes are likely the result of the more direct east-west route along Plumas Arboga Road and the new Morrison Road connection compared to using McGowan Parkway and SR 65 to the north.

With the East Wheatland Expressway added to the SR 65/South Beale Road Interchange (Scenario 5), the additional volume changes would be generally less than 500 vehicles per day. The greatest change would be for SR 65, which would decrease by about 1,000 vehicles per day as drivers would use the expressway and Jasper Lane as a quicker north-south route due to congestion on SR 65 in Wheatland. Traffic volumes on South Beale Road east of SR 65 would increase by 500 to 800 vehicles per day.

SYTIA CIS Projects Assessment June 1, 2021 Page 5 of 8



East Wheatland Expressway

Figure 5 shows the cumulative year daily volume forecasts for roads in and around the proposed East Wheatland Expressway under Scenarios 2, 4, and 5. This project would shift some traffic away from SR 65 between Riosa Road near Sheridan and Main Street in Wheatland to the proposed expressway. Under cumulative conditions, the proposed two-lane expressway would carry about 21,000 vehicles per day, and SR 65 would see a corresponding decrease of about 20,000 vehicles per day³. Traffic volumes would also decrease on Spenceville Road between Wheatland and the end of the expressway at Jasper Lane by about 8,000 vehicles per day. The new expressway connection would result in about 3,000 more vehicles per day on Jasper Lane. The addition of the SR 65/South Beale Road interchange (Scenario 5) would cause additional volume changes of up to 700 vehicles per day at Spenceville Road west of Jasper Lane.⁴

Network Performance

Table 2 presents the network performance measures of VMT, VHT, and VHD for the scenarios. The modeling results show that all proposed projects will reduce VMT when compared to the baseline (Scenario 1). Importantly, the travel demand forecasting model does not include all components of induced travel, which is the increase in travel due to travel time reduction. The model can account for shifting from one route to another and shifting from one destination to another, but the model does not account for shifts from other modes to driving and for long-term changes in development patterns.

	Performance Measure				
Scenario	VMT	VHT	VHD		
1. Baseline (no project improvements)	4,804,500	322,500	212,500		
2. SR 70/Plumas Lake Blvd Interchange Phase 2	4,749,100	313,300	204,600		
3. SR 70/Plumas Lake Blvd Interchange Phase 2 and SR 65/South Beale Road Interchange	4,680,700	306,900	199,900		
4. SR 70/Plumas Lake Blvd Interchange Phase 2 and East Wheatland Expressway	4,719,600	295,800	188,200		
5. SR 70/Plumas Lake Blvd Interchange Phase 2, SR 65/South Beale Road Interchange, and East Wheatland Expressway	4,763,400	305,000	196,100		

Table 2: Network Performance

Source: Fehr & Peers (2021)

³ The cumulative condition assumes substantial levels of development both in Wheatland (both on the east and west side of downtown) and in unincorporated Yuba County. Consequently, traffic levels on SR 65 are substantially greater than under existing conditions.

⁴ This is likely local traffic (i.e., new development east of downtown) that changes routes to use the expressway versus continuing toward Main Street in downtown Wheatland to travel to/from the south on existing SR 65.



The SR 70/Plumas Lake Boulevard Interchange Phase 2 (Scenario 2) would result in a 1.2 percent decrease in VMT. An additional 1.4 percent decrease would occur with the SR 65/South Beale Road Interchange primarily due to the Morrison Road extension to Forty Mile Road (Scenario 3). The East Wheatland Expressway would shorten trips with the more direct route to planned growth areas along Spenceville Road providing an additional 0.6 percent decrease in VMT. With all three projects (Scenario 5), the VMT decrease would be less than the other scenarios, which is most likely due to the cumulative effect of adding new roads to the network.

Regarding network delay, the project scenarios (2 through 5) would have less delay than the baseline (Scenario 1), which is consistent with the reduction in VMT. Scenario 4 would have the lowest delay since it provides the most reduction in volume on the congested SR 65 in Wheatland. The added capacity at the SR 65/South Beale Road interchange in Scenario 5 would result in a higher volume on SR 65 compared to Scenario 4, so the VHD is higher.

Collision History

The Transportation Injury Mapping System (tims.berkeley.edu) was used to identify fatal and injury collisions in the California Highway Patrol's Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System for the five-year period from January 2015 to December 2019. Collisions in the project areas are described below along with the project's potential to improve safety⁵.

At the SR 70/Plumas Lake Boulevard Interchange, four injury-related collisions occurred on Plumas Lake Boulevard between SR 70 and River Oaks Boulevard. Two collisions occurred at Plumas Arboga Road/Old Marysville Road and one each at Plumas Lake Boulevard/River Oaks Boulevard, Algodon Road/River Oaks Boulevard, and Algodon Road/Plumas Arboga Road, plus one midblock collision on River Oaks Boulevard. The five collisions on Plumas Arboga Road are in the section that will be bypassed by the Plumas Lake Boulevard extension. So, the new alignment that will be built to current design standards may result in fewer collisions in the project area.

At the SR 65/South Beale Road intersection, seven injury-related collisions occurred in the five-year period. To the north, two collisions occurred at the SR 65/Morrison Road/Rancho Road intersection, and three mid-segment collisions occurred to the south. Further south, the SR 65/Oakley Lane intersection had five collisions, including two that involved fatalities. This section of SR 65 would be realigned to the west with the proposed SR 65/South Beale Road interchange which would likely result in fewer collisions

⁵ The data presented here is intended to inform readers of the reported collision history in the study area and to highlight general collision trends and patterns from the data. This does not constitute, and is not meant to be, a comprehensive review of safety in the study or surrounding area, which could be much broader in scope (e.g., including a review of individual collision records, human factors considerations, and comparisons of the collision rates and frequencies with similar localities). While some possible conceptual treatments may have been identified, the data is not adequate on its own for identifying all potential countermeasures that may be required to sufficiently address recurring or other safety issues. Such an evaluation would require a more in-depth approach, which is beyond the scope of this study.



since interchanges have fewer conflict points with high-speed vehicles than at-grade intersections⁶ and freeways generally have lower crash rates than multilane highways.

Injury-related collisions on SR 65 from Wheatland to the south include three at the Main Street, which connects to Spenceville Road and eight on SR 65 from south of Main Street to the Placer County line at Bear River. Two collisions occurred at Spenceville Road/Jasper Lane, one of which involved a fatality. With the proposed East Wheatland Expressway, the volume on SR 65 south of Main Street will decrease which may reduce the collisions that occur on this stretch, which is known to have stop-and-go traffic during peak periods. The project will also provide roadway improvements at the Spenceville Road/Jasper Lane intersection which could also improve safety conditions.

Conclusion and Recommendations

This planning level assessment has evaluated the following three projects proposed in south Yuba County.

- SR 70/Plumas Lake Boulevard Interchange Phase 2
- SR 65/South Beale Road Interchange
- East Wheatland Expressway

The second phase of the SR 70/Plumas Lake Boulevard interchange will shift some traffic from parallel facilities to the north. The new connection to the east will improve network efficiency by reducing out-ofdirection travel, thereby reducing VMT. The project will improve safety with improved roadways and intersections and by closing an at-grade railroad crossing.

Constructing an interchange on SR 65 at South Beale Road and a connection to Forty Mile Road will shift traffic from parallel facilities to the north. The new connection to Forty Mile Road will improve network efficiency by reducing out-of-direction travel, thereby reducing VMT. The project will improve safety by replacing at grade intersections at Rancho Road/Morrison Road and South Beale Road with an interchange and by closing an at-grade railroad crossing.

The East Wheatland Expressway will shift traffic from a congested SR 65 at the Placer County line to serve planned development east of downtown Wheatland. The new connection will improve network efficiency by reducing out-of-direction travel, thereby reducing VMT. The project will improve safety by shifting traffic from the congested SR 65 and improving the Spenceville Road/Jasper Lane intersection.

Based on this assessment, the following order of improvements is recommended. The SR 70/Plumas Lake Boulevard Interchange Phase 2 already has preliminary design plans, and this traffic assessment confirmed its benefit to network efficiency. Therefore, this project is recommended to have highest priority.

⁶ The crash modification factors (CMFs) for converting from an at-grade intersection to a grade-separated interchange range from 0.43 to 0.84 (*Highway Safety Manual* as reported by the CMF Clearinghouse, cmfclearinghouse.org).



The SR 65/South Beale Road interchange will address operational and safety deficiencies of the existing SR 65 facility. Additionally, the project will improve network efficiency by reducing out-of-direction travel between the traffic generators on Forty Mile Road (casino and amphitheater) and SR 65. It may also serve as a catalyst to encourage new development in the Highway 65 Employment Center and Entertainment District.

The East Wheatland Expressway will provide operational improvements, but most of its benefits will occur when planned developments east of downtown Wheatland are constructed. The safety benefits of the project also rely on the traffic diversion effect that will not occur until planned development occurs.

It is difficult to prioritize either the SR 65/South Beale Road interchange or the East Wheatland Expressway as the second highest priority project. Though the safety benefits of each project are readily apparent, the operational and economic benefits are more challenging to measure. The timing of planned development east of downtown Wheatland will directly influence the operational benefits provided by the East Wheatland Expressway. Although 21,000 vehicles per day are forecast to use this roadway under cumulative conditions, it would serve less than 2,000 vehicles per day if it were built in the very near future prior to new land development coming online. Likewise, while **Figure 4** shows sizeable traffic volumes on County roadways approaching the SR 65/South Beale Road interchange, usage would be much lower in the near-term if construction occurred prior to new land development occurring. Hence, the timing of land development would appear to be a critical factor in terms of prioritizing these projects. The reverse is also true in that the accessibility benefits to the geographic areas served by each improvement could also be an important consideration.



- SR 70/Plumas Lake Blvd Interchange Phase 2
- S. Beale Rd Interchange with Connection to Forty Mile Rd
- East Wheatland Expressway
- SR 65 Realignment

- Bridges/Overheads
- × Existing Road to be Abandoned
- ----- Existing Railroad



EAST WHEATLAND EXPRESSWAY

- NEW LOCAL ROAD FROM RIOSA RD TO SPENCEVILLE RD - LOCATION APPROXIMATE - FUTURE SR 65 ALIGNMENT

SYTIA Comprehensive Implementation Strategy

Figure 1



- SR 70/Plumas Lake Blvd Interchange Phase 2 S. Beale Rd Interchange with Connection to Forty Mile Rd East Wheatland Expressway
- Bridges/Overheads
- × Existing Road to be Abandoned

----- Existing Railroad

Two-way Daily Volume

Cumulative

Figure 2 SYTIA Projects - Existing and Cumulative Conditions





Proposed Road

Scenario 1 Scenario 2 Two-way Daily Volume for Cumulative Conditions

----- Existing Railroad

Figure 3 SR 70/Plumas Lake Boulevard Interchange Phase 2





Χ

Roadway Closed Proposed Road ----- Existing Railroad -O Cul-de-Sac

Scenario 2 Scenario 5

Scenario 3 Two-way Daily Volume for Cumulative Conditions

Figure 4 SR 65/South Beale Road Interchange



East Wheatland Expressway

SYTIA CIS Report - Roadway Construction Estimates *2022 Dollars

Project	Rdwy Square Footage	Sqft Cost	Rdwy Cost	Interchanges	Interchange Complexitities	Rating	Interchange Cost *	Signal & Lighting	Lighting Only	SUBTOTAL
East Wheatland Expressway	688028.42	\$25.31	\$17,412,958.14	N/A					\$100,000.00	\$17,512,958
S. Beale Rd IC w/ Extension to Forty Mile Rd	892121.19	\$25.31	\$22,578,237.12	S. Beal Rd IC	Could be sig. enviro impacts	Med-High	\$30,000,000.00	\$700,000.00	-	\$53,278,237
Plumas Lake Blvd Extension & SR 70 SB Loop On-Ramp	From TyLIn		\$11,162,592.00							
SR 65 Realignment	3087009.38	\$25.31	\$78,127,535.42	Riosa Rd	No homes impacted, canal	Low	\$19,000,000.00	\$650,000.00	-	\$97,777,535
				Spenceville Rd	Several Houses impacted	Med	\$24,000,000.00	\$650,000.00	-	\$24,650,000
				Addnl IC between Beale and Spenceville	Likely would be placed prior to heavy development	Low	\$18,000,000.00	\$700,000.00	-	\$18,700,000

*Not including structures

SYTIA CIS Report - Construction Estimates - Comparative Roadway Costs

Project	County	Route	Description	Area (SQFT)	Items Total from Est or Bid Result	Structure & Non Rdwy Items Total from Est or Bid Result	Roadway Items Total from Est or Bid Result	Year of Costs	2022 Costs (Inflated at 3% Per Year)	Rdwy Cost per SQFT
SR 132	Sta	132	New Roadway and widening	1581175	\$92,307,624	\$36,017,642	\$56,289,982	2019	\$61,356,080	\$38.80
SE Connector D3	Sac	Local	New Connector along exist Local	1340756	\$26,399,561	\$4,582,339	\$21,817,222	2020	\$23,126,256	\$17.25
Horseshoe Bar Rd	Plac	Local	Small local road widening and utility work	13196	\$257,248	\$0	\$257,248	2012	\$334,423	\$25.34
FH 171	But	171	Highway in very rural area	394400	\$6,293,000	\$755,792	\$5,537,208	2009	\$7,696,719	\$19.52
Wagon Trail	Cal	4	Realigning SR 4 and local road connections	833763	\$22,964,400	\$2,215,621	\$20,748,779	2021	\$21,371,242	\$25.63

Ave Sq Footage Cost: \$25.31

SYTIA CIS Report - Construction Estimates - Comparative Interchange Costs

Project	County	Route	Description	Complexity Ranking (Low, Med, High)	Items Total from Est or Bid Result	Structure Items Total from Est or Bid Result	Roadway Items Total from Est or Bid Result	Year of Costs	2022 Costs (Inflated at 3% Per Year)
SR 70/Feather River Blvd	Yub	70	spread diamond style, no loops	Low-Med	\$14,594,828	\$3,407,039	\$11,187,789	2014	\$13,872,859
US 80/SR 65	Plac	80					\$0	2019	\$0
US 50/Miss Flat Rd	ED	50	spread diamond, no loops, work on local roads, Complex TH, reconstrcuction of commerical parking and driveways	Med	\$22,566,034	\$7,959,481	\$14,606,553	2007	\$21,179,502
SR 99/Sheldon Rd	Sac	99	All new IC mod L-9 with sig. local and frontage work	High	\$37,913,000	\$12,876,868	\$25,036,132	2007	\$36,302,391
Scott Rd IC	Riv	215	Reconstruction of all ramps and OC, Spread Diamond with 2 Loops, Mod L-9	Med	\$43,227,968	\$28,772,969	\$14,454,999	2010	\$19,658,799
Chrisman Rd IC	SJ	205	Irregular spread diamond with one loop. Local Rd Relaligned, Mod L-9. Local Rdwy work	Med-High	\$42,540,000	\$18,767,800	\$23,772,200	2015	\$28,764,362
							\$0		\$0

 Interchange Cost Range:
 13,872,859 - 36,302,391

 Average:
 \$23,955,583

	Left, Right, or	Width [ft]	Length [ft]	Area [sqft]	Total Min Vertical	Structure Type	Cost Range [\$/sqft]	Use [\$/sqft]	Brid	ge Costs	Em	bankment Cost	Total Cost		
	Utimate	S R	eale Rd	Interchand	e with Exter	osion to Forty Mile	ВЧ							-	
1 Morrison Over SR 65	Ultimate	44	511	22476	19.8	CIP/PS Box	110-315	\$ 315	\$ 7	100 000	\$	392 000	\$ 7 492 000	-	
	Ontinuato	44	96	4220	19.8	Wide Flange Girder	125 - 250	\$ 250	\$ 1	.100.000	\$	553.000	¢ 7,172,000	-	
2 S Beal over SPRR	Ultimate	44	130	5720	23.5	CIP/PS Slab	115-200	\$ 200	\$ 1	,200,000	\$	-	\$ 2,853,000		
3 Morrison Road over canal	Ultimate	56	77	4312		CIP/PS Slab	115-200	\$ 200	\$	900,000	\$	-	\$ 900,000	-	
4 Morrison Road over Ag Drainage	Ultimate	56	45	2520		RC Box	160-250	\$ 250	\$	700,000	\$	-	\$ 700,000	\$	11,945,000
× ×															
				East Whe	eatland Exp	ressway									
5 Wheatland over SPRR	I	44	451	19859	16.5	CIP/PS Slab	115-200	\$ 200	\$4	,000,000	\$	553,000	\$ 6,453,000		
	L	44	130	5720	23.5	CIP/PS Box	110-315	\$ 315	\$ 1	,900,000			\$ 0,433,000		
6 Bear River	L	46	1650	75900		CIP/PS Box	110-315	\$ 315	\$ 24	,000,000	\$	-	\$ 24,000,000	\$	30,453,000
														_	
				SR6	5 Realignm	ent								4	
7 Riosa Interchange	Ultimate	44	259	11392	19.8	CIP/PS Box	110-315	\$ 315	\$ 3	8,600,000	\$	392,000	\$ 3,992,000	_	
Grasshopper Slough	L	43	99	4257		RC Box	160-250	\$ 250	\$ 1	,100,000	\$	-			
8	R	43	99	4257		RC Box	160-250	\$ 250	\$ 1	,100,000	\$	-	\$ 3.600.000		
Left Ramp	Ultimate	28	99	2772		RC Box	160-250	\$ 250	\$	700,000	\$	-			
Right Ramp	Ultimate	28	99	2772		RC Box	160-250	\$ 250	\$	700,000	\$	-			
9 Spenceville Interchange	Ultimate	44	259	11392	19.8	CIP/PS Box	110-315	\$ 315	\$ 3	8,600,000	\$	392,000	\$ 3,992,000		
10 Dry Creek Bridge	L	46	172	7894		CIP/PS Box	110-315	\$ 315	\$2	2,500,000	\$	-	\$ 5,000,000		
To Dry creek Bridge	R	46	172	7894		CIP/PS Box	110-315	\$ 315	\$ 2	2,500,000	\$	-	\$ 0,000,000		
11 Jasper	Ultimate	44	144	6353	19.8	CIP/PS Box	110-315	\$ 315	\$ 2	2,100,000	\$	391,000	\$ 2,491,000		
	1	43	218	9375	19.8	CIP/PS Box	110-315	\$ 315	\$ 3	8,000,000	\$	543,000			
12 Old SD65/SDDD Undergrossing	L	43	130	5590	23.5	Wide Flange Girder	125 -250	\$ 250	\$ 1	,400,000	\$	-	\$ 9 886 000		
	D	43	217	9333	19.5	CIP/PS Box	110-315	\$ 315	\$ 3	8,000,000	\$	543,000	\$ 7,000,000		
	ĸ	43	130	5590	23.5	Wide Flange Girder	125 -250	\$ 250	\$1	,400,000	\$	-			
13 Best Slough	R	43	66	2838		RC Box	160-250	\$ 250	\$	800,000	\$	-	\$ 800,000		
14 Fututre Interchange	Ultimate	44	259	11392	19.8	CIP/PS Box	110-315	\$ 315	\$ 3	8,600,000	\$	392,000	\$ 3,992,000		
15 Future Local Road Over Best Slough	R	44	66	2904		RC Box	160-250	\$ 250	\$	800,000	\$	-	\$ 800,000		
16 Bear River	R	44	1650	72600		CIP/PS Box	110-315	\$ 315	\$ 22	,900,000	\$	-	\$ 22,900,000	1	
17 SR 65 Over SPRR	R	44	451	19859	23.5	Wide Flange Girder	125 -250	\$ 250	\$ 5	6,000,000	\$	553,000	\$ 5,553,000	1	
18 Future Local Road over North Best Slough	Ultimate	44	80	3520		RC Box	160-250	\$ 250	\$	900,000	\$	-	\$ 900,000	1	
19 Future Local Road over Canal	Ultimate	44	74	3243		RC Box	160-250	\$ 250	\$	900,000	\$	-	\$ 900,000	\$	64,806,000

806,000



	1 inch = 1,0	00 feet			
0	1,000	2,000	3,000	4,000	5,000
					Feet

Attachment C

East Wheatland Expressway Project Estimated Biological Impacts SYTIA Comprehensive Implementation Strategy Butte County, California



	1 inch = 300) feet		
0	300	600	900	1,200

1,500 Feet

Attachment C

Plumas Lake Blvd Expansion and SR70 SB Loop On-Ramp Project Estimated Biological Impacts SYTIA Comprehensive Implementation Strategy Butte County, California



	1 inch = 40	D feet			
0	400	800	1,200	1,600	2,000
					Feet

Attachment C

South Beale Road Interchange with Extension to Forty Mile Road Project Estimated Biological Impacts SYTIA Comprehensive Implementation Strategy Butte County, California



				Feel
600	1,200	1,800	2,400	3,000
1 inch = 600	J feet			

000 0

0

Attachment C

SR65 Realignment Project Estimated Biological Impacts Page 1 of 2 SYTIA Comprehensive Implementation Strategy Butte County, California





Attachment C

Bra	
A	Dry Creek
	65 Leveo I
Rd	
	Wheatland
and a	
	SR65 Take
Estim	nated Permanent Impacts
	Fluvial Channel
	GGS Upland Habitat
	Lake, Reservoir, and Associated Vegetation
	Pond and Associated Vegetation
10	
	SR65 Realignment Project Estimated Biological Impacts Page 2 of 2

SYTIA Comprehensive Implementation Strategy Butte County, California









BEALE INTERCHANGE TAKES ULTIMATE SR65 REALIGN TAKES

	6) 014-280-096-000
	63 014-410-021-000
e la constante	63 014-280-079-000
5	6 014-200-043-000
23	65 014-280-089-000
	69 015-060-051-000
	6) 014-280-092-000
	69 014-200-036-000
	69 014-280-092-000
8	015-050-001-000
	015-530-032-000
	015-060-073-000
	(15-060-067-000
:0 2	(3 015-870-050-000
1019	015-530-014-000
	015-530-016-000
63	015-530-016-000
	015-070-072-000
	60 015-070-078-000
ALIGN SLOUGH REDUCE CROSSINGS	NOTE: PRELIMINARY RIGHT OF WAY IMPACTS ARE BASED ON THE INDIVIDUAL PROJECT ALTERNATIVES CHOSEN FOR ESTIMATION. RIGHT OF WAY IMPACTS MAY CHANGE BASED ON ALTERNATIVE SELECTION AND REFINEMENT DURING PROJECT APPROVAL.
PREHENSIVE IMPLEMI	ENTATION STRATEGY
	ATTACTMENT U, 5 UF T
PRELIMINARY RIGHT OF WA	AY IMPACTS

ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER

No.

JUNE 2021





WHEATLAND EXPRESSWAY TAKES BEALE INTERCHANGE TAKES ULTIMATE SR65 REALIGN TAKES

FULL TAKE

- BRIDGES / OVERHEADS
- EXISTING ROADS
- EXISTING RAILROAD



PRELIMINARY RIGHT OF WAY IMPACTS

JUNE 2021

SYTIA COMPREHENSIVE IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY ATTACHMENT D, 4 OF 6

NOTE: PRELIMINARY RIGHT OF WAY IMPACTS ARE BASED ON THE INDIVIDUAL PROJECT ALTERNATIVES CHOSEN FOR ESTIMATION. RIGHT OF WAY IMPACTS MAY CHANGE BASED ON ALTERNATIVE SELECTION AND REFINEMENT DURING PROJECT APPROVAL.

	ASSESSOR'S
No.	NUMBER
0	019-120-050-000
2	019-120-051-000
3	019-120-048-000
0	019-120-053-000
9	019-120-039-000
6	019-120-038-000
0	019-120-025-000
8	019-120-035-000
9	019-120-046-000
0	019-120-044-000
0	019-080-070-000
0	019-010-039-000
0	019-010-069-000
0	019-060-013-000
0	019-060-004-000
(6	019-060-007-000
0	019-060-008-000
(1)	019-060-005-000
0	019-030-012-000
80	019-030-011-000
2	019-030-010-000
83	019-030-035-000
0	019-020-006-000
8	015-360-055-000
0	015-360-055-000
69	015-360-053-000
()	015-360-033-000
8	015-360-031-000
8	015-360-032-000





WHEATLAND EXPRESSWAY TAKES BEALE INTERCHANGE TAKES ULTIMATE SR65 REALIGN TAKES UNUSABLE REMNANTS

FULL TAKE

BRIDGES / OVERHEADS

EXISTING ROADS

EXISTING RAILROAD



No.	ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER
69	015-360-053-000
0	015-360-033-000
23	015-360-031-000
29	015-360-032-000
89	015-360-030-000
<mark>()</mark>	015-550-021-000
53	015-360-029-000
63	015-550-010-000
9	015-550-009-000
63	015-550-005-000
56	015-550-001-000
5 7	015-540-015-000
<u>58</u>	015-540-004-000
<u>69</u>	015-540-004-000
••	015-540-004-000
0	015-540-004-000
•2	015-110-026-000
0	015-110-020-000
••	015-110-022-000
6 3	015-110-023-000
66	015-110-024-000
0	015-150-045-000
(1)	015-070-074-000

NOTE: PRELIMINARY RIGHT OF WAY IMPACTS ARE BASED ON THE INDIVIDUAL PROJECT ALTERNATIVES CHOSEN FOR ESTIMATION. RIGHT OF WAY IMPACTS MAY CHANGE BASED ON ALTERNATIVE SELECTION AND REFINEMENT DURING PROJECT APPROVAL.

SYTIA COMPREHENSIVE IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY ATTACHMENT D, 5 OF 6

PRELIMINARY RIGHT OF WAY IMPACTS

JUNE 2021



UNUSABLE REMNANTS

BEALE INTERCHANGE TAKES

ULTIMATE SR65 REALIGN TAKES

FULL TAKE WHEATLAND EXPRESSWAY TAKES

- **BRIDGES / OVERHEADS**
- EXISTING ROADS
- EXISTING RAILROAD



	ASSESSOR'S PARCEL
No.	NUMBER
6	015-110-023-000
•	015-150-045-000
•	015-110-001-000
5)	015-100-052-000
5 6	015-060-001-000
5)	015-100-085-000
53	015-100-043-000
5 9	015-100-051-000
60	015-060-052-000
63	014-280-079-000
6	014-280-043-000
65	014-280-089-000
66	015-060-051-000
60	014-280-092-000
63	014-280-056-000
69	014-280-092-000
0	015-960-001-000

NOTE: PRELIMINARY RIGHT OF WAY IMPACTS NOTE: PRELIMINARY RIGHT OF WAY IMPACTS ARE BASED ON THE INDIVIDUAL PROJECT ALTERNATIVES CHOSEN FOR ESTIMATION. RIGHT OF WAY IMPACTS MAY CHANGE BASED ON ALTERNATIVE SELECTION AND REFINEMENT DURING PROJECT APPROVAL.

SYTIA COMPREHENSIVE IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY ATTACHMENT D, 6 OF 6

PRELIMINARY RIGHT OF WAY IMPACTS

0

JUNE 2021

SYTIA CIS - Cost Estimate Accumulation Worksheet

See Estimate Back-up Packages for more detail *2022 Dollars

			COS	STS*		7
		East Wheatland Expressway	S. Beale IC	Plumas Lake Blvd Onramp	SR 65 Realignment	
		(CONSTRUCTION	I		_
Roadway		\$17,512,958	\$53,278,237	\$11,162,592	\$141,127,535	
Structures		\$30,453,000	\$11,945,000	\$23,000,700	\$64,806,000]
Direct Const Subtota	I	\$47,965,958	\$65,223,237	\$34,163,292	\$205,933,535]
25% Contingency		\$11,991,490	\$16,305,809	N/A*	\$51,483,384	*TY L escalat
Direct Const Total		\$59,957,448	\$81,529,046	\$34,163,292	\$257,416,919]
USE		\$60,000,000	\$81,600,000	\$34,200,000	\$257,500,000	1
			RIGHT OF WAY			-
Right of Way		\$4,637,420	\$3,061,682	\$3,965,000	\$20,376,707	1
25% Contingency		\$1,159,355	\$765,421	N/A*	\$5,094,177	*TY Li escalat
Right of Way Total		\$5,796,775	\$3,827,103	\$3,965,000	\$25,470,884]
USE		\$5,800,000	\$3,900,000	\$4,000,000	\$25,500,000]
		E	NVIRONMENTAL			1
Environmental Mitigati	ons	\$5,839,200	\$3,297,600	\$338,700	\$5,088,600]
Environmental Permitt	ing	\$81,000	\$93,000	\$46,000	\$153,000	1
Environmental Subtotal		\$5,920,200	\$3,390,600	\$384,700	\$5,241,600]
25% Contingency		\$1,480,050	\$847,650	\$96,175	\$1,310,400	1
Environmental Total		\$7,400,250	\$4,238,250	\$480,875	\$6,552,000	1
USE		\$7,500,000	\$4,300,000	\$500,000	\$6,600,000	1
			SERVICE FEES	•		7
Phase	% of Const					
Preliminary Design/PSR	1	\$600,000	\$850,000	Funded	\$2,600,000]
Environmental Clearance/Project Approval	3	\$1,800,000	\$2,500,000	Funded	\$7,800,000	
Final Design	12	\$7,200,000	\$9,800,000	Funded	\$30,900,000]
Construction Support	15	\$9,000,000	\$12,250,000	\$5,200,000	\$38,700,000]
TOTALS		\$91,900,000	\$115,200,000	\$43,900,000	\$369,600,000]

Apr-21



Attachment B: Funding Source Descriptions and Assessment

The vast majority of Federal transportation funds are distributed to the State or Metropolitan Transportation Organizations (MPOs) like SACOG for disbursement. Many are added to Statewide programs such as the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), while others, such as Highway Bridge Program, are standalone programs that the State administers. Still others, such as Federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) and Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds, flow through SACOG. For the sake of clarity, funding sources discussed in this funding assessment are categorized based on the entity making the funding decision, rather than the ultimate source of funds.

	POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES – FEDERAL
Source	Rebuilding American Infrastructure with Sustainability and Equity (RAISE) Program (Formerly TIGER/BUILD)
Project Eligibility	Surface transportation infrastructure projects that will have a significant local or regional impact are eligible, including roads, bridges, transit, rail, ports, or intermodal transportation. Projects must be in the MTIP and funds obligated within two years of award. Federal environmental clearances (NEPA) and permitting must be complete, or applicant must demonstrate how they can be completed by the obligation date.
Selection Criteria	Grants are awarded based on merit that include safety, environmental sustainability, quality of life, economic competitiveness, state of good repair, innovation, and partnership. Within these criteria, priority is given to those projects that can demonstrate improvements to racial equity, reduce impacts of climate change and create good-paying jobs.
Amount Available	\$1 billion annually, though each cycle varies slightly, with no more than \$100 million awarded to projects in any single state. Half the funds are awarded to urban areas, the other half to rural areas.
Timing	Annually. Current cycle grants are due on July 12, 2021
Application Requirements	Public agencies may apply. Applicants must complete a detailed Benefit Cost Analysis for the submitted project.
Assessment	 SYTIA projects meet several of the criteria for the program, particularly in safety, economic competitiveness, and partnership. The assurance of half the funds going to rural areas could also be favorable. However, the RAISE program, like BUILD and TIGER before it, is exceedingly competitive on a national scale. In the 2020 cycle, only 680 grants were awarded out of 9700 applications, making the odds of success very low. This is juxtaposed with the cost of putting together the application, as the required Federal Benefit/Cost Analysis is highly technical and time consuming. This is not a realistic source in the short term but may be considered once projects are closer to construction, which can make them more attractive to Federal discretionary sources.



DOTENTIA		
PUTENTIA	a suukurs -	E FFUFRAL

Source	Defense Access Road Program
Project Eligibility	Public highway improvements necessary to mitigate an unusual impact of defense activity. Examples of an unusual impact could be a significant increase in personnel at a military installation, relocation of an access gate, or the deployment of an oversized or overweight military vehicle or transporter unit.
Selection Criteria	Projects are requested and analyzed on a case by case basis, based on the mission and impact on the subject military base.
Amount Available	No set amount.
Timing	Continuous, with awards included in the annual military budget.
Application Requirements	Any State, local, or tribal government that owns or maintains a transportation facility that provides access to Federal land may apply. Requests are made by the military base commander to the Military Surface Deployment and Distribution Command (SDDC) to prepare a needs evaluation, as well as determine eligibility of the project for DAR funds and certify the need. It is up to the military branch to then submit the DAR request as part of its annual budget.
Assessment	Two of the SYTIA projects directly impact access points to Beale Air Force Base, and SYTIA is already pursuing this funding source with the military.

	POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES – FEDERAL
Source	Congress Member Designated Projects ("Earmarks")
Project Eligibility	Highway projects must be eligible for Federal transportation funding under Title 23. All project phases are eligible. Projects must have the support of the State Department of Transportation or local agencies.
Selection Criteria	None stated.
Amount Available	None stated.
Timing	Applications were due on April 16, 2021 for consideration in the 2021 Surface Transportation Reauthorization Bill.
Application Requirements	Applicants must complete a questionnaire describing the project and documenting status in Federal transportation planning processes, including the MTIP.
Assessment	Member Designated Projects, more commonly referred to as earmarks, were a common feature in Federal transportation bills before being banned in 2011. This changed in 2021 when the House Transportation Committee agreed to accept earmark requests, and Congressmembers have solicited project applications. The South Beale Road/SR 65 Interchange was submitted through Congressman Garamendi, with details on how this project was selected provided in Funding Strategy Implementation Example at the end of this chapter. Notably, there is no specific parameters for project awards, such as timing, dollar amounts, or distribution. It is also possible that no awards will be made. Yet, with wide eligibility and relatively easy
	application process, this is a source that should continue to be pursued every cycle it is available.



	POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES – FEDERAL
Source	Federal Lands Access Program (FLAP)
Project Eligibility	Projects eligible for funding under Title 23, as well as transit facilities, rest stops, and planning to transportation facilities that provide access to, are adjacent to, or are located within Federal and tribal lands are eligible. Emphasis is placed on high-use recreation sites and economic generators. Each state has its own FLAP program. All phases of a project are eligible.
Selection Criteria	 Applications are reviewed on the following: Federal lands access proximity & significance High-use recreation site and/or Federal economic generator Improves public access Safety improvement Preservation Sustainability & environmental quality benefits Project cost & scope risk Overmatch & leveraging of funds Coordination with FLMA Consistent with FLAP's vision
Amount Available	\$50M - \$90M statewide for 2021 cycle.
Timing	Varies. Previous rounds were awarded in 2013, 2014, and 2017. California's current FLAP program applications are due May 27, 2021.
Application Requirements	Applicants include State, local, or tribal governments that own or maintain transportation access to Federal lands. Endorsement of the Federal Land Management Agency (FLMA) for the project is required. A minimum of 11.47% match is required.
Assessment	Possible. Beale Air Force Base, as Federal land, is certainly a major economic generator and three of the SYTIA projects include Federal land access. The South Beale Road/SR 65 IC also accesses tribal land, which may make it more competitive. Program history indicates rehabilitation and reconstruction projects have been most successful, which may also favor the South Beale Road project.



Unless noted, State programs are selected by the California Transportation Commission (CTC) and administered by Caltrans and/or the CTC.

POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES – STATE		
Source	Solutions for Congested Corridor Program (SCCP)	
Focus	The Solutions for Congested Corridors Program funds projects designed to reduce congestion in highly traveled and highly congested corridors through performance improvements that balance transportation improvements, community impacts, and that provide environmental benefits	
Project Eligibility	Construction projects only. Project must be within adopted MTP and comprehensive corridor plan. Improvements to state highways, local streets and roads, rail facilities, public transit facilities, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and restoration or preservation work that protects critical local habitat or open space. Program funds cannot be used to construct general purpose lanes on a state highway. Capacity increasing projects on the state highway system are restricted to high-occupancy vehicle lanes, managed lanes, and other non-general purpose lane improvements for safety and/or operational improvements for all modes of travel. Examples are auxiliary lanes, trucks climbing lanes, or dedicated bicycle lanes.	
Selection Criteria	 Applications are reviewed on the following: Safety; Congestion; Accessibility; Economic development, job creation and retention; Air pollution and greenhouse gas emission reductions; Efficient land use; Level of matching funds; and The ability to complete the project in a timely manner. 	
Amount Available	\$250M annually.	
Timing	Every two years, with next programming in 2022.	
Application Requirements	RTPAs/MPOs or Caltrans must be applicant. No matching funds required, but leverage does increase competitiveness. Environmental clearances required within 6 months of award, but competitiveness increases if CEQA/NEPA completed prior to application. All funds besides SCCP must be secured. Applicant must pledge they will cover any overruns.	
Assessment	Not currently realistic, as the SYTIA projects are capacity increasing, and do not meet the narrow criteria that would allow funding for such. It is possible that certain project components, such as railroad overcrossings, could be considered in the more distant future. Any project consideration would require the development of a comprehensive corridor plan with Caltrans.	



	POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES – STATE
Source	Trade Corridor Enhancement Program (TCEP)
Focus	The Trade Corridor Enhancement Program funds projects designed to move freight more efficiently on corridors with high volumes of freight, while also enhancing air quality and safety.
Project Eligibility	Projects must be within an adopted MTP. Eligible projects are those that significantly contribute to the freight system's economic activity or vitality; relieve congestion on the freight system; improve the safety, security, or resilience of the freight system; improve or preserve the freight system infrastructure; implement technology or innovation to improve the freight system or reduce or avoid its negative impacts; or reduce or avoid adverse community and/or environmental impacts of the freight system; or improve system connectivity. These may include highway, rail, port, or advanced technology projects. All phases of a project, from environmental through construction, and including mitigations, are eligible.
Selection Criteria	 Applications are reviewed on the following: Freight System Factors – Throughput, Velocity, and Reliability; Transportation System Factors – Safety, Congestion Reduction/Mitigation, Key Transportation Bottleneck Relief, Multi-Modal Strategy, Interregional Benefits, and Advanced Technology; Community Impact Factors – Air Quality Impact, Community Impact Mitigation, and Economic/Jobs Growth; The overall need, benefits, and cost of the project Project Readiness – ability to complete the project in a timely manner; Demonstration of the required 30% matching funds; The leveraging and coordination of funds from multiple sources; and Jointly nominated and/or jointly funded
Amount Available	\$300M annually from SB 1. The current program was enhanced with \$391M in Federal National Highway Freight Program funds.
Timing	Every two to three years, with next programming round expected in 2023.
Application Requirements	Programming is done with fair share targets by freight corridor, with 40% of the funding allocated to Caltrans nominated projects and the other 60% going to projects nominated by transportation agencies, cities, counties, or other public agencies. Funding targets are determined by percentages of goods movement within six regional corridors around the State, with Yuba County being classified as "Other". 30% matching funds are required.
Assessment	Promising. Three of the SYTIA projects include eligible overcrossings of the Union Pacific Railroad lines, so parsing out those projects into a separate overcrossing phases would make them most competitive candidates for TCEP funding. The Plumas Lake Blvd/SR 70 and South Beale Road/SR 65 Interchanges might be a bit more attractive, as they remove existing at-grade crossings. To the extent that the East Wheatland Expressway and SR 65 Realignment could be shown to also improve air quality and safety, as well as reducing congestion by removing interregional truck traffic from a traditional downtown, they could also be competitive. The good news about the TCEP program is that projects compete by corridors. While the "other" category has a relatively small target (only 2% of the funds in the 2020 round), SYTIA projects would be competing with other rural counties, rather than massive corridors in the Bay Area and Los Angeles. Another positive



	POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES – STATE
Source	Local Partnership Program (LPP)
Focus	The Local Partnership Program is designed to balance the need to direct increased revenue to the state's highest transportation needs while fairly distributing the economic impact of increased funding to entities that have enacted transportation sales taxes or imposed developer impact fees specifically for transportation.
Project Eligibility	Eligible projects include improvements to state highways, local roads, transit facilities, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, environmental mitigations, and road rehabilitation and maintenance.
	LPP contains two programs: the statewide competitive component, which allocates 40% of the funds, and a formulaic component, which awards 60% of the funds. Public agencies that have voter-approved taxes, tolls, or fees dedicated to transportation are eligible for both the formulaic component and statewide competitive components, while public agencies that have imposed fees, such as development fees exclusively for transportation, are only eligible for the competitive funds.
	Within the competitive program, funding is divided by those with voter imposed taxes and those with user fees only in proportion to the funds generated. The proportion of funds available to user fees only has a required minimum share of \$5M. Funding is for construction only.
Selection Criteria	 Cost Effectiveness Deliverability Projects that leverage funds above the required matching funds amount Air Quality & Greenhouse Reductions Vehicle-Miles Traveled Regional and Community Project Support System Preservation Regional and Local Transportation, Land Use, and Housing Goals
Amount Available	\$216M was available in the 2020 cycle.
Timing	Every two years, with the next cycle occurring in 2022.
Application Requirements	50% match from local funds is required, unless the fees generated are less than \$100K annually, in which case the match requirement is 25%. Application packages require detailed information on project costs and benefits, scope, funding, and schedule.
Assessment	Promising. Yuba County's Measure D is considered a voter approved transportation tax, which combined with the SYTIA impact fees, makes Yuba's projects eligible for all three funding pots. While the formulaic calculations provide only a minimum of \$100K, the eligibility of both SYTIA and Measure D for competitive pots could open up the possibility of additional funds. It is highly recommended that SYTIA follow up with the CTC regarding previous applications for discretionary funds to better understand how to frame projects to make them more competitive.



POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES – STATE		
Source	Active Transportation Program (ATP)	
Focus	The Active Transportation Program is focused on projects that encourage walking and biking and increase the share of walking and biking trips, including increasing safety and mobility for non-motorized users.	
Project Eligibility	Eligible projects include both infrastructure, planning, and non-infrastructure programs than demonstrate the benefit to the goals of the ATP. Infrastructure projects must have a completed PSR; preconstruction is eligible if application also requests funding for construction. Projects must be consistent with MTP. Minimum request is \$250,000 for infrastructure projects only.	
Selection Criteria	 Applications are considered in five categories based on project type and size of the request. Criteria for individual categories vary amongst the following: Benefits to Disadvantaged Communities (DAC) Need Safety Public Participation & Planning Scope and Plan Layout Consistency and Cost Effectiveness OR Scope and Plan Layout Consistency Context Sensitive & Innovation Transformative Projects Evaluation and Sustainability Leveraging Implementation & Plan Development Use of California Conservation Corps Past Performance 	
Amount Available	\$241M in 2021 cycle. 25% of the funds must go to benefit disadvantaged communities.	
Timing	Every two years, with next cycle expected in 2023.	
Application Requirements	Applicant must be Federal, State, local, or tribal governments, school districts, or certain non-profit agencies with responsibility for transportation or recreational trails.	
Assessment	Promising. Caltrans generally requires bicycle and pedestrian facilities as part of any project touching the State highway system, and this is a funding source that can be used to help plan and/or construct those portions of the SYTIA projects. Statewide competition may be stiff, but the same applications can also be used for the regional ATP program administered by SACOG.	



POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES – STATE	
Source	Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP)
Focus	The ITIP makes improvements to the connections in the interregional highway system, including connections between urban and rural areas.
Project Eligibility	Projects are selected from the State's Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan (ITSP), which was adopted in 2015 and an update is currently in progress. The ITSP identifies strategic corridors of investment and the facility concept that the investments are intended to achieve. Regional and local agencies work with Caltrans on identifying those projects included in the ITSP, but the SR 65 corridor is not currently included.
Selection Criteria	At least 60% of the funds must be programmed outside urban areas, with at least 9% going to intercity rail. Programming is also subject to the 40/60% North-South split. Within those parameters, selections are made on the following: Accessibility Reliability Safety Integration Economy Sustainability
Amount Available	\$625M was available in the 2020 cycle, which includes \$52M of new capacity. \$350M of new capacity is expected to be available in the 2022 cycle.
Timing	Every two years, with next cycle expected in 2022.
Application Requirements	Projects must be nominated by Caltrans.
Assessment	Not a current option, but could change. The SR 65 is not designated as a Strategic Interregional Corridor in the current ITSP, which eliminates three of the SYTIA project. The SR 70 corridor does have that designation, but Caltrans current policy does not allow use ITIP funds for interchange projects. SYTIA would significantly improve the long term funding options for projects in the SR 65 corridor by working with SACOG, PCTPA, and Caltrans to get SR 65 designated as a Strategic Interregional Corridor in the 2021 ITSP update.


POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES – STATE	
Source	Highway Bridge Program
Focus	The Highway Bridge Program (HBP) funds the replacement or rehabilitation of public highway bridges over waterways, other highways, or railroads when the State and the Federal Highway Administration determine that a bridge is significantly important.
Project Eligibility	Projects must qualify under HBP guidelines.
	Proposals are assessed in the following priority order:
	 Seismic retrofit projects and Scour countermeasure projects or rehabilitation and/or replacement of scour critical bridges.
	2. Bridges that have major structural deficiencies causing the bridge to be posted or closed.
	3. Scour countermeasure projects or rehabilitation of scour critical bridges.
Selection Criteria	 Projects that are eligible for replacement. Structurally Deficient with a sufficiency rating less than 50.
	5. Projects that are eligible for rehabilitation. Structurally Deficient with a sufficiency rating 80 or less.
	6. Bridge Preventive Maintenance Plan Projects.
	7. Projects that are Functionally Obsolete with application dated prior to October 1, 2016.
	8. Low water crossing projects with application dated prior to October 1, 2016
Amount Available	\$265M is programmed statewide for FY 20/21.
Timing	Continuous application. New programming is added to the last two years of the MTIP cycle.
Application Requirements	Public agencies with executed State/Local Federal-Aid Master Agreements are eligible. Application package includes scope definition, field review, and roadway data.
Assessment	The HBP is only a realistic option if any of the bridges included in a selected alternative alignment/design for an SYTIA project update an existing structure. Yuba County would need to evaluate the relative importance of SYTIA project applications for HBP versus other county bridge rehabilitation and replacement priorities.



The two following funding programs deal with rail crossings. While funding decisions are made by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), the input of the subject railroad and Caltrans is a critical factor. It is therefore strongly recommended, before finalizing these approaches, that SYTIA meet with Union Pacific Railroad, Caltrans Division of Rail, and key CPUC staff to get their viewpoints to determine which project might be most competitive for which fund.

POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES – STATE Source Section 130 Railroad Highway Grade Crossing Elimination Program The Railroad-Highway Grade Crossing Elimination Program seeks to reduce the number and severity of Focus highway accidents by eliminating hazards to vehicles and pedestrians at existing railroad crossings. Eligible projects make improvements to at-grade rail crossings, such as approach improvements, signage Project and pavement marking, active warning equipment installation/upgrades, visibility improvements, roadway Eligibility geometric improvements, and grade crossing elimination through roadway closure. Unspecified. The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) identifies and prioritizes project locations. Selection Criteria Projects are developed in coordination with local agencies, railroads and Caltrans. Amount \$16M annually. Available A priority list of projects is developed by the CPUC and updated each August. Timing Application None specified. Requirements The low annual funding level and sheer number of at grade railroad crossings make this a highly competitive funding source. Both the Plumas Lake Blvd/SR 70 Interchange and South Beale Road/SR 65 Interchange projects are eligible for this funding source, but submitting both would put the two projects in competition with each other. The Plumas Lake Blvd/SR 70 Interchange might be a better fit for the Section 130 program as it has the element of eliminating an existing at-grade crossing through a more distinct road closure. To the extent the project scope can specify the road closure as a separate phase or element of the overall interchange project, it becomes worthy of pursuit with the CPUC. Assessment South Beale Road/SR 65 Interchange also has elements that would be attractive for Section 130 program to the extent that the project may be phased to improve at-grade crossing safety until a grade separation is constructed. That construction could be submitted for the Section 190 Grade Separation Program discussed below. Because of the similarity of the features of these projects, a frank discussion with the funding agencies is critical in determining which project and phase would have the best chance of funding.



POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES – STATE	
Source	Section 190 Grade Separation Program
Focus	The Grade Separation Program improves safety and expedite the movement of vehicles by eliminating highway-rail crossing at grade with a grade separation.
Timing	Applications are due to the CPUC on April 1 of each year.
Amount Available	\$15M annually. Maximum allocation in any year is \$5M except in specific circumstances and/or legislative authority, with cumulative allocations no greater than 80% of construction cost.
Project Eligibility	Roadway/railroad grade separation structure projects are eligible. Pre-construction expenses are eligible once environmental clearances are obtained.
Selection Criteria	Unspecified. The CPUC issues a prioritized project list by July 1 of each year for allocation by the California Transportation Commission.
Application Requirements	Applicants must be cities, counties, or rail authorities. Railroads are required to provide at least 10% of funding for eliminating an at-grade crossing or replace or alter an existing grade separation, with assurances documented.
Assessment	Again, the low annual funding level and high demand and cost for railroad grade separations make this a highly competitive funding source. All the SYTIA projects except for the SR 65 Realignment include the construction of grade separations. Due to the required railroad match, a discussion with Union Pacific would be a critical step in determining their interest/ability to financially participate, and help determine the best project to pursue with the CPUC.



POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES – REGIONAL / SACOG	
Source	Regional Program
Focus	SACOG aggregates a number of Federal, State, and local funding sources to a single Regional Program application effort, divided into Maintenance and Modernization or Transformative.
Amount Available	\$164M available in 2021 round.
Timing	SACOG solicits applications approximately every two years; the most recent round application deadline was January 15/February 1, 2021.
Application Requirements	Applicants must review proposals with SACOG ahead of application and include a Project Performance Assessment (PPA). A non-federal 11.47% match is generally required. Applicants must provide a ranking of their project submissions if there is more than one.

POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES – REGIONAL / SACOG	
Source	Regional Program – Maintenance and Modernization
Project Eligibility	The Maintenance & Modernization category is for non-expansion project requests of \$5 million or less that improve the management and condition of existing transportation assets. Eligible projects include all transportation modes within the four county Sacramento region, must be in the MTP/SCS, and must be either 'exempt' or be included in the current MTIP. All project phases are eligible. All project phases are eligible.
Selection Criteria	 Projects are evaluated in categories as follows: Project Sponsor Priorities (1) Sponsor Priority Ranking (2) Documentation & Support for Priorities Asset Condition & Use (1) Maintenance need (2) Cost-effectiveness Modernization Benefits (1) Project Benefit narrative score (2) Project Performance Assessment (PPA) score Project Deliverability & Readiness (1) Risk Assessment narrative score (2) Project Readiness narrative score (2) Project Readiness narrative score
Assessment	Unlikely. All four SYTIA projects are considered expansion and are well in excess of \$5 million, thus making them ineligible. While it is possible that aspects of the projects, such as a grade separation, could be separated out to form a non-expansion project, it is still unlikely to be less than \$5 million total cost. More importantly, this is already a source that SYTIA agencies use for desperately needed road maintenance and rehabilitation projects elsewhere in the county. SYTIA projects would again be in competition with itself and/or member agencies for this funding.



POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES – REGIONAL / SACOG	
Source	Regional Program – Transformative
Focus	Transformative projects are system expansion project requests (of any size) and for larger (above \$5m) non-expansion project requests that can demonstrate significant regional benefit. Eligible projects include all transportation modes within the four county Sacramento region, must be in the MTP/SCS, and must be either 'exempt' or be included in the current MTIP. All project phases are eligible.
Selection Criteria	 Projects are evaluated in categories as follows: Project Benefit (1) Project Performance Assessment (PPA/TAM) score (2) Project Benefit narrative score In addition to an overarching objective to advance socioeconomic equity as it supports the performance outcomes, applicants can choose two of the following seven Project Benefit criteria for SACOG to consider their project on: Reduce regional vehicle miles travelled (VMT) and/or greenhouse gases (GHG) per capita. Reduce regional congested VMT per capita. Increase multi-modal travel/alternative travel/choice of transportation options. Provide long-term economic benefit, recognizing the importance of sustaining urban and rural economies. Improve goods movement, including farm-to-market travel, in and through the region. Significantly improve safety and security. Demonstrate "state of good repair" benefits that maintain and improve the existing transportation system. Project Leverage & Cost Effectiveness (1) Project Leverage data and narrative score (2) Cost-Effectiveness data calculation Project Deliverability & Risk Assessment (1) Risk Assessment narrative score (2) Project Readiness narrative score (2) Project Readiness narrative score
Assessment	Very promising. While SACOG must be mindful of MTP and MTIP requirements and the funding is competitive, the competition is on a smaller scale than State or Federal programs. SACOG is also careful to consider equitable balance around the region. It is also a positive that hard to find pre-construction funding is eligible.



POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES – REGIONAL / SACOG	
Source	Community Design Program
Focus	The Community Design Program is divided into two categories: The Competitive category is for cities, counties, and agencies with Federal-aid agreements for projects up to \$4M, while the Non-Competitive category applies to cities or counties applying for a single project between \$100K - \$500K. A new, separate category of Regional Early Action Planning (REAP) for housing is also available.
Project Eligibility	Eligible projects are those within the four county region that improve or enhance the livability of a community and/or support land uses that lead to fewer vehicle miles traveled and more walking, biking, and transit use. Projects must conform to some of the seven Blueprint Principles. Examples include transportation infrastructure directly connected to a land development project, land use plan, or in an existing "Blueprint friendly" community, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and streetscaping such as median landscaping, street trees, lighting, and furniture. All phases of construction are eligible.
Amount Available	\$16M available in 2021 round.
Timing	SACOG solicits applications approximately every two years; the most recent round application deadline was January 15/February 1, 2021.
Application Requirements	Applicants must be A non-federal 11.47% match is generally required. Applicants must indicate if the application is for Competitive or Non-competitive funds.
Assessment	Depending on the details of the supporting adjacent development, any of the SYTIA projects could have eligible project elements. The East Wheatland Expressway/SR 65 Realignment has the additional aspect of funding improvements to the current SR 65 that would be required for a future relinquishment.



Source	Regional Program – Active Transportation Program
Focus	The Regional Active Transportation Program funds projects in the six county SACOG region that were not funded in the State ATP. Program eligibility and criteria are the same as the State ATP program, but competition is limited to the Sacramento region.
Amount Available	\$11.8M in 2021 cycle. 25% of the funds must go to benefit disadvantaged communities.
Timing	Every two years, with next cycle expected in 2023.
Application Requirements	Applicant must be Federal, State, local, or tribal governments, school districts, or certain non-profit agencies with responsibility for transportation or recreational trails. Applications must include SACOG's Project Performance Assessment (PPA) tool. Applicants may also make revisions to the previous State ATP for the Regional program.
Assessment	Promising. Caltrans generally requires bicycle and pedestrian facilities as part of any project touching the State highway system, and this is a funding source that can be used to help plan and/or construct those portions of the SYTIA projects. Statewide competition may be stiff, but the same applications can also be used for the regional ATP program administered by SACOG.

POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES – LOCAL	
Source	Measure D
Focus	Passed by the voters of Yuba County in 2004, Measure D collects 15 cents for every ton of mined materials for road maintenance and repair. Funding allocations must go for roads and are discretionary, as no projects are listed in the ordinance.
Source	South Yuba Transportation Improvement Authority (SYTIA) Fee Program
Focus	SYTIA, a joint powers authority formed by Yuba County and the City of Wheatland, imposes a fair-share impact fee for development in South Yuba County for four specified projects. The overall program is expected to generate \$100M over its lifetime; approximately \$1.3M is anticipated to be collected in FY 2020/21. Funding allocations may go to any phase of the four projects, and are focused on maximizing leverage of discretionary funding.
Source	Direct or In-Kind Contributions
Focus	Public and private interests, such as developers, tribal governments, major employers, and adjoining jurisdictions, have interest in furthering SYTIA projects. There may be opportunities to partner with these groups on advocacy, environmental mitigation, right of way, outreach, or other elements to reduce overall project costs.

Hard Rock Hotel and Casino

FORTY MILE

RD

FORTA MILE RD

REPLACE AN

at the South

UNSIGNALIZED

INTERSECTION

Beale Road access

point at SR 65 to

Beale Air Force

Base with a full

interchange;

Attachment G

BRADSHAW RD

RANCHORD

MORRISON RD

PROJECT

AREA

NOTE: This map is conceptual.

PROJECT OVERVIEW

REPLACE

AT GRADE

CROSSING

Union Pacific

line with a

of the adjacent

Railroad freight

grade separated

overcrossing;

The South Beale Road/SR 65 Interchange

and Extension to Forty Mile Road will:

Actual alignments will be chosen as a result of the Project Study Report/Preliminary Engineering. SBEALERD

OAMEYLN

DAIRY RD

SOUTH BEALE ROAD/ SR 65 INTERCHANGE & EXTENSION TO FORTY MILE ROAD

REQUEST

The South Yuba Transportation Improvement Authority

(SYTIA) requests a 2021 Surface Transportation Reauthorization Member Project Designation for \$850,000 for preliminary engineering and project study report for the Wheatland Parkway Phase 1a: South Beale Road/SR 65 Interchange with Extension to Forty Mile Road



The South Beale Road/SR 65 Interchange project is Phase 1a of a larger Wheatland Parkway project that will relocate the current SR 65 from downtown Wheatland to an eastern alignment.

Enterprise Rancheria.

Maidu Tribe of the

PROVIDE A TWO-LANE

(Morrison Road) to connect

to Forty Mile Road with signalization, providing

safe access to the tribal land of the Estom Yumeka

EXTENSION

PROJECT BENEFITS

South Yuba County is an economically disadvantaged area, and the South Beale Road/SR 65 Interchange and Extension to Forty Mile Road is a key element to changing that. The project will



IMPROVE SAFETY AND REDUCE

COLLISIONS by removing an unsignalized intersection and at-grade crossing of the busy Union Pacific Railroad freight line at South Beale Road and SR 65 with a full grade separated interchange and overcrossing;



PROVIDE GREATER SAFETY AND ACCESS to Beale Air Force Base to the east;



SUPPORT JOB GROWTH AND IMPROVE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES in a low income area by providing safe access to the voter-approved sports and entertainment zone as well as the Estom Yumeka Maidu Tribe's hotel and gaming facility to the west;

ULTIMATELY, TAKE A STATE HIGHWAY OUT of historic downtown Wheatland.



