



# REPORT TO COUNCIL

## City of Sacramento

# 21

915 I Street, Sacramento, CA 95814-2671  
www. CityofSacramento.org

CONSENT ITEM  
**December 13, 2005**

Honorable Mayor and  
Members of the City Council

**Subject:** SACOG Community Design Grant Applications (M05-055)

**Location/Council District:** Citywide

**Recommendation:**

Staff recommends that City Council adopt the attached Resolution: 1) Directing staff to submit applications to SACOG's Community Design Grant Program for five projects; 2) Directing staff to prepare the 65<sup>th</sup> Street/University Transit Village Circulation Plan Update application with language encouraging SACOG to also fund California State University Sacramento's application for grant funding to begin Bus Rapid Transit Service as a desired compliment to the Transit Village; and 3) Directing staff to prepare and submit letters of support for Regional Transit's Streetcar Feasibility Study and Streetcar Starter Line applications.

**Contact:** Fedolia "Sparky" Harris, Senior Planner (916) 808-2996;  
Theresa Arnold, Special Projects Engineer (916) 808-5514

**Presenters:** Fedolia "Sparky" Harris

**Department:** Development Services

**Division:** Planning

**Organization No:** 4827

**Summary:**

Applications for approximately \$12 million in the second round of grant funding for transportation-related planning and capital projects in Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo, and Yuba counties that support smart growth are due to SACOG on January 12, 2006. Twenty-seven projects were received from staff and partner agencies for consideration. Staff performed an initial round of scoring and ranking based on objective criteria. That ranking was adjusted somewhat based on conversations with SACOG regarding potential competitiveness, the dollar amount sought, and project readiness to arrive at the recommended five projects.

**Committee/Commission Action:**

None

**Background Information:**

The City of Sacramento was awarded funding for four of five applications submitted during the first round of funding for a total of \$2,913,000.

SACOG has expressed a desire to be equitable in the distribution of funding suggesting that the City of Sacramento may have a difficult time during this round due our relative success in the first round. Staff's goal was to determine which projects to choose as candidates and at what funding level.

An initial round of scoring and ranking based on objective criteria was performed. That ranking was adjusted somewhat based on conversations with SACOG regarding potential competitiveness, the dollar amount sought, and project readiness. Final grant amounts could be adjusted if new information comes to light suggesting that the City's best interest would be served by such a decision. The following is a list of the five final candidate projects and their total project costs:

- 65<sup>th</sup> Street/University Transit Village Circulation Plan Update (\$1,000,000),
- Alternative Modes Parkway along the Sacramento Riverfront (\$625,000),
- City College Transit Village Plan including Pedestrian Bridge Feasibility (\$800,000),
- R Street Pedestrian Plaza between 16th and 19<sup>th</sup> (\$2,400,000), and
- Redding Avenue Improvements (\$2,700,000).

The key to the success of any of these projects is the demonstrated transportation related benefits as well as their conformity to the Blueprint Smart Growth Principles. Regardless of their merits, the City of Sacramento has to be realistic about the amount of funding that can be anticipated to be awarded within the city limits including applications from external agencies (RT, CSUS, etc.) The transportation merits of the projects vary widely, but staff recommends that SACOG and its project selection committees be charged with allocating scarce resources in an equitable manner without the City unnecessarily limiting the pool of viable projects. Descriptions of the projects are included as Attachment 3.

Project applications are due to SACOG on January 12, 2006. Staff is requesting that City Council approve the project list now in order to allow staff adequate time to prepare the applications, which are very detailed and require modeling using SACOG's PLACE<sup>3</sup>S model. Staff anticipates that the scopes and estimates of the selected projects may change as they move through the application and selection process.

**Financial Considerations:**

There are significant staff costs to prepare each project application. Staff estimates that it will take between 75 to 100 hours to prepare each application. These expenses will be borne by each employee's Department operating budget.

Each selected project requires an 11.47 percent match plus start-up costs from local funds. Depending on the selected project, the local funds would come from

redevelopment tax increment, Community Development Block Grant funding, developer fees, Measure A, Regional Transit, or other available City funds. Federal funding will allow the city to deliver priority projects and programs sooner.

**Environmental Considerations:**

The Environmental Services Manager has determined that submittal of a grant application does not meet the definition of a 'project' as defined by CEQA (Section 15378) for the following reasons: 1) it is not an activity such as public works construction, clearing or grading of land, improvements to existing structures, or enactment/amendment of zoning ordinance or the General Plan; 2) it is not an activity that is supported in whole or part by assistance by a public agency; and 3) it is not an activity that involves the issuance of an entitlement for use by one or more public agencies.

**Policy Considerations:**

The action requested herein is consistent with the Sacramento City Code, Title 3, and with the City's Strategic Plan goals of improving and diversifying the transportation system and supporting economic vitality by investing in infrastructure development. Leveraging of local funds with state or federal funding is consistent with Council priorities of fiscal soundness.

**Emerging Small Business Development (ESBD):**

No goods or services are being purchased under this report.

Approved by:

  
CAROL SHEARLY  
Director of Planning

  
MARTY HANNEMAN  
Director of Transportation

Recommendation Approved:

  
ROBERT P. THOMAS  
City Manager

Table of Contents:

Pg 1-3	Report
Pg 4-13	Attachment 1: Community Design Funding Program Guidelines
Pg 14	Attachment 2: Complete List of Projects Considered
Pg 15-19	Attachment 3: Initial Scoring Worksheet
Pg 20-21	<b>Resolution</b>

## ATTACHMENT 1

### 2005-07 Community Design Funding Program

#### GUIDELINES

##### G. PROGRAM BACKGROUND

The overall purpose of the Community Design Program is to provide support for planning and capital development projects that promote the Blueprint Project Principles.

The Community Design Program supports implementation of the Blueprint Project with financial incentives to local governments. Grants are awarded to projects sponsored by qualified public agencies in the SACOG region. These projects must support specific development or planning projects that conform to the seven Blueprint Principles (which are discussed in detail on the SACOG website: [www.sacog.org/regionalfunding/betterways.pdf](http://www.sacog.org/regionalfunding/betterways.pdf)):

- transportation choices;
- housing diversity;
- compact development;
- mixed land uses;
- use of existing assets;
- natural resource protection; and
- quality design.

The Metropolitan Transportation Plan for 2025 authorized the program through 2025. The MTP included \$500 million dedicated to directly fund public agencies (possibly in partnership with private developers and community organizations) for projects that support the goals of the Plan. The intent of the Community Design Program is to use regional transportation funding to promote the construction of land use developments (or land use and projects) that lead to fewer vehicles miles traveled and more walking, biking, and transit usage. The program results from the recognition that land use influences travel behavior and can be a powerful tool to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the regional transportation system. If it is convenient for people to travel to common destinations by walking, biking, or public transit, we can reap air quality and congestion-relief benefits at the local and regional scale. Near-term goals and objectives for the program are expanded upon below. Community Design proposals, which must be submitted by public agencies, will be evaluated for how well they promote the Blueprint Principles and the level of project maturity and commitment to actual physical construction.

## H. BLUEPRINT PROJECT

The six-county Sacramento metropolitan area presently faces a golden opportunity to promote construction of projects that will lead to more livable communities. The convergence of rapid growth, market conditions and new-found attitude towards regionalism offers the opportunity to reverse the trend of urban sprawl that communities in the Sacramento region – and all across America – have allowed. The timing is right since this region is projected to approximately double its population to 3.8 million by 2050.

SACOG's Blueprint Project has laid the groundwork for a better managed, more compact urban form. The project started in the year 2000 when SACOG was developing the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) for 2025. The modeling for the MTP showed that despite spending an estimated \$23 billion through the year 2025 for transportation projects throughout the six-county region, the Sacramento metropolitan area vehicular congestion would increase by 50% and vehicle miles traveled per household would increase by 20%. In addition, based on the sprawl-like development patterns of the late 1990s, the region would urbanize 661 additional square miles by 2050 under the base case scenario. With the region expecting to add more than 1 million jobs, 840,000 new dwelling units will need to be created to house the related doubling of the population to 3.8 million.

The Blueprint Project has given this region a long-range vision for land use to better manage the growth pressures of this region. The Blueprint Project has been on the cutting edge of regional growth management in four areas: (1) innovative use of geographic information system software, (2) extensive community outreach, (3) broad-based participatory techniques and (4) on-the-ground economic reality checks. Using interactive computer software, the average citizen can see the relationship between transportation performance and land use patterns, and what impacts land use has on quality of life indicators. More than 5,000 area residents have participated in 37 Blueprint half or full-day public workshops. After developing different growth pattern scenarios at neighborhood, county and regional levels and being able to compare development results, 99% of all participants have concluded that implementation of the seven Blueprint Principles are needed if this region is going to maintain its livability, protect open space and agriculture lands, provide housing that is attainable to all economic segments, and manage transportation impacts. Public opinion polling commissioned by SACOG yields similar public sentiments.

As a result, the SACOG Board of Directors adopted a Blueprint Project Preferred Scenario in December, 2004. The Preferred Scenario serves only as a concept-level illustration of the growth principles. It was developed with parcel-level data and analysis to help ensure that the growth concepts were being applied in a realistic manner; however, the Preferred Scenario is not for literal, parcel-level interpretation.

SACOG is working with local jurisdictions to implement the concepts of the Preferred Scenario. The Community Design Funding Program is designed for the planning and construction of projects that meet the Blueprint Principles.

## I. PROGRAM GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The Community Design Funding Program's stated goals and objectives are stated below:

### Goals

The Community Design Funding Program is a transportation funding program that provides a means to:

- A. encourage patterns of land development in new areas, following Blueprint Principles, that foster walking, biking and use of public transit instead of driving.
- B. improve walkability, bikability, and transit use in existing communities where there is the potential for infill and redevelopment that follows the Principles.
- C. improve a community's sense of identity and place as well as its quality of life through integrated transportation and land use development or redevelopment projects.

### Near-term program objectives

The following near-term objectives pertain to the next two years of the program, fiscal years 2005-06 and 2006-07.

1. Provide transportation infrastructure for specific land development projects that conform to the Blueprint Principles.
2. Provide transportation infrastructure for areas with a plan or policies adopted by a policy board that conform to the Principles.
3. Provide transportation infrastructure for developed areas where the built environment already conforms to the Principles, but where key features such as sidewalks and bike lanes are missing.
4. Provide planning assistance to modify plans and development projects to follow the Principles.
5. Provide incentives for new land development or redevelopment proposals that, if it were not for the Community Design Program, would be built according to standard development practices or not built at all.
6. Provide leverage for other public and private funding or enhance another transportation project.

7. Provide prototype examples of Community Design Principles throughout the region in different land use settings, including urban, suburban, and rural.

#### Future program objectives

SACOG envisions a broader array of objectives in future funding rounds, including public education on the strong link between land use and transportation, a housing incentive program, and an infrastructure bank loan program.

### **J. PROGRAM FUNDING AND GRANT TYPES**

In fiscal years 2005-06 and 2006-07, SACOG staff has preliminarily recommended that \$12 million be funded for Community Design Grants. This figure may change depending the quality of the grant applications. Ultimately, the SACOG Board of Directors will make the determination on the final program amount for 2005-07 after it reviews the award recommendations. Please note that the staff's recommended figure is for only for grants within Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo and Yuba Counties; funding for El Dorado and Placer County projects will be according to their respective agreements with SACOG, as summarized in sub-section L and detailed in Appendix B.

There are three types of grants within the Community Design Funding Program for 2005-07, of which the first two may be applied for through the Request for Applications in Section 3.

- **Capital grants** are available to public agencies (with or without private or non-profit partners) for transportation infrastructure projects. These infrastructure projects must either (1) connect directly to a site, corridor, or neighborhood development or redevelopment project that incorporates Blueprint Principles, or (2) supports a land use plan for development or redevelopment that incorporates the Principles, or (3) support an existing community that conforms to the Principles but lacks transportation infrastructure for alternative modes.
- **Planning grants** are available to local governments for updating local general plans, specific plans, other kinds of relevant plans, zoning ordinances, or other guidance documents to incorporate the Principles.
- **Quick Response Planning Grants** will be available starting in 2006 to local government agencies seeking planning assistance to improve specific development projects to conform to the Blueprint Principles. SACOG will select a limited number of pre-qualified planners, architects and other consultants through an RFQ process to provide on-going assistance that will be used to significantly improve specific development or redevelopment projects through incorporation of the Principles. Local governments will apply for technical assistance, and SACOG staff will make a determination whether to provide the assistance through consultant services. Projects may be submitted on an on-going basis throughout the

2005-07 fiscal years once the program has commenced. SACOG staff will review applications about every two months. This program will be available in 2006 and SACOG will issue a separate request for applications.

#### **K. PROJECT SPONSORSHIP**

Public agencies,<sup>2</sup> either with or without partnership with land developers or community groups, are eligible to sponsor Community Design projects. Public/private collaborations are encouraged, and all proposals will be expected to include a community outreach component. Community groups and developers who may wish to apply for these funds with a public agency are strongly encouraged to contact the agency early in the application process for its support and coordination. Non-city/county qualified public agencies that choose to serve as the lead sponsor are also strongly recommended to seek support from the local government in which the project site is located, preferably with coordination early in the application process. Lack of documented support or coordination will leave the impression that the project is not endorsed by the SACOG member agency and would considerably weaken the project's chances for program funding.

Also please note that if the awarded government agency intends to hire consulting or construction services with the grant funds, public bidding laws will take affect regarding the selection of contractors.

#### **L. PLACER AND EL DORADO COUNTIES**

For Placer and El Dorado Counties, a different situation applies, due to Memoranda of Understanding between the Placer County Transportation Planning Agency and SACOG and the El Dorado Transportation Commission and SACOG that govern the use of federal funds in those counties. Please refer to Appendix B for a detailed explanation of how federally-funded projects are approved in those counties.

In summary, the Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPA) for Placer and El Dorado Counties each hold a written agreement with SACOG that allows them to select projects with a fair share of federal funds. Local governments in these two counties will submit their grant applications to their RTPA. The RTPA will forward its selected projects to SACOG for funding. SACOG staff will review these projects and make a determination if they are qualified for the Community Design Funding Program, and, if so, they will be designated as receiving funding through this program and will be recognized as such. If not, they will be funded without being so designated.

---

<sup>2</sup> Public agencies are those organizations qualified to enter into a Cooperative Agreement with the California Department of Transportation to receive and use Federal transportation funds.

## M. ELIGIBLE PROJECTS

All projects awarded through the Community Design Funding Program must conform to federal transportation funding requirements. Potential applicants are encouraged to directly contact the SACOG Program Manager listed in sub-section **P** early in the application process for eligibility review. Summary descriptions of projects that received Community Design Funding Program funding in 2003-05 may be viewed in Appendix D. In addition, SACOG will provide a letter of understanding to the award recipient regarding SACOG's requirements and expectations regarding the grant. The draft model letter is found in Appendix E.

The following lists show the broad range of possible projects that are likely to be eligible for Community Design Funding Program funding:

### Capital Grants

- infrastructure directly connected to a land development project, land use plan, or in an existing "Blueprint friendly" community
- Bicycle and pedestrian paths, tunnels, and bridges
- On-street bike lanes
- Pedestrian plazas
- Pedestrian street crossings
- Streetscaping such as median landscaping, street trees, lighting, and furniture
- Traffic calming (but not interfering with public transit, bicycling or walking)
- Transit buses and services that serve the site (operations limited to 3 years)
- Transit stop amenities such as shelters, restrooms, and benches
- Transit transfer centers
- Shared parking systems and parking garages
- Electric vehicle charging stations and other support infrastructure<sup>3</sup>
- Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) associated with the site, such as smart parking or public Transit real-time information signs
- Outreach to the neighborhood and stakeholders

### Planning

Updates to general plans, specific plans, transportation plans, zoning codes, or other planning guidance, to conform them to the Blueprint Principles.

---

<sup>3</sup> Electric vehicles themselves, which are privately owned, may not be paid for with Federal funds.

**N. PROJECT SELECTION PROCESS**

Two committees will review and recommend grant applications for awards before they are submitted to the SACOG Board of Directors for review and action. The first committee, the Community Design Working Group, will review each application in detail. It will meet four times over a one month period to make recommendations awards and amounts purely on the basis of the technical merit of each project as described on the next sub-section.

This second committee, the Grant Programs Overview Committee, will review recommended applications from the Working Group for regional balance and relative equity amongst the different communities in the region relative to the strength of their applications. The Committee will also review recommended projects within the context of SACOG’s other three funding programs: Air Quality, Transportation Demand Management and Bicycle/Pedestrian. This committee will meet no more than two times specifically for the Community Design Program. (It will also meet to review the recommendations from the other three SACOG grant programs – Air Quality, Bicycle/Pedestrian and Transportation Demand Management.)

If the recommendations from both committees are the same, then they will be forwarded to the SACOG Board for review and action. If there are differences between the two committees’ recommendations, SACOG staff will try to rectify any differences and submit a compromised set of recommendations based in the spirit of the discussions by the two committees to the Board.

Members for both of these committees will be selected from the Regional Planning Partnership, the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee, the Transit Coordinating Committee, the Transportation Demand Management Task Force and the Planners Committee as shown below:

**Community Design Working Group Composition**

<b>Expertise</b>	<b>Appointment By:</b>	<b>Working Group Positions</b>
Planners	Planners Committee	5
Project Engineers	Regional Planning Partnership	3
Urban Designer	Regional Planning Partnership	1
Bike/Ped	Bike/Ped Advisory Committee	1
Air Quality	Air Districts	1
TDM	TDM Task Force	1
Transit	Transit Coordinating Committee	2
Community Groups	Regional Planning Partnership	1
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>15</b>

### Grant Programs Overview Committee

Appointment By:	Number of Grant Programs Overview Committee Positions
Planners Committee	3
Regional Planning Partnership	4
Bike/Pedestrian Advisory Committee	2
TDM Task Force	2
Transit Coordinating Committee	2
Air Districts	2
TOTAL	15

#### O. EVALUATION CRITERIA

The evaluation criteria described in this subsection are based on the Working Group discussions from the selection process of the 2003-05 Community Design Grant Program. Essentially, the Working Group narrowed several stated criteria down to the overall impression each application made on two characteristics. These two characteristics will serve as the evaluation criteria for this cycle's selection process. They are not formally written agreed-upon language, but rather summarize the practical implications that will be considered.

##### ***Criterion #1: How well does the proposed project promote the Blueprint Project Principles?***

Practical considerations: This is the most fundamental question each project will be judged against. Based on the 2003-05 selection of projects, the Working Group identified projects that best exemplified the Blueprint Principles. Projects that failed to make a compelling argument that they support the principles were immediately eliminated from further consideration. Some applicants tried to rationalize how a public project that was in high demand was therefore a Blueprint-friendly project, when it was not. Projects that were considered not detrimental to the Blueprint Project did not necessarily mean that they were considered Blueprint friendly. This program is intended to support the region's best examples of Blueprint implementation and not necessarily to provide a funding source for public works projects.

Applicants seeking to understand how competitive their projects might be, may wish to compare their idea against the 15 projects that were funded in 2003-05. These applications may also give prospective applicants an idea of what application contents were successfully used. The .PDF files of grant applications of each of those projects may be found at [www.sacog.org/regionalfunding/awarded\\_grant\\_applications.cfm](http://www.sacog.org/regionalfunding/awarded_grant_applications.cfm)

The single most common concern the Working Group had in reviewing applications was that the lack of clarity. Some applications lacked why their project was Blueprint-supportive, while others tried unsuccessfully to rationalize why a project followed the Blueprint principles. Some

applicants also lacked a clear explanation of why the project was needed to support Blueprint. Other applicants failed to clearly describe how they would use the grant funding in a way that would lead to Blueprint-friendly development.

***Criterion #2: How “real” is the project? What is the likelihood that the project will be implemented as the application implies?***

Of the applications that showed a strong tie with the Blueprint Principles, the Working Group spent a considerable amount of time deliberating about how realistic these proposals were. Successful applicants were able to provide evidence that the project had been well-thought through and that the project was likely be implemented immediately.

Commonly asked questions by the Working Group used to evaluate applications were:

- Has the governing body with the most legal standing endorsed or approved this project?
- Is there an existing adopted plan in which this project is identified?
- Has the surrounding neighborhood been involved in the project’s development and has the affected neighborhood or the appropriate neighborhood association endorsed the grant project?
- Is there support from adjacent and nearby property owners who is proposing development on their property?
- For capital projects, where is this project in the development review process?
- For planning projects, what is the project’s potential to meet the Blueprint Principles in the plans, zoning ordinances or other development guidance?
- Are there leveraged, private development funds being invested in or near the subject area? If so, how much, and is the private development considered Blueprint-friendly?
- What documentation is there on how much funding has been invested in the study area? Are there letters or other documentation from property owners in the application stating support for the project or stating what they are intending to do with their property that is Blueprint-friendly?
- Is this a “lynchpin” project –does its implementation and success mean other Blueprint-supportive projects will also be built? If this project is not funded, will other Blueprint-supportive projects not be built as a result?
- Has the project been carefully thought-through, or are there significant obstacles that the applicant has not addressed in the application?
- Does this project serve as a good example of the Blueprint Principles for the region?
- What is the likelihood that this project will be built as it is described in the application? And how soon will it get built or implemented?
- Are there major outstanding issues that are not resolved? Does this project need to be awarded in this funding cycle, or can it wait until future cycles after the applicant has addressed all critical issues?

- What are the number of units of housing, commercial space, jobs and other important indicators within a quarter mile of this site? Within one mile? How do residential densities compare with other comparable subject areas?
- How did the project perform using PLACE<sup>3</sup>S or in comparison with the Desired Land Development Profiles Matrix?
- What is the track record of the applicant in Blueprint implementation?
- (Expected questions in 2005-07): What is the track record of the jurisdiction if it received a Community Design Grant in 2003-05? Has the applicant been accountable to SACOG for how it has utilized its grant? Has the project been implemented in the spirit it was stated in the grant application?

Practical Considerations: Applications that adequately addressed the issues raised in these questions were more likely to have been successful in 2003-05, and this will likely hold true for the 2005-07 funding cycle as well. Some of the tools that successful applicants included in their applications included:

- A context map of the site: where is the subject area in relation to the commonly known landmarks within the region.
- An aerial map showing the project or subject area. The maps showed what exist currently, what projects are in place, and how and where grant funds were going to be used.
- A list of major capital improvements within, adjacent to, or near the subject site. This list could show infrastructure improvements, private development investment made or committed, and long-term public works projects likely to be built according to an adopted plan.
- PLACE<sup>3</sup>S maps and analysis showing different land use configurations, and the preferred scenario on that conforms well with the Blueprint Principles.
- Photographs of the site or subject area as they currently exist.
- Renderings or drawings of what the subject site or area will look like as a result of grant funding.
- Renderings, graphics or photographs of projects that have recently been built or are going through development review for construction in or near the project subject area.
- Letters of support from key organizations (neighborhood association, adjacent property owners, private developers directly affected by the subject project).
- Written information that addresses as many of the questions mentioned above. The level of detail that is provided should be enough to provide the Working Group a clear, overall picture of what activities, investments, etc. are taking place without providing extraneous information.

**ATTACHMENT 2**

**SACOG Community Design Grant Program 2005-2007  
City of Sacramento Preliminary Project List**

**Planning**

- 1. ~~R St Form Based Code~~ ..... CADA
- 2. ~~Richards Blvd Area Planning for Parks, Open Space and Regional Destination Attractions including the California Indian Heritage Center~~ ..... PARKS
- 3. ~~High Rise Open Space Policy Development~~ ..... PARKS
- 4. ~~65<sup>th</sup> St Transit Village Circulation Plan Amendments~~..... SHRA
- 5. ~~65<sup>th</sup> Street/Elvas Auto Tunnel into CSUS Feasibility Study~~ ..... SHRA
- 6. ~~Gap funding for Swanston Station~~ ..... DSD
- 7. ~~Florin and Meadowview LRT Station Gap Funding~~ ..... DSD
- 8. ~~Develop in lieu of parking assessment district for Central City structures~~ ..... DSD
- 9. ~~Excursion Train Realignment & Front St Streetcar Line Feasibility~~ ..... ED
- 10. ~~16<sup>th</sup> St LRT Station Relocation Feasibility Study~~ ..... CADA
- 11. *Regional Streetcar Feasibility Study* ..... RT

**Capital**

- 1. ~~East End Gateway Garage (16<sup>th</sup> and O) Gap Funding~~ ..... CADA
- 2. ~~R Street 16<sup>th</sup> to 18<sup>th</sup> Pedestrian Plaza~~ ..... CADA
- 3. ~~Gateway District Master Plan Implementation~~ ..... SHRA
- 4. ~~Des Rios LRT Station Planning and Capital Improvements~~ ..... SHRA
- 5. ~~CSUS Faculty Village Roadway Improvements (Ramona Ave/CYA Property)~~ . SHRA
- 6. ~~Redding Ave Improvements~~..... SHRA
- 7. ~~Broadway Streetscape improvements between 15<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup>~~ ..... DSD
- 8. ~~City College Transit Village Plan including Ped Bridge~~ ..... DSD
- 9. ~~R Street to Garden Street Pedestrian Bridge~~ ..... DOT
- 10. ~~Sutterville and 23<sup>rd</sup> Intersection Improvements~~ ..... DOT
- 11. ~~Curtis Park West Ped Bridge~~ ..... DOT
- 12. ~~Fruitridge LRT Station Area Ped Improvements~~ ..... DOT
- 13. ~~Northgate Streetscape Phase 1 Improvements~~ ..... ED
- 14. ~~Alternative Modes Parkway along the Sacramento Riverfront~~ ..... ED
- 15. *LRT Capital Enhancements* ..... RT
- 16. *Streetcar Starter Line Project Implementation* ..... RT

*Note: Regional Transit (RT) can apply for Grant funding independently RT projects are listed simply for consideration as to whether the City would support their project*

DSD – Development Service Department  
 DOT – Department of Transportation  
 ED – Economic Development Division  
 SHRA – Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment Agency  
 CADA – Capitol Area Development Authority

Projects deemed ineligible shown in RED-STRIKEOUT  
 Projects pulled by sponsor shown in BLACK-STRIKEOUT  
 Low scoring projects shown in GREEN-STRIKEOUT

**ATTACHMENT 3**

Project Title	R Street Pedestrian Plaza
Lead Applicant	Capitol Area Development Authority
Lead Person and Contact Information	Todd Leon, R Street Manager 1522 14 <sup>th</sup> Street Sacramento, CA 95814 <a href="mailto:tleon@cada.org">tleon@cada.org</a> (916) 323-1272 (916) 441-1804 fax
Partner Organizations	City of Sacramento
Grant Type	Capital
Overall Total Project Costs	\$2,400,000
Project Description	The plaza is a pedestrian open space/park on R Street that would front and accompany the development of the Crystal Ice Development between 16th and 19th Streets. This plaza park would accommodate multiple uses throughout the day, week and year. For example, during the weekdays, it could serve as a small pocket plaza with limited parking for retail and commercial uses, and during the weekends transform as a space for host flea markets, art shows, fashion shows, or other community events and festivals.

Project Title	Redding Avenue Improvements
Lead Applicant	Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment Agency
Lead Person and Contact Information	Chris Pahule, Redevelopment Manager 600 I Street, Suite 250 Sacramento, CA 95814 <a href="mailto:cpahule@shra.org">cpahule@shra.org</a> (916) 440-1399
Partner Organizations	City of Sacramento
Grant Type	Capital
Overall Total Project Costs	\$2,700,000
Project Description	This project proposes to construct frontage improvements along Redding Avenue between 4th Avenue and Q Street intersections. The proposed improvements include bicycle lanes, curb and gutter, landscaped planters, separated sidewalks, and decorative lighting.

Project Title	Alternative Modes Parkway along the Sacramento Riverfront
Lead Applicant	City of Sacramento
Lead Person and Contact Information	Laura Sainz, Senior Project Manager 1030 15th Street, 2nd floor Sacramento, CA 95814 <a href="mailto:lsainz@cityofsacramento.org">lsainz@cityofsacramento.org</a> (916) 808-2677 (916) 808-8161 fax
Partner Organizations	City of Sacramento
Grant Type	Capital
Overall Total Project Costs	\$625,000
Project Description	This project includes extending the existing riverfront promenade from O Street approximately one mile into the Marina and Miller Park. The objective would be to fund the design and construction drawings of a riverfront parkway that connects key locations in downtown along the riverfront. Ideally, the parkway will spur development in the Docks Area and the Marina, as well as facilitate the relocation of the tank farms on either side of Broadway to allow for more infill. The project also leverages public investment in Old Sacramento and the Marina/Miller Park by providing improved access to these locations.

Project Title	65th Street Transit Village Circulation Plan Amendments
Lead Applicant	City of Sacramento
Lead Person and Contact Information	Fedolia "Sparky" Harris, Senior Planner 915 Street, Suite 300 Sacramento, CA 95814 <a href="mailto:fharris@cityofsacramento.org">fharris@cityofsacramento.org</a> (916) 808-2996 (916) 808-7185 fax
Partner Organizations	City of Sacramento
Grant Type	Capital
Overall Total Project Costs	\$1,000,000
Project Description	Feasibility study and amendment to the 65th Street Transit Village Circulation Plan to determine the feasibility and cost to change the circulation patterns in the area to accommodate the following elements: - Major entrance to CSUS at 65th Street/Elvas Avenue Tunnel - Widen 65th Street and Folsom Boulevard for alternative modes (on-street parking, wider sidewalks, dedicated bikeways) rather than new travel and turn lanes - Elvas Avenue improvements in support of a new entrance at 65th Street and Elvas Avenue - Additional streets (between Folsom Blvd. and Q Street) to form a circulation plan that is closer to a grid pattern which is more conducive towards a pedestrian and transit oriented village area - Amendment to the TVP with Circulation Plan and address other issues in support of public investment in the area (higher densities, shared parking, and stricter development and design standards)

Project Title	City College Transit Village Plan
Lead Applicant	City of Sacramento
Lead Person and Contact Information	Fedolia "Sparky" Harris, Senior Planner 915 I Street, Suite 300 Sacramento, CA 95814 <a href="mailto:fharris@cityofsacramento.org">fharris@cityofsacramento.org</a> (916) 808-2996 (916) 808-7185 fax
Partner Organizations	City of Sacramento
Grant Type	Capital
Overall Total Project Costs	\$800,000
Project Description	The City is currently processing a development application for a 66-acre planned unit development known as Curtis Park West which will add single-family, multi-family, and commercial uses adjacent to the Union Pacific Rail lines between the Curtis Park neighborhood and Sacramento City College. The college has significant development potential on the west side of the tracks centered on the City College LRT station that opened with the South Line extension of light rail. A SACOG Planning Grant would allow the City to develop a comprehensive plan for the transit village (potentially including a pedestrian bridge over the tracks) that will develop at the City College station in an attempt to maximize the ridership for an area that will serve as both a major origin as well as a major destination.

**RESOLUTION NO. 2005-XXXX**

Adopted by the Sacramento City Council

December 13, 2005

**ADOPT RESOLUTION DIRECTING STAFF TO SUBMIT APPLICATIONS TO SACOG'S  
COMMUNITY DESIGN GRANT PROGRAM**

**BACKGROUND**

- A. Applications for approximately \$12 million in the second round of grant funding for transportation-related planning and capital projects that support smart growth are due to SACOG on January 12, 2006.
- B. City Council adopted the Smart Growth Principles into the General Plan (Resolution No. 2001-805).
- C. City Council adopted a resolution demonstrating the City's commitment to Blueprint Implementation and Metropolitan Transportation Plan Growth Allocation. (Resolution No. 2005-755).
- D. Staff has conducted an objective scoring and ranking process in an attempt to identify the projects most competitive for the Community Design Grant Program.
- E. Staff has coordinated with Regional Transit and California State University, Sacramento in an effort to fully appreciate the merits of the projects that they intend to submit as eligible federal funding recipients apart from the City of Sacramento.

**BASED ON THE FACTS SET FORTH IN THE BACKGROUND, THE CITY COUNCIL  
RESOLVES AS FOLLOWS:**

Section 1. The following list of projects is approved for submission to the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) for the second round of the Community Design Grant Program barring unforeseen obstacles related to timing, funding, or deliverability of any particular project:

- **65th Street/University Transit Village Circulation Plan Update,**
- **Alternative Modes Parkway along the Sacramento Riverfront,**
- **City College Transit Village Plan including Pedestrian Bridge Feasibility,**
- **R Street Pedestrian Plaza between 16<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup>, and**
- **Redding Avenue Improvements.**

Section 2. Staff is directed to prepare the 65th Street/University Transit Village Circulation Plan Update application with language encouraging SACOG to also fund California State University Sacramento's application for grant

funding to begin Bus Rapid Transit Service as a desired compliment to the Transit Village.

Section 3. Staff is directed to prepare letters of support for Regional Transit's Streetcar Feasibility Study and Streetcar Starter Line applications.