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## Executive Summary:

All local, regional, and state transportation plans recognize the importance of providing increased mobility and accessibility to the cities and towns within the State Route (SR) 70 and 99 Corridor that only a modern freeway can provide. The Corridor is critical for interregional travel, goods movement, and connectivity to Interstate routes. These routes have high truck volumes with significant increases during agricultural peak season. The routes are increasingly becoming congested through the urbanized areas. By 2040, an additional 5.2 million people are projected to live in the Valley counties. This pattern of expanding urbanization is expected to continue. Development of the routes in the Sacramento Valley to freeway and expressway standards is vital to the economic health of the region.

The Sacramento Valley Route 70/99 Corridor Business Plan (Business Plan) is designed as a guide for decision-makers in making strategic investment decisions for improving mobility and accessibility in the corridor. The Plan addresses existing conditions along the length of corridor through Caltrans District 2 and 3 from the Sacramento/San Joaquin County Line to the City of Red Bluff in Tehama County. The Plan draws upon existing planning, programming, and project documents to create a comprehensive list of current, planned, and future projects. These projects are designed to improve safety, increase capacity, and close gaps on the routes that are critical for movement of goods, services, and people in the eastern Sacramento Valley.

This Business Plan contains four chapters. In Chapter 1, the purpose, goals and objectives of the plan are identified, and the need for local and regional cooperation is articulated. The primary goals identified in Chapter 1 are to close gaps, improve mobility, and bring the Route 70/99 Corridor up to expressway and freeway standards, and to reach consensus amongst the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG), Butte County Association of Governments (BCAG), Tehama County Transportation Commission (TCTC), and Caltrans.

Chapter 2 discusses a brief history of the routes and identifies the existing conditions along the Corridor. Many of the segments on the Route 70/99 Corridor are currently experiencing an unacceptable level of service, and have safety and operational issues that need to be resolved. An examination of the history of the Corridor and an in depth, segment-by-segment look at existing conditions is provided in Appendices A and B to the Plan.

Chapter 3 identifies projects by priority that need to be completed to meet the goals and objectives identified in Chapter 1. The four project priority categories are Priority 1, Priority 2, Planned Projects, and Future Projects. Priority 1 projects have the highest priority for completion as identified through a consensus with SACOG, BCAG, the TCTC, and Caltrans. These projects are shown by geographic location in Figure ES. 1 and identified in Table ES. 1 and on the following pages.

Figure ES.1, Priority - 1 Projects


Table ES.1, Priority - 1 Projects

| 0 0 0 0 3 3 3 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 3 \\ & 3 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 줄 } \\ & 0 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | - |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { x } \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0 \\ 0 \\ 2 \\ \text { a } \\ 10 \\ i 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 2 \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | SAC | 99 | $\begin{aligned} & 16.25 / \\ & 19.61 \end{aligned}$ | Calvine <br> Road | Florin Road | Calvine/Florin Roads Auxiliary Lanes Restriping/ Reconfiguration | SHOPP, RIP, Go CA | Caltrans, SACOG | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \text { TSDP, } \\ \text { TCR, RTP, } \\ \text { PSR } \end{array}$ | \$13,056 | 2007 |
| 2 | SAC | 99 | 35.37 | Elverta Road |  | Elverta Road Interchange Construction | RIP, IIP | Caltrans, SACOG, City of Sacramento | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { TSDP, } \\ \text { TCR, RTP, } \\ \text { PSR } \end{array}$ | \$50,000 | $\begin{gathered} 2011- \\ 2014 \end{gathered}$ |
| 3 | SUT | 99 | 0.95 | Riego Road |  | Riego Road Interchange Construction | Developer Capital Investment, SSTP, State Cash | Caltrans, Sutter County, SACOG | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { TSDP, } \\ \text { TCR, RTP, } \\ \text { PSR } \end{array}$ | \$50,000 | 2009 |
| 4 | SUT | 99 | $\begin{aligned} & 11.97 / \\ & 13.68 \end{aligned}$ | Garden <br> Highway | Sacramento Avenue | Garden Hwy./ <br> Sacramento Ave. 4Lane Expressway Conversion and Feather River Bridge | RIP, IIP, Fed. Demo | Caltrans, Sutter County, SACOG | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { TSDP, } \\ \hline \text { TCR, RTP, } \\ \text { PSR, RTL- } \\ 2008 \end{array}$ | \$76,600 | $\begin{array}{\|l} 2011- \\ 2020 \end{array}$ |
| 5 | SUT | 99 | $\left\|\begin{array}{l} 16.89 \\ 22.60 \end{array}\right\|$ | Central <br> Avenue | O'Banion Road | Tudor Bypass 4-Lane Expressway Conversion | RIP, IIP, Fed. Demo, SHA, NHSF | Caltrans, Sutter County, SACOG | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { TSDP, } \\ \text { TCR, RTP, } \\ \text { PSR, RTL- } \\ 2008 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | \$63,029 | 2011 |
| 6 | SUT | 70 | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} 00.05 / \\ 8.08 \end{gathered}\right.$ | SR 99 | North side of Bear River | SR 99/Bear River 4Lane Expressway Conversion | IIP and NHSF | Caltrans, SACOG | TSDP, TCR, RTP, PSR, RTL2006 | \$168,800 | 2012 |
| 7 | BUT | 70 | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} 3.30 / 6 \\ .80 \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { South of } \\ \text { East } \\ \text { Gridley } \\ \text { Road } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | North of Cox Road | E. Gridley/Cox Roads Passing Lanes Construction | SHOPP, RIP, IIP | Caltrans, BCAG | TSDP, <br> TCR, RTP, <br> PSR, RTL- <br> 2009 | \$21,000 | $\begin{aligned} & 2010- \\ & 2025 \end{aligned}$ |
| 8 | BUT | 70 | $\begin{aligned} & 11.70 / \\ & 13.60 \end{aligned}$ | Ophir <br> Road | Beginning of Freeway, south of SR 162 | Oroville Freeway Extension and Ophir Road Interchange Construction | Ph. 1: RIP, IIP, Tea 21 Demo; Ph. 2: TIM (Oroville), RIP, IIP | Caltrans, BCAG | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { TSDP, } \\ \hline \text { TCR, RTP, } \\ \text { PSR, RTL- } \\ 2008 \end{array}$ | \$65,584 | Ph. 1: <br> 2008- <br> 2009, <br> Ph. 2: <br> 2010- <br> 2018 |
| 9 | BUT | 99 | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} 32.38 / \\ 33.28 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | SR 32 | East 1st Avenue | SR 32/E. 1st Ave. Auxiliary Lanes Construction and Interchange Improvements | $\begin{gathered} \text { RIP, } \\ \text { SHOPP } \end{gathered}$ | BCAG | TSDP, TCR, RTP, PSR, RTL: Phase 12008 | \$45,736 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} 2008- \\ 2018 \end{array}$ |
| 10 | TEH | 99 | $\begin{aligned} & 12.00 / \\ & 12.60 \end{aligned}$ | Grant <br> Street, <br> Los <br> Molinos | Tehama <br> Vina, Los <br> Molinos | "Main Street" Drainage, Curbs, Gutters, Sidewalks, and Lighting Safety Improvements | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { IIP TE, RIP } \\ \text { TE } \end{array}\right\|$ | Caltrans, TCTC, Tehama County, Los Molinos Community Group | $\begin{gathered} \text { TSDP, } \\ \text { RTP, PSR } \end{gathered}$ | \$13,200 | 2009 |

* Project Status includes various planning and programming stages that must be completed prior to project construction. A few of these stages that are applicable to this Business Plan include inclusion in a Transportation System Development Plan (TSDP), Transportation Concept Report (TCR), and Regional or Metropolitan Transportation Plan (RTP); completion of a Project Study Report (PSR) or equivalent; and the Project is Ready to List (RTL) for construction.

In Chapter 4, the phasing of projects by priority and funding strategies to expedite successful construction of the projects are documented.

In view of the current and projected traffic congestion, and safety and operational issues along this corridor, and the projected cost of upgrading the corridor, it is clear that the Sacramento Valley cannot afford to wait 20 years for implementation of this Business Plan. Therefore, the challenge and opportunity to accelerate this plan are great. Caltrans' Districts 2 and 3, and our regional partners are ready to accept this challenge and opportunity!

## Chapter 1 Introduction

### 1.1 Overview:

The Sacramento Valley Route 70/ 99 Corridor Business Plan (Business Plan) is designed as a guide for decision-makers in making strategic investment decisions for improving mobility and accessibility in the corridor. The Plan addresses existing conditions along the length of the corridor through Caltrans District 2 and 3 from the Sacramento County Line to Red Bluff in Tehama County. The Plan draws upon existing planning, programming, and project documents to create a comprehensive list of current, planned, and future projects. These projects are designed to improve safety, increase capacity, and close gaps on the routes that are critical for movement of goods, services, and people in the eastern Sacramento Valley.

### 1.2 Background:

This Business Plan examines SR 99 south of Sacramento, and the SR 70/99 Corridor north of Sacramento. SR 99 south of Sacramento provides critical linkage between the communities of the eastern San Joaquin Valley and the Sacramento urban area. The SR 70/90 Corridor, north of Sacramento, is the primary north/south route for the communities of the eastern Sacramento Valley. SR 70 and 99 run parallel from just south of the community of Nicolaus in Sutter County to south of the City of Chico in Butte County where the two routes are connected by SR 149. SR 70 continues easterly from the junction of SR 149 junction into Plumas County. SR 99 ends at the SR 36 junction, just $21 / 2$ miles south of the City of Red Bluff in Tehama County. The Business Plan also includes an analysis of this short section of SR 36, which is a vital link in the connection to Interstate 5 (I-5).

All local, regional, and state transportation plans recognize the importance of providing increased accessibility to the cities and towns within the corridor that only a modern freeway can provide. The SR 70/SR 99 Corridor is critical for both interregional travel to and through urbanized areas and for connectivity to other adjoining routes through the length of the Valley. These routes have high volumes of truck freight movement overall with significant increases in the agricultural peak season. The routes are increasingly becoming congested through the urbanized areas. Development of the routes to freeway and expressway standards, and improvement of interchanges are vital to the economic health of Valley communities. By 2040, an additional 5.2 million people are projected to live in the Valley counties. The pattern of expanding urbanization and designation of new urbanized areas along the route path is expected to continue. Congestion in the Sacramento, Marysville, Yuba City and Chico areas, and spot congestion between Chico and Red Bluff has been prevalent for many years. Growth forecasts indicate that the Level of Service will only worsen if highway improvements are not made in a timely
manner. At this time, Chico and the Marysville/Yuba City area are two of the few urbanized areas in California without Freeway access.

### 1.2.1 State Route 99:

SR 99 is a primary north-south transportation route for the 11 urbanized areas in 13 counties within California's San Joaquin and Sacramento Valleys. Additionally, it is a critical alternative route for the Sacramento and Stockton urbanized areas served by I-5. The route is not complete to freeway standards, primarily north of Sacramento. There are numerous expressway and conventional highway "gaps", and an overall lack of adequate capacity throughout. The route concept is a full freeway from its beginning in Kern County to north of the City of Chico and a 4-lane expressway north of Chico to the City of Red Bluff in Tehama County with additional lanes in the existing freeway portions.

SR 99 highway begins at its junction with I-5 in Kern County to the south and terminates 424 miles north at SR 36 near the City of Red Bluff in Tehama County. There are 274 miles of SR 99 within the boundaries of Caltrans Districts 6 and 10, and 125 miles within District 3 with the remaining 25 miles within District 2. In Districts 2 and 3, SR 99 provides access to the City of Galt, the City of Elk Grove, the City and County of Sacramento, the City of Yuba City, Sutter County, the City of Live Oak, the City of Gridley, the City of Biggs, the City of Chico, Butte County, the community of Los Molinos, the City of Tehama, the City of Red Bluff (County Seat), and Tehama County to the north.

### 1.2.2 State Route 70:

In conjunction with SR 99, SR 70 is the primary north-south transportation corridor for the 3 urban areas and several small communities in 4 counties within the eastern Sacramento Valley. The route is not to freeway standards and is predominantly a 2 -lane conventional highway. However, there are two segments, which are to expressway and freeway standards. These segments extend from the Sutter/Yuba County line to the City of Marysville, and from the City of Oroville to SR 149 in Butte County. The expressway and freeway gaps along the route contribute to overall lack of adequate capacity. The improvement concept for the route is a 4-lane freeway in Sutter County from the SR 70/99 wye to Marysville in Yuba County. A bypass is proposed for the City of Marysville with a expressway/freeway extending north to the City of Oroville.

SR 70 begins at its junction with SR 99 in Sutter County south of the community of Nicolaus in Sutter County and terminates 182 miles north at SR 395 at Hallelujah Junction in Lassen County near the California/Nevada state line. The portion of the route that is a focus of the Business Plan is from the SR 70/99 wye to the SR 70/149 wye, within District 3. SR 70 provides access to Sutter County, Yuba County, the communities of Olivehurst and Linda, the City of Marysville (County Seat), Butte County, and the City of Oroville (County Seat). SR 70 is a gateway to recreational areas
of the Sierra Nevada Mountains. SR 70 via SR 99 provides interregional connections to I-5 south of the Yuba River and north at Red Bluff.

### 1.2.3 State Route 36:

SR 36 is a west-east transportation route that begins in the community of Rio Dell in Humboldt County at the intersection with U.S. 101 and terminates 268 miles east at the junction with SR 395, 4.9 miles east of the City of Susanville in Lassen County. The portion of the route that is a focus of the Business Plan is in Tehama County between the junction with SR 99 and the I-5 Interchange in the City of Red Bluff (County Seat).

### 1.2.4 State Route 149:

SR 149 is an east-west transportation route that begins north of the City of Oroville in Butte County at the conjunction with SR 70 and terminates 4.6 miles west at the conjunction with SR 99, south of the City of Chico. This 2-lane expressway is the vital connection between SR 70 and SR 99. The upgrading of this facility to a 4-lane expressway or freeway has been in various Caltrans planning documents since 1990. In May of 2006, construction finally began on upgrading SR 149 to a 4-lane expressway. As part of this project, the intersections at SR 70 and SR 99 are being replaced with interchanges. This project is scheduled for completion by the end of 2009.

### 1.3 Need For Corridor Improvements:

The communities along SR 70 and SR 99 have been experiencing a high rate of growth with many residents commuting to regional and interregional employment opportunities in the Cities of Redding, Red Bluff, Corning, Tehama, Chico, Oroville, Marysville, Yuba City, Sacramento, Elk Grove, and Galt as well as cities near these routes in Yolo and Placer Counties that include, but are not limited to the Cities of Davis, Woodland, Citrus Heights, Roseville, Rocklin, and Lincoln. There is also a growing population of residents commuting to educational opportunities along and near these routes at the California State University, Sacramento, California State University, Chico, and the University of California, Davis. As a result of this growth, the highway capacity is quickly becoming exceeded. It is clear that to maintain the corridor's ability to support ongoing development, facilitate efficient goods movement, and improve the quality of life in this fast-growing region, a substantial investment is needed to maintain and improve the corridor.

The location of the SR 70/99 Corridor in California and within Districts 2 and 3 is delineated on page 5 in Figure 1.1.

### 1.4 Purpose of Plan:

This Business Plan was written with the purpose of providing decision-makers an implementation plan to achieve the functional goals identified in the various planning documents written for these routes. A few of these planning documents include the most recent editions of the 1990 State Routes 70 and 99 Corridor Study (SR 70/99 Study), the Districts 2 and 31991 State Route 99 Cooperative Special Study (SR 99 Coop Study), the 2001 Chico Corridor Study for SR 99 (Chico Study), the District 3 System Management Plan (DSMP), the Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan (ITSP), the Districts 2 and 3 Transportation System Development Plans (TSDP), and the Districts 2 and 3 Transportation Concept Reports (TCR) for State Routes 36, 70, 99, and 149.

The focus of this Business Plan is on the identification and prioritization of major facility improvements that will increase capacity, enhance operations, and improve safety. By clearly identifying Caltrans' long-term goals and a corresponding list of prioritized projects to achieve those goals, the ability to make funding decisions regarding the corridor as a whole will be much easier. Major facility improvements identified in this Business Plan would typically be funded through the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and local funding participation; however, some projects may qualify for the State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPP) funding. Along with this, two ballot measures, Propositions 1A and 1B, were voted on and passed by the people of California on November 7, 2006, which may provide an additional source of revenue that could expedite the implementation of this Business Plan. For additional discussion of various funding options, please refer to Chapter 4, Section 4.4.

Figure 1.1, SR 70/99 Corridor, Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys


### 1.5 Goals and Objectives:

The goals for this Business Plan are as follows:

- Identify major projects that will assist in the completion of the improvements needed to close gaps, improve mobility, and bring the SR 70/99 Corridor up to expressway and freeway standards, which is vital to bringing increased economic health and jobs to Valley counties.
- Achieve consensus among Caltrans, the Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs), and Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) in the Sacramento Valley on the priority that will be given to different classifications of projects.

The objectives for this Business Plan are as follows:

- Identify a comprehensive list of major highway projects to be completed along the SR 70/99 Corridor that will improve safety, reduce congestion, increase capacity, close gaps, and facilitate efficient goods movement.
- Develop criteria for measuring the performance of the list of major highway projects.
- Using the performance measurement system, prioritize the list of highway projects into four priority categories - Priority 1, Priority 2, Planned, and Future Projects.
- Identify current and future potential funding sources and strategies.
- Identify the economic benefits associated with an improved transportation corridor.
- Determine the proper phasing of construction that will result in the most efficient use of invested funds in a timely manner.


### 1.6 Local and Regional Cooperation:

In an effort to gain the cooperation and consensus necessary to develop this Business Plan, coordination and collaboration with Caltrans' local partners has occurred. The two MPOs within Caltrans District 3, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) and the Butte County Association of Governments (BCAG), as well as the one RTPA within Caltrans District 2, the Tehama County Transportation Commission (TCTC), have been consulted as part of the development of this Plan. In an effort to realize the successful implementation of this Plan, Caltrans will continue to work together SACOG, BCAG, and the TCTC to reach consensus on the priority and funding of projects to be constructed.

## Chapter 2 Existing Facilities

### 2.1 SR 70/99 Corridor History:

SR 99 first became a State highway in 1909, was paved in about 1913-1914, and was redesignated as US 99 in 1926. US 99 was the main north-south highway on the West Coast of the United States and ran from US/Mexico border to US/Canada border. US 99 became known as the "Golden State Highway" and "The Main Street of California" because it passed through a large number of cities. Once in the City of Sacramento, US 99 split into two highways, 99 E and 99 W . 99 W followed Interstate 80 (I-80) west to Davis, then north on SR 113 to Woodland, and then continued along the general route of I-5 to Red Bluff. US 99E extended through Sacramento, then east to Roseville, then north along SR 65 to SR 70, then through Marysville and west on SR 20 to Yuba City, and then north along the current SR 99 through the City of Chico and into the City of Red Bluff in District 2 where it rejoined US 99W. In the 1960s, US 99 was upgraded to a 4lane freeway through the City of Chico. Following the completion of I-5 in 1970, US 99 was completely decommissioned and turned over to the State of California.

SR 70 first became a State highway in 1934 as Route 24. In the late 1930's, it was resigned as Alternate US 40 and served as a "low elevation" route over the Sierra-Nevada Mountains. From 1951 through 1963, the route traveled from Sacramento to Marysville along El Centro Road. In 1970, I-5 was completed through the Natomas portion of Sacramento, bypassing the old El Central Road routing of SR 70 and SR 99. SR 70 also traveled through downtown Marysville and Oroville. During the 1960s, SR 70 was rerouted and upgraded to a 4-lane freeway through Oroville. Upgrading the facility to an expressway or freeway through or around Marysville has yet to occur.

Additional details on the history of the SR 70/99 Corridor are contained in Appendix A.

### 2.2 Existing Conditions:

Existing conditions in the SR 70/99 Corridor were derived from SR36, SR 70, SR99 and SR 149 Transportation Concept Reports (TCR). Each TCR divides the routes into segments for analysis purposes. The forty segments designated in the TCRs are illustrated in Figure 2.1. A comprehensive, segment by segment, analysis of existing conditions is provided in Appendix B. The following discussion compresses that analysis into an overview by the general area where segments share similar characteristics and issues. Area 1 includes SR 99 south of Sacramento, Area 2 looks at SR 99 north of Sacramento, Area 3 addresses the parallel SR 70 and 99 routes, Area 4 covers SR 99 through the City of Chico, and Area 5 includes SR 99 and SR 36 in Tehama County.

Figure 2.1, SR 70/99 Corridor by TCR Segment, Districts 2 and 3


Area 1: 24.35 miles in SR 99 Segments 1-7, San Joaquin/Sacramento County line to the SR 99/US 50 Junction in the City of Sacramento. This facility begins as a 4-lane freeway at the San Joaquin/Sacramento County line and gradually widens to an 8-lane freeway with High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes on the north end of this section. The northern portion of this area in the City of Sacramento is urbanized to the edge of the right-of-way (ROW) line and the southern portion in the Cities of Galt and Elk Grove are approaching build-out. The 2005 average annual daily traffic volumes (AADT) range from 97,805 at the south and increase to 316,588 trips per day on the north end. The 2005 Level of Service (LOS) is at "D" in the south and "F" in the north. By 2025, all segments within Area 1 will have a LOS of " F ", unless improvements are made. The Fatality-Plus-Injury and Total Collision rates are generally below the Statewide average rates on the south end of this section, but increase to twice the Statewide average on the north end towards downtown Sacramento. There is enough ROW width or potential
 ROW width in the most southern segment of this facility to add additional travel, HOV and Auxiliary lanes, which will permit meeting the 2025 TCR Concept LOS of "D".
However, the remaining six segments have ROW width constraints that limit the ability to expand the facility. Additionally, many of the existing interchanges that were constructed in the 1950s do not meet current design standards and need to be reconstructed and widened to accommodate additional travel lanes. These interchanges that need be reconstructed include Central Galt, Grant Line Road, Elk Grove Boulevard, Sheldon Road, and US 50. Additionally, the Twin Cities Road overpass needs to be widened to 4-lanes. As a consequence of existing physical constraints, the 2025 TCR Concept LOS will be " $F$ " without constructing improvements and LOS "E" and "F" with improvements.

Area 2: 12.94 miles in SR 99 Segments 8 - 10, SR 99/I-5 Interchange in Sacramento County to the SR 99/SR70 Junction in Sutter County. This facility begins as a 4-lane freeway at the SR 99/I-5 Interchange and changes to a 4-lane expressway towards the SR 99/SR 70 Junction. The 2005 LOS is "B" in this section and the collision rates are generally below the Statewide average rates.
 There are a number of large residential, commercial, and industrial development projects that are currently in the planning stages that will significantly impact the operations of this section of SR 99, unless certain improvements are made. These developments include the 1,734 acre Elverta Specific Plan community, the 1,450 acre Sacramento Metro Air Park, the 7,500 acre Sutter Pointe Specific Plan, and various projects in west Placer County that access SR 99, which total 40,000 dwelling units and over 10 million square feet of office and commercial uses. Upgrading the facility to a six-lane freeway,
adding HOV lanes, widening the Elkhorn Boulevard Interchange from 2- to 6-lanes, constructing a new Meister Way overcrossing, and replacing intersections with interchanges at Elverta, Riego, Sankey, and Catlett Roads, and at Placer Parkway (future connection) have been identified in the 2025 TCR Concept for this section. With these improvements, the 2025 TCR Concept LOS of "D" in Segment 8 and " $E$ " in Segments 9 and 10 should be achieved.

Area 3: 54.64 miles in SR 70 Segments $1-7 / 55.41$ miles in SR 99 Segments 11 23/7.44 miles in SR 149 Segment 1, SR 99/SR70 Junction to the SR 99/SR 149 Wye. This area includes seven segments along SR 70, twelve segments along SR 99 and one segment in SR 149.
$\boldsymbol{S R} \mathbf{7 0}$ is currently a 2-lane expressway from the SR 99/SR 70 Junction to the Bear River at the Sutter/Yuba County line. The facility then becomes a 4-lane expressway from the Sutter/Yuba County line north to just south of McGowan Parkway Interchange, where the facility becomes a 4-lane freeway. Upon entering into the City of Marysville, SR 70 becomes a 4-lane urban arterial along "E" Street, which changes to a 2-lane urban arterial along " B " Street to the northern city limits. The facility then becomes a 2 -lane conventional highway from Marysville to the City of Oroville and then changes to a 4lane freeway from just south of SR 162 to its Junction with SR 149.

The 2005 AADT ranged from 15,800 vehicle trips near the SR 99/SR 70 wye to 60,000 trips in the City of Marysville and the 2005 LOS ranged from LOS "A" from the Bear River to just south of McGowan Parkway and from Oroville near SR 162 to SR 149, to LOS " F " within the City of Marysville. Collision rates were above the Statewide average rates from McGowan Parkway north to the City of Marysville, the north end of the City of Marysville to the Yuba/Butte County line, and the beginning of the freeway in the City of Oroville to SR 149. The percentage of truck traffic was above average from McGowan Parkway in southern Yuba County through the City of Oroville in Butte County. By 2025, four of the seven TCR route segments are projected to have a LOS of " $E$ " and " $F$ ", unless improvements are made.

With the exceptions of the communities of Linda and Olivehurst, the City of Marysville, and the City of Oroville, the land use along this route is predominantly agriculture. However, this land use pattern is changing. Just north of the Bear River in Yuba County, the 14,000 plus dwelling unit Plumas Lake Specific Plan is currently being constructed and an existing 18,500 person Amphitheatre and planned 55,000 spectator Yuba Motorplex will require construction of interchanges at Feather River Boulevard and at Algodon/Plumas Arboga Roads. Further north, the 6,000 plus dwelling unit East Linda Specific Plan and 1,650 acre, 10,000 job mixed use Woodbury Specific Plan communities are being planned or constructed. To meet the 2025 TCR Concept, the existing gap between the 4 -lane expressway at the SR 99/SR70 Wye in Sutter County and the 4-lane expressway in southern Yuba County must be closed; to close this gap, the remaining 2 -lane conventional highway needs to be upgraded to a 4 -lane expressway.

Along with this, reconstruction of the McGowan Parkway and Erle Road Interchanges will need to be completed to minimize adverse impacts to SR 70 within this area. Once
 into Marysville, there was a 2005 AADT volume of 60,000 vehicles. Many of these vehicles are aggregate and farm related 5axle plus trucks, which travel through Marysville from the Yuba River Gold Fields along SR 20 and from orchards along both SR 20 and SR 70. The 2005 LOS was " $F$ " and will continue to be at LOS "F" in 2025, unless improvements area made.
Constructing a 2- to 4-lane expressway through or around the City of Marysville would improve the LOS to an acceptable level.

Between the City of Maryville and Oroville, the facility is a 2-lane conventional highway with occasional passing lanes. The collision rates are above the Statewide average rates. In the near-term, additional passing lanes are needed to improve the safety and operations of this section. In the long-term, the facility needs to be upgraded to a 4-lane expressway and connect with a future expressway through or around Marysville on the south and with the existing 4-lane freeway to the north.

Once in Oroville, the facility becomes a 4-lane freeway that extends to SR 149. While the 2005 LOS along this freeway section was LOS "A", the collision rates were above the Statewide average rates. This may be due to traffic backing up on the Grand and Nelson Avenues intersections' on- and off-ramps and from slow traffic merging onto the 65 -mile per hour facility. Improvements needed to improve safety of this facility include extending the freeway from south of SR 162 to Ophir Road, constructing an interchange at Ophir Road, widening of the Grand and Nelson Avenues ramps and adding round-abouts or traffic signals at the ramp intersections, widening the Grand Avenue overcrossing to 4-lanes, and widening the Feather River Bridge to 6-lanes.

SR 99 extends from the SR 70 wye as a 2-lane conventional highway, changes at Sacramento Avenue to a 4-lane expressway and then reverts back to a 2-lane facility at Wilson Road. Thereafter, the facility changes back to a 4-lane expressway until it reaches the intersection with SR 20 where it becomes a 4-lane freeway. Between the Cities of Yuba City and Live Oak the facility reverts to a 2lane conventional highway until it enters into the City of Gridley, where the facility becomes a 5-lane urban arterial. North of
 Gridley, the facility reverts back to a 2-lane highway until it intersects with SR 149.

Traffic volumes ranged from a 2005 AADT of 11,433 vehicle trips north of Gridley to 34,673 vehicle trips in Yuba City. Collision rates were above the Statewide average rates in the growing urbanized area of Yuba City, in Live Oak where vehicles typically backup at the existing signalized intersection along this 2-lane highway during peak hours, and in Gridley where numerous driveways encroach along the 5-lane highway. By 2025, the projected LOS will be "E" or "F" along most of the existing 2-lane portions of the facility and in the urbanized area of Yuba City south of SR 20. The 2025 TCR Concept LOS for Area 3 along SR 99 for all but one of the segments is "D". The exception to this "D" standard is one segment in Yuba City, which has numerous signalized intersections. This segment has a 2025 Concept LOS of "E".

Improvements needed to meet the 2025 Concept LOS include widening the 2-lane facility in Live Oak and between Gridley and Biggs to a 5-lane facility, constructing passing lanes between East Biggs Highway and SR 149, converting the various 2-lane highway sections located within this area to 4-lane expressways, widening the 4-lane expressway from O'Banion Road to SR 20 to a 6-lane freeway, and constructing an interchange at SR 20.

SR 149, which extends from SR 70 to SR 99, links the two highways together. This 2lane expressway is currently being upgraded to a 4-lane limited access expressway. As part of this upgrade, interchanges are being constructed at the existing intersections with SR 70 and SR 99. Long-term improvements beyond a 25-year time frame include widening the facility to a 6-lane expressway.

Area 4: 15.51 miles, SR 99 Segments $24-26$, SR 99/SR 149 wye to north end of the City of Chico. This facility begins as a 4-lane expressway changes to a 4-lane freeway about 9 -miles north of SR 149. The land use adjacent to the facility is predominantly agriculture and rural residential near SR 149, but changes to suburban and then urban uses once into the City of Chico City limits. The 2005 AADT ranged from 27,066 vehicle trips near SR 149 and increased to 77,635 vehicle trips near the SR 32 Interchange in Chico. The amount of AADT traffic in Chico is the second highest for urbanized areas along the SR 70/99 Corridor, only to be exceeded by the traffic along SR 99 in Sacramento, south of US 50. The 2005 LOS ranged from "B" near SR 149, but
 deteriorated to LOS "F" near the SR 32 Interchange in Chico. Two regional shopping malls, numerous "big box" commercial retail stores, businessprofessional office centers, car dealers, numerous new residential subdivisions, a community college, and State university are located off SR 99 in Chico, and contribute to the LOS " $F$ " as well as to the collision rate near SR 32, which is higher than the Statewide average rate. The 2025 TCR Concept LOS for the three TCR segments is "D-E" near SR 149 and "D" in Chico. The projected

2025 LOS within the three segments is " $F$ ", unless improvements are made.
Improvements needed to meet the TCR Concept include widening the Durham-Pentz Interchange overcrossing to 4-lanes; constructing Southgate Avenue and Neal Road Interchanges; reconstructing the Skyway/Park Avenue, E. $20^{\text {th }}$ Street, Cohasset Road, and Eaton Road Interchanges; modifying the interchanges at E. $20^{\text {th }}$ Street, East Avenue, and Eaton Roads by widening or adding turn lanes on the ramps; adding round-a-bouts or turn signals at the Eaton Road Interchange ramp intersections; widening the facility to a 6lane freeway; and constructing Auxiliary lanes between interchanges from Skyway/Park Avenue to Garner Lane.

Area 5: 35.27 miles, SR 99 Segment 27, SR 99 Segments 1330 - 1370, SR 36 Segment 460 , north end of the City of Chico to the SR 36/I-5 Interchange in the City of Red Bluff.

SR 99 begins as a 2-lane conventional highway near Garner Lane north of Chico, changes to a 2-lane expressway at the Butte/Tehama County line, and reverts back to a 2lane conventional highway with occasional passing or left turn lanes south of Los Molinos to the intersection with SR 36. Land along this Area of SR 99 is predominately used for agriculture. However, the community of Los Molinos contains a mixture of urban uses that are located along the facility. Commercial uses are predominating along the facility where access is provided. SR 99 serves as a "Main Street" for Los Molinos, but does not contain curbs, gutters, sidewalks, and adequate drainage facilities. The 2005 AADT ranged from 7,200 vehicle trips south of Los Molinos to 16,664 trips north of the Chico. The 2005 LOS ranged from "C" to "D". The collision rates in Los Molinos were
 substantially higher than the Statewide average rates. The 2025 TCR Concept LOS for the five TCR segments is "D" in Butte County north of Chico, and "C-D" within Tehama County. The projected 2025 LOS is "F" from north of Chico in Butte County to South Avenue in Tehama County, "F" in Los Molinos, and "E" south of the SR 36 Junction, unless improvements are constructed. Improvements needed to meet the TCR Concept include installing drainage facilities, curbs, gutters, sidewalks, and lighting in Los Molinos. Additional needed improvements include extending the 4-lane freeway in Chico north to Garner Lane, widening the 2-lane conventional highway to a 4-lane expressway from Garner to the Butte/Tehama County line, constructing passing lanes between the Butte/Tehama County line and South Avenue, converting various 2-lane conventional highway sections to a 4-lane conventional highway in Los Molinos and to a 2- or 4-lane controlled access expressway along the entire length of SR 99 within Tehama County, replacing three bridges between Los Molinos and Mill Race Creek, and reconstructing three bridges along Salt Creek. Beyond the 2025 planning period of this Business Plan, the portions of SR 99 and SR 36 referenced in Area 5 should be upgraded to a 4-lane freeway.

SR 36 is a 4-lane conventional highway from the SR 99 Junction to the I-5 Interchange. The facility is a 4-lane conventional highway. The land use adjacent to the facility contains numerous motels, gasoline stations, food establishments, and agribusiness companies, as well as a school, two State agency facilities, and the Tehama County
 Fairgrounds. Additionally, this segment provides access to the Red Bluff Diversion Dam and Lassen Nation Park. The combination of commercial and public uses, and access to public and recreational facilities has resulted in the generation of a substantial amount of multi-modal traffic, which is causing considerable safety and operational concerns. This portion of SR 36 had a 2005 AADT of 27,000 vehicle trips and a corresponding LOS "C". The collision rates are a concern due to the 176 percent level of total collision rate above the State average rate and the 166 percent level of fatal-plus injury collision rate above the State average rate. The 2025 TCR Concept LOS for this segment is "C-D". The projected 2025 LOS is " $E$ ", unless improvements are constructed. Improvements needed for this segment of SR 36 to meet the TCR Concept include installing bicycle lanes, curbs, sidewalks, and street lighting.

A summation of existing conditions for each segment by County, Segment Number, Post Mile, Location, Facility Type, 2005 Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT), 2005 Level of Service (LOS), 2004 Truck AADT, 2004 Truck Percent of Total AADT, Level of Fatal-plus Injury Collision Rate, Level of Total Collision Rate, 2025 Planned Facility Type, 2025 AADT, and 2025 LOS without improvements, and 2025 TCR Concept LOS is identified in Tables 2.1 and 2.2 on the following pages.

Table 2.1, State Routes 99 and 36, D-3 and D-2, Existing Conditions

| $\begin{aligned} & \hat{\theta} \\ & \stackrel{\theta}{E} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{e} \end{aligned}$ | $\overrightarrow{0}$ $\underset{0}{0}$ 0 0 0 0 0 | 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & \text { U } \\ & \text { 首 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & \text { O } \\ & \text { U } \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { E N } \\ & \text { E } \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  | 2 0 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SR 99 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SAC | 1 | 0.00/ 3.53 | San Joaquin- Sacramento County line/Twin Cities Rd.-SR 104 Jct. | 4F | 63,705 | D | 11,467 | 18.0 | 52 | 58 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 6F+ } \\ \text { HOV } \end{gathered}$ | 97,805 | F | D |
| SAC | 2 | 3.53/8.96 | Twin Cities Road-SR 104 Junction/ Eschinger Road | 4F | 67,048 | D | 8,716 | 13.0 | 63 | 97 | $\begin{gathered} 6 \mathrm{~F}+ \\ \mathrm{HOV} \end{gathered}$ | 107,998 | F | F |
| SAC | 3 | 8.96/12.76 | Eschinger Road/Elk Grove Blvd. | 4F | 68,079 | E | 8,850 | 13.0 | 68 | 65 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 6 \mathrm{~F}+ \\ \mathrm{HOV} \end{gathered}$ | 109,659 | F | F |
| SAC | 4 | 12.76/16.28 | Elk Grove Blvd./ Consumnes River Blvd.Calvine Road | $\begin{aligned} & 4 \mathrm{~F}+ \\ & \mathrm{HOV} \end{aligned}$ | 116,673 | F | 21,001 | 18.0 | 116 | 97 | $\begin{gathered} 6 \mathrm{~F}+ \\ \mathrm{HOV}+ \\ \text { AUX } \end{gathered}$ | 190,123 | F | F |
| SAC | 5 | 16.28/17.29 | Consumnes River Blvd.Calvine Road/Mack Road | $\begin{gathered} 4 \mathrm{~F}+ \\ \text { HOV+ } \\ \text { AUX } \end{gathered}$ | 147,254 | D | 11,780 | 8.0 | 157 | 141 | $\begin{gathered} 6 \mathrm{~F}+ \\ \text { HOV+ } \\ \text { AUX } \end{gathered}$ | 252,334 | F | E |
| SAC | 6 | 17.29/19.65 | Mack Road/Florin Road | 6F | 168,713 | F | 26,994 | 16.0 | 112 | 118 | $\begin{gathered} 6 \mathrm{~F}+ \\ \text { AUX } \end{gathered}$ | 242,963 | F | E |
| SAC | 7 | 19.65/24.35 | Florin Road/U.S. 50 Junction | $\begin{gathered} 6 \mathrm{~F}+ \\ \mathrm{HOV}+ \\ \text { AUX } \end{gathered}$ | 219,838 | F | 13,190 | 6.0 | 203 | 212 | $\begin{gathered} 8 \mathrm{~F}+ \\ \mathrm{HOV}+ \\ \text { AUX } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 316,588 | F | E |
| SAC |  |  | (Break in Route) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SAC | 8 | 32.12/33.36 | I-5 Junction/Elkhorn Blvd. | 4F | 49,163 | B | 5,900 | 12.0 | 28 | 49 | $\begin{gathered} 6 \mathrm{~F}+ \\ \mathrm{HOV} \end{gathered}$ | 82,413 | D | E |
| SAC | 9 | 33.36/36.86 | Elkhorn Boulevard/SutterSacramento County line | 4F/4E | 42,120 | B | 5,054 | 12.0 | 90 | 112 | 6F | 74,520 | C | E |
| SUT | 10 | 0.00/8.20 | Sutter-Sacramento County line/SR 70 Junction | 4E | 33,520 | B | 3,687 | 11.0 | 37 | 55 | 8F, 6F | 63,920 | C | D |
| SUT | 11 | 8.820/14.00 | SR 70 Junction/Sacramento Ave. | 2 C | 16,185 | D | 1,457 | 9.0 | 25 | 37 | 4E | 27,885 | F | D |
| SUT | 12 | 14.00/17.62 | Sacramento <br> Avenue/Wilson Road | 4E | 16,185 | B | 1,457 | 9.0 | 30 | 27 | 4E | 27,885 | C | D |
| SUT | 13 | 17.62/26.15 | Wilson Road/Barry Road | 2C, 4E | 18,286 | E | 2,377 | 13.0 | 94 | 104 | 4E | 32,014 | F | D |
| SUT | 14 | 26.15/28.67 | Barry Road/Lincoln Road | 4E | 34,673 | A | 3,467 | 10.0 | 61 | 114 | 6E | 58,123 | E | D |
| SUT | 15 | 28.67/30.63 | Lincoln Road/SR 20 Junction | 4E | 34,673 | D | 3,467 | 10.0 | 150 | 129 | 6E | 58,123 | F | E |
| SUT | 16 | 30.63/34.97 | SR 20 Junction/End of Freeway | 4F | 20,910 | A | 1,882 | 9.0 | 167 | 83 | 4F | 31,110 | B | D |
| SUT | 17 | 34.97/38.33 | End of Freeway/Paseo Road | 2C | 16,913 | E | 1,522 | 9.0 | 57 | 80 | 4E | 25,163 | E | D |
| SUT | 18 | 38.33/41.46 | Paseo Road/Rivera Road | 2 C | 19,373 | A | 1,744 | 9.0 | 147 | 139 | 4 C | 28,823 | B | D |
| SUT | 19 | 41.46/42.42 | Rivera Road/Butte-Sutter County line | 2 C | 15,580 | D | 1,402 | 9.0 | 29 | 35 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2 \mathrm{C}+ \\ & \text { Pass } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 23,180 | E | D |
| BUT | 20 | 0.00/ 2.60 | Butte-Sutter County line/Nielson Road | 2 C | 16,686 | A | 1,502 | 9.0 | 33 | 23 | 4C | 26,406 | B | D |

Table 2.1, State Routes 99 and 36, D-3 and D-2, Existing Conditions

| $\begin{aligned} & \hat{O} \\ & \stackrel{\theta}{E} \\ & \stackrel{y}{2} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & \text { U } \\ & \text { B } \\ & \text { E } \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & \text { O } \\ & \text { un } \\ & \tilde{0} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { B N } \\ & \text { N } \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { B } \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SR 99 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BUT | 21 | 2.60/ 5.00 | Nielson Road/Ord Ranch Road | 4C | 23,793 | A | 2,141 | 9.0 | 124 | 153 | 5C | 37,653 | B | D |
| BUT | 22 | 5.00/13.16 | Ord Ranch Road/SR 162 East | 2 C | 11,433 | D | 1,143 | 10.0 | 51 | 75 | 5C, 4E | 18,093 | E | D |
| BUT | 23 | 13.16/21.81 | SR 162 East/SR 149 | 2E | 11,828 | D | 1,183 | 10.0 | 84 | 100 | 4E | 20,378 | E | D |
| BUT | 24 | 21.81/30.40 | SR 149/Beginning of Freeway | 4E | 27,066 | B | 2,707 | 10.0 | 50 | 71 | 6F | 48,386 | D | D |
| BUT | 25 | 30.40/32.45 | Beginning of Freeway/ SR 32 | 4F | 71,243 | E | 6,412 | 9.0 | 27 | 47 | $\begin{gathered} 6 \mathrm{~F}+ \\ \mathrm{AUX} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 116,093 | F | D-E |
| BUT | 26 | 32.45/37.32 | SR 32/End of Freeway | 4F | 77,625 | F | 3,105 | 4.0 | 100 | 110 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 6 \mathrm{~F}+ \\ \text { AUX } \end{gathered}$ | 130,125 | F | D |
| BUT | 27 | 37.32/45.98 | End of Freeway/ TehamaButte County line | 2C | 16,664 | E | 2,333 | 14.0 | 54 | 59 | 4F, 4E | 27,934 | F | D |
| TEH | 1330 | 0.00/4.50 | Butte-Tehama County line to South Avenue | 2E | 11,900 | C | 1,428 | 12.0 | 119 | 81 | 4E | 25,350 | F | C-D |
| TEH | 1340 | 4.50/11.30 | South Avenue to Los Molinos | 2E, 2C | 7,200 | C | 792 | 11.0 | 47 | 55 | 2E | 13,200 | D | C-D |
| TEH | 1350 | 11.30/12.50 | Los Molinos | 2C | 10,100 | D | 1,010 | 10.0 | 174 | 170 | 4C | 17,300 | F | C-D |
| TEH | 1360 | 12.50/24.20 | Los Molinos to Mill Race Creek | 2C | 7,500 | C | 975 | 13.0 | 107 | 117 | 2E | 13,700 | D | C-D |
| TEH | 1370 | 24.20/24.94 | Mill Race Creek to SR 36 Jct. | 2 C | 9,900 | D | 1,089 | 11.0 | 28 | 68 | 2E | 17,550 | E | C-D |
| SR 36 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TEH | 460 | 41.66/44.00\| | SR 36/SR 99 Jct. to I-5 | 4C | 27,000 | C | 2,106 | 7.8 | 166 | 176 | 4C | 45,900 | E | C-D |

* Level compared to Statewide average in percent. Source: TASAS 3-year 2003 through 2006 data.

Table 2.2, State Route 70, D-3, Existing Conditions

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { è } \\ & \stackrel{\theta}{\theta} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  | N 0 0 0 0 3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & \text { O } \\ & \text { U } \\ & \underset{\sim}{0} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { E } \\ & \text { N } \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { E } \\ & \text { E } \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & E \\ & E \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SUT | 1 | 0.00/8.30 | SR 99/SR 70 Junction to Sutter/Yuba County line | 2E | 15,800 | E | 1,300 | 9.0 | 79 | 77 | 4E | 30,800 | F | C |
| YUB | 2 | 0.00/6.62 | Sutter/Yuba County line to beginning of freeway by McGowan Pkwy. | 4E | 16,300 | A | 2,700 | 11.0 | 69 | 97 | 4E | 31,800 | C | C |
| YUB | 3 | 6.62/13.94 | Beginning of freeway by McGowan Pkwy. to north end of Yuba River Bridge in Marysville | 4F | 45,500 | B | 4,710 | 12.0 | 133 | 156 | 4F | 79,625 | C | D |
| YUB | 4 | 13.94/15.85 | North end of Yuba River Bridge to north city limit of Marysville | $\begin{gathered} \text { 4C- } \\ \text { Urban } \end{gathered}$ | 60,000 | F | 2,560 | 9.0 | 83 | 57 | $\begin{gathered} 6 \mathrm{C}- \\ \text { Urban } \end{gathered}$ | 75,000 | F | D |
| YUB | 5 | 15.85/25.82 | North city limit of Marysville to Yuba/Butte County line | 2 C | 15,000 | E | 1,493 | 14.0 | 118 | 126 | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { 2E w/ } \\ \text { pass. } \\ \text { Lanes } \end{array}$ | 20,250 | E | D |
| BUT | 6 | 0.00/13.51 | Yuba/Butte County line to beginning of freeway 6 mi. south of SR 162, Oroville | 2C | 13,600 | E | 1,492 | 14.0 | 68 | 75 | 2E w/ pass. lanes, 4FOphir north | 22,400 | E | D |
| BUT | 7 | 13.51/20.52 | Beginning of freeway . 6 mi. south of SR 162 to junction of SR 149 | 4F | 31,500 | A | 2,147 | 10.0 | 145 | 144 | 4F | 50,400 | B | C |

* Level compared to Statewide average in percent. Source: TASAS 3-year 2003 through 2006 data.

In reviewing Tables 2.1 and 2.2, there are a number of segments that have or will have an unacceptable Level of Service (LOS), operations, and safety issues that need to be addressed. The next chapter in this Business Plan identifies and describes the projects that need to be delivered, which will increase capacity, close conventional highway/ expressway/freeway gaps, and improve the operations and safety along the SR 70/99 Corridor.

## Chapter 3 Projects

### 3.0 Background:

The projects that are identified in this Chapter are based on numerous planning studies and documents that have been produced over the past sixteen years. Studies utilized in this Business Plan include 1990 State Routes 70 and 99 Corridor Study (SR 70/99 Study), the Districts 2 and 31991 State Route 99 Cooperative Special Study (SR 99 Coop Study), the 2001 Chico Corridor Study for SR 99 (Chico Study), the District 3 System Management Plan (DSMP), the Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan (ITSP), the Districts 2 and 3 Transportation System Development Plans (TSDP), the Districts 2 and 3 State Route 99 Transportation Concept Reports (TCR), the District 3 State Route 70 Transportation Concept Report, the District 3 State Route 149 Transportation Concept Report, and the District 2 State Route 36 Transportation Concept Report. Other documents that are referenced in this Chapter include the Caltrans' 2006 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), the Sacramento Area Council of Governments' (SACOG) 2006 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) and 2007/2009 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP), the Butte County Association of Governments' (BCAG) 2004 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) as well as the 2006 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) and 2007 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP), and the Tehama County Transportation Commissions' (TCTC) 2005 RTP and 2004 RTIP.

Out of the above referenced planning studies, the two that provide for the most comprehensive long-term vision of the SR 70/99 Corridor are the SR 70/99 Study and the SR 99 Coop Study. The SR 70/99 Study was prepared in 1990 under the direction of SACOG and BCAG. It was the first in a series of documents addressing development of major highway corridors in the eastern Sacramento Valley. The Study recognized that both SR 99 and SR 70 are transportation lifelines and vital links for the movement of goods, services, and people for communities east of the Sacramento River. The Study concluded that both SR 70 and SR 99 should be upgraded to controlled access expressway and freeway standards to better serve the travel demands of the corridor, and to make travel safer between Sacramento and Chico. Since the $S R$ 70/99 Study has been completed, some improvements have been made to various sections SR 99 and SR 70, primarily south of Yuba City, upgrading these facilities from 2-lane highways to 4 - and 6-lane expressways and freeways, and south of Marysville, upgrading the highway from the Bear River to just south of McGowan Parkway in Yuba County to a 4-lane expressway. This Business Plan is an extension of the sixteen-year-old Study that focuses on the SR 70/99 Corridor.

Caltrans District 2, Caltrans District 3, Tehama County, Butte County, BCAG, and the City of Chico jointly sponsored the SR 99 Coop Study. This study was completed in June 1991, and proposed improvements and strategies for the future of SR 99 from Chico to Red Bluff. The long-term objective identified in this study was that SR 99 should be
realigned and upgraded to a 4-lane divided expressway standard, with the potential for conversion to a full freeway.

The need to identify the future realignment of SR 99 is in the TCTC's current RTP as a long-range project. This future realignment and conversion of SR 99 in Butte County adjacent to the Tehama County line to a 4-lane expressway is consistent with Caltrans District 3 draft TCR. The realignment or conversion of SR 99 to a 2-lane expressway with the optimal goal of improving the facility to a 4-lane divided expressway will create a safer facility and yield the highest capacity and LOS available. Realigning the SR 99 from Chico to Red Bluff will move the route out of the flood plain, providing a safe crossing to I-5 that is not prone to flooding. Tehama County is in favor of realigning SR 99 and sought a Livable Cities Grant in 2002 for that purpose. Although the grant was denied, the intent of the realignment remains the same; the earlier the realignment occurs the less impact it will have on the surrounding communities. Currently, the nearby towns would be able to stay in tact and not be bisected by an expressway. As growth ensues and land use changes, this may not be the case. Realigning SR 99 may prove to be a more cost competitive alternative to converting the existing route, with potential savings to overall maintenance, travel time, and end users.

In Chapter 2, existing conditions were described for the 32 segments of SR 99, one segment of SR 36, and seven segments of SR 70 that are contained within Districts 3 and 2. As part of this description, issues, constraints and needed improvements were identified for each TCR segment. These needed improvements are identified and described in the Sections of this Chapter that follow as Priority 1 Projects, Priority 2 Projects, Planned Projects, and Future Projects. It should be noted that Intelligent Transportation System projects under $\$ 1$ million and 100 percent funded SHOPP projects have not been included in the priority projects that follow.

### 3.1 Priority 1 Projects:

Priority 1 Projects are active programmed projects that have been identified based on the following selection criteria:

- Included in applicable regional transportation plans.
- Approved Project Study Report (PSR) or a PSR that is underway.
- Project development underway or project Ready to List (RTL).
- Can be in construction by December 31, 2012.
- Shared funding plan indicating match (not required, but encouraged):
- Local (Developer Fees, General Fund, Sales Tax, Capital Improvement Program, other),
- Regional (STIP, RSTP, CMAQ, other),
- Caltrans (ITIP, SHOPP).
- Safety Component: widen lanes or shoulders, restriping, modify vertical and horizontal site distances, change non-standard geometrics, reduce access points, construct drainage improvements, and other improvements to reduce collision fatalities and injuries.
- Mainline capacity increasing: add auxiliary lanes and other operational improvements, widen main lines (add lanes) and bridges, and add bus and carpool lanes.
- Expressway conversion: convert intersections to interchanges, and add or modify interchanges.
- Consensus among Caltrans, SACOG, BCAG, and the TCTC that the projects in this category represent the current highest priority for completion.

Utilizing the above selection criteria, ten Priority 1 Projects were identified. The locations of the Priority 1 Projects are shown on Figure 3.1. Thereafter, the pages that follow contain Project Data Sheets that have been prepared for each of the ten projects. It should be noted that when a LOS is listed, it is for the mainline route segment, and not the intersection or interchange. It should also be noted that while all of these active projects are programmed, they are not all fully funded.

Figure 3.1, Priority 1 Projects


| Proje | ct No.:1 | Map No.: | Figure 3.1 | Priority |  | Priority 1 Projects |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name: |  | Calvine/Florin Auxiliary Lanes |  | MTP/EA\# |  | CAL18766/2E120 |  |  |
| $\mid$ County: SAC <br> Project Description: Construct auxiliary lanes by restriping and <br> reconfiguring the Florin Road Interchange. |  |  |  | Project Status (Planning/Programming) |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | TSDP | TCR | RTP | PSR | RTL |
|  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
|  |  |  |  | Funding Source(s) |  |  |  |  |
| Purpose and Need: Traffic volumes on this 6-lane freeway are currently at LOS "F". Congestion and delay are increasing. The Level of Fatal-plus Injury Collision Rate is 112 percent above the Statewide average and the Level of Total Collision Rate is 118 percent above the Statewide average. The addition of auxiliary lanes will add capacity that will help relieve congestion, reduce delay, and reduce the Levels of Fatal-plus Injury and Total Collisions. |  |  |  | Caltrans | Regional | Local | TIM | Other |
|  |  |  |  | X | X |  |  | Go CA |
|  |  |  |  | Estimated Cost |  |  | \$13,056,000 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Construction Year |  |  | 2007 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Project Priority Criteria |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Mainline Capacity |  |  | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |  | Expressway Conversion |  |  | No |  |
|  |  |  |  | Safety Component |  |  | Yes |  |
| LOS | 2025 LOS |  |  | Funding Partners |  |  |  |  |
| Existing | w/o Project | w/Project | Concept |  |  |  | Caltran |  |
| F | F | E | E |  |  |  |  |  |


| Proje | t No.: 2 | Map No.: | Figure 3.1 |  |  |  | ity 1 P |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name: |  | Elverta Road Interchange |  | MTP/EA\# |  | CAL15510 |  |  |
| County: | SAC | SR99-Post Mile: 35.37 |  | Project Status (Planning/Programming) |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description: Construct L-9 Interchange. |  |  |  | TSDP | TCR | RTP | PSR | RTL |
|  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
|  |  |  |  | Funding Source(s) |  |  |  |  |
| Purpose and Need: The collision rate at the Elverta Road/SR 99 intersection is above the Statewide average. A high percentage of these accidents are rear end and broad sideswipes. Although both the mainline existing and 2025 projected LOS are acceptable, the existing intersection LOS is at " E " and is projected to decline to LOS "F" by 2025. Replacing the existing intersection with an interchange will upgrade the facility from an Expressway to a Freeway. The conversion will increase capacity, reduce congestion, and improve safety. |  |  |  | Caltrans | Regional | Local | TIM | Other |
|  |  |  |  | X | X |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | ated Cost |  | 000 |
|  |  |  |  |  | Cons | ction Year |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Proj | Priority C |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Main | Capacity |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Expressway Conversion |  |  | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |  | Safety Component |  |  | Yes |  |
| LOS | 2025 LOS |  |  | Funding Partners |  | Caltrans <br> City of Sacramento SACOG |  |  |
| Existing | w/o Project | w/Project | Concept |  |  |  |  |  |
| B | C | C | E |  |  |  |  |  |


| Proje | et No.: 3 | Map No.: | Figure 3.1 | Priority |  | Priority 1 Projects |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name: |  | Riego Road Interchange |  | MTP/EA\# |  | SUT16950/3L44/40660 |  |  |
| County:SUT |  | SR99-Post Mile: 0.95 |  | Project Status (Planning/Programming) |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description: Construct L-9 Interchange. |  |  |  | TSDP | TCR | RTP | PSR | RTL |
|  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
|  |  |  |  | Funding Source(s) |  |  |  |  |
| Purpose and Need: The traffic volume on Riego Road from Roseville to SR 99 and Sacramento has increased substantially. The collision rate at the Riego Road/SR 99 intersection is above the Statewide average. Two-thirds of these accidents are rear end and broad sideswipes. Although both the mainline existing and 2025 projected LOS are acceptable, the existing intersection LOS is at " $E$ " and is projected to decline to LOS "F" by 2025. Replacing the existing intersection with an interchange will upgrade the facility from an Expressway to a Freeway. The conversion will increase capacity, reduce congestion, and improve safety. |  |  |  | Caltrans | Regional | Local | TIM | Other |
|  |  |  |  | X | X | Developer Cap. Invst. | X | Go CA |
|  |  |  |  | Estimated Cost |  |  | \$40,000,000 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Construction Year |  |  | 2009 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Project Priority Criteria |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Mainline Capacity |  |  | No |  |
|  |  |  |  | Expressway Conversion |  |  | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |  | Safety Component |  |  | Yes |  |
| LOS | 2025 LOS |  |  | Funding Partners |  | Caltrans Sutter County SACOG |  |  |
| Existing | w/o Project | w/Project | Concept |  |  |  |  |  |
| B | C | C | D |  |  |  |  |  |


| Proje | ct No.: 4 | Map No.: | Figure 3.1 | Priority |  | Priority 1 Projects |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name: |  | Garden Hwy./Sacramento Ave. |  | MTP/EA\# |  | CAL17660/1A432 |  |  |
| County: | SUT | SR99-Post Mile: $11.975 / 13.680$ |  | Project Status (Planning/Programming) |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description: Construct 2 additional lanes, new Feather River Bridge and undercrossing, and a median left turn lane (Segment 2). |  |  |  | TSDP | TCR | RTP | PSR | RTL |
|  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 2008 |
|  |  |  |  | Funding Source(s) |  |  |  |  |
| Purpose and Need: The project will upgrade this segment of SR 99 from a 2-lane conventional highway to a 4-lane Expressway with a continuous left-turn median. Due to increased traffic from commuters and trucks, congestion has been increasing. The project is needed to increase capacity, relieve congestion, and close one of several Expressway/Freeway gaps on SR 99 between Sacramento County and the City of Yuba City. |  |  |  | Caltrans | Regional | Local | TIM | Other |
|  |  |  |  | X | X |  | X | Fed. Demo |
|  |  |  |  | Estimated Cost |  |  | \$76,600,000 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Construction Year |  |  | 2011-2020 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Project Priority Criteria |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Mainline Capacity |  |  | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |  | Expressway Conversion |  |  | No |  |
|  |  |  |  | Safety Component |  |  | No |  |
| LOS | 2025 LOS |  |  | Funding Partners |  | Caltrans Sutter County SACOG |  |  |
| Existing | w/o Project | w/Project | Concept |  |  |  |  |  |
| D | F | D | D |  |  |  |  |  |


| Proje | ct No.: 5 | Map No.: | Figure 3.1 | Priority |  | Priority 1 Projects |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name: |  | Central Avenue/O'Banion Road |  | MTP/EA\# |  | CAL18350/1A461 |  |  |
| County: |  | SR99-Post Mile: $16.886 / 22.600$ |  | Project Status (Planning/Programming) |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description: Construct Tudor Bypass 4-lane Expressway with a continuous median left-turn lane (Segment 4). |  |  |  | TSDP | TCR | RTP | PSR | RTL |
|  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 2008 |
|  |  |  |  | Funding Source(s) |  |  |  |  |
| Purpose and Need: The project will upgrade this segment of SR 99 from a 2-lane conventional highway to a 4-lane Expressway with a continuous left-turn median. Due to increased traffic from commuters and trucks, congestion has been increasing. The collision rate in the area is above the Statewide Average. The project will re-route SR 99 around the community of Tudor and reduce access points. The project is needed to increase capacity, relieve congestion, improve safety, and close one of several Expressway/Freeway gaps on SR 99 between Sacramento County and the City of Yuba City. |  |  |  | Caltrans | Regional | Local | TIM | Other |
|  |  |  |  | X | X |  | X | Fed. Demo., NHSF |
|  |  |  |  | Estimated Cost |  |  | \$63,029,000 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Construction Year |  |  | 2011 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Project Priority Criteria |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Mainline Capacity |  |  | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |  | Expressway Conversion |  |  | No |  |
|  |  |  |  | Safety Component |  |  | Yes |  |
| LOS | 2025 LOS |  |  | Funding Partners |  | Caltrans, FHWA Sutter County SACOG |  |  |
| Existing | w/o Project | w/Project | Concept |  |  |  |  |  |
| E | F | D | D |  |  |  |  |  |


| Proj | t No.: 6 | Map No.: | Figure 3.1 | Priority |  | Priority 1 Projects |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| County: SUT $^{\text {Proct }}$ |  | Expressway: SR 99/Bear River |  | MTP/EA\# |  | CAL15722/38641 \& CAL17350/38642 |  |  |
|  |  | SR 70-Post Mile: $.051 / 8.080$ |  | Project Status (Planning/Programming) |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description: Widen 2-lane Conventional Highway to 4lane Expressway. |  |  |  | TSDP | TCR | RTP | PSR | RTL |
|  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
|  |  |  |  | Funding Source(s) |  |  |  |  |
| Purpose and Need: The project will upgrade this segment of SR 70 from a 2-lane Conventional Highway to a 4-lane Expressway. Due to increased traffic from commuters and trucks, congestion has been increasing. Mainline LOS on SR 99 is currently at " $E$ ". During peak hours, traffic backs up at the SR 99/Nicholaus Avenue intersection, which results in an intersection LOS of " $F$ ". The project is needed to increase capacity, relieve congestion, improve safety, and close the one remaining Expressway gaps on SR 70 between Sacramento County and Yuba County. |  |  |  | Caltrans | Regional | Local | TIM | Other |
|  |  |  |  | X | X |  |  | NHSF |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | ated Cost |  | ,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | tion Year |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Priority C | eria |  |
| The project is needed to increase capacity, relieve congestion, improve safety, and close the one remaining Expressway gaps on SR 70 between Sacramento County and Yuba County. |  |  |  |  |  | Capacity |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Expressw | onversion |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Safety Component |  |  | Yes |  |
| LOS |  | 2025 L |  | Funding Partners |  |  |  |  |
| Existing | w/o Project | w/Project | Concept |  |  |  | Caltran |  |
| E | F | D | C |  |  |  | SACO |  |



| Projec | No.: 10 | Map No.: | Figure 3.1 | Priority |  | Priority 1 Projects |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name: |  | "Main Street" Improvements |  | MTP/EA\# |  | 02-4C580 |  |  |
| County: | TEH | SR99-Post Mile: $12.000 / 12.600$ |  | Project Status (Planning/Programming) |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description: Install curbs, gutters, sidewalks, decorative street lighting, and drainage systems between Grant and Tehama Vina Streets, Los Molinos. |  |  |  | TSDP | TCR | RTP | PSR | RTL |
|  |  |  |  | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No |
|  |  |  |  | Funding Source(s) |  |  |  |  |
| Purpose and Need: SR 99 serves as the "Main Street" for the community of Los Molinos, with the majority of the businesses in the town facing the highway. The lack of street lighting, curbs, gutters, and sidewalks creates a safety issue for pedestrians and bicyclists. The Fatality plus Injury Collision rate is 174 percent above the Statewide average. In addition, the area is subject to annual flooding, which inhibits goods movement and multimodal traffic. Three phased project alternatives have been developed. The project will improve safety and deter flooding. |  |  |  | Caltrans | Regional | Local | TIM | Other |
|  |  |  |  | X | X |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Estimated Cost |  |  | \$13,200,000 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Construction Year |  |  | 2009 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Project Priority Criteria |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Mainline Capacity |  |  | No |  |
|  |  |  |  | Expressway Conversion |  |  | No |  |
|  |  |  |  | Safety Component |  |  | Yes |  |
| LOS | 2025 LOS |  |  | Funding Partners |  | Caltrans |  |  |
| Existing | w/o Project | w/Project | Concept |  |  | TCTC, Tehama County |  |  |
| D | E | E | C-D |  |  | Los Moli | Comm | Group |

### 3.2 Priority 2 Projects:

Priority 2 Projects are active programmed projects that have been identified based on similar selection criteria as the Priority 1 Projects, but with slightly lower priority ranking. The selection criteria for Priority 2 projects are as follows:

- Included in applicable regional transportation plans.
- Approved Project Study Report (PSR) or a PSR that is underway.
- Project development underway or project Ready to List (RTL).
- Can be in construction by December 31, 2012.
- Shared funding plan indicating match (not required, but encouraged):
- Local (Developer Fees, General Fund, Sales Tax, Capital Improvement Program, other),
- Regional (STIP, RSTP, CMAQ, other),
- Caltrans (ITIP, SHOPP).
- Safety Component: widen lanes or shoulders, restriping, modify vertical and horizontal site distances, change non-standard geometrics, reduce access points, construct drainage improvements, and other improvements to reduce collision fatalities and injuries.
- Mainline capacity increasing: add auxiliary lanes and other operational improvements, widen main lines (add lanes) and bridges, and add bus and carpool lanes.
- Expressway conversion: convert intersections to interchanges, and add or modify interchanges.

Utilizing the above selection criteria, ten Priority 2 Projects were identified. The locations of the Priority 2 Projects are shown on Figure 3.2. Thereafter, the pages that follow contain Project Data Sheets that have been prepared for each of the projects. It should be noted that when a LOS is listed, it is for the mainline route segment, and not the intersection or interchange. It should also be noted that while all of these active projects are programmed, they are not all fully funded.

Figure 3.2, Priority 2 Projects


| Proje | ct No. 1 | Map No.: | Figure 3.2 |  |  | Priority 2 Projects |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name: |  | Central Galt Interchange |  | MTP/EA\# |  | SAC20580/3C630K |  |  |
| County: | SAC |  |  | Project Status (Planning/Programming) |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description: Reconstruct interchange and widen overpass to 4-lanes. |  |  |  | TSDP | TCR | RTP | PSR | RTL |
|  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | ding Source |  |  |
| Purpose and Need: The interchange does not meet current standards. Vehicles are starting to back-up onto the highway. Widening the overpass will help relieve congestion, reduce delay, and queuing onto SR 99. |  |  |  | Caltrans | Regional | Local | TIM | Other |
|  |  |  |  | X | X | Developer Cap. Investment | X | Meas. A, Fed. Demo. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | imated Cost |  | 00,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  | Cons | uction Year |  | 010 |
|  |  |  |  |  | Proje | Priority Cr | teria |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Main | ne Capacity |  | Yes |
|  |  |  |  |  | Expresswa | Conversion |  | Yes |
|  |  |  |  |  | Safet | Component |  | Yes |
| LOS | 2025 LOS |  |  | Funding Partners |  |  | Caltra |  |
| Existing | w/o Project | w/Project | Concept |  |  |  | City of |  |
| D | F | D | D |  |  |  | SACO |  |


| Project No.: 2 |  | Map No.: | Figure 3.2 | Priority |  | Priority 2 Projects |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name: |  | Simmerhorn Overcrossing, Ph. 1 |  | MTP/EA\# |  | SAC24165 |  |  |
| County: SAC |  | SR 99-Post Mile: 1.566 |  | Project Status (Planning/Programming) |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description: Realign and replace overcrossing. |  |  |  | TSDP | TCR | RTP | PSR | RTL |
|  |  |  |  | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No |
|  |  |  |  | Funding Source(s) |  |  |  |  |
| Purpose and Need: The overcrossing does not meet current standards. Vehicles are starting to back-up onto the highway. Widening the overpass will help relieve congestion, reduce delay, and queuing onto SR 99. |  |  |  | Caltrans | Regional | Local | TIM | Other |
|  |  |  |  |  | X | X | X | Meas. A |
|  |  |  |  | Estimated Cost |  |  | \$4,450,000 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Construction Year |  |  | 2011 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Project Priority Criteria |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Mainline Capacity |  |  | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |  | Expressway Conversion |  |  | No |  |
|  |  |  |  | Safety Component |  |  | Yes |  |
| LOS | 2025 LOS |  |  | Funding Partners |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { City of Galt } \\ & \text { SACOG } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| Existing | w/o Project | w/Project | Concept |  |  |  |  |  |
| D | F | D | D |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project No.: 3 |  | Map No.: | Figure 3.2 | Priority |  | Priority 2 Projects |  |  |
| Project Name: |  | Elk Grove Interchange |  | MTP/EA\# |  | SAC24116/1E410 |  |  |
| County: SAC |  | SR 99-Post Mile: 12.765 |  | Project Status (Planning/Programming) |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description: Modify IC, add NB loop on-ramp to SR 99, remove traffic signal at existing NB on-ramp, and add second WB left turn lane to existing SB on-ramp. |  |  |  | TSDP | TCR | RTP | PSR | RTL |
|  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
|  |  |  |  | Funding Source(s) |  |  |  |  |
| Purpose and Need: The interchange does not meet current standards. Congestion and delay are increasing. Adding an onramp and left turn lane will help relieve congestion and reduce delay. |  |  |  | Caltrans | Regional | Local | TIM | Other |
|  |  |  |  |  | X | X | X |  |
|  |  |  |  | Estimated Cost |  |  | \$6,361,000 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Construction Year |  |  | 2007 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Project Priority Criteria |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Mainline Capacity |  |  | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |  | Expressway Conversion |  |  | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |  | Safety Component |  |  | Yes |  |
| LOS | 2025 LOS |  |  | Funding Partners |  | City of Elk Grove SACOG |  |  |
| Existing | w/o Project | w/Project | Concept |  |  |  |  |  |
| F | F | F | F |  |  |  |  |  |


| Proje | t No.: 4 | Map No.: | Figure 3.2 |  | rity |  | ity 2 | ects |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project N | me: | Sheldon Road I | rchange |  | EA\# |  | 19389 | 200 |
| County: | SAC | SR 99-Post M | :14.869 |  | ject St | anning/P | ran |  |
| Project | cription: | construct inte | , relocate and | TSDP | TCR | RTP | PSR | RTL |
| increase ca | pacity of the | transit park-and- | lot, and provide bus | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
| shelter and | destrian | sswalks. |  |  |  | ing Sourc |  |  |
| Purpose and Need: The interchange does not meet current standards. Additionally, the Fatality plus Injury Collision rate along the section of Freeway connected to this Interchange is 116 percent above the Statewide average. To meet the standards, the park-and ride lot will need to be relocated and crosswalks will need to be constructed. The project will increase capacity, relieve congestion, and improve vehicle and pedestrian safety. |  |  |  | Caltrans | Regional | Local | TIM | Other |
|  |  |  |  | X | X | BAD | X | Meas. A, Fed. Demo, FTA 5309 |
|  |  |  |  | Estimated Cost |  |  | \$74,356,000 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Construction Year |  |  | 2008 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Project Priority Criteria |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Mainline Capacity |  |  | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |  | Expressway Conversion |  |  | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |  | Safety Component |  |  | Yes |  |
| LOS | 2025 LOS |  |  | Funding Partners |  | Caltrans, Federal Transit Admin. City of Elk Grove |  |  |
| Existing | w/o Project | w/Project | Concept |  |  |  |  |  |
| F | F | F | F |  |  |  | SACO |  |


| Project No.: 5 |  | Map No.: | Figure 3.2 | Priority |  | Priority 2 Projects |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name: |  | E. Gridley Rd./Spruce Ave., Gridley |  | MTP/EA\# |  | 3A270 |  |  |
| County: BUT |  | SR 99-Post Mile: $4.121 / 4.380$ |  | Project Status (Planning/Programming) |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description: Construct a continuous left-turn lane and install a traffic signal. |  |  |  | TSDP | TCR | RTP | PSR | RTL |
|  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
|  |  |  |  | Funding Source(s) |  |  |  |  |
| Purpose and Need: The purpose of the project is to complete the widening of SR 99 in the City of Gridley to a 5-lane facility that includes a continuous median left-turn lane. The Total Collision rate along this segment of highway is 153 percent above the Statewide average. The project will improve the operations and safety of the facility and improve air quality. |  |  |  | Caltrans | Regional | Local | TIM | Other |
|  |  |  |  | X | X |  |  | CMAQ |
|  |  |  |  | Estimated Cost |  |  | \$5,391,000 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Construction Year |  |  | 2008 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Project Priority Criteria |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Mainline Capacity |  |  | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |  | Expressway Conversion |  |  | No |  |
|  |  |  |  | Safety Component |  |  | Yes |  |
| LOS | 2025 LOS |  |  | Funding Partners |  |  | Caltrans BCAG |  |
| Existing | w/o Project | w/Project | Concept |  |  |  |  |  |
| A | B | B | D |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project No.: 6 |  | Map No.: | Figure 3.2 | Priority |  | Priority 2 Projects |  |  |
| Project Name: |  | Rio Bonito Rd., Biggs/SR 162E Safety |  | MTP/EA\# |  | 36690 |  |  |
| County: BUT |  | SR 99-Post Mile: $8.390 / 13.249$ |  | Project Status (Planning/Programming) |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description: Widen highway to improve vertical sight distance and provide 8-foot wide shoulders. |  |  |  | TSDP | TCR | RTP | PSR | RTL |
|  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | by 2008 |
|  |  |  |  | Funding Source(s) |  |  |  |  |
| Purpose and Need: This segment of SR 99 does not meet current standards for a 2-lane conventional highway. Improving the vertical sight distance and adding shoulders to the highway will reduce collision fatalities and injuries, and thereby, increase safety along the corridor. |  |  |  | Caltrans | Regional | Local | TIM | Other |
|  |  |  |  | X | X |  |  | NHS |
|  |  |  |  | Estimated Cost |  |  | \$34,939,000 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Construction Year |  |  | 2009 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Project Priority Criteria |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Mainline Capacity |  |  | No |  |
|  |  |  |  | Expressway Conversion |  |  | No |  |
|  |  |  |  | Safety Component |  |  | Yes |  |
| LOS | 2025 LOS |  |  | Funding Partners |  |  | FHWA Caltrans BCAG |  |
| Existing | w/o Project | w/Project | Concept |  |  |  |  |  |
| D | E | D | D |  |  |  |  |  |


| Projec | ct No.: 7 | Map No.: | Figure 3.2 | Priority |  | Priority 2 Projects |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name: |  | Freeway Extension Interim Signal |  | MTP/EA\# |  | 20200000036/1E1601 |  |  |
| County: | BUT | SR 70-Post Mile: $8.390 / 13.249$ |  | Project Status (Planning/Programming) |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description: Relocate and signalize SR 70/Ophir Road/Pacific Heights Road intersection, add turn pockets, and realign frontage roads, Oroville. |  |  |  | TSDP | TCR | RTP | PSR | RTL |
|  |  |  |  | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | by 2007 |
|  |  |  |  | Funding Source(s) |  |  |  |  |
| Purpose and Need: This project is an interim phase of the Oroville Freeway Extension/Interchange Project (No. 8, Priority 1 - Active). Prior to installing an interchange, the Ophir Road/Pacific Heights intersection with SR 70 must be realigned to conform to sight distance and recovery zone standards. Once realigned, a traffic signal will be placed at this intersection until the full interchange is constructed. The project will reduce collisions, and improve safety and operations along the corridor. |  |  |  | Caltrans | Regional | Local | TIM | Other |
|  |  |  |  | X | X |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Estimated Cost |  |  | \$9,415,000 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Construction Year |  |  | 2007 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Project Priority Criteria |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Mainline Capacity |  |  | No |  |
|  |  |  |  | Expressway Conversion |  |  | No |  |
|  |  |  |  | Safety Component |  |  | Yes |  |
| LOS | 2025 LOS |  |  | Funding Partners |  |  | Caltrans <br> BCAG |  |
| Existing | w/o Project | w/Project | Concept |  |  |  |  |  |
| E | E | E | D |  |  |  |  |  |


| Proje | ct No.: 8 | Map No.: | Figure 3.2 | Priority |  | Priority 2 Projects |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name: |  | Skyway/Park Ave. IC Improvements |  | MTP/EA\# |  | N/A |  |  |
| County: | BUT | SR 99-Post Mile: 30.603 |  | Project Status (Planning/Programming) |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description: Reconfigure interchange by adding westbound Skyway, southbound SR 99 on ramp; widen, channelize, and re-stripe; and reconfigure west side. |  |  |  | TSDP | TCR | RTP | PSR | RTL |
|  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
|  |  |  |  | Funding Source(s) |  |  |  |  |
| Purpose and Need: The Skyway/Park Avenue Interchange is located in the southern portion of a highly developed commercial corridor with "Big Box" stores, a Regional Shopping Mall, and other Highway Commercial uses. Skyway/Park Avenue also provides access to the Town of Paradise and to the Butte County Fair Grounds. The traffic from these uses is causing congestion on the Interchange ramps and over crossing. The project will improve the operations of traffic on both SR 99 and Skyway/Park Avenue. |  |  |  | Caltrans | Regional | Local | TIM | Other |
|  |  |  |  |  | X | X | X | CMAQ |
|  |  |  |  | Estimated Cost |  |  | \$8,000,000 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Construction Year |  |  | 2008 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Project Priority Criteria |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Mainline Capacity |  |  | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |  | Expressway Conversion |  |  | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |  | Safety Component |  |  | No |  |
| LOS | 2025 LOS |  |  | Funding Partners |  | City of Chico BCAG |  |  |
| Existing | w/o Project | w/Project | Concept |  |  |  |  |  |
| E | F | E | D/E |  |  |  |  |  |


| Project | ct No.: 9 | Map No.: | Figure 3.2 | Priority |  | Priority 2 Projects |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name: |  | Cohasset Road IC Improvements |  | MTP/EA\# |  | N/A |  |  |
| County: | BUT | SR 99-Post Mile: 34.254 |  | Project Status (Planning/Programming) |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description: Add southbound slip on-ramp to SR 99 from Cohasset/Mangrove, re-stripe overcrossing to add another lane that will connect to westbound Cohasset southbound onramp. |  |  |  | TSDP | TCR | RTP | PSR | RTL |
|  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | 2009 |
|  |  |  |  | Funding Source(s) |  |  |  |  |
| Purpose and Need: The Cohasset Road Interchange provides access to a Regional Shopping Mall, the Chico Municipal Airport, a growing residential area, and downtown Chico. Traffic congestion is increasing to where vehicles queuing back from Cohasset Street onto the freeway are a major operational and safety concern. The Total Collision rate is 110 percent above the Statewide average. The proposed improvements will increase the interchange capacity, and improve safety and operations. |  |  |  | Caltrans | Regional | Local | TIM | Other |
|  |  |  |  |  | X | X | X |  |
|  |  |  |  | Estimated Cost |  |  | \$13,686,000 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Construction Year |  |  | 2010-2018 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Project Priority Criteria |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Mainline Capacity |  |  | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |  | Expressway Conversion |  |  | No |  |
|  |  |  |  | Safety Component |  |  | Yes |  |
| LOS | 2025 LOS |  |  | Funding Partners |  | City of Chico BCAG |  |  |
| Existing | w/o Project | w/Project | Concept |  |  |  |  |  |
| F | F | E | D |  |  |  |  |  |


| Project Name: |  | Map No.: | Figure 3.2 | Priority |  | Priority 2 Projects |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Replace Three Bridges |  | MTP/EA\# |  | 2C110 |  |  |
| County:TEH |  | SR 99-Post Mile: $13.900 / 20.900$ |  | Project Status (Planning/Programming) |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description: Replace 3 bridges - North Branch of North fork Mill Creek (08-0009), Sunset Canal (08-0010), and Craig Creek (08-0014). |  |  |  | TSDP | TCR | RTP | PSR | RTL |
|  |  |  |  | Yes | No | Yes | No | No |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | ng Source |  |  |
| Purpose and Need: The 3 bridges are experiencing critical scour and need to be replaced before they collapse. The replacement of the bridges will improve safety and operations along the corridor. |  |  |  | Caltrans | Regional | Local | TIM | Other |
|  |  |  |  | X | X |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | ated Cost |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Con | ction Year |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Proj | Priority C |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Mai | Capacity |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Expressw | onversion |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Safe | omponent |  |  |
| LOS | 2025 LOS |  |  | Funding Partners |  | CaltransTCTCTehama County Public Works |  |  |
| Existing | w/o Project | w/Project | Concept |  |  |  |  |  |
| C | D | C | C-D |  |  |  |  |  |

### 3.3 Planned Projects:

Planned projects are based on the following selection criteria:

- Included in applicable regional transportation plans.
- Included in Transportation System Development Plans (TSDP).
- Capacity increasing.
- Major operational improvement.

Utilizing the above selection criteria, thirty-three Planned Projects were identified. The locations of the Planned Projects are shown on Figures 3.3 and 3.4. Thereafter, the pages that follow contain Project Data Sheets that have been prepared for each of the thirtythree projects. It should be noted that when a LOS is listed, it is for the mainline route segment, and not the intersection or interchange.

Figure 3, Planned Projects


Figure 3.4, Planned Projects



| Project No.: 2 |  | Map No.: | Figure 3.3 | Priority |  | Priority 3 - Planned |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name: |  | U.S. 50 Interchange Reconstruction |  |  |  |  | AL18 |  |
| County: SAC |  | SR 99-Post Mile: 24.351 |  | Project Status (Planning/Programming) |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description: Reconstruct interchange and add HOV ramp connections. |  |  |  | TSDP | TCR | RTP | PSR | RTL |
|  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No |
|  |  |  |  | Funding Source(s) |  |  |  |  |
| Purpose and Need: This 8-lane section of SR 99 is experiencing severe and increasing congestion, and has a Fatality and Injury Collision rate that is are over twice of the Statewide Average. The proposed reconstruction of the interchange and addition of HOV ramp connections will reduce the increase in congestion, should lower the collision fatality and injury rates, and improve the operations of the facility. |  |  |  | Caltrans | Regional | Local | TIM | Other |
|  |  |  |  | X | X |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Estimated Cost |  |  | \$50,000,000 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Construction Year |  |  | 2014 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Project Priority Criteria |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Capacity Increasing |  |  | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |  | Major Operational Improvement |  |  | Yes |  |
| LOS | 2025 LOS |  |  | Funding Partners |  |  | Caltrans |  |
| Existing | w/o Project | w/Project | Concept |  |  |  |  |  |
| F | F | F | E |  |  |  | SACO |  |


| Proje | t No.: 3 | Map No.: | Figure 3.3 | Priority |  | Priority 3 - Planned |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name: |  | Meister Way Overcrossing |  | MTP/EA\# |  | SAC23810 |  |  |
| County: SAC |  | SR 99-Post Mile: 32.835 |  | Project Status (Planning/Programming) |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description: Construct Meister Way overcrossing. |  |  |  | TSDP | TCR | RTP | PSR | RTL |
|  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No |
|  |  |  |  | Funding Source(s) |  |  |  |  |
| Purpose and Need: New development that is rapidly occurring near the Sacramento Metropolitan International Airport and in the North Natomas area is causing a need to construct an overcrossing at Meister Way. This overpass is needed to relieve congestion from development that is utilizing the Elkhorn Boulevard Interchange to gain access to SR 99 and the North Natomas area. The LOS at this Interchange is currently at LOS "D" and is projected to decline to LOS "F" by 2025. Constructing the overpass will help relieve congestion at the Elkhorn Boulevard Interchange and improve the operation of SR 99. The City of Sacramento is funding a portion of this project through the North Natomas Public Facilities Fee program. |  |  |  | Caltrans | Regional | Local | TIM | Other |
|  |  |  |  |  | X | X |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | ated Cost |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | ction Year |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Priority C | teria |  |
|  |  |  |  | Capacity Increasing |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | 2025 LOS |  |  |  |  |  | Funding Partners |  | City of SacramentoSACOG |  |  |
| Existing | w/o Project | w/Project | Concept |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| B | D | C | E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Proje | t No.: 4 | Map No.: | Figure 3.3 |  | ority |  | ty 3 - |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name: |  | I-5/Sutter County line, Widen Freeway |  | MTP/EA\# |  | N/A |  |  |
| County: | SAC | SR 99-Post Mile: $32.124 / 36.863$ |  | Project Status (Planning/Programming) |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description: Widen 4-lane expressway to 6-lane freeway. |  |  |  | TSDP | TCR | RTP | PSR | RTL |
|  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No |
|  |  |  |  | Funding Source(s) |  |  |  |  |
| Purpose and Need: The project will upgrade this segment of SR 99 from a 4-lane expressway to a 6-lane freeway. Due to increased traffic from commuters and trucks, congestion has been increasing. Moreover, the Total Collision rate along this freeway segment is 112 percent above the Statewide average. The project is needed to increase capacity, relieve congestion, and close one of several Expressway/Freeway gaps on SR 99 between Sacramento County and Sutter County. |  |  |  | Caltrans | Regional | Local | TIM | Other |
|  |  |  |  | X | X | X |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | ated Cost |  | ,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  | Con | tion Year |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Priority C | teria |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Capac | ncreasing |  |  |
| County and Sutter County. |  |  |  | Major Operational Improvement |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | 2025 LOS |  |  | Funding Partners |  | Caltrans <br> County of Sacramento <br> City of Sacramento, SACOG |  |  |
| Existing | w/o Project | w/Project | Concept |  |  |  |  |  |
| B | D | C | E |  |  |  |  |  |


| Proje | ( No.: 5 | Map No.: | Figure 3.3 | Priority |  | Priority 3 - Planned |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name: |  | Elkhorn Blvd. IC Improvements |  | MTP/EA\# |  | SAC18690 |  |  |
| County:SAC |  | SR 99-Post Mile: 33.364 |  | Project Status (Planning/Programming) |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description: Expand interchange crossing of SR 99 to accommodate widening of Elkhorn Boulevard from 2- to 6-lanes. |  |  |  | TSDP | TCR | RTP | PSR | RTL |
|  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No |
|  |  |  |  | Funding Source(s) |  |  |  |  |
| Purpose and Need: The purpose of this project is to improve the Elkhorn Boulevard interchange to accommodate widening the street from 2- to 6-lanes. The LOS at the Elkhorn Boulevard Interchange is currently at LOS " $D$ " and is projected to decline to LOS "F" by 2025. This project is needed to reduce congestion by increasing capacity. The project will improve the operations of traffic on both SR 99 and Elkhorn Boulevard. |  |  |  | Caltrans | Regional | Local | TIM | Other |
|  |  |  |  |  | X | X |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Estimated Cost |  |  | \$11,909,000 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Construction Year |  |  | 2015 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Project Priority Criteria |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Capacity Increasing |  |  | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |  | Major Operational Improvement |  |  | Yes |  |
| LOS | 2025 LOS |  |  | Funding Partners |  | City of Sacramento County of Sacramento SACOG |  |  |
| Existing | w/o Project | w/Project | Concept |  |  |  |  |  |
| B | D | D | E |  |  |  |  |  |


| Proje | t No.: 6 | Map No.: | Figure 3.3 | Priority |  | Priority 3 - Planned |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name: |  | Elverta Rd/Elkhorn Blvd. Imprvmnts. |  | MTP/EA\# |  | SAC24128/37150 |  |  |
| County: | SAC | SR 99-Post Mile: 33.364 \& 35.370 |  | Project Status (Planning/Programming) |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description: Elverta Road - Construct intersection channelization with eastbound left-turn lane and modify existing signal. Elkhorn Blvd. - Construct northbound and southbound exit ramp terminus signalization. |  |  |  | TSDP | TCR | RTP | PSR | RTL |
|  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
|  |  |  |  | Funding Source(s) |  |  |  |  |
| Purpose and Need: The Elverta intersection LOS is currently at LOS "E" and is projected to decline to LOS " $F$ " by 2025. The LOS at the Elkhorn Boulevard Interchange is currently at LOS "D" and is projected to decline to LOS "F" by 2025. The project is needed as an interim measure to constructing the Elverta Road Interchange (see Priority 1, Project No. 2) and the Elkhorn Boulevard Interchange widening project (Project 5 above). Improvements to the Elverta Road intersection and Elkhorn Boulevard interchange will help relieve congestion, reduce delay, and reduce the potential for queuing of vehicles onto SR 99. |  |  |  | Caltrans | Regional | Local | TIM | Other |
|  |  |  |  | X | X | Developer Cap. Invstmnt. | X |  |
|  |  |  |  | Estimated Cost |  |  | \$4,268,000 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Construction Year |  |  | 2009 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Project Priority Criteria |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Capacity Increasing |  |  | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |  | Major Operational Improvement |  |  | No |  |
| LOS | 2025 LOS |  |  | Funding Partners |  | Caltrans County of Sacramento SACOG |  |  |
| Existing | w/o Project | w/Project | Concept |  |  |  |  |  |
| B | C | D | E |  |  |  |  |  |


| Proje | ct No.: 7 | Map No.: | Figure 3.3 | Priority |  | Priority 3 - Planned |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name: |  | Sac. County line/SR 70, widen Freeway |  |  | P/EA\# |  | N/A |  |
| County: |  | SR 99-Post M | :0.000/7.65670 | Project Status (Planning/Programming) |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description: Widen 4-lane expressway to 6-lane freeway. |  |  |  | TSDP | TCR | RTP | PSR | RTL |
|  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | ing Sour |  |  |
| Purpose and Need: The project will upgrade this segment of SR 99 from a 4-lane expressway to a 6-lane freeway. Due to increased traffic from commuters and trucks, congestion has been increasing. The project is needed to increase capacity, relieve congestion, and close one of several Expressway/Freeway gaps on SR 99 within Sutter County. |  |  |  | Caltrans | Regional | Local | TIM | Other |
|  |  |  |  | X | X | X |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | ated Cost | Inclu | oject 4 |
|  |  |  |  |  | Cons | tion Year |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Pro | Priority C | riteria |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Capac | ncreasing |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Major Operational Improvement |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | 2025 LOS |  |  | Funding Partners |  | Caltrans Sutter County SACOG |  |  |
| Existing | w/o Project | w/Project | Concept |  |  |  |  |  |
| B | C | C | D |  |  |  |  |  |


| Proje | ( No.: 8 | Map No.: | Figure 3.3 | Priority |  | Priority 3 - Planned |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name: |  | Placer Parkway Interchange |  | MTP/EA\# |  | CAL18590 |  |  |
| County: | SUT | SR 99-Post Mile: 2.759 |  | Project Status (Planning/Programming) |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description: Construct L-9 interchange between Riego and Sankey Roads. |  |  |  | TSDP | TCR | RTP | PSR | RTL |
|  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Purpose and Need: The purpose of this interchange is to connect to the planned Placer Parkway arterial roadway. The interchange is needed because major new developments are being planned that will impact SR 99. In Sutter County, development is proposed that will result in up to 17,500 dwelling units, 39,000 new residents, and an estimated 70,000 jobs. In Placer County, a series of development projects have been proposed that will result in up to 40,000 dwelling units and over 10 million square feet of commercial and office uses. |  |  |  | Funding Source(s) |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Caltrans | Regional | Local | TIM | Other |
|  |  |  |  | X | X |  | X |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | ated Cost |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Cons | tion Year |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Proj | Priority C | teria |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Capac | Increasing |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Majo | Operational | rovement |  |  |
| LOS |  | 2025 L |  |  |  |  | Caltra |  |
| Existing | w/o Project | w/Project | Concept | Fundin | Partners |  | SACO |  |
| B | C | C | D |  |  |  | PCTC |  |


| Proje | No.: 9 | Map No.: | Figure 3.3 | Priority |  | Priority 3 - Planned |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name: |  | Feather River Blvd. Interchange |  | MTP/EA\# |  | YUB15362 |  |  |
| County: | YUB | SR 70-Post Mile: 0.354 |  | Project Status (Planning/Programming) |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description: Construct SR 70 interchange at Feather River Boulevard in southern Yuba County. |  |  |  | TSDP | TCR | RTP | PSR | RTL |
|  |  |  |  | Yes | No | Yes | No | No |
|  |  |  |  | Funding Source(s) |  |  |  |  |
| Purpose and Need: The SR 70/Feather River Boulevard intersection provides major access to 14,000 new and planned homes within the Plumas Lake community. Without an interchange, the intersection LOS will deteriorate to LOS " $F$ " by 2025. The project will connect the recently completed 4 -lane expressway in Yuba County with the programmed 4-lane expressway conversion project (See Priority 1, Project No. 6) in Sutter County, thereby closing another Expressway/Freeway gap on SR 70 between Sacramento and Yuba County. The project is a major operational improvement that will increase capacity. |  |  |  | Caltrans | Regional | Local | TIM | Other |
|  |  |  |  | X | X | X | X |  |
|  |  |  |  | Estimated Cost |  |  | \$22,330,000 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Construction Year |  |  | 2010 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Project Priority Criteria |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Capacity Increasing |  |  | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |  | Major Operational Improvement |  |  | Yes |  |
| LOS | 2025 LOS |  |  | Funding Partners |  | Caltrans SACOG |  |  |
| Existing | w/o Project | w/Project | Concept |  |  |  |  |  |
| A | C | C | C |  |  | Yuba County |  |  |


| Projec | t No.: 10 | Map No.: | Figure 3.3 | Priority |  | Priority 3 - Planned |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name: |  | Algodon Road Interchange-East |  | MTP/EA\# |  | YUB15370/2A2720 |  |  |
| County: YUB |  | SR 70-Post Mile: $2.700 / 3.800$ |  | Project Status (Planning/Programming) |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description: Construct SR 70 interchange at Algodon Road/Plumas Arboga Road in southern Yuba County (Phases 1 \& 2) |  |  |  | TSDP | TCR | RTP | PSR | RTL |
|  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
|  |  |  |  | Funding Source(s) |  |  |  |  |
| Purpose and Need: The project will construct an L-2 interchange on the recently completed 4-lane expressway in Yuba County at the Algodon Road/Plumas Arboga Road intersection. This intersection is currently uncontrolled. The improvement is needed to provide safe access to the planned Yuba Motorplex and existing Amphitheatre. This major operational improvement in conjunction with Project No. 12 will close an Expressway/ Freeway gap on SR 70 between Sacramento County and the City of Marysville in Yuba County and increase capacity of the facility. |  |  |  | Caltrans | Regional | Local | TIM | Other |
|  |  |  |  | X | X | X | X | NHSF |
|  |  |  |  | Estimated Cost |  |  | \$21,000,000 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Construction Year |  |  | 2010 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Project Priority Criteria |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Capacity Increasing |  |  | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |  | Major Operational Improvement |  |  | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | 2025 LO |  |  |  |  |  | Funding Partners |  | Caltrans <br> SACOG <br> Yuba County |  |  |
| Existing | w/o Project | w/Project | Concept |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A | C | C | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project No.: 11 |  |  |  |  |  | Priority 3 - Planned |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Map No.: | Figure 3.3 | Priority |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Name: |  | Algodon Road Interchange-West |  | MTP/EA\# |  | YUB15375/2A2700 |  |  |  |  |  |
| County:YUB |  | SR 70-Post Mile: $2.700 / 3.800$ |  | Project Status (Planning/Programming) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description: Construct SR 70 interchange at Algodon Road/Plumas Arboga Road intersection in southern Yuba County (Phase 3) |  |  |  | TSDP | TCR | RTP | PSR | RTL |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Yes | $Y$ | Yes | Yes | No |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Funding Source(s) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Purpose and Need: The project will construct a bridge and modify the L-2 interchange from Project No. 11 into a full L-9 interchange that will provide access to the 14,000 new and planned homes in the Plumas Lake community located on the west side of SR 70. Without an interchange, the intersection LOS will deteriorate to LOS " $F$ " by 2025. The improvement is needed to provide safe controlled-access on and off of SR 70. This major operational improvement in conjunction with Project No. 11 will close an Expressway/Freeway gap on SR 70 between Sacramento County and the City of Marysville and increase capacity. |  |  |  | Caltrans | Regional | Local | TIM | Other |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | X | X | X | X | NHSF |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Estimated Cost |  |  | \$20,000,000 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Construction Year |  |  | 2012 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Project Priority Criteria |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Capacity Increasing |  |  | Yes |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Major Operational Improvement |  |  | Yes |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | 2025 LOS |  |  | Funding Partners |  | CaltransSACOGYuba County |  |  |  |  |  |
| Existing | w/o Project | w/Project | Concept |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A | C | C | C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Project No.: 12 |  | Map No.: | Figure 3.3 | Priority |  | Priority 3 - Planned |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name: |  | O'Banion/SR 20, widen Freeway |  |  | P/EA\# |  | N/A |  |
| County:SUT |  | SR 99-Post Mile: $22.600 / 30.629$ |  | Project Status (Planning/Programming) |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description: Widen 4-lane expressway to 6-lane freeway. |  |  |  | TSDP | TCR | RTP | PSR | RTL |
|  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No |
|  |  |  |  | Funding Source(s) |  |  |  |  |
| Purpose and Need: The project will upgrade this segment of SR 99 from a 4 -lane expressway to a 6 -lane freeway. Due to increased traffic from commuters and trucks, congestion has been increasing. The project is needed to increase capacity, relieve congestion, and close one of several Expressway/Freeway gaps on SR 99 within Sutter County. |  |  |  | Caltrans | Regional | Local | TIM | Other |
|  |  |  |  | X | X |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Estimated Cost |  |  | \$64,240,000 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Construction Year |  |  | 2025 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Project Priority Criteria |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Capacity Increasing |  |  | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |  | Major Operational Improvement |  |  | Yes |  |
| LOS | 2025 LOS |  |  | Funding Partners |  | Caltrans Sutter County SACOG |  |  |
| Existing | w/o Project | w/Project | Concept |  |  |  |  |  |
| D | F | E | E |  |  |  |  |  |


| Project No.: 13 |  | Map No.: | Figure 3.3 |  | ority | Priority 3 - Planned |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name: |  | Widen SR 70, 1st/9th Strts., Marysville |  | MTP/EA\# |  |  | CAL15 |  |
| County:YUB |  | SR 70-Post Mile: 14.100/14.700 |  | Project Status (Planning/Programming) |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description: Widen SR 70 (E. Street) from 4- to 6-lanes between 1st through 9th Streets, and widen approach to 10th Street Bridge, Marysville. |  |  |  | TSDP | TCR | RTP | PSR | RTL |
|  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No |
|  |  |  |  | Funding Source(s) |  |  |  |  |
| Purpose and Need: The project will widen SR 70 to 6 -lanes and widen the approaches to the SR 20 (10th Street) bridge. There are over 60,000 vehicles entering the City of Marysville from the south on SR 70. The level of service is currently at LOS "F". The project is needed to increase capacity, reduce congestion, and improve the operations of the facility. |  |  |  | Caltrans | Regional | Local | TIM | Other |
|  |  |  |  | X | X | X |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Estimated Cost |  |  | \$3,049,000 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Construction Year |  |  | 2012 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Project Priority Criteria |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Capacity Increasing |  |  | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |  | Major Operational Improvement |  |  | Yes |  |
| LOS | 2025 LOS |  |  | Funding Partners |  |  |  |  |
| Existing | w/o Project | w/Project | Concept |  |  | SACOG <br> City of Marysville |  |  |
| F | F | E | D |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project No.: 14 |  | Map No.: | Figure 3.3 | Priority |  | Priority 3 - Planned |  |  |
| Project Name: |  | SR99/SR20 Interchange, Yuba City |  | MTP/EA\# |  | CAL15780 |  |  |
| County: SUT |  | SR 99-Post Mile: 30.629 |  | Project Status (Planning/Programming) |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description: Construct an urban interchange. |  |  |  | TSDP | TCR | RTP | PSR | RTL |
|  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No |
|  |  |  |  | Funding Source(s) |  |  |  |  |
| Purpose and Need: The intersection LOS is currently at LOS " $E$ " and is projected to decline to LOS " $F$ " by 2025. Additionally, the Fatality plus Injury Collision rate for this section of SR 99 is over 150 percent of the Statewide average rate. Increasing traffic not yielding to the existing traffic signal at this major expressway/freeway intersection gap is a major cause of this high collision rate. An interchange will be needed to connect one expressway section with one freeway section, close Freeway/Expressway gaps, improve safety, increase capacity, and decrease congestion that will be occurring over the next 20 years. |  |  |  | Caltrans | Regional | Local | TIM | Other |
|  |  |  |  | X | X |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Estimated Cost |  |  | \$25,000,000 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Construction Year |  |  | 2025 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Project Priority Criteria |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Capacity Increasing |  |  | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |  | Major Operational Improvement |  |  | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | 2025 LOS |  |  | Funding Partners |  | Caltrans Sutter County SACOG |  |  |
| Existing | w/o Project | w/Project | Concept |  |  |  |  |  |
| D | F | E | E |  |  |  |  |  |


| Proje | No.: 15 | Map No.: | e 3.3 |  | rity |  | ity 3 - |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name: |  | End of Fwy/Paseo, 4-lane Expressway |  | MTP/EA\# |  | CAL18160 |  |  |
| County: SUT |  | SR 99-Post Mile: $34.973 / 38.400$ |  | Project Status (Planning/Programming) |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description: Widen from a 2-lane conventional highway to a 4-lane expressway between the end of the freeway at Sanders Road to Paseo Avenue in the City of Live Oak. |  |  |  | TSDP | TCR | RTP | PSR | RTL |
|  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No |
|  |  |  |  | Funding Source(s) |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Caltrans | Regional | Local | TIM | Other |
|  |  |  |  | X | X |  |  |  |
| Purpose and Need: New development that is being planned in the northern portion of Yuba City and in Live Oak will increase traffic congestion and delay. The project is needed to increase capacity, relieve congestion, improve safety, and close another Conventional Highway/Expressway gap on SR 99. |  |  |  | Estimated Cost |  |  | \$56,800,000 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Construction Year |  |  | 2015 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Project Priority Criteria |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Capacity Increasing |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Majo | Operational | rovement |  |  |
| LOS | 2025 LOS |  |  | Funding Partners |  |  | Caltra |  |
| Existing | w/o Project | w/Project | Concept |  |  |  | utter C |  |
| E | E | D | D |  |  |  | SACO |  |


| Proje | No.: 16 | Map No.: | Figure 3.3 | Priority |  | Priority 3 - Planned |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name: |  | Paseo/Riviera, 5-lane Highway |  | MTP/EA\# |  | CAL18160 |  |  |
| County: |  | SR 99-Post Mile: $38.400 / 42.135$ |  | Project Status (Planning/Programming) |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description: Widen from a 2-lane to a 5-lane conventional highway with continuous left-turn median between Paseo Avenue and Riviera Road in the Live Oak. |  |  |  | TSDP | TCR | RTP | PSR | RTL |
|  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No |
|  |  |  |  | Funding Source(s) |  |  |  |  |
| Purpose and Need: The project, which will also include curbs, gutters, and sidewalks, is located on the "Main Street" for the City of Live Oak. The Live Oak section of SR 99 has a high crown and no drainage facilities. During winter months, surface water flooding impedes the safe operation of the highway. The City is experiencing a high rate of growth from new development, which utilizes SR 99 to commute to jobs. This new development is increasing traffic congestion. The project is needed to increase capacity, relieve congestion, and improve drainage. |  |  |  | Caltrans | Regional | Local | TIM | Other |
|  |  |  |  | X | X | X | X |  |
|  |  |  |  | Estimated Cost |  |  | included in Project 16 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Construction Year |  |  | 2015 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Project Priority Criteria |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Capacity Increasing |  |  | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |  | Major Operational Improvement |  |  | Yes |  |
| LOS | 2025 LOS |  |  | Funding Partners |  |  |  |  |
| Existing | w/o Project | w/Project | Concept |  |  | City of Live Oak SACOG |  |  |
| A | B | B | D |  |  |  |  |  |


| Proje | No.: 17 | Map No.: | Figure 3.4 |  | ority |  | ty 3 - |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name: |  | Southgate Avenue Interchange |  | MTP/EA\# |  | N/A |  |  |
| County: | BUT | SR 99-Post Mile: 29.367 |  | Project Status (Planning/Programming) |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description: Construct interchange and extend Otterson Drive, Entler Drive, Hegan Lane, and Speedway. |  |  |  | TSDP | TCR | RTP | PSR | RTL |
|  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No |
|  |  |  |  | Funding Source(s) |  |  |  |  |
| Purpose and Need: Industrial and commercial development in the southern portion of the City of Chico has been increasing. The Park Avenue/Skyway interchange and the signalized Southgate Avenue/SR 99 intersection are reaching capacity. The project would realign local streets to connect to Southgate and construct an interchange. The project will increase capacity and improve the operations of the facility. |  |  |  | Caltrans | Regional | Local | TIM | Other |
|  |  |  |  | X | X | X |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | ated Cost |  | 000 |
|  |  |  |  |  | Con | tion Year |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Priority C | teria |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Сара | ncreasing |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Majo | Operational | rovement |  |  |
| LOS | 2025 LOS |  |  | Funding Partners |  | Caltrans Butte County, City of Chico BCAG |  |  |
| Existing | w/o Project | w/Project | Concept |  |  |  |  |  |
| B | D | D | D |  |  |  |  |  |


| Proje | No.: 18 | Map No.: | Figure 3.4 | Priority |  | Priority 3 - Planned |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name: |  | Skyway/Park to E. 20 ${ }^{\text {th }}$, Aux. Lanes |  | MTP/EA\# |  | N/A |  |  |
| County: |  | SR 99-Post Mile: $30.603 / 31.498$ |  | Project Status (Planning/Programming) |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description: Construct Auxiliary lanes between Skyway/Park Avenue to E. $20^{\text {th }}$ Street in the City of Chico. |  |  |  | TSDP | TCR | RTP | PSR | RTL |
|  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No |
|  |  |  |  | Funding Source(s) |  |  |  |  |
| Purpose and Need: The proposed project is one of several auxiliary lane and interchange upgrade projects that are planned for SR 99 through the City of Chico. Due to increased residential and commercial development, and use of SR 99 for local travel trips, the Level of Service is projected to be "F" in 20 years, unless improvements are made. The proposed project will increase highway capacity, help relieve congestion, and reduce delay. |  |  |  | Caltrans | Regional | Local | TIM | Other |
|  |  |  |  |  | X | X | X |  |
|  |  |  |  | Estimated Cost |  |  | \$5,000,000 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Construction Year |  |  | 2011-2025 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Project Priority Criteria |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Capacity Increasing |  |  | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |  | Major Operational Improvement |  |  | Yes |  |
| LOS | 2025 LOS |  |  | Funding Partners |  | City of Chico BCAG |  |  |
| Existing | w/o Project | w/Project | Concept |  |  |  |  |  |
| E | F | E | D-E |  |  |  |  |  |


| Proj | No.: 19 | Map No.: | Figure 3.3 | Priority |  | Priority 3 - Planned |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name: |  | E. 20 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ St. Interchange Improvement |  | MTP/EA\# |  | N/A |  |  |
| County: |  | SR 99-Post Mile: 31.498 |  | Project Status (Planning/Programming) |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description: Widen on- and off-ramps, construct another lane to the southbound off-ramp, and add a northbound loop onramp and loop off-ramps. |  |  |  | TSDP | TCR | RTP | PSR | RTL |
|  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | Underway | No |
|  |  |  |  | Funding Source(s) |  |  |  |  |
| Purpose and Need: The East $20^{\text {th }}$ Street interchange provides access to a highly developed commercial corridor with "Big Box" stores, a Regional Shopping Mall, and other Highway Commercial uses. Traffic congestion is increasing to where vehicles' queuing back from E. $20^{\text {th }}$ Street onto the freeway is a major operational and safety concern. The proposed improvements will increase the interchange capacity, and improve safety and operations. |  |  |  | Caltrans | Regional | Local | TIM | Other |
|  |  |  |  |  | X | X | X |  |
|  |  |  |  | Estimated Cost |  |  | \$5,000,000 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Construction Year |  |  | 2011-2025 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Project Priority Criteria |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Capacity Increasing |  |  | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |  | Major Operational Improvement |  |  | Yes |  |
| LOS | 2025 LOS |  |  | Funding Partners |  |  | City of Chico BCAG |  |
| Existing | w/o Project | w/Project | Concept |  |  |  |  |  |
| E | F | E | D-E |  |  |  |  |  |


| Project No.: 20 |  | Map No.: | Figure 3.4 | Priority |  | Priority 3 - Planned |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name: |  | E. $\mathbf{2 0}^{\text {th }}$ SR 32, Auxiliary Lanes |  |  | P/EA\# |  | N/A |  |
| County: BUT |  | SR 99-Post Mile: $31.498 / 32.435$ |  | Project Status (Planning/Programming) |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description: Construct auxiliary lanes between East $20^{\text {th }}$ Street and SR 32 interchanges. |  |  |  | TSDP | TCR | RTP | PSR | RTL |
|  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes | No | No | No |
|  |  |  |  | Funding Source(s) |  |  |  |  |
| Purpose and Need: This section of SR 99 is experiencing a traffic volume of over 71,000 average annual vehicle trips per day, which is the second highest in the City of Chico. This portion of SR 99 will experience a LOS "F", unless improvements are made. The project will increase capacity, and improve the operations and safety of this freeway section. |  |  |  | Caltrans | Regional | Local | TIM | Other |
|  |  |  |  |  | X | X | X |  |
|  |  |  |  | Estimated Cost |  |  | \$6,000,000 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Construction Year |  |  | 2011-2025 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Project Priority Criteria |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Capacity Increasing |  |  | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |  | Major Operational Improvement |  |  | Yes |  |
| LOS | 2025 LOS |  |  | Funding Partners |  | City of Chico <br> BCAG |  |  |
| Existing | w/o Project | w/Project | Concept |  |  |  |  |  |
| E | F | E | D-E |  |  |  |  |  |


| Project No.: 21 |  | Map No.: | Figure 3.4 | Priority |  | Priority 3 - Planned |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name: |  | E. ${ }^{\text {st }}$ Cohasset, Auxiliary Lanes |  | MTP/EA\# |  | N/A |  |  |
| County: BUT |  | SR 99-Post Mile: 33.282/34.245 |  | Project Status (Planning/Programming) |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description: Construct auxiliary lanes between East $1^{\text {st }}$ Avenue and Cohasset Road, Chico. |  |  |  | TSDP | TCR | RTP | PSR | RTL |
|  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No |
|  |  |  |  | Funding Source(s) |  |  |  |  |
| Purpose and Need: This project proposes to construct auxiliary lanes in the City of Chico that will relieve congestion, increase capacity, and improve safety. This section of highway between East $1^{\text {st }}$ Avenue and Cohasset Road has an average annual daily traffic volume of 77,625 vehicle trips, which is the highest of any section within Chico. This project ties in with other programmed and planned auxiliary lane projects in Chico between Skyway/Park Avenue and Eaton Road. |  |  |  | Caltrans | Regional | Local | TIM | Other |
|  |  |  |  |  | X | X | X |  |
|  |  |  |  | Estimated Cost |  |  | \$16,100,000 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Construction Year |  |  | 2011-2025 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Project Priority Criteria |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Capacity Increasing |  |  | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |  | Major Operational Improvement |  |  | Yes |  |
| LOS | 2025 LOS |  |  | Funding Partners |  | City of Chico <br> BCAG |  |  |
| Existing | w/o Project | w/Project | Concept |  |  |  |  |  |
| F | F | E | D |  |  |  |  |  |



| Project No.: 24 |  | Map No.: | Figure 3.4 | Priority |  | Priority 3 - Planned |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name: |  | Eaton Rd. IC: Ph. 2 -Widen Overpass |  | MTP/EA\# |  | N/A |  |  |
| County: ${ }^{\text {BUT }}$ |  | SR 99-Post Mile: 36.305 |  | Project Status (Planning/Programming) |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description: Widen/reconstruct the interchange overcrossing to a 5 -lane facility with a center left-turn lane. |  |  |  | TSDP | TCR | RTP | PSR | RTL |
|  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No |
|  |  |  |  | Funding Source(s) |  |  |  |  |
| Purpose and Need: As described under Project 25, the Eaton Road Interchange provides major access to several large developing areas. Traffic congestion is increasing to where vehicles' queuing back from Eaton Road onto the Freeway is a major operational and safety concern. The Total Vehicle Collision rate of the section of freeway adjacent to Eaton Road is 110 percent above the Statewide average. Widening the interchange will increase the interchange capacity, and improve safety and operations. |  |  |  | Caltrans | Regional | Local | TIM | Other |
|  |  |  |  | X | X | X | X |  |
|  |  |  |  | Estimated Cost |  |  | \$10,500,000 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Construction Year |  |  | 2011-2025 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Project Priority Criteria |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Capacity Increasing |  |  | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |  | Major Operational Improvement |  |  | Yes |  |
| LOS | 2025 LOS |  |  | Funding Partners |  | Caltrans City of Chico BCAG |  |  |
| Existing | w/o Project | w/Project | Concept |  |  |  |  |  |
| F | F | E | D |  |  |  |  |  |


| Projec | No.: 25 | Map No.: | e 3.4 | Priority |  | Priority 3 - Planned |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name: |  | Eaton/Garner, Expressway |  | MTP/EA\# |  | N/A |  |  |
| County: |  | SR 99-Post Mile: $37.251 / 37.765$ |  | Project Status (Planning/Programming) |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description: Extend freeway from north of Eaton Road to Garner Lane as a 4-lane expressway, and construct a signal and turn lanes at the SR99/Garner Lane intersection. |  |  |  | TSDP | TCR | RTP | PSR | RTL |
|  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No |
|  |  |  |  | Funding Source(s) |  |  |  |  |
| Purpose and Need: The project will upgrade this segment of SR 99 from a 2-lane conventional highway to a 4-lane expressway, and construct a traffic signal and turn lanes at Garner Lane. Due to increased traffic in the northern portion of the City of Chico, congestion has been increasing. The project is needed to increase capacity, relieve congestion, and close one of several Expressway/Freeway gaps on SR 99 within Butte County. |  |  |  | Caltrans | Regional | Local | TIM | Other |
|  |  |  |  | X | X | X | X |  |
|  |  |  |  | Estimated Cost |  |  | \$6,500,000 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Construction Year |  |  | 2011-2025 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Project Priority Criteria |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Capacity Increasing |  |  | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |  | Major Operational Improvement |  |  | Yes |  |
| LOS | 2025 LOS |  |  | Funding Partners |  | Caltrans City of Chico BCAG |  |  |
| Existing | w/o Project | w/Project | Concept |  |  |  |  |  |
| E | F | D | D |  |  |  |  |  |


| Proje | t No.: 26 | Map No.: | Figure 3.4 | Priority |  | Priority 3 - Planned |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Na |  | Garner/Esplanade, Expressway |  | MTP/EA\# |  | N/A |  |  |
| County: |  | SR 99-Post Mile: $37.765 / 38.210$ |  | Project Status (Planning/Programming) |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description: Widen from 2-lane conventional highway to a 4-lane expressway. |  |  |  | TSDP | TCR | RTP | PSR | RTL |
|  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No |
|  |  |  |  | Funding Source(s) |  |  |  |  |
| Purpose and Need: The project will upgrade this segment of SR 99 from a 2-lane conventional highway to a 4-lane expressway. Due to increased traffic in the northern portion of Chico, congestion has been increasing. The project is needed to increase capacity, relieve congestion, and close one of several Expressway/Freeway gaps on SR 99 within Butte County. |  |  |  | Caltrans | Regional | Local | TIM | Other |
|  |  |  |  | X | X |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Estimated Cost |  |  | \$5,800,000 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Construction Year |  |  | 2011-2025 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Project Priority Criteria |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Capacity Increasing |  |  | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |  | Major Operational Improvement |  |  | Yes |  |
| LOS | 2025 LOS |  |  | Funding Partners |  |  | Caltrans <br> BCAG |  |
| Existing | w/o Project | w/Project | Concept |  |  |  |  |  |
| E | F | D | D |  |  |  |  |  |


| Project No.: 27 |  | Map No.: | Figure 3.4 | Priority |  | Priority 3 - Planned |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name: |  | Garner/Esplanade, Realignment |  | MTP/EA\# |  | N/A |  |  |
| County: BUT |  | SR 99-Post Mile: $37.765 / 38.210$ |  | Project Status (Planning/Programming) |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description: Realign Esplanade with Garner Lane with a combined at-grade intersection with SR 99. |  |  |  | TSDP | TCR | RTP | PSR | RTL |
|  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No |
|  |  |  |  | Funding Source(s) |  |  |  |  |
| Purpose and Need: The intersection of Esplanade with SR 99 is non-standard and has a skew angle that is less than 75 percent. The project would realign Esplanade with Garner Lane with a combined at-grade intersection with SR 99. The realignment will improve the safety and operations of the highway. |  |  |  | Caltrans | Regional | Local | TIM | Other |
|  |  |  |  | X | X |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Estimated Cost |  |  | \$6,000,000 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Construction Year |  |  | 2011-2025 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Project Priority Criteria |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Capacity Increasing |  |  | No |  |
|  |  |  |  | Major Operational Improvement |  |  | Yes |  |
| LOS | 2025 LOS |  |  | Funding Partners |  |  | CaltransBCAG |  |
| Existing | w/o Project | w/Project | Concept |  |  |  |  |  |
| E | F | E | D |  |  |  |  |  |


| Proje | No.: 28 | Map No.: | Figure 3.4 | Priority |  | Priority 3 - Planned |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name: |  | Butte County/South, Passing Lanes |  | MTP/EA\# |  | N/A |  |  |
| County: |  | SR 99-Post Mile: $0.000 / 4.500$ |  | Project Status (Planning/Programming) |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description: Add passing lanes between Butte County/Tehama County line and South Avenue. |  |  |  | TSDP | TCR | RTP | PSR | RTL |
|  |  |  |  | Yes | No | Yes | No | No |
|  |  |  |  | Funding Source(s) |  |  |  |  |
| Purpose and Need: The increase in interregional traffic will result in the Level of Service decreasing from "C" to "F" unless improvements are constructed. The Fatality plus Injury Collision rate along this section of highway is 119 percent above the Statewide average. Although some passing lanes do exist, more passing lanes will be needed to relieve congestion, increase capacity, and improve the safety and operations of the highway. |  |  |  | Caltrans | Regional | Local | TIM | Other |
|  |  |  |  | X | X |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Estimated Cost |  |  | \$4,860,000 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Construction Year |  |  | 2011-2025 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Project Priority Criteria |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Capacity Increasing |  |  | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |  | Major Operational Improvement |  |  | Yes |  |
| LOS | 2025 LOS |  |  | Funding Partners |  | Caltrans |  |  |
| Existing | w/o Project | w/Project | Concept |  |  |  |  |  |
| C | F | C | C-D |  |  | Tehama County Public Works |  |  |


| Proje | No.: 29 | Map No.: | Figure 3.4 |  |  | Priority 3 - Planned |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name: |  | Butte County/Vina, Expressway |  | MTP/EA\# |  | N/A |  |  |
| County |  | SR 99-Post Mile:. $000 / 6.900$ |  | Project Status (Planning/Programming) |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description: Convert 2- and 3-lane Conventional Highway to a Controlled Access 4-lane Expressway from the Butte/Tehama County line to the South Avenue intersection near Vina. |  |  |  | TSDP | TCR | RTP | PSR | RTL |
|  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No |
|  |  |  |  | Funding Source(s) |  |  |  |  |
| Purpose and Need: This project was identified in the 1991 Cooperative Special Study. The increase in interregional traffic will result in the Level of Service decreasing from LOS "C" to LOS " F " throughout this segment unless improvements are constructed. The project will upgrade the facility in 2 phases from a 2- and 3-lane Conventional Highway to a 4-lane Controlled Access Expressway. This conversion upgrade will help close Expressway gaps, increase capacity for interregional travel, and help relieve congestion. |  |  |  | Caltrans | Regional | Local | TIM | Other |
|  |  |  |  | X | X |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Estimated Cost |  |  | \$63,000,000 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Construction Year |  |  | 2011-2025 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Project Priority Criteria |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Capacity Increasing |  |  | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |  | Major Operational Improvement |  |  | Yes |  |
| LOS | 2025 LOS |  |  | Funding Partners |  |  |  |  |
| Existing | w/o Project | w/Project | Concept |  |  | Caltrans <br> TCTC <br> Tehama County Public Works |  |  |
| C | F | B | C-D |  |  |  |  |  |


| Proje | t No.: 30 | Map No.: | Figure 3.4 | Priority |  | Priority 3 - Planned |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name: |  | Los Molinos, Additional Lanes |  | MTP/EA\# |  | N/A |  |  |
| County:TEH |  | SR 99-Post Mile: $11.300 / 12.500$ |  | Project Status (Planning/Programming) |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description: Add passing lanes in the community of Los Molinos. |  |  |  | TSDP | TCR | RTP | PSR | RTL |
|  |  |  |  | Yes | No | Yes | No | No |
|  |  |  |  | Funding Source(s) |  |  |  |  |
| Purpose and Need: The increase in interregional traffic will result in the Level of Service decreasing "D" to "F" unless improvements are constructed. The Fatality plus Injury Collision rate along this section of highway is 174 percent above the Statewide average. The addition of lanes will increase capacity for interregional travel, help relieve congestion, and improve the safety and operations of the highway. |  |  |  | Caltrans | Regional | Local | TIM | Other |
|  |  |  |  | X | X |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Estimated Cost |  |  | \$16,200,000 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Construction Year |  |  | 2011-2025 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Project Priority Criteria |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Capacity Increasing |  |  | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |  | Major Operational Improvement |  |  | Yes |  |
| LOS | 2025 LOS |  |  | Funding Partners |  | Caltrans TCTC <br> Tehama County Public Works |  |  |
| Existing | w/o Project | w/Project | Concept |  |  |  |  |  |
| D | F | D | C-D |  |  |  |  |  |


| Project | t No.: 31 | Map No.: | Figure 3.4 | Priority |  | Priority 3 - Planned |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Na |  | Vina/I-5, Conversion to Expressway |  | MTP/EA\# |  | N/A |  |  |
| County: |  | SR 99-Post Mile: 6.900/24.950 |  | Project Status (Planning/Programming) |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description: Convert/Upgrade SR 99 from Vina to I-5 from a conventional highway to a 2-lane controlled access expressway. |  |  |  | TSDP | TCR | RTP | PSR | RTL |
|  |  |  |  | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No |
|  |  |  |  | Funding Source(s) |  |  |  |  |
| Purpose and Need: This project was identified in the 1991 Cooperative Special Study. The increase in interregional traffic will result in the Level of Service decreasing from a range of "C to F" to "D to F" unless improvements are constructed. The project will realign the facility in 4 phases from a 2 - and 3-lane conventional highway to a 2-lane controlled access expressway, which will help close Conventional Highway/ Expressway gaps, increase capacity for interregional travel, and relieve congestion. |  |  |  | Caltrans | Regional | Local | TIM | Other |
|  |  |  |  | X | X |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Estimated Cost |  |  | \$128,000,000 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Construction Year |  |  | 2011-2025 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Project Priority Criteria |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Capacity Increasing |  |  | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |  | Major Operational Improvement |  |  | Yes |  |
| LOS | 2025 LOS |  |  | Funding Partners |  | Caltrans TCTC |  |  |
| Existing | w/o Project | w/Project | Concept |  |  |  |  |  |
| C-D | D-F | B | C-D |  |  | Tehama County Public Works |  |  |


| Proje | No.: 32 | Map No.: | Figure 3.4 | Priority |  | Priority 3 - Planned |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name: |  | Salt Creek Bridges, Reconstruction |  | MTP/EA\# |  | N/A |  |  |
| County: |  | SR 99-Post Mile: $24.66 / 24.78 / 24.84$ |  | Project Status (Planning/Programming) |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description: Reconstruct 3 Salt Creek Overflow Bridges Numbers 08-0017, 08-0018, and 08-0019. |  |  |  | TSDP | TCR | RTP | PSR | RTL |
|  |  |  |  | Yes | No | Yes | No* | No |
|  |  |  |  | Funding Source(s) |  |  |  |  |
| Purpose and Need: The 3 bridges have non-standard sightdistance and shoulders, are prone to flooding during winter months, and inhibit crossing by pedestrians and bicyclists. These bridges are utilized to access elementary schools and the Tehama County Fairgrounds. The reconstruction of the 3 bridges will also include widening the shoulders along the structures. Due to the close proximity of the structures, left turn lanes need to be added to allow adjacent driveways access to SR 99. The reconstruction will result in improved sight-distance, reduced risk of flooding, and increased mobility for pedestrians and bicyclists. |  |  |  | Caltrans | Regional | Local | TIM | Other |
|  |  |  |  | X | X |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Estimated Cost |  |  | \$9,800,000 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Construction Year |  |  | 2012 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Project Priority Criteria |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Capacity Increasing |  |  | No |  |
|  |  |  |  | Major Operational Improvement |  |  | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |  | * A Preliminary Study is currently being conducted. |  |  |  |  |
| LOS | 2025 LOS |  |  | Funding Partners |  |  |  |  |
| Existing | w/o Project | w/Project | Concept |  |  | TCTC <br> Tehama County Public Works |  |  |
| D | E | D | C-D |  |  |  |  |  |


| Projec | No.: 33 | Map No.: Figure 3.4 |  | Priority |  | Priority 3 - Planned |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name: |  | Multi-modal Improvements, I-5/SR99 |  | MTP/EA\# |  | 4C420 |  |  |
| County: |  | SR 36-Post Mile: $41.00 / 43.900$ |  | Project Status (Planning/Programming) |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description: Install bike lanes, curb, sidewalk, and street lighting from SR 36/SR 99 Jct. to I-5 in Red Bluff. |  |  |  | TSDP | TCR | RTP | PSR | RTL |
|  |  |  |  | Yes | No | Yes | No | No |
|  |  |  |  | Funding Source(s) |  |  |  |  |
| Purpose and Need: This 4-lane highway is without multi-modal facilities, yet provides direct access to hotels, gasoline stations, restaurants, home improvement stores, agribusinesses, an elementary school, State agencies, and the County Fairgrounds, and indirect access to the Red Bluff Diversion Dam salmon viewing area and Lassen National Park. This segment attracts a number of tourists who walk or bike ride between the business facilities. The Total Collision and Fatal-Plus Injury rates along this highway section are respectively 176 and 166 percent above the Statewide average rates. The project is needed to improve the safety and operations of both pedestrians and bicyclists. |  |  |  | Caltrans | Regional | Local | TIM | Other |
|  |  |  |  | X | X |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Estimated Cost |  |  | \$2,025,000 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Construction Year |  |  | 2014 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Project Priority Criteria |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Capacity Increasing |  |  | No |  |
|  |  |  |  | Major Operational Improvement |  |  | Yes |  |
| LOS | 2025 LOS |  |  | Funding Partners |  | Caltrans |  |  |
| Existing | w/o Project | w/Project | Concept |  |  |  |  |  |
| C | E | E | C-D |  |  | Tehama County Public Works |  |  |

### 3.4 Future Projects:

Future projects are those that have been selected, which have a priority less than Planned projects. Future projects are based on the following selection criteria:

- Included in TSDP.
- Capacity increasing.
- Major operational improvement.
- Candidate for future regional transportation plan.

Using the above selection criteria, forty projects were identified as Future Projects. It is anticipated that most of the Future Projects may not be in construction by 2025. Therefore, Project Data Sheets have not been prepared. However, these future projects are described in Table 3.1 on the pages that follow.

Table 3.1, Future SR 70/99 Corridor Projects

| $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & 2 \\ & 3 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{0} \\ & \underset{y}{3} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 0 0 0 3 3 3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 중 } \\ & 3 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | SAC | 99 | 0.000/12.764 | San Joaquin County line | Elk Grove Boulevard | Widen from 4-lane freeway to 6lane freeway with Auxiliary lanes, Galt \& Elk Grove | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TSDP, } \\ & \text { TCR (1- } \\ & 3) \end{aligned}$ | TBD | TBD | PSR not yet begun | \$395,000 |
| 2 | SAC | 99 | 0.000/12.764 | San Joaquin County line | Elk Grove Boulevard | Construct HOV lanes | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { TSDP, } \\ \text { TCR (1- } \\ 3) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | TBD | TBD | PSR-PDS complete | \$100,000 |
| 3 | SAC | 99 | 12.191 | Whitelock <br> Road |  | Construct Interchange, Elk Grove | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TSDP, } \\ & \text { TCR (1- } \\ & 3) \end{aligned}$ | TIM | Elk Grove, SACOG, Caltrans | PSR not yet begun | \$30,000 |
| 4 | SAC | 99 | 12.764/16.280 | Elk Grove Boulevard | Calvine Road | Widen from 4-lane freeway with HOV lanes to 8-lane freeway, Elk Grove | $\begin{gathered} \text { TSDP, } \\ \text { TCR (4) } \end{gathered}$ | TBD | TBD | PSR not yet begun | TBD |
| 5 | SAC | 99 | 16.280/17.290 | Calvine Road | Mack Road | Widen from 6-lane freeway with HOV lanes to 8-lane freeway | $\begin{gathered} \text { TSDP, } \\ \text { TCR (5) } \end{gathered}$ | TBD | TBD | PSR not yet begun | TBD |
| 6 | SAC | 99 | 17.290/19.612 | Mack Road | Florin Road | Widen from 6-lane freeway to 8lane freeway | $\begin{gathered} \text { TSDP, } \\ \text { TCR (5) } \end{gathered}$ | TBD | TBD | PSR not yet begun | TBD |
| 7 | SAC | 99 | 24.273/24.351 | Oak Park interchange | $\begin{gathered} \text { U.S. } 50 \\ \text { interchange } \end{gathered}$ | Reconstruct Oak Park Interchange, and add HOV ramp connections and HOV lanes | TSDP, <br> Measure <br> A | TBD | Sacramento <br> County, <br> SACOG | PSR not yet begun | TBD |
| 8 | SAC | 99 | 32.124/36.863 | $\begin{gathered} \text { I-5/SR99 } \\ \text { Wye } \end{gathered}$ | Sutter County Line | Construct HOV lanes | $\begin{gathered} \text { TSDP, } \\ \text { TCR (8) } \end{gathered}$ | TBD | TBD | PSR not yet begun | \$100,000 |
| 9 | SAC | 99 | 32.124 | $\begin{gathered} \text { I-5/SR99 } \\ \text { Wye } \end{gathered}$ |  | ```Reconstruct Interchange, add 3rd NB/SB lanes``` | New Project | TBD | Sacramento <br> County, <br> SACOG | PSR not yet begun | TBD |
| 10 | SUT | 99 | 0.000/8.070 | Sacramento County line | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SR 99/SR } \\ & 70 \text { Wye } \end{aligned}$ | Construct HOV lanes | $\begin{gathered} \text { TSDP, } \\ \text { TCR (10) } \end{gathered}$ | TBD | TBD | PSR not yet begun | TBD |
| 11 | SUT | 99 | 3.040 | Sankey Road |  | Construct L-9 <br> 4-lane <br> Interchange | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { TSDP, } \\ \text { TCR } \\ (10), \\ 2006 \\ \text { MTP } \end{gathered}$ | TBD | TBD | PSR Complete in 1992, PA\&ED in 1993 | \$20,000 |
| 12 | SUT | 99 | 7.080 | Catlett Road |  | Construct Interchange | $\begin{gathered} \text { TSDP, } \\ \text { TCR (10) } \end{gathered}$ | TIM | TBD | PSR not yet begun | \$25,000 |

Table 3.1, Future SR 70/99 Corridor Projects

| $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & 3 \\ & 3 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 0 \\ & 2 \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{0} \\ & \underset{y}{\theta} \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ | تِ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 줄 } \\ & 0 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | 0 |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { n } \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 13 | SUT | 99 | 36.031 | Lomo Crossing |  | Construct grade separation | $\begin{gathered} \text { TSDP, } \\ \text { TCR (17) } \end{gathered}$ | TBD | TBD | PSR not yet begun | TBD |
| 14 | SUT | 99 | 42.135/42.389 | Riviera Road, Live Oak | Butte County line | Widen from 2-lane conventional highway to 4lane expressway | $\begin{gathered} \text { TSDP, } \\ \text { TCR (19) } \end{gathered}$ | TBD | TBD | PSR not yet begun | TBD |
| 15 | BUT | 99 | 0.000/3.130 | Sutter County line | West Liberty Road, Gridley | Widen from 2-lane conventional highway to 4lane expressway | $\begin{gathered} \text { TSDP, } \\ \text { TCR }(20, \\ 21) \end{gathered}$ | TBD | TBD | PSR not yet begun | TBD |
| 16 | BUT | 99 | 4.580/5.137 | North of Ford Avenue, Gridley | Ord Ranch Road, Gridley | Widen from 2-lane conventional highway to 5lane conventional urban arterial with curbs, gutters, and sidewalks | $\begin{gathered} \text { TSDP, } \\ \text { TCR (21) } \end{gathered}$ | TBD | TBD | PSR not yet begun | TBD |
| 17 | BUT | 99 | 5.137/7.690 | Ord Ranch Road, Gridley | B Street/ East Biggs Highway | Widen from 2-lane conventional highway to 5lane conventional urban arterial | $\begin{gathered} \text { TSDP, } \\ \text { TCR (22) } \end{gathered}$ | TBD | TBD | PSR not yet begun | TBD |
| 18 | BUT | 99 | 7.690/21.810 | B Street/ East Biggs Highway | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { SR 99/SR } \\ 149 \\ \text { Junction } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Phase 1: Construct passing lanes | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { TSDP, } \\ \text { TCR (22, } \\ 23) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | TBD | TBD | PSR not yet begun | TBD |
| 19 | BUT | 99 | 7.690/21.810 | B Street/ East Biggs Highway | $\begin{gathered} \text { SR 99/SR } \\ 149 \\ \text { Junction } \end{gathered}$ | Phase 2: Widen from 2-lane conventional highway to 4lane expressway | $\begin{gathered} \text { TSDP, } \\ \text { TCR (22, } \\ 23) \end{gathered}$ | TBD | TBD | PSR not yet begun | TBD |
| 20 | BUT | 99 | 23.863 | DurhamPentz |  | Interchange improvement: widen overcrossing to 4-lanes | $\begin{gathered} \text { TSDP, } \\ \text { TCR (24) } \end{gathered}$ | TBD | TBD | PSR <br> Complete | \$1,100 |
| 21 | BUT | 99 | 26.040 | Neal Road |  | Construct Interchange | $\begin{gathered} \text { TSDP, } \\ \text { TCR (24) } \end{gathered}$ | TBD | TBD | PSR not yet begun | \$25,000 |
| 22 | BUT | 99 | 30.603 | Skyway/ <br> Park <br> Avenue, Chico |  | Interchange improvement: Widen overcrossing to 4-lanes | TSDP, TCR (25), 2001 SR 99 Chico Corridor Study, Chico Nexus Study | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TIM, } \\ & \text { RIP, } \\ & \text { STIP } \end{aligned}$ | City of Chico | PS\&E underway | TBD |

Table 3.1, Future SR 70/99 Corridor Projects

| $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & 3 \\ & 3 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 8 \\ \underset{2}{2} \\ \hline 1 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & 0 \\ & 3 \\ & 3 \\ & 3 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 제줄 } \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $0$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23 | BUT | 99 | 31.498 | E. 20th Street, Chico |  | Reconstruct <br> Interchange: widen overcrossing to 6-lanes | TSDP, <br> TCR <br> (25), <br> 2001 <br> SR99 <br> Chico <br> Corridor <br> Study | TBD | TBD | PSR not yet begun | TBD |
| 24 | BUT | 99 | 37.765/45.975 | Esplanade | Tehama County line | Widen from 2-lane conventional highway to 4lane expressway | $\begin{gathered} \text { TSDP, } \\ \text { TCR (27) } \end{gathered}$ | TBD | TBD | PSR not yet begun | \$54,000 |
| 25 | TEH | 99 | 0.000/24.950 | Butte <br> County line | $\begin{gathered} \text { I-5 } \\ \text { Junction } \end{gathered}$ | Convert controlled access 2-lane expressway and 4-lane divided expressway to a 4-lane freeway in 10 phases. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TCR, } \\ & \text { RTP } \end{aligned}$ | TBD | Caltrans, TCTC, Tehama County Public Works | PSR not yet begun | \$200,000 |
| 26 | YUB | 70 | 7.345 | McGowan Parkway |  | Modify McGowan Parkway Interchange | MTP | TBD | Yuba <br> County, <br> SACOG | PSR not yet begun | \$5,000 |
| 27 | YUB | 70 | 10.155/11.386 | Erle Road | N. Beale <br> Road | Construct 2lane <br> Goldfields <br> Parkway (E. Linda Blvd.) on Marysville Bypass alignment | Nexus Study | TIM fees | Yuba County | PSR <br> Underway | \$4,360 |
| 28 | YUB | 70 | 10.155/11.386 | Erle Road | N. Beale Road | Additional <br> right-of-way <br> and final <br> design for 4- <br> lane <br> Goldfields <br> Parkway | Nexus Study | TIM fees | Yuba County | PSR not yet begun | \$5,000 |
| 29 | YUB | 70 | 11.25 | Feather River Blvd.North |  | Widen Feather River Boulevard onramp | $\begin{gathered} \text { TSDP, } \\ \text { TCR } \end{gathered}$ | IIP and NHSF | Caltrans, SACOG | PSR <br> Complete | TBD |
| 30 | YUB | 70 | 11.35 | Feather River Blvd.North |  | Widen Feather River Boulevard bridge and extend eastbound merge | $\begin{gathered} \text { TSDP, } \\ \text { TCR } \end{gathered}$ | SHOPP | Caltrans, SACOG | PSR not yet begun | \$2,000 |
| 31 | YUB | 70 | 13.57 | North Beal Road ramp |  | Widen North Beale Road northbound on ramp | New Project | TBD | TBD | PSR not yet begun | \$240 |

Table 3.1, Future SR 70/99 Corridor Projects

| $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & 3 \\ & 3 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \\ 8 \\ \underset{2}{2} \\ \hline 1 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 제줄 } \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $0$ | 부N |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 32 | YUB | 70 | 13.94/15.850 | North end of Yuba River Bridge | North city limit of Marysville | Construct 2lane <br> Expressway, Feather River Parkway around or through the City of Marysville | $\begin{gathered} \text { TSDP, } \\ \text { TCR } \end{gathered}$ | TBD | Caltrans, SACOG | PSR not yet begun | TBD |
| 33 | YUB | 70 | 15.11 | UPRR <br> Underpass |  | Widen underpass to meet safety standards | MTP | SHOPP <br> \& TBD | Caltrans, SACOG | PSR not yet begun | \$7,000 |
| 34 | YUB | 70 | 15.850/25.822 | City of Marysville | Butte/Yuba County line | Construct Passing Lanes | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { TSDP, } \\ \text { TCR, } \\ \text { MTP, } \\ \text { and } \\ \text { MTIP } \end{gathered}$ | SHOPP <br> \& TBD | Caltrans, SACOG | PSR not yet begun | \$20,000 |
| 35 | YUB | 70 | 18.7/22.890 | Woodruff Lane | Ramirez <br> Road | Construct Passing Lanes | New Project | TBD | Caltrans | PSR not yet begun | \$30,000 |
| 36 | BUT | 70 | 12.500 | Georgia Pacific Way |  | Construct Georgia Pacific Way Interchange | $\begin{gathered} \text { TSDP, } \\ \text { RTP } \end{gathered}$ | TBD | BCAG | PSR not yet begun | TBD |
| 37 | BUT | 70 | 14.831/15.141 | Beginning of Feather River Bridge | End of Feather River Bridge | Widen <br> Feather River <br> Bridge to 6- <br> lanes, <br> Oroville | New Project | TBD | TBD | PSR not yet begun | TBD |
| 38 | BUT | 70 | 15.43 | Grand <br> Avenue 3rd and 4th Streets ramp intersections |  | Install traffic signals or roundabouts, widen northbound off-ramp \& add turn lanes, Oroville | Nexus Study, RTP | TIM | Oroville, BCAG | PSR not yet begun | \$640 |
| 39 | BUT | 70 | 15.72 | Nelson <br> Avenue 3rd and 4th Streets ramp intersections |  | Install traffic signals or roundabouts, widen ramps \& add turn lanes, Oroville | Nexus Study, RTP | TIM | Oroville, BCAG | PSR not yet begun | \$640 |
| 40 | BUT | 70 | 15.43 | Grand Avenue |  | Widen overcrossing from 2- to 4lanes | New Project | TBD | TBD | PSR not yet begun | TBD |

## Chapter 4 Implementation Plan

### 4.1 Project Development Process:

Most of the active, programmed, planned, and future projects that were identified in Chapter 3 are in various stages of the project development process. The project development process usually begins after a transportation need has been identified. The project initiation document (PID) starts the process leading to the programming of funds. The process ends upon completion of the construction and closing out the project. Figure 4.1 delineates the project development process.

Figure 4.1, Project Development Process


All ten Priority 1 Projects and eleven Priority 2 Projects have achieved Phase 1 status in that a PID document has been approved. In addition, many of these active programmed projects have achieved Phase 2 status in that Project Approval and Environmental Documents have been completed. Five of the active projects have also achieved Phase 3 status in that project design has been completed and right-of-way acquired. These
projects are Ready to List (RTL) for construction, but are not being advertised for construction because they are not yet fully funded.

Seven of the thirty-four projects that are listed in the Planned projects list have achieved Phase 1 status in that a PID has been or is nearing completion. A couple of these projects have also achieved Phase 2 status. Without additional funding assistance, many of the Planned Projects may not realize full development and construction for at least 20 years.

Six of the forty projects that are listed in the Future projects list have achieved Phase 1 status in that a PID has been or is nearing completion. One of the projects has achieved Phase 2 status and one project has achieved the design component of the Phase 3 status. As is the case with the Planned Projects, additional funding assistance is needed in order to realize programming and construction of the Future Projects; otherwise, these projects may not be built until after 2025.

### 4.2 Phasing of Projects:

A consideration of phasing of the projects listed within this Business Plan is critical to the successful completion of work on the SR 70/99 Corridor. If all of the almost \$2-billion that is needed for all the Sacramento Valley SR 70/99 Corridor projects identified was allocated at one time, it would not be possible to complete the projects any faster than if they were allocated over a twenty-year period. Depending on the type of environmental document that is required, an identified project can take anywhere from four to fourteen years to be completed.

The projects needed for SR 70/99 Corridor within Districts 2 and 3 have been identified by four priority categories. These categories include Priority 1 Projects, Priority 2 Projects, Planned Projects, and Future Projects. The phasing of the projects identified in this Business Plan will correspond with each category. It is anticipated that construction for the needed projects will occur as follows:

- Phase 1: Priority 1 and Priority 2 projects: prior to December 31, 2012.
- Phase 2: Planned projects: from 2012 through 2025.
- Phase 3: Future projects: after 2025.

While this Business Plan proposes a twenty-year timeframe for implementing the improvements identified under the Priority 1, Priority 2, and Planned projects, it is clear that the Sacramento Valley cannot wait twenty years for implementation and there is great pressure to accelerate this effort.

### 4.3 Performance Measures:

As noted in Chapter 3, performance criteria were identified for each of the four Priority categories. Every candidate project that was selected in each category was evaluated for conformity to the identified performance criteria. In order to maximize the State's investments in transportation infrastructure, the projects contained within each Priority of this Business Plan will further be evaluated for performance and cost-effectiveness at the system and project level where appropriate.

### 4.4 Project Funding Process:

The most significant obstacle facing the improvement of the SR 70/99 Corridor is the lack of adequate funding. Neither the STIP nor the SHOPP are adequately funded to maintain and improve the routes. In order to attempt to address this issue, this Business Plan identifies a number of funding strategies.

It is anticipated that this Business Plan will be realized by utilizing a mixture of traditional and non-traditional funding programs, a portion of the Transportation Investment Fund, and a portion of the Strategic Growth Plan Bond Program.

### 4.4.1 Traditional Funding:

Traditional funding programs include federal, state, and local programs that are funded by state fuel taxes, federal fuel taxes, sales taxes on fuel, truck weight fees, roadway and bridge tolls, user fares, local sales tax measures, development traffic impact mitigation fees, bonds, and state and local general funds. Historically, many local government entities viewed highway mainline improvements as primarily the State's responsibility, while they viewed improvements to interchanges on the route as primarily a local responsibility. Due to the requirement of the California Environmental Quality Act to mitigate impacts to the State Highway System (SHS) caused by local development projects, this attitude is starting to change. Most counties and cities along the SR 70/99 Corridor in the Sacramento Valley have a traffic impact mitigation fee program that includes a portion of the fees to be utilized for improvements to the highway.
Additionally, there is a growing trend by local governments to sponsor sales tax measures to help fund transportation improvements to the SHS. The use of development impact fees and local sales taxes as part of a shared funding program will help expedite the construction of the improvements identified in this Business Plan.

A description of the traditional funding programs, the allocation process, eligible uses and projects, program type and applicability to help fund improvements identified in this Business Plan is shown on the following page in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1, Traditional Transportation Funding Programs Federal Programs
Program

| Bridge Replacement/ <br> Rehabilitation (HBRR) |
| :---: |
|  <br> Air Quality (CMAQ) |
| Emergency Relief (ER) |


|  |
| :--- |
| Safety Program (HES) |
| 而 |

Interstate Maintenance

| Program (IM) | ba |
| :---: | :--- |
| National Highway | Co |
| System Program (NHS) |  |
| ba |  |
| Surface Transportation | Co |


| Surface Transportation <br> Program (STP) | C |
| :---: | :---: |
| Special Federal <br> Earmarks |  |


| Earmarks |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Transportation <br> Enhancements (TE) | ITIP |
| Safe Routes To Schools | S |


|  | Allocation <br> Process |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Competitive statewide <br> based on need \& merit | St <br> re |  |
| MPO selects projects | Tran |  |


| Eligible Uses | Program <br> Type | Applicable <br> to SRs70/99 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| wide <br> merit | State and local highway bridge <br> rehabilitation and replacement | Categorical | Yes |
| jects | Transportation projects that improve <br> air quality | Categorical | Maybe |
| bid |  |  |  |


| State Programs |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Program | Allocation <br> Process | Eligible Projects | Program <br> Type | Applicable <br> to SRs70/99 |
| Interregional <br> Improvement Program <br> (IIP) | Statewide competitive <br> through Caltrans | Rural highway projects on IIP State <br> highways \& urban extensions that <br> generate economic development | Programming | Yes |
| Regional Improvement <br> Program (RIP) | MPO selects projects <br> by competitive bid | All types of highway projects on and <br> off the State Hwy. System | Programming | Yes |
| State Highway <br> Operations and <br> Protection (SHOPP) | Statewide competitive <br> through Caltrans | State Highway System safety, <br> operations, and rehab. projects | Programming | Yes |
| Traffic Congestion <br> Relief Program (TCRP) | Legislation or STIP | All types of transportation projects | Categorical | Yes |
| Transportation <br> Development Act | Use determine by <br> MPO | Transit, roads, bicycles, pedestrian <br> facilities | Categorical | Yes |
| Bicycle Transportation <br> Account | Statewide competitive <br> through Caltrans | Bicycle facilities | Categorical | Yes |

## Local Programs

| Program | Allocation <br> Process | Eligible Projects | Program <br> Type | Applicable <br> to SRs70/99 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Local Sales Tax Measure <br> A, Sacramento County | Expenditure Plan | Highways, streets, light rail, bus, <br> bicycle, pedestrian | Expenditure <br> Plan | Yes |
| Development Traffic <br> Impact Mitigation Fees | Local agency selection | Any specified use identified in <br> agency's Nexus Study | Local budget | Yes |
| Local Agency Budget | Annual budget process | Any specified use | Local budget | Yes |

### 4.4.2 Non-Traditional Funding:

Non-traditional funding programs include Innovative Funding Sources strategy such as those introduced by the Business, Transportation, and Housing Agency under the Go California program, and Pooled Mitigation Funds strategy. Included in these programs are the use of innovative financing strategies that will help fund and advance important transportation system improvements. These financing strategies fall into four classifications, which include innovative management of Federal funds, debt financing, credit assistance, and highway tolls.

The Innovative Management of Federal Funds strategy consists of several specific programs including Advance Construction, Tapered Non-Federal Match, Flexible Match, and Tolls Credits. These strategies can allow California to move projects on SR 70 and SR 99 forward. The Debt Financing strategy allows bond financing of projects for advance construction if there is a source of ongoing funding to retire the bonds. The recent use of GARVEE bonds in California permits projects to move to construction sooner than the traditional pay-as-you-go approach.

The Credit Assistance strategy allows the use of federal funds for a public or private project sponsor to better access credit for transportation projects. This strategy also uses credit enhancement techniques, which allows a project sponsor to borrow funds at lower interest rates that can result in reducing the amount of capital borrowed from other sources.

The Highway Tolls strategy would establish highway tolls on SR 70 and SR 99, which would be used to finance improvements to the facility. To implement this strategy, special legislation will need to be authorized through legislative action.

The Pooled Mitigation Funds option could be used when multiple projects are proposed. Each of the projects within this Business Plan will most likely require specific environmental mitigation on a project-by-project basis including acquiring a multitude of separate mitigation sites, which can be very expensive. As an alternative, a regional approach can be utilized to preserve and maintain large tracts of habitat with multispecies values that may enhance and expedite the environmental process. This approach would require Caltrans establishing a Memorandum of Understanding with federal and State agencies including the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Federal Highway Administration, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, California Department of Fish and Game, and other applicable Resource Agencies. Continued and ongoing cooperation between Federal, State, and local agencies can help reduce the costs of projects and expedite delivery.

### 4.4.3 Transportation Investment Fund:

Proposition 42, which was approved by voters in 2002, amended the State Constitution to dedicate most of the revenue from the sales tax on gasoline to transportation uses. Specifically, Proposition 42 requires those revenues that previously went to the General Fund be transferred to the Transportation Investment Fund to provide for improvements to highways, streets and roads, and transit systems. The use of a portion of the Transportation Investment Fund revenue will help expedite the needed improvements to the SR 70/99 Corridor identified in this Business Plan.

### 4.4.4 Strategic Growth Plan Bond Program:

Another possible funding source that may be utilized to partially fund projects contained within this Business Plan is the Strategic Growth Plan Bond Program (Proposition 1B or SGPBP). Approved in the November 7, 2006 election, Proposition 1B authorizes the issuance of bonds, not to exceed $\$ 19.925$ billion, to fund transportation projects to help finance the upgrading of freeways to reduce congestion and of major highways along major transportation corridors, to improve goods movement and air quality, and to enhance the safety and security of the transportation system. Projects that may be funded by the SGPBP must be included in either an RTP amendment or in the next RTP update. All projects receiving federal transportation funds must also be programmed in a Federal TIP and also in a Federal STIP.

### 4.5 Amendments to Route 99 Business Plan:

As projects from the Priority 1 and Priority 2 categories are constructed, projects from Priority 3 and Priority 4 will "move up the ladder" into a Priority 2 or Priority 1 category. It is anticipated that as projects are constructed or move up the ladder, new projects will be identified and added to this Business Plan. As such, this Business Plan will be amended from time to time.

### 4.6 Economic Benefits of Implementation:

The benefit of investing in transportation projects greatly exceeds the purposes of improving safety, increasing capacity, increasing Level of Service, and improving operations of the facility. In a regional economy, there are generally three types of benefits that occur when a transportation project is built. These include direct benefits, indirect benefits, and induced benefits. Direct benefits equate to the number of jobs created by the amount of dollars invested. Indirect benefits are the number of jobs created as a result of the goods and services needed to support the transportation project construction. Induced benefits are the total of the consumption by employees in both the direct and indirect categories benefit industries.

A 2004 report published by the Sacramento Regional Research Institute used the IMPLAN model that was developed at the University of Minnesota to calculate the regional benefits per one billion dollars invested in transportation projects. The following table is extrapolated from their findings.

| Table 4.2, Total Economic Benefit |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Dollars in Billions |  |  |  |
|  | Phase 1 | Phase 2 | Phase 3 | Total |
| Transportation Dollars Spent | $\$ 1$ | $\$ 1$ | $\$ 4$ | $\$ 6$ |
| Effect on Economy (Multiplier = 1.97) | $\$ 1.97$ | $\$ 1.97$ | $\$ 7.88$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 1 . 8 2}$ |
| Effect on Jobs (Multiplier $=1.76$ ) | 17,866 | 17,866 | 71,464 | $\mathbf{1 0 7 , 1 9 6}$ |

Source: SRRI Economic Impact of Funding California's Transportation Infrastructure
Capital investment into the SR 70/99 Corridor in the Sacramento Valley can also spur additional indirect economic benefits in commercial and industrial growth. History has shown that businesses tend to expand or relocate around intersections or interchanges of well-maintained expressways or freeways that have capacity.

While the funding strategies discussed in this Chapter deal primarily with advancing future revenues, they do not actually generate additional revenue. Both are required to achieve the goals and objectives of this Business Plan.

### 4.7 Conclusions:

The Sacramento Valley Route 70/99 Corridor Business Plan (Business Plan) has been designed as a guide for decision-makers in making strategic investment decisions for improving mobility and accessibility in the corridor. The Business Plan addresses existing conditions along the length of corridor through Caltrans District 2 and 3 from the Sacramento/San Joaquin County Line to the City of Red Bluff in Tehama County. The Business Plan draws upon existing planning, programming, and project documents to create a comprehensive list of current, planned, and future projects. These projects are designed to improve safety, increase capacity, and close gaps on the routes that are critical for movement of goods, services, and people in the eastern Sacramento Valley.

This Business Plan contains four chapters. In Chapter 1, the purpose, goals and objectives of the plan were identified, and the need for local and regional cooperation was articulated. The primary goals identified in Chapter 1 are to close gaps, improve mobility, and bring the Route 70/99 Corridor up to expressway and freeway standards, and to reach consensus amongst the SACOG), BCAG, TCTC, and Caltrans.

Chapter 2 discussed a brief history of the routes and identified the existing conditions for each route by applicable Transportation Concept Report segment. Many of the segments
on the Route 70/99 Corridor are currently experiencing an unacceptable level of service, and have safety and operational issues that need to be resolved.

Chapter 3 identified projects by priority that need to be completed to meet the goals and objectives identified in Chapter 1. The four priorities are Priority 1 Projects, Priority 2 Projects, Planned Projects, and Future Projects. Selection criteria were developed for each of the four priorities. There are ten projects within Priority 1 that were identified by SACOG, BCAG, the TCTC, and Caltrans as having the highest priority.

In Chapter 4, the phasing of projects by priority and funding strategies to expedite successful construction of the projects was documented. It should be noted that the cost estimates did not include inflation. Over the twenty-year life of this Business Plan, inflation will increase the costs identified in this document. With inflation calculated into the costs for the projects identified in this Business Plan, each subsequent year will demand additional funding. With a 5-percent a year inflation rate, it is foreseeable that the total costs of the projects may increase by almost 300-percent!

In view of the current and projected traffic congestion, and safety and operational issues along this corridor, and the projected cost of upgrading the corridor, it is clear that the Sacramento Valley cannot afford to wait twenty years for implementation of this Business Plan. Therefore, the challenge and opportunity to accelerate this plan are great. Caltrans' Districts 2 and 3, and our regional partners are ready to accept this challenge and opportunity!

## Appendix A

## SR 70/99 Corridor History

## A. 1 Route 99 History:

State Route (SR) 99 first became a State highway in 1909 and was designated as Legislative Route Number 4 in the Sacramento area, Route 7 from Woodland to Red Bluff, and Route 3 from Red Bluff to the California/Oregon State line. It was paved in about 1913-1914 and was redesignated as US 99 in 1926. US 99 was the main north-south highway on the West Coast of the United States until 1964. This highway ran from Calexico, California on the US/Mexico border to Blaine, Washington on the US/Canada border. Known also as the "Golden State Highway" and "The Main Street of
 California", US 99 was an important route in California throughout much of the 1930's as a route for Dust Bowl immigrant farm workers traversing the state.


Source: 1931 State of California Map
along the current SR 99 to Red Bluff, where it rejoined US 99W. Later, the US 99E route ran north of Sacramento along Jibboom Street, Garden Highway, and El Centro Road towards Yuba City. At the community of In District 3, south of Sacramento, US 99 was in its same location as it is currently. However, upon reaching Sacramento, US 99 split into two highways, 99 E and 99 W . 99W followed Interstate 80 (I-80) west to Davis, then north on SR 113 to Woodland, and then continued along the general route of I-5 as to Red Bluff.

US 99E extended through Sacramento via Stockton Boulevard, Broadway, $16^{\text {th }}$ Street, L and M Streets, and then followed SR 160 to the old Auburn Boulevard, I-80/ US 40 route to Roseville, then headed north along SR 65 to Olivehurst where it followed SR 70 to Marysville, then west on SR 20 across the Feather River to Yuba City, and then north Nicolaus, 99E headed west on Nicolaus Road, then north on Garden Highway into Yuba City. From Yuba City 99E extended northwest on Live Oak Boulevard through the
communities of Live Oak and Gridley, and then north through Biggs, Richvale, and Durham towards Chico by way of Riceton Road, Richvale Highway, and Midway. US 99E traversed through the City of Chico by way of Midway, Broadway, Main Street, and the Esplanade north to the current SR 99 location near Wilson Landing Road. North of Chico, 99E extended into Tehama County along the Vina plain, through Los Molinos, then continued north to the community of Red Bluff.

In 1953, I-5 was adopted as a Federal Freeway, and was added to the Freeway and Expressway system in 1959. In 1967, the Chico freeway bypass of US 99E was completed. Thereafter, US 99 was decertified as a US route in 1969. Following the completion of Interstate 5 (I-5) in 1970, US 99 was completely decommissioned and turned over to the State of California.

Today, SR 99 stretches from Wheeler Ridge in Kern County to SR 36, $21 / 2$ miles southeast of the City of Red Bluff in Tehama County. This 424-mile long highway is California's second-longest state highway behind SR 1 and is part of the Freeway and Expressway System, as stated by Section 253.1 of the California State Highway Code. The portion of SR 99 within the Caltrans Districts 2 and 3 boundaries begin at the San Joaquin/Sacramento County line and end near the City of Red Bluff and the junction with I-5.

Most of the land adjacent to SR 99 is utilized for agriculture. Transporting agricultural commodities to market has made SR 99 an even more vital economic link. Changes in "on-time delivery" of goods have led to higher truck volumes on the route. Rapid population growth over several decades in the urbanized areas adjacent to SR 99 has also led
 to more traffic.


In Sacramento County, SR 99 from the SR 99/I-5 junction north to the SR 99/SR 70 wye was widened from a 2-lane conventional highway to a 4-lane expressway in the 1980s.

In Sutter County, portions of SR 99 north of the SR 99/SR 70 wye and south of Garden Highway as well as north of O'Banion Road have recently been widened from a 2-lane conventional highway to a 4-lane expressway with a median.


## A. 2 Route 70 History:



Source: 1950 Metsker's Yuba County Map

SR 70 first became a State highway in 1934 as Route 24. In the late 1930's, it was resigned as Alternate US 40. From 1951 through 1963, the route was also signed as SR 232 and as Route 3 from Sacramento to Marysville along El Centro Road. Portions of this route turned west out of Sacramento along the river with Route 16 to Woodland. In 1967, Route 70, which was co-signed with Route 99 began at Route 16 or at Route 275 (Capitol Avenue, former US 40/US 99W) and continued along Jibboom Street, Garden Highway, and El Centro Road north towards Marysville. Once in Yuba County the route continued along Feather River Boulevard north to the intersection of SR 65 (former US 99E) where the two highways merged and entered into the City of Marysville by way of the D Street Bridge. This bridge was replaced after 1957. North of Marysville, the route was known as Route 87 and later became Route 21 in the City of Oroville. The route entered Oroville by way of the Old Power House Hill Road, then north on Feather River Boulevard as well as Lone
Tree Road and Marysville-Baggett Road, then east on Montgomery Street, and then north on Table Mountain Boulevard where it intercepted SR 149 and the current SR 70, which extends northeast into the scenic Feather River Canyon and Sierra-Nevada Mountains.

During the 1960s, SR 70 was rerouted and upgraded to a 4-lane freeway through Oroville. Upgrading the facility to an expressway or freeway through or around Marysville has yet to occur.

In 1970, I-5 was completed through the Natomas portion of Sacramento between Elkhorn Boulevard and downtown Sacramento, bypassing the old El Central Road SR 232/SR 24 routing of SR 70/SR 99. During the early 1970s, SR 70 truncated to begin at the Elkhorn wye and was co-signed with SR 99. In the late 1990s, SR 70 signage was pushed further north to the legislative western terminus of Catlett Road. Throughout the years, the legislative definition never changed in that one of the SR 70 extension (co-signed with

SR 99) south to downtown Sacramento was ever covered by it, but was a direct replacement of former Route 24.

Today, SR 70 stretches from the SR 70/SR 99 wye in Sutter County to the SR 70/SR 395 wye at Hallelujah Junction. This 182 -mile long highway is part of the Freeway and Expressway System, as stated by Section 253.1 of the California State Highway Code. This highway lies solely within the boundaries of Districts 2 and 3. Within this highway 54.6 miles are a part of the Corridor being analyzed under this Business Plan. As is the case with SR 99, most of the land adjacent to SR 70 is utilized for agriculture.
Transporting agricultural commodities to market has made SR 70 an even more vital economic link. Additionally, SR 70 has become a "gateway" route to accessing multiple recreational destinations in the Sierra-Nevada Mountains. Rapid population growth over several decades in the urbanized areas adjacent to SR 70 has also led to more traffic and increased congestion.

There have been a number of recent and planned improvements for SR 70. A portion of SR 70 from the Sutter/Yuba County line to the existing freeway south of Marysville was upgraded from a 2 -lane conventional highway to a 4 -lane expressway in 2004. In addition, the portion from the SR 70/SR 99 wye to the Sutter/Yuba County line has been programmed for the same expressway upgrade by 2012. These two portions will eventually be upgraded to a full freeway.

At one time, there were plans and some programming towards constructing a Marysville Bypass that would start at the SR 70/SR 65 junction, run east of Marysville, and connect with the existing SR 70 Freeway south of the City of Oroville. Plans for the Marysville Bypass have been in various Caltrans' planning and programming documents for over 20 years and in Yuba County's General Plan Circulation Element for almost 40 years. Due to the difficulty of assembling funding for such a large project, the bypass has been temporarily put on hold. However, the County of Yuba has programmed construction for a portion of this bypass from Erle Road to North Beale Road as a local arterial road and has plans to construct other portions from the SR 70/SR 65 junction to Erle Road at a future date. Currently, District 3 staff is examining alternatives to a Marysville expressway bypass that includes a 2 -lane expressway around the perimeter of or through the City of Marysville. The need to complete the upgrading of the facility to an expressway or freeway standard is great.

## Appendix B

## Existing Conditions By Route Segment

The Caltrans District 3 draft Transportation Concept Report (TCR) for SR 99 proposes 27 segments. The District 2 TCR for SR 99 contains five segments. The District 2 TCR for SR 36 identifies one segment and the District 3 TCR for SR 70 identifies seven segments that are applicable to this Business Plan. These District 2 and 3 route segments for SR 99, SR 36 and SR 70 are shown on Figure B. 1 and described on the pages that follow. The descriptions of existing conditions include a brief discussion of the current performance of the highway segment, as well as safety issues, problem areas, and needed improvements.

Figure B.1, SR 70/99 Corridor by TCR Segment, Districts 2 and 3


## B. 1 District 3, SR 99:

Segment 1: 3.53 miles - San Joaquin-Sacramento County line to the Twin Cities Road/SR 104 interchange in the City of Galt. This facility is a 4-lane freeway, which has a 2005 Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) of 63,705 vehicle trips and a Level of Service (LOS) of "D". Currently, 18 percent of these vehicle trips are from trucks, which is above the District 3 average of 10.7 percent. The level of fatal-plus injury collision rate and the total collision rate are below State average rates. The City of Galt is strategically located between the Cities of Stockton and Sacramento. These two cities offer numerous employment opportunities. Due to the City of Galt's location close to job markets and relatively affordable housing for the area, the City has been experiencing tremendous growth over the past 20 years. This growth is expected to continue. As a consequence of growth, the level of congestion is increasing and the level of service is declining. The 2025 traffic volume and level of service projections indicate that traffic will increase over 53 percent to 97,805 vehicle trips and result in a LOS of " $F$ " without any freeway improvements. The 2025 TCR Concept is LOS "F". In order to
 meet this LOS target, the freeway will need to be widened to 6-lanes plus High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes. In addition, the Central Galt and Twin Cities Road interchanges will have to be widened, and the Simmerhorn overcrossing will have to be replaced. In addition, there are a number of freeway overpasses in this segment that are not wide enough to accommodate 8 -lanes, which will have to be reconstructed. Even when the needed improvements are constructed, the higher traffic volumes will continue to be at LOS " F " for the next 20 years.

Segment 2: 5.43 miles - Twin Cities Road/SR 104 interchange in the City of Galt to Eschinger Road, south of the City of Elk Grove. This facility is also a 4-lane freeway, which has a 2005 AADT of 67,048 vehicle trips and a LOS of "D". Currently, 13 percent
 of these vehicle trips are from trucks. The level of fatal-plus injury collision rate and the total collision rate are below State average rates. Due to the location of this segment, there are pressures to develop the adjacent agricultural land with housing and commercial projects. For example, Sacramento County staff is currently processing a large Del Webb Development. It is anticipated that the land area along SR 99 between the Cities of Galt and Elk Grove will eventually be converted from farmland to urbanized development. As a consequence of growth, the level of congestion is increasing and the level of service is declining. The 2025 traffic volume and level of service projections indicate that traffic will increase by over 61 percent to 107,998 vehicle trips and a LOS
"F" without any freeway improvements. The 2025 TCR Concept is LOS "F". In order to meet this LOS target, the freeway will need to be widened to 6-lanes, HOV lanes will need to be added, and a number of freeway overpasses in this segment that are not wide enough to accommodate 8-lanes will have to be reconstructed. Even when the needed improvements are constructed, the higher traffic volumes will continue to be at LOS "F" for the next 20 years.

Segment 3: 3.8 miles - Eschinger Road to Elk Grove Boulevard in the City of Elk Grove. This facility is a 4-lane freeway that changes to a 4-lane freeway with HOV lanes almost a mile south of Elk Grove Boulevard, which has a 2005 AADT of 68,079 vehicle trips and a LOS of "E". Currently, 13 percent of these vehicle trips are from trucks. The level of fatal-plus injury collision rate and the total collision rate are below State average rates. This segment passes through the transitional development areas of Elk Grove urban fringe and infill areas that are experiencing a high growth rate. Agricultural land is being developed into residential and commercial projects at a rapid pace. The Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) Housing, Population \& Employment Projections suggest that the City of Elk Grove realize growth by 243 percent in employment, 143 percent in housing units, and 129 percent in population by 2020. As a consequence of growth, the level of congestion is increasing and the level of service is declining. The 2025 traffic volume and level of service projections indicate that traffic will increase by over 61 percent to 109,659 vehicle trips and a LOS "F"
 without any freeway improvements. The 2025 TCR Concept is LOS " $F$ ". In order to meet this LOS target, the freeway will need to be widened to 6 -lanes and HOV lanes will need to be added, the interchange at Grantline Road will need to be reconstructed, and a new interchange at Whitelock/Poppy Seed Road will need to be constructed. Even when the needed improvements are constructed, the higher traffic volumes will continue to be at LOS "F" for the next 20 years.

Segment 4: 3.52 miles - Elk Grove Boulevard to Consumnes River Boulevard/Calvine Road in the center of the City of Elk Grove. This facility is a 4-lane freeway with a HOV lane extending north to Florin Road in each direction (6-lanes total). Segment 4 has a


2005 AADT of 116,673 vehicle trips and a LOS of "F". Currently, 18 percent of these vehicle trips are from trucks, which is almost twice the average amount of trucks on SR 99 in District 3. The level of fatal-plus injury collision rate is 16 percent higher than the State average rate per million vehicle miles traveled. Like in Segment 3, this segment has been experiencing a high growth rate for almost 20 years and will
continue to do so. As a consequence of growth, the level of congestion is increasing and the level of service is declining. The 2025 traffic volume and level of service projects indicate that traffic will increase by over 62 percent to 190,123 vehicle trips and a LOS "F" without any freeway improvements. The 2025 TCR Concept is LOS "E". In order to meet this LOS target, the freeway will need to be widened to 6 -lanes, auxiliary lanes will need to be added, and the Elk Grove Boulevard and Sheldon Road interchanges will need to be reconstructed.

Segment 5: 1.01 miles - Consumnes River Boulevard/Calvine Road to Mack Road in Sacramento County. This facility is a 4-lane freeway with a HOV lane extending north to Florin Road in each direction and auxiliary lanes between Calvine and Mack Roads (8lanes total). Segment 5 has a 2005 AADT of 147,254 vehicle trips and a LOS of "D". Currently, 8 percent of these vehicle trips are from trucks. The level of fatal-plus injury collision rate is 57 percent higher and the level of total collision rate is 41 percent higher than the State average rates per million vehicle miles traveled. The increase of traffic in this segment appears to be a result of employees from the City of Elk Grove and City of Galt commuting towards downtown Sacramento. This segment is dominated by residential, commercial and industrial land uses on each side of the corridor. HOV lanes run both northbound and southbound, which assist improving the flow of commute, peak
 hour travel and truck traffic that is mixed in mainline traffic congestion. As a consequence of growth, the level of congestion is increasing and the level of service is declining. The 2025 traffic volume and level of service projects indicate that traffic will increase by over 71 percent to 252,334 vehicle trips and a LOS " F " without any freeway improvements. The 2025 TCR Concept is LOS "E". In order to meet this LOS target, the freeway will need to be widened to 10 -lanes total that includes the HOV and auxiliary lanes. In addition, there are a number of freeway overpasses in this segment that are not wide enough to accommodate 10 -lanes, which will have to be reconstructed.

Segment 6: 2.36 miles - Mack Road to Florin Road in Sacramento County. The facility is a 6 -lane freeway. Segment 6 has a 2005 AADT of 168,713 trips and a LOS of " $F$ ".


Currently, 16 percent of these vehicle trips are from trucks, which is substantially higher than the 10.8 percent District 3 SR 99 average from trucks! The increase of traffic in this segment appears to be a result of employees from the City of Elk Grove and City of Galt commuting towards downtown Sacramento as well as a large number of regional retail shopping
opportunities. The level of fatal-plus injury collision rate is 12 percent higher and the level of total collision rate is 18 percent higher than the State average rates per million vehicle miles traveled. This segment is dominated by residential and industrial land uses on each side of the corridor as well as commercial land uses, which include the Florin Shopping Mall, Southgate Plaza, South Pointe Shopping Center, and a Super Wal-Mart. As a consequence of growth, the level of congestion is increasing and the level of service is declining. The 2025 traffic volume and level of service projections indicate that traffic will increase by 44 percent to 242,963 vehicle trips and a LOS " $F$ " without any freeway improvements. The 2025 TCR Concept is LOS "E". In order to meet this LOS target, auxiliary lanes from Calvine to Florin Roads will need to be constructed.

Segment 7: 4.7 miles - Florin Road to the US 50 Junction in the City of Sacramento. The facility is a 6-lane freeway, which includes a HOV lane in each direction and auxiliary lanes between major interchanges. Segment 7 has a 2005 AADT of 219,838 vehicle trips, which is the highest number of trips on any portion of SR 99 from Kern County to Tehama County, and a corresponding LOS of "F". Currently, 6 percent of these vehicle trips are from trucks. The increase of traffic in this segment appears to be a result of employees from the City of Elk Grove and City of Galt commuting towards downtown Sacramento as well as persons driving to a number of large regional retail shopping opportunities identified in Segment 6. The level of fatal-plus injury collision rate is 103 percent higher and the level of total collision rate is 112 percent higher than the State average rates per million vehicle miles traveled. Clearly these high fatal injury and collision rates indicate that there are safety issues in this segment. This segment passes through an established area of Sacramento of
 mostly built-out residential neighborhoods and retail commercial activities along Florin Road. The 2025 traffic volume and level of service projections indicate that traffic will increase by over 44 percent to 316,588 vehicle trips and a LOS " $F$ " without any freeway improvements. As a consequence of growth, the level of congestion is increasing and the level of service is declining. The 2025 TCR Concept is LOS " $E$ ". In order to meet this LOS target, the Oak Park Boulevard interchange will need to be reconstructed and additional lanes will need to be added to this segment. However, established development abuts the highway's right-of-way (ROW) and the costs associated with obtaining additional ROW for capacity expansion may become cost prohibitive.

Segment 8: 1.24 miles - SR 99/Interstate 5 (I-5) to Elkhorn Boulevard in the City of Sacramento. The facility is a 4-lane freeway. Segment 8 has a 2005 AADT of 49,163 vehicle trips and a corresponding LOS of "B". Currently, 12 percent of these vehicle trips are from trucks. The level of fatal-plus injury collision rate and the level of total
collision rate are below the State average rates per million vehicle miles traveled. This segment passes through the developing North and South Natomas communities, and the


1,734-acre Elverta Specific Plan community. This segment will also pass through the soon to be developed 1,450 acre Sacramento Metro Air Park, a commercial and light industrial development, which will be served by SR 99 via Elkhorn Boulevard. These communities contain and will contain a mix of residential commercial, office, and industrial land uses. In addition to the traffic that is generated or will be generated from existing and planned urbanized uses along this SR 99 segment, an increasing amount of traffic that passes through this segment are from commuters that reside or will reside in Sutter, Yuba, and Placer Counties, which is described under Segment 10. As a result of the existing and planned growth, the 2025 traffic volume and level of service projections indicate that traffic will increase by to 82,413 vehicle trips and a LOS "D" without any freeway improvements. As a consequence of growth, the level of congestion is increasing and the level of service is declining. The 2025 TCR Concept is LOS "E". Although there are plans to extend the Sacramento Light Rail to the Natomas area, the extension will not result in any significant alteration to the congestion level and reduced LOS. In order to meet this LOS target, an interchange at Meister will need to be constructed and this segment will need to be widened to an 8-lane freeway facility that includes an HOV lane in each direction.

Segment 9: 3.5 miles - Elkhorn Boulevard to the Sacramento-Sutter County line. The facility is a 4-lane freeway from Elkhorn Boulevard to Elverta Road on the north and then becomes a 4-lane expressway thereafter. Segment 9 has a 2005 AADT of 42,120 vehicle trips and a corresponding LOS of "B". Currently, 12 percent of these vehicle trips are from trucks. The level of fatal-plus injury collision rate is slightly below and the total collision rate is slightly above the State average rates. Although there are no major communities along this segment at this time, the segment leads to the Counties of Sutter, Yuba, and Placer, which is home for a growing number of commuters. Additional communities are in the planning stages that will use SR 99 for travel. The proposed
 developments are described in Segment 10. The 2025 traffic volume and level of service projections indicate that traffic will increase to 74,520 vehicle trips and a LOS "C" without any facility improvements. As a consequence of growth, the level of congestion is increasing and the level of service is declining. The 2025 TCR Concept is LOS "E". In order to maintain a LOS "C", this segment will need to be widened to at least a 6-lane freeway standard and an interchange will need to be constructed at the Elverta Road intersection.

Segment 10: 8.2 miles - Sacramento-Sutter County line to the SR 99/SR 70 Junction in Sutter County. The facility is a 4-lane expressway. This segment has a 2005 AADT of 33,520 vehicle trips and a corresponding LOS of "B". Currently, 11 percent of these vehicle trips are from trucks. The level of fatal-plus injury collision rate and the total collision rate are below State average rates. Although there are no major communities along this segment at this time, the segment leads to the Counties of Sutter, Yuba, and Placer, which is home for a growing number of commuters. Additional communities are in the planning stages that will use SR 99 for travel. In Sutter County, Measure M was approved in 2004 to allow development of a mix of land uses on 7,500 acres of land
 located along the east and west sides of SR 99 between the Sutter-Sacramento County line to just north of Sankey Road. As a follow-up to this voter approved initiative, the Sutter Pointe Specific Plan was submitted for review in August 2006. This Plan proposes development of 7,500 acres of land, which includes 3,600 acres for industrial and commercial uses that will support an estimated 70,000 jobs, 2,900 acres for residential uses that will result in up to 17,500 dwelling units and 39,000 new residents, and various public uses on the remainder acreage. In Placer County, a series of development projects have been proposed in west Placer County and western Roseville that will result in up to 40,000 dwelling units and over 10 million square feet of commercial and office uses. A few of these projects include the Curry Creek Specific Plan, Riolo Vineyards, Placer Vineyards Specific Plan, Regional University and Specific Plan, Placer Ranch Specific Plan, Sierra Vista, and Creek View. The 2025 traffic volume and level of service projections indicate that traffic will increase by 91 percent to 63,920 vehicle trips and a LOS " $C$ " without any facility improvements. As a consequence of growth, the level of congestion is increasing and the level of service is declining. The 2025 TCR Concept is LOS "D". It should be noted that several of the proposed developments identified above have not been included in the 2025 traffic volume and LOS projections. Therefore, the need for improvements will be much greater than what was quantified. In order to meet this LOS target, this segment will need to be upgraded to a 6-lane freeway north of Riego Road and an 8-lane freeway south of Riego Road, and interchanges will need to be constructed at Riego Road, Sankey Road, Placer Parkway, and Catlett Road.

Segment 11: 5.18 miles - SR 99/SR 70 Junction to Sacramento Avenue in Sutter County, which is just north of the Feather River. The facility is a 2-lane conventional highway. This segment has a 2005 AADT of 16,185 vehicle trips and a corresponding LOS of "D". Currently, 9 percent of these vehicle trips are from trucks. The level of fatal-plus injury collision rate and the total collision rate are below State average rates. Although there are no major communities along this segment at this time, the segment leads to the residential development in Yuba City in Sutter County, which is home for a growing number of commuters. In addition, the Sutter Pointe Specific Plan has been
prepared. The Plan proposes development of 7,400 acres within this segment, which will add 39,000 new residents generate jobs at various designated industrial and commercial use sites. Like Segment 10, this South Sutter development alone will add more local and regional truck movements in the corridor. The anticipated expansion of the Port of Sacramento will result in an increase of trucks on this segment thereby increasing goods movement. The 2025 traffic volume and level of service projections indicate that traffic will increase by 72 percent to 27,885 vehicle trips and
 a LOS "F" without any facility improvements. As a consequence of growth, the level of congestion is increasing and the level of service is declining. The 2025 TCR Concept is LOS "D". In order to meet this LOS target, this segment will need to be improved to a 4-lane expressway with a continuous left-turn lane and a 4-lane Feather River Bridge will need to be constructed.

Segment 12: 3.62 miles - Sacramento Avenue to Wilson Road in Sutter County. The facility has been recently improved to a 4-lane expressway with a center median/left turn lane. This segment has a 2005 AADT of 16,185 vehicle trips and a corresponding LOS of "B". Currently, 9 percent of these vehicle trips are from trucks. The level of fatal-plus injury collision rate and the total collision rate are below State average rates. Although there are no major communities along this segment at this time, the segment leads to the
 residential development in Yuba City in Sutter County, which is home for a growing number of commuters. In addition, the Sutter Pointe Specific Plan has been prepared and was discussed under Segment 10. The 2025 traffic volume and level of service projections indicate that traffic will increase by 72 percent to 27,885 vehicle trips and a LOS "C" without any facility improvements. As a consequence of growth, the level of congestion is increasing and the level of service is declining. The 2025 TCR Concept is LOS "D". Additional improvements will not be needed.

Segment 13: 8.53 miles - Wilson Road north through the community of Tudor to Barry Road in Sutter County. The facility is a 2-lane conventional highway from Wilson Road to O'Banion Road and then becomes a 4-lane expressway from O'Banion Road northward to Barry Road. This segment has a 2005 AADT of 18,286 vehicle trips and a corresponding LOS of "E". Currently, 13 percent of these vehicle trips are from trucks. The level of fatal-plus injury collision rate is slightly below, while the level of total collision rate is slightly above the State average rates per million vehicle miles traveled.

Although there are no major communities along this segment at this time, the segment leads to the residential development in Yuba City in Sutter County, which is home for a growing number of commuters. The 2025 traffic volume and level of service projections indicate that traffic will increase by 75 percent to 32,014 vehicle trips and a LOS "F" without any facility improvements. As a consequence of growth, the level of congestion is increasing and the level
 of service is declining. The 2025 TCR Concept is LOS "D". In order to meet this LOS target, the traversed section of the highway in this segment will need to be straightened out and a 4-lane expressway/bypass from Wilson Road to O'Banion Road around the Tudor community will need to be constructed.

Segment 14: 2.52 miles - Barry Road to Lincoln Road in Sutter County. The facility is a 4-lane expressway. This segment has a 2005 AADT of 34,673 vehicle trips and a corresponding LOS of "A". Currently, 10 percent of these vehicle trips are from trucks.
 The level of fatal-plus injury collision rate is below, while the level of total collision rate is 14 percent above the State average rates per million vehicle miles traveled. The southern boundaries of the City of Yuba City are located along the northern portion of this segment. The 2025 traffic volume and level of service projections indicate that traffic will increase by 68 percent to 58,123 vehicle trips and a LOS "E" without any facility improvements. As a consequence of growth, the level of congestion is increasing and the level of service is declining. The 2025 TCR Concept is LOS "D". In order to meet this LOS target, the facility will need to be widened to a 6 -lane expressway.

Segment 15: 1.96 miles - Lincoln Road to SR 20 in Yuba City. The facility is a 4-lane expressway. This segment has a 2005 AADT of 34,673 vehicle trips and a corresponding LOS of "D". Currently, 10 percent of these vehicle trips are from trucks. The level of fatal-plus injury collision rate and the total collision rate are 50 and 29 percent respectively above the State average rates. Signalized intersections ease delays during peak hour congestion at local road access
 points. However, the 2025 traffic volume and level of service projections indicate that traffic will increase by 68 percent to 58,123 vehicle trips and a LOS " $F$ " without any
facility improvements. As a consequence of growth, the level of congestion is increasing and the level of service will be declining. The 2025 TCR Concept is LOS "E". The facility will eventually need to be widened to a 6-lane expressway and an interchange constructed at the SR 99/SR 20 intersection.

Segment 16: 4.34 miles - SR 20 to the end of freeway in northern Yuba City in Sutter County. The facility is a 4-lane freeway. This segment has a 2005 AADT of 20,910 vehicle trips and a corresponding LOS of "A". Currently, 9 percent of these vehicle trips are from trucks. The level of fatal-plus injury collision rate is 67 percent above and the total collision rate is 17 percent below the State average rates. This higher than average fatality rate may be due to the transitioning of a freeway to expressway facility with vehicles driving through the red stop light at SR 20. This segment is dominated by residential and commercial land uses on each side of the corridor. There is a moderate amount of residential growth occurring in the northern and western portions of Yuba


City. The 2025 traffic volume and level of service projections indicate that traffic will increase by 48 percent to 31,110 vehicle trips and a LOS "B" without any facility improvements. The 2025 TCR Concept is LOS " $D$ ". While no facility improvements will be needed on this segment of SR 99 in the near term, an interchange at the intersection with SR 20 will improve safety and help close an expressway/freeway gap of this facility. Additionally, local residential development near Pease Road in Yuba City will cause a backup of the interchange ramps at Queens Road and Eager Road, and along the roads parallel to SR 99. This backup will result in the need for a new interchange at Pease Road. Consequently, the City of Yuba City will be funding eventual construction of the Pease Road interchange, which will help maintain a LOS "B".

Segment 17: 3.36 miles - End of freeway at Lomo to Paseo Road, which is the southern boundary of the City of Live Oak. The facility is a 2-lane conventional highway. This segment has a 2005 AADT of 16,913 vehicle trips and a corresponding LOS of "E". Currently, 9 percent of these vehicle trips are from trucks. The level of fatal-plus injury collision rate and the level of total collision rate are below the State average rates per million vehicle miles traveled. This segment primarily travels through agricultural farmland. However, there are a few
 scattered large-parcel residential lots and several Light Industrial uses that are located adjacent to the highway. The 2025 traffic volume and level of service projections indicate that traffic will increase by 49 percent to 25,163 vehicle trips and a LOS "E"
without any facility improvements. As a consequence of growth, the level of congestion is increasing and the level of service will be declining. The 2025 TCR Concept is LOS "D". In order to meet this LOS target, the facility will need to be upgraded to a 4-lane expressway, which includes a grade separation at the Lomo Railroad Crossing of the highway.

Segment 18: 3.13 miles - Paseo Road to Riviera Road in the City of Live Oak. The facility is a 2-lane conventional highway, which serves as the main street for the City. This segment has a 2005 AADT of 19,373 vehicle trips and a corresponding LOS of "A". Currently, 9 percent of these vehicle trips are from trucks. The level of fatal-plus injury collision rate is 47 percent above and the total collision rate is 39 percent above the State average rates. This segment primarily travels through the existing and planned boundaries of the City of Live Oak and contains a variety of residential, commercial, industrial, and agricultural uses. SR 99 has no bicycle or pedestrian modal options within this segment, and automobiles are the primary transportation mode within the City. There is an existing traffic signal at the intersection with Pennington. During peak hours, traffic backs up causing delay and congestion. As development increases in the City, the
 increase in vehicular traffic will increase congestion and collisions. Operational improvements will be needed that includes traffic signalization at Elm and Kola Streets, drainage improvements, and placement of curbs, gutters, and sidewalks. There will also be a need to upgrade the facility to a 4-lane conventional highway with continuous left-turn lane that will serve as an urban arterial and to construct an overpass at Paseo and Riviera Roads. The 2025 traffic volume and level of service projections indicate that traffic will increase by 49 percent to 28,823 vehicle trips and a LOS "B" without any facility improvements. These projections do not account for the City of Live Oak's current General Plan update, which will include three large specific plan areas with a mixture of residential, commercial and industrial land uses. The 2025 TCR Concept is LOS "D". As a consequence of growth, the level of congestion is increasing and the level of service will be declining unless the improvements described above are constructed. Beyond the TCR Concept, a 2-lane highway bypass will be needed that will bypass the Cities of Live Oak, Gridley, and Biggs.

Segment 19: 0.96 miles - Riviera Road to the Sutter-Butte County line. The facility is a 2-lane conventional highway. This segment has a 2005 AADT of 15,580 vehicle trips and a corresponding LOS of "D". Currently, 9 percent of these vehicle trips are from trucks. The level of fatal-plus injury collision rate and the total collision rate are below State average rates. This segment primarily travels through agricultural farmland. The 2025 traffic volume and level of service projections indicate that traffic will increase by

49 percent to 23,180 vehicle trips and a LOS "E" without any facility improvements. As a consequence of growth, the level of congestion is increasing and the level of service will be declining. The 2025 TCR Concept is LOS "D". In order to meet this LOS target, the facility will need to be
 upgraded to a 4-lane expressway.

Segment 20: 2.6 miles - Sutter-Butte County line to Nielson Road, south of the City of Gridley. The facility is a 2-lane conventional highway. This segment has a 2005 AADT of 16,686 vehicle trips and a corresponding LOS of "A". Currently, 9 percent of these
 vehicle trips are from trucks. The level of fatal-plus injury collision rate and the total collision rate are below State average rates. This segment primarily travels through agricultural farmland. The 2025 traffic volume and level of service projections indicate that traffic will increase by 58 percent to 26,406 vehicle trips and a LOS "B" without any facility improvements. As a consequence of growth, the level of congestion is increasing and the level of service will be declining. The 2025 TCR Concept is LOS "D".

Segment 21: 2.4 miles - Nielson Road, through the City of Gridley, to Ord Ranch Road. The facility is a 4-lane conventional "urban arterial" highway with a continuous left-turn lane, and curbs, gutters, and sidewalks that passes through the City as a main street. The 4-lane facility reverts back to a 2-lane conventional highway from Ford Avenue north to Ord Ranch Road. This segment has a 2005 AADT of 23,793 vehicle trips and a corresponding LOS of "A". Currently, 9 percent of these vehicle trips are from trucks.
The level of fatal-plus injury collision rate is 24 percent above and the total collision rate is 53 percent above the State average rates. This segment contains commercial and industrial land uses along the highway as well as a few parcels with residential and agricultural uses. On the south end of
 the City, a 107-acre industrial park was approved on the northwest corner of SR 99 and West Liberty Road/Lane intersection, which will result in the requirement to realign this intersection. On the north end of the City extending to Ord Ranch Road, a large scale project known as Deniz Ranch has been proposed adjacent to the west side of SR 99, which will result in development of 718 dwelling units and a 12 acre commercial
shopping center. The 2025 traffic volume and level of service projections indicate that traffic will increase by 58 percent to 37,653 vehicle trips and a LOS "B" without any facility improvements. As a consequence of growth, the level of congestion is increasing and the level of service will be declining. The 2025 TCR Concept is LOS "D". Beyond the 20 -year planning period, there will be a need to construct a 2 -lane expressway around the City of Gridley as well as the Cities of Live Oak and Biggs (see Segments 18 and 22).

Segment 22: 8.16 miles - Ord Ranch Road to SR 162, East. The facility is a 2-lane conventional highway. This segment has a 2005 AADT of 11,433 vehicle trips and a corresponding LOS of "D". Currently, 10 percent of these vehicle trips are from trucks. The level of fatal-plus injury collision rate and the level of total collision rate are below the State average rates per million vehicle miles traveled. This segment primarily travels through agricultural farmland. There are a number of side streets with access to SR 99 between Ord Ranch Road and B Street/E. Biggs Highway. The intersection of SR 99
 and B Street/E. Biggs Highway is signalized and provides access to the City of Biggs on the west side of SR 99. A project to develop a 927-lot subdivision with two commercial centers has been proposed around this intersection, which extends northwards towards Rio Bonito Road. Since the highway is conventional without access control, access to the large project from SR 99 will have to be provided. A SHOPP funded highway project is currently in the planning stages that will widen and improve vertical sight distance of SR 99 from Rio Bonito Road to the intersection with SR 162 East. The 2025 traffic volume and level of service projections indicate that traffic will increase by 58 percent to 18,093 vehicle trips and a LOS "E" without any facility improvements. As a consequence of growth, the level of congestion is increasing and the level of service will be declining. The 2025 TCR Concept is LOS "D". In order to meet this LOS target, the facility will need to be upgraded to a 4-lane conventional highway up to the B Street/E. Biggs Highway intersection and passing lanes north of this intersection to the end of the segment. Thereafter, a 4-lane expressway will need to be constructed north of the B Street/East Biggs Highway intersection to the end of the segment.

Segment 23: 8.65 miles - SR 162 East to SR 149. The facility is a $2-$ lane conventional highway. This segment has a 2005 AADT of 11,828 vehicle trips and a corresponding LOS of "D". Currently, 10 percent of these vehicle trips are from trucks. The
 level of fatal-plus injury collision rate is below and the total collision rate is the same as
the State average rates. This segment primarily travels through agricultural farmland. A placement of a traffic signal and intersection improvements at the SR 162 intersection is nearing completion. SR 162 provides access to the east to a growing Oroville community where development projects along or near SR 162 with a combined total of over 5,000 dwelling units have been proposed. One large project along SR 162 and near SR 99, Oro Bay Estates, proposes 2,400 dwelling units. The 2025 traffic volume and level of service projections indicate that traffic will increase by 72 percent to 20,378 vehicle trips and a LOS "E" without any facility improvements. As a consequence of growth, the level of congestion is increasing and the level of service will be declining. The 2025 TCR Concept is LOS "D". In order to meet this LOS target, the facility will need to be upgraded to a 4-lane expressway.

Segment 24: 8.59 miles - SR 149 to the beginning of the freeway, which is located at the southern fringe of the City of Chico. The facility is a 4-lane expressway. This segment has a 2005 AADT of 27,066 vehicle trips and a corresponding LOS of "B". Currently, 10 percent of these vehicle trips are from trucks. The level of fatal-plus injury collision rate and the total collision rate are below State average rates. This segment primarily travels through agricultural farmland with occasional pockets of residential and industrial

uses. The placement of an interchange has been proposed at the SR 99/SR 149 intersection as part of the SR 149 widening project and is currently being constructed. At the Durham-Pentz Road Interchange, industrial development is being planned. At the signalized Estates Drive intersection, there is a residential development and a Golf Country Club. The 2025 traffic volume and level of service projections indicate that traffic will increase by 79 percent to 48,386 vehicle trips and a LOS "D" without any facility improvements. As a consequence of growth, the level of congestion is increasing and the level of service will be declining. The 2025 TCR Concept is LOS "D". In order to meet this LOS target, the facility will need to be upgraded to a 6-lane freeway with interchanges constructed at Neal Road and Southgate Avenue.

Segment 25: 2.05 miles - Beginning of the freeway to the junction of SR 32 in the City of Chico. The facility is a 4-lane freeway. This segment has a 2005 AADT of 71,243 vehicle trips and a corresponding LOS of "E". Currently, 9 percent of these vehicle trips are from trucks. The level of fatal-plus injury collision the levels of total collision rates are below the State
 average rates per million vehicle miles traveled. This segment primarily travels through
the urbanized portion of the City of Chico, which has a mixture of residential, commercial, industrial, and public land uses. A number of "big box" retail commercial stores as well as a regional shopping mall and other commercial uses are located near each interchange with SR 99, which is causing an increase in congestion. The 2025 traffic volume and level of service projections indicate that traffic will increase by 63 percent to 116,093 vehicle trips and a LOS " $F$ " without any facility improvements. As a consequence of growth, the level of congestion is increasing and the level of service will be declining. The 2025 TCR Concept is LOS "D/E". In order to meet this LOS target, the facility will need to be upgraded to a 6-lane freeway with auxiliary lanes from Skyway to SR 32, and interchanges upgraded at Skyway, E. $20^{\text {th }}$ Street, and SR 32.

Segment 26: 4.87 miles - SR 32 to the end of freeway, north of Eaton Road in the City of Chico. The facility is a 4-lane freeway. This segment has a 2005 AADT of 77,625 vehicle trips and a corresponding LOS of "F". Currently, 4 percent of these vehicle trips
 are from trucks. The level of fatal-plus injury collision rate is the same as and the total collision rate is 10 percent above the State average rates. This segment primarily travels through the urbanized portion of the City of Chico, which has a mixture of residential, commercial, industrial, and public land uses. A number of "big box" retail commercial stores as well as a regional shopping mall, other commercial uses, and a California State University are located along or near SR 99 and secure access from the various interchanges along SR 99, which is causing an increase in congestion. The 2025 traffic volume and level of service projections indicate that traffic will increase by 68 percent to 130,125 vehicle trips and a LOS "F" without any facility improvements. As a consequence of growth, the level of congestion is increasing and the level of service will be declining. The 2025 TCR Concept is LOS "D". The City of Chico has established a traffic impact mitigation fee program that will result in local development paying the City for construction of a number of highway improvements to both SR 32 and SR 99. However, these City funded highway improvements will not be sufficient to meet the LOS target. In order to meet the LOS target, SR 99 will need to be upgraded to a 6-lane freeway with auxiliary lanes from SR 32 to Eaton Road, and the interchanges at E. First Avenue, Cohasset Avenue, East Avenue, and Eaton Road will need to be upgraded.

Segment 27: 8.66 miles - End of the freeway to the Butte-Tehama County line. The facility is a 2-lane conventional highway. This segment has a 2005 AADT of 16,664 vehicle trips and a corresponding LOS of "E". Currently, 14 percent of these vehicle trips are from trucks, which is substantially higher than the 10.8 percent average for Districts 2 and 3. The level of fatal-plus injury collision rate and the total collision rate are below State average rates. This segment primarily travels through the suburban and then rural agricultural portion of Butte County. The North Chico Specific Plan contains
predominantly suburban residential land uses that are planned on the east side of SR 99 from Garner Road northward to Keefer Road. The 2025 traffic volume and level of service projections indicate that traffic will increase by 68 percent to 27,934 vehicle trips and a LOS "F" without any facility improvements. As a consequence of growth, the level of congestion is increasing and the level of service will be declining. The 2025
 TCR Concept is LOS "D". In order to meet the LOS target the facility will need to be upgraded by extending the freeway north to Garner Road and by constructing a 4-lane expressway from Garner Road to the Butte-Tehama County line to the north. Additionally, a signal and later an interchange will be needed at Garner Road, an alignment of Wilson Road/Kittyhawk Road and a traffic control device at SR 99 will be needed, and a traffic signal will be needed at Keefer Road.

## B. 2 District 2, SR 99:

Segment 1330: 4.5 miles - From the Butte County/Tehama County Line to South Avenue. This facility is a 2-lane expressway with occasional passing lanes. This segment has a 2005 AADT of 11,900 vehicle trips and a corresponding LOS "C". Currently, over 12 percent of these vehicle trips are from trucks. The level of fatal-plus
 injury collision rate is 19 percent above and the total collision rate is 19 percent below the State average rates. The 2025 traffic volume and level of service projections indicate that traffic will increase by over 110 percent to 25,350 vehicle trips and a LOS "F" without any improvements. As a consequence of growth, the level of congestion is increasing and the level of service will be declining. Improvements to this segment that would add additional passing lanes will only achieve an LOS "D". However, the more desirable improvement, which would allow the route to reach the concept LOS "C"-"D", would be to widen this segment to a Controlled-Access 4-lane expressway. Additional issues and constraints in this segment include the following:

- Merging problems occur at the existing northbound and southbound passing lanes when they transition from three-lanes to two-lanes.
- The Vina Plains Preserve is included in this segment. This Preserve is an environmentally protected area owned by The Nature Conservancy and contains grasslands and vernal pools.
- This segment terminates at South Avenue. South Avenue is utilized by interregional traffic to access I-5.

Segment 1340: 6.8 miles - From South Avenue to the community of Los Molinos. This facility begins as a 2-lane expressway and reverts to a 2-lane conventional highway near Vina. This segment has a 2005 AADT of 7,200 vehicle trips and a corresponding LOS "C". Currently, over 11 percent of the vehicle trips are from trucks. The level of fatal-plus injury collision and the total collision rates are below the State average rates.
 The 2025 traffic volume and level of service projections indicate that traffic will increase by 83 percent to 13,200 vehicle trips and a LOS "D" without any improvements. As a consequence of growth, the level of congestion is increasing and the level of service will be declining. However, improvements to this segment such as realigning and constructing a 2 -lane Expressway will improve the LOS " D " to a LOS " B ". This segment has a concept LOS "C"-"D". Issues and constraints in this segment include the following:

- Access points are uncontrolled on the highway and can lead to delay in travel time.
- The Vina Plains Preserve is included in this segment. This Preserve is an environmentally protected area owned by The Nature Conservancy and contains grasslands and vernal pools.
- Agricultural land uses and equipment uses often affect the highway. For instance, tractors travel down the highway with hazard lights on, which can cause delay.
- Mature tree growth along the highway limits vehicle recovery area.
- Left and right turning vehicles cause delay to through traffic in a number of locations.
- There are limited passing opportunities in this segment.
- The railroad runs parallel to the highway along the east side. The railroad is very close to the highway. Additionally, when the railroad comes through town, train arms block off all frontage roads in the town. This causes traffic to backup onto the highway.

Segment 1350: 1.2 miles - Through the community of Los Molinos. This facility is a 2 lane conventional highway. This segment has a 2005 AADT of 10,100 vehicle trips and a corresponding LOS "D". Currently, over 10 percent of the vehicle trips are from trucks. The level of fatal-plus injury collision rate is 74 percent above and the total collision rate is 170 percent above the State average rates. These extremely high collision rates can be attributed to the fact that this segment of SR 99 in Tehama County has a high concentration of multi-modal traffic. The highway also serves as the communities' "main-street" with the majority of the businesses in the town facing SR 99. Since businesses are not located on side streets, but primarily along the highway, there is
growing concern regarding the safety of pedestrians and bicyclists in crossing the road to their vehicle, to another business, or traveling along the roadside. The 2025 traffic

volume and level of service projections indicate that traffic will increase by 71 percent to 17,300 vehicle trips and a LOS " $F$ " without any improvements. As a consequence of growth, the level of congestion is increasing and the level of service will be declining. However, improvements to this segment, which include adding lanes and installing curbs, gutters, and sidewalks will better the concept LOS "C"-"D" to LOS "B". These improvements will also address some of the safety concerns for multi-modal traffic. Another area of concern is the periodic flooding this segment receives, inhibiting goods movement and multi-modal traffic. The traffic volumes and speeds through this segment warrant improvements to the route due to safety and capacity concerns. Additional issues in this segment include the following:

- This segment contains a small-developed community. With this already planned community, adding additional lanes will be challenging.
- Left and right turning vehicles cause delay to through traffic in a number of locations.
- Speed limits are lowered in the community.
- Agricultural land uses and equipment often affect the highway. For instance, tractors travel down the highway with hazard lights on.
- There are limited passing opportunities in this segment.
- The railroad runs parallel to the highway along the east side. The railroad is very close to the highway. Additionally, when the railroad comes through town, train arms block off all frontage roads in the town. This causes traffic to backup onto the highway.

Segment 1360: 11.7 miles - Los Molinos to Mill Race Creek. This facility is a 2-lane conventional highway. This segment has a 2005 AADT of 7,700 vehicle trips and a corresponding LOS "C". Currently, over 13 percent of the vehicle trips are from trucks. The level of fatal-plus injury collision rate is 7 percent above and the total collision rate is 17 percent above the State average rates. This segment travels through both residential and agricultural developments, which in turn places several access roads along the highway. During the winter
 months, flooding is a common occurrence within this segment, which often closes the route at Antelope Creek. Flooding at this location also affects County roads that,
otherwise, may be utilized as detours. The 2025 traffic volume and level of service projections indicate that traffic will increase by 78 percent to 13,700 vehicle trips and a LOS "D" without improvements. As a consequence of growth, the level of congestion is increasing and the level of service will be declining. However, improvements to this segment, which include realigning and constructing a 2-lane expressway will improve the LOS "D" to LOS "B". Additional issues in this segment include the following:

- Access points are uncontrolled on the highway and can lead to delay in travel time.
- Agricultural land uses and equipment often affect the highway. For instance, tractors travel down the highway with hazard lights on.
- Tree growth along the highway limits vehicle recovery area.
- Left and right turning vehicles cause delay to through traffic in a number of locations.
- There are limited passing opportunities in this segment.

Segment 1370: 0.74 miles - Mill Race Creek to the SR 36 junction. This facility is a 2lane conventional highway. This segment has a 2005 AADT of 9,900 vehicle trips and a corresponding LOS "D". Currently, over 11 percent of the vehicle trips are from trucks.
 The level of fatal-plus injury collision rate and the total collision rate are below the State average rates. The 2025 traffic volume and level of service projections indicate that traffic will increase by 77 percent to 17,550 vehicle trips and a LOS "E" without improvements. As a consequence of growth, the level of congestion is increasing and the level of service will be declining. However, improvements to this segment, which include realigning and constructing the facility to a 2-lane Expressway will better the concept LOS "C"-"D" to LOS "B". Within the existing segment, there are several structures that have safety and operational concerns. These structures have non-standard shoulders that need to be widened, and are prone to flooding. There are significant safety concerns due to the amount of pedestrian traffic utilizing the non-standard shoulders on the structures as well as impaired sight distance access roads onto SR 99 as a result of bridge rails being in the line of sight. The land located
 between these structures has been considered for development; however, the short distance between the structures does not facilitate left turn lanes. Additional issues in this segment include the following:

- Access points are uncontrolled on the highway and can lead to delay in travel time.
- Agricultural land/equipment uses often affect the highway. For instance, tractors travel down the highway with hazard lights on.
- Mature tree growth along the highway limits vehicle recovery area.
- Left and right turning vehicles cause delay to through traffic in a number of locations.
- There are limited passing opportunities in this segment.
- Children walk or ride bicycles on the narrow shoulders of the highway to access school facilities.


## B. 3 District 2, SR 36:

Segment 460: 2.34 miles - SR 36/SR 99 junction to the SR 36/I-5 Interchange. This segment of SR 36 is included because it is essential in the connectivity of SR 99 to I-5 in Tehama County, as SR 99 may be utilized as an alternative route to I-5. This facility is a 4-lane conventional highway. This segment has a 2005 AADT of 27,000 vehicle trips and a corresponding LOS "C". Currently, 7.8 percent of vehicle trips are from trucks. The level of fatal-plus injury collision rate is 66 percent above and the total collision rate is 76
 percent above the State average rates. The 2025 traffic volume and level of service projections indicate that traffic will increase by 70 percent to 45,900 vehicle trips and a LOS "E" without or with improvements. This segment contains numerous Highway Commercial facilities such as hotels, gasoline stations, food establishments, home improvement stores, and agribusiness companies, as well as a school facility, two State agency facilities, and the Tehama County Fairgrounds. Additionally, this segment provides access to the Red Bluff Diversion Dam and Lassen Nation Park. Due to the combination of commercial and public uses, and access to a major recreational destination, a substantial amount of multi-modal traffic is generated. Multi-modal users yield considerable safety concerns for the route, which may adversely impact the flow of traffic from SR 99 to I-5. The placement of curbs, sidewalks, and street lighting is needed to accommodate multi-modal transportation needs and to increase safety. Additional issues in this segment include the following:

- Opportunity for roadway expansion is limited due to current land development. I-5 interchange is developed heavily in all four quadrants.
- Multiple access roads are uncontrolled and signalized intersections cause delay to through traffic in a number of locations.


## B. 4 District 3, SR 70:

Segment 1: 8.30 miles - SR 99/SR 70 junction to Sutter/Yuba County line. The facility in this segment is a 2 -lane expressway, which is being programmed for upgrading the facility to a 4 -lane expressway. This segment has a 2005 AADT of 15,800 vehicle trips and a corresponding LOS of "E". Currently, 9 percent of these vehicle trips are from trucks. The level of fatal-plus injury collision rate and the total collision rate are below State average rates. This segment
 primarily travels through a rural agricultural portion of Sutter County, which contains rice fields, sheep and cattle ranches and orchards. The 2025 traffic volume and level of
 service projections indicate that traffic will increase by 95 percent to 30,800 vehicle trips and a LOS "F" without any facility improvements. This increase is largely due to development in southern Yuba County, which is described in Segment 2 below. As a consequence of growth, the level of congestion is increasing and the level of service will be declining. The 2025 TCR Concept is LOS "C". In order to meet the LOS target, the facility will need to be upgraded by to a 4-lane expressway from the SR 99/SR 70 wye to just north of the Bear River with overcrossings at Marcum Road and Cornelius Avenue, an at-grade intersection at Kempton-Berry Roads, and an interchange at Nicolaus Avenue.

Segment 2: 6.62 miles - Sutter/Yuba County line to beginning of Freeway by McGowan Parkway in Yuba County. The facility in this segment is a 4-lane expressway, which was completed in 2004. This segment has a 2005 AADT of 16,300 vehicle trips and a corresponding LOS of "A".
Currently, 11 percent of these vehicle trips are from trucks. The level of fatal-plus injury collision rate and the total collision rate are below State average rates. This segment extends through a rural agricultural portion of Yuba County, which is quickly transitioning into an urban setting.
 Construction of a 14,000-plus residential unit, mixed use Plumas Lake Specific Plan community is well underway on the west side of SR 70 between Feather River Boulevard
and McGowan Parkway, and an existing 18,500 person Amphitheatre and planned 55,000 spectators Yuba Motorplex on the east side of SR 70 are creating operational and safety
 issues at the at-grade intersections with Feather River Boulevard and at the Algodon Road/Plumas Arboga Road. The 2025 traffic volume and level of service projections indicate that traffic will increase by 95 percent to 31,800 vehicle trips and a LOS "C" without any facility improvements. As a consequence of growth, the level of congestion is increasing and the level of service will be declining. The 2025 TCR Concept is LOS "C". In order to meet the LOS target, the interchanges need to be constructed at both the Feather River Boulevard intersection and at the Algodon Road/Plumas Arboga Road intersection.

Segment 3: 7.32 miles - Beginning of Freeway by McGowan Parkway to north end of Yuba River Bridge in Marysville. The facility in this segment is a 4-lane freeway. This segment has a 2005 AADT of 45,500 vehicle trips and a corresponding LOS of "B". Currently, 12 percent of these vehicle trips are from trucks. The level of fatal-plus injury collision rate is 33 percent above and the total collision rate is 56 percent above the State average rates. This segment extends through the urbanized communities of Olivehurst and Linda in Yuba County. Several large-scale developments are being built and planned on the east side of SR 70 along Erle Road. The 1,760-acre, 6,000-plus dwelling unit, mixed use East Linda Specific Plan is currently being constructed in phases along the north side of Erle Road. Additionally, the 1,650-acre, 10,000 jobs mixed use Woodbury Specific Plan community
 is being planned along the south side of Erle Road. The 2025 traffic volume and level of service projections indicate that traffic will increase by 75 percent to 79,625 vehicle trips and a LOS "C" without any facility improvements. As a consequence of growth, the level of congestion is increasing and the level of service will be declining. The 2025 TCR Concept is LOS "D". In order to meet the LOS target, certain improvements will eventually need to be construction. These improvements include the modification to the McGowan Parkway interchange, a 2-lane expressway highway bypass from the SR 70/SR65 junction to around the east side of the City of Marysville or equivalent, widening of the Erle Road overcrossing, widening of the Feather River Boulevard-North interchange ramps, and widening of the North Beale Road northbound on ramp.

Segment 4: 1.91 miles - North end of Yuba River Bridge to north city limit of Marysville. The facility in this segment is a 4-lane conventional urban arterial, which serves as a "Main Street" for the City of Marysville. SR 20 intersects SR 70 in Marysville
at $10^{\text {th }}$ and $12^{\text {th }}$ Streets. Most of the land that is adjacent to SR 70 in Marysville is development with commercial businesses. The combination of short city blocks and
 numerous driveways along this segment has contributed greatly to the congestion within the City. This segment has a 2005 AADT of 60,000 vehicle trips and a corresponding LOS of "F". Currently, 14 percent of these vehicle trips are from trucks, which is well above the 10.7 percent District 3 average along this Business Plan corridor. The high percentage of truck traffic is largely due to the movement of aggregate, agricultural, and timber materials. The level of fatalplus injury collision rate and the total collision rate are below State average rates, largely because of the near gridlock conditions in Marysville. The 2025 traffic volume and level of service projections indicate that traffic will increase by 25 percent to 75,000 vehicle trips and a further decline of LOS " $F$ " without any facility improvements. As a consequence of growth, the level of congestion is increasing and the level of service will be further declining, unless improvements are realized. At one time, a proposed 2-lane Marysville Bypass expressway was proposed to extend around the east side of Marysville and connect the SR 70/SR 65 junction in Yuba County to Ophir Road intersection in Butte County.


This proposal was found to be too costly. As a consequence, other proposals are currently being examined and include widening SR 70 (E. Street) from 4- to 6-lanes, adding additional left turn lanes, and constructing a 2-lane expressway on a new alignment along the perimeter of or through Marysville itself and several new interchanges at key intersections within the City itself. Another option that has been explored for many years is to construct a third crossing of the Feather River on SR 65 south of Marysville. This option can reduce up to 30,000 trips that currently pass through Marysville.

Segment 5: 9.97 miles - North city limit of Marysville to Yuba/Butte County line. This
 facility in this segment is a 2-lane conventional highway, which extends through rural agricultural lands containing primarily rice fields and orchards in northern Yuba County. This segment has a 2005 AADT of 15,000 vehicle trips and a corresponding LOS of "E".
Currently, 14 percent of these vehicle trips are from trucks, which is well above average for this route. The level of fatal-plus injury collision rate is 18 percent above and the
total collision rate is 26 percent above the State average rates. These high rates can be attributed to the lack of passing opportunities along this $10-\mathrm{mile}$ section of highway. The 2025 traffic volume and level of service projections indicate that traffic will increase by 35 percent to 20,250 vehicle trips and a LOS "E" without any facility improvements. As a consequence of growth, the level of congestion is increasing and the level of service will be declining. The 2025 TCR Concept is LOS "D". In order to meet the LOS target, the facility should be upgraded to a 2-lane expressway with passing lanes.

Segment 6: 13.51 miles - Yuba/Butte County line to beginning of Freeway, .6 miles south of SR 162 in Oroville. This facility in this segment is a 2-lane conventional highway, which extends through rural agricultural lands containing primarily rice fields, orchards, and cattle in southern Butte County. This segment has a 2005 AADT of 13,600 vehicle trips and a corresponding LOS of "E". Currently, 14 percent of these vehicle trips are from trucks, which is well above average for this route. The level of fatal-plus injury collision rate and the total collision rate are below the State average rates. This can be attributed to the fact that there are passing lane sections within this segment. The 2025 traffic volume and level of service projections indicate that traffic will increase by 65 percent to 22,400 vehicle trips and a LOS "E" without any facility improvements. As a consequence of growth, the level of congestion is increasing and the level
 of service will be declining. The 2025 TCR Concept is LOS "D". In order to meet the LOS target, the facility should be upgraded to a 2-lane expressway with additional passing lanes constructed between the Yuba/Butte County line and Ophir Road. The Ophir Road intersection should be realigned and an interchange should be constructed. Additionally, the 2-lane highway facility should be upgraded to a 4-lane freeway from Ophir Road north to the beginning of the existing 4-lane freeway.

Segment 7: 7.01 miles - 6 miles south of SR 162 in Oroville to junction of SR 149. The facility in this segment is a 4-lane freeway. This segment has a 2005 AADT of 31,500 vehicle trips and a corresponding LOS of "A". Currently, 10 percent of these vehicle
 trips are from trucks. The level of fatal-plus injury collision rate is 45 percent above and the total collision rate is 44 percent above the State average rates. This segment extends through the urbanized City of Oroville and extends to the end of the freeway at SR 149. SR 149 is currently being widened from a 2-lane conventional highway to a 4-lane expressway with interchanges at SR 99 and at SR 70. The City of Oroville is currently experiencing growth. Development
applications with parcels containing over 10,000 residential units have been proposed over the past three years. The 2025 traffic volume and level of service projections indicate that traffic will increase by 60 percent to 50,400 vehicle trips and a LOS "B" without any facility improvements. As a consequence of growth, the level of congestion is increasing and the level of service will be declining. The 2025 TCR Concept is LOS "C". In order to meet the LOS target, certain improvements will eventually need to be construction. These improvements include the installing traffic signals or roundabouts, widening the ramps, and adding turn lanes on the Nelson Avenue and Grand Avenue $3^{\text {rd }}$ and $4^{\text {th }}$ Streets ramp intersections. Thereafter, the Grand Avenue overcrossing should be widened to 4-lanes and the Feather River Bridge widened to 6-lanes.

## Appendix C

Glossary of Abbreviated Terms
The abbreviations listed on the left side of this page used in this Business Plan shall have the meaning that follows on the right side of the term.

| AADT | Annual Average Daily Traffic |
| :--- | :--- |
| ADT | Average Daily Traffic |
| AADTT | Annual Average Daily Truck Traffic |
| BCAG | Butte County Association of Governments |
| Caltrans | California Department of Transportation |
| CEQA | California Environmental Quality Act |
| CTC | California Transportation Commission |
| DSMP | District System Management Plan |
| EIR | Environmental Impact Report |
| EIS | Environmental Impact Statement |
| FHWA | Federal Highway Administration |
| FONSI | Finding of No Significant Impact |
| HDM | Highway Design Manual |
| I | Interstate |
| ITIP | Interregional Transportation Improvement Program |
| ITSP | Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan |
| LOS | Level of Service |
| MPO | Metropolitan Planning Organization |
| MTP | Metropolitan Transportation Plan |
| NEPA | National Environmental Policy Act |
| ND | Negative Declaration |
| NHS | National Highway System |
| PA\&ED | Project Approval and Environmental Documentation |
| PID | Post-mile |
| PM | Project Study Report |
| PSR | Regional Transportation Improvement Program |
| RTIP | Regional Transportation Plan |
| RTP | Regional Transportation Planning Agency |
| RTPA | Right-of-Way |
| ROW | Sacramento Area Council of Governments |
| SACOG | Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A |
| SAFETEA-LU | Legacy for Users |
|  | Strategic Growth Plan Bond Program |
| SGPBP | State Highway Operation and Protection Program |
| SHOPP | State Highway System |
| SHS | State Route |
| SR | State Transportation Improvement Program |
| STIP | Transportation Concept Report |
| TCR | Tehama County Transportation Commission |
| TCTC | Traffic Impact Mitigation |
| TIM |  |
| TSDP |  |
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