

APPENDIX C

SACRAMENTO METRO AREA

COST TO SACRAMENTO MOTORISTS OF INADEQUATE ROADS

TRIP estimates that Sacramento roadways that lack some desirable safety features, have inadequate capacity to meet travel demands or have poor pavement conditions, cost the average Sacramento driver \$1,678 annually in the cost of traffic crashes, additional vehicle operating costs and congestion-related delays.

- Driving on roads in need of repair costs the average motorist in the Sacramento region \$622 annually in extra vehicle operating costs. These costs include accelerated vehicle depreciation, additional repair costs and increased fuel consumption and tire wear.
- Traffic congestion in the Sacramento area costs the average motorist in the region \$805 annually in lost time and wasted fuel.
- Traffic accidents and fatalities in which roadway characteristics were likely a contributing factor cost each Sacramento area driver an average of \$251 annually, including medical costs, lost economic and household productivity, property damage and travel delays.

ROAD CONDITIONS

A total of 88 percent of major roads in the Sacramento area are in poor or mediocre condition, costing area drivers more than \$600 each year in extra vehicle operating costs.

- Forty-four percent of major roads in the Sacramento urban area are rated in poor condition, the eleventh highest percentage in the nation among cities with at least 500,000 population. An additional 44 percent of the area's major roads are in mediocre condition. This includes Interstates, highways, connecting urban arterials, and key urban streets that are maintained by state, county or municipal governments.
- Roads rated in poor condition often have significant rutting, potholes or other visible signs of deterioration. Roads in poor condition typically need to be resurfaced or reconstructed. Roads rated in mediocre condition show signs of significant wear and may also have some visible pavement distress. Most pavements in mediocre condition can be repaired by resurfacing, but some may need more extensive reconstruction to return them to good condition.
- Just eight percent of major roads in the Sacramento area are in good condition. A desirable goal for state and local organizations responsible for road maintenance is to keep 75 percent of major roads in good condition.
- The following is a list of the most deteriorated sections of state roadways in the Sacramento area, which are not scheduled for repair through the end of 2009.

Chart 1. Most deteriorated sections of state roadways in the Sacramento metro area.

Rank	Route Name	From	To	Length	ADT
1	Route 49	Center St., Auburn	Palm Ave., Auburn	1.4	16,000
2	Route 193	Armes Ln., outside	Route 80, outside Auburn	2.1	5,200
3	Route 51 (Business 80)	H Street, Sacramento	El Camino Ave., Sacramento	3.5	165,000
4	Route 80	Sacramento County	Route 5, Sacramento	1	80,000

Source: Caltrans response to TRIP survey. (ADT = Average Daily Traffic)

BRIDGE CONDITIONS

Approximately a third of bridges and overpasses in the Sacramento area are structurally deficient or functionally obsolete.

- Sixteen percent (153) of the 986 bridges in the Sacramento area are rated as structurally deficient, showing significant deterioration to decks and other major components.
- Nineteen percent (182) of the 986 bridges in the Sacramento area are functionally obsolete. These bridges no longer meet modern design standards for safety features such as lane widths or alignment with connecting roads or are no longer adequate for the volume of traffic being carried.
- Bridge deficiencies have an impact on mobility and safety. Restrictions on vehicle weight may cause many vehicles – especially emergency vehicles, commercial trucks, school buses and farm equipment – to use alternate routes to avoid these bridges. Narrow bridge lanes, inadequate clearances and poorly aligned bridge approaches reduce traffic safety. Redirected trips lengthen travel time, waste fuel and reduce the efficiency of the local economy.
- The following is a list of the most structurally deficient bridges in the Sacramento area, carrying at least 5,000 vehicles per day. Bridges are assigned an overall sufficiency rating between one and 100, with deficient bridges receiving a lower score. Individual components of the bridge, including the deck, super-structure and sub-structure are also assigned a rating between one and nine, with a lower score indicating a greater level of deficiency.

Chart 2. Bridges in the Sacramento metro area with the lowest sufficiency rating.

Rank	Route	City	Route or feature intersected	Daily Traffic	Year built	Sufficiency Rating	Deck Rating	Super-structure Rating	Sub-structure Rating
1	HOWE AVE	Sacramento	UNIVERSITY AVE	24,020	1969	17	2	3	7
2	HOWE AVE	Sacramento	UNIVERSITY AVE	24,279	1969	18	2	3	7
3	RIVER ROAD	Sacramento	DELTA CROSS CHANNEL	9,400	1951	35	7	4	7
4	WALNUT GROVE XING	Sacramento	SACRAMENTO RIVER	6,020	1952	35.2	7	6	7
5	ROSEVILLE RD	Sacramento	ARCADE CREEK	15,905	1938	42	3	6	7
6	SUTTER SLU BR RD	Sacramento	SUTTER SLOUGH	6,020	1939	42	3	6	7
7	EL CAMINO AVE	Sacramento	NATOMAS E. DRAIN CANAL	7,000	1945	43.8	4	5	6
8	Route 5	Sacramento	West End Viaduct (left)	78,000	1969	47.7	3	6	7
9	JIBBOOM ST	Sacramento	UP RR YARD	7,607	1937	47.8	3	5	6
10	Route 5	Sacramento	S. Connector Undercrossing	126,000	1971	48.5	4	7	7
11	RIO LINDA BLVD	Sacramento	N. CHANNEL DRY CREEK	6,000	1939	49.8	4	5	7
12	HOWE AVE	Sacramento	AMERICAN RIVER	24,020	1969	54.8	4	5	7
13	FLORIN ROAD	Sacramento Co.	MORRISON CREEK	47,000	1956	55.6	4	7	7
14	Route 5	Sacramento	West End Viaduct (right)	78,000	1969	59	3	6	7
15	Route 51	Sacramento	Fort Sutter Viaduct	81,500	1966	59.8	4	5	7
16	C STREET	W. Sacramento	UPRR, BNSF RY, AMTRAK	7,364	1958	59.8	3	5	5
17	HAZEL AVENUE	Sacramento	AMERICAN RIVER	75,000	1966	61	3	7	5
18	FRANKLIN BLVD	Sacramento	UNION HOUSE CREEK	6,000	1998	62.7	3	6	7
19	ON I STREET	Sacramento	I STREET VIADUCT	8,200	1936	63.1	3	6	5
20	Route 99	Sacramento	12th Avenue Overcrossing	21,000	1959	64.6	3	6	7
21	Route 50	Sacramento	Sacramento River Viaduct (left)	102,500	1966/1971	66	4	5	7
22	Route 50	Sacramento	Sacramento River Viaduct (right)	102,500	1966/1971	66	3	5	7
23	Route 50	Sacramento Co.	Watt Avenue Overcrossing	28,900	1971	66	4	8	7
24	Route 50	Sacramento	Camellia City Viaduct	123,500	1968	67	3	5	7
25	HOWE AVE	Sacramento	AMERICAN RIVER	24,279	1969	68.1	4	7	7

Source: Caltrans response to TRIP survey.

CONGESTION

Traffic congestion in Sacramento is a growing burden, hampering mobility for individuals and businesses impeding the region’s economic development.

- In 2007, 70 percent of urban highways in the Sacramento metro area were congested, carrying traffic volumes that result in significant rush hour delays.
- The average Sacramento driver loses 39 hours per year due to traffic congestion according to the Texas Transportation Institute’s (TTI) 2009 Annual Urban Mobility Report.

TRAFFIC SAFETY

Improving safety features on Sacramento’ roads and highways would likely result in a decrease in traffic fatalities in the state.

- In 2008, 115 people were killed in traffic accidents in the Sacramento metro area.
- Sacramento’ fatality rate per 100,000 population was 7.2 in 2008. This was lower than the statewide average of 9.3.

- Where appropriate, highway improvements can reduce traffic fatalities and accidents while improving traffic flow to help relieve congestion. Such improvements include removing or shielding obstacles; adding or improving medians; adding rumble strips, wider lanes, wider and paved shoulders; upgrading roads from two lanes to four lanes; and better road markings and traffic signals.

PUBLIC TRANSIT

Public transit systems in the Sacramento area play an important role in providing mobility in the region.

- Public transit provided 133 million passenger miles of travel in the Sacramento urban area in 2007, a 12 percent increase since 2002.
- In 2007 the average age of buses in the region was 8.6 years. The Federal Transit Administration recommends that buses be replaced after 12 years.
- In 2007 the average age of passenger rail cars in the region was 11.1 years. The Federal Transit Administration recommends that passenger rail cars be replaced after 35 years.