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Background

1. Received a $125,000 Sustainable Transportation Planning Grant from Caltrans and SACOG for a Multimodal Facility Feasibility Study

2. April 2017 – Executed a contract with Kimley Horn and Associates to perform the study
Study Goals

1. Identify and assess the feasibility of potential locations for a multi-modal facility on existing or future passenger rail service lines

2. Evaluate potential reductions to commuter traffic

3. Select a recommended location(s) using a detailed evaluation process and public input

4. Inform future planning and funding efforts for a multi-modal facility
Study Process

Schedule – 7 months (June 2017 to Dec 2017)

Process:

1. Identify potential site locations
2. Estimate ridership and congestion relief
3. Evaluate site locations based on evaluation criteria
4. Present draft results to the public
5. Incorporate public input
6. Identify recommended multi-modal facility site(s)
Stakeholder Agencies

San Joaquin Joint Powers Authority (SJJPA)

Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG)

Sacramento Regional Transit (SacRT)
Rail Service Connectivity

Connecting to existing or future rail services will maximize the benefits of a Multi-Modal Facility.

• Gain access to national, state and regional destinations
• Leverages past and future infrastructure investments
• Potential to have Multi-Modal Facility costs partially or fully covered by near term grant opportunities

As such, the Feasibility Study has focused on potential sites immediately adjacent to existing or future rail services
SacRT - Existing Light Rail Services

Light Rail is owned and operated by SacRT

Blue line currently stops at Cosumnes River College (CRC)

Recent Blue Line extension of 4.3 miles cost $270M
SacRT - Future Light Rail Services

Blue Line extension from CRC to Civic Center would cost approximately $230M

City continues to plan for an extension but:

- Extension is not funded
- No apparent near-term funding opportunities
- No timeline identified for extension
SJPPA - Existing Heavy Rail Services

Rail Lines Owned by UPPR

City has no influence over:
• Rail line uses
• Volume of train traffic

Eastside Line (Fresno Subdivision)
• SJPPA currently provides Amtrak passenger service (2 off peak trains)
• UPPR unlikely to allow additional passenger service on the east line

Westside Line (Sacramento Subdivision)
• No existing passenger service
SJJPA - Future Heavy Rail Services

Eastside Line
• UPRR unlikely to allow additional passenger service on the east line (2 off peak trains and 1 peak train)

Westside Line
• UPRR conducting a study to determine if they are willing to allow SJJPA passenger service on this line
• Potential for considerably more daily passenger trains
Site Requirements – Initial Screening

• Adjacent to a current or future passenger rail corridor (heavy or light rail)

• Within or adjacent to City Limits

• Space for 1,000-foot long platform along tracks

• 5-10 acres for facilities including parking

• Connectivity to existing transportation system

• Prefer vacant lots or lots with low real estate impacts

• Minimize risk of environmental issues (e.g. wetlands, soil contamination)

• Avoid excessive construction/site design costs
Initial Screening - Map of 13 Potential Sites
Detailed Evaluation Criteria

- Within City Limits
- Rail service feasibility
- Site adequacy for multimodal use
- Grant potential
- Accessibility
- Ridership estimation
- Site acquisition feasibility
- Cost
- Other risk factors
- Congestion relief
- Changes to bus network
- Nearby bus and bike facilities
- Opportunity for supporting uses
Detailed Evaluation – 4 Potential Sites
Public Outreach

Two Open Houses
- August 2, 2017 - 20 attendees
- September 14, 2017 - 30 attendees

Two Online Forums
- August 2 – 16 (Questionnaire) - 138 participants
- September 14 – 21 (Comment Forum) - 6 comments received

City Council update on August 23rd via Consent Agenda

172 Total Comments Provided
Public Outreach Notifications

- City Newsletter – Sept/Oct 2017 (City Wide)
- City Webpage
- Project Webpage
- Notifications at City Council Meetings
- Press Releases
- News Articles in the Citizen
- Social Media
  - Week at a Glance, NextDoor, Twitter and Facebook
- Attempted contact with Home Owner and Neighborhood Associations for which contact information was readily available
Summary of Public Input

In general, most of the public are in favor of having a Multi-Modal Facility.

Public input on specific site locations is as follow:

• Site 1 – Bilby/Willard
  • Not a centralized location.
  • Viewed by some as the most viable location for commuting to Sacramento Area
  • Possibilities for future bay area connections.
  • Located too close to existing established neighborhoods. Concerned with home values, crime, traffic, train noise

• Site 2 – Franklin/Elk Grove Boulevard
  • Impacts to the Stone Lakes National Wildlife Refuge

• Site 3 – Civic Center/Future Light Rail
  • Centralized location.
  • Connectivity with future bus rapid transit and/or light rail services

• Site 4 – Grant Line
  • More centralized than Sites 1 and 2
  • Not near neighborhoods.
  • Near State Route 99
Assume there will be a multi-modal facility on each type of rail service in the future.
Site 3 would be recommended as a viable location for the “light rail multi-modal facility”
#3 Preliminary Study Results—Recommended Heavy Rail Line

1. East line (Fresno Subdivision) has limited SJPPA passenger service potential

2. West line (Sacramento Subdivision) has better potential for expanded SJJPA passenger services and has a near-term grant opportunity

3. Preliminarily recommend the West line (Sacramento Subdivision) as the rail corridor for the “heavy rail multi-modal facility”

4. However, recommend allowing SJJPA and UPRR to conclude rail line negotiations before the City selects a recommended rail corridor.
Recommend Site 4 as a viable location for a potential “heavy rail multi-modal facility” on the east line (Fresno Subdivision).
#5 Preliminary Study Results—Heavy Rail West Line

Recommend Site 1 and Site 2 as potentially viable locations for a “heavy rail multi-modal facility” on the west line (Sacramento Subdivision).
The range of costs for a multi-modal facility is estimated between $15 million to $25 Million.
Next Steps

**Tonight** — Receive additional public input and direction from City Council

**November/December 2017** — Finalize the Feasibility Study

**Future City Council Meeting** — Present the Final Feasibility Study to City Council for Approval
Questions & Comments

Contact Information
Tom Metcalf, Project Manager
tmetcalf@elkgrovecity.org
916-478-2281
8401 Laguna Palms Way
Elk Grove, CA 95758

Project Webpage & Online Comment Forum
bit.ly/ElkGroveMultimodal
## Site Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Heavy Rail Connection</th>
<th>Light Rail Connection</th>
<th>Bus Rapid Transit Connection</th>
<th>Ability to Attract Ridership</th>
<th>Near Term Grant Opportunities</th>
<th>Cost to Construct</th>
<th>Centrally Located</th>
<th>Right-Of-Way Acquisition Required</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site 1 – Willard &amp; Bilby</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Located in proximity to established neighborhoods. Concerns have been expressed about impact to home values, increase in crime, increase in traffic on local roads and increased noise due to trains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 3 - Civic Center</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>Most</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dependent on future $230 million light rail extension and future bus rapid transit services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site 4 - Grant Line</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UPRR will likely not increase passenger service on the Fresno Line which is the rail line that serves this location. With only 2 or 3 trains a day, ridership will likely not be maximized at this location.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>