

REGIONAL TRANSIT NETWORK PLAN



Table of Contents

	Page
Introduction	1
Planning Process	3
Regional Transit Network Goals	4
Supporting Plans	5
What is High-Capacity Transit?.....	6
Elements of HCT	7
Regional Transit Network	8
Bus with Speed and Reliability Improvements	17
BRT Lite	19
Full BRT	21
Freeway BRT	23
Near-Term Improvements	25
Corridor Selection	26
Speed & Reliability Toolkit.....	26
Next Steps	30
Political Readiness & Partnerships	31
Benefits to the Region	33
Appendix A: Corridor Evaluation and Prioritization	A-1
Goal-Based Metrics.....	A-1
Scoring and Weighting	A-2
Prioritized Corridors.....	A-3
Appendix B: Corridor Profiles.....	B-1
Appendix C: Proposed Near-Term Improvements.....	C-1

Cover photo source: Sacramento Regional Transit District

INTRODUCTION

The Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) recently embarked upon an extensive effort to shape and define strategies for advancing transit initiatives in the region, outlining high level actions that include the need to develop a truly regional transit network predicated on fast, reliable, high frequency transit service. The resulting plan, the *Next Generation Transit Study*, adopted by the Board of Directors in 2021, identified a need for an accessible, integrated regional and inter-county transit network by providing more frequent transit service in the most transit-competitive corridors.

Through this Regional Transit Network Plan, SACOG is taking the first step in developing and prioritizing a list of regional transit corridors for future investment. The plan also identifies potential near-term projects to improve transit service more quickly on existing bus routes. These regional transit corridors will be included in the 2025 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy, now named the 2025 Blueprint.

The RTN Plan will create an accessible, integrated regional and inter-county transit network by providing more frequent and reliable transit service in the most transit-competitive corridors.




Photo source: Sacramento Regional Transit District

As the region's designated regional transportation planning agency, SACOG is focused on ensuring that any transportation study, plan, or investment is completed through a regional lens while also exhibiting a clear connection and benefit to other regional entities. This plan is a coordinated six-county effort, spanning the entire region and bringing together all transit operators, regional transportation planning agencies, and transportation districts towards a common regional transit framework and focused implementation strategies.

The project team built off the existing transit network in SACOG's six-county region to develop new regional transit corridors based on:

- Technical analyses of existing and future conditions, relevant plans, and policies in the region
- Input from partner agencies on all steps of the technical analyses including the evaluation framework, existing conditions, network development, evaluation, screening and prioritization, and the list of corridors for near term improvements
- Using best practices in transit network planning to guide development of the network framework, identification of transit corridors, and screening of the corridors using key performance metrics

Through this comprehensive process of identifying, evaluating, and prioritizing corridors, decision-makers and leaders now have a roadmap for focusing their efforts in building the next generation of transit services and riders in the Sacramento Region.


PLANNING PROCESS

The Regional Transit Network was developed through a multi-step technical process involving partner agency input and guidance throughout. These partner agencies included transit operators, planning agencies, and other governing bodies. In addition, the RTN Project Team also presented project updates to the SACOG Transit Coordinating Committee (TCC), Transportation Committee (TC), Regional Planning Partnership (RPP), and the SACOG Board at key milestones in the planning process.

Error! Reference source not found. summarizes each of the five phases for developing the Regional Transit Network.

In the first phase of the process, the RTN Team developed the framework for corridor identification and evaluation linked with plan goals (See **Figure 2** and **Appendix A**). Next, the RTN Team identified potential corridors based on an existing and future conditions analysis and partner input. Then, the RTN Team screened corridors using a small selection of prioritization criteria to eliminate any corridors with fatal flaws or where high-capacity transit may not be justified.

Figure 1: RTN Evaluation Framework



Following the screening, each remaining corridor was evaluated against the other corridors of its type (e.g., Short-, Medium- and Long-Distance Corridors) using multiple criteria of existing and project metrics (See **Appendix A**). The RTN Team studied multiple weighting scenarios to assess how the composite result of evaluation would reflect overall RTN goals. The chosen scenario weighted each of the plan's goals equally. The prioritization score assigned to each corridor is intended to aid with planning for long-term investment in regional transit. In the final phase of the process, several corridors were selected for near-term bus speed and reliability improvements.









REGIONAL TRANSIT NETWORK GOALS

The goals for the Regional Transit Network are based on SACOG regional plans, with the goals from the Next Generation Transit Strategy as a primary source. These goals were developed specifically for the region's transit network and align with overall goals from SACOG's 2020 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategies (MTP/SCS). Additionally, the goals were designed to be outcome-oriented and align with existing transit metrics used by the region's transit operators.

A workshop was held with partners to reach consensus on the goals and objectives of the RTN to ensure it reflects the regional vision for transit. The goals are tied to specific prioritization criteria used to develop the RTN.

As a result, a smaller set of goals was developed for the RTN. **Figure 2** provides a list of goals for the RTN Plan, identifying their relationship with the consolidated Next Generation Transit Strategy goals.

Figure 2: RTN Plan Goals

 RTN PLAN GOALS	 NEXT GENERATION TRANSIT STRATEGY GOALS	 DESCRIPTION
 Fast and Reliable Service	✓ Fast and Reliable	Increases the competitiveness of transit with driving.
 Equitable Investment	✓ Equitable	Reduces disparities in transit travel time and access and provides more transit options for historically disadvantaged communities.
 Access and Interconnectivity	Moves the Economy ✓ Interconnected ✓ User Friendly	Leverages existing transit services to provide seamless and easy travel for all users to the top regional centers and destinations.
 Financial Stewardship	✓ Cost-Effective ✓ Financially Sustainable	Puts public funds to the best use by minimizing costs while maintaining or increasing ridership.
 Climate Smart	✓ Climate Smart	Meets or exceeds targets for reduced emissions and vehicle miles travelled.

SUPPORTING PLANS

The RTN will serve as the long-range network for SACOG's ongoing Blueprint update. The RTN Team coordinated regularly with SACOG's Blueprint team to ensure that the long-range network was represented accurately in the Blueprint. Additionally, several metrics that illustrate the benefits of the Regional Transit Network are derived from the SACOG Blueprint team regional modeling efforts.

An important part of the regional transit vision is understanding the related plans of transit operators, regional transportation planning agencies and transportation districts in the six-county region. Multiple plans supplement or complement the RTN by defining a vision for high-capacity transit, managed travel lanes, or both. The RTN Team convened the region's key stakeholders as project partners to review previous plans, confirm that those plans still reflected local priorities, and gather input about current stakeholder needs.

WHAT IS HIGH-CAPACITY TRANSIT?

The regional transit vision captured in SACOG's *Next Generation Transit Study* calls for focusing resources to provide more frequent transit service in the most transit-competitive corridors. Building on that vision, this plan identifies a regional network of high-capacity transit (HCT) corridors. A successful HCT corridor will have a high density of residents and jobs, many destinations within walkable distance of each other; sidewalks and paths for safe and comfortable walking, biking, and rolling; and streets with sufficient right-of-way to prioritize transit vehicles.

High-capacity transit make fewer stops, travel at higher speeds, have more frequent service, and carry more people than local service. HCT provides faster and more reliable transit service using transit priority treatments, including segments of dedicated lanes or rights-of-way. Frequencies of 15 minutes or better are typical for HCT. However, depending on the corridor context (e.g., low-density land use and long-distance corridors) service may be less frequent than every 15 minutes.

HCT encompasses several modes, including light rail transit (LRT), bus rapid transit (BRT), and commuter rail. The Sacramento region's existing HCT is comprised of two frequent LRT lines (Figure 6) and two frequent bus routes. Through analysis of existing and future conditions and input from the project partner engagement process, the RTN Team identified various forms of bus based HCT for inclusion in the plan.

Figure 3: Sacramento Regional Transit Light Rail




Photo source: Sacramento Regional Transit District.

ELEMENTS OF HCT

Several key elements work together to make HCT a fast, convenient, and comfortable transit service (**Figure 4**). These elements each contribute to a convenient, fast, reliable, and comfortable transit journey. Transit routes and services which encapsulate several or all these elements should be considered eligible for categorization, branding, and funding as a regional HCT project.

Figure 4: Definitions of HCT Elements in the Context of an Example HCT Station



REGIONAL TRANSIT NETWORK

The overall corridor evaluation process considered both strengths of individual corridors and how each would function as part of a regional transit network. Insights provided by project partners throughout the process also helped to incorporate the region's transit vision and values. The resulting proposed RTN is comprised of three corridor HCT distance types, assigned by their relative distance covered. There are 47 corridors in total (Figure 5, **Table 1**): 7 Long-Distance HCT (**Figure 6**), 30 Medium-Distance HCT (**Figure 7**), and 10 Short-Distance HCT (**Figure 8**).

1. **Long Distance Corridors:** facilitate long-distance trips generally defined as 10 miles or greater, such as trips served today by express buses on I-80, SR 99, and US 50. Specific improvements could include increased service in existing rail corridors and/or existing or new freeway-oriented BRT services. Stations would be widely spaced and use transit priority measures to enable high-speed operations.
2. **Medium Distance Corridors:** facilitate medium-distance trips generally 5 to 10-miles, with the region's existing light rail system being an example of this type of corridor. Specific improvements could be new or expanded light rail routes and arterial-oriented BRT services. Station spacing would be similar to existing LRT services. This attribute, along with a wide range of potential arterial transit priority measures, would facilitate higher-speed operations in key arterial corridors.
3. **Short Distance Corridors:** enhance short-distance trips five miles or shorter in areas with existing local routes and/or in surrounding land uses with existing or potential high transit ridership.

LEGEND

- Long HCT
- Medium HCT
- Short HCT
- Urbanized Area

0 15 30 Miles

Figure 6: Long-Distance HCT Corridors




Figure 7: Medium-Distance HCT Corridors




Figure 8: Short-Distance HCT Corridors




Table 1: List of Regional Transit Network Corridors

Corridor Name	HCT Distance Type	RTN Inclusion Justification	County of Origin	County of Destination	Prioritization Score ¹
I-80 Davis to Sacramento	Long	Regional trunk line for inter-county and long-distance trips	Yolo	Sacramento	4.2
I-5 Woodland to Sacramento	Long	Regional trunk line for inter-county and long-distance trips	Yolo	Sacramento	3.9
US-50 Placerville to Sacramento	Long	Regional trunk line for inter-county and long-distance trips	El Dorado	Sacramento	3.8
I-80/SR-160 Auburn to Sacramento	Long	Regional trunk line for inter-county and long-distance trips	Placer	Sacramento	3.7
SR-99/US-50 Lodi to Sacramento	Long	Regional trunk line for inter-county and long-distance trips	San Joaquin	Sacramento	3.5
SR-70/SR-99/I-5 Yuba City to Sacramento	Long	Regional trunk line for inter-county and long-distance trips	Sutter	Sacramento	3.0
SR-65 Lincoln to Roseville	Long	Project partner priority, regional trunk line for inter-county and long-distance trips	Placer	Sacramento	2.7
Watt	Medium	Previously studied HCT corridor	Sacramento	Sacramento	4.2
Stockton	Medium	Existing frequent bus route, proposed SacRT Rapid corridor, links areas of high transit propensity with healthcare jobs	Sacramento	Sacramento	4.0
Broadway	Medium	Existing frequent bus route, proposed SacRT Rapid corridor, links areas of high transit propensity with	Sacramento	Sacramento	3.9

¹ See Appendix A for details about the corridor evaluation and prioritization methodology and scores.

Regional Transit Network Plan
April 2024

Corridor Name	HCT Distance Type	RTN Inclusion Justification	County of Origin	County of Destination	Prioritization Score ¹
		Downtown and healthcare jobs			
Howe/65th	Medium	Major medical and university employers	Sacramento	Sacramento	3.7
J/Fulton	Medium	Major public administration and healthcare employers	Sacramento	Sacramento	3.6
Jefferson/ Sacramento	Medium	Future population growth	Sacramento	Sacramento	3.6
Sunrise	Medium	Previously studied HCT corridor	Placer	Sacramento	3.5
65th/Marconi/ Manzanita	Medium	4th greatest travel flow in the region	Sacramento	Sacramento	3.5
44th	Medium	Existing high ridership corridor	Sacramento	Sacramento	3.4
Freeport	Medium	Existing high ridership corridor	Sacramento	Sacramento	3.4
Madison	Medium	Existing high ridership corridor	Sacramento	Sacramento	3.4
Truxel/ Commerce	Medium	Previously studied LRT extension, links the region to Sacramento International Airport	Yolo	Sacramento	3.3
Power Inn	Medium	Future population growth	Sacramento	Sacramento	3.3
El Camino	Medium	Existing high ridership corridor	Sacramento	Sacramento	3.2
Franklin	Medium	Moderate to high transit propensity populations	Sacramento	Sacramento	3.2
Franklin/MLK	Medium	Existing high ridership corridor	Sacramento	Sacramento	3.2
Northrop/ Morse/Watt	Medium	Existing high ridership corridor	Sacramento	Sacramento	3.2
Watt/ Elk Grove-Florin	Medium	Previously studied HCT corridor	Sacramento	Sacramento	3.2
I-5/Laguna	Medium	Faster connection between Laguna and downtown Sacramento	Sacramento	Sacramento	3.1

Regional Transit Network Plan
April 2024

Corridor Name	HCT Distance Type	RTN Inclusion Justification	County of Origin	County of Destination	Prioritization Score ¹
Elkhorn/Sunrise	Medium	Links historically disadvantaged communities with healthcare jobs	Sacramento	Sacramento	3.0
Big Horn	Medium	Previously studied LRT extension, future transit-supportive land use	Sacramento	Sacramento	2.9
Auburn/Riverside	Medium	Previously studied LRT extension, future transit-supportive land use	Placer	Sacramento	2.8
Florin/Sunrise	Medium	3rd greatest travel flow in the region	Sacramento	Sacramento	2.8
Greenback	Medium	Links historically disadvantaged communities to jobs in Folsom	Sacramento	Sacramento	2.8
Laguna	Medium	Project partner priority	Sacramento	Sacramento	2.8
Jackson	Medium	Project partner priority	Sacramento	Sacramento	2.7
Walerga/Foothills	Medium	Links historically disadvantaged communities to logistics/warehousing jobs	Placer	Sacramento	2.7
SR-113	Medium	Links Woodland and Davis	Yolo	Yolo	2.3
Hazel/Roseville	Medium	8th greatest travel flow in the region	Placer	Sacramento	2.1
Watt/Sunset	Medium	Previously studied HCT corridor	Placer	Sacramento	2.0
West El Camino	Short	Existing high ridership corridor	Sacramento	Sacramento	4.8
Florin	Short	Proposed SacRT Rapid corridor	Sacramento	Sacramento	4.2
Rio Linda/Grand	Short	Existing high ridership corridor	Sacramento	Sacramento	3.6
Arden	Short	Previously studied HCT corridor	Sacramento	Sacramento	3.5
Kiefer/Lincoln	Short	Existing high ridership corridor	Sacramento	Sacramento	3.4

Regional Transit Network Plan
April 2024

Corridor Name	HCT Distance Type	RTN Inclusion Justification	County of Origin	County of Destination	Prioritization Score ¹
Meadowview	Short	Moderate to high transit propensity populations	Sacramento	Sacramento	3.2
San Juan	Short	Moderate transit propensity populations	Sacramento	Sacramento	3.2
43 rd	Short	Moderate to high transit propensity populations	Sacramento	Sacramento	3.0
Russell/5th	Short	Proposed HCT corridor	Sacramento	Sacramento	3.0
Douglas	Short	Major employers and future transit supportive land use	Sacramento	Sacramento	2.5

The RTN Team developed corridor profiles describing the Long-, Medium-, and Short-Distance HCT Corridors with prioritization scores in the top third of their respective distance type. See **Appendix B** for these detailed profiles.

Following the prioritization process, each RTN corridor was assigned a specific category: Bus with Speed and Reliability Improvements, BRT Lite, Full BRT, and Freeway BRT. The following sections describe the types of treatments that can be implemented for each category and show maps of the corridors in each category (**Figure 9, Figure 10, Figure 11, Figure 12**).


BUS WITH SPEED AND RELIABILITY IMPROVEMENTS

Typical local bus service can be enhanced with techniques that improve speed and reliability. In this category, buses mostly operate in mixed traffic but may have dedicated transit lanes in select locations. Although enhanced bus services should not be confused with HCT services with a “rapid” branding, there are targeted measures that ensure Bus with Speed & Reliability Improvements stands apart from traditional local bus service. Examples of location-specific approaches to investment in this category may include stop consolidation, queue jump lanes, transit signal priority, and other spot treatments at intersections.

Passengers board and alight vehicles at **consolidated stops** spaced further apart than local bus stops (1/4 to 1/2 miles).



Intersections are designed to prioritize safe and expedient bus movement.



Queue jump lanes, transit signal priority, and other spot treatments at intersections are intended to speed up transit service, including situations where the vehicle is in mixed traffic.





Figure 9: Bus with Speed & Reliability Improvements Corridors



BRT LITE

Compared to Bus with Speed & Reliability Improvements, Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Lite contains additional distinguishing improvements to convenience, speed, and reliability. Features of BRT Lite include all previously specified aspects of Bus with Speed & Reliability Improvements, with the addition of off-board fare purchases at distinguished stations with attractive amenities.

For less than half of the corridor length, vehicles run along an **exclusive right-of-way** with dedicated signals, which allows vehicles to move at a speed faster than congested traffic.




Stations also contain multiple **distinguishing and attractive amenities** to ensure passengers can easily identify each station and are comfortable waiting on the platform and connecting to other modes of transportation outside the station.



Fares are purchased off-board at stations or by app or smart card, and not on-board buses, relieving buses of delays associated with fare payment and enabling quick **all-door boarding**.



Figure 10: BRT Lite Corridors



FULL BRT

Bus rapid transit (BRT) is a high-quality bus service that operates with all the possible enhancements to passenger convenience, travel time, and reliability. This makes the service much like light rail, but BRT is far more efficient in terms of capital and operational costs. When fully implemented, BRT can decrease travel times, improve corridor safety, and spur economic development.

Passengers board and alight vehicles at **consolidated stops** spaced further apart than local or enhanced bus stops (1/2 to 1 mile).




For the majority of the corridor length, vehicles run along an exclusive **right-of-way** with dedicated signals, freeing vehicles from traffic congestion.



Stations are designed with **platforms at the same level as the buses**, creating a seamless and accessible user experience for users of all ages and abilities.



Figure 11: Full BRT Corridors



FREEWAY BRT

Freeway BRT consists of buses operating on limited-access freeways, typically serving longer corridors with stations spaced three to five miles apart. This service is typically focused on commuters working conventional hours, but it has the potential to provide the region's residents with access to hospitals, colleges and universities, and other key destinations across county lines. Freeway BRT may use managed lanes, such as high-occupancy vehicle lanes or express toll lanes, to make trips faster and more reliable.

Stations are **spaced farther apart** than local or enhanced bus stops (3 to 5 mile).




For the majority of the corridor length, vehicles mainly run along freeway in managed lanes or exclusive transit.



The stations are located within the freeway right-of-way and are designed with **platforms at the same level as the buses**, creating a seamless and accessible user experience for users of all ages and abilities.



Figure 12: Freeway BRT Corridors



NEAR-TERM IMPROVEMENTS

While RTN Plan is focused on identifying HCT corridors for the region's long-range transit vision, the RTN Team also identified potential projects that could improve speed and reliability in the near-term for existing transit riders.

Advancing the near-term improvements described in this report will demonstrate proof of concept for strategies that decrease bus travel times, make service more reliable, and produce near-term results that encourage more people to use public transit.

These projects require stakeholder collaboration to plan, fund, and implement, which will foster partnerships between the region's local governments and transit operators. The partnerships created and strengthened through implementing these improvements will, in turn, demonstrate political readiness to make the Sacramento region more competitive in winning federal grant funding to implement the long-term RTN Plan.

The following sections summarize the process for selecting corridors for near-term speed and reliability improvements, list the selected corridors, and describe the infrastructure toolkit for achieving faster speeds and greater reliability.



Photo source: Sacramento Regional Transit District

CORRIDOR SELECTION

The corridor selection process started with reviewing recent project partners' plans for potential BRT and LRT corridors. The recent plans compared the RTN corridors and existing local bus routes to identify areas of alignment. The following plans provided sources of BRT concepts:

- Caltrans I-5 Corridor Improvement Project (FixSac5)
- Caltrans Yolo 80 Corridor Improvements Project
- City of Sacramento General Plan Update 2040
- City of Sacramento Stockton Boulevard Corridor Plan
- PCTPA Placer-Sacramento Gateway Plan
- SacRT Envisioned Network of the Future
- SacRT High-Capacity Bus Service Study
- Unitrans Short-Range Transit Plan

The candidate corridors were shared with transit operators and local government partners. Freeway corridors were eliminated from consideration due to the complexity of implementing freeway bus speed and reliability projects. The corridors' prioritization scores served to prioritize the candidate corridors for near-term improvements. The six top-ranked corridors were selected for development of near-term bus speed and reliability improvements (**Table 2**). See **Appendix C** for maps of the proposed improvements by corridor.

Table 2: Near-Term Candidate Corridors

Study Corridor	Examples of Recommended Improvements
Arden	Queue jump and transit signal priority
Broadway	Queue jump, transit signal priority, in-lane stops, and bus only lanes
Florin	Stop relocation, queue jump, transit signal priority, and in-lane stop
Rio Linda/Grand	Queue jump, transit signal priority, in-lane stops, and bus only lanes
Stockton	Queue jump, transit signal priority, in-lane stops, and bus only lanes
Sunrise	Queue jump, signal priority, bus only lanes

SPEED & RELIABILITY TOOLKIT

There is a variety of near-term improvements to bus speed and reliability for transit agencies and public works departments to consider, including those developed based on best practices from the Transit Cooperative Research Program (TCRP) and National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO). The following five improvement types were workshopped with project partners and chosen to apply to the selected near-term corridors for their relevance and feasibility.

Bus-Only Lanes

Bus-only lanes provide a dedicated travel lane for buses (**Figure 13**) to improve travel time reliability and make transit more resilient to traffic congestion by separating them from other traffic. Bus-only lanes work on major streets and roads sufficiently wide enough to support either center- or curb-running bus lanes.

Figure 13: Bus-Only Lane in Seattle, Washington



Photo source: [Seattle Department of Transportation](#), licensed CC BY 2.0

Transit Signal Priority

Transit signal priority (TSP) reduces the time transit vehicles spend waiting at signals by lengthening green phases or shortening red phases. TSP is best applied on streets and roads where signals are a significant source of delay, signal cycles are long, or signals are spaced far apart. TSP pairs well with bus stops located at the far side of signalized intersections.

Bus Stop Bulb-outs

Bus stop bulb-outs extend the sidewalk and curb so that buses do not need to pull out of traffic to pick up and drop off passengers (**Figure 14**). They improve speeds and reliability because bus operators do not need to wait for a break in traffic to merge back into the travel lane. Bus stop bulb-outs also enhance safety and better accommodate accessible boarding by keeping the bus parallel and close to the curb. They can be constructed on streets with curbside parking lanes and streets with sufficient space for a curb extension of six to ten feet.

Figure 14: Bus Stop Bulb-out in New York, New York



Photo source: [New York City Department of Transportation/NACTO](#)

Queue Jumps

Queue jumps use a special traffic signal to allow a transit vehicle to pass through an intersection before other vehicles waiting at a red signal (**Figure 15**). Queue jumps can be employed in right-turn lanes with short queues, or situations in which a bus needs a head start to change lanes prior to making a left turn at the next intersection.

Figure 15: Queue Jump in Portland, Oregon




Photo source: [TriMet](#)

Bus Stop Relocations

Queue jumps and TSP both help transit vehicles advance through signalized intersections more quickly. For these tools to work best, bus stops should be relocated to the far side of signalized intersections, as illustrated in **Figure 16**.

Figure 16: Near-Side (left) and Far-Side (right) Bus Stop Bus Movement




Images source: [NACTO](#)

NEXT STEPS

The process of realizing an RTN corridor from vision to reality will require strong partnerships, governance, leadership, and inclusive community involvement along the way. **Figure 17** illustrates a potential roadmap for transit agencies and local governments in corridor development.

Figure 17: Project Development Roadmap



POLITICAL READINESS & PARTNERSHIPS

There are numerous options for transit governance. **Table 3** presents five of the many potential options for governing an HCT system in the Sacramento region and summarizes their advantages and disadvantages. Governance options are not limited to those in **Table 3**; these represent a range of options to help start a conversation with elected officials, partner agency leadership, and involve key stakeholders in determining next steps.

Table 3: Advantages and Disadvantages of Potential Governance Options

Type	Description	Advantages	Disadvantages
Existing Structure	Existing operators operate and maintain HCT within their service area. Each operator could directly operate HCT or contract with a private company.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change to existing governance and operating structures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited ability to achieve a unified HCT network Limited formal interagency coordination, funding competition, parallel functions
Sacramento Regional Transit District (SacRT) Lead Role	SacRT has the lead role in development, operations, and maintenance of the HCT network.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enables smaller operators to continue to focus on their current operations Utilizes the capacity and experience of the region's largest transit operator 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The region's other transit operators would not have input on the design and operations of the HCT system
Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) Lead Role	SACOG has the lead role in development of the HCT network. SACOG could directly operate HCT, contract with a private company, or contract with local operators.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Utilizes the sole public agency representing every jurisdiction in the region 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SACOG lacks experience and capacity to develop, operate, and maintain transit services
Regional Joint Powers Agreement (JPA)	Regional transit operators, SACOG, and Caltrans jointly exercise their powers to operate transit or create an agency to lead development of the HCT network. The JPA could directly operate HCT or contract with a private company.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Each jurisdiction can negotiate their level of commitment State law enables JPAs to have a broad set of powers, including financing projects and holding property 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires mutual trust among elected officials Changes in public support and changes in elected leadership can split up a JPA

Type	Description	Advantages	Disadvantages
New Regional Transit Development Agency	Create a new agency to develop the HCT network. A board could be directly elected or appointed by local jurisdictions. The new agency could directly operate HCT or contract with a private company.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Offers the opportunity to establish a governance structure designed specifically for the purpose of delivering regional HCT ▪ Provides more stability and certainty than a JPA ▪ Unifies funding, planning, and delivery of regional HCT 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Requires the greatest amount of time and effort to establish

Keys to Success

“The keys to success appear to depend more on the people, priorities, and partnerships behind planning and operations. This conclusion is corroborated by studies from the National Transit Center, which found that critical human elements—committed political leadership, well-supported government staff, and community advocates and leaders—are the keys to successful delivery of transit services.” — *A People’s History of Recent Urban Transportation Innovation* by Transit Center

There is no simple recipe for implementing a new governance model. Each region that explores transit governance options needs to find ways to work effectively with legislative leaders, local government, the business community, transit users, taxpayers, and the public.

Transit governance initiatives in Los Angeles, Orange County, San Diego, Seattle, and elsewhere have yielded the following lessons:

- Recognize stakeholders’ common and different goals and priorities
- Retain local control as best as possible while leveraging benefits of regional cooperation
- Provide clear benefits to transit users, residents, and taxpayers
- Recognize funding capacity
- Create consensus around achievable outcomes
- Communicate, communicate, communicate

BENEFITS TO THE REGION

A successfully implemented high-capacity transit network has the potential to benefit the region in numerous ways including:

- Improving air quality
- Promoting sustainable travel choices
- Saving time for transit riders
- Increasing operator efficiency
- Enhancing the economic resilience and competitiveness of the greater Sacramento region

The corridors highlighted in this plan make up the critical links to transit-supportive communities and regionally significant places. The corridors have undergone a comprehensive screening and prioritization process, which specifies their relative importance to the RTN vision.

Now is the time for action and implementation. With this plan, local decision-makers and regional transit champions have guidance to seek out the necessary grants, partnerships, and future governance structures for project development. As project development proceeds, it is expected that, transit in the region and country will continue to experience an evolution in recovering ridership and funding. Agencies should do everything in their power to keep the public updated on their efforts to plan thoughtfully using real-time travel data, travel demand, consumer preferences, and focus on equitable outcomes.

Strategic partnerships, high quality standards, context-sensitive planning, and reliable commitments to infrastructure investment will ensure that the RTN meets its full potential. Moreover, short-term corridor improvements to bus speed and reliability will help close the mobility and accessibility gaps in the region's communities. By continuing to close those critical gaps through improvements envisioned in this plan, everybody in the region will benefit.

APPENDIX A: CORRIDOR EVALUATION AND PRIORITIZATION

GOAL-BASED METRICS

Twenty-seven evaluation metrics were selected to apply to corridors that advanced beyond the screening phase. These metrics, listed in **Table 4**, incorporated data from 2019 to 2022 for existing conditions and 2040 future projections. The metrics were organized by project goal.

Table 4: Prioritization Metrics

#	Goal	Prioritization Metrics
1	Fast and Reliable Service	Percent of corridor with four or more travel lanes (combined in both directions) or other existing dedicated right-of-way dedicated to transit
2		Percent of corridor in a Congestion Management Plan deficient corridor
3	Equitable Investment	Percent of population within 1/2 mile that is non-white or Hispanic
4		Percent of population within 1/2 mile with household incomes less than twice the Federal poverty line
5		Percent of households within 1/2 mile with no access to a vehicle
6		Percent of population within 1/2 mile that has one or more disabilities
7		Percent of population within 1/2 mile age 65 or older
8		Percent of public transit Commuters within 1/2 mile
9		Change in travel flows from 2019 to 2021 (as a factor)
10	Access & Interconnectivity	Normalized existing population within 1/2 mile
11		Normalized existing jobs within 1/2 mile
12		Normalized projected population in 2040 within 1/2 mile
13		Normalized projected jobs in 2040 within 1/2 mile

Regional Transit Network Plan
April 2024

#	Goal	Prioritization Metrics
14		Percent of population within 1/2 mile age 16 and older with commutes longer than 45 minutes
15		Count of the top 50 origin-destination pairs in 2019 where the corridor intersects with both the origin and destination
16		Count of the top 50 origin-destination pairs in 2021 where the corridor intersects with both the origin and destination
17		Count of intersecting frequent bus routes
18		Count of intersecting rail lines
19		Count of intersecting park-and-ride lots
20		Count of intersecting existing and planned bicycle facilities (Class I & IV)
21		Criticality to the overall network
22	Climate Smart	Percent of transit-supportive land use in 2040 within 1/2 mile of corridor (sq. mi.)
23		Percent of green zone area within 1/2 mile of corridor (sq. mi.)
24		Average air quality index
25		Estimated reduction in greenhouse gas emissions
26		Estimated reduction in vehicle miles traveled (Fall 2021-Fall 2022 baseline)
27		Count of intersecting station areas with high opportunity TOD sites

SCORING AND WEIGHTING

In the prioritization process, each corridor was assessed within its respective type (Long Distance, Medium Distance, and Short Distance). The corridor's individual metrics were converted to indexed numerical scores from 0 to 1, with 1 going to the highest scoring corridor for each metric among each corridor type. Corridors' indexed scores were summed for each goal, meaning that each corridor received a raw score of the sum of individual indexed metrics. The raw score under each goal was then re-indexed to a maximum of 5 possible points. Thus, the Short-, Medium-, and Long-Distance Corridor that performed best each received a score of 5 for each individual goal.

The scores were then weighted equally between each goal (Fast and Reliable Service, Equitable Investment, Access & Interconnectivity, and Climate Smart) and summed to calculate a total prioritization score.

PRIORITIZED CORRIDORS

Table 5, Table 6, and Table 7 list the prioritization scores of Short-, Medium-, and Long-Distance Corridors, respectively. Corridors are sorted by their total prioritization score in descending order.

Table 5: Prioritized Long-Distance Corridors

Corridor Name	Corridor Type	Fast and Reliable Service	Equitable Investment	Access & Inter-connectivity	Climate Smart	Total Prioritization Score
I-80 Davis to Sacramento	Long	5.0	5.0	3.8	2.9	4.2
I-5 Woodland to Sacramento	Long	3.0	4.4	3.3	5.0	3.9
US-50 Placerville to Sacramento	Long	4.2	4.2	4.2	2.5	3.8
I-80/SR-160 Auburn to Sacramento	Long	3.1	4.2	5.0	2.5	3.7
SR-99/US-50 Lodi to Sacramento	Long	2.2	4.6	4.1	3.2	3.5
SR-70/SR-99/ I-5 Yuba City to Sacramento	Long	1.5	4.4	2.7	3.6	3.0
SR-65 Lincoln to Roseville	Long	1.2	2.9	2.5	4.1	2.7

Table 6: Prioritized Medium-Distance Corridors

Corridor Name	Corridor Type	Fast and Reliable Service	Equitable Investment	Access & Inter-connectivity	Climate Smart	Total Prioritization Score
Watt	Medium	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.2
Stockton	Medium	2.4	5.0	5.0	3.6	4.0
Broadway	Medium	1.5	4.7	4.5	5.0	3.9
Howe/65th	Medium	2.6	4.5	4.4	3.2	3.7
J/Fulton	Medium	1.9	4.6	4.1	3.9	3.6

Regional Transit Network Plan
April 2024

Corridor Name	Corridor Type	Fast and Reliable Service	Equitable Investment	Access & Inter-connectivity	Climate Smart	Total Prioritization Score
Jefferson/ Sacramento	Medium	1.6	4.8	3.4	4.4	3.6
65th/Marconi/ Manzanita	Medium	2.5	4.0	3.2	4.4	3.5
Sunrise	Medium	2.7	3.7	3.4	4.1	3.5
44th	Medium	1.6	4.9	3.7	3.2	3.4
Madison	Medium	2.6	3.6	3.1	4.2	3.4
Freeport	Medium	0.8	4.6	5.0	3.0	3.4
Truxel/ Commerce	Medium	0.9	4.3	3.9	4.0	3.3
Power Inn	Medium	2.3	4.4	2.3	4.1	3.3
Northrop/ Morse/Watt	Medium	2.0	4.2	3.4	3.4	3.2
Franklin	Medium	2.0	4.1	3.6	3.1	3.2
Watt/Elk Grove-Florin	Medium	2.9	4.0	2.0	3.9	3.2
Franklin/MLK	Medium	1.5	4.7	4.3	2.3	3.2
El Camino	Medium	2.3	4.0	3.4	3.0	3.2
I-5/Laguna	Medium	1.6	4.3	3.7	2.5	3.1
Elkhorn/ Sunrise	Medium	2.9	3.7	3.8	1.7	3.0
Big Horn	Medium	1.1	3.7	3.0	3.8	2.9
Florin/Sunrise	Medium	2.0	4.1	2.7	2.5	2.8
Greenback	Medium	2.2	3.5	3.4	2.1	2.8
Laguna	Medium	2.5	3.4	2.6	2.5	2.8
Auburn/ Riverside	Medium	2.4	3.6	2.9	2.1	2.8
Jackson	Medium	0.4	4.8	2.1	3.4	2.7
Walerga/ Foothills	Medium	2.0	3.5	2.1	3.1	2.7
SR-113	Medium	0.7	4.5	1.4	2.4	2.3
Hazel/ Roseville	Medium	1.0	3.2	2.3	1.8	2.1
Watt/Sunset	Medium	0.1	2.8	2.0	3.2	2.0

Regional Transit Network Plan
April 2024

Table 7: Prioritized Short-Distance Corridors

Corridor Name	Corridor Type	Fast and Reliable Service	Equitable Investment	Access & Inter-connectivity	Climate Smart	Total Prioritization Score
West El Camino	Short	4.2	5.0	5.0	4.9	4.8
Florin	Short	5.0	4.8	3.9	3.1	4.2
Rio Linda/Grand	Short	1.9	4.7	2.9	5.0	3.6
Arden	Short	2.4	4.2	3.2	4.0	3.5
Kiefer/Lincoln	Short	1.6	4.2	3.6	4.0	3.4
Meadowview	Short	2.5	4.6	2.6	3.2	3.2
San Juan	Short	1.7	4.1	3.1	3.9	3.2
43rd	Short	2.2	4.7	2.3	2.8	3.0
Russell/5th	Short	1.5	4.3	2.9	3.2	3.0
Douglas	Short	0.7	3.8	2.7	2.8	2.5

APPENDIX B: CORRIDOR PROFILES


The RTN Team developed corridor profiles describing the following Long-, Medium-, and Short-Distance HCT Corridors with prioritization scores in the top third of their respective distance type:

- Long-Distance High-Capacity Transit (3 of 7 corridors)
 - I-80 Davis to Sacramento
 - I-5 Woodland to Sacramento
 - US-50 Placerville to Sacramento
- Medium-Distance High-Capacity Transit (10 of 30 corridors)
 - Watt
 - Stockton
 - Broadway
 - Howe/65th
 - J/Fulton
 - Jefferson/Sacramento
 - 65th/Marconi/Manzanita
 - Sunrise
 - 44th
 - Madison
- Short-Distance High-Capacity Transit (4 of 10 corridors)
 - West El Camino
 - Florin
 - Rio Linda/Grand
 - Arden











I-80 DAVIS TO SACRAMENTO

8th St & E St to UC Davis

Long-Distance HCT



QUICK FACTS

	Length	19.5 miles
	Jurisdiction(s)	Sacramento & Yolo Counties
	Service Type	Freeway BRT
	Level of Investment	\$\$\$
	Projected Ridership in 2050	4,000
	Population in 2020 (1/2 Mile)	54,550
	Employment in 2019 (1/2 Mile)	84,120
	Congestion Management Plan Deficient Corridor	16.9%
	Transit-Supportive Land-Use in 2040 (1/2 Mile)	21.8%
	Prioritization Score	4.2/5

EXISTING BUS LINES ON CORRIDOR

Agency	Bus Line
SacRT	138
Yolo TD	42, 43, 43R, 44, 230, & 232

POTENTIAL OPERATIONAL ISSUES

- AM peak period congestion westbound to Davis
- PM peak period congestion eastbound to Sacramento


HIGH-CAPACITY TRANSIT FEATURES AND INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS

- Managed lanes or bus-on-shoulder lanes
- Center-running (in-line) or side-running stations
- Pedestrian bridges and other pedestrian infrastructure needed to access stations
- Direct access ramps (DARs) to park-and-ride facilities











I-5 WOODLAND TO SACRAMENTO

Main St & East St to 8th St & Q St

Long-Distance HCT



QUICK FACTS

	Length	16.2 miles
	Jurisdiction(s)	Sacramento & Yolo Counties
	Service Type	Freeway BRT
	Level of Investment	\$\$\$
	Projected Ridership in 2050	6,000
	Population in 2020 (1/2 Mile)	47,490
	Employment in 2019 (1/2 Mile)	84,880
	Congestion Management Plan Deficient Corridor	66.2%
	Transit-Supportive Land-Use in 2040 (1/2 Mile)	21%
	Prioritization Score	3.9/5

EXISTING BUS LINES ON CORRIDOR

Agency	Bus Line
SacRT	142, 170, 171, 172, & 174
Yolo TD	35, 39, 40, 41, 42, 45, 45X, 46, & 240

POTENTIAL OPERATIONAL ISSUES

- AM peak period congestion near I-80 and SR-99 interchanges
- PM peak period congestion northbound from downtown Sacramento

HIGH-CAPACITY TRANSIT FEATURES AND INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS

- Managed lanes or bus-on-shoulder lanes
- Center-running (in-line) or side-running stations
- Pedestrian bridges and other pedestrian infrastructure needed to access stations
- Direct access ramps (DARs) to park-and-ride facilities











US-50 PLACERVILLE TO SACRAMENTO

Watt Ave & Elverta Rd to Watt/Manlove Station

Long-Distance HCT



QUICK FACTS

	Length	44.6 miles
	Jurisdiction(s)	Sacramento & El Dorado Counties
	Service Type	Freeway BRT
	Level of Investment	\$\$\$
	Projected Ridership in 2050	1,000
	Population in 2020 (1/2 Mile)	129,770
	Employment in 2019 (1/2 Mile)	166,400
	Congestion Management Plan Deficient Corridor	19.5%
	Transit-Supportive Land-Use in 2040 (1/2 Mile)	22%
	Prioritization Score	3.8/5

EXISTING BUS LINES ON CORRIDOR

Agency	Bus Line
SacRT	109 Gold
Yoba-Sutter Transit	HWY 99 to Sacramento, Sacramento Mid Day Express, & HWY 70 to Sacramento
El Dorado Transit	Sac Commuter, Sac Reverse Commuter, & 50 Express

POTENTIAL OPERATIONAL ISSUES

- Peak period congestion in Sacramento in both directions

HIGH-CAPACITY TRANSIT FEATURES AND INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS

- Managed lanes or bus-on-shoulder lanes
- Center-running (in-line) or side-running stations
- Pedestrian bridges and other pedestrian infrastructure needed to access stations
- Direct access ramps (DARs) to park-and-ride facilities











WATT

Watt Ave & Elverta Rd to Watt/Manlove Station

Medium-Distance HCT



QUICK FACTS

	Length	11.7 miles
	Jurisdiction(s)	Sacramento County
	Service Type	Full BRT
	Level of Investment	\$\$\$
	Projected Ridership in 2050	9,000
	Population in 2020 (1/2 Mile)	61,140
	Employment in 2019 (1/2 Mile)	27,160
	Congestion Management Plan Deficient Corridor	84%
	Transit-Supportive Land-Use in 2040 (1/2 Mile)	25%
	Prioritization Score	4.2/5

EXISTING BUS LINES ON CORRIDOR

Agency	Bus Line
SacRT	26 & 84

POTENTIAL OPERATIONAL ISSUES

- Peak period congestion between US 50 and Arden Way


HIGH-CAPACITY TRANSIT FEATURES AND INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS

- Bus-only lanes
- Center-running or side-running stations
- Transit signal priority (TSP) and/or queue jumps











STOCKTON

Downtown Sacramento to Cosumnes River College

Medium-Distance HCT



QUICK FACTS

	Length	11.2 miles
	Jurisdiction(s)	Sacramento County
	Service Type	Full BRT
	Level of Investment	\$\$\$
	Projected Ridership in 2050	8,000
	Population in 2020 (1/2 Mile)	87,540
	Employment in 2019 (1/2 Mile)	126,300
	Congestion Management Plan Deficient Corridor	19%
	Transit-Supportive Land-Use in 2040 (1/2 Mile)	42%
	Prioritization Score	4/5

EXISTING BUS LINES ON CORRIDOR

Agency	Bus Line
SacRT	51 & 213

POTENTIAL OPERATIONAL ISSUES

- Peak period congestion near UC Davis Medical Center area and US 50 interchange
- No direct path across SR-99 to reach hospitals along Bruceville Rd without a route deviation

HIGH-CAPACITY TRANSIT FEATURES AND INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS

- Bus-only lanes
- Center-running or side-running stations
- Bridge across SR-99 to connect Stockton Boulevard to Bruceville Road
- Transit signal priority (TSP) and/or queue jumps

BROADWAY

Downtown Sacramento to Sacramento State

Medium-Distance HCT



QUICK FACTS

	Length	7.9 miles
	Jurisdiction(s)	Sacramento County
	Service Type	Full BRT
	Level of Investment	\$\$\$
	Projected Ridership in 2050	5,000
	Population in 2020 (1/2 Mile)	53,780
	Employment in 2019 (1/2 Mile)	100,780
	Congestion Management Plan Deficient Corridor	7%
	Transit-Supportive Land-Use in 2040 (1/2 Mile)	38%
	Prioritization Score	3.9/5

EXISTING BUS LINES ON CORRIDOR

Agency	Bus Line
SacRT	51

POTENTIAL OPERATIONAL ISSUES

- Peak period congestion between 59th and 65th Streets
- Congestion near Sacramento State on 65th Street and Elvas Avenue
- One travel lane in each direction east of Stockton Boulevard


HIGH-CAPACITY TRANSIT FEATURES AND INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS

- Bus-only lanes
- Center-running or side-running stations
- Transit signal priority (TSP) and/or queue jumps

HOWE/65TH

Marconi/Arcade Station to Consumnes River College

Medium-Distance HCT



QUICK FACTS

	Length	12.8 miles
	Jurisdiction(s)	Sacramento County
	Service Type	Full BRT
	Level of Investment	\$\$\$
	Projected Ridership in 2050	5,000
	Population in 2020 (1/2 Mile)	87,840
	Employment in 2019 (1/2 Mile)	52,860
	Congestion Management Plan Deficient Corridor	8%
	Transit-Supportive Land-Use in 2040 (1/2 Mile)	32%
	Prioritization Score	3.7/5

EXISTING BUS LINES ON CORRIDOR

Agency	Bus Line
SacRT	81, 82, & 87

POTENTIAL OPERATIONAL ISSUES

- Peak period congestion near Sacramento State on 65th Street and Elvas Avenue
- Peak period congestion on Howe Avenue
- One travel lane in each direction between El Camino Avenue and Marconi Avenue
- No direct path across SR-99 to Kaiser Permanente South Sacramento Medical Center and Methodist Hospital of Sacramento

HIGH-CAPACITY TRANSIT FEATURES AND INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS

- Bus-only lanes
- Center-running or side-running stations
- Bridge across SR-99 to connect Stockton Boulevard to Bruceville Road
- Transit signal priority (TSP) and/or queue jumps

J/FULTON

Downtown Sacramento to Marconi/Arcade Station

Medium-Distance HCT



QUICK FACTS

	Length	11.1 miles
	Jurisdiction(s)	Sacramento County
	Service Type	BRT Lite
	Level of Investment	\$\$\$
	Projected Ridership in 2050	12,000
	Population in 2020 (1/2 Mile)	83,330
	Employment in 2019 (1/2 Mile)	140,550
	Congestion Management Plan Deficient Corridor	0%
	Transit-Supportive Land-Use in 2040 (1/2 Mile)	36%
	Prioritization Score	3.6/5

EXISTING BUS LINES ON CORRIDOR

Agency	Bus Line
SacRT	26 & 30

POTENTIAL OPERATIONAL ISSUES

- Peak period congestion throughout J Street and Fulton Avenue
- One travel lane in each direction on J Street between I-80 and Elvas Avenue

HIGH-CAPACITY TRANSIT FEATURES AND INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS

- Bus-only lanes
- Bus stop upgrades and relocations
- Transit signal priority (TSP) and/or queue jumps

JEFFERSON/SACRAMENTO

Downtown Sacramento to Southport Pkwy & Jefferson Blvd

Medium-Distance HCT



QUICK FACTS

	Length	9.6 miles
	Jurisdiction(s)	Sacramento & Yolo Counties
	Service Type	BRT Lite
	Level of Investment	\$\$\$
	Projected Ridership in 2050	2,000
	Population in 2020 (1/2 Mile)	41,620
	Employment in 2019 (1/2 Mile)	97,850
	Congestion Management Plan Deficient Corridor	0%
	Transit-Supportive Land-Use in 2040 (1/2 Mile)	27%
	Prioritization Score	3.6/5

EXISTING BUS LINES ON CORRIDOR

Agency	Bus Line
N/A	N/A

POTENTIAL OPERATIONAL ISSUES

- Peak period congestion on I Street Bridge
- One travel lane in each direction on Jefferson Boulevard south of Harmon Road
- One travel lane in each direction on Sacramento Avenue between Jefferson Boulevard and C Street
- One travel lane in each direction on I Street Bridge


HIGH-CAPACITY TRANSIT FEATURES AND INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS

- Bus-only lanes
- Bus stop upgrades and relocations
- Transit signal priority (TSP) and/or queue jumps

65TH/MARCONI/MANZANITA

Sunrise Mall to University/65th Street Station

Medium-Distance HCT



QUICK FACTS

	Length	17.3 miles
	Jurisdiction(s)	Sacramento County
	Service Type	BRT Lite
	Level of Investment	\$\$\$
	Projected Ridership in 2050	4,000
	Population in 2020 (1/2 Mile)	112,650
	Employment in 2019 (1/2 Mile)	59,110
	Congestion Management Plan Deficient Corridor	12%
	Transit-Supportive Land-Use in 2040 (1/2 Mile)	30%
	Prioritization Score	3.5/5

EXISTING BUS LINES ON CORRIDOR

Agency	Bus Line
SacRT	25

POTENTIAL OPERATIONAL ISSUES

- Peak period congestion on Fulton Avenue near Sacramento State
- Peak period congestion on Watt Avenue near Country Club Center
- One travel lane in each direction on Folsom Boulevard, State University Drive, and Coyle Avenue
- Stop sign-controlled intersections on Coyle Avenue

HIGH-CAPACITY TRANSIT FEATURES AND INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS

- Bus-only lanes
- Bus stop upgrades and relocations
- Traffic signals
- Transit signal priority (TSP) and/or queue jumps











SUNRISE

Sutter Roseville Medical Center to Sunrise Station

Medium-Distance HCT



QUICK FACTS

	Length	12.4 miles
	Jurisdiction(s)	Sacramento & Placer Counties
	Service Type	BRT Lite
	Level of Investment	\$\$\$
	Projected Ridership in 2050	3,000
	Population in 2020 (1/2 Mile)	53,825
	Employment in 2019 (1/2 Mile)	32,110
	Congestion Management Plan Deficient Corridor	21%
	Transit-Supportive Land-Use in 2040 (1/2 Mile)	28%
	Prioritization Score	3.5/5

EXISTING BUS LINES ON CORRIDOR

Agency	Bus Line
SacRT	21

POTENTIAL OPERATIONAL ISSUES

- Peak period congestion on Sunrise Boulevard south of Winding Way


HIGH-CAPACITY TRANSIT FEATURES AND INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS

- Bus-only lanes
- Bus stop upgrades and relocations
- Transit signal priority (TSP) and/or queue jumps











44TH

Arden Fair to Cosumnes River College

Medium-Distance HCT



QUICK FACTS

	Length	20.4 miles
	Jurisdiction(s)	Sacramento County
	Service Type	Bus with Speed & Reliability Improvements
	Level of Investment	\$\$\$
	Projected Ridership in 2050	5,000
	Population in 2020 (1/2 Mile)	115,680
	Employment in 2019 (1/2 Mile)	71,430
	Congestion Management Plan Deficient Corridor	21%
	Transit-Supportive Land-Use in 2040 (1/2 Mile)	31%
	Prioritization Score	3.4/5

EXISTING BUS LINES ON CORRIDOR

Agency	Bus Line
SacRT	67 & 68

POTENTIAL OPERATIONAL ISSUES

- Peak period congestion on I-80
- One travel lane in each direction on 14th Avenue, Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard, 34th Street, 44th Street, Scottsdale Drive, and Palmer House Drive
- Several stop sign-controlled intersections throughout the route
- Speed humps on 44th Street, Scottsdale Drive, and Palmer House Drive
- Several turns and deviations from main roads, which may contribute to slower speeds and less reliability

HIGH-CAPACITY TRANSIT FEATURES AND INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS

- Bus-only lanes (in select locations)
- Traffic signals
- Speed hump modifications
- Transit signal priority (TSP) and/or queue jumps











MADISON

Watt/I-80 Station to Folsom Lake College

Medium-Distance HCT



QUICK FACTS

	Length	17.3 miles
	Jurisdiction(s)	Sacramento County
	Service Type	Bus with Speed & Reliability Improvements
	Level of Investment	\$\$\$
	Projected Ridership in 2050	5,000
	Population in 2020 (1/2 Mile)	79,760
	Employment in 2019 (1/2 Mile)	32,010
	Congestion Management Plan Deficient Corridor	14%
	Transit-Supportive Land-Use in 2040 (1/2 Mile)	22%
	Prioritization Score	3.4/5

EXISTING BUS LINES ON CORRIDOR

Agency	Bus Line
SacRT	1, 10, 26, 82, & 124

POTENTIAL OPERATIONAL ISSUES

- Peak period congestion on Riley/Bidwell Street in Folsom
- Peak period congestion on Madison Avenue between Manzanita Avenue and Auburn Boulevard
- One travel lane in each direction on Riley Street/Greenback Lane across Rainbow Bridge, on College Oak Drive north of Myrtle Avenue, and Orange Grove Avenue


HIGH-CAPACITY TRANSIT FEATURES AND INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS

- Bus-only lanes (in select locations)
- Transit signal priority (TSP) and/or queue jumps











WEST EL CAMINO

L St & 12th St to Arden/Del Paso Station

Short-Distance HCT



QUICK FACTS

	Length	8.9 miles
	Jurisdiction(s)	Sacramento County
	Service Type	Bus with Speed & Reliability Improvements
	Level of Investment	\$\$\$
	Projected Ridership in 2050	500
	Population in 2020 (1/2 Mile)	44,640
	Employment in 2019 (1/2 Mile)	94,870
	Congestion Management Plan Deficient Corridor	19.8%
	Transit-Supportive Land-Use in 2040 (1/2 Mile)	35.3%
	Prioritization Score	4.8/5

EXISTING BUS LINES ON CORRIDOR

Agency	Bus Line
SacRT	88

POTENTIAL OPERATIONAL ISSUES

- Peak period congestion on Arden Way near Arden Fair

HIGH-CAPACITY TRANSIT FEATURES AND INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS

- Bus-only lanes (in select locations)
- Transit signal priority (TSP) and/or queue jumps











FLORIN

Riverside Blvd & Florin Rd to Stockton Blvd & Florin Rd

Short-Distance HCT



QUICK FACTS

	Length	6.7 miles
	Jurisdiction(s)	Sacramento County
	Service Type	Full BRT
	Level of Investment	\$\$\$
	Projected Ridership in 2050	1,000
	Population in 2020 (1/2 Mile)	47,775
	Employment in 2019 (1/2 Mile)	10,025
	Congestion Management Plan Deficient Corridor	24.7%
	Transit-Supportive Land-Use in 2040 (1/2 Mile)	27.4%
	Prioritization Score	4.2/5

EXISTING BUS LINES ON CORRIDOR

Agency	Bus Line
SacRT	81

POTENTIAL OPERATIONAL ISSUES

- Peak period congestion between Stockton Boulevard and SR-99
- One travel lane in each direction between Gloria Drive and Riverside Boulevard

HIGH-CAPACITY TRANSIT FEATURES AND INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS

- Bus-only lanes
- Center-running or side-running stations
- Transit signal priority (TSP) and/or queue jumps











RIO LINDA/GRAND

Watt/I-80 Station to Arden/Del Paso Station

Short-Distance HCT



QUICK FACTS

	Length	6.4 miles
	Jurisdiction(s)	Sacramento County
	Service Type	BRT Lite
	Level of Investment	\$\$\$
	Projected Ridership in 2050	1,000
	Population in 2020 (1/2 Mile)	33,400
	Employment in 2019 (1/2 Mile)	11,270
	Congestion Management Plan Deficient Corridor	3.4%
	Transit-Supportive Land-Use in 2040 (1/2 Mile)	25%
	Prioritization Score	3.6/5

EXISTING BUS LINES ON CORRIDOR

Agency	Bus Line
SacRT	15

POTENTIAL OPERATIONAL ISSUES

- Peak period congestion on Del Paso Boulevard
- One travel lane in each direction on Del Paso Boulevard and Grand Avenue
- Stop sign-controlled intersections on Rio Linda Boulevard

HIGH-CAPACITY TRANSIT FEATURES AND INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS

- Bus only lanes
- Bus stop upgrades and relocations
- Traffic signals
- Transit signal priority (TSP) and/or queue jumps











ARDEN

Arden/Del Paso Station to Arden Way & Fair Oaks Blvd

Short-Distance HCT



QUICK FACTS

	Length	6.2 miles
	Jurisdiction(s)	Sacramento County
	Service Type	Full BRT
	Level of Investment	\$\$\$
	Projected Ridership in 2050	1,000
	Population in 2020 (1/2 Mile)	34,920
	Employment in 2019 (1/2 Mile)	33,550
	Congestion Management Plan Deficient Corridor	0%
	Transit-Supportive Land-Use in 2040 (1/2 Mile)	27.4%
	Prioritization Score	3.5/5

EXISTING BUS LINES ON CORRIDOR

Agency	Bus Line
SacRT	13, 23, & 129

POTENTIAL OPERATIONAL ISSUES

- Peak period congestion between Watt Avenue and I-80

HIGH-CAPACITY TRANSIT FEATURES AND INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS

- Bus-only lanes
- Center-running or side-running stations
- Transit signal priority (TSP) and/or queue jumps

APPENDIX C: PROPOSED NEAR-TERM IMPROVEMENTS

The following figures map the proposed near-term bus speed and reliability capital improvements in the Arden (Figure 18), Florin (Figure 19), Rio Linda/Grand (Figure 20), Stockton/Broadway (Figure 21), and Sunrise (Figure 22) corridors.

Figure 18: Arden Corridor Proposed Near-Term Bus Speed & Reliability Improvements




Figure 19: Florin Corridor Proposed Near-Term Bus Speed & Reliability Improvements



Figure 20: Rio Linda/Grand Corridor Proposed Near-Term Bus Speed & Reliability Improvements




Figure 21: Stockton/Broadway Corridor Proposed Near-Term Bus Speed & Reliability Improvements




Figure 22: Sunrise Corridor Proposed Near-Term Bus Speed & Reliability Improvements

