



CITY OF LODI

COUNCIL COMMUNICATION

AGENDA TITLE: Consider certifying the City of Lodi's Compliance with the Congestion Management Program (CMP) of San Joaquin County for the Period July 1, 1992 to June 30, 1993

MEETING DATE: July 21, 1993

PREPARED BY: Community Development Director

RECOMMENDED ACTION: That the City Council consider certifying that the City of Lodi is in conformity with the Congestion Management Plan (CMP) of San Joaquin County.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: On January 1, 1992, the San Joaquin County Congestion Management Plan (CMP) became operative for all jurisdictions in San Joaquin County. This state mandated program was adopted in an attempt to improve congestion on San Joaquin County's highways and major roads and also to improve air quality in the county.

State law requires a CMP to be created and for local compliance with the CMP to be annually monitored. The program is linked to new gasoline tax revenues which local governments receive under the provisions of Propositions 111 and 108, approved by the voters in June 1990. Failure to comply with CMP requirements can jeopardize the City's share of these new revenues.

The San Joaquin County CMP has a self-certification program to determine conformity with the CMP. Annually, each jurisdiction must fill out a check list and certify that they are in compliance. The check list must be accompanied by a Certification Statement adopted by the local jurisdiction's governing board, stating that to the best of its knowledge, the jurisdiction is conforming with the CMP.

The annual monitoring to determine compliance will take place in September of every year, with the compliance material due by July 31 each year. The Community Development Department has determined the City is in compliance with the CMP and recommends that the City Council consider certifying the City's conformity.

FUNDING: None required.

James B. Schroeder
Community Development Director

Prepared by David Morimoto, Senior Planner
JBS/DM/cg
Attachments

APPROVED: _____

THOMAS A. PETERSON
City Manager



recycled paper

CC-1

CCCD93.35/TXTD.01C

CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PLAN
Self-Certification Checklist

Designated CMP System

1. Are there any principal arterial segments that might be considered for addition to the CMP regional transportation system? If yes, please add to the attached conformance documentation.

No.

Level of Service Standards

2. Are all level of service calculations for principal arterial segments for which the jurisdiction is listed as "lead entity" (or which fall primarily within its jurisdiction) included in the attached documentation?

Yes. See attached A-1 and Table 1

3. Do any of these calculations indicate a LOS below the standard before interregional travel has been removed?

No.

4. Are all facility changes that may affect level of service calculations on the CMP system included in the attached documentation?

Yes.

Transit Standards

5. Is all information verifying compliance with routing, frequency and coordination standards included in the attached documentation?

No. Lodi currently meets the City's transit needs by providing general public dial-a-ride service. This service is available weekdays from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m., Saturdays 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. and Sundays 12:00 noon to 5:00 p.m. The service is available to the general public, although a majority of riders are elderly or handicap certified. The average weekday trip count for 1992 was 330 passengers.

The City has completed an evaluation of our Transit Needs and Assessment Plan prepared by a consultant, to determine the direction of future transit plans. The City is proceeding with a two-tier level of service for public transit. The two-tier service includes both a demand response system and a fixed route system. The demand response system would enable the City to continue to meet the needs of the elderly and disabled residents. The fixed route service would provide a reliable and convenient transit service for those whose mobility needs require more frequent and routine service than provided under current demand

response system. The City hopes to implement the fixed route system beginning in the 1994-95 fiscal year.

6. Are there any standards that the jurisdiction is having difficulty complying with or believes that it should not be required to comply with? If so, explain in the attached documentation.

Yes. The City is still in the planning stage for a fixed route transit system. The City has made application for Federal funding to implement a fixed route transit system. If the City is successful in securing funding, we will prepare the details of fixed route system including operating schedules, routing and frequency and farebox structure.

7. Have policies for facilities coordination, new/reconstructed streets and long-range transit needs been adopted by the jurisdiction as of June 30, 1992? Will implementation policies proceed according to a regular schedule after that date?

No. Specific policies for long-range transit needs have not been adopted but will probably be adopted in the 1993-1994 fiscal year. As noted in Item No. 6, the City has applied for Federal funds that will allow us to move forward with a fixed route system. The funding will allow us to develop a specific program that will include facilities coordination and specific construction projects.

The City is working with the County on the Lodi Multi-Modal Station Feasibility and Site Location Study with the intent of bringing passenger train service to Lodi. We are also working with COG on the Regional Transit System Plan.

Land Use Analysis Program

8. Have all land use decisions requiring CMA review been submitted to the CMA as part of the local environmental review process? (e.g. General plan amendments with 1,000 or more additional average daily trips, general plan revisions, cumulative total of all general plan amendments).

Yes. There has only been one project that falls within this CMA review process (Bridgetown Shopping Center).

9. Have all significant impacts of the individual 1,000 additional trip general plan revisions been mitigated? Has documentation of the proposed mitigations and their estimated costs been submitted to the CMA?

Yes. The Bridgetown Shopping Center project is still going through the review process and has not been annexed to the City of Lodi. It has been determined that the potential traffic generated by the proposed project will not significantly affect any CMA roadway.

Trip Reduction and Travel Demand Element

10. Is a description of all transportation control measures in place or underway included in the attached documentation?

No. The City of Lodi is waiting for the Transportation Control Measures (TMC) plan being prepared by the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District. Once this plan is published and adopted, the City will adopt a trip reduction ordinance.

Capital Improvement Program

11. Is a list of all projects requiring state Flexible Congestion Relief, Traffic System Management or Urban Commuter Rail funds included in the attached documentation? Jurisdictions may also wish to include projects applying for Transit Capital Improvement program funds on this list.

No. No projects are currently being funded by this program.

12. Is a list of all projects on the CMP system that the jurisdiction believes will increase roadway capacity or person capacity (transit) included in the attached documentation?

N/A.

13. Is the information in these project lists given in the Regional Transportation Program format, in priority order, with estimated costs and all proposed funding sources?

N/A.

Regional Model Analysis

14. Does the jurisdiction wish to use its own regional model to perform CMP forecasts and analysis? If so, has the CMA approved the use of the model?

No.

Deficiency Plans

15. Has the CMA indicated that the jurisdiction must prepare a deficiency plan for a current or projected level of service deficiency? If so, please list the segments(s) for which a plan was required and when the plans(s) were submitted to the CMA. Were these required plans accepted by the CMA? If no, explain why.

No.

CMP LOS calculations

Hutchins Street from Harney Lane to Kettleman Lane
Use urban, two-way arterials, Group C (Use Table 1)

AWT

n/o Harney Lane 12577
1993 Median AWT = 12577

LOS A

Lower Sacramento Road from Kettleman Lane to Turner Road
Use urban, two-way arterials, Group B (Use Table 1)

AWT

s/o Vine Street 13775
s/o Turner Road 11500
1993 Median AWT = 12638

LOS B

Table 1
GENERALIZED DAILY LEVEL OF SERVICE MAXIMUM VOLUMES
FOR FLORIDA'S URBAN/URBANIZED (5,000+) AREAS
 (Valid for use from January 1989 through December 1990)

TWO-WAY ARTERIALS						FREEWAYS					
Group A (0.0 to 0.75 signalized intersections per mile)						Group 1 (within urbanized area over 500,000 and leading to or within 3 miles of primary city central business district)					
Lanes/Divided	Level of Service					Lanes	Level of Service				
	A	B	C	D	E		A	B	C	D	E
2 Unadv.	13,700	15,000	15,800	16,500	17,400	4	27,800	42,800	61,100	72,800	79,200
4 Div.	23,800	31,900	33,000	34,900	36,700	6	41,700	64,300	91,600	110,700	119,000
6 Div.	45,400	48,100	48,700	52,400	55,200	8	55,500	83,700	122,200	147,800	158,700
						10	88,400	107,100	152,700	184,500	198,400
Group B (0.75 to 1.5 signalized intersections per mile)						Group 2 (within urbanized area over 50,000 and not in Group 1)					
Lanes/Divided	Level of Service					Lanes	Level of Service				
	A	B	C	D	E		A	B	C	D	E
2 Unadv.	9,000	12,700	14,500	15,200	16,100	4	21,400	23,000	47,100	58,900	61,100
4 Div.	20,000	28,700	31,000	32,500	34,000	6	32,100	48,500	70,800	85,300	91,700
6 Div.	30,800	45,100	48,700	49,900	51,200	8	42,800	68,000	94,200	113,700	122,200
						10	53,500	82,500	117,700	142,200	152,900
Group C (1.6 to 2.5 signalized intersections per mile)						Group 3 (within non-urbanized areas)					
Lanes/Divided	Level of Service					Lanes	Level of Service				
	A ^a	B	C	D	E		A	B	C	D	E
2 Unadv.	--	10,200	12,500	14,800	15,700	4	17,100	28,200	37,800	45,400	48,800
4 Div.	--	22,800	28,500	31,500	31,400	6	23,800	39,500	58,300	68,000	72,200
6 Div.	--	33,100	45,000	47,900	50,200	8	34,100	52,700	73,100	90,700	97,500
Group D (2.6 to 3.5 signalized intersections per mile)						ONE-WAY ARTERIALS					
Lanes/Divided	Level of Service					Group D (less than 3.6 signalized intersections per mile)					
	A ^a	B ^a	C	D	E	Lanes	Level of Service				
2 Unadv.	--	--	9,200	11,700	13,400	2	A ^a	B	C	D	E
4 Div.	--	--	20,100	22,200	23,500	3	--	9,800	14,800	18,900	18,000
6 Div.	--	--	30,700	41,500	50,200	4	--	14,900	22,700	25,800	27,200
Group E (3.6 to 4.5 signalized intersections per mile)						Group E (3.6 to 4.5 signalized intersections per mile)					
Lanes/Divided	Level of Service					Lanes	Level of Service				
	A ^a	B ^a	C	D	E	2	A ^a	B ^a	C	D	E
2 Unadv.	--	--	--	12,000	14,600	3	--	--	13,000	18,200	17,800
4 Div.	--	--	--	26,000	31,000	4	--	--	20,200	24,800	26,000
6 Div.	--	--	--	38,500	48,800				27,100	33,000	33,600
Group F (more than 4.5 signalized intersections per mile and not within primary city central business district of urbanized area over 500,000)						Group F (more than 4.5 signalized intersections per mile and not within primary city central business district of urbanized area over 500,000)					
Lanes/Divided	Level of Service					Lanes	Level of Service				
	A ^a	B ^a	C	D	E	2	A ^a	B ^a	C	D	E
2 Unadv.	--	--	--	10,200	14,800	3	--	--	10,900	15,800	17,700
4 Div.	--	--	--	21,900	23,000	4	--	--	18,600	21,900	26,800
6 Div.	--	--	--	34,900	49,000				22,400	23,400	23,900
Group G (more than 4.5 signalized intersections per mile and within primary city central business district of urbanized area over 500,000)						Group G (more than 4.5 signalized intersections per mile and within primary city central business district of urbanized area over 500,000)					
Lanes/Divided	Level of Service					Lanes	Level of Service				
	A ^a	B ^a	C	D	E	2	A ^a	B ^a	C	D	E
2 Unadv.	--	--	--	13,100	13,400	3	--	--	13,300	17,200	18,200
4 Div.	--	--	--	25,000	23,700	4	--	--	20,400	28,200	27,700
6 Div.	--	--	--	45,200	51,200				27,800	33,200	37,100
DIVIDED/UNDIVIDED ADJUSTMENTS (after corresponding two-way arterial volume increased percent)						TWO-WAY COLLECTORS AND LOCAL STREETS (signalized intersection volumes)					
Lanes	Median	Left Turn Bays	Adjustment Factor			Lanes	Level of Service				
2	Divided	Yes	- 5%			2	A ^a	B ^a	C	D	E
2	Undivided	No	- 15%			4	--	--	7,700	11,500	12,900
Multi	Undivided	Yes	- 5%			6	--	--	18,200	24,300	28,400
Multi	Undivided	No	- 20%						24,900	37,200	40,100

* The table does not constitute a standard and should be used only for general planning applications. The computer models from which this table is derived should be used for more specific planning applications. The data and deriving computer models should not be used for corridor or intersection design, where more refined techniques exist. Values above are average daily traffic maximum volumes based on peak hour "whichever" level of service and are based on the 1985 Highway Capacity Manual and Florida traffic data. Roadways with more than the number of lanes shown should be treated on a case by case basis. The table's input value assumptions and level of service criteria appear on the back.

^a Cannot be achieved.



San Joaquin County Council of Governments

Member Agencies: Cities of Escalon, Lathrop, Lodi, Manteca, Ripon, Stockton, Tracy, County of San Joaquin

Congestion Management Program

LAND USE ANALYSIS

Trip Generation Worksheet: Six Month Summary of All Active General Plan Amendments

Date: July 12, 1993
Lead Agency: City of Lodi
Contact: David Morimoto
Phone: (209) 333-6711

Please list information on all active General Plan Amendments that your jurisdiction received over the six month period from July 1, 1992 to June 30, 1993. Attach a location map for each project to this worksheet.

Project I.D. Numbers, Titles and Brief Descriptions:

Bridgetown General Plan Amendment - Redesignate 9.6 acre parcel from
Planned Residential to Neighborhood/Community Commercial to permit
construction of a shopping center.

City staff estimates that this project will generate approximately
1800 additional V.T.s per day. This is well within the capacity of
Turner Road and Lower Sacramento Road. No streets on the CMP network
will be adversely impacted.

(attach another sheet if necessary)

**Congestion Management Program
Procedures Manual**

Certification Statement

Staff

This 1992-93 self-certification was prepared by:
(year)

David Morimoto
Name

Community Development, City of Lodi
Department, Jurisdiction

(209) 333-6711
Phone Number

Based upon the self-certification checklist and the attached documentation, staff is of the opinion that City of Lodi has conformed to the requirements of the
(jurisdiction)
Congestion Management Program.

By: David Morimoto
(Signature)

July 8, 1993
(Date)

Governing Body

The City Council, City of Lodi has reviewed the completed checklist and
(governing body)

supporting documentation and has found that the policies and actions of the jurisdiction as reported herein comply to the requirements for conformance with the Congestion Management Program for San Joaquin County.

Certified: Phillip A. Pennino
Phillip A. Pennino

Date: July 21, 1993

Title: Mayor

Attest: Jennifer M. Pennino
City/County Clerk