

# Streets for People:

## Sacramento's Active Transportation Plan

FINAL PLAN | AUGUST 2025





# Acknowledgments

## City

---

### PROJECT STAFF

*Charisse Padilla,  
Transportation Planner*

*Jeff Jelsma,  
Transportation Planner*

*Jennifer Donlon Wyant,  
Mobility and Sustainability  
Division Manager*

### PROJECT DEVELOPMENT TEAM (PDT)

*Alex Goloveshkin,  
Associate Civil Engineer*

*Pelle Clark, Senior Engineer*

*John Matoba,  
Senior Electrical Engineer*

*William Shunk,  
Senior Engineer*

*Ryan Billeci, Senior Engineer*

### CITY COUNCIL

*Mayor – Kevin McCarty*

*District 1 – Lisa Kaplan*

*District 2 – Roger Dickinson*

*District 3 – Karina Talamantes*

*District 4 – Phil Pluckebaum*

*District 5 – Caity Maple*

*District 6 – Eric Guerra*

*District 7 – Rick Jennings*

*District 8 – Mai Vang*

## Community Planning Team (CPT)

---

*Afsoon Aflaki*

*Albanita Erebia*

*Alena Maudru*

*Ana Taukolo*

*Angela Cook*

*Billy Gilmore*

*Brandon Martinez*

*Cayla McDonnell-  
Encina*

*Carol Marque*

*Chelsea Lane*

*CJ Meakes*

*Courtnie Thomas*

*Dominique  
Espinosa*

*Don Feliz*

*Essence Sellers*

*Gloria Garcia*

*Jeff Lidicker*

*Jen Metes*

*Jocelyn Gomez*

*Joel Leong*

*Jofil Borja*

*Jonathan  
Sampson*

*Joshua Cain*

*Luka Davis*

*Marianne  
Gonzalez Sims*

*Maximilian Rosa*

*Michael Clark*

*Michael Gorletti*

*Patrick Wong*

*Sheriah Brown*

*Spencer Eberle*

*Verna Erby-  
Ekipeduma*

## Consultant Team

---

*Alta Planning + Design*

*Civic Thread*

*DIYSL*





# Table of Contents

1

## About This Plan 1

What Is <i>Streets for People</i> ? . . . . .	1
Need for a Focused Approach . . . . .	2
What's in the Plan? . . . . .	4
Plan Goals . . . . .	6
Recent Achievements . . . . .	7

2

## Walking, Biking, and Rolling in Sacramento Today 8

Building on the Past . . . . .	10
What the Data Shows . . . . .	12
Equity . . . . .	14
Walking and Rolling. . . . .	16
Biking . . . . .	20
Safety. . . . .	26
Comfort . . . . .	28
Access . . . . .	32
Sustainability . . . . .	34

3

## Community Engagement 40

Leading with Equity . . . . .	41
Community Planning Team . . . . .	42
Engagement Events . . . . .	43
What We Heard . . . . .	46

4

## Recommendations 52

Network Recommendations . . . . .	56
Intersection Recommendations . . . . .	86
Recommended Policies and Programs . . . . .	94
Maintenance Considerations . . . . .	102
Common Questions . . . . .	104

5

## Implementation 106

Costs . . . . .	107
Return on Investment: The Case for Active Transportation . . . . .	108
Funding . . . . .	109
Monitoring and Review. . . . .	110
Next Steps . . . . .	111

A

## Appendices 112

[Click this icon to return to the table of contents](#)





## LIST OF FIGURES

<b>Figure 1</b> – City of Sacramento Focus Areas. . . . .	3
<b>Figure 2</b> – CalEnviroScreen 4.0. . . . .	15
<b>Figure 3</b> – Existing Walking Facilities in Sacramento . . . . .	17
<b>Figure 4</b> – Frequent Walking Routes in Sacramento . . . . .	19
<b>Figure 5</b> – Existing Biking Network . . . . .	20
<b>Figure 6</b> – Existing Biking Facilities in Sacramento . . . . .	21
<b>Figure 7</b> – Existing Biking Facilities in Central Sacramento . . . . .	22
<b>Figure 8</b> – Frequent Biking Trips in Sacramento . . . . .	25
<b>Figure 9</b> – High-Collision Intersections for Active Transportation Users and City of Sacramento’s HIN . . . . .	27
<b>Figure 10</b> – Pedestrian Level of Traffic Stress Illustrated . . . . .	28
<b>Figure 11</b> – PLTS Analysis in the City of Sacramento. . . . .	29
<b>Figure 12</b> – Bike Level of Traffic Stress Illustrated . . . . .	30
<b>Figure 13</b> – BLTS Analysis in the City of Sacramento . . . . .	31
<b>Figure 14</b> – CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Analysis Showing Pollution Burden in Sacramento. . . . .	35
<b>Figure 15</b> – Urban Heat Island Effect . . . . .	37
<b>Figure 16</b> – Existing Tree Canopy Density . . . . .	39
<b>Figure 17</b> – Community Engagement Events . . . . .	45
<b>Figure 18</b> – Incorporation of Community Comments into Recommendations . . . . .	51
<b>Figure 19</b> – Recommendations for People Walking and Rolling in Sacramento. . . . .	67
<b>Figure 20</b> – Recommendations for People Walking and Rolling in Northwest Sacramento . . . . .	68
<b>Figure 21</b> – Recommendations for People Walking and Rolling in Northeast Sacramento . . . . .	69
<b>Figure 22</b> – Recommendations for People Walking and Rolling in Central West Sacramento . . . . .	70
<b>Figure 23</b> – Recommendations for People Walking and Rolling in Central East Sacramento . . . . .	71





<b>Figure 24</b> – Recommendations for People Walking and Rolling in Southwest Sacramento . . . . .	72
<b>Figure 25</b> – Recommendations for People Walking and Rolling in Southeast Sacramento . . . . .	73
<b>Figure 26</b> – Recommended Bicycle Facilities for Urban Areas, Suburban Areas, and Rural Main Streets . . . . .	75
<b>Figure 27</b> – Recommendations for People Biking in Sacramento. . . . .	77
<b>Figure 28</b> – Recommendations for People Biking in Northwest Sacramento . . . . .	78
<b>Figure 29</b> – Recommendations for People Biking in Northeast Sacramento. . . . .	79
<b>Figure 30</b> – Recommendations for People Biking in Central West Sacramento. . . . .	80
<b>Figure 31</b> – Recommendations for People Biking in Central East Sacramento . . . . .	81
<b>Figure 32</b> – Recommendations for People Biking in Southwest Sacramento . . . . .	82
<b>Figure 33</b> – Recommendations for People Biking in Southeast Sacramento . . . . .	83
<b>Figure 34</b> – Neighborhood Connections Network. . . . .	84
<b>Figure 35</b> – Intersection Recommendations in Sacramento. . . . .	87
<b>Figure 36</b> – Intersection Recommendations in Northwest Sacramento. . . . .	88
<b>Figure 37</b> – Intersection Recommendations in Northeast Sacramento . . . . .	89
<b>Figure 38</b> – Intersection Recommendations in Central West Sacramento. . . . .	90
<b>Figure 39</b> – Intersection Recommendations in Central East Sacramento . . . . .	91
<b>Figure 40</b> – Intersection Recommendations in Southwest Sacramento . . . . .	92
<b>Figure 41</b> – Intersection Recommendations in Southeast Sacramento . . . . .	93

## LIST OF TABLES

<b>Table 1</b> – Generalized Costs for People Walking and Rolling . . . . .	107
<b>Table 2</b> – Generalized Costs for People Biking . . . . .	107







## Abbreviations

**AHSC:** Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities

**ATIIP:** Active Transportation Infrastructure Improvement Program

**ATP:** Active Transportation Program

**BIPOC:** Black, Indigenous, and People of Color

**BLTS:** Bike level of traffic stress

**BUILD:** Better Utilizing Investments to Leverage Development

**CAAP:** *Climate Action and Adaptation Plan*

**Caltrans:** California Department of Transportation

**CHAT:** California Heat Assessment Tool

**CPT:** Community Planning Team

**HIN:** High injury network

**HSIP:** Highway Safety Improvement Program

**I:** Interstate

**KSI:** Killed or seriously injured

**LTS:** Level of traffic stress

**PLTS:** Pedestrian level of traffic stress

**RIA:** Regional Infrastructure Accelerator

**SR:** State route

**SS4A:** Safe Streets and Roads for All

**TPP:** *Transportation Priorities Plan*



# Glossary of Terms

**Active Transportation:** A term for using human physical activity to get people and goods from one place to another as opposed to motorized vehicles like cars and trucks. Active transportation includes walking or jogging, biking (including by electric bikes), and rolling with a scooter, skateboard, or assisted mobility device like a wheelchair. This plan uses the terms *active transportation* and *walking, biking, and rolling* interchangeably.

**Arterial Streets:** Provide mobility and regional connectivity.

**Collectors:** Major and minor streets that connect local streets and arterial streets.

**Complete Streets:** Complete streets are streets for everyone. They are designed and operated to enable safer access for all users, including people walking, biking, rolling, driving, and taking transit. Complete streets make it easy to cross the street, walk to shops, and bike to work. They allow buses to run on time and make it safer for people to walk to and from train stations.

**First- and Last-Mile:** Transit systems usually involve some multimodal connection from one destination to another. This is referred to as the “first- and last-mile” problem. To encourage more ridership, transit needs to provide convenient options that enable point-to-point connections. Biking or walking connections may encourage access to transit because active transportation can be more convenient than other modes.<sup>1</sup>

**Killed or Seriously Injured (KSI):** This metric is used to focus on areas with a history of crashes causing serious injury and death. Areas with a history of KSI crashes typically represent the areas with greater safety challenges rather than areas with a high level of mostly non-injury or minor injury crashes.

**Level of Traffic Stress:** The level of traffic stress (LTS) analysis measures the ability of people using active transportation to travel between their origin and destination using routes that feel safe to them and without the need for excessive detours. There are four levels of traffic stress. LTS 1 is suitable for children; LTS 2 represents stress that most adults will tolerate; and LTS 3 and 4 represent greater levels of stress.<sup>2</sup>

**Quick Build:** A low-cost and semi-permanent street improvement which helps to test design concepts and get safety improvements on the ground more quickly than a large scale construction project.<sup>3</sup>

---

1 Maaza C. Mekuria, Peter G. Furth, and Hilary Nixon, *Low-Stress Bicycling and Network Connectivity*, MTI Report 11-19, May 2012.

2 Mekuria et al., *Low-Stress Bicycling and Network Connectivity*.

3 PeopleforBikes, *Quick Builds for Better Streets: A New Project Delivery Model for U.S. Cities*, 2016, [https://nacto.org/wp-content/uploads/2016PeoplefoBikes\\_Quick-Builds-for-Better-Streets.pdf](https://nacto.org/wp-content/uploads/2016PeoplefoBikes_Quick-Builds-for-Better-Streets.pdf).







1

# About This Plan

# What Is Streets for People?

*Streets for People: Sacramento's Active Transportation Plan* equips the City with a vision for a safer, more connected, and more comfortable active transportation network that serves all ages, all abilities, and all communities.



This plan offers strategies and recommendations for how we can get there. Throughout the process of creating this plan, we worked in partnership with communities, community groups, City departments, and other interested parties to develop implementable solutions that best meet the needs of each of the focus areas.



## In this plan, “we” represents...

city residents, businesses, employees, agencies, community based organizations, and the City organization.



## “Active Transportation” is...

a term for using human physical activity to get people and goods from one place to another as opposed to motorized vehicles like cars and trucks. Active transportation includes walking, biking, jogging, scooting, skateboarding, or using assisted mobility devices like wheelchairs.





# Need for a Focused Approach

The *Streets for People Plan* identifies improvements to the active transportation network across the entire City of Sacramento. While developing these recommendations with input from communities throughout the city, we focused additional engagement efforts within three areas. These areas have some of Sacramento's most [disadvantaged communities](#) and experience some of the highest numbers of fatal and serious roadway collisions in the city. Compared to the rest of the city, communities in these areas experience higher housing

and pollution burdens, coupled with lower median household incomes, among other disadvantages. In an effort to address the unique needs within these areas of Sacramento, we conducted additional research and spent more time engaging with people in these communities. The three focus areas are shown in **Figure 1**:


- North Sacramento
- Fruitridge/Broadway
- South Sacramento

*Community members on Del Paso Boulevard*





Figure 1 – City of Sacramento Focus Areas



# What's in the Plan?

We've designed this plan to provide a roadmap to improving conditions for people walking, biking, and rolling. The plan contains the following elements:

[Chapter 1: About This Plan](#) defines the scope of the *Streets for People Plan*. This chapter captures the goals for the future of our transportation system and identifies recent achievements by the City in furthering those goals.

[Chapter 2: Walking, Biking, and Rolling in Sacramento Today](#) provides an overview of the present-day conditions, including the state of walking, biking, and rolling; community health; economic conditions; and environmental burdens.

## [Chapter 3: Community Engagement](#)

chronicles our extensive community engagement efforts and strategies used, and summarizes what we heard from our communities during engagement events.

[Chapter 4: Recommendations](#) offers the proposed infrastructure recommendations and complementary policy and programmatic recommendations to improve walking, biking, and rolling in the city.

[Chapter 5: Implementation](#) outlines how we can get started. It identifies planning level costs for recommended improvements and strategies on how they could be implemented. This chapter also considers ongoing maintenance and monitoring approaches as the network expands.







*Bike Lanes on Lemon Hill Avenue*





# Plan Goals

The plan's goals align with the criteria and metrics developed as part of the City's [2040 General Plan](#) (2024), the [Climate Action and Adaptation Plan](#) (CAAP) (2024), and the [Transportation Priorities Plan](#) (TPP) (2022):



## Access Providing Access to Destinations

Mobility opens doors to education, economic opportunity, health, and personal growth. Connections to institutions and places that provide economic, educational, and health benefits should be prioritized.



## Equity Providing Equitable Investment to Address Historical Inequities

We acknowledge historical racial inequities and are committed to transparent, deliberate, and actionable solutions that will remedy those inequities, including the impact air quality and climate have on these neighborhoods.



## Maintenance Fixing and Maintaining the System

Sacramento's transportation infrastructure is in "fair" condition but is predicted to rapidly deteriorate by the end of the decade. Fixing potholes, repaving streets, and maintaining traffic signals supports communities' health and the city's economic health.



## Safety Improving Transportation Safety

Sacramento continues to rank as one of the worst cities in California for transportation safety based on data from the Office of Traffic Safety. Transportation safety is a primary driver for future investments with the intent to address the highest need areas first.



## Sustainability Improving Air Quality, Climate, and Health

We face an existential climate emergency that threatens our city, region, state, nation, humanity, and the natural world. Over 50% of Sacramento's greenhouse gases come from transportation. Air quality, health, and climate change should be drivers for our mobility investments.

# Recent Achievements

*The City has already started its transformation with a host of walking, biking, and rolling friendly projects and initiatives, including:*

## South Sacramento Parkway West

*(Completed 2023)*

The City completed this shared-use path connecting South Sacramento communities including Meadowview to the Sacramento River shared-use path and Del Rio Trail.

## Del Rio Trail *(Completed 2024)*

The City is constructing a 4.8-mile shared-use path that connects Land Park, South Land Park, Freeport Manor, Z'berg, Pocket, and Meadowview communities.

## Central City Mobility Project

*(Completed 2024)*

The Central City Mobility Project implemented traffic calming, lane reductions, buffered and separated bikeways, new marked crosswalks, and other safety and mobility improvements.

## Dixieanne Neighborhood Clean and Green Alleys Project *(Completed 2025)*

This project is cleaning and beautifying some of the 23 residential alleys in the community of Old North Sacramento. Improvements provide comfortable corridors for people walking and biking to connect to destinations.



*Del Rio Trail at Fruitridge*



*Dixieanne Alleys*





A photograph of a family walking and biking on a paved path, overlaid with a semi-transparent blue filter. In the center, a woman in a light-colored sweater and jeans walks away from the camera, holding the hand of a young girl in a patterned dress. To their left, a young boy in a blue shirt and jeans walks. Further left, a man in a dark shirt and helmet is riding a bicycle. To the right, another person in a light-colored jacket and helmet is also riding a bicycle. The background consists of dense green foliage. A white circle with the number '2' is positioned at the top center. A white signpost with two signs is visible on the right side of the path. The top sign reads 'MOTOR VEHICLES OR TRUCKS NO LEFT TURN' and the bottom sign reads 'BICYCLE LIGHTS REQUIRED'.

2

# Walking, Biking, and Rolling in Sacramento Today



*To better understand the future active transportation potential in our city, we needed to take stock of what the transportation system offers today.*



In creating the *Streets for People Plan*, we considered previously identified needs and issues and evaluated the present state of the transportation system to improve safety and comfort for people walking, biking, or rolling. We looked at the transportation system from different perspectives including demographics, community health, economic conditions, environmental burdens, and street systems. This helped us better understand what motivates or deters people in how they choose to travel.

*Community member accessing Arden/Del Paso Light Rail Station*






# Building on the Past

We reviewed 11 citywide and 17 focus area-specific plans from the past 17 years to make sure the *Streets for People Plan* builds on and furthers the transportation goals and actions identified by prior and ongoing planning efforts. A complete summary of plans and policies can be found in [Appendix 1 – Plan and Policy Review](#).

The City's focus on improving active transportation has been years in the making through community engagement, seeking competitive funding, and finally implementation of projects like the central city separated bikeways, the Del Rio Trail, and more. The City has also developed policies to enhance active transportation networks. These include the [Complete Streets Policy](#), [Pedestrian Crossing Guidelines](#), and [Guidance for Creative Crosswalks](#), which were developed and passed between 2019 and 2021. The recently approved [Transportation Priorities Plan](#) (TPP) and [Climate Action and Adaptation Plan](#) (CAAP) further advance implementation of active transportation projects in a way that equitably addresses transportation safety, sustainability, public health, and air quality.

*Top: Sacramento Bikeways Master Plan (1977)*

*Bottom: Sacramento's Pedestrian Crossing Guidelines (2021)*





*Sacramento's Vision Zero Action Plan (2018)*

The [\*Vision Zero Action Plan\*](#), adopted in 2018, identifies strategies for the City to eliminate traffic fatalities and serious injuries by 2027. The plan identified streets with the highest number of injuries and fatalities, known as the high injury network (HIN), and included actions to address transportation safety. Since its adoption, the City has made significant progress toward addressing existing safety and connectivity issues.

The *Streets for People Plan* builds off these plans and policies and works to align recommendations with other state, regional, and local plans while supporting community-wide goals by acting as the guide for implementing active transportation facilities.



# What the Data Shows

The highlights of our analysis are included below. For more detailed methodology and analysis citywide and in the focus areas, please refer to [Appendix 2 – Existing Conditions](#).



**Sacramento is a diverse community:** Sacramento communities come from diverse racial and ethnic backgrounds and include people who identify as Asian (19%), Black (13%), Hispanic (29%), and white (31%).



**Many of our communities rely on active transportation to travel:** Over one in ten (11.3%) of all trips in the Greater Sacramento Region are active transportation trips.<sup>4</sup> Black communities use public transit at nearly twice the rate compared to all other races.



**A higher percentage of our communities live in poverty compared to the rest of the county and the state:** In particular, the project focus areas have the lowest median household income in the city. Moreover, most households in the focus areas experience higher housing burdens, meaning that the households are low income and pay greater than 50% of their income for housing costs.



**Some of our communities are more burdened by pollution and are more vulnerable to climate impacts than others:** Some of the highly pollution burdened and vulnerable communities in the city are in the focus areas. In particular, large portions of the North Sacramento focus area are disproportionately affected.

<sup>4</sup> "2020 NextGen NHTS National OD Data," NextGen NHTS OD Data Portal, Federal Highway Administration, 2020, <https://nhts.ornl.gov/od/>.





**Safety analyses reveal trends where people walking and biking are particularly vulnerable:** People walking along the street (without a sidewalk), people crossing the street (not using a crosswalk), and people improperly turning their vehicles into people biking account for a significant proportion of fatal and serious injury collisions for people walking and biking.



**Our walking and biking facilities are not created as low-stress environments:** While most corridors include continuous sidewalks and major roadways have conventional or buffered bike lanes, several of them are high-stress environments for people walking and biking.



**Improving comfort and reducing stress can go a long way in improving access:** We can increase access to destinations like parks, schools, and transit for more people walking and biking, particularly in focus areas, by creating low-stress networks.



# Equity

Equity was a driving force throughout the development of the *Streets for People Plan*. We considered equity in setting our goals, understanding the local context and the state of transportation, identifying the types and strategies for community engagement efforts, and prioritizing the recommendations in this plan. One way to achieve a more equitable transportation system is to identify vulnerable populations who are more susceptible to transportation impacts. We used data from CalEnviroScreen to understand this. CalEnviroScreen is a data tool used to identify communities disproportionately burdened by pollution and that have characteristics that make them more sensitive to pollution. It uses environmental, health, and socioeconomic

information to produce scores. A higher CalEnviroScreen score reflects a higher pollution burden. See **Figure 2** for scores and communities with higher pollution burdens in Sacramento, as shown in red and yellow.

Some of the most vulnerable communities in the city, shown in red and yellow on the map, are found in the focus areas. In particular, a large portion of the **North Sacramento** focus area south of Main Avenue and the northern half of the **Fruitridge/Broadway** focus area experience the highest levels of inequities in terms of pollution and population vulnerabilities. In addition to the overall findings, we reviewed key individual metrics derived from census data and identified the following issues:



**People with disabilities may require specialized services or infrastructure to get around, like longer time to cross the street.** These individuals may be less likely to own a vehicle. Areas with the highest concentrations of people with disabilities include South Sacramento, Fruitridge/Broadway, and Midtown.



**People without access to a vehicle are likely to walk, bike, roll, or ride transit by necessity to get to various destinations.** These communities may also benefit the most from investments focusing on improving the safety and comfort along city streets. Areas with the highest concentration of communities without access to a vehicle include Central City, Midtown, and Oak Park.



**People over 65 may walk slower and require more time to cross the street.** They may also be less likely to own a vehicle or travel during traditional commute times (7:00 to 9:00 a.m. and 4:00 to 6:00 p.m.), creating different street needs at different times of the day. The areas with the highest concentration of people over 65 include Pocket-Greenhaven, South Sacramento, and East Sacramento.




**Disadvantaged populations are also likely to walk, bike, roll, or ride transit and have historically faced transportation inequities.** Areas with higher concentrations of disadvantaged populations may be eligible for funding opportunities to address transportation inequities. The areas with the highest concentrations of disadvantaged populations include North Sacramento, Fruitridge/Broadway, and South Sacramento.



A complete account of findings related to socioeconomic conditions can be found in [Appendix 2 – Existing Conditions \(Citywide and Focus Areas\)](#).

Figure 2 – CalEnviroScreen 4.0





# Walking and Rolling

Throughout the city, there are almost 80 miles of shared-use paths, the majority of which are located along the old Sacramento Northern Railway, Ueda Parkway, and the Sacramento River Parkway, among others.

Walking and rolling facilities in the city include sidewalks, shared-use paths (Class I), freeway overpasses, bridges, and intersection or midblock crossing facilities. Sidewalks are present on most streets. However, in northern and southeastern parts of the city, streets lack sidewalks. Outside the central city, marked crosswalks and pedestrian signals are largely concentrated on major arterial streets (like Marysville Boulevard, Stockton Boulevard, and

Florin Road) and near elementary and middle schools. Although expansive, the shared-use path network is disjointed, presenting difficulty for people connecting to various destinations.

**Figure 3** shows the existing walking and rolling network. Streets highlighted in red lack sidewalks while streets shown in dark gray lack data on the presence of sidewalks. Some key findings from our analysis are:



## Proximity and directness are critical to access.

**Less than half (44%) of communities have access to essential needs (grocery stores, health care, and shopping centers) by walking and rolling.** People in the central city, Midtown, and East Sacramento areas have significant access to schools and major institutions to meet their essential, civic, and social needs. The further from the core of Sacramento, the less dense and less accessible destinations become to walking and rolling.



## Not all people travel at the same pace.

**Seniors and those who use a mobility device may walk at slower speeds, and walking or rolling itself may be more of a challenge to these groups.<sup>5</sup>** Therefore, walking and rolling access for these groups may be more limited.




## Places to cross barriers like highways, rivers, and major streets are limited.

**This makes it less convenient to access some destinations. The infrequency of these crossings leads to increases in the distance people must walk to get to their destination, thus rendering some destinations less accessible.** While Interstate 80 (I-80) has several crossings into and out of the central city from surrounding neighborhoods, there are few low-stress pedestrian crossings across I-5 north or south of Sacramento, no low-stress crossings across I-80 within city limits, and limited crossings over State Routes (SR) 99, 50, and 160 (shown in **Figure 3**).

5 Hyun Gu Kang and Jonathan B Dingwell, "Effects of Walking Speed, Strength and Range of Motion on Gait Stability in Healthy Older Adults," *Journal of Biomechanics* 2008 Sep 13;41(14):2899–2905. doi: 10.1016/j.jbiomech.2008.08.002.

Figure 3 – Existing Walking Facilities in Sacramento







## WHERE ARE PEOPLE WALKING?


We used Replica Places data to identify walking trends in the city.<sup>6</sup> This data combines a variety of sources including anonymized cell phone data to create a simulated model that highlights where people are going. **Figure 4** shows the frequency of walking trips compared to concentrations of neighborhood destinations. As there are a lot of people walking within the central city, it has the densest neighborhood destinations per square mile. Outside the central city, commercial corridors like **Stockton Boulevard** and **Folsom Boulevard** experience a high number of walking trips.

---


6 Replica Places is an activity-based model that uses a combination of mobile, land use, census, and transaction data to generate census-block group level origin and destination estimates that can be used to estimate trip distances and understand common origins-destinations. This data also provides estimates of mode split and trip purpose based on synthetic populations that are created as part of the estimation process.



Figure 4 – Frequent Walking Routes in Sacramento



# Biking




A complete, connected biking network that is comfortable for people of all ages and abilities is critical to make biking a viable transportation option for travel in Sacramento. The city has 449 miles of existing facilities for people biking. They consist of bike lanes, buffered bike lanes, bike routes, shared-use paths, and separated bikeways as shown in **Figure 5** and **Figure 6**. For more information on each facility type, please see the **Bike Facility Toolbox** on page 60.

While the city has several existing facilities for people biking, there are bikeways that are disconnected, gaps in the network, and bikeways that do not provide the level of comfort to be usable for the general population. The **Fruitridge/Broadway, North Sacramento**, and **South Sacramento** focus areas have the least coverage of bike facilities in the city.

Key observations from our assessment can be found on **page 23**.


**Figure 5 – Existing Biking Network**




*\*Rounded to the nearest whole number*

## EXISTING FACILITIES FOR PEOPLE BIKING


*For more information about existing facilities for people biking, please see **page 60**.*




**SHARED-USE PATH**




**SEPARATED BIKEWAY**



**BUFFERED BIKE LANE**



**BIKE LANE**




**BIKE ROUTE**







**Figure 7 – Existing Biking Facilities in Central Sacramento**





The following key issues about people biking in Sacramento were highlighted from our assessment:



### Less access by bike

Less than half (47%) of communities have access to essential needs by bike.



### Barriers limit access

Places to cross barriers like highways, rivers, and major streets are limited, which makes it less convenient to access some destinations.



### Majority of Sacramentans are disconnected

The majority of Sacramento residents live in lower density, single use development built after World War II. These communities lack a gridded street network, requiring travel on higher speed and volume streets. This land use pattern leaves these communities disconnected from daily needs. A notable inaccessible destination is the State Office of Civil Defense, located in the South Sacramento focus area. John F. Kennedy High School has access points only on Gloria Drive and Florin Road, which are high-stress streets, making it inaccessible to communities even though it is surrounded by a residential neighborhood.

*Local bike group members*








*People biking on the Sacramento Northern Bikeway Trail*

## WHERE ARE PEOPLE BIKING?

We also used Replica Places data to identify trends for people biking around the city. **Figure 8** shows the most used biking trip routes compared to concentrations of neighborhood destinations. As there are a lot of people biking within the central city, it has the densest neighborhood destinations per square mile. This is in part because of the grid street network and the commercial opportunities that the central business district provides. The further away from the central city, the less dense neighborhood destinations become. Residents who live further away from the central city often face more barriers to access a smaller number of nearby destinations. This is partly why the most frequent biking routes are concentrated in the central city and areas with a high concentration of destinations.



Figure 8 – Frequent Biking Trips in Sacramento



# Safety

Safety was also an important aspect to the development of the *Streets for People Plan* as people walking, biking, and rolling are particularly vulnerable and more likely to be killed or seriously injured (KSI) in a collision with a vehicle. Based on our analysis, we found that:



**Street segments** (the portions of the street between intersections) accounted for **78% of KSI collisions involving a person walking** and **58% of KSI collisions involving a person biking**.



**27% of KSI collisions involving people walking** occurred on streets **without sidewalks**.



**People improperly turning their vehicles into people biking** account for **16% of KSI collisions involving a person biking**.


## TOP LOCATIONS FOR COLLISIONS INVOLVING PEOPLE WALKING AND BIKING

In addition to the characteristics of streets with more frequent and severe collisions, we identified the top 10 intersections with the highest number of collisions involving people walking and biking. This was determined using available collision data from 2016 to 2020, as shown in **Figure 9**. Our analysis revealed several trends:

- The **Fruitridge Road/Stockton Boulevard** and **Mack Road/Center Parkway** intersections were identified to be top 10 intersections for people walking and top 10 intersections for people biking.
- **North Sacramento** and **South Sacramento** focus areas, and **Central City**, have multiple top 10 intersections.
- All the top collision intersections were in corridors identified in the city's HIN streets.



Figure 9 – High-Collision Intersections for Active Transportation Users and City of Sacramento’s HIN



Data source: City of Sacramento, County of Sacramento, County of Yolo, Caltrans, UC Berkeley TMS. Date saved: 11/12/2024.

# Comfort

We also analyzed how comfortable our street network is for the average person walking, biking, or rolling. To do this, we used *pedestrian level of traffic stress* (PLTS) and *bike level of traffic stress* (BLTS) analyses, which helped us identify the streets that are least comfortable for people walking, biking, and rolling. A full methodology of this analysis can be found in [Appendix 3 – Gap Analysis](#).



## PEDESTRIAN LEVEL OF TRAFFIC STRESS

Our analysis showed that several major streets outside the central city represent high-stress environments for people walking, even as most of these corridors include continuous sidewalks on both sides of the street. This is largely due to a lack of separation between people walking and people driving along multilane and high-speed streets. Some notable high-stress streets include **Fruitridge Road, Freeport Boulevard, Northgate Boulevard, Meadowview Road, and Norwood Avenue**. The results of this analysis are shown in **Figure 11**.


**Figure 10 – Pedestrian Level of Traffic Stress Illustrated**



These descriptions are simplified; additional criteria may impact the results. See [Appendix 3 – Gap Analysis](#) for a detailed description of how level of traffic stress is calculated.



Figure 11 – PLTS Analysis in the City of Sacramento




## **BIKE LEVEL OF TRAFFIC STRESS**

The results from our BLTS analysis are shown in **Figure 13**. Most major streets in Sacramento represent high-stress (BLTS 3 and 4) environments for people biking, despite the presence of conventional or buffered bike lanes in some locations. These include north-south connections like **Stockton Boulevard** and **Truxel Road**, as well as east-west connections including **San Juan Road, Del Paso Road**, and **El Camino Avenue**.

Lower comfort levels for people biking on these streets are associated with high-speed, multilane conditions with little to no buffer or vertical separation between people driving and people biking. Alternatively, residential streets and shared-use paths in the city are low-stress environments suitable for a broad segment of our community members.


**Figure 12 – Bike Level of Traffic Stress Illustrated**



*These descriptions are simplified; additional criteria may impact the results. See [Appendix 3 – Gap Analysis](#) for a detailed description of how level of traffic stress is calculated.*



Figure 13 – BLTS Analysis in the City of Sacramento



# Access

We analyzed how the existing street network impacts an average adult's ability to reach key destinations like parks, schools, and high-ridership transit locations while walking, biking, and rolling.<sup>7</sup> While the presence and quality of facilities for walking, biking, and rolling, as well as distance to destinations, are key elements to improve access, they do not tell the whole story. To this end, our analysis accounted for how traffic stress impacts the level of access to these key destinations. Areas that could be accessed in a short trip under low-stress conditions but are out of reach under stressful facilities are areas that would benefit most from specific improvements in the network. This section describes the results of the analysis with existing levels of stress (based on the PLTS and BLTS) on the street network. For more information on both analyses, please refer to [Appendix 3 – Gap Analysis](#).

We used the results from our access analysis to inform the development of recommendations as we focused on providing the easiest and most comfortable access to local destinations including parks, schools, and transit.



## How does stress affect how our communities move around the city?

Streets with high vehicle speeds and little or no physical separation from motor vehicles tend to feel more stressful for people walking, biking, and rolling. This limits transportation options for our communities who become dependent on motor vehicles, even for relatively short trips that could be accommodated by walking, biking, or rolling.



<sup>7</sup> We defined high-ridership transit locations as those light rail stations and bus stops used most frequently across Sacramento. See [Appendix 3 – Gap Analysis](#) section for more information.



## WHAT WE FOUND



### Access to Parks

**74%** of Sacramento communities live within a **15-minute walk** of a park. Similarly, **74%** of communities live within a **5-minute bike ride** of a park.





### Access to Schools

**64%** of communities live within a **15-minute walk or 5-minute bike ride** of a school. However, open enrollment in Sacramento's school districts results in many families having longer distances to travel to school.



### Access to Transit<sup>8</sup>

**15%** of communities live within a **15-minute walk** of a light rail station or high-ridership bus stop. Additionally, only **12%** live within a **5-minute bike ride** of a light rail station or high-ridership bus stop.



<sup>8</sup> For this analysis, we considered ridership from 2019 to determine the highest ridership locations (bus or light rail) in the city. We used data from before the COVID-19 pandemic disrupted the ridership levels in public transit. We also defined two generalized areas along J Street at 19th Street and Alhambra Boulevard to represent the most popular bus routes through the central city. Similarly, the Florin Towne Center bus stop just outside the city limits was included to account for the high number of trips at this location.

# Sustainability

We developed pollution burden, urban heat island effect, and tree canopy density analyses to understand the effects of climate change on active transportation users. Understanding where the greatest need is will help the City focus its investments so we can achieve our climate and sustainability goals set forth in the City's [\*Climate Action & Adaptation Plan\*](#) (CAAP).

## Pollution Burden

In Sacramento, **more than half (57%) of the greenhouse gases come from transportation-related sources.**<sup>9</sup> In addition to contributing to climate change, high levels of greenhouse gas emissions can lead to higher daytime temperatures, reduced nighttime cooling, and higher air-pollution levels. We conducted an analysis using data from CalEnviroScreen to identify areas most impacted by pollution.

The results from the analysis showed us that areas of the city experiencing the highest pollution burden include:

- The neighborhoods in the **Fruitridge/Broadway** focus area located east of Power Inn Road and the Union Pacific railroad tracks. This includes **Elder Creek, Depot Park, Florin Fruitridge Industrial Park, Elmhurst, and Fairgrounds.**
- Neighborhoods near I-80 such as **Ben Ali, Del Paso Park, and East Del Paso Heights** in the **North Sacramento** focus area.
- Almost the entire Central City west of 19th Street, southwest of Central City along the Sacramento River, and north of Central City below the American River.


Results from the analysis are mapped in **Figure 14.**

---

<sup>9</sup> Transportation Prioritization Criteria, Metrics and Points for Transportation Investments and Funding Opportunities, Resolution No. 2022-0079, Adopted by the Sacramento City Council (March 15, 2022), <https://www.cityofsacramento.gov/content/dam/portal/pw/Transportation/Transportation-Planning/TransportationPrioritiesPlan/R20220079-Transportation-Prioritization-Criteria-Metrics-and-Points-for-Transportation-Investments-a.pdf>.



Figure 14 – CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Analysis Showing Pollution Burden in Sacramento



Data source: City of Sacramento, County of Sacramento, County of Yolo, and Caltrans. Date saved: 11/12/2024.



*The urban heat island effect can have serious effects on our communities' health, especially children and seniors.*

## Urban Heat Island Effect

Urban heat islands occur when impervious surfaces such as pavement absorb heat during the day and then radiate that heat at night, warming up the environment. This has various impacts on public health including excess heat concerns and increase in cooling energy demand and emissions. Our analysis showed that:


- On average, **Sacramento is about 1.2°C (2.1°F) warmer than the baseline surrounding rural areas.** But the hottest areas in the northeastern portions of the city are as much as 2.4°C (4.3°F) warmer. In general, the urban heat island effect decreases to the south and west.
- In **Fruitridge/Broadway**, the urban heat island effect decreases when moving from the north to the south. The greatest temperature differences of about 1.5°C (2.7°F) occur north of Broadway and decrease to about 1°C (1.8°F) south of Fruitridge Road.

- **North Sacramento** has some of the most intense urban heat island effect in the city, marked by the greatest difference in temperature compared to nearby rural areas. The maximum temperature difference within the focus area is about 2.2°C (3.9°F).
- **South Sacramento** has among the least intense heat island effect in the city, particularly south of Meadowview Road and Mack Road.

**Figure 15** shows the census tract-level [California Heat Assessment Tool](#) (CHAT) data on urban heat island intensity in the city.



**Figure 15 – Urban Heat Island Effect**







*Tree coverage keeps our streets cooler and enables community members to walk more comfortably*

## Tree Canopy Density


People who walk, bike, roll, or take transit tend to be more vulnerable to high temperatures because they do not have much protection from the heat. Therefore, the availability or lack of shade can significantly affect their comfort and can be a major factor in their transportation choices. We used existing tree canopy density metrics to identify areas of the city that could benefit from additional tree canopy coverage along with active transportation improvements like separated bike lanes and shared-use paths. Our results, shown in **Figure 16**, revealed several trends:<sup>10</sup>

- Generally, **neighborhoods located farther away from the central city tend to have lower tree canopy density**, especially in areas north of I-80 and most of the southern portions of the city.
- Residential neighborhoods like **Land Park, East Sacramento, Curtis Park, and Boulevard Park** have some of the highest tree canopy densities in the city, along with natural areas like the American River Parkway.
- Within the focus areas, tree canopy density is generally low with the lowest coverage on the northern parts of **North Sacramento**, eastern portions of **Fruitridge/Broadway**, and southwestern areas of **South Sacramento**.

<sup>10</sup> It is important to note that many parks across the city are shown as having low tree canopy density due to their typically large areas of open grass.



Figure 16 – Existing Tree Canopy Density





3

# Community Engagement





*Input from community members, advocates, community-based organizations, local businesses, and City committees was crucial in developing the Streets for People Plan every step of the way.*

Through the *Streets for People Plan*, we received input from a broad range of community members to help us identify and better understand transportation needs, challenges, and community priorities about our transportation network. We conducted a three-phased effort with a range of in-person and virtual activities to meet people where they are as well as provide a variety of convenient opportunities to be involved in the project. For a more detailed breakdown of engagement activities, events, dates, locations visited, and findings, please refer to [Appendix 5 – Public Engagement Feedback](#).

## Leading with Equity

We conducted engagement activities across the city with special attention to activities in the plan's focus areas: **North Sacramento**, **South Sacramento**, and **Fruitridge/Broadway**.

We also sought out priority audiences for engagement including Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) communities; households with no/limited access to motor vehicles; and people with disabilities. The experiences of these individuals were crucial in understanding existing issues and concerns across a range of perspectives, and their feedback informed recommendations to create a transportation system that works for everyone. To reach broader and often underrepresented audiences, our communication materials were made available in English, Hmong, simplified

Chinese, Spanish, and Vietnamese with targeted engagement activities conducted in Spanish, Hmong, Mandarin, and Vietnamese.

We recognize that even while we visited many neighborhoods and made efforts to disseminate information widely, not all communities had the time, capacity, or internet access to go out of their way to engage with us. While we made some organic connections with the help of our community leaders and trusted voices, we acknowledge that just because certain voices were not able to join the conversation, we should not assume they have no lived experiences or visions for the future of the city's active transportation network.




# Community Planning Team

We created a volunteer Community Planning Team (CPT) composed of a diverse group of community members primarily from the focus areas but also representing different city neighborhoods. CPT members were compensated for their time and valuable insights. CPT members advised us throughout the process to make sure community voices and priorities were centered. CPT members attended meetings, suggested opportunities for community engagement events like farmers' markets and school resource fairs, provided feedback on recommended improvements, and helped us spread the word about project engagement activities for the larger community.

## A big thank you...

*to each and every one of our neighbors who gave their time, energy, and commitment to share their transportation needs and priorities with us. That input made the Streets for People Plan a plan created by the community and for everyone in Sacramento.*



Community Planning Team meeting





# Engagement Events

To see both the neighborhood-scale and citywide picture, we employed several strategies designed to provide people options for how they wished to share their input (see **Figure 17** on page 45).

## Pop-up events and neighborhood meetings

We held pop-up events and presented at neighborhood meetings to engage with communities in place and reduce travel barriers to participation. These events provided project information to communities and requested their input on the local context to inform the plan such as important destinations within the neighborhood and streets or intersections that pose a barrier to accessing those destinations by walking or biking.

## Online interactive engagement

Our project website ([streetsforpeople.org](https://streetsforpeople.org)) served as a space to share information about the project and other related initiatives. Our online interactive maps enabled users to provide feedback about the existing transportation network and current deficiencies. These tools also allowed users to share their thoughts about the proposed network improvements.



*Pop-up event at Rio Velo*

## Walking workshops and related case studies

We held in-person walking workshops in various neighborhoods throughout the city with an emphasis on neighborhoods within the three focus areas. These were selected based on feedback from our CPT to be representative of the active transportation challenges that exist in Sacramento today. These events provided communities with the opportunity to express their concerns about their perceptions of safety, accessibility, and comfort in real time and brainstorm their vision for what the corridor could look like in the future.



# Engagement by the Numbers

## IN-PERSON ENGAGEMENT

 **69**  
engagement events

-  5 canvassing sessions
-  9 community workshops
-  13 neighborhood presentations
-  31 pop-up events
-  11 walking workshops

 **1,438**  
participants



 **640+**  
comments

 **3**  
City Commission presentations

---

## ONLINE ENGAGEMENT

 **9**  
virtual events

-  6 Community Planning Team meetings
-  3 focus groups

Project website and  
online interactive map


 **3,191**  
comments

 **160**  
participants

 **2,415**  
contributors



Figure 17 – Community Engagement Events



# What We Heard

*The following four themes represent what we heard throughout the engagement process related to walking, biking, and rolling in Sacramento:*



## MAKE IT SAFER AND MORE CONNECTED

### **Address safety concerns related to traffic conditions, user behavior, and network gaps.**

Safety was often identified as the most important project goal. Our communities are concerned about the way drivers seem to travel at unsafe speeds at specific locations and noted general problematic behavior such as not looking during turns or veering into bike lanes. They also noted feeling unsafe while crossing because of traffic conditions and because crossings are too infrequent.

### **Establish more comfortable east-west connections.**

Our communities noted feeling unsafe walking, biking, and rolling on various east-west streets because of the fast traffic and lack of separation from oncoming traffic. They also see existing highways as barriers to local destinations. They would like to see more comfortable facilities for people walking, biking, and rolling, particularly in the **Fruitridge/Broadway** and **North Sacramento** focus areas.

### **Create safer, more frequent connections to transit, neighborhood destinations, and jobs.**

Our residents confirmed a need for a greater network of high-frequency transit, and that it is difficult to access the limited existing high-frequency transit because of the lack of low stress infrastructure outside the urban core. They would like to see additional lower-stress connections to transit and neighborhood destinations including parks and schools. Existing highways also limit our communities' ability to go to different destinations within their neighborhoods.







*Some of our communities don't have comfortable facilities to walk or bike on, leading to people biking on sidewalks which creates conflicts with people walking.*







## MAKE IT MORE COMFORTABLE

### **Provide wider sidewalks and bikeways along major streets.**

Our communities feel the sidewalks and bike facilities are too narrow to use comfortably and sidewalks are sometimes blocked by utility poles or boxes. Community members also felt that some walking facilities are too steep for mobility device users. Additionally, residents highlighted existing rolled curbs allow drivers to park on the sidewalk, acting as barriers for people walking.

### **Include more shade along sidewalks, bike facilities, and at bus stops.**

Our communities said that shade was an important aspect along sidewalks and bike facilities and at bus stops to improve comfort for walking, biking, and rolling. Also, shaded rest stops or benches are needed to make walking more accessible and comfortable along shared-use paths during heat and for those traveling longer distances or with physical disabilities. This need is supported by the results from [Appendix 2 – Existing Conditions](#), particularly the heat vulnerability analysis.





## MAINTAIN WHAT WE ALREADY HAVE

### Focus on maintenance of existing infrastructure.

Increased maintenance on existing streets to delineate space for all users often came up as an important project goal. Our communities highlighted a desire for better maintenance of street elements including pavement quality, lane striping, and using reflective delineators.

*Sidewalks in Old North Sacramento with overgrown vegetation*







## PROVIDE SUPPORTIVE AMENITIES AND PROGRAMS

### Supporting infrastructure should be included.

Our communities requested additional pedestrian scale lighting throughout neighborhood streets and shared-use paths to better see and be seen during evening and darker hours of the day. Additional bike parking was also highlighted for various locations throughout the city. More connections to regional shared-use paths would support people walking, biking, and rolling across neighborhoods.

### Interdepartmental collaborations are needed to support people experiencing homelessness.

We often heard about conditions and issues surrounding people experiencing homelessness and the active transportation network. In some places our communities noted being hindered from walking or biking by existing encampments of people experiencing homelessness. While outside the scope of this specific plan, this input helped inform interdepartmental collaborations to leverage available support and resources for these individuals.






# Our Communities' Input Matters!

*The feedback our communities provided through various engagement events was combined with our analyses to inform the development of infrastructure and programmatic/policy recommendations as shown below:*

**Figure 18** – Incorporation of Community Comments into Recommendations





4

# Recommendations





The *Streets for People Plan* focuses on expanding the existing network of sidewalks, bikeways, and general infrastructure to enhance and promote people walking, biking, and rolling in Sacramento. This plan also includes supportive policies and programs to enhance the infrastructure improvements.

The recommendations included in this chapter build on the findings from our analysis and the key themes we heard from our communities during our public engagement events:



**Make it safer and more connected**



**Make it more comfortable**



**Maintain what we already have**



**Provide supportive amenities and programs**



This chapter presents infrastructure, policy, and programmatic recommendations, as well as maintenance considerations. Infrastructure recommendations have been divided to show proposed network improvements for people walking and rolling, improvements for biking, and improvements at intersections. Policy and programmatic recommendations have been organized thematically into those focusing on equity, education, engagement, engineering, evaluation, and encouragement. Finally, the maintenance considerations provide solutions to challenges expressed by our communities.





## What we heard



*Make it safer and more connected*



## What we propose

- Providing **greater separation** between people driving and people walking, biking, and rolling.
- **Closing gaps** for people walking, biking, and rolling to transit.
- Identifying **key intersections for safety improvements**.
- Enhancing multiple **east-west connections on major streets** that work together with the [Neighborhood Connections Plan](#).



## What we heard



*Make it more comfortable*



## What we propose

- Emphasizing **increased separation** between people driving and people walking, biking, and rolling.
- Identifying **sidewalk widening and sidewalk buffering** opportunities.
- Providing tools to identify opportunities for **greater shade cover** along street improvements.





## What we heard



*Maintain what we already have*



## What we propose

- Talking openly about the **existing and ongoing need for maintenance** of our network.
- Focusing improvements in **historically underinvested areas of the city**.
- Finding **overlap between upgrades to infrastructure** for people walking, biking, and rolling to more easily implement it.



## What we heard



*Provide supportive amenities and programs*



## What we propose

- **Expanding City policies** that support people walking, biking, and rolling.
- Enhancing existing programs to **increase education around walking and biking** and encourage people to walk and bike more frequently.
- Identifying opportunities for more supportive amenities like **bike parking, shade trees, systemic safety improvements, and citywide Safe Routes to Schools programming**.





# Network Recommendations

The recommendations included in this section are based on our communities' feedback. The recommendations build off the existing walking and biking networks, incorporate previous plans (see [Appendix 1 – Plan and Policy Review](#)), and complement the improvements identified in the [Neighborhood Connections Plan](#).

## Recommendations Toolbox

Different facilities are better suited for different streets, based on characteristics such as how fast and how frequently vehicles use the street, the street width, and other types of transportation using the space. The following facilities and amenities are part of the city's bikeway and pedestrian "toolbox."

As part of this toolbox, this plan also includes **traffic calming improvements** from the [Neighborhood Connections Plan](#).

### What is a toolbox?

A toolbox is a collection of resources and infrastructure related improvements designed to support the goals of this plan. This toolbox complements the improvements included in the [Neighborhood Connections Plan](#).





# Toolbox for People Walking and Rolling



## SIDEWALKS

- Provide an area for people walking to travel separated from vehicle traffic.
- Typically constructed out of concrete and raised at least four inches above the adjacent roadway. Includes a curb, gutter, and sometimes a landscaped buffer.
- Wider sidewalks (>6ft) allow for comfortable passing, side-by-side walking, and accommodate people using wheelchairs and strollers. Wide sidewalks are particularly beneficial in areas with high walking traffic, near schools, at transit stops, and near retail and entertainment areas.



## SHADE TREES

- Can increase comfort for people walking and biking by lowering temperatures, filtering air and water, and improving the quality of both.
- The presence of trees can make walking and biking facilities feel more comfortable and appealing, contributing to mode shift and reducing greenhouse gas emissions.



## PLANTING STRIPS

- Create expanded space for roots so trees can grow faster; share nutrients; better resist disease, pests, and drought; and live longer.
- Reduce risk of pavement damage by root systems.
- Can serve to capture stormwater recharge, and potential storage opportunity.

\* Intersection or crossing improvement



# Toolbox for People Walking and Rolling (cont.)

---



## **CURB EXTENSIONS**

- Horizontal extensions of the curb into the street at intersections or mid-block crossings to expand the place where pedestrians can stand, narrow crossing distances for people walking, provide additional space for placemaking and landscape features, and reduce speeds of turning vehicles.
- Shortens crossing distances and improves visibility.
- Slows turning vehicles.



## **HIGH-VISIBILITY CROSSWALKS\***

- High-visibility crosswalks are marked with thick bars, drawing additional attention and awareness to the crossing.
- In school zones, these crossings are yellow instead of the standard white color.



## **MEDIAN REFUGE ISLANDS\***

- Help improve access for people walking by increasing visibility and allowing pedestrians to cross one direction of traffic at a time.
- Minimize pedestrian exposure at mid-block crossings by shortening the crossing distance and increasing the number of available gaps for crossing.

\* Intersection or crossing improvement







## PEDESTRIAN SIGNAL\*

- Used at mid-block crossings where there are three (3) or more travel lanes, traffic volumes greater than 9,000, and posted speed limits 35 mph or greater.
- Used at shared-use path crossings, both at intersections and mid-block.
- Flashing amber warning beacons may be utilized at unsignalized intersection crossings.



## WAYFINDING

- Directional signage for people walking to orient themselves within the network and navigate to typical destinations.
- Helps make the active transportation network more approachable to people walking or rolling in an unfamiliar area.
- Can help people discover new destinations and services.



# Toolbox for People Biking

---



## SHARED-USE PATHS

- Paths shared by people walking and biking completely separated from motor vehicle traffic.
- Comfortable for people of all ages and abilities.
- Typically located within or along parks, rail corridors, rivers, or other bodies of water.



## SEPARATED BIKEWAYS

- On-street bike lane separated from motor vehicle traffic by curb, median, planters, parking, or other physical barrier.
- One- or two-way facility.
- More comfortable for people of all ages and abilities.



## BUFFERED BIKE LANES

- Dedicated lane for bike travel adjacent to traffic.
- Separated from traffic or parking by painted lane line or buffer.
- Buffer provides additional comfort and space from motor vehicles and/or parking.



## BIKE LANES

- Dedicated lane for bike travel adjacent to traffic.
- Enable people biking to ride at their preferred speed without interference from cars or traffic conditions.
- Separated from traffic or parking by painted lane line or buffer.





## BIKE ROUTES\*

- Signed and/or marked streets where drivers share the travel lane with people biking.
- May include additional traffic calming elements to improve user comfort (sometimes referred to as bike boulevards).
- Generally not considered comfortable for most users on higher speed and volume streets.
- Typically appropriate with speeds under 25 mph and vehicle volumes of 3,000 per day or less.



## BIKE-FRIENDLY INTERSECTIONS

- Intersections designed to provide additional separation, comfort, and safety for people biking and walking.
- May include bike boxes, signal priority, curb extensions, or fully protected intersection.
- Ideal for locations with conflicts between people driving, walking, and biking.



## BIKE PARKING

- Includes curbside racks, corrals, bike lockers, or bike stations.
- Racks provide short-term dedicated parking outdoors or in garages.
- Lockers provide long-term secure parking at specific locations.
- Stations provide long-term indoor parking typically near transit and can be staffed or self-serve.
- The City adopted the [Bike Rack Design and Placement Standards](#) in 2017 that apply to all newly installed bike parking.



## WAYFINDING

- Directional signage for people biking to orient themselves within the network and navigate to typical destinations.
- Helps make the biking network more approachable to new riders and people riding in an unfamiliar area.
- Can help people discover new destinations and services.

\* As of January 1, 2025, cities and agencies are prohibited from installing sharrows on any street with a speed limit above 30 mph following the signing into law of SB 1216. Some exceptions are allowed when used at or near intersections for connecting to other bikeways. The bill also requires that any project funded through the CA Active Transportation Program (ATP) not install a Class III facility or sharrows on a street with a speed limit above 25 mph (into effect on January 1, 2026). Jurisdictions may still implement Class III facilities/sharrows on roadways with speeds over 25 mph if it can be demonstrated that the project will reduce the speed to 25 mph or lower, or if the Class III designation/ marking is appropriate and context sensitive.



# Toolbox for Neighborhood Connections

---



## **SPEED HUMPS / LUMPS / TABLES**

- Elevated mounds three to four feet in height placed in the roadway intended to slow vehicles. The mounds may include gaps to allow emergency vehicles and bicycles to travel through without experiencing vertical deflection.
- To achieve effective traffic calming, features should be spaced appropriately 250 to 500 feet apart.
- When placed near pedestrian crossings, they can significantly enhance comfort for those crossing.



## **TRAFFIC DIVERTER / STREET CLOSURE**

- Street modifications which partially or fully close the street to vehicular traffic while still allowing access for people walking and biking.
- Diagonal diverters prevent all through movement, and forced turn diverters prevent through traffic on one street.
- Reduces cut-through traffic.
- Can be accomplished with temporary, quick-build materials.



## **MINI ROUNDABOUTS / TRAFFIC CIRCLES**

- Mini roundabouts are unsignalized, circular intersections where incoming traffic yields to traffic in the intersection.
- Designs may include separated bike lanes or shared lanes to accommodate people biking.
- Traffic circles require less space and may be stop controlled.
- Provides an opportunity for landscaping or placemaking.





### CHICANES

- Segments of curb, landscaping, or other curb extension and alternate from one side of the road to the other to create a curved segment of roadway which shortens a driver's sight lines, lowering speeds.
- Additional space may be utilized for parking, landscaping, or other elements.
- Increase available public space on a corridor. Requires additional roadway space; generally feasible for streets with on-street parking.



### PINCH POINTS

- Horizontal extension of the curb into the street that narrow travel lanes by one to two feet or narrow a two-lane roadway into one wide travel lane shared by vehicles traveling in both directions, requiring drivers to yield to each other.
- Reduces vehicle speeds.
- May be paired with mid-block crossings to reduce crossing distances for people walking.



### RAISED CROSSWALKS / INTERSECTIONS

- Crosswalks or intersections which are elevated to sidewalk level to slow vehicles and increase driver alertness.
- Raised crossings are a variation which raises only the pedestrian/ bicycle crossing, and they can be used as shared use path crossings.
- Detectable warnings and drainage should also be considered.
- Increases visibility and slows down drivers.

## Toolbox for Neighborhood Connections (cont.)

---



### ON-STREET PARKING

- On-street parking reduces roadway width by allowing parking along a roadway curb, causing a driver to experience increased “friction” on the side of the road resulting in lower driver speeds.
- Slows drivers and provides public service for people who drive.



### LANE NARROWING

- Narrowing lanes to 11 feet and reducing the total amount of space for vehicles can provide visual cues for drivers to slow down. This effect may be achieved via striping, adding a bikeway, adding vertical elements, or moving curb.
- Slows down drivers. Reduces crossing distances for people walking.
- May provide space for placemaking amenities.



### CURB EXTENSIONS

- Horizontal extensions of the curb into the street at intersections or mid-block crossings to expand the place where pedestrians can stand, narrow crossing distances for people walking, provide additional space for placemaking and landscape features, and reduce speeds of turning vehicles.
- Shortens crossing distances and improves visibility.
- Slows turning vehicles.






## HARDENED CENTERLINES

- Hardened centerlines are typically a flexible delineator post or raised speed hump placed along the road centerline at an intersection to narrow the path through the intersection.
- Encourages drivers to turn left at lower speeds.
- Guides vehicles to a wider turning angle for slower, more predictable turns.
- Helps drivers better see people crossing the street.



## STREET TREES

- Trees planted along a roadway ("Street Trees") can change the perception of drivers such that the road appears narrower than it is.
- Street trees can be used to increase comfort for people walking by lining sidewalks and for people biking by providing shade in bike lanes, helping to reduce temperatures on hot days.
- This treatment helps to reduce traffic noise and address the City's tree canopy goals



## GEOMETRY CHANGES / CURB RADII

- Changing roadway geometry or narrowing curb radii increases the amount of curb space, requiring vehicles to slow down when turning. This treatment can also be used to realign skewed intersections to right angles.
- Improves visibility for everyone using the intersection.
- Reduces crossing distances and vehicle turning speeds. May provide additional space for landscaping.




Students walking to school along Del Paso Road. Credit: North Natomas Jibe

## Recommendations for People Walking and Rolling

The *Streets for People Plan* identifies **567 miles of new or improved sidewalks throughout the city**. Recommendations for people walking, including planned active transportation crossings over major barriers, are shown in **Figure 19–Figure 25** on the following pages.



### WHAT WE PROPOSE



\*Sidewalk widening and filling in missing sidewalks.

\*\*Rounded to the nearest whole number.







Figure 20 – Recommendations for People Walking and Rolling in Northwest Sacramento






Figure 21 – Recommendations for People Walking and Rolling in Northeast Sacramento




Figure 22 – Recommendations for People Walking and Rolling in Central West Sacramento






Figure 23 – Recommendations for People Walking and Rolling in Central East Sacramento




Figure 24 – Recommendations for People Walking and Rolling in Southwest Sacramento







Figure 25 – Recommendations for People Walking and Rolling in Southeast Sacramento





## Recommendations for People Biking

The recommendations included here are intended to create a more extensive network of facilities for people biking that provides easy and comfortable connections to neighborhood and regional destinations. Recommended improvements for people biking, including planned active transportation crossings over major barriers, are shown in **Figure 27–Figure 33**.

The recommendations have also been developed to build on the [Neighborhood Connections Plan](#) which includes both **Primary** (i.e., routes that provide access to everyday destinations with traffic calming features) and **Secondary** (i.e., signed routes that serve as “feeder routes,” linking additional users to their desired destinations) routes. Primary Routes for Neighborhood Connections are identified with an outline on **Figure 27–Figure 33**. For the complete Neighborhood Connections network, see **Figure 34**.

Additional information on how we developed the recommended improvements can be found in [Appendix 7 – Development of Recommendations and Segmentation \(Methods\)](#).





## HOW THE RECOMMENDED BIKE FACILITIES WERE SELECTED

The number and speed of vehicles on a roadway can affect whether people biking feel comfortable taking that route or bicycling at all. Identifying the appropriate bikeway facility type can be a challenge.


The Caltrans Bikeway Facility Selection Guidelines and Complete Streets Contextual Design Guidance (DIB-94) provide a starting point to help identify which bike facility type (e.g., bike lane, buffered bike lane, separated bikeway) is appropriate for each street context.

The goal of these guidelines is to provide staff a framework to implement low-stress bikeways that are comfortable for all ages and abilities by using the posted travel speed and average daily traffic (ADT) volume (as shown in **Figure 26**). Please note that this document only provides general guidance. Corridor specific factors including land use context should be considered when determining the appropriate bikeway facility to implement.

Feasibility determination, final design, accessibility, funding, community-identified needs, and implementation of any recommended improvements will be undertaken in future feasibility studies and addressed at the individual project level.

**Figure 26** – Recommended Bicycle Facilities for Urban Areas, Suburban Areas, and Rural Main Streets

Source: [Figure 5-A. Design Information Bulletin 94 – Complete Streets IB 94 Complete Streets Contextual Design Guidance](#)



# WHAT WE PROPOSE






Existing Facilities  
for People Biking\*



New + Upgraded Facilities  
for People Biking\*



Complete Recommended  
Network for People Biking\*



\*Rounded to the nearest whole number. More information on facilities for people biking can be found in the [Neighborhood Connections Plan](#).





Figure 27 – Recommendations for People Biking in Sacramento






Figure 28 – Recommendations for People Biking in Northwest Sacramento






Figure 29 – Recommendations for People Biking in Northeast Sacramento







Figure 30 – Recommendations for People Biking in Central West Sacramento





**Figure 31 – Recommendations for People Biking in Central East Sacramento**




Figure 32 – Recommendations for People Biking in Southwest Sacramento








Figure 33 – Recommendations for People Biking in Southeast Sacramento



### Figure 34 – Neighborhood Connections Network







*The absence of bicycle facilities is a barrier for our communities accessing transit along Del Paso Boulevard.*



Recommendations



85



# Intersection Recommendations

In addition to the network recommendations, we identified key intersections for improving safety and connectivity across the city. We identified **612 intersections** where existing and proposed biking routes intersect or where safety concerns like motor vehicles turning at high-speeds, lack of crossing facilities, turning vehicles encroaching onto bike lanes, and others were identified through public engagement and data analysis. Specific improvements at each intersection will require

future assessment of their conditions like speeds, volumes, number of vehicle lanes, existing facilities, and even context of the street.

A decision matrix to help City staff identify the most appropriate intersection improvements is available in [Appendix 7 – Development of Recommendations and Segmentation \(Methods\)](#). Intersection recommendation locations are shown in **Figure 35–Figure 41**.




*The intersection of Stockton Blvd and Lemon Hill Ave experiences high numbers of people walking or biking to access Lemon Hill Plaza.*






Figure 35 – Intersection Recommendations in Sacramento




Data source: City of Sacramento, County of Sacramento, County of Yolo, Caltrans, ACS 2021 5-year. Date saved: 6/20/2025.

Figure 36 – Intersection Recommendations in Northwest Sacramento





### Figure 37 – Intersection Recommendations in Northeast Sacramento



**Figure 38 – Intersection Recommendations in Central West Sacramento**





Figure 39 – Intersection Recommendations in Central East Sacramento




Figure 40 – Intersection Recommendations in Southwest Sacramento







Figure 41 – Intersection Recommendations in Southeast Sacramento



# Recommended Policies and Programs

Making Sacramento more walkable and bikeable requires not only new infrastructure investments but also ongoing policies and programs that support and encourage those who rely on active travel and those who choose it for convenience. This section outlines the recommended policies and programs designed to help achieve the goals set forth in this plan. The recommendations are organized under the following themes:

## EQUITY



Equity is a major component throughout these proposed policies and programs to prioritize recommendations within Equity Priority Communities that are heavily dependent on public transit or active transportation.

## EDUCATION



Bike and pedestrian education policies and programs help those who are interested in active transportation to feel safer, more comfortable, and more confident navigating streets and shared-use paths.

## ENGAGEMENT



Engagement policies and programs can institutionalize safer biking and walking transportation systems. By prioritizing people who walk, bike, and roll, these policies and programs help create safer environments for all users.

## ENGINEERING



Support infrastructure and facilities that provide increased comfort and ease for people who walk, bike, and roll. These engineering policies and programs are intended to work with existing bike and pedestrian infrastructure to improve the experience for people walking, biking, and rolling.

## EVALUATION



Policies and programs to evaluate and track progress toward reaching the plan's goals are important for long-term success.

## ENCOURAGEMENT



Encouragement policies and programs help to create a lasting active transportation culture and can encourage overall mode share shifts.

### Active Transportation Commission Recommendations

In September 2024, the Active Transportation Commission provided the City Council with various recommendations for policies and programs to improve active transportation in Sacramento through the [Sacramento Active Transportation Commission Annual Report](#). These recommendations are currently under consideration by the City Council.



## POLICIES

### Equity



#### RECOMMENDED POLICY

#### DESCRIPTION

#### **Prioritize People Walking, Biking, and Taking Transit**

The City shall prioritize mobility, comfort, health, safety, and convenience for those walking, followed by those biking and riding transit, ahead of design and operations for those driving.

*Sacramento 2040 General Plan (M-1.2)*

#### **Invest Equitably**

The City shall ensure that the transportation system is planned and implemented with an equitable process to achieve equitable outcomes and investments so that all neighborhoods one day will have similar levels of transportation infrastructure such as sidewalks, marked low-stress crossings, and bikeways.

*Sacramento 2040 General Plan (M-1.9)*

#### **Reduce or Eliminate Barriers to Walking**

The City shall remove barriers to walking, where feasible, and work with utility companies to remove barriers to allow people of all abilities to move with comfort and convenience throughout the city, including through the following:

- Provision of curb ramps, crosswalks, and overpasses;
- Relocation of infrastructure or street furniture that impedes travel pathways;
- Reducing or consolidating driveways and curb cuts;
- Providing long and short-term bike and scooter parking to minimize sidewalk obstructions; and
- Creation of additional walking entrances to important destinations like schools, parks, and commercial areas.

*Sacramento 2040 General Plan (M-1.16)*

#### **Support Community Efforts to Expand Access to Bikes**

The City shall continue to support community efforts to offer, promote, and expand access to bikes, bike skills, and bike repair.

*Sacramento 2040 General Plan (NS-M-2)*



## POLICIES

### Education

#### RECOMMENDED POLICY

#### DESCRIPTION



#### ***Promote Greater Use of TDM Strategies by Employers***

The City should promote the greater use of Transportation Demand Management strategies by employers and residents to reduce dependence on single-occupancy vehicles with the target that 17 percent of all trips are made by transit and active transportation modes by 2030 and 23 percent of all trips are made by transit and active transportation modes by 2045.

*Sacramento 2040 General Plan (M-2.1)*

### Engagement

#### RECOMMENDED POLICY

#### DESCRIPTION



#### ***Continue Sidewalk Bike Riding Ticket Diversion Program***

The City should continue to implement its Urban Biking and Scooting class. The class also serves as the City's Sidewalk Bike Riding Ticket Diversion program to allow people to avoid paying a fine for illegally biking on the sidewalk if they take the course. This program helps to provide important education, encouragement, and information on the rules of the road.





## POLICIES

### Engineering



#### RECOMMENDED POLICY

#### DESCRIPTION

#### ***Support Existing Complete Streets Policy***

The City should continue to implement the existing City of Sacramento Complete Streets Policy by incorporating Complete Street elements and designs across all street projects.

#### ***Develop a Policy for Leading Pedestrian Intervals***

The City should develop and implement a policy for leading pedestrian intervals at signalized intersections.

#### ***Implement Bikeway Project Design Based on DIB-94***

The City should incorporate guidance from California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) Design Information Bulletin – 94 which encourages increased separation between people biking and people driving. Going forward, the City will incorporate this guidance on bikeway design projects to provide increased separation wherever possible.

#### ***Implement Streets For People Projects***

The City should implement projects recommended in this plan based on the *Transportation Priorities Plan* process and in combination with any City projects as well as with private development projects.

#### ***Incorporate Tree Canopy Strategies in Active Transportation Infrastructure Projects***

The City should include street trees as a part of transportation projects infrastructure to support achievement of 50 percent shading over streets and sidewalks. Street trees have been proven to have traffic calming, urban heat, and air quality benefits and should be employed as part of strategies to create more bikeable and walkable streets and paths.

The *Streets for People Plan* has identified high-opportunity areas for tree planting, particularly in areas with substantial urban heat exposure and limited existing tree canopy coverage, which creates a barrier to accessing and using active transportation facilities, such as sidewalks and bikeways.

This policy recommends including street trees as a part of active transportation projects infrastructure to support achievement of 50 percent shading over streets and sidewalks. The additional canopy should prioritize shading of active transportation facilities, such as sidewalks, bikeways, and shared use paths.



## POLICIES

### Engineering

#### RECOMMENDED POLICY

#### DESCRIPTION



#### *Continue Bike Parking Requirements and Program*

The City should continue to require new development to include long and short term bicycle parking. The City should also continue to install bike parking through its bike parking program.

### Evaluation

#### RECOMMENDED POLICY

#### DESCRIPTION



#### *Evaluate Infrastructure and Programs Regularly*

As part of the regular update of this plan, conduct in-depth engagement with the community to gauge how the community views the success of recent active transportation projects, programs, and policies.

### Encouragement

#### RECOMMENDED POLICY

#### DESCRIPTION



#### *Implement Forthcoming TDM Policies*

The City should implement the policies, programs, and regulations included in the forthcoming Transportation Demand Management Implementation Plan/Report to increase support for travel by walking, biking, and transit. The *General Plan* and *Climate Action & Adaptation Plan* mode share goals include increasing active transportation to 6% by 2030 and 12% by 2045; and transit to 11% by 2030.





*Residents at the Sacramento Northern Bikeway*





## PROGRAMS

### Education



#### RECOMMENDED PROGRAM

#### DESCRIPTION

##### *Continue the Urban Biking and Scooting Class*

The City should continue to implement the Urban Biking and Scooting 101 Course. This program educates people biking and scooting on how to anticipate and respond to drivers and walkers.

### Engineering



#### RECOMMENDED PROGRAM

#### DESCRIPTION

##### *Create a Wayfinding Program*

The City should implement a citywide comprehensive wayfinding program to highlight low-stress all ages and abilities routes for walking, rolling, and biking to community destinations and transit.





## PROGRAMS

### Evaluation



#### RECOMMENDED PROGRAM

#### DESCRIPTION

##### *Monitor Crash Data*

Regularly review crash data for collisions involving people walking, biking, and rolling.

##### *Active Transportation Count Program*

Conduct regular counts of people walking and biking throughout the community to identify trends in usage and assess the benefits of completed projects.

### Encouragement



#### RECOMMENDED PROGRAM

#### DESCRIPTION

##### *Develop Bikeway Maps*

The City should continue to develop and provide bikeway maps for public navigation throughout Sacramento. Types of public bike maps include an interactive map, brochures, handouts, etc. Bike maps would serve as recommendations of which routes to take throughout the City as an encouraging mode to explore the City and/or commute to work.

##### *Host Bicycling and Walking Events*

Continue to host public events to support walking and biking such as public bike rides or walking events.



# Maintenance Considerations

Maintenance of the existing and proposed network includes multi-level challenges that may reduce the ability of the City to keep up with proactive maintenance. To address these issues, we propose the following:

## Shared-use path maintenance

### ISSUE



As the City continues to expand its shared-use path network, the maintenance funding for paths has not increased. Path construction comes from competitive grants, but grants do not fund recurring maintenance.

### SOLUTION



Identify additional funding source for ongoing maintenance costs.

*Sacramento Northern Bike Trail entrance*





# Sidewalk maintenance

## ISSUE



This is currently the responsibility of the adjacent property owner and not the City. While this reduces the overall maintenance burden on the City, it can result in a patchwork of sidewalk conditions including overgrown vegetation blocking the sidewalk, piles of leaves in the sidewalk path, and other issues.

## SOLUTION



Identify a program that will determine ways to address sidewalk maintenance, focusing on equity.

# Deferred maintenance

## ISSUE



Like many cities, the City of Sacramento has a significant level of deferred maintenance across the transportation network, which has only grown in the last decade. The current total backlog of \$1.4 billion means that new maintenance issues may be deferred to later years to address other needs that were deferred previously.

## SOLUTION



Identify additional funding source for ongoing deferred maintenance needs.

# Areas of historical underinvestment

## ISSUE



Areas that have lacked historical investment from the City such as our focus areas have also typically received a lower level of maintenance funding on the transportation network.

## SOLUTION



Prioritize maintenance in historically underinvested areas.



# Common Questions

**We received several similar questions about the draft plan that we want to address. Please see below for these common questions and our responses.**

**Why doesn't this plan consider more street reallocations (lane reductions) to accommodate more active transportation infrastructure?**

The number of vehicle lanes on a street is dictated by the City's *General Plan*. In the development of the [2040 General Plan](#), staff evaluated all streets for eligibility for lane reductions. Considerations include existing and projected vehicle volume, land uses, transit headways, and more. The *2040 General Plan* was the City's first major attempt to look citywide at reallocation of street space to accommodate walking, bicycling and transit. That plan, not this *Streets for People Plan*, dictates how many vehicle lanes are on a street.

**Why doesn't this plan consider converting one-way streets to two-way?**

Converting one-way streets to two-way is expensive and can cause challenges near rail. Converting streets to two-way requires new traffic signals and new signal operations. This currently (2025) costs over \$1 million per intersection. If the proposed street is near rail, the City must receive approval from the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) and from the rail owners (often Union Pacific Railroad). These agencies are reluctant to approve two-way conversions.

**Why hasn't the City closed some streets in William Land Park to cars?**

Most of the streets in William Land Park are managed by the Department of Youth, Parks, and Community Enrichment (YPCE). The YPCE team has investigated the possibility but determined the cost to implement is beyond available funding at this time.





### Why can't the City reduce the default speed limit to 20 mph?

A reduction in the 'prima facie' or default speed limit will be brought to council for resolution in the 2025-2026 fiscal year. The application must follow [State laws](#) regarding speed limits. City staff anticipate that the proposal will establish a 20 mph prima facie speed limit for Business Activity Districts, based on specific roadway and land use criteria. A reduction in the prima facie speed limit to 20 mph is also anticipated for Local Roads and Senior Zones pending determination by an Engineering & Traffic Survey.

### Why doesn't this plan include a recommendation to prohibit right turns on red in the central city?

Prohibiting right turns on red would require a study to determine impacts and feasibility. A study for this is not in the Public Works' Transportation Division's current work plan.

### Why can't the City have more leading pedestrian intervals?

An evaluation of best practice to establish guidelines for leading pedestrian intervals (LPIs) at signalized intersections is currently (2025) underway and will be included in the updated City of Sacramento Traffic Signal Operations Manual (TSOM). The TSOM and the guidelines for LPIs will be presented to the Active Transportation and Disability Advisory Commissions to allow for public discussion of the proposed standard practices.

### Why doesn't the City institute an all-red phase at traffic signals?

As direction from the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, the "all-red" time between signal phases is determined by equation using specific site conditions and geometric measurements of the intersection. Nearly all signalized intersections operated by the City of Sacramento have "all-red" time between phases. Typically, the amount of time is difficult for a driver waiting at one approach of the intersection to notice. It may be a period less than one second, but greater than zero.

A practice to establish a greater "all-red" time, with a minimum of one second added to the calculated value previously used at all signalized intersections, is currently under evaluation as the Transportation Division prepares a Traffic Signal Operations Manual (TSOM). The TSOM will be presented to the Active Transportation and Disability Advisory Commissions in the 2025-2026 fiscal year to allow for public input into the adoption of standard practices.



5

# Implementation





# Costs

The *Streets for People Plan* recommends over \$1.5 billion in projects for people walking and rolling across the city and up to \$893 million in projects for people biking. Cost estimates are provided in 2024 dollars.

The cost estimates identified in this chapter include planning, design, environmental clearances, implementation, as well as staff time.

**Table 1 – Generalized Costs for People Walking and Rolling<sup>11</sup>**

Proposed Improvement	Cost
Curb Extensions	\$\$\$\$
Hardened Centerlines and Turn Wedges	\$\$\$\$
Median Refuge Islands	\$\$\$\$
Pedestrian Hybrid Beacons	\$\$\$\$
Planting Strips	\$\$\$\$
Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons	\$\$\$\$
Shade Trees	\$\$\$\$
Sidewalks*	\$\$\$\$

\$ – Up to \$300,000  
 \$\$ – \$300,000–\$500,000  
 \$\$\$ – \$500,000–\$1M  
 \$\$\$\$ – \$1M–\$5M

\*Assumes up to \$100,000 per 50 feet

**Table 2 – Generalized Costs for People Biking**

Classification	Cost (per mile)
Shared-Use Path	\$\$\$–\$\$\$\$
Bike Lane	\$–\$\$\$
Bike Routes	\$
Separated Bikeway	\$\$\$–\$\$\$\$

\$ – Up to \$300,000  
 \$\$ – \$300,000–\$500,000  
 \$\$\$ – \$500,000–\$1M  
 \$\$\$\$ – \$1M–\$5M

<sup>11</sup> Only sidewalks are included in the estimated total for people walking as specific intersection improvements will be identified on a case-by-case basis. Estimates for those improvements are included in Table 1 for reference.



# Return on Investment: The Case for Active Transportation

Through the *Streets for People Plan*, the City has a unique opportunity to build a comprehensive active transportation network that supports comfortable, accessible, and convenient travel for people of all ages and abilities. By investing in well-designed walking and biking infrastructure, the City can unlock a wide range of benefits—from enhancing public health and reducing traffic congestion to supporting local businesses and improving environmental sustainability:

- In Minneapolis-St. Paul, for every 400 meters closer a median-priced home is to an off-street bicycle facility, its value increases by \$510.<sup>12</sup>
- People biking in Philadelphia ride 260,000 miles daily, saving 47,450 tons of CO<sub>2</sub> from being emitted by cars each year.<sup>13</sup>
- A study of the Great Allegheny Passage estimated \$40 million in shared-use path-attributed revenue and \$7.5 million in wages distributed by shared-use path-facing businesses. In 2014, an estimated 40% of sales were related to shared-use path traffic in towns along the Great Allegheny Passage.<sup>13</sup>
- In North Carolina, every \$1.00 of trail construction supported \$1.72 annually from local business revenue, sales tax revenue, and benefits related to health and transportation.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> "Protected Bike Lanes Statistics," PeopleForBikes, accessed July 9, 2025, <https://www.peopleforbikes.org/statistics/economic-benefits>.

<sup>13</sup> Rails to Trails Conservancy, *Active Transportation Transforms America: The Case for Increased Public Investment in Walking and Biking Connectivity*, October 2019, <https://www.railstotrails.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/12/Active-Transportation-Transforms-America.pdf>.

<sup>14</sup> Institute for Transportation Research and Education (ITRE) and Alta Planning and Design, *Evaluating the Economic Impact of Shared Use Paths in North Carolina*, February 2018, [https://itre.ncsu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/NCDOT-2015-44\\_SUP-Project\\_Final-Report\\_optimized.pdf](https://itre.ncsu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/NCDOT-2015-44_SUP-Project_Final-Report_optimized.pdf).



# Funding

The City's *Capital Improvement Plan* is the primary method for allocating funding for street projects; however, the City does not have a dedicated funding source specifically for transportation improvements and often leverages grant funding for larger projects. A variety of funding opportunities are available to support project design and construction. The following represent a few of the potential grant funds the City may pursue for project implementation:



## Federal

- [Better Utilizing Investments to Leverage Development \(BUILD\)](#)
- [Safe Streets and Roads for All \(SS4A\)](#)
- [Reconnecting Communities Pilot](#)
- [Active Transportation Infrastructure Improvement Program \(ATIIP\)](#)
- [Regional Infrastructure Accelerator \(RIA\) Grant](#)



## State

- [Caltrans Active Transportation Program \(ATP\)](#)
- [Caltrans Sustainable Transportation Planning Grant](#)
- [Caltrans Highway Safety Improvement Program \(HSIP\) Grant](#)
- [California Strategic Growth Fund Transformative Climate Communities Grant](#)
- [Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities \(AHSC\) Program](#)



## Regional / Local

- [SACOG Active Transportation Program](#)
- [Sacramento Transportation Authority - Tax Measure A](#)




# Monitoring and Review

It will be important for us to measure how well-used these proposed improvements are and how they benefit the community's well-being once they're constructed. While we have not historically tracked the total levels of activity for people walking, biking, and rolling, it may be possible to evaluate the level of use through:

- **Conducting surveys for people walking, biking, and rolling** throughout the city with each plan update to assess how people are using new facilities.
- **Leveraging data resources such as StravaMetro or Replica Places** to estimate total levels of walking, biking, and rolling over time.

These strategies will help to review which projects have been most beneficial and assess the benefits to different areas of the city following projects. Reviewing the success of projects once they are completed is an important step to guiding thoughtful implementation of future projects.





# Next Steps

*The Streets for People Plan envisions a significant level of improvement across the city guided by our communities' input and the needs they've helped identify. Implementation of these improvements will rely on the TPP's process, available funding, and our communities' continued engagement.*

## Prioritizing Implementation

The TPP identified a clear process for identifying which transportation projects are the highest priority based on the following community values:

- Improving air quality, climate, and health
- Providing equitable investment
- Providing access to destinations
- Improving transportation safety
- Fixing and maintaining the system<sup>15</sup>

The City of Sacramento will include the projects in the *Streets for People Plan* as part of the next TPP process. Once completed, this process will identify which projects are the highest priority and which will receive funding first. More information about this plan and the prioritization process is available on the [City website](#).

<sup>15</sup> City of Sacramento, [Transportation Priorities Plan](#), November 2022, page 42.

### STAY ENGAGED

The *Streets for People Plan* is a major step forward toward creating a more walkable and bikeable Sacramento with streets that work for everyone, but it is one step in a long process toward making real change. Our communities can continue to help shape that process along each step of the way by staying connected and engaged with City staff and elected leaders on transportation issues important to them.

**We encourage our communities to reach out and engage with us as we work through this process together using any of the resources below:**



Contact the [Mayor and Council District Offices](#).



Attend a [City Council meeting](#) or an [Active Transportation Commission meeting](#).



Sign up for the [City's newsletters](#) and report concerns to [311](#).





# Appendices



# Appendices

**Appendix 1 – Plan and Policy Review**

---

**Appendix 2 – Existing Conditions (Citywide and Focus Areas)**

---

**Appendix 3 – Gap Analysis**

---

**Appendix 4 – Tree Opportunity Analysis**

---

**Appendix 5 – Public Engagement Feedback and Summaries**

---

**Appendix 6 – Case Studies and Recommendations**

---

**Appendix 7 – Development of Recommendations and  
Segmentation (Methods)**

---

**Appendix 8 – Project Costs**

---





