SCTA Citizens Advisory Committee

MEETING AGENDA

July 27, 2015 at 4:00 p.m.
Sonoma County Transportation Authority
SCTA Large Conference Room
490 Mendocino Avenue, Suite 206
Santa Rosa, California 95401

ITEM
1. Introductions
2. Public Comment
3. Administrative - Approval of Notes June 29, 2015* - ACTION
4. Measure M – DISCUSSION/ACTION
   a. Measure M Project Presentation –County – Forestville Bypass, Arnold Drive
   b. Measure M Financial Reports
6. Managed Lanes Implementation Plan (MLIP) – as presented to SCTA - INFORMATION
7. Updates - DISCUSSION
   a. Highway 101
   b. SMART
8. Announcements
9. Adjourn

The next SCTA/RCPA meeting will be September 14, 2015
The next CAC meeting will be August 24, 2015

Please note that date is different from scheduled date.

Copies of the full Agenda Packet are available at www.sctainfo.org. DISABLED ACCOMMODATION: If you have a disability that requires the agenda materials to be in an alternate format or that requires an interpreter or other person to assist you while attending this meeting, please contact SCTA at least 72 hours prior to the meeting to ensure arrangements for accommodation. SB 343 DOCUMENTS RELATED TO OPEN SESSION AGENDAS: Materials related to an item on this agenda submitted to the Citizens Advisory Committee after distribution of the agenda packet are available for public inspection in the Sonoma County Transportation Authority office at 490 Mendocino Ave., Suite 206, during normal business hours. Pagers, cellular telephones and all other communication devices should be turned off during the committee meeting to avoid electrical interference with the sound recording system.
ITEM

1. Introductions
Meeting called to order at 4:08 p.m. by Chair Bob Anderson.

Committee Members: Bob Anderson, United Winegrowers, Chair; Mousa Abbasi, Santa Rosa Chamber of Commerce; Steve Birdlebough, Sierra Club; Janice Cader-Thompson, Sonoma County Conservation Council; Dennis Harter, Sonoma County Alliance; Gary Helfrich, Sonoma County Bicycle Coalition; Albert Lerma, Fifth District; Willard Richards, League of Women Voters of Sonoma County.

Guests: John Bly, Northern California Engineering Contractors Association; Adam Kirshenbaum, citizen; Dubii Lechuga, citizen; Linda Picton, citizen.

Staff:

2. Public Comment
Dubii Lechuga and Linda Picton noted dirty and unsanitary conditions at the Transit Mall. They addressed the need to accommodate those with special needs, including the economically disadvantaged. It was noted that the transit operators need to work together to resolve these issues.

Additional comments included suggestions to provide change for those taking transit, and improving the bus schedules.

3. Administrative - Approval of Notes April 27, 2015* - ACTION
Motion by Dennis Harter, seconded by Gary Helfrich, to approve the meeting notes as submitted. Motion carried unanimously.

At Chair Anderson’s request, Items 5 and 6 were addressed at the end of the agenda.

4. Measure M – DISCUSSION/ACTION

   a. Measure M Project Presentation – schedule for FY 15/16
Seana Gause referred to the schedule for Fiscal Year 2015/16, noting that this has been approved by the Technical Advisory Committee. She explained that this schedule shows project presentations to be given by those sponsors that expect to be receiving revenue.

Discussion followed regarding the possibility of installing vending machines for giving change at the Transit Mall. Ms. Gause noted that this would be an issue for the transit operators, and that only two transit operators that use the Transit Mall are Measure M recipients. Comments included the fact that transit has been impacted with loss of funding; transit operators are unable to expand service. Currently Measure M has been helping just to maintain transit service.

Discussion continued regarding the possibility of scheduling each of the transit operators to provide a presentation on operations, what they need, and how funds are spent. This would be separate from Measure M presentations. It was pointed out that this information is available for the prior year in the Annual Report; however, Committee members expressed interest in seeing projected expenditures by transit operators for the next year.

   b. Measure M – Maintenance of Effort report* - ACTION
James Cameron explained that in Fiscal Year 2011/12 the State stopped requiring State-level
maintenance of effort. Two jurisdictions, Windsor and Sebastopol, are falling below their baseline levels. Staff’s recommendation is that because the County, as a whole, is on track, to make the determination that Measure M is in compliance and not to impose any special requirements on Windsor or Sebastopol.

Mr. Cameron responded to Committee questions regarding the status of Windsor and Sebastopol. The Committee approved staff’s determination that the SCTA is in compliance with Measure M.

c. Measure M Financial Reports*

5. Moving Forward 2040 – CTP 2015*
Performance Evaluation- INFORMATION
Chris Barney presented a slideshow summarizing the five goals of the CTP, explaining that performance targets have been identified for each of the goals and the metrics used in quantifying performance in reaching the goals, and projecting performance to 2040.

Analysis was conducted to determine the impact of projects on the CTP and future travel. Data projected from 2010 to 2040 included employment and housing growth; VMT; person hours of delay; changing demographics of the population; level of active transportation; comparative traffic congestion levels of Sonoma County and other metropolitan areas; GHG emission levels; and average trip time.

Committee suggestions included showing traffic congestion levels with cities more comparable in size to those in Sonoma County (e.g., not San Francisco, San Jose, or Los Angeles). Mr. Barney agreed to look up this information.

It was also noted that several small projects can cost more than one large project.

Discussion ensued regarding expectations of lower GHG levels and why these do not seem to decrease significantly. Mr. Barney explained that employment and population growth have a large impact on future travel conditions. He also noted that projects provide countywide congestion relief and travel time reduction, but have little impact in other areas.

Additional comments by the Committee included long distance commuting and the need to address this in research; TOD planning around future SMART rail stations when SMART is established, and addressing increased fuel costs.

6. HOV lane memo from MTC – under separate cover
Mr. Cameron referred to a memo from MTC explaining that MTC staff will be providing data to respond to questions that have been raised regarding the Managed Lanes Implementation Plan (MLIP) and Highway 101 in Sonoma County. This information will address how effective the HOV lanes in Sonoma County are currently, whether the hours of operation are practical and effective, the region’s current plans for express lanes, and other questions related to HOV lanes.

Discussion followed regarding what constitutes an HOV lane and an express lane.

7. California Transportation Plan - Draft California Transportation Plan 2040-available for review – Caltrans still taking comments
a. CALCOG comments on CA2040*

8. Updates - DISCUSSION
a. Highway 101
Mr. Cameron announced the completion of the deck pour for the northbound Petaluma River Bridge and a traffic switch will likely take place the first week in August. Starting August 15 demolition will start on the last section of this bridge.

b. SMART
Steve Birdlebough announced delivery of the new train sets and noted that these will be on display at the Marin County Fair.

9. Announcements
Suzanne Smith noted that a special session of the State legislature will be taking place some time between now and the end of September on transportation issues, and that she would provide more details as these become available.

Mr. Cameron announced significant construction in the Town of Windsor at Shiloh Road, including the bridge, in 2011/12 and 2012/13. Due to the resulting increase in their CIP they are now back at more standard road maintenance.

10. Adjourn
6:08 p.m.
Staff Report

To: Citizens Advisory Committee
From: Chris Barney, Senior Transportation Planner
Item: 2015 CTP Performance Assessment – Analysis of Transportation Policies
Date: 7/27/2015

Issue

The first phase of the 2015 CTP Performance Assessment analyzed project level impacts on plan performance measures. The performance assessment demonstrated that projects provided congestion and travel time benefits, but did not provide countywide benefits in other performance areas. The next phase of the performance assessment will focus on how transportation policies, technology, and behavioral changes can help SCTA meet CTP performance targets and goals.

Testing Policy Impacts

Innovations in transportation technologies, changes to how people travel, and transportation policies could reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT), reduce emissions and improve air quality, and provide other benefits that would help SCTA reach CTP performance targets. Staff will test the performance impact of the following policy approaches, improvements to technology, and changes to travel choice/behavior in phase 2 of the performance assessment:

1. Transportation Pricing: The cost of driving or traveling using different modes can have a significant impact on mode choice. Making driving more expensive and other modes less expensive could shift travel onto more efficient travel modes. Staff proposes testing the impact of transportation pricing using the following policy levers:
   a. Cost of driving: Increase the cost of driving representing a combination of the following pricing policies: VMT tax, use based fees, pay as you drive insurance, congestion pricing, and/or fuel tax increases.
   b. Parking pricing: Increase parking pricing in all downtown areas.
   c. Lower transit fares: Assume lower transit fares.

2. Alternative Commuting: Travel to and from work represents 1/3 of daily travel in Sonoma County most of which occurs during the most congested periods of the day. Changes to when, how, and where commuters travel could have a big impact on future congestion, VMT, and other CTP performance measures. Staff proposes that the following alternative commute strategies be analyzed in phase 2 of the performance assessment:
   a. Car-sharing
   b. Increased telecommuting
   c. Increased carpool/vanpool rates and use of dynamic ridesharing
   d. Compressed work week
e. Increased HOV lane utilization
f. Travel demand management implantation including: ride-matching, free transit passes, parking cash-outs, and other incentive programs.
g. Increased instant or digital delivery of goods and services including increased teleconferencing, online shopping and delivery, online media consumption, etc.

3. **Mode shift to non-motorized transportation**: Bicycling and walking are inexpensive and low impact travel modes and increased travel using these travel modes can help decrease VMT, emissions, and the cost of travel, and improve health and safety. Staff proposes that the following mode shift policies be analyzed in phase 2 of the performance assessment:
   a. Build-out of the bicycle and pedestrian network
   b. Continued implementation of Complete Streets projects
   c. Improvements focused on making walking and biking a better experience including urban design, marketing, and improvements in technology.

4. **Mode shift to transit**: Travel shifting onto transit from auto-based modes can reduce VMT and emissions, reduce the cost of transportation, reduce wear and tear on the roadway system and improve community health and safety. Staff proposes that the following policies that could encourage increased transit use be analyzed in phase 2 of the performance assessment:
   a. Lower transit fares
   b. Increased headways/improved transit service
   c. Transit marketing and changes in public attitudes towards transit

5. **Land Use**: The first phase of the performance assessment showed that housing and employment growth have a very large impact on CTP performance measures and will contribute to increased travel, congestion, emissions, accident rates, and travel times in Sonoma County. More efficient land use patterns could help reduce the impact of existing and forecasted growth in the county. Staff proposes analyzing the following land use policies in phase 2 of the performance assessment:
   a. More development in priority development areas
   b. Higher densities
   c. Balanced housing and employment growth

6. **System Efficiency**: Improved efficiencies could allow the existing transportation system to operate more effectively and could reduce future degradation of the transportation system and accessibility. The countywide transportation system could be improved and made more efficient through technological advances and implementation of programs and policies that encourage efficient travel behavior. Staff proposes that the following system efficiency improvements be analyzed in phase 2 of the performance assessment:
   a. Intelligent transportation systems – Signal timing, corridor management, incident response programs, changeable message signs, metering improvements, traffic information communication programs. Etc.
   b. Improvements in vehicle technology – smart cars, freeway vehicle platooning, driverless vehicles, fuel economy improvements, increased electric vehicle fleet, etc.
   c. Freight improvements – more efficient vehicles, changes to distribution networks, route planning improvements.
   d. Eco-driving training and marketing programs
   e. Improved enforcement – HOV lane usage and speed limits.
**Maintaining the System**

SCTA has identified maintaining the existing transportation system as a priority and one of the five CTP goals. The Sonoma County Travel Model and available post-processing tools do not provide a way to estimate future system condition. Project sponsors have identified projects that are expected to improve roadway condition (PCI), transit system condition (average fleet age), or non-motorized facility condition. A list of maintenance projects will be included in the final CTP.

**Next Steps**

Staff will test policy based scenarios during July and August. The results of this analysis will be used to identify a package of projects and policies that could be implemented that would allow CTP performance targets to be met.

**Policy Impacts**

Policies that are shown to help SCTA achieve CTP goals and reach performance targets could be prioritized in the CTP or by the SCTA board.

**Fiscal Impacts:** No direct impacts at this time.

**Staff Recommendation:** Provide feedback on the list of transportation policies to be tested.
2015 CTP Goals, Performance Measures, and Targets

Goal 1: Maintain the System

- **Performance Target: Roadway Condition** – Improve countywide Pavement Condition Index (PCI) for arterial and collector streets to 80 (very good condition) by 2040. Improve countywide PCI for residential streets to 65 (good condition) by 2040.
- **Performance Target: Transit System Condition** – Reduce the average bus fleet age by 25% below 2010-2012 average fleet age by 2040 (7.5 years for 2010-2012).

Goal 2: Relieve Traffic Congestion.

- **Performance Target: Congestion Reduction - Reduce Person Hours of Delay (PHD) by 20% below 2005 levels by 2040.** Staff has estimated annual peak period delay per traveler in addition to (PHD) for each transportation scenario. This metric can be used to compare countywide congestion conditions to congestion conditions in other regions.¹

Goal 3: Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions

- **Performance Target: Reduce GHG emissions to 40% below 1990 levels by 2040.** Climate Action 2020 targets shall be incorporated into the CTP when they are finalized.

Goal 4: Plan for Safety and Health

- **Performance Target: Active Transportation** – Reduce drive alone mode share for all trips to 33.3% by 2040 (2010 - 45%). Increase active transportation mode share (bike, walk, and transit) to 15% by 2040 (2010 – 8.38%).
- **Performance Target: Safety** – Reduce total daily accident rates by 20% by 2040.

Goal 5: Promote Economic Vitality

- **Performance Target: Reduce transportation costs for business and residents** - Reduce average peak period travel time per trip by 10% by 2040 (2010 – 11.31 minutes).
- **Performance Target: Provide equitable access** - CTP projects should serve Communities of Concern² if possible. Staff has calculated average monthly household transportation costs and percentage of average household income devoted to transportation for each scenario. This metric provides additional information on how different transportation projects and policies may impact the affordability of transportation in Sonoma County.

¹ Annual person-hours of traffic delay per traveler is an estimate made for large, medium, and small regions annually by the Texas Transportation Institute and published by the US Bureau of Transportation Statistics.
² SCTA defines Communities of Concern as census tracts in which 30% or more of families have incomes between 0-200% of the federal poverty level ($21,660-$74,020 total household income depending on family size).
Memorandum

TO: Sonoma County Transportation Authority  
FR: Ashley Nguyen & Toshi Shepard-Ohta  
RE: Managed Lanes Implementation Plan & Sonoma US 101

In March 2015, MTC, Caltrans and the California Highway Patrol launched the Managed Lanes Implementation Plan (referred to as MLIP for short), which is the successor to the High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Master Plan adopted by the Commission in 2002. The key difference between this new implementation plan and past plans is that the focus is on identifying discrete projects that can be implemented within the next five to ten years. Staff will also prepare a high-level evaluation of projects that could be considered for longer-term implementation. The relevant work involves identifying opportunities for the following:

- Convert existing HOV lanes to express lanes;
- Develop new express lanes where no HOV or express lane exists today;
- Provide improved or new express bus services using managed lanes (including associated capital, stops and ramp improvements to support bus operations);
- Improve existing near-or at-capacity park-ride facilities, including parking management/pricing;
- Establish new park-ride facilities to support carpooling and transit use; and
- Conduct research (focus groups, telephone poll) to understand public opinion about managed lanes so that MTC may find ways to better communicate managed lanes to the public.

At your upcoming board meeting, MTC staff will provide data and context for the following questions:

- How are the HOV lanes on US 101 in Sonoma County working? Are speeds in the HOV lanes at 45 mph or better? Do the hours of operations for Sonoma US 101 make sense?
- How many carpoolers, shuttles, and buses are using the HOV lanes today?
- How does an express lane work? What are the region’s current plans for express lanes?
- Are there interest and opportunities to convert existing HOV lanes into express lanes in Sonoma County?

MTC staff looks forward to discuss these questions with the board and later work with SCTA staff to define potential strategies that may further enhance the performance of the managed lanes in this corridor.
Congestion on Sonoma & Marin 101 - AM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6 AM</th>
<th>7 AM</th>
<th>8 AM</th>
<th>9 AM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Sonoma 101 Corridor
(Old Redwood Highway to Windsor)

101 - NB - Travel Time Distribution

101 - SB - Travel Time Distribution

Segment Speed

MLIP
Bay Area Managed Lanes Implementation Plan

MLIP
Bay Area Managed Lanes Implementation Plan
Congestion on Sonoma & Marin 101 - PM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3 PM</th>
<th>4 PM</th>
<th>5 PM</th>
<th>6 PM</th>
<th>3 PM</th>
<th>4 PM</th>
<th>5 PM</th>
<th>6 PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>SB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>NB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MLIP
Bay Area
Managed Lanes Implementation Plan
Managing Congestion

Causes of Congestion

- Bottlenecks: 50%
- Traffic Incidents: 25%
- Work Zones: 15%
- Bad Weather: 10%

Freeway Management Tool Box

1. Incident Management
2. Demand Management
3. Active Traffic Management
4. Express Lanes
5. Pricing
6. Transportation Management System

MLIP - Bay Area Managed Lanes Implementation Plan
Managed Lanes: includes HOV and express lanes

- **High-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lane**: a traffic lane reserved at peak travel times or longer for exclusive use for carpools, vanpools, transit buses, and exempt vehicles
- **Express lane**: a traffic lane available to carpools, vanpools, transit buses and exempt vehicles without charge but allows other vehicles to pay a fee to use the lane
Goals

• **Connectivity**
  • Encourage carpools, vanpools and express buses by closing gaps in the current HOV system

• **Efficiency**
  • Make the best use of HOV lane capacity

• **Reliability**
  • Provide more reliable travel times
HOVs, Buses and Vanpools are 25% of All Vehicles, but Carry Close to 50% of the Total Passengers.

**AM Peak Period**

**PM Peak Period**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Person Throughput by HOV</th>
<th>HOV Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midweek 2015 Data</td>
<td>Midweek 2013 Data (Caltrans)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MLIP
Bay Area Managed Lanes Implementation Plan
Significant Buses, Vanpools and Shuttles Services Take Advantage of HOV Lanes

1 Bus Capacity
= 50+ Passengers
= 40 Cars

Buses and Vanpools Per Hour

Typical Number of Buses and Vanpools on Bay Area Freeways

1 Bus Capacity
= 50+ Passengers
= 40 Cars
Existing HOV Lanes are Uncongested... but Underutilized

- HOV Lane Speeds above 58 MPH
- Unused capacity can be filled with more buses, vanpools, HOVs, and tolled vehicles
- Pricing will allow full use of the HOV facility

![Graph showing HOV Vol and Avail. Cap (Peak Period Average)]
Existing HOV Lanes Provide Up to 8 Minutes (28%) of Travel Time Savings

Northbound

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>HOV</th>
<th>GP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:00 AM</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 AM</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 PM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 PM</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 PM</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 PM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Southbound

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>HOV</th>
<th>GP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:00 AM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00 AM</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 PM</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 PM</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00 PM</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21 Miles Between Old Redwood Highway and Windsor River Road
Commuters Must Build in Extra 19 Minutes to be On-Time

- Limits: Old Redwood Highway to Windsor River Road
- Free flow travel times (at 100%) is about 19 minutes
Managing Sonoma 101

(1) Ramp Metering

• Ramp meters activated in September and October 2014
• 18 Northbound On-Ramps & 25 Southbound On-Ramps
• Reduces accidents due to merges onto freeway
• Smooths traffic on the freeways
Managing Sonoma 101
(2) Marin-Sonoma Narrows

- Closes 17 Miles of HOV Lane Gap Between Marin and Sonoma
- $429 M in funded projects are completed or underway (gray segments)
- $250 M funding shortfall to complete the entire project (colored segments: C2, B2 Phase 2, B1 Phase 2, A4)
Managing Sonoma 101

(3) Express Lanes?

• **Convert Existing HOV Lanes to Express Lanes**
  • General purpose lanes are congested and unreliable
  • HOV lanes are underutilized
  • Pricing can fill the HOV lane, reduce congestion in general purpose lanes

• **Complimentary Strategies**
  • Coordination with Marin on HOV operations to improve overall corridor performance
  • Golden Gate Express Bus Services
  • Park and Ride Lots