



# **BOARD OF DIRECTORS AGENDA PACKET**

**Monday, July 11, 2016  
2:30 p.m.**

**Sonoma County  
Permit & Resource Management Department  
2550 Ventura Avenue  
Santa Rosa, California**

## BOARD OF DIRECTORS AGENDA

*July 11, 2016 – 2:30 p.m.*

Sonoma County Permit & Resource Management Department  
Planning Commission Hearing Room – 2550 Ventura Avenue, Santa Rosa, CA

1. **Call to order the meeting of the Sonoma County Transportation Authority (SCTA) and the Sonoma County Regional Climate Protection Authority (RCPA)**
2. **Public comment on items not on the regular agenda**
3. **Consent Calendar**
  - A. **SCTA Items**
    - 3.1. **Measure M** – FY 15/16 Budget Adjustment, Bond Trustee Accounts (ACTION)\*
  - B. **SCTA/RCPA Concurrent Items**
    - 3.2. **Admin** – Minutes of the June 13, 2016 meeting (ACTION)\*
4. **Regular Calendar**
  - A. **SCTA Items**
    - 4.1. SCTA Planning
      - 4.1.1. **CTP** –release of DRAFT Comprehensive Transportation Plan *Moving Forward 2040* for review (ACTION)\*
    - 4.2. SCTA Projects and Programming
      - 4.2.1. **Measure M** – 2017 Strategic Plan Programming (ACTION)\*
      - 4.2.2. **Measure M** – 2017 Strategic Plan Proposed Policy 19 Amendment (ACTION)\*
      - 4.2.3. **Measure M** - Local Street Project -116/121 Intersection Improvements Environmental Document (INFORMATION)\*
      - 4.2.4. **Highways** – update on State Highway projects (ACTION)
  - B. **RCPA Items**
    - 4.3. RCPA Planning
      - 4.3.1. **CA2020** –adoption of Climate Action 2020 and Beyond and certification of the related programmatic environmental impact report (ACTION)\*
5. **Reports and Announcements**
  - 5.1. Executive Committee report
  - 5.2. Regional agency reports\*
  - 5.3. Advisory Committee agendas\*
  - 5.4. SCTA/RCPA staff report
  - 5.5. Announcements
6. **Adjourn**

\*Materials attached.

---

The next **SCTA/RCPA** meetings will be held **September 12, 2016**

Copies of the full Agenda Packet are available at <http://scta.ca.gov/meetings-and-events/board-meetings/>

**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/RCPA 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 SCTA/RCPA after distribution of the agenda packet are available for public inspection in the SCTA/RCPA 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.

**TO REDUCE GHG EMISSIONS:** Please consider carpooling or taking transit to this meeting. For more information check [www.511.org](http://www.511.org), [www.srcity.org/citybus](http://www.srcity.org/citybus), [www.sctransit.com](http://www.sctransit.com) or <https://carmacarpool.com/sfbay>

## Staff Report

**To: Sonoma County Transportation Authority**  
**From: James R. Cameron, Director of Projects & Programming**  
**Item: 3.1. Measure M – FY 15/16 Budget Adjustment, Bond Trustee Accounts**  
**Date: July 11, 2016**

---

### **Issue:**

Shall the SCTA adopt Resolution No. 2016-011 approving the FY 15/16 budget adjustments necessary for the Measure M financials to align with the Bond trustee accounts by increasing appropriations related to the 2011 Bonds debt service and 2015 Bonds cost of issuance residual?

### **Background:**

The SCTA Measure M financials have several funds set up to properly reflect both the 2011 Bonds and 2015 Bonds in accordance with Government Accounting Standards Board (GASB). The cash in these funds are either held by the Trustee or the Auditor Controller/Treasure Tax Collector - County Pool. The Trustee's accounts activities are reconciled against Measure M financials monthly.

In the month of June 2016, two Measure M 15/16 Budget appropriations were found insufficient to mirror transactions in the Trustee Accounts.

1. 2011 Bond Debt Service was insufficient due to rounding.
2. 2015 Bond Cost of Issuance residual transfer to the Project Fund in accordance with the Bond Indentures was initially budgeted in the 16/17 Measure M preliminary budget, but has occurred sooner than staff anticipated.

The requested action is more of an administrative formality and does not move any cash. It brings the SCTA into compliance with our accounting and budgeting practices. The Board has already granted full authority for the transactions that have occurred. This action will make sure that it is accurately reported and budget revision requirements were met.

The Budgetary Adjustment Request Forms and adjusted budget are attached.

### **Policy Impacts:**

None

### **Fiscal Impacts:**

None.

### **Staff Recommendation:**

Staff recommends that the Board adopt Resolution No. 2016-011 approving the budget adjustments necessary for the Measure M financials to align with the bond trustee accounts by increasing appropriations

related to the 2011 Bonds debt service and 2015 Bonds cost of issuance residual, and authorize the Executive Director to sign the budget adjustment forms.

**RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE SONOMA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY, COUNTY OF SONOMA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, ADOPTING AN ADJUSTMENT TO THE FINAL MEASURE M BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015/2016 RELATED TO THE MEASURE M BOND FUNDS.**

**WHEREAS**, a Final Measure M Budget for Fiscal Year 2015/2016 was prepared by the Executive Director and approved by the Sonoma County Transportation Authority on October 12, 2015; and

**WHEREAS**, the Final Measure M Budget for Fiscal Year 2015/2016 approved on October 12, 2015 had insufficient appropriations to properly record the Series 2011 Bond debt service paid by the trustee on June 1, 2016, and

**WHEREAS**, the Final Measure M Budget for Fiscal Year 2015/2016 approved on October 12, 2015 had insufficient appropriations to properly transfer residual cost of issuance funds in accordance with the indentures of the 2015 bond issuance, and

**WHEREAS**, the Final Measure M Budget for Fiscal Year 2015/2016 requires a budgetary adjustment to accurately reflect the trustee bond account transactions; and

**WHEREAS**, the adjustment to the Final Measure M Budget for Fiscal Year 2015/2016 shall be processed as described in the Budgetary Adjustment Request Form attached hereto and incorporated herein as Attachment A.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, that the Final Measure M Budget for Fiscal Year 2014/2015 be adjusted to accurately account for the 2011 Series Bonds debt service and the 2015 Series Bonds cost of issuance residual.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that the Executive Director, acting as Clerk of the Authority, shall deliver a certified copy of this resolution to the Sonoma County Auditor-Controller.

**Resolution No. 2016-011**

Sonoma County Transportation Authority  
Santa Rosa, California  
July 11, 2016

**THE FOREGOING RESOLUTION,** was moved by Director, seconded by Director, and approved by the following vote:

Director Chambers	_____	Director Mackenzie	_____
Director Coursey	_____	Director Miller	_____
Director Gallian	_____	Director Rabbitt	_____
Director Gorin	_____	Director Russell	_____
Director Gurney	_____	Director Salmon	_____
Director Landman	_____	Director Zane	_____

Ayes:                      Noes:                      Absent:                      Abstain:

**SO ORDERED**

I, the undersigned, certify that the foregoing resolution was duly adopted at a regular meeting of the Board of Directors of the Sonoma County Transportation Authority held on December 14, 2015.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Suzanne Smith, Executive Director  
Clerk, Sonoma County Transportation Authority

**SPECIAL DISTRICTS GOVERNED BY  
LOCAL BOARDS - BUDGETARY REVISIONS**

**ATTACHMENT A**

Resolution No. **2016-011**  
 Name of District Sonoma County Transportation Authority  
 Address of District 490 Mendocino Ave., Suite 206, Santa Rosa, CA  
 Telephone No. of District 707 565-5373

Inc/Dcr	GL BU	FUND	DEPARTMENT ID	ACCOUNT	AMOUNT
Inc	SC002	74659	70030900	53103 - Interest on LT Debt	1
Inc	SC002	74664	70031400	53103 - Interest on LT Debt	1
Inc	SC002	74667	70031700	57011 - Transfers Out - within a Fund	21,084
Inc	SC002	74669	70031900	47101 - Transfers In - within a Fund	21,084
Totals					42,170

WHEREAS, THE 2015 to 2016 Budget revised had insufficient appropriations to properly record debt service on the 2011 Bonds \_\_\_\_\_ and

WHEREAS, appropriations now are needed to transfer residual cost of issuance funds in accordance with the indentures of the 2015 Bond Issuance \_\_\_\_\_, now

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, the County Auditor be and he is hereby authorized and directed to make the above appropriations within the authorized budget of name of district Sonoma County Transportation Authority - Measure M

The foregoing resolution was introduced by DIRECTOR ( ) TRUSTEE ( ) \_\_\_\_\_, who moved its adoption, seconded by \_\_\_\_\_, and adopted on roll call by the following vote:

DIRECTORS ( ) TRUSTEES ( )

NAME VOTE

See Attached SCTA resolution 2016-011  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

AYES: \_\_\_\_\_ NOES: \_\_\_\_\_ ABSENT OR NOT VOTING: \_\_\_\_\_

WHEREUPON, the Chairman declared the forgoing resolution adopted, and

Date \_\_\_\_\_

SO ORDERED

Attested:  
 Signature: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Secretary/Clerk of the Board

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Chairman

**Sonoma County Transportation Authority  
Measure M FY 2015-2016 Final Budget  
Budget Summary for All Programs**

Exhibit A

Sub-Object	Account	Description	Actual FY 13-14	Budgeted FY 13-14	Actual FY 14-15	Budgeted FY 14-15	Final FY 15-16
1140	40301	Sales/Use Tax Receipts	20,558,932	21,085,522	20,891,959	21,175,700	21,518,718
1700	44002	Interest on Pooled Cash	317,874	295,619	224,501	190,843	190,079
1701	44003	Interest Earned	1	-	16,122	40,500	16,419
2500	42358	State - Other (Caltrans)	1,609,958	926,000	808,599	1,433,000	561,000
	42461	Federal Other Funding	-	-	-	-	-
2901	42601	County	4,627,608	3,897,000	-	569,000	369,000
2913	42612	City of Petaluma	5,147,050	4,972,000	3,213,778	5,517,000	1,610,000
2916	42615	City of Cotati	-	-	-	-	-
3980	46200	Prior Year Revenue	10,000	-	793,912	-	-
4102	46029	Donations/Reimbursements	2,505	-	-	-	500
4109	46050	Outdated/Cancelled Warrant	-	-	-	-	-
4210	49002	Advances	-	2,800,000	-	1,700,000	500,000
4219	49003	Advances - Clearing	-	-	-	670,000	(500,000)
	47101	Transfer in within a Fund	-	-	6,229,993	6,231,836	21,084
4680	47111	Bond Proceeds	-	-	49,265,000	48,000,000	-
4682	47112	Bond-Premium	-	-	7,225,508	6,000,000	-
4683	47113	Bond-Cost of Issuance	-	-	-	-	-
		<b>Total Revenues</b>	<b>32,273,929</b>	<b>33,976,141</b>	<b>88,669,374</b>	<b>91,527,879</b>	<b>24,286,800</b>
Check balance			32,273,928	33,976,141	88,669,374	91,527,879	24,286,800
Variance			0	-	0	-	-
6040	51902	Communication	-	-	-	-	-
6280	52091	Memberships	5,326	2,800	4,750	5,500	5,500
6300	52101	Misc Expenses	489	1,000	1,692	1,020	1,910
6400	52111	Office Expense	135	2,000	-	2,000	2,000
6410	52117	Postage	-	2,000	-	2,000	2,000
6415	52115	Books/Periodicals	-	500	-	500	500
6430	52116	Printing Services	4,540	13,000	651	13,000	13,000
6500	51249	SCTA Staff Time	98,606	100,000	195,686	200,000	200,000
6521	51916	County Services Contract	15,319	15,000	16,348	16,000	17,000
	51919	EFS Charges	-	-	-	-	-
6570	51226	Consultants	2,539,728	3,961,000	2,277,172	3,174,000	2,647,000
6573	51201	Administration Costs	2,750	8,500	7,025	8,500	10,800
6589	51244	Permits	-	-	-	-	-
6610	51211	Legal Services	140,502	170,000	563,189	670,000	630,000
6629	51207	Fiscal Accounting	27,537	30,500	32,678	30,500	40,500
6630	51206	Audit Services	17,325	22,000	17,325	22,000	22,000
6640	53105	Debt Issuance Costs	-	-	347,463	540,000	2,000
6800	51301	Public/Legal Notices	-	250	-	250	250
6840	51421	Rents/Leases-Buildings	36,685	37,000	37,000	37,000	37,000
7110	52163	Professional Development	-	1,500	1,262	3,000	3,000
7120	51225	Training-In-Service	-	-	-	-	-
7302	51602	Travel Expense	9,571	17,000	5,574	19,000	19,000
7750	N/A	Conservation Credits	-	65,000	-	15,000	15,000
7910	53101	LT Debt - Principal Payments	3,245,000	3,245,000	8,012,500	8,012,500	6,105,000
	53102	Debt Principal Other	-	-	-	970,000	-
7930	53103	LT Debt - Interest Payments	3,224,613	3,224,613	3,063,913	3,063,913	3,039,078
	53104	Debt- Interest Other	-	-	16,122	40,500	20,000
8010	53501	Contributions to Other Govts	47,601,277	56,534,231	22,790,214	43,256,135	31,832,925
	57011	Transfers out within a Fund	-	-	6,229,994	48,831,836	21,084
	57101	Other Financing Uses	-	-	38,954,138	-	-
9210	59002	Advances	-	2,800,000	-	1,700,000	1,500,000
	59003	Advances Clearing	-	-	-	-	(1,500,000)
		<b>Total Expenses</b>	<b>56,969,402</b>	<b>70,252,894</b>	<b>82,574,695</b>	<b>110,634,153</b>	<b>44,686,547</b>
Check balance			56,969,402	70,252,894	82,574,695	110,634,153	44,686,547
Variance			-	-	-	-	-
		<b>Beginning Fund Bal.</b>	69,683,726	69,717,416	44,319,709	44,319,709	50,414,388
		<b>Revenues</b>	32,273,929	33,976,141	88,669,374	91,527,879	24,286,800
		<b>Expenses</b>	(56,969,402)	(70,252,894)	(82,574,695)	(110,634,153)	(44,686,547)
		<b>Audit Adjustments</b>	(668,544)	-	-	-	-
		<b>Change in Encumbrances</b>	-	-	-	-	-
		<b>Change in Fund Balance</b>	(25,364,017)	(36,276,753)	6,094,679	(19,106,274)	(20,399,746)
		<b>Ending Fund Bal.</b>	<b>44,319,709</b>	<b>33,440,663</b>	<b>50,414,388</b>	<b>25,213,435</b>	<b>30,014,642</b>

6/14/2016 8:46 AM

**Sonoma County Transportation Authority  
Measure M FY 2015-2016 Final Budget  
Highway 101 2011 Series Bonds - Debt Service Fund**

Dept ID: 70030900

Index: 793489

Fund 74659

<u>Subobject</u>	<u>Account</u>	<u>Description</u>	<b>Actual FY 13-14</b>	<b>Budgeted FY 13-14</b>	<b>Actual FY 14-15</b>	<b>Budgeted FY 14-15</b>	<b>Final FY 15-16</b>
1140	40301	Sales/Use Tax	1,097,081	684,150	1,952,728	1,092,141	2,201,784
	44002	Interest on Pooled Cash			21		
3980	46200	Prior Year Revenue	-	-			
	47101	Transfer in within a Fund	-	-	15,427	15,688	-
<b>Total Revenue</b>			<b>1,097,081</b>	<b>684,150</b>	<b>1,968,176</b>	<b>1,107,829</b>	<b>2,201,784</b>
7910	53101	Bond - Principal Payments	273,750	273,750	285,000	285,000	1,436,250
7930	53103	Bond - Interest Payments	816,947	816,947	807,141	807,141	765,535
<b>Total Expenses</b>			<b>1,090,697</b>	<b>1,090,697</b>	<b>1,092,141</b>	<b>1,092,141</b>	<b>2,201,785</b>
Beginning Fund Balance			406,549	406,549	412,933	412,933	1,288,969
Revenues			1,097,081	684,150	1,968,176	1,107,829	2,201,784
Expenses			(1,090,697)	(1,090,697)	(1,092,141)	(1,092,141)	(2,201,785)
Audit Adjustments			-	-	-	-	-
Change in Encumbrances			-	-	-	-	-
Change in Fund Balance			6,384	(406,547)	876,036	15,688	(1)
Ending Fund Balance			<b>412,933</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1,288,969</b>	<b>428,621</b>	<b>1,288,968</b>

**Sonoma County Transportation Authority  
Measure M FY 2015-2016 Final Budget  
Passenger Rail 2011 Bond Debt Service**

Dept ID: 70031400  
Index: 793638

Fund 74664

<u>Subobject</u>	<u>Account</u>	<u>Description</u>	<b>Actual FY 13-14</b>	<b>Budgeted FY 13-14</b>	<b>Actual FY 14-15</b>	<b>Budgeted FY 14-15</b>	<b>Final FY 15-16</b>
1140	40301	Sales/Use Tax	365,694	228,050	650,909	364,047	733,928
	44002	Interest on Pooled Cash			13		
3980	46200	Prior Year Revenue		-			
	47101	Transfer in within a Fund		-	9,197	10,778	-
<b>Total Revenue</b>			<b>365,694</b>	<b>228,050</b>	<b>660,119</b>	<b>374,825</b>	<b>733,928</b>
7910	53101	Bond - Principal Payments	91,250	91,250	95,000	95,000	478,750
7930	53103	Bond - Interest Payments	272,316	272,316	269,047	269,047	255,179
<b>Total Expenses</b>			<b>363,566</b>	<b>363,566</b>	<b>364,047</b>	<b>364,047</b>	<b>733,929</b>
Beginning Fund Balance			135,516	135,516	137,644	137,644	433,717
Revenues			365,694	228,050	660,119	374,825	733,928
Expenses			(363,566)	(363,566)	(364,047)	(364,047)	(733,929)
Audit Adjustments			-	-	-	-	-
Change in Encumbrances			-	-	-	-	-
Change in Fund Balance			2,128	(135,516)	296,073	10,778	(1)
Ending Fund Balance			<b>137,644</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>433,717</b>	<b>148,422</b>	<b>433,716</b>

**Sonoma County Transportation Authority  
Measure M FY 2015-2016 Final Budget  
Highway 101 2015A Series Bonds**

Dept ID: 70031700

**Escrow Account with Trustee for Payoff of 2008 Bond – Callable 12/1/2017**

Fund 74667

<u>Account</u>	<u>Description</u>	Actual FY 13-14	Budgeted FY 13-14	Actual FY 14-15	Budgeted FY 14-15	Final FY 15-16
40301	Sales/Use Tax	-	-	-	-	-
44002	Interest on Pooled Cash	-	-	-	-	-
44003	Interest Earned	-	-	-	-	-
46200	Prior Year Revenue	-	-	-	-	-
47101	Transfer in within a Fund			4,607,500	4,607,500	
47111	Bond Proceeds	-	-	34,200,000	37,000,000	-
47112	Bond-Premium	-	-	5,015,846	6,000,000	-
47113	Bond-Cost of Issuance	-	-	-	-	-
	<b>Total Revenue</b>	-	-	<b>43,823,346</b>	<b>47,607,500</b>	-
52101	Misc Expense	-	-	-	-	-
51249	SCTA Staff Time	-	-	-	-	-
51226	Consultants*	-	-	-	-	-
51211	Legal Services	-	-	-	-	-
51242	Fiscal Agent Fees	-	-	-	-	-
53101	Bond - Principle Payments			4,607,500	4,607,500	
53103	Bond - Interest Payments					
53105	Debt Issuance	-	-	240,149	400,000	1,000
51602	Travel Expense	-	-	-	-	-
N/A	Conservation Credits	-	-	-	-	-
53501	Contributions to Other Govts	-	-	-	-	-
57011	Transfers Out - within a Fund					21,084
57101	Other Financing Uses			38,954,138	42,600,000	
	<b>Total Expenses</b>	-	-	<b>43,801,786</b>	<b>47,607,500</b>	<b>22,084</b>
	Beginning Fund Balance	-	-	-	-	21,559
	Revenues	-	-	43,823,346	47,607,500	-
	Expenses	-	-	(43,801,786)	(47,607,500)	(22,084)
	Audit Adjustments	-	-	-	-	-
	Change in Encumbrances	-	-	-	-	-
	Change in Fund Balance	-	-	21,559	-	(22,084)
	Ending Fund Balance	-	-	<b>21,559</b>	-	<b>(525)</b>

**Sonoma County Transportation Authority  
Measure M FY 2015-2016 Final Budget  
Highway 101 2015B Series Bonds**

Dept ID: 70031900

		Fund 74669				
<u>Account</u>	<u>Description</u>	Actual FY 13-14	Budgeted FY 13-14	Actual FY 14-15	Budgeted FY 14-15	Final FY 15-16
40301	Sales/Use Tax	-	-	-	-	-
44002	Interest on Pooled Cash	-	-	1,118	-	48,574
44003	Interest Earned	-	-	-	-	-
46200	Prior Year Revenue	-	-	-	-	-
47101	Transfers In - within a Fund					21,084
47111	Bond Proceeds	-	-	15,065,000	11,000,000	-
47112	Bond-Premium	-	-	-	-	-
47113	Bond-Cost of Issuance	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total Revenue</b>		-	-	<b>15,066,118</b>	<b>11,000,000</b>	<b>69,658</b>
52101	Misc Expense	-	-	-	-	-
51249	SCTA Staff Time	-	-	-	-	-
51226	Consultants*	-	-	404,883	500,000	807,000
51211	Legal Services	-	-	514,458	500,000	510,000
51242	Fiscal Agent Fees	-	-	-	-	-
53105	Debt Issuance	-	-	107,314	140,000	1,000
51602	Travel Expense	-	-	-	-	-
N/A	Conservation Credits	-	-	-	-	-
53501	Contributions to Other Govts	-	-	4,324,574	6,000,000	8,445,464
57101	Transfers out within a Fund	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total Expenses</b>		-	-	<b>5,351,228</b>	<b>7,140,000</b>	<b>9,763,464</b>
	Beginning Fund Balance	-	-	-	-	9,714,890
	Revenues	-	-	15,066,118	11,000,000	69,658
	Expenses	-	-	(5,351,228)	(7,140,000)	(9,763,464)
	Audit Adjustments	-	-	-	-	-
	Change in Encumbrances	-	-	-	-	-
	Change in Fund Balance	-	-	9,714,890	3,860,000	(9,693,806)
	Ending Fund Balance	-	-	<b>9,714,890</b>	<b>3,860,000</b>	<b>21,084</b>

## BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING

### Meeting Minutes of June 13, 2016

#### ITEM

#### 1. Call to order the meeting of the Sonoma County Transportation Authority (SCTA) and the Sonoma County Regional Climate Protection Authority (RCPA)

Meeting called to order at 2:35 p.m. by Chair David Rabbitt.

Directors Present: Chair Rabbitt, Supervisor, Second District; Director Russell, City of Cloverdale, Vice Chair; Director Coursey, City of Santa Rosa; Director Gallian, City of Sonoma; Director Gorin, Supervisor, First District; Director Gurney, City of Sebastopol; Director Landman, City of Cotati; Director Mackenzie, City of Rohnert Park; Director Miller, City of Petaluma; Director Salmon, Town of Windsor, Director Zane, Supervisor, Third District.

#### 2. Public comment on items not on the regular agenda

Duane DeWitt addressed transit-oriented development and the need for coordination of SMART rail, transit, pedestrian and bicycle transportation. He also cited the need for better communication between cities and agencies regarding transportation.

#### 3. Consent Calendar

##### A. SCTA Items

- 3.1. **Measure M** – Hwy 101 North B, amendments to Caltrans cooperative agreement 4-2373-A3 and to County of Sonoma

cooperative agreement  
SCTA10015-A3 (ACTION)\*

- 3.2. **Measure M** – SR116/121 amendment to agreement with Parsons SCTA15001-A1 (ACTION)\*
- 3.3. **Transit** – amendment to FY16/17 State Transit Assistance Coordinated Claim (ACTION)\*

In response to Board questions Dana Turréy explained the revisions to the Program, which are based on a reduction in STA-population-based and regional paratransit funds per the Governor’s budget estimate.

##### B. SCTA/RCPA Concurrent Items

- 3.4. **Admin** – Minutes of the May 9, 2016 meeting (ACTION)\*

Motion by Director Zane, seconded by Director Miller, to approve the Consent Calendar. The motion carried unanimously (12-0-0) with the exception of Item 3.4 (Minutes of May 9, 2016), which had two abstentions, (10-0-0-2), Directors Chambers and Zane, who were not present at this meeting.

#### 4. Regular Calendar

##### A. SCTA/RCPA Joint Items

- 4.1. **Shift** – status of Shift Sonoma County project (REPORT)\*

Lauren Casey presented slides on this low carbon transportation plan. She explained that this is in concert with the Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP), and reviewed the five goals of the CTP.

Ms. Casey next summarized the goals of Shift Sonoma County in meeting the goals of the CTP

and Climate Action 2020. She explained how this will depend to a great extent on mode shift.

Shift objectives were summarized; including infrastructure and services gaps for low-carbon transportation, policy and program gaps, and tools needed to support local actions.

Work products include mode shift and fuel shift. The goal is to develop a feasibility study and management program plan.

Extensive community input has been conducted via website updates, committee meetings, a transportation survey, and local government partnerships. An EV Stakeholder Advisory Group has been developed.

Dana Turréy addressed mode shift goals, which relies on reducing VMT. She summarized barriers to the use of alternative transportation. These include an incomplete bicycle network, low transit viability, and consumer preference.

Ms. Turréy reviewed the tasks and status of each relating to mode shift.

Results of the bike share feasibility study were summarized. Potential user markets were identified (including Sonoma State University).

Ms. Turréy presented maps of different areas in Sonoma County where potential “hot spots” for bike sharing have been identified.

She next referred to the two docking models being explored for bike sharing, and summarized recommendations and next steps presented in the feasibility study.

Brant Arthur reviewed goals and barriers to growth of EV use. Issues related to further growth in use of EVs include vehicle cost and charging infrastructure.

Mr. Arthur referred to the Drive EverGreen program that is under way in collaboration with Sonoma Clean Power.

Mr. Arthur next reviewed tasks and their status, and summarized the infrastructure needs of EVs. This includes charging systems. He presented a map illustrating the likelihood of single family households to acquire an EV. Another map showed workplace areas that are the most likely to implement EV charging systems. Another map illustrated potential multi-family charging areas.

In response to questions from the Board, Mr. Arthur summarized the barriers to driving EVs (initial cost of the vehicle and infrastructure/chargers), and showed how EV charging systems for low income housing have been considered.

The Board inquired about and encouraged examining gender use/ownership of EVs and incentivizing the purchase and installation of charging stations. The importance of a sound EV infrastructure for the new rail system was also pointed out.

Additional comments from the Board included communication and coordination with major local financial institutions regarding EV car loans; questions regarding the necessary wattage for charging (110 vs. 120 watts); and budgeting for city fleet EVs.

The Board encouraged staff to look at potential grant opportunities.

Suzanne Smith responded to Board questions regarding barriers to greater EV use. She acknowledged the issue of initial cost in hindering greater growth in the use of EVs, but added that the investment for infrastructure, particularly in

the workplace, will make a greater impact in meeting other mode shift goals.

Ms. Casey answered Board questions regarding EV charging systems for low income, multi-family housing.

Additional issues raised by the Board involved the issue of parking and low income housing. Further questions included how technology would be used and the implementation of bike sharing programs.

Ms. Turr y responded to Board questions regarding funding.

Kevin Conway addressed the Board regarding the possibility of implementing electric bicycle charging systems. He noted their growing popularity.

Steve Birdlebough of the Sierra Club reported on research conducted by the Sierra Club regarding EV chargers and how to make it easier for landlords to offer this service.

Gerry La Lone-Berg of the North Bay Organizing Project/Transit Riders United addressed the issue of equity in transit and the possibility of conducting a feasibility study for fare-less transit for the low income population.

#### **B. SCTA Items**

##### 4.2. SCTA Projects and Programming

##### 4.2.1. **Highways** – update on State Highway projects (ACTION)

James Cameron reported that the Airport Blvd. project (Item 3.1 approved earlier in the meeting) is undergoing mitigation monitoring through 2019. Transportation and Public works is making good progress on the landscape design. This should be going out to bid this fall for construction next year.

An excess land sale was successfully completed for the Central A project, which will result in \$711,000 in revenue for the Measure M Highway 101 program.

The MSN B-3(San Antonio Creek Bridge at Sonoma/Marin County Line) project has made good progress and is well under way. Completion is expected in December 2018.

A groundbreaking ceremony for the Marin-Sonoma Narrows project being planned for July 6, the location to be determined.

Final paving for the Petaluma Bridge project (MSN B-2) is scheduled for July, which will substantially complete the project. Punch list work is being completed and is expected to finish by the end of this year.

This project is also scheduled to be addressed at the June 29-30 California Transportation Committee meeting for additional slide repair funding.

Mr. Cameron next reported on Highway 37 activity, noting that the Financial Opportunities Analysis Consultant selection is complete. Project Finance Advisory, Ltd. (PFAL) was selected. A Public Private Partnership Summit was hosted by MTC, which addressed Highway 37.

Seana Gause reported that the Laguna de Santa Rosa Bridge project on Highway 12 has resumed construction, with pile driving starting by June 15. Construction is anticipated throughout the summer.

Finalization of the environmental document for Highway 116/121 intersection improvements project is in process. The public meeting date has been changed to July 13. This is tentatively scheduled to take place at the Finnish American Home Association Center in Sonoma.

Mr. Cameron explained activity in further detail regarding ongoing construction on MSN B-2 and B-3 in response to Board questions.

#### 4.3. SCTA Planning

##### 4.3.1. **Plan Bay Area** – proposed project list (ACTION)\*

Ms. Smith referred to the revised project list, identifying both capacity-increasing and non-capacity-increasing projects. She summarized differences in the previous list and the revised list.

Ms. Smith next referred to the letter from SMART to MTC regarding the compelling case for inclusion of certain projects. She noted the specific projects summarized in the letter that have been recommended by SCTA.

She confirmed that if a new project were to be identified it could be included in this list in the future. She also confirmed specific projects that have been included under “minor highway improvements.” She also responded to Board questions regarding the two categories for bicycle and pedestrian improvements.

Minor formatting and clerical changes were identified to the revised project list.

#### **C. RCPA Items**

##### 4.4. RCPA Projects

##### 4.4.1. RCPA Activities Report (REPORT)\*

Ms. Casey reported progress on the two items of legislation (SB 1030, the RCPA Sunset Removal) and SB 1233 (The Water Bill Savings Act). SB 1030 passed the floor vote in the Senate May 27 and will be considered by the Assembly Committee on Local Government on June 15. SB 1233 passed the floor vote in the Senate on May 26.

The Climate Action Plan is still under development. Ms. Casey also reported on a recent grant application for the Energy Grant Application for CITIES-LEAP.

BAY Area Regional Area Network activity continues with the Town of Windsor. Staff has worked with representatives from real estate, land title and mortgage industries to promote this program and elicit feedback.

Ongoing improvements to the RCPA website are taking place. Ms. Casey invited any comments, suggestions or issues in using the website.

Ms. Casey next reported on the Climate Action Summit of May 5 and 6 and how this provided information on delivering climate commitments.

Ms. Casey responded to Board questions regarding disclosure in the transfer of property in connection with the BAYRen program and efficiency charges.

Additional Board comments involved the referral of other local agencies to the RCPA website for information and resources.

Director Mackenzie announced the introduction of the Executive Director of the Library Commission to Ms. Casey in connection with the Commission’s sustainability program.

##### 4.4.2. **Resiliency** – Climate Ready North Bay (REPORT)\*

Ms. Casey introduced Lisa Micheli of Pepperwood Preserve, who presented a slideshow on behalf of the Terrestrial Biodiversity and Climate Change Collaborative that summarized how their climate adaptation knowledge base would be applied to North Bay watersheds, and how the data gathered would be applied in the implementation of Climate Action 2020, and the Napa and Marin

County partner agencies that are involved in this effort.

Ms. Micheli next referred to Climate Ready North Bay, and upcoming availability of the database.

Supervisor James Gore addressed goals and activities of the Climate Ready North Bay effort and conducted a ribbon cutting of the new website.

Director Mackenzie reminded the Board of the upcoming California Climate Adaptation Forum to be held September 7 and 8 in Long Beach.

## **5. Reports and Announcements**

### 5.1. Executive Committee report

Vice Chair Russell reported that the RCPA budget and Executive Director's upcoming annual evaluation were addressed.

### 5.2. Regional agency reports\*

*Sonoma Clean Power:* Director Landman announced the potential inclusion of Mendocino County at the upcoming meeting of July 7. Biggest concerns are that this be regional, the upfront costs, and that this is one of the most significant regional GHG reduction actions in recent years.

*SMART:* Director Russell reported that the fare schedule has been released and referred to a summary of the highlights.

*Golden Gate Bridge Highway and Transportation District:* Chair Rabbitt reported that a ferry had technical issues involving rotation incompatibility, resulting in a delay in the ferry returning. Bids will

be opening for design of the bridge's suicide prevention barrier the first or second week of July.

*MTC:* Director Mackenzie reported loss of interest in a proposal for putting a measure to implement a 5¢ gallon gas tax on the ballot.

*ABAG:* Chair Rabbitt announced that an open house is to be held this evening at the Wells Fargo Center.

*BAAQMD:* Director Zane reported on the recent relocation of BAAQMD offices.

*BCTC:* Director Gorin reported that BCTC has relocated.

*CALCOG:* Director Mackenzie announced an upcoming CALCOG Board meeting in June.

### 5.3. Advisory Committee agendas\*

Included in agenda packet.

### 5.4. SCTA/RCPA staff report

Ms. Smith reported that the One Bay Area Grant call for projects has not yet been released, and that staff will likely not have the call for projects until December.

In response to Board questions about recent State budget discussions, Ms. Smith reported that transportation has not been addressed.

### 5.5. Announcements

N/A

## **6. Adjourn**

4:40 p.m.

## Staff Report

**To: Sonoma County Transportation Authority**

**From: Janet Spilman, Director of Planning**

**Item: 4.1.1 – Draft Comprehensive Transportation Plan – Moving Forward 2040**

**Date: July 11, 2016**

---

**Issue:**

What is the status of the Comprehensive Transportation Plan Update?

**Background:**

Moving Forward 2040, the Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP), tells the story of Sonoma County's transportation system. The plan examines the current state of transportation in the county, and looks at future needs and goals and provides information on how these needs and goals can be met. The CTP is updated frequently enough to ensure that the plan is relevant, useful, and represents the current transportation needs and goals of SCTA and Sonoma County Jurisdictions. The previous CTP was completed in 2009, the current update will be adopted in 2016, and it is estimated that the CTP will be updated again in 2020.

The importance of maintaining an updated planning document is two-fold. First, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) requires local Transportation Authorities such as the SCTA to establish transportation plans that can feed into the larger Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The RTP is a federally required, long range planning document that is now called Plan Bay Area. Second, the SCTA is responsible for programming, or allocating, numerous state and federal funding sources to transportation projects. In order to meet these requirements, the SCTA needs a policy and planning document to help guide the programming process. If the SCTA does not meet these two requirements it is at risk of losing critical transportation dollars.

**Identifying Plan Goals and Objectives**

Moving Forward 2040 builds on the efforts of local elected officials and staff from the cities, town, and county government in Sonoma County. This update has been developed with the understanding that existing transportation funding is inadequate, that there is increasing pressure on the existing transportation system, and that transportation impacts on the environment, public health, and safety are growing. Overall, the CTP is meant to refine the vision, goals, and objectives for improving mobility on Sonoma County's streets, highways, and transit system and bicycle/pedestrian facilities, as well as to reduce transportation related impacts. To that end, it provides policy guidance and identifies transportation improvements for development over the next 25 years. This plan has tackled the important task of determining if our efforts are successful in helping us reach our goals, by including an enhanced performance evaluation. Measuring progress in achieving goals will help identify actions that are helping improve the Sonoma County transportation system and improve mobility for county residents.

The goals of the CTP are:

**Goal 1. Maintain the system** Objective: Protect the investment in public transportation infrastructure.

**Goal 2. Relieve Traffic Congestion** Objective: Reduce person hours of delay through strategic improvements, technology and changes in driving habits.

**Goal 3. Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions** Objective: Meet the targets to reduce GHG emissions in the transportation sector.

**Goal 4. Planning for Safety and Health** Objective: Increase safety and emphasize health aspects of transportation planning strategies.

**Goal 5. Promote Economic Vitality** Objective: Reduce travel time and cost and increase mobility in communities of concern.

### **CTP Update Process**

The CTP Update has included the following phases:

- Develop and implementation of Public Engagement Strategy
- Review and presentation of Goals
- Review project list, update project objectives
- Call for projects
- Review and update performance targets. Evaluated if the performance targets are still relevant and still represent SCTA priorities.
- Summarize current conditions. Determined how close we currently are to meeting the performance targets.
- Estimate future conditions and set a future baseline. Provided an estimate of what future conditions could look like if we don't construct any projects or make improvements to the transportation system, and what impacts population, housing, and employment growth have on future travel conditions.
- Develop a list of transportation projects, policies, strategies, and technologies that could help SCTA meet goals and targets.
- Test transportation project performance. Do projects help us achieve CTP goals and meet performance targets? If yes, which targets do they help us meet, and which projects are most effective.
- Test transportation policy, strategy, and technology impacts. How do policies, strategies, and technology help SCTA achieve CTP goals and targets?
- Determine how CTP goals and targets could be achieved. Estimate what it will take to meet CTP goals and performance targets by assembling a future scenario in which promising transportation projects, policies, strategies, and technologies would be implemented.
- Distribute the Administrative Draft CTP to members of SCTA Advisory Committees (50 people)
- Log comments, make appropriate changes

**Key findings**

- The population will grow and collectively get older by 2040 - planning will make a difference in meeting our goals.
- Addressing the great transportation needs will provide significant benefits, even if that is not overtly reflected in the countywide analysis.
- Transportation projects alone will not accomplish the CTP goals. Policy change, at all levels of government, and change in behavior is necessary to meet all of the goals.

**2016 Schedule and Next Steps**

Release of CTP for review – July 11

Open House in Atrium at 490 Mendocino Ave., Santa Rosa – July 13

Comments due – August 16

Anticipated adoption of CTP and EIR Addendum – September 12

**Policy Impacts:**

The CTP serves as guidance for transportation projects and policies.

**Fiscal Impacts:**

The CTP, to date, has been produced entirely by SCTA staff. Limited costs for outreach have been incurred. The Addendum to the EIR will require staff time and at least a minimal amount of technical consulting work. Precise costs are unknown at this time but is in the range of \$50,000 for an Addendum. Funding for consultant work on environmental review of the CTP will need to come from existing sources such as Planning, Programming and Management (PPM) or MTC funding currently included in the FY15/16 budget.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Consider providing feedback and direction to staff on the Draft CTP.

## Staff Report

**To: Sonoma County Transportation Authority**  
**From: Seana L. S. Gause – Senior, Programming and Projects**  
**Item: 4.2.1 - Measure M – 2017 Strategic Plan Programming**  
**Date: July 11, 2016**

---

### **Issue:**

Shall the Board approve the proposed programming for the Strategic Plan update?

### **Background:**

#### **Programming for FY16/17 through FY20/21**

The *Measure M Strategic Plan* (Plan) is a five year programming document. The Plan has been updated four times since the first Plan was approved by the Board in 2005. SCTA staff has been developing the next update and expect to bring a final document before the SCTA Board for approval by December of 2016.

As part of the development of the Plan, staff issued a call for new programming and has reviewed the submitted requests. Staff has met with project sponsors, in some cases several times, to assess status of projects and deliverability. The TAC was presented with the results of submitted applications for funding the Measure M Local Streets Projects (LSP) and Bike/Ped Projects programs for the FY16/17 through FY 20/21 period. The spreadsheets attached to this staff report show the proposed programming approved by the TAC and by the CAC.

The Bike/Ped Project program is estimated to start FY16/17 with a carry-forward balance of \$712K. This program can consistently expend more than revenues will allow. However, after meeting with all project sponsors to determine delivery schedule and additional fund sources, staff has developed a 5 year program that allows all projects requesting funds to receive programming.

Staff used the following principals to recommend the proposed programming for the Bike/Ped Project program:

1. Program those projects that have advanced local funds in accordance with policy 4.8 and have already been constructed first;
2. Keep commitments in *2014 Strategic Plan*, unless requested otherwise by sponsor;
3. Assess project deliverability through construction;
4. Assess whether Measure M funds are being used to leverage other fund sources; and
5. Past performance by the project sponsor

The Bike/Ped Project program is challenging given its popularity; consistently the requests for funds exceed capacity. Applying the above principles allowed staff to program all requested funding by shifting the programming year to align with projected availability of Measure M funds.

Current finances estimate the LSP program is to start FY16/17 with a carry-forward balance of more than \$13M. This program continues to accrue funds faster than they are being spent and SCTA is able to meet all of the requests for programming from project sponsors.

Both the Technical and Citizens Advisory Committees recommended the proposed programming for the Board's approval.

**Policy Impacts:**

Approving the proposed programming for the attached list of projects is within the Policies and Procedures established in the Measure M Strategic Plan.

**Fiscal Impacts:**

Programming of the recommended funds would allow funding to be available for appropriation and expenditure in the years in which the funds are programmed.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Staff recommends that the Board approve the proposed 2017 Strategic Plan programming.

**Local Street Projects Program  
Proposed Programming 5/26/16**

Local Street Projects	Sponsor	Phase	Prior	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	TOTAL	2004\$	Comments
<b>Penngrove</b>	<b>Co DPW</b>		<b>200</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>19,000</b>	
		0	200						200		
		1	0						0		
		2	0						0		
		3	0						0		
<b>Airport Blvd</b>	<b>Co DPW</b>		<b>10,758</b>	<b>2,742</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,500</b>	<b>15,000</b>	<b>15,000</b>	
Aviation to Orindiance		1	84	2,047					2,131		
101 to Aviation		1A	496						496		Completed
Brickway Extension		2	0	0				1,500	1,500		
Airport Rd / Fulton Rd IC		3	650						650		Completed
101 Overcrossing / Interchange		4	8,959						8,959		Completed
Landscaping		4A	569	695					1,264		
Widen Laughlin Rd (to River Rd)		5	0						0		
<b>Rte 121/116 &amp; Arnold Drive</b>	<b>Co DPW</b>		<b>2,930</b>	<b>3,050</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5,980</b>	<b>7,000</b>	
Arnold Dr-South of Glen Ellen		1	330						330		Completed
Arnold @ Agua Caliente Signal		2	650						650		Completed
Arnold 121 & 116		3	1,950	3,050					5,000		
Country Club to Loma Vista		4	0						0		
Arnold @ Madrone		5	0						0		
<b>Forestville Bypass</b>	<b>Co DPW</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2,000</b>	<b>2,000</b>	
Roundabout @ Mirabel		1	0			2,000			2,000		
Bypass		2	0						0		
<b>Old Redwood Hwy I/C</b>	<b>Petaluma</b>		<b>10,000</b>						<b>10,000</b>	<b>10,000</b>	Completed
<b>Hearn Avenue</b>	<b>Santa Rosa</b>		<b>2,950</b>	<b>1,800</b>	<b>800</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5,550</b>	<b>9,000</b>	
Santa Rosa Ave		1	1,300						1,300		
Dutton to Corby		2	500						500		Completed
101 Overcrossing / Interchange		3	1,150	1,800	800				3,750		
<b>Farmers Lane Ext</b>	<b>Santa Rosa</b>		<b>437</b>						<b>437</b>	<b>10,000</b>	
<b>Mark West Springs</b>	<b>Co DPW</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,000</b>	
Ursuline to Quietwater		1	0						0		
Michelle Way		2	0						0		
<b>River Road</b>	<b>Co DPW</b>		<b>0</b>						<b>0</b>	<b>1,000</b>	
<b>Fulton Rd</b>	<b>Santa Rosa</b>		<b>500</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,200</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7,000</b>	<b>8,700</b>	<b>19,000</b>	
Wood Rd to Guernville Rd		1	500		1,200			7,000	8,700		
HWY 12 Interchange		2	0						0		
<b>Bodega Hwy</b>	<b>Co DPW</b>		<b>0</b>						<b>0</b>	<b>1,000</b>	
Other Program Expenditures	SCTA		57						57		
<b>Totals</b>			<b>\$27,832</b>	<b>\$7,592</b>	<b>\$2,000</b>	<b>\$2,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$8,500</b>	<b>\$47,924</b>	<b>\$94,000</b>	<b>Per Expenditure Plan</b>

2017 Programming Flow	PRIOR	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21
<b>Start Balance</b>	0	13,066	11,458	14,589	17,844	23,269
<b>Interest on Pooled Cash</b>	1,932	37	49	36	62	89
<b>Sales Tax Revenue</b>	41,688	4,538	4,674	4,814	4,959	5,108
<b>Inter Program Loan with Bike/Ped</b>	(1,000)	1,000	-	-	-	-
<b>Inter Program Loan with SMART</b>	(1,872)	410	408	406	404	302
<b>Programming</b>	(27,832)	(7,592)	(2,000)	(2,000)	-	(8,500)
<b>Reimbursements</b>	150					
<b>End Balance</b>	\$13,066	\$11,458	\$14,589	\$17,844	\$23,269	\$20,267

**Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects Program  
Proposed Programming 5/26/16**

Bike / Ped Projects	Sponsor	Phase	Prior	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	TOTAL	2004\$	Comments
<b>Santa Rosa Cr Tr</b>	<b>Santa Rosa</b>		<b>817</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>471</b>	<b>1450</b>	<b>1450</b>	
<i>Streamside to Mission</i>		1	435						435		Constructed.
<i>Dutton East ADA Access</i>		2	382						382		Constructed.
<i>Dutton West Ped Access</i>		3	0		52	110		471	633		
<b>Old Red/Mendo/SR</b>	<b>Santa Rosa</b>		<b>157</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>500</b>	
<i>Fountaingrove to Steele Lane</i>			157						157		Constructed.
<i>Maple Street to Sonoma Ave</i>			0						0		
<b>Central Sonoma Valley Tr</b>	<b>Co Reg Pk</b>		<b>163</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>1900</b>	
<i>Larson Park</i>		1A	63						63		
<i>Flowery School/Verano</i>		1B/1C	100						100		
<b>Sonoma/Schellville Tr</b>	<b>Co Reg Pk</b>		<b>100</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>650</b>	<b>650</b>	
<b>Arnold Dr</b>	<b>Co DPW</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>2000</b>	
<b>Petaluma River Tr (Phase III)</b>	<b>Petaluma</b>		<b>1637</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>331</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2000</b>	
<b>Copeland Creek Tr</b>	<b>Rohnert Prk</b>		<b>350</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>350</b>	<b>350</b>	Completed.
<b>Street Smart Sebastopol</b>	<b>Sebastopol</b>		<b>2000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2000</b>	Completed.
<b>West County Tr (Mirabel Rd)</b>	<b>Co TPW</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>500</b>	
<i>116 to Forestville Youth Park</i>		1	0	0					0		
<i>Not Defined</i>		2	0						0		
<i>Not Defined</i>		3	0						0		
<b>McCray Road</b>	<b>Co DPW</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>250</b>	
<b>Highway 1 in Bodega Bay</b>	<b>Co Reg Pk</b>		<b>450</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>350</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>950</b>	<b>950</b>	
<i>Cheney Creek (6c)</i>		0	100						100		Designated Phase 1 Completed
<i>Coastal Prarie Trail (1b &amp; 1c)</i>		1	350						350		changed from Phase 1 to Phase 2 Con
<i>Harbor Coast Trail</i>		2	0					50	50		changed from Phase 2 to Phase 3
<i>Coastal North Harbor</i>		3	0			300			300		changed from Phase 3 to Phase 4
<i>Smith Brothers Road</i>		4	0			50	100		150		
<b>Foss Creek Tr</b>	<b>Healdsburg</b>		<b>1410</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1062</b>	<b>778</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3250</b>	<b>3250</b>	
<i>Mill Street to North Street</i>		1	380						380		Completed.
<i>North Street to Norton Slough</i>		2	215						215		Completed.
<i>Front Street to Rail Depot</i>		3	541						541		Completed
<i>Rail Depot to Mill St</i>		4	0						0		Completed (No M\$ used)
<i>West Grant St. to Grove St.</i>		6	274						274		Completed
<i>Dry Creek Rd to Grove St</i>		7	0			1062	778		1840		
<i>Dry Creek Rd to Grove St</i>		8	0						0		
<b>NWPRR Various</b>	<b>SMART</b>		<b>1000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1000</b>	<b>1000</b>	
<b>Access Across 101</b>	<b>Various</b>		<b>250</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>750</b>	<b>1000</b>	
<i>Santa Rosa</i>			250						250		
<i>Rohnert Park</i>				250					250		
<i>Windsor</i>				250					250		
<b>Bike Safety and Education</b>	<b>Various</b>		<b>480</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>322</b>	<b>310</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1200</b>	<b>1200</b>	
<i>SCBC SRTS</i>			76	20	300	300	17	0	713		
<i>DHS SRTS</i>			104	26	10				140		
<i>SCBC BTW</i>			60	15	12	10	5	5	107		
<b>Other Program Expenditures</b>			<b>11</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>11</b>		
<b>Totals</b>			<b>\$8,825</b>	<b>\$593</b>	<b>\$755</b>	<b>\$1,932</b>	<b>\$1,000</b>	<b>\$1,076</b>	<b>\$14,181</b>	<b>\$19,000</b>	

2017 Programming Flow	PRIOR	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21
<b>Start Balance</b>	0	712	29	1,199	241	249
<b>Interest on Pooled Cash</b>	199	3	2	11	16	21
<b>Sales Tax Revenue</b>	8,338	908	935	963	992	1,022
<b>Inter Program Loan with LSP</b>	1,000	(1,000)	-	-	-	-
<b>SLPP funds from 101</b>	-	-	988	-	-	-
<b>Programming</b>	(8,825)	(593)	(755)	(1,932)	(1,000)	(1,076)
<b>End Balance</b>	\$712	\$29	\$1,199	\$241	\$249	\$216

## Staff Report

**To: Sonoma County Transportation Authority**  
**From: Seana L. S. Gause – Senior, Programming and Projects**  
**Item: 4.2.2 – Measure M – 2017 Strategic Plan Policy 19 Amendment**  
**Date: July 11, 2016**

**Issue:**

Shall the Board approve the proposed Policy Amendment for Policy 4.19 “Amendments to Measure M Projects”?

**Background:**

In the 2005 Measure M Strategic Plan it was established that adjustments related to revenue projections would not be made until the Measure was 10 years into its 20 year life. The Measure states that the expenditure plan is based on the percentage distributions to each Program Category and Project and the dollar values included are *estimates only*. The Measure M Strategic Plans have consistently programmed against the sales tax measure revenue estimates.

As a programming document, the Plan has laid out revenue projections based on data from a number of sources, including historical data for both Measure M and the Sonoma County Open Space sales tax revenue. Balanced with conservative inflationary growth forecasts, the forecasted sales tax revenue total over 20 years is \$430M which is approximately \$40Million lower than the original estimate in 2004 dollars of \$470Million. Given these estimates, and that the half way mark of the sales tax measure is now here, it is timely that the Board consider how to address the lower revenue projections.

The current approach uses a “first come, first served” method based on project readiness and deliverability. Measure M projects that have not yet begun development will have numerous challenges to being delivered prior to the end of Measure M in 2024, and thus may receive less than the 2004 voter approved expenditure plan estimated amount or not be delivered at all. The projects that have yet to be delivered are:

**Local Streets Program:**

Penngrove	\$18.8M
Farmers Lane	\$9.563M
Mark West Springs Road	\$1.0M
River Road	\$1.0M
Bodega Highway	\$1.0M
Hwy 12 / Fulton Interchange	\$10.3M
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$41.663M</b>

All dollars shown in millions. LSP projects (above) in the expenditure plan that will be cut short by approximately \$8M (20% of \$40M).

## Bicycle and Pedestrian Program

Access Across 101	\$0.25
Central Sonoma Valley Trail	\$1.737
McCray Rd	\$0.25
West County Trail (Mirabel Rd)	\$0.5
Arnold Drive	\$1.750
Old Redwood Hwy/Mendocino Ave/Santa Rosa Ave	\$0.343
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$4.83</b>

All dollars shown in millions. Bike and Pedestrian projects (above) in the expenditure plan that will be cut short by approximately \$1.6M (4% of \$40M)

Staff proposes to amend Policy 4.19 in part, to read: (changes in strikethrough and italics)

“If overall revenues exceed the level projected in the Measure M Expenditure Plan funds will be distributed into the same program categories and existing or new projects can be considered within those categories. An existing project in a program category has priority in accessing these additional funds but still must maintain a 50% match from other funding sources. ~~Adjustments related to revenue projections will not be considered until 2015, the tenth year of Measure M.~~ *If overall revenues fail to meet projected levels, the projects in the program categories will be funded on a first come, first served basis, using the following criteria for selecting projects ready to receive available funding:*

- *Program those projects that have advanced local funds in accordance with policy 4.8 and have already been constructed first;*
- *Keep commitments in previous Strategic Plans; unless requested otherwise by sponsor;*
- *Assess Project deliverability through construction;*
- *Weigh whether M funds are being used to leverage other fund sources; and*
- *Consider past delivery performance of project sponsor”*

The full text of Policy 4.19 as it currently reads is attached to this staff report. Both the Technical and Citizen’s Advisory Committees recommended this policy change for your approval, although there was one dissenting vote at the CAC.

### **Policy Impacts:**

Changing the existing Measure M Policy 4.19 will allow the projects most ready for delivery to receive funding on a first come, first served basis. This shadows the “shovel ready” approach that the Board has employed successfully in other Measure M programs. The change would mean that some Measure M projects will likely fall short of original projected funding amounts, or not receive funds at all. This approach will also minimize the amount of sales tax funds waiting for a project that may or may not be delivered.

**Fiscal Impacts:**

Changing the policy acknowledges that the funding projections fall short of those originally estimated for the Measure and provides a strategy for the shortfall that will prevent all projects from being fully funded. Projects that have already been delivered received the amounts estimated in the original expenditure plan, where as projects that have not yet been delivered would receive less than originally estimated or not be funded at all.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Staff recommends that the Board consider approving the proposed amendment to Strategic Plan Policy 4.19.

For reference, from pages 47-48 of the 2014 Measure M Strategic Plan, currently reads as follows:

#### **4.19 Policy 19 – Amendments to Measure M Projects**

The ability to fully fund or complete all programs or projects in Measure M may be impacted by changing circumstances over the duration of the sales tax. Tax proceeds originally allocated to a listed project may become available for reallocation due to any of the following reasons:

- A listed project is completed under budget;
- A listed project is partially or fully funded by funding sources other than Measure M proceeds;
- A project sponsor and implementing agency request deletion of a listed project because of unavailability of matching funds;
- A listed project cannot be completed due to an infeasible design, construction limitation or substantial failure to meet specified implementation milestones.

Upon a finding that tax proceeds are available for reallocation due to one of the conditions above, the SCTA may reallocate such tax proceeds subject to the following guidelines:

- Available tax proceeds can be reallocated only to projects(s) within the same program category as the originally listed project.
- Reallocation of tax proceeds within a category will be based first on project readiness and availability of matching funds. The next tier of criteria will include impact on congestion, cost-effectiveness, ranking in the Comprehensive Transportation Plan, and schedule adherence as determined by the SCTA.
- An existing project within a program category that needs additional funding, not as a result of scope change, has priority over a newly proposed project. However, the project must maintain the match level from other funding sources (50% in most cases) required in the original Measure M Expenditure Plan.

If overall revenues exceed the level projected in the Measure M Expenditure Plan funds will be distributed into the same program categories and existing or new projects can be considered within those categories. An existing project in a program category has priority in accessing these additional funds but still must maintain a 50% match from other funding sources. *Adjustments related to revenue projections will not be considered until 2015, the tenth year of Measure M.* [emphasis added]

The Traffic Relief Act of Sonoma County (Measure M) passed by the voters cannot be changed without another vote of the people. However, the Legislature has vested in local authorities the ability to annually review and amend voter-approved expenditure plans following a procedure and for reasons established by the statute. California Public Utility Code Section 180207, reads as follows:

California Public Utility Code Section 180207

- a. SCTA may annually review and propose amendments to the county transportation expenditure plan adopted pursuant to Section 180206 to provide for the use of additional

federal, state and local funds, to account for unexpected revenues, or to take into consideration unforeseen circumstances.

- b. SCTA shall notify the board of supervisors and the city council of each city in the county to provide them with a copy of the proposed amendments.
- c. The proposed amendments shall become effective 45 days after notice is given.

## Staff Report

**To: Sonoma County Transportation Authority**  
**From: Seana L. S. Gause, Senior – Programming and Projects**  
**Item: 4.2.3 – Measure M - Local Street Project -116/121 Intersection Improvements Environmental Document**  
**Date: July 11, 2016**

---

### Issue:

The 116/121 Intersection Improvement Project Environmental Document (Mitigated Negative Declaration/Finding of No Significant Impact) has been released for public comment.

### Background:

The draft Initial Study and Environmental Assessment on the 116/121 Intersection Improvement Project was released to the Public for review and comment in June 2016. The comment period is open from June 29<sup>th</sup> to August 2<sup>nd</sup>. There is an open house format public meeting scheduled for July 13<sup>th</sup> at the Finnish American Heritage Association Center in Sonoma. The document is available on-line at <http://scta.ca.gov/measure-m/local-streets/local-street-hwy-121116-interchange/>. The Environmental Document has three alternatives under consideration, a signalized intersection, a roundabout, and a no build option. As part of this process, the Project Development Team (PDT), made up of Parsons, SCTA, and Caltrans staff, includes selecting a preferred alternative that will be specified in the final environmental document.

The 116/121 intersection operations currently experience significant delays and are expected to degrade in the future given traffic volume increases due to natural population growth and increased recreational travel through the area. Improvements to the intersection are warranted.

The 116/121 intersection improvement project proposes options for improvements to operations for motorist, bicyclists, and pedestrians at the intersection, consequently reducing congestion and the occurrence of accidents. Additionally, the project would maintain and, where possible, enhance access to adjacent properties and parking for public transit and carpoolers. With previous Board input, two build alternatives were selected to move forward in the draft Environmental Document, a roundabout and a signalized intersection. Each build alternative is summarized below.

### ROUNDABOUT ALTERNATIVE:

Multi Lane roundabout with 180 degrees of the circulatory roadway having two lanes, a full right turn by-pass lane in the northbound direction and a partial right-turn bypass lane (yield control at the exit) in the eastbound direction. Bonneau Road would be widened and realigned to accommodate standard, 12' wide, single entry and single exit lanes with 2' wide shoulders. Flashing beacons and warning signs would be installed as appropriate to alert approaching motorists to slow down from the approaching lanes. Bicycle and Pedestrian facilities such as sidewalks, crosswalks, pedestrian-scale lighting and signage to alert motorists to pedestrians and bicyclists will be included. The existing park and ride lot, located in the southeastern quadrant of the intersection, would be relocated to the northeast quadrant of the roundabout, which would require right of way acquisition. Landscaping and drainage would be redesigned to support the roundabout.

**SIGNALIZED INTERSECTION ALTERNATIVE:**

The signalized intersection alternative proposes to introduce a four-way traffic signal to the project intersection. The existing intersection would be widened to accommodate a configuration that would include an additional left-turn lane for traffic turning eastbound from SR16/Arnold Drive and add an additional right turn lane on northbound SR 121/Arnold Drive. Bonneau Road would be widened to accommodate standard lanes and shoulders. Flashing beacons and advance warning signs would be installed to alert approaching motorists to slow down. The existing free right turn on northbound SR121/Arnold Drive would be removed. Pedestrian and bicycle facilities would be constructed for connectivity between all four intersection legs. The existing Park and Ride lot, located in the southeast quadrant of the intersection, would remain in the southeast quadrant of the intersection and would be reconfigured. Existing landscaping and drainage would be slightly modified under the signalized intersection alternative.

Environmental impacts of the two build alternatives are similar for several resources. Impacts differ for the following resources:

Wetlands, Natural Communities, Water Quality and Stormwater, Traffic and Transportation, Farm Lands, and Land Use Impacts under the signal alternative are higher than the roundabout. For a full listing of the impacts, please see the attached table.

**NO BUILD ALTERNATIVE:**

The no build alternative consists of the future conditions with transportation improvements only as currently planned and programmed for funding. The no build alternative provides a basis for comparing the build alternatives. The no build alternative would result in additional congestion and delay at the intersection by 2040. The wait time for traffic to cross the intersection worsens from more than 5 minutes to more than 10 minutes in the morning peak hour, and from 6 minutes to more than 12 minutes in the evening peak hour. Due to this additional congestion and delay, safety at the intersection would continue to worsen and ingress and egress from adjacent properties would continue to be challenging. Additionally, pedestrian and bicycle facilities would not be constructed.

Mitigated Negative Declaration/Finding of No Significant Impact (MND/FONSI) is the expected final document.

**Policy Impacts:**

None

**Fiscal Impacts:**

The estimated unfunded cost for the various alternatives is shown below:

<b>Alternative:</b>	<b>R/W Cap \$</b>	<b>CON Cap \$</b>	<b>Total \$</b>
Roundabout	\$.375	\$13.191	\$13.566
Signalized Intersection	\$.871	\$12.052	\$12.923

**Staff Recommendation:**

This is an information only item.

**Table S-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts**

Affected Resource	Potential Impact			Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures
	No Build Alternative	Roundabout Alternative	Signalized Intersection Alternative	
Land Use	No impacts.	The Roundabout Alternative would permanently convert 4.43 acres of land to transportation use, including 0.04 acre of diverse agriculture, 4.26 acres of land-intensive agriculture, 0.05 acre of limited commercial, and 0.07 acre of recreation/visitor-serving commercial land uses.	The Signalized Intersection Alternative would convert 4.72 acres of land to transportation use, including 0.03 acre of diverse agriculture, 4.33 acres of land-intensive agriculture, 0.07 acre of limited commercial land uses, and 0.29 acre of recreation/visitor-serving commercial land uses.	The project alignment has been adjusted to fit within existing right-of-way (ROW) where feasible.
Consistency with State, Regional, and Local Plans and Programs	The No Build Alternative is not consistent with regional and local land use policies.	The Build Alternatives are mostly consistent with planning goals and policies in local and regional plans and studies. The only policy with which the Build Alternatives would be inconsistent relates to the protection of agricultural land. The Build Alternatives would be consistent with the other stated objectives of these jurisdictions.		No avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures are required.
Farmlands	No impacts.	The Roundabout Alternative would result in the direct conversion of 4.2 acres of Farmland of Local Importance.	The Signalized Intersection Alternative would result in the direct conversion of 4.3 acres of Farmland of Local Importance.	No avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures are required.
Acquisitions	No impacts.	The Build Alternatives would not affect any residential properties. Partial acquisitions of commercial properties and agricultural land would be required under both Build Alternatives.		Property acquisition will be conducted in compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act. Compensation will be negotiated with all affected property owners during the ROW acquisition phase. Access to all properties will be maintained during construction.

**Table S-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts**

Affected Resource	Potential Impact			Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures
	No Build Alternative	Roundabout Alternative	Signalized Intersection Alternative	
Utilities and Emergency Services	No impacts.	Both Build Alternatives would require the relocation of utilities, Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E) utility poles, and underground storm drain facilities. There would be no impacts to emergency service providers.		Where feasible, relocations will be undertaken in advance of project construction. Coordination efforts with utility providers will include planning for utility reroutes. A Traffic Management Plan will be developed to address impacts to emergency services. If the Roundabout Alternative is selected, a public education campaign will be implemented to inform area drivers and residents about the new roundabout, and it will include information on how drivers should respond when emergency vehicles are approaching the roundabout.
Traffic and Transportation, Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities	The No Build Alternative would not add pedestrian and bicycle facilities or modify the Park-and-Ride lot. Under future no build conditions, intersection delay and level of service (LOS) would continue to worsen. By 2040, the wait time for traffic to cross the intersection would worsen from more than 5 minutes to more than 10 minutes in the	The Park-and-Ride lot would be relocated to the northeast quadrant of the intersection. Pedestrian and bicycle facilities would be added. By 2040, the Roundabout Alternative would provide acceptable LOS conditions for the morning and evening peak period, accommodate queue lengths, and reduce the delay by approximately 4 minutes, 51 seconds per vehicle in the morning peak hour and by 5 minutes, 56 seconds per vehicle in the evening peak hour.	The Park-and-Ride lot would be reconfigured in its existing location. Pedestrian and bicycle facilities would be added. By 2040, the Signalized Intersection Alternative would provide acceptable LOS conditions for the morning and evening peak period, accommodate queue lengths, and reduce the delay by approximately 4 minutes, 22 seconds per vehicle in the morning peak hour and by 5 minutes, 14 seconds per vehicle in the evening peak hour.	A Transportation Management Plan will be developed and implemented as part of the project construction planning phase. In addition, if a full closure of the Park-and-Ride lot is required, Caltrans will redirect patrons to other associated lots.

**Table S-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts**

Affected Resource	Potential Impact			Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures
	No Build Alternative	Roundabout Alternative	Signalized Intersection Alternative	
	morning peak hour, and from 6 minutes to more than 12 minutes in the evening peak hour.			
Visual/Aesthetics	No Impacts.	The Roundabout Alternative would result in visual changes from widening the intersection, shifting the intersection to the northeast, relocating the Park-and-Ride lot to the northeast quadrant, tree removal, and the addition of pedestrian and bicycle facilities, lighting, and signage. Temporary visual impacts would also result from construction activities.	The Signalized Intersection Alternative would result in visual changes from widening the intersection, tree removal, and the addition of pedestrian and bicycle facilities, lighting, and signage, and signal poles. Temporary visual impacts would also result from construction activities.	Vegetation will be preserved to the extent feasible, and tree replanting will occur onsite. Decorative paving and fencing and barriers will be installed. Stormwater treatment facilities will be designed so that they appear to be a natural landscape feature.
Cultural Resources	No Impacts.	One National Register of Historic Places-eligible property was identified within the archaeological or historical areas of potential effect – the Vineyard Inn Hotel. Both Build Alternatives would acquire land from this property permanently and temporarily; however, neither Build Alternative would adversely affect the Vineyard Inn Hotel. There is a low potential for buried archaeological sites within the archaeological area of potential effects; therefore, the Build Alternatives would have no adverse effect on unidentified archaeological resources that may be present.	One National Register of Historic Places-eligible property was identified within the archaeological or historical areas of potential effect – the Vineyard Inn Hotel. Both Build Alternatives would acquire land from this property permanently and temporarily; however, neither Build Alternative would adversely affect the Vineyard Inn Hotel. There is a low potential for buried archaeological sites within the archaeological area of potential effects; therefore, the Build Alternatives would have no adverse effect on unidentified archaeological resources that may be present.	The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties Action Plan will be implemented to protect the Vineyard Inn Hotel during construction. The Phased Identification Plan will be implemented for archaeological resources in the unsurveyed northeast parcel. If cultural materials are discovered during construction, earth-moving activities will be stopped at that location until an archaeologist can assess the find. If human remains are discovered, the procedures described in State law will be implemented.

**Table S-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts**

Affected Resource	Potential Impact			Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures
	No Build Alternative	Roundabout Alternative	Signalized Intersection Alternative	
Hydrology and Floodplain	No Impacts.	Neither of the Build Alternatives are located within the floodplain; there would be no impacts to natural and beneficial floodplain values and no longitudinal encroachment to the base floodplain.		No avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures are required.
Water Quality and Stormwater Runoff	The No Build Alternative may have potential permanent water quality impacts due to increasing congestion, leading to a greater deposition of particulates from exhaust and heavy metals from braking.	Potential temporary impacts to water quality may include vegetation removal and stormwater runoff from road construction and increases in sediment-laden flow into water bodies. Permanent impacts would increase the potential for stormwater runoff and soil erosion due to the net increase of impervious surfaces by 0.5 acre under the Roundabout Alternative.	Potential temporary and permanent impacts to water quality are the same as described for the Roundabout Alternative, except the net increase of impervious surfaces would be 1.53 acres under the Signalized Intersection Alternative.	Best management practices will be included to prevent adverse changes in downstream water quality. Measures will include feasible temporary (i.e., during construction) and permanent (i.e., post-construction) best management practices. Pollution and erosion control measures will be incorporated. A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan will be implemented during construction.
Geology, Soils, and Seismicity	No impacts.		Earthquake shaking potential for this site is considered strong, and the risk of secondary seismic hazards to affect users of the intersection (i.e., liquefaction, seismically induced landslides, rock falls, settlement, and subsidence) is low.	Project elements will be designed and constructed to meet seismic design requirements for ground shaking and ground motions. A geotechnical investigation will be conducted to determine the engineering characteristics of native soil in undeveloped areas.
Paleontology	No impacts.	Ground-disturbing activities for both Build Alternatives would impact native material up to 3 feet below ground surface within the project study area, with some locations requiring excavations up to 13 feet for utility poles. Earthwork to these depths would impact sensitive geological deposits (Late Pleistocene alluvium), but it is unlikely to affect significant paleontological resources.		A project-specific Paleontological Mitigation Plan will be prepared by a qualified principal paleontologist. Paleontological monitors will be onsite during excavation.

**Table S-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts**

Affected Resource	Potential Impact			Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures
	No Build Alternative	Roundabout Alternative	Signalized Intersection Alternative	
Hazardous Waste and Materials	No impacts.	Three properties with known historical releases of hazardous materials are present within the study area. Aerially deposited lead from exhaust from leaded gasoline may occur near a highway or roadway. Subsurface construction activities could encounter petroleum hydrocarbons in shallow groundwater. Project activities would require removal of pavement and disturbance of the underlying soil within a commercial complex, and impacts could occur from exposure to hazardous materials associated with automotive repairs, fueling of vehicles, and other vehicle maintenance activities below the paved surface. The potential for environmental contamination from pesticide usage in agricultural lands is also possible.	A preliminary site investigation will be conducted during the design phase of the project and will include the collection and analysis of soil samples for lead in areas near the highway or painted structures where surface soil will be disturbed. All activities involving contaminated soil or groundwater, if found, will comply with the various regulatory agencies' requirements.	
Air Quality	Air quality would worsen in the study area under the No Build Alternative due to worsening congestion, slower speeds, queuing, and delay times.	Neither of the Build Alternatives would increase emissions of criteria air pollutants or precursors (i.e., ozone, carbon monoxide, sulfur dioxide, particulate matter, nitrogen dioxide, and lead) relative to the No Build Alternative in the vicinity of the SR 116/121 intersection. A much greater reduction would occur under the Roundabout Alternative. Project construction would generate fugitive (airborne) dust and exhaust emissions that would have direct temporary effects on local air quality.	Dust control practices will be employed to minimize or avoid potential exceedances of the respirable particulate matter air quality standard during construction. The construction contractor will comply with Caltrans' Standard Specifications in Section 14 (2010).	
Noise	No impacts.	Future noise levels under the Build Alternatives approach or exceed the noise abatement criteria at one receptor in 2040; therefore, consideration of noise abatement is required. Construction activities could at times generate noise levels higher than existing traffic noise levels.	A soundwall has been identified as feasible based on the acoustical design goal in one location; however, it was found not reasonable from a cost perspective. Temporary construction-related noise and vibration will be reasonably minimized by implementing provisions of Section 14-8.02, "Noise Control" of the Caltrans Standard Specifications and abatement measures.	

**Table S-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts**

Affected Resource	Potential Impact			Signalized Intersection Alternative	Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures
	No Build Alternative	Roundabout Alternative	Signalized Intersection Alternative		
Natural Communities	No impacts.	Approximately 36 native and 74 non-native trees would be removed. Permanently impacted habitat would include 8.76 acres of urban, 3.09 acres of landscaped, 4.4 acres of annual grassland, 0.06 acre of eucalyptus, and 1.5 acres of wetland, for a total of 17.81 acres. Construction activities would temporarily impact 0.41 acre of urban, 0.08 acre of landscaped, 0.01 acre of annual grassland, and 0.08 acre of eucalyptus, for a total of 0.58 acre.	Approximately 49 native and 89 non-native trees would be removed. Permanently impacted habitat would include 10.14 acres of urban, 3.57 acres of landscaped, 3.9 acres of annual grassland, 0.1 acre of eucalyptus, and 1.54 acres of wetland, for a total of 19.25 acres. Construction activities would temporarily impact 0.4 acre of urban, 0.22 acre of landscaped, 0.03 acre of eucalyptus, and 0.22 acre of wetland, for a total of 0.87 acre.	Existing native vegetation will be preserved to the greatest extent feasible. Native trees removed will be replanted at a 1:1 ratio within the relocated Park-and-Ride lot under the Roundabout Alternative or along SR 116/Arnold Drive and SR 121/Fremont Drive under the Signalized Intersection Alternative. Environmentally sensitive areas will be delineated; disturbed areas will be replanted, reseeded, and restored; wildlife exclusion fencing will be installed; and best management practices will be implemented. An environmental awareness training program will be implemented for project personnel.	
Wetlands and Other Waters of the United States	No impacts.	This alternative would result in permanent impacts to 1.5 acres of wetlands. There would be no direct impacts to Yellow Creek.	This alternative would result in permanent impacts to 1.54 acres of wetlands and temporary impacts to 0.22 acre of wetlands. There would be no direct impacts to Yellow Creek.	Wetlands will be replaced at a minimum 1:1 ratio through the purchase of credits at a wetland mitigation bank. Additionally, environmentally sensitive areas will be established, water quality best management practices will be implemented, and a Restoration Plan will be developed to restore all wetlands temporarily impacted by the project.	
Plant Species	No impacts.	Special-status plant species were not observed in the study area during surveys; therefore, impacts are not anticipated. However, a portion of the study area was not surveyed due to access restrictions.		When the inaccessible parcel northeast of the intersection becomes accessible to biologists, seasonally timed special-status plant surveys will occur prior to project construction. If protected species are discovered, appropriate agency coordination and protective measures will be established.	

**Table S-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts**

Affected Resource	Potential Impact			Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures
	No Build Alternative	Roundabout Alternative	Signalized Intersection Alternative	
Animal Species	No impacts.	<p>Direct impacts to individual western pond turtles may result from relocation efforts and earth-moving activities in potential habitat during construction of the Build Alternatives. Indirect impacts may result from water-quality degradation from erosion or sediment-loading due to construction activities. Vegetation removal could affect migratory birds, such as nesting raptors, through temporary habitat removal. The removal of large trees within the project area that may provide suitable roosting habitat could cause a temporary impact on roosting bats, including the pallid bat.</p>		<p>Western pond turtle monitoring, wildlife exclusion fencing, worker awareness training, and preconstruction surveys will be implemented. To avoid impacts to roosting bats, a qualified biologist will conduct visual and acoustic surveys during the maternity season prior to permitting. If bats are found during the survey, a plan will be developed for passive relocation. Preconstruction surveys for nesting birds will be conducted by a qualified biologist no more than 72 hours prior to the start of construction for activities occurring during the breeding season (February 15 to August 31). If an active nest of a raptor, game, or non-game bird is found, a no work zone buffer will be established to minimize disturbance. A 300-foot-wide buffer will be erected around active raptor nests and a 50-foot-wide buffer will be erected around active game and non-game bird (non-raptor) nests.</p>

**Table S-1: Summary of Environmental Impacts**

Affected Resource	Potential Impact			Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures
	No Build Alternative	Roundabout Alternative	Signalized Intersection Alternative	
Threatened and Endangered Species	No impacts.	Contra Costa goldfields, Sebastopol meadowdoam, Sonoma sunshine, and two-fork clover/showy rancheria clover could be impacted during grading of the project area. Vernal pool fairy shrimp and California red-legged frog could be injured or killed by construction-related personnel or equipment during project construction if they enter or are found in the work area. Due to the project's increases in pervious and impervious surface area, permanent impacts to California red-legged frog dispersal habitat would occur. Listed species could also be injured or killed by construction-related personnel or equipment during project construction if they enter or are found in the work area. It should be noted that a portion of the study area was not surveyed due to access restrictions. Species assumed to be present until surveys are conducted include vernal pool fairy shrimp, Contra Costa goldfields, Sebastopol meadowdoam, Sonoma sunshine, and two-fork clover/showy rancheria clover.	When the undeveloped field northeast of the intersection becomes accessible to biologists, seasonally timed special-status plant surveys and surveys for vernal pool fairy shrimp will occur prior to project construction. Compensatory mitigation will be required for the potential permanent loss of California red-legged frog dispersal habitat. Additionally, general avoidance and minimization measures will be implemented to protect California red-legged frogs.	
Invasive Species	No impacts.	Project construction activities could have the potential to inadvertently spread invasive species.	Project landscaping and erosion control will avoid using species listed as noxious weeds. The contractor will be required to use equipment that is cleaned and inspected for plant material prior to arrival and use at the project site. A wash station will be established or designated so that equipment is free of soil tracked from other sites that may harbor invasive plant seeds prior to the deployment of equipment onto the site.	
Cumulative Impacts	No impacts.	The resources identified for cumulative analysis would not result in cumulative impacts; therefore, the Build Alternatives would not result in cumulative impacts.	No avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures are required.	
Climate Change	No Impacts.	The Build Alternatives would result in decreases in carbon dioxide emissions due to differences in vehicle speeds and idling time. The potential for sea level rise is not an issue within the study area.	No avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures are required.	

## Staff Report

**To: RCPA Board of Directors**

**From: Lauren Casey, Director of Climate Programs**

**Item: 4.3.1 – Adoption of Climate Action 2020 and Beyond and certification of the related programmatic environmental impact report**

**Date: July 11, 2016**

---

### **Issue:**

Shall the Regional Climate Protection Authority (RCPA) certify the Climate Action 2020 and Beyond FEIR, and make related findings? Shall the RCPA adopt the Climate Action 2020 and Beyond Plan?

### **Background:**

The Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) is the final step in the process of completing the Climate Action 2020 and Beyond Plan, a Sonoma County Regional Climate Action Plan (CAP). With the certification of the FEIR the RCPA can adopt the proposed Regional CAP.

### **Development of Climate Action 2020 and Beyond**

The Regional Climate Action Plan was developed to reflect the priorities of each local government in achieving a countywide greenhouse gas reduction target of 25% below 1990 levels. It was developed by a Staff Working Group comprised of RCPA staff and planning staff from each of the ten jurisdictions. It incorporates the CAP previously developed and adopted by the City of Santa Rosa in 2012, and includes new proposed implementation measures for each city and the County.

In addition to local government staff, the plan was informed by technical experts, community leaders, and the public. The technical analysis behind the plan was completed by Staff and ICF, International, a consulting firm based out of San Francisco that has deep experience with climate action planning in California. A Stakeholder Advisory Group, appointed by the RCPA Board, was consulted at key project milestones to provide review and recommendations from diverse perspectives to RCPA staff. Dozens of public workshops, presentations, and community outreach efforts were held throughout the county over the course of the project.

The work of the SWG and consultants has been funded by a Sustainable Communities Planning Grant administered by the Strategic Growth Council.

The development of the Draft CAP was directed by the RCPA Board, and the Public Review Draft was presented to the RCPA Board, each Council, and the Board of Supervisors for comments in March through May of 2016. The Final Draft CAP reflects the direction provided to RCPA staff by each of the ten elected local governments in the county. After adoption by the RCPA Board, the Final CAP will be considered for adoption by each local government.

## Changes in the Final Regional Climate Action Plan

The Final Draft CAP is substantially the same as the one presented to the RCPA Board in March, however staff and consultants edited the document in response to comments and direction provided on the Public Review Draft. Edits were intended to better align the plan with community priorities by direction from elected officials, to update analysis with new and locally specific data sources, to address typos or errors in the text, to improve clarity, and to respond to feedback from the community. A summary of key changes by section is provided in the table below.

Plan Section	Important Changes in Final Draft
Throughout	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarified that emissions “sectors” are more accurately described as “sources”; economic sectors contribute emissions from sources such as transportation and building energy</li> </ul>
Executive Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Corrected Figure to include Santa Rosa in the 1990 backcast.</li> </ul>
Chapter 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Added equity as a co-benefit.</li> <li>Clarified that the RCPA Board previously adopted goals of 25% below 1990 by 2015 and 40% below 1990 by 2035 but the Plan establishes new targets of 25% below 1990 levels by 2020, 40% below 1990 by 2030, and 80% below 1990 by 2050.</li> <li>Clarified use of the template consistency checklist for CEQA tiering and streamlining.</li> </ul>
Chapter 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarified that the plan methods for GHG accounting are consistent with standard practice <i>and</i> include leading practices enabled by the work of partners like the Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District, and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District who published two instrumental reports in early 2016 regarding quantification of carbon sinks and consumption based emissions, respectively.</li> <li>Updated the backcast, baseline, and forecast inventories for emissions from livestock manure based on Sonoma County specific data on manure management practices provided by the Resource Conservation Districts.</li> <li>Expanded on the discussion of existing carbon sinks in Sonoma County based on the findings of the <i>Climate Action through Conservation</i> project.</li> <li>Expanded the discussion of consumption based emissions using the findings of the UC Berkeley/BAAQMD team that evaluated household consumption based emissions in the Bay Area.</li> </ul>
Chapter 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Updated countywide Business-As-Usual, Target, and GHG reduction measure potential numbers and figures based on new livestock manure data and final city/county measure selections.</li> <li>Updated 2030 and 2050 vision discussion based on new and emerging policy goals for the State.</li> <li>Clarified that measures in support of the Advanced Climate Initiatives (goals 17-20) will be led by regional entities with support from local jurisdictions ; these measures remain non-quantified in the Final CAP and are not relied upon to achieve the reduction target for 2020.</li> <li>Updated Table 3-11, which summarizes each jurisdiction’s participation in local measures, to reflect final selections by city and the county, and to include Santa Rosa CAP measures equivalent to those in Climate Action 2020.</li> <li>Expanded hot water fuel switching measure to include electrifying other building equipment, and to clarify intent to focus on highly efficient systems.</li> <li>Clarified that local land use strategies to reduce transportation emissions include Urban Growth Boundaries, community separators, and land conservation.</li> <li>Replaced the methane digester measure with a broader manure management measure that includes any techniques that reduce methane emissions, including use of digesters.</li> </ul>
Chapter 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expanded the discussion of adaptive management to clarify how plan measures will be amended if inadequate to meet the adopted reduction target and contributions proposed by each jurisdiction.</li> </ul>

Plan Section	Important Changes in Final Draft
Chapter 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Updated city and county specific discussion and measure commitments at the request of Councils or the Board.</li> <li>Participation rates proposed for each measure for each local government are now included.</li> <li>Added detail to the City of Santa Rosa section to include data and commitments from their adopted Community Climate Action Plan.</li> </ul>
Chapter 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No substantial edits.</li> </ul>
Chapter 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No substantial edits.</li> </ul>
Appendices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appendix A – plan consistency checklist: updated to include directions for tracking implementation, customizing it to each jurisdiction, how to address project GHG impacts when the checklist is not appropriate, and clarified language to better guide project applicants and planners when using the checklist.</li> <li>Appendix B – inventory and forecast methods: were updated to include discussion of new manure management data provided by RCDs and sequestration data included from the <i>Climate Action Through Conservation</i> project.</li> <li>Appendix C – reduction measure analysis: was updated to reflect the change to the livestock manure measure to a non-quantified measure, and expanded the narrative around regional strategies to advance goals 17 through 20, particularly in relation to land conservation and carbon sequestration.</li> <li>Appendix D – funding and financing: no substantial edits.</li> <li>Appendix E – municipal measures: no substantial edits.</li> <li>Appendix F – public comments: was updated to include themes from public comments received on the Public Review Draft.</li> </ul>

### CEQA Process – Programmatic EIR

RCPA staff working with ICF International prepared the environmental analysis associated with Climate Action 2020. The analysis provides your Board, responsible agencies, trustee agencies, and the public with information about the potential environmental effects of implementing the proposed CAP.

As required by CEQA, the RCPA is required to consider the environmental impacts of proposed implementation measures and to minimize these impacts where feasible. An EIR is an informational document for decision-makers and the general public. An EIR analyzes the significant environmental effects of a project, identifies possible ways to minimize significant effects, and describes alternatives to the project that could reduce or avoid significant environmental impacts.

The EIR before the Board is a Program EIR under Section 15168 of the CEQA Guidelines and evaluates the environmental impacts of the proposed project on a general level rather than a project-specific level (see DEIR pages 2.0-1 through -3). The impacts identified would come from subsequent projects in furtherance of the plan, rather than the plan itself. The Program EIR discloses potential impacts and the means by which they can be mitigated. Because the means of mitigating the potential impacts would not be in RCPA’s jurisdiction, and pursuant to CEQA’s requirements, the identified mitigation measures are identified as measures that “can and should” be implemented by RCPA’s member agencies.

## EIR Findings and Comments

With one exception the EIR identifies no significant impacts. The single exception is that the addition of solar roofs, which are incentivized, in certain circumstances could substantially change a character-defining feature of an individual historic building. State law limits the circumstances under which these types of projects can be denied. Thus, the feasible options for mitigation of this potential impact are limited. The proposed findings would override this uncertain but potential significant impact, as required by CEQA for the adoption of the CAP. For this override, CEQA requires the Board find that specific economic, legal, social, technological and other benefits of Climate Action 2020 outweigh the significant impact. The proposed findings track the findings of the CAP itself, which is that the benefits of the CAP include reductions in GHG emissions, but also energy savings, air quality improvements, public health improvements, job creation, resource conservation, cost savings, and climate resilience.

RCPA released the Draft EIR for Climate Action 2020 on March 21, 2016. The public comment period on the Draft EIR was from March 21, 2016 to May 6, 2016. A public information meeting was held on April 20 to accept comments on the DEIR, and the opportunity to comment in writing or via the RCPA website was noticed in the Notice of Availability and Board and Council reports presented throughout the county.

The individual CEQA comments received and a detailed response to each specific comment is included in the FEIR. Comments on the EIR that required a response touched on several issues, including the following:

- *The jurisdiction of BCDC and preparation for sea level rise:* Information about BCDC's jurisdiction and BCDC's authority is included in the FEIR.
- *The scope of GHG emissions inventories included in the CAP, and related issues regarding transportation models and carbon sequestration:* One commenter submitted critical comments on the scope of the inventory conducted, and suggested that it needed to include more or different information with respect to all emissions, including from transportation and sequestration. The FEIR explains that there are many ways to conduct inventories, and a central issue faced by planners is that inventories using different protocols are not comparable. The present inventory was conducted pursuant to the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI) U.S. Community Protocol for Accounting and Reporting of Greenhouse Gas Emissions (Community Protocol) to make it comparable with other inventories. With respect to transportation, standard means of measuring VMT were used in the inventory. With respect to comments about sequestration, the final CAP includes recent cutting edge estimates of carbon stock in 1990 and 2010, and projections for 2030 and 2050, but it does not combine any of these biological sequestration estimates or projections with the GHG emissions inventory. The ICLEI Community Protocol advises the separation of biological carbon sequestration estimates from other GHG emissions for reasons that are explained in the FEIR.
- *Uncertainty in implementation:* One comment suggested that only mandatory emissions reductions measures could be included in the CAP because voluntary measures will not be implemented. The FEIR explains why this is incorrect, and also explains that the CAP is a planning document, and that GHG reductions measures may change based on monitoring.
- *A proposed growth moratorium alternative to the CAP:* The FEIR explains that the proposed alternative was not required to be considered by CEQA, as it does not meet the project objectives. The CAP is drafted to be consistent with the individual local agencies' general plans and to allow for growth in Sonoma County.

### **Next Steps**

If the RCPA finds that the FEIR is adequate and complete, the RCPA should consider certifying the FEIR, which is a precondition of adopting the CAP. The rule of adequacy generally holds that the EIR can be certified if: (1) it shows a good faith effort at full disclosure of environmental information; and (2) it provides sufficient analysis to allow decisions to be made regarding the project in contemplation of its environmental consequences.

Upon adoption of the FEIR, the RCPA may take action to adopt, revise, or reject the proposed Climate Action 2020 and Beyond Regional Climate Action Plan (CAP):

- A decision to adopt the CAP would be accompanied by written findings in accordance with CEQA. Proposed findings are attached.
- If revisions to the CAP are requested, additional analysis will be required to determine if the current environmental review is adequate to address the proposed revisions.
- If the RCPA rejects the FEIR and the proposed Climate Action 2020 and Beyond Plan, there will be no long range planning document in effect to guide regional climate action efforts.

Should the SCTA choose to certify the FEIR and approve the Climate Action 2020 and Beyond Regional CAP and related findings and the mitigation monitoring plan, staff will work with the Staff Working Group from RCPA member jurisdictions to bring the CAP forward for adoption by each participating jurisdiction.

The primary conclusion captured in the FEIR and the attached resolution is that the specific economic, legal, social, technological and other benefits of Climate Action 2020 outweigh the limited unavoidable, adverse impacts of Climate Action 2020, and that Climate Action 2020 should be adopted.

### **Policy Impacts:**

The Regional Climate Action Plan will become the roadmap for the RCPA's work with member jurisdictions and, with subsequent adoption by member jurisdictions, create a tool for the evaluation of greenhouse gas impacts of future development projects.

### **Fiscal Impacts:**

The plan was developed using grant funds awarded by the Strategic Growth Council that were to be spent by June 30, 2016. Future efforts related to adoption and implementation of the CAP will be supported by RCPA Member contributions, grants (such as those administered by the RCPA through the Department of Energy, California Public Utilities Commission, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District), and the budgets made available by local and regional agencies for implementation.

### **Staff Recommendation:**

Staff recommends that the Board certify the FEIR and adopt the Climate Action 2020 and Beyond Regional Climate Action Plan (CAP), the related findings and the mitigation monitoring program by the attached Resolution No. 2016-002.

**RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE SONOMA COUNTY REGIONAL CLIMATE PROTECTION AUTHORITY, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, CERTIFYING A FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT, MAKING REQUIRED FINDINGS UNDER THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT FOR ADOPTION, AND ADOPTING THE CLIMATE ACTION 2020 AND BEYOND: A REGIONAL PROGRAM FOR SONOMA COUNTY COMMUNITIES.**

**RESOLVED**, that the Board of Directors (“the Board”) of the Sonoma County Regional Climate Protection Authority (“RCPA”) hereby finds as follows.

**1. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND PURPOSE FOR FINAL EIR**

1.1. The RCPA was formed as a result of legislation passed in 2009 and serves as the coordinating agency to act as a clearinghouse for greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reduction efforts throughout Sonoma County, and to assist agencies within the County to establish and meet greenhouse gas reduction goals.

1.2. The RCPA is composed of 10 jurisdictions—Sonoma County, the Town of Windsor, and the following incorporated cities: Cloverdale, Cotati, Healdsburg, Petaluma, Rohnert Park, Santa Rosa, Sebastopol, and the City of Sonoma. The RCPA is governed by a twelve-member Board of Directors, nine of whom are chosen from the councils of the nine incorporated cities or towns and three of whom are chosen from the County Board of Supervisors.

1.3. Climate Action 2020 and Beyond: A Regional Program For Sonoma County Communities (“Climate Action 2020” or “Proposed Project”) is a climate action plan that includes both regional measures (to be implemented by the RCPA and other regional agencies with local government support) and local measures (to be implemented by local governments with RCPA and regional agency support and on their own) to reduce GHG emissions.

1.4. In compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act, RCPA has prepared an Environmental Impact Report (“EIR”) analyzing and disclosing the environmental impacts of Climate Action 2020.

**2. PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

2.1. Climate Action 2020 is a county-wide planning document. RCPA’s work on Climate Action 2020 began in 2010 with a Sonoma County grant application to the State of California for planning funds, and continued in 2013 when RCPA and the ten local agencies agreed that RCPA would be the lead agency in preparing and adopting a regional climate action plan consistent with CEQA Guideline 15183.5. Pursuant to an agreement between RCPA and the 10 local agencies, RCPA has prepared and analyzed Climate Action 2020 as the lead agency, and it is anticipated that the 10 local agencies will adopt the plan as responsible agencies.

2.2. All member agencies of RCPA participated in the development of Climate Action 2020 through a Staff Working Group. The City of Santa Rosa participated, but has completed a separate climate action plan (Santa Rosa Climate Action Plan, adopted June 5, 2012), and will not be adopting Climate Action 2020.

2.3. On September 24, 2015, RCPA filed a notice of preparation (“NOP”) with the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research, and on October 13, 2015 RCPA held a public scoping meeting for the EIR. All oral and written comments received during the scoping comment period were considered in the preparation of the Draft EIR.

2.4. RCPA released the Draft EIR for Climate Action 2020 on March 21, 2016. The public comment period on the Draft EIR was from March 21, 2016 to May 6, 2016. RCPA held a hearing to obtain oral comment from the public on the Draft EIR on April 20, 2016. All interested persons were given the opportunity to hear and be heard.

2.5. RCPA held a hearing to obtain comment on the draft Climate Action 2020 on March 14, 2016. Between March and May 2016, RCPA staff also made public presentations to the governing bodies of each of the ten member local agencies in Sonoma County regarding the nature of the plan.

2.6. The Final EIR incorporates the Draft EIR, changes to it, and responses to comments. The Final EIR was provided to commenting agencies on June 24, 2016. All comments on the Draft EIR were considered and responded to in the Final EIR.

2.7. The Board conducted a noticed public hearing to consider adoption of Climate Action 2020 and certification of the Final EIR on July 11, 2016. All interested persons were given the opportunity to hear and be heard. At the conclusion of public testimony, the Board closed the hearing, deliberated, and voted to certify the Final EIR, adopt the appropriate CEQA findings, and adopt Climate Action 2020.

2.8. The Board has had an opportunity to review this resolution and the exhibits thereto and hereby finds that it accurately sets forth the intentions of the Board regarding Climate Action 2020 and the Final EIR.

### 3. CEQA COMPLIANCE

#### CERTIFICATION OF THE FINAL EIR

3.1. The Draft EIR was completed, noticed, and made available for public review in accordance with all procedural and substantive requirements of CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines.

3.2. The Final EIR was completed in accordance with all procedural and substantive requirements of CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines.

3.3. The Final EIR was presented to the Directors and that the Directors reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR prior to taking action on the Project.

3.4. The Final EIR reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the Board of Directors.

3.5. Although in response to comments, additional information was included in the Final EIR that amplifies and clarifies information provided in the Draft EIR, the conclusions in the Draft EIR regarding the impacts of the Proposed Project and the significance of those impacts have not changed. No significant new information was added that would trigger recirculation of the Draft EIR under CEQA or the State CEQA Guidelines. Specifically, there were no new significant environmental impacts, or a substantial increase in the severity of any impact, identified in the comments or responses that were not already identified in the Draft EIR. Furthermore, there were no new feasible project alternatives or mitigation measures considerably different from others already analyzed in the Draft EIR that was identified in the responses or comments. Nor was the Draft EIR so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded.

#### FINDINGS ON IMPACTS

3.6. The Final EIR discloses that the Proposed Project poses certain significant or potentially significant adverse environmental impacts, not directly from the adoption of Climate Action 2020, but indirectly from further projects in furtherance of Climate Action 2020. The Board finds that all feasible mitigation measures have been required, and that the responsible agencies can and should implement mitigation measures to avoid or substantially lessen the significant effects identified in the Final EIR.

3.7. The Board finds that the following impacts are arguably foreseeable, but can all be addressed by the responsible agencies through standard and well understood mitigation measures, as discussed in the EIR, and for the reasons stated in the EIR:

3.8. **Aesthetics:** Subsequent actions in furtherance of the Proposed Project could indirectly result in daytime glare impacts for motorists while traveling in the project vicinity as well as residents in the area if reflections from the rooftop photovoltaic solar panels are directed toward a roadway or residence, thereby affecting public safety (Impact AES-2). These impacts can and should be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with mitigation identified in Section 3.2 (3.2.3.3 and 3.2.3.4) of the EIR, Aesthetics.

3.9. **Air Quality:** Subsequent actions in furtherance of the Proposed Project could increase emissions of ozone-precursor pollutants (i.e., reactive organic gases [ROGs] and oxides of nitrogen [NOX]) and fugitive dust (i.e., particulate matter [PM]) during new or remodeled construction of solid waste facilities, mixed-use and transit-oriented development in city centers, wastewater plant upgrades, recycled water line extensions, and transportation facilities (Impact AQ-2a). These impacts can and should be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with mitigation identified in Section 3.4 (3.4.3.3 and 3.4.3.4) of the EIR, Air Quality.

3.10. **Biological Resources:** Subsequent actions in furtherance of the Proposed Project could affect sensitive and special-status species, their habitat, migratory corridors, and wetlands or riparian habitat if solid waste facilities, recycled water line extensions, or transportation facilities (that are not part of existing roadways) are sited in areas with these

resources (Impacts BIO-1 and BIO-2). These impacts can and should be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with mitigation identified in Section 3.5 (3.5.3.3 and 3.5.3.4) of the EIR, Biological Resources. The Proposed Project could conflict with local tree ordinances if the construction of solid waste facilities, recycled water line extensions, or transportation facilities or the installation of rooftop photovoltaic solar panels (if overhanging trees substantially hinder access) would result in the removal of protected trees (Impact BIO-3). These impacts also can and should be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with mitigation identified in Section 3.5 (3.5.3.3) of the EIR, Biological Resources.

3.11. Hazards and Hazardous Materials: Subsequent actions in furtherance of the Proposed Project could result in the accidental release of hazardous materials during the installation of rooftop photovoltaic solar panels or the construction of energy-efficient retrofits; electric charging or alternative fueling facilities; transit, pedestrian, bicycle, or traffic-calming facilities; solid waste facilities; wastewater plant upgrades; recycled water line extensions; methane digesters; or mixed-use and transit-oriented development in city centers (Impacts HAZ-1a and HAZ-2). These impacts can and should be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with mitigation identified in Section 3.9 (3.9.3.3 and 3.9.3.4) of the EIR, Hazards and hazardous Materials.

3.12. Transportation and Traffic: Subsequent actions in furtherance of the Proposed Project could temporarily disrupt traffic flows on area roadways, substantially increase hazards due to incompatible uses, or delay emergency access by increasing the number of heavy-duty construction vehicles on roadways with normal vehicle traffic during the installation of rooftop photovoltaic solar panels or the construction of energy-efficient retrofits; electric charging or alternative fueling facilities; transit, pedestrian, bicycle, or traffic calming facilities; solid waste facilities; wastewater plant upgrades; recycled water line extensions; methane digesters; or mixed-use and transit-oriented development in city centers (Impacts TRA-1a, TRA-4a, and TRA-5a). These temporary impacts can and should be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with mitigation identified in Section 3.5 of the EIR, Transportation/Traffic.

3.13. Cultural Resources: Subsequent actions in furtherance of the Proposed Project could disturb archeological resources, paleontological resources, and human remains through ground-disturbing activities associated with the construction of solid waste facilities, recycled water line extensions, transportation facilities, or mixed-use and transit-oriented development in city centers (Impacts CUL-2 and CUL-3). These impacts can and should be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with mitigation identified in Section 3.6 of the EIR, Cultural Resources.

3.14. The Board finds that the following impacts are foreseeable, but arguably cannot be mitigated to a level that is less than significant, for the reasons discussed in the EIR:

3.15. Cultural Resources: Subsequent actions in furtherance of the Proposed Project could alter a historic resource's physical characteristics if energy-efficient retrofits; electric charging or alternative fueling facilities; transit, pedestrian, bicycle, or traffic-calming facilities; solid waste facilities; wastewater plant upgrades; recycled water line extensions; methane digesters; or mixed-use and transit-oriented developments in city centers are located at the site of a historic resource, thereby resulting in an adverse change in the significance of the resource itself. Although unlikely, for the reasons also discussed in Section 3.2.3.3 of the EIR,

Aesthetics, future projects in furtherance of the Proposed Project could alter the character-defining feature of a historic building if rooftop photovoltaic solar panels are installed on the structure (Impact CUL-1). These impacts can be mitigated with mitigation identified in Section 3.6 of the EIR, Cultural Resources, but not necessarily to a less-than-significant level related to potential impacts of solar roofs on historic buildings.

3.16. The Board finds that changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the Proposed Project, or can and should be incorporated into the actions of the responsible agencies, which will mitigate to a less than significant level the impacts set forth in Exhibit A (Table ES-1 in the EIR), attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference.

#### STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

3.17. Because the adoption of all feasible mitigation measures will not substantially lessen or avoid all significant adverse environmental effects caused by the Proposed Project, the Board adopts this Statement of Overriding Considerations concerning the Proposed Project's unavoidable significant impact documenting why the Proposed Project's benefits override and outweigh its unavoidable impacts on the environment as set forth below.

3.18. Climate Action 2020 presents a road map to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in Sonoma County. As discussed in Chapter 1 of Climate Action 2020, climate change is a serious threat and strong action is needed to avoid serious damage to human wellbeing and natural systems. Achieving the objectives of Climate Action 2020 will reduce greenhouse gas emissions and will have numerous other collateral public benefits, such as reducing other unhealthful emissions, improving public health through alternative modes of transportation, improving access to alternative transportation, and improving efficiency and reducing waste. The Board specifically incorporates by reference and concurs in the findings in Sections 1.2.2 and 1.2.3 of Climate Action 2020 regarding building on established community goals, energy savings, air quality improvements, public health improvements, job creation, resource conservation, cost savings, and climate resilience.

3.19. When deciding whether to approve Climate Action 2020, RCPA is faced with presumed unmitigated impacts which are limited in nature. When considering the significant benefits outlined in this Statement of Overriding Consideration against limited impacts, the balance of weight clearly falls in favor of the merits of Climate Action 2020 and its benefits.

3.20. Notwithstanding the identification and analysis of the impacts that are identified in the Final EIR as being significant and potentially significant which arguably may not be avoided, lessened, or mitigated to a level of insignificance, the RCPA, acting pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 and Section 15093 of the State CEQA Guidelines, hereby determines that specific economic, legal, social, technological and other benefits of Climate Action 2020 outweigh any unavoidable, adverse impacts of Climate Action 2020, and that Climate Action 2020 should be adopted.

#### FINDINGS ON ALTERNATIVES

3.21. The purpose of the discussion of alternatives in an EIR is to provide a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant environmental effects of a proposed project, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives or would be more costly. The range of alternatives describes those that could feasibly accomplish most of the basic objectives of the project and could avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects. A feasible alternative is an alternative capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social and technological factors, and other considerations.

3.22. State CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6 provides that an EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to the project. Rather, it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision making and public participation. The discussion of alternatives need not be exhaustive, and the requirement as to the discussion of alternatives is subject to a construction of reasonableness.

3.23. The Final EIR satisfies the requirements of CEQA by providing a reasonable range of alternatives, each of which is intended to address means by which the unavoidable adverse impacts of the Proposed Project can be lessened. Although the alternatives may avoid one or more significant effects identified for the Proposed Project, they would result in other potentially significant impacts, are infeasible, or do not result in a reduction of overall impacts, relative to the Proposed Project.

3.24. Given the goal of reducing significant environmental impacts, as listed above, alternatives were developed for evaluation in the EIR: 1) the No Project Alternative, 2) the Zero Net Energy Buildings Alternative and 3) the Carbon Offset Alternative. The Board concurs with the analysis of the alternatives in the EIR (found in Table ES-2, Chapter 5, and specifically Section 5.5 of the EIR). For the reasons set forth herein, the Board finds that specific economic, legal, social, technological or other considerations make it infeasible to approve the project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

3.25. No Project Alternative: The discussion of a No-Project Alternative is required by CEQA to allow decision makers to compare the impacts of approving the Proposed Project with the impacts of not approving it. Accordingly, the discussion of this alternative in the Final EIR evaluates the impacts that could reasonably be expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the Proposed Project is not approved. As set forth in Section 5.3.2 of the EIR, GHG emissions avoided under the No Project Alternative would represent approximately a 20% reduction in GHG emissions, compared with 1990 levels, by 2020. This alternative would lessen the severity of the Proposed Project's environmental impacts but would not meet the basic objective of the Proposed Project to reduce countywide GHG emissions to 25% below 1990 levels by 2020. The Board finds that this alternative is not feasible.

3.26. Zero Net Energy ("ZNE") Buildings: As set forth in Section 5.3.2 of the EIR, this alternative would lessen the severity of the Proposed Project's environmental impacts, and would meet the basic objective of the project to reduce countywide GHG emissions to 25% below 1990 levels by 2020, although it would involve major costs and would not likely lessen impacts to historic resources. While it is feasible at a technological level to construct ZNE

buildings using current technology, the cost of constructing such buildings would be substantially higher than the cost of constructing current new buildings. There is a housing shortage in Sonoma County, and it is uncertain whether it would be financially feasible for private and public project proponents to require all new construction to meet such a higher standard immediately starting in 2017. This alternative would likely have negative impacts on the availability of new housing within the County. The Board finds this alternative is not feasible.

3.27. Carbon Offset Alternative: As set forth in Section 5.3.3 of the EIR, this alternative would lessen the severity of the Proposed Project's secondary environmental impacts, and would meet the basic objective of the project to reduce countywide GHG emissions to 25% below 1990 levels by 2020. The Carbon Offset Alternative would result in similar impacts as the Proposed Project but would avoid significant and unavoidable impacts on historical resources. Given the ongoing nature of emissions for projects, and the uncertain life of projects, this alternative would have a significant administrative overhead and it could also lead to a significant amount of money leaving the County. The Board finds that this alternative is not feasible.

3.28. The Draft EIR explains that several alternatives were considered but not carried forward for analysis. A commenter asserted that a growth moratorium alternative should have been carried forward for further analysis. The Board concurs in full with the response to Comment 2-6 in the Final EIR.

3.29. The Board hereby finds that the Proposed Project, as identified and mitigated by adoption of mitigation measures identified in the EIR, can be feasibly implemented and serves the best interests of the RCPA.

#### ADOPTION OF THE MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM

3.30. The Board hereby finds that the proposed mitigation measures described in the Final EIR and Findings are feasible. The Mitigation Monitoring Program is included as Exhibit B attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference and is adopted as a recommendation for the responsible agencies as part of the adoption of Climate Action 2020.

#### ADOPTION OF CLIMATE ACTION 2020

3.31. The Board finds that Climate Action 2020 meets the requirements of State CEQA Guideline 15183.5 for tiering and streamlining of the analysis of greenhouse gas emissions, and that the adoption of Climate Action 2020 provides an appropriate mechanism for meeting the target levels of GHG emissions.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT**, based on the foregoing findings and the record of these proceedings, the Board hereby determines, declares, and orders as follows:

1. The Board certifies that the Final EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA, that the Final EIR was presented to the Board and that the Board reviewed and considered the

**Resolution No. 2016-002**  
**Regional Climate Protection Authority**  
**Santa Rosa, California**  
**July 11, 2016**

information contained in the Final EIR and the Final EIR reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the Board.

2. The Board makes the findings set forth herein regarding the environmental effects disclosed in the Draft and Final EIR as part of taking action on Climate Action 2020 and the overriding considerations that justify adoption of Climate Action 2020 notwithstanding its significant and unavoidable environmental effects.
3. The Board adopts Climate Action 2020.
4. The foregoing findings are true and correct, are supported by substantial evidence in the record, and are adopted as hereinabove set forth.
5. The Executive Director of the RCPA is designated as the custodian of the documents and other materials that constitute the record of the proceedings upon which the Board's decisions herein are based. These documents may be found at the RCPA Office, 490 Mendocino Avenue, Suite 206, Santa Rosa, CA 95401.

THE FOREGOING RESOLUTION was moved by Director \_\_\_\_\_, seconded by Director \_\_\_\_\_, and approved by the following vote:

Director Chambers	_____	Director Mackenzie	_____
Director Coursey	_____	Director Miller	_____
Director Gallian	_____	Director Rabbitt	_____
Director Gorin	_____	Director Russell	_____
Director Gurney	_____	Director Salmon	_____
Director Landman	_____	Director Zane	_____

Ayes: 0      Noes: 0      Absent: 0      Abstain: 0

**SO ORDERED**

I, the undersigned, certify that the foregoing resolution was duly adopted at a regular meeting of the Board of Directors of the Regional Climate Protection Authority held on \_\_\_\_\_, 2016.

\_\_\_\_\_

Suzanne Smith, Executive Director  
 Clerk, Regional Climate Protection Authority

**Resolution No. 2016-002  
Regional Climate Protection Authority  
Santa Rosa, California  
July 11, 2016**

**EXHIBIT "A"  
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

**Resolution No. 2016-002  
Regional Climate Protection Authority  
Santa Rosa, California**

<b>Project Summary and Mitigation Measures</b>			
<b>Impact</b>	<b>Significance before Mitigation</b>	<b>Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Significance after Mitigation</b>
<b>Aesthetics</b>			
<b>Impact AES-1: Implementation of the CAP could result in substantial adverse effects on scenic views or vistas, substantially damage scenic resources within a state scenic highway, or substantially degrade the existing visual character of the County</b>	<b>Less than significant</b>	<b>None required</b>	<b>--</b>
<b>Impact AES-2: Implementation of the CAP could result in an increase of daytime glare and/or nighttime lighting</b>	<b>Significant</b>	<b>Mitigation Measure AES-1: Design guidelines for photovoltaic solar energy panels on rooftops regarding glare and safety</b>	<b>Less than significant</b>
<b>Impact C-AES-1: Implementation of the CAP, in combination with other foreseeable development in the surrounding area, could have a significant cumulative impact on aesthetics</b>	<b>Significant</b>	<b>Mitigation Measure AES-1</b>	<b>Less than considerable contribution</b>
<b>Agricultural and Forest Resources</b>			
<b>Impact AG-1: Implementation of the CAP could convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) to non-agricultural use</b>	<b>Less than significant</b>	<b>None required</b>	<b>--</b>
<b>Impact AG-2: Implementation of the CAP could conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract</b>	<b>Less than significant</b>	<b>None required</b>	<b>--</b>
<b>Impact AG-3: Implementation of the CAP could conflict with zoning for or cause rezoning of forestland or timberland or result in the loss of forestland or conversion of forestland to non-forest use</b>	<b>Less than significant</b>	<b>None required</b>	<b>--</b>
<b>Impact AG-4: Implementation of the CAP could involve other changes in the existing environment that could result in the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or forestland to non-forest use</b>	<b>Less than significant</b>	<b>None required</b>	<b>--</b>

**Resolution No. 2016-002  
Regional Climate Protection Authority  
Santa Rosa, California**

<b>Project Summary and Mitigation Measures</b>			
<b>Impact</b>	<b>Significance before Mitigation</b>	<b>Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Significance after Mitigation</b>
<b>Impact C-AG-1: Implementation of the CAP, in combination with other foreseeable development in the surrounding area, could have a significant cumulative impact on agricultural and forest resources</b>	Less than considerable contribution	None required	--
<b>Air Quality</b>			
<b>Impact AQ-1: Implementation of the CAP would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan</b>	Beneficial	None required	--
<b>Impact AQ-2a: Implementation of the CAP could violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing long-standing air quality violation during construction activities</b>	Significant	Mitigation Measure AQ-1: Implement basic construction mitigation measures to reduce construction emissions	Less than significant
<b>Impact AQ-2b: Implementation of the CAP could violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing long-standing air quality violation during operation</b>	Less than significant	None required	--
<b>Impact AQ-3: Implementation of the CAP could result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant</b>	Less than significant	None required	--
<b>Impact AQ-4: Implementation of the CAP could expose sensitive receptors to toxic air contaminants</b>	Less than significant	None required	--
<b>Impact AQ-5: Implementation of the CAP could create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people</b>	Less than significant	None required	--
<b>Impact C-AQ-1: Implementation of the CAP, in combination with other foreseeable development in the surrounding area, could have a significant cumulative impact on air quality</b>	Significant	Mitigation Measure AQ-1	Less than considerable contribution
<b>Biological Resources</b>			

**Resolution No. 2016-002  
Regional Climate Protection Authority  
Santa Rosa, California**

<b>Project Summary and Mitigation Measures</b>			
<b>Impact</b>	<b>Significance before Mitigation</b>	<b>Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Significance after Mitigation</b>
<b>Impact BIO-1: Implementation of the CAP could impact sensitive and special-status species and their associated habitat or migratory corridors</b>	<b>Significant</b>	<b>Mitigation Measure BIO-1a: Project-level biological surveys and avoidance, minimizations, and compensation for impacts on CEQA-defined special-status species, sensitive natural communities, state- and federally protected waters/wetlands, and riparian habitat Mitigation Measure BIO-1b: Replacement of removed trees Mitigation Measure BIO-1c: Preconstruction surveys</b>	<b>Less than significant</b>
<b>Impact BIO-2: Implementation of the CAP could impact wetland and riparian habitat in some areas of the County</b>	<b>Significant</b>	<b>Mitigation Measure BIO-1a Mitigation Measure BIO-1b Mitigation Measure BIO-1c</b>	<b>Less than significant</b>
<b>Impact BIO-3: Implementation of the CAP could conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources or the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan/natural community conservation plan</b>	<b>Significant</b>	<b>Mitigation Measure BIO-1b</b>	<b>Less than significant</b>
<b>Impact C-BIO-1: Implementation of the CAP, in combination with other foreseeable development in the surrounding area, could have a significant cumulative impact on biological resources</b>	<b>Significant</b>	<b>Mitigation Measure BIO-1a Mitigation Measure BIO-1b Mitigation Measure BIO-1c</b>	<b>Less than considerable contribution</b>
<b>Cultural Resources</b>			
<b>Impact CUL-1: Implementation of the CAP could result in the potential disturbance of historical resources</b>	<b>Significant</b>	<b>Mitigation Measure CUL-1a: Review of alternatives for solar roofs on historic buildings Mitigation Measure CUL-1b: Studies documenting the presence/absence of historical resources Mitigation Measure CUL-1c: Historical resources investigations</b>	<b>Significant and unavoidable for CAP solar roofs on historic buildings; less than significant for all other CAP facilities</b>

**Resolution No. 2016-002  
Regional Climate Protection Authority  
Santa Rosa, California**

<b>Project Summary and Mitigation Measures</b>			
<b>Impact</b>	<b>Significance before Mitigation</b>	<b>Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Significance after Mitigation</b>
<b>Impact CUL-2: Implementation of the CAP could result in the potential disturbance of known or undiscovered archaeological resources and human remains</b>	<b>Significant</b>	<b>Mitigation Measure CUL-2a: Cultural resource investigations and protection and recovery of significant resources</b> <b>Mitigation Measure CUL-2b: Work stoppage if cultural resources are encountered during ground-disturbing activities</b> <b>Mitigation Measure CUL-2c: Work stoppage if human remains are encountered during ground-disturbing activities</b>	<b>Less than significant</b>
<b>Impact CUL-3: Implementation of the CAP could result in the potential disturbance of paleontological resources within the County</b>	<b>Significant</b>	<b>Mitigation Measure CUL-3: Avoidance of encountered paleontological resources until resources have been evaluated and recorded, and treatment has been determined</b>	<b>Less than significant</b>
<b>Impact C-CUL-1: Implementation of the CAP, in combination with other foreseeable development in the surrounding area, could have a significant cumulative impact on cultural resources</b>	<b>Significant</b>	<b>Mitigation Measure CUL-1a</b> <b>Mitigation Measure CUL-1b</b> <b>Mitigation Measure CUL-1c</b> <b>Mitigation Measure CUL-2a</b> <b>Mitigation Measure CUL-2b</b> <b>Mitigation Measure CUL-2c</b> <b>Mitigation Measure CUL-3</b>	<b>Considerable contribution</b>
<b>Geology and Soils</b>			
<b>Impact GEO-1: Implementation of the CAP could expose people or structures to risks involving earthquake induced seismic hazards, such as surface fault ruptures, groundshaking, ground failures including liquefaction, and landslides</b>	<b>Less than significant</b>	<b>None required</b>	<b>--</b>
<b>Impact GEO-2: Implementation of the CAP could result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil</b>	<b>Less than significant</b>	<b>None required</b>	<b>--</b>
<b>Impact GEO-3: Facilities promoted by the CAP could be located on an unstable geological unit/soil or expansive soil, potentially resulting in increased risks of geologic and soil hazards or damage to project structures</b>	<b>Less than significant</b>	<b>None required</b>	<b>--</b>

**Resolution No. 2016-002  
Regional Climate Protection Authority  
Santa Rosa, California**

<b>Project Summary and Mitigation Measures</b>			
<b>Impact</b>	<b>Significance before Mitigation</b>	<b>Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Significance after Mitigation</b>
<b>Impact GEO-4: Implementation of the CAP would not involve the use of septic tanks or alternate wastewater disposal systems that would result in soil impacts</b>	No impact	None required	--
<b>Impact C-GEO-1: Implementation of the CAP, in combination with other foreseeable development in the surrounding area, could have a significant cumulative impact to geology and soils</b>	Less than considerable contribution	None required	--
<b>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</b>			
<b>Impact GHG-1: Implementation of the CAP would be consistent with and would support applicable plan, policy, and regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions</b>	Beneficial	None required	--
<b>Impact GHG-2: Implementation of the CAP would help Sonoma County to be more resilient to the future effects of climate change on Sonoma County</b>	Disclosure item only; not a CEQA impact	None required	--
<b>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</b>			
<b>Impact HAZ-1a: Implementation of the CAP could cause a significant hazard to the public or environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment during construction</b>	Significant	Mitigation Measure HAZ-1: Spill prevention, control, and countermeasure program for construction activities	Less than significant
<b>Impact HAZ-1b: Implementation of the CAP could cause a significant hazard to the public or environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment during operation</b>	Less than significant	None required	--

**Resolution No. 2016-002  
Regional Climate Protection Authority  
Santa Rosa, California**

<b>Project Summary and Mitigation Measures</b>			
<b>Impact</b>	<b>Significance before Mitigation</b>	<b>Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Significance after Mitigation</b>
<b>Impact HAZ-2: Implementation of the CAP could emit or involve handling hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school</b>	<b>Significant</b>	<b>Mitigation Measure HAZ-1</b>	<b>Less than significant</b>
<b>Impact HAZ-3: Implementation of the CAP could be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment</b>	<b>Less than significant</b>	<b>None required</b>	<b>--</b>
<b>Impact HAZ-4: Implementation of the CAP could be located within an airport land use plan area, within two miles of a public airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip and result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area</b>	<b>Less than significant</b>	<b>None required</b>	<b>--</b>
<b>Impact HAZ-5: Implementation of the CAP could interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan</b>	<b>Less than significant</b>	<b>None required</b>	<b>--</b>
<b>Impact HAZ-6: Implementation of the CAP could expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires</b>	<b>Less than significant</b>	<b>None required</b>	<b>--</b>
<b>Impact C-HAZ-1: Implementation of the CAP, in combination with other foreseeable development in the surrounding area, could have a significant cumulative impact from hazards and hazardous materials</b>	<b>Significant</b>	<b>Mitigation Measure HAZ-1</b>	<b>Less than considerable contribution</b>
<b>Hydrology and Water Quality</b>			
<b>Impact HYD-1a: Implementation of the CAP could violate water quality standards and waste discharge requirements, or could otherwise substantially degrade water quality during construction</b>	<b>Less than significant</b>	<b>None required</b>	<b>--</b>

**Resolution No. 2016-002  
Regional Climate Protection Authority  
Santa Rosa, California**

<b>Project Summary and Mitigation Measures</b>			
<b>Impact</b>	<b>Significance before Mitigation</b>	<b>Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Significance after Mitigation</b>
<b>Impact HYD-1b: Implementation of the CAP could violate water quality standards and waste discharge requirements, or could otherwise substantially degrade water quality during operation</b>	<b>Less than significant</b>	<b>None required</b>	<b>--</b>
<b>Impact HYD-2: Implementation of the CAP could substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge in the County</b>	<b>Less than significant</b>	<b>None required</b>	<b>--</b>
<b>Impact HYD-3: Implementation of the CAP could alter existing drainage patterns in the County that would result in substantial erosion or siltation onsite or offsite, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding onsite or offsite</b>	<b>Less than significant</b>	<b>None required</b>	<b>--</b>
<b>Impact HYD-4: Implementation of the CAP could create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff</b>	<b>Less than significant</b>	<b>None required</b>	<b>--</b>
<b>Impact HYD-5: Implementation of the CAP could place housing within flood hazard areas or could place structures within flood hazard areas that would impede or redirect flood flows</b>	<b>Less than significant</b>	<b>None required</b>	<b>--</b>
<b>Impact HYD-6: Implementation of the CAP could expose people or structures to significant risk involving flooding a result of levee or dam failures</b>	<b>Less than significant</b>	<b>None required</b>	<b>--</b>
<b>Impact HYD-7: Implementation of the CAP could contribute to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow</b>	<b>Less than significant</b>	<b>None required</b>	<b>--</b>

**Resolution No. 2016-002  
Regional Climate Protection Authority  
Santa Rosa, California**

<b>Project Summary and Mitigation Measures</b>			
<b>Impact</b>	<b>Significance before Mitigation</b>	<b>Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Significance after Mitigation</b>
<b>Impact C-HYD-1: Implementation of the CAP, in combination with other foreseeable development in the surrounding area, could have a significant cumulative impact to hydrology and water quality</b>	Less than considerable contribution	None required	--
<b>Land Use and Recreation</b>			
<b>Impact LU-1: Implementation of the CAP could physically divide an established community</b>	Less than significant	None required	--
<b>Impact LU-2: Implementation of the CAP could conflict with applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations</b>	Less than significant	None required	--
<b>Impact LU-3: Implementation of the CAP would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan</b>	No impact	None required	--
<b>Impact LU-4: Implementation of the CAP could temporarily disrupt recreational facilities during construction but would not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would occur or be accelerated</b>	Less than significant	None required	--
<b>Impact LU-5: Implementation of the CAP would include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that could have an adverse physical effect on the environment</b>	Significant	Mitigation to be identified during project-level review, as appropriate	Less than significant
<b>Impact C-LU-1: Implementation of the CAP, in combination with other foreseeable development in the surrounding area, could have a significant cumulative impact on land use and recreation</b>	Less than considerable contribution	None required	--
<b>Noise</b>			

**Resolution No. 2016-002  
Regional Climate Protection Authority  
Santa Rosa, California**

<b>Project Summary and Mitigation Measures</b>			
<b>Impact</b>	<b>Significance before Mitigation</b>	<b>Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Significance after Mitigation</b>
<b>Impact NOI-1a: Implementation of the CAP could generate noise levels in excess of local standards or result in a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels during construction</b>	<b>Less than significant</b>	<b>None required</b>	<b>--</b>
<b>Impact NOI-1b: Implementation of the CAP could generate noise levels in excess of local standards or result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels during operation</b>	<b>Less than significant</b>	<b>None required</b>	<b>--</b>
<b>Impact NOI-2: Implementation of the CAP could expose people to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels</b>	<b>Less than significant</b>	<b>None required</b>	<b>--</b>
<b>Impact NOI-3: New development promoted by the CAP could be located within airport land use plan areas, within 2 miles of a public airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip and expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels</b>	<b>Less than significant</b>	<b>None required</b>	<b>--</b>
<b>Impact C-NOI-1: Implementation of the CAP, in combination with other foreseeable development in the surrounding area, could have a significant cumulative impact from noise</b>	<b>Less than considerable contribution</b>	<b>None required</b>	<b>--</b>
<b>Public Services, Utilities, and Energy</b>			
<b>Impact PSU-1: Implementation of the CAP could reduce service ratios or response times for fire protection or police protection services or require new or physically altered governmental facilities to maintain acceptable service ratios and response times</b>	<b>Less than significant</b>	<b>None required</b>	<b>--</b>

**Resolution No. 2016-002  
Regional Climate Protection Authority  
Santa Rosa, California**

<b>Project Summary and Mitigation Measures</b>			
<b>Impact</b>	<b>Significance before Mitigation</b>	<b>Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Significance after Mitigation</b>
<b>Impact PSU-2: Implementation of the CAP could increase student enrollment at schools or increase level of service required at other public facilities resulting in an adverse physical impact to these facilities</b>	<b>Less than significant</b>	<b>None required</b>	<b>--</b>
<b>Impact PSU-3: Implementation of the CAP could decrease the demand for water supply and thus would reduce the demand for additional water supplies but would increase demand for water facilities infrastructure related to water efficiency, renewable energy, recycled water and greywater use</b>	<b>Less than significant</b>	<b>None required</b>	<b>--</b>
<b>Impact PSU-4: Implementation of the CAP could decrease wastewater generation and thus would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements, but would require the expansion or modification of existing wastewater facilities</b>	<b>Less than significant</b>	<b>None required</b>	<b>--</b>
<b>Impact PSU-5: Implementation of the CAP could require the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities</b>	<b>Less than significant</b>	<b>None required</b>	<b>--</b>
<b>Impact PSU-6: Implementation of the CAP would reduce solid waste generation and would not conflict with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste diversion</b>	<b>Beneficial</b>	<b>None required</b>	<b>--</b>
<b>Impact PSU-7: Implementation of the CAP would not result in land use locations and patterns causing wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy</b>	<b>Beneficial</b>	<b>None required</b>	<b>--</b>
<b>Impact PSU-8: Implementation of the CAP would not result in the construction of new or retrofitted buildings that would have excessive energy requirements for daily operation</b>	<b>Beneficial</b>	<b>None required</b>	<b>--</b>

**Resolution No. 2016-002  
Regional Climate Protection Authority  
Santa Rosa, California**

<b>Project Summary and Mitigation Measures</b>			
<b>Impact</b>	<b>Significance before Mitigation</b>	<b>Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Significance after Mitigation</b>
<b>Impact PSU-9: Implementation of the CAP would not result in increased energy demand and the need for additional energy resources overall</b>	<b>Beneficial</b>	<b>None required</b>	<b>--</b>
<b>Impact C-PSU-1: Implementation of the CAP, in combination with other foreseeable development in the surrounding area, could have a significant cumulative impact on public services, utilities, and energy</b>	<b>Less than considerable contribution, usually beneficial</b>	<b>None required</b>	<b>--</b>
<b>Transportation and Traffic</b>			
<b>Impact TR-1a: Implementation of the CAP could conflict with applicable plans, ordinances, or policies related to the transportation circulation system during construction</b>	<b>Significant</b>	<b>Mitigation Measure TR-1: Traffic control plan implementation during construction</b>	<b>Less than significant</b>
<b>Impact TR-1b: Implementation of the CAP could conflict with applicable plans, ordinances, or policies related to the transportation circulation system during operation</b>	<b>Less than significant</b>	<b>None required</b>	<b>--</b>
<b>Impact TR-2: Implementation of the CAP could conflict with an applicable congestion management program established by the Sonoma County Transportation Authority for designated roads or highways</b>	<b>Less than significant</b>	<b>None required</b>	<b>--</b>
<b>Impact TR-3: Implementation of the CAP could change air traffic patterns resulting in substantial safety risks</b>	<b>Less than significant</b>	<b>None required</b>	<b>--</b>
<b>Impact TR-4a: Implementation of the CAP could substantially increase hazards due to design features or incompatible uses during construction</b>	<b>Significant</b>	<b>Mitigation Measure TR-1</b>	<b>Less than significant</b>
<b>Impact TR-4b: Implementation of the CAP could substantially increase hazards due to design features or incompatible uses during operation</b>	<b>Less than significant</b>	<b>None required</b>	<b>--</b>

**Resolution No. 2016-002  
Regional Climate Protection Authority  
Santa Rosa, California**

<b>Project Summary and Mitigation Measures</b>			
<b>Impact</b>	<b>Significance before Mitigation</b>	<b>Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Significance after Mitigation</b>
<b>Impact TR-5a: Implementation of the CAP could result in inadequate emergency access during construction</b>	<b>Significant</b>	<b>Mitigation Measure TR-1</b>	<b>Less than significant</b>
<b>Impact TR-5b: Implementation of the CAP could result in inadequate emergency access during operation</b>	<b>Less than significant</b>	<b>None required</b>	<b>--</b>
<b>Impact TR-6: Implementation of the CAP could conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs related to public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities or could otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities</b>	<b>Beneficial</b>	<b>None required</b>	<b>--</b>
<b>Impact C-TR-1: Implementation of the CAP, in combination with other foreseeable development in the surrounding area, could have a significant cumulative impact to transportation and traffic</b>	<b>Significant</b>	<b>Mitigation Measure TR-1</b>	<b>Less than considerable contribution</b>

**Resolution No. 2016-002  
Regional Climate Protection Authority  
Santa Rosa, California**

**EXHIBIT "B"  
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

## **CLIMATE ACTION 2020 AND BEYOND: A REGIONAL PROGRAM FOR SONOMA COUNTY COMMUNITIES**

### **Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program**

#### **BACKGROUND**

RCPA was created to coordinate greenhouse gas (GHG) and climate change issues in Sonoma County (County) and consists of ten communities, including the County, the Town of Windsor, and the following cities: Cloverdale, Cotati, Healdsburg, Petaluma, Rohnert Park, Santa Rosa, Sebastopol, and the City of Sonoma. The RCPA will adopt the CAP, certify the EIR, and recommend that the participating jurisdiction adopt the local GHG reduction measures. The participating jurisdictions (acting as Responsible Agencies under CEQA) will need to individually adopt the CAP, consider the EIR, and implement mitigation measures pursuant to their own authority and jurisdiction. The Responsible Agencies for the CAP include:

- City of Cloverdale,
- City of Cotati,
- City of Healdsburg,
- City of Petaluma,
- City of Rohnert Park,
- City of Sebastopol,
- City of Sonoma,
- Town of Windsor, and
- County of Sonoma.

The mitigation measures identified in the EIR may be adopted by the responsible agencies pursuant to CEQA Guideline 15096(g).

Climate Action 2020 is analyzed in the EIR at a program level. The EIR analyzes a series of actions that may result from CAP implementation that are related geographically and that are likely to have similar environmental effects that can be mitigated in similar ways (CEQA Guidelines Section 15168(a)). However, specific and site-specific projects are not identified. The program-level analysis identifies standard and well understood mitigation measures for the environmental impacts of implementing GHG-reduction measures in the sectors of building energy, on-road transportation, off-road transportation and equipment, solid waste management, wastewater treatment, water conveyance, livestock and fertilizer, and agriculture. The EIR is the first tier of environmental documentation. It would be augmented by second-tier environmental documents for specific public or private projects as necessary. Second-tier environmental review would revise the applicable mitigation measures as necessary.

At a programmatic level, mitigation measures were identified in the following areas for subsequent responsible agency projects in furtherance of CAP implementation:

- **Aesthetics;**
- **Air Quality;**
- **Biological Resources;**
- **Cultural Resources;**
- **Hazards and Hazardous Materials;**
- **Transportation and Traffic.**

The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program was prepared pursuant to the requirements of California Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 and incorporates the mitigation measures identified in the Draft EIR. Pursuant to CEQA Guideline 15091(a)(2), RCPA has found that these mitigation measures are not within its own jurisdiction, but that they can be implemented to avoid or lessen significant impacts.

#### **MITIGATION MONITORING PLAN TABLE**

The mitigation measures for each of the significant and potentially significant impacts identified in the CAP EIR and the parties responsible for implementation and monitoring each measure are identified in the following table. Local agency staff will monitor pursuant to each agency's CEQA implementation protocols. Mitigation measures are numbered using a prefix to link them with the impact they address (i.e., "Mitigation Measure AQ-1" refers to the first mitigation measures identified in the Air Quality section of the Draft EIR.).

- **Mitigation Measure:** provides the text of the mitigation measure identified in the Draft EIR.
- **Action:** identifies the key implementing actions of the mitigation measure
- **Implementing Agency/Party:** identifies who will be responsible for directly implementing the mitigation measures
- **Timing:** the timeframe for when the mitigation measure will be implemented

**Resolution No. 2016-002  
Regional Climate Protection Authority  
Santa Rosa, California**

Mitigation Measure	Action	Implementing Agency	Timing
<p><b>Mitigation Measure AES-1: Design guidelines for photovoltaic solar energy panels on rooftops regarding glare and safety.</b></p> <p>To ensure that photovoltaic solar energy panels on rooftops do not result in glare impacts on motorists traveling in the vicinity or on nearby airports/airstrips, the responsible agency shall develop a set of design guidelines for the siting of such facilities. The guidelines shall contain specific provisions for design. At a minimum, the guidelines shall require solar installations to meet the following standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Solar panels shall be required to use non-reflective coatings wherever they have the potential to result in glare on public roadways or facilities.</li> <li>• Exposed frames and components should have a non-reflective surface.</li> <li>• Reflection angles from collector surfaces should be oriented away from neighboring windows and, to the extent possible, away from public areas.</li> </ul>	<p>Incorporate requirements into applicable projects that propose solar roofs in furtherance of the CAP.</p>	<p>Responsible Agency and/or Project Sponsor</p>	<p>Prior to approving or implementing rooftop solar actions in furtherance of the CAP</p>

**Resolution No. 2016-002  
Regional Climate Protection Authority  
Santa Rosa, California**

<p><b>Mitigation Measure AQ-1: Implement basic construction mitigation measures to reduce construction emissions.</b></p> <p>The responsible agency will require construction contractors to implement the basic construction mitigation measures to reduce fugitive dust and equipment exhaust emissions. Alternative measures may be identified by the project sponsor or its contractor, as appropriate, provided that they are as effective as the measures below. Alternative measures shall be submitted to the responsible agency for approval.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All exposed surfaces affected by construction (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) will be watered two times per day, or as needed during the dry season(s) (unless limited by state or local drought response requirements or if there is a rain event).</li> <li>• All excavation, grading, and/or demolition activities will be suspended when average wind speeds exceed 20 miles per hour (mph) for a period of 2 hours or more.</li> <li>• Windbreaks (e.g., fences) will be installed on the windward side(s) of actively disturbed areas of construction. Windbreaks will have at maximum 50 percent air porosity.</li> <li>• Exposed ground areas that are to be reworked more than one month after initial grading will be sown with fast-germinating native grass seed and watered appropriately until vegetation is established. If grass seeding is not feasible, then non-toxic soil stabilizers may be used.</li> <li>• All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks to be paved will be completed as soon as possible. Building pads will be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.</li> <li>• All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads will be limited to 15 mph.</li> <li>• All construction trucks and equipment, including tires, involved in ground disturbance or transit through loose soil areas will be washed off prior to leaving the site. Site accesses to a distance of 25 feet from the paved road shall be treated with a 6- to 12-inch compacted layer of wood chips, mulch, or gravel. Alternatively, a rumble plate may be used in place of chips, mulch, or gravel.</li> <li>• All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off site will be covered.</li> <li>• Sandbags or other erosion control measures will be installed to prevent silt runoff to public roadways from sites with a slope greater than 1 percent.</li> <li>• All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads will be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.</li> <li>• Idling time of diesel powered construction equipment will be limited to 2 minutes.</li> <li>• All construction equipment, diesel trucks, and generators will be equipped with Best</li> <li>• Available Control Technology for emission reductions of PM and NOx.</li> <li>• All contractors will use equipment that meets the California Air Resources Board's most recent certification standard for off-road heavy-duty diesel engines.</li> <li>• A publicly visible sign will be posted with the telephone number and person to contact at the lead agency regarding dust complaints. This person will respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. BAAQMD's or NSCAPCD's phone number (depending on the project's jurisdiction) will also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Incorporate measure into project specifications and construction requirements.</b></p>	<p><b>Responsible Agency and/or Project Sponsor or Project Contractor</b></p>	<p><b>Planning and project design, and prior to a construction project approval in furtherance of the CAP</b></p>
--	--	---	---

**Resolution No. 2016-002  
Regional Climate Protection Authority  
Santa Rosa, California**

<p><b>Mitigation Measure BIO-1a: Project-level biological surveys and avoidance, minimizations, and compensation for impacts on CEQA-defined special-status species, sensitive natural communities, state- and federally protected waters/wetlands, and riparian habitat.</b></p> <p>Lead agencies will require that any new project that could potentially impact a CEQA-defined special status species, sensitive natural community, state- or federally protected water/wetland, or riparian habitat conduct a biological resources survey of the site to determine if any areas would have the potential to contain such resources and, if such resources are found in the areas, whether they would be affected by the project. If such resources are found on the site, measures necessary to avoid, minimize, and/or compensate for identified impacts on these resources will be identified in the project-level CEQA review. The lead agency will adopt the feasible measures necessary to reduce impacts on such resources to a less-than-significant level.</p>	<p>Prior to project design.</p>	<p>Responsible Agency and/or Project Sponsor or Project Contractor</p>	<p>Prior to the issuance of grading and/or building permits for a proposed action in furtherance of the CAP</p>
<p><b>Mitigation Measure BIO-1b: Replacement of removed trees.</b></p> <p>Lead agencies will require that any new project removing trees will replace all trees removed in accordance with the tree preservation policies or ordinances of the jurisdiction in which the improvements are constructed.</p>	<p>Action would be pursuant to local ordinance.</p>	<p>Responsible Agency</p>	<p>Prior to the issuance of grading and/or building permits for a proposed action in furtherance of the CAP</p>

**Resolution No. 2016-002  
Regional Climate Protection Authority  
Santa Rosa, California**

---

<p><b>Mitigation Measure BIO-1c: Preconstruction surveys.</b> Projects will avoid conducting vegetation removal during the migratory bird nesting season (February 1–August 31), if feasible. If construction activities must commence during the migratory bird nesting season, the project sponsor will retain a qualified wildlife biologist to conduct a survey for nests of migratory birds. Surveys for nesting migratory birds will occur within three (3) days prior to the commencement of ground disturbance and vegetation removal.</p> <p>If an active nest is discovered, a no-disturbance buffer zone around the nest tree or shrub (or, for ground-nesting species, the nest itself) will be established. The no-disturbance zone will be marked with flagging or fencing that is easily identified by the construction crew and will not affect the nesting bird or attract predators to the nest location. In general, the minimum buffer zone widths will be as follows: 50 feet (radius) for non-raptor ground-nesting species, 50 feet (radius) for non-raptor shrub- and tree-nesting species, and 300 feet (radius) for raptor species. Buffer widths may be modified based on discussion with the CDFW. Buffers will remain in place as long as the nest is active or young remain in the area and are dependent on the nest. If a burrowing owl nest is identified during preconstruction surveys, no-activity buffers will adhere to the recommendations in the 2012 Department of Fish and Game <i>Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation</i>.</p>	<p><b>Incorporate measure into pre-construction requirements.</b></p>	<p><b>Responsible Agency/Project Sponsor</b></p>	<p><b>Prior to the issuance of grading and/or building permits for a proposed action in furtherance of the CAP</b></p>
--	---	--	--

---

**Resolution No. 2016-002  
Regional Climate Protection Authority  
Santa Rosa, California**

<p><b>Mitigation Measure CUL-1a: Review of alternatives for solar roofs on historic buildings.</b> If solar roofs are proposed on historic buildings, the lead land use agency will require the following.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A qualified architectural historian will determine if the building is eligible for the CRHR or the NRHP. If the building is eligible for one or both of the registers, the qualified architectural historian will identify if the proposed solar roof will substantially affect the eligibility of the building as a historic resource. If a substantial effect is identified, the qualified historian will identify feasible alterations to the proposed solar roof installation that would avoid or minimize the substantial effects. If no feasible alterations can be identified, the qualified architectural historian will document measures considered and why they are not feasible.</li> <li>• The lead agency will review the architectural historian’s report for completeness only.</li> <li>• The project sponsor will identify which of the feasible design alternatives that avoid the substantial effect they prefer if one or more are identified by the qualified architectural historian. If the feasible alternatives will only reduce, but not avoid a substantial effect, the project proponent will identify which of the minimization alternatives it prefers.</li> <li>• The lead agency will only issue a permit for the preferred feasible alternative identified by the project sponsor per the above requirements.</li> <li>• If no feasible alternatives are available that reduce or avoid the substantial effect, then the lead agency will issue the permit for the proposed solar roof.</li> </ul>	<p>Incorporate measure into project review.</p>	<p>Responsible Agency/ Project Sponsor</p>	<p>Prior to the issuance of permits for solar rooftop installations in furtherance of the CAP</p>
<p><b>Mitigation Measure CUL-1b: Studies documenting the presence/absence of historical resources.</b> In areas of documented or inferred historic resource presence, the lead agency staff will require applicants for development permits to provide studies to document the presence/ absence of historical resources. On properties where historic structures or resources are identified, such studies will provide a detailed mitigation plan, including a monitoring program and recovery and/or in situ preservation plan, based on the recommendations of a qualified historical preservation expert.</p>	<p>Incorporate measure into project review. Where historic structures or resources are identified, a qualified historical preservation expert will prepare a mitigation plan (CUL-1b).</p>	<p>Responsible Agency or Project Sponsor, in conjunction with Qualified Historical Preservation Expert</p>	<p>Prior to the issuance of grading and/or building permits for a proposed action in furtherance of the CAP</p>

**Resolution No. 2016-002  
Regional Climate Protection Authority  
Santa Rosa, California**

<p><b>Mitigation Measure CUL-1c: Historical resources investigations.</b></p> <p>Prior to activities that would physically affect buildings or structures 45 years old or older or affect their historic setting, the project applicant will retain a cultural resource professional who meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards for Architectural History to determine if the project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. The investigation will include, as determined appropriate by the cultural resource professional and the lead agency, the appropriate archival research, including, if necessary, a records search of the Archaeological Information Center of the CHRIS and a pedestrian survey of the proposed improvements area to determine if any significant historic-period resources would be adversely affected by the proposed CAP activities. The results of the investigation will be documented in a technical report or memorandum that identifies and evaluates any historical resources within the improvements area and includes recommendations and methods for eliminating or reducing impacts on historical resources. The technical report or memorandum will be submitted to the lead agency for approval. As determined necessary by the lead agency, environmental documentation (e.g., CEQA documentation) prepared for future development within the project site will reference or incorporate the findings and recommendations of the technical report or memorandum. The project applicant will be responsible for implementing methods for eliminating or reducing impacts on historical resources identified in the technical report or memorandum. Additional methods could include, but not be limited to, written and photographic recordation of the resource in accordance with the level of Historic American Building Survey documentation that is appropriate to the significance (local, state, national) of the resource.</p>	<p><b>Incorporate requirement into subsequent project requirements.</b></p> <p>A cultural resource specialist will determine if proposed action would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.</p>	<p><b>Responsible Agency and/or Project Sponsor/ Qualified Cultural Resources Specialist</b></p>	<p><b>Prior to the issuance of grading and/or building permits for a proposed action in furtherance of the CAP</b></p>
---	--	--	--

**Resolution No. 2016-002  
Regional Climate Protection Authority  
Santa Rosa, California**

<p><b>Mitigation Measure CUL-2a: Cultural resource investigations and protection and recovery of significant resources.</b> The lead agency will conduct a cultural resource investigation that includes a background records search (including a search of records from Sonoma State and historical societies, contact with Native American representatives identified by the NAHC, and site pedestrian surveys) for the areas of ground disturbance from each roadway improvement. If significant known or suspected sites are discovered within the project footprint and would be disturbed by the project, then a cultural resource treatment plan will be prepared, defining project monitoring and resource recovery and curation requirements concerning any encountered cultural resources.</p>	<p><b>Incorporate measure into subsequent project review and subsequent project requirements.</b></p>	<p><b>Responsible Agency and/or Project Sponsor</b></p>	<p><b>Prior to the issuance of grading and/or building permits for a proposed action in furtherance of the CAP</b></p>
<p><b>Mitigation Measure CUL-2b: Work stoppage if cultural resources are encountered during ground-disturbing activities.</b> In the event that cultural resources are encountered during ground-disturbing activities, all work within proximity of the find will temporarily halt so that a qualified archaeologist, as determined by the responsible agency, can examine the find and document its location and nature (e.g., with drawings, photographs, written descriptions). The archaeologist will then direct that the work proceed if the find is deemed to be insignificant, continue elsewhere, or cease until adequate mitigation measures are adopted. If the find is determined to be potentially significant, the archaeologist, in consultation with the appropriate jurisdiction, will develop a treatment plan, which could include site avoidance, capping, or data recovery. If data recovery is determined to be appropriate, excavation will target recovery of an appropriate amount of information from archaeological deposits to determine the potential of the resource to address specific research questions. If it occurs, data recovery will emphasize the understanding of the archaeological deposit's structure, including features and stratification, horizontal and vertical extent, and content, including the nature and quantity of artifacts.</p>	<p><b>Incorporate requirement into subsequent project requirements.</b></p>	<p><b>Project Sponsor and/or Responsible Agency, Project Contractor/ Qualified Archeologist</b></p>	<p><b>When cultural resources are encountered during ground-disturbing activities for a proposed action in furtherance of the CAP</b></p>

**Resolution No. 2016-002  
Regional Climate Protection Authority  
Santa Rosa, California**

<p><b>Mitigation Measure CUL-2c: Work stoppage if human remains are encountered during ground-disturbing activities.</b> If human remains are discovered (in either an archaeological or construction context), all work within proximity of the remains will stop so that the archaeological monitor can examine the remains. The County Coroner will be notified to make a determination as to whether the remains are of Native American origin. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) immediately. The NAHC will notify those persons it believes are most likely descended from the deceased Native American. Once the NAHC identifies the most likely descendants, the descendants will make recommendations regarding proper burial, which will be implemented in accordance with Section 15064.5(e) of the State CEQA Guidelines.</p>	<p><b>Incorporate requirement into subsequent project requirements.</b></p>	<p><b>Project Sponsor/ Project Contractor/ Archeological Monitor</b></p>	<p><b>In the event human remains are encountered during ground-disturbing activities for a proposed action in furtherance of the CAP</b></p>
<p><b>Mitigation Measure CUL-3: Avoidance of encountered paleontological resources until resources have been evaluated and recorded, and treatment has been determined.</b> If paleontological resources are encountered during future grading or excavation activities associated with CAP-related activities, work will avoid altering the resource and its stratigraphic context until a qualified paleontologist has evaluated, recorded, and determined appropriate treatment of the resource, in consultation with the lead agency. Project personnel will not collect cultural resources. Appropriate treatment may include collection and processing of “standard” samples by a qualified paleontologist to recover micro vertebrate fossils; preparation of significant fossils to a reasonable point of identification; and depositing significant fossils in a museum repository for permanent curation and storage, together with an itemized inventory of the specimens.</p>	<p><b>Incorporate requirement into subsequent project requirements.</b></p>	<p><b>Project Sponsor/ Project Contractor/ Qualified Paleontologist</b></p>	<p><b>In the event a paleontological resource is identified during the construction of a proposed action in furtherance of the CAP</b></p>

**Resolution No. 2016-002  
Regional Climate Protection Authority  
Santa Rosa, California**

---

<p><b>Mitigation Measure HAZ-1: Spill prevention, control, and countermeasure program (SPCCP) for construction activities.</b> Lead agencies will require project sponsors to develop and implement an SPCCP to minimize the potential for and effects from spills of hazardous, toxic, or petroleum substances during construction activities. The SPCCP will be completed before any construction activities begin, and the measures will comply with state and federal water quality regulations. The project sponsor will include the SPCCP with construction documents to be implemented by the construction contractor.</p>	<p><b>Incorporate requirement into subsequent project requirements.</b></p>	<p><b>Responsible Agency/Project Sponsor/ Project Contractor</b></p>	<p><b>Prior to the issuance of grading and/or building permits for a proposed action in furtherance of the CAP</b></p>
---	---	--	--

---

**Resolution No. 2016-002  
Regional Climate Protection Authority  
Santa Rosa, California**

**Mitigation Measure TR-1: Traffic control plan implementation during construction activities.**  
The lead agencies will require project sponsors and construction contractors to coordinate with the local jurisdiction, transit providers, and emergency service providers to develop a traffic control plan to minimize the effects of construction traffic on transit service, roadway operations, emergency responses, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and public safety in the surrounding area. (A traffic control plan may not be required for minor construction activities.) The project sponsor will be responsible for monitoring to ensure that the plan is effectively implemented by the construction contractor(s). Measures that may be employed throughout the course of the construction period include, but are not limited, to the following.

- Provide advance notice of lane and sidewalk closures, durations, and alternative routes to emergency service providers, motorists, bicyclists, and pedestrians.
- Provide clearly marked pedestrian detours if any sidewalk or pedestrian walkway closures are necessary.
- Provide clearly marked bicycle detours if heavily used bicycle routes must be closed, or if bicyclist safety may otherwise be comprised.
- Provide crossing-guards and/or flag persons as needed to avoid traffic conflicts and ensure pedestrian and bicyclist safety.
- Locate all stationary equipment as far as possible from areas used heavily by vehicles, bicyclists, and pedestrians.
- Use nonskid traffic plates over open trenches to minimize hazards.
- Implement traffic control measures to minimize vehicle travel delays through construction zones.
- Maintain acceptable response times and performance objectives for emergency response services.
- Avoid routing construction traffic through residential areas to the extent feasible. Prohibit mobilization and demobilization of heavy construction equipment during AM and PM peak traffic hours.
- Maintain access for driveways and private roads outside the immediate construction zone by using steel plates or temporary backfill, as necessary.
- Provide designated areas for construction worker parking wherever feasible to minimize use of parking on streets or in city center areas.

Incorporate requirement into subsequent project requirements.

Project Sponsor/  
Project Contractor

Prior to the issuance of grading and/or building permits for a proposed action in furtherance of the CAP

**Resolution No. 2016-002  
Regional Climate Protection Authority  
Santa Rosa, California**

## Staff Report

**To: SCTA Board of Directors**  
**From: Suzanne Smith**  
**Item: 5.2 – Regional Agency Reports**  
**Date: July 11, 2016**

---

### **Issue:**

Recent updates from:

- Sonoma Clean Power
- Sonoma/Marin Area Rail Transit (SMART)
- Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District (GGBHTD)
- Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)
- Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG)
- Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD)
- Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC)
- California Councils of Governments (CALCOG)
- Self Help Counties Coalition

### **Background:**

The following links provide information regarding various regional agencies and issues:

- MTC Executive Director's Report
  - <http://www.mtc.ca.gov/whats-happening/news/executive-directors-report>
- SMART
  - [http://www2.sonomamarintrain.org/userfiles/GM\\_Report\\_-\\_June\\_2016\\_Final.pdf](http://www2.sonomamarintrain.org/userfiles/GM_Report_-_June_2016_Final.pdf)

### **Staff Recommendation:**

This is an informational item only.

## Technical Advisory Committee

### MEETING AGENDA

**June 23, 2016 – 1:30 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. Approval of Minutes, May 26, 2016\*
4. Measure M **DISCUSSION / ACTION**
  - 4.1. Measure M Invoicing Status\*
  - 4.2. Measure M 2017 Strategic Plan Proposed Policy Amendment\*
  - 4.3. Measure M Fiscal Year End Reminder Letter\*
  - 4.4. Measure M Project Presentation Schedule to Citizens Advisory Committee\*
5. Regional Information Update - **DISCUSSION**
6. Rail Update **DISCUSSION**
7. Comprehensive Transportation Plan Update
8. Draft SCTA Board Meeting Agenda for July 11, 2016 **DISCUSSION**
9. Other Business / Comments / Announcements **DISCUSSION**
10. Adjourn **ACTION**

\*Materials attached. \*\*Materials handed out at Meeting.

---

The next **SCTA** meeting will be held **July 11, 2016**  
The next **TAC** meeting will be held **July 28, 2016**

Copies of the full Agenda Packet are available at [www.sctainfo.org](http://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 **Title of 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.



## **Citizens Advisory Committee MEETING AGENDA**

***June 27, 2016 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 May 23, 2016\* - ACTION
4. Measure M – DISCUSSION/ACTION
  - a. Measure M project presentation – Santa Rosa CityBus
  - b. Measure M Financial Reports\*
  - c. Measure M proposed presentation schedule\*
  - d. Measure M proposed Strategic Plan Programming and Policy Amendment
5. Comprehensive Transportation Plan update - Open House 5-7 at 490 Mendocino Ave, SR
6. Highway Updates – DISCUSSION
7. Announcements
8. Adjourn

\*Materials attached.

---

The next **SCTA** meeting will be held **July 11, 2016**

The next **CAC** meeting will be held **July 25, 2016**

Copies of the full Agenda Packet are available at [www.sctainfo.org](http://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.

## Planning Advisory Committee

### MEETING AGENDA

*June 16, 2016 – 9:30 a.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
    - 3.1. Approval of the agenda – changes, additional discussion items- ACTION
    - 3.2. Review Meeting Notes from April 21, 2016\* – ACTION
  4. Plan Bay Area\* - update and information from MTC representative
  5. SCTA Comprehensive Transportation Plan update\*
  6. Shift Sonoma County – Mode Shift and Fuel Shift updates\*
  7. Round table members discussion
  8. Other Business /Next agenda
  9. Adjourn
- \*Attachment
- 

The next **SCTA** meeting will be held **July 11, 2016**

The next **PAC** meeting will be held **August 18, 2016**

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/RCPA 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 Transit-Technical 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.

TO REDUCE GHG EMISSIONS: Please consider carpooling or taking transit to this meeting. For more information check [www.511.org](http://www.511.org), [www.srcity.org/citybus](http://www.srcity.org/citybus), [www.sctransit.com](http://www.sctransit.com) or <https://carmacarpool.com/sfbay>

## Transit – Technical Advisory Committee

### MEETING AGENDA

*June 8, 2016 – 10:00 a.m.*

Sonoma County Transportation Authority  
SCTA Large Conference Room  
490 Mendocino Avenue, Suite 206  
Santa Rosa, California 95401

#### ITEM

1. Introductions
2. Approval of Meeting Notes: May 11, 2016 – **DISCUSSION/ACTION\***
3. Transit Operator Updates
4. Comprehensive Transportation Plan update - Discussion\*
5. STA Coordinated Claim, update per May 25, 2016 MTC Fund Estimate – Information\*
6. Lifeline Cycle 4, STA Funding Update - Discussion\*
7. Other Business / Comments / Announcements
8. Adjourn - **ACTION**

\*Materials attached

\*\*Materials to be handed out

---

The next **SCTA/RCPA** meeting will be held July 11, 2016

The next **T-TAC** meeting will be held July 13, 2016

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/RCPA 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 Transit-Technical 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.

TO REDUCE GHG EMISSIONS: Please consider carpooling or taking transit to this meeting. For more information check [www.511.org](http://www.511.org), [www.srcity.org/citybus](http://www.srcity.org/citybus), [www.sctransit.com](http://www.sctransit.com) or <https://carmacarpool.com/sfbay>