Planning Advisory Committee

MEETING AGENDA

December 15, 2016 – 9:00 a.m. NEW TIME

Refreshments will be served

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 September 15, 2016* – ACTION
4. Local updates and information
   4.1. Housing initiatives, including rent control – DISCUSSION
   4.2. Medical cannabis policy update – County information available here on the website:
        http://sonomacounty.ca.gov/CAO/Cannabis/Proposed-Cannabis-Ordinance/- and from the City of
        Santa Rosa Ssrcity.org/cannabis
5. SCTA updates and information
   5.1. SHIFT Policy Toolkit – model TDM ordinances and EV readiness ordinance – DISCUSSION
   5.2. SCTA Travel Model update*– DISCUSSION
6. Regional Government updates and information
        Scenario.html - new items include final growth projections and new ACTION PLAN - INFORMATION
   6.2. OBAG2 – http://mtc.ca.gov/our-work/fund-invest/federal-funding/obag-2 – also SCTA application
        and Surplus Land Sample Resolution*
7. State policy update
   7.1. SB 743– Intergovernmental Review Program, Interim Guidance, request to create ad hoc
        subcommittee/working group DISCUSSION / ACTION*
9. Round table members discussion
10. Items of interest*

11. Other Business / Next agenda

12. Adjourn

*Attachment

The next SCTA meeting will be held February 6, 2017
The next PAC meeting will be held January 19, 2017

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, www.srcity.org/citybus, www.sctransit.com or https://carmacarpool.com/sfbay
PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING NOTES

Meeting Notes of October 20, 2016

ITEM

1. Introductions
   Meeting called to order at 9:37 a.m. by Janet Spilman.

   Committee Members: Jennifer Barrett, Sonoma County PRMD; Scott Duiven, City of Petaluma; Gary Helfrich, Sonoma County PRMD; Olivia Ius, SMART.

   Guests: David Guhin, City of Santa Rosa; Clare Hartman, City of Santa Rosa; Karen Milman, Sonoma County Department of Health Services.

   Staff: Brant Arthur, Chris Barney, Lauren Casey, Nina Donofrio, Seana Gause, Janet Spilman, Dana Turréy.

2. Public Comment
   N/A

3. Administrative
   1. Approval of the agenda – changes, additional discussion items - ACTION
      Approved as submitted.

   2. Review Meeting Notes from September 15, 2016* – ACTION
      Approved as submitted.

4. Policies related to medical cannabis – County information available here on the website: http://sonomacounty.ca.gov/CAO/Cannabis
   s/Proposed-Cannabis-Ordinance/ - and from the City of Santa Rosa Srcity.org/cannabis materials to be handed out at meeting – INFORMATION

   Clare Hartman of the City of Santa Rosa presented materials on the interim ordinance and policies regarding medical cannabis for the City of Santa Rosa.

   David Guhin, Planning Director of the City of Santa Rosa, explained that the ordinance will ultimately address all phases of cultivating, distributing and selling medical cannabis. Staff is working on making a draft policy available by Christmas, for approval early in 2017.

   Ms. Hartman referred to the City website for information on activities related to this issue, including policies and FAQs. She pointed out features of the current policies, which were adopted in April.

   Ms. Hartman summarized allowed land uses and permit requirements by zoning district: Testing, manufacturer, distributor and transporter.

   Ms. Hartman next summarized various types of applications that have been submitted.

   Jennifer Barrett of the Sonoma County PRMD reported on its medical cannabis cultivation ordinance, referring to the County website.
Discussion followed regarding the possibility of the County Department of Health Services designing policy for the unincorporated area. Ms. Barrett explained the process within the County, citing safety concerns, environmental concerns, and the significant economic impact of medical cannabis to the County.

Additional discussion involved outdoor cultivation and energy used, the need for a health permit, enforcement, and the fact that this is currently a civil matter.

Discussion next took place regarding abatement issues. The difficulty of enforcement, and the significant economic impact and complexity of commercializing medical cannabis was discussed.

Ms. Barrett invited comments and suggestions. The Committee consensus was to revisit this issue in the future.

The following agenda item was addressed out of order:

Lauren Casey reported that this was adopted by the Board at its July meeting and that the associated EIR document was certified.

Recent activity involves litigation initiated by California River Watch and ongoing legal issues involving the EIR. Ms. Casey summarized activity and reported that a court hearing is scheduled for February. In the meantime, staff is moving forward.

Brant Arthur reported on activities involving Shift Sonoma County, including charging station planning and infrastructure.

5. Regional Government
5.1 One Bay Area Grant land use requirements* - ACTION
Ms. Spilman referred to potential benefits of OBAG 2, funding sources, and project selection methodology. She cited the need to address displacement in the scoring criteria and other requirements, including the Surplus Land Act, noting that Petaluma and Santa Rosa are charter cities (and therefore exempt). The County and most of the other cities will be required to pass a resolution. She noted that MTC will provide a sample resolution. Gary Helfrich of Sonoma County PRMD confirmed that the County does not meet the Surplus Land Act requirements.

Discussion followed regarding what constitutes a charter city and what benefits there are to being a charter city.

Ms. Spilman next addressed project selection methodology, noting the need for policy recommendations from the PAC and the challenge this presents for those areas that are not urbanized. The PAC is being asked to recommend policies to be included in the scoring criteria as effective anti-displacement measures, or seriously addressing the issue. PAC recommendations will be included in the OBAG2 application materials presented to the SCTA in November.

The PAC asked about MTC’s requirements and discussed their own local policies.
Mr. Duiven suggested providing a list of “bullet points” referring to those provided by the City of Petaluma, highlighting inclusionary policies and ordinances (e.g., Condominium Conversion; Mobile Home Conversions); Inclusionary Policy: Housing Element Policy).

As part of a general anti-displacement policy, affordable housing policies and rent control were cited as examples to be added to the policy list.

It was suggested that a menu of policies be provided, to be assigned a certain number of points (e.g., three checks may receive one point; six items may receive two points) based on the number of policies in place. This method would allow jurisdictions to name as many policies as possible and receive a point for each three policies.

Motion by Scott Duiven, seconded by Ms. Kranz, that each jurisdiction identify local, relevant housing policies that address displacement, including those provided by the City of Petaluma and those suggested by the City of Santa Rosa, in order to include the policies that are relevant to as many jurisdictions as possible. Motion passed unanimously.

5.2 Plan Bay Area – Draft Preferred Scenario update* - INFORMATION

Chris Barney referred to comments that have been collected, noting that MTC and ABAG have been working with staff regarding concerns involving inconsistencies in data and issues with UrbanSim.

Staff is examining the data that will be published in the Plan and anticipates that resolution of UrbanSim results may likely resolve some of the inconsistencies noted in the data.

Further discussion addressed issues with modeling in relation to actual feasibility of planning and development of the forecast.

Mr. Barney noted that he would be providing updates to the Committee.


7. Round table members discussion

SMART: Olivia Ius reported that the start date for service has been pushed back to late spring due to defective engines and the need to replace these. These will be changed out. In the meantime, testing will continue.

8. Other Business /Next agenda

Ms. Spilman suggested changing the meeting time to 9:00 a.m. This will be included in the next agenda.

Ms. Spilman announced Nina Donofrio’s retirement.

9. Adjourn

11:10 a.m.
Staff Report

To: Planning Advisory Committee
From: Lauren Casey, Director of Climate Programs
Dana Turréy, Transportation Planner
Item: Shift Sonoma County – Policy Toolkit Update
Date: December 15, 2016

Issue:
What is the proposed Shift Sonoma County Policy Toolkit and how can it be utilized by local jurisdictions?

Background:
In 2014, the SCTA and RCPA applied for and were awarded a Strategic Growth Council Planning Grant to develop Shift Sonoma County – a strategic action plan to promote a shift in both the mode and fuel used for personal transportation in Sonoma County. Through this project the agencies are working together with consultants and stakeholders to better define the role of local government in accelerating the transition to low carbon transportation.

The emphasis of the planning project is on developing tools and recommendations that can inform future grant applications, and investments in programs, policies, government operations, and public and private investment in infrastructure. Specific policy tools being developed include model ordinances which local jurisdictions may customize and adopt to support low carbon transportation. A set of policies that support reduced single occupancy vehicle trips and increased use of electric vehicles were identified through an assessment of existing conditions, barriers, needs, and opportunities and the desired outcomes of the project.

The policy toolkit will include a model local electric vehicle (EV) readiness resolution and model transportation demand management ordinances for employers and for developers. The SCTA/RCPA and their consultants are currently developing the model ordinances and will seek input from the Planning Advisory Committee once the draft products are available.

Policy Toolkit:

Local EV Readiness Policy Toolkit

The model EV Ready Community resolution will outline local government commitments to a countywide EV adoption target, and provide a menu of policy options that local governments can consider to take local actions in support of those targets. A toolkit of model ordinances and examples from other communities will be provided to support implementation of the resolution with actions that go beyond what is required by State building code. The draft outline for this toolkit so far includes municipal fleet commitments, streamlined permitting, workplace charging policies, and pre-wiring requirements.
Model Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Ordinance for Employers

The model TDM ordinance for employers will provide a set of policies placing requirements on employers. Each jurisdiction may define the threshold for application of the ordinance, which TDM measures they would like to require or include as optional, and methods for monitoring employer compliance. The ordinance will include policy options that go beyond what is required by the Bay Area Commuter Benefits Program by including additional requirements and requirements for employers with fewer than 50 employees. The model ordinance will include language for incentives, such as reduced parking requirements or reduction in fees, and options for non-trip reduction alternatives in the form of purchase of equivalent GHG offsets. The purpose of the ordinance is to help reduce congestion and emissions, improve mobility and access, and increase safety of walking, bicycling and transit.

Model TDM Ordinance for Developers

The model TDM ordinance for developers will target new and major improvements to large residential, commercial, and mixed use developments. Similar to the model TDM ordinance for employers, each jurisdiction may define the threshold for application of the ordinance, the specific required TDM measures, and methods for monitoring developer compliance. Policy language for shared parking and supportive parking for hybrid/EV cars, carpools, vanpools, and car share will be included. This ordinance intends to reduce single-occupant vehicle trips and, where appropriate, minimize the amount of parking demand associated with projects.

Policy Impacts:

Shift Sonoma County is providing tools for the SCTA, RCPA, and partners to implement measures included in the Comprehensive Transportation Plan and Climate Action 2020.

Staff Recommendation:

Information only.
Issue:
The Sonoma County Travel Model (SCTM) was last updated and revalidated in 2012 in preparation for the 2016 Comprehensive Transportation Plan Update. SCTA staff has begun the process of updating the Sonoma County Travel Model in order to ensure that model output accurately represents current conditions and is able to reasonably predict future travel conditions.

Background:
The Sonoma County Travel Model is used to evaluate the performance of the Comprehensive Transportation Plan, estimate travel demand impacts of new development and transportation improvements, and forecast the travel demand impacts of population and employment growth. The model is routinely used to analyze transportation impacts of development projects, road improvements, and local planning documents. This analysis is often performed to support project development work, to support local planning, or as part of the environmental review process. State requirements, such as pending SB 743 requirements, may require that the model be used to analyze additional transportation impacts with a focus on broader regional impacts to the transportation system and vehicle miles traveled.

The accuracy and quality of model output is dependent on the quality of input data. The accuracy and age of model inputs can impact the quality of model output. SCTM was last updated and revalidated in 2012 using a base year of 2010. More recent data, including local development data, census estimates, traffic counts, transit ridership counts, and travel surveys, are available which represent how growth and travel have changed in the county since 2010. Updating model inputs will improve the reasonableness and usefulness of the model and its output.

This update will focus on updating existing land use conditions from 2010 to 2015 and updating 2040 general plan and forecast scenarios so that they incorporate the most recent General Plan, Regional Transportation Plan, and other local plan updates. The model update will include a revision of model networks (road, highway, transit, and non-motorized), update of traffic analysis zone (TAZ) boundaries, implement possible model improvements, and revalidate the model using recent traffic counts, transit ridership information, and transportation survey data. A more detailed description of the SCTM is included in Attachment A and an overview of model update components is shown in Figure 1.
**Land Use Update:**

Local and regional planning approaches and priorities have changed since the last model update. A number of general plans have been updated and area specific planning documents have been developed which should be reflected in the travel model. MTC and ABAG have changed how future growth is forecasted at the regional level. Housing and job growth that has occurred over the past 5 years could impact local, countywide, and regional travel patterns and this growth should be included in the travel model.
Staff will check in with jurisdictional representatives to discuss the model update, gather new data, and to receive guidance regarding the construction of new baseline and forecast modeling scenarios (see attachment for SCTM Land Use Update meeting outline). Once local input has been gathered, staff will develop an updated 2015 existing conditions scenario, and new 2040 general plan build-out and forecast scenarios. Once draft land use scenarios have been developed, they will be provided to each jurisdiction for review, and will be reviewed by the PAC, TAC, and SCTA board before being incorporated into the Sonoma County Travel Model.

2015 Existing Conditions – Parcel Database:

Staff developed a countywide parcel land use database as part of the 2010 existing land use update. Housing and job growth that has occurred from 2010 – 2015 will be included in the travel model. If available, staff will use existing land use data developed and maintained by local jurisdictions to update the existing land use database. 2015 County Assessor’s parcel data will be used as a starting point for updating the parcel database for jurisdictions which do not maintain their own parcel level land use data. Assessor’s parcel data will be checked for errors and omissions and will be coded to match Sonoma County Travel Model land use codes. Parcel errors are corrected using aerial photography, building footprint, and local general plan GIS layers. Supplemental datasets are used to check the parcel level land use data for reasonableness. The SCTA parcel level land use database summarizes the number of housing units, square feet of commercial or industrial uses, hotel rooms, students, hospital rooms, and recreational acres for each parcel.

Recent review of regional model output developed for Plan Bay Area has suggested that existing land use estimates and local planning assumptions that have been included in the regional travel model (MTC’s Travel Model One) may contain a considerable number of errors and may be a poor representation of existing conditions and planning constraints in Sonoma County. Staff has worked with MTC/ABAG staff to correct some of these errors and have agreed to work on improving regional model inputs for Sonoma County in the future. Staff will compare MTC/ABAG parcel data with the updated SCTM parcel data for consistency, and work with regional staff to ensure that SCTM and regional model land use and zoning assumptions are aligned.

- Review updated parcel level data (2015 County Assessor’s data or jurisdiction data if available) and incorporate changes into parcel level existing land use database.
- Incorporate recent permit/project completion data from jurisdictions.
- Validate parcel level data estimates using updated US Census (American Community Survey, LEHD, etc.), CA DOF, and other data sources available at the Census Block/Block Group/Tract, or Jurisdiction level.
- Check 2010/2015 ABAG parcel level estimates against updated SCTM parcel level data
- Translate into SCTM LU Categories
- Flag missing/erroneous data
- Correct errors using other data sources, imagery
- Summarize and present existing conditions to jurisdictions
- Meet with local planning staff to review and make changes as necessary
- Forward updated base year data to MTC/ABAG for inclusion in the regional travel model

Figure 2: SCTM Existing Conditions - Parcel Level Database Update Process
2040 Land Use:

Future land use assumptions for the travel model are out of date. A number of general plan and area specific plans have been updated or adopted since the last land use update in 2012. The designation of priority development areas and continued focus on development in these areas is expected to have some impact on future development in the county.

Future land use forecasts will build upon existing conditions land use estimates and will use local forecasts, zoning, build-out potential, and other relevant data to adjust land use estimates up to 2040. SCTA forecast scenarios are required to be consistent with the most recent version of MTC/ABAG’s forecast (Sustainable Communities Strategy or SCS) for comprehensive transportation planning analysis (within +/- 1%), and a final adjustment will be made to ensure that SCTA’s land use assumptions are consistent with the regional forecast.

2040 CTP Forecast:

County level transportation models maintained and used by San Francisco Bay Area transportation planning agencies and congestion management agencies such as SCTA are required to be consistent with the regional travel demand model (MTC’s Travel Model One) and the regional land use forecast used by the regional model. MTC modeling staff provide forecast data at the census tract, jurisdiction, and county level to be incorporated into local models.

Regional housing and employment forecasts are generally below or near general plan build-out estimates but regional forecasts appear to be moving further away from local general plan growth assumptions. SCTA staff will develop the final 2040 land use scenario by adjusting general plan build-out estimates based on jurisdiction or county planning area control totals from the regional forecast. This approach ensures that the final 2040 scenario follows local planning policy as closely as possible and allocates future housing and employment growth consistent with local planning documents and zoning. SCTA staff will work with the SCTA Planning Advisory Committee and local planning staff to ensure that growth forecasts are reasonable and will continue to review and revise future growth allocations as local policy and expectations on future development change.

This simple formula approximates the formula that will be used to assign 2040 land use estimates:

$$2040 \text{ Land use} = \text{General Plan Build-out} \times \left( \frac{MTC \text{ estimate}}{\text{General Plan Build-out estimate}} \right)$$

General Plan Build-out Scenario:

Many jurisdictions have expressed an interest in including a general plan build-out scenario as a model future year alternative. MTC/ABAG forecasts, which are used to develop SCTM future year land use forecasts, do consider local general plans, land use policies, and zoning in their growth estimates, but also consider market and regional policies in their forecasts that may not be completely consistent with local planning assumptions and planning documents. The planning horizon for many local planning documents is also often much shorter than the 2040 planning horizon considered by the SCTM.

Local agencies often wish to test local project impacts under general plan build-conditions. The inclusion of a general plan build-out scenario in the SCTM will allow build-out analysis to be done without requiring custom land use scenarios to be developed for this sort of work.
Some jurisdictions calculate general plan build-out or development potential at the TAZ or parcel level. This data can be incorporated directly into the SCTM land use database and will be used to build the countywide build-out scenario.

**Countywide Build-out Model:**

Build-out data is not available at the TAZ or parcel level for all jurisdictions. Staff developed a simple GIS model to estimate build-out at the parcel level for areas for which no parcel or TAZ level build-out information is available. A basic outline of the general plan build-out estimation model is provided below:

1. Update GIS layer to incorporate local zoning code including the following information:
   - Min/max units per acre.
   - Maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) for commercial, industrial, and institutional land
   - Generalized land use designation

2. Transfer zoning information to existing land use parcel layer.

3. Calculate parcel level maximum build-out using zoning designation:
   - Housing: Parcel acres * maximum housing units per acre
   - Non housing: Parcel square feet * maximum FAR

4. Calculate remaining capacity/development potential by subtracting existing uses from calculated maximum build-out. Summarize development potential/capacity at the Traffic Analysis Zone (TAZ) level.

   \[ \text{Development potential} = \text{Calculated Maximum build-out} - \text{Existing Land Use} \]

5. Gather most current published General Plan build out by use from General Plans or GP EIRs to use as city-wide control total for build-out calculations.

   \[ \text{Jurisdictional Build-out Control Total (by land use type)} = \text{published number by land use type}. \]

6. Update general plan build-out control total to include build-out published in area specific plans, specific area plans, or other localized planning documents which provide more detailed information on desired or permitted development for subsections of the city/jurisdiction. These subarea plans are generally detailed enough that ASP/SAP control totals can be assigned to individual or a few TAZs.

7. Assign ASP/SAP build-out growth to individual TAZs and subtract ASP/SAP TAZ level control totals from the citywide/jurisdictional control total. Use calculated development potential for TAZs to assign build-out for specific plan areas which cover multiple TAZs.

   Example: A SAP indicates that 100 single family homes may be built in the plan area. The plan area spans 2 traffic analysis zones (zones 3 & 4). Using zoning code and parcel area information, zone 3 has capacity for 150 new single family homes, and zone 4 has capacity for 50 new single family homes. Zone 3 contains 75% of calculated capacity and zone 4 contains 25% of calculated capacity, so 75 single family
homes are assigned to zone 3 and 25 single family homes are assigned to zone 4 in the build out scenario using this methodology.

General Plan Build-out Estimation Model Input Data and Data Sources:

1. Countywide Planned Land Use Layer – This GIS polygon layer summarizes zoning policy at the county level.
2. Countywide Parcel Base – Zoning restrictions can be applied to each parcel to determine development capacity for each parcel. Development capacity for each parcel was compared to existing development on each parcel to determine development potential beyond existing conditions.
3. Local General and Area Specific Plans – Local general and area specific plans were consulted to determine development minimum or maximums for different types of land uses in specific zoning areas. Zoning typically uses housing units, sq. ft., or floor area ratios as metrics of development.
4. Existing build-out calculations or assumptions regarding infrastructure requirements for development - Most jurisdictions do not use 100% build-out in their calculations. They generally default to 50-70% of maximum build-out to account for infrastructure and parking. Staff will reach out to planning staff to update the table in Attachment B which outlines local approaches to calculating build-out potential.

Model Network Updates:

SCTM uses simplified representations of major streets, highways, bike and pedestrian paths, and transit routes to represent possible travel routes in Sonoma County. Most local streets and driveways are represented by simplified links, or zone centroid connectors, that represent local connections to the simplified transportation network.

The following variables are coded for each road network segment:
- Road Type or functional classification
- Lanes
- Speed (observed)
- HOV lanes

Network capacities are assigned in the model based on functional classification and terrain type and are based on Highway Capacity Manual formulas.

Transit networks are coded to include:
- Bus Speeds
- Transfer Points
- Headways (peak and off-peak)
- Stop Locations
- Fare

SCTA staff will provide each jurisdiction with hard copy or digital maps showing model network assumptions and request that local engineering staff review and recommend changes to the network assumptions where appropriate. Based on local feedback, new network links will be added, and speeds and number of lanes will
be updated to match 2015 conditions. New non-motorized connectors will be added to the model network where appropriate.

Local transit providers will be asked to provide updated information on countywide transit service and the model transit network assumptions will be updated to match the 2015 transit system by SCTA staff as necessary.

Figure 3: Highway/Non-motorized Networks, Sonoma County Travel Model

Figure 4: Transit Networks, Sonoma County Travel Model
**Validation and Accuracy:**

SCTM was last calibrated and validated using a base year of 2010. The model will be recalibrated and revalidated to a base year of 2015. Sensitivity and reasonableness checks will be performed in order to ensure that the model is able to accurately represent current and future travel conditions in Sonoma County.

Model calibration is the process of adjusting model formulas and constants until predicted travel matches the observed travel within the study area for the base year. Model validation tests the ability of the model to predict current and future travel behavior and highlights possible errors that should be corrected. As part of the validation process, model forecasts will be compared to real world observations of travel behavior such as traffic counts, travel surveys, and transit ridership counts. Calibration and validation is an iterative process, and model parameters are adjusted based on model validation comparisons. Once model output and observed data are in acceptable agreement, the model will be considered validated. Staff will work with local and regional staff to gather recent traffic count, transit ridership, and travel survey information to be used in model validation.

**Model Update Timeline:**

*Winter 2016 – Spring 2017:*
- Update existing land use conditions and parcel database from 2010 to 2015.
- ABAG/MTC existing conditions consistency checks
- Update model networks

*Spring 2017 – Summer 2017:*
- Update 2040 SCS consistent scenario and General plan build-out Scenario.
- Land use scenario error checking
- Model network error checking
- Model calibration and validation scope of work and RFP

*Fall 2017 – Winter 2017:*
- Model recalibration and validation
- Model reasonableness and sensitivity testing

*Winter 2017:*
- Final review and adoption of updated SCTM

**Policy Impacts:**

The SCTM is used to measure Comprehensive Transportation Plan performance, to provide information on the current and future performance of the countywide transportation system, and to analyze transportation and emissions impacts of projects and planning documents. Once complete, the updated version of SCTM will be used for all SCTA travel demand modeling activities.
**Fiscal Impacts:**

Staff will be able to complete the majority of the model update in-house and will coordinate with local planning and public works staff to review updated model inputs (land use, transportation networks, trip generation, etc.). Consultants will be required to assist with model recalibration and validation and with the implementation of any recommended model improvements.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Provide feedback on proposed update framework and work with SCTA staff to develop and review updated model land use data.

Staff will reach out to planning staff in each jurisdiction to request any existing land use data that is available (GIS data, permit and construction data for 2010 – 2015), and to set up meetings to review existing (2015) and future land use scenarios (2040 general plan build-out and 2040 forecast).

Staff will work with local public works and engineering staff and transit providers to update and review model transportation networks and gather traffic count and transit ridership data for model recalibration and validation.
ATTACHMENT A: Sonoma County Travel Model Overview

SCTM is a conventional four-step travel demand forecasting model that is similar in structure and implementation to most regional models used for traffic forecasting. Estimates of land use, socioeconomic conditions, and transportation networks are used to forecast travel patterns, traffic volumes and congestion, and transit ridership.

The Sonoma County Travel Model has been developed with a focus on the Highway 101 corridor and the larger regional transportation system. The modeling program’s primary focus has remained on the analysis of countywide regional travel demand impacts and supporting SCTA’s long range transportation planning efforts. The focus on model improvement has been on long-range planning, but SCTA staff has worked with local planning and engineering staff to improve model detail and performance so that the model can be more effectively applied to more localized areas of the county. This work has allowed SCTM to be used to provide the modeling data required for project level analysis, including environmental work, and the preparation of local traffic studies.

SCTA staff works with Bay Area modelers to ensure that SCTM is consistent with other regional models. Model output, assumptions, and methodologies are compared to other local and regional modeling efforts.

The model covers all of Sonoma County, and is divided into over 900 traffic analysis zones (TAZs). Model land use inputs (estimates of population and employment) are summarized by TAZ. Population inputs are represented by housing units. Employment inputs are represented by square footage of various employment related uses such as retail, office, or industrial activities. Additional inputs are used to represent recreation and tourism attractors (hotel rooms, recreation acres, or other special destination types) and education related uses. Activity outside of the county is captured by existing and projected travel at the county line.

Figure 5: Traffic Analysis Zones, Sonoma County
The regional transportation system is represented by a simplified network of roadways, transit routes, and non-motorized pathways. Represented roadways include freeways, highways, arterials, and local collectors. Local residential streets are not represented in the model unless a local jurisdiction specifically requests that it be included, and is able to demonstrate that the requested facility is an important connector locally or regionally. The model includes road attribute information such as topography, uncongested travel speed, and if the roadway is an urban or rural facility. Transit service is represented as a simplified system of transit routes and stops, and includes information on headways and transfers. Sonoma County Transit, Golden Gate Transit, Santa Rosa CityBus, Petaluma Transit, SMART, and some smaller regional providers are represented in the model.

SCTA uses a traditional, four-step travel demand forecasting process to estimate existing and future travel behavior (see Figure 6). These four sequential steps, or sub-models, are included in the travel demand forecasting process:

- **Trip Generation: How much travel?** In the trip generation step, the model estimates the number of trips going to and from each TAZ. Trips are divided by purpose – work trips, shopping trips, etc. Each TAZ produces and attracts a certain number of trips based on the amount of residential and employment development in the zone. Zones with high levels of residential development produce many trips, and zones with high levels of job related development attract many trips.

- **Trip Distribution: Who goes where?** In this step, produced trips are allocated to zones or destinations. A mathematical gravity model determines flows between zones based on travel time, distance, and cost, and the amount of population or employment in each zone. The output of this step is an origin/destination table, which is a large matrix showing the number of trips moving between different zones.

- **Mode Choice: How Do People Travel?** This step estimates the proportion of total person trips using drive-alone or shared-ride auto, transit, or non-motorized modes for travel. The model calculates the utility, or attractiveness, of each mode for each trip and uses this to determine which mode will be used for each trip.

- **Trip Assignment: What Routes Do People Take?** In this final step, the model selects the best path for each trip. The model assumes that people will take the fastest route, avoiding traffic and congestion where possible. Each trip is examined and a best path or route is determined which minimizes the time, distance, and cost needed to travel from zone to zone.

SCTM estimates travel demand and traffic and transit volumes for an average weekday day, along with traffic volumes and congestion for the AM and PM peak commute hours.

The travel demand model can be used to forecast future travel patterns and travel demand by assessing the impact changes in the transportation system (new roads, changes in capacity, new transit service, etc.), population (number and density of housing, demographic changes), and employment (new job sites, new construction) have on traffic and travel in the county. Potential model applications include:
• Identifying existing and future traffic “hot spots”
• Forecasting the effectiveness of major road or transit improvements
• Assessing the impact of land use changes
• Comparing land use or transportation policy alternatives using regional performance measures such as vehicle miles traveled, greenhouse gas emissions, delay or congestion, and average travel time.

Model output can include the following:

• Traffic volumes for sections of roadways, highways, or streets
• Congested speeds and travel time
• Level of Service (LOS) or volume to capacity ratios (V/C ratios)
• VMT generated by TAZ or specific developments or sub-regions
• Transit ridership on bus routes and transit systems
• Traffic volumes by vehicle occupancy (single, two-person, 3+ persons)
• Travel mode summaries (auto, transit, bike, walk)
• Countywide measure of effectiveness (MOE) summaries such as vehicle miles traveled, person/vehicle hours of delay, average speed by road type, and greenhouse gas emissions
Figure 6: Travel Modeling Process

INPUTS
- LAND USE DATA
  - Housing
  - Employment
- NETWORK INPUTS

FACTORs
- Trip Generation Rates
- Distribution Factors
- Mode Choice Coefficients
- Auto Occupancy Factors
- Time of Day Factors
- Speed-Congestion Curves

TRIP GENERATION
- Person Trips by Zone

TRIP DISTRIBUTION
- Zone-to-Zone Person Trips

MODE CHOICE
- Zone-to-Zone Trips by Mode

SHORTEST PATHS
- Estimated Travel Times

TRIP ASSIGNMENT
- Zone-to-Zone Vehicle Trips by Time Period

RESULTS
- Volumes
- Speeds
- LOS
- Daily Traffic
- AM Peak Traffic
- PM Peak Traffic
- Daily Transit
## ATTACHMENT B: Local Build-out Assumptions Used in SCTM 2010 Update

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Build-out Horizon</th>
<th>Density Ratio</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>2035</td>
<td>Midpoint</td>
<td>Provided TAZ level build-out last update.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petaluma</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>varies by use</td>
<td>Within UGB to 2018, expansion of UGB after 2018. Data provided at TAZ level last update.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Res. - varies by use, near or at max. density. Non-res. – max. adjusted down based on identified constraints</td>
<td>Residential holding capacity provided at parcel level, non-res at TAZ level last update.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloverdale</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>72% Res., 40% Non-res.</td>
<td>From GP EIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healdsburg</td>
<td>2030</td>
<td>Development Potential varies by site</td>
<td>Calculated by city staff. Provided at parcel level last update.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Midpoint</td>
<td>Max. allowable density also calculated. Data provided at parcel level last update.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastopol</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Non-res. - max 75% of potential acres, Res. - max of 25 units/year</td>
<td>Growth management plan determines maximum residential development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rohnert Park</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Res. - max for all but MF, Non-res. greater than 50%, but less than max.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotati</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>varies by site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>maximum build-out potential</td>
<td>From GP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Agenda Item 4a

TO: MTC Commission and the ABAG Executive Board

DATE: November 10, 2016

FR: ABAG Deputy Executive Director and MTC Executive Director

RE: Plan Bay Area 2040 Final Preferred Scenario and Investment Strategy

Background
The Plan Bay Area 2040 Preferred Scenario encompasses a 2040 regional pattern of household and employment growth and a prioritized set of transportation investments comprising $303 billion of projected revenues. Staff presented the Draft Preferred Scenario in September and provided an update on local jurisdiction and stakeholder feedback in October. On November 4, the Joint MTC Planning Committee and the ABAG Administrative Committee referred approval of the Final Preferred Scenario to the MTC Commission and ABAG Executive Board.

Action Plan
The Joint Committees also discussed a proposed resolution submitted by a coalition of community organizations. The resolution requests that MTC and ABAG establish an action plan for Plan Bay Area 2040 focused on steps for achieving the Plan’s performance targets. At the committee’s direction, staff engaged with community organizations, congestion management agencies, and other stakeholders on how to incorporate this type of work product into the Plan Bay Area 2040 process. In general, the community organizations have requested including specific language on the actions to be undertaken by the two staffs (e.g. incentives and partnerships, regional funding, policy and programmatic actions and state and federal advocacy) while the congestion management agencies have requested an emphasis on advocacy for new funding resources.

Based on the Joint Committees direction to focus on establishing a process and timeframe for an action plan and in recognition of implementation work already initiated by ABAG and MTC staff, staff proposes that the Commission and Executive Board approve the following policy statement below related to an action plan:

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) shall establish an Action Plan to be adopted concurrent with the final Plan Bay Area 2040, currently scheduled for late summer 2017.

The Action Plan will be developed starting in early 2017 following adoption of the Preferred Scenario, in consultation with local jurisdictions, interested public agencies, and non-governmental organizations representing the economy, environment and social equity.
The Action Plan will identify concrete near and medium-term action items for MTC, ABAG, and other stakeholders to make meaningful progress on the Plan's performance targets, with a focus on those targets where Plan Bay Area 2040 is moving off trajectory - housing affordability, displacement risk, and access to jobs.

**November Election Results**

In the recent election, Bay Area voters approved approximately $11 billion of the possible $19 billion in local transportation revenue measures. This corresponds to three of the five measures assumed in the revenue forecast for the draft and final scenarios of Plan Bay Area 2040: the BART bond, the Santa Clara County sales tax and the AC Transit parcel tax. The two measures that did not pass were the sales tax measure in Contra Costa County and the charter amendment in City and County of San Francisco. Combined, these two revenue measures would have generated approximately $7 billion.

After consultation with the Contra Costa and San Francisco sales tax authorities and project sponsors, staff recommends removing the revenue for the measures that did not pass and reprioritizing the project lists for those two counties. The main impact of removing these revenue measures is to increase the local streets and roads shortfall and reduce several other program areas, given the largely programmatic nature of the two measures. At the meeting, staff will provide detailed information on affected programs and projects. The attached chart illustrates the overall change in revenue before and after the November election. However, if either county returns to the voters and passes a measure in the future, we will be able to amend or update the plan and include the projects and revenues accordingly.

**Next Steps**

Once adopted, the preferred scenario will undergo an environmental assessment under CEQA to inform decision-makers, responsible and trustee agencies, and Bay Area residents of the range of potential environmental impacts that could result from its implementation. This analysis along with federal air quality conformity requirements will incorporate a deeper level of transportation analysis to inform the final 2040 air quality results and other transportation-related performance results of the preferred scenario. The environmental analysis will also analyze a range of reasonable alternatives to the adopted preferred scenario that could feasibly attain most of the Plan's objectives and would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant environmental impacts. Staff will present potential alternatives for the environmental analysis at the December meeting of the Joint MTC Planning Committee and ABAG Administrative Committee.

**Recommendation**

We recommend the following actions: 1) Adoption of the Final Preferred Scenario and Investment Strategy; and 2) Approval of the proposed Action Plan policy statement.

Brad Paul

Steve Heminger

**Attachments**

SH:MM
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Sonoma County Transportation Authority
One Bay Area Grant Application

Project Sponsor: 

Single Point of Contact: 

Email/Phone: 

Project Title: 

Project Location/Description: (1-5 points) 

Project Type: Check all that apply; indicate percentage of each if there is more than one element

- Transit Improvements: %
- Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements: %
- Local Streets and Roads Preservation: %
- Safe Routes to Schools or Transit: %
- Transportation for Livable Communities: %
- Priority Conservation Areas: %

1 Is project within the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD)? Y N

2 Roads must be eligible for federal aid.

See Attachment A of Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Resolution 4035 Cycle 2 Program Project Selection Criteria and Programming Policy for details on the above.

RTP ID#: 

- Transportation for Livable Communities: 21011 
- Regional Bicycle Program: 22247 
- Local Streets and Roads Maintenance: 230700 
- Other:

RTP Goals: Please describe the relationship of project to meeting goals of the MTC Regional Transportation Plan (RTP):

Check which goals apply: (0-2 points)

- Climate Protection
- Reduce Premature Death from Particulate Matter
- Increase Average Daily Walking and Biking for Transportation by 60%
- Equitable Access
- Decrease Average Per Trip Travel Time
- Adequate Housing
- Reduce # of Injuries and Fatalities from Collisions
- Open Space and Agricultural Preservation
- Economic Vitality
- Maintain the Transportation System in a State of Good Repair

November 2016
Sonoma County Transportation Authority  
One Bay Area Grant Application

Please answer the following questions regarding the proposed project:

1. Has the sponsor failed to comply with regional or state delivery milestones in the past 3 years? (0-5 pts) 
   Y  N

2. Is there a Project Map attached to the current application? 
   Y  N

3. Is the proposed project inside the boundaries of an approved Priority Development Area (PDA), Rural Investment Area (RIA) or Employment Center? (0-1 pt) 
   Y  N

4. Does the Project serve a PDA? (0-1 pt) 
   Y  N

5. If the project serves a PDA, please explain how: (0-2 pts) 
   (0-2 pts)

6. Did sponsor do public outreach to develop this project specifically? 
   Y  N

Please provide documentation of the public outreach process including dates and times of meetings held, number of participants and notification process:

7. Funding Estimates: Round to nearest thousand for programming purposes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Request:</th>
<th>Total Project Cost:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase FFY 18/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicate source(s) of matching funds here:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Establishing Connections to Land Use:

8a. Is the project located in high impact area? (0-1 point) 

8b. Is the project located in Community of Concern as defined by MTC? 
   [www.scta.ca.gov/pdf/transportation/coc-map.pdf](http://www.scta.ca.gov/pdf/transportation/coc-map.pdf) (0-1 point)

8c. Is the project in a PDA? (0-1 point)

8d. Does the project represent an investment that is consistent with the Air District's Planning Healthy Places guidelines? (0-1 point)
8e. Is the project located in PDAs that overlap or are co-located with 1) populations exposed to outdoor toxic air contaminates, as identified in the Air District’s Community Air Risk Evaluation (CARE) Program and / or 2) freight transport infrastructure? (0-1 point)

8f. Does the sponsor employ any of the anti-displacement land use policies and regulations?: (1 point for each three policies checked)

- Condominium Conversion Regulations
- Mobile Home Conversion Regulations
- Living Wage Ordinance
- Inclusionary Policy: Housing Element
- In Lieu Fee for Affordable Housing
- Commercial Linkage Fee
- Preservation of Affordable Housing Projects
- Rent Control or Stabilization
- Single Room Occupancy Preservation Policies
- Other

If “Other” is chosen above please explain (1 point):

9. Complete Streets Components: Please indicate all the complete streets elements proposed as part of this project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9a. Choose an item.</th>
<th>9b. Choose an item.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9c. Choose an item.</td>
<td>9d. Choose an item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9e. Choose an item.</td>
<td>9f. Choose an item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9g. Choose an item.</td>
<td>9h. Choose an item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9i. Choose an item.</td>
<td>9j.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Schedule: Please provide project development schedule: (0-5 points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Begin MO/YR</th>
<th>End MO/YR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scoping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please indicate the dates sponsor anticipates achieving the following milestones. Base schedule on 5/8/2017 SCTA board grant award date and add justification and narrative where appropriate:

10a. Resolution of Local Support for project:

10b. FMS Application:

10c. Field Review:

10d. Cultural Resources record search:

10e. Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Local Assistance Procedures Manual Form 9-B:

10f. Request for Authorization: (Please indicate both PE and CON phases if seeking funding for both):

10g. Receipt of Authorization (E-76):

11. If a Local Streets and Roads Preservation (LSRP) project, please indicate the federal aid classification of each road proposed: (0-1 point)

12. If a LSRP, please indicate the number of lane miles to be improved (include street name, length and Pavement Condition Index [PCI] of each segment): (0-1 point)

13. If LSRP project, what type? (0-1 point)
   □ Pavement Rehabilitation (<70 PCI),
   □ Preventative Maintenance(>70 PCI),
   □ Non-Pavement

14. Does sponsor have a current, certified Pavement Management Program? Y □ N □
   14a. Please indicate the date of last certification:

15. Is this a bicycle/ pedestrian and/or non infrastructure project only? Y □ N □
   (3 points)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Attachments: FOR INTERNAL SCTA USE ONLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ General Plan (GP) Circulation Element Amendment or Complete Streets Policy Resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Housing &amp; Community Development (HCD) Certification for General Plan Housing Element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Complete Streets Checklist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Project Map (including Priority Development Area (PDA) boundaries)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Transit District: GP and HCD Exempt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Project on Tribal Lands: GP and HCD Exempt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Current Certified Pavement Management Program?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Complete Streets Act Compliant GP (Post 2010) or Resolution for Complete Streets Policy?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OBAG 2 Application Instructions

**Required Attachments:** If an agency is submitting multiple applications, an application for each project should be submitted, however, it is not necessary to provide multiple copies of the required elements. Please submit ONE copy of required elements. All sponsors must have adopted a Complete Streets Resolution incorporating MTC’s nine required complete streets elements or have adopted a significant revision to the General Plan Circulation element after January 1, 2010 that complies with the Complete Streets Act of 2008.

**Project Sponsor:** Please indicate the Agency sponsoring the project. Agency must have a master agreement with Caltrans to be eligible to receive federal transportation funds.

**Single Point of Contact:** Agencies must choose ONE single point of contact for all Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) funded projects, per MTC project and delivery monitoring requirements. Please update FMS if an agency’s single point of contact has changed.

**Email/Phone:** Please provide the email address and primary phone number for the single point of contact listed above.

**Project Title:** Please provide the project title. If project is a LSRP project please use “Year Rehabilitation of Various Streets in X jurisdiction” for the title. Use the expanded project location category below to outline street names and segments. When projects are programmed into MTC’s Fund Management System (FMS) this will facilitate minor scope changes to project without the need for a full Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) amendment.

**Project Location/Description:** Please provide an expanded project description of your proposed project, including if applicable, street names, PDA name, how project focuses growth of PDA and proposed improvements.

**Project Type:** Please indicate the Project Type by checking the appropriate box listed. Please also indicate the percentage of each project type if you are applying for more than one. The fund sources available are Surface Transportation Program (STP), Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ), and Transportation Enhancement Funds (TE). If applying for a project to be funded with CMAQ, please indicate if the project is located within the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) boundaries. If applying for STP/CMAQ funds for roadway improvements, projects must be Federal Aid eligible roadways. Bicycle and Pedestrian improvements do not need to be located on federal aid eligible roadways, however, they must be included in the Countywide Bike Plan. CMAQ funds may NOT be used for routine maintenance of
bicycle and pedestrian facilities. CMAQ funds may be used if substantially upgrading bicycle and pedestrian facilities where improvements will substantially increase use (dirt path to paved pathway, etc). Please see the links for more information on STP and CMAQ eligibility criteria:

STP:  http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/lam/prog_g/g04stp.pdf

CMAQ:  http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/lam/prog_g/g05cmaq.pdf

RTP ID#:  Please identify the RTP identification number. See attached list.

RTP Goals:  Please identify the relationship of the proposed project to meeting the goals of the MTC Regional Transportation Plan (Plan Bay Area). See attachment. Also please check all the boxes of the listed RTP goals that apply to the proposed project.

Guidance to questions 1-16

1. Regional Delivery Deadlines: Please indicate (Yes or No) if sponsor agency has failed to meet regional delivery deadlines (as defined in MTC Resolution 3606) in the last three years.

2. Project Map: Please indicate (Yes or No) if a Project Map is attached to the current OBAG application. Project Map (including Priority Development Area (PDA) boundaries) should show the project location, including street names and boundaries of any PDA, if being served. Applications without a project map will be rejected.

3. Priority Development Areas: Please indicate (Yes or No) if the proposed project is located within an approved Priority Development Area (PDA), Rural Investment Area (RIA), or Employment Center boundary. See http://arcg.is/2fS9kDI If yes, skip to #10.

4. If the proposed project is not within an approved PDA boundary, please indicate (Yes or No) if the project serves a PDA.

5. If the project serves a PDA, please explain how it serves the PDA in detail (ex: provides bike path from residential neighborhood to school located in PDA; improves streets leading to shopping or services located in PDA; provides transit stops within reasonable walking distance to goods and services in PDA, etc).

6. Public Outreach: Please indicate (Yes or No) per Title VI, if any public outreach was done as part of project development by sponsor agency specifically for the proposed project. Please attach documentation in the form of a MS Word document or Adobe pdf that include dates of any meetings held, the number of participants that attended the meetings, whether alternative language services were included and what the public notification process entailed (local
newspaper public notice, web posting, radio spots, bus advertisements etc.). Points will be awarded as follows (no public outreach = 0, general public outreach, as for a CIP or other = 1, project specific outreach = 2).

7. **Funding Estimates**: please provide project total cost (rounded to the nearest thousand dollars). Please indicate the federal fiscal year (FFY) and phase in which sponsor jurisdiction is requesting the funding be programmed (in the appropriate column). Federal fiscal year runs from October 1 through September 30. Please note that no programming will be available for FFY17/18, as only regional programs will receive funding in that year. ONLY Preliminary Engineering funds will be programmed in FFY 18/19 unless a jurisdiction can demonstrate federal environmental compliance and 100% completed Design and Right-of-Way phases. See number 14 below for more on phases. FFY 18/19 the deadline for completing a field review with Caltrans Local Assistance is October 30, 2018. Preliminary Engineering consists of scoping, environmental, design (or PS&E) and right-of-way phases. Construction/Construction Engineering are programmed separately. Field reviews should be completed or scheduled with Caltrans in 2018 and 2019 even if funding is not programmed until subsequent fiscal years. This is to allow adequate time for project development and completion of the environmental process. Deadlines for submittals of COMPLETE Requests for Authorization (RFA) and receipt of Authorization to Proceed (E-76) for each federal fiscal year (FFY) are listed below:

- **FFY 18/19** RFA package to Caltrans Local Assistance is November 1, 2018. E-76 from FHWA: January 31, 2019.
- **FFY 19/20** RFA package to Caltrans Local Assistance is November 1, 2019. E-76 from FHWA: January 31, 2020.
- **FFY 20/21** RFA package to Caltrans Local Assistance is November 1, 2020. E-76 from FHWA: January 31, 2021.
- **FFY 21/22** RFA package to Caltrans Local Assistance is November 1, 2021. E-76 from FHWA: January 31, 2022.

Please also note that all OBAG projects will require a minimum 11.47% local match. In order to determine the amount of federal funding requested and the amount of match, please estimate the total project cost, and then multiply by 11.47% to determine the minimum match amount. ONLY funds expended AFTER federal authorization to proceed is received are eligible for reimbursement*.

*Unless “Advanced Construction” is secured. See Local Assistance Procedures Manual for details
Please also indicate the amount of matching funds per source. Be specific about the source of matching funds (EXAMPLE: Flowerfield Apartment Mitigation Funds $20K, or General Fund allocation $500K).

8. Connections to Local Land Use:
   a. High Impact Areas are defined as:
      • PDAs taking on significant housing growth (total number of units) in the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) including RHNA allocations, as well as housing production, especially those PDAs that are delivering large numbers of very low, low and moderate income housing units;
      • Dense job centers in proximity to transit and housing (both current levels and those included in the SCS) especially those which are supported by reduced parking requirements and Travel Demand Management (TDM) programs;
      • Improved transportation choices for all income levels (reduces VMT), proximity to quality transit access, with an emphasis on connectivity (including safety, lighting, etc.)

8b. Communities of Concern (COC) as defined by MTC: See the following map for Sonoma County COCs
   [link]

8c. Indicate if the project is within a PDA with affordable housing preservation, creation strategies and community stabilization policies. Provide references.

8d. See Bay Area Air Quality Management District website for Planning Healthy Places Guidelines:
   [link]

8e. Indicate if the project is located in PDAs that overlap or are co-located with populations exposed to outdoor toxic contaminants or freight transportation infrastructure.

8f. Please check each of the boxes that apply to regulations or policies employed within the sponsor jurisdiction and provide reference (not necessarily full text) of where this policy is located (ie General Plan, City Ordinance, Council Resolution number, etc.). For each three policies chosen, 1 point will be awarded. If “other” is chosen please indicate how the policy applies to anti-displacement. If policy not listed in application is specific to anti-displacement, an additional point for that policy may be awarded. For those project sponsors (such as transit districts) which might occur in multiple jurisdictions, all the policies in all the jurisdictions in question may be marked cumulatively on the application.
9. **Complete Streets Components** Please use the pull down menus to indicate all the applicable complete streets elements included as part of your proposed project. Options include sidewalks, ADA ramps, crosswalks, bulb outs, bike lanes, signage, signals, street furniture, bus stops, bus pull outs, bus routes, truck routes. Use box 11i to indicate “other” and 11j to list other elements not listed in the above pull-down menu.

10. **Schedule**: Please indicate the month and year beginning and end of each developmental phase Preliminary Engineering (Scoping, Environmental or ENV, Design or PSE), Right-of-Way or R/W, and Construction or CON (and Construction Engineering) of proposed project. If proposed project does not conform to the standard infrastructure milestones, please use the Construction phase (CON) to indicate your project implementation beginning and end.

**Project Delivery Milestones a through f**. Please indicate the dates upon which your agency anticipates achieving the listed milestones: Resolution of Local Support (must be completed by the time the FMS application is submitted to MTC), FMS application (to be submitted after SCTA approval of Program of Projects for OBAG), Field Review (see deadlines listed above in number 10), Request for Authorization (see deadlines listed above in number 10), Receipt of Authorization to Proceed or E-76 (see deadlines listed above in number 10). New to this application is the Cultural Resources record search date. This will help identify any valuable cultural resources early in the development process in order to avoid and protect such resources and avoid costly delays. 0-5 points will be awarded based on the demonstrated understanding of regional deadlines and deliverability of the project.

11. **Local Streets and Roads Preservation Projects** If the proposed project is a Local Streets and Roads Preservation project, please indicate the federal classification of each road proposed. If not LSRP project skip to number 15.
12. If an LSRP project, please indicate the number of lane miles of each road segment to be improved, including street name, length, and Pavement Condition Index of each segment.
13. If an LSRP project, please check the appropriate box to indicate which type of LSRP project is being proposed.

14. **Certified Pavement Management Program**: Transit Districts and Non-infrastructure projects may skip this question. Please indicate (Yes or No) if sponsor agency has an approved certified Pavement Management Program (PMP). Proposed LSRP projects from agencies without a certified PMP are ineligible for OBAG funding. Please provide the date of the last MTC certification of the PMP.

15. **Bicycle and Pedestrian Only Project or Non-infrastructure Project**: this question allows non-road projects to garner the same number of total points as a LSRP projects. LSRP projects will not receive points on this question.
MTC Surplus Land Resolution
For San Francisco Bay Area Cities and Counties

- SAMPLE -

Resolution No. ___________

A RESOLUTION OF THE [City Council/Board of Supervisors] OF THE [Jurisdiction] TO
COMPLY WITH ASSEMBLY BILL 2135, SURPLUS LAND ACT

WHEREAS, the San Francisco region has the highest housing costs in the United States; and

WHEREAS, the Bay Area produced less than 30% of the need for low- and moderate-income housing units from 2007-2014; and

WHEREAS, there are limited funding sources available to secure land for the construction of low- and moderate-income housing; and

WHEREAS, public lands can play a critical role in increasing the supply of land for affordable housing;

WHEREAS, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission adopted Resolution No. 4202, outlining the programming policy and project selection criteria for the One Bay Area Grant Program (OBAG 2), including certain requirements to access these funds;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the [City Council/Board of Supervisors] of [Jurisdiction], State of California, as follows:

That the [Jurisdiction] agrees to comply with the terms of Surplus Land Act - Assembly Bill 2135 (California Government Code § 54220, et seq.), as exists now or may be amended in the future.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the [City Council/Board of Supervisors] of the [Jurisdiction], State of California, on __________, 201_, by the following vote:

Link to state law or current text may be supplied for reference.
Appendix A-8: PDA Investment & Growth Strategy

The purpose of a PDA Investment & Growth Strategy is to ensure that CMAs have a transportation project priority-setting process for OBAG 2 funding that supports and encourages development in the region’s PDAs, recognizing that the diversity of PDAs will require a range of different strategies. Some of the planning activities noted below may be appropriate for CMAs to consider for jurisdictions or areas not currently designated as PDAs if those areas are still considering future housing and job growth. Regional agencies will provide support, as needed, for the PDA Investment & Growth Strategies. From time to time, MTC shall consult with the CMAs to evaluate progress on the PDA Investment and Growth Strategy. This consultation may result in specific work elements shifting among MTC, ABAG and the CMAs. Significant modifications to the scope of activities may be formalized through future revisions to this resolution. The following are activities CMAs need to undertake in order to develop a project priority-setting process:

(1) Engaging Regional/Local Agencies

- Develop or continue a process to regularly engage local planners and public works staff. Understand the needs of both groups and share information with MTC and ABAG.
- Encourage community participation throughout the development of the Investment and Growth Strategy, consistent with the OBAG 2 Call for Projects Guidance (Appendix A-7).
- The CMA governing boards must adopt the final Investment & Growth Strategy.
- Participate as a TAC member in local jurisdiction planning processes funded through the regional PDA Planning Program or as requested by jurisdictions. Partner with MTC and ABAG staff to ensure that regional policies are addressed in PDA plans. Look for opportunities to support planning processes with technical or financial assistance.

(2) Planning Objectives – to Inform Project Priorities

- Keep apprised of ongoing transportation and land-use planning efforts throughout the county
- Encourage local agencies to quantify transportation infrastructure needs and costs as part of their planning processes
- Encourage and support local jurisdictions in meeting their housing objectives established through their adopted Housing Elements and RHNA.

The second round of PDA Investment & Growth Strategies will assess local jurisdiction success approving sufficient housing at all income levels. They will also, where appropriate, assist local jurisdictions in implementing local policy changes to facilitate achieving these goals. The locally crafted policies should be targeted to the specific circumstances of each PDA. For example, if the PDA currently has few moderate- or low-income households, any recommend policy changes should be aimed at promoting affordable housing. If the PDA currently is mostly low-income housing, any needed policy changes should be aimed at community stabilization.

1 Such as inclusionary housing requirements, city-sponsored land-banking for affordable housing production, “just cause eviction” policies, policies or investments that preserve existing deed-restricted or “naturally” affordable housing, condo conversion ordinances that support stability and preserve affordable housing, etc.
MTC and ABAG staff will distribute a technical memo to guide this task by October 1, 2016, including data to identify jurisdictions’ challenges (e.g. RHNA performance and current affordability) and a listing of the Bay Area’s best housing policies that are intended to address a range of housing challenges. This section should identify planning costs needed to address policy changes and other barriers to creating or maintaining affordability.

(3) Establishing Local Funding Priorities
Develop funding guidelines for evaluating OBAG projects that support multi-modal transportation priorities based on connections to housing, services, jobs and commercial activity. Emphasis should be placed on the following factors when developing project evaluation criteria:

- **Projects located in high impact project areas.** Favorably consider projects in high impact areas, defined as:
  a. PDAs taking on significant housing growth in the SCS (total number of units), including RHNA allocations, as well as housing production, especially those PDAs that are delivering large numbers of very low, low and moderate income housing units,
  b. Dense job centers in proximity to transit and housing (both current levels and those included in the SCS) especially those which are supported by reduced parking requirements and TDM programs,
  c. Improved transportation choices for all income levels (reduces VMT), proximity to quality transit access, with an emphasis on connectivity (including safety, lighting, etc.)

- **Projects located in Communities of Concern (COC) –** favorably consider projects located in a COC as defined by MTC or as defined by CMAs or Community Based Transportation Plans.

- **PDAs with affordable housing preservation, creation strategies and community stabilization policies –** favorably consider projects in jurisdictions with affordable housing preservation, creation strategies and community stabilization policies.

- **Projects that protect public health during construction and operation –** Favorably consider projects that implement the Best Practices in the Air District’s Planning Healthy Places, or projects located in jurisdictions that have demonstrated a commitment to adopt, as policies and/or enforceable ordinances, best practices to reduce emissions of and exposure to local air pollution.²

- **PDAs that overlap or are co-located with: 1) populations exposed to outdoor toxic air contaminants as identified in the Air District’s Community Air Risk Evaluation (CARE) Program and/or 2) freight transport infrastructure –** Favorably consider projects in these areas where local jurisdictions employ best management practices to mitigate PM and toxic air contaminants exposure.

² Guidance and maps have been developed in partnership with BAAQMD, CMAs, ABAG, and city staff, please see: [http://www.baaqmd.gov/plans-and-climate/planning-healthy-places](http://www.baaqmd.gov/plans-and-climate/planning-healthy-places).
Process/Timeline

CMAAs will develop a new PDA Investment & Growth Strategy every four years, consistent with the update of the Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy. The Investment & Growth Strategy must be adopted by the CMA Board (new for OBAG 2). CMAAs will provide a status report update every two years.
Staff Report

To: Technical Advisory Committee
From: Chris Barney, Senior Transportation Planner
Item: SB 743 Update
Date: December 8, 2016

Issue:
What is the status of SB 743 implementation?

Background:
SB 743 directed the California Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to amend CEQA guidelines for analyzing transportation impacts. OPR has recommended using vehicle miles travelled (VMT) to replace level of service (LOS) for measuring transportation impacts in CEQA.

OPR's most recent guidance for implementation was released January 20, 2016 and can be viewed on the OPR website.


OPR intends to release final revised guidance in late 2016.

Timeline:
Winter 2016: OPR has stated that they intend to make a final set of revisions to the CEQA analysis guidelines related to the analysis of transportation impacts in CEQA. This final document will be submitted to the Natural Resources Agency for review and to be officially included in formal CEQA guidance.

Late 2016/Early 2016: After the Natural Resources Agency rulemaking process, SB 743 goes into effect. Current OPR recommendations allow for a 2 year opt-in or grace period for making the switch from LOS to VMT.

Caltrans has recently released updated guidance on intergovernmental review (attached) which directs district staff to refocus reviewer comments on VMT impacts, transportation demand measures (TDM), and multimodal transportation safety and operational issues. Caltrans has already started requesting VMT impact analysis in new transportation impact studies.

Local Implementation:
Staff recommends that a SB 743 implementation working group or ad hoc subcommittee of the TAC be formed to discuss the following issues related to SB 743:

- Impact analysis and Measurement – VMT vs LOS
  - VMT calculation methods
  - VMT screening techniques and mapping
- VMT Significance Thresholds
• Analyzing multimodal travel impacts and safety
• Analyzing Induced Travel
• Mitigation
  o Planning Documents
  o Development Projects
  o Transportation Projects
• Training and information sharing
• Using LOS post SB 743

Policy Impacts:
Delay or LOS was the primary metric for measuring transportation impacts in CEQA previously. SB 743 has changed how transportation impacts will be analyzed and assessed under CEQA. New transportation impacts will be assessed based on project and plan based VMT increases.

Fiscal Impacts:
Additional analysis will be required to estimate VMT impacts of projects as part of the CEQA process. Environmental analysis costs could change based on new requirements.

Staff Recommendation:
Consider forming an ad hoc subcommittee/working group to discuss SB 743 implementation.
LOCAL DEVELOPMENT – INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVIEW PROGRAM INTERIM GUIDANCE
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Implementing Caltrans Strategic Management Plan 2015-2020
Consistent with SB 743 (Steinberg, 2013)
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I. Introduction and Background

Caltrans’ Local Development-Intergovernmental Review (LD-IGR) program reviews land use and infrastructure plans and projects across the state for potential impacts and enhancements to the State’s environment, natural resources and multimodal transportation system for the California public. Through the LD-IGR process, Caltrans advises Lead Agencies on what these impacts might be and ways to avoid, minimize, and/or mitigate adverse impacts. Caltrans also identifies land use and design strategies that may enhance connectivity and access to destinations. As required through a host of state and federal planning requirements, the LD-IGR program has historically supported smart growth policies designed to create vibrant communities with a sustainable multimodal transportation system. For example, the program’s 2005 Deputy Directive 25-R1 states:

“The Department works to ensure that local land use planning and development decisions include the provision of transportation choices, including transit, intercity rail passenger service, air service, walking, and biking, when appropriate. The Department advocates community design (e.g., urban infill, mixed use, transit oriented development) that promotes an efficient transportation system and healthy communities.”

With the enactment of legislation such as AB 32 (2006), SB 375 (2008), SB 226 (2011), SB 743 (2013), etc. and the development of planning guidance such as the Smart Mobility Framework, Complete Streets Implementation Action Plan, the California Transportation Plan 2040, as well as Caltrans’ adoption of its new mission, vision, goals and the Strategic Management Plan 2015 – 2020 (SMP), the LD-IGR program is strengthening its focus on transportation infrastructure that supports smart growth and efficient development. This is intended to help ensure that greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduction, good community design, improved proximity to key destinations, and a safe, multimodal transportation system are all integral parts of land use decision making throughout the state. Past LD-IGR practices primarily utilized Level of Service to identify various impacts to the State Highway System (SHS), and often limited its recommended mitigation to traditional road improvements. Although Caltrans recognized that Lead Agencies could implement other measures, such as improvements to other modes of transportation or incentive programs to encourage use of other modes, the Lead Agencies often rely on Caltrans’ recommended measures. Going forward, efforts to fulfill our LD-IGR obligation should consider multimodal solutions to not only improve access to destinations for all system users (motorists, transit riders, bicyclists, pedestrians), but also encourage efficient land use that helps achieve the multitude of goals sought, including quality of life, economic prosperity, the development of multimodal networks, and GHG emissions reduction.

The LD-IGR program provides an important opportunity to encourage Lead Agencies to implement the goals and targets of the Caltrans Strategic Management Plan. By year 2020, the SMP calls for several specific targets related to the LD-IGR program:

- a doubling of walking and transit, and tripling of bicycle trips as a percentage of overall trips
- a reduction of per capita vehicle miles traveled (VMT) by 15%
- a reduction of the number of fatalities in each travel mode by 10% a year
- a reduction of GHG and other pollutants consistent with the Air Resources Board’s AB 32 Scoping Plan and State Implementation Plan
- an increase of freight system efficiency by 10%
• a reduction to an 8% rate of growth in Daily Vehicle Hours of Delay (DVHD) under 35 miles per hour on urban State highways

The SMP also contains several strategic objectives related to the LD-IGR program, including:
• reduce user fatalities and injuries by adopting a “Toward Zero Deaths” practice
• promote community health through active transportation and reduced pollution in communities
• effectively manage taxpayer funds and maximize the use of available financial resources
• improve the quality of life for all Californians by providing mobility choice, increasing accessibility to all modes of transportation and creating transportation corridors not only for conveyance of people, goods, and services, but also as livable public spaces
• reduce environmental impacts from the transportation system with emphasis on supporting a statewide reduction of greenhouse gas emissions to achieve 80% below 1990 levels by 2050
• improve economic prosperity of the State and local communities through a resilient and integrated transportation system
• improve travel time reliability for all modes
• reduce peak period travel times and delay for all modes through intelligent transportation systems, operational strategies, demand management, and land use/transportation integration
• increase the number of Complete Streets features on State highways that are also local streets in urban, suburban, and small town settings
• improve collaborative partnerships with agencies, industries, municipalities and tribal governments and advance national engagement with the transportation research and policy committees

As highlighted in the guidance below, the LD-IGR program’s revised approach to commenting on plans and projects will help meet the goals and targets of the Strategic Management Plan. One important component to help achieve these goals is Caltrans’ current process of creating a statewide Transportation Analysis Guide (TAG) and completing a comprehensive update of our Transportation Impact Study Guide (TISG). The TAG-TISG will better inform transportation infrastructure investment and land use and infrastructure project impact analysis, bring Caltrans practices in line with state policy (including those policies named above), and bring Caltrans analysis practices up to state of the practice by providing a suite of methodologies, tools, and best practices. It will help public and private sector practitioners across the state perform the various types of analysis needed to identify multimodal transportation impacts from new land use, transportation, and infrastructure plans and projects.

In the interim, this Interim Guidance document intends to ensure that all Caltrans LD-IGR comments on growth plans, development projects, and infrastructure investments align with state policies through the use of efficient development patterns, innovative demand reduction mitigation strategies, and necessary multimodal roadway improvements. This is in addition to Caltrans’ long-standing commitment to maintain a safe, multimodal transportation system that provides access to destinations for all users. We also continue to recognize that under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), it is ultimately the Lead Agency’s responsibility to perform a CEQA analysis, set local thresholds of significance, analyze potential impacts, determine significance, and identify, implement, and monitor any required mitigations.

This guidance supersedes the 2002 Caltrans Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies in comments to local agencies. Instead of referencing the 2002 guide, Districts should make specific analysis requests of the Lead Agency when additional information is needed. The District can offer to provide the Lead Agency assistance in developing the scope of any analysis and answering questions. Headquarters
LD-IGR staff is also able to assist with scoping required analysis and developing recommended solutions for the Districts’ and Caltrans’ local and regional partners to consider.

In order to ensure alignment of Caltrans comments with state goals described above, LD-IGR comments henceforth should take into consideration whether the project exhibits low or high VMT (by place type e.g., urban, suburban, and rural areas) and should focus recommendations on smart land use, multimodal access, safety for all users, and reducing single occupant vehicle trips. Well planned urban infill projects which are located close to transit, bike and pedestrian facilities (see Appendix A: Project Type 1), which also have proximity benefits to employment centers, services and goods – will reduce travel demand on the entire transportation system and will therefore require significantly less review and mitigation than rural fringe projects (Project Type 5), which generate proportionately higher number of trips and vehicle miles traveled.

Senate Bill 743 (2013) mandated that CEQA review of transportation impacts of proposed development be modified by eliminating consideration of delay- and capacity- based metrics such as level of service (LOS) and instead focusing analysis on another metric of impact. The Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) is currently updating its CEQA Guidelines to implement SB 743 and is proposing that vehicle miles traveled be the primary metric used in identifying transportation impacts. OPR has released a separate “Technical Advisory” outlining recommended techniques for measuring impacts with this new metric, which applies statewide. The General Plan Guidelines are also concurrently being updated to align with state policy, including SB 743.

The need to evolve LD-IGR comments on local development transportation analysis and local development mitigation responses was articulated in a California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA) commissioned review of Caltrans practices in the State Smart Transportation Initiative (SSTI). Their January 2014 report stated that “SB 743 could do more to advance state planning goals than anything else Caltrans has done”, and “would put California and Caltrans back at the leading edge of modern transportation practice … It would begin to make Caltrans a real contributor to the success of modern policy in the state, and it would provide a model for how the staff could help implement a challenging new charge.” A December 2014 report titled A Follow-Up to The California Department of Transportation: SSTI Assessment and Recommendations noted that OPR, CalSTA and Caltrans have been collaborating closely on remaining CEQA rulemaking issues, such as “to manage operational challenges, namely where congested exit ramps may back up onto freeways, in a way that is not simply level of service by another name, failing to deliver the relief to infill development as the law directs. The draft rulemaking would also base mitigation on a development’s total vehicle-miles generated.”

The TAG-TISG will also help implement Caltrans Strategic Management Plan 2015-2020 objectives consistent with SB 743 changes to CEQA. The TAG-TISG focuses transportation analysis on VMT impacts, assessing impacts from growth plans and development projects on the multimodal transportation network, and quantifying VMT and GHG reductions achieved through smart mobility principles and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies. Until the TAG-TISG is complete, the Interim Guidance provided herein is intended to help ensure that District LD-IGR comment letters evolve to carry out state law, reflect the State’s strategic safety goals and planning priorities, and align with California’s climate change goals.

Purpose of this Interim Guidance
With the Strategic Management Plan objectives and SB 743’s changes to CEQA, LD-IGR coordinators and functional reviewers will transition away from using delay based analysis, such as LOS or similar measures of vehicular capacity or traffic congestion, to determine the impacts of land use and infrastructure plans and projects. Instead, they will identify opportunities for reduced VMT generation, advise Lead Agencies on maintaining safe operations, and provide recommendations on developing location-efficient (e.g., centrally located, infill) and travel-efficient (e.g., inclusion of TDM measures) land use.

This Interim Guidance will remain in effect until superseded by Caltrans Transportation Impact Study Guidelines (TISG), currently under development.

Henceforth, LD-IGR comment letters should reflect the “top six” elements discussed below, as well as the more detailed guidance in the accompanying appendices. It is important to note that this Interim Guidance is intended to be the overarching policy and guidance of the LD-IGR program, aside from any Director’s Policies or Deputy Directives. The Headquarters LD-IGR program will be updating guidance and training to be aligned with the Strategic Management Plan 2015-2020 lens over the upcoming months. If reviewers notice any discrepancies in policy and direction between the existing guidance on the Caltrans intranet and this Interim Guidance, please notify the LD-IGR program manager for further direction. Similarly, if reviewers experience any difficulties in applying this Interim Guidance to individual development-related plans, programs, or projects, they are encouraged to contact Alyssa Begley, SB 743 Program Implementation Manager, for assistance on a statewide perspective, and suggested solutions that might be useful.

Active participation by the Districts in regularly scheduled LD-IGR Teleforum meetings with Headquarters will also help District staff keep abreast of emerging methodologies, relevant examples, and current events that may further inform this Interim Guidance while OPR’s CEQA Guidelines Update and Caltrans’ TAG-TISG Update are in progress.

The existing LD-IGR program’s intranet guidance and the technical resources are found at:
http://transplanning.onramp.dot.ca.gov/local-development-intergovernmental-review-ld-igr-branch

II. Key Elements to Include in LD-IGR Letters

This section summarizes the “top six” elements to emphasize when reviewing development plans and project proposals for transportation impacts and when drafting LD-IGR comment letters. The following appendices provide explicit guidance, technical considerations, and template language for District LD-IGR coordinators and functional reviewers to incorporate as needed.

A. Comment on Vehicle Miles Traveled associated with the project.

Reviewers should comment on vehicle miles traveled resulting from the land use project, applying local agency thresholds or absent those, thresholds recommended by the most recent draft of OPR’s CEQA Guidelines and Technical Advisory. If an assessment of VMT is not presented, Caltrans should request it be presented. Though SB 743 clarifies requirements for transportation analysis, a VMT analysis is already
needed to meet other CEQA requirements.\(^1\) Methods for assessing VMT should be compared to the methods recommended in the OPR Technical Advisory. Where methods are not consistent with the recommendations in the Technical Advisory, Caltrans should comment on those methods. Where the project exhibits less than threshold VMT, Caltrans comments should acknowledge the project’s transportation efficiency. Where the project exhibits greater than threshold VMT, Caltrans should request mitigation. Examples of mitigation measures are included in the OPR Technical Advisory. Contact the SB 743 Program Implementation Manager, Alyssa Begley, for assistance with VMT calculation.

B. Rather than providing recommendations that primarily accommodate motor vehicle travel, provide recommendations that strive to reduce VMT generation; improve pedestrian, bike, and transit service and infrastructure; and which don’t induce additional VMT.

As demonstrated by the template language provided in Appendix C of this Interim Guidance, it is important that Caltrans comment letters express the intent and purpose of the LD-IGR program and Caltrans’ review of land use and infrastructure plans and projects through the new lens of the Caltrans Strategic Management Plan 2015-2020. In other words, providing recommendations for solutions that reduce automobile travel rather than recommendations that accommodate more of it. For example, consider the following sample paragraph intended for letter introductions:

“\emph{The mission of Caltrans is to provide a safe, sustainable, integrated, and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability. The Local Development-Intergovernmental Review (LD-IGR) Program reviews land use and infrastructure plans and projects through the lenses of our mission, vision, and goals as guided by the State’s planning priorities of prioritizing infill, conservation, and efficient development.}”

Consider also the following paragraph intended to discuss demand reduction and mitigation strategies:

“\emph{Caltrans seeks to reduce vehicle trips and new vehicle miles traveled associated with development and recommends appropriate measures to avoid, minimize, or mitigate transportation impacts through smart mobility community design and innovative multimodal demand reduction strategies.”}

C. Focus on travel efficiency

Coordinators and reviewers should use the terms “\emph{transportation impact study}” rather than “\emph{traffic impact study}” and note that the study should analyze all modes. Such terminology helps developers, decision makers, and the public better understand that Caltrans seeks a holistic perspective on the infrastructure (roadways, bicycle facilities, sidewalks, transit stations, etc.), the service (e.g. transit, rail, etc.) needs, opportunities for closer proximity to key destinations, and other factors that may be created by growth plans and development projects under review. This language acknowledges and builds upon the multimodal perspective taken by the LD-IGR program since its inception, but not always followed in practice. This approach will also help shape the analysis techniques applied to the review so that the right kinds of data and analyses are provided for consideration. For example, Districts should help the Lead Agency contextualize the project by describing not just what and where it is, but also

\(^1\) See CEQA Guidelines §15064.4 (analysis of greenhouse gas emissions) and Appendix F (requiring analysis of “the project’s projected transportation energy use requirements and its overall use of efficient transportation alternatives”. See also California Clean Energy Committee v. City of Woodland (2014) 225 Cal. App. 4\(^{th}\) 173, 210.
how those factors relate to both the multimodal transportation system and parallel objectives such as job creation, resource and open space conservation, or housing affordability—especially for projects and plans that generate high VMT. If the project is on the suburban edge of a region or far from transit, it is likely to induce more VMT than an infill project. In assessing how the project might be able to reduce its VMT generation, it is also critical to understand how the project can enhance a multimodal transportation network, how the project may increase access to key destinations (by foot or bicycle), and what aspects of the system can be utilized as feasible TDM mitigation measures. See Appendix D for additional information.

Districts should be cognizant of land use economics when reviewing local development projects in order to be mindful of all factors that lead to viability of individual project, more specifically, for projects that generate less overall vehicle miles traveled.

Districts are strongly encouraged to work with Lead Agencies to address transportation deficiencies and enhancements through policies at the planning level and through mitigation fee programs. Districts should still encourage Lead Agencies to share plans and projects for review that directly abut the SHS, are in vicinity of a State Highway, or projects for which Caltrans must approve and issue an encroachment permit.

Headquarters LD-IGR staff recognizes that this type of analysis will be a dramatic shift in process for Caltrans, and that Headquarters programs, District coordinators, and functional reviewers will need extensive training to adapt to the new analysis methods. Headquarters LD-IGR staff will coordinate with the Districts to ensure additional training and tools are provided throughout the Department. If Districts have training requests or concerns, please contact their Headquarters LD-IGR coordinator.

D. Remain neutral on project purpose while framing recommendations for mitigation of the project’s impacts within statewide policy.

Commenting on local development can be controversial and should be written in a tone that promotes partnership, promotes collaboration, focuses on technical aspects of plans and projects, and is deferential to the Lead Agency’s discretionary authority. However, Caltrans has a responsibility to advance the state’s legislative priorities and carry out its role as a Responsible or Commenting Agency under CEQA. In order to strike this balance, our response letters should convey Caltrans’ desire to be an active partner in Lead Agencies understand the transportation implications of development and to assist Lead Agencies in shaping projects to make more efficient use of our transportation system. Districts may choose to, for example:

- State whether the project is location-efficient (e.g. transit-oriented infill), with safe and adequate access to a multimodal transportation system and key destinations, that will help the state meet its GHG reduction targets under AB 32; or if it is sprawl that will increase VMT and regional emissions. As described in Section A above, ascertain VMT per OPR’s guidance. Residential development should be assessed on a per capita basis. Office development VMT should be assessed on a per employee basis. Retail project VMT should be assessed on an absolute basis, but need not be calculated for local-serving retail (which generally reduces VMT). Land use project VMT should be compared to thresholds created by the local agency. In the absence of local agency thresholds, use recommendations in OPR’s Technical Advisory, i.e., 15 percent below overall regional or city VMT per capita for residential projects, 15 percent below regional VMT per employee for office projects, and any increase in overall VMT for retail (further details can be
found in the Technical Advisory). For residential and office development, VMT Maps produced by either regional travel demand models, or the California Statewide Travel Demand Model may be used as a shortcut to estimating VMT. VMT Calculation training will be made available to District staff. Sample language is provided in Appendix C.

- Note if the project is consistent or inconsistent with the growth patterns and future infrastructure features identified in the General Plan or Master-Specific Plans, as well as Regional Transportation Plans (RTP) or Sustainable Community Strategies (SCSs).
- Note if the project is consistent or inconsistent with State planning priorities of infill, conservation, and efficient development. For more information on the State’s planning priorities, see the text from AB 857 (2002) and SB 226 (2011).

While it is not necessary to “take a stand” by commenting on a Lead Agency’s actual decision to adopt a plan or approve-deny a project, comment letters should express findings of consistency or concern related to the implications and impacts, particularly VMT impacts, of development projects. And remember, Caltrans can recommend plan changes or project re-design where impact avoidance or minimization could be achieved. For example, a high-VMT-inducing edge development may consider walking or biking connectivity around a new major transit station with high-quality transit service (see SB 375), or if such a transit station is not present or planned, then around a neighborhood town center. Similarly, a jurisdiction or developer might be able to take advantage of reduced parking requirements or affordability density-bonus credits for projects located in infill areas to achieve a more efficient growth pattern. Such suggestions can point to a “win-win” by substantially reducing the plan’s or project’s VMT generation while still meeting the developer and Lead Agency’s overarching economic and community development objectives. Our comment letters should note when Caltrans has had discussions in person with Lead Agency staff.

E. Be collaborative – Create paths for workable solutions and overcome roadblocks.

Cities, counties, and developers, as well as Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs), Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs), transit and inner-city rail operators, and a wide array of employers and service providers across the State face increasing pressures to accommodate California’s population growth with limited funding, while also facing environmental and community-acceptance constraints. Caltrans, through our LD-IGR role, can work collaboratively to assist these agencies. Comment letters should not just identify potential concerns or problems, but offer suggested solutions that could be taken toward their resolution.

District staff should proactively establish early consultation in the planning and development project process. For example, request face-to-face meetings with Lead Agencies and project proponents to discuss how state law and the multimodal policies in city/county General Plans and RTPA/MPO RTPs and SCSs apply to the development project being reviewed or plan amendments being considered. This would allow both plan-level and project-specific technical concerns to be conveyed and, if possible, resolved with Lead Agencies as part of on-going information sharing. Such meetings can be used to link “early” and “late” steps in the development approval process by identifying potential planning policies and avoidance or minimization strategies, and developing mitigation implementation programs that help achieve Caltrans Strategic Management Plan 2015-2020 objectives and other state goals. Specifically, Districts should perform robust review of the land use and transportation analysis contained in the transportation impact studies for the environmental impact reports performed on General Plans, Specific/Master/Community plans, Regional Transportation Plans, Sustainable Community Strategies, etc.. This affords District staff a better
understanding of how individual “streamlined” developments and infrastructure investments “tier” off of the analysis in plan- or program-level EIRs and provides opportunities for Caltrans to encourage and help shape new VMT-based impact fees.

F. Comments related to impacts to the State Highway System (SHS) will be focused on VMT impacts not delay or effects on road capacity.

Transportation analysis under CEQA is evolving, in part because of SB 743, to measure impacts using vehicle miles traveled. Similarly, Caltrans has adopted Strategic Management Plan goals related to reducing VMT per capita and increasing use of non-auto modes. Therefore, in reviewing project proposals and related CEQA documents, LD-IGR will focus its comments on reducing demand on the SHS as measured with VMT. Caltrans continues to be responsible for ensuring that encroachments on or changes to the SHS are designed to provide for safe operations.

The use of LOS as a CEQA threshold of significance will soon be disallowed and replaced with vehicle miles traveled. SB 743 did not alter a Lead Agency’s responsibility to “analyze a project’s potentially significant transportation impacts related to air quality, noise, safety, or any other impact associated with transportation.” Any information requests should be consistent with the guidance found in Appendices A and B.

This section will not address specifics of how to conduct an operational impacts analysis for all modes of transportation. This section is focused on the general policy, tone, and approach.

Improvements on conventional roadways should, as appropriate to the context, emphasize a complete streets approach to improvements (improvements such as lane width reduction, landscaped medians, pedestrian bulb outs, etc.) and should avoid increasing automobile capacity and/or other measures that would significantly increase VMT.

Suggested improvements to address operational impacts should not result in increased speeds that are not suitable for vulnerable users on the conventional facility. Operational impact improvements should be appropriate to the context and consistent with complete streets principles wherever feasible. Capacity improvements to freeway ramps and freeway mainlines to address operational impacts should be a last resort. Improved crosswalk signal timing, intelligent transportation systems improvements, enhanced signage, roadway designs that result in reduced speed limits, and other effective methods that do not significantly increase VMT should first be explored as potential solutions.

---

2 A safety-related transportation impact under CEQA is not the same as, and does not establish, an unsafe condition. Instead, the CEQA determinations are based on modeling and projections of potential future conditions and any mitigation is focused on making conditions safer.
Appendix A: Recommended Guidance for Site-Specific Development Project Review

Please use this flow chart and the guidance following it to determine whether to comment on site-specific projects and what types of comments to make based on the type of project and its location. Reviewers should first consider the project’s geographic setting and whether projects are located in an infill location, have a walkable project design, and assess VMT generation (definitions of key terms are at the end of this appendix). Projects may not fall perfectly into the place type categories below, so please use your best judgment on types of comments to make. We recognize every project is different.

Before sending a comment letter, the District LD-IGR coordinator should consider what the main objective of sending a letter is, what point of the process the project is in, and if it is necessary to even make comments. A request for additional analysis should be followed by an explanation of why that analysis is needed. If we request a Lead Agency to provide additional analysis on how a project impacts the SHS, we should articulate our concerns. Districts should not just ask for studies or analysis for projects just to have the information. For high-VMT projects, comments should have a primary focus on helping a project reduce VMT loaded onto roadway networks, including the State Highway System.
LD-IGR Site-Specific Development Project Review Decision Tree

See the definitions section on p. 7 of this appendix for guidance on terminology used in this decision tree

What type of development project is being proposed?

- Infill
  - Does the project clearly incorporate principles of walkable design and lower VMT per capita?
    - Yes
      - What type of setting is the project located in?
        - Urban
          - Project Type 1 Urban Infill
        - Rural or Suburban
          - Project Type 2 Rural/Suburban Infill
      - No
        - What type of setting is the project located in?
          - Urban or Suburban
            - Project Type 3 Opportunity Development
          - Rural
            - Project Type 5 Rural Fringe Development or Undeveloped Land
    - No
      - What type of setting is the project located in?
        - Urban or Suburban
          - Project Type 4 Traditional Suburban
        - Rural
          - Project Type 5 Rural Fringe Development or Undeveloped Land

- Non-Infill
  - Does the project clearly incorporate principles of walkable design and lower VMT per capita?
    - Yes
      - What type of setting is the project located in?
        - Urban or Suburban
          - Project Type 4 Traditional Suburban
        - Rural
          - Project Type 5 Rural Fringe Development or Undeveloped Land
    - No
      - What type of setting is the project located in?
        - Urban or Suburban
          - Project Type 3 Opportunity Development
        - Rural
          - Project Type 5 Rural Fringe Development or Undeveloped Land

SMF = Smart Mobility Framework
Please see Chapter 3 of the SMF for definitions of Place Types 1-7
### Guidance for Site-Specific Development Project Review by Place Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban Infill Project Type 1</th>
<th>Rural/Suburban Infill Project Type 2</th>
<th>Opportunity Development Project Type 3</th>
<th>Traditional Suburban Project Type 4</th>
<th>Rural Fringe/Undeveloped Land Project Type 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>a. General Review Approach</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • Generally Districts should have minimal comments (or no comments) on Type 1-2 because they are well planned infill projects which are located close to transit, bike and pedestrian facilities which also have proximity benefits to employment centers, services, and goods will reduce travel demand on the entire transportation system and will therefore require significantly less review and mitigation than rural fringe projects (Project Type 5) which generate proportionally higher number of trips and vehicle miles traveled. Districts should coordinate with SB 743 Program Implementation Manager when developing letters for Type 1 land use projects.
| • Consistent with the new Caltrans mission, vision, and goals, and other statewide laws and policy, projects meeting Type 1-2 criteria typically minimize the overall demand on the SHS compared to what would be built in their place to accommodate demand.
| • Infill projects have the benefit of proximity to employment, services, and retail that helps reduce trip length and increase accessibility for all modes.
| • While in some cases, projects with a walk and bike friendly design may actually increase regional VMT in rural areas, projects in town centers that incorporate pedestrian friendly designs could encourage more trips by walking, biking, and transit for local residents. Districts may still encourage project construction traffic to avoid peak hours when specific non-delay operational concerns arise.
| • Opportunity development projects are similar to those in Type 1 and Type 2, but they are typically designed in such a way that is traditional suburban type development that happens to reduce VMT due to its location. Or they are projects on the fringe of urban areas designed in a way that minimizes VMT impacts.
| • Districts may encourage the Lead Agency to improve pedestrian connectivity both within the project and its connections to surrounding areas. The Districts may also encourage a reduction in parking spaces (when warranted), and potentially reorienting the development so that parking lots are not located between buildings and the streets.
| • If some of the individual components of the project exceed VMT thresholds on page 6 of this appendix (when accounting for mixed-use trip reduction), then Districts can encourage transportation demand management (TDM) measures. See the Appendix D section on Demand Management for suggestions on TDM.
| • Other projects that typically do not generate permanent traffic (such as levee repairs, signs, pipelines, solar farms, etc.) should follow existing LD-IGR guidance. Comments related to these types of projects should not focus on congestion.
| • Type 4 and 5 projects generally are considered traditional suburban or rural fringe development that generate higher VMT, and do not encourage walking or biking by their project design.
| • Districts should make comments on ways projects can minimize VMT generation to meet VMT reduction goals from SB 743 and assist the State in meeting GHG reduction targets. Caltrans should press for significant connections to existing pedestrian, bicycle, and transit infrastructure to avoid a development relying solely on the existing local roadway system or State Highway System.
| • Districts are also encouraged to use the Smart Growth Principles language suggested in the Appendix C: Recommended Language that identifies whether or not a project incorporates smart growth principles.
| • Districts should make comments on ways the projects can improve internal circulation for all modes, better integrate with other nearby land uses, and provide a network of complete streets that benefits all users of the transportation system. |
### Guidance for Site-Specific Development Project Review by Place Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban Infill Project Type 1</th>
<th>Rural/ Suburban Infill Project Type 2</th>
<th>Opportunity Development Project Type 3</th>
<th>Traditional Suburban Project Type 4</th>
<th>Rural Fringe/ Undeveloped Land Project Type 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>b. Multimodal Operational Impacts Analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• For purposes of this Interim Guidance, projects in Urban Infill areas are presumed to have multiple community benefits that include multimodal mobility, increased access, and safety for all users. Urban Infill projects also tend to increase pedestrian and bicycling travel, which promotes livable and healthy communities. This is important to note, because an important goal of this guidance is to help implement statewide objectives to minimize VMT generation and reduce GHGs—which research suggests infill development helps accomplish.</td>
<td>• While an important overall goal of this guidance is to minimize VMT generation, many new development projects will increase traffic in a localized area and could create or exacerbate operational concerns that may increase the potential for future collisions (operational impacts).</td>
<td>• When necessary, the Districts should still analyze a project’s potential operational impacts and impact of significant increases of VMT on walkers, bikers, and drivers using the SHS.</td>
<td>• Well planned infill projects which are located close to transit, bike and pedestrian facilities which also have proximity benefits to employment centers, services, and goods will reduce travel demand on the entire transportation system and will therefore require significantly less review and mitigation than rural fringe projects (Project Type 5) which generate proportionally higher number of trips and vehicle miles traveled.</td>
<td>• Well planned infill projects which are located close to transit, bike and pedestrian facilities (see Appendix A: Project Type 1), which also have proximity benefits to employment centers, services and goods – will reduce travel demand on the entire transportation system and will therefore require significantly less review and mitigation than traditional suburban projects (Project Type 4), and rural fringe projects (Project Type 5), which generate proportionally higher number of trips and vehicle miles traveled. Caltrans should press for significant and safe connections to existing pedestrian, bicycle, and transit infrastructure to avoid a Project Type 2-5 relying solely on the existing local roadway system or State Highway System.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In cases where the Districts have specific substantial evidence that operational impacts or safety concerns exist, the Districts should work with the Lead Agency to identify the appropriate analysis needed, ways it can be provided, and how the operational impacts can be addressed.</td>
<td>• In cases where multimodal operational impact analysis is needed, but it is not provided, the Districts should work with the Lead Agency to identify the appropriate analysis needed and ways it can be provided. To date, no state law has exempted project proponents from performing a safety analysis for all transportation modes. That does not mean that project proponents necessarily need to perform an analysis. Consideration should be given to the context of the area in relation to the SHS.</td>
<td>• The Districts can also ask for construction traffic management plans. See Appendix C for sample language.</td>
<td>• Districts are encouraged to work with Lead Agencies to proactively address relevant transportation concerns at the plan-level or corridor-level; this helps ensure that the Department is able to carry out its responsibilities as owner/operator of the SHS without having to ask for additional project-level analysis when individual Urban Infill developments move forward to approval, if it is not needed.</td>
<td>• Districts can also ask for construction traffic management plans. See Appendix C for sample language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consideration should be given to the context of the area in relation to the SHS. Comments related to operational impacts should not be used as a mechanism to increase capacity of the roadway—they should only be made to address specific operational impacts as defined above. Districts should coordinate with SB 743 Program Implementation Manager when developing letters for Type 1 land use projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Guidance for Site-Specific Development Project Review by Place Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban Infill</th>
<th>Rural/Suburban Infill</th>
<th>Opportunity Development</th>
<th>Traditional Suburban</th>
<th>Rural Fringe/Undeveloped Land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Type 1</td>
<td>Project Type 2</td>
<td>Project Type 3</td>
<td>Project Type 4</td>
<td>Project Type 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## c. Pedestrian, Bicycle, and Transit Facilities

For projects that directly abut the SHS, agreements may be required for maintenance of pedestrian facilities. The Districts are strongly encouraged to advocate in comment letters for completing a network of pedestrian walkways along the SHS where feasible and appropriate to the context. The Districts should make efforts to familiarize themselves with local agencies’ policies and design standards and work with project proponents early to resolve any design or safety-related issues for the walkways.

Bicycle and transit facilities within the Caltrans ROW should also be considered and encouraged on a case-by-case basis. Agreements with other agencies may be necessary.

## d. Fee Programs

The Districts can request that projects pay into established fee programs (mandatory or voluntary programs are ok). Districts are encouraged to promote projects or improvements within the fee programs that help reduce VMT and enhance efficient access to destinations when feasible. Programmatic fee programs to address operational impacts are also encouraged to help avoid individual development projects avoid triggering direct operational impacts; this is especially important for Project Type 1-2.

## e. Level of Service (LOS) Related Comments Aimed at Reducing VMT

| Not applicable | Some jurisdictions have set LOS thresholds for the SHS either through plans or by ballot measures and will provide this analysis during project review. Until the TAG-TISG is completed, Districts can make technical comments about a Lead Agency’s deficiencies in LOS analysis of the SHS when a project is inconsistent with smart growth principles (“sprawl”). In this circumstance, the District can also point out LOS deficiencies on the SHS and request mitigation that minimizes new VMT on the SHS. Please note that the District should suggest capacity increasing improvements sparingly. Comments can focus on operational impacts and should be consistent with complete streets principles. Particularly for Project Type 3-5, Districts should assist the Lead Agency in identifying appropriate demand reduction measures by listing specific programs (see Appendix D – Section A “Demand Management”) |

## f. ROW Preservation

In areas where Caltrans system planning documents are aligned with local plans that call for the eventual widening of the SHS, Caltrans may find it necessary to make comments about preserving that ROW. The context of the situation is critical. District staff should consult with System Planning to maintain consistency with any existing local plans to enhance the livability and neighborhood connectivity of a State Highway segment, and determine whether Caltrans is working with a local agency to relinquish that portion of the State Highway.

## g. Responsible Agency

Caltrans is a Responsible Agency under CEQA when we have to approve and issue an Encroachment Permit for a local development project. We are a Commenting Agency when the local development project does not require an Encroachment Permit. Districts should inform the Lead Agency when an Encroachment Permit is required as early as possible in the local development project’s process. District Planning should coordinate with District Encroachment Permits regarding which local development projects are not required to provide a transportation analysis. The Encroachment Permit process still requires some level of transportation analysis. Particularly for infill, the level of analysis required should balance the engineer’s need for information with monetary costs incurred by the project. Time and money will be saved if Caltrans and the Lead Agency discuss the analysis needs for the Encroachment Permit as early as possible. See the “Encroachment Permits” section in Appendix C for language that should be included in a comment letter.
### Guidance for Site-Specific Development Project Review by Place Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban Infill Project Type 1</th>
<th>Rural/Suburban Infill Project Type 2</th>
<th>Opportunity Development Project Type 3</th>
<th>Traditional Suburban Project Type 4</th>
<th>Rural Fringe/Undeveloped Land Project Type 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### h. Projects in Close Proximity to the SHS

The Districts should consider commenting on projects that border or are within a few hundred feet of Caltrans ROW. Some specific examples include projects that may have hydraulic impacts to the SHS, ROW Engineering concerns, sound wall placement along freeways, and other cases. For projects that border or plan any work within the state highway system ROW, Districts should comment about the potential need for an encroachment permit. The Lead Agency and developers appreciate being made aware of issues that could affect the cost, scope, or schedule of the project. We recommend working with Lead Agencies as early in the process as possible to resolve issues before CEQA-stage documents are released for public review and comment. The tone in the letters should be of a cooperative approach.

#### i. Parking

If District staff notice an excessive number of parking spaces, greater than required by local zoning, associated with a development related to its context (i.e., in places with excessive amounts of underutilized parking nearby, in places with very high transit connectivity, etc.) the District may choose to comment that a reduction in parking may help reduce VMT and development project costs. Note that **AB 744** (2015) identifies maximum parking ratios for affordable housing projects located within one-half mile of a major transit stop, and affordable housing projects outside of those locations.
Questions to Consider for VMT Impacts

Questions to consider for VMT impacts:
Reviewers should comment on vehicle miles traveled resulting from the land use project, applying local agency thresholds. Or absent those, apply thresholds recommended by the most recent draft of OPR’s CEQA Guidelines and Technical Advisory.

a) Will residential components of the project lower both the citywide (or countywide) and the regionwide existing VMT per capita by at least 15%?
b) Will office components of the project lower existing VMT per employee across the region by at least 15%?
c) Will retail components of the project decrease total VMT (note: can presume local serving retail will)?

Note: These questions are consistent with the most recent draft of the OPR Technical Advisory Implementing SB 743.

If the answer is no to any of the above questions (when accounting for internal trip capture for mixed use projects), then it may be appropriate to request the Lead Agency to minimize VMT generated by a project. See Appendix D for Transportation Demand Management suggestions.
Definitions of Key Terms

**Infill Site:** According California Public Resources Code Section 21061.3, an infill site is defined as “a site in an urbanized area that meets either of the following criteria: (a) The site has not been previously developed for urban uses and both of the following apply: (1) The site is immediately adjacent to parcels that are developed with qualified urban uses, or at least 75 percent of the perimeter of the site adjoins parcels that are developed with qualified urban uses, and the remaining 25 percent of the site adjoins parcels that have previously been developed for qualified urban uses. (2) No parcel within the site has been created within the past 10 years unless the parcel was created as a result of the plan of a redevelopment agency. (b) The site has been previously developed for qualified urban uses.” For purposes of LD-IGR evaluation, whether or not a project is considered infill should also be considered with its effects on VMT. If it is unclear whether a project is infill or not, if a project induces high-VMT, the District should treat the project as a Type 3 Opportunity Development. Taking projects through the project place type decision tree above may help in determining the types of comments to make on the project.

**Walkable Project Design:** There is no perfect definition of what comprises a project with good walkable design. However, there are resources that help define some of the principles of walkable design. The San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association (SPUR) has developed seven principles of walkable urban districts that may be useful to District staff to help understand what walkable design incorporates: create fine-grained pedestrian circulation; orient buildings to street and open spaces; organize uses to support public activity; place parking behind or below buildings; address the human scale with building and landscape details; provide clear, continuous pedestrian access; and build complete streets. A project does not necessarily have to incorporate all of these principles to be considered having walkable design, but it should incorporate almost all of them.

**Operational Impacts:** When new development may create or exacerbate operational concerns that may increase the potential for future collisions. A safety-related transportation impact under CEQA is not the same as, and does not establish, an unsafe condition. Instead, the CEQA determinations are based on modeling and projections of potential future conditions and any mitigation is focused on making conditions safer.

**Place Types:** Districts should not be too concerned with whether or not a project is considered rural, urban, or suburban to navigate the decision tree. What matters more is the project design and the VMT generated by the project (i.e., which project type box is selected). The Districts can also use the Smart Mobility Framework (SMF) Place Types to help navigate the decision tree. The SMF Place Type descriptions are located in Chapter 3 of the SMF. The SMF Place Type numbers on the decision tree correspond to the numbers in Chapter 3.
Appendix B: Recommended Guidance for Plans and Programs Review

There are many different types of plans (General, Specific, Community, Regional Transportation, Watershed, Air Quality to name a few) and programs that LD-IGR reviewers receive. To cover all the different types of them would defeat the purpose of keeping this guidance brief and just providing an overall policy framework.

OPR’s Technical Advisory provides guidance on VMT-based impact analysis and mitigation. An array of research is available on this topic, much of which is summarized and packaged for deployment in the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures document (which focuses also on VMT). Further, HQ will post Technical Bulletins on Onramp notification letter template for transmittal to Lead Agencies explaining what SB 743 requires them to consider, noting how Caltrans can assist, and stating that OPR is drafting an update of its CEQA Guidelines in order to spell out the new requirements in more detail.

It is important to note that one of the likely outcomes of SB 743 implementation will be the closer alignment of project-specific impact analysis and mitigation with the regional growth and program-level management strategies identified through the regional and systems planning process. Through regional and system planning efforts, the existing transportation system is analyzed and future improvements are planned to improve human mobility and system operations based on the regional population growth and mobility needs identified through city and county General Plans, RTPs/MTPs, etc. For example, when District system planners update Transportation Concept Reports (TCR), District System Management Plans (DSMPs), and Corridor System Management Plans (CSMP), coordination with LD-IGR is an opportunity to reflect long range growth plans, development projects, and regional improvement plans identified in regional planning documents. Similarly, when LD-IGR coordinators are reviewing development plans and projects, coordination with regional and system planning can be used to identify ultimate ROW setbacks, access management restrictions, planned frontage improvements, and facility improvements identified in system planning documents that should be factored into a project’s site plan and mitigation measures.

Particularly at a project level, we want to avoid disadvantaging the last-in development. Caltrans (as well as other agencies) is sometimes criticized for being a barrier to local infill development by asking for costly studies or mitigation. In order to achieve equity in transportation financing and not place unreasonable burdens on site-specific development projects that advance state goals of smart growth and reduced greenhouse gas emissions, Caltrans should work with Lead Agencies to address impacts to the SHS at the plan level and in fee programs. In general, plans and programs can be an extremely important and efficient mechanism to identify and mitigate issues at a macro level and thus avoid issues with the site-specific project analysis. VMT reduction can have substantial safety benefits, so Districts should emphasize VMT reduction in their comments on lead agency plans or programs.

One way Districts can work with their partners to address mitigation issues is to proactively and directly participate in the development of comprehensive plans (e.g. General Plans, Master Plans, Specific Plans, etc.) and mitigation implementation programs (regional advance mitigation programs, impact fee nexus plans and capital improvement plans, etc.). For instance, a local agency could forecast expected development, identify needed transportation improvements that provides safe access for all modes (like lowering speeds at interchanges, mid-block crossings for pedestrians, cycle tracks for bicyclists, bus bays, added transit capacity, etc.), create cost estimates for those improvements, and create a financing program that development projects pay into to implement those improvements. Then local development
projects would simply pay their fair share toward those improvements. There are many examples around the state where local agencies have established fee programs to pay for improvements. One example of a plan and fee program that does comprehensively address transportation needs (including safety and multimodal improvements) based on projected development is the Martell Triangle Plan in Amador County.

This process may also be beneficial for Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) and CEQA streamlining. The District should work with the MPO to address potential safety issues and needed mitigation in the RTP/SCS, in an effort to establish a corresponding fee program is established to pay for those improvements; then local development projects could simply pay fair share toward those improvements based upon their proportional impact and therefore would not need to perform any additional analysis of the SHS during the environmental review process if they met the CEQA streamlining provisions of the RTP/SCS. Please contact the HQ LD-IGR program manager for assistance with individual development projects tiering from programmatic-level CEQA documents.

LD-IGR coordinators should be proactively engaged in the regional and system planning processes and provide comments on the development of General Plans, Specific Plans/Master Plans, RTPs, and SCs or Alternative Planning Strategies that integrate policies, priorities, and projects identified in TCRs, DSMPs, and CSMPs. Reviewers should advise lead agencies of any regional or system planning implications related to their travel demand models and RTP/SCSs-General Plans. Specifically, coordinators should also ask lead agencies if their regional models and Transportation Impact Mitigation (TIM) fee programs reflect long-range multimodal system improvements. In coordinating these efforts with System Planning, coordinators should be focused on helping lead agencies integrate their plan’s or project’s mitigation measures with corridor and system level management strategies and planned multimodal improvements on specific facilities. The Districts may also need to work with lead agencies on preserving ROW in some SHS corridors for future improvements and ensure consistency with Caltrans system planning documents.

Similarly, when evaluating proposed mitigation measures, reviewers should analyze the potential effects of induced travel (both VMT and GHG increases) resulting from any roadway capacity expansion improvements intended to reduce congestion. Reviewers should also evaluate the potential for connectivity improvements, such as internal circulation within a development or local roadway extensions-connections, to reduce VMT and GHG emissions by providing more efficient land use and direct routes between locations.

The intention for this integration should be conveyed to cities and counties through on-going communication and specifically requested at the Initial Study stage for growth plans, financing programs, and development projects. In order acquire the necessary data, to provide peer review, and in cases where District staff may need to assist lead agencies in performing these evaluations, LD-IGR coordinators should ask the regions to share their model platforms through a Model Users Agreement (contact HQ for examples) and Caltrans should share the California State Transportation Demand Model. Coordinators should also request copies of any sub-area models that might be developed for Traffic Operations Reports required in the capital project delivery process as these may include additional levels of refinement not available in regional models. Depending on the answers received, coordinators should recommend changes to ensure that planned plan-level and project-specific mitigation measures are consistent with adopted regional and system plans. If needed, coordinators should recommend changes to ensure that local and regional TIM programs include multimodal improvement intended to reduce, rather than induce VMT. Districts should create an electronic archive of the models they ask for and receive from local partners.
Districts should, when appropriate, request that local agencies provide a multimodal transportation demand and impact analysis for plans and programs. The Districts should note that this plan/program level analysis may also be useful for the evaluation of individual development projects that are utilizing CEQA streamlining provisions. Appendix C contains sample language for use in comment letters on plans and programs.

For certain projects and plans, District staff should coordinate with transit operators so information can be jointly shared for the purpose of service coordination and long-range transit planning.

*Level of Service (LOS) Related Comments Aimed at Reducing VMT*

Some jurisdictions have set LOS thresholds for the SHS either through plans or by ballot measures and will provide this analysis during plan review. LOS can still be used as a transportation analysis tool, however, for CEQA purposes District comments should address VMT.

Until the TAG-TISG guidance is provided, Districts can make technical comments about a lead agency’s deficiencies in LOS analysis of the SHS when a plan is inconsistent with smart growth principles (“sprawl”). In this circumstance, the District can also point out LOS deficiencies on the SHS and request mitigation that minimizes new VMT on the SHS. Please note that the District should suggest roadway capacity improvements sparingly. Comments should focus on operational impacts and should be consistent with complete streets principles. Particularly for Project Types 3-5, Districts should assist the lead agency in identifying appropriate transportation demand reduction measures by listing specific programs (see Appendix D).
Appendix C: Recommended Language for LD-IGR Comment Letters

The template language below is provided for District LD-IGR coordinators to adapt as needed in order to reflect the key terms and general guidance outlined above. Please note that LD-IGR letters should be tailored to reflect the context surrounding the different types of plans and projects under review, what stage they are at in the review and approval process, and relevant background information such their scope and relationship to the multimodal transportation system.

All letters should contain introductory language that references the Department’s new vision, mission, and goals, as well as versions of the general language below where appropriate in the standard LD-IGR letter format.

A. Caltrans New Mission

“Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the environmental review process for the project referenced above. The mission of Caltrans is to provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability. The Local Development-Intergovernmental Review (LD-IGR) Program reviews land use projects and plans through the lenses of our mission and state planning priorities of infill, conservation, and travel-efficient development. To ensure a safe and efficient transportation system, we encourage early consultation and coordination with local jurisdictions and project proponents on all development projects that utilize the multimodal transportation network. We provide these comments consistent with the State’s smart mobility goals that support a vibrant economy, and build communities, not sprawl. The following comments are based on the (insert type of document).”

“Caltrans new mission supports safety and sustainability in its call to “provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability”. Caltrans Sustainability, Livability, and Economy goal states we will “make long-lasting, smart mobility decisions that improve the environment, support a vibrant economy, and build communities, not sprawl.”

“Caltrans supports six smart mobility principles of location efficiency, reliable mobility, health and safety, environmental stewardship, social equity, and robust economy. The California Transportation Plan 2040 further encourages infill development and conservation opportunities as a way to reduce urban sprawl, allow for better transit and to be consistent with SB 375.”

“The following comments are based on the (insert type of document). We provide these comments consistent with the State’s smart mobility goals that support a vibrant economy and sustainable communities.”

B. Plan Development, Project Design and Mitigation Strategies

“In (developing this plan/designing this project) we encourage the (City/County/Developer) to integrate transportation and land use in a way that reduces Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions by facilitating the provision of more proximate goods and services to shorten trip lengths, and achieve a high level of non-motorized travel and transit use. As such, we encourage the (City/County/Developer) evaluate the potential of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies and Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) applications in order to better manage the transportation network, as well as transit service and bicycle or pedestrian connectivity improvements. The Department also seeks to reduce serious injuries and fatalities, as well as provide equitable mobility options for people
who are economically, socially, or physically disadvantaged. Therefore, we ask the (City/County/Developer) to evaluate the (plan/project site) for access problems, VMT and service needs that may need to be addressed.

For example, we recommend that the (City/County/Developer) analyze the following issues related to the (plan/project): “(identify the scope of what we are asking for)

C. Multimodal Transportation Impact Study

Well planned infill projects which are located close to transit, bike and pedestrian facilities (see Appendix A: Project Type 1) which also have proximity benefits to employment centers, services and goods – will reduce travel demand on the entire transportation system and will therefore require significantly less review and mitigation than rural fringe projects (Project Type 5) which generate proportionately higher number of trips and vehicle miles traveled.

Districts should coordinate with SB 743 Program Implementation Manager when developing letters for Type 1 land use projects.

Below is suggested language for consideration and is generally targeted for Type 4 and 5 projects from Appendix A and some plans.

“The environmental document should include an analysis of the multimodal travel demand expected from the proposed project. This analysis should also identify potentially significant adverse impacts from such demands and avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures needed to address them.

Early collaboration, such as sharing the analysis for review and comment prior to the environmental document, leads to better outcomes for all stakeholders.

Given that Caltrans current guidelines are in the process of being updated, a transportation impact study scoping meeting with District staff could be used to discuss the most appropriate methodology for this analysis. At a minimum, the analysis should provide the following:

1. Vicinity maps, regional location map, and a site plan clearly showing project access in relation to nearby roadways and key destinations. Ingress and egress for all project components should be clearly identified. Clearly identify the State right-of-way (ROW). Project driveways, the State Highway System and local roads, intersections and interchanges, pedestrian and bicycle routes, car/bike parking, and transit routes and facilities should be mapped.

2. Project-related VMT should be calculated factoring in per capita use of transit, rideshare or active transportation modes and VMT reduction factors. The assumptions and methodologies used to develop this information should be detailed in the study, should utilize the latest place based research, and should be supported with appropriate documentation. Mitigation for any roadway section or intersection with increasing VMT should be identified and mitigated in a manner that does not further raise VMT.

3. Schematic illustrations of walking, biking and auto traffic conditions at the project site and study area roadways, trip distribution percentages and volumes as well as intersection geometrics, i.e., lane configurations, for AM and PM peak periods. Operational concerns for
all road users that may increase the potential for future collisions should be identified and fully mitigated in a manner that does not further raise VMT.

D. Encroachment Permits

“Please be advised that any ingress-egress, work (e.g. construction, vegetation management, drainage improvement, etc.), or traffic control that is conducted within or adjacent to or encroaches upon the State Right of Way (ROW) requires an encroachment permit that is issued by Caltrans. Where construction related traffic restrictions and detour affect State highways, a Transportation Management Plan or construction traffic impact study may be required. Traffic-related mitigation measures should be incorporated into the construction plans prior to the encroachment permit process. To apply, a completed encroachment permit application, environmental documentation, and six (6) sets of plans clearly indicating State ROW as well as any applicable specifications, calculations, maps, etc. must be submitted to the following address: (insert District Permits contact and address). It is important to note that, in order to uphold the Department’s statutory responsibility to protect the safety of the traveling public, if this information is not adequately provided, then a permit will not be issued for said encroachments. See the following website for more information: [http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/developserv/permits]

A note about encroachment permits: compliance with CEQA must be completely addressed before an encroachment permit application is submitted to the District Encroachment Permits Office. Before an encroachment permit application package can be deemed as complete, all applicable Federal and State statutory requirements including but not limited to Storm Water, Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), and CEQA must be complied with. Therefore it is critical that all issues have been ironed out prior to the applicant submitting an application package to the District Encroachment Permits Office. This is also critical to provide documentation for District Encroachment Permit Engineers’ consideration when issuing subsequent encroachments or when processing developer-built mitigation measures within State right-of-way. Comment letters should remind the reader that such analysis is required during the permit review process and a development’s needed improvements, even opening day access, may be delayed if adequate detail is not provided during the environmental process upfront. This should be explained in such a way to convey that Caltrans is also trying to help save time and money for all those concerned.

E. Smart Growth Principles

“Support for infill and smart growth development is found in our new Mission, Vision, and Goals, the California Transportation Plan 2040, Smart Mobility Framework, Strategic Management Plan, and related guidance documents.

Based on its place-type, VMT, design characteristics, potential impacts, and proposed mitigations, the Department feels that this (plan/project) (is/is not) representative of the smart growth principles and (assists/does not assist) in meeting the state’s goals.”

Note: If the plan/project is not representative of smart growth principles, assist the lead agency by recommending specific changes that could help it move in a different direction. This should be done at the earliest point in the planning process possible.

F. Transportation Impact Fees

“We request that an analysis of the (plans/project’s) impacts and mitigation include information regarding the (city/county’s) local and/or regional impact fee program. The analysis should identify if those
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programs include improvements to pedestrian, bicycle and transit infrastructure or that could be considered representative of the project's likely TDM mitigation measures. If no such fee exists, we would appreciate exploring with you the establishment of (local or regional) VMT-based transportation impact fee programs.”

Two jurisdictions are currently using VMT-based thresholds: City of Pasadena, and City of San Francisco. City of Pasadena is updating a nexus study for its fee program that includes bicycle, pedestrian, and VMT metrics. City of San Francisco legislated a fee program based upon square footage of new development.

G. Responsiveness of the Lead Agency to Caltrans Comments

Generally, the second introductory paragraph of comment letters should reiterate the project description, reference previous comment letters, summarize the results of interagency coordination and outcome of previous comments, clarify where the project is currently at in the process, and identify key decision points.

Specifically, it is important to compare issues raised in the NOP stage with those addressed in the Draft TIS and EIR, as well as those between the Draft and Final EIRs, so that decision makers and the public know what concerns were addressed/resolved or remain a concern. If all of Caltrans concerns have been resolved, that would be valuable information for the public and decision makers to know. A brief summary paragraph should be adequate to summarize relevant points related to key concerns and convey a conclusion to the reader.

In the event that substantive concerns were brought up in the NOP stage and commented on in the Draft TIS-EIR stage, but not sufficiently resolved by the Final EIR stage, then IGR coordinators should consider making a statement related to adequacy of the FEIR based on either CEQA’s public disclosure or reasonable argument provisions and recommend to the lead agency how it could be corrected prior to certification. Any comments on adequacy of an FEIR should consider the policies outlined earlier in this document.

No template language is provided because this information is specific to the nature and history of each plan/project and District staff would be best suited to summarize the relevant issues for the public record.
Appendix D: Additional Technical Considerations

Note that any considerations below must fall into the policy framework of the main guidance.

A. Transportation Demand Management

Transportation Demand Management is a set of tools that increases the efficiency of the transportation system by providing options for users other than driving alone, or by shifting travel away from peak periods. In direct support of SB 743, reviewers should always evaluate opportunities for TDM measures that could be deployed to reduce VMT and increase walking, biking, and transit use. Evidence of VMT reduction benefits resulting from the project’s design, siting, and TDM mitigation measures should provide a clear nexus in the VMT analysis. This analysis should be place-based and utilize the latest trip-generation research available to describe influencing factors such as mode-shift due to transit availability and internal capture attributable to mixed use developments (see the Caltrans research on new trip generation rates for infill development). District and Headquarters staff can help recommend emerging methodologies that could be used to better estimate mixed use infill trip generation rates or quantify VMT reduction from TDM mitigation measures. Similarly, rather than making a vague reference that a lead agency should use VMT-based impact fees to mitigate the effects of its cumulative development, provide sample language for an actual Condition of Approval or Mitigation Measure to that effect and offer to participate in its creation. If there were questions about the project or assumptions about the analysis that were resolved or agreed to, comment letters should reflect those outcomes for the record and state that Caltrans’ concerns were adequately addressed.

Reviewers should request that Lead Agencies include in their transportation impact studies (TIS) a project vicinity map and site-design layout plan that identifies all of the priority pedestrian and bicycle routes and transit routes/stops serving the site (based on relevant bike-pedestrian and transit service-development plans). It would be helpful for the lead agency if reviewers included a brief summary of what the District thinks the potential impacts of concern are likely to be based on the project and its location. This will help them focus the emphasis of their TIS. One repository for TDM strategies is found in the CAPCOA Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures document (which focuses also on VMT). Also consider the following as a non-exhaustive list of potential TDM strategies:

1. Parking Management:
   a) In urban settings, recommend eliminating parking where transit is adjacent, significantly reduce parking where transit is within ¼ mile. See AB 744 (2015), which identifies maximum parking ratios for affordable housing projects located within one-half mile of a major transit stop, and affordable housing projects outside of those locations.
   b) In rural resort and special event settings, ensure an adequate balance between on-site parking and availability of off-site parking coupled with shuttle service for peak demand dates/times.
   c) Raise the cost of parking in general parking zones.
   d) Give preferential parking for carpools, vanpools, carshare, and rideshare programs.
   e) Create park and ride lots adjacent to transit commuter facilities or near HOV entrances.
   f) Establish maximum parking units per dwelling unit equivalent (d.u.e.) and thousand square foot (k.s.f.) ratios.
   g) Provide preferred and/or restricted parking stalls for Transportation Network Companies at select locations.
2. Additional non-auto centric measures
   a) Add or extend transit routes or increase transit frequency.
   b) Issue transit passes or subsidies to employees.
   c) Issue housing-based transit passes.
   d) Promote telecommuting and flexible work schedules.
   e) Provide shelter and lighting for pedestrians as well as quality street furniture.
   f) Compliment bicycle routes with secure bicycle parking facilities and showers at strategic locations.
   g) Establish bike share programs or systems.
   h) Establish safe routes to school programs (for example: a walking school bus program)
   i) Complete sidewalk systems and mixed-use pathways for non-motorized travel.
   j) Implement bus rapid transit (BRT) systems along key corridors.
   k) Encourage light rail stations and complimentary adjacent TOD.
   l) Develop toll-funded TOD redevelopment incentive programs for high density residential corridors.
   m) Integrate solar-power shade structures and electric vehicle charging stations with rideshare parking lots and transit-rail station planning.

It may also be useful for Districts to provide lead agencies with links to local/regional TDM program resources that serve those jurisdictions.

B. Safety Considerations

Generally, Districts should have minimal comments (or no comments) on Project Type 1-2 (Appendix A) because well-planned, well-located infill projects are presumed to have multiple community benefits that include increased access and safety for all users. Urban infill projects also tend to increase pedestrian and bicycling travel, which promotes livable and healthy communities. In cases where the Districts have specific substantial evidence that safety concerns exist, the Districts should work with the Lead Agency to identify the appropriate analysis needed, ways it can be provided, and how the safety concerns can be addressed. Appropriate multimodal mitigation can be suggested that advances safety for bicyclists, pedestrians, transit users, and motorists. Districts should coordinate with the SB 743 Program Implementation Manager when developing letters for Type 1 land use projects.

Districts should analyze how increased VMT from either planned development (particularly project types 3-5) or proposed infrastructure investments may cause traffic operational dynamics that exacerbated modal conflict in the transportation system. For example, increased traffic volumes from high-VMT development and/or high speeds can exacerbate safety concerns related to inadequate acceleration-deceleration lengths, sight-distance, and reaction-time that may affect adjacent pedestrian facilities. Similarly, increasing traffic volumes at uncontrolled turn-movement points or in locations without adequate modal separation/refuge can increase the vulnerability for all modes, especially pedestrians and bicyclists.

Highway intersections and interchanges are often a challenge for motorists, bicyclists, and pedestrians. This is due to higher volumes, variable speeds, complex or unique designs, numerous conflict points, a mix of vehicle types, and changes in land uses. Care must be employed to assure all system users perceive the design, operating conditions, and speed limits allow them to act and react in a safe manner.
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This transition zone between free flow and metered flow is considered a “critical transition area”. Traffic design speeds near intersections and interchanges should be appropriate to the context. Where pedestrians and bicyclists are present, design speeds should be slower to help ensure the safety of all road users. For more guidance on intersections and interchanges, please see Caltrans Complete Intersections: A Guide to Reconstructing Intersections and Interchanges for Bicyclists and Pedestrians, 2010. Page 15 of the document states:

Any reduction in vehicle speed benefits pedestrian and bicyclist safety, since there is a direct link between impact speeds and the likelihood of fatality. Methods to reduce pedestrian and bicyclist exposure to vehicles improve safety by lessening the time that the user is in the likely path of a motor vehicle. These methods include the construction of physically separated facilities such as sidewalks, raised medians, refuge islands, and off-road paths and trails, or reductions in crossing distances through roadway narrowing.

Pedestrian and bicyclist warning signage, flashing beacons, crosswalks, and other signage and striping should be used to indicate to motorists that they should expect to see and yield to pedestrians and bicyclists. Formal information from traffic control devices should be reinforced by informal sources of information such as lane widths, landscaping, street furniture, and other road design features.

Other documents that should be referenced include the Caltrans Class IV Bikeway (Separated Bikeways/Cycletracks) Guidance, 2015 and the Highway Design Manual.

All discussions or comments should keep in mind Caltrans Strategic Management Plan goals, including to increase walking, biking, and transit use, and reduce per capita vehicle miles traveled. Suggested Operational Impact improvements must consider the most vulnerable roadway users (i.e., children and elderly pedestrians, children bicyclists, etc.).

Caltrans staff should be ready to provide a list of potential multimodal mitigation measures for specific concerns that might be raised. Listed below are a few resources to reference when making Operational Impact determinations for development projects and plans:


The Caltrans Highway Design Manual (HDM) can be found at: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/oppd/hdm/hdmtoc.htm

Topics contained within the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (California MUTCD), such as pedestrian hybrid beacons, can be found at: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/engineering/mutcd/ca_mutcd2014.htm

The Caltrans-endorsed National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) guides on Urban Street Design and Urban Bikeways provide best practices and standards for pedestrian, bicycle, and transit features. The guides can be found in the Caltrans Library. More information about the guides can be found here: http://nacto.org/
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More Caltrans resources related to Complete Streets and Smart Mobility can be found at: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/ocp/smbr.html

C. Access Management

Access management is a particular concern at the interface between vehicular and bicycle-pedestrian use of roadways, shoulders, bike lanes, and sidewalks and the ingress-egress points for land use destinations. Avoiding operational impacts that may increase the likelihood of collisions is an integral and important part of multimodal access management. Significant speed differentials and travel volumes can result in a need for access management mitigation measures. These include efforts to limit modal conflicts and increase accessibility for vulnerable road users, reduce speed differentials between vehicles, modulate flow volumes for specific directions, control specific turning movements, and provide adequate stopping sight distance and decision site distance. These issues are amplified where large buses or trucks are involved. Where design features are recommended to mitigate pedestrian and/or bicycle safety concerns, various issues should be considered such as topography, ADA accessibility, maintenance, and seasonal factors (e.g. snow removal and/or storage, etc.). Access management efforts must also take into consideration of other state goals such as designing for motor vehicle speeds appropriate to the place setting, protection of vulnerable road users, reduction in motor vehicle travel, and adding features that increase driver attention.

Reviewers may also highlight the benefits of roundabouts because they facilitate road diets, produce narrower pedestrian crossing widths compared to signalized and stop-controlled intersections, and produce lower speeds and speed differential at and near pedestrian and bike conflict areas. Roundabouts may not be appropriate at some intersection contexts and locations. See the Intersection Control Evaluation guidance for more information.
Sebastopol dives into rent control conversation

by Amie Windsor Sonoma West Staff Writer amie@sonomawest.com | Posted: Wednesday, October 26, 2016 9:05 am

Sebastopol city staff will be busy over the next seven weeks as they prepare a study on possible rent control policies the city could enact to help protect families from rising rental costs.

“We need to start talking about what are the values of our community,” Vice Mayor Una Glass said. “What are the housing remedies and policy solutions we can use to help?”

The city council embarked on discussions about rent control during their Oct. 18 city council meeting after Councilmember Robert Jacob requested council approval to direct staff to analyze myriad tenant protection policies, including legislation to establish rent control, rent stabilization and just cause eviction.

“I think we all recognize Sebastopol is an expensive place to live,” said City Manager/Attorney Larry McLaughlin during his staff report to the council.

According to the U.S. Census Bureau, median gross rent in Sebastopol between 2010 and 2014 was $1,225, while the median home value hovered around $470,000. However, according to the 2016 Sonoma County Local Economic Profile on Sebastopol, the median home sales price has spiked to $742,854, roughly $170,000 more than the county average.

“There’s no need to continue going in that direction,” said Jeanne Bates, a Sebastopol resident of 16 years. “There’s no denying this is an expensive place to live.”

Of the roughly 3,500 houses in Sebastopol, about half are owner-occupied, leaving about 1,875 units available for rental. Many of those, according to Daniel Sanchez, government affairs director at the North Bay Association of Realtors, would be ineligible for rent control policies.

“Under state law, single-family homes, condominiums and older units cannot be under rent control,” Sanchez said.

Sanchez refers to the Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act of 1995 which exempts rent control measures to be enacted upon single family houses and condominiums or properties built after 1995.

Additionally, housing units already classified as subsidized or affordable, such as Petaluma Avenue Homes, Bodega Hills Apartments and Burbank Heights & Orchard Senior Housing, are ineligible for rent control.

“That leaves roughly 88 units that could be eligible for rent control,” Sanchez said.

Sanchez’s estimate factors in excluding rental complexes with fewer than four residential units, a policy that parallels Santa Rosa’s proposed rent control ordinance.

While Sanchez believed those 88 units weren’t worth the city’s efforts, others disagreed.

“Those are 88 units you have the power to do something about,” said Omar Medina, president of the North Bay Organizing Project. “Rent stabilization needs to come in with just cause eviction.”
The conversation made some leery, including city council members, who fear talk of rent control policies will push landlords to reactively spike rents before a new policy is put in place.

In reaction to the fear, Jacob, Glass and Councilmember John Eder supported staff working on an urgency ordinance to establish a retroactive moratorium on rent that would be effective Oct. 18, 2016. According to McLaughlin, an urgency ordinance for a rent moratorium would “freeze rents as they presently are, with allowances for return of investment. It would keep the status quo,” he said.

“A moratorium is to protect renters right now,” Jacob said. “There will be newspaper articles about this, which will artificially raise rents.”

In a 3-2 vote, the council approved instructing staff to work on and present an urgency ordinance by the council’s next meeting on Tuesday, Nov. 1. Because staff is already pressed with many issues, McLaughlin indicated the city would have to hire outside counsel for the urgency ordinance. Uncertain of the price tag associated with outside help, McLaughlin guessed the additional work would easily cost “in excess of $10,000.”

Despite the split decision on the moratorium, all council members agree the city should research possible policy solutions to create a more affordable Sebastopol.

“I’m a believer in rent control,” Jacob said. “But it’s not the only solution. It’s part of a package, which includes constructing new houses.”

Councilmember Patrick Slayter, who with Mayor Sarah Glade Gurney voted against the moratorium, agreed with Jacob.

“While I’d like to think the five of us here can solve the problem, I don’t think we can. This is all untreaded water, but I support this,” Slayter said.

Were Sebastopol to enact rent control policies, it would be the second city in the county, following Santa Rosa, to pursue such legislation.

Rent control legislation has been abolished in most the United States, save Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Washington D.C. and California. Many California cities maintain rent control policies, including Bay Area locales like Berkeley, Oakland and San Francisco.
General Plan approved with last minute changes

by Amie Windsor Sonoma West Staff Writer amie@sonomawest.com | Posted: Wednesday, November 23, 2016 10:01 am

City farmer demands density change

The Sebastopol City Council unanimously approved the city’s new General Plan — a culmination of two-and-a-half years of work — with an eleventh-hour amendment that accommodates the wishes of a fifth-generation Sebastopol resident and her illegal in-city farm.

The city council did not have plans to discuss the General Plan on Tuesday night, having spent an additional five hours during the Nov. 15 city council meeting to finish making edits to a document that’s been poured over by both the planning commission and city council. As such, the approval of the General Plan was placed on the consent calendar of the agenda.

“The mayor polled the council on whether the General Plan should be agendized or placed on the consent calendar” after the council held a special meeting in early November to make all final changes to The General Plan, according to City Manager/Attorney Larry McLaughlin.

“No one requested that it be placed on the agenda,” McLaughlin said.

Nancy Prebilich, owner of the property in question, however, had a different idea, interrupting the mayor during the reading of the consent calendar to demand the item be taken off of the consent calendar to allow for public comment and deliberation.

“Madam Mayor, what about the public?” Prebilich said, standing up with approximately 25 supporters.

City Councilmember Robert Jacob requested the item be pulled off the consent calendar on Prebilich’s behalf.

Prior to Tuesday night’s meeting, Prebilich’s parcel, located at 7600 Leland Street, was allocated to remain zoned at medium residential density (MRD). MRD does not allow for the current number of animals Prebilich owns, which includes pigs, a tiny horse, sheep and goats. She serves as a support for her community, offering farming and agricultural mentorships to neighborhood kids. A change from MRD to low residential density allows Prebilich to pursue a land use change to get her farm in compliance.

“All the land around me is used for agriculture,” Prebilich said. “It makes sense that my land is too.”
According to McLaughlin, Prebilich has been issued citations for owning and maintaining too many animals and an illegal “snack shack.” The “snack shack,” Prebilich said, is a shed used to trade house-grown and created goods between neighbors, including kombucha and coffee.

“It’s not a snack shack,” Prebilich said.

The sale of homemade edible goods is not allowed within the city without proper licensing and facilities. A zoning code amendment would not allow for the sale of any goods Prebilich produces, including pork sausage.

“It’s ridiculous,” Prebilich said. “We’re just trying to create a culture that preserves how Sebastopol used to be. There are people around this town who sell local honey and eggs who are all out of compliance.”

The city has also been informed of alleged pollution of the Calder Creek. The city responded by sending a notice to the North Coast Regional Quality Board, McLaughlin said.

He noted, however that the city currently is not pursuing any action against Prebilich regarding the alleged and recorded violations.

“There has been no further action against her, period,” McLaughlin said.

Prebilich said she was happy with the council’s decision but was frustrated by the process and route the city council took in order to allow the change.

“They put us at the back of the meeting,” Prebilich said. “They could have listened to us right away but they moved us back past 10 p.m.”

The council made its final vote on the land use change at 11:30 p.m.

Community, council celebrate hard work

The final amendment was a dramatic finish to a two-plus year process during which the city council, planning commission and various community members worked together to revise the vision of the next 20 years for Sebastopol.

That vision is the newly adopted General Plan, which supersedes and replaces the 1994 General Plan. Since July 2014, a designated group of 16 individuals known as the General Plan Action Committee (GPAC), met 12 times to establish guiding principles that ultimately led to revisions and updates in the General Plan. The current plan focuses on pushing Sebastopol as a leader in sustainability and innovation encouraging a strong downtown core while also protecting the city’s small-town charm and unique character.

The General Plan serves as the guide for any decisions made by the city council, planning commission and design review board. Its contents include 10 elements: land use, circulation, community services and facilities, conservation and open space, noise, community design, safety, economic vitality, community health and wellness and housing.

Key changes in the new General Plan include a focus on providing affordable housing in the downtown core through the use of multi-storied buildings. A revision to the Zoning Code requires a minimum height of two
stories for new major development projects within the central core. Buildings can be up to four stories or 50 feet in the Central Core if residential uses are on any of the upper stories.

Sebastopol’s traffic was also a key focus of the General Plan. Possible roadway improvements to improve circulation include traffic lights or roundabouts at Healdsburg Avenue and Covert Lane and Highway 116 and Fircrest Avenue. To help deter motor vehicle use, the city’s General Plan provides guidelines for incentives for proposed development to include bicycle and pedestrian facilities. These facilities, including bike lanes and multi-use trails, would work together to create an interconnected system that enables bicyclists and pedestrians to safely travel throughout the city.

Other changes in the new General Plan include revising the Zoning Ordinance to allow parks as a permitted use in all districts, establishing and revising a list of parcels and areas around the Laguna de Santa Rosa for future acquisition and preservation and reviewing and possibly strengthening the exterior lighting standards contained in the Design Review Board to prevent light nuisance and/or noise.

The full General Plan is available online at the city’s website.

Along with the General Plan, the city council unanimously approved the accompanying environmental impact report (EIR). The EIR meets the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and provides analysis of the potential environmental impacts of the General Plan.
Draft General Plan enshrines 1 percent growth for 20 years

by Laura Hagar Rush Staff Writer laura@sonomawest.com | Posted: Wednesday, November 30, 2016 2:27 pm

On Monday, Nov. 28, the Windsor Town Council accepted the Draft General Plan and directed city staff to begin the Environmental Impact Report that is the final—well, almost final—step in the adoption of the document that will guide Windsor’s development over the next 24 years. The Draft General Plan is the result of two-and-a-half years of work on the part of the council, city staff and the public, who participated in a series of 10 public meetings as part of the Windsor 2040 process.

The document is conservative in the old fashioned sense, in that it attempts to conserve what was continually referred to as Windsor’s “small town feel,” and progressive in its embrace of cutting-edge environmental urban planning, which was embodied this week by the council’s call to redevelop the city center as a national demonstration model of energy and water efficiency. “It seems only fair,” said Mayor Mark Millan, “If we are going to ask other developers to live by higher standards that we live by them ourselves.”

The Draft General Plan was introduced by community development director Ken McNab and planning consultants Chelsea Payne and Emmanuel Ursu. But it was clear from early on that the evening belonged to councilwoman Debora Fudge, who had a sheaf of last minute changes. The council acceded readily to many of her suggestions—inserting language like “aiming at net-zero-energy,” embracing the adoption of emerging technologies like self-driving cars that would reduce the need for parking downtown, and including climate change language that referred to flooding as well as drought. They pushed back on others—including her request that no “vast seas” be visible from the freeway and her opposition to the transformation of portions of three main roads in pedestrian-unfriendly five-lane arterials.

Most controversial was Fudge’s insistence on a hard 1 percent growth rate, written into the general plan, replacing more general language about managing growth. After a long discussion, in which Fudge pointed out that a growth rate of 1 percent was considerably higher than Windsor’s recent growth rate of .7 percent, the council agreed, utilizing language from city attorney Robin Donoghue “limiting growth to 1 percent as a means of managing growth in accordance with historical rates of growth.”

For some, this language didn’t go far enough. Salmon voiced his concern about a softening of the language in the land use and community design section — a shift away from the old sharp agricultural buffers to
language calling for “a sense of transition between active farmland at the Town edge and development within the Town.” What this means, Salmon said, is the ability of developers on the eastern edge of town to build progressively less dense developments on the town’s edges — an urban boundary style known as feathering. Salmon says this is a move away from Windsor’s past insistence on hard boundaries at the town edges.

At the end of the 4.5 hour meeting, all the council members thanked the public for their robust participation in the process, particularly those that, in Foppoli’s words, “didn’t have a dog the fight.” By this point in the evening, however, most of the public had filtered out, leaving a smattering of the diehard policy wonks and landowners with the proverbial dog. Okrepkie earned the biggest laugh of the evening with his statement that he was looking forward to the whole general plan process “being almost over.”
Large turnout for Civic Center Revisioning meeting

By Tony Landucci Staff Writer tony@sonomawest.com | Posted: Wednesday, October 5, 2016 5:45 pm

No timeline for project, yet

It was standing room only until additional chairs were brought out at a special Town Council meeting on Wednesday, Sept. 28, to explore big changes to Windsor’s downtown area. There will still be months to years for public input and Mayor Mark Millan said “there is no timeline” for the possible changes in and around the Town Green as a result of the project which is still in its infancy. The meeting was the first public forum for people to see the Civic Center Revisioning project and react to it. More public meetings are being planned.

Last week, the Town Council heard presentations from contractors hired by the city to help redesign the area, including access roads and paths for both motorized and non-motorized transportation.

Three design plans were discussed at the meeting. Council member Deb Fudge said that the city coffers are lacking for any work to begin. Grants and investors are being sought. Millan hazarded a guess that it would be years before anything is built or torn down.

The two consultants, WRT (Wallace Roberts & Todd) and Urban3 focused on different aspects of the town’s potential as Windsor continues to grow.

“There’s a lot of energy in this area,” said WRT’s James Stickley about what he called the “downtown core,” which includes the Town Green and businesses south and west of the grassy expanse.

Design changes could include moving the Huerta Gym, Windsor Police Station and the Windsor Library to make way for multi-use buildings that incorporate commercial, residential and other multi-use applications. Live-work buildings could replace the gym, with restaurants and retail spaces on the ground floor and apartments aimed at the millennial generation on the top floor and mixed use in between, such as office space.

The gym could be moved to the proposed Multi-Generational Recreation Center proposed for the future in Keiser Park, per the May, 2008 Keiser Park Master Plan, Parks and Recreation Director Donna Legge said. “It would be desirable,” she said. In the event the timing does not line up, the town would explore its options.

The Windsor Library could be moved about a block north, potentially getting a second story and an outdoor reading area. Not everyone was happy about the relocation. Among the more than two-dozen speakers in the Econ MRI

At the Sept. 28 council meeting on the Civic Center Revisioning project, consultants Urban3 presented a map showing the tax value of communities in the county. The tall markings are a measure of income for the area.
council chambers, Children’s Librarian Tiffany Bronzan voiced her opposition.

“We need a bigger, better library,” Bronzan said. “But I would hate to lose that location.”

She said that the library is the cultural center of Windsor and should stay where it is. But it seems there is a question of value to be pondered; the cultural value of the library’s current location versus the potential revenue brought in by alternative uses for the land.

According to Windsor Economic Development Manager Robert Ramirez, the Huerta Gym and the Windsor Regional Library are zoned for public use and not currently generating property tax revenue for the town.

WRT presented potential uses for the pieces of land where the civic center area currently sits and a large property to the north that is owned. The triangle-shaped property running from Howard Drive to Old Redwood Highway might be redeveloped into residential properties. The land will need to be acquired by the town if that option is pursued.

Oak trees around town and in the area of the Town Green were acknowledged and praised by the urban designer. “One of the key exhibits in our analysis is the existing tree canopy,” Stickley said. “One of the greatest assets that you have out here are the Heritage Oaks, they’re really quite magnificent and in some ways, they really make this area in terms of its defining character.”

The contractors addressed the likelihood of a need for more parking in the area and Stickley said that a multi-level parking structure would not be necessary. Surface level parking can be used “for the foreseeable future,” he said.

Joseph Minicozzi from the consulting company Urban3 gave a spirited presentation on Windsor’s potential for economic gain if the town focuses on the taxable value of developments in Windsor. Minicozzi’s presentation showed what he called an magnetic resonance imaging scan or MRI of the local economy and the taxable value. “Windsor is a $3.3 billion tax value corporation,” Minicozzi said about Windsor’s maximum potential taxable value, according to Urban3’s research.

Stickley said that two or three level buildings could be placed there, similar to the live-work buildings on the south side of the Town Green, replacing the gym and library. The concept of a boutique hotel was discussed for the multi-use areas, as well.

A hotel in the civic center area could potentially bring $64,000 to the town per year in taxes, according to the projections presented at the council meeting.

Minicozzi emphasized Urban3’s work to remodel existing buildings in Asheville, North Carolina, and encouraged smaller, better-built buildings for Windsor’s core area. He used Walmart as a comparison to buildings like La Rose Hotel in Santa Rosa, which was built in 1907. Minicozzi said Walmart buildings are designed to last about 20 years, “they’re designed to fall apart.” Minicozzi said the retail giant does this in order to pay less in tax money because the buildings have a lower value, “that’s the game,” he said.

Minicozzi said Windsor has a good start for a more financially successful downtown area. “You’ve essentially made a downtown from scratch, or added to it,” he said.
The study, which is ongoing, will be paid for out of the town’s General Fund, with up to $200,000 being allocated for the research project. Of that amount, $97,784.36 has been paid out, so far.

“Both consultants did a good job of capturing the purpose of both studies,” Ramirez said. “Our goal was to conduct a study that would not only identify more functional and inclusive uses of the Civic Center but one that is economically advantageous.

Ramirez said that Minicozzi’s presentation provided valuable information on the benefits of sustainable development and the potential economic benefits that the Town stands to gain, considering the proximity of the SMART train station.

During public comments, several people said to the council that they did not want Windsor to become like Healdsburg.