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BOARD OF DIRECTORS AGENDA

February 6, 2017 – 2:30 p.m.

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

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

2. Public comment on items not on the regular agenda

3. Consent Calendar
   A. SCTA/RCPA Concurrent Items
      3.1. Admin – Minutes of the December 12, 2016 meeting (ACTION)*
      3.2. Admin – contract for State advocacy with Dunn Consulting (ACTION)*
   B. RCPA Items
      3.3. BayREN – 2017 contract for energy efficiency program funds (ACTION)*
   C. SCTA Items
      3.4. Measure M – cooperative agreement with Town of Windsor for access across Hwy 101 project and; Appropriation request(ACTION)*
      3.5. Measure M – appropriation request from City of Santa Rosa for Hearn Avenue Interchange(ACTION)*
      3.6. Hwy 101 – MSN-B2 Phase 2 construction funding (ACTION)*
      3.7. MTC – program unused funding from One Bay Area Grant to Safe Routes to School (ACTION)*

4. Regular Calendar
   A. SCTA/RCPA Items
      4.1. Admin – Election of Officers 2017 (ACTION)*
      4.2. Admin – 2016 SCTA & RCPA Annual Report (ACTION)*
      4.3. Outreach – Community Affairs update (REPORT)
   B. SCTA Items
      4.4. SCTA Planning
         4.4.1. Senior Mobility – presentation on mobility management from Area Agency on Aging (REPORT)*
      4.5. SCTA Projects and Programming
         4.5.1. Measure M – FY15/16 Annual Report (ACTION)*
         4.5.2. Legislation – letter of support for AB1 and SB1 related to State transportation funding (ACTION)*
         4.5.3. Legislation – Regional Measure 3 (REPORT)*
         4.5.4. Highways – update on State Highway projects (ACTION)
C. **RCPA Items**

4.6. **RCPA Planning**
   4.6.1. **CA2020** – implementation update with examples from Windsor and Sonoma (REPORT)*

4.7. **RCPA Projects and Programming**
   4.7.1. **Activities Report** – (REPORT)*

5. **Reports and Announcements**

   5.1. Executive Committee report
   5.2. Regional agency reports
   5.3. Advisory Committee agendas*
   5.4. SCTA/RCPA staff report
   5.5. Announcements

6. **Adjourn**

*Materials attached.

---

The next **SCTA/RCPA** meetings will be held **March 13, 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 SCTA/RCPA after distribution of the agenda packet are available for public inspection in the SCTA/RCPA office at 490 Mendocino Ave., Suite 206, during normal business hours.

Pagers, cellular telephones and all other communication devices should be turned off during the committee meeting to avoid electrical interference with the sound recording system.

TO REDUCE GHG EMISSIONS: Please consider carpooling or taking transit to this meeting. For more information check [www.511.org](http://www.511.org), [www.srcity.org/citybus](http://www.srcity.org/citybus), [www.sctransit.com](http://www.sctransit.com) or [https://carmacarpool.com/sfbay](https://carmacarpool.com/sfbay)
BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING
Meeting Minutes of December 12, 2016

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

Meeting called to order at 2:32 p.m. by Chair David Rabbitt.

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

Directors Absent: Director Mackenzie, City of Rohnert Park

2. Public comment on items not on the regular agenda

Steve Birdlebough presented information from the U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration demonstrating data on an increase of travel times and vehicle miles travelled, with specifics to an increase of 6.3% in the State of California. Mr. Birdlebough explained this data is not sustainable with current transportation plans and stressed the importance of more transit opportunities to get more cars off the roads. As well as transit, Mr. Birdlebough acknowledged the high cost of parking.

Duane Dewitt presented the transportation element to the 1975 Sonoma County General Plan and the plans for bicycle paths through Santa Rosa, with specifics in the Roseland neighborhood. Mr. DeWitt spoke on the need for market area surveys on bike planning and stronger outreach efforts to get more individuals onto bicycles and out of vehicles.

3. Consent Calendar

SCTA/RCPA Concurrent Items
3.1. Admin – Minutes of the November 11, 2016 meeting (ACTION)*
3.2. Admin – accept FY 15/16 annual audits (ACTION)*
3.3. Admin – commendation of Director Tom Chambers (ACTION)*
3.4. Admin – commendation of Director Laurie Gallian (ACTION)*

SCTA Items

3.5. Hwy 101 – conflict waiver re: legal services and Marin Sonoma Narrows C2 project (ACTION)*
3.6. Hwy 101 – amendment No. 2 to cooperative agreement SCTA11012 with City of Petaluma related to Rainier undercrossing and Marin Sonoma Narrows C2 (ACTION)*
3.7. Measure M – appropriation of funds to Sonoma County Bicycle coalition for Safe Routes to School funds (ACTION)*
Chair Rabbit thanked Director Chambers and Director Gallian for their service on the Board of Directors.

Motion by Director Landman, seconded by Director Miller, to approve the Consent Calendar as presented. Motion passed unanimously.

4. Regular Calendar
   A. SCTA/RCPA Items
      4.1. Hwy 37 – status of planning efforts and policy issues (REPORT)

James Cameron presented to the Board the planning efforts regarding Highway 37. Mr. Cameron identified Highway 37 as crucial for connecting the North Bay through commerce, the job market, housing, tourism and recreation. Mr. Cameron described the current vulnerability of Highway 37 in relation to sea level rise and the potential consequences on neighboring highways. Should Highway 37 close, Highways 116 and 12 to the north and Interstate 580 to the south will not be able to handle the increased traffic.

Mr. Cameron explained Highway 37 is not the top transportation project of the four North Bay counties and funding is in crisis.

Mr. Cameron furthered described a study conducted by Caltrans and UC Davis where sea level rise was modeled and possible alternatives studied.

A policy committee composed of three elected representatives from Marin, Napa, Solano, and Sonoma Counties formed and Project Finance Advisory Ltd (PFAL) was selected as the financial consultant.

The Highway 37 Corridor Plan is estimated to be completed in May 2017.

Mr. Cameron finished the presentation by conveying the message of public outreach, confirmed UC Davis and Caltrans have completed a study and identified stakeholders. There is an eagerness and a desire for more public participation and Caltrans has offered to assist in reaching out to the public.

Upon opening for questions and comments, Chair Rabbitt commented on the difficulties of a Private-Public-Partnership, whether the Bay Area Toll Authority will participate, and acknowledged the lack of resources available to transportation.

Director Gorin commented on the dangerous driving conditions on Highway 37, specifically around Sonoma Raceway and the Highway 116/121 intersection, due to increased congestion. Director Gorin acknowledged this is going to be challenging and this body is only one of a few discussing this challenge.

Director Gorin also conveyed the importance of this topic and willingness to work on public meetings.

Director Landman inquired of the general four possible financial solutions: public private partnership, full privatization, traditional public financing, or a toll road; of which is more likely to be a solution, or if all are equitable options.

Mr. Cameron responded that a traditional option is not likely, but toll studies still need to be completed to understand what the corridor can generate. From these studies, the policy committee will have the answers to help in finding the most suitable solution. Mr. Cameron described other options available that are less costly, i.e. rising levees or modifying areas outside the corridor.
Director Landman discussed his understanding of why a toll road or privatization is attractive to those who would use it, but acknowledged that although he may be against full privatization, the Board needs to keep an open mind to all solutions.

Chair Rabbitt added that the question of a toll will either be through a private public partnership or through a publicly owned toll agency such as the Bay Area Toll Authority.

Director Gallian urged committees to look into all possible solutions. Furthermore, Director Gallian conveyed the importance to have more conversations with elected representatives in Washington D.C. and Sacramento as solutions become more evident.

Director Gallian advocated to keep this process transparent.

Director Coursey expressed his contentment to hear Caltrans will aid in public outreach, yet said to tell the public now what needs to be done and why this needs to be done.

Director Gurney spoke in favor of a more traditional public system. As a group, California taxpayers pay more in federal taxes than what is received in benefits. Director Gurney encouraged the body to keep pressure on local, state, and national elected leaders to ensure California will get the attention and financial support to combat rising sea levels.

Director Gorin expressed her contentment with the policy committee.

Chair Rabbitt opened for public comment.

Steve Birdlebough mentioned the possibility of ferry service, and stressed the importance to think creatively for public transit.

Willard Richards hopes the SCTA will talk with the new transportation secretary to get this project on their radar. Mr. Richards also mentioned that the body should have projects ready so when funds are available, they can begin. Finally, Mr. Richards stated the best way to solve congestion is to have more public transit.

4.2. Outreach – 2017 Legislative Platforms for SCTA and RCPA (ACTION)*

Suzanne Smith gave an overview on the legislative principles set forth in the agenda packet and described how these principles will give the staff general guidance from the Board of Directors when reviewing legislative proposals or participating in funding meetings; monitoring and engaging in rulemaking with partnering agencies; advocating and distributing funds; and opposing efforts to reduce or divert funding from climate protecting.

Ms. Smith asked the Board of Directors for their approval on these legislative principles.

Chair Rabbitt asked for clarification on how information on legislation is followed at the state and federal levels.

Ms. Smith responded transportation legislation is followed at the state level through associations with CALCOC, MTC, CSAC and the League of Cities; federal legislation is followed through MTC. Climate change legislation is followed via state and regional associations, as well as the Water Agency and their lobbyist.
Director Landman asked if there are any statewide interest groups, such as CALCCA, within the realm of RCPA.

Ms. Smith responded there is an organization, Local Government Sustainable Energy Coalition (LGSEC), which is a statewide organization focused on energy efficiency and conservation that looks at state and federal policies.

Director Coursey inquired about updates on state transportation.

Ms. Smith explained Assembly Member Frazier and Senator Beall introduced Assembly Bill 1 (2017-2018) and Senate Bill 1 (2015-2016), titled Transportation Funding. These bills seek increasing revenue sources for transportation by increasing existing sources, i.e. increasing diesel tax, gas tax, vehicle licensing fees, etc.

These proposals amount to $6 billion in new revenue.

Director Zane inquired why there is no federal lobbyist for the SCTA/RCPA.

Ms. Smith responded for a brief period a federal lobbyist was available; however when the earmark system was eliminated, there was no need for a federal lobbyist.

A discussion around federal money, projects, privatization, and influences continued.

Director Landman moved to accept the legislative platforms, Director Miller second. The motion passed unanimously.

4.3. Outreach – Community Affairs Update (REPORT)

Brant Arthur presented information on election results within the state of California regarding transportation tax measures passed and failed, state legislature infrastructure proposals, the Drive Evergreen program, a recent grant proposal submitted to the California Energy Commission, and updated on Social Media outreach.

Director Landman commented that the number of incentive-certificates (290 total) for Drive Evergreen have been issued and surprised by the number of the dealerships who have agreed to participate. The numbers of incentive-certificates will continue to increase.

Director Gurney asked if the cities could receive the language to promote Drive Evergreen on their websites.

Director Russell expressed her interest to target local government regarding this program and also expressed her gratification of a data base to locate charging stations and signs to point towards charging stations so drivers are easily able to find them.

Chair Rabbitt opened for public comment.

Duane DeWitt expressed the need for more bicycle use. Mr. DeWitt also commented on the need for a stronger public outreach campaign to inform citizens about traveling by bicycle, reducing the amount of vehicles on the road, and increasing the awareness of Electric Vehicles.

Director Salmon responded that bicycles are inexpensive and introduced the idea to think of a subsidy for bicycles.

Director Gorin voiced two concerns: first, bicyclists need to feel safe on the road; second, bicycles
usually sit unrepaired in a garage. Since there is conversations around EV charging stations, Director Gorin suggested to include bicycle outreach as well.

Director Gurney suggested with the arrival of SMART, bicycle tourism should be marketed and planned.

Director Zane advised looking into bicycle share program funding.

B. SCTA Items

4.4. SCTA Planning

4.4.1. Measure M – report out from ad hoc on possible 2018 sales tax (REPORT)

Chair Rabbitt reported on the first Measure M Ad Hoc committee meeting held on November 28th. Questions surrounding timing of the measure, the content, and how should the formula be updated were discussed.

The political questions of framing this extension as a new or existing tax were explored.

The Measure M extension is targeted for the November 2018 election.

Director Miller emphasized that outreach is important and stressed the need to get the information out to the public, to make it easy to understand, and to demonstrate the need for the extension.

Director Russell agreed with Director Miller, and added there needs to be ways to show the success in bringing the money back. Measure M has been successful and to ask for the increase, taxpayers need to see where their tax dollars are going and what they receive.

Director Zane suggested to begin a grassroots campaign on the extension now. Now is the time to get the information out to the public.

Director Coursey reminded the body to listen to constituents and is encouraged by the conversation in the meeting.

Director Chambers agreed with Director Miller by keeping the message simple, adding the message must be clear and straightforward.

Chair Rabbitt explained that the messaging must be clear in delivering what is promised.

Suzanne Smith described two tracks on the public outreach: first, explain what has been accomplished; second, talk with residents on what the priorities are going forward.

Currently, the focus is generating the information to provide the talking points to staff and board members.

Steve Birdlebough reminded to keep public transit, specifically SMART, in mind while discussing the extension.

Willard Richards commented that when this extension goes on the ballot, SMART will already be in service and hopes this will influence voters.

4.5. SCTA Projects and Programming

4.5.1. Highways – 2016 State Highway Operations and Preservation Program status report and presentation by Caltrans (ACTION) *

Ron Moriguchi, District Division Chief North Region, and Betsy Joseph, Regional Project Manager Sonoma County, of Caltrans presented
on the *State Highway Operations and Preservation Program* (SHOPP).

This is a four year program and is updated every even year.

Betsy Joseph described the status of the projects in Sonoma County in relation to statewide and district wide projects.

30% of Sonoma County highways are categorized as “distressed,” following Alameda and Napa Counties.

In the 2016 SHOPP Program, Caltrans has programmed $203 million through 19 projects, totaling 670 lane miles in Sonoma County. Ms. Joseph noted there is a need to fund the aging infrastructure, paying specific attention to culverts, as opposed to funding new projects. Culverts are repaired in emergency situations and are identified as “invisible infrastructure.”

Chair Rabbitt thanked Ms. Joseph for the presentation and opened for questions.

Director Gorin asked for clarification on the SHOPP map provided to the Board.

Director Zane asked about the prospects of a rest stop in Sonoma County due to an increase in tourism.

Mr. Moroguchi responded that the answers can be provided, however did not have the immediate information.

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

James Cameron reported on the Sonoma Marin Narrows project in Petaluma, the Petaluma River Bridge project is substantially complete, and the San Antonio Bridge at the county line has been winterized.

The Highway 37 project policy meeting on Jan 5th has been cancelled.

C. **RCPA Items**

4.6 RCPA Planning

4.6.1 **Outreach** – proposal to create the Climate Action Advisory Committee and seek appointments (ACTION)*

Lauren Casey described the proposed *Climate Action Advisory Committee* (CAAP) and asked the Board for guidance in creating this committee.

This committee will meet quarterly and discuss current RCPA projects and programs, future RCPA project and program opportunities, and involve community based efforts. This committee will provide information and advice to RCPA staff and project consultants.

Ms. Casey requested the Board provide membership recommendations, asking each Director nominate two individuals.

Chair Rabbitt wondered if the terms of the committee members will be staggered. Ms. Casey responded originally the terms are not staggered, but is something that can be implemented.

Director Gorin voiced her support for staggered terms to ensure the lasting function of the committee.

Director Coursey asked if public outreach through social media will be explored.

Director Landman expressed his support of this committee.
Upon public comment, Tom Conlon expressed his support of this committee and stressed the importance of diversity.

Director Russell moves to authorize the creation of the Climate Action Advisory Committee, Director Gorin seconds. The motion passed unanimous.

4.7 RCPA Projects and Programming

4.7.1 Activities Report – (REPORT)

Lauren Casey reported on the activities the RCPA participated in the month of November. These activities include coordinating with the North Bay Climate Adaptation Initiative and attendance at the Climate Readiness Institute. Ms. Casey also explained policy and legislation, specifically Senate Bill 32 (2015-2016), and staff is closely following the decisions in President-Elect Trump’s transitions team.

5. Closed Session

5.1. CA2020 – Conference with Legal Counsel – Existing Litigation – California River Watch v. County of Sonoma, Superior Court Case No. SCY-259242 (Government Code Section 54956.9(d)(1))

Cancelled

6. Reports and Announcements

6.1. Executive Committee report

N/A

6.2. Regional agency reports

Sonoma Clean Power: Director Landman reported that incentive certificates for Drive Evergreen are expected to increase.

Bay Area Air Quality Management District:
N/A

Bay Conservation & Development Commission:
N/A

MTC:
N/A

SMART: Director Russell discussed the possibility of an introductory period of free rides to introduce residents to SMART, parking lots, and expressed satisfaction with the meeting.

Director Zane added that introductory monthly fare pass are starting at $200 per month, which amounts to roughly $10 per day, or two trains stops. This plan is more economical than the original plan proposed.

Golden Gate Bridge District:
N/A

6.3. Advisory Committee Agendas

Included in agenda packet.

6.4. SCTA/RCPA staff report

N/A

6.5. Announcements

N/A

7. Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 4:48 p.m.
Staff Report

To: RCPA Board of Directors
From: Lauren Casey, Director of Climate Programs
Item: 3.2 – Dunn Agreement for climate change policy advocacy
Date: February 6, 2017

Issue:
Shall the Board authorize staff to execute the attached agreement for professional services from Dunn Consulting?

Background:
Keith Dunn was retained by the RCPA in 2016 to support legislative efforts including SB 1030 (McGuire) RCPA Sunset Removal and SB 1233 (McGuire) Water Bill Savings Act, as well as to keep staff informed about developments related to the RCPA and SCTA legislative principles.

Staff found the support to extremely useful and wishes to retain support from Dunn Consulting again in 2017 to maintain a strong awareness of and presence in Sacramento, especially to track policy developments that may increase funding for local programs such as those articulated in Item 4.7.1.

Policy Impacts:
Legislative engagement is necessary to advance the Mission, Goals, and Objectives of the RCPA and SCTA.

Fiscal Impacts:
The FY16/17 RCPA and SCTA budgets anticipated funding for legislative support services in the amount $15,000.

Staff Recommendation:
That the Board authorize the Executive Director to execute the attached agreement for consulting support.
Professional Services Agreement for Assistance with Climate Change Policy Advocacy

This agreement (“Agreement”) is by and between Sonoma County Regional Climate Protection Authority (“RCPA”) and Dunn Consulting, a sole proprietorship (“Consultant”). The Effective Date of this Agreement is January 1, 2017.

RECITALS

A. Consultant represents that he is duly qualified with expertise in climate change policy, advocacy, legislative strategy, and related services in the State of California.

B. Consultant will provide consulting services to RCPA in support of monitoring legislative activity, representing RCPA in various forums related to policy advocacy, and providing policy advice, strategy and implementation ideas in partnership RCPA staff and Board members.

In consideration of the foregoing recitals and the mutual covenants contained herein, the parties hereto agree as follows:

AGREEMENT

1. RECITALS

1.1. The above recitals are true and correct.

2. LIST OF EXHIBITS

2.1. The following exhibits are attached hereto and incorporated herein:
   a. Exhibit A: Scope of Work
   b. Exhibit B: Insurance Requirements

3. SCOPE OF SERVICES

3.1. Consultant’s Specified Services: Consultant shall perform the services described in Exhibit A (Scope of Work), within the times or by the dates provided for in Exhibit A and pursuant to Article 9 (Prosecution of Work). In the event of a conflict between the body of this Agreement and Exhibit A, the provisions in the body of this Agreement shall control.

3.2. Cooperation with RCPA: Consultant shall cooperate with RCPA in the performance of all work hereunder. Consultant shall coordinate the work with RCPA’s Project Manager. Contact information and mailing addresses:
3.3. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RCPA</th>
<th>Consultant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Manager: Suzanne Smith</td>
<td>Contact: Keith Dunn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>490 Mendocino Ave, Ste 206</td>
<td>1115 11th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa, CA 95401</td>
<td>Sacramento, CA 95814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: 707-565-5374</td>
<td>Phone: 916-273-6567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:Suzanne.Smith@scta.ca.gov">Suzanne.Smith@scta.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:keithdunn@me.com">keithdunn@me.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remit invoices to: 
Marge Fernandez
Same address as above or
Email: Margaret.Fernandez@scta.ca.gov

Remit payments to: 
Same as above.

3.4. *Performance Standard and Standard of Care*: Consultant hereby agrees that all its work will be performed and that its operations shall be conducted in accordance with the standards of a reasonable professional having specialized knowledge and expertise in the services provided under this Agreement and in accordance with all applicable federal, state and local laws, it being understood that acceptance of Consultant’s work by RCPA shall not operate as a waiver or release. RCPA has relied upon the professional ability and training of Consultant as a material inducement to enter into this Agreement. If RCPA determines that any of Consultant’s work is not in accordance with such level of competency and standard of care, RCPA, in its sole discretion, shall have the right to do any or all of the following: (a) require Consultant to meet with RCPA to review the quality of the work and resolve matters of concern; (b) require Consultant to repeat the work at no additional charge until it is satisfactory; (c) terminate this Agreement pursuant to the provisions of Article 6 (Termination); or (d) pursue any and all other remedies at law or in equity.

4. **PAYMENT**

4.1. *Total Costs*: Total costs under this Agreement shall not exceed $15,000.

4.2. *Method of Payment*: Consultant shall be paid in accordance with the following terms:
   a. Consultant shall receive a monthly retainer not to exceed $1,250.
   b. Expenses not expressly authorized by the Agreement shall not be reimbursed.

4.3. *Invoices*: Consultant shall submit its bills in arrears on a monthly basis, based on monthly retainer cap of $1,250.

4.4. *Monthly Reports with Invoices*: Payment of invoices is subject to receipt of the monthly reports required under Exhibit A.
5. **TERM OF AGREEMENT**

5.1. This Agreement shall expire on December 31, 2017, unless terminated earlier in accordance with the provisions of Article 6 (Termination).

6. **TERMINATION**

6.1. *Termination Without Cause:* Notwithstanding any other provision of this Agreement, at any time and without cause, either party shall have the right, in its sole discretion, to terminate this Agreement by giving 5 days written notice to the other party.

6.2. *Termination for Cause:* Notwithstanding any other provision of this Agreement, should Consultant fail to perform any of its obligations hereunder, within the time and in the manner herein provided, or otherwise violate any of the terms of this Agreement, RCPA may immediately terminate this Agreement by giving Consultant written notice of such termination, stating the reason for termination.

6.3. *Delivery of Work Product and Final Payment Upon Termination:* In the event of termination, Consultant, within 14 days following the date of termination, shall deliver to RCPA all materials and work product subject to Paragraph 11.7 and shall submit to RCPA an invoice showing the services performed, hours worked, and copies of receipts for reimbursable expenses up to the date of termination.

6.4. *Payment Upon Termination:* Upon termination of this Agreement by RCPA, Consultant shall be entitled to receive as full payment for all services satisfactorily rendered and expenses incurred hereunder, an amount which bears the same ratio to the total payment specified in the Agreement as the services satisfactorily rendered hereunder by Consultant bear to the total services otherwise required to be performed for such total payment; provided, however, that if services are to be paid on a per-hour or per-day basis, then Consultant shall be entitled to receive as full payment an amount equal to the number of hours or days actually worked prior to termination times the applicable hourly or daily rate; and further provided, however, that if RCPA terminates the Agreement for cause pursuant to Paragraph 6.2, RCPA shall deduct from such amounts the amount of damage, if any, sustained by RCPA by virtue of the breach of the Agreement by Consultant.

6.5. *Authority to Terminate:* RCPA’s right to terminate may be exercised by RCPA’s Executive Director.

7. **INDEMNIFICATION**

7.1. Consultant agrees to accept responsibility for loss or damage to any person or entity, including RCPA, and to defend, indemnify, hold harmless, and release RCPA, its officers, agents, and employees, from and against any actions, claims, damages, liabilities, disabilities, or expenses, that may be asserted by any person
or entity, including Consultant, that arise out of, pertain to, or relate to the negligence, recklessness, or willful misconduct of Consultant or its agents, employees, contractors, subcontractors, or invitees hereunder, whether or not there is concurrent negligence on RCPA’s part, but, to the extent required by law, excluding liability due to RCPA’s conduct. This indemnification obligation is not limited in any way by any limitation on the amount or type of damages or compensation payable to or for Consultant or its agents, employees, contractors, subcontractors, or invitees under workers’ compensation acts, disability benefits acts, or other employee benefit acts. This indemnity provision survives the Agreement.

8. **INSURANCE**

8.1. With respect to performance of work under this Agreement, Consultant shall maintain and shall require all of its subcontractors, consultants, and other agents to maintain, insurance as described in Exhibit B (Insurance Requirements).

9. **PROSECUTION OF WORK**

9.1. Performance of the services hereunder shall be completed within the time required herein, provided, however, that if the performance is delayed by earthquake, flood, high water, or other Act of God or by strike, lockout, or similar labor disturbances, the time for Consultant’s performance of this Agreement shall be extended by a number of days equal to the number of days Consultant has been delayed.

10. **EXTRA OR CHANGED WORK**

10.1. Extra or changed work or other changes to the Agreement may be authorized only by written amendment to this Agreement, signed by both parties. Minor changes, which do not increase the amount paid under the Agreement, and which do not significantly change the scope of work or significantly lengthen time schedules may be executed by the RCPA’s Executive Director in a form approved by County Counsel. The parties expressly recognize that RCPA personnel are without authorization to order all other extra or changed work or waive Agreement requirements. Failure of Consultant to secure such written authorization for extra or changed work shall constitute a waiver of any and all right to adjustment in the Agreement price or Agreement time due to such unauthorized work and thereafter Consultant shall be entitled to no compensation whatsoever for the performance of such work. Consultant further expressly waives any and all right or remedy by way of restitution and quantum meruit for any and all extra work performed without such express and prior written authorization of RCPA.
11. **REPRESENTATIONS OF CONSULTANT**

11.1. *Status of Consultant:* The parties intend that Consultant, in performing the services specified herein, shall act as an independent contractor and shall control the work and the manner in which it is performed. Consultant is not to be considered an agent or employee of RCPA and is not entitled to participate in any pension plan, worker’s compensation plan, insurance, bonus, or similar benefits RCPA provides its employees. In the event RCPA exercises its right to terminate this Agreement pursuant to Article 6 (Termination), Consultant expressly agrees that it shall have no recourse or right of appeal under rules, regulations, ordinances, or laws applicable to employees.

11.2. *Taxes:* Consultant agrees to file federal and state tax returns and pay all applicable taxes on amounts paid pursuant to this Agreement and shall be solely liable and responsible to pay such taxes and other obligations, including, but not limited to, state and federal income and FICA taxes. Consultant agrees to indemnify and hold RCPA harmless from any liability which it may incur to the United States or to the State of California or to any other public entity as a consequence of Consultant’s failure to pay, when due, all such taxes and obligations. In case RCPA is audited for compliance regarding any withholding or other applicable taxes, Consultant agrees to furnish RCPA with proof of payment of taxes on these earnings.

11.3. *Records Maintenance:* Consultant shall keep and maintain full and complete documentation and accounting records concerning all services performed that are compensable under this Agreement and shall make such documents and records available to RCPA for inspection at any reasonable time. Consultant shall maintain such records for a period of four (4) years following completion of work hereunder.

11.4. *Conflict of Interest:* Consultant covenants that it presently has no interest and that it will not acquire any interest, direct or indirect, that represents a financial conflict of interest under state law or that would otherwise conflict in any manner or degree with the performance of its services hereunder. Consultant further covenants that in the performance of this Agreement no person having any such interests shall be employed. In addition, if required by law or requested to do so by RCPA, Consultant shall submit a completed Fair Political Practices Commission Statement of Economic Interests (Form 700) with RCPA within 30 calendar days after the Effective Date of this Agreement and each year thereafter during the term of this Agreement, or as required by state law.

11.5. *Nondiscrimination:* Consultant shall comply with all applicable federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations in regard to nondiscrimination in employment because of race, color, ancestry, national origin, religion, sex, marital status, age, medical condition, pregnancy, disability, sexual orientation or other prohibited basis. All nondiscrimination rules or regulations required by law to be included in this Agreement are incorporated herein by this reference.
11.6. **Assignment of Rights:** Consultant assigns to RCPA all rights throughout the world in perpetuity in the nature of copyright, trademark, patent, right to ideas, in and to all versions of the plans and specifications, if any, now or later prepared by Consultant in connection with this Agreement. Consultant agrees to take such actions as are necessary to protect the rights assigned to RCPA in this Agreement, and to refrain from taking any action which would impair those rights. Consultant’s responsibilities under this provision include, but are not limited to, placing proper notice of copyright on all versions of the plans and specifications as RCPA may direct, and refraining from disclosing any versions of the plans and specifications to any third party without first obtaining written permission of RCPA. Consultant shall not use or permit another to use the plans and specifications in connection with this or any other project without first obtaining written permission of RCPA.

11.7. **Ownership and Disclosure of Work Product:** All reports, original drawings, graphics, plans, studies, and other data or documents (“documents”), in whatever form or format, assembled or prepared by Consultant or Consultant’s subcontractors, consultants, and other agents in connection with this Agreement shall be the property of RCPA. RCPA shall be entitled to immediate possession of such documents upon completion of the work pursuant to this Agreement. Upon expiration or termination of this Agreement, Consultant shall promptly deliver to RCPA all such documents, which have not already been provided to RCPA in such form or format as RCPA deems appropriate. Such documents shall be and will remain the property of RCPA without restriction or limitation. Consultant may retain copies of the above described documents but agrees not to disclose or discuss any information gathered, discovered, or generated in any way through this Agreement without the express written permission of RCPA.

12. **DEMAND FOR ASSURANCE**

12.1. Each party to this Agreement undertakes the obligation that the other's expectation of receiving due performance will not be impaired. When reasonable grounds for insecurity arise with respect to the performance of either party, the other may in writing demand adequate assurance of due performance and until such assurance is received may, if commercially reasonable, suspend any performance for which the agreed return has not been received. “Commercially reasonable” includes not only the conduct of a party with respect to performance under this Agreement, but also conduct with respect to other agreements with parties to this Agreement or others. After receipt of a justified demand, failure to provide within a reasonable time, but not exceeding thirty (30) days, such assurance of due performance as is adequate under the circumstances of the particular case is a repudiation of this Agreement. Acceptance of any improper delivery, service, or payment does not prejudice the aggrieved party's right to demand adequate assurance of future performance. Nothing in this Article 12 limits RCPA's right to terminate this Agreement pursuant to Article 6 (Termination).
13. **ASSIGNMENT AND DELEGATION**

13.1. *Consent:* Neither party hereto shall assign, delegate, sublet, or transfer any interest in or duty under this Agreement without the prior written consent of the other, and no such transfer shall be of any force or effect whatsoever unless and until the other party shall have so consented.

13.2. *Subcontracts:* Notwithstanding the foregoing, Consultant may enter into subcontracts with the subconsultants specifically identified herein. If no subconsultants are listed, then no subconsultants will be utilized in the performance of the work specified in this Agreement.

13.3. *Change of Subcontractors or Subconsultants:* If, after execution of the Agreement, parties agree that subconsultants not listed in Paragraph 13.2 will be utilized, Consultant may enter into subcontracts with subconsultants to perform other specific duties pursuant to the provisions of this Paragraph 13.3. The following provisions apply to any subcontract entered into by Consultant other than those listed in Paragraph 13.2 above:

a. Prior to entering into any contract with subconsultant, Consultant shall obtain RCPA approval of subconsultant. RCPA’s Board of Directors must approve the selection of any subconsultant if the amount payable to subconsultant under the agreement exceeds $25,000. In connection with such approval, Consultant shall provide RCPA with copies of the responses to Consultant’s Request for Proposals (RFP) to subconsultants, the names of key personnel who will be performing work under the agreement, and an explanation of Consultant’s reasons for choosing the recommended subconsultant based upon the criteria in the RFP.

b. All agreements with subconsultants shall (a) contain indemnity requirements in favor of RCPA in substantially the same form as that contained in Article 7, (b) contain language that the subconsultant may be terminated with or without cause upon reasonable written notice, and (c) prohibit the assignment or delegation of work under the agreement to any third party.

13.4. *Summary of Subconsultants’ Work:* Consultant shall provide RCPA with a summary of work performed by subconsultants with each invoice submitted under Paragraph 4.3. Such summary shall identify the individuals performing work on behalf of subconsultants and the total amount paid to subconsultant, broken down by the tasks listed in the Scope of Work.

14. **METHOD AND PLACE OF GIVING NOTICE, SUBMITTING BILLS, AND MAKING PAYMENTS**

14.1. *Method of Delivery:* All notices, bills, and payments shall be made in writing and shall be given by personal delivery, U.S. Mail, courier service, or electronic means. Notices, bills, and payments shall be addressed as specified in Paragraph 3.2.
14.2. *Receipt:* When a notice, bill, or payment is given by a generally recognized overnight courier service, the notice, bill, or payment shall be deemed received on the next business day. When a copy of a notice, bill, or payment is sent by electronic means, the notice, bill, or payment shall be deemed received upon transmission as long as (1) the original copy of the notice, bill, or payment is deposited in the U.S. mail and postmarked on the date of the electronic transmission (for a payment, on or before the due date), (2) the sender has a written confirmation of the electronic transmission, and (3) the electronic transmission is transmitted before 5 p.m. (recipient’s time). In all other instances, notices, bills, and payments shall be effective upon receipt by the recipient. Changes may be made in the names and addresses of the person to whom notices are to be given by giving notice pursuant to this Article 14.

15. **MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS**

15.1. *No Waiver of Breach:* The waiver by RCPA of any breach of any term or promise contained in this Agreement shall not be deemed to be a waiver of such term or promise or any subsequent breach of the same or any other term or promise contained in this Agreement.

15.2. *Construction:* To the fullest extent allowed by law, the provisions of this Agreement shall be construed and given effect in a manner that avoids any violation of statute, ordinance, regulation, or law. The parties covenant and agree that in the event that any provision of this Agreement is held by a court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, void, or unenforceable, the remainder of the provisions hereof shall remain in full force and effect and shall in no way be affected, impaired, or invalidated thereby. Consultant and RCPA acknowledge that they have each contributed to the making of this Agreement and that, in the event of a dispute over the interpretation of this Agreement, the language of the Agreement will not be construed against one party in favor of the other. Consultant and RCPA acknowledge that they have each had an adequate opportunity to consult with counsel in the negotiation and preparation of this Agreement.

15.3. *Consent:* Wherever in this Agreement the consent or approval of one party is required to an act of the other party, such consent or approval shall not be unreasonably withheld or delayed.

15.4. *No Third-Party Beneficiaries:* Except as provided in Article 7 (Indemnification), nothing contained in this Agreement shall be construed to create and the parties do not intend to create any rights in third parties.

15.5. *Applicable Law and Forum:* This Agreement shall be construed and interpreted according to the substantive law of California, regardless of the law of conflicts to the contrary in any jurisdiction. Any action to enforce the terms of this Agreement or for the breach thereof shall be brought and tried in Santa Rosa or in the forum nearest to the city of Santa Rosa, in the County of Sonoma.
15.6. **Captions:** The captions in this Agreement are solely for convenience of reference. They are not a part of this Agreement and shall have no effect on its construction or interpretation.

15.7. **Merger:** This writing is intended both as the final expression of the Agreement between the parties hereto with respect to the included terms and as a complete and exclusive statement of the terms of the Agreement, pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section 1856. No modification of this Agreement shall be effective unless and until such modification is evidenced by a writing signed by both parties.

15.8. **Survival of Terms:** All express representations, waivers, indemnifications, and limitations of liability included in this Agreement will survive its completion or termination for any reason.

15.9. **Time of Essence:** Time is and shall be of the essence of this Agreement and every provision hereof.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have executed this Agreement as of the date last signed by the parties to the Agreement.

Approved as to form:

By: ________________________________
   Cory O’Donnell, RCPA Counsel

Date: ________________________________

Sonoma County Regional Climate Protection Authority    Dunn Consulting

By: ________________________________    By: ________________________________
   Suzanne Smith    Keith Dunn
   Executive Director, RCPA    President, Dunn Consulting

Date: ________________________________    Date: ________________________________

Insurance Documentation is on file with RCPA
Exhibit A

Scope of Work

1. **TASKS**

1.1. Develop an advocacy strategy to help advance climate change policy matters important to RCPA, particularly eliminating the sunset provision for RCPA;

1.2. Identify key stumbling blocks to successfully achieving policy advocacy and strategize how to overcome them;

1.3. Provide lobbying services specifically related to energy efficiency, renewable energy, drought, municipal financing and reducing GHG emissions from the transportation sector;

1.4. Work with RCPA representatives to implement the lobbying strategy;

1.5. Work with Sonoma County’s legislative delegation on climate change related policy activities;

1.6. Provide updates on the status of climate change legislation and related matters;

1.7. Inform policy and advocacy strategies for the Highway 37 corridor, adaptation funding for infrastructure and related financing and funding mechanisms;

1.8. Organize meetings in Sacramento as needed;

1.9. Provide monthly reports, letter format acceptable, along with invoices to RCPA;

1.10. File with state or federal officials any forms or reports required of lobbyists under state or federal law.
Exhibit B

Insurance Requirements

With respect to performance of work under this Agreement, Consultant shall maintain and shall require all of its subcontractors, consultants, and other agents to maintain insurance as described below unless such insurance has been expressly waived by the attachment of a Waiver of Insurance Requirements. Any requirement for insurance to be maintained after completion of the work shall survive this Agreement.

RCPA reserves the right to review any and all of the required insurance policies and/or endorsements, but has no obligation to do so. Failure to demand evidence of full compliance with the insurance requirements set forth in this Agreement or failure to identify any insurance deficiency shall not relieve Consultant from, nor be construed or deemed a waiver of, its obligation to maintain the required insurance at all times during the performance of this Agreement.

1. INSURANCE

1.1. Workers Compensation and Employers Liability Insurance
   a. Required if Consultant has employees.
   b. Workers Compensation insurance with statutory limits as required by the Labor Code of the State of California.
   c. Employers Liability with minimum limits of $1,000,000 per Accident; $1,000,000 Disease per employee; $1,000,000 Disease per policy.
   d. Required Evidence of Insurance: Certificate of Insurance.
   e. If Consultant currently has no employees, Consultant agrees to obtain the above-specified Workers Compensation and Employers’ Liability insurance should any employees be engaged during the term of this Agreement or any extensions of the term.

1.2. General Liability Insurance
   a. Commercial General Liability Insurance on a standard occurrence form, no less broad than Insurance Services Office (ISO) form CG 00 01.
   b. Minimum Limits: $1,000,000 per Occurrence; $2,000,000 General Aggregate; $2,000,000 Products/Completed Operations Aggregate. The required limits may be provided by a combination of General Liability Insurance and Commercial Umbrella Liability Insurance. If Consultant maintains higher limits than the specified minimum limits, RCPA requires and shall be entitled to coverage for the higher limits maintained by Consultant.
   c. Any deductible or self-insured retention shall be shown on the Certificate of Insurance. If the deductible or self-insured retention exceeds $25,000 it must be approved in advance by RCPA. Consultant is responsible for any deductible or self-insured retention and shall fund it upon RCPA’s written
request, regardless of whether Consultant has a claim against the insurance or is named as a party in any action involving the RCPA.

d. Sonoma County RCPA, its officers, agents, and employees, shall be additional insured(s) for liability arising out of operations by or on behalf of the Consultant in the performance of this Agreement.

e. The insurance provided to the additional insureds shall be primary to, and non-contributory with, any insurance or self-insurance program maintained by them.

f. The policy definition of “insured contract” shall include assumptions of liability arising out of both ongoing operations and the products-completed operations hazard (broad form contractual liability coverage including the “f” definition of insured contract in Insurance Services Office form CG 00 01, or equivalent).

g. The policy shall cover inter-insured suits between the additional insureds and Consultant and include a “separation of insureds” or “severability” clause which treats each insured separately.

h. Required Evidence of Insurance:
   i. Copy of the additional insured endorsement or policy language granting additional insured status, and
   ii. Certificate of Insurance.

1.3. **Automobile Liability Insurance**

   a. Minimum Limit: $300,000 Combined Single Limit per Accident; or Bodily Injury: $100,000 per person/$300,000 per accident and Property Damage: $50,000 per accident.

   b. Required Evidence of Insurance:
      i. Copy of Auto Policy Declarations Page; or
      ii. Certificate of Insurance.

1.4. **Standards for Insurance Companies**

   a. Insurers, other than the California State Compensation Insurance Fund, shall have an A.M. Best's rating of at least A:VII.

1.5. **Documentation**

   a. The Certificate of Insurance must include the following reference: TW 13/14-152.

   b. All required Evidence of Insurance shall be submitted prior to the execution of this Agreement. Consultant agrees to maintain current Evidence of Insurance on file with RCPA for the entire term of this Agreement and any additional periods if specified in Sections 1.1, 1.2, or 1.3, above.

   c. The name and address for mailing Additional Insured endorsements and Certificates of Insurance is: Sonoma County RCPA, its officers, agents, and employees, 404 Aviation Boulevard, Santa Rosa, CA 95403-9019.
d. Required Evidence of Insurance shall be submitted for any renewal or replacement of a policy that already exists, at least ten (10) days before expiration or other termination of the existing policy.

e. Consultant shall provide immediate written notice if: (1) any of the required insurance policies is terminated; (2) the limits of any of the required policies are reduced; or (3) the deductible or self-insured retention is increased.

f. Upon written request, certified copies of required insurance policies must be provided within thirty (30) days.

1.6. Policy Obligations

a. Consultant's indemnity and other obligations shall not be limited by the foregoing insurance requirements.

1.7. Material Breach

a. If Consultant fails to maintain insurance which is required pursuant to this Agreement, it shall be deemed a material breach of this Agreement. RCPA, at its sole option, may terminate this Agreement and obtain damages from Consultant resulting from said breach. Alternatively, RCPA may purchase the required insurance, and without further notice to Consultant, RCPA may deduct from sums due to Consultant any premium costs advanced by RCPA for such insurance. These remedies shall be in addition to any other remedies available to RCPA.
Staff Report

To: RCPA Board of Directors
From: Lauren Casey, Director of Climate Programs
Item: 3.3 – Bay Area Regional Energy Network Agreements for 2017
Date: February 6, 2017

Issue:
Shall the Board authorize staff to execute updated BayREN agreements for 2017?

Background:
The Bay Area Energy Network is a collaboration of the nine counties of the Bay Area to administer energy efficiency programs funded by the California Public Utilities Commission. BayREN programs are administered by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) in partnership with the RCPA and similar county agencies from the region. Info can be found at www.bayren.org.

The CPUC currently authorizes program budgets annually so ABAG must update the agreement for local program implementers each year to reflect the current approved budget. Funding for BayREN is passed to ABAG through PG&E, which has caused some delays in finalizing the agreement for 2017.

In the interim, ABAG has provided the attached letter to each BayREN county lead to confirm the 2017 budget allocations and allow local agencies to begin reimbursable work. The RCPA has begun work on BayREN consistent with this guidance as articulated in Item 4.6.1. The RCPA will still need to execute final 2017 agreements with ABAG and with BKi (the technical lead for PAYS) once finalized. Staff expects the agreements to be substantively similar to the 2016 agreements. Therefore, staff is seeking authorization to work with counsel to negotiate and execute the 2017 agreement with ABAG, barring any substantive changes to the terms. The BKi agreement will come before the Board in March for consideration.

Policy Impacts:
BayREN programs advance the RCPA Mission, Goals, and Objectives.

Fiscal Impacts:
The FY16/17 budget anticipated BayREN funding in the amount awarded, $408,217.

Staff Recommendation:
That the Board authorize the Executive Director to execute the final agreements for BayREN in 2017, barring any substantive changes to the terms.
December 22, 2016

Lauren Casey
Director of Climate Programs
Sonoma County Regional Climate Protection Authority
490 Mendocino Ave, #206
Santa Rosa, CA 95401

Dear Lauren,

Pending execution of an amendment to extend the Association of Bay Area Governments’ (ABAG’s) contract with the County of Sonoma for BayREN implementation, this correspondence serves as an extension of the 2016 contract for services between the County and ABAG, until February 28, 2017, for an amount not to exceed $408,718, as detailed on Page 2.

Please sign and return one of the duplicate original letters.

Association of Bay Area Governments

Dated: 12/22/2016

Jennifer K. Berg
BayREN Senior Program Manager

The undersigned has read, understood and hereby agrees to the above extension.

County of Sonoma

Dated: 12/22/2016

Lauren Casey
Director of Climate Programs
### BayREN Program Elements

Sonoma County Regional Climate Protection Authority, on behalf of the County of Sonoma

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Budget Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Single-Family Residential</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$ 15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing &amp; Outreach</td>
<td>$ 38,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Single-Family</strong></td>
<td>$ 53,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multi-Family Residential</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$ 15,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing &amp; Outreach</td>
<td>$ 5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Multi-Family</strong></td>
<td>$ 20,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Codes &amp; Standards</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$ 2,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>$ 27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing &amp; Outreach</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total C&amp;S</strong></td>
<td>$ 29,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financing</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Multi-Family Capital Advance</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing &amp; Outreach</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total MF Cap Adv:</strong></td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commercial PACE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$ 700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing &amp; Outreach</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total CPACE:</strong></td>
<td>$ 700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pay as You Save</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$ 1,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>$ 232,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing &amp; Outreach</td>
<td>$ 69,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total PAYS:</strong></td>
<td>$ 303,946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Program Portfolio:</strong></td>
<td>$ 408,718</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Staff Report

To: Sonoma County Transportation Authority

From: Seana L. S. Gause, Senior – Programming and Projects

Item: Measure M Access Across 101 cooperative agreement and appropriation request, Town of Windsor

Date: February 6, 2017

Issue:

Shall the Board approve a cooperative agreement with the Town of Windsor to initiate a Measure M Project within the Bicycle and Pedestrian Program? Shall the SCTA then appropriate funds to the Town of Windsor for the Access Across 101 Project, Windsor Phase in the amount of $250,000 for a feasibility study?

Background:

The 2017 Strategic Plan identifies within the Measure M Bicycle and Pedestrian Program a project known as Access Across 101. Funding for this project will be used for feasibility studies and be provided to four jurisdictions along the 101 corridor on a first come, first served basis, and will not exceed $250,000 per jurisdiction. The Town of Windsor is the second jurisdiction along the 101 corridor to apply for these funds. The Board approved funding to be programmed to the Town as part of the 2017 Measure M Strategic Plan. At the Town’s request, a draft cooperative agreement was drawn up and circulated between SCTA and Windsor. A final version was approved by the Town Council and is attached hereto. Windsor has already awarded a contract and has been working with Steven Grover and Associates on a feasibility study.

The SCTA adopted the 2017 Measure M Strategic Plan, which sets forth the SCTA’s program and project implementation policies with regard to the use of Measure M funds. Pursuant to the Strategic Plan and the associated cooperative agreements, each jurisdiction must submit an appropriation request (attached) to initiate reimbursement of Measure M funding for the fiscal year in which the funds are programmed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coop Funding Agreement</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Appropriation Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M71409</td>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>Bike/Ped</td>
<td>Access Across 101</td>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy Impacts:

None. It is within existing policy for the Board to approve such an agreement. Additionally, the appropriation is within the established policies outlined in the Measure M Strategic Plan, Chapter 4, Policy 7.
Fiscal Impacts:
None, The SCTA Board approved the program of projects in the 2017 Strategic Plan which affords the jurisdictions along 101 the opportunity to use these funds.

The approval of the appropriation is consistent with the Strategic Plan, making $250,000 available to the Town of Windsor for the Access Across 101 Project. Appropriation of these funds is consistent with the funding availability defined in the Measure M cash flow model.

Staff Recommendation:
Staff recommends that the Board approve and authorize the Chair and the Executive Director to sign and execute the agreement. Staff also recommends that subsequent to that action, the Board approve resolution 2017-001, thus approving the Town of Windsor’s Access Across 101 appropriation request.
COOPERATIVE FUNDING AGREEMENT NO. M71409
BETWEEN
THE SONOMA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
AND
TOWN OF WINDSOR

This Agreement is made and entered into as of __________________________, 2016 ("Effective Date") by and between the TOWN OF WINDSOR hereinafter referred to as "TOWN" and the SONOMA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY hereinafter referred to as "AUTHORITY."

RECITALS

1. AUTHORITY adopted that certain 2014 Strategic Plan that sets forth AUTHORITY’s program and project implementation policies with regard to the use of funds provided under the 2004 Traffic Relief Act for Sonoma County Expenditure Plan and Ordinance approved by the voters of Sonoma County on November 2, 2004 (hereinafter referred to as “Measure M”). The 2014 Strategic Plan as such plan may be amended from time to time is hereinafter referred to as the “Strategic Plan”.

2. Pursuant to the Strategic Plan and Measure M, AUTHORITY and TOWN desire to enter into a Cooperative Funding Agreement to define a framework to enable the two parties to work cooperatively in developing transportation improvements on Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects in Sonoma County (hereinafter referred to as “Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects Program Improvements”).

3. In connection with the Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects Program Improvements, TOWN desires to complete Feasibility Study of Bicycle and Pedestrian Access Across Highway 101, as more particularly described in Exhibit A to this Agreement (hereinafter referred to as the “Project”).

4. TOWN has submitted a financial plan and schedule for completion of the Project which is attached hereto as Exhibit B (hereinafter referred to as the “Project Plan”).

5. Pursuant to the Strategic Plan and Measure M, AUTHORITY is committed to make available up to $250,000 in 2004 dollars to assist with the Project.

6. The Town will provide additional funds from the Town’s General Operating Budget to complete the study if required.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the foregoing, AUTHORITY and TOWN do hereby agree as follows:
SECTION I

TOWN AGREES:

1. TOWN Contribution. To provide at least $0 (2004 dollars) in local funds towards the Project.

2. Project Completion. To timely complete the Project in accordance with the deadlines set forth in the Project Plan.

3. Invoices. Should TOWN desire reimbursement of its expenses in connection with this Agreement, TOWN shall do so by requesting a specific appropriation of Measure M funding by submitting to AUTHORITY a Request for Funding Appropriation in the form attached hereto as Exhibit C (hereinafter referred to as “Appropriation Request”). Once an Appropriation Request is approved by AUTHORITY, TOWN may submit to AUTHORITY invoices for reimbursements for expenses authorized under the terms of this Agreement and an approved Appropriation Request. Invoices shall be submitted to AUTHORITY no more frequently than monthly, and no less frequently than every six months following initial appropriation, provided however that if TOWN is unable to invoice in this time frame a written request for time extension shall be provided or the funds may be deobligated. Invoices shall be in a form reasonably acceptable to AUTHORITY’s Executive Director.

4. Compliance with Laws. With regard to administering and completing the Project, TOWN shall at all times comply with all applicable laws of the United States, the State of California, the County, and with all applicable regulations promulgated by federal, state, regional, or local administrative and regulatory agencies, now in force and as they may be enacted, issued, or amended during the term of this Agreement.

5. Records. To allow AUTHORITY to audit all expenditures relating to the Project funded through this Agreement. For the duration of the Project, and for five (5) years following completion of the Project, or earlier discharge of the Agreement, TOWN shall make available to AUTHORITY all records relating to expenses incurred in performance of this Agreement.

6. Reporting Requirements. To provide annual updates on the PROJECT to AUTHORITY in the form attached hereto as Exhibit D.
SECTION II

AUTHORITY AGREES:

1. Reimbursement of TOWN Expenses. Consistent with its Strategic Plan, to make available Measure M funds (currently set at $250,000 in 2004 dollars) to assist with the Project. AUTHORITY shall process TOWN invoices within forty-five (45) days of receiving an invoice in a form reasonably acceptable to AUTHORITY’s Executive Director.

2. Notice of Audit. To provide timely notice to TOWN if an audit is to be conducted.

SECTION III

IT IS MUTUALLY AGREED:

1. Funding Availability and Needs. The funding available to the Project for expenditure is limited by the funds identified in Exhibit B and to approved appropriations by the SCTA Board. If funds beyond those identified in Exhibit B are necessary to complete the Project, AUTHORITY will cooperate with TOWN to identify and secure new or increased fund commitments; however, completion of the Project remains the responsibility of TOWN.

2. Term. This Agreement will remain in effect until discharged as provided in Paragraph 3 or 13 of this Section III.

3. Discharge. This Agreement shall be subject to discharge as follows:

a. This Agreement may be canceled by a party for breach of any obligation, covenant or condition hereof by the other party, upon notice to the breaching party. With respect to any breach which is reasonably capable of being cured, the breaching party shall have thirty (30) days from the date of the notice to initiate steps to cure. If the breaching party diligently pursues cure, such party shall be allowed a reasonable time to cure, not to exceed sixty (60) days from the date of the initial notice, unless a further extension is granted by the non-breaching party. On cancellation, the non-breaching party retains the same rights as a party exercising its right to terminate under the provisions of paragraph 3(b), except that the canceling party also retains any remedy for breach of the whole contract or any unperformed balance. If the Agreement is cancelled by AUTHORITY because TOWN has failed to wholly or partially complete the Project, AUTHORITY may, at its option, demand repayment of all unexpended funds and funds determined by audit not to have been expended as provided for in this Agreement, with interest accrued thereon as would have accrued had such funds been invested in the Sonoma County Treasury Pool; and, further, to offset such balances due AUTHORITY from any other Measure M funds due TOWN.
b. By mutual consent of both parties, this Agreement may be terminated at any time. Upon termination by mutual consent, TOWN shall repay to AUTHORITY any unexpended funds originally provided to TOWN under this Agreement, and any interest that has accrued thereon.

4. **Indemnity.** TOWN agrees to accept all responsibility for loss or damage to any person or entity, including but not limited to AUTHORITY, and to defend, indemnify, hold harmless, reimburse and release AUTHORITY, its officers, agents, employees, successors and assigns from and against any and all actions, claims, damages, disabilities, liabilities and expense including, but not limited to attorneys’ fees and the cost of litigation incurred in the defense of claims as to which this indemnity applies or incurred in an action by AUTHORITY to enforce the indemnity provisions herein, whether arising from personal injury, property damage or economic loss of any type, that may be asserted by any person or entity, including TOWN, arising out of or in connection with the receipt or use of funds provided pursuant to this Agreement, whether or not there is concurrent negligence on the part of AUTHORITY, but, to the extent required by law, excluding liability due to the sole or active negligence or due to the willful misconduct of AUTHORITY. If there is a possible obligation to indemnify, TOWN’s duty to defend exists regardless of whether it is ultimately determined that there is not a duty to indemnify. AUTHORITY shall have the right to select its own legal counsel at the expense of TOWN, subject to TOWN’s approval, which approval shall not be unreasonably withheld. This indemnification obligation is not limited in any way by any limitation on the amount or type of damages or compensation payable to or for TOWN or its agents under workers’ compensation acts, disability benefits acts, or other employee benefit acts.

5. **Notices.** Any notice which may be required under this Agreement shall be in writing, shall be effective when received, and shall be given by personal service, or by certified or registered mail, return receipt requested, to the addresses set forth below, or to such addresses which may be specified in writing to the parties hereto.

To TOWN: Toni Bertolero
Town of Windsor
9291 Old Redwood Highway
PO Box 100
Windsor, CA 95492

To AUTHORITY: Executive Director Sonoma County Transportation Authority
490 Mendocino Avenue, Suite 206
Santa Rosa, CA 95401
(707) 565-5373
suzsmith@sctainfo.org
6. **Additional Acts and Documents.** Each party agrees to do all such things and take all such actions, and to make, execute and deliver such other documents and instruments, as shall be reasonably requested to carry out the provisions, intent and purpose of the Agreement.

7. **Integration.** This Agreement represents the entire agreement of the parties with respect to the subject matter hereof. No representations, warranties, inducements or oral agreements have been made by any of the parties except as expressly set forth herein, or in other contemporaneous written agreements.

8. **Amendment.** This Agreement may not be changed, modified or rescinded except in writing, signed by all parties hereto, and any attempt at oral modification of this Agreement shall be void and of no effect.

9. **Independent Agency.** TOWN renders its services under this Agreement as an independent agency. None of the TOWN’s agents or employees shall be agents or employees of the AUTHORITY.

10. **Assignment.** The Agreement may not be assigned, transferred, hypothecated, or pledged by any party without the express written consent of the other party.

11. **Successors.** This Agreement shall be binding upon the successor(s), assignee(s) or transferee(s) of the AUTHORITY or TOWN as the case may be. This provision shall not be construed as an authorization to assign, transfer, hypothecate or pledge this Agreement other than as provided above.

12. **Severability.** Should any part of this Agreement be determined to be unenforceable, invalid, or beyond the AUTHORITY of either party to enter into or carry out, such determination shall not affect the validity of the remainder of this Agreement which shall continue in full force and effect; provided that, the remainder of this Agreement can, absent the excised portion, be reasonably interpreted to give effect to the intentions of the parties.

13. **Limitation.** All obligations of AUTHORITY under the terms of this Agreement are expressly subject to AUTHORITY’s continued authorization to collect and expend the sales tax proceeds provided by Measure M. If for any reason AUTHORITY’s right to collect or expend such sales tax proceeds is terminated or suspended in whole or part, AUTHORITY shall promptly notify TOWN, and the parties shall consult on a course of action. If, after twenty-five (25) working days, a course of action is not agreed upon by the parties, this Agreement shall be deemed terminated by mutual or joint consent; provided, that any future obligation to fund from the date of the notice shall be expressly limited by and subject to (i) the lawful ability of AUTHORITY to expend sales tax proceeds for the purposes
of the Agreement; and (ii) the availability, taking into consideration all the obligations of
AUTHORITY under all outstanding contracts, agreements to other obligations of
AUTHORITY, of funds for such purposes.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have executed this Agreement as of the Effective
Date.

TOWN OF WINDSOR

By: __________________________
   Linda Kelly
   Town Manager

SONOMA COUNTY
TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

By: __________________________
   SCTA Chair

RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL

By: __________________________
   Assistant Town Manager
   Camille Kazarian

APPROVED AS TO SUBSTANCE:

ATTEST:

By: __________________________
   Maria De La O
   Town Clerk

APPROVED AS TO LEGAL FORM
FOR Town:

By: __________________________
   Robin Donoghue
   Town Attorney

By: __________________________
   Legal Counsel
   Authority
This project is a Study to provide alternative travel routes for non-motorized travelers (including pedestrians, bicycles and persons with disabilities) to encourage a mode shift away from motorized vehicle travel. The Study will offer alternative design concepts and feasibility of direct connections for bicyclists and pedestrians crossing U.S. 101 to important destinations on the east and west sides of the freeway.

The Study will focus on the downtown area of the Town. This central area is the primary crossing point between the east and west and also serves as the main vehicle access point to U.S. 101. Crossing options will include above ground (US101 overcrossing), ground level (existing Old Redwood Highway travel paths and/or US101 ramp raising), below ground (Windsor Creek culvert) and other potential options.
COOPERATIVE FUNDING AGREEMENT NO._________
BETWEEN
THE SONOMA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
AND
TOWN OF WINDSOR

EXHIBIT B

FINANCIAL PLAN AND SCHEDULE (2004 Dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>FY16/17</th>
<th>FY17/18</th>
<th>FY18/19</th>
<th>FY19/20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COOPERATIVE FUNDING AGREEMENT NO.__________
BETWEEN
THE SONOMA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
AND
TOWN OF WINDSOR
EXHIBIT C

REQUEST FOR FUNDING APPROPRIATION
Date

SCTA Chair
Sonoma County Transportation Authority
490 Mendocino Avenue, Suite 206
Santa Rosa, CA 95401

FUNDING APPROPRIATION REQUEST
PROJECT NAME: DOWNTOWN BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN CROSSING OF U.S. 101 STUDY
AGREEMENT NO. ____________________

Dear SCTA Chair:

The Town of Windsor hereby requests that the Sonoma County Transportation Authority (SCTA) take action to appropriate funds at its next Board meeting for the Downtown Bicycle and Pedestrian Crossing of U.S. 101 Study.

The Town has entered into a cooperative funding agreement with the SCTA (Cooperative Agreement No. (number of agreement)) and is ready to begin work on the scoping phase of the project. Below is the specific appropriation request information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name &amp; Description:</th>
<th>Downtown Bicycle and Pedestrian Crossing of U.S. 101 Study for feasibility and alternative concept designs to connect east and west Windsor in the downtown interchange.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Category:</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase Development Phase of this Appropriation:</td>
<td>Scoping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Measure M Appropriate Request:</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Local Funding Match:</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources of Local Funding Match:</td>
<td>Town General Operating Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Cost:</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The current schedule for the (name of project) is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Development Phase</th>
<th>Begin</th>
<th>Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scoping</td>
<td>6-18-2015</td>
<td>June, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Stuart Hayre
Deputy Director of Engineering

cc: Alejandro Perez, Senior Civil Engineer
    Mona Ibrahim, Engineer I
COOPERATIVE FUNDING AGREEMENT NO.________
BETWEEN
THE SONOMA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
AND
TOWN OF WINDSOR
EXHIBIT D

PROJECT REPORTING LETTER
Date

Sonoma County Transportation Authority
490 Mendocino Avenue, Suite 206
Santa Rosa, CA 95401

Bike-Ped Study - Annual Reporting Letter – FY 16-17

Dear SCTA Chairman:

The Town of Windsor is pleased to present information related to Measure M funding for the following project for FY 16-17:

Work was performed on the following project using Measure M funds including:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Project Name: Downtown Bike and Ped Crossing of U.S. 101 Study</th>
<th>B. Project Phase/Development Phase: Scoping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Amount Appropriated in Previous Fiscal Years $ -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Total Amount of Unexpended Appropriations from Prior FY $ -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Amount Appropriated in FY16-17 $ -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Reimbursements Received in FY17 $ -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Amount of Matching Funds Provided $ -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Total Measure M Reimbursements Received in Prior Years $ -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Total Measure M Funding Reimbursed to Date $ -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Total Appropriation Remaining Balance to Rollover to FY17-18 $ -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Describe work completed this fiscal year: This is an US101-Old Redwood Highway Crossing Study in the central downtown interchange for bicycle and pedestrian connection between east and west Windsor. The study includes the feasibility and alternative concepts for above, below and at ground connections. The current total cost is $250,000 and the current expenditure is $95,723.05.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. How were bike/pedestrian needs considered? The study is focused on how to provide safe and aesthetic alternatives for bikes and pedestrians in the downtown area of Windsor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L. Overall Status of Project by Phase</th>
<th>% Complete</th>
<th>Est. Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scoping</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>June 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction &amp; Construction Management</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
M. Describe where you displayed the Measure M logo, such as on signs at the construction site or on vehicles? This is not a construction activity. The Measure M logo was placed on the Study website www.connectingwindsor.com

N. Provide digital pictures of projects before, during and after construction. None


P. Identify project benefits and discuss how Measure M funds assisted in project delivery.

To meet our reporting requirements we are submitting an original signed copy on our letterhead. In addition we have also emailed an electronic copy to the SCTA.

We have also attached prints of photographs and/or have provided the same photos in jpeg file format.

If you have any questions regarding this project information please contact:

Name: Sturt Hayre  
Phone: 707-838-5976  
Email: shayre@townofwindsor.com

Sincerely,

SIGNATURE REQUIRED

Toni Bertolero  
Public Works Director/Town Engineer

cc: Alejandro Perez, Senior Civil Engineer
    Stuart Hayre, Deputy Director of Engineering
January 17, 2017

SCTA Chair
Sonoma County Transportation Authority
490 Mendocino Avenue, Suite 206
Santa Rosa, CA 95401

FUNDING APPROPRIATION REQUEST
PROJECT NAME: DOWNTOWN BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN CROSSING OF U.S. 101 STUDY
AGREEMENT NO. M71409

Dear SCTA Chair:

The Town of Windsor hereby requests that the Sonoma County Transportation Authority (SCTA) take action to appropriate funds at its next Board meeting for the Downtown Bicycle and Pedestrian Crossing of U.S. 101 Study.

The Town has entered into a cooperative funding agreement with the SCTA (Cooperative Agreement No. M71409 and is ready to begin work on the scoping phase of the project. Below is the specific appropriation request information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name &amp; Description:</th>
<th>Downtown Bicycle and Pedestrian Crossing of U.S. 101 Study for the feasibility and alternative concept designs to connect east and west Windsor in the downtown interchange.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Category:</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase Development Phase of this Appropriation:</td>
<td>Scoping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Measure M Appropriate Request:</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Local Funding Match:</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources of Local Funding Match:</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Cost:</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The current schedule for the (name of project) is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Development Phase</th>
<th>Begin</th>
<th>Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scoping</td>
<td>6-16-2015</td>
<td>June 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Toni Bertolero
Public Works Director/Town Engineer

c: Alejandro Perez, Senior Civil Engineer
Mona Ibrahim, Engineer I
RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE SONOMA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY, COUNTY OF SONOMA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, APPROPRIATING MEASURE M FUNDS TO THE TOWN OF WINDSOR IN ACCORDANCE WITH COOPERATIVE FUNDING AGREEMENT NO. M71409

WHEREAS, the 2004 Sonoma County Traffic Relief Act Expenditure Plan (hereinafter “Expenditure Plan”) includes $250,000 in 2004 dollars, for the Bicycle and Pedestrian funding category; and

WHEREAS, the Sonoma County Transportation Authority (hereinafter “Authority”) and the Town of Windsor (hereinafter “Town”) have entered into Cooperative Funding Agreement No. 71409 (hereinafter “Cooperative Agreement”) regarding the Access Across 101 projects (hereinafter “Project”); and

WHEREAS, the Town has submitted a Request for Appropriation of Funds dated January 18, 2017 in connection with the Project pursuant to the above referenced Cooperative Agreement; and

WHEREAS, funds are included in the Authority’s Strategic Plan and annual budget for such projects.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED the Authority finds the Request for Appropriation of funds consistent with the Expenditure Plan, the Strategic Plan, and the Cooperative Agreement; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Authority appropriates $250,000 to the Town pursuant to the Cooperative Agreement to be used for the purposes set forth in Attachment A attached hereto; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, funds will be disbursed to the Town in accordance with the provisions of the Cooperative Agreement but shall not exceed on an annual basis, the amounts programmed by fiscal year, as shown in the Program of Projects in the 2017 Strategic Plan, as such plan may be amended from time to time; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the funds appropriated by the Authority under the Cooperative Agreement are hereby reflected in Attachment B; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, this appropriation shall expire three years from the date of this Resolution.

THE FOREGOING RESOLUTION was moved by Director , seconded by Director , and approved by the following vote:
Resolution No. 2017-001
Cooperative Agreement Number: M71409
Project Sponsor: Town of Windsor
Amount: $250,000
February 6, 2017

David Rabbitt, Chair

This RESOLUTION was entered into at a meeting of the Sonoma County Transportation Authority held February 6, 2017 in Santa Rosa, California

Attest:  
Suzanne Smith, Executive Director

Attachment:  
“A” Use of Appropriated Funds
“B” Chronological Listing of Fund Appropriation Resolutions
Date: February 6, 2017

Amount of Funds: $250,000

Appropriated to: Town of Windsor

Program Category: Bicycle/Pedestrian Program

Specific Project: Access Across 101

Appropriated For: Scoping (Feasibility Study and Alternative Concept Designs) for a community connector in Windsor ($250,000)

Scope of Work: Identify key east-west access points across Highway 101

Other Conditions: None

Staff Comments: This is the first and only appropriation for this project. This appropriation will fund completion of a Feasibility and Alternative Concept design to connect east and west Windsor in the downtown interchange.
## ATTACHMENT B

Chronological Listing of Fund Appropriation Resolutions

**COOPERATIVE FUNDING AGREEMENT NO. M71409**

Between the Sonoma County Transportation Authority

and the Town of Windsor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Funds Appropriated</th>
<th>Cumulative Total</th>
<th>Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M71409</td>
<td>2017-000</td>
<td>Feb 6, 2017</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>Scope</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL FUNDS APPROPRIATED** $250,000
Staff Report

To: Sonoma County Transportation Authority
From: Seana L. S. Gause, Senior – Programming and Projects
Item: Measure M Appropriation Request for Hearn Avenue Phase 3, City of Santa Rosa
Date: February 6, 2017

Issue:
Shall the SCTA appropriate funds for the Hearn Avenue, Phase 3 project in the amount of $1,800,000 for the Plans, Specifications and Estimates (PSE) phase (letter attached)?

Background:
The SCTA adopted the 2017 Measure M Strategic Plan, which sets forth the SCTA’s program and project implementation policies with regard to the use of funds provided under Measure M. Pursuant to the Strategic Plan and the associated cooperative funding agreements, each jurisdiction must submit an appropriation request to initiate spending of Measure M funding for the fiscal year in which the funds are programmed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coop Funding Agreement #</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Appropriation Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M30706-A1</td>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>LSP</td>
<td>Hearn Ave Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>PSE</td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policy Impacts:
The appropriation is within the established policies outlined in the Measure M Strategic Plan Chapter 4, Policy 7.

Fiscal Impacts:
Consistent with the Strategic Plan, Measure M funds in the amount of $1,150,000 will be made available to the City of Santa Rosa for the Hearn Avenue Interchange Improvements. Appropriation of these funds is consistent with the funding availability defined in the Measure M cash-flow model.

Staff Recommendation:
Staff recommends that the Board adopt SCTA Resolution No. 2017-002 thus approving the aforementioned appropriation request.
December 15, 2016

SCTA Chair
Sonoma County Transportation Authority
490 Mendocino Avenue, Suite 206
Santa Rosa, CA 95401

FUNDING APPROPRIATION REQUEST
PROJECT NAME Hearn Avenue Interchange - Phase 3
AGREEMENT NO. M30706-05

Dear SCTA Chair:

The City of Santa Rosa hereby requests that the Sonoma County Transportation Authority (SCTA) take action to appropriate funds at its next Board meeting for the Hearn Avenue Improvements Interchange - Phase 3.

The City has entered into a cooperative funding agreement with the SCTA (Cooperative Agreement No. M30706-05) and is ready to begin work on the Plans Specifications and Estimate phase of the project. Below is the specific appropriation request information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name &amp; Description:</th>
<th>Hearn Avenue Interchange - Phase 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Category:</td>
<td>Local Street Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase Development Phase of this Appropriation:</td>
<td>PS&amp;E (Plans, Specifications, and Estimate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Measure M Appropriate Request:</td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Local Funding Match:</td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources of Local Funding Match:</td>
<td>Capital Facilities Fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Cost:</td>
<td>$35,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The current schedule for the Hearn Avenue Improvements Interchange - Phase 3 is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Development Phase</th>
<th>Begin</th>
<th>Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scoping</td>
<td>April 2010</td>
<td>April 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAED</td>
<td>August 2014</td>
<td>December 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>February 2017</td>
<td>November 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>February 2017</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>July 2019</td>
<td>July 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for your consideration.
Sincerely,

Jason Nutt
Director of Transportation and Public Works

cc: Chris Catbagan, Project Manager
    Nancy Adams, Transportation Planner
RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE SONOMA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY, COUNTY OF SONOMA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, APPROPRIATING MEASURE M FUNDS OF $1,800,000 TO THE CITY OF SANTA ROSA FOR HEARN AVENUE PHASE 3 PLANS SPECIFICATIONS AND ESTIMATES, IN ACCORDANCE WITH COOPERATIVE FUNDING AGREEMENT NO. M30706-A1

WHEREAS, the 2004 Sonoma County Traffic Relief Act Expenditure Plan (hereinafter "Expenditure Plan") includes $1,800,000 in 2004 dollars, for the Hearn Avenue Interchange Improvements in Santa Rosa funding category; and

WHEREAS, the Sonoma County Transportation Authority (hereinafter “Authority”) and the City of Santa Rosa (hereinafter “City”) have entered into Cooperative Funding Agreement No. M30706-A1 (hereinafter “Cooperative Agreement”) regarding the Hearn Avenue Improvements (hereinafter “Project”); and

WHEREAS, City of Santa Rosa has submitted a Request for Appropriation of Funds dated January 3, 2017 in connection with the Project pursuant to the above referenced Cooperative Agreement; and

WHEREAS, funds are included in the Authority’s Strategic Plan and annual budget for such projects.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, the Authority finds the Request for Appropriation of Funds consistent with the Expenditure Plan, the Strategic Plan and the Cooperative Agreement; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Authority appropriates $1,800,000 to the City of Santa Rosa pursuant to the Cooperative Agreement to be used for the purposes set forth in Attachment A attached hereto; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, funds will be disbursed to the City of Santa Rosa in accordance with the provisions of Cooperative Agreement but shall not exceed, on an annual basis, the amounts programmed by fiscal year, as shown in the Program of Projects in the 2017 Strategic Plan, as such plan may be amended from time to time; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, all funds appropriated by the Authority under the Cooperative Agreement are hereby reflected in Attachment B; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, this appropriation shall expire three years from approval of this resolution.
THE FOREGOING RESOLUTION was moved by Director    seconded by Director    , and approved by the following vote:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Director Agrimonti</th>
<th>Director Mansell</th>
<th>Director Miller</th>
<th>Director Gorin</th>
<th>Director Rabbitt</th>
<th>Director Gurney</th>
<th>Director Russell</th>
<th>Director Landman</th>
<th>Director Salmon</th>
<th>Director Mackenzie</th>
<th>Director Zane</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ayes:     Noes:     Absent:    Abstain:

___________________________________
David Rabbitt, SCTA Chair

This RESOLUTION was entered into at a meeting of the Sonoma County Transportation Authority held on February 6, 2017 in Santa Rosa, California.

Attest:

______________________________________
Suzanne Smith, Executive Director
Clerk, Sonoma County Transportation Authority

Attachment:   “A” Use of Appropriated Funds

   “B” Chronological Listing of Fund Appropriation Resolutions
Date: February 6, 2017

Amount of Funds: $1,800,000

Appropriated to: City of Santa Rosa

Program Category: Local Streets Project (LSP)

Specific Project: Hearn Avenue Phase I

Appropriated For: Plans Specifications, and Estimates (PSE)

Scope of Work: Complete the Design Phase with a consultant and under partnership with Caltrans.

Other Conditions: None

Staff Comments: This is the fifth appropriation for this project
## ATTACHMENT B

Chronological Listing of Fund Appropriation Resolutions

**COOPERATIVE FUNDING AGREEMENT NO. M30706-A1**

**Between the Sonoma County Transportation Authority**

**And the City of Santa Rosa**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Funds Appropriated</th>
<th>Cumulative Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M30706</td>
<td>2006-010</td>
<td>June 12, 2006</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M30706</td>
<td>2010-011</td>
<td>May 10, 2010</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M30706</td>
<td>2010-019</td>
<td>June 14, 2010</td>
<td>$1,050,000</td>
<td>$1,550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M30706-A1</td>
<td>2015-006</td>
<td>April 13, 2015</td>
<td>$1,150,000</td>
<td>$2,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M30706-A1</td>
<td>2017-002</td>
<td>February 6, 2017</td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
<td>$4,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL FUNDS APPROPRIATED**

$4,500,000
Staff Report

To: Sonoma County Transportation Authority
From: James R. Cameron, Director of Projects and Programming
Item: 3.6 - Highway 101 – MSN-B2 Phase 2 Construction Funding
Date: February 6, 2017

Issue:

Shall the SCTA adopt Resolution No. 2017-003 required by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission to establish the Board’s support of the MSN B2, Phase 2 Median Widening Project, securing the last $1 million needed for a fully funded financial plan to construct the project?

Shall the SCTA adopt Resolution No. 2017-003 required by the California Transportation Commission authorizing the Executive Director to execute a Trade Corridor Improvement Fund (TCIF) Baseline Agreement with Caltrans, MTC and CTC to allocate $3 M in MSN B2 Phase 2 Median Widening Project funds?

Background:

The Highway 101 Marin Sonoma Narrows (MSN) project is an estimated $724 Million project (with escalation) to widen Highway 101 for High Occupancy Vehicles (HOV) from Route 37 in Novato to just south of Old Redwood Highway in Petaluma. To accelerate project delivery, SCTA, Caltrans, and the Transportation Authority of Marin (TAM) have divided the corridor into more than a dozen projects.

The B2, Phase 2 project is approximately 5 miles in length. It will add 4.0 miles of southbound and 4.3 miles of northbound High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes to US 101 from 0.6 mile south of the Marin/Sonoma County line (MRN 27.0) to 0.3 miles south of the East Washington Street Overcrossing in Sonoma County (SON 4.5). The carpool lanes will end before the lane drop resulting in 8.8 miles of a full width 3rd lane and 8.3 miles of Highway 101 HOV lanes.

On November 30, 2012, SCTA and Caltrans entered into Cooperative Agreement 4-2462, which is necessary to define the roles and responsibilities and divide $2,642,000 federal earmark funds between SCTA and Caltrans. In accordance with Coop 4-2462, SCTA has been assigned a budget of $2,492,000 to use on the design of the project. The remaining $170K budget has been assigned to Caltrans to prepare the right of way certification and for the final PS&E packaging necessary to advertise the project for construction.

On March 11, 2013, the Board authorized the SCTA Chair to execute the original agreement with URS for MSN B2, Phase 2 Design (PS&E) Services (SCTA13008). The effective date for the original agreement is August 8, 2013, with a 24 month term, subsequently amended to five year term.

On October 20, 2014, URS submitted a 100% design package but cannot finalize the design until construction funding is identified.

On June 23, 2015, the SCTA issued bonds generating approximately $15 M in new Highway 101 funds and recognizing $1.8 million in interest savings.
In 2016 SCTA successfully secured $15 million of the Port Sonoma Earmark to be repurposed to the MSN B2, Phase 2 project.

On January 18, 2017, the California Transportation Commission approved $3.0 million in TCIF funding for the MSN B2, Phase 2 Project.

The MSN B2, Phase 2 project construction estimate is $35 million and with the execution of the attached resolutions the project will have a fully funded financial plan per the attached Project Programming Request referenced as Exhibit A to the TCIF Baseline agreements.

The summary of the construction funding plan is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure M</td>
<td>$15.2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSN Earmark Savings</td>
<td>$ 0.8 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-purposed Earmark</td>
<td>$15.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCIF –Prop 1B (CTC)</td>
<td>$ 3.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP/CMAQ (MTC)</td>
<td>$ 1.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL CONSTRUCTION FUNDS</strong></td>
<td><strong>$35.0 Million</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The MSN B2, Phase 2 project is scheduled to advertise before the end of 2017 and start construction in 2018. The HOV lanes will open late in 2019.

**Policy Impacts:**

None

**Fiscal Impacts:**

Funding for the construction capital and construction support phases are based on the TCIF Baseline Agreement and Project Programming Request (PPR) funding commitments made by MTC, SCTA and the State. The Measure M Cash Flow Model has been updated to include the Measure M funding commitments.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Staff recommends that the Board adopt Resolution No. 2017-003 required by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission to establish the Board's support of the MSN B2, Phase 2 Median Widening Project, securing the last $1 million needed for a fully funded financial plan to construct the project.

Staff recommends that the Board adopt Resolution No. 2017-003 required by the California Transportation Commission authorizing the Executive Director to execute a Trade Corridor Improvement Fund (TCIF) Baseline Agreement with Caltrans, MTC and CTC to allocate the $3 million in MSN B2, Phase 2 Median Widening Project funds.
RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE SONOMA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY, COUNTY OF SONOMA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AUTHORIZING THE FILING OF AN APPLICATION FOR FUNDING ASSIGNED TO MTC AND COMMITTING ANY NECESSARY MATCHING FUNDS AND STATING ASSURANCE TO COMPLETE THE PROJECT

WHEREAS, Sonoma County Transportation Authority (herein referred to as APPLICANT) is submitting an application to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) for $1,000,000 in funding assigned to MTC for programming discretion, which includes federal funding administered by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and federal or state funding administered by the California Transportation Commission (CTC) such as Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STP) funding, Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) funding, Transportation Alternatives (TA) set-aside/Active Transportation Program (ATP) funding, and Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) funding (herein collectively referred to as REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING) for the MSN, B2 Phase 2 Sonoma Median Widening HOV lanes Project (herein referred to as PROJECT) for the Surface Transportation and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement program (herein referred to as PROGRAM); and

WHEREAS, the United States Congress from time to time enacts and amends legislation to provide funding for various transportation needs and programs, (collectively, the FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION ACT) including, but not limited to the Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STP) (23 U.S.C. § 133), the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) (23 U.S.C. § 149) and the Transportation Alternatives (TA) set-aside (23 U.S.C. § 133); and

WHEREAS, state statutes, including California Streets and Highways Code §182.6, §182.7, and §2381(a)(1), and California Government Code §14527, provide various funding programs for the programming discretion of the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION ACT, and any regulations promulgated thereunder, eligible project sponsors wishing to receive federal or state funds for a regionally-significant project shall submit an application first with the appropriate MPO, or RTPA, as applicable, for review and inclusion in the federal Transportation Improvement Program (TIP); and

WHEREAS, MTC is the MPO and RTPA for the nine counties of the San Francisco Bay region; and

WHEREAS, MTC has adopted a Regional Project Funding Delivery Policy (MTC Resolution No. 3606, revised) that sets out procedures governing the application and use of REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING; and

WHEREAS, APPLICANT is an eligible sponsor for REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING; and

WHEREAS, as part of the application for REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING, MTC requires a resolution adopted by the responsible implementing agency stating the following:

• the commitment of any required matching funds; and
• that the sponsor understands that the REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING is fixed at the programmed amount, and therefore any cost increase cannot be expected to be funded with additional REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING; and
• that the PROJECT will comply with the procedures, delivery milestones and funding
deadlines specified in the Regional Project Funding Delivery Policy (MTC Resolution No. 3606, revised); and

- the assurance of the sponsor to complete the PROJECT as described in the application, subject to environmental clearance, and if approved, as included in MTC's federal Transportation Improvement Program (TIP); and
- that the PROJECT will have adequate staffing resources to deliver and complete the PROJECT within the schedule submitted with the project application; and
- that the PROJECT will comply with all project-specific requirements as set forth in the PROGRAM; and
- that APPLICANT has assigned, and will maintain a single point of contact for all FHWA- and CTC-funded transportation projects to coordinate within the agency and with the respective Congestion Management Agency (CMA), MTC, Caltrans, FHWA, and CTC on all communications, inquiries or issues that may arise during the federal programming and delivery process for all FHWA- and CTC-funded transportation and transit projects implemented by APPLICANT; and
- in the case of a highway project, the PROJECT will comply with MTC Resolution No. 4104, which sets forth MTC’s Traffic Operations System (TOS) Policy to install and activate TOS elements on new major freeway projects; and
- in the case of an RTIP project, state law requires PROJECT be included in a local congestion management plan, or be consistent with the capital improvement program adopted pursuant to MTC’s funding agreement with the countywide transportation agency; and

WHEREAS, that APPLICANT is authorized to submit an application for REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING for the PROJECT; and

WHEREAS, there is no legal impediment to APPLICANT making applications for the funds; and

WHEREAS, there is no pending or threatened litigation that might in any way adversely affect the proposed PROJECT, or the ability of APPLICANT to deliver such PROJECT; and

WHEREAS, APPLICANT authorizes its Executive Director, General Manager, or designee to execute and file an application with MTC for REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING for the PROJECT as referenced in this resolution; and

WHEREAS, MTC requires that a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the MTC in conjunction with the filing of the application.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the APPLICANT is authorized to execute and file an application for funding for the PROJECT for REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING under the FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION ACT or continued funding; and be it further

RESOLVED that APPLICANT will provide any required matching funds; and be it further

RESOLVED that APPLICANT understands that the REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING for the project is fixed at the MTC approved programmed amount, and that any cost increases must be funded by the APPLICANT from other funds, and that APPLICANT does not expect any cost increases to be funded with additional REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING; and be it further

RESOLVED that APPLICANT understands the funding deadlines associated with these funds and will comply with the provisions and requirements of the Regional Project Funding Delivery Policy (MTC Resolution No. 3606, revised) and APPLICANT has, and will retain the expertise, knowledge and resources necessary to deliver federally-funded transportation and transit projects, and has assigned, and will maintain a single point of contact for all FHWA- and CTC-funded transportation projects to
coordinate within the agency and with the respective Congestion Management Agency (CMA), MTC, Caltrans, FHWA, and CTC on all communications, inquiries or issues that may arise during the federal programming and delivery process for all FHWA- and CTC-funded transportation and transit projects implemented by APPLICANT; and be it further

RESOLVED that PROJECT will be implemented as described in the complete application and in this resolution, subject to environmental clearance, and, if approved, for the amount approved by MTC and programmed in the federal TIP; and be it further

RESOLVED that APPLICANT has reviewed the PROJECT and has adequate staffing resources to deliver and complete the PROJECT within the schedule submitted with the project application; and be it further

RESOLVED that PROJECT will comply with the requirements as set forth in MTC programming guidelines and project selection procedures for the PROGRAM; and be it further

RESOLVED that, in the case of a transit project, APPLICANT agrees to comply with the requirements of MTC’s Transit Coordination Implementation Plan as set forth in MTC Resolution No. 3866, revised; and be it further

RESOLVED that, in the case of a highway project, APPLICANT agrees to comply with the requirements of MTC’s Traffic Operations System (TOS) Policy as set forth in MTC Resolution No. 4104; and be it further

RESOLVED that, in the case of an RTIP project, PROJECT is included in a local congestion management plan, or is consistent with the capital improvement program adopted pursuant to MTC’s funding agreement with the countywide transportation agency; and be it further

RESOLVED that APPLICANT is an eligible sponsor of REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING funded projects; and be it further

RESOLVED that APPLICANT is authorized to submit an application for REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING for the PROJECT; and be it further

RESOLVED that there is no legal impediment to APPLICANT making applications for the funds; and be it further

RESOLVED that there is no pending or threatened litigation that might in any way adversely affect the proposed PROJECT, or the ability of APPLICANT to deliver such PROJECT; and be it further

RESOLVED that APPLICANT authorizes its Executive Director, General Manager, City Manager, or designee to execute and file an application with MTC for REGIONAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING for the PROJECT as referenced in this resolution; and be it further

RESOLVED that a copy of this resolution will be transmitted to the MTC in conjunction with the filing of the application; and be it further

RESOLVED that the MTC is requested to support the application for the PROJECT described in the resolution, and if approved, to include the PROJECT in MTC’s federal TIP upon submittal by the project sponsor for TIP programming.
THE FOREGOING RESOLUTION was moved by Director Agrimonti, seconded by Director Mansell, and approved by the following vote:

- Director Agrimonti
- Director Coursey
- Director Gorin
- Director Gurney
- Director Landman
- Director Mackenzie
- Director Mansell
- Director Miller
- Director Rabbitt
- Director Russell
- Director Salmon
- Director Zane

Ayes:  
Noes:  
Absent:  
Abstain:  

David Rabbitt, SCTA Chair

This RESOLUTION was entered into at a meeting of the Sonoma County Transportation Authority held on February 6, 2017 in Santa Rosa, California

Suzanne Smith, Executive Director
Clerk, Sonoma County Transportation Authority
RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE SONOMA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY, COUNTY OF SONOMA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO EXECUTE A TRADE CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENT FUND (TCIF - PROPOSITION 1B) BASELINE AGREEMENT FOR THE HIGHWAY 101 MARIN SONOMA NARROWS (MSN) B2 PHASE 2 SONOMA MEDIAN WIDENING HOV LANES PROJECT WITH THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (CALTRANS), THE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION (MTC) AND THE CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION IN ORDER TO RECEIVE $3 MILLION DOLLARS IN TCIF FUNDING

WHEREAS, at the January 18, 2017 California Transportation Commission (CTC) meeting the CTC voted $3,000,000 towards MSN, B2 Phase 2 Sonoma Median Widening HOV lanes Project; and

WHEREAS SCTA, MTC and Caltrans will need to enter into a TCIF Baseline Agreement with CTC in order for the MSN B2 Phase 2 project to receive the $3,000,000 in TCIF funds;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors authorizes the Executive Director to execute the TCIF Baseline Agreement with Caltrans, MTC and CTC on behalf of the SCTA in the amount of $37.662 million for the MSN B2 Phase 2 Project, in substantially similar form as provided for in the attachment, subject to final review and approval by legal counsel.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Director Agrimonti</th>
<th>Director Mansell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director Coursey</td>
<td>Director Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director Gorin</td>
<td>Director Rabbitt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director Gurney</td>
<td>Director Russell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director Landman</td>
<td>Director Salmon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director Mackenzie</td>
<td>Director Zane</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ayes: Noes: Absent: Abstain:

___________________________________
David Rabbitt, SCTA Chair

This RESOLUTION was entered into at a meeting of the Sonoma County Transportation Authority held on February 6, 2017 in Santa Rosa, California

____________________________________
Suzanne Smith, Executive Director
Clerk, Sonoma County Transportation Authority
TRADE CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENT FUND
PROJECT BASELINE AGREEMENT

1. PARTIES AND DATE

1.1 This Project Baseline Agreement (Agreement) for the Marin Sonoma Narrow (MSN) B2 Phase 2 Sonoma Median Widening High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Lanes Project, effective on _________________________, is made by and between the California Transportation Commission (Commission), the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), and the Sonoma County Transportation Authority (Project Sponsor), sometimes collectively referred to as the “Parties”.

2. RECITAL

2.1 Whereas at its January 18, 2017 Meeting the California Transportation Commission amended the Trade Corridor Improvement Fund and included in this program of projects the MSN B2 Phase 2 Sonoma Median Widening HOV Lanes Project as Project 124 in the Bay Area Corridor element of the TCIF Program, the parties are entering into this Project Baseline Agreement to document the project cost, schedule, scope and benefits, as detailed on the Project Programming Request Form attached hereto as Exhibit A, the Project Study Report/Project Study Report Equivalent attached hereto as Exhibit B, and the Project Benefits Form as attached hereto as Exhibit C, as the baseline for project monitoring by the California Transportation Commission and its Project Delivery Council. The undersigned Project Sponsor certifies that the funding sources cited are committed and expected to be available; the estimated costs represent full project funding; and the scope and description of benefits is the best estimate possible.

3. GENERAL PROVISIONS

The Project Sponsor and Caltrans agree to abide by the following provisions:

3.1 To meet the requirements of Government Code Section 8879.23(c)(1), as added by Proposition 1B, and to Government Code Section 8879.50, as enacted through implementing legislation in 2007 (Senate Bill 88 and Assembly Bill 193).

3.2 To adhere to the provisions of the California Transportation Commission Resolution TCIF-P-0708-01, “Adoption of Program of Projects for the Trade Corridors Improvement Fund (TCIF),” dated April 10, 2008.

3.3 To adhere to the California Transportation Commission’s Trade Corridor Improvement Fund Guidelines.

3.4 To adhere to the California Transportation Commission’s Accountability Implementation Plan and policies, and program and baseline amendment processes.
3.5 The Sponsoring Agency agrees to secure funds for any additional costs of the project. Any change to the funding commitments outlined in this agreement requires an amendment.

3.6 To report to the California Transportation Commission on a quarterly basis on the progress made toward the implementation of the project, including scope, cost, and schedule.

3.7 To report to the California Transportation Commission on the progress, on a quarterly basis, and outcomes, at the end of the environmental phase, of the environmental process with regard to air quality impacts due to emissions from diesel or other particulates and related mitigation strategies. Whereas the Bond Act mandates that the Commission shall allocate TCIF for trade infrastructure improvements in a manner that places emphasis on projects that improve trade corridor mobility while reducing emissions of diesel particulate and other pollutant emissions, the Department of Transportation, the Sponsoring Agency, and the Corridor Coalition understand and agree that the California Transportation Commission will only allocate TCIF to projects that can demonstrate compliance with applicable environmental requirements. If environmental clearance is conditioned to the implementation of mitigation measures, the sponsoring agency must commit, in writing, to the implementation of those mitigation measures.

3.8 To maintain and make available to the California Transportation Commission and/or its designated representative, all work related documents, including engineering and financial data, during the course of the project and retain those records for four years from the date of the final closeout of the project. Financial records will be maintained in accordance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles.

3.9 The California Transportation Commission and/or its designated representative, has the right to audit the project records, including technical and financial data, of the Department of Transportation, the Sponsoring Agency, and any subconsultants at any time during the course of the project and for four years from the date of the final closeout of the project. Audits with be conducted in accordance with Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards.

4. SPECIFIC PROVISIONS AND CONDITIONS

4.1 Project Schedule and Cost
See Project Programming Request Form, attached as Exhibit A.

4.2 Project Scope
See Project Study Report/Project Study Report Equivalent, attached as Exhibit B.

4.3 Project Benefits
See Project Benefits Form, attached as Exhibit C.

4.4 Other Project Specific Provisions and Conditions
SIGNATURE PAGE
TO
TRADE CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENT FUND
PROJECT BASELINE AGREEMENT

____________________________________________
Suzanne Smith          Date
Executive Director     
Sonoma County Transportation Authority

____________________________________________
Steve Heminger          Date
Executive Director     
Metropolitan Transportation Commission

____________________________________________
Malcolm Dougherty       Date
Director               
California Department of Transportation

____________________________________________
Susan Bransen           Date
Executive Director     
California Transportation Commission
## Project Programming Request

### General Instructions

- **Date:** 1/22/17

### New Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>EA</th>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>MPO ID</th>
<th>TCRP No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>2640N</td>
<td>0412000649</td>
<td>0360u</td>
<td>SON70004</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Route/Corridor</th>
<th>PM Bk</th>
<th>PM Ahd</th>
<th>Project Sponsor/Lead Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SON</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Sonoma County Transportation Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRN</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>MPO Element MTC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project Manager/Contact

- **Name:** James Cameron
- **Phone:** 707-565-5377
- **E-mail Address:** james.cameron@scta.ca.gov

### Project Title

**MSN B2 Phase 2 Sonoma Median Widening HOV lanes (MRN 27.0-SON 4.5)**

### Location, Project Limits, Description, Scope of Work

Marin and Sonoma Counties: Provide median and shoulder widening between Kastania Road and just south of the Marin/Sonoma county line for HOV lanes.

### Includes ADA Improvements

- Includes ADA Improvements
- Includes Bike/Ped Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Implementing Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>SCTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>SCTA/Caltrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Purpose and Need

Reduce congestion by adding HOV lanes on primary freight corridor.

### Project Benefits

Reduced congestion, reduced GHG. 2,700 vehicle hours and 4,100 person hours saved per day due to increased travel speed and reduced congestion through the corridor. Reducing travel delay in the corridor will provide a direct benefit to freight throughput by reducing trucking hours lost due to congestion.

- Supports Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) Goals
- Reduces Greenhouse Gas Emissions

### Project Milestone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Milestone</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Study Report Approved</td>
<td>01/29/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begin Environmental (PA&amp;ED) Phase</td>
<td>04/23/01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulate Draft Environmental Document</td>
<td>10/16/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Project Report</td>
<td>10/09/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End Environmental Phase (PA&amp;ED Milestone)</td>
<td>10/29/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begin Design (PS&amp;E) Phase</td>
<td>08/08/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End Design Phase (Ready to List for Advertisement Milestone)</td>
<td>08/11/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begin Right of Way Phase</td>
<td>08/08/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End Right of Way Phase (Right of Way Certification Milestone)</td>
<td>08/11/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begin Construction Phase (Contract Award Milestone)</td>
<td>12/30/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End Construction Phase (Construction Contract Acceptance Milestone)</td>
<td>12/31/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begin Closeout Phase</td>
<td>01/01/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End Closeout Phase (Closeout Report)</td>
<td>12/30/20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For individuals with sensory disabilities, this document is available in alternate formats. For information call (916) 654-0410 or TDD (916) 654-3880 or write Records and Forms Management, 1120 N Street, MS-89, Sacramento, CA 95814.
New Project

**District** | **EA** | **Project ID** | **PPNO** | **MPO ID** | **TCRP No.**
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
04 | 2640N | 0412000649 | 0360u | SON70004 | 124

**Project Title**
MSN B2 Phase 2 Sonoma Median Widening HOV lanes (MRN 27.0-SON 4.5)

**Additional Information**
Project Level Performance Evaluation: new General Purpose lane miles to be added by this project is zero. New HOV lanes are approximately 8.8 miles. There will be no new sidewalks/pedestrian lane/bicycle lane added with this project. Although the project will provide pavement structural section for approximately 2 miles, the construction of this project will allow striping and use of existing pavement from other recent projects to be realized for a total of approximately 4.3 mile northbound and 4.0 miles southbound of new HOV lanes. There will be no new or reconstructed interchanges as part of this project. There will be no new or reconstructed bridges as part of this project.
### District County Route EA Project ID PPNO TCRP No. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>SON, MRN</td>
<td>101, 101</td>
<td>2640N</td>
<td>0412000649</td>
<td>0360u 124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Project Title:
MSN B2 Phase 2 Sonoma Median Widening HOV lanes (MRN 27.0-SON 4.5)

### Proposed Total Project Cost ($1,000s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior 16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20</th>
<th>20/21</th>
<th>21/22+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td>2,642</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W SUP (CT)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON SUP (CT)</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2,662</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37,662</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Fund No. 1: Local

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior 16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20</th>
<th>20/21</th>
<th>21/22+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W SUP (CT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON SUP (CT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>15,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>15,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Fund No. 2: Re-Purposed Port Sonoma Earmark

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior 16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20</th>
<th>20/21</th>
<th>21/22+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W SUP (CT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON SUP (CT)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Fund No. 3: SAFETEA-LU Earmark

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior 16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20</th>
<th>20/21</th>
<th>21/22+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td>2,642</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W SUP (CT)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON SUP (CT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2,662</td>
<td>800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,462</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**State of California**  
**Department of Transportation**

**Project Programming Request**

**DTP-0001 (Revised April 2015)**

**Date:** 1/22/17

### District County Route EA Project ID PPNO TCRP No.

| 04 | SON, MRN | 101, 101 | 2640N | 0412000649 | 0360u | 124 |

**Project Title:** MSN B2 Phase 2 Sonoma Median Widening HOV lanes (MRN 27.0-SON 4.5)

### Fund No. 4: Prop 1b Trade Corridor Improvement Fund (TCIF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20</th>
<th>20/21</th>
<th>21/22+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W SUP (CT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON SUP (CT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Funding Agency:** MTC

### Fund No. 5: Federal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20</th>
<th>20/21</th>
<th>21/22+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W SUP (CT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON SUP (CT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fund No. 6: Program Code

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20</th>
<th>20/21</th>
<th>21/22+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W SUP (CT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON SUP (CT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fund No. 7: Program Code

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20</th>
<th>20/21</th>
<th>21/22+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;P (PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W SUP (CT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON SUP (CT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PROJECT REPORT
ROUTE 101 - MARIN / SONOMA NARROWS

In Marin and Sonoma Counties
From the Route 101/37 Separation in Novato to north of the Corona Road Overcrossing.

I have reviewed the right of way information contained in this Project Report and the R/W Data Sheet attached hereto, and find the data to be complete, current and accurate:

[Signature]
R.A. MACPHERSON
Deputy District Director
Division of Right of Way, District 4

APPROVAL RECOMMENDED:
JIT PANDHER
Regional Project Manager

APPROVAL: [Signature] w/o ROD approval
HELENA (LENKA) CULIK-CARO
Deputy District Director - Design, District 4

June 2009
This Project Report has been prepared under the direction of the following registered civil engineer. The registered civil engineer attests to the technical information contained herein and the engineering data upon which recommendations, conclusions, and decisions are based.

John L. Martin, P.E.
Registered Civil Engineer

Date
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# Trade Corridor Improvement Fund

## Project Benefits Form – Exhibit C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Marin Sonoma Narrows (MSN) B2 Phase 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Type</td>
<td>High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Widening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outputs</td>
<td>Approximately 5 miles of HOV lane in each direction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Throughput</td>
<td>2,700 vehicle hours and 4,100 person hours saved per day due to increased travel speed and reduced congestion through the corridor.</td>
<td>Average annual daily traffic through this corridor ranges from 96,000 - 105,000 vehicles per day depending on the specific location and direction of travel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Highway 101 is a primary freight corridor and connection in Sonoma County. 5-7% of travel through the corridor is estimated to be truck traffic. Over 10% of some connecting highway traffic is estimated to be truck traffic. Reducing travel delay in the corridor will provide a direct benefit to freight throughput by reducing trucking hours lost due to congestion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velocity</td>
<td>Project is predicted to increase average bi-directional travel speed in the corridor by 21% per day by 2040 (51mph to 62mph), and increase PM peak period average bi-directional speeds by 25% by 2040 (47 mph to 59 mph).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>Increased corridor traffic congestion has increased the occurrence of unexpected stoppages and has reduced travel reliability. The congestion reduction provided by this project will reduce the incidence of unexpected stoppages and improve travel reliability through the corridor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Reduced congestion and associated unexpected stoppages are expected to reduce collision rates and increase safety overall through the travel corridor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion</td>
<td>2,700 vehicle hours and 4,100 person hours saved per day due to increased travel speed and reduced congestion through the corridor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Transportation Bottleneck Relief**

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission has identified this corridor as one of the top 100 most congested highway bottlenecks in the San Francisco Bay Area (PM Northbound #40, AM Southbound #61). Congestion reduction activities will help lessen the...
negative impact of these transportation bottlenecks and increase connectivity with the rest of the region.

### Interregional Benefits

Highway 101 is a primary freight and commute corridor for Marin and Sonoma Counties and serves as the primary connection between Sonoma County businesses, workers, markets, and job centers in the San Francisco Bay area. Reduced congestion through the corridor will reduce commute times, improve connections between Sonoma County and other Bay Area businesses, and improve delivery and goods movement between Sonoma County production facilities and markets in the Bay Area and abroad.

### Emissions

Emissions including ROG, CO, CO2, and CO2e are predicted to increase by 1% due to increased vehicle miles travelled and throughput associated with the project. Vehicle efficiency and fuel economy improvements including statewide Low Carbon Fuel Standard and Pavley I reductions are expected to offset vehicle greenhouse gas and other emissions in the corridor.

### Economic/Job Growth

Highway 101 is a primary freight and commute corridor for Marin and Sonoma Counties and serves as the primary connection between Sonoma County businesses and workers and markets and job centers in the San Francisco Bay area. Reduced congestion through the corridor will reduce commute times, improve connections between Sonoma County and other Bay Area businesses, and improve delivery and goods movement between Sonoma County production facilities and markets in the Bay Area and abroad.
Staff Report

To: Sonoma County Transportation Authority

From: Seana L. S. Gause, Senior – Programming and Projects

Item: 3.7 – Program unused funding from One Bay Area Grant to Safe Routes to School

Date: February 6, 2017

Issue:
Shall the Board authorize staff to reprogram Surface Transportation funds from One Bay Area Grant (OBAG 1) that are unable to be obligated by the original jurisdictions before they are lost to the county?

Background:
During the first cycle of OBAG 1, funds were programmed to all the Sonoma County jurisdictions for various eligible projects. It is now the end of the cycle for OBAG 1 and two of the jurisdictions find that they are unable to spend a portion of the funding programmed to them. The City of Santa Rosa had funding programmed for activities in the right-of-way (R/W) phase ($100,000) that have since been determined ineligible for that phase. Since the construction estimates for the project in question are low, the City feels that there is no need to obligate the funds programmed into the R/W phase and has asked SCTA to reprogram them.

The City of Cloverdale had funding programmed into two phases for a sidewalk gap closure project. The City encountered difficulty negotiating with property owners and subsequently moved funding from the first phase programmed (R/W) into construction for a total of $250,000. The R/W negotiations continued to plague the project and now the City finds that there is not enough time left in the fiscal year to deliver the complete project. The City does have final design and has secured right of way for a portion of the project and proposes to deliver that portion for some but not all of the funding ($100,000). The remaining funds ($150,000) would be lost to the county if not reprogrammed.

SCTA recently directed staff to assume administration of the Countywide Safe Routes to Schools Program and program available (OBAG 2) funding to that federal project. The funding mentioned above could be shifted to the on-going program to allow for further flexibility with some tasks that are ineligible under the majority funding program (Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality Improvement Program).

Policy Impacts:
None. There are no other projects that can meet the deadline to obligate these funds.

Fiscal Impacts:
The proposed action would allow $250,000 in funds currently programmed within the county to be shifted to another project in the county and not lost. This proposal would bring the total Safe Routes budget to $1.9M.

Staff Recommendation:
Staff recommends that the Board authorized staff to reprogram $250,000 in STP funds to the Safe Routes to Schools program so that the funding is not lost to the county.
Staff Report

To: SCTA/RCPA Board of Directors
From: Suzanne Smith, Executive Director
Item: 4.1 – Election of Officers 2017
Date: February 6, 2017

Issue:
Who shall be the 2017 officers of the SCTA/RCPA?

Background:
The Sonoma County Transportation Authority Ordinance No. 3 and Regional Climate Protection Authority Ordinance No. 1 require that at the first meeting of each calendar year, the SCTA elect a Chair and Vice-Chair to serve during the upcoming year. SCTA Ordinance No. 3 states that, “The position of Chair shall be rotated bi-annually and no person shall serve consecutive terms as Chair. At no time should two Members from the Board of Supervisors (BOS) or two Members from City or Town Councils hold both the Chair and Vice Chair positions.”

- In 2016 the Chair was David Rabbitt, BOS; Vice Chair was Carol Russell, City of Cloverdale
- In 2015 the Chair was Sarah Gurney, Sebastopol; Vice Chair was David Rabbitt, BOS
- In 2014 the Chair was Sarah Gurney, Sebastopol; Vice Chair was David Rabbitt, BOS
- In 2013 the Chair was Mike McGuire, BOS; Vice Chair was Sarah Gurney, Sebastopol
- In 2012 the Chair was Valerie Brown, BOS; Vice Chair was Sarah Gurney, Sebastopol
- In 2011 the Chair was Jake Mackenzie, Rohnert Park; Vice Chair was Valerie Brown, BOS
- In 2010 the Chair was Jake Mackenzie, Rohnert Park; Vice Chair was Valerie Brown, BOS

The selection of the Executive Committee takes place at the first meeting of the year as well. Ordinance No. 3 states, “The Executive Committee shall have two members, in addition to the Chair, Vice-Chair and one alternate. The selection of the Executive Committee shall take place annually, in conjunction with the selection of the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Board. The Board shall individually nominate members of the Executive Committee, and each nominee shall be appointed after receiving a majority vote of the full Board.”

The current Executive Committee members are Chair Rabbitt, Vice Chair Russell, and Directors Landman and Miller. Director Gallian was the alternate.

Policy/Fiscal Impacts:
Not applicable.

Staff Recommendation:
Accept nominations for and elect officers to serve as Chair, Vice Chair and the Executive Committee for 2017. No resolution is required although an action must be recorded in the meeting minutes.
Staff Report
To: Sonoma County Transportation Authority
From: Suzanne Smith, Executive Director
Item: 4.2 – SCTA & RCPA 2016 Annual Report
Date: February 6, 2017

Issue:
Shall the Board approve the SCTA & RCPA 2016 Annual Report?

Background:
Every year the SCTA & RCPA produce a report of activities from the previous year. This Annual Report provides information on activities in 2016 and includes fiscal year 2015/2016 programming and financial information.

The past year has brought about collaboration on significant planning efforts as well as innovative projects and programs that will help Sonoma County residents with mobility, energy and sustainability. Some of the highlights in 2016:
- The Comprehensive Transportation Plan and Climate Action 2020 and Beyond were significant planning documents completed in 2016.
- The Highway 101 and SMART projects were recipients of additional funding, moving them forward.
- In 2016 more time and effort was spent collaborating with neighboring counties to develop strategies for the future of Highway 37.
- And, finally, the State Legislature and Governor approved legislation that allows the RCPA to continue its mission without a sunset date.

To read the document please see the SCTA website here:

Policy Impacts:
The Annual Report serves as review of the previous year.

Fiscal Impacts:
No fiscal impacts.

Staff Recommendation:
Staff recommends that the Board approve the SCTA & RCPA 2016 Annual Report.
Staff Report

To: Sonoma County Transportation Authority
From: Dana Turrey, Transportation Planner
Item: 4.4.1 - Senior Mobility Management, Human Services Department Area Agency on Aging
Date: February 6, 2017

Issue:
What mobility management programs and services are provided by the Area Agency on Aging?

Background:
The Sonoma County Human Services Department Area Agency on Aging (AAA) has leveraged Federal grants to provide mobility management planning and transportation programs in Sonoma County. Mobility Management involves strategic coordination of human service and community transportation service providers to connect seniors and people with disabilities to services that meet their needs.

The AAA is currently managing volunteer driver programs that provide rides to medical and social service appointments to people age 60 and over and people with disabilities, and a travel voucher program that provides subsidized taxi, Uber/Lyft or wheelchair accessible rides to enrolled, eligible participants residing in the County of Sonoma. A summary of these transportation programs is attached and will be discussed in a presentation from the AAA. The AAA is represented on the SCTA’s Transit Paratransit Coordinating Committee and the SCTA is represented on the AAA’s Sonoma Access Coordinated Transportation Services (SACTS) Consortium.

Policy Impacts:
None.

Fiscal Impacts:
None.

Staff Recommendation:
None. This is an informational item.
Volunteer Driver Program: The Sonoma County Human Services Department Area Agency on Aging’s Volunteer Driver Programs are community based, volunteer programs that provide rides to medical and social service appointments to people age 60 and over and people with disabilities. The programs have been developed in response to the identified, unmet transportation needs of our older adult communities. Trained volunteer drivers are community members who donate their time and gas so their neighbors can meet their medical, social service appointments, and shopping needs. Each partner agency has their own service area.

Travel Voucher Program: The Sonoma County Human Services Department Area Agency on Aging’s Transportation Voucher Services program is a transportation service that provides subsidized taxi, Uber/Lyft or wheelchair accessible rides to enrolled, eligible participants residing in the County of Sonoma. The purpose of this program is to provide an affordable, accessible transportation alternative when existing fixed route transit services, paratransit or volunteer driver programs are not able to meet the transportation needs of the participants. The program provides transportation to medical and social appointments to people age 60 and older who have no other viable transportation option. Participants are a cross section of socioeconomic levels and varied physical and mental abilities, with the majority of riders being seniors who have outlived their ability to drive and people living with disabilities.

Provider Agencies:

- For Santa Rosa (Bennett Valley to Roseland), call Catholic Charities’ St. Rose CARES Program. The contact is Lindsey Hazelwood-Schmidt at 707.528-2063 or visit their website for more information: http://www.srcharities.org/get-help/senior-services (Volunteer Driver and Travel Voucher Program available)

- For Petaluma and the unincorporated communities of Penngrove, Two Rock, and Valley Ford, call Petaluma Peoples Service Center’s iRIDE Program. The contact is Lauren Garibaldi at 707.765.8488 or visit their website for more information: http://petalumapeople.org/seniors/transportation/ (Volunteer Driver and Travel Voucher Program available)

- For the West County Area, call the Sebastopol Area Senior Center’s Volunteer Driver Transportation Program. The contact is Dean Brittingham at 707.829.2440 or visit their website for more information: http://www.sebastopolseniorcenter.org/transportation (Volunteer Driver and Travel Voucher Program available)

- For non-medical rides only in Sonoma Valley from Sears Point to Kenwood, call Vintage House’s Local Independent Mobility Options (LIMO) Program. The contact is Michele Alba at 707.996.0311, ext. 308 or visit their website for more information: http://vintagehouse.org/programs-and-services/limo/ (Volunteer Driver and Travel Voucher Program available)

- For County of Sonoma residents that are blind and visually impaired and/or 60 years and older, call the Earle Baum Center for the Blind at 707.523-3222, or visit their website for more information: http://earlebaum.org/ (Travel Vouchers only)
Staff Report

To: Sonoma County Transportation Authority
From: Seana L. S. Gause, Senior – Programming and Projects
Item: 4.5.1 – Measure M Annual Report FY15/16
Date: February 6, 2017

Issue:
Shall the Board approve the Measure M Annual Report for FY15/16?

Background:
Every year the SCTA produces a report of Measure M activities from the previous year. This Annual Report provides information on activities, programming and financial information for fiscal year 2015/2016.

To read the document please see the SCTA website here:

Policy Impacts:
The Annual Report serves as review of the previous year. The CAC has also reviewed this report and concurs with its content.

Fiscal Impacts:
No fiscal impacts.

Staff Recommendation:
Staff recommends that the Board approve the SCTA & RCPA 2016 Annual Report.
Staff Report

To:       SCTA Board of Directors

From:  Suzanne Smith, Executive Director

Item:  4.5.2 – letter of support for AB1 and SB1 related to State transportation funding

Date:  February 6, 2017

Issue:
Shall the SCTA support AB1 and SB1 related to State transportation funding? How do the Legislative proposals compare to the Governor’s proposed FY17/18 State Budget?

Background:
Two significant pieces of transportation legislation have been introduced in the new State legislative session – AB1 (Frazier) and SB1 (Beall). The Governor has also included increased funding in the State Budget released in January. The funding levels and proposed expenditures are summarized at a high level below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenues</th>
<th>AB1/SB1</th>
<th>Governor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gas Tax</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration Fees</td>
<td>$1,321</td>
<td>$2,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price Based Excise Tax</td>
<td>$2,003</td>
<td>$1,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight Fees</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cap and Trade</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$195</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,119</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,225</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>AB1/SB1</th>
<th>Governor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Road Maintenance</td>
<td>$2,160</td>
<td>$1,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Transportation</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>$1,607</td>
<td>$1,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP</td>
<td>$760</td>
<td>$85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Corridors</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>$603</td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Help</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor Mobility</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$35</td>
<td>$25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,115</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,190</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Dollars are in millions)

The formula distribution for the AB1/SB1 local road funds is shown in the table below. The Governor’s proposal would reduce this amount by half.
**Policy Impacts:**

Increases to the gas tax, price based excise tax, weight fees and vehicle registration fees to address local transportation priorities are aligned with the SCTA Legislative Platform for 2017.

**Fiscal Impacts:**

Local roads – the increased funding levels would go directly to Public Works Departments for road maintenance and rehabilitation.

State highways – the increased STIP funds will be distributed by formula and SCTA could expect to see funds available in the STIP starting in 2020 at the earliest. Trade Corridor funds and Corridor Mobility funds will be competitive but the Narrows project would likely be a viable candidate for partial funding. The increase to the SHOPP will provide opportunity for highway rehabilitation throughout the County and operation projects like the intersection at 121/116 and on 116 between Cotati and Sebastopol may be good candidates if the SHOPP is more robust.

Transit – In AB1/SB1 a portion of the proposed transit funding (263M) will be distributed using the State Transit Assistance formula but the majority would be competitive. The Governor’s proposal would direct all of the funding to the Intercity Rail Program.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Consider sending a letter of support to Senator Jim Beall and Assembly Member Jim Frazier for SB1 and AB1 respectively with copies to the Sonoma legislative delegation. Direct staff to engage in effort to support the measures and ensure SCTA priorities are protected.
### AB 1 & SB 1: REVENUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road Maintenance &amp; Rehab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas Tax</td>
<td>.12 cents/gallon</td>
<td>$1.8 billion</td>
<td>(SB 1 phases the tax in over three years - indexed for inflations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration Fee</td>
<td>$38 per vehicle</td>
<td>$1.3 billion</td>
<td>(indexed for inflation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZEV Registration Fee</td>
<td>$165 per vehicle</td>
<td>$21 million</td>
<td>(SB 1 uses $100 fee and raises $13 million)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3.121 billion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Highway Account</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restore Price Based Excise Tax to</td>
<td>7.5 cents/gallon</td>
<td>$1.1 billion</td>
<td>Rate indexed going forward; increase is from current rate: 9.8 cents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redirect Misc. Revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td>$125 million</td>
<td>Off road and Ag Uses Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restore Weight Fees</td>
<td></td>
<td>$500 million</td>
<td>(Phased in over 3 years @ $100 million/yr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1.725 billion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Excise Tax Base</td>
<td>20 cents/gallon</td>
<td>$600 million</td>
<td>(Resets diesel tax rate to existing 13 cents; then adds 20 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cap &amp; Trade</td>
<td></td>
<td>$300 million</td>
<td>Doubles TIRCP and LCTOP (Assumes $2 Billion/yr in auction proceeds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Excise Tax - Transit</td>
<td>3.5% increase</td>
<td>$263 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.05% increase</td>
<td>$40 million</td>
<td>SB 1 imposes an addition 1/2% that raises $40 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>$563 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Transportation Add</td>
<td></td>
<td>$70 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ONGOING REVENUES</td>
<td></td>
<td>Approximately $6.1 Billion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AB 1 and SB 1 Expenditures Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road Maintenance &amp; Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Help Funds</td>
<td>$200 million</td>
<td>RMRA Set Aside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance Mitigation</td>
<td>$30 million</td>
<td>RMRA Set Aside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>$5 million</td>
<td>RMRA Set Aside - in SB 1, this figure is only $2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Transportation</td>
<td>$80 million</td>
<td>RMRA Set Aside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State RMRA</td>
<td>$1.4 Billion</td>
<td>50% of RMRA after Set Asides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local RMRA</td>
<td>$1.4 Billion</td>
<td>50% of RMRA after Set Asides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$3.125 Billion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Highway Account</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Streets &amp; Roads (44%)</td>
<td>$760 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOPP (12%)</td>
<td>$207 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP - Regional (44% *.75)</td>
<td>$570 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP - Inter-regiona (44%*.25)</td>
<td>$190 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$1.725 Billion</td>
<td>Akk funds would be indexed to inflation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Corridors</td>
<td>$600 million</td>
<td>SB 1 makes delegations that reflect the discussions in AB 2170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit capital &amp; ops (STA)</td>
<td>$263 million</td>
<td>(SB 1 only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC &amp; Commuter Rail</td>
<td>$40 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIRCP &amp; LCTOP</td>
<td>$300 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>$563 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous: Add to Active Transportation</td>
<td>$70 million</td>
<td>Caltrans efficiencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</td>
<td></td>
<td>Approx. $6.1 Billion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Plus One Time Loan Repayments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State RMRA funds</td>
<td>$353 Million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local RMRA funds</td>
<td>$353 Million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$706 Million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### GOVERNOR's TRANSPORTATION PROPOSAL: REVENUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Registration Fee</td>
<td>$68 per vehicle</td>
<td>$2.1 Billion</td>
<td>ZEVs are included. Indexed for inflation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reset Price Based Excise Rate</td>
<td>$70 million</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 yr average (assumes current CTC Fund Estimate that rate climbs back to 18 cents by 2022)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retre base to 18 cents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add an addition 3.5 cents</td>
<td>$520 million</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Inflation Indexing (10 yr Ave)</td>
<td>$510 million</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Price Based Excise Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1.1 Billion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Excise Tax</td>
<td>11 cents gallon</td>
<td>$425 million</td>
<td>figure is based on 10 year average after indexing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cap and Trade</td>
<td></td>
<td>$500 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans Efficiencies</td>
<td></td>
<td>$100 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ONGOING REVENUES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4.25 Billion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GOVERNOR's EXPENDITURE PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Intercity Rail Capital Program</td>
<td>$400 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Transportation Program</td>
<td>$100 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 375 Local Planning Grants</td>
<td>$25 million</td>
<td>Not indexed, to be further defined by TBL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor Mobility Program</td>
<td>$275 million</td>
<td>Not indexed, to be further defined by TBL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Partnership (begin 7/1/2018)</td>
<td>$250 million</td>
<td>Not indexed, to be further defined by TBL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local STIP (regional programming)</td>
<td>$65 million</td>
<td>(increase over current fund estimate; zeros out after 4 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Streets &amp; Roads (from Excise Adjustment)</td>
<td>$85 million</td>
<td>(increase over current fund estimate; zeros out after 4 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Streets &amp; Roads (from Registration Fee)</td>
<td>1 billion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal:</strong></td>
<td>$2.2 billion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOPP/Maintenance (from Registration Fee)</td>
<td>1.7 billion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOPP (current allocation)</td>
<td>$20 million</td>
<td>(increase over current fund estimate; zeros out after 4 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interegional STIP</td>
<td>$20 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Corridors</td>
<td>$250 million</td>
<td>Not indexed, to be further defined by TBL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal:</strong></td>
<td>$2.0 billion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ONGOING ALLOCATIONS</strong></td>
<td>$4.2 Billion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Loan Repayments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Corridors</td>
<td>$323 Million</td>
<td>Loan Repayments made over three years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Intercity Rail Capital Program</td>
<td>$256 Million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOPP/Maintenance</td>
<td>$127 Million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal:</strong></td>
<td>$706 Million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NOTES & ASSUMPTIONS

**Price Based Excise Tax.** Based on the structure from last year, this table projects that of the 21.5 cents, only 18 cents goes to the State Highway Account (which includes funding for the STIP, SHOPP, and LSR on a 44-12-44 formula). The additional 3.5 cents and all indexing (including the indexing on the base 18 cents), goes to the new Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account. The figures for the STIP are low in this table because there is no indexing and the Administration projects that the PBE will return to 18 cents by the fourth year of its 10 year calculation.

**Calculation Method.** Like last year’s proposal, the Administration seems to be making 10 year projections and dividing by 10 to come up with the annual budget figure. This explains in part how the Administration proposal gets $425 million out of an 11 cent increase in the Diesel Tax when the Legislative proposals are calculating $600 million for a 20 cent increase. The administration appears to be factoring the indexing over that time period. However, only some of the funds appear to be indexed.

**Disclaimer: Some Guess Work Here.** This is based on some educated guessing, back of the envelope estimates, and the assumption that the proposal will largely be structured like last year with most of the funding going into one larger new fund that is split roughly evenly between state and local programs. We will have to wait for the Trailer Bill Language (Feb 1) to be sure.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>AB 1 (Frazier)</th>
<th>SB 1 (Beall)</th>
<th>Governor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hwy Design Manual</td>
<td>Include Complete Streets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Review</td>
<td>Exemption for work in existing right of way</td>
<td>Exemption for work in existing right of way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPA Delegation</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance Mitigation</td>
<td>Sets Program Framework w 4yrs Funding</td>
<td>Sets Program Framework w 4 yrs Funding</td>
<td>Supports, Program &amp; funding not yet defined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPA Delegation</td>
<td>Extended Permanently</td>
<td>Extended Permanently</td>
<td>Extend Permanently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA Transportation Comm</td>
<td>Independent from CalSTA</td>
<td>Independent from CalSTA</td>
<td>Expand Oversight Role (but no reorganization)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHIPP</td>
<td>CTC Oversight</td>
<td>CTC Oversight</td>
<td>State Highway Performance Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oversight</td>
<td>Inspector General</td>
<td>Inspector General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Funding Accountability</td>
<td>CTC Oversight over RMRA</td>
<td>CTC Oversight over RMRA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracting</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plan to double contracts to small, disadvantaged, and disabled veteran enterprises</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Shortage</td>
<td></td>
<td>Work force; job training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Streamlining</td>
<td>CM/GC project delivery until 2025</td>
<td></td>
<td>Extend Public-Private Partnership Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming</td>
<td></td>
<td>Expand Caltrans federal exchange/state match program; provide flexibility for engineering and ROW contracting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitutional Protections (anticipated)</td>
<td>Protect Transportation Revenues 55% Threshold</td>
<td>Protect Transportation Revenues 55% Threshold</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Staff Report

To: SCTA Board of Directors
From: Suzanne Smith, Executive Director
Item: 4.5.3 – Regional Measure 3
Date: February 6, 2017

Issue:
What is the status of the MTC proposal for a bridge toll increase known as Regional Measure 3 (RM3)? What steps will be taken in 2017 in pursuit of this effort and what role will SCTA play?

Background:
MTC is exploring the possibility of placing a measure on the ballot asking Bay Area voters to approve a bridge toll increase to fund congestion relief projects for improved mobility in the bridge corridors.

Unlike local sales tax measures where the Legislature has provided a general grant of authority to a county to create an expenditure plan to be placed on the ballot, when MTC seeks to raise bridge tolls an expenditure plan written and adopted by the Legislature as part of its normal bill passage process is the required process.

The toll program is also unique in that it is regional in nature and the tolls are pooled together to fund projects throughout the bridge system. The toll revenue provides a benefit to those paying the fees (i.e. toll bridge users) or mitigates for the activity associated with the fees. As fees, toll increases are subject to a simple majority vote, rather than two-thirds. In the case of RM1 and RM2, and MTC’s regional gas tax authorization statute, the vote is tallied region-wide rather than county-by-county.

In 2003, when RM 2 was under consideration by the Legislature, then Senate Pro Tern Don Perata created a special Select Committee that held a number of public hearings to solicit public input on the expenditure plan. Concurrently, MTC hosted a Technical Advisory Committee that met monthly to provide interested parties – transit operators, CMA’s and other stakeholders – an opportunity to propose projects and discuss the attributes of proposals as they emerged in an open public forum. MTC expects to follow a similar approach with RM3 with a goal of passing a bill in 2017 and placing the measure on the ballot in 2018.

Attached is a handout from MTC that spells out key principles and policy considerations for RM3 and data on usage of the Bay Area bridges. The Golden Gate Bridge is its own district, not part of the Bay Area Toll Authority, and is not included in RM3.

Policy Impacts:
This is the first time Sonoma County will be included in a bridge toll program. As part of the development of the expenditure plan the SCTA has been asked by MTC to indicate what priority projects in Sonoma County will align with the proposed principles. Finishing the Marin/Sonoma Narrows, initiating work in the Highway 37 corridor, the SMART transit hub in San Rafael, extending SMART to Windsor and the intersection of 116 and 121 in Sonoma Valley are the capital projects that seem most in line with the proposed requirements.
**Fiscal Impacts:**

The cost of a regional ballot measure will be borne by MTC.

RM3 represents a new funding source for transportation projects in the Bay Area. If return to source based on tolls collected is a measurement used to assess possible distribution of funds, the Sonoma total would be between $35M and $100M depending upon the level of toll assessed. If population is the metric, the amount increases to between $100M and $300M. MTC is not proposing to use either of these formula approaches.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Provide direction to staff on the priority projects that should be submitted to MTC for consideration in RM3 with further direction to work with MTC on crafting the expenditure plan and getting through the legislative process.
Regional Measure 3 —
Key Policy Considerations

When should the vote take place?
We recommend either the primary or general election in 2018. This will require the Legislature to pass the enabling legislation no later than the end of August 2017.

How large of a toll hike should we seek?
A comparison of the revenue yield from a $1–$3 toll surcharge as well as a comparison of toll rates on other bridges are shown in the tables below. A multi-dollar toll surcharge could be phased in over a period of years.

### Toll Rate Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Standard Auto Toll</th>
<th>Carpool Toll</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BATA Bridges</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Gate Bridge</td>
<td>$7.50/$6.50 Plate/FasTrak</td>
<td>$4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTA Verrazano Narrows Bridge</td>
<td>$11.081/$16.00 EZ-Pass/Cash</td>
<td>$3.081,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Authority of New York/New Jersey (Bridges and Tunnels)</td>
<td>$10.50/$12.50/$15.00 Off-Peak/Peak/Cash</td>
<td>$6.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Results from EZ-Pass discount rate
*Average rate, based on 24 trips

---

**Draft Principles for Regional Measure 3**

**Bridge Nexus**
Ensure all projects benefit toll payers in the vicinity of the San Francisco Bay Area’s seven state-owned toll bridges

**Regional Prosperity**
Invest in projects that will sustain the region’s strong economy by enhancing travel options and improving mobility in bridge corridors

**Sustainability**
Ensure all projects are consistent with Plan Bay Area 2040’s focused growth and greenhouse gas reduction strategy

**State of Good Repair**
Invest in projects that help restore bridges and transportation infrastructure in the bridge corridors

**Demand Management**
Utilize technology and pricing to optimize roadway capacity

**Freight**
Improve the mobility, safety and environmental impact of freight

**Resiliency**
Invest in resilient bridges and approaches, including addressing sea level rise
Which counties should vote on the toll increase?

Regional Measure 1 (1988) and Regional Measure 2 (2004) were placed on the ballot in only seven of the nine Bay Area counties; Napa and Sonoma were excluded. We propose that all nine counties be included in Regional Measure 3.

Should toll revenue be used for operating purposes?

If a portion of toll revenue is reserved for operating funding (such as to subsidize transit service), the capital funding shown in the table on the prior page would be reduced. For example, for every 10% of total revenue reserved for operating purposes under a $2 toll scenario, the capital yield from toll revenue bonds would be reduced by approximately $300 million. Accordingly, we recommend restricting operating funding to the smallest possible amount. If an operating program is created, we recommend establishing performance standards similar to those in Regional Measure 2 as a condition of funding eligibility.

Should congestion pricing be expanded?

The $6 peak/$4 off-peak weekday toll on the San Francisco-Bay Bridge has successfully reduced congestion on that span by encouraging some commuters to change their time or mode of travel. The $6/$4 differential toll also raises about the same amount of revenue as would a flat $5 toll on that span. To further reduce congestion, we suggest consideration of a greater discount between the peak and off-peak rate for the Bay Bridge in Regional Measure 3.

Should a FasTrak® discount be authorized?

The Golden Gate Bridge district offers FasTrak Discounts to incentivize more drivers to sign up for FasTrak, since electronic toll collection significantly speeds up traffic throughput on the bridge. RM 3 is an opportunity to remove a statutory restriction that currently prohibits BATA from offering similar FasTrak discounts. We recommend pursuing this change to help reduce delays and associated emissions.

Should trucks pay an additional toll?

The last toll hike approved by the Bay Area Toll Authority (BATA) in 2010 included a substantial increase in the axle-based rate paid by commercial vehicles and trucks. As a result, we recommend that Regional Measure 3 be a flat surcharge added to all vehicles crossing the seven state-owned bridges.

What kind of projects should be considered for funding?

Since bridge tolls are fees and not taxes, the use of toll revenue should benefit the payers of the fee. In other words, the projects funded by Regional Measure 3 should provide safety, mobility, access, or other related benefits in the toll bridge corridors. Regional Measure 1 funded primarily a small set of bridge replacement and expansion projects. By contrast, Regional Measure 2 funded a much larger set of both bridge, highway, and transit projects in the bridge corridors. Given the region’s significant needs on all modes, we expect that Regional Measure 3 will resemble its immediate predecessor in the breadth and modal mix of projects.
Share of Bridge Toll Revenue by Bridge

- SF - Oakland Bay Bridge, 32%
- Benicia-Martinez, 16%
- Carquinez, 17%
- Dumbarton, 8%
- Richmond-San Rafael, 11%
- San Mateo - Hayward, 14%
- Antioch, 2%


Share of Toll Revenue by County of Residence

- Alameda, 31%
- Contra Costa, 18%
- Marin, 4%
- Napa, 2%
- San Francisco, 10%
- San Mateo, 8%
- Santa Clara, 2%
- Solano, 14%
- Sonoma, 2%
- Out of Region, 9%

Source: 2015 MTC FasTrak Data - Average Typical Weekday Transactions by County of Billing Address
Share of Voters by County

- Alameda, 22%
- Contra Costa, 15%
- Marin, 4%
- Napa, 2%
- San Francisco, 12%
- San Mateo, 10%
- Santa Clara, 22%
- Solano, 6%
- Sonoma, 7%

Source: 2016 California Secretary of State Report of Registration (registered voters by county as of 10/24/2016)
Staff Report

To: Regional Climate Protection Authority
From: Carolyn Glanton, Climate Action Coordinator
Item: 4.6.1 – Climate Action Implementation Update
Date: February 6, 2017

Issue:
Information only.

Background:
In June 2016, the RCPA adopted Climate Action 2020 and Beyond, a regional climate action plan (CAP) for all communities of Sonoma County. Although formal adoption of the Plan by the jurisdictions has not yet occurred, climate action goals and measures are still being pursued, and specific actions directly connected to the plan have been taken in the City of Sonoma and the Town of Windsor.

Two examples that have been brought to the attention of the RCPA are showcased below and we encourage the Directors to share updates with RCPA staff as CAP implementation is moving forward in other jurisdictions. RCPA staff strives to stay current on member efforts and to provide an ongoing forum for jurisdictions to share efforts in climate action planning or adaptation with one another.

City of Sonoma

In November 2016, the City of Sonoma approved a resolution adopting all 22 local climate action measures (see Exhibit A) as referenced in the CAP and authorized staff to move forward with implementation of measures. The agenda item highlighted the importance for the City of Sonoma to continue working towards addressing climate change measures and leading by example. The Council also authorized staff to review options for a college intern to assist with updating current inventory data and designing an implementation program. The City of Sonoma will work with a subcommittee from the Community Services and Environment Commission on community outreach and implementation.

The RCPA will continue to work with City of Sonoma, developing a CAP implementation work plan for 2017. The City of Sonoma will begin implementation by working with RCPA and regional partners to promote existing tools such as Energy Upgrade California incentives for retrofits, Home Energy Score residential energy performance benchmarking, the Bay Area Multifamily Building Enhancements Program, the BayREN Codes and Standards program, the BayREN Pay As You Save (PAYS) on bill repayment program, and the Shift Sonoma County low carbon transportation planning project. Encouraging greater participation by local businesses and residents of Sonoma will help the city reduce greenhouse gas emissions resulting from building energy use and transportation.

In a related action, the City of Sonoma opted to transition all municipal utility accounts to the Sonoma Clean Power 100% renewable option, EverGreen.
**Town of Windsor**

The Town of Windsor is currently in the process of updating their General Plan and have incorporated greenhouse gas reduction measures from the CAP into the recently released Public Review Draft of the updated General Plan policy document. Sustainability and Resilience are two of the guiding principles identified in the introductory chapter of the draft, highlighting the importance of recognizing the environmental, social, and economic effects of changing climate conditions. Policies addressing greenhouse gas reduction are found throughout the draft update, including Transportation and Mobility, Public Facilities and Services, Environmental Resources, and Public Health and Safety. The Town has integrated the effects of climate change into the chapter on public health and safety, highlighting the connection to drought, flood risk, and fire hazards. The proposed update also provides a new goal on climate adaptation.

Several draft General Plan policies reference the Regional Climate Action Plan, including supporting the development of local charging stations in both public and private parking lots and large commercial parking lots (M-6.8 Alternative Fuel Vehicle Parking), traffic calming (M-3.14) and greenhouse gas reduction goals (ER-5.1 and ER-5.2).

The Public Review Draft includes modern policies that support climate action and greenhouse gas reduction efforts. RCPA staff review of the Public Review Draft identified new climate action related policies from the Town of Windsor that advance Climate Action 2020:

- **Economic Development:**
  - Green Industries (ED-1.15)
  - Green Tourism (ED-3.11)

- **Transportation and Mobility:**
  - Traffic Calming (M-3.14)
  - Impacts of Driverless Vehicles (M-3.24)
  - Walkable and Bikeable Community (goal M-4)
  - Reduce heat island (M-6.3)
  - Parking Offsets (M-6.4)
  - Alternative Fuel Vehicle Parking (M-6.8)
  - Impact of Driverless Vehicles on Parking Demand (M-6.10)
  - Regional Coordination on Transportation GHG Reduction (M-10.6)

- **General Public Facilities and Services**
  - Sustainable Practices (PFS-1.5)
  - Energy Efficient Buildings and Infrastructure (PFS-1.6)
  - Water Conservation (PFS-2.6-PFS-2.8, updated from current General Plan)
  - Carbon Free Water System by 2030 (PFS-2.13)
  - Recycled Water Plan (PFS-3.10)
  - Solid Waste and Recycling (PFS-5)

- **Environmental Resources**
  - Town Vehicle and Equipment Fleet (ER-4.5)
  - Grant Funding for EV Charging Stations (ER-4.6)
  - Residential EV Charging Stations (ER-4.7)
  - Zero Emission and Low Emission Vehicle Use (ER-4.8)
  - Collaboration for Businesses to Use Low and Zero Emissions Vehicles (ER-4.9)
  - Community Greenhouse Gas Reduction (ER-5.1)
o Municipal Services Greenhouse Gas Reduction (ER-5.2)
o Greenhouse Gas Efficiency Target (ER-5.3)
o Encourage Development Patterns that Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions (ER-5.4)
o AB 32 and SB 32 Greenhouse Gas Assessment and Monitoring (ER-5.5)
o Coordinate with BAAQMD and NSCAPCD (ER-5.6)
o Reduced Emissions for Town Operations (ER-5.7)
o Energy Performance Standards (ER-5.10)
o Net Zero Energy Goals (ER-5.11)
o Retrofitting Existing Buildings (ER-5.12)
o Update Energy Policies and Programs (ER-5.13)
o Urban Shade Tree Planting (ER-5.17, updated)
o Preservation of Trees (ER-5.18)

• Public Health and Safety
  o Hazards Mitigation Plan (PHS-1.1)
o Climate Adaption Resiliency (PHS-7.1)
o Reduce Impacts of Climate Change (PHS-7.2)
o Climate Change Education (PHS-7.3)
o Heat Waves (PHS-7.4)
o Resiliency to Drought (PHS-7.5)
o Groundwater Sustainability (PHS-7.6)
o Alternative Groundwater Sources (PHS-7.7)
o Preserve Groundwater Recharge Areas (PHS-7.8)
o Groundwater Recharge Projects (PHS-7.9)
o Rainwater Harvesting (PHS-7.10)

RCPA staff will continue working with the jurisdictions as they advance all climate action efforts, under the CA2020 umbrella or not. The RCPA will continue to help local jurisdictions in their climate action efforts and local hazard mitigation planning, providing resources such as implementation tools, funding, legislative advocacy, coordination, and specific project tools from current RCPA efforts including (but not limited to) Climate Ready North Bay, BayREN, and Shift Sonoma County low carbon transportation planning.

**Policy Impacts:**

Supports the Regional Climate Action Plan and the RCPA’s work with member jurisdictions.

**Fiscal Impacts:**

Efforts related to adoption and implementation of the CAP will be supported by RCPA Member contributions, grants (such as those administered by the California Energy Commission, California Public Utilities Commission, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District), private investments (through clean energy investments in homes and businesses), and the budgets made available by local and regional agencies for implementation.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Information only.
CITY OF SONOMA

RESOLUTION #___-2016

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SONOMA ADOPTING CLIMATE ACTION 2020 MEASURES FOR THE CITY OF SONOMA AND MAKE FINDINGS THAT THEY ARE EXEMPT FROM ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PURSUANT TO SECTION 15308 OF TITLE 14 OF THE CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS

Whereas, climate change is a serious threat to worldwide and strong action is needed to avoid serious damage to human wellbeing and natural systems, and

Whereas, the implementation of Climate Action 2020 Measures developed for the City of Sonoma will result in the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions and will thus result both in substantial environmental benefits, and

Whereas, achieving the objectives of Climate Action 2020 measures for the City of Sonoma will reduce greenhouse gas emissions and will have numerous other collateral public benefits, such as reducing other unhealthful emissions, improving public health through alternative modes of transportation, and improving efficiency and reducing waste.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT,

1. Exemption from Environmental Review. The adoption and implementation of the climate protection measures developed for the City of Sonoma in Climate Action 2020 are categorically exempt from environmental review pursuant to section 15308 of title 14 of the California Code of Regulations, because these measures constitute actions taken by a regulatory agency, as authorized by state or local ordinance, to assure the maintenance, restoration, enhancement, or protection of the environment.


The foregoing Resolution was duly adopted this 21st day of November 2016, by the following vote:

Ayes: 
Noes: 
Absent: 

__________________________________
Laurie Gallian, Mayor

ATTEST:

__________________________________
Rebekah Barr, MMC, City Clerk
The Final Draft CA 2020 includes an updated target to reduce GHGs in the City of Sonoma by 36,460 metric tons by achieving the following participation goals for local measures (from CAP Table 5.8-5):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City of Sonoma Local Measures</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 1: Increase Building Energy Efficiency</strong></td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 1-L2: Outdoor Lighting</td>
<td>172 80% of outdoor lighting to participate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 1-L3: Shade Tree Planting</td>
<td>1 50 trees planted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 2: Increase Renewable Energy Use</strong></td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 2-L1: Solar in New Residential Development</td>
<td>2 8% of new houses to participate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 2-L2: Solar in Existing Residential Building</td>
<td>245 11% of existing homes with solar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 2-L3: Solar in New Non-Residential Developments</td>
<td>7 2% of new non-residential development to participate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 2-L4: Solar in Existing Non-Residential Buildings</td>
<td>141 2% of existing non-residential development with solar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 4: Reduce Travel Demand Through Focused Growth</strong></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 4-L1: Mixed-Use Development in City Centers and Along Transit Corridors</td>
<td>16 50% of growth to result in mixed use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 4-L2: Increase Transit Accessibility</td>
<td>2 15% of growth to be 25+ units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 4-L3: Supporting Land Use Measures</td>
<td>NQ Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 4-L4: Affordable Housing Linked to Transit</td>
<td>1 20% of new development to be affordable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 5: Encourage a Shift Toward Low-Carbon Transportation Options</strong></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 5-L4: Supporting Bicycle/Pedestrian Measures</td>
<td>NQ Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 5-L5: Traffic Calming</td>
<td>26 80% of trips affected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 5-L7: Supporting Parking Policy Measures</td>
<td>NQ Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 7: Encourage a Shift Toward Low-Carbon Fuels in Vehicles and Equipment</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 7-L1: Electric Vehicle Charging Station Program</td>
<td>2 3 charging stations installed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 7-L2: Electrify Construction Equipment</td>
<td>22 5% of equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 7-L3: Reduce Fossil Fuel Use in Equipment through Efficiency or Fuel Switching</td>
<td>NQ Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 8: Reduce Idling</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 8-L1: Idling Ordinance</td>
<td>NQ 2 minutes below state law</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Goal 9: Increase Solid Waste Diversion

| Measure 9-L1: Create Construction and Demolition Reuse and Recycling Ordinance | <1 | 0% |

### Goal 11: Reduce Water Consumption 729

| Measure 11-L1: Senate Bill SB X7-7 - Water Conservation Act of 2009* | 436 | 10% | Reduction in per capita water use |
| Measure 11-L2: Water Conservation for New Construction* | 16 | 50%/50% | % of new residential/nonresidential development |
| Measure 11-L3: Water Conservation for Existing Buildings* | 278 | 25%/10% | % of new residential/nonresidential development |

### Goal 12: Increase Recycled Water and Greywater Use < 1

| Measure 12-L1: Greywater Use | < 1 | 2% | greywater goal |

### State Measure Reductions in Sonoma 22,990

### Regional Measure Reductions in Sonoma 12,110

### Local Measure Reductions in Sonoma 1,360

### Grand Total Emissions Reductions in Sonoma 36,460
Staff Report

To: RCPA Board of Directors
From: Lauren Casey, Director of Climate Programs
Item: 4.7.1 – RCPA Activities Report
Date: February 6, 2017

Issue:
Information only.

Background:
Planning and Coordination

Climate Action 2020
See item 4.6.1.

RCPA Coordination Committee
The theme for the January meeting of the RCPA Coordination Committee was the Status of Local Climate Action efforts in California and beyond. RCPA staff presented on the findings of a report recently published by the State Energy Efficiency Collaborative and Local Governments for Sustainability (ICLEI) called State of Local Climate Action: California 2016. Staff participants from RCPA members reviewed and discussed new ideas for climate solutions working in practice at a community scale. Highlights from the presentation include:

- 42% of local governments in California have completed a climate, energy, or sustainability plan
- 100 communities have set greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction goals
- California CAPs articulate reduction goals amounting to over 42 million tons of GHGs by 2020; the RCPA Regional CAP represents 3.3% of that total.

Examples of new implementation actions recently reported in other jurisdictions include:

- Hayward, CA – is requiring that all new or significantly renovated municipal facilities be Net Zero Energy starting in 2017 and that all municipal facilities are ZNE by 2020.
- Watsonville, CA – imposes an impact fee on new development that can be reduced or eliminated by implementing energy efficiency beyond state requirements.
- Santa Monica, CA – is considering adoption of a ZNE requirement for all new residential construction starting in 2017, three years ahead of the State goal for 2020.
- Portland, OR – now requires a Home Energy Score before a residential property is sold.

RCPA staff continue to monitor and assemble examples of local climate action for the CA2020 implementation toolkit.
Implementation

Bay Area Regional Energy Network

RCPA Staff continue to deliver on the local implementation of regional BayREN programs, all of which are described at [www.bayren.org](http://www.bayren.org).

RCPA efforts in December and January were focused on scoping county level work plans for the year ahead. The proposed 2017 scope of work for the RCPA includes:

- **Residential (single family and multi-family):** homeowner and property owner workshops, contractor networking events, Home Upgrade open houses, print and digital media, event tabling, community based organization outreach, and collaboration with planning/building departments, all to promote the Home Upgrade Advisor, Home Upgrade incentives, and additional residential programs of interest to Sonoma County homeowners including the Sonoma County Energy Independence Program PACE Marketplace, Sonoma Clean Power EverGreen and Drive EverGreen, and water utility programs.

- **Codes and Standards:** coordination with local building departments and the Redwood Empire Association of Code Officers (REACO) regarding the implementation of energy code, planning and delivering local energy code trainings, supporting the development of policy and implementation tools related to building energy code.

- **Pay As You Save (PAYS):** serving as the regional program lead, supporting Town of Windsor in making improvements to its existing program, and expanding the program to serve additional utilities.

All of these RCPA efforts are funded by California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) funding awarded to BayREN as an energy efficiency program administrator (see item 3.3).

**Funding**

California Energy Commission Solicitation for ZEV Readiness and Planning

The RCPA proposal for Sonoma County Drive EverGreen: Regional Readiness Plan Implementation submitted to the CEC was recommended for funding at the full $300,000 proposed. This scope will allow for on-going work to promote and be ready for electric vehicles, including an EV information website (to expand driveEV.org) and help desk, local government planning and permitting support, and a detailed index of priority charging station locations (using local government staff and community knowledge to expand the siting framework developed through Shift). The Notice of Proposed Awards (attached) must be approved by the Commission before the grant agreement can be finalized.

**Policy and Legislation**

Cap and Trade Funding

Governor Brown released the proposed budget in January at: [http://www.ebudget.ca.gov/](http://www.ebudget.ca.gov/). This proposal includes an expenditure plan for cap and trade revenue of $2.2 billion, most of which is contingent upon the legislature taking action to extend the cap and trade program through 2030. The attached memo explains the proposed breakdown of the cap and trade budget and process by which the program may be extended (through a 2/3 vote).

RCPA staff will issue support for the Governor’s proposed budget and for AB 151 once introduced, as these state efforts are consistent with our 2017 legislative platform and may provide important revenue for Sonoma County programs in the future.
Outreach, Advocacy, and Education

California Climate Change Symposium

RCPA staff attended the 2017 California Climate Change Symposium on January 25 and 26 to learn about the state of climate science and policy best practice in California. Highlights of most interest to the RCPA and its members include:

- Safeguarding California: The 2017 update to the State’s adaptation plan is expected in February. In the meantime, the high level policy recommendations and draft outline are available at: http://resources.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/DRAFT-High-Level-Policy-Recommendations-for-Safeguarding-CA.pdf. This document provides excellent insight into State Agency priorities in reacting to climate change.

- Climate Communication: The Center for Climate Communication highlighted the need for messages regarding climate change that are simple, repeated often, and carried by trusted messengers. The key points are that climate change is: real, bad, caused by us, and solvable.

- Leadership: Participants and presenters stressed over and over that state and local leadership in solving climate challenges is increasingly important given the roll-backs of climate progress already initiated by the new President’s Administration.

- Economic value: California has successfully decoupled economic growth from GHG emissions, by using efficiency, local renewable energy, clean fuels, and other tactics that create jobs, cost savings, and overall welfare improvement for the state.

National Climatic Data Center

For the third year in a row, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) announced that the prior year was the hottest ever recorded: https://www.nasa.gov/press-release/nasa-noaa-data-show-2016-warmest-year-on-record-globally.

Policy Impacts:

The RCPA will support the Governor’s efforts to extend and distribute revenue from the cap and trade program.

Fiscal Impacts:

The RCPA was recommended for a $300,000 grant from the California Energy Commission to conduct local EV Readiness Plan implementation.

Staff Recommendation:

Information only.
NOTICE OF PROPOSED AWARDS

Alternative and Renewable Fuel and Vehicle Technology Program
Grant Solicitation GFO-16-601
Zero-Emission Vehicle Regional Readiness and Planning Solicitation

January 12, 2017

On October 17, 2016, the California Energy Commission (Energy Commission) released a Grant Solicitation and Application Package entitled "Zero Emission Vehicle (ZEV) Readiness" under the Alternative and Renewable Fuel and Vehicle Technology Program (ARFVTP). This first-come, first-served grant solicitation was an offer to fund projects that support new and existing planning efforts for zero-emission vehicles (battery-electric vehicles and hydrogen fuel cell electric vehicles, and plug-in hybrid electric vehicles).

The attached table, “Notice of Proposed Awards”, identifies additional applicants selected and recommended for funding by Energy Commission staff and includes the amount of recommended funding and score. This notice is being mailed to all parties who submitted an application to this solicitation and is also posted on the Energy Commission’s website at: http://www.energy.ca.gov/contracts/index.html.

Funding of proposed projects resulting from this solicitation is contingent upon the approval of these projects at a publicly noticed Energy Commission Business Meeting and execution of a grant agreement. If the Energy Commission is unable to timely negotiate and execute a funding agreement with an Applicant, the Energy Commission, at its sole discretion, reserves the right to cancel the pending award.

Questions should be directed to: Kevyn Piper
Contracts, Grants and Loans Officer
California Energy Commission
1516 Ninth Street, MS-18
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 654-4845
## California Energy Commission

### Alternative and Renewable Fuel and Vehicle Technology Program

**Solicitation GFO-16-601**  
**ZEV Regional Readiness and Planning Solicitation**  
**Notice of Proposed Awards**  
**January 12, 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal Number</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Funds Requested</th>
<th>Proposed Award</th>
<th>Match Amount</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Redwood Coast Energy Authority</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>North Coast ZEV Readiness Plan Implementation Phase 2</td>
<td>$109,651</td>
<td>$109,651</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Awardee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Central Coast Go-Zero: Zero Emission Vehicle Readiness Implementation in the Tri-Counties</td>
<td>$299,280</td>
<td>$299,280</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Awardee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Monterey Bay EV Acceleration Project</td>
<td>$289,942</td>
<td>$289,942</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Awardee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Tahoe Regional Planning Agency</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Tahoe-Truckee PEV Readiness Plan Implementation</td>
<td>$104,897</td>
<td>$104,897</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Awardee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sonoma County Regional Climate Protection Authority</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Sonoma County Drive EverGreen: Regional Readiness Plan Implementation</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Awardee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Plug-in SD: San Diego Regional PEV Readiness Plan Implementation</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Awardee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL FUNDING RECOMMENDED**  
$1,403,770  
$1,403,770

**Proposed Awards**

**Did Not Pass**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal Number</th>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Funds Requested</th>
<th>Proposed Award</th>
<th>Match Amount</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>AMBAG Regional ZEV Regional Plan Development</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Did Not Pass</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL PROPOSALS NOT FUNDED**  
$300,000  
$0  
$1,200

**TOTAL PROPOSALS RECEIVED**  
$1,703,770  
$1,403,770  
$1,200
To:    Sonoma County RCPA; Suzanne Smith
From: Keith Dunn
Date:  1/23/17
Re:    Governor’s Proposed Cap and Trade Budget

The Governor’s budget has a proposed cap and trade expenditure plan that is contingent on extending the program with a 2/3 Vote.

The Governor’s budget proposes to spend $2.2 billion in cap-and-trade revenue in fiscal year 2017–18. This would be supported from $1.5 billion in auction revenue assumed to be collected in 2017–18 and almost $700 million in unallocated prior-year collections.

60 percent ($900 million) of 2017–18 revenue would be continuously appropriated to certain programs like HSR, affordable housing, transit/intercity rail and transit operations (outlined in below graph).

Under the Governor’s proposal, the remaining $1.3 billion in proposed discretionary spending would only be spent after the Legislature enacted—with a 2/3rd vote—new legislation providing the Air Resources Board (ARB) with the authority to operate a cap-and-trade program beyond 2020. There are many opportunities for RCPA in this new appropriation including the $142 million in Transformative Climate Communities. I suggest RCPA should support the Governor’s budget request during the budget hearing process. Also RCPA should look to support AB 151 (attached) as it will be the vehicle for supporting the 2/3rd endorsement of the cap and trade program.

If the Legislature enacted such legislation, the budget would provide $500 million to support the Governor’s transportation funding package. The remaining $755 million would be allocated for other categories of programs designed to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. In addition, under the Governor’s proposal, the Department of Finance would have the authority to reduce allocations to discretionary programs proportionally if less auction revenue is available to support the proposed expenditures.

The Governor’s proposal to reauthorize cap-and-trade beyond 2020 and to do so with a two-thirds vote instead of a simple majority vote, has a couple of additional benefits. First, it provides additional legal certainty regarding the ARB’s ability to operate the cap-and-trade program that includes auctioning of allowances beyond 2020. (There is an ongoing court case challenging the ARB’s authority to auction allowances and collect revenue, the 2/3rd vote would end this legal challenge..)
# 2017–18 Cap-and-Trade Expenditure Plan

*In Millions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continuous Appropriations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-speed rail</td>
<td>$375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable housing and sustainable communities</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit and intercity rail capital</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit operations</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, Continuous Appropriations</strong></td>
<td>($900)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discretionary Spending</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transit and active transportation projects</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean transportation and petroleum use reduction</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformative Climate Communities</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon sequestration</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-lived climate pollutants</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy efficiency and renewable energy</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, Discretionary Spending</strong></td>
<td>($1,255)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$2,155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ASSEMBLY BILL

No. 151

Introduced by Assembly Members Burke and Cooper
(Coauthors: Assembly Members Low and Rubio)

January 11, 2017

An act relating to greenhouse gases.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL’S DIGEST

AB 151, as introduced, Burke. California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006: market-based compliance mechanisms.

The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 designates the State Air Resources Board as the state agency charged with monitoring and regulating sources of emissions of greenhouse gases. The state board is required to approve a statewide greenhouse gas emissions limit equivalent to the statewide greenhouse gas emissions level in 1990 to be achieved by 2020 and to ensure that statewide greenhouse gas emissions are reduced to at least 40% below the 1990 level by 2030.

The act authorizes the state board to include the use of market-based compliance mechanisms and to adopt a regulation that establishes a system of market-based declining annual aggregate emissions limits for sources or categories of sources that emit greenhouse gases, applicable from January 1, 2012, to December 31, 2020, inclusive, as specified.

This bill would state the intent of the Legislature to enact legislation that authorizes the state board to utilize a market-based compliance mechanism after December 31, 2020, in furtherance of the statewide greenhouse gas emissions limit of at least 40% below the 1990 level by 2030.
The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. It is the intent of the Legislature to enact later legislation to achieve the maximum technologically feasible and cost-effective reductions in greenhouse gas emissions in furtherance of the statewide greenhouse gas emissions limit target of at least 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030, pursuant to Section 38566 of the Health and Safety Code, by authorizing the State Air Resources Board to use a market-based compliance mechanism beyond the year 2020.
Citizens Advisory Committee
MEETING AGENDA

January 30, 2017 at 4:00 p.m.
Sonoma County Transportation Authority
SCTA Large Conference Room
490 Mendocino Avenue, Suite 206
Santa Rosa, California 95401

ITEM

1. Introductions
2. Public Comment
3. Administrative - Approval of Notes November 28, 2016* - ACTION
4. Measure M – DISCUSSION/ACTION
   a. Measure M Project, Hearn Avenue Interchange Improvements, Fulton Ave Improvements, Access Across 101 presentation by Santa Rosa Public Works
   b. Measure M Annual Report
   c. Measure M Financial Reports*
5. Legislation
   a. AB1 and SB1 State transportation funding legislation*
   b. Regional Measure 3*
6. Highway Updates
7. Announcements
8. Adjourn

*Materials attached.

The next SCTA meeting will be held February 6, 2017
The next CAC meeting will be held February 27, 2017

Copies of the full Agenda Packet are available at www.sctainfo.org

DISABLED ACCOMMODATION: If you have a disability that requires the agenda materials to be in an alternate format or that requires an interpreter or other person to assist you while attending this meeting, please contact SCTA at least 72 hours prior to the meeting to ensure arrangements for accommodation.

SB 343 DOCUMENTS RELATED TO OPEN SESSION AGENDAS: Materials related to an item on this agenda submitted to the Citizens Advisory Committee after distribution of the agenda packet are available for public inspection in the Sonoma County Transportation Authority office at 490 Mendocino Ave., Suite 206, during normal business hours.

Pagers, cellular telephones and all other communication devices should be turned off during the committee meeting to avoid electrical interference with the sound recording system.
Countywide Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee

MEETING AGENDA

January 24, 2017 – 1:30 p.m.

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

ITEM

1. Introductions

2. Approval of Meeting Notes: November 22, 2016 - DISCUSSION / ACTION*

3. Public Comment

4. CBPAC Officer Elections for 2017 - DISCUSSION / ACTION*

5. Complete Streets Checklists
   - 5.1. OBAG 2, Safe Routes to School - DISCUSSION / ACTION*
   - 5.2. OBAG 2, various applications - DISCUSSION*

6. TDA3/TFCA Quarterly Report – Information*

7. TDA3 FY17/18 Call for Projects – Discussion*

8. Caltrans District 4 Bike Plan Update – Information*

9. Projects for Caltrans Bike Plan and Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan – Discussion

10. ATP Cycle 3 Regional Grant Recommendations – Information*

11. Roundtable updates - Discussion

12. Other Business / Comments / Announcements

13. Adjourn - ACTION

*Materials attached
**Materials to be handed out

The next SCTA/RCPA meeting will be held February 6, 2017
The next CBPAC meeting will be held March 28, 2017

Copies of the full Agenda Packet are available at www.scta.ca.gov

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 COUNTYWIDE BICYCLE & PEDESTRIAN 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 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 Srcity.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 **S C T A** 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](http://www.511.org), [www.srcity.org/citybus](http://www.srcity.org/citybus), [www.sctransit.com](http://www.sctransit.com) or [https://carmacarpool.com/sfbay](https://carmacarpool.com/sfbay)
Technical Advisory Committee

MEETING AGENDA
SCTA Headquarters Office

December 8, 2016 – 1:30 p.m.
Sonoma County Transportation Authority
Large Conference Room
490 Mendocino Avenue, Suite 206
Santa Rosa, California 95401

ITEM

1. Introductions
2. Public Comment
3. Approval of Minutes, October 27, 2016*
4. SB 743 Update – Intergovernmental Review Program, Interim Guidance DISCUSSION / ACTION*
5. Measure M DISCUSSION / ACTION
   5.1 Measure M Invoicing Status*
   5.2 Maintenance of Effort – Policy 14 Compliance*
   5.3 Measure M Extension
6. Regional Information Update DISCUSSION
   6.1 One Bay Area Grant Round 2 (OBAG2)*
      6.1a OBAG Call for Projects Released November 15, 2016. Applications for the OBAG 2 Call for projects are due to SCTA offices no later than January 13, 2017. For additional guidance under the OBAG 2 program, please see MTC’s resolution 4202 here: http://mtc.ca.gov/sites/default/files/RES-4202_approved_1.pdf
7. Rail Update DISCUSSION
8. Draft SCTA Board Meeting Agenda for December 12, 2016 DISCUSSION*
9. Other Business / Comments / Announcements DISCUSSION
10. Adjourn ACTION

*Materials attached.

The next SCTA meeting will be held December 12, 2016
The next TAC meeting will be held January 26, 2017

Copies of the full Agenda Packet are available at www.sctainfo.org
DISABLED ACCOMMODATION: If you have a disability that requires the agenda materials to be in an alternate format or that requires an interpreter or other person to assist you while attending this meeting, please contact SCTA at least 72 hours prior to the meeting to ensure arrangements for accommodation.

SB 343 DOCUMENTS RELATED TO OPEN SESSION AGENDAS: Materials related to an item on this agenda submitted to the 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.

TAC Voting member attendance – (6 Month rolling 2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Feb.</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>December</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cloverdale Public Works</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotati Public Works</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Sonoma DHS</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Sonoma PRMD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Sonoma Regional PR</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Sonoma TPW</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healdsburg Public Works</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petaluma Public Works &amp; Tra</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rohnert Park Public Works</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa Public Works</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa Transit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastopol Public Works</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMART</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma County Transit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma Public Works</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor Public Works</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB: March, August, September and November meetings were cancelled. The standing November meeting conflicted with the Thanksgiving Holiday.
Technical Advisory Committee

MEETING AGENDA
SCTA Headquarters Office

January 26, 2017 – 1:30 p.m.
Sonoma County Transportation Authority
Large Conference Room
490 Mendocino Avenue, Suite 206
Santa Rosa, California 95401

ITEM
1. Introductions
2. Public Comment
3. Approval of Minutes, December 6, 2016*
4. TFCA/TDA3 Quarterly Reports DISCUSSION / ACTION
5. Measure M DISCUSSION / ACTION
   5.1 Measure M Invoicing Status*
   5.2 FY2017/18 LSR/LBT Allocation Estimates*
6. Regional Information Update DISCUSSION
   6.1 One Bay Area Grant Round 2 (OBAG2)*
      6.1a OBAG 2 List of Submitted Projects
      6.1b Schedule for OBAG Approval
   6.2 Regional Joint Local Streets and Roads/Programming and Delivery Working Group Actions Needed
      6.2a Regional Pavement Condition Update
      6.2b Pavement Management Program Certification Status
7. Rail Update DISCUSSION
8. Draft SCTA Board Meeting Agenda for December 12, 2016 DISCUSSION*
9. Other Business / Comments / Announcements DISCUSSION
10. Adjourn ACTION

*Materials attached.

The next SCTA meeting will be held February 6th, 2017
The next TAC meeting will be held February 23, 2017
Copies of the full Agenda Packet are available at www.sctainfo.org

DISABLED ACCOMMODATION: If you have a disability that requires the agenda materials to be in an alternate format or that requires an interpreter or other person to assist you while attending this meeting, please contact SCTA at least 72 hours prior to the meeting to ensure arrangements for accommodation.

SB 343 DOCUMENTS RELATED TO OPEN SESSION AGENDAS: Materials related to an item on this agenda submitted to the 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.

TAC Voting member attendance – (6 Month rolling 2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Feb.</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>December</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cloverdale Public Works</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotati Public Works</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Sonoma DHS</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Sonoma PRMD</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Sonoma Regional</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Sonoma TPW</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healdsburg Public Works</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petaluma Public Works &amp; Tra</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rohnert Park Public Works</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa Public Works</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa Transit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastopol Public Works</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMART</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma County Transit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma Public Works</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor Public Works</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB: March, August, September and November meetings were cancelled. The standing November meeting conflicted with the Thanksgiving Holiday.
Transit Paratransit Coordinating Committee

MEETING AGENDA

January 17, 2017 – 1:30 p.m.
Sonoma County Transportation Authority
SCTA Large Conference Room
490 Mendocino Avenue, Suite 206
Santa Rosa, California 95401

ITEM
1. Introductions
2. Approval of Meeting Notes: November 15, 2016 - DISCUSSION / ACTION*
3. Officer Elections – DISCUSSION / ACTION*
4. Bylaws and Membership Roster – Discussion
5. Roundtable Updates
   5.1. Transit / Paratransit Operators
   5.2. Other Entities
6. FTA Section 5310 Formula Grants, FY15 – FY17 Caltrans Call for Projects – Discussion**
7. Paratransit passenger survey concept – Discussion
8. Public Comment
9. Other Business / Comments / Announcements
10. Adjourn - ACTION

*Materials attached
**Materials to be handed out

The next SCTA/RCPA meeting will be held February 6, 2017
The next TPCC meeting will be held March 21, 2017

Copies of the full Agenda Packet are available at www.sctainfo.org

DISABLED ACCOMMODATION: If you have a disability that requires the agenda materials to be in an alternate format or that requires an interpreter or other person to assist you while attending this meeting, please contact SCTA at least 72 hours prior to the meeting to ensure arrangements for accommodation.

SB 343 DOCUMENTS RELATED TO OPEN SESSION AGENDAS: Materials related to an item on this agenda submitted to the Transit Paratransit Coordinating 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.
Transit – Technical Advisory Committee

MEETING AGENDA

December 14, 2016 – 10:00 a.m.

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

ITEM

1. Introductions

2. Approval of Meeting Notes: November 9, 2016 – ACTION*

3. One Bay Area Grant 2 - Call for Projects – Discussion*

4. Transit Operator Updates

5. Clipper Update, if available – Discussion

6. FTA Section 5310 – Discussion*

7. Other Business / Comments / Announcements

8. Adjourn - ACTION

*Materials attached
**Materials to be handed out

The next SCTA/RCPA meeting will be held February 6, 2017
The next T-TAC meeting will be held January 11, 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.gosonoma.org

490 Mendocino Ave. #206, Santa Rosa, CA | 707.565.5373 | scta.ca.gov | rcpa.ca.gov
Transit – Technical Advisory Committee

MEETING AGENDA

January 11, 2017 – 10:00 a.m.
Sonoma County Transportation Authority
SCTA Large Conference Room
490 Mendocino Avenue, Suite 206
Santa Rosa, California 95401

ITEM

1. Introductions
2. Approval of Meeting Notes: December 14, 2016 – ACTION*
3. Transit Operator Updates
4. Clipper Update, Jennifer Largaespada, MTC joining via phone – Discussion
5. Technology Update (real-time information, AVL, passenger counters, fare apps, etc.) - Discussion
6. Coordinated Claim, Preliminary Draft FY 2018 TDA Claim – DISCUSSION/ACTION**
7. FTA Section 5310 – Discussion**
8. Other Business / Comments / Announcements
9. Adjourn - ACTION

*Materials attached
**Materials to be handed out

The next SCTA/RCPA meeting will be held February 6, 2017
The next T-TAC meeting will be held February 8, 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.gosonoma.org