Planning Directors/Planning Advisory Committee

MEETING AGENDA

Thursday, March 27, 2014, 9:30 a.m.
Sonoma County Transportation Authority
SCTA Large Conference Room
490 Mendocino Avenue, Suite 206
Santa Rosa, California 95401

ITEM
1. Introductions
2. Public Comment/Announcements
3. Approval of the agenda – changes, additional discussion items
4. Approval of Minutes of February 27, 2014* - ACTION
5. Round table members discussion
6. Climate Action 2020 – update*
7. 2014 Highway 101 Corridor Landscaping & Tree Planting Plan:
8. Countywide Transportation Plan update*
9. SB 743 update*
10. Other Business /Next agenda
11. Adjourn

*Attachment

The next SCTA meeting will be held April 14, 2014
The next Planning Directors/PAC meeting will be held April 24, 2014

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 Planning Advisory Committee after distribution of the agenda packet are available for public inspection in the Sonoma County Transportation Authority office at 490 Mendocino Ave., Suite 206, during normal business hours. Pagers, cellular telephones and all other communication devices should be turned off during the committee meeting to avoid electrical interference with the sound recording system.
# Planning Directors/ Planning Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

**Meeting Minutes of February 27, 2014**

## Planning Advisory Committee Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>August (July meeting cancelled)</th>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>December (November meeting cancelled)</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>February</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cloverdale</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotati</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healdsburg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAFCO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petaluma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petaluma Transit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rohnert Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa CityBus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastopol</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma County Transit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Item

1. Introductions

Meeting called to order at 9:38 a.m. by Lisa Kranz, Chair.

*Committee Members:* Lisa Kranz, City of Santa Rosa, Chair; Jonathan Atkinson (on behalf of Kenyon Webster), City of Sebastopol; Richard Bottarini, LAFCo; Amy Lyle, Sonoma County
PRMD; Linda Meckel, SMART; Barbara Nelson, City of Healdsburg.

Guests: Della Acosta, Sonoma State University; Bob Anderson, United Winegrowers; Travis Bradley, Sonoma State University; Elizabeth Dippel, Sonoma State University; Lois Fisher, Fisher Town Design; Wayne Goldberg, Sonoma State University; Jana Hill, Sonoma County Department of Health Services; Stefanie Hom, MTC; Tom Jacobson, Sonoma State University; Dana Janian, Sonoma State University; Alan Montes, Sonoma State University.

Staff: Chris Barney, Lauren Casey, Diane Dohm, Nina Donofrio, Janet Spilman.

2. Public Comment/Announcements
None.

3. Approval of the agenda – changes, additional discussion items
Approved as submitted.

4. Approval of Minutes of January 23, 2014* - ACTION
Approved as submitted.

5. Round table members discussion
Sonoma County PRMD:
Nothing to report.

SMART:
Linda Meckel reported that construction is expected continue in Marin within the next couple of months. This will include the Haystack Bridge, a section of track from the Marin Civic Center to downtown San Rafael, seven segments of pathway (some of which have been completed), and Airport Boulevard.

LAFCo:
Mr. Bottarini reported that a series of fire studies is taking place throughout the County and cited fiscal issues facing all County fire districts. Staff is working with cities and the County to develop a new paradigm for fire delivery as there are currently insufficient funds for this service.

City of Sebastopol:
Jonathan Atkinson reported that staff is preparing to update the General Plan. City Council is currently selecting members for the General Plan Advisory Committee. A kick-off is planned at the March 25 Planning Commission meeting.

Staff is currently processing business license applications and development applications for tenants.

City of Healdsburg:
Barbara Nelson announced that staff has selected and is working with Mintier Harnish, consultant, on the Housing Element update.

A comprehensive parking strategy is being studied and developed by Walker Parking Consultants to evaluate and design a more cost effective and efficient parking management system throughout the City.

The City is continuing to experience robust development activity.

Ms. Nelson noted that current efforts in updating the Housing Element and the City parking system are linked together as part of a larger, overall strategic plan that staff is developing.

Ms. Meckel added, as part of recent SMART activities, that a Strategic Plan update and overview of SMART progress over the last two years was presented at the recent Board meeting as part of the General Manager’s report. She offered to email a link to the streaming video (which is available online at the SMART website).

MTC:
Stefanie Hom announced the upcoming retirement of Ann Flemer, Executive Director Policy, and that Alex Bockelman will be taking her place.

Staff is preparing for the Cycle 2 Climate Initiative update. A strategy for expansion of EV infrastructure is being examined and developed (MTC is partnering with BAAQMD on this).
City of Santa Rosa:

Ms. Kranz announced that staff is anticipating the release of their draft Housing Element next week. They are also following up with City Council at the April 1 meeting on expediting a work plan for the annexation of the Roseland area.

Ms. Kranz next announced that the City Council certified the EIR for the reunification of Courthouse Square.

6. Climate Action 2020 – update*
Lauren Casey reported that staff is currently working on the reduction tool 1.0 based on feedback from jurisdictions. Staff is still awaiting comments from a few jurisdictions.
A meeting will be scheduled with chief building officials and planning directors to discuss potential GHG reduction strategies in connection with building code. This is anticipated to be scheduled within the next two weeks.

Ms. Casey reported that the website has been updated, with the addition of comments posted by sector, as well as comments from the first Stakeholders Advisory Group meeting and Frequently Asked Questions.

Ms. Casey announced the submittal of a proposal to the Strategic Growth Council for the last round of the Sustainable Communities planning grant, called Shift Sonoma County, centered around transportation-related strategies of the Climate Action Plan, the Comprehensive Transportation Plan (which will be updated this year), and Plan Bay Area. Key initiatives identified in this study are to shift transportation away from single occupancy vehicles and to alternative modes, and the proposal of a fuel shift from gasoline to electric vehicles.

Stefanie Hom agreed to look into the EV strategy under development by MTC and BAAQMD to identify any overlap with the RCPA/SCTA proposal.

7. Healthy By Design 2.0/Healthy Communities Training* presentation by Sonoma County PRMD
Amy Lyle of PRMD invited input and referred to tools under development for training by Lois Fisher of Fisher Town Design, consultant. Training will be held from April through December. She introduced Tom Jacobson of Sonoma State University for leading a dialogue on possible case studies for the next version of the Healthy by Design workbook.

Mr. Jacobson summarized the history of the workbook, which began in 2010 as a collaboration of all local planning directors, the Department of Health Services, SCTA, and the Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District. He announced that part of this collaboration was the implementation of a new course in “Planning for Healthy Communities,” which he and Wayne Goldberg developed. A series of community forums has also been scheduled. The next forum is scheduled for Wednesday, March 5, and any interested Committee members are welcome to attend.

Mr. Jacobson explained that students are currently working on making the Healthy by Design workbook available online as a resource, and that 20 case studies (which include all jurisdictions in Sonoma County as well as some in other areas) were researched by the students and included in the workbook. He invited input and contributions from the Committee to include in the workbook, and explained that this workbook is an ongoing resource to be maintained and kept current.

Committee comments included the value of examining health impacts and outcomes of these policies over time, and zoning code amendments. Ms. Spilman cited examples of Community-Based Transportation Plans that address transportation gaps in different communities and the current interest in the relationship between equity and disadvantaged communities.

Additional discussion involved disadvantaged communities and the need to address water
and sewer needs as well as transportation; examples of communities with these needs are Cloverdale, Healdsburg and Monte Rio. These communities were noted to have major effluent issues.

8. SB 743 Preliminary Evaluation of Alternative Methods of Transportation Analysis for CEQA by OPR - Comment Letter*

Chris Barney reported that this was presented to the Board and that the Board’s recommendation was to respond by letter with the following comments: The comment period needs to be extended; that it is critical that the alternative metric be transparent and easily understood; provide guidance as to how thresholds will set; the need to address mitigation; calculation methods; and that a “one-size-fits-all” approach is not appropriate for the State of California or Sonoma County.

Additional concerns addressed by the Board were litigation exposure. The Board emphasized their support for focusing on a metric that encourages multi-modal transportation and safety.

Mr. Barney announced that OPR will be holding a meeting in Oakland March 5 to discuss the comments that have been received. He will be attending this meeting and invited any interested members to attend; he also invited members to notify him of any specific, additional comments they may have for him to bring to the meeting.

Mr. Barney reported that next steps will be for OPR to develop an alternative metric. This is likely to come out April/May. A report is expected to be presented to the Natural Resources Board July 1.

The Committee noted that the metrics as outlined are vague.

9. Bicycle & Pedestrian Master Plan*

Diane Dohm presented slides of the draft plan, summarizing key areas that were updated; project lists, data and maps. Additional text includes more pedestrian-focused planning and projects, Safe Routes to School information, and a glossary of acronyms.

According to MTC data, bicycling has increased 104% in Sonoma County since 2010, and walking has increased 85% since 2002.

Traffic collision data involving bicyclists shows an increase in collisions since 2002, but a decrease in fatalities of 6% to 7%. There have been a total of four fatalities from 2004 to 2011.

Pedestrian activity shows a decrease in collisions by 8%; however, fatalities have increased; Sonoma County had 31 pedestrian fatalities from 2007 to 2011.

Map edits are being completed. The draft Plan will be reviewed at the March CBPAC meeting and upon approval will be presented at the May Board meeting for Board approval.

Discussion followed regarding integrating the local jurisdictions’ plans with the Countywide Plan.

10. 2014 Highway 101 Corridor Landscaping & Tree Planting Plan*

Janet Spilman announced that the Plan has been approved by the Board and is available to view online.

11. Countywide Transportation Plan update*

Ms. Spilman noted that the previous Plan was a significant change in format, with the addition of GHG reduction, safety and health factors. This update will likely not be as significant a change.

Ms. Spilman addressed the matter of public outreach, noting that this has been a challenge and will likely be more difficult with the upcoming Plan update. SCTA members, jurisdictions and advisory committees, will be asked for input as part of the public outreach effort. Online engagement will also be made available. These activities are projected to take place this summer. The draft Plan is expected to be released early next year.

Project assessment will also be included in the Plan for the first time. A prioritized list of projects will be developed, with categories of projects that will be analyzed as groups.
Ms. Spilman added that health and safety activity will also be addressed and incorporated into the Plan goals, identifying progress made since 2009.

The travel demand model has been updated, which will be a significant help in measuring alternative modes of transportation.

Ms. Spilman explained that most of this work will be done in-house due to lack of a budget.

12. Other Business /Next agenda
None.

13. Adjourn
11:00 a.m.
Staff Report

To: Sonoma County Transportation Authority
From: Janet Spilman, Deputy Director, Planning & Public Outreach
Item: 8 – 2009 Comprehensive Transportation Plan update process / approach
Date: March 27, 2014

Issue:
Kick off of the 2015 Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP). Elements requiring advisory committee review.

Background:
The CTP is a 25 year planning document that was first created in 2001 and updated in 2004. The 2009 CTP was essentially a new plan, including a major policy shift to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. There is no required update schedule, however many funding sources require projects and programs to be listed in a CTP. The purpose of the 2015 update is to refresh the project lists; review the Goals, Objectives and Policies and assess progress; and reach out to the public about their priorities. We will also have the opportunity to update data and integrate new technology in our analyses.

The SCTA Board approved the recommendation to direct staff and Advisory committees to review CTP planning process and provide assessment of scope of necessary updates. Completion of the 2015 CTP is estimated for late 2015.

The Board had the additional directions:

- Report on performance assessment of 2009 CTP.
- Targets should be demonstrably achievable.
- Assume no previous experience with CTPs when making reports and presentations.
- Do not make too many demands of staff time.
- There are many other issues competing for the public’s attention – make requests for input quick and easy.
- Reach out to business leaders.

Elements requiring Advisory Committee review

1) The Public Engagement Strategy, 2) Goals, Objectives and Policies and 3) review of the existing project list are the first parts of the CTP to be reviewed. The first two items will be discussed in the PAC and CAC. The initial review of the project list will be done by the TAC.
**Policy Impacts:**

The CTP is the long term planning document for the SCTA. CTP Goals reflect SCTA policy.

**Fiscal Impacts:**

The 2009 CTP used intensive public outreach including a poll and culminating in the Moving Forward Conference. The document includes revised Goals, GHG reducing strategies, and technical papers on GHG Emissions, and Planning for Safety, and Transportation and the Built Environment (which includes Planning for Health). The process to create the CTP and EIR took 32 months and cost over $700,000. This figure does not include SCTA staff time.

There is limited budget available for the update. CTP model improvement work was completed and paid for in 2012/2013 allowing better analysis in house. Current budget would go toward public outreach, analytic tools (besides traffic modeling), and design and production work.

Staff cannot estimate the level, schedule or cost of environmental review, as is it dependent on the outcomes developed in the CTP. However the 2009 CTP EIR cost $225,000.

Staff will further assess budget, pending direction today, and include the budget needs in the proposed FY14/15 SCTA Preliminary Budget for review in May 2014.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Advisory Committee members are requested to review and comment on the Public Engagement Strategy and the Goals, Objectives and Policies. Committee will be asked for recommendation for adoption by the SCTA.
Staff Report

To:          Sonoma County Transportation Authority  
From:  Janet Spilman, Deputy Director, Planning & Public Outreach  
Item:  4.1.1 – 2009 Comprehensive Transportation Plan update process / approach  
Date:   March 10, 2014

Issue:
How shall the SCTA proceed with the update of the Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP)?

Background:
The CTP is a 25 year planning document that was first created in 2001 and updated in 2004. The 2009 CTP was essentially a new plan, including a major policy shift to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. There is no required update schedule, however many funding sources require projects and programs to be listed in a CTP. The purpose of the 2015 update is to refresh the project lists; review the Goals, Objectives and Policies and assess progress; and reach out to the public about their priorities. We will also have the opportunity to update data and integrate new technology in our analyses.

The 2009 CTP represented a complete overhaul of nearly every element of the previous document. New Goals regarding GHG Reductions and Safety and Health joined existing Goals of Maintenance and Congestion Relief along with detailed objectives and potential strategies. New features of the 2009 CTP included the following:

Research & Technical Documents:
• Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction White Paper;  
• Pavement Management;  
• Transportation & the Built Environment;  
• Sonoma County Travel Model Update & Analysis,  
• Planning for Safety

Public Outreach was extensive including:
• Public Opinion poll – over 600 Sonoma County Residents were surveyed via telephone polling  
• Public workshops in 6 locations around the county featuring “world café” discussion on the topic “What will motivate and support you in making significant behavior change that results in reducing your green house gas emissions?”  
• Focus groups on business, paratransit, seniors, youth and the Latino community  
• Individual interviews

The budget for Public Outreach was $200,000.

Project Lists
In early 2008, after approval of the Goals, SCTA requested project submissions, including review of the existing list of road, transit, bike/ped and ITS projects from the 2004 CTP.
Concurrently, the list of GHG reducing strategies was developed. This list represents a wide range of projects and programs, many of which didn’t have identified funding sources or project sponsors. Since then, several of those projects have received funding (i.e. Safe Routes to Schools and Rideshare programs).

The project list submitted for inclusion in Plan Bay Area was largely derived from the 2009 CTP. The document was relevant and timely throughout the recently completed Plan Bay Area process.

**2015 CTP update**

The concepts of the CTP remain timely and have held up well over the years. However, every chapter needs updating, new information should be added and the project lists need to be reviewed, refreshed and prioritized. The Goals, Objectives and Policies of the 2009 CTP are attached, and although still compelling, may require modification. There are significant new planning efforts, in land use, climate protection, bike/ped planning and health and issues like equity and access that should be addressed in our CTP going forward.

**Alignment with the SCS and other Plans**

The CTP serves as the basis for input into the Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategies. Plan Bay Area, the regional SCS, was adopted in 2013 providing new concepts (i.e. Priority Development Areas) and data that will be applied to this CTP update. The next SCS is scheduled for adoption in 2017.

The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) made significant updates to regional and Sonoma County population and housing growth forecasts as part of the development of Plan Bay Area and the SCS. New forecasts focus more growth into the urbanized core of the San Francisco Bay Area and concentrate growth in Priority Development Areas. Future growth forecasts have also been adjusted to account for the economic recession that impacted national and regional growth in the past decade. Future housing and employment growth estimates for Sonoma County in particular are lower than they were in past forecasts, and lower than the forecasts that were used to evaluate the 2009 CTP. The updated Plan Bay Area/SCS 2040 growth forecasts will be used to evaluate the CTP update.

The SCTA’s Bicycle Master Plan project is nearly completed and the RCPA is engaged in Climate Action 2020, both projects that will provide important new information to be included in the 2015 CTP.

**Updated Travel Demand Model**

The Sonoma County Travel Model (SCTM10) has been updated and revalidated since the 2009 CTP. The model base year has been updated from 2005 to 2010 and the model forecast year has been updated from 2035 to 2040. Model land use assumptions have been revised and are now consistent with Plan Bay Area and the SCS. Model constants and formulas have been updated using current travel survey and census data, and model output has been validated using more recent traffic count data and transit ridership data. Reporting improvements focused on the measurement of GHG emissions and impacts have also been added to the model.

**Performance Assessment**

The following performance metrics and performance targets were part of the 2009 CTP:

- **GHG Emissions**: Reduce GHG emissions to 25% below 1990 levels by 2015, and reduce GHG emissions to 40% below 1990 levels by 2035.
- **Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)/Per Capita**: Reduce VMT per capita by 10% below 2005 levels by 2035.
• Person Hours of Delay (Congestion): Reduce person hours of delay by 20% below 2005 levels by 2035.

• Pavement Condition Index (PCI): Improve countywide PCI to 80 by 2035, with a minimum road PCI of 70 by 2035.

Performance metrics align with CTP goals and were added in order to evaluate progress being made in achieving goals and objectives. The 2015 CTP will use the performance metrics to assess progress towards meeting goals, and reassess and update targets if necessary.

New Technologies

Technology, data, and analytic tools are more readily available which could help highlight transportation challenges and opportunities. Mobile or GPS sourced travel data, updated census and transportation survey data, and new geographic information system or data analysis techniques could be used to highlight problem areas and help identify possible solutions. New tools and technology could help indentify issues such as senior’s access to health care or disadvantaged communities’ access to healthy food (to name a couple of examples). New data may also provide improved countywide origin/destination data and indentify areas that would be well-served by pedestrian, transit, or bicycling improvements.

New technologies also figure in the constant quest to include more voices in the process. Continuing our poll for this plan will give us invaluable data on a number of issues across several years. In addition, online engagement has evolved to capture new levels of participation. Focus groups (i.e. Latinos, seniors, youth, etc.) will help deliver harder to reach stakeholders. Along the way, regular meetings will provide updates and opportunities for input. Important decisions, such as approval of the Goals, approval of the project list, approval of the draft 2015 CTP will include public hearings. Attached is a Draft Public Engagement Strategy.

Policy Impacts:

The CTP is the long term planning document for the SCTA. CTP Goals reflect SCTA policy.

Fiscal Impacts:

The 2009 CTP used intensive public outreach including a poll and culminating in the Moving Forward Conference. The document includes revised Goals, GHG reducing strategies, and technical papers on GHG Emissions, and Planning for Safety, and Transportation and the Built Environment (which includes Planning for Health). The process to create the CTP and EIR took 32 months and cost over $700,000. This figure does not include SCTA staff time.

There is limited budget available for the update. CTP model improvement work was completed and paid for in 2012/2013 allowing better analysis in house. Current budget would go toward public outreach, analytic tools (besides traffic modeling), and design and production work.

Staff cannot estimate the level, schedule or cost of environmental review, as is it dependent on the outcomes developed in the CTP. However the 2009 CTP EIR cost $225,000.

Staff will further assess budget, pending direction today, and include the budget needs in the proposed FY14/15 SCTA Preliminary Budget for review in May 2014.

Staff Recommendation:

Direct staff and Advisory committees to review CTP planning process and provide assessment of scope of necessary updates. Completion of the 2015 CTP is estimated for late 2015.
Public Engagement Strategy for the
SCTA Comprehensive Transportation Plan

Sonoma County Transportation Authority (SCAT) is a 12-member policy board composed of local elected officials from throughout Sonoma County, including three members of the County Board of Supervisors as well as council members from each town or city in the County. The Board meets monthly on the second Monday of the month, at 2:30 pm., at the PRMD Hearing Room at 2550 Ventura Boulevard in Santa Rosa.

The SCTA Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) is the long range planning document that guides policy makers by setting transportation related policies and priorities. The 2015 CTP will build upon an extensive body of transportation planning and land use analyses developed over many years that have focused on identifying and evaluating the county’s access and mobility needs. See Attachment A for a review of related plans and planning activities.

Stakeholder Engagement

The goal of engaging local governments and other stakeholders in the CTP planning effort is to promote an open, transparent process that encourages the ongoing and active participation of local governments, a broad range of stakeholders and the general public. The success of the CTP is predicated on effective partnership with local governments and public support for policies, programs and projects to support jurisdictions’ ability to achieve CTP targets.

Government Engagement

In developing the CTP, the SCTA will involve both government and non-government agencies, organizations and individuals. A partnership with local governments is critical — from elected officials to city managers, planning and public works directors, transit operators and tribes.

SCTA/RCPA Advisory Committees

SCTA has several advisory committees that include members of public works and planning departments of local governments as well as transit agencies. Key staff also meets regularly with city managers. Advisory committee meeting agendas are available here: http://sctainfo.org/agenda

Advisory Committees include:

- Citizens Advisory Committee:    - Transit Technical Advisory Committee
- Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee
- Planning Advisory Committee
- Technical Advisory Committee
- RCPA Climate Action Forum
- Transit/Paratransit Advisory Committee
- Climate Action 2020 Stakeholder Advisory Group

Other Agencies or Departments

The CTP will address the mobility connections that create a community. SCTA recognizes the overlap with the important work done in health, housing, education, emergency services and public safety (among others) and will include these organizations in outreach.
Native American Tribal Governments

In addition to the local governments that will be involved in development of the CTP, SCTA will coordinate and consult with the county’s five federally recognized Native American tribes.

Community Stakeholder Engagement

The SCTA will seek the active participation of a broad range of non-governmental groups in the development of the CTP. Outreach efforts will encourage the participation of a broad range of public advocates and community members. We will make special effort to engage under-represented communities who may not typically participate in regional and local planning.

The CTP planning stakeholders include, but is not limited to, the following:

- Transportation and environmental advocates
- Organizations representing the senior and disabled populations
- Neighborhood and community groups
- Broad-based business organizations
- Organized labor
- Affordable housing advocates, home builder representatives, homeowner associations
- Low-income communities, communities of color and limited English proficient communities
- School districts and the county office of education
- Goods movement advocates, including agriculture
- Youth and student input
- Other interested opinion leaders, advocacy groups and the general public.

Public Participation Techniques

Voices from Underserved Communities

The success of the CTP is dependent on a range of voices in the county being represented and involved. SCTA will take special effort to engage minority and low-income residents.

Participation Techniques include:

Advance Notice

- Maintain an updated calendar of events on the www.sctainfo.org website.
- Provide timely notice about upcoming meetings. Post agendas and meeting materials on the web in advance of meetings.
- Use a mailing list database to keep participants notified throughout the process (via email and/or U.S. mail).
- Circulate a Draft CTP and Draft EIR, if one is required, for public review at least 55 days before the adoption of the Final CTP.
- Work with media outlets to encourage news coverage in advance of meetings.

Poll

- Conduct a statistically relevant public opinion poll (building data points and trends from previous polls).

Presentations, Hearings

- Hold at least three public hearings on the Draft CTP
- Report regularly at SCTA and SCTA Advisory Committee meetings
• Use “visualization” tools and techniques to communicate technical planning issues and strategies to the public, such as maps and graphics to depict alternatives under consideration
• Provide a summary of comments heard at meetings via www.sctainfo.org
• Seek out and consider the needs of those traditionally under-represented in the planning process, including minority, low-income and limited English proficient communities
• Conduct focus groups targeted at stakeholders
• Piggy-back on existing meetings in order to attract greater attendance and participation.
• Consider a “Moving Forward 2040” conference

Internet/Social Media

• Use of a web address — www.sctainfo.org for current updates, and to request to receive notices and information.
• Offer interactive web polls, surveys, etc.
• Provide timely, easy-to-understand information on a website that is accessible, per the Americans with Disabilities Act.
• Explore using social media methods to reach, engage and survey residents.

Media Outlets

• Issue press releases to media outlets, including foreign-language and community media, to keep reporters apprised of progress and generate coverage on radio, television, newspapers and the Internet.
• Translate news releases about public workshops into Spanish
Attachment A – Review of Related Current Plans and Planning Activities

SCTA 2009 Comprehensive Transportation Plan: The 2009 CTP represented a complete overhaul of nearly every element of the previous document. New goals regarding GHG Reductions and Safety and Health joined previous goals of Maintenance and Congestion Relief along with detailed objectives and potential strategies. New features included Research & Technical Documents that remain relevant.

Public Outreach was extensive including

- Public Opinion poll – over 600 Sonoma County Residents were surveyed via telephone polling
- Public workshops in 6 locations around the county featuring “world café” discussion on the topic “What will motivate and support you in making significant behavior change that results in reducing your green house gas emissions?”
- Focus groups on business, paratransit, seniors, youth and the Latino community
- Individual interviews
- Moving Forward day-long conference

The budget for public outreach in 2008 (not including staff time) was $200,000. The conference had its own budget and was largely supported by sponsorships. The 2009 CTP Plan is available at: http://sctainfo.org/reports.asp

Climate Action 2020: Climate Action 2020 is a collaborative effort among all 9 cities and the County of Sonoma to take further actions in reducing GHG emissions community-wide and respond to the threats of climate change. RCPA is working with communities to develop a comprehensive and detailed plan for each jurisdiction that will identify measures to reduce GHGs from sources including building energy (electricity and natural gas), transportation, water use and transport, waste, wastewater and agriculture. This detailed plan is called a Community Climate Action Plan, and known locally as Climate Action 2020. http://sctainfo.org/climate_action_2020.htm

SCTA Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan: SCTA adopted the first Countywide Bicycle Plan in 2003. The plan that followed was adopted in 2008, and established a comprehensive, collaborative approach to countywide bicycle and pedestrian planning. In 2013, SCTA and its jurisdictions embarked on a process to update data, map and project list. The County vision, goal and objectives were reviewed and remain the same with inclusion of discussion of “complete streets.” Final approval of the document is expected in Spring 2014. http://sctainfo.org/reports.asp

Priority Development Area Investment and Growth Strategy: This report provides a look at place types in Sonoma County that were developed with the regional land-use blueprint plan lead by ABAG and MTC to support voluntary, incentive-based efforts to direct development toward a more compact land use pattern for the Bay Area. Jurisdictions in Sonoma County have identified twelve Priority Development Areas (PDAs), six Rural Community Investment Areas (RIAs) and one Employment Investment Area. Recognizing the value of conserving the region’s most significant resource lands there are eighteen Priority Conservation Areas (PCAs) in the County as well. For more information, visit: http://sctainfo.org/reports.asp

Station Area/PDA Planning: Almost every jurisdiction with a SMART station or PDA has developed a plan that addresses planning elements such as traffic circulation, community engagement, housing types, as well as implementation and financing strategies. For more information visit: http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/smart_growth/#stations.
Community-Based Transportation Plans: With MTCs Community-Based Transportation Planning Program, the SCTA engaged in a collaborative planning process that involves residents in low-income communities, community- and faith-based organizations that serve them, transit operators, and transportation agencies. The SCTA produced four CBTPs in the following locations: Roseland in Santa Rosa, The Springs in Sonoma Valley, The River Area, including Monte Rio and Guerneville, and the west end of Healdsburg that is home to predominantly migrant laborers. These communities set priorities and evaluated options for filling transportation gaps. These plans are available at http://sctainfo.org/reports.asp

Portrait of Sonoma County: This effort is working to identify disadvantaged communities in Sonoma County at a census block level. Portrait results will allow the SCTA/RCPA to target disadvantaged communities in Sonoma County with outreach and prioritize implementation actions in the communities that have greatest need.

Healthy Communities Training/Healthy By Design 2.0: This effort is a collaborative with the Permit Resource Management Department, Health Services and Sonoma State University to implement broad sustainable strategies to reduce health disparities and expand clinical and community preventive services, with an emphasis on healthy communities.
**Goal 1. Maintain the system**
Objective: Protect the investment in public transportation infrastructure.
- **Policy 1A:** Pavement Management: Maintain streets and roads at a standard within the range of 70-80 Pavement Condition Index (PCI) – the equivalent of good to excellent on the PCI scale. Include the maintenance of bicycle routes along roadways as part of this measure.
- **Policy 1B:** Bus Fleet Management: Ensure that all revenue vehicles and all bus stop facilities and transfer stations are properly maintained and all maintenance personnel are properly trained.

**Goal 2. Relieve Traffic Congestion**
Objective: Reduce person hours of delay 20% below 2005 levels by 2035 through strategic improvements, technology and changes in driving habits.
- **Policy 2A:** Implement strategic transit and roadway capacity expansion to meet current and future needs
- **Policy 2B:** Expand rideshare, carpool, van pool, travel demand management, and telecommute programs.
- **Policy 2C:** Implement new technologies to monitor and control traffic flow.
- **Policy 2D:** Implement pricing strategies to help relieve congestion and make progress in attaining goals related to reducing GHG and maintaining the transportation system.

**Goal 3. Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions**
Objective: Meet the targets to reduce GHG emissions 25% below 1990 levels by 2015, and 40% below 1990 levels by 2035 by working with government agencies and the public.
- **Policy 3A:** Reduce vehicle miles of travel (VMT) per capita by 10% below 2005 levels by 2035.
- **Policy 3B:** Increase transit use and productivity.
- **Policy 3C:** Improve accessibility and safety for pedestrians at and around activity centers.
- **Policy 3D:** Implement 2008Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan
- **Policy 3E:** Support development and deployment of new technologies to reduce transportation emissions.

**Goal 4. Planning for Safety and Health**
Objective: Increase safety and emphasize health aspects of transportation planning strategies
- **Policy 4A:** Planning for Transportation Safety - Adopt State of California goals to minimize traffic related fatalities.
- **Policy 4B:** Planning for Public Health - Plan neighborhoods that encourage walking, biking and physical activity, and connect residential areas, workplaces, schools, commercial centers and community facilities
CHAPTER 4
VISION FOR THE FUTURE

TRANSPORTATION PLAN GOALS
The four goals of the 2009 CTP are
• Maintain the System
• Relieve Congestion
• Reduce Emissions
• Plan for Safety & Health

The 2009 CTP has four overarching goals. The first two, Maintain the System and Relieve Congestion have been in previous Comprehensive Transportation Plans and continue to pose challenges and opportunities.

The last two goals, Plan for Safety and Health and Reduce Emissions are new to this plan. The issue of personal and public safety and health as it relates to transportation planning arose during the public outreach as an area of significant concern in Sonoma County. These have always been important issues in the development of transportation plans and projects, but now, especially as they intersect with other goals such as preserving air quality, maintaining a safe and efficient transportation system and reducing congestion, health and safety require special attention in transportation planning.

Addressing emissions from transportation projects has historically been done via air quality analysis on a project level basis, but with new State law and local expectations about reducing greenhouse gas emissions the 2009 CTP has a greater focus on the problem of climate change, a look at the connection to transportation and analysis of strategies to address the problem here in Sonoma County. This is set forth in the new policy goal to Reduce Emissions.

In support of the CTP update, six transportation scenarios, representing sets, or programs, of transportation improvement solutions, were tested using SCTA’s travel demand model. The Sonoma County Travel Model (SCTM 07) uses land use, population, and employment data for

CTP TRANSPORTATION SCENARIOS
No Action/No Build
Projects with Likely Sources of Funding
Projects with Unknown Sources of Funding
Smart Growth Land Use with Supportive Transit Expansion
Innovative Congestion Pricing Strategies
Comprehensive—Projects, Smart Growth Land Use/Transit, and Pricing
Important transportation strategy categories are shown below with more detailed strategies included in the discussion of each CTP goal and objective (See Appendix A-i—Strategies Matrix for more detail):

- Improve Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities and Safety
- Improve Transit Service and Facilities
- Land Use Improvements
- Promote Ride Sharing and more efficient use of existing travel system
- Implement Travel Demand Management
- Implement Transportation Pricing Policy
- Implement Traffic Flow Improvements
- Encourage Transportation Technology Improvements
- Maintain the System
- Expand the System

Sonoma County to estimate trips, travel patterns, traffic volumes, congestion, and travel mode for the current and future (2035) countywide transportation system.

The six scenarios representing different future transportation improvement alternatives were evaluated based on a set of scenario performance measures. Performance measures can be used to quantify how well the goals and objectives of the plan are being meet. Performance measures analyzed include greenhouse gas emissions, vehicle miles traveled, and congestion (See Appendix C-vi for more information on SCTM 07 and a detailed summary of scenario analysis results).

The results of the scenario analysis support the policies and projects contained in this plan. Model output, CTP project lists, and the transportation strategies matrix serve as decision support tools to aid decision makers in the prioritization of transportation projects and policies, and provide guidance on which types of projects and policies will allow SCTA to meet its goals and objectives.

There are a few specific cases where the solutions proposed here seem to contradict (for example roadways that are safer often carry more traffic and lead to more driving), but the overarching solution to transportation problems is to drive less. This is only possible when viable options are available to the public—be it transit, bike routes, land use planning, housing, school and job linkages, pedestrian amenities, car share and ride share programs, ability to make shorter trips or avoid trips altogether, etc.

Mobility relies on options and the 2009 CTP is aimed at addressing how those options can best meet the needs of our community and address the plan goals.

Implementing the necessary options requires two basic ingredients: funding and a shift in personal transportation habits. Aside from being inadequate to meet the needs of transportation, funding is funneled through dozens of special programs, at various levels of government, with specific goals and eligibility that do not always fit well with the goals of the local community. Funding will be addressed in greater detail as a separate chapter in the plan. The issue of modifying personal transportation habits is reliant on the availability of reliable options to driving and is linked to pricing, land use and technology.

The 2009 CTP is structured to place general policy and planning information in this chapter and provide a higher level of detail as appendices to cover key information such as project lists, a list of innovative transportation improvements (or Transportation Strategies Matrix), transportation’s role in the production of GHG emissions and more detailed reports.

**PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

**REDUCE GHG EMISSIONS TO 25% BELOW 1990 LEVELS BY 2015, AND 40% BELOW 1990 LEVELS BY 2035.**

**REDUCE VMT PER CAPITA BY 10% BELOW CURRENT LEVELS (2005) BY 2035.**

**REDUCE PERSON HOURS OF DELAY 20% BELOW TODAY’S LEVELS (2005) BY 2035.**

**IMPROVE COUNTYWIDE PCI TO 80 BY 2035, WITH A MINIMUM ROAD PCI OF 70 BY 2035.**
GOAL 1. MAINTAIN THE SYSTEM

Objective: Protect the investment in public transportation infrastructure.

Maintaining transportation infrastructure covers many activities from keeping ditches clear so they drain properly to purchasing new buses to keeping bike lanes free of debris and sealing cracked pavement on a local roadway. The transportation infrastructure is the most expensive asset owned by local governments and is also the most expensive to maintain.

No one likes potholes, but it is a fact of life that many jurisdictions respond to funding shortages by deferring preventative maintenance for roads, which has drastic consequences on the condition of pavement. The 25 year planning horizon must also account for replacement of the bus fleet—large fixed route vehicles as well as paratransit buses, vans and cars. This, in addition to important routine maintenance, is protection of a significant investment.

Policy 1A:

Pavement Management: Maintain streets and roads at a standard within the range of 70-80 Pavement Condition Index (PCI)—the equivalent of good to excellent on the PCI scale. Include the maintenance of bicycle routes along roadways as part of this measure.

Transportation Strategies:

• Maintain State Highway System
• Improve Local Streets/Roads PCI
• Improve Conditions/Maintenance Of Bike/Ped Facilities

Policy 1B:

Bus Fleet Management: Ensure that all revenue vehicles and all bus stop facilities and transfer stations are properly maintained and all maintenance personnel are properly trained.

Transportation Strategies:

• Maintain Transit System

GOAL 2. RELIEVE TRAFFIC CONGESTION

Objective: Reduce person hours of delay 20% below 2005 levels by 2035 through strategic improvements, technology and changes in driving habits.

Freeway congestion monitoring data for 2006 indicates that freeway congestion, measured in vehicle hours of delay, increased 75% between 2002 and 2006 in Sonoma County, and 45% between 2004 and 2006. In 2007 it increased another three percent, to 7,900 vehicle hours of delay. By way of contrast, the remainder of the Bay Area (eight counties) had less than a 15% increase in delay between 2004 and 2006. It is also noteworthy that the duration of congestion—from the time it starts until the time it ends—has also increased dramatically. Some segments of US 101 now begin experiencing congestion in the early- to mid-afternoon. Southbound Highway 101 in south Petaluma becomes congested by 5:30 AM.

State Highway 12 links Sebastopol, Santa Rosa, the Sonoma Valley, and Napa County. It also provides an important connection to the Interstate 80 corridor, for interstate trucks, commuters and recreational trips. Within Santa Rosa, between Fulton Road on the west to Farmers Lane on the east, State Highway 12 is developed to freeway standards.
The two lane sections in Sebastopol and in the Sonoma Valley are severely congested on both weekdays and weekends. Arterials are also showing signs of strain. Main Street (Penngrove) suffers considerable peak period weekday traffic congestion due to drivers avoiding congestion on U.S. 101, and new development in northeast Petaluma and east Rohnert Park. Arnold Drive, River Road, Old Redwood Highway, Bodega Highway, Lakeville Highway, and Petaluma Hill Road have heavy weekday traffic. Todd Road, Llano Road, Crane Canyon Road have congested conditions on weekdays and many roads within incorporated cities have severe congestion.

Future travel demand analysis shows that congestion could continue to worsen (roughly 6 times more congestion that current levels) given our current course. Currently congested locations are expected to experience increased back-ups, with local arterials absorbing the bulk of future traffic and becoming more and more congested.

Adding additional roadway and transit capacity, implementing smart growth land use policies, and implementing transportation pricing policies, were all shown to provide significant congestion relief in future model output.

Travel Demand Management programs and new technologies are promising methods for reducing traffic delay. Shifting travelers to different travel modes (transit, car/vanpools, bicycles, walking and car-sharing), different times to avoid peak congested periods (flextime, compressed work week), and avoiding trips altogether (telecommuting, etc) also have great potential for reducing traffic congestion.

Increases to transit service, adding rail service in Sonoma and Marin, and decreased transit headways require strategic expansion as well in terms of both capital expenses to purchase rolling stock (buses and trains), and operating and maintenance needs.

**Policy 2A:**

**Implement strategic transit and roadway capacity expansion to meet current and future needs**

There are critical roadway projects that have been planned for decades that still need to be completed—Highway 101 HOV lanes, Penngrove area improvements, certain interchange and intersection configurations and other projects identified in Appendix A-ii.

Additionally, expansion of transit service is needed both with the initiation of passenger rail service via SMART and with increased bus service from all of our local and regional operators. Providing individuals with convenient, safe and easy alternatives to their car expands the capacity of the roadways.

Adding additional roadway and transit capacity was shown to provide one of the biggest congestion relief benefits in future model runs. Roadway expansion, beyond the completion of the HOV system, may create immediate congestion relief, however long term consequences include increased VMT and GHG emissions.

*Transportation Strategies:*

- Expand Local Streets/Roads Capacity
- Expand Transit Capacity
- Complete HOV system

**Policy 2B:**

**Expand rideshare, carpool, van pool, travel demand management, and telecommute programs.**

There are innovative programs in place that reduce the vehicle miles traveled of individuals in single occupant vehicles. Santa Rosa CityBus and Sonoma County Transit work with local employers to provide incentives to ride the bus instead of drive. Regionally, 511.org offers rideshare programs. Car-sharing is a new option that is in preliminary development in Sonoma County but is in effect in the urban centers in the Bay Area. Travel demand management and telecommute programs can be effective.
at reducing countywide travel or shifting trips to less congested periods.

Transportation Strategies:
- Increase Ridematching Services
- Increase the number and capacity of park and ride facilities
- Telecommuting
- Travel Demand Management

Policy 2C:
Implement new technologies to monitor and control traffic flow.

Moving traffic smoothly will help relieve congestion on major roads by reducing the stop and go and increasing awareness of conditions with changeable message signs. Signals at freeway on ramps helps control the number of vehicles attempting to merge at one time and allows the flow of traffic to absorb more vehicles without a significant slowdown. Real-time information about traffic conditions enables drivers to make choices about what route or what mode will serve them best.

Transportation Strategies:
- Incident Management
- Traveler Information Programs
- Signalization Improvements/Intelligent Transportation Systems
- Traffic Circles/Traffic Calming
- Turn Restrictions at Intersections
- Goods Movement Improvements

Policy 2D:
Implement pricing strategies to help relieve congestion and make progress in attaining goals related to reducing GHG and maintaining the transportation system.

User based pricing strategies have demonstrated the ability to reduce congestion, reduce the number of solo drivers, shift vehicle trips from peak hours, decrease vehicle emissions, and improve safety. Successful implementations such as London and Singapore congestion pricing systems, San Diego’s I-15 HOT Lane implementation, and Trondheim, Norway’s ‘toll ring’, suggest that these types of strategies may be successful in Sonoma County.

Transportation pricing policy measures are shown to have significant congestion and travel reduction benefits in future year analysis.

Transportation Strategies:
- Increase Gas Tax or User Fees
- Congestion Pricing
- High Occupancy Toll Lanes
- Increased Parking Charges
- Carbon Offsets

GOAL 3. REDUCE GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Objective: Meet the targets to reduce GHG emissions 25% below 1990 levels by 2015, and 40% below 1990 levels by 2035 by working with government agencies and the public.

In Sonoma County the transportation sector contributes roughly 60% of all county greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. This is a new issue to the field of transportation planning which requires research, analysis and aggressive strategies to ensure success in meeting greenhouse gas reduction targets. Included as Appendix C-i is the SCTA Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction White Paper that was written specifically to inform policy makers and the community about the connection between transportation and climate change.

In 2007, transportation GHG production represented a roughly 34% increase from 1990 levels of GHG production. The California Global Warming Solutions Act (AB32) mandates that CO2 and other GHG emissions be reduced to 1990 levels by the year 2020. All Sonoma County Jurisdictions have set a more ambi-

---

1 Data from the Climate Protection Campaign 2005 May 2008 Status Report, HPMS (Highway Performance Management System) Annual VMT data, and GHG eCO2 productions based on output from CACP software.
tious goal of reducing GHG emissions to 25% below 1990 levels by 2015. The Bay Area region has set a longer term goal of reducing regional GHG emissions to 40% below 1990 levels by 2035.

A number of broad approaches can be taken to meet these goals. CTP model analysis shows that increasing fuel efficiencies and vehicle occupancies, implementing transportation pricing policies aimed at reducing VMT, and encouraging transit oriented development are effective at reducing future GHG emissions.

The policy solutions that reduce GHG emissions, and will allow SCTA and local jurisdictions to meet county and regional GHG reduction targets, rely upon a variety of approaches and require a concerted and sustained effort at varying levels of government. See Appendix C-i for a more detailed look at GHG Reduction strategies.

**Policy 3A:**

**Reduce vehicle miles of travel (VMT) per capita by 10% below 2005 levels by 2035.**

Land use planning for concentrated, contiguous and balanced development provides opportunities to meet daily needs with shorter car trips or by walking, bicycling, or taking transit. This will reduce overall VMT and efforts to manage congestion, reduce energy vulnerability, and achieve air quality health standards. These land use changes in conjunction with expansion of the transit system and transportation pricing measures are shown to have the greatest impact on reducing future VMT in CTP model analysis.

The VMT reduction benchmark may seem quite conservative when compared to the GHG reduction benchmark. This represents the difficulty in actually reducing the number and length of trips people are making. GHG reduction includes reducing VMT, but can also be addressed by shifting travel modes, using more efficient vehicles, and by using cleaner fuels, and achieving more aggressive reductions in GHG emissions should be easier due to the breadth of possible reduction methods.

**Transportation Strategies:**

- Transit Oriented Development
- 4-d Transportation Investment (density, diversity, design, destinations)
- Infill Development and Carbon Efficient Design
- Address Jobs-Housing imbalance
- Encourage smaller neighborhood locations for daily goods and services
- Housing Assistance
- Travel Demand Management (TDM)
- Public Education/Travel Choice Programs
- Promote Telecommuting
- Promote school based TDM
- Implement Carsharing Programs

**Policy 3B:**

**Increase transit use and productivity.**

Clustering and intensification of residential and commercial development along transit lines and around transit facilities increases the number of jobs, services, and recreation opportunities that can conveniently be reached by transit. These increased opportunities to use non-automobile travel modes lead to higher levels of transit ridership, cost effectiveness, and potential for even higher transit service levels.

Expansion of the countywide transit system, in conjunction with supportive land use policy, is shown to have a positive impact on reducing future congestion, VMT, and emissions in the future based on CTP modeling.

**Transportation Strategies:**

- Implement Rail Transit Service (SMART)
- Transit Marketing
- Increase and Improve Bus Transit Service
- Improve Transit Amenities
• Implement Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) and Express Bus Service
• Transit Priority Measures
• Lower fares
• Implement Ferry Service

Policy 3C:
Improve accessibility and safety for pedestrians at and around activity centers.
Concentrated, mixed land uses coupled with pedestrian friendly site design not only facilitate non-motorized and other non-auto driver travel by residents, but also by commuters, students and commercial visitors. Knowledge that most activities within a center can be reached on foot or via local transit diminishes perceived need to drive to a center, enhancing choice of transit and carpooling.

Transportation Strategies:
• Improve Pedestrian Facilities
• Promote and Seek Funding for Safe Routes to Schools

Policy 3D:
Implement 2008 Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan
Providing a safe, attractive, and effective bicycle and pedestrian network that includes bicycle parking is an important step in encouraging increased bicycle and pedestrian travel.

Transportation Strategies:
• Improve Roadway Bicycle Facilities and Bike Paths
• Improve Transit and Bicycle Integration
• Require Bicycle Lockers/Racks at Park and Ride Lots
• Require Bicycle Facilities and Showers at new Developments

Policy 3E:
Support development and deployment of new technologies to reduce transportation emissions.
Transportation improvements such as increase vehicle fuel economies are shown to have great potential for reducing future GHG emissions in future years. Other emerging or yet to be developed technological transportation improvements will provide additional benefits.

Transportation Strategies:
• Increase Fuel Efficiencies
• Improve Fuels/Biofuels
• Accelerate School Bus Replacement
• Provide Fuel at Stabilized Cost

GOAL 4. PLANNING FOR SAFETY AND HEALTH
Objective: Increase safety and emphasize health aspects of transportation planning strategies
There is a growing trend among transportation planners and health professionals to focus on the link between a healthy community and safe transportation options as a means to improving public health. Transportation is intimately related to public health issues on a variety of fronts, be it that traffic accidents are
the leading cause of death for teenagers or that fatality and injury accidents impact everyone in the community or that air quality effects asthma suffers, or that safe bicycle and pedestrian routes can benefit transportation and health. This chapter discusses safety and health issues in the transportation context. Appendix C-iv provides more detailed information that helps define strategic safety planning. Appendix C-ii, Transportation & the Built Environment, provides background about the health problem and healthy transportation options.

Policy 4A:

Planning for Transportation Safety—Adopt State of California goals to minimize traffic related fatalities.

Strategic safety planning, which has also been called “safety conscious planning,” is done to assure that road safety becomes an explicit priority in land use and transportation planning, thus establishing a safer transportation network.

The fundamental approach is to do whatever possible at each stage of planning and design of transportation infrastructure to promote safety. This includes:

- Reducing exposure and the amount of travel
- Reducing the risk associated with travel that does take place
- Reducing the consequences of crashes that do occur

Policy 4B:

Planning for Public Health—Plan neighborhoods that encourage walking, biking and physical activity, and connect residential areas, workplaces, schools, commercial centers and community facilities

There is mounting evidence that land use planning, urban design, and transportation systems have a powerful effect on health issues.

Chronic disease, including cancer, heart disease, stroke, chronic lung disease and diabetes, accounts for the majority of deaths in Sonoma County. Many chronic diseases, some of which are linked to obesity and lack of exercise, are considered preventable.

Reduced reliance on the automobile is central to healthier transportation.

Transportation Strategies:

- Transit Oriented Development
- 4-d Transportation Investment (density, diversity, design, destinations)
- Infill Development and Carbon Efficient Design
- Address Jobs-Housing imbalance
- Encourage smaller and more frequent service centers
- Housing Assistance
- Improve Roadway Bicycle Facilities and Bike Paths
- Improve Transit and Bicycle Integration
- Require Bicycle Lockers/Racks at Park and Ride Lots
- Require Bicycle Facilities and Showers at new Developments
- Improve Pedestrian Facilities
- Promote and Seek Funding for Safe Routes to Schools
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IMPLEMENTATION

A combination of capital improvements (transit and selected expansion of the highway/roadway system), land use improvements, transportation technology improvement, and the introduction of transportation pricing policy, has been demonstrated in CTP model analysis to come closest to meeting CTP benchmarks. Future year model analysis demonstrates that SCTA will only be able to make it roughly 1/10 of the way to meeting CTP benchmarks assuming only projects with likely funding are implemented in the future. Considering approaches that do not have indentified funding such as smart growth land use development and supportive transit, implementing innovative congestion pricing strategies, and funding additional transit and roadway projects have the potential to get SCTA about 70% of the way to meeting CTP benchmarks. Additional transportation improvement measures identified in this policy chapter and the transportation strategies matrix, along with emerging and currently unidentified transportation improvement strategies can help close the gap and allow these benchmarks to be met.

A balanced approach, focused on pricing, road and transit improvements, smart growth land use policy, system maintenance, maximizing and seeking new funding, and encouraging and implementing transportation technology improvements have the potential to provide the greatest level of VMT reduction, congestion, and GHG emissions reduction benefits. Many of the strategies identified in this plan are currently unfunded, making the identification and procurement of additional future transportation funding a critical component to supporting this approach and will be necessary to allow SCTA to meet CTP goals.
**2035 GOALS**

- Pricing
- Road/Transit Improvements
- Smart Growth Land Use
- Maintenance
- Funding
- Technology

**CURRENT CONDITIONS**

**MEETING CTP GOALS**

- Additional Transportation Improvement Measures
- Projects, Land Use, Transit, Pricing
- Innovative Congestion Pricing Strategies
- Smart Growth Land Use and Supportive Transit
- Projects-Unidentified Funding
- Projects-Likely Funding

---

**WHAT DO WE NEED TO DO NOW?**

- Maximize and Find New Sources of Funding
- Change Travel Behavior
- Improve Transit Capacity
- Support Improvement of the Highway and Local Streets and Roads System
- Support Smart Growth Land Use
- Support Alternative Transportation
- Maintain Existing Infrastructure
- Advocate State and Federal Legislative Change
- Gather Public and Private Support
- Support Technological Innovation and Deployment
Staff Report

To: Planning Advisory Committee

From: Chris Barney, Senior Transportation Planner

Item: 9.0 Senate Bill 743 Update

Date: 3/27/2014

Issue:
The Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) met with the SB 743 Bay Area Stakeholder’s group on March 5, 2014 to discuss comments that were received on the “Preliminary Evaluation of Alternative Methods of Transportation Analysis”. OPR provided a summary of comments and an update on progress made on SB 743 implementation.

Background:
Senate Bill 743 directs OPR to amend CEQA guidelines for analyzing transportation impacts. OPR’s work is focused on recommending an alternative metric to level of service (LOS) for measuring transportation impacts. OPR released a preliminary evaluation of potential alternative methods for addressing transportation impacts under CEQA in December, 2013 and accepted comments on the preliminary evaluation document through February 14, 2014.

OPR received over 100 comments from a diverse mix of groups including local and regional governments, professional organizations, citizen groups, and non-profit organizations. Comments on the changes to the transportation analysis portions of CEQA were mixed with some supporting moving away from LOS and some advocating keeping LOS. Vehicle miles traveled (VMT) received the most support as an alternative metric, with multi-modal LOS (MMLOS) and auto trips generated (ATG) receiving limited support, and with vehicle hours traveled (VHT) and fuel consumption receiving little to no support.

Misconceptions about SB 743 and CEQA:
OPR provided some clarifications regarding SB 743 and the CEQA process:

- SB 743 does not prevent local governments from using LOS in their General Plans, Zoning Ordinances, plan review, etc.
- SB 743 does not affect local fee programs and only affects transportation analysis for CEQA purposes.
- SB 743 does not affect projects in the pipeline, and projects will not be required to comply with the updated rules if the NOP is issued before the final CEQA update is made by the State Natural Resource Agency in early 2015.
- CEQA should focus on impacts to the physical environment and not on social and economic impacts.
• Absolute precision isn't required as part of CEQA, and CEQA analysis requires professional judgment and should use the best data available.

• Mitigations should have a reasonable, but not perfect relation to the impact and should be roughly proportional to the level of impact.

• CEQA analysis should consider both alternatives and mitigation.

OPR and stakeholders discussed the possibility of including a LOS section in EIRs as informational or background information with no CEQA finding. Other non-CEQA impacts such as parking, cut-through traffic, and other localized impacts are often included in EIRs as supplemental or background sections.

**Alternative Metrics:**

OPR has identified VMT as the preferred alternative metric based on continued research and comments they've received.

OPR cited the following benefits for using VMT:

• VMT is a system-wide measurement and addresses regional impacts.

• VMT provides a better connection to environmental impacts.

• Consistent with State goals

• Already in use

Concerns about VMT include:

• Accuracy of measurement, what approach or tools would be used

• VMT does not address operational issues.

• VMT may not be the best metric for measuring impacts for transportation projects.

• VMT may not be able to assess impacts to non-fixed route or bus based transit operations.

OPR will be meeting with the Bay Area Regional Model Users Group and other technical groups to discuss how VMT would be calculated. They are currently envisioning a tiered approach where larger projects would be analyzed using regional travel demand models and smaller projects could be analyzed using sketch models such as MXD, CalEEMod, Urbimis, Urban Footprint, or spreadsheet based VMT sketch modeling tools. A VMT efficiency metric will most likely be recommended, such as VMT per capita or VMT per employee.

Stakeholder groups recommend some flexibility in calculation methodologies and are urging OPR to provide guidance and examples on VMT calculation approaches. OPR and the state are being asked to provide lead agencies and analysts with the flexibility to use their professional judgment and to consider local conditions when calculating VMT based transportation impacts.

**Litigation:**

OPR legal staff doesn't believe that using VMT to estimate transportation impacts in CEQA will create additional litigation risk. Almost two-thirds of CEQA litigation is currently associated with traffic impacts and how LOS is calculated.

**Thresholds:**

Thresholds are established by lead agencies and OPR develops criteria that can be used to determine significance. OPR is not planning on changing this, and SB 743 does not require statewide thresholds of significance. OPR will likely provide guidance and examples on how thresholds could be set locally.
based on project type and size, project location, jobs/housing balance, and baseline conditions. Thresholds may need to be connected to statewide SB 375 GHG reduction targets, or be connected to local or regional targets. Written comments and the Bay Area Working Group urged OPR to provide flexibility and to allow local conditions and circumstances to be considered in the local threshold setting process.

**Transit Priority Areas:**

OPR is still considering limiting changes to TPAs but cited many reasons for applying the changes statewide. OPR staff members are concerned that having two separate requirements would be confusing and prefer a consistent approach. Other concerns include:

- TPAs are still not well defined, and it is still unclear who would determine where TPAs are located. Would TPAs be determined at the state level, MPO/regional level, or would they be identified by local jurisdictions.
- How would projects located partially inside of a TPA be analyzed?
- Having different metrics for TPAs could provide incentives for developers to build outside of TPAs.

Working group members suggested that phasing the adoption process may be appropriate. A separate working group will be meeting separately with OPR to work on better defining TPAs and how they could be identified.

**Mitigation:**

OPR has been investigating possible mitigation measures that could be employed to mitigate for VMT based transportation impacts. Local agencies have requested some guidance in this area. OPR in consultation with CAPCOA (California Air Pollution Control Officers Association) has provided some possible strategies that could be used to mitigate VMT based impacts:

- Change project location
- Change project density
- Change transportation network density and/or configuration
- Mix land use
- Provide pedestrian improvements
- Improve bicycle facilities
- Provide affordable housing
- Provide electric vehicle charging stations
- Traffic calming
- Parking reform – unbundling parking, parking cash-out, pricing
- Van pools/Shuttles
- Car-pooling, Car-sharing
- Telecommuting

OPR will likely provide further guidance on mitigation, but reiterated that CEQA mitigation is purposefully flexible, and needs to be related to the impact and roughly proportional to the size of the impact.
Safety Impacts:
Safety is a local issue that is sometimes measured using LOS. Comment letters and discussions at the Bay Area Working Group urge OPR to leave the measurement of safety up to local agencies. Many local governments have existing methods and qualitative/quantitative approaches for estimating safety impacts. Some local staff recommended that OPR provide guidance on, or examples of, how safety impacts could be estimated using a new metric, but requested that the final determination on how safety impacts would be assessed be left up to the local jurisdiction.

Next Steps and Timeline:
OPR is continuing to conduct research on alternative transportation metrics and will be meeting with regional stakeholder groups to get feedback on possible changes to the environmental review process. OPR will meet with technical groups in the Bay Area to discuss VMT calculation methodologies and tools, and to discuss TPA definitions and the TPA/statewide metric issue in greater detail. OPR continues to evaluate the feedback received through public comment and stakeholder groups and will develop a draft document proposing an alternative metric that would be used in place of LOS. Feedback will be accepted on that discussion draft, and a final draft of the changes to CEQA guidelines will be forwarded to the Natural Resources Agency by July 1, 2014. Updated CEQA guidelines should be adopted and in effect in early 2015.

Policy Impacts:
OPR’s final recommendations will change the methods required for estimating transportation impacts under CEQA. LOS will be replaced by another metric in the CEQA process. The change represents a shift away from measuring congestion reduction to measuring GHG reduction, multimodal transportation, and efficient access in the environmental review process.

Fiscal Impacts: No direct fiscal impacts at this time.

Staff Recommendation: Information item. No action requested.