Planning Directors/Planning Advisory Committee

MEETING AGENDA

Thursday, July 24, 2014, 9:30 a.m.
Sonoma County Transportation Authority
SCTA Large Conference Room

ITEM

1. Introductions
2. Public Comment
3. Approval of the agenda – changes, additional discussion items- ACTION
4. Review Meeting Notes from June 26, 2014 – ACTION*
5. Round table members discussion
6. Climate Action 2020 – update
7. Local Roads – County of Sonoma transportation sales tax measure *
8. Countywide Transportation Plan update
9. Legislative Updates
10. Other Business /Next agenda
11. Adjourn

*Attachment

The next SCTA meeting will be held September 8, 2014
The next Planning Directors/PAC meeting will be held August 28, 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 NOTES

Meeting Notes of June 26, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>December (November meeting cancelled)</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</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>ð</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graton Tribe</td>
<td></td>
<td>ð</td>
<td>ð</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healdsburg</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ð</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>ð</td>
<td>ð</td>
<td></td>
<td>ð</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>ð</td>
<td></td>
<td>ð</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>ð</td>
<td>ð</td>
<td>ð</td>
<td>ð</td>
<td></td>
<td>ð</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMART</td>
<td>ð</td>
<td>ð</td>
<td>ð</td>
<td>ð</td>
<td></td>
<td>ð</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma County Transit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>ð</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 9:06 a.m. by Chair Lisa Kranz.

   *Committee Members:* Lisa Kranz, Chair, City of Santa Rosa; Jesse Brown, City of Healdsburg; Olivia Ins, SMART; Linda Meckel, SMART; Barbara Nelson, City of Healdsburg; Kenyon Webster, City of Sebastopol; Tennis Wick, Sonoma County PRMD.

   *Guests:* Bob Anderson, United Winegrowers.

   *Staff:* Chris Barney, Nina Donofrio, Misty Mersich, Suzanne Smith, Janet Spilman.

2. **Public Comment**
   None.

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

4. **Review Meeting Notes from May 22, 2014**
   ACTION
   Approved as submitted.

5. **Round table members discussion**
   *City of Healdsburg:*
   Barbara Nelson introduced Jesse Brown, new City planner, who is involved in the Housing Element update.
Work is continuing on the Downtown Parking Plan and staff is preparing to schedule a second public meeting for this project.

The Central Healdsburg Avenue Plan will be addressed at the City Council meeting.

City of Petaluma:
Scott Duiven reported significant development activity.
A few minor changes will be made to the draft Housing Element.

Sonoma County PRMD:
Tennis Wick reported that development activity has increased by approximately 30% over the previous year; seven new positions have been added to staff.
Contract approval was granted for a new permit system.
Work is progressing on the Roseland Area Specific Plan. This will be presented to the Board of Supervisors in August.

SMART:
Linda Meckel introduced Olivia Ins. She reported that the latest General Manager’s report is now available.
Full board construction is continuing with both contractors. The Haystack Bridge project is moving forward.
Ms. Meckel announced that the Larkspur station area plan process has stopped due to public opposition, citing increased housing and resulting traffic concerns.

City of Santa Rosa:
Ms. Kranz reported that progress is continuing on the Housing Element. It has received a positive recommendation from the Planning Commission and will be presented to City Council at the end of the month.
Discussions have begun with the State Board of Forestry and Fire regarding the need to amend the Safety Element of the Housing Element; Ms. Kranz noted that this will be evaluated for all jurisdictions’ Housing Elements.

City of Sebastopol:
Kenyon Webster announced that the General Plan Advisory Committee meeting will take place in two weeks.
Mr. Webster reported that a tax measure for the modernization of utilities is likely to be placed on the ballot.
A Request for Proposals is anticipated to be released in August for the Laguna Preserve Park for a management plan.

RCPA:
Suzanne Smith announced the award of a $883,000 planning grant by the Strategic Growth Council to study mode shift and fuel shift, to address emissions from the transportation sector. This will augment the work taking place on Climate Action 2020, and will include bicycle and car share programs, converting fleets of vehicles to electric vehicles, a financing program for purchasing electric vehicles (EVs), and assisting the public to install EV chargers in their homes and make EVs affordable.

6. Climate Action 2020 – update
Misty Mersich reported that this is moving forward; important dates to note are July 14 and July 30 for Staff Working Group meetings.

Staff is awaiting the next iteration of the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Tool Kit 2.0 the week of July 7. This will be sent to the Committee.
Significant public outreach is continuing at Farmers Markets. Ms. Mersich encouraged Committee members to refer her to anyone associated with local Chambers of Commerce where staff might provide presentations on Climate Action 2020.

Ms. Mersich next reported that Ms. Smith addressed the Mayors and Council Members meeting the previous week and that this was well received.

A special session of the RCPA Board is scheduled August 25 to discuss GHG reduction measures and targets.

7. Countywide Transportation Plan update*
Janet Spilman referred to an updated staff report and explained that this has undergone revisions and editing through the various advisory committees. The following issues will be presented to the Board at their July meeting:

Poll questions – ACTION
Ms. Spilman explained that staff is trying to establish benchmarks for the demographics; identify issues and concerns, and what the change is with voters that support mode shift. She summarized survey questions addressing transportation priorities, and evaluation of Measure M, identification of possible funding sources, and evaluation of options.

Ms. Spilman compared previous poll results and priorities of various issues and how these have changed over time in different polls. She noted that transportation was a moderately high priority in the previous poll, and that the public was basically supportive of Measure M.

Staff is seeking Board approval of the poll at its July meeting, in order to implement it in August.
Ms. Spilman summarized highlights of the poll, pointing out changes and additional issues and questions (e.g., passenger rail service, Route 37 and affordable housing near bus and train stops). Staff is also interested in data related to car use.

The Committee approved presentation of the poll to the Board at the July meeting.

Review Performance Assessment – DISCUSSION

Chris Barney cited recent developments in MTC guidelines and requirements for project-level assessments in the CTP guidelines update. These will not go into effect until 2017.

Projects will be evaluated in groups, based on project type and status (either financially constrained or vision projects).

Mr. Barney referred to project lists and noted that each of the project groups will be analyzed and scored in each of the categories of the five goals identified for the CTP (reduce greenhouse gas emissions, relieve traffic congestion, maintain the system, plan for safety and health, and promote economic vitality). He briefly summarized how performance in each of these five goals will be evaluated for project groups.

Staff will also be reporting on and examining total VMT, PDAs, and growth and employment investment areas.

Mr. Barney showed hypothetical examples/scenarios to illustrate how performance evaluation works: (1) an additional lane on Highway 101 from River Road to Rohnert Park Expressway; and (2) implementing ten-minute headways and free fares for all transit service (rail and bus) in Sonoma County. He also showed the significant impact of land use on performance measures.

Mr. Barney noted that most projects, if they are helping to achieve the established goals, will likely score between the 2-3 range.

Next steps will be to update the project lists, analyze the project groups, and then scoring.

It was suggested that, in addition to projecting ahead 30 years, staff look back 30 years, to compare findings.

Ms. Spilman added that this item will be addressed on this date by the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC).

8. Legislative Updates

8.1 Cap & Trade

Ms. Smith referred to a memorandum/policy brief from CalCOG summarizing the cap and trade program. The Strategic Growth Council is a significant policy body and will be a key entity for transportation and housing funds.

Ms. Spilman referred to a flyer from Amy Lyle of the Sonoma County PRMD announcing a Healthy Communities Colloquium, connecting health to the built environment, that is scheduled for July 24. This is a partnership between PRMD and the Sonoma County Department of Health Services.

Ms. Spilman next pointed out important information from ABAG regarding PCA designations and revisions to PCA criteria. The PCA application period began June 1 and runs through the end of May 2015.

Finally, Ms. Spilman referred to information from the MTC on goods movement that will be addressed at the Alameda CTC offices in Oakland on July 23. She noted that this will likely be an issue to be addressed in the future. Ms. Meckel reported that SMART will be attending this event.

10. Adjourn

10:24 a.m.
Staff Report

To: SCTA Board of Directors
From: Suzanne Smith, Executive Director
Item: 4.5.2 – Local Roads – County of Sonoma Long Term Road Plan June 2014
Date: July 14, 2014

Issue:
What is the status of planning and funding for local road maintenance in the unincorporated County?

Background:
The County of Sonoma has released a long term roads plan to address the condition of unincorporated roads. The report identifies roadway types, conditions and funding needs to improve pavement condition. As part of this effort there has been a discussion of a possible ¼ cent sales tax measure being placed on the ballot in November 2014. At the time this staff report was written a specific proposal had not been released but the concept is in development for consideration at the Board of Supervisors in late July or early August. In order for a measure to be placed on the November 2014 ballot action must occur by August 8.

Should something become available by July 14 staff will bring it to the Board meeting.

Policy Impact:
At this point the SCTA is not called out to have a specific role.

Fiscal Impact:
The Measure M sales tax that the SCTA does administer is at the mid-point of its 20-year life. The SCTA Board has had discussions in the past about when to consider renewing or extending Measure M and what those funds might be used for but no specific timeframe or expenditure plan has been crafted or deliberated.

Staff Recommendation:
Discussion and direction to staff as appropriate.
County of Sonoma  
Agenda Item Summary Report

Clerk of the Board  
575 Administration Drive  
Santa Rosa, CA 95403

To: Board of Supervisors

Board Agenda Date: June 17, 2014  
Vote Requirement: Majority

Department or Agency Name(s): Transportation and Public Works

Staff Name and Phone Number: Susan Klassen, Director (707) 565-2231  
Supervisory District(s): All

Title: Long-Term Road Plan

Recommended Actions:
Accept the Long-Term Road Plan report and provide direction to staff.

Executive Summary:
Sonoma County is prioritizing transportation infrastructure, enhancing safety for vehicles, pedestrians, and cyclists, fixing potholes, repairing local roads and streets, and improving the quality of life for County residents to achieve its’ strategic goal of economic and environmental stewardship. A well maintained road network is vital to economic development and activity, especially in the areas of agriculture, recreation, and tourism.

In August 2013, the Board Chairman created the Long-Term Roads Ad Hoc Committee (Supervisors McGuire and Rabbitt) with a charter to improve the quality and safety of the County road system by developing a Long-Term Road Plan including funding strategies for pavement condition improvements. This item presents the Long-Term Road Plan and recommendations of the Long-Term Road Ad Hoc Committee (Ad Hoc).

Specifically, the Long-Term Roads Ad Hoc recommends that the Board take the following actions to fund the Long-Term Road Plan:

1. Approve recommendation to improve approximately 700 miles of the County road network during the next ten years. In total, over 50% of the road network would be in good condition, as compared to the 26% that would be considered good today.
2. Direct CAO and Transportation and Public Works staff to develop a financing plan that incorporates all identified sources of revenue, including General Funds, other revenue currently received by the Department, a local sales tax measure, support additional funding from Sonoma County Transportation Agency (SCTA) for leveraging; and possible new State and Federal funding, as well as financing strategies such as bonding and distribution scenarios to meet the Long-Term Road needs of the County.
3. Support and direct staff to lobby at the State and Federal level for initiatives that increase Federal or State revenues directed to County roads, including proposals which could modify state gas tax allocation formula, lower required voter thresholds for passage of sales taxes for transportation, or adjust the cap on local transaction and use (sales) taxes of 2%.

**Roads Funding - A Legacy Problem**

It has been a challenge to properly fund and maintain the approximately 1,370 miles of road in the County system. Years of inadequate State and local funding have created a deteriorating road network. Unfavorable formulas and declining State and Federal gas-tax revenues, which are the primary revenue stream for road repair and maintenance, coupled with significant local budget reductions due to the “Great Recession” (overall County General Fund revenue from property tax declined approx. $40 million between FY 08/09 and FY 12/13), along with increased costs of raw materials necessary for pavement preservation, have exacerbated the difficulty in maintaining such an extensive road network.

During several years of significant budget reductions where the County budget was reduced cumulatively by $103.6 million and 529 full time equivalent positions, the Board committed to making every effort to address the shortfall with available General Fund dollars, and to use those dollars intelligently to leverage outside funding and maintain a “good” Pavement Condition Index (PCI) rating on the Primary Roads and roadways vital to the County’s agricultural and tourism economy within the County network.

In both fiscal years, FY 12/13 and FY 13/14, the Board of Supervisors dedicated the highest level of funding for County roads infrastructure in recent history by investing $8 million of General Funds. These investments were part of a significant commitment from the Board totaling approximately $50 million budgeted in FY 13/14 (see Fiscal Summary for detail) toward improving roads, bridges, drainage and safety features. Of this amount, approximately $47 million was directed into the local economy through contracts awarded by the County.

The Long-Term Road Plan outlines a recommended strategy to address all roads in the County and utilizes a combination of long range, community-based funding solutions and State and Federal legislative funding authority. These funds will sustain the County’s primary roads, begin to systematically fix potholes and improve maintenance on Local Roads, which comprise almost 65% of the County system but have no identified funding source for pavement preservation activities. The Ad Hoc Committee, Transportation and Public Works staff and County Administrative Office staff worked together to reach a common understanding of the current roads network, assess the existing backlog of needed repairs and investment, set a Long-Term goal for the network in total, and then develop an approach to help guide investment within that network as well as track progress in PCI improvement. In addition, the Ad-Hoc and staff explored financial needs and options for achieving the recommended Long-Term goal.

The Ad-Hoc members conducted extensive community outreach in developing the Long-Term Road Plan. Supervisors McGuire and Rabbitt have each individually hosted town hall meetings in partnership with local stakeholder and community groups, presented information to and solicited feedback from local service groups and associations, and held numerous meetings with residents and local stakeholder groups. In addition, County staff have conducted community sentiment surveys, which indicate roads...
and transportation infrastructure continue to be a high priority for the community, have met with local jurisdictions, and collected additional input through the Ad-Hoc’s work.

**Current Conditions**

To establish a commonly understood baseline of the current County road network, the County hired Harris and Associates (HA) to field survey and verify the condition of all roads in the County. HA completed this work over a period of 18 months. The table below summarizes the results of that work:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Eligibility</th>
<th>ROAD TYPE (Functional Classification)</th>
<th>Road Miles</th>
<th>% of Total Road Miles</th>
<th>Pavement Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eligible for Federal $</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>76 – Very Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Principal Arterials</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>62 – Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major Collectors</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>65 – Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Eligible for Federal $</td>
<td>Minor Collector</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>44 - Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>34 - Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Paved Road Network</td>
<td>1370</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>46 - Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Investment and Repair Backlog**

HA used the StreetSaver® program to analyze the existing backlog in investments and repairs throughout the roads network. StreetSaver® is an Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) managed program which all local agencies in the Bay Area use to help identify maintenance needs and to develop a cost-effective pavement capital program, to address those needs. The program inputs consist of the Length, Width, Surface Type, Functional Classification and Current Pavement Condition for each road. The program then applies a complex model to predict how each road will deteriorate over time, when and what type of pavement maintenance or repair treatment is appropriate and the cost of the treatment.

The data used account for what is realistic and regionally appropriate to the types of roads in Sonoma County, recent bid estimates, and that the predicted frequency of maintenance treatments is reasonably achievable. The output from the model can then predict the total value of the maintenance and repair backlog at a given interval of time, such as today, in 10 years, or in 20 years. StreetSaver® can also be used to run various “budget scenarios” for pavement condition. For example how much investment is needed on an annual basis over a specified period of time to have a network pavement condition that is good, or very good, as well as “budget constrained” scenarios to show what improvements can be made with limited resources.
Using StreetSaver®, HA analyzed over a dozen scenarios, with varying levels of financial commitment, and target pavement condition or combination of those two criteria. Based on this analysis, the estimate of the current backlog for the County Road network is $268 million dollars. This number will continue to grow without significant investment. The complete consultant report of on the pavement condition survey and analysis is on file with the clerk.

**The Long-Term Road Plan**

The Ad Hoc’s recommended plan continues the County’s focus on creating a well maintained road network that supports economic development, agriculture, recreation and tourism. The Plan also seeks to maximize and leverage federal dollars and identify new revenue sources as well as legislative changes to create more favorable allocation.

Because the total County road network is so extensive, multiple “tiers” within the network were established to help identify and understand use, guide investments, and better track progress in PCI improvement over time. The “tiers” are: Tier 1: The Federally Eligible Network; Tier 2: Significant Rural Road Network; Tier 3: Local Communities; and Tier 4: Remaining Local Roads. Maps showing the roads in each of the top 3 Tiers are included as attachments.

**Tier 1: The Federally Eligible Network** – This Tier consists of all of the Roads in the County that are classified as either Arterials or Major Collectors. There are 350 miles (25% of total network) of Tier 1 roads throughout the County. These roads are on the average in good or very good condition. Most importantly these roads are eligible for federal road funding, in other words these are the roads where the County can maximize its ability to leverage local dollars.

**Tier 2: Significant Rural Road Network** – This Tier consists of all of the roads classified as Minor Collector roads and a strategic selection of Local roads that are significant to the economic vitality of Sonoma County because they tie rural communities together or provide access to agricultural, tourism, and recreation opportunities. There are approximately 220 miles of roads (16% of total network) in this Tier and they are in generally poor condition with an average PCI of 44.

**Tier 3: Local Communities** – This Tier consists of roads classified as Local. They are in areas around population centers, townships and neighborhoods. Examples include such areas as: Graton, Penngrove, The Springs, Geyserville, Larkfield, Southwest Santa Rosa, etc. This Tier consists of approximately 250 miles (18% of total network) of the remaining local roads, and are in generally poor condition.

**Tier 4: Remaining Local Roads** – This Tier as the name implies consist of the remainder of the Local classification of roads. These roads would generally be in more rural areas, may often be dead end roads and generally serve relatively few residents. This Tier consists of approximately 560 (41% of the total network) of the local roads in the County network.

Based on modeling through StreetSaver®, achieving a “Very Good” PCI rating for all roads is financially unrealistic. However, by using these tiers, the Long-Term Road Plan makes significant progress in improving the County’s road network. Specifically, the plan recommends bringing up and maintaining the Tier 1 Federally Eligible and Tier 2 Significant Rural Roads in “Good” PCI condition, (PCI of 60 or better). The Report recommends improving approximately one half of the Tier 3 roads to a “Good” or
better condition within 10 years, and then to continue work within this Tier on an ongoing basis, gradually improving the remaining 50% of Tier 3 roads over time. Tier 4 roads would be addressed as funding is available or when emergency repairs are needed.

Based on the Long-Term Roads Plan, the County would improve approximately 700 miles of the County road network during the next ten years. In total, over 50% of the road network would be in good condition, as compared to the 26% that would be considered good today.

HA and County staff believes that to implement this plan, the County will need to invest an average of approximately $20M annually over the 10 year period. To achieve this level of funding, the Road Plan includes the continuation of existing support through the County General Fund and other local sources. However, even with this level of ongoing investment, the County will need to seek additional revenue to achieve the estimated $20M needed. Based on that the Ad-Hoc believes the County should move forward with a local revenue measure to help finance the Long-Term Road Plan; explore financing strategies including bonding and distribution scenarios. Additionally new State and Federal revenues directed to road should be encouraged such as modifying the state gas tax allocation formula, lowering the required voter thresholds for passage of sales taxes for transportation, or adjusting the cap on local transaction and use (sales) taxes of 2%.

Prior Board Actions:


Strategic Plan Alignment

Goal 2: Economic and Environmental Stewardship

A well maintained road network is vital to economic development in the areas of agriculture, recreation and tourism. Investing in transportation infrastructure improves the pavement quality and safety of the County road system for vehicles, transit, and bicycles.

Fiscal Summary - FY 14-15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Funding Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budgeted Amount</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Appropriations Reqd.</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditure</strong></td>
<td><strong>$</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Narrative Explanation of Fiscal Impacts (If Required):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staffing Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Payroll Classification)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Narrative Explanation of Staffing Impacts (If Required):

### Attachments:
- Long Term Road Plan Dated June 2014

### Related Items “On File” with the Clerk of the Board:
Long Term Road Plan

Dated June 2014
Roads Funding - A Legacy Problem

Under the County Strategic Goal of Economic and Environmental Stewardship the Board has consistently prioritized investing in transportation infrastructure, to enhance safety for vehicles, pedestrians, and cyclists, fix potholes, repair local roads and streets and improve the quality of life for County residents. A well maintained road network is vital to economic development and activity, especially in the areas of agriculture, recreation and tourism. The 2008 Roads Report started with the following problem description:

“The Sonoma County Board of Supervisors approved the first-ever Strategic Plan for the County on December 11, 2007. Goal 5 of the Plan aims to proactively address the failing transportation infrastructure so that it can be maintained and operated to provide safe reliable and accessible movement of people and goods throughout the County. Objectives include developing resources to provide for the ongoing maintenance and improvement of county roads and developing a multi-year prioritized countywide maintenance plan.

The Board approved the Strategic Plan Implementation of projects on July 8, 2008. Included within the Implementation Plan was Project 47 – Road Funding. The following report is a funding analysis of Sonoma County road and represents one of the identified project deliverables. There are several key points identified within the report and they are summarized as follows:

1. The Sonoma County Road System represents one of our largest public assets with a replacement value of $1.7 billion.
2. Today’s transportation revenues are woefully inadequate to address the road maintenance needs of Sonoma County.
3. Road maintenance activities are interdependent, with pavement life extension reliant upon a coordinated program of implementation.
4. Road maintenance service levels, already identified as deficient, are projected to worsen, with annual shortfalls ranging from $3.5 million to $4.5 million over the next five years.
5. Failure to address the projected shortfall in road maintenance will result in a need for a significant portion, if not the entire County road network, to be completely reconstructed within 10 years.

Most people acknowledge that road networks are a vital centerpiece to a vibrant economy. Roads provide connectivity of countless origins and destinations, thus providing flexible choices for many users. Further, most consider roads to be permanent, important and free. Roads are far from permanent and they are not free for those tasked with building and maintaining them. They are; however, important and new strategies need to be explored in order to extend their life and quality. By helping to create and sustain jobs and allowing for the safe transport
and delivery of goods and services, every dollar spent preserving our County road system is a dollar invested in our local economy.”

Unfortunately, this continues to be true today as the general state of County roads has continued to decline despite recent efforts by the Board of Supervisors to curtail the degradation of the roadway infrastructure. To address this strategic priority, the Board Chair created the Long-Term Roads Ad Hoc Committee (Supervisors McGuire and Rabbitt) in August 2013, with a mission to improve the quality and safety of the County road system by developing a Long-Term Road Plan including funding strategies for pavement condition improvements. This item presents the Long-Term Road Plan and recommendations of the Long-Term Road Ad Hoc Committee (Ad Hoc).

Since 2008, the Board received reports outlining the challenges of properly funding and maintaining the approximately 1,370 miles of road in the County system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Center Line Miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minor Arterials</td>
<td>31.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Principal Arterials</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Collector</td>
<td>326.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Collector</td>
<td>122.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>887.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1369.63</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Years of inadequate State and local funding have created a deteriorating road network. Unfavorable formulas and declining State and Federal gas-tax revenues, which are the primary revenue stream for road repair and maintenance, coupled with significant local budget reductions due to the “Great Recession” (overall County General Fund revenue from property tax declined approx. $40 million between FY 08/09 and FY 12/13), along with increased costs of raw materials necessary for pavement preservation, have exacerbated the difficulty in maintaining such an extensive road network. Even during several years of significant budget reductions where the County budget was reduced cumulatively by $103.6 million and 529 full time equivalent positions, the Board has committed to making every effort to address the shortfall with available General Fund dollars, and to use those dollars intelligently to leverage outside funding and maintain a “good” Pavement Condition Index (PCI) rating on the Primary Roads and roadways vital to the County’s agricultural and tourism economy within the County network.

Reflecting the County’s continued commitment to maintaining its roadway infrastructure, the Board of Supervisors have dedicated the highest level of funding for County roads infrastructure in recent history by investing $8 million of General Funds during each of the last two fiscal years, FY 12/13 and FY 13/14. These investments were part of a significant commitment from the Board totaling approximately $50 million budgeted in FY 13/14 (see Fiscal Summary for detail) toward
improving roads, bridges, drainage and safety features. Of this amount, approximately $47 million was directed into the local economy through contracts awarded by the County.

The Long-Term Road Plan prepared by the Ad Hoc outlines a recommended strategy to address for all roads in the county which utilizes a combination of long range, community-based funding solutions, and work with State and Federal legislators to not only sustain the County’s primary roads, but to begin to systematically fix potholes and improve maintenance on Local Roads, which comprise almost 65% of the County system but have no identified funding source for pavement preservation activities.

**Funding Sources**

*Federal Funding*

Roads funding have traditionally focused on legacy programs based on fuel excise taxes. The federal excise tax on gasoline and diesel is 18.4 and 24.4 cents per gallon of fuel sold, respectively. Federal funds are deposited into the State Highway Account to be distributed to projects as part of the Federal and State Transportation Improvement Programs (FTIP & STIP) relating to four general categories: federal highway projects, federal bridge projects, federal safety projects and congestion management and air quality. The County currently receives approximately $1.8 million per year to maintain the federally eligible road network in addition to bridge funds through the Highway Bridge Retrofit and Replacement (HBRR) program.

*State Funding*

The State of California has utilized a combination of funding sources to help local agencies finance road repairs, such as taxes, fees and bonds. Similar to the federal government, California imposes an excise tax on fuels of 18 cents per gallon. Approximately 44% stays in the State Highway Account to supplement federal funds through the STIP, 12% is dedicated to the State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPP) and the remaining 44% is provided to local jurisdictions based on formula.
The County receives approximately $12.7 million per year in state fuel tax funds, which is among the lowest in the State considering the number of road miles within the maintained system. As clearly shown in the figure above, the eight most populace counties receive approximately 47% of the total State fuel tax despite having only 12% of the total statewide roads. As an example, Orange County receives $45 million per year and has only 309 miles of road. Additionally, due to heavy swings in the price of gasoline and shifting trends toward alternative fuel vehicles, it is becoming more difficult to predict and budget into the future. The figure below demonstrates the shift downward in millions of gallons sold between 2002 and 2012 exacerbating the uncertain future of this critical road funding.
**Local Funds**

In 2004, Sonoma County voters approved Regional Measure M, a ¼ cent sales tax focused on transportation projects including approximately 20% set aside for local road rehabilitation projects. Measure M local road funds are distributed via a 50% road mile and 50% population formula. This results in an annual allocation to Sonoma County of approximately $1.7 million.

The Board of Supervisors has historically dedicated some General Funds to annual road maintenance. Over the past few years, this contribution has been $5.3 million; however, this is down from $7.8 million in 2008, which is less than 25% of the maintenance budget. This is still a fraction of the historical funding from two decades ago, where the Board contributed approximately 50% of the maintenance budget from the General Fund. In fiscal years 12-13 and 14-15, the Board demonstrated their commitment to addressing the road issue by dedicating $8 million for each of the two years.

It is a common misconception that property taxes support local infrastructure, such as roads and bridges. In fact, the majority, roughly half, of property tax revenues go to schools with approximately 27% coming to the County.

![WHERE DOES YOUR PROPERTY TAX](image)

The County also receives a portion of the General Fund Franchise Fee from the County’s waste hauler to compensate for the accelerated degradation of the roads resulting from the heavy vehicle use. In 2012, the Board of Supervisors agreed to focus these funds to maintain the federally eligible road network.
FY 13-14 Pavement Preservation Funds

Corrective Maintenance Operations
- State Gas Tax - 39.5₵/gallon $12.7M
- Measure M Maintenance $1.7M
- Annual General Fund $5.3M
  $19.7M

Pavement Preservation
- Federal Gas Tax - 18.4₵/gallon $1.65M/year (latest 3-year cycle)
- General Fund Franchise Fees $2.2M/year
- One-Time General Funds $8M/year (last 2 years - future funds uncertain)
  $11.85M/year

2013 Pavement Management Program

Current Conditions

To establish a commonly understood baseline of the current County road network, the County hired Harris and Associates (Harris) to field survey and verify the condition of all roads in the County. These surveys have been traditionally occurred on a four year cycle, where all arterials and major collectors are surveyed every other year and where minor collectors and local roads are surveyed on a quadrant basis every four years. To ensure that the current effort was comprehensive and current, Harris was contracted to survey the entire network over an 18 month period. The table below summarizes the results of that work:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>PCI Range</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>90-100</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>70-89</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good/Fair</td>
<td>50-69</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>25-49</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>0-24</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This created a clear snapshot of the County's network and provided comprehensive platform for Harris to develop long-term funding scenarios.
In addition to current road condition, staff and the Ad Hoc committee evaluated and discussed road volumes and average daily traffic to help define what roads should be given highest priority in the Long-Term Plan. Recognizing that staff has not collected counts on every street, data collected over the past decade was used to provide the broadest information possible. The table below provides average system wide Average Daily Traffic data for each roadway classification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Average Daily Traffic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minor Arterial</td>
<td>6601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Principal Arterial</td>
<td>6898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Collector</td>
<td>3705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Collector</td>
<td>821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>779</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Investment and Repair Backlog**

Harris used the StreetSaver® program to analyze the existing backlog in investments and repairs throughout the roads network. StreetSaver® is an Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) managed program which all local agencies in the Bay Area use to help identify maintenance needs and to develop a cost effective pavement capital program, to address those needs. The program inputs consist of the Length, Width, Surface Type, Functional Classification and Current Pavement Condition for each road. The program then applies a complex model to predict how each road will deteriorate over time, when and what type of pavement maintenance or repair treatment is appropriate and the cost of the treatment. The software focuses on providing cost effective recommendations that enhance the overall system Pavement Condition Index (PCI). In general, asphalt pavement deteriorates over time by both traffic loading and weathering. It recommends that 20% of the budget be put to preventative maintenance treatments such as slurry seab or crack seal for a 10 year program and 38% for a 20 year program. The remaining budget is programmed for more expensive asphalt overlays and reconstruction.

The inputs and decision tree in Streetsaver® were reviewed and updated to reflect proper roadway classifications, realistic and regionally appropriate pavement treatments, current unit prices based on recent contracts in our area and more reasonable and achievable treatment frequencies. With all this work that has been completed staff is now very confident that the results presented in this new report show more of a true picture of the funding that will be required to upgrade the County road system and preserve this very important public asset.

The results of this survey conclude that the County’s overall network has a pavement condition index (PCI) of 46 or “Poor,” this is a 3 point increase from the prior survey completed in 2011. The positive news is that our regionally significant road network is in generally good condition with an average PCI of 76, it is the minor collectors and local roads that are in generally poor to very poor shape.
The data used account for what is realistic and regionally appropriate to the types of roads in Sonoma County, recent bid estimates, and that the predicted frequency of maintenance treatments is reasonably achievable. The output from the model can then predict the total value of the maintenance and repair backlog at a given intervals of time, such as today, in 10 years, or in 20 years. StreetSaver® can also be used to run various “budget scenarios” for pavement condition. For example how much investment is needed on an annual basis over a specified period of time to have a network pavement condition that is good, or very good, as well as “budget constrained” scenarios to show what improvements can be made with limited resources.

Using StreetSaver®, Harris analyzed over a dozen scenarios, with varying levels of financial commitment, and target pavement condition or combination of those two criteria. Based on this analysis, the estimate of the current backlog for the County Road network is $268 million dollars. This number will continue to grow without significant investment. The complete consultant report of on the pavement condition survey and analysis is on file with the clerk.

The Budget Needs Average analysis projects the total budget needed to bring the County’s pavement system to a condition where most pavement sections require only minor preventative maintenance. It is defined as the cumulative budget need identified for a specified target pavement condition divided by the number of years in the analysis. The software analyzes each pavement section and picks specific maintenance practices to maximize the improvement of the entire pavement system. Maintenance treatments are allocated to as many roads as the annual budget will allow. The budget scenarios tested were calculated utilizing a 20% and 38% fixed preventative maintenance for the 10 and 20 years funding scenarios, respectively, split with 3% interest and 3% inflation values built in to the calculations.

Five budget scenarios were analyzed as part of the primary report, while twelve (12) additional scenarios were added as an addendum. The key scenarios are highlighted below and briefly described in the 2014 Pavement Program Harris Report Summary.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario Name</th>
<th>10 Year Budget</th>
<th>Rough Annual Budget</th>
<th>2023 PCI</th>
<th>2023 Deferred Maintenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Expected Annual Budget I</td>
<td>$22.0M</td>
<td>$2.2M</td>
<td>26 (-20)</td>
<td>$636M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a Maintain PCI of 46</td>
<td>$195M</td>
<td>$19.5M</td>
<td>46 (+0)</td>
<td>$522M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Increase PCI 5 Points</td>
<td>$240M</td>
<td>$24.0M</td>
<td>51 (+5)</td>
<td>$506M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Budget Needs Average I</td>
<td>$620M</td>
<td>$62.0M</td>
<td>75 (+29)</td>
<td>$138M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario Name</th>
<th>20 Year Budget</th>
<th>Rough Annual Budget</th>
<th>2033 PCI</th>
<th>2033 Deferred Maintenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Expected Annual Budget II</td>
<td>$80.0M</td>
<td>$4.0M</td>
<td>18 (-28)</td>
<td>$1,129M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Maintain 2013 Funding</td>
<td>$240M</td>
<td>$12.0M</td>
<td>31 (-15)</td>
<td>$953M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b Maintain PCI of 46</td>
<td>$430M</td>
<td>$21.5M</td>
<td>46 (+0)</td>
<td>$760M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Budget Needs Average II</td>
<td>$954M</td>
<td>$47.7M</td>
<td>68 (+22)</td>
<td>$268M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Deferred maintenance costs increase between the 10 and 20 year scenarios as due to continued cost increases over time of the backlogged rehabilitation in combination with the increasing amount of routine maintenance needs to keep the “Good” roads in “Good” condition.

Two other key scenarios were run relating to the value, scope and breadth of a potential sales tax measure.

8. One-Quarter (¼) Cent Sales Tax – Current Funding plus Sales Tax Revenue I

Based on sales tax data from FY 12/13, it is estimated that the County would receive approximately $8 million from a regional ¼ cent sales tax if the countywide funding split were on a 50% population and 50% road miles formula. In combination with the “Maintain 2013 Funding”
scenario of $12 million, this scenario will mirror the system wide benefits provided in the “Status Quo” scenario and allow the County to maintain a PCI of 46. This will allow for improvements to some of the non-federally eligible network of minor collectors and local roads, resulting in individual road repairs rather than system wide improvements.

9. One-Half (½) Cent Sales Tax – Current Funding plus Sales Tax Revenue II

A half-cent regional sales tax would generate approximately $16 million per year (FY 12/13 data) assuming a formula consisting of 50% population and 50% road miles. This additional $8 million added to the “¼ Cent Sales Tax” scenario for a total annual investment of $28 million, would result in the County beginning to see more comprehensive system improvements. The various scenarios have demonstrated that an investment of $24 million annually will result in a system wide increase in PCI of 5 points. It can be inferred from the data ranges of other scenarios that an investment of $28 million per year could result in an approximate 10 point increase in the system wide PCI.

Long Term Road Plan

To develop its Long-Term Road Plan and recommendations, the Ad Hoc evaluated the 2013 Pavement Management Program analysis to gain a common understanding of the current road network, assess the existing backlog of needed repairs and investment, set a Long-Term goal for the network in total and then develop an approach to help guide investment within that network as well as track progress in PCI improvement. In addition, the Ad-Hoc explored financial needs and options for achieving the recommended Long-Term goal.

The Ad-Hoc conducted extensive community outreach in developing the Long-Term Road Plan. Supervisors McGuire and Rabbitt have each individually hosted town hall meetings in partnership with local stakeholder and community groups, presented information to and solicited feedback from local service groups and associations, and held numerous meetings with residents and local stakeholder groups. In addition, County staff has conducted community sentiment surveys, which indicate roads and transportation infrastructure continue to be a high priority for the community, have met with local jurisdictions, and collected additional input through the Ad-Hoc’s work.

The Ad Hoc’s recommended plan continues the County’s focus on creating a well maintained road network that supports economic development, agriculture, recreation and tourism. The Ad-Hoc’s plan also seeks to maximize and leverage federal dollars and continues to seek new revenue sources as well as legislative changes to create more favorable allocation.

Because the total County road network is so extensive, the Ad-Hoc established multiple “tiers” within the network to help identify and understand use, guide investments, and better track progress in PCI improvement over time. The “tiers” are: Tier 1: The Federally Eligible Network; Tier 2: Significant Rural Road Network; Tier 3: Local Communities; and Tier 4: Remaining Local Roads. Maps showing the roads in each of the top 3 Tiers are included as attachments.
Tier 1: The Federally Eligible Network – This Tier consists of all of the Roads in the County that are classified as either Arterials or Major Collectors (Federally Eligible Roads map attached). There are 350 miles (25% of total network) of Tier 1 roads throughout the County. These roads are on the average in good or very good condition. Most importantly these roads are eligible for federal road funding, in other words these are the roads where the County can maximize its ability to leverage local dollars.

Tier 2: Significant Rural Road Network – This Tier consists of all of the roads classified as Minor Collector roads and a strategic selection of Local roads that are significant to the economic vitality of Sonoma County because they tie rural communities together or provide access to agricultural, tourism, and recreation opportunities, shown in the attached map titled “Significant Rural Roads.” There are approximately 220 miles of roads (16% of total network) in this Tier and they are in generally poor condition with an average PCI of 44.

Tier 3: Local Communities – This Tier consists of roads classified as Local. They are in areas around population centers, townships and neighborhoods as shown on the map titled “County Long Term Pavement Management Program Strategy.” Examples include such areas as: Graton, Penngrove, The Springs, Geyersville, Larkfield, Southwest Santa Rosa, etc. This Tier consists of approximately 250 miles (18% of total network) of the remaining local roads, and are in generally poor condition.

Tier 4: Remaining Local Roads – This Tier as the name implies consist of the remainder of the Local classification of roads. These roads would generally be in more rural areas, may often be dead end roads and generally serve relatively few residents. This Tier consists of approximately 560 (41% of the total network) of the local roads in the County network.

Based on modeling through StreetSaver®, achieving a “Very Good” PCI rating for all roads is financially unrealistic; however, by using these tiers, the Long-Term Road Plan makes significant progress in improving the County’s road network. Specifically, the plan recommends bringing up and maintaining the Tier 1 Federally Eligible and Tier 2 Significant Rural Roads in “Good” PCI condition, (PCI of 60 or better). The Report recommends improving approximately one half of the Tier 3 roads to a “Good” or better condition within 10 years and then to continue work within this Tier on an ongoing basis, gradually improving the remaining 50% of Tier 3 roads over time. Tier 4 roads would be addressed as funding is available or when emergency repairs are needed.

Based on the Long-Term Roads Plan, the County would improve approximately 700 miles of the County road network during the next ten years. In total, over 50% of the road network would achieve “Good” PCI ratings or better, compared to the 26% that are “Good” today. Moreover, this would establish a “Good” PCI rating for the roads most frequented and important to economic development, agriculture, recreation, and tourism.

Both County staff and Harris believe that to implement this plan, the County will need to invest an average of approximately $20 million annually over the 10 year period. To achieve this level of funding, the Long-Term Road Plan includes the continuation of existing support through the County General Fund and other local sources; however, even with this level of ongoing
investment, the County will need to seek additional revenue to achieve the estimated $20 million needed. Based on that the Ad-Hoc believes the County should move forward with a local revenue measure to help finance the Long-Term Road Plan.

**Conclusion**

The County road network is a vital asset to the community. It provides access to homes and business, connectivity between communities, opportunities and connections for recreating and a critical component of public safety. Maintaining these assets in good condition should be a high priority for every public agency including Sonoma County. With the current state of the County road network being listed in “Poor” condition with an average pavement condition index of 46, it is important for the County to develop a long-term strategy to both improve the overall condition of the network and have a program of ongoing maintenance to ensure that the investments being made to get the roads into “Good” condition are kept in “Good” condition.

The study conducted by Harris provided valuable information and data for the Ad Hoc and staff to develop a Long-Term Road Plan that both focuses on the community connections, roads providing access to economic and recreational destinations in addition to key local roads in the neighborhoods and townships. While the proposed Plan does not accomplish addressing all roads, it makes significant strides at improving roads throughout all sectors of the County.
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Amend Item 4.5.2 as follows:

4.5.2 Local Roads – County of Sonoma Long Term Road Plan June 2014 (ACTION)*

4.5.2 Local Roads – proposal to place a ¼ cent sales tax measure for local roads on the November 2014 ballot (ACTION)*

- Draft ballot question and expenditure plan language
- Role of SCTA
- County of Sonoma Long Term Road Plan June 2014
- Actions requested of cities

*Materials attached. See this web site for the full agenda packet: http://sctainfo.org/agenda.htm

There will be a special SCTA/RCPA workshop on August 25, 2014

The next SCTA/RCPA meetings will be held September 8, 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/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, www.srcity.org/citybus, www.sctransit.com or www.wegorideshare.com/sonoma/
Staff Report

To: SCTA Board of Directors
From: Suzanne Smith, Executive Director
Item: 4.5.2 Amended – Local Roads – proposal to place a ¼ cent sales tax measure for local roads on the November 2014 ballot
Date: July 14, 2014

Issue:
What is the status of efforts led by the County of Sonoma to place a ¼ cent sales tax measure for local roads on the ballot in November 2014? What role, if any, should SCTA play in this effort?

Background:
The County of Sonoma has released a long term roads plan to address the condition of unincorporated roads. The report identifies roadway types, conditions and funding needs to improve pavement condition. As part of this effort there has been a discussion of a possible ¼ cent sales tax measure being placed on the ballot in November 2014.

In the past few weeks a draft ballot question and expenditure plan have been crafted and input from each jurisdiction is being sought by July 18. County staff have developed a draft version of this proposal, known as the Sonoma County Road Safety and Improvement Act; it is attached but does not include detail for the jurisdictions yet. Cities are being asked to develop a paragraph to describe how they would use the funds generated through this measure on the roadway system.

The deadline for a measure to be placed on the ballot is August 8, 2014 so the County Board of Supervisors are likely to agendize the measure either July 29 or August 5; or possibly both if needed.

Policy Impact:
SCTA staff has had discussion with County staff and offered to use the Measure M structure and SCTA staff and Citizens Advisory Committee to help administer the sales tax should the effort be successful in November. This offer was made without SCTA Board direction and staff is seeking guidance as to whether this is a role the SCTA Board would welcome or defer.

As currently drafted, the SCTA is called out in the proposed expenditure plan as the administering agency responsible for budgets, allocations, audits, annual reports, citizen oversight, maintenance of effort review, etc. Should the SCTA choose not to serve in this capacity it would likely fall to the County of Sonoma to fully administer the program.

The Measure M sales tax that the SCTA administers is at the mid-point of its 20-year life. The SCTA Board has had discussions in the past about when to consider renewing or extending Measure M and what those funds might be used for but no specific timeframe or expenditure plan has been crafted or deliberated.

Fiscal Impact:
The fiscal impact of the SCTA accepting the role of sales tax measure administrator would be tied primarily to staff time required to manage the tasks described above, accounting and audit functions and public reporting efforts. This work would be offset by up to a 1% set aside to the SCTA for the administration and citizen oversight portion of the measure; approximately $200,000 annually.

Measure M functions would likely be mimicked for much of this effort should the SCTA take it on. There would be a fairly high level of activity and higher costs for the first year of implementation (cooperative agreements, initial strategic plan, Board of Equalization engagement, etc.) and then it would settle in to a more routine work effort that would be in alignment with the estimated $200,000 available from the new tax measure for these purposes.

The cost of the election will be borne by the County of Sonoma, not the SCTA.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Authorize the SCTA to be named as the entity responsible for implementing the sales tax measure and provide direction to staff to assist the jurisdictions to the degree requested in completing the expenditure plan.
Ballot Question:

**Sonoma County Road Safety and Improvement Act:** Shall Measure X, the Sonoma County Road Safety and Improvement Act, be implemented with a quarter-cent sales tax for 20 years to maintain, resurface and pave local streets and roads; fill potholes; improve traffic flow and mobility; and enhance safety, with an annual audit conducted to ensure that funds are spent as mandated by the voters including the authority to issue bonds to finance the projects if needed?

**Full Text of Measure ---:**

**SONOMA COUNTY ROAD SAFETY AND IMPROVEMENT ACT**

**EXPENDITURE PLAN**

I. Executive Summary

The Sonoma County Road Safety and Improvement Act will dedicate money from a ¼ cent sales tax to each city and the unincorporated County for the sole purposes of maintaining local streets and roads, filling potholes, improving traffic flow and enhancing safety.

The funding will be distributed directly to each city and the County of Sonoma on a quarterly basis based on a population and road mile formula as described in Table 1.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Population/ Road Mile Share (1)</th>
<th>Estimated Annual Amount - Year 1</th>
<th>Estimated Amount Over 20 Years (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cloverdale</td>
<td>1.54%</td>
<td>$308,612</td>
<td>$8,286,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotati</td>
<td>1.20%</td>
<td>$239,281</td>
<td>$6,424,692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healdsburg</td>
<td>2.06%</td>
<td>$412,843</td>
<td>$11,084,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petaluma</td>
<td>9.50%</td>
<td>$1,899,943</td>
<td>$51,013,473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rohnert Park</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
<td>$1,200,833</td>
<td>$32,242,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>27.41%</td>
<td>$5,481,679</td>
<td>$147,183,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastopol</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
<td>$249,510</td>
<td>$6,699,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>1.77%</td>
<td>$353,781</td>
<td>$9,499,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>4.50%</td>
<td>$899,645</td>
<td>$24,155,479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Sonoma</td>
<td>43.77%</td>
<td>$8,753,872</td>
<td>$235,041,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin/Citizen Oversight</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$5,370,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
<td><strong>$20,000,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$537,000,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Formula is 50% population and 50% road miles

(2) 20-year estimate assumes 3% annual growth annual

II. Oversight and Administration
The implementation of the Sonoma County Road Safety and Improvement Act will be the responsibility of the Sonoma County Transportation Authority (SCTA). The SCTA is comprised of twelve elected officials; a representative from each of the nine cities in Sonoma County and three members of the Sonoma County Board of Supervisors.

The SCTA will be responsible for developing an annual budget and distributing the Sonoma County Road Safety and Improvement Act funds to each jurisdiction. The SCTA will develop the first budget by July 1, 2015.

The Citizens Advisory Committee established under the original ordinance that created the SCTA will serve as an independent oversight body that will advise the SCTA and the public on the administration of the Sonoma County Road Safety and Improvement Act via an annual audit and annual reports.

III. Goals and Objectives

The Sonoma County Road Safety and Improvement Act seeks to provide a stable and secure funding source directly to local governments in order to improve roadways through maintenance, repair, enhancement and safety measures such as re-paving, pothole filling, bicycle and pedestrian safety and roadway reconstruction.

The goal of the Sonoma County Road Safety and Improvement Act is to increase the Pavement Condition Index to very good in all of the cities and the County. This will improve driver safety, improve bicycle and pedestrian safety and mobility, reduce accidents, improve traffic flow and reduce maintenance costs to cars and trucks.

IV. How the Funds Will Be Spent

Each city and the County will receive funding annually. With a stable funding source that cannot be used for other purposes or be taken away by other governments, the jurisdictions can prepare street and road maintenance and improvement plans based on their highest priority and need. Each entity will be required to provide an annual reporting letter to the SCTA defining how the funds were spent and how they meet the requirements of the Sonoma County Road Safety and Improvement Act.

a. **The County of Sonoma** will focus its share of funding on
b. **The City of Cloverdale** will focus its share of funding on
c. **The City of Cotati** will focus its share of funding on
d. **The City of Healdsburg** will focus its share of funding on
e. **The City of Rohnert Park** will focus its share of funding on
f. **The City of Petaluma** will focus its share of funding on
g. **The City of Santa Rosa** will focus its share of funding on
h. **The City of Sebastopol** will focus its share of funding on
i. **The City of Sonoma** will focus its share of funding on
j. **The Town of Windsor** will focus its share of funding on
V. Implementation Guidelines
A. The duration of the tax will be 20 years, beginning on April 1, 2015 and expiring on March 31, 2035.

B. Environmental reporting, review and approval procedures as provided for under the National Environmental Policy Act, the California Environmental Quality Act, or other applicable laws will be adhered to as a prerequisite to the implementation of any project.

C. Use of the retail transactions and use tax under this Transportation Expenditure Plan will be subject to the following restrictions:

1. The tax proceeds must be spent for the purposes of funding the transportation programs and projects as allowed in the Sonoma County Road Safety and Improvement Act and may be not used for other purposes.

2. The additional funds provided to governmental agencies by the Road Safety and Improvement Act shall not supplant existing local revenues being used for transportation purposes. The SCTA will require that local jurisdictions maintain their existing commitment of local funds for transportation purposes or face penalties. Each local jurisdiction shall be responsible for identifying which of their accounts have local funds for transportation purposes. For these purposes, expenditures would be calculated per fiscal year. A fiscal year is defined as July 1 through June 30. The baseline amount is the average of transportation fund expenditures from FY11/12 through FY13/14 which will be converted to a percentage of general fund expenditure from that same period of time. Expenditures for each subsequent year will be compared to the baseline to determine that the same percentage of general fund expenditures is occurring. Baseline percentages and subsequent year percentages of discretionary fund expenditures on transportation shall be provided to SCTA by each jurisdiction no later than February 15, starting in February 2016. This is to allow agency audits to be completed prior to submittal. After submittal the SCTA will report to the public how each jurisdiction has met the maintenance of effort requirement.

3. The SCTA is charged with a fiduciary duty in administering the tax proceeds in accordance with the applicable laws and this Sonoma County Road Safety and Improvement Act. Receipt of tax proceeds may be subject to appropriate terms and conditions as determined by the SCTA in its reasonable discretion, including, but not limited to, the right to require recipients to execute funding agreements and the right to audit recipients’ use of the tax proceeds.

D. Actual tax proceeds may be higher or lower than estimated in this Sonoma County Road Safety and Improvement Act over the 20-year term. The Sonoma County Road Safety and Improvement Act expenditure plan is based on the percentage distributions to each jurisdiction and the dollar values included are estimates only. Actual tax proceeds will be programmed
annually in accordance with the percentage distributions in the Sonoma County Road Safety and Improvement Expenditure Plan.

E. The Sonoma County Transportation Authority will prepare a Strategic Plan prior to July 1, 2015, which will identify funding criteria consistent with the goals and objectives of the Sonoma County Road Safety and Improvement Act expenditure plan. The Strategic Plan will include general procedures for project sponsors to initiate a project and identify an implementation schedule and the programming of funds for each listed project. The Strategic Plan will be updated at least every five years during the term of the Sonoma County Road Safety and Improvement Act.

F. The County of Sonoma is authorized to bond for the purposes of advancing the commencement of or expediting the delivery of transportation programs or projects. The County of Sonoma may issue limited tax bonds, from time to time, to finance any program or project in the Sonoma County Road Safety and Improvement Act as allowed by applicable law and as approved by the SCTA, and the maximum bonded indebtedness shall not exceed the total amount of proceeds of this retail transactions and use tax, estimated to be $537 million in 2014 dollars. All costs associated with the issuance of bonds, including debt service payments, issuance costs, interest, reserve requirements, and insurance shall be accounted for within that program category in which the bond proceeds were used. Such bonds will be payable solely from the proceeds of the retail transactions and use tax and may be issued any time before expiration of the tax.