BOARD OF DIRECTORS
AGENDA PACKET
Monday, March 10, 2014
2:30 p.m.

Sonoma County
Permit & Resource Management Department
2550 Ventura Avenue
Santa Rosa, California
1. Call to order the meeting of the Sonoma County Transportation Authority (SCTA) and the Sonoma County Regional Climate Protection Authority (RCPA)

2. Public comment on items not on the regular agenda

3. Consent Calendar
   A. SCTA Consent
      3.2. Measure M – Airport Boulevard unused appropriation of Local Streets Projects (LSP), Amendment #4 to Cooperative Agreement M30210-05 with the County of Sonoma and appropriation of landscaping funds (ACTION)*
      3.3. Hwy 101 – Amendment 1 to Cooperative Agreement 04-2309 with Caltrans for right of way services on the Marin Sonoma Narrows C2 Project. (ACTION)*
      3.4. Hwy 101 – Amendment 1 to Cooperative Agreement 04-2459 with Caltrans to reimburse SCTA expenditures on the Marin Sonoma Narrows C3 Project. (ACTION)*

   B. SCTA/RCPA Concurrent Items
      3.5. Minutes of the February 10, 2014 meeting (ACTION)*

4. Regular Calendar
   A. SCTA
      4.1. SCTA Planning
         4.1.1. 2009 Comprehensive Transportation Plan update process / approach (ACTION)*
         4.1.2. Transit – North Bay 101 Corridor Clipper program update (REPORT)*
      4.2. SCTA Projects and Programming
         4.2.1. Funding – analysis of State gas tax revenues (REPORT)


         4.2.2. Highways – Update on State Highway projects (REPORT)

   B. RCPA
      4.3. RCPA Planning
         4.3.1. Prop 84 planning grant – proposed submittal related to transportation sector and GHG reduction (ACTION)*

      4.4. RCPA Projects and Programs
         4.4.1. RCPA activities report (REPORT)*

5. Reports and Announcements
5.1. Executive Committee report
5.2. Regional agency reports*
   SMART   NCRA   MTC   Self Help Counties Coalition
   ABAG   BAAQMD   CALCOG   GGBHTD   Sonoma Clean Power
5.3. Advisory Committee agendas*
5.4. SCTA/RCPA staff report
5.5. Announcements – Form 700

6. Adjourn

*Materials attached.

The next SCTA/RCPA meetings will be held April 14, 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: Sonoma County Transportation Authority
From: James R. Cameron, Deputy Director of Projects and Programming
Item: 3.1 – Measure M - 2014 Bond Disclosure Reports - Series 2008 and 2011
Date: March 10, 2014

Issue:
What is the status of the Continuing Disclosure Annual Report for the Measure M Sales Tax Revenue Bonds Series 2008 and Bonds Series 2011?

Background:
The attached Continuing Disclosure Annual Reports are provided by the Office of the County Auditor-Controller-Treasurer-Tax Collector. The report contains reference to the audited financial report of the SCTA, a debt service schedule, and Measure M sales tax revenues for fiscal years ended June 30, 2006 through June 30, 2013.

These reports ensure SCTA is in compliance with financial reporting requirements.

Policy Impacts:
None

Fiscal Impacts:
The sales tax revenues for FY12/13 were up 9.3% per State Board of Equalization Revenue over FY 11/12. Allocations to Measure M Hwy 101, LSP, Bike/Ped, LSR, LBT, SMART, and Administration programs reflect current sales tax revenue trends. Although sales tax revenue is currently at approximately 90% of the 2004 forecasts, the Hwy 101 program has been the beneficiary of substantial construction bid savings which has allowed for project programming to be maintained at originally anticipated levels. SCTA staff prepared the FY13/14 Measure M budgets with anticipated sales tax revenue increasing 3% over actual FY 12/13 FAMIS revenues.

Staff Recommendation:
None, this is an informational item only.
COUNTY OF SONOMA

$46,075,000
Sonoma County Transportation Authority
Sales Tax Revenue Bonds (Limited Tax Bonds), Series 2008

CONTINUING DISCLOSURE
ANNUAL REPORT
CONTENTS OF REPORT

(1) The comprehensive audited financial report of the Sonoma County Transportation Authority for the period July 01, 2012 through June 30, 2013 is posted as a separate document on the DAC Website.

(2) Table "Debt Service Schedule" contained in the Official Statement, dated November 2, 2007. (See page 3.)

(3) Measure C & Measure M Actual Sales Tax (See page 4)
DEBT SERVICE SCHEDULE

The following table sets forth the annual debt service requirements for the Series 2008 Bonds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year Ending</th>
<th>Principal Amount</th>
<th>Interest Payment (1)</th>
<th>Annual Debt Service (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 711,257.22</td>
<td>$ 711,257.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 2,207,350.00</td>
<td>$ 2,207,350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 2,207,350.00</td>
<td>$ 2,207,350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 2,207,350.00</td>
<td>$ 2,207,350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 2,207,350.00</td>
<td>$ 2,207,350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 2,207,350.00</td>
<td>$ 2,207,350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$ 2,880,000.00</td>
<td>$ 2,135,350.00</td>
<td>$ 5,015,350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$ 3,025,000.00</td>
<td>$ 1,987,725.00</td>
<td>$ 5,012,725.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$ 3,185,000.00</td>
<td>$ 1,832,475.00</td>
<td>$ 5,017,475.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$ 3,345,000.00</td>
<td>$ 1,669,225.00</td>
<td>$ 5,014,225.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$ 3,515,000.00</td>
<td>$ 1,497,725.00</td>
<td>$ 5,012,725.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$ 3,700,000.00</td>
<td>$ 1,317,350.00</td>
<td>$ 5,017,350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$ 3,890,000.00</td>
<td>$ 1,127,600.00</td>
<td>$ 5,017,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$ 4,085,000.00</td>
<td>$ 928,225.00</td>
<td>$ 5,013,225.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$ 4,295,000.00</td>
<td>$ 718,725.00</td>
<td>$ 5,013,725.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>$ 4,515,000.00</td>
<td>$ 498,475.00</td>
<td>$ 5,013,475.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>$ 4,725,000.00</td>
<td>$ 291,100.00</td>
<td>$ 5,016,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>$ 4,915,000.00</td>
<td>$ 98,300.00</td>
<td>$ 5,013,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$ 46,075,000.00</td>
<td>$25,850,282.22</td>
<td>$ 71,925,282.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Totals may not add due to rounding.

- There have not been any unscheduled redemptions, retirements or defeasances.

- On January 26, 2011, the Authority closed the Series 2011 Sales Tax Revenue Bonds which were issued on parity with the 2008 Bonds. The par amount of the Series 2011 Bonds is $25,200,000

- Disclosure documents for the Series 2008 Bonds are also available on the DAC Website.
## Sonoma County Open Space Authority Measure C Sales Tax Revenues

**Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 1997 through June 30, 2005**

## Sonoma County Transit Authority Measure M Sales Tax Revenues

**Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 2006 through June 30, 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Measure C Sales Tax Revenues</th>
<th>Measure M Sales Tax Revenues</th>
<th>% Increase/Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996-97</td>
<td>$11,316,594</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>$12,304,491</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>$13,659,318</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>$14,901,427</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>$17,838,335</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>$16,707,842</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>$16,399,538</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>$16,589,626</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>$17,482,449</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>$18,915,434</td>
<td>(4)(5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>$19,858,661</td>
<td>4.99%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>$18,864,061</td>
<td>-5.01%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>$16,923,047</td>
<td>-10.29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>$15,268,289</td>
<td>-9.78%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>$16,535,252</td>
<td>8.30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>$17,444,645</td>
<td>5.50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>$20,079,659</td>
<td>15.11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

(1) Receipts for existing one-fourth of one percent transactions and use tax within the County to fund the acquisition of open space and parkland, net of State Board of Equalization fee.

(2) Excludes $409,164 which was misallocated to the Open Space Authority as sales tax revenues. This amount was corrected in Fiscal Year 1998-99.

(3) Excludes $528,270 which was misallocated during Fiscal year 1999-00. The misallocation was corrected in Fiscal year 2000-01.

(4) Figures for Measure M Sales Tax Revenue were not available prior to July 1, 2005.

(5) Receipts are for April 1, 2005 thru June 30, 2006.

(6) Restated in June 30, 2011 Audit.

Source: Office of the County Auditor-Controller-Treasurer-Tax Collector
COUNTY OF SONOMA

$25,200,000
Sonoma County Transportation Authority
Sales Tax Revenue Bonds (Limited Tax Bonds), Series 2011

CONTINUING
DISCLOSURE

ANNUAL REPORT
CONTENTS OF REPORT

(1) The comprehensive audited financial report of the Sonoma County Transportation Authority for the period July 01, 2012 through June 30, 2013 is posted as a separate document on the DAC Website.

(2) Table "Debt Service Schedule" contained in the Official Statement, dated November 2, 2007. (See page 3.)

(3) Measure C & Measure M Actual Sales Tax (See page 4)
DEBT SERVICE SCHEDULE

The following table sets forth the annual debt service requirements for the Series 2008 Bonds and the Series 2011 Bonds:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year Ending</th>
<th>Series 2008 Bonds</th>
<th>Series 2011 Bonds</th>
<th>Combined Annual Debt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principal Payment</td>
<td>Interest Amount</td>
<td>Principal Payment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 2,207,350.00</td>
<td>$ 387,478.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 2,207,350.00</td>
<td>$ 350,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 2,207,350.00</td>
<td>$ 360,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$ 2,880,000.00</td>
<td>$ 2,135,350.00</td>
<td>$ 365,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$ 3,025,000.00</td>
<td>$ 1,987,725.00</td>
<td>$ 380,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$ 3,185,000.00</td>
<td>$ 1,832,475.00</td>
<td>$ 1,915,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$ 3,345,000.00</td>
<td>$ 1,669,225.00</td>
<td>$ 2,015,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$ 3,515,000.00</td>
<td>$ 1,497,725.00</td>
<td>$ 2,110,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$ 3,700,000.00</td>
<td>$ 1,317,355.00</td>
<td>$ 2,190,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$ 3,890,000.00</td>
<td>$ 1,127,600.00</td>
<td>$ 2,290,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$ 4,085,000.00</td>
<td>$ 928,225.00</td>
<td>$ 2,410,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$ 4,295,000.00</td>
<td>$ 718,725.00</td>
<td>$ 2,530,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>$ 4,515,000.00</td>
<td>$ 498,475.00</td>
<td>$ 2,650,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>$ 4,725,000.00</td>
<td>$ 291,100.00</td>
<td>$ 2,760,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>$ 4,915,000.00</td>
<td>$ 98,300.00</td>
<td>$ 2,875,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$ 46,075,000.00</td>
<td>$ 20,724,325.00</td>
<td>$ 25,200,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Totals may not add due to rounding.

- There have not been any unscheduled redemptions, retirements or defeasances.
- On January 26, 2011, the Authority closed the Series 2011 Sales Tax Revenue Bonds which were issued on parity with the 2008 Bonds.
- Disclosure documents for the Series 2008 Bonds are also available on the DAC website.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Measure C Sales Tax Revenues</th>
<th>Measure M Sales Tax Revenues</th>
<th>% Increase/Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996-97</td>
<td>$11,316,594</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>$12,304,491</td>
<td>(2) n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>$13,659,318</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>$14,901,427</td>
<td>(3) n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>$17,838,335</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>$16,707,842</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>$16,399,538</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>$16,589,626</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>$17,482,449</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>$18,915,434</td>
<td>(4)(5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>$19,858,661</td>
<td>4.99%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>$18,864,061</td>
<td>-5.01%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>$16,923,047</td>
<td>-10.29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>$15,268,289</td>
<td>(6) -9.78%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>$16,535,252</td>
<td>8.30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>$17,444,645</td>
<td>5.50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>$20,079,569</td>
<td>15.10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Receipts for existing one-fourth of one percent transactions and use tax within the County to fund the acquisition of open space and parkland, net of State Board of Equalization fee.

(2) Excludes $409,164 which was misallocated to the Open Space Authority as sales tax revenues. This amount was corrected in Fiscal Year 1998-99.

(3) Excludes $528,270 which was misallocated during Fiscal year 1999-00. The misallocation was corrected in Fiscal year 2000-01.

(4) Figures for Measure M Sales Tax Revenue were not available prior to July 1, 2005.

(5) Receipts are for April 1, 2005 thru June 30, 2006.

(6) Restated in June 30, 2011 Audit.

Source: Office of the County Auditor-Controller-Treasurer-Tax Collector
Staff Report

To: Sonoma County Transportation Authority
From: James R. Cameron, Deputy Director

Item: 3.2 – Measure M – Airport Boulevard unused appropriation of Local Streets Projects (LSP), Amendment #4 to Cooperative Agreement M30210-05 with the County of Sonoma and appropriation of landscaping funds

Date: March 10, 2014

Issue:
Shall the SCTA (1) make available unused Local Streets Projects (LSP) appropriation on Airport Boulevard, (2) revise cooperative funding agreement M30210-05-A3 to amend the funding summaries and (3) appropriate Phase 4A landscaping funding?

Background:
1. Prior programming of Airport Boulevard LSP funds showed 100% of the LSP funds programmed. Further review revealed that $47,000 in prior appropriation was not expended. Therefore the Sonoma County Transportation and Public Works Department has requested that the $47,000 in unused prior appropriation to be carried forward to FY15/16 programming for the Construction Capital funding of Phase 1. See attached table: 2014 Measure M Strategic Plan Development Local Streets Projects (LSP) Program.

2. Cooperative agreement M30210-05 with the Sonoma County Transportation and Public Works Department requires an amendment before appropriation. See attached map for location of various phases. The previously approved 2014 Strategic Plan programming includes $2,047,000 for Phase 1 from Aviation to Ordinance; $1,500,000 for Phase 2 Brickway Extension; and $1,264,000 for Phase 4A Landscaping. The attached amendment #4 to M30210-05 includes an updated Financial Plan and Schedule in Exhibit B-1 to reflect the previously approved programming from the 2014 Strategic Plan programming for Airport Boulevard.

3. Phase 4A Landscaping for the Airport Boulevard and Highway 101 interchange is required for visual mitigation, following the interchange improvements. The total landscaping project is estimated to be $1,264,000, of which staff is recommending $569,000 be appropriated for Plans, Specifications and Estimate (PS&E).

Policy Impacts:
None, these actions are within the established policies outlined in the 2011 Measure M Strategic Plan and adopted 2014 Strategic Plan 5-Year programming plan.

Fiscal Impacts:
The proposed revisions to cooperative agreements with the County M30210-05-A4 would increase Measure M LSP funding for the Airport Boulevard project by $4,764,000 to $6,041,000. When combined with the existing $8,959,000 for the interchange project, all $15,000,000 of Measure M Airport Boulevard Local Street Project funds are programmed and covered under a cooperative agreement.
Staff Recommendation:

1. Staff recommends that the Board approve the Revised 2014 Strategic Plan programming of the Airport Boulevard LSP project making available $47,000 in unused allocation while maintaining the current total programming of $15M though FY16/17.

2. Staff recommends that the Board authorize staff to negotiate and the Chair to execute proposed Cooperative Agreement M30210-05-A4 (draft attached) for the Airport Boulevard LSP project at amounts not to exceed $6.041M in Measure M LSP funds, subject to the review and approval of legal counsel.

3. Staff recommends that the Board adopt SCTA Resolution No 2014-002 approving the Sonoma County appropriation of $569,000 for the Airport Boulevard Interchange Landscaping – Phase 4A Project; subject to the execution of Cooperative Agreement M30210-05-A4 and receipt of the appropriation request letter from Sonoma County.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Street Projects</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>13/14</th>
<th>14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>2004$</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Penngrove</td>
<td>Co DPW</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Blvd</td>
<td>Co DPW</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,264</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,047</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold Dr-South of Glen Ellen</td>
<td>Co DPW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,950</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold @ Agua Caliente Signal</td>
<td>Co DPW</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold 121 &amp; 116</td>
<td>Co DPW</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>1,950</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Club to Loma Vista</td>
<td>Co DPW</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Under Construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold @ Madrone</td>
<td>Co DPW</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Under Construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestville Bypass</td>
<td>Co DPW</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roundabout @ Mirabel</td>
<td>Co DPW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bypass</td>
<td>Co DPW</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Redwood Hwy I/C</td>
<td>Petaluma</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>Under Construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearn Avenue</td>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>5,550</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa Ave</td>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutton to Corby</td>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 Overcrossing / Interchange</td>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>3,750</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,750</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers Lane Ext</td>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark West Springs</td>
<td>Co DPW</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ursuline to Quietwater</td>
<td>Co DPW</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Way</td>
<td>Co DPW</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Road</td>
<td>Co DPW</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulton Rd</td>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>8,700</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Rd to Guenville Rd</td>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>8,700</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWY 12 Interchange</td>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodega Hwy</td>
<td>Co DPW</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Program Expenditures</td>
<td>SCTA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$23,163 $4,864 $2,500 $3,047 $3,500 $7,800 $44,874 $94,000 Per Expenditure Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AMENDMENT NO. 4 TO
COOPERATIVE FUNDING AGREEMENT NO. M30210-05
(Airport Blvd Improvements)
BETWEEN
THE SONOMA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
AND
COUNTY OF SONOMA

This Amendment 4 to Cooperative Funding Agreement M30210-05 is made and entered into as of January 14, 2014 (“Effective Date”) by and between the COUNTY OF SONOMA hereinafter referred to as “COUNTY” and the SONOMA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY hereinafter referred to as “AUTHORITY.”

RECITALS

1. Consistent with Measure M and the Strategic Plan, AUTHORITY and COUNTY previously entered into that certain Cooperative Funding Agreement No. M30210-05 to identify transportation improvement projects in the Airport Boulevard area of Sonoma County (the “Airport Boulevard Improvements”), agreeing to work cooperatively to fund those projects, which included $15,000,000 in Measure M - Local Street Project (“LSP”) program funding.

2. Consistent with Measure M and the Strategic Plan, AUTHORITY and COUNTY entered into SCTA Contract Number SCTA10015 to define the roles, responsibilities, and funding plan for Phase IV of the Airport Boulevard Improvements.

3. SCTA10015 has been amended two times and provides $8,959,000 of the $15,000,000 of Measure M-LSP funds for Phase 4 of the Airport Boulevard Improvement project indentified in the Measure M Expenditure Plan.

4. Cooperative Funding Agreement No. M30210-05 has been modified three times and provides $6,041,000 of the Measure M-LSP funds for the remaining phases of the Airport Boulevard Improvement project identified in the Expenditure Plan.

5. COUNTY and AUTHORITY desire to amend the financial plan reflecting the 2014 programming to the various phases of the project covered by Cooperative Funding Agreement No. M30210-05 and schedule for completion of the Project which is attached hereto as Amendment 4 to Exhibit B-1.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the foregoing, AUTHORITY and COUNTY do hereby agree as follows:
AGREEMENT

I. AMENDMENTS.

Paragraph 1 of Section I shall be amended to read as follows:

1. COUNTY Contribution. Consistent with the Strategic Plan, County shall make available a minimum of $4,777,000 in matching funds towards the Project.

Add to Paragraph 1 of Section II:

AUTHORITY will make available $1,264,000 (2004 dollars) in Measure M funds towards Phase IV A as of January 14, 2014.

Exhibits. The following Exhibits in the Original Agreement are replaced by the Exhibits attached hereto:

Exhibit B-1 is replaced with Amendment 4 to M30210-05 - Exhibit B-1

II. Remainder of Agreement Unchanged.

Except to the extent the Agreement is specifically amended or supplemented hereby, the Agreement and all previous Amendments, together with exhibits and schedules is, and shall continue to be, in full force and effect as originally executed, and nothing contained herein shall be construed to modify, invalidate or otherwise affect any provision of the Agreement or any right of AUTHORITY or COUNTY arising there under.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have executed this Agreement as of the Effective Date.

COUNTY OF_______________________

By: ___________________________
Chair, Board of Supervisors

ATTEST:

By: ___________________________
COUNTY COUNSEL

SONOMA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

By: ___________________________
SCTA Chair

APPROVED AS TO SUBSTANCE:

By: ___________________________
Executive Director

APPROVED AS TO FORM
FOR COUNTY:

By: ___________________________
Authority Legal Counsel

APPROVED AS TO FORM
FOR AUTHORITY:
The following table is a description of the five Phases of Airport Boulevard Improvements, their estimated costs and anticipated sources of funding. Please note that the expected costs exceed currently identified funds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Phase</th>
<th>Project Name: Airport Blvd. Improvements Phases 1</th>
<th>Measure M Amount</th>
<th>Other Funding</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
<th>Planned Request Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scoping</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>54,000</td>
<td>PRIOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>580,000</td>
<td>PRIOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>2,047,000</td>
<td>2,047,000</td>
<td>4,094,000</td>
<td>15/16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Phase I</td>
<td>2,131,000</td>
<td>2,597,000</td>
<td>4,728,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Phase</th>
<th>Project Name: Airport Blvd. Improvements Phases 1A</th>
<th>Measure M Amount</th>
<th>Other Funding</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
<th>Planned Request Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scoping</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>PRIOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>PRIOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>496,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>996,000</td>
<td>PRIOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Phase I A</td>
<td>496,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>996,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Project Name: Airport Blvd. Improvements Phase 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Phase</th>
<th>Measure M Amount</th>
<th>Other Funding</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
<th>Planned Request Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scoping</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,125,000</td>
<td>1,125,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,260,000</td>
<td>1,260,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>11,360,000</td>
<td>12,860,000</td>
<td>16/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Phase II</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>14,045,000</td>
<td>15,545,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Project Name: Airport Blvd. Improvements Phase 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Phase</th>
<th>Measure M Amount</th>
<th>Other Funding</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
<th>Planned Request Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scoping</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>263,905</td>
<td>263,905</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46,652</td>
<td>46,652</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>303,000</td>
<td>303,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>650,000</td>
<td>831,000</td>
<td>1,481,000</td>
<td>Prior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Phase III</td>
<td>650,000</td>
<td>1,464,557</td>
<td>2,114,557</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Project Name: Airport Blvd. Improvements Phase 4 *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Phase</th>
<th>Measure M Amount</th>
<th>Other Funding</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
<th>Planned Request Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scoping</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Phase IV</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Phase</td>
<td>Measure M Amount</td>
<td>Other Funding</td>
<td>Total Funding</td>
<td>Planned Request Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoping</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>569,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>625,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Phase IV A</td>
<td>1,264,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Phase</th>
<th>Measure M Amount</th>
<th>Other Funding</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
<th>Planned Request Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scoping</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Phase V</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Agreement No.SCTA10015-A2 between SCTA and Sonoma County TPW includes funding of all Work Phases (Scoping through Construction) for the Airport Blvd Phase 4 (North B) interchange project including $8,959,000 in Measure M LSP funds.

** COUNTY required match funds for Phase 4A is accounted for through COUNTY funds committed to the Phase 4 project in Agreement No.SCTA10015a3

*** The Funding Plan above shows $6,041,000 in Measure M - LSP funds programmed in the 2014 Measure M Strategic Plan, as amendment by the SCTA Board of Directors. All funds are now programmed because there is a total of $6,041,000 (2004$) in Measure M - LSP funds committed to this project.
Resolution No. 2014-002
Sonoma County Transportation Authority
Santa Rosa, California
Board Meeting Date: March 10, 2014
Coop Agreement No.: M30210-05-A4
Project Sponsor: County of Sonoma
Amount: $569,000

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE
SONOMA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY, COUNTY
OF SONOMA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, APPROPRIATING
MEASURE M FUNDS OF $569,000 TO THE COUNTY OF
SONOMA FOR AIRPORT BLVD PHASE 4A PS&E, IN
ACCORDANCE WITH COOPERATIVE FUNDING AGREEMENT
NO. M30210-05-A4

WHEREAS, the 2004 Sonoma County Traffic Relief Act Expenditure Plan (hereinafter "Expenditure Plan") includes $15 million in 2004 dollars, for the Airport Boulevard Improvements and Airport Boulevard Interchange Local Street Projects funding category; and

WHEREAS, the Sonoma County Transportation Authority (hereinafter "Authority") and the County of Sonoma (hereinafter "County") will enter into Cooperative Funding Agreement No. M30210-05-A4 (hereinafter "Cooperative Agreement") regarding the Airport Blvd Phase 4a Improvements (hereinafter "Project"); and

WHEREAS, County of Sonoma will submit a Request for Appropriation of Funds in connection with the Project pursuant to the above referenced Cooperative Agreement; and

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

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Authority appropriates $569,000 to the County of Sonoma pursuant to the Cooperative Agreement to be used for the purposes set forth in Attachment A attached hereto; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that funds will be disbursed to the County of Sonoma in accordance with the provisions of Cooperative Agreement but shall not exceed, on an annual basis, the amounts programmed by fiscal year, as shown in the Program of Projects in the 2014 Strategic Plan, as such plan may be amended from time to time; and

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

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this appropriation shall expire three years from July 1, 2014.
Resolution No. 2014-002  
Sonoma County Transportation Authority  
Santa Rosa, California  
Board Meeting Date: March 10, 2014  
Coop Agreement No.: M30210-05-A4  
Project Sponsor: County of Sonoma  
Amount: $569,000

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

Director Allen  Director Landman  Director Carlstrom  Director Mackenzie  Director Chambers  Director McGuire  Director Gallian  Director Rabbitt  Director Gurney  Director Russell  Director Harris  Director Zane

Ayes: Noes: Absent: Abstain:

___________________________________  
SCTA Chair

SO ORDERED

This RESOLUTION was entered into at a meeting of the Sonoma County Transportation Authority held on March 10, 2014 in Santa Rosa, California.

Attest:  
Suzanne Smith, Executive Director  
Clerk, Sonoma County Transportation Authority

Attachment: “A” Use of Appropriated Funds  
“B” Chronological Listing of Fund Appropriation Resolutions
ATTACHMENT A
Use of Appropriated Funds
SONOMA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
M30210-05-A4
RESOLUTION No. 2014-002

Date: March 10, 2014
Amount of Funds: $569,000
Appropriated to: County of Sonoma
Program Category: Local Streets Project (LSP)
Specific Project: Airport Blvd - Phase 4A
Appropriated For: Plans, Specifications and Estimate
Scope of Work: Plans, Specification and Estimate ($569,000)
Other Conditions: Appropriation Effective January 14, 2014
Staff Comments: This is the fourth appropriation for this project
**ATTACHMENT B**  
Chronological Listing of Fund Appropriation Resolutions  
**COOPERATIVE FUNDING AGREEMENT NO. M30210-05-A4**  
Between the Sonoma County Transportation Authority  
and the County of Sonoma

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Resolution Number</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Funds Appropriated</th>
<th>Cumulative Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M30210-05</td>
<td>2006-013</td>
<td>June 6, 2006</td>
<td>$375,000</td>
<td>$375,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M30210-05</td>
<td>2009-010</td>
<td>April 13, 2009</td>
<td>$252,000</td>
<td>$252,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M30210-05-A2</td>
<td>2012-004</td>
<td>March 12, 2012</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M30210-05-A4</td>
<td>2014-002</td>
<td>March 10, 2014</td>
<td>-$47,000</td>
<td>-$47,000 (Credit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1&amp;1A Unused</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M30210-05-A4</td>
<td>2014-002</td>
<td>March 10, 2014</td>
<td>$569,000</td>
<td>$569,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 4A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL FUNDS APPROPRIATED**  
$1,799,000
Staff Report

To: Sonoma County Transportation Authority

From: James R. Cameron, Deputy Director of Projects & Programming

Item: 3.3 – Highway 101 – Amendment 1 to Cooperative Agreements 4-2309 with Caltrans for right of way services on the Marin Sonoma Narrows (MSN) C2 Project.

Date: March 10, 2014

**Issue:**
Shall the Board approve the proposed Caltrans Cooperative Agreement Amendment 4-2309-A1 for right-of-way acquisition needed to deliver the Highway 101 Marin Sonoma Narrows (MSN) C2 Project?

**Background:**
The MSN C2 Contract provides for widening US 101 in Petaluma, from Lakeville Highway to just north of Corona Road. The project is fully funded for design and Plans, Specifications, and Estimates (PS&E) are 95% complete. The estimated construction cost is $90M which is currently unfunded.

SCTA and Caltrans entered into an initial cooperative agreement (Coop 4-2309) for the MSN C2 Contract to provide right of way engineering and support services for $950,000. The intent was to start identifying the right of way mapping and needs for the project. It is estimated that an additional $6.55M is needed for right of way acquisition. An amendment to the cooperative agreement with Caltrans is needed in order to proceed with acquiring right of way to position the project for potential future funding opportunities. Since construction is not yet funded, right of way can only be acquired from willing sellers. SCTA has been successful in leveraging other fund sources by demonstrating a project is ready to go to construction and advancing right of way acquisition where possible will assist in executing that strategy.

**Policy Impacts:**
None.

**Fiscal Impacts:**
SCTA previously programmed $7.5M in the 2014 Measure M Strategic Plan for right of way services and acquisition – $950,000 for right-of-way engineering and support (already authorized) and $6.55M for right of way acquisition.

The proposed amendment authorizes $4.507M in Measure M funds for right-of-way capital out of the $6.55M available. Since this funding is represented in the previously approved programming for Measure M, there are no new financial impacts.
Staff Recommendation:
Staff recommends that the Board authorize the Chair to execute the attached Amendment No. 1 to Cooperative Agreement 4-2309 to fund right-of-way acquisition for $5.457M, in substantially similar form as provided for in the attachment, subject to the final review and approval by legal counsel.
RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE SONOMA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY, COUNTY OF SONOMA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AUTHORIZING THE CHAIR TO EXECUTE THE FOLLOWING AMENDMENT TO THE HIGHWAY 101 MSN PROJECT WITH THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (CALTRANS):

AMENDMENT 1 TO COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT 4-2309 FOR RIGHT OF WAY ACQUISITION FOR THE MSN-C2 (HOV) PROJECT AT A COST NOT TO EXCEED $5,457,000 IN MEASURE M - 101 PROGRAM FUNDS

WHEREAS, SCTA is authorized to provide Measure M funds for project development and construction of certain transportation projects though the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans); and;

WHEREAS, Cooperative Agreement No. 4-2309 was previously executed with Caltrans for right of way engineering and support services for the MSN-C2 Contract at a cost not to exceed $950,000 in Measure M 101 Program funds; and

WHEREAS, the estimated final cost to complete the work specified in Coop 4-2309 is $7,500,000, which has been authorized by programming included in the development of the 2014 Strategic Plan.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of the Sonoma County Transportation Authority authorizes the chair to execute Amendment 1 to Cooperative Agreement 4-2309 with the California Department of Transportation, in substantially similar form as provided for in the attachment, subject to the final review and approval by legal counsel.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Director</th>
<th>Ayes</th>
<th>Noes</th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Abstain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlstrom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chambers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gurney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackenzie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGuire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbitt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I, the undersigned, certify that the foregoing resolution was duly adopted at a regular meeting of the Board of Directors of the Sonoma County Transportation Authority held on March 10, 2014.

Suzanne Smith, Executive Director
Clerk, Sonoma County Transportation Authority
AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO AGREEMENT 04-2309

This Amendment No. 1 to Agreement (AMENDMENT), entered into and effective on _______________, 2014 is between the State of California, acting through its Department of Transportation, referred to as CALTRANS, and:

Sonoma County Transportation Authority, a public corporation referred to as SCTA.

RECITALS

1. CALTRANS and SCTA, collectively referred to as PARTNERS, entered into Agreement No. 04-2309, (AGREEMENT) on June 10, 2011, defining the terms and conditions to perform Right of Way work on the northerly segment of the Marin-Sonoma Narrows project through Petaluma from just north of the US 101 and SR 116 connection to 0.3 mile north of the Corona Road Overcrossing, referred to as PROJECT.

2. PARTNERS hereto now wish to enter into AMENDMENT to add $4,507,000 of Local SCTA Measure M Funds to Right of Way Capital Cost. The total amount of Local Funds for Right of Way OBLIGATION is now $5,457,000. The reason for the AMENDMENT is to revise the FUNDING SUMMARY to reflect these changes and also to extend the date for COMPLETION OF WORK.

IT IS THEREFORE MUTUALLY AGREED:

3. Recital 7 of AGREEMENT is hereby revised in its entirety to read as follows:

7. The estimated date for COMPLETION OF WORK is December 31, 2018.


5. Article 71a is hereby added to the AGREEMENT to read as follows:

71a. FUNDING PARTNERS will share the cost of R/W Capital as shown on the FUNDING SUMMARY A1.

6. Article 71b is hereby added to the AGREEMENT to read as follows:

71b. The following partners will submit invoices for R/W Capital:
   • CALTRANS will invoice SCTA

7. Article 71c is hereby added to the AGREEMENT to read as follows:
71c. PARTNERS will exchange funds for actual costs.

CALTRANS will invoice SCTA for an $75,000 initial deposit upon execution of this Agreement. This deposit represents one (1) months’ estimated capital costs.

Thereafter, CALTRANS will submit to SCTA monthly invoices for estimated monthly costs based on the prior month’s actual expenditures.

After PARTNERS agree that all Scope activities are complete, CALTRANS will submit a final accounting for all WORK costs. Based on the final accounting, PARTNERS will refund or invoice as necessary in order to satisfy the obligation of this Agreement.

8. FUNDING SUMMARY of AGREEMENT is hereby replaced in its entirety by FUNDING SUMMARY A1 attached to and made a part of this AMENDMENT, and any reference to FUNDING SUMMARY in AGREEMENT is deemed to be a reference to FUNDING SUMMARY A1.

9. All other terms and conditions of AGREEMENT shall remain in full force and effect.

10. This AMENDMENT is deemed to be included and made part of AGREEMENT.

CONTACT INFORMATION

The information provided below indicates the primary contact data for each PARTNER to this agreement. PARTNERS will notify each other in writing of any personnel or location changes. Contact information changes do not require an amendment to this agreement.

The primary agreement contact person for CALTRANS is:
Betyc Joseph, Regional Project Manager
111 Grand Avenue
Oakland, California 94623
Office Phone: (510) 286-5097

The primary agreement contact person for SCTA is:
James Cameron, Deputy Director, Projects & Programming
490 Mendocino Avenue, Suite 206
Santa Rosa, California 95401
Office Phone: (707) 565-5373
SIGNATURES

PARTNERS declare that:
1. Each PARTNER is an authorized legal entity under California state law.
2. Each PARTNER has the authority to enter into this agreement.
3. The people signing this agreement have the authority to do so on behalf of their public agencies.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

By: ______________________________
Helena (Lenka) Culik-Caro
Deputy District Director, Design

SONOMA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

By: ______________________________
SCTA Chair

CERTIFIED AS TO FUNDS:

By: ______________________________
Kevin M. Strough
District Budget Manager

Attest: ______________________________
SCTA Executive Director

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND PROCEDURE

By: ______________________________
County Counsel
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Funding Partner</th>
<th>Fund Type</th>
<th>RW Capital</th>
<th>RW Support</th>
<th>Subtotal Support</th>
<th>Subtotal Capital</th>
<th>Subtotal Funds Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL</td>
<td>SCTA</td>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>$4,507,000</td>
<td>$950,000</td>
<td>$950,000</td>
<td>$4,507,000</td>
<td>$5,457,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotals by Component</td>
<td>$4,507,000</td>
<td>$950,000</td>
<td>$950,000</td>
<td>$4,507,000</td>
<td>$5,457,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Staff Report

To: Sonoma County Transportation Authority
From: James R. Cameron, Deputy Director of Projects & Programming
Item: 3.4 – Highway 101 – Amendment 1 to Cooperative Agreement 04-2459 with Caltrans to reimburse SCTA for railroad expenditures on the Marin Sonoma Narrows (MSN) C3 Project
Date: March 10, 2014

Issue:
Shall the Board approve proposed Caltrans Cooperative Agreement 4-2459-A1 to reflect construction bid savings and to allow reimbursement of Sonoma Marin Area Rail Transit (SMART) cost on the Highway 101 Marin Sonoma Narrows (MSN) Contract C3?

Background:
SCTA entered into Coop 4-2459 with Caltrans to provide construction services for the Construction of the Highway 101 - Marin Sonoma Narrows (MSN) Contract C3 (Lakeville Highway Bridges). The project construction support and capital phases are fully funded with State Proposition 1B - Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA) funds.

SCTA provides design services and funded right-of-way for the MSN C3 project. SCTA also entered into a Construction and Maintenance (C&M) Agreement with SMART, which allows the new Lakeville Bridges to span SMART tracks and pays for SMART’s cost of plan review and flagging trains during construction. The C&M Agreement SCTA12021 is for a cost, not to exceed $88,000.

Caltrans normally funds the cost of railroad C&M agreements from construction capital and has determined that SCTA is eligible for reimbursement of the C&M cost from the construction capital budget. SCTA is currently being reimbursed for Design Services During Construction (DSDC) with a budget of $420,000 from the project’s construction support budget. Proposed Coop 4-2459-A1 would revise the total construction capital budget from $28,200,000 to $25,929,000 to reflect the State's bid savings. It would also provide an SCTA construction capital budget of $88,000 for reimbursement of SCTA’s costs on C&M Coop SCTA12021.

Policy Impacts:
None, the proposed programming complies with existing policies.

Fiscal Impacts:
Measure M funds used on Coop SCTA12021 will be reimbursed and available for other programming within the Highway 101 account.
**Staff Recommendation:**

Staff recommends the Board authorize the Chair to execute the attached Amendment No. 1 to Caltrans Coop 4-2459, in substantially similar form as provided for in the attachment, subject to the final review and approval of legal counsel.
RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE SONOMA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY, COUNTY OF SONOMA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AUTHORIZING THE CHAIR TO EXECUTE AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT 4-2459 WITH THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (CALTRANS) FOR THE CONSTRUCTION THE HIGHWAY 101 MSN C3 PROJECT

WHEREAS, SCTA is authorized to provide Measure M funds for project development and construction of certain transportation projects though the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans); and,

WHEREAS, SCTA executed Cooperative Agreement No. 4-2459 with Caltrans for the construction of the MSN-C3 Contract; and,

WHEREAS, SCTA executed Construction and Maintenance (C&M) Agreement No. SCTA12012 with SMART at a cost not to exceed $88,000 in Measure M - Highway 101 funds; and,

WHEREAS, Caltrans has determined that SCTA is eligible for reimbursement of SCTA12021 expenses from the MSN C3 construction capital budget; and,

WHEREAS, the California Transportation Commission has adjusted the allocation of State Proposition 1B - Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA) funds for construction capital to reflect bid savings and contract award.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that Board of Directors of the Sonoma County Transportation Authority authorizes the chair to execute Amendment 1 to Cooperative Agreement 4-2459 with the California Department of Transportation, in substantially similar form as provided for in the attachment, subject to the final review and approval by legal counsel.

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

| Director Allen | Director Landman |
| Director Carlstrom | Director Mackenzie |
| Director Chambers | Director McGuire |
| Director Gallian | Director Rabbitt |
| Director Gurney | Director Russell |
| Director Harris | Director Zane |

Ayes: Noes: Absent: Abstain:

SO ORDERED

I, the undersigned, certify that the foregoing resolution was duly adopted at a regular meeting of the Board of Directors of the Sonoma County Transportation Authority held on March 10, 2014.

Suzanne Smith, Executive Director
Clerk, Sonoma County Transportation Authority
AMENDMENT NO. 1 TO COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT

This Amendment No. 1 (AMENDMENT), entered into and effective on ___________________, is between the State of California, acting through its Department of Transportation, referred to as CALTRANS, and Sonoma County Transportation Authority, a public corporation referred to as SCTA.

RECITALS

1. CALTRANS and SCTA, collectively referred to as PARTNERS, entered into Cooperative Agreement No. 4-2459 (AGREEMENT) on June 1, 2012, defining the terms and conditions for constructing a portion of the Marin-Sonoma Narrows (MSN) project consisting of widening the southbound State Route (SR) 116 separation bridge and replacement of the northbound SR 116 separation bridge, on U.S. 101 from 0.1 mile north of Petaluma River Bridge to 0.2 mile north of the Caulfield Lane overcrossing in Sonoma County. This portion of the project is also known as MSN Contract C3, and referred to herein as PROJECT.

2. PARTNERS now seek to amend AGREEMENT to (a) revise the CMIA funds shown on the Funding Summary from $28,200,000 to $25,929,000 to reflect the amount allocated for Construction Capital by the California Transportation Commission (CTC) due to low bids; and (b) add a new Spending Summary for Construction Capital for reimbursement to SCTA of $88,000 for Construction and Maintenance (C&M) costs that SCTA will reimburse to the Sonoma-Marin Area Rail Transit (SMART) District via a separate agreement between SCTA and SMART.

IT IS THEREFORE MUTUALLY AGREED:

3. The attached FUNDING SUMMARY A1 will replace the FUNDING SUMMARY in AGREEMENT in its entirety.

4. The attached SPENDING SUMMARY A1 will replace the SPENDING SUMMARY in AGREEMENT in its entirety.

5. The following new Article 77a is added under Cost: CONSTRUCTION CAPITAL:

77a. Each PARTNER listed below may submit invoices for CONSTRUCTION CAPITAL associated with C&M costs:
   • SCTA may invoice CALTRANS
6. The following new Article 77b is added under **Cost: CONSTRUCTION CAPITAL**

77b. PARTNERS will exchange funds for actual costs.

SCTA will invoice CALTRANS for up to $88,000, for reimbursement of actual C&M agreement costs.

After PARTNERS agree that all WORK is complete, SCTA will submit a final accounting for all OBLIGATIONS COSTS. Based on the final accounting, PARTNERS will refund or invoice as necessary in order to satisfy the financial commitments of this agreement.

7. All other terms and conditions of AGREEMENT shall remain in full force and effect.

8. **AMENDMENT** is deemed to be included and made a part of AGREEMENT.

**CONTACT INFORMATION**

The information provided below indicates the primary contact data for each partner to this agreement. PARTNERS will notify each other in writing of any personnel or location changes. These changes do not require an amendment to this agreement.

The primary agreement contact person for CALTRANS is:
Wajahat Nyaz, Project Manager
111 Grand Avenue
Oakland, California 94612
Office Phone: (510) 286-5119
Mobile Phone: (510) 715-6273
Email: Wajahat_Nyaz@dot.ca.gov

The primary agreement contact person for SCTA is:
James Cameron, Deputy Director of Projects and Programming
490 Mendocino Avenue, Suite 206
Santa Rosa, California 95401
Office Phone: (707) 565-5377
Email: jcameron@sctainfo.org
SIGNATURES

PARTNERS declare that:

1. Each PARTNER is an authorized legal entity under California state law.
2. Each PARTNER has the authority to enter into this AMENDMENT.
3. The people signing this AMENDMENT have the authority to do so on behalf of their public agencies.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

By:____________________________
Helena (Lenka) Culik-Caro
Deputy District Director - Design

SONOMA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

By:____________________________
SCTA Chair

CERTIFIED AS TO FUNDS:

By:____________________________
Kevin M. Strough
District Budget Manager

Attest:__________________________
SCTA Executive Director

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND PROCEDURE

By:____________________________
County Counsel
# Funding Summary A1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Funding Partner</th>
<th>Fund Type</th>
<th>CON Capital</th>
<th>CON Support</th>
<th>Subtotal Support</th>
<th>Subtotal Capital</th>
<th>Subtotal Funds Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>Bond - Corridor Mobility Improvement</td>
<td>$25,929,000</td>
<td>$4,200,000</td>
<td>$4,200,000</td>
<td>$25,929,000</td>
<td>$30,129,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotals by Component:
- **CON Capital**: $25,929,000
- **CON Support**: $4,200,000
- **Subtotal Support**: $4,200,000
- **Subtotal Capital**: $25,929,000
- **Subtotal Funds Type**: $30,129,000
## SPENDING SUMMARY A1

### Construction Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WBS Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Partner assigned by Scope Summary</th>
<th>Bond - Corridor Mobility Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 5</td>
<td>Construction Support - 270, 275, 285, 290, 295, 4.300</td>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>$3,780,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Construction Support - 285</td>
<td>SCTA</td>
<td>$420,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,200,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Construction Capital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Bond - Corridor Mobility Improvement and Federal Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Contract</td>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>$25,841,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C&amp;M Capital Cost</td>
<td>SCTA</td>
<td>$88,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,929,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **Call to order the meeting of the Sonoma County Transportation Authority (SCTA) and the Sonoma County Regional Climate Protection Authority (RCPA)**

Meeting called to order at 2:34 p.m. by Chair Sarah Gurney.

**Directors Present:** Sarah Glade Gurney, City of Sebastopol, Chair; Director Rabbitt, Supervisor, District 2, Vice Chair; Director Allen, Town of Windsor; Director Chambers, City of Healdsburg; Director Carlstrom, City of Santa Rosa; Director Gallian, City of Sonoma; Director Harris, City of Petaluma; Director Landman, City of Cotati; Director Mackenzie, City of Rohnert Park; Director McGuire, Supervisor, District 4; Director Russell, City of Cloverdale; Director Zane, Supervisor, District 3.

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

Lee Torr of Monte Rio voiced concern regarding a planned bicycle/pedestrian path along Bohemian Highway, along a ridge line, claiming that the project does not meet Class 1 criteria and that this is not an acceptable location for a bicycle/pedestrian path.

3. **Consent Calendar**

   **A. SCTA Consent**


   Motion by Director Gallian, seconded by Director Russell, to approve the URS Contract Amendment – MSN B2 – DSDC. Motion passed unanimously.

   **B. SCTA/RCPA Concurrent Items**

   3.2. Minutes of the January 13, 2014 meeting (ACTION)*

   Motion by Director Gallian, seconded by Director Landman, to approve the minutes with the following correction: Page one, under Item 1, to be corrected to read “Chair McGuire welcomed City Council member Teresa Barrett of Petaluma and Council Member Julie Combs of Santa Rosa.” Motion carried unanimously.

4. **Regular Calendar**

   **C. SCTA/RCPA Concurrent Items**

   4.1. **Appointment of Executive Committee (ACTION)**

   Chair Gurney announced the appointment of Vice Chair Rabbitt as Vice Chair of the Executive Committee, and the appointment of Director Russell from alternate member to a regular seat on the Committee. Director Gallian will serve as alternate member. Chair Gurney expressed her appreciation for the service of Director Mackenzie on this Committee.

   **D. SCTA**

   4.2. **SCTA Planning**

   4.2.1. Senate Bill 743 – CEQA, Level Of Service metrics changes (REPORT)*

   Chris Barney presented a slideshow and reported that under SB 743 the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) has been directed to amend the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) guidelines for transportation impacts, changing the focus from the measurement of automobile delay and congestion to focusing on reduction in greenhouse gas emissions, the development of multi-modal transportation alternatives, and encouraging efficient development and design. He clarified that this is referring to CEQA guidelines only, and is not intended to impact local General Plan or zoning requirements.

   Mr. Barney pointed out that the PAC had discussed the distinction between social and physical environmental impacts, and that the purpose of CEQA is to focus on physical impacts; therefore, any proposed metric needs to focus on physical environmental impacts.

   Mr. Barney summarized next steps. OPR is accepting comments through February 14. Regional working groups are meeting throughout February. The Bay Area Regional Working Group is scheduled to meet March 5. Local staff members will be meeting with OPR members to discuss the initial document and comments. Comments and feedback from the working groups will be considered next, and a draft discussion document will be developed that will include a proposed alternative metric. A comment period will follow to get feedback on the proposed metric, and a final draft will be submitted to the California Natural Resources Agency by July 1, 2014. The final change is expected to be
incorporated into the CEQA guidelines some time in 2015.

Mr. Barney invited feedback to be submitted to OPR or to SCTA.

Comments from the Board included litigation and exposure issues, and exactly what constitutes “not served by transit” (the OPR definition for Priority Transit Areas is those areas without a 15-minute conversion bus service).

Additional Board comments were that the comment period is inadequate; that model analysis is flawed, and using a “one-size-fits-all” approach is not effective in Sonoma County. Further comments included safety issues for pedestrians, balancing the need to move traffic with encouraging more alternative modes of transportation (e.g., walking and bicycling) by ensuring safety.

Other comments were the fact that LOS does not address all components; that thresholds are vague and undefined; therefore, how would mitigation measures be applied, and that the multi-modal modeling as proposed is also undefined.

In response to Board questions/comments, Mr. Barney explained that a section of SB 743 does address local infill opportunity areas which are locally-designated areas; a process is in place to designate these areas and these could be eligible for CEQA streamlining.

Steve Birdlebough of the Transportation and Land Use Coalition noted that LOS measurements are problematic, citing the problem of favoring greenfield development over infill development, and depending on an overly simplistic formula to address complex issues.

Suzanne Smith clarified that under this Bill, at a local level a jurisdiction may choose to acquire LOS; however, for CEQA plans this is not an acceptable protocol.

The Board concurred on drafting a letter requesting that the comment period be extended; concerns regarding clearer and more measureable standards; concerns for alternatives that recognize and respect the variety in Sonoma County communities (urban, suburban and rural); litigation; and the traffic calming/safety component.

Ms. Smith suggested that in addition to addressing this letter to OPR, it be copied to the legislative delegation. She said this matter would be addressed by TAC and PAC, but also suggested that the Board have their respective staff and City Councils review and comment.

Chair Gurney referred back to agenda Item 4.1, noting the service of past Board Chair Director McGuire to the Executive Committee and expressed her appreciation for his experience and participation on the Committee.

4.3. SCTA Projects and Programming
4.3.1. Transit – presentation on Sonoma Access: Public, private, non-profit transportation collaboration – “one call-one click” website and call center now available:
http://www.sonomaaccess.org/ (REPORT)

Michael Ivory of Santa Rosa CityBus presented a slideshow and report on the implementation of this website and call center service, which is the collaboration of various local agencies. Sonoma County 211 is under contract to handle the mobile management component of this service. This was designed as information and education resource to the public for transportation, health care, legal, and various other services. This was funded under a New Freedom grant.

Administration of the website will be handled by the Area Agency on Aging. Various agencies collaborated to provide one central network for services.

Some of the features demonstrated by Mr. Ivory were trip planning and volunteer driver programs, as well as how to apply online to provide services (e.g., volunteer driver). MTC’s 511 also has a link at this website.

Mr. Ivory introduced Tracy Repp of the Area Agency on Aging, who explained that ultimately the goal is to form a consortium for mobility management and to enhance the volunteer driver programs.

Director Zane commented on the nationwide and countywide need for transportation and other services for seniors, and that Sonoma Access is an encouraging step in addressing these issues. She noted the need to involve the healthcare industry in funding for transportation to these services. She also cited the need to make existing bus routes more senior-friendly and accessible.

Additional Board suggestions included providing route directions, mapping, and the timeline to destinations. Mr. Ivory responded that the 511 website (which is linked to this site) provides this information, but Sonoma Access also provides live operators for further details and information.

Further discussion involved costs for providing transit/traveling coordinators to help those in need be matched up with the appropriate transportation.

Director Gallian cited cases of seniors who are hospitalized at the local Sonoma hospital and have
to try to call on family or friends in the middle of the night for transportation home.

Director Russell inquired about outreach and cited several agencies that she could contact locally to provide this information. She also recommended contacting the Health Action Council. Mr. Ivory confirmed that he and Ms. Repp have been aggressively contacting these agencies and providing materials promoting Sonoma Access.

Ms. Repp added that the first meeting of the consortium is scheduled for February 11. She invited anyone interested to attend.

Chair Gurney opened the item for public comment:
Sheila Baker of Petaluma voiced her concerns for safety as a bicyclist and expressed fears of those with disabilities and physical limitations to walk on city streets, and the fear some seniors have of losing their automobile.

Steve Birdlebough addressed the need for health services to be further involved in transporting seniors and better coordination of shuttle service, commenting that he often observes buses that are only half full servicing Friends House.

4.3.2. Measure M – adoption of the FY12/13 Measure M Annual Report (ACTION)

Seana Gause reported that staff is seeking Board approval for this draft report. Some highlights she pointed out include revenue disbursements and project information sheets for those projects that had activity last year.

Ms. Gause noted that the CAC made corrections of some typographical errors and requested the addition of captions for some of the photographs, but other than these revisions, they approved the Report for review and approval by the Board.

Board comments included thanks by Director McGuire to staff for their efforts on behalf of SMART to aid in extending the rail to the Airport.

Ms. Gause offered to provide hard copies of the Report upon request and announced that this will be available online. She also noted that the CAC roster is different this year than it was for Fiscal Year 2012/13.

Motion by Director McGuire, seconded by Director Mackenzie, to approve the Fiscal Year 2012/13 Measure M Annual Report with corrections as noted. Motion passed unanimously.

4.3.3. Highways – Update on State Highway projects (REPORT)

James Cameron reported that the deck pour at the Airport Boulevard Interchange overcrossing is completed.

The traffic shift to the Central C project new half-bridge has been delayed due to weather. This has tentatively been rescheduled for February 21, depending on weather. Full freeway closures at night will be taking place in March to demolish the existing structure. In response to questions from the Board, Mr. Cameron reported that the current staging in the contract is to have the two diagonal onramps closed for six months; however, staff is working with the contractor to implement a plan to possibly open them prior to the next stage. Mr. Cameron described the detour routes during this construction.

Comments have been received from Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) on the MSN C-2 Central Petaluma project and plans are proceeding on design. Staff is continuing to seek additional funding to move the project forward beyond design.

Work is proceeding on the Petaluma River Bridge and on the Petaluma Boulevard South Interchange, where construction is continuing on the approaches and retaining walls.

A successful traffic switch took place on the Lakeville Highway project. Both northbound and southbound traffic are on the southbound structure. The existing northbound structure will be demolished and replaced. Full night closures will be taking place on Highway 116 on this date, weather dependent.

Utility relocation work will be starting on the MSN B-3 with the North Marin Water District, PG & E and AT&T.

Ramp metering was tentatively scheduled to go live in March. This is now scheduled for May at the earliest, based on comments from MTC and Ramp Metering Technical Advisory Committee.

Mr. Cameron then referred to a letter sent from the Board to Caltrans in October regarding the State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPP), requesting Caltrans’ attention to three projects: (1) corridor improvements along Route 116 between Cotati and Sebastopol; (2) rehabilitation on highway 101 north of Windsor to address failing concrete slabs; and (3) safety and operational improvements at the intersection of Routes 116 and 121 in Sonoma Valley.

Caltrans responded to this letter acknowledging that corridor improvements along Route 116 between Cotati and Sebastopol and Highway 101 north improvements have the potential to be amended in the 2014 program; they said they would continue to work with staff on intersection improvements at Routes 116 and 121.
Director McGuire recommended reiterating the need for attention to these projects in another letter to Caltrans, and encouraging them to expedite this. The Board concurred.

Director Rabbitt inquired whether the corridor improvements on Route 116 between Cotati and Sebastopol take into account previous discussion regarding updating traffic counts and attempting to limit the first phase. Ms. Smith responded that staff received the letter from Caltrans prior to her meeting with Caltrans, and that discussion at that meeting would be in addition to those comments addressed in the letter. Caltrans will also be responding to additional issues brought up at the meeting (accident data, etc.).

Board comments included appreciation for the work of staff and outgoing Chair Director McGuire, and keeping Director Mackenzie informed as to activities (e.g. ramp metering). Ms. Smith noted that ramp metering delays are the result of MTC and Caltrans.

Chair Gurney added that Caltrans will be holding a public forum regarding the Laguna de Santa Rosa bridge closure on Highway 12. Mr. Cameron also reported that by February 15 vegetation will be completed.

Director Gallian commented on the flooding at the area of Routes116/121, and continuing problems with routing of traffic at Broadway.

Ms. Smith referred to three reports issued by the Secretary of Transportation and Caltrans, and identified highlights as to the potential impact on the relationship and conflict between local government and Caltrans. She offered to have this addressed at a future Board meeting.

E. RCPA

4.4. RCPA Projects and Programs

4.4.1. Request For Qualification for energy efficiency outreach activities (ACTION)*

Lauren Casey noted that this is a Request for Qualifications for community outreach services and campaigns related to residential energy efficiency programs. $30,000 has been budgeted for marketing and community outreach. Contracts will be brought back to the Board for their approval.

Motion by Director Chambers, seconded by Director Gallian, to approve the Request for Qualifications for energy efficiency. Motion carried unanimously.

4.4.2. Climate Action Forums hosted at RCPA (REPORT)*

Ms. Casey announced a proposed change to the partner engagement strategy. This would involve restructuring forums to take place three times a year, tailored to address specific issues which would be addressed by a partner in that area of expertise.

In response to Board questions, Ms. Casey reported that staff has not yet started offering these forums in Spanish at the Coordination Committee level, but have been considering conducting a Climate Action 2020 workshop in Spanish, and have been trying to identify local partners that may help in coordinating this. Director Zane suggested contacting the North Bay Organizing Group to assist in reaching the Latino community.

Ms. Smith added that she had talked previously with the Latino leaders’ group Los Cien and with the Leadership Institute regarding engagement of the Latino community.

Director Gallian referred staff to La Luz and the Community Health Clinic, and noted that the Sonoma Grange is a potential venue for these meetings.

4.4.3. RCPA activities report (REPORT)*

Ms. Casey reported that the one-page energy efficiency reviews have been updated for homeowners, multi-family property owners, business owners, and pointed out the addition of an energy efficiency review for municipalities.

Implementation is continuing on the BayREN Program. Sonoma County contractors continue to be active in the home upgrade incentive program. There have been 155 projects regionally, 60 of which are in Sonoma County.

Staff is not as actively recruiting on the multi-family front, as the regional incentive pipeline is full. Staff is developing an application for additional funding due to the significant interest in multi-family projects.

In connection with Codes and Standards, staff is meeting with chief building officials to participate in a series of on-site baseline code-compliance assessments in 2014, to compile data regarding which aspects of building energy code are not being implemented, and why. Staff’s goal is to identify a participating jurisdiction from Sonoma County by the end of February.

Expansion efforts for the Pay As You Save (PAYS) Pilot are continuing. A program design was submitted to the City of Hayward and RFPs were issued to recruit program vendors and contractors. This will be addressed by the Hayward City Council in February. The East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) approved a program concept and is pursuing internal funding to proceed with pilot implementation.
The first series of Climate Action 2020 public outreach meetings were completed in January. Ms. Casey referred to the attendance listed by jurisdiction for each of these meetings, noting that there was good attendance overall. Staff will be compiling public comments and posting them to the website for review.

Ms. Casey next announced that the first Stakeholders Advisory Group (SAG) meeting was held January 22 and was highly successful, with excellent attendance and participation. Comments from this meeting will be posted online, as well as Frequently Asked Questions related to Climate Action 2020. The next SAG meeting is scheduled for April 23.

Ms. Casey presented a memorandum from a member of the public regarding GHG reduction targets. Staff will be presenting an item to the Board at its next meeting regarding RCPA’s role in setting GHG targets and the status of targets.

Directors Chambers and Carlstrom thanked staff for their efforts. Director Carlstrom requested to be included in Santa Rosa activities.

Bob Williamson, citizen, addressed the matter of GHG reduction targets and summarized his memorandum, which was previously presented to the Board by Ms. Casey.

5. Reports and Announcements

5.1. Executive Committee report
The Executive Committee did not meet.

5.2. Regional agency reports*
SMART/MTC: Director Mackenzie announced a proposal by MTC to allocate $20 million to SMART. This will be addressed at the MTC Committee meeting February 11.

Director Russell reported that the January SMART meeting was cancelled, and had nothing new to report.

Director Zane reported that staff is continuing to work on getting permits to continue rail construction.

GGBHTD: Director Rabbitt announced a bridge toll increase and reported that some District members want to charge bicyclists and pedestrians for crossing the Golden Gate Bridge.

ABAG: Director Rabbitt reported that mitigation and litigation is continuing in connection with Plan Bay Area.

Sonoma Clean Power: Director Landman reported that, according to Geoffrey Cyphers, Chief Executive Officer, Sonoma Clean Power is the single largest GHG reduction measure in Sonoma County’s action plan. This has also resulted in a profit to the public.

Phase I Enrollment Notices have begun to be mailed to consumers. Service will be initiated in May.

Three public workshops are scheduled to take place in the evening; these will be held in Sebastopol, Sonoma and Santa Rosa.

Director Zane suggested that RCPA staff look into the possibility of legislatively doing away with the 6% energy surcharge in order make the cost of energy more competitive and to realize greater savings for consumers.

NCRA: Director Mackenzie reported that freight continues to run on the rail, and that SMART will be continuing track construction once permitting issues in Petaluma and Marin are resolved. These permitting issues have led to in uncertainty in NCRA’s ability to commit to freight delivery schedules and has resulted in financial difficulties for the agency.

5.3. Advisory Committee agendas*
Included in agenda.

5.4. SCTA/RCPA staff report
None.

5.5. Announcements
Director Gallian thanked Chair Gurney for appointing her as an alternate member to the Executive Committee.

6. Adjourn
4:59 p.m.
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:
- 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 greenhouse 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](http://sctainfo.org/agenda)

Advisory Committees include:

- Citizens Advisory Committee
- Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee
- Planning Advisory Committee
- Technical Advisory Committee
- RCPA Climate Action Forum
- Transit/Paratransit Advisory Committee
- Transit Technical 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.
Staff Report

To: SCTA Board of Directors
From: Diane Dohm, Transportation Planner
Item: 4.1.2 – North Bay 101 Corridor Clipper Program Update
Date: March 10, 2014

Issue:
What is the status of Clipper program implementation in the North Bay 101 Corridor?

Background:
The Clipper card is a regional transit card, which allows users to ride a variety of different operators using one transit card throughout the entire Bay Area. The Clipper card stores value on the card equivalent to cash, tickets, and/or passes (i.e. monthly pass). Clipper currently operates on the 8 largest transit systems, which represent 95 percent of all transit riders in the Bay Area. The Clipper program implementation has occurred in stages over several years; it began in 2006 and has seen phased implementation to transit operators in the 9 counties. The operators in Sonoma, Napa and Solano, as well as small operators in the East Bay, Marin Transit and Union City Transit are all part of Phase III of this implementation. The different operator groups (i.e. North Bay 101 Corridor) have a staggered implementation of which operators in Sonoma County are last in this implementation process.

In July 2013, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) gave a presentation to the SCTA Board on the Clipper program. After this presentation, MTC began having meetings with transit operators in Sonoma County for Clipper implementation. An initial Clipper meeting was held in August 2013 to discuss Clipper program implementation in Sonoma County. MTC and its consultant (CH2M HILL), then held meetings in September 2013 with each operator individually to discuss bus fleets, equipment, business rules (i.e. routes, fares, products), and fare distribution. SCTA was present at these meetings. A follow-up meeting, including all North Bay 101 Corridor operators (SMART, Sonoma County Transit, Santa Rosa CityBus, Petaluma Transit and Marin Transit) was held in November. At this meeting, CH2M HILL, MTC and the operators discussed the proposed scope of work for Sonoma County Transit, Santa Rosa CityBus, and Petaluma Transit. Due to the fact that the business rules are still unknown for SMART, they will have their own Clipper program implementation process. SMART has been working with MTC on Clipper program implementation separately.

Concurrently to the above process, MTC also asked the North Bay 101 Corridor to assign a representative to attend MTC Clipper Long-Range Planning Committees. These committees are tasked with guiding development and procurement of the system (initially named “C2”) that will replace the current Clipper program starting in 2019. For the purposes of the long range planning effort, the 101 Corridor includes: Sonoma County Transit, Santa Rosa CityBus, Petaluma Transit, SMART and Marin Transit. All North Bay 101 Corridor operators attended a meeting at SCTA to discuss this process and assigned representatives to each committee:
• Executive Committee: Joe Rye (Petaluma Transit) – primary, Bryan Albee (Sonoma County Transit) – alternate
• Steering Committee: Joanne Parker (SMART) – primary; Steven Schmitz (Sonoma County Transit) – alternate
• Planning Committee: Joy Gipson (Santa Rosa Transit) – primary; Robert Betts (Marin Transit) – alternate

The North Bay 101 Corridor decided to assign a primary and an alternate for each committee due to the challenges that all parties in the North Bay face in attending meetings in Oakland.

Next Steps
The Metropolitan Transportation Commission is planning to send the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) by the end of February to each operator for their signature over the next few months. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission will also be scheduling a follow-up coordination meeting with the North 101 operator group to discuss business rules and operation with the vendor (Cubic) in the room. This meeting is likely to occur this summer.

Proposed Schedule (from Cubic)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>NORTH 101 GROUP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Preparation</td>
<td>Q1 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(bus yard preparation for antenna, computer racks, network)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleet Inspection</td>
<td>January 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(inspections for hardware installation onto buses)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Installation</td>
<td>August 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(installing antenna, computer racks, network)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleet Installation</td>
<td>September-December 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(installing hardware devices onto buses)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion</td>
<td>March 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendation:**

None. This item is for information only. Staff will continue to provide quarterly updates on implementation per Board direction.
Staff Report

To: SCTA and RCPA Board of Directors

From: Lauren Casey, Climate Protection Program Manager

Item: 4.3.1 – Sustainable Communities Planning Grant and Incentives Program – Shift Sonoma County proposal

Date: March 10, 2013

Issue:
Shall the SCTA and RCPA submit a joint proposal to the Strategic Growth Council Planning Grant and Incentives Program to fund the development of Shift Sonoma County, a transportation action plan?

Background:
Proposition 84 created a fund of $580 million to improve the sustainability and livability of California’s communities. Ninety million dollars of this fund are available to cities, counties, and designated regional agencies in the form of competitive grants managed by the Strategic Growth Council (SGC). The SGC has awarded funding through the “Sustainable Communities Planning Grant and Incentives Program” in two prior rounds; Climate Action 2020 (formerly the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Implementation Program – GRIP) was one of several planning projects funded in Round 2.

An RFP for Round 3 of the Sustainable Communities Planning Grant program was opened in December 2013. Sixteen million dollars is available to fund the development and implementation of plans that lead to significant reductions in greenhouse gas emissions (GHGs) and foster the development of sustainable communities. Key program objectives in the RFP of interest to both the SCTA and RCPA include: reduce automobile usage and fuel consumption, promote public health, and promote equity. There is also an emphasis placed on connecting state, regional, and local plans.

The full RFP can be viewed at: http://sgc.ca.gov/planning_grants.html

SCTA and RCPA staff views this as an opportunity to seek funding to integrate and implement the strategies at the center of three essential planning efforts: Plan Bay Area, the Comprehensive Transportation Plan, and Climate Action 2020.

Proposal Overview:
Coordinated investment in land use planning and transportation infrastructure, across regional boundaries and utilizing regional solutions, is needed to implement sustainable development in the urban, suburban, and rural communities of Sonoma County. To deliver this coordinated investment, the SCTA and RCPA, on behalf of the ten local jurisdictions of Sonoma County, propose a planning and implementation program designed to facilitate a large shift in transportation patterns in Sonoma County.

Shift Sonoma County will define locally specific actions to implement high priority transportation strategies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by encouraging a shift in both the mode and fuel used for personal transportation. Strategies to be developed through Shift are those at the nexus of Plan Bay Area, the SCTA Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP), and Climate Action 2020 (CA2020, a
multijurisdictional community Climate Action Plan). *Shift* will enable Sonoma County jurisdictions to better integrate transportation investment and land use planning and make diverse transportation choices more feasible and attractive throughout Sonoma County, including Priority Development Areas and disadvantaged communities. In this way, *Shift* will enable measurable reductions in automobile usage and fuel consumption while improving public health and equity in Sonoma County.

The main work products will be:

**Shift Sonoma County**, a transportation action plan that address strategies to reduce VMT through:

1. **Mode shift**
   - a. Shared mobility and transportation demand management (TDM) needs assessment
   - b. Bike share feasibility study
   - c. Car share feasibility study
   - d. TDM program plan
   - e. Transportation mode shift action plan

2. **Fuel shift (to electric vehicles)**
   - a. Electric vehicle charging infrastructure (EVCI) needs assessment
   - b. Municipal EVCI action plan
   - c. Private EVCI action plan
   - d. Transportation fuel shift action plan

3. **Public outreach**
   - a. Market analysis
   - b. Engagement tool
   - c. Community engagement
   - d. Website enhancements
   - e. Spanish language translation
   - f. Marketing plan

Unlike Round 2, California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) expenses are eligible for inclusion in Round 3 proposals; therefore staff also proposes funding to support CEQA analysis related to the transportation elements of Climate Action 2020 and the 2015 CTP, efforts that are currently underfunded.

Lastly, the SCTA and RCPA are excited to work with the Department of Health Services to explore how to utilize the results of the soon to be completed Portrait of Sonoma County (POS) project, which will map human development (health, income, education) levels across census tracts countywide. The results of POS will enable all recommendations made in *Shift Sonoma County* to consider how programs, infrastructure, policies, and other actions to improve transportation infrastructure and access to alternatives can serve disadvantaged communities.

The deadline to submit proposals was February 28th. Should the Board disagree with the approach proposed, changes may be negotiated with the SGC upon award or the proposal may be retracted. The full proposed work plan submitted to the SGC is attached.

**Policy Impacts:**

None.

**Fiscal Impacts:**

Total funding requested is $882,997. A five percent cash match ($45,000) requirement will be met using existing SCTA funding to develop the CTP update.

**Staff Recommendation:**
That the Board approve the staff proposal to the Sustainable Communities Planning Grant and Incentive Program to fund the development of *Shift Sonoma County*, a transportation action plan and adopt the attached resolutions of support for the joint proposal.
SHIFT SONOMA COUNTY (SHIFT) - PROPOSAL SUMMARY STATEMENT

The problem:
Transportation is the single largest contributor to greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in Sonoma County (at 1,976,295 MTCO2e in 2010, or 53% of countywide emissions). Specifically, personal vehicles contribute the largest share (at 92% of all trips). Vehicular travel also contributes to traffic congestion, public health risks related to safety and air and water quality, and social inequity as lower income residents are more likely to spend a higher share of income on transportation. Shifting transportation away from single occupant, internal combustion engine (ICE) vehicles towards cleaner modes including bicycles, walking, rideshare, transit, telecommuting, and electric vehicles (EV) is an essential effort in the quest for sustainable, resilient communities.

Sonoma County has a profile much like other suburban counties in California and the U.S. that makes tackling emissions from transportation very challenging: insufficient density to support comprehensive transit, large distances between where people live, work, and play, aging infrastructure, limited viable alternatives to personal automobiles and relatively small public funding to invest in those alternatives and equitable access to transportation options in low income communities. Urban density and transit alone are not enough to address transportation emissions. Innovative and aggressive strategies across land use, infrastructure, incentives, and information are needed to reduce the 11 million vehicle miles traveled in Sonoma County each day.

Solutions are emerging, however far too slowly. Ridesharing pilots have launched, but are still used primarily by existing carpools and young, white collar workers. Electric vehicle purchases are increasing, but infrastructure to support their use and make them viable for mainstream adoption lags. The Bay Area Strategic EV Council reports that in 2012 the ratio of electric vehicles to chargers was 5:1. In 2013, it jumped to 11:1. Strategic planning is needed to make these solutions mainstream and to successfully facilitate a transition away from single occupant ICE vehicles.

Proposed solutions:
Coordinated investment in land use planning and transportation infrastructure, across regional boundaries and utilizing regional solutions, is needed to implement sustainable development in the urban, suburban, and rural communities of Sonoma County. To deliver this coordinated investment, the Sonoma County Transportation Authority (SCTA) in partnership with the Regional Climate Protection Authority (RCPA), on behalf of the ten local jurisdictions of Sonoma County, propose a planning and implementation program – or action plan - to facilitate a large shift in transportation patterns in Sonoma County.

Shift Sonoma County will define locally specific actions to implement high priority transportation strategies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by encouraging a shift in both the mode and fuel used for personal transportation. This work is the logical next step after completion of Plan Bay Area, the SCTA Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP), and Climate Action 2020 (CA2020, a multijurisdictional community Climate Action Plan). Shift Sonoma County will reduce GHG emissions by facilitating a shift in transportation away from ICE vehicles towards low emitting modes and by making development and housing in Priority Development Areas (PDAs) and disadvantaged communities more attractive due to access to diverse mobility options.
The main work product of *Shift Sonoma County* will be a transportation action plan comprised of:

1. A Strategic Plan for Transportation Mode Shift including bike share, care share, Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program planning, and community outreach
2. A Strategic Plan for Transportation Fuel Shift (to electric vehicles) including a municipal electric vehicle charging infrastructure (EVCI) action plan and a private EVCI action plan
3. A marketing and outreach plan to integrate and promote strategies to enhance mobility and increase access to transportation infrastructure improvements

*Characteristics of the Populations and Areas Served*

*Shift* will make shared mobility, active transportation, transit, and electric vehicles viable for more diverse users than early adopters, for work, school, and play, and specifically for disadvantaged communities. In Sonoma County today, only half of the population is living at 300% above the poverty line. The remaining half can barely make ends meet, let alone pursue new options for transportation.

Lastly, *Shift* comes at a perfect time: Sonoma County has the opportunity to implement programs and invest in infrastructure in an extremely strategic and targeted way thanks to the culmination of multiple efforts:

- **Plan Bay Area** – the recently adopted Sustainable Communities Strategy for the Bay Area identifies 9 PDAs in Sonoma County; prioritizing PDAs for investments in shared mobility and EV will promote infill development and urban living due to increased mobility options in these areas.
- **Sonoma Marin Area Rail Transit (SMART)** – the launch of SMART and associated station area planning efforts provide a framework to support increased transit oriented development by connecting SMART to car and bike share and other TDM programs developed in *Shift*.
- **Portrait of Sonoma County** – the County Department of Health Services will be releasing a measurement of health, education, and income across census tracts in Sonoma County in 2014 that will allow for decision makers to direct investment towards communities with the most need.
- **Climate Action 2020** – the multijurisdictional climate action plan and associated model policies toolkit to be adopted in early 2015 will provide tools and policy support to implement mode shift and EV action plans developed in *Shift*.
- **Comprehensive Transportation Plan** – the 2015 update to the CTP will provide context for the state of transportation and land use in Sonoma County as well as data, modeling, and analysis used to inform specific implementation plans and investment recommendations developed through *Shift*.

*Shift Sonoma County* is necessary to bring together the above plans in a manner that most effectively decreases VMT and GHG emissions while addressing public health and equity. If successful, a 10% reduction in per capita VMT would save over 234,000 MTCO2e/year, roughly 6.2% of current countywide emissions.
### SHIFT SONOMA COUNTY - WORK PLAN

**STRATEGIC GROWTH COUNCIL/Department of Conservation– Sustainable Communities Planning Grant Award**

Grantee: _Sonoma County Transportation Authority______________  
Grant Number: ___PIN 27344________________

Jurisdiction: ____Sonoma County_____________  
Department/Office: _____SCTA_____________________________

Project Title: __Shift Sonoma County____________________________________________________________

#### High Level Activities/Milestones  
(with Deliverables and Indicators)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK 1. Project Management and Administration</th>
<th>Responsible Parties</th>
<th>Timetable in months (Start year: 2012)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This task provides for SCTA and RCPA project management, including coordination between city and county planning staff, management of consultants/partners, and financial and progress reporting to the SGC. SCTA staff will manage the mode shift elements of the Shift Sonoma County plan (Task 2); RCPA staff will manage the fuel shift elements of the Shift Sonoma County plan (Task 3).</td>
<td>SCTA and RCPA</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### TASK 2. Draft Plan for Transportation Mode Shift

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Task A</th>
<th>Sub-Task B</th>
<th>Sub-Task C</th>
<th>Sub-Task D</th>
<th>Sub-Task E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shared mobility and TDM program needs assessment</td>
<td>Bike share feasibility study</td>
<td>Car share feasibility study</td>
<td>TDM program plan</td>
<td>Draft transportation mode shift action plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible Parties</th>
<th>Timetable in months (Start year: 2012)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCTA and RCPA Local partners Consultant</td>
<td>September 2014 – June 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK 3. Draft Plan for Transportation Fuel Shift (to electric vehicles)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Task A  Electric vehicle charging infrastructure (EVCI) needs assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Task B  Municipal EVCI action plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Task C  Private EVCI action plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Task D  Draft transportation fuel shift action plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCTA and RCPA Local partners Consultant</td>
<td>September 2014 – June 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK 4. Public outreach campaign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Task A  Market analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Task B  Engagement tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Task C  Community meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Task D  Website enhancements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Task E  Spanish language translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Task F  Marketing plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCTA and RCPA Consultant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK 5. Shift Sonoma County Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Task A  Draft Shift Sonoma County plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Task B  Final Shift Sonoma County plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCTA and RCPA Consultant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK 6. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Task A  Admin draft and final EIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Task B  Public draft and final EIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCTA and RCPA consultant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SHIFT SONOMA COUNTY – DETAILED WORK PLAN

Shift Sonoma County Work Plan
The following sections detail the goals, outcomes, and subtasks of the activity milestones listed in the work plan and budget. This work plan is designed to achieve significant reductions in greenhouse gas emissions (GHGs) and foster sustainable communities throughout Sonoma County. It is designed to align with Plan Bay Area, by the emphasis placed on infrastructure and programs to serve Priority Development Areas and disadvantaged communities. It has been developed to support implementation of the local Comprehensive Transportation Plan and Climate Action 2020, the multijurisdictional community climate action plan.

TASK 1 – PROJECT MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION
Responsibility: SCTA and RCPA
Work Products & Meetings: Reporting to the SGC
Monthly coordination meetings
Time Frame: Ongoing

Ongoing and active project management is essential to ensure a successful project. This task provides for SCTA and RCPA project management, including coordination between city and county planning staff, management of consultants/partners, and financial and progress reporting to the SGC. This task also covers financial management of the grant, which includes tracking SGC grant expenditures, matching funds, in-kind contributions, sub-grants, and more. SCTA staff will manage the mode shift elements of the Shift Sonoma County plan (Task 2); RCPA staff will manage the fuel shift elements of the Shift Sonoma County plan (Task 3).

TASK 2 – DEVELOP DRAFT PLAN FOR TRANSPORTATION MODE SHIFT
Responsibility: SCTA, with input from RCPA, local partners, and consultant
Work Products & Meetings: Monthly coordination meetings
Policy board meetings
Bike share feasibility study
Car share feasibility study
TDM action plan
Mode shift action plan
Time Frame: September 2014 – June 2015

This task will yield a feasibility study and action plan for shared mobility infrastructure and transportation demand management (TDM) programs on behalf of the ten local jurisdictions of Sonoma County. The subtasks and work products of Task 2 will facilitate
greater use of alternative modes of transportation in Sonoma County, thus decreasing VMT, enhancing compact land uses per the SCS and reducing GHG emissions.

**Task 2.A – Shared Mobility and TDM Program Needs Assessment**
The SCTA, RCPA, local partners, and consultant will develop a comprehensive policy and program needs assessment. The needs assessment will identify current programs, policies and efforts related to transportation demand management within each jurisdiction, identify regional inconsistencies, and identify the adopted policies and plans that will be supported by work products developed in Task 2.

**Task 2.B – Bike Share Feasibility Study**
The SCTA, working with local partners and a consultant, will develop a countywide bike share feasibility study in Sonoma County. The study shall assess costs, benefits, market context and demand, risks, funding and incentive models, and operating models for a bike share program. It shall include a description of the necessary technology and infrastructure, density and multi-factor suitability analysis, and public, countywide site recommendations for bike share facilities that incorporate recommendations based on Priority Development Areas, SMART station area plans, downtown area plans, and specific area plans as identified by planning directors, and the results of the Portrait of Sonoma County project. The opportunity for public private partnerships to expand the reach of a program to business sites throughout the county, especially for tourism and recreation, will also be presented.

**Task 2.C – Car Share Feasibility Study**
The SCTA, working with local partners and a consultant, will develop a countywide car share feasibility study in Sonoma County. The study shall assess costs, benefits, market context and demand, risks, funding and incentive models, and operating models for a car share program. It shall include a description of the necessary technology and infrastructure, density and multi-factor suitability analysis, and public countywide site recommendations for car share facilities that incorporate recommendations based on Priority Development Areas, SMART station area plans, downtown area plans, and specific area plans as identified by planning directors, and the results of the Portrait of Sonoma County project. The opportunity for public private partnerships to expand the reach of a program to business sites throughout the county, especially for tourism and recreation, will also be presented.

**Task 2.D – Transportation Demand Management Program Plan**
The SCTA, working with local partners and consultant, will develop a county-wide action plan for TDM programs. The action plan will include an assessment of existing programs and what is needed to improve their effectiveness and increase participation including funding, marketing, technology improvements, integration with other services, and policy changes. The plan will also include a gap analysis to identify new and complementary programs that, based on the findings of Task 4 (community outreach), will meet the needs of travelers and reduce VMT generated by:

- Aging and disabled populations
- Students (home to school)
• Commuters (home to work)
• Tourists and recreation
Across all trip types, service to disadvantaged communities will be a priority.

Partnerships with existing programs will be leveraged to harness existing access data, marketing plans, technology, and infrastructure. The SCTA already actively coordinates with or manages the following:
• BAAQMD Spare the Air Resource Team
• Carma real time rideshare
• Eco2School
• Golden Gate Transit
• Safe Routes to School
• Santa Rosa City Bus
• Sonoma Access (mobility options resource for seniors and disabled)
• Sonoma County Bicycle Coalition
• Sonoma County Green Business Program
• Sonoma County Health Action
• Sonoma County Transit
• Sonoma County One Day Clean Commute

Task 2.E – Draft Transportation Mode Shift Action Plan
The SCTA will package the results and recommendations from Tasks 2.1-2.4 into a comprehensive plan for facilitating increased use of alternative modes of transportation in Sonoma County. The action plan will explore how the SCTA, RCPA, and individual jurisdictions can facilitate better linkages across modes of transportation and can be incorporated into the 2015 Comprehensive Transportation Plan that helps guide funding decisions at the local level, including programming decisions made by the SCTA.

Task 3 – DEVELOP DRAFT PLAN FOR TRANSPORTATION FUEL (EV) SHIFT

Responsibility: RCPA, with input from SCTA, local partners, and consultant

Work Products & Meetings: Monthly coordination meetings
Policy board meetings
Public EVCI action plan
Private sector EVCI action plan
Fuel shift action plan

Time Frame: September 2014 – June 2015

This task will yield a countywide strategic plan to support rapid growth in electric vehicle (EV) use in Sonoma County through local government deployment and operation of electric vehicle charging infrastructure (EVCI) and local government facilitation of privately owned EVCI. The subtasks and work products of Task 3 will address planning deficiencies as identified by the Sonoma County EV Partnership and facilitate greater
use of electricity as a transportation fuel in Sonoma County, measurably decreasing GHG emissions from transportation.

**Task 3.A – EVCI Program Needs Assessment**
The RCPA, SCTA, local partners, and consultant will develop a comprehensive policy and program needs assessment focused on how to help make EV use more feasible for the broader population (not just early adopters). The needs assessment will identify current programs, policies and efforts related to EVCI deployment and operation within each jurisdiction, identify regional inconsistencies, and identify the adopted policies and plans that will be supported by work products developed in Task 3. Specific sectors to be served included workplace charging, multifamily properties (renters), and low-income.

**Task 3.B – Municipal EVCI action plan**
The RCPA, SCTA, local partners, and consultant will develop guidance for local governments of Sonoma County to address and create regional consistency around: public access to municipal charging stations, fee structure, and station siting recommendations based on technical feasibility, site characteristics, suitability analysis, and alignment with local plans. The existing Sonoma County Electric Vehicle Partnership will be used as a forum to solicit input on critical issues, review draft work products, and vet final strategy recommendations. The action plan will also recommend EVCI etiquette proposals and publicize them to encourage a uniform understanding of how and when to charge an EV. Best practices issues by regional EV initiatives such as the Bay Area EV Strategic Council will be incorporated when possible.

**Task 3.C – Private EVCI action plan**
The RCPA, SCTA, local partners and consultant will develop an action plan to support expansion of privately owned EVCI at residences (including multifamily properties) and businesses, in a manner consistent with local and regional plans. The action plan for private EVCI will include guidance on how to install stations that will leverage the existing “Electric Vehicle Charging Station Program and Installation Guidelines” developed by the County in 2011. The plan will also identify local policies that aid or hinder private EVCI development and EV deployment, explore incentives (including streamlined permitting, EV electric rates, and rebates), explore dealer partnerships and trainings, suggest marketing and awareness campaigns, and identify financing options. Sonoma Clean Power will partner with the RCPA to explore how to support EVCI and EV deployment to their customers through rates, rebates, on-bill financing, and other mechanisms to reduce combined monthly automobile and energy costs. Specific attention will be given to financial tools to support disadvantaged populations, renters, and project developers in Priority Development Areas.

The RCPA will package the results and recommendations from Tasks 3.1-3.3 into a comprehensive plan for facilitating increased use of electric vehicles in Sonoma County. The action plan will explore how the SCTA, RCPA, Sonoma Clean Power, and individual jurisdictions can support the growing fleet of electric vehicles in Sonoma
County. It will also explore how to accelerate investment in infrastructure in Priority Development Areas and disadvantaged communities, providing a roadmap for reducing emissions in transportation while promoting equity, public health, infill, and TOD.

**Task 4 – Public Outreach Campaign**

Responsibility: SCTA and RCPA with input from local partners and consultant

Work Products & Meetings: Monthly coordination meetings
Market analysis
Engagement tool
Website enhancements
Community engagement
Spanish language translation
Marketing plan

Time Frame: September 2014 – March 2016

The SCTA and RCPA will conduct a market research and public outreach campaign to assess the specific barriers to transportation mode and fuel switching in Sonoma County, as well as to explore incentive structures, information, infrastructure, and other strategies that will facilitate behavior change. Each subtask will be developed to target populations living in Priority Development Areas and disadvantaged communities, as identified through the Portrait of Sonoma County (Portrait) which is quantifying human development (in terms of health, income, and education levels) across census blocks. Portrait results will allow decision makers to target disadvantaged communities with outreach, and prioritize implementation actions in the communities that have the greatest need. Both Task 2 and Task 3 will be informed by Task 4.

**Task 4.1 – Market analysis**

The SCTA and RCPA will work with a consultant and local partners to consolidate information that is already known about barriers to transportation mode and fuel switching in Sonoma County and beyond, as well as the incentives, information, infrastructure, and other strategies most likely to remove those barriers. This analysis will consider needs across demographics for the different travel needs outlined in Task 2: aging and disabled populations, home to school, home to work, and recreation and tourism. The Portrait of Sonoma County results will allow for an emphasis to be placed on disadvantaged communities.

**Task 4.2 – Engagement tool**

The SCTA and RCPA will work with a consultant or vendor to develop online and/or mobile engagement tools to collect input from various sectors and communities on transportation priorities and needs.
Task 4.3 – Community engagement
The SCTA and RCPA will conduct a series of public outreach efforts and focus groups to collect input from various sectors and communities on transportation priorities and needs. Particular focus areas will include: disadvantaged communities, aging and disabled populations, commuters, families with school aged children, recreation and tourism.

Task 4.4 – Website enhancements
The SCTA and RCPA will use the results of Task 4.1 to design updated web content for the SCTA and RCPA website and to support the creation of a countywide transportation options site.

Task 4.5 – Spanish language translation
The SCTA and RCPA will work with a consultant to translate all outreach and marketing materials into Spanish in order to better reach Spanish speaking populations of Sonoma County.

Task 4.6 – Marketing plan
The SCTA and RCPA, with input from a consultant, will develop a marketing plan that incorporates the results and recommendations from Tasks 4.1-4.5 to promote the strategies developed in Tasks 2 and 3, and provide a comprehensive strategy for promoting resources available to residents of Sonoma County to facilitate a shift in transportation mode and fuel choice.

TASK 5 – FINAL SHIFT SONOMA COUNTY PLAN
Responsibility: SCTA and RCPA with input from local partners, and consultant

Work Products & Meetings: Draft Shift Sonoma County Plan
Final Shift Sonoma County Plan

Time Frame: June 2015 – March 2016

The SCTA and RCPA will develop a draft Shift Sonoma County plan that summarizes key findings and strategies across transportation mode shift, transportation fuel shift, and community engagement. The draft plan will be reviewed by staff from all ten jurisdictions, non-governmental partners, and private sector partners. Comments will be incorporated into a final Shift Sonoma County plan that will be published by the SCTA and RCPA. The final plan will include recommendations for both infrastructure and programs to facilitate a shift in transportation choices to reduce both VMT and GHG emissions. Shift Sonoma County will enable alignment of investments in transportation with health, equity, infill and TOD, and rural and open space preservation goals.

Shift Sonoma County will help inform the SCTA Board as it prioritizes funding for transportation projects and inform prioritization in the Comprehensive Transportation
Plan. It will also inform the RCPA Board as it prioritizes funding and programs to reduce GHG emissions.

**TASK 6 – CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA) ANALYSIS**

**Responsibility:** SCTA, RCPA and consultant

**Work Products & Meetings:**
- Draft EIR for transportation element of Climate Action 2020 and mode shift element of 2015 CTP
- Final EIR for transportation element of Climate Action 2020 and mode shift element of 2015 CTP

**Time Frame:** September 2014 – March 2015

The SCTA is beginning to develop the 2015 update to the Comprehensive Transportation Plan and the RCPA is currently developing *Climate Action 2020*, a multijurisdictional community climate action plan. Both agencies will be working with consultants to develop the appropriate level of CEQA documentation pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5. The final document will provide CEQA compliant environmental and public review for the entire climate action plan and CTP. It is anticipated that a Programmatic EIR would be the preferred approach, and the EIR process will rely heavily on incorporation by reference of the technical documents, GHG emission reduction and adaptation standards, and emission reduction targets produced for the CTP and *Climate Action 2020*. The CEQA review process will assess relevant substantial evidence in the record, including any applicable standards previously adopted by jurisdictions to reduce GHG’s.

After adoption of *Climate Action 2020*, its implementation will include its use as a CEQA tiering document for individual projects. Projects consistent with *Climate Action 2020*, including the transportation programs and infrastructure planned for through *Shift Sonoma County*, may rely on the programmatic cumulative impact analysis of GHG emissions contained in the certified *Climate Action 2020* EIR.

Neither agency has sufficient funding to complete the full EIR and is seeking funding to prepare the transportation mode shift elements of the EIR for the CTP and *Climate Action 2020* in the scope for *Shift Sonoma County*. The consultant will ensure that the EIRS meet the latest applicable guidance of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5. The consultant will determine appropriate air quality thresholds of significance based on substantial evidence in the record.
Resolution No. 2014-001
Regional Climate Protection Authority
Santa Rosa, California
March 10, 2014

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE REGIONAL CLIMATE PROTECTION AUTHORITY, COUNTY OF SONOMA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, APPROVING THE APPLICATION FOR GRANT FUNDS FOR THE SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES PLANNING GRANT AND INCENTIVES PROGRAM UNDER THE SAFE DRINKING WATER, WATER QUALITY AND SUPPLY, FLOOD CONTROL, RIVER AND COASTAL PROTECTION BOND ACT OF 2006 (PROPOSITION 84)

WHEREAS, the Legislature and Governor of the State of California have provided funds for the program shown above; and

WHEREAS, the Strategic Growth Council has been delegated the responsibility for the administration of this grant program, establishing necessary procedures; and

WHEREAS, said procedures established by the Strategic Growth Council require a resolution certifying the approval of application(s) by the Applicants governing board before submission of said application(s) to the State; and

WHEREAS, the applicant, if selected, will enter into an agreement with the State of California to carry out the development of the proposal.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Regional Climate Protection Authority

1. Approves the filing of an application for the Shift Sonoma County proposal in order to become a sustainable community;

2. Certifies that applicant understands the assurances and certification in the application, and

3. Certifies that applicant or title holder will have sufficient funds to develop the Proposal or will secure the resources to do so, and

4. Certifies that the Proposal will comply with any applicable laws and regulations.

5. Appoints the Executive Director, or designee, as agent to conduct all negotiations, execute and submit all documents including, but not limited to applications, agreements, payment requests and so on, which may be necessary for the completion of the aforementioned project(s).

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Director Allen</th>
<th>Director Landman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director Carlstrom</td>
<td>Director Mackenzie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director Chambers</td>
<td>Director McGuire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director Gallian</td>
<td>Director Rabbitt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director Gurney</td>
<td>Director Russell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director Harris</td>
<td>Director Zane</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ayes: Noes: Absent: Abstain:
Resolution No. 2014-001
Regional Climate Protection Authority
Santa Rosa, California
March 10, 2014

SO ORDERED

I, the undersigned, certify that the foregoing resolution was duly adopted at a regular meeting of the Board of Directors of the Regional Climate Protection Authority held on March 10, 2014.

Suzanne Smith, Executive Director
Clerk, Regional Climate Protection Authority
RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE SONOMA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY, COUNTY OF SONOMA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, APPROVING THE APPLICATION FOR GRANT FUNDS FOR THE SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES PLANNING GRANT AND INCENTIVES PROGRAM UNDER THE SAFE DRINKING WATER, WATER QUALITY AND SUPPLY, FLOOD CONTROL, RIVER AND COASTAL PROTECTION BOND ACT OF 2006 (PROPOSITION 84)

WHEREAS, the Legislature and Governor of the State of California have provided funds for the program shown above; and

WHEREAS, the Strategic Growth Council has been delegated the responsibility for the administration of this grant program, establishing necessary procedures; and

WHEREAS, said procedures established by the Strategic Growth Council require a resolution certifying the approval of application(s) by the Applicants governing board before submission of said application(s) to the State; and

WHEREAS, the applicant, if selected, will enter into an agreement with the State of California to carry out the development of the proposal.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Sonoma County Transportation Authority

1. Approves the filing of an application for the Shift Sonoma County proposal in order to become a sustainable community;

2. Certifies that applicant understands the assurances and certification in the application, and

3. Certifies that applicant or title holder will have sufficient funds to develop the Proposal or will secure the resources to do so, and

4. Certifies that the Proposal will comply with any applicable laws and regulations.

5. Appoints the Executive Director, or designee, as agent to conduct all negotiations, execute and submit all documents including, but not limited to applications, agreements, payment requests and so on, which may be necessary for the completion of the aforementioned project(s).

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

Director Allen  Director Landman
Director Carlstrom  Director Mackenzie
Director Chambers  Director McGuire
Director Gallian  Director Rabbitt
Director Gurney  Director Russell
Director Harris  Director Zane

Ayes:  Noes:  Absent:  Abstain:
Resolution No. 2014-005
Sonoma County Transportation Authority
Santa Rosa, California
March 10, 2014

SO ORDERED

I, the undersigned, certify that the foregoing resolution was duly adopted at a regular meeting of the Board of Directors of the Sonoma County Transportation Authority held on March 10, 2014.

Suzanne Smith, Executive Director
Clerk, Sonoma County Transportation Authority
Staff Report

To: RCPA Board of Directors

From: Lauren Casey, Climate Protection Program Manager

Item: 4.4.1 – RCPA activities report

Date: March 10, 2014

---

**Issue:**
Information Only

**Background:**

**CLIMATE ACTION PLANNING**

**Climate Action 2020**

The comments from the first round of Public Outreach Workshops, held throughout the county and the first Stakeholder Advisory Meeting are now posted online and are available at: [http://www.sctainfo.org/climate_action_2020_participation.htm](http://www.sctainfo.org/climate_action_2020_participation.htm).

A Frequently Asked Questions document was also created, and is now available online at: [http://www.sctainfo.org/climate_action_2020.htm](http://www.sctainfo.org/climate_action_2020.htm).

Staff has created an additional, online community engagement opportunity for members of the community that missed our public outreach workshops. Posted on the website are engagement forms, by sector, that allow members of the public to provide valuable input on the climate action planning process: [http://www.sctainfo.org/climate_action_2020_participation.htm](http://www.sctainfo.org/climate_action_2020_participation.htm).

Staff continues to work with each jurisdiction, other agencies, and expert stakeholders (through the Climate Action Forums and one-on-one outreach) to “finalize” the draft potential greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction strategy list that will be evaluated by ICF.

Lastly, in response to the February discussion around GHG reduction targets, **staff proposes that an RCPA Board special study session be scheduled to take place either in May or June 2014.** The session will allow the Board to examine the potential GHG reduction strategies in detail, and have a discussion around GHG targets and regional consistency.

**Climate Readiness Institute (CRI)**

The Bay Area Climate and Energy Resilience Project (an initiative of the Joint Policy Committee) recently completed a Climate Adaptation Needs Assessment. The study, which can be found here: [http://www.abag.ca.gov/jointpolicy/pdfs/Task%207d%20Action%20Plan.pdf](http://www.abag.ca.gov/jointpolicy/pdfs/Task%207d%20Action%20Plan.pdf), identified a number of strategies to increase the Bay Area's ability to respond to the threats of climate change. One specific near term priority was the creation of a Bay Area Adaptation Center to provide overall coordination for the region and support specific initiatives with information, best practices, funding, and other resources.
Leaders from four local institutions – Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, UC Berkeley, UC Davis, and Stanford – are working to create just such a regional center. The Climate Readiness Institute (CRI) convened its first Summit in February, 2014.

The stated mission of the CRI is “to develop, in partnership with concerned policy makers and business leaders, the cutting-edge climate science, adaptation strategies, and mitigation tools needed to ensure a resilient, low carbon Bay Area and beyond.” The institute will “instigate and produce the relevant research; host workshops and conferences at which the science is shared, discussed, and used for potential policy; and disseminate the findings and recommendations of the Institute and its affiliates to the peer-reviewed journals and the general public.”

Director Jake Mackenzie and Program Manager Lauren Casey, as well as several other partners from Sonoma County, attended the CRI Summit. This emergent resource will assist with the implementation of Climate Action 2020 and future adaptation and mitigation initiatives in Sonoma County. The CRI website is: http://climatereadinessinstitute.org/.

**ENERGY EFFICIENCY:**

The RCPA continues to administer and implement Bay Area Regional Energy Network (BayREN) programs on behalf of Sonoma County across single family Energy Upgrade California, Multifamily Energy Upgrade California, Pay As You Save (PAYS) on bill repayment, and Codes and Standards. Staff continues to coordinate on a weekly basis with the Sonoma County Energy Independence Program (SCEIP) regarding program updates, outreach to building owners and contractors, event planning, and other issues related to energy efficiency program implementation.

Staff is in the process of soliciting additional support for energy efficiency outreach through the RFQ approved by the Board in February. The 2014 Climate Corps Fellow continues to conduct outreach to community based organizations and is working to schedule a series of homeowner workshops and tabling at local hardware stores and farmers’ markets.

Final print versions of the one-page overviews of energy efficiency resources were posted on the RCPA website at: http://www.sctainfo.org/efficient_build.htm. Staff will also distribute hard copies to RCPA jurisdictions upon request.

**CLIMATE POLICY AND SCIENCE**

**AB 32 Scoping Plan Update**

The California Air Resources Board (ARB) issued a draft Proposed First Update to the AB 32 Scoping Plan. AB 32 (The Global Warming Solutions Act) required ARB to develop a Scoping Plan that describes the steps California will take to reduce greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) to 1990 levels by 2020. The original Scoping Plan was published in 2008, and must be updated every five years.

The update outlines the remaining steps to meet the 2020 limits set by AB 32, based largely on continued implementation of existing programs. It also outlines new actions that will move the State further along the path to long-term reductions. The update identifies eight key sectors for ongoing action:

- Energy
- Transportation, fuels, land use and infrastructure
- Agriculture
- Water
• Waste management
• Natural lands
• Short-Lived Climate Pollutants (such as methane and black carbon)
• Green Buildings

The update also incorporates the latest scientific consensus on the need for accelerated reductions in the coming decades to achieve climate stabilization, which adds to the call for extended State commitment to the 2050 target and addition of a midterm target.

Lastly, the update includes more discussion around the role of local and regional efforts than the first Scoping Plan: “Local governments are in many ways the “boots on the ground” for meeting California’s climate change goals, beginning with their local planning efforts,” and “Local and regional governments are uniquely positioned to collaborate to affect GHG emission reductions on a larger scale. As cities and counties fall into a larger regional framework, they are working together to create synergistic relationships for reductions through land use and transportation networks, as well as within specific sectors, such as energy.”

The Executive Summary is attached and the full draft can be viewed at:
http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/2013_update/draft_proposed_first_update.pdf

Legislation to Watch

California Senate President pro Tempore Darrell Steinberg has introduced legislation related to California’s climate policies through 2050 suggesting his proposal will address the connection between climate change and social inequality.

In his address to the Sacramento Press Club, Senate leader Steinberg announced his proposal to:

• Set aggressive targets in statute, beyond 2020, to break our fossil fuel addiction and reinforce the climate goals of AB32 through 2030 and 2050.
• Continue Cap and Trade for polluting industrial plants but replace Cap and Trade’s current 2015 expansion into the transportation fuel economy with a broader, more stable and more flexible Carbon Tax of a similar amount on these same fuels
• Return two-thirds of the Carbon Tax revenues to poor and middle-income Californians through a state Earned Income Tax Credit for families making less than $75,000 per year
• Inject the remaining Carbon Tax revenues into a multi-billion dollar 21st Century development of California’s mass transit infrastructure to reduce traffic and pollution from cars using fossil fuels

State of the Climate Update

The National Climatic Data Center (NCDC), an initiative of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), published an update to the “State of the Climate” report. State of the Climate is a collection of monthly summaries recapping climate-related occurrences on both a global and national scale. Significant events for January 2014 are illustrated in the following graphic, and the full summary of national and regional climate data can be found at: http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/sotc/national/2014/1
**Policy Impacts:**
None.

**Fiscal Impacts:**
None.

**Staff Recommendation:**
Information Only.
Glossary of Acronyms

AB32 = Assembly Bill 32, Global Warming Solutions Act (2006)
ABAG = Association of Bay Area Governments
AR5 = Fifth Assessment Report (IPCC)
ARB = Air Resources Board
BayREN = Bay Area Regional Energy Network
BAMBE = Bay Area Multifamily Building Enhancements
C&S = Codes and Standards (BayREN)
CCBA = Climate Corps Bay Area
CPUC = California Public Utilities Commission
EBMUD = East Bay Municipal Utility District
EPA = Environmental Protection Agency
GHG = greenhouse gas
GIS = Geographic Information Systems
HUA = Home Upgrade Advisor (BayREN)
IPCC = Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
ME&O = marketing, education, and outreach
MFCAP = Multi Family Capital Advance Program
NCDC = National Climate Data Center
NOAA = National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NCBE = North Coast Builders Exchange
PACE = Property Assessed Clean Energy
PAYS® = Pay As You Save
PG&E = Pacific Gas and Electric
RCPA = Regional Climate Protection Authority
REACO = Redwood Empire Association of Code Officers
SCS = Sustainable Communities Strategy
SCEIP = Sonoma County Energy Independence Program
SCTA = Sonoma County Transportation Authority
SFLLR = Single Family Loan Loss Reserve
SFPUC = San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The 2006 adoption of Assembly Bill 32 propelled California further into an international leadership role in the fight against global climate change. By building on decades of successful actions to cut pollution and promote cleaner and more efficient energy, AB 32 solidified California's commitment to tackling climate change in a comprehensive way.

Since 2006, the State has continued to steadily implement a set of actions that are driving down greenhouse gas emissions, cleaning the air, diversifying the energy and fuels that power our society, and spurring innovation in a range of advanced technologies. These efforts have put California on course to achieve the near-term 2020 emissions limit, and have created a framework for ongoing climate action that can be built upon to maintain and continue reductions beyond 2020 as required by AB 32.

California’s approach to climate change is not simply about reducing greenhouse gas emissions. It is built upon the principle that economic prosperity and environmental sustainability are one and the same. And it continues the state’s long and successful legacy of building a world-class economy in concert with some of the most effective environmental and public health policies on the planet.

By remaining steadfastly committed to this approach, we can not only do our part to tackle climate change, we can also forge a cleaner, healthier, and more sustainable future for all Californians.

In the words of Governor Brown, our collective challenge is to “build for the future, not steal from it.” That is what this Plan is designed to do.

PROPOSED FIRST UPDATE TO THE CLIMATE CHANGE SCOPING PLAN

This Proposed First Update to California’s Climate Change Scoping Plan was developed by ARB in collaboration with the Climate Action Team and reflects the input and expertise of a range of state and local government agencies. A Draft Update was released on October 1, 2013, and presented to the Board at a public meeting on October 24, 2013. This version of the Update reflects public input and recommendations from business, environmental, environmental justice, and community-based organizations provided in response to the October draft. ARB will hold a public informational presentation on the Proposed Update at its February 20, 2014, meeting, and will formally present the Update to the Board at its meeting in Spring 2014.

Progress to Date

California is on track to meet the near-term 2020 greenhouse gas limit and is well positioned to maintain and continue reductions beyond 2020 as required by AB 32. The set of actions the State is taking are driving down greenhouse emissions and moving us steadily in the direction of a cleaner energy economy. Many of these actions have been
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bold, ambitious, and truly trail-blazing. Some are more recent, while others precede the passage of AB 32.

Collectively, these actions are evidence of California’s ability to show that it is possible to break the historical connection between economic growth and associated increases in energy demand, combustion of carbon-intensive resources, and pollution. We have shown it is possible to break this chain by relying on cleaner technologies, more efficiency, and more renewable energy sources. And we know that preventing the worst impacts of climate change will require accelerated development and diffusion of these technologies across the world. Stable, flexible, yet durable policies like those developed under AB 32 are key.

Cleaner and More Efficient Energy
California continues to be a global leader in energy efficiency. Since energy efficiency efforts began 40 years ago, Californians have saved $74 billion in reduced electricity costs. As the State’s first priority for providing for its energy needs, ongoing efficiency efforts—like new green building standards now in effect for homes and businesses and new standards for appliances, televisions, and other “plug loads”—continue to reduce energy use and emissions, make our businesses and economy more efficient, and cut energy costs.

California has also made tremendous strides in harnessing its abundant renewable energy resources. Currently, about 23 percent of the State’s electricity comes from renewable power. This will increase to at least 33 percent by 2020 under new requirements set in place by Governor Brown and the Legislature in 2011. Renewable energy is rapidly coming down in cost and is already cost-effective in California for millions of homes and businesses, and in certain utility applications. Once thought of as exotic and alternative, renewable energy technologies have now become an integral part of California’s energy mix.

Cleaner Transportation
California has taken a number of innovative actions to cut emissions from the transportation sector. Collectively, the State’s set of vehicle, fuels, and land use policies will cut in half emissions from passenger transportation and drivers’ fuel costs over the next 20 years.

California’s Low Carbon Fuel Standard (LCFS) is beginning to drive the production of a broad array of cleaner fuels. Since its launch in 2011, the regulation has generated a multitude of unique approaches for cleaner fuels. The LCFS is driving the necessary transition to cleaner fuels and is providing California businesses and consumers with more choices for the fuels they use. Companies in California and elsewhere are rising to the challenge by finding innovative ways to produce cleaner, low carbon fuels.

The cars on California’s roads are also undergoing a transformation. California’s vehicle GHG standards—authorized by AB 1493 (Pavley) in 2002, first approved in 2004, and extended in 2012—are delivering both carbon dioxide (CO₂) reductions and
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savings at the pump. These standards are now federal law and the benefits of California’s policies will be realized nationwide, dramatically scaling up emission reductions. The transition to a fleet of lower-emitting, more-efficient vehicles in California will continue beyond 2020, as these rules cover model years through 2025, and turnover of the fleet will deliver additional benefits from these rules for many more years. And now, ARB is working with the U.S. EPA on national GHG standards for medium- and heavy-duty trucks.

California’s pioneering zero emission vehicle (ZEV) regulation is also driving a transformation of the fleet. As a result of ARB’s 2012 ZEV program and Governor Brown’s Executive Order B-16-12, California will see 1.5 million zero emission vehicles on the State’s roads by 2025. Each day, more and more zero emission vehicles and cleaner, more efficient cars are driving on our streets and highways—visible signs of the transformation of California’s transportation sector.

California is also making major strides toward reducing the number of miles people drive, through more sustainable local and regional housing, land use, and transportation planning. To date, seven Metropolitan Planning Organizations have adopted Sustainable Community Strategies. In addition to helping drive GHG emission reductions, these plans will help create more livable communities that offer greater housing and transportation options; improved access to resources and services; safer, more vibrant neighborhoods; and healthier lifestyles where people can live, work, and play without having to travel long distances or sit through congestion.

Cap-and-Trade Program
Last year, California successfully launched the most comprehensive greenhouse gas Cap-and-Trade Program in the world. As the emissions cap is gradually reduced over time, and as additional sources are brought under the cap to include the vast majority of emissions in the State, the program will ensure that California remains on track to continually reduce emissions and meet the 2020 limit. Looking out into the future, the Cap-and-Trade Program will play a critical role in keeping California on the right emissions reduction trajectory to meet ongoing reduction targets at the lowest possible cost. The program is also sending a clear signal that investment in clean, low carbon technologies will pay off.

On January 1, 2014, California linked its Cap-and-Trade Program with Québec’s. By successfully linking cap-and-trade programs across jurisdictions and increasing opportunities for emission reductions, this linkage represents another important step in California’s efforts to collaborate with other partners around the globe to address climate change.

Building on the Framework

Through AB 32, California has established an effective framework for climate action. This version of the Update includes a more in-depth discussion of climate change science, reflecting the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change’s recently released
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Fifth Assessment and input from a distinguished team of scientific expert reviewers. The science clearly highlights the need for action—greenhouse gas emissions must be cut 80% below 1990 levels by mid-century to stave off the worst impacts of climate change. Setting a mid-term target and sector-specific targets will help guide our path.

Reaching our ultimate objective—reducing California’s greenhouse gas emissions to the scientifically recognized level necessary for climate stabilization—will require California to keep building on the framework by continuing to pursue the maximum technologically feasible and cost-effective actions that will steadily drive down greenhouse gas emissions over the coming decades. It is also clear that many of these same actions are needed to reduce emissions of smog-forming and toxic pollutants to meet federal air quality requirements and ensure that all Californians have healthy air quality.

This Plan lays out a set of new actions that will move the State further along the path to a low-carbon, sustainable future, including specific recommended actions with lead agency assignments and anticipated due dates. Some of the actions are near-term, while others are focused on longer-term efforts that will provide major benefits well into the future.

Every major economic sector in the state will need to play an increasing role in this effort. Success will require the creation of new policies in some sectors, and expanding and refining existing policies in others. We must continue working to find the right combination of policy-based “push” and incentive-based “pull” to accelerate commercial markets for clean energy and efficiency. And we have to coordinate and align public investments in ways that most effectively leverage private resources.

The Great Unifier
Climate change presents an unprecedented set of challenges for California. We are already experiencing its impacts and know that they will only increase. But it can also be a great unifier. It gives us the opportunity to focus on doing more with less; to work across programmatic, policy and political boundaries; and to figure out ways to achieve various goals more quickly and more effectively. The task is to continue building on the steps we have already taken by further integrating climate thinking and sustainability programming into the range of actions we take to grow the economy, protect the environment and public health, and plan for the future.

The strategies we pursue to cut greenhouse gas emissions from our cars, trucks, buses, trains and industries can support ongoing efforts to improve air quality up and down the state, especially in our most heavily impacted communities. Efficiency and conservation programs in the water sector needed to cut emissions will also drive critically needed efforts to enhance supply and reliability priorities. We can cut emissions from our waste stream while also increasing home-grown sources of low-carbon energy and fuels. And we can manage our natural lands and valuable agricultural resources in ways that both achieve climate objectives and enhance their long-term sustainability.
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With strategic investment and coordinated policy-making, California can slash emissions from trucks and trains while at the same time building a world-class goods movement and freight-delivery system. We can modernize our rail and passenger transportation systems to move people in ways that both reduce greenhouse gases and increase mobility options and safety. We can take actions to cut emissions of potent short-lived climate pollutants that will also deliver key public health benefits. And we can align strategies that both support reduction goals and bolster our ability to deal with the impacts of climate change already underway.

The reality is that while climate change demands it, these and myriad other examples described in this Plan are exactly the types of actions California must take in any case to build for our future.

Mid-Term Target
A key step needed to build on California’s framework for climate action is to establish a mid-term statewide emission reduction target. Cumulative emissions drive climate change, and a continuum of action is needed to reduce emissions not just to stated limits in 2020 or 2050, but also every year in between. The target will ensure that the State stays on course and expands upon the successes we have achieved to date so that we can achieve our long-term objective of reducing California’s greenhouse gas emissions to the scientifically recognized level necessary for climate stabilization. A mid-term target, informed by climate science, will be critical in helping to frame the additional suite of policy measures, regulations, planning efforts, and investments in clean technologies that are needed to continue driving down emissions. It will also send a clear signal that California is solidifying its commitment to a low-carbon future, giving businesses the long-term certainty they need to plan for the future.

Each of the major sectors highlighted in this Plan must play a role in supporting the statewide effort to continue reducing emissions. As steps are taken to develop a statewide target, sector targets will also be developed that reflect the opportunities for reductions that can be achieved through existing and new actions, policies, regulations and investments.

Sector-Specific Actions

Energy
The actions outlined in this Plan support California’s efforts to build a state-of-the-art energy generation, supply and distribution system that is clean, affordable and reliable. Many of the actions expand upon existing policy frameworks that have made our state a global leader in areas like energy efficiency, demand response, and renewable energy generation. Others reflect the need to incorporate new and rapidly evolving technologies like energy storage, demand response, and a smarter grid into the fabric of California’s energy system.

A core element of the Plan is the development of a comprehensive greenhouse gas reduction program for the state’s electric and energy utilities by 2016. This approach
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will enable California to pull together and coordinate a range of policies, technologies, and investments needed to achieve the most cost-effective emissions reductions across the sector, in-line with meeting mid-term and long-term statewide targets. It also will give utilities, electricity providers and a range of other businesses the flexibility and the right incentives to pursue the most innovative strategies to cut emissions.

Transportation, Land Use, Fuels, and Infrastructure
Over the past several decades, California has pioneered a host of innovative policies in the transportation sector that have cut air pollution and greenhouse emissions. This Plan builds on a set of existing policies and lays out new strategies that will continue to push down emissions and scale up clean, advanced technologies across the entire transportation sector. It calls for targeted investment in critical infrastructure projects that will be necessary to keep California on track to meet our ongoing climate objectives. And it recognizes the need to closely integrate climate planning with efforts to meet California’s air quality goals.

Meeting California’s long-term air quality and climate objectives will require the State to continue building on efforts underway to put more low and zero-emission vehicles on the road. These efforts also need to be expanded to include an increasing focus on cleaner medium- and heavy-duty vehicles. At the same time, we must continue working to figure out the right mix of policies and incentives for increasing reductions in the carbon content of transportation fuels. And we must invest in building the cleanest, most advanced systems and infrastructure to move people and goods in the state.

Agriculture
California’s agricultural industry provides hundreds of thousands of jobs and tens of billions of dollars in economic value to the state each year. The long-term sustainability of the sector is vital to California’s economic future. This Plan describes a set of actions to ensure California’s agricultural sector continues to thrive in the face of a changing climate and plays a key role in the state’s efforts to continue reducing greenhouse emissions.

There is a range of opportunities for greenhouse gas emissions reductions and sequestration in the agriculture sector. Technology advancements allow for more precise irrigation techniques, which cut energy costs and preserve valuable water resources. Strategic approaches to conservation will keep valuable agricultural lands in operation and help eliminate greenhouse gas emissions that result from conversion. And capturing methane from agriculture operations will provide climate benefits while also affording opportunities to produce bioenergy and biofuels. The coordinated effort to develop the right mix of policies and incentives described in this Plan will help keep California’s agriculture sector thriving into the future.

Water
Water is the lifeblood of our state and economy, and integrally connected to our food supply and energy systems. The state needs to employ a range of approaches that will cut emissions, maximize efficiency and conservation, and enhance water quality and
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supply reliability, while also addressing growing climate resiliency requirements.

A greater focus on integrated policy design in the water sector is needed as California implements strategies that will support our state’s longer-term climate objectives. State policy and regulatory frameworks must be developed that allow for, and incentivize, effective regional integrated planning and implementation. We need to employ pricing policies will maximize efficiency and conservation efforts in the water sector, and put in place mandatory conservation measures to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and maintain water supply reliability during drought periods.

Waste
California’s goal of reaching 75 percent recycling and composting by 2020 provides an opportunity to achieve substantial GHG reductions across the waste sector, while providing other significant economic and environmental co-benefits. Much of what is traditionally considered “waste” can be a resource for other uses. California must take advantage of waste materials to generate energy to power our homes and cars, and to improve our working lands.

Compostable organics represent over a third of California’s disposed waste, and are the primary source of fugitive methane emissions at landfills. A new organics management approach for California that will divert this material to minimize emissions at landfills and provide feedstock for critically needed alternatives to agricultural amendments and for low carbon fuel manufacturing.

Achieving the 75 percent waste diversion goal will require substantial expansion of the collection, recycling, and manufacturing industries within California. This Plan sets forth a series of actions to support this industrial growth and calls on California to manage its waste at home in ways that will support greenhouse gas emission reductions, environmental co-benefits, and job growth.

Natural and Working Lands
Three-quarters of California’s landmass comprises natural and working lands, such as forests, rangelands, and wetlands. These lands provide a multitude of economic and environmental benefits, and must play increasingly important role in California’s efforts to prepare for and adapt to the impacts of climate change. Natural and working lands must also play a key role to help achieve California’s long-term climate objectives. We have to start investing now in strategies that ensure these lands are managed in ways that maximize their carbon benefits while also ensuring landscape resilience; protecting and enhancing the state’s water supplies; safeguarding the state’s wildlife, fish, and plants, and promoting sustainable rural communities.

This Plan describes a series of policies, actions, and strategic investments to enhance, protect, and conserve California’s natural and working lands in ways that will provide important climate benefits as well as a more resilient California that is better prepared for climate risks such as more frequent and severe wildfires, varying and unpredictable water availability, and stressors on species and natural communities. A key element of
Executive Summary

this approach is the development of a “Forest Carbon Plan” by 2016 that will set mid and long-term greenhouse gas reduction planning targets, and identify funding and investment needs.

Short-Lived Climate Pollutants
Over the past several decades, California’s actions to improve air quality and protect public health have resulted in significant reductions in potent short-lived climate pollutants, which include black carbon, methane, and hydrofluorocarbons. These pollutants remain in the atmosphere for shorter periods of time and have much larger global warming potentials compared to CO₂.

While we must continue taking steps to rapidly reduce CO₂, additional efforts to cut emissions of short-lived climate pollutants can yield immediate climate benefits. In addition, fast and sustainable action to reduce these emissions can help to achieve other benefits though avoided impacts on agriculture, water availability, ecosystems and human health. The reduction of methane would reduce tropospheric ozone concentrations and ozone precursors, which would help with progress towards healthy air quality and avoid crop yield losses due to direct action of ozone on crop growth. Black carbon deposits accelerate glacial melting and impact cloud formation and precipitation. Further reducing black carbon and methane emissions will help reduce premature deaths and associated medical expenses each year.

California is committed to continuing to reduce emissions of short-lived climate pollutants, particularly where efforts will result in air quality and public health co-benefits. ARB will develop a short-lived climate pollutant strategy by 2015 that will include an inventory of sources and emissions, the identification of additional research needs, and a plan for developing necessary control measures.

Green Buildings
Buildings in California represent a significant source of greenhouse gas emissions. Over the past five years, California has solidified its commitment to green building; leading the way with State buildings, improving building standards, continuing to raise the bar with voluntary programs at the local level, and greening existing buildings. We must continue to build on this approach by ensuring successful implementation of current initiatives and expanding the long term focus towards zero-carbon buildings.

This Plan describes a set of actions to continue cutting emissions from California’s building sector including the development of a comprehensive greenhouse gas emission reduction program for new construction, existing building retrofits, and operation and maintenance of certified green buildings.

Courage, Creativity, and Boldness
Climate change has presented us with unprecedented challenges—challenges that cannot be met with traditional ways of thinking or conventional solutions. As Governor
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Brown has recognized, meeting these challenges will require “courage, creativity, and boldness.”

It will require California to continue to lead the world in pioneering effective strategies toward a cleaner, more sustainable economy. It will require us to continue sharing our successful approaches to climate policy with others, including continuing to partner and collaborate with other state, national, and global leaders as we work toward common goals. And it will require further engaging California’s citizens, businesses, and its most creative minds to continue building a state that provides low carbon, high-quality lifestyles.

As we take these steps, we understand that we don’t have all of the answers today. But, we are on the right path. We have a framework for action in place that is driving down emissions, spurring innovation across a range of clean and advanced technology sectors, improving the air Californians breathe, and creating more livable communities. By building on this framework with the set of actions outlined in this Plan, we can do our part to meet the challenge of global climate change, and in the process, continue to build the clean, sustainable future that all Californians deserve.
Darrell Steinberg says California should junk its complex cap-and-trade system for pollution credits and replace it with a carbon tax on gasoline, diesel and other fossil fuels.

By Marc Lifsher

6:00 PM PST, February 20, 2014

SACRAMENTO — Californians, who already pay some of the highest gasoline prices in the nation, could soon be asked to pay more.

Pump prices are likely to climb more than 12 cents per gallon starting Jan. 1, both the oil industry and environmental experts agree. That's when the state's complex cap-and-trade system for pollution credits expands to cover vehicle fuels and their emissions.

As a result, gasoline producers would need to buy pollution credits, and they are expected to pass the cost along at the pump.

But state Senate leader Darrell Steinberg (D-Sacramento) has an alternative in mind: a carbon tax of 15 cents a gallon on fuels starting next year.

"Cap and trade is about to grow in a big way," he said Thursday in a luncheon speech. The upshot, he warned, could include "spikes and wild fluctuations in gas prices."

Steinberg thinks that he has a better plan to create a financial incentive for cars and trucks to spew less pollutants from their tailpipes.

He wants to junk the buying and selling of credits for vehicle fuel emissions and replace them with a straightforward "carbon tax." The tax on gasoline, diesel and other fossil fuels would be more transparent and predictable, Steinberg said.

His proposed carbon tax would be collected at the distribution point and probably passed along to wholesalers, retailers and ultimately consumers, he said.

A carbon tax would add 15 cents to the price of a gallon of gas in 2015, Steinberg said, and go up after that.

That's on top of the current state gasoline tax of 71.9 cents per gallon, the nation's highest, and the federal gas tax of 18.4 cents per gallon, plus a state sales tax levied on the total retail sale.
His proposed carbon tax would rise to an estimated 24 cents per gallon in 2020, which would keep total gas prices lower than they would be under cap-and-trade projections, Steinberg said.

Steinberg, who will be termed out of the state Legislature at year’s end, said he realizes that the carbon tax could be a tough sell. Nevertheless, he said he’s eager to start a conversation on the best financial mechanism to help the state meet its goal of reducing carbon emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2020.

But changing the regulations drafted by the California Air Resources Board since the 2006 passage of the state landmark global warming law, AB 32, won’t be easy.

Conservative Republican and so-called moderate Democratic members of the Legislature could be hesitant to provide the two-thirds super-majority vote required to pass a tax increase.

On top of that, Democratic Gov. Jerry Brown, who led a successful ballot measure to raise income and sales taxes in 2012, has said he’s not interested in signing any tax hikes this year.

California’s anti-tax activists agree with the governor. "We don't think that putting a big, new tax on gasoline is going to go over well with people spending a whole lot of money just to get to work," said David Kline, a spokesman for the California Taxpayers Assn.

Environmentalists and businesses that are already participating in the cap-and-trade auction system for stationary pollution sources, such as factories and power plants, oppose any change.

Junking part of cap and trade would "tarnish California's reputation as a national and global climate leader," said Derek Walker of the Environmental Defense Fund.

Susan Frank, director of the California Business Alliance, which represents small to medium-sized clean-energy companies, called Steinberg’s proposal "a free pass" for the oil industry.

The president of a powerful oil trade group, the Western States Petroleum Assn., says her group has "no formal position" for now on the carbon tax proposal. But Catherine Reheis-Boyd said she's excited that "there's now a conversation" about which policy will deliver what Californians need in a way that has the least economic impact.

Greenhouse gases generated by burning vehicle fuels account for about 40% of California’s total carbon emissions, she said.

Last year, the petroleum association shopped its own carbon tax proposal around the state Capitol, said legislative aides in both the Senate and Assembly, who were not authorized to speak to a reporter on the record.

Oil companies prefer a carbon tax to a cap-and-trade system because it’s more predictable and easier to pass the cost on to consumers, they said.

Under Steinberg’s plan, most of the proceeds from the tax, estimated at $3.6 billion in the first year, would be earmarked to help low- and moderate-income families, who suffer disproportionately from environment-related health problems.

The boost would be in the form of an earned income tax credit similar to a federal program to assist the poor. The rest would pay for transit and related environmental projects designed to give people an alternative to consuming oil, natural gas, propane and other hydrocarbons.
"Under either a carbon tax or cap and trade applied to fuel, consumers will pay more at the pump," Steinberg acknowledged in his lunchtime speech to the Sacramento Press Club. "That's necessary. Higher prices discourage demand. If carbon pricing doesn't sting, we won't change our habits."

marc.lifsher@latimes.com

Twitter: @MarcLifsher
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Staff Report

To:        SCTA Board of Directors
From:      Suzanne Smith
Item:      5.2 – Regional Agency Reports: SMART, NCRA, MTC, ABAG, BAAQMD, CALCOG, Self Help Counties Coalition
Date:      March 10, 2014

Issue:
Recent updates from:
• North Coast Railroad Authority (NCRA)
• Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)
• Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG)
• Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD)
• Self Help Counties Coalition

Background:
The following links provide information regarding various regional agencies and issues:
• MTC Executive Director’s Report
• California Association of Councils of Government
• Sonoma/Marin Area Rail Transit (SMART)
  o  http://www2.sonomamarintrain.org/index.php/videos

Staff Recommendation:
This is an informational item only.
Technical Advisory Committee

MEETING AGENDA

February 27, 2014 1:30 PM
Sonoma County Transportation Authority
SCTA Large Conference Room
490 Mendocino Avenue, Suite 206
Santa Rosa, California 95401

Note: The Ramp Metering Technical Advisory Committee will meet on February 27, 2014 at 12:00 P.M. immediately preceding the SCTA TAC meeting.

ITEM

1. Introductions
2. Public Comment
3. Approval of Minutes, January 23, 2014* – DISCUSSION / ACTION
4. Level of Service Comments to OPR* - DISCUSSION / ACTION
5. Draft Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Update* - DISCUSSION
6. TDA3 Call for Projects* - DISCUSSION
7. Local Streets and Roads Working Group Update DISCUSSION
8. Measure M DISCUSSION / ACTION
   8.1 Measure M Maintenance of Effort Policy Compliance*
   8.2 Measure M Invoicing Status*
   8.3 Measure M Strategic Plan Draft (emailed separately)
   8.4 Measure M Final Annual Report available on-line
9. Rail Update DISCUSSION
10. DRAFT Upcoming SCTA Agenda for March 10, 2014* - DISCUSSION
11. Other Business / Comments / Announcements DISCUSSION
12. Adjourn – ACTION

*Materials attached.
**Handout at meeting

The next SCTA meeting will be held March 10, 2014
The next TAC meeting will be held March 27, 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 Technical Advisory Committee after distribution of the agenda packet are available for public inspection in the Sonoma County Transportation Authority office at 490 Mendocino Ave., Suite 206, during normal business hours.

Pagers, cellular telephones and all other communication devices should be turned off during the committee meeting to avoid electrical interference with the sound recording system.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cloverdale Public Works</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotati Public Works</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Sonoma PRMD</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Sonoma Reg. Parks</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Sonoma TPW</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healdsburg Public Works</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petaluma Public Works &amp; Transit</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rohnert Park Public Works</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa Public Works</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa Transit</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastopol Public Works</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMART</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma County Transit</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma Public Works</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor Public Works</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCTA Citizens Advisory Committee

MEETING AGENDA

February 24, 2014 at 4:00 p.m.
Sonoma County Transportation Authority
SCTA Large Conference Room
490 Mendocino Avenue, Suite 206
Santa Rosa, California 95401

ITEM

1. Introductions
2. Public Comment
3. Approval of Minutes January 27, 2014*
4. Measure M – DISCUSSION/ACTION
   4.1. Measure M Project Presentation –
   4.2. Measure M Bond Disclosures*
   4.3. Measure M Financial Reports*
5. Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan*
6. Updates
   6.1. Highway 101
   6.2. SMART
7. Announcements
8. Adjourn

*Materials attached.

The next SCTA/RCPA meeting will be March 10, 2014
The next CAC meeting will be March 31, 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 Citizens Advisory Committee after distribution of the agenda packet are available for public inspection in the Sonoma County Transportation Authority office at 490 Mendocino Ave., Suite 206, during normal business hours. Pagers, cellular telephones and all other communication devices should be turned off during the committee meeting to avoid electrical interference with the sound recording system.
MEETING AGENDA

Thursday, February 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 January 23, 2014* - ACTION
5. Round table members discussion
6. Climate Action 2020 – update*
7. Healthy By Design 2.0/Healthy Communities Training* presentation by Sonoma County PRMD
8. SB 743 Preliminary Evaluation of Alternative Methods of Transportation Analysis for CEQA by OPR - Comment Letter*
9. Bicycle & Pedestrian Master Plan*
10. 2014 Highway 101 Corridor Landscaping & Tree Planting Plan*
11. Countywide Transportation Plan update*
12. Other Business /Next agenda
13. Adjourn

*Attachment

The next SCTA meeting will be held March 10, 2014
The next Planning Directors/PAC meeting will be held March 27, 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.
Transit - Technical Advisory Committee

MEETING AGENDA

February 19, 2014 10:00 AM
Sonoma County Transportation Authority
SCTA Large Conference Room
490 Mendocino Avenue, Suite 206
Santa Rosa, California 95401

ITEM

1. Introductions
2. Approval of Minutes: January 15, 2014 – DISCUSSION / ACTION*
3. Updates: Transit Operators
4. Updates: Other Entities
5. Coordinated Claim – DISCUSSION*
6. Clipper Update – DISCUSSION*
7. 2014 Work Plan – DISCUSSION*
8. Yearly Update to SCTA Board – DISCUSSION*
9. Other Business / Comments / Announcements
   9.1. Santa Rosa CityBus unveils bus locator system -
   http://www.pressdemocrat.com/article/20140127/articles/140129613
10. Adjourn – ACTION

*Materials attached.

The next SCTA meeting will be held February 10, 2013
The next T-TAC meeting will be held February 19, 2013

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

SB 343 DOCUMENTS RELATED TO OPEN SESSION AGENDAS: Materials related to an item on this agenda submitted to the Transit-Technical Advisory Committee after distribution of the agenda packet are available for public inspection in the Sonoma County Transportation Authority office at 490 Mendocino Ave., Suite 206, during normal business hours. Pagers, cellular telephones and all other communication devices should be turned off during the committee meeting to avoid electrical interference with the sound recording system.