ITEM
1. Introductions
2. Public Comment
3. Approval of Minutes, February 23, 2016*
4. Measure M DISCUSSION
   4.1. Measure M Invoicing Status*
   4.2. Measure M Maintenance of Effort*
5. Regional Information Update DISCUSSION / ACTION
   5.1. Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS)*
   5.2. One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) 2 application scoring results *(Spreadsheets will be distributed separately from this agenda)*
6. SB 743 Information Update DISCUSSION
7. Rail Update DISCUSSION
8. Draft SCTA Board Meeting Agenda for March 27, 2017 DISCUSSION*
9. Other Business / Comments / Announcements DISCUSSION
10. Adjourn ACTION

*Materials attached.

The next SCTA meeting will be held May 8th, 2017
The next TAC meeting will be held April 20, 2017
Copies of the full Agenda Packet are available at www.sctainfo.org

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

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

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

TAC Voting member attendance – (6 Month rolling 2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>December</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cloverdale Public Works</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotati Public Works</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Sonoma DHS</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Sonoma PRMD</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Sonoma Regional 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>

*NB: September meeting was cancelled. November and December meetings fell on holidays so a single TAC meeting was held in early December.*
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Minutes of February 23, 2017

ITEM

1. Introductions
   Meeting called to order by Larry Zimmer at 1:34 p.m.
   Committee Members: Larry Zimmer, City of Petaluma; Heny Mikus, City of Sonoma; Elizabeth Tyree, Sonoma County Regional Parks; Eydie Tacata, City of Rohnert Park; Alejandro Perez, Town of Windsor; Brittany Lobo, Sonoma County Department of Health Services; Mark Rincon, City of Cloverdale; Erica Jansen, City of Cloverdale; Anwar Mirza, City of Cotati; Joanne Parker, SMART.
   Guests: Mallory Atkinson, MTC; Adam Crenshaw, MTC; Karl Anderson, MTC; Alisha O’Loughlin, Sonoma County Bicycle Coalition.
   Staff: Seana Gause, James Cameron, Dana Turrey, Chris Barney, Drew Nichols

2. Public Comment
   N/A

3. Approval of Minutes, January 26, 2017*
   Approved as submitted.

4. TFCA/TDA3 Call for Projects – DISCUSSION
   Dana Turrey clarified that the TFCA and TDA3 grants are two separate calls for projects. This is item simply informational purposes for the committee.

   TFCA
   The TFCA grant, Transportation for Clean Air, was released earlier this month and applications will be due March 20th. There is a two part distribution. First, an off-the-top portion of the fund is granted directly to the County of Sonoma, City of Santa Rosa, and City of Petaluma for transit expenses. The second part is a competitive portion that is open to the other cities within the Air District.
   Highlights in changes from last year: increase cost effectiveness for shuttle projects and allowance for upgrades to existing bicycle facilities, only when converting class 2, 3 to a class 1 or 4.
   Application materials were emailed. Ms. Turrey is available to provide applications and fielded questions.
   Joanne Parker, SMART, discussed the emergency ride home program and how transit operators have expressed support for this program to be funded through the competitive portion of the grant.
   Dana Turrey added that this program benefits those who bike, walk, or carpool. The program is in effect throughout most of the Bay Area and in Santa Rosa. This type of program is worth considering county wide.

   TDA3
   The TDA3 call for projects was issued in January. This grant is for bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure projects, and can be used for bicycle and pedestrian planning. A state wide sales tax is allocated for this fund. Allocations are based on jurisdiction population size and funds can roll over into the following year.
   Included in the agenda packet is a correct version of TDA 3 funding estimates. Applications are due March 17th and the CBPAC committee will be reviewing applications on March 28th.
   Edie Tacata asked for clarification on whether TFCA requires cost effectiveness for the slate of projects or whether these are for each projects? Ms. Turrey
responded each individual project is dependent on a threshold. Larry Zimmer asked if one can borrow certain amount of TDA3 funds in advance. Ms. Turrey responded that one can borrow up to two years in advance.

5. Measure M DISCUSSION / ACTION

5.1. Measure M Invoicing Status*
Seana Gause reported on the current Measure M appropriations. Highlighted items on the chart are past the six month due date.

6. Regional Information Update DISCUSSION / ACTION

6.1 Fund Management System (FMS) and Single Point of Contact (SPOC) Primer

MTC was available for a presentation on the Fund Management System (FMS) and Single Point of Contact (SPOC). Mallory Atkinson, Adam Crenshaw, and Karl Anderson presented on OBAG status, provided an overview on Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), who is the appropriate as the point of contact, and explained the FMS.

Ms. Atkinson described the relevant requirements relating to OBAG. $28 million is available for Sonoma County, and this grant is administered via MTC through the CMAs then to the local agencies.

Requirements for local jurisdictions are: complete streets checklist; inclusion of a housing element; and, new to this cycle, a completed annual report. Annual reports are required – first progress report due April 1st. MTC will be checking for annual reports.

In regards to local streets and road requirements, there is a requirement to maintain certification for the Pavement Management Program, participate in the statewide Needs Assessment (required every other year), and the traffic count data. These elements are not intended to be a burden, rather a mode of information sharing. Ms. Atkinson welcomed any form of data, for it is helpful for regional and state agencies.

Each jurisdiction is required to identify their SPOC. A FMS account is required to ensure communication to FHWA, Caltrans, and MTC. This is important for project delivery.

Joanne Parker asked to clarify projects within an agency's right-of-way.

Ms. Atkinson responded all jurisdictions within the project must meet compliances, however will follow up with details pertaining to the right-of-way.

Seana Gause elaborated on the SPOC responsibilities. The SPOC must have the authority to give direction on a project, and coordinate with MTC and the CMAs.

Ms. Atkinson added the SPOC needs to be someone who has experience delivering federal programs and someone with authority to ensure the flow of communication between Caltrans, MTC, and the CMAs.

Adam Crenshaw presented a detailed presentation on the FMS and TIP. The presentation highlighted how to one receives access to federal funding.

The Transportation Improvement Program is a four year program. Key milestones required by Caltrans correctly described in the TIP are: schedule a field review, projects in which the description matches environmental documents, and an obligation of funding must be established.

The TIP must be consistent throughout regarding the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), including descriptions, costs, and completion year. It must not be greater in scope referenced in the RTP.

Mr. Crenshaw further described the process in evaluating and modeling these projects.

Most projects are listed individually. Monthly administrative modifications are done, and specific requirements are laid out on what MTC is allowed to do.

A discussion around submitting projects, assuring consistency, and making necessary edits to TIP was held.

Mr. Crenshaw provided a detailed explanation and guidance on using the FMS. Public viewers can look
at existing projects and the progress of the respective project.

MTC will review accounts, approve new users, and continue with the privileges and restrictions a user has on FMS.

Projects are revised, edited, and/or archived under the user accounts. The FMS does the ranking, and develop the cost.

Transit operators are able to submit projects on their own; however, other jurisdictions must submit their applications through SCTA.

7. SB 743 Information Update - DISCUSSION

Chris Barney updated the committee on SB 743. OPR’s final guidance on implementation has not yet been submitted to the CA Natural Resource Agency. Caltrans HQ has requested that district comments on local projects be more conservative and less emphasis be placed on the VMT analysis until the final guidance has been released and SB 743 requirements are formally in place.

Staff has checked in with a number of local consultants that perform traffic analyses and help prepare CEQA documents in the Bay Area and determined that this group is generally waiting until the final guidance is released to move forward with a specific approach to addressing SB 743 or analyzing VMT as part of the environmental process or when preparing traffic studies.

Once the final guidance is released, staff make sure that the TAC is informed.

8. Project initiation Update DISCUSSION

Seana Gause provided an update on the Project Initiation Document (PID) list, stating Caltrans will no longer fund Project Initiating Documents. The project sponsor is responsible for funding the document relating to new projects.

As well, jurisdictions must provide funds to Caltrans for oversight of these documents and projects must be funded through the environmental stage to be included on the active project list.

Ms. Gause fielded requests to add or remove projects on the PID.

9. Rail Update DISCUSSION

Joanne Parker updated the committee on SMART. So far, ten of the 14 motors have been successfully replaced and the remaining four are on schedule. SMART has begun Positive Train Control testing, anticipating to continue in the next few weeks. Upon approval from the Federal Railroad Administration, full system testing is expected to begin.

Ms. Parker outlined the last board meeting, to which an agreement was made in allowing freight car storage on the Shellville yard.

The March 1st board meeting is cancelled; the next board meeting will be held on March 15th.

A discussion relating to the Larkspur extension, San Rafael Civic Center, and the recent flooding along the tracks were held.

10. Draft SCTA Board Meeting Agenda for March 13, 2017 – DISCUSSION*

The PID list will be presented to the next SCTA-RCPA Board of Directors meeting, and transit operators are scheduled to give presentations between March and May.

11. Other Business / Comments / Announcements - DISCUSSION

N/A

12. Adjourn ACTION

The meeting adjourned at 3:17p.m.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Sponsor</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Measure M Program</th>
<th>Prior Apprp Balance</th>
<th>16/17 Programmed</th>
<th>16/17 Amount Apprp</th>
<th>Appropriation Date</th>
<th>Last Invoice Date</th>
<th>Balance Remaining</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cotati</td>
<td>116 Landscaping</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>9/12/2016</td>
<td>10/21/2016</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>Hearst Avenue (Phase 3)</td>
<td>LSP</td>
<td>$429,916</td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>12/22/2016</td>
<td>12/22/2016</td>
<td>$387,484</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>Fulton Road Improvements</td>
<td>LSP</td>
<td>$387,614</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>12/22/2016</td>
<td>$331,225</td>
<td>$311,225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma County</td>
<td>Airport Blvd</td>
<td>LSP</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,047,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>11/16/2016</td>
<td>$222,219</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma County</td>
<td>Airport Blvd Landscaping PS&amp;E</td>
<td>LSP</td>
<td>$270,560</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Moved amount to 16/17 based on Prog req.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma County</td>
<td>Airport Blvd Landscaping CON</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$695,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>12/22/2016</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0 March Board action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma County</td>
<td>Airport Blvd Landscaping CON</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>12/22/2016</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0 March Board action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>Access Across 101 Comm Conn Bike/Ped</td>
<td>$2,019</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>12/22/2016</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rohnert Park</td>
<td>Access Across 101 Bike/Ped</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>11/16/2016</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>Access Across 101 Bike/Ped</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>11/16/2016</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SoCo DHS</td>
<td>SRTS (DHS) Bike/Ped</td>
<td>$20,603</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>8/29/2016</td>
<td>$20,563</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCBC</td>
<td>SRTS (SCBC) Bike/Ped</td>
<td>$10,157</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$19,000</td>
<td>12/13/2016</td>
<td>$20,973</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCBC</td>
<td>BTW (SCBC) Bike/Ped</td>
<td>$3,988</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>8/29/2016</td>
<td>$12,012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SoCo Regional Pk</td>
<td>Sonoma Schellville Bike/Ped</td>
<td>$24,059</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$17,438</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SoCo Regional Pk</td>
<td>Petaluma River Trail Bike/Ped</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>2/3/2017</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMART</td>
<td>NVPPR Bike/Ped</td>
<td>$585,777</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>5/23/2016</td>
<td>$585,777</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total remaining:
- $5,185,000
- $19,000

$1,569,705

$648,778 Bike Ped Remaining

$920,928 LSP Remaining
Issue:

Is SCTA in compliance with Public Utilities Code 180200 and Measure M Policy 14 Maintenance of Effort (MOE)?

Background:

The Traffic Relief Act for Sonoma County, Measure M, is governed by the Public Utilities Code. PUC 180200 requires that “local governments maintain their existing commitment of local funds for transportation purposes.” The PUC does not specify how an existing commitment must be measured, in order to ensure compliance with the requirement.

Until 2010, Sonoma County jurisdictions received Proposition 42 funds, which had specific MOE requirements. Since the Prop 42 requirements were more stringent than Measure M, there seemed little need for a Measure M policy to address maintenance of effort. Once Proposition 42 funds ended, the SCTA acted to implement its own MOE policy. The SCTA board approved Measure M Policy 14 on July 11, 2011 after Technical and Citizens Advisory Committee (TAC and CAC) review.

Policy 14 (attached) requires that jurisdictions report the amount of local transportation funding, as a percentage of that jurisdiction’s overall general fund spending. By analyzing the commitment as a percentage of general funds, as opposed to the actual amount of transportation funding, the policy considers the possibility that transportation spending may go down, if there is a decrease in general fund spending. However, if the general fund increases, transportation funding would be expected to be increased by the same percentage.

The baseline percentage was set for FY 2011/12, since it was the year the policy was enacted. In 2014, 2015 and 2016 the SCTA board accepted the recommendation from the TAC & CAC and determined all jurisdictions were in conformance based on the submitted reporting. SCTA staff has now received FY 15/16 reporting from all Measure M Local Street Rehabilitation (LSR) Program recipients. A summary of that reporting is shown in the attached table.

Countywide, the commitment of transportation funding increased both in overall dollars and as a percentage of cumulative general funds. Nine of ten jurisdictions increased their individual percentage commitment of local funds for transportation purposes between the baseline in FY11/12 and FY15/16. The Town of Windsor decreased their percentage of transportation funding. The Town of Windsor built a large capital project on Shiloh in the baseline year causing them to have a large baseline percentage and they continue to be below the baseline, but the Town consistently has one of the largest percentages of all the jurisdictions.
The PUC does not state that the commitment must be calculated as a percentage of the general fund or that it be met annually. Policy 14 requires that each jurisdiction provide reporting, but it does not state that each jurisdiction’s individual commitment must be maintained. Since many small jurisdictions need to "bank" transportation funding for several years in order to deliver a reasonably sized project, a single year’s baseline figure can easily be skewed, based on whether the baseline year contained a large transportation project. Additionally, Policy 14 does not specify consequences for a jurisdiction that does not individually meet their baseline figure. Finally, although the Traffic Relief Act of Sonoma County requires that local governments maintain their existing commitment of local funds for transportation purposes, it does not state whether the commitment must be maintained individually by each jurisdiction, or collectively.

Given that all jurisdictions met the reporting requirements of Policy 14 and that collectively the commitment of transportation funding has increased over baseline, both in actual dollars and as a percentage of overall general fund spending, the TAC should consider recommending to the Board that SCTA is in compliance, with the PUC, the Traffic Relief Act of Sonoma County, and Measure M Policy 14.

**Policy Impacts:**

This is an interpretation of the Measure M Strategic Plan Policy 14 that would allow for individual jurisdictions to not meet their baseline MOE commitment, provided that collectively SCTA jurisdictions meet or exceed the baseline MOE commitment. This interpretation was previously approved by the SCTA board in May 2014, July 2015 and April 2016.

**Fiscal Impacts:**

Consequences of determining that individual jurisdictions must maintain their baseline contribution to transportation could result in a suspension of a portion of the Measure M Local Street Rehabilitation (LSR) allocations to those jurisdictions, until contributions are brought back to FY 11/12 baseline levels. Estimates of FY 17/18 allocations are shown in the attached table.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Staff recommends that the TAC consider recommending to the Board that SCTA is in compliance with the Public Utilities Code Section 180200, the Traffic Relief Act of Sonoma County, and Measure M Policy 14.
MEASURE M - STRATEGIC PLAN POLICY 14

The Traffic Relief Act for Sonoma County is governed by the Public Utilities Code. PUC 180200 requires that “local governments maintain their existing commitment of local funds for transportation purposes.” The Measure M Expenditure Plan states “consistent with California Public Utilities Code Section 180200, the SCTA intends that the additional funds provided governmental agencies by the Traffic Relief Act for Sonoma County shall supplement existing local revenues being used for public transportation purposes and that local jurisdictions maintain their existing commitment of local funds for transportation purposes.” Measure M cooperative agreements for the Local Streets Rehabilitation Program also require maintenance of effort.

For the Local Streets Rehabilitation Program funding, each local agency shall be responsible for identifying which of their accounts have local funds for transportation purposes. For these purposes, expenditures would be calculated per fiscal year. A fiscal year is defined as July 1 through June 30. The baseline amount is transportation fund expenditures in FY11/12 which will be converted to percentage of general fund expenditure. Expenditures for each subsequent year will be compared to the baseline to determine the same percentage of general fund expenditures is occurring. Baseline percentages (FY11/12) and subsequent year percentages of discretionary fund expenditures on transportation shall be provided to SCTA by each jurisdiction no later than February 15, starting in February 2013. This is to allow agency audits to be completed prior to submittal.
### Maintenance of Effort Calculations - % of Local Fund Expenditures on Transportation as a Percentage of the General Fund Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>FY 11-12 (BASELINE)</th>
<th>Measure M Local Streets Rehab Estimated FY 17/18 Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation (A)</td>
<td>General Fund (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Sonoma*</td>
<td>$7,510,980</td>
<td>$360,118,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotati</td>
<td>$96,726</td>
<td>$4,436,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloverdale</td>
<td>$162,404</td>
<td>$5,270,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healdsburg</td>
<td>$916,656</td>
<td>$7,547,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petaluma</td>
<td>$775,000</td>
<td>$32,472,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rohnert Park</td>
<td>$558,407</td>
<td>$22,477,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>$2,298,378</td>
<td>$117,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastopol</td>
<td>$159,486</td>
<td>$4,884,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma (City)</td>
<td>$749,256</td>
<td>$11,838,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>$3,043,675</td>
<td>$13,108,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>$16,270,968</td>
<td>$579,154,968</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>FY15-16</th>
<th>Measure M Local Streets Rehab Estimated FY 17/18 Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation (I)</td>
<td>General Fund (J)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Sonoma*</td>
<td>$31,289,317</td>
<td>$444,252,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotati</td>
<td>$1,130,832</td>
<td>$5,793,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloverdale</td>
<td>$339,076</td>
<td>$6,123,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healdsburg</td>
<td>$1,651,821</td>
<td>$13,302,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petaluma</td>
<td>$1,320,000</td>
<td>$42,463,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rohnert Park</td>
<td>$5,543,827</td>
<td>$35,655,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>$3,165,358</td>
<td>$137,334,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastopol</td>
<td>$325,848</td>
<td>$7,704,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma (City)</td>
<td>$1,594,155</td>
<td>$16,471,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>$2,112,932</td>
<td>$17,382,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>$48,473,166</td>
<td>$726,482,867</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is HPMS?

HPMS is a national highway information system that includes data on the extent, condition, performance, use, and operating characteristics of the Nation's highways.

Details can be found on this website: https://www fhwa dot gov/policyinformation/hpms cfm

Caltrans is required to:
1) Submit HPMS dataset to FHWA by June 15th.
2) Submit CA Public Road Mileage Certification by June 1st.

HPMS- What to submit?

• Sixty-Nine (69) data items on all “Public Roads” Full Extent, Sample Panels or Summary. (HPMS Field Manual)
• Linear Reference System (LRS) Network links HPMS sections data by Route ID.
Public Road

• A public road is any road or street owned and maintained by a public authority and open to public travel. [23 U.S.C. 101(a)]
• To be open to public travel, a road section must be available, except during scheduled periods, extreme weather, or emergency conditions, passable by four-wheel standard passenger cars, and open to the general public for use without restrictive gates, prohibitive signs, or regulation other than restrictions based on size, weight, or class of registration. [23 CFR 460.2(c)]

HPMS Current Challenges

• Update/maintain local data:
  To coordinate with 482 cities + 58 counties + 18 MPOs to maintain and update the network data, traffic data, pavement data and shapefiles.

• Update/maintain current (Caltrans) All-Roads network:
  To continue clean up our All Roads LRS network to reflect current ownership, geometry, public roads and mileage.
HPMS Data Source

State Highway System:
- Transportation System Network (TSN) Database
- Other Caltrans’ Databases (Division of Maintenance, Pavement, and Planning)

Local Roads:
- Caltrans’ annual contracts (traffic and pavement), but only cover samples and NHS sections
- Caltrans’ manual collection effort from Google Map/Earth, Google Street View, Bing Map
- Local agencies

HPMS Data Requesting from Local Agencies

Traffic Data
Inventory Data
Pavement Data
Traffic Data

AADT: Annual Average Daily Traffic (FE)
• Represent an average day of the year
• Must reflect application of day of a week and seasonal factor
• The latest three years historical AADT

OR

ADT: Average Daily Traffic (FE)
• Preferably 48 hours count but 24 hours count is also acceptable
• Counts should be taken during a typical weekday (Tuesday, Wednesday or Thursday)
• The latest three years historical ADT

Inventory Data

Facility Type (FE):
• One way or two way street

Ownership (FE):
• The entity that has legal ownership of a roadway (city, county, tribal, state or federal…etc)

Through Lane (FE): # of lanes designated for through traffic
• Exclude turn lanes (left turn and right turn pocket lane, two way left turn lane in center)

Speed Limit/Posted Speed (SP):
Pavement Data

Year Last Improvement (SP):
• 0.5 inch or more of compacted material must be put in place
• Completion date is the actual date when the project was opened to traffic

Year Last Construction (SP):
• Replacement of the existing pavement structure.

Last Overlay Thickness (SP):
• New pavement surface places on the top the old pavement surface
• Must be more than 0.5 inch

HPMS Data Collection Format

Full Extent Data Items (AADT/ADT, Facility Type, Ownership, Through Lane):
• Excel Format

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section Identification</th>
<th>Either of these</th>
<th>Month and Year of Traffic Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Name</td>
<td>Street_From</td>
<td>Street_To</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AADT</td>
<td>ADT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Shapefile

Local agencies populate these data to the extent they are available
HPMS Data Collection Format

Sampled Data Items (Speed Limit, Year Last Improvement, Year Last Construction, Last Overlay Thickness):

- Caltrans will provide a list of sampled sections in tabular format for local jurisdictions to fill in with the requested data

All Road Network of Linear Referenced Data (ARNOLD)

In 2012, FHWA expanded the HPMS reporting requirement for State DOTs to submit all public roads in a Linear Referencing System (LRS)

This requirement is referred to as the “All Road Network of Linear Referenced Data (ARNOLD)”
What is LRS?

Spatial referencing method, in which locations of features are described in terms of measurement along a linear element, from defined starting point.

LRS is suitable for management data related to:

- Roads
- Railways
- Oil and gas transmission pipeline

LRS = Route (Base Geometry) + Event Table

All Road Network of Linear Referenced Data (ARNOLD)

Assistance requesting from local jurisdictions:

- Review and provide feedbacks on LRS Route Layer
- Provide Caltrans with your city/county street centerline shape file with public, non-public streets, and ownership information
All Road Network of Linear Referenced Data (ARNOLD)

ARNOLD Reference Manual:


What is MIRE FDE?

- A listing of 37 roadway inventory and traffic elements fundamental to safety analysis and to support State’s Highway Safety Improvement Program
- A new requirement per MAP-21 and FAST Act Legislation
- States are required to incorporate MIRE FDE data collection plan into their Traffic Records Strategic Plan by July 1, 2017, and have access to the complete collection of MIRE FDE by September 30, 2026
### MIRE FDE for Non-Local Paved Road (FC 1-6):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Roadway Segment</strong></th>
<th><strong>Intersection</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Segment Identifier  (12)</td>
<td>Unique Intersection Identifier (120)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route/Street Name (9)*</td>
<td>Location Identifier for Road X Crossing Point (823)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Aid/Route Type (23)*</td>
<td>Location Identifier for Road Y Crossing Point (873)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural/Urban Designation (10)*</td>
<td>Intersection/Junction Geometry (110)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Type (23)*</td>
<td>Interchange/Junction Traffic Control (111)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begin Point Segment Descriptor (11)*</td>
<td>Number of Through Lanes (31)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End Point Segment Descriptor (11)*</td>
<td>Average Annual Daily Traffic (79)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segment Length (10)*</td>
<td>Year of Roadway Improvement (192)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### MIRE FDE for Local Paved Road (FC 7):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Roadway Segment</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Segment Identifier  (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Class (19)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Type (23)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Governmental Ownership (4)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Through Lanes (31)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Annual Daily Traffic (79)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begin Point Segment Descriptor (10)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End Point Segment Descriptor (11)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural/Urban Designation (20)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MIRE FDE

MIRE FDE for Unpaved Road (FC 1-7):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MIRE Name (MIRE Number)*</th>
<th>Roadway Segment</th>
<th>Functional Class (19)*</th>
<th>Type of Governmental Ownership (4)*</th>
<th>Begin Point Segment Descriptor (10)*</th>
<th>End Point Segment Descriptor (11)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Guidance Memorandum on MIRE FDE can be found from the following website:

https://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/legislationandpolicy/fast/sds_guidance.cfm
One Bay Area Grant (OBAG 2)
Local Streets and Roads Requirements
One Bay Area Grant Funding

Bay Area Federal Funding
FHWA – STP/CMAQ

$862M
5 year period
FY2018 – FY2022

Plan Bay Area
MTC/ABAG (2013)

Regional Transportation Plan

Sustainable Communities Strategy

One Bay Area Grant
OBAG 2

Regional Programs
$476M

County Programs
$386M
Regional Programs

- Regional Transit Priorities: 40%
- Regional Operations: 38%
- Regional Planning: 2%
- Pavement Mngmt. Prgm.: 2%
- Priority Development (PDA) Planning: 4%
- Climate Initiatives: 5%
- Priority Conservation (PCA): 3%
- Housing Production Incentive*: 6%

**OBAG 1**
FY2013-2017

**OBAG 2**
FY2018-2022

$451M $476M
County Programs

- Local Streets and Roads
- Bike/Ped. Improvements
- Transportation for Livable Communities

CMA Discretionary 80%
Planning 10%
Safe Routes to School 7%
Federal-Aid Secondary 3%

$327M OBAG 1 FY2013-2017
$386M OBAG 2 FY2018-2022

West Oakland Walk of Blues Fame
Beth Johnson East Bay Express
County Program Distribution

**Distribution Formula**

- Population: 50%
- RHNA - Affordable: 12%
- RHNA - Total: 8%
- Production - Affordable: 18%
- Production - Total: 12%

**Program Amounts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>$77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa</td>
<td>$56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin</td>
<td>$11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>$8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>$48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>$33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>$104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solano</td>
<td>$21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>$28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**: $386

Millions $, rounded
Requirements for OBAG 2 funding reinforce existing state or federal mandates

• **Complete Streets** resolution or plan update

• **Housing Element** certified

• **Annual reporting** of Housing Element – April 1

• **Surplus Land Act** resolution
general law cities, counties

• **Local Streets and Roads**
HPMS reporting, Pavement Management Program, and
statewide needs assessment
Local Streets and Roads Requirements

Pavement Management Program

**Requirement:** Maintain a certified PMP, updated at least once every 3 years

- Updated PMP database
- Inspection of pavement sections
- Budget-need calculations for current year and next 3 years
- Pavement Management Technical Assistance Program (P-TAP) available
- Certification status on MTC website
  - mtc.ca.gov/sites/default/files/_PMP_Certification_Status_Listing.xlsx
Statewide Needs Assessment

**Requirement:** Fully participate in statewide local streets and roads needs assessment survey

- Biennial survey
  - Participation throughout OBAG 2
  - Surveys collected 2017, 2019, and 2021
- Purpose is to educate and inform policy makers; funding advocacy
Local Streets and Roads Requirements

Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS)

Official federal source of data on the extent, condition, performance, use, and operating characteristics of the nation’s federal-aid system

- Data Reporting - 23 CFR 420.105 (b)
- Clean Air Act – 42 USC section 7512(a)
- Public Road Mileage – 23 CFR 460.6(b)
- TMS Components of Traffic Data – 23 CFR 500.204(b)

https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/policyinformation/hpms.cfm
Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS)

**Requirement:** Provide updated HPMS information to MTC/Caltrans

1. Pavement condition:
   - Collected by MTC
   - StreetSaver data

2. Roadway Inventory:
   - Collected by Caltrans
   - Geospatial & roadway attributes data
Local Streets and Roads Requirements

Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS)

**Requirement:** Provide updated HPMS information to MTC/Caltrans

3. Traffic counts:
   - National Highway System (NHS) – primarily Interstate & principal arterials (Caltrans)
   - Non-NHS – minor arterials & collectors (Local jurisdictions)
     - MTC compiles local data
     - Annual survey, sent March/April
     - OBAG 2 recipients must participate in survey throughout OBAG 2 (starting 2017)
## OBAG 2 LSR Compliance Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>OBAG 2 Funding</th>
<th>Local Streets and Roads Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Year 1 (FY18) – funding priority for ongoing programs, planning, PE for capital projects</td>
<td>Winter – Update pavement database &lt;br&gt; Spring – Annual HPMS survey (1/5) &lt;br&gt; Summer – 2018 Needs Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Years 2 (FY19) through 5 (FY22) – all projects eligible for programming &lt;br&gt; Subject to annual capacity, annual obligation plan</td>
<td>Winter – Update pavement database &lt;br&gt; Spring – Annual HPMS survey (2/5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>CMAs and MTC work to program evenly through year 5</td>
<td>Winter – Update pavement database &lt;br&gt; Spring – Annual HPMS survey (3/5) &lt;br&gt; Summer – 2020 Needs Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td>Winter – Update pavement database &lt;br&gt; Spring – Annual HPMS survey (4/5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td></td>
<td>Winter – Update pavement database &lt;br&gt; Spring – Annual HPMS survey (5/5) &lt;br&gt; Summer – 2022 Needs Assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ongoing <br> Maintain certified PMP
OBAG 2 County Programs:

County Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs)
http://mtc.ca.gov/about-mtc/what-mtc/partner-agencies/congestion-management-agencies

OBAG 2 Program Management:

Mallory Atkinson
matkinson@mtc.ca.gov
(415) 778-6793
Staff Report

To: Sonoma County Transportation Authority – Technical Advisory Committee

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

Item: 6.2 One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) 2 Requested Programming and Staff Recommendation

Date: March 23, 2017

Issue:
Shall the TAC support a recommendation related to OBAG 2 funding based on the applications, scoring, eligibility and related factors?

Background:
SCTA issued a call for projects on November 15, 2016 for the next cycle of federal funding made available. Applications were submitted to SCTA by January 15, 2017 and were required to have several elements in order to be eligible for consideration. Eight cities, two county departments and the Sonoma Marin Area Rail Transit Agency submitted 19 projects for evaluation.

Scoring criteria were developed to balance project type, ability to meet Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) goals and emphasis on Priority Development Areas (PDAs). Project description and delivery history were given the most weight in scoring. Points were awarded for public outreach and if the milestone dates provided agreed with the proposed schedule for delivery. Because of the number of questions, and the fact that some questions only applied to rehabilitation type projects, points were also awarded if a project was deemed a bike/ped only project, to ensure that the same number of points was available to each project.

After scoring was completed by committee, the projects were evaluated together and a number of scenarios were developed for consideration. The spreadsheets (to be provided separately) illustrate each of the four proposed scenarios. Also included are each project’s scoring (raw data), a sort of the projects based solely on score (highest first). The following is a description of each of the proposed scenarios for consideration:

**Scenario 1**
Score only: This scenario caps the eligible projects at an application score of 26 and above. This method would cause this scenario to be over-subscribed by more than $2.6M. Choosing this scenario would also award more than one project to two applicants.
**Scenario 2**

Score X1: This scenario is similar to the first in that it uses highest scoring projects, but only awards one project per jurisdiction (highest scoring of all projects submitted by a jurisdiction). This method caused Available STP funding to be over-subscribed by more than $1.4M but within the combined available STP/CMAQ allocation.

**Scenario 3**

Score X1 + Priority + color: This scenario uses score as the base for evaluation, but also chooses only one project per jurisdiction, selects the stated and/or presumed priority of a jurisdiction with multiple applications, and tries to more closely balance the STP/CMAQ allocations. This scenario is much closer to the allocation target but leaves $284K unprogrammed.

**Scenario 4**

Score X1 + Priority + color + geographic distribution: This scenario most closely balances to the available allocation balances of STP/CMAQ funding. It also selects one project per jurisdiction based on stated or presumed priority, and attempts to provide some geographic equity.

None of the scenarios includes the applications or allocation for Federal Aid System, Priority Conservation Areas, Safe Routes to Schools, or CMA planning funds, which are all assumed to be programmed under OBAG 2.

**Policy Impacts:**

The action requested is within existing policy, however each scenario is a different take on policy.

**Fiscal Impacts:**

The TAC’s recommendation will be provided to the other advisory committees and ultimately the SCTA Board for approval. Depending on the scenario chosen for recommendation, some jurisdictions may not receive any funding, or not receive the same level of funding that has been awarded to that jurisdiction in the past based on different distribution ratios. There are NO distribution ratios per jurisdiction for OBAG funding.

The OBAG budget for the purposes of this programming exercise is $17.8M. The overall budget provided to SCTA for OBAG was $27.7M – $18.7 in STP and $9M in CMAQ. SCTA will program $5M in STP for operational funds per the SCTA contract with MTC for planning and programming work.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Staff recommends that the TAC consider the scenarios provided, deliberate on the most viable approach and make a recommendation to the SCTA Board for awarding One Bay Area Grant funding.
## OBAG 2 County Program Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2017</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1</td>
<td>Local Jurisdictions</td>
<td>Deadline for Annual Housing Element Report submittal to HCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>CMAs</td>
<td>Deadline for update to PDA Investment &amp; Growth Strategy adopted by CMA Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1</td>
<td>CMAs</td>
<td>Effective date for CMA planning agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 31</td>
<td>CMAs</td>
<td>Deadline for CMA list of projects to be adopted by CMA Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deadline for CMA to submit list of projects recommended for funding to MTC, which must include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Programming spreadsheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• CMA Checklist (Res. 4202 Appendix A-10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• All required documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 31</td>
<td>Local Jurisdictions</td>
<td>Deadline for local jurisdictions to demonstrate compliance with complete streets requirements; Surplus Land Act requirement; local streets &amp; roads requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 31</td>
<td>All Project Sponsors</td>
<td>Deadline for projects to be submitted into FMS along with Resolution of Local Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>MTC</td>
<td>MTC adoption of County Program, followed by OBAG 2 TIP amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1</td>
<td>All Project Sponsors</td>
<td>First year of OBAG 2 funding availability for ongoing efforts such as planning, non-infrastructure and preliminary engineering for capital projects (FY2017-18).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>MTC</td>
<td>MTC evaluation of County Program, including an evaluation of anti-displacement policies and project selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2018</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1</td>
<td>Local Jurisdictions</td>
<td>Deadline for annual housing progress report submittal to HCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1</td>
<td>All Project Sponsors</td>
<td>First year of OBAG 2 funding availability for capital projects (FY2018-19).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2019</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1</td>
<td>Local Jurisdictions</td>
<td>Deadline for annual housing progress report submittal to HCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1</td>
<td>CMAs</td>
<td>Deadline for providing status report on PDA Investment and Growth Strategy (required two years after adoption of I&amp;GS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2020</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1</td>
<td>Local Jurisdictions</td>
<td>Deadline for annual housing progress report submittal to HCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 31</td>
<td>CMAs/All Project Sponsors</td>
<td>Deadline to obligate 50% of the County Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Entity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>April 1</td>
<td>Local Jurisdictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>April 1</td>
<td>Local Jurisdictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 1</td>
<td>CMAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>January 31</td>
<td>CMAs/All Project Sponsors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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BOARD OF DIRECTORS AGENDA

March 27, 2017 – 2:30 p.m.

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

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

2. Public comment on items not on the regular agenda

3. Consent Calendar
   A. SCTA/RCPA Concurrent Items
      3.1. Admin – Minutes of the February 6, 2017 meeting (ACTION)*
      3.2. Admin – Form 700 conflict of interest filing (ACTION)*
      3.3. Planning – Amendment No. 3 to Agreement No. 15012 with Nelson Nygaard and Amendment No. 2 to Agreement No. 15011 with ICF for consultant services related to Shift Sonoma County (ACTION)*

   B. RCPA Items
      3.4. BayREN – BKi agreement for consultant services related to PAYS (ACTION)*
      3.5. Electric Vehicles – approve Agreement from the California Energy Commission for Drive Evergreen implementation grant from (ACTION)*

   C. SCTA Items
      3.6. Highway 101 – Amendment No. 3 to design services Agreement No. SCTA13008 with URS (AECOM) for MSN-B2 Phase 2 (ACTION)*
      3.7. Measure M – 2017 Measure M Bond Disclosure Reporting (ACTION)*
      3.8. Measure M – Airport Blvd Landscaping Project, County of Sonoma cooperative agreements M30210-05-A5 and M42010, approval and appropriation request (ACTION)*
      3.9. SR 37 – amendment no.1 to SCTA16014 interagency funding agreement for preliminary design analysis on the State Route 37 corridor (ACTION)*
      3.10. Admin – SCTA FY2016/2017 Final Budget Adjustment to Salaries and Benefits Expenditures (ACTION)*

4. Regular Calendar
   A. SCTA Items
      4.1. SCTA Planning
         4.1.1. Activities Report – update on planning activities (REPORT)*
      4.2. SCTA Projects and Programming
         4.2.1. Measure M – update from ad hoc committee (ACTION)*
         4.2.2. Legislation – update on transportation measures: SB1/AB1 (ACTION)
         4.2.3. Caltrans – FY17/18 Project Initiation Document list of priorities (ACTION)*
4.2.4. **Transit** - FY17/18 Coordinated Claim for transit funding (ACTION)*
4.2.5. **Highways** – update on State Highway projects (ACTION)

**B. RCPA Items**

4.3. RCPA Projects and Programming
   4.3.1. **Admin** – update on status of Climate Action Advisory Committee appointments (REPORT)*
   4.3.2. **Legislation** – support for SB564 (McGuire) the Water Bill Savings Act (ACTION)*
   4.3.3. **Activities Report** – (REPORT)*

**5. Reports and Announcements**

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

**6. Adjourn**

*Materials attached.

---

The next **SCTA/RCPA** meetings will be held **May 8, 2017**


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

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

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

TO REDUCE GHG EMISSIONS: Please consider carpooling or taking transit to this meeting. For more information check [www.511.org](http://www.511.org), [www.srcity.org/citybus](http://www.srcity.org/citybus), [www.sctransit.com](http://www.sctransit.com) or [https://carmacarpool.com/sfbay](https://carmacarpool.com/sfbay)