Technical Advisory Committee

MEETING AGENDA

January 23, 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 January 23, 2014 at 12:00 P.M. immediately preceding the SCTA TAC meeting.

ITEM

1. Introductions
2. Public Comment
3. Approval of Minutes, December 5, 2013* – DISCUSSION / ACTION
4. Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA)/Transportation Development Act, Article 3 (TDA3) Quarterly Report* - DISCUSSION / ACTION
5. Senate Bill 743: CEQA LOS Reform* - DISCUSSION
6. Governor’s Budget for Transportation* - DISCUSSION
7. Request for new Project Initiation Documents* - DISCUSSION / ACTION
8. Local Streets and Roads Working Group Update DISCUSSION
   8.1 Draft ATP Guidelines and MTC comment letter*
9. Measure M DISCUSSION / ACTION
   9.1 Measure M Maintenance of Effort Policy Compliance*
   9.2 Measure M LSR/LBT Distribution Ratios and Allocation Estimates*
   9.3 Measure M Invoicing Status*
   9.4 Measure M Strategic Plan Draft Chapters 3, 4, and 6*
10. Rail Update DISCUSSION
11. DRAFT Upcoming SCTA Agenda for February 10, 2014** - DISCUSSION
12. Other Business / Comments / Announcements DISCUSSION
13. Adjourn – ACTION

*Materials attached.
**Handout at meeting

The next SCTA meeting will be held February 10, 2014
The next TAC meeting will be held February 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.
SCTA TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Meeting Minutes of December 5, 2013

2013/14 TAC Voting Members Attendance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cloverdale Public Works</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Sonoma PRMD</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Sonoma TPW</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petaluma Public Works &amp; Transit</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa Public Works</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastopol Public Works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMART</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma County Transit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma Public Works</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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Call to Order/Introductions**

   The meeting was called to order by Chair Kelly.

   **Attendees:**

   Members: Nancy Adams, Santa Rosa, Susan Kelly, Sebastopol, Damien O’Bid, Cotati, Joanne Parker, SMART, Alejandro Perez, Windsor, Steven Schmitz, Sonoma County Transit, Eydie Tacata, Rohnert Park, Dan Takasugi, Sonoma, Elizabeth Tyree, Sonoma County Regional Parks, Steve Urbanek, Sonoma County TPW, Larry Zimmer, Petaluma.

   **Guests:** None.

   **Staff:** Chris Barney, James Cameron, Diane Dohm, Seana Gause.

2. **Public Comment**

   None.

3. **Approval of Minutes, September 26, 2013**

   The minutes were approved as submitted.

4. **TFCA / TDA3 Quarterly Report**

   The TDA3 County Bike Lockers project has been completed and has been paid out. The Sonoma Class I Path through Depot Park is complete and has been constructed and came in under budget. Sonoma has reallocated the left over funds to their Napa
Rd Class II bike lanes project, which is now $23,533.81.

The TFCA Petaluma Corridor Signal Timing project has also been completed and has come in under budget. The remaining funds will be reprogrammed into next year’s TFCA program.

5. Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Update
The Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan update is in progress. SCTA staff will continue to work with all jurisdictions to update the remaining sections of the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan. Staff is in the process of updating the bicycle and pedestrian maps. Staff anticipates that the plan update will be completed in spring 2014.

6. Assembly Bill 417 Update
This bill would exempt from CEQA a bicycle transportation plan for an urbanized area, as specified, and would also require a local agency that determines that the bicycle transportation plan is exempt under this provision and approves or determines to carry out that project, to file notice of the determination with the OPR and the county clerk. Therefore bicycle transportation plans in an urbanized area are not exempt from CEQA.

7. Local Streets and Roads Working Group (LSRWG) Update
MTC sent out a request in October requesting information on a spreadsheet regarding federal obligations. The request was for a status update on current active projects and there was not a response from Sonoma County other than Regional Parks.

SCTA Staff also attended the Federal Efficiency Subcommittee (FES) meeting following the LSRWG meeting. Caltrans has provided to the subcommittee a draft format of the new Caltrans Local Assistance invoices. Caltrans is looking for additional information / comments from the subcommittee. Caltrans has not decided if these new invoices would be mandatory or left up to each district to determine if they are mandatory to use. An FHWA audit had findings for Caltrans’ processing of invoices. Therefore Caltrans is creating this step to address those audit findings. When it gets through the draft stage at the FES it may come to the LSRWG at which point SCTA staff would request input from the TAC.

Resolution 3606 regional delivery guidelines from MTC have been updated. It was released to LSRWG for comments before it goes to the Policy Advisory Committee at MTC. MTC has had very little feedback on the proposed changes to resolution 3606. Resolution 3606 is available on the MTC website in the December 5, 2013 LSRWG agenda packet.

8. Measure M
8.1. Measure M Maintenance of Effort Policy Compliance
This item will remain on the agenda as a standing item. Baseline Maintenance of Effort reporting is due on December 15, 2013 for FY 2011/12 to fulfill Measure M Strategic Plan policy 14; and FY 2012/13 reporting (1st year of comparison) will be due on February 15, 2014.

8.2. Measure M Invoicing Status
The updated invoicing status report is included in the agenda packet for reference.

8.3. Measure M Bike/Ped and LSP DRAFT Project Schedules for Strategic Plan Update
The TAC is requested to review and comment on these project schedules by December 20, 2013. The jurisdictions need to verify that what is represented in these schedules is an accurate representation of their projects to date.

9. Rail Update
At the October SMART Board meeting it was announced that SMART procured the Mira Monte property between Sonoma County and Marin County for future mitigations.

At the November SMART Meeting, the SMART Board awarded a contract to a major design contractor; Shimmick Construction Company, Inc. The contract package includes design and construction of track from the Marin County Civic Center to downtown San Rafael; new moveable bridge over the Petaluma River; Operations and Maintenance Facility; seven segments of the
pathway; four segments in Marin County and three segments in Sonoma County and Station Platform Finishes.

10. Upcoming SCTA Agenda for December 9, 2013

There was a request to include information about the upcoming SCTA Board meetings in our agenda packet. The timing of this information is not always available to include in every TAC agenda packet. However, staff will include information on upcoming staff reports that are available and would be presented to the Board.

11. Other Business / Comments / Announcements

Agencies should anticipate receiving a letter in January 2014 from CSAC, or the League of Cities, for this year’s Statewide Needs Assessment update.

Caltrans is beginning the tree removals for the Laguna Bridge replacement next week.

SCTA staff wants to build an awareness campaign on Measure M accomplishments. Place the Measure M Logo on all M projects and equipment. Also recognize Measure M in press releases.

12. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 2:35 p.m.
This report provides the status of TDA3 and TFCA projects not yet fully expended as of December 31, 2013.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Programmed Amount</th>
<th>Funds Expended</th>
<th>Funds Remaining</th>
<th>Funds Expire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Healdsburg</td>
<td>Foss Creek Pathway</td>
<td>12-0010-60</td>
<td>$110,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$110,000.00</td>
<td>6/30/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healdsburg</td>
<td>Grove &amp; Rosewood</td>
<td>12-0010-59</td>
<td>$18,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$18,000.00</td>
<td>6/30/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>Humboldt Street</td>
<td>12-0010-11</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>$21,997.61</td>
<td>$28,002.39</td>
<td>6/30/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>Pedestrian Flasher</td>
<td>12-0010-12</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>$1,208.83</td>
<td>$48,791.17</td>
<td>6/30/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>Brush Creek Class I</td>
<td>12-0010-14</td>
<td>$250,000.00</td>
<td>$10,202.07</td>
<td>$239,797.93</td>
<td>6/30/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>North Dutton Avenue</td>
<td>13-0010-03</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>$792.68</td>
<td>$29,007.32</td>
<td>6/30/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>Neotomas Bike/Pedestrian Path</td>
<td>13-0010-05</td>
<td>$85,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$85,000.00</td>
<td>6/30/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>Class III Bike Signage Program</td>
<td>14-0010-04</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>6/30/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>Ped Enhancements</td>
<td>14-0010-05</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>6/30/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>Class II on 7th/A/6th Streets</td>
<td>14-0010-06</td>
<td>$55,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$55,000.00</td>
<td>6/30/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>3rd Street Traffic</td>
<td>14-0010-07</td>
<td>$93,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$93,000.00</td>
<td>6/30/2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Transportation Development Act, Article 3 (TDA3) Projects (cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Programmed Amount</th>
<th>Funds Expended</th>
<th>Funds Remaining</th>
<th>Funds Expire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sebastopol</td>
<td>Class II Bike Lanes on 116</td>
<td>14-0010-01</td>
<td>$59,439.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$59,439.00</td>
<td>6/30/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>Napa Rd Class II Bike Lanes</td>
<td>14-0010-02</td>
<td>$23,533.81</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>6/30/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>Old Redwood Hwy - Lakewood Dr Bike/Ped</td>
<td>13-0010-02</td>
<td>$169,992.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$169,992.00</td>
<td>6/30/2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Original programmed amount was $5,000; 14-0010-03 was completed under budget of which the remaining funds ($18,533.18) were moved to this project.

Project costs must be incurred prior to the TDA3 expiration date (typically June 30). Sponsors must submit invoices no later than August 31 for any funds expiring June 30.

## Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Programmed Amount</th>
<th>Funds Expended</th>
<th>Funds Remaining</th>
<th>Funds Expire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Petaluma</td>
<td>Transit Marketing Program</td>
<td>14-SON-07</td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
<td>10/29/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rohnert Park</td>
<td>Southwest Blvd Bike Lane Gap Closure &amp; Traffic Calming</td>
<td>13-SON-02*</td>
<td>$131,122.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$131,121.75</td>
<td>10/16/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>Student/Youth Bus Pass Subsidy</td>
<td>14-SON-01</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
<td>$66,054.70</td>
<td>$8,945.30</td>
<td>10/29/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>Free Ride Program</td>
<td>14-SON-02</td>
<td>$153,636.00</td>
<td>$42,722.04</td>
<td>$110,913.96</td>
<td>10/29/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma County Transit</td>
<td>Sonoma County Transit Passenger Info. System</td>
<td>11-SON-01</td>
<td>$227,955.40</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$227,955.40</td>
<td>11/14/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma County Transit</td>
<td>Transit Marketing program</td>
<td>13-SON-05*</td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
<td>$38,788.14</td>
<td>$21,211.86</td>
<td>10/16/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma County Transit</td>
<td>Bus Stop Improvement Projects</td>
<td>13-SON-06*</td>
<td>$82,299.00</td>
<td>$23,791.25</td>
<td>$58,507.75</td>
<td>10/16/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma County Transit</td>
<td>Transit Shelters</td>
<td>14-SON-04</td>
<td>$77,983.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$77,983.00</td>
<td>10/29/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma County Transit (Sebastopol)</td>
<td>Sebastopol Bus Stop Improvements</td>
<td>14-SON-05</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
<td>10/29/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Programmed Amount</td>
<td>Funds Expended</td>
<td>Funds Remaining</td>
<td>Funds Expire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>Pedestrian Enhancement Project</td>
<td>14-SON-06</td>
<td>$151,687.18</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$81,000.00</td>
<td>10/29/2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For FY12/13, SCTA project numbers differ from BAAQMD numbers. BAAQMD files are "12-SON" and SCTA files are "13-SON"; there are no "13SONxx" project numbers at BAAQMD.
Issue:
On September 27, 2013, Governor Brown signed Senate Bill 743 which requires that the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) amend CEQA guidelines for analyzing transportation impacts. OPR’s work will focus on providing an alternative metric to level of service (LOS) for measuring transportation impacts. OPR has released a preliminary evaluation of potential alternative methods for addressing transportation impacts under CEQA. This document is summarized in this staff report and the full document is attached.

Background:
Intersection and road segment LOS, volume to capacity ratios, and other measures of automobile delay are currently used to measure traffic impacts during a project’s environmental review process. LOS is measured using a letter grade ranging from A to F, with LOS A representing free flow conditions, and LOS F representing congested conditions.

Under SB 743, OPR is directed to shift transportation analysis away from the measurement of driver delay and to focus on greenhouse gas reduction, traffic-related pollution reduction, the development of multi-modal transportation systems, improving equity, improving health, providing simple methods of measuring transportation system performance, increasing economic efficiency, and promoting land use diversity and accessibility.

OPR is investigating criteria that would apply to all project types statewide. Previous legislation and approaches had focused on changing criteria for residential, mixed-use, or employment center projects located in transit priority areas only.

Proposed Metrics:
OPR has identified the following alternative metrics that could replace LOS in CEQA:

- **Vehicle Miles Traveled**: Number of miles traveled by motor vehicles generated by or attracted to the project. Accounts for trip generation, trip length, and regional location. Per-capita, per employee, or per trip measures could be employed.

- **Automobile Trips Generated**: Counts the number of vehicle trips generated by or attracted to a project. Does not account for trip length or regional location. Easy to calculate. Per-capita or per employee measures could be used.

- **Multi-modal Level of Service**: Measures user comfort for travelers using all modes. Combines traditional vehicle based LOS with qualitative assessments of transit, walking, and biking system
MMLOS estimation methodologies are relatively complicated and expensive to implement and there is some controversy about preferred methodology.

- **Fuel Use:** Measures fuel use for trips attracted to or generated by the project. Captures trip generation rates, trip length/regional location, and fuel efficiency. Could require relatively detailed modeling and might ignore the impacts of induced demand. Electric/alternative fuel vehicle market penetration could make this metric irrelevant.

- **Motor Vehicle Hours Traveled:** Summarizes time taken by vehicles for trips generated by or attracted to the project. Captures trip generation, trip length, and regional location. Would require moderately sophisticated modeling tools which could make generating this metric difficult or expensive. Per-capita, per employee, or per trip measures could be used.

### CEQA Streamlining in Selected Locations:
OPR has proposed that development in predefined “transportation-beneficial development areas” or “infill opportunity zones” could be eligible for CEQA streamlining and could claim “less that significant” transportation impacts automatically. These areas would be predefined and would be mapped so that it would be easy to determine if a project would fall within one of these zones. Projects outside of these areas would be subject to full CEQA review and possible mitigation.

### Next Steps and Timeline:
OPR is continuing to conduct research on alternative transportation metrics, and will be meeting with regional stakeholder groups in February to get feedback on possible changes to the environmental review process. SCTA staff will attend the Bay Area stakeholder group. Public comments on possible alternative metrics and OPR’s approach are being accepted through February 14, 2014. OPR will evaluate the feedback received through public comment and stakeholder groups and will develop a draft document proposing an alternative metric that would be used in place of LOS and how this would impact CEQA guidelines. Feedback will be accepted on that discussion draft, and a final draft of the changes to CEQA guidelines will be forwarded to the Natural Resources Agency by July 1, 2014.

### Policy Impacts:
OPR’s final recommendations will change the methods required for estimating transportation impacts under CEQA. LOS will most likely be replaced by another metric.

### Fiscal Impacts:
No direct fiscal impacts at this time.

### Staff Recommendation:
OPR is accepting comments on the proposed revisions through COB on February 14, 2014. Electronic comments can be sent to OPR at the following email address: CEQA.Guidelines@ceres.ca.gov.
Preliminary Evaluation of Alternative Methods of Transportation Analysis

Dear [Recipient],

As required by statute, the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research is developing a new way to measure environmental impacts related to transportation. This is an opportunity both to reduce costs associated with environmental review, and, importantly, to achieve better fiscal, health and environmental outcomes. We need your help in this effort.

I. Introduction

On September 27, 2013, Governor Brown signed Senate Bill 743 (Steinberg, 2013). Among other things, SB 743 creates a process to change analysis of transportation impacts under the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code section 21000 and following) (CEQA). Currently, environmental review of transportation impacts focuses on the delay that vehicles experience at intersections and on roadway segments. That delay is measured using a metric known as “level of service,” or LOS. Mitigation for increased delay often involves increasing capacity (i.e. the width of a roadway or size of an intersection), which may increase auto use and emissions and discourage alternative forms of transportation. Under SB 743, the focus of transportation analysis will shift from driver delay to reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, creation of multimodal networks and promotion of a mix of land uses.

Specifically, SB 743 requires the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to amend the CEQA Guidelines (Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations sections and following) to provide an alternative to LOS for evaluating transportation impacts. Particularly within areas served by transit, those alternative criteria must “promote the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, the development of multimodal transportation networks, and a diversity of land uses.” (New Public Resources Code Section 21099(b)(1).) Measurements of transportation impacts may include “vehicle miles traveled, vehicle miles traveled per capita, automobile trip generation rates, or automobile trips generated.” (Ibid.) OPR also has discretion to develop alternative criteria for areas that are not served by transit, if appropriate. (Ibid. at subd. (c).)

Though a draft of the Guidelines revisions is not required until July 1, 2014, OPR is seeking early public input into its direction. This document provides background information on CEQA, the use of LOS in transportation analysis, and a summary of SB 743’s requirements. Most importantly, it also contains OPR’s preliminary evaluation of LOS and different alternatives to LOS. It ends with a description of open

Best regards,

[Your Name]

[Your Position]
questions and next steps. In developing a better alternative to LOS, OPR will rely heavily on input from all stakeholders. We hope that you will share your thoughts and expertise in this effort.

Input may be submitted electronically to CEQA.Guidelines@ceres.ca.gov. Please include “LOS Alternatives” in the subject line. While electronic submission is preferred, suggestions may also be mailed or hand delivered to:

Christopher Calfee, Senior Counsel
Governor’s Office of Planning and Research
1400 Tenth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Please submit all suggestions before **February 14, 2014 at 5:00 p.m.**

II. **CEQA Background**
Since SB 743 requires a change in the analysis of transportation impacts under CEQA, this section provides a brief overview of CEQA’s requirements.

CEQA generally requires public agencies to inform decision makers and the public about the potential environmental impacts of proposed projects, and to reduce those environmental impacts to the extent feasible. The rules governing that environmental analysis are contained in the Public Resources Code, in the administrative regulations known as the CEQA Guidelines, and in cases interpreting both the statute and the CEQA Guidelines.

Many projects are exempt from CEQA. Typically, however, some form of environmental analysis must be prepared. If a project subject to CEQA will not cause any adverse environmental impacts, a public agency may adopt a brief document known as a Negative Declaration. If the project may cause adverse environmental impacts, the public agency must prepare a more detailed study called an Environmental Impact Report (EIR). An EIR contains in-depth studies of potential impacts, measures to reduce or avoid those impacts, and an analysis of alternatives to the project.

The key question in an environmental analysis is whether the project will cause adverse physical changes in the environment. CEQA defines the “environment” to mean “the physical conditions that exist within the area which will be affected by a proposed project, including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, noise, or objects of historic or aesthetic significance.” (Pub. Resources Code, § 21060.5 (emphasis added).) As this definition suggests, the focus of environmental review must be on physical changes in the environment. Generally, social and economic impacts are not considered as part of a CEQA analysis. (CEQA Guidelines, § 15131.)

Once an agency determines that an impact might cause a significant adverse change in the environment, it must consider feasible mitigation measures to lessen the impact. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002.) Specifically, a lead agency may use its discretionary authority to change a project proposal to avoid or minimize significant effects. (CEQA Guidelines, § 15040(c).) The authority to mitigate must respect constitutional limitations, however. Mitigation measures must be related to a legitimate governmental
III. Background on Measures of Automobile Delay

Many jurisdictions currently use “level of service” standards, volume to capacity ratios, and similar measures of automobile delay, to assess potential traffic impacts during a project’s environmental review. Level of service, commonly known as LOS, is a measure of vehicle delay at intersections and on roadway segments, and is expressed with a letter grade ranging from A to F. LOS A represents free flowing traffic, while LOS F represents congested conditions. LOS standards are often found in local general plans and congestion management plans.

Traffic has long been a consideration in CEQA. (See, e.g., Fullerton Joint Union High School Dist. v. State Bd. of Education (1982) 32 Cal. 3d 779, 794 (school district’s reorganization could potentially affect the environment by altering traffic patterns).) In 1990, the Legislature linked implementation of congestion management plans, including LOS requirements, with CEQA. (Gov. Code, § 65089(b)(4).) LOS has been an explicit part of CEQA analysis since at least the late 1990’s, when the sample environmental checklist in the CEQA Guidelines asked whether a project would exceed LOS standards. (See former CEQA Guidelines, App. G. § XV; see also, Sacramento Old City Assn. v. City Council (1991) 229 Cal. App. 3d 1011, 1033 (addressing claims of an EIR’s inadequacy related to level of service analysis).)

IV. Problems with using LOS in CEQA

Though, as explained above, LOS has been used in CEQA for many years, it has recently been criticized for working against modern state goals, such as emissions reduction, development of multimodal transportation networks, infill development, and even optimization of the roadway network for motor vehicles. The following are key problems with using LOS in CEQA:

**LOS is difficult and expensive to calculate.** LOS is calculated in several steps:

- First, the number of vehicle trips associated with a project must be estimated.
- Second, after estimating the number of vehicle trips generated by the project, an analysis requires assumptions about the path that those vehicles may take across the roadway network.
- Third, traffic levels must be estimated at points along the roadway network, as compared to traffic that might occur without the project.
- Fourth, microsimulation models are used to determine traffic outcomes of volume projections.

Thus, an analysis under LOS typically requires estimates of trip generation, estimates of trip distribution, conducting existing traffic counts at points along the network, and an analysis and comparison of traffic function at each point for future project and “no project” scenarios.
**LOS is biased against “last in” development.** Typical traffic analyses under CEQA compare future traffic volumes against LOS thresholds. A project that pushes LOS across the threshold triggers a significant impact. In already developed areas, existing traffic has already lowered LOS closer to the threshold. Because the LOS rating used to determine significance of the project’s impact is determined by total traffic (existing traffic plus traffic added by the project), infill projects disproportionately trigger LOS thresholds compared to projects in less developed areas.

**LOS scale of analysis is too small.** LOS is calculated for individual intersections and roadway segments. As traffic generated by a project fans out from the project, it substantially affects a few nearby intersections and roadway segments, then affects more distant intersections and roadway segments by a smaller amount. LOS impacts are typically triggered only at the nearby intersections and roadway segments where the change is greatest. Projects in newly developed areas typically generate substantially more vehicle travel than infill projects, but that traffic is more dispersed by the time it reaches congested areas with intersections and roadway segments operating near the thresholds. As a result, while outlying development may contribute a greater amount of total vehicle travel and cause widespread but small increases in congestion across the roadway network, it may not trigger LOS thresholds. Further, piecemeal efforts to optimize LOS at individual intersections and roadway segments may not optimize the roadway network as a whole. Focusing on increasing vehicle flow intersection-by-intersection or segment-by-segment frequently results in congested downstream bottlenecks, in some cases even worsening overall network congestion.

**LOS mitigation is itself problematic.** Mitigation for LOS impacts typically involves reducing project size or adding motor vehicle capacity. Without affecting project demand, reducing the size of a project simply transfers development, and its associated traffic, elsewhere. When infill projects are reduced in size, development may be pushed to less transportation-efficient locations, which results in greater total travel. Meanwhile, adding motor vehicle capacity may induce additional vehicle travel, which negatively impacts the environment and human health. It also negatively impacts other modes of transportation, lengthening pedestrian crossing distances, adding delay and risk to pedestrian travel, displacing bicycle and dedicated transit facilities, and adding delay and risk to those modes of travel.

**LOS mischaracterizes transit, bicycle, and pedestrian improvements as detrimental to transportation.** Tradeoffs frequently must be made between automobile convenience and the

---

1 For information on the relationship between infill and compact development, and vehicle travel and GHG emissions, see *Growing Cooler, Evidence on Urban Development and Climate Change*, September 2007.
provision of safe and efficient facilities for users of transit and active modes. Since LOS measures
the delay of motor vehicles, any improvement for other modes that might inconvenience
motorists is characterized as an impediment to transportation.

**Use of LOS thresholds implies false precision.** Calculating LOS involves a sequence of estimates,
with each step using the output of the previous step. Imprecision in an early step can be
amplified throughout the sequence. While it is difficult to estimate the distribution of future
trips across the network with a high level of precision, the calculation of congestion levels is
highly sensitive to that estimate. Further, LOS is typically reported in environmental analyses
without acknowledging potential uncertainty or error.

As a measurement of delay, LOS measures motorist convenience, but not a physical impact to
the environment. Other portions of an environmental analysis will account for vehicular
emissions, noise and safety impacts.

V. **SB 743**

SB 743 marks a shift away from auto delay as a measure of environmental impact. It does so in several
ways.

First, it allows cities and counties to designate “infill opportunity zones” within which level of service
requirements from congestion management plans would no longer apply. (See, SB 743, § 4 (amending
Gov. Code, § 65088.4).)

Second, it requires OPR to develop criteria for determining the significance of transportation impacts of
projects within transit priority areas, and further provides OPR with discretion to develop such criteria
outside of transit priority areas. The Secretary for the Natural Resources Agency must then adopt the
new criteria in an update to the CEQA Guidelines. (See, SB 743, § 5 (adding Pub. Resources Code §
21099).)

Third, and perhaps most importantly, once the CEQA Guidelines containing the new criteria are
certified, “automobile delay, as described solely by level of service or similar measures of vehicular
capacity or traffic congestion shall not be considered a significant impact on the environment pursuant
to this division, except in locations specifically identified in the guidelines, if any.” (Id. at subd. (b)(2).)

SB 743 includes legislative intent to help guide the development of the new criteria for transportation
impacts. For example, Section 1 of the bill states: “New methodologies under the California
Environmental Quality Act are needed for evaluating transportation impacts that are better able to
promote the state’s goals of reducing greenhouse gas emissions and traffic-related air pollution,
promoting the development of a multimodal transportation system, and providing clean, efficient access
to destinations.” Further, subdivision (b) of the new Section 21099 requires that the new criteria
“promote the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, the development of multimodal transportation
networks, and a diversity of land uses.” It also suggests several possible alternative measures of
potential transportation impacts, including, but not limited to: “vehicle miles traveled, vehicle miles traveled per capita, automobile trip generation rates, or automobile trips generated.”

Notably, SB 743 does not limit the types of projects to which the new transportation criteria would apply. Rather, it simply authorizes the development of criteria for the “transportation impacts of projects[.]” (New § 21099(b)(1); see also subd. (c)(1) (referring only to “transportation impacts”).) The Legislature intended the new criteria to apply broadly. An early version of this provision, in SB 731, would have limited the new criteria to “transportation impacts for residential, mixed-use residential, or employment center projects [on] infill sites within transit priority areas.” (See, SB 731 (Steinberg), amended in Assembly August 6, 2013.) Therefore, OPR will investigate criteria that would apply to all project types, including land use development, transportation projects, and other relevant project types.

An earlier version of SB 731 would have limited the application of these changes by determining that automobile delay is not an environmental impact only in transit priority areas. (See, SB 731(Steinberg), amended in Assembly September 9, 2013, at § 12 (“Upon certification of the guidelines by the Secretary of the Natural Resources Agency pursuant to this section, automobile delay, as described solely by level of service or similar measures of capacity or congestion within a transit priority area, shall not support a finding of significance”) (emphasis added.) As adopted in SB 743, however, automobile delay may only be treated as an environmental impact “in locations specifically identified in the guidelines, if any.” (New § 21099(b)(2).) Further, subdivision (c) explicitly authorizes OPR to develop criteria outside of transit priority areas. Given the statement of legislative intent that new transportation metrics are needed to better promote the state’s goals, OPR intends to investigate metrics and criteria that will apply statewide.

VI. OPR Goals and Objectives in Developing Alternative Criteria

In developing alternative transportation criteria and metrics, OPR must choose metrics that “promote the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, the development of multimodal transportation networks, and a diversity of land uses.” (New Section 21099(b)(1).) In addition to this statutory directive, OPR will also weigh other factors in evaluating different criteria. Those additional factors include:

**Environmental Effect.** The California Supreme Court has directed that CEQA “be interpreted in such manner as to afford the fullest possible protection to the environment within the reasonable scope of the statutory language.” (Friends of Mammoth v. Board of Supervisors (1972) 8 Cal. 3d 247, 259.) OPR, therefore, seeks to develop criteria that maximize environmental benefits, and minimize environmental harm.

**Fiscal and Economic Effect.** Our state and local governments have limited fiscal resources. The state’s planning priorities are intended to, among other things, strengthen the economy. (Gov. Code, § 65041.1.) In evaluating alternative criteria, OPR seeks criteria that will lead to efficient use of limited fiscal resources, for example by
reducing long run infrastructure maintenance costs, and to the extent relevant in the CEQA context, promotion of a stronger economy.

**Equity.** OPR will look for alternative criteria that treat people fairly. The state’s planning priorities are intended to promote equity. (Gov. Code, § 65041.1.) OPR seeks to develop criteria that facilitate low-cost access to destinations. Further, OPR recognizes that in its update to the General Plan Guidelines, OPR must provide planning advice regarding “the equitable distribution of new public facilities and services that increase and enhance community quality of life throughout the community, given the fiscal and legal constraints that restrict the siting of these facilities.” (Gov. Code, § 65040.12.) In addition, OPR must also provide advice on “promoting more livable communities by expanding opportunities for transit-oriented development so that residents minimize traffic and pollution impacts from traveling for purposes of work, shopping, schools, and recreation.” (Ibid.) Though this advice must be developed within the General Plan Guidelines, OPR recognizes that similar issues may be relevant in the context of evaluating transportation impacts under CEQA.

**Health.** OPR recognizes that “[h]ealthy and sustainable communities are the cornerstones of the state’s long-term goals.” (Environmental Goals and Policy Report, Discussion Draft (September 2013), at p. 26.) OPR will, therefore, look for alternative criteria that promote the health benefits associated with active transportation and that minimize adverse health outcomes associated with vehicle emissions, collisions and noise.

**Simplicity.** The purpose of environmental analysis is to inform the public and decision-makers of the potential adverse effects of a project. (Pub. Resources Code, § 21003(b).) Environmental documents must “be written in plain language and may use appropriate graphics so that decision makers and the public can rapidly understand the documents.” (CEQA Guidelines, § 15140.) OPR, therefore, seeks to develop criteria that are as simple and easy to understand as possible. The criteria should enable the public and other interested agencies to participate meaningfully in the environmental review process.

**Consistency with Other State Policies.** SB 743 included legislative intent that the alternative criteria support the state’s efforts related to greenhouse gas reduction and the development of complete streets. OPR will also be guided by the state’s planning priorities, and in particular, the promotion of infill development, as described in Government Code section 65041.1.

**Access to destinations.** Even as it serves and impacts many other interests, the fundamental purpose of the transportation network is to provide access to destinations for people and goods. A transportation network does this by providing mobility and supporting proximity. In growing communities, some degree of roadway congestion is
inevitable; we cannot “build our way out of congestion” by adding roadway capacity because doing so induces additional vehicle travel. Therefore, accommodating better proximity of land uses and improving the overall efficiency of network performance is essential for providing and preserving access to destinations. Transit and active mode transportation options can play a key role in providing access to destinations and supporting proximity.

The objectives described above need not be the only considerations in selecting alternative criteria. In fact, OPR invites your input into these objectives. Are these the right objectives? Are there other objectives that should be considered?

VII. Preliminary Evaluation of the Alternative Criteria

This section provides OPR’s preliminary evaluation of the alternative metrics set forth in SB 743, as well as other metrics suggested during our initial outreach. This preliminary evaluation asks whether the alternative satisfies the objectives set forth in SB 743, as well as OPR’s own objectives described above. It also attempts to identify which mitigation measures and project alternatives might flow from use of each candidate metric. Finally, this evaluation seeks to identify the level of difficulty of using each metric, including availability of models and data required.

Vehicle Miles Traveled

Variant 1: per capita for residential, per employee for employment centers, per trip for commercial
Variant 2: per person-trip for all projects

Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) is one of two metrics specified by SB 743 for consideration. VMT counts the number of miles traveled by motor vehicles that are generated by or attracted to the project. VMT captures motorized trip generation rates, thereby accounting for the effects of project features and surrounds. It also captures trip length, and so can also account for regional location, which is the most important single determinant of vehicle travel. Although VMT counts only motor vehicle trips, not trips taken by other modes, it registers the benefits of transit and active transportation trips insofar as they reduce motor vehicle travel. In this way, VMT captures the environmental benefits of transit and active mode trips.

Of the metrics we consider here, VMT is relatively simple to calculate. Assessing VMT is substantially easier than assessing LOS because it does not require counting existing trips, estimating project trip distribution, or traffic microsimulation for determining congestion. Assessing VMT requires only estimates of trip generation rates and trip length, and can be readily modeled using existing tools such as the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s EPA’s MXD model.

---

Mitigation to reduce VMT can include designing projects with a mix of uses, building transportation demand management (TDM) features into the project, locating the project in neighborhoods that have transit or active mode transportation opportunities, or contributing to the creation of such opportunities. Since VMT is sensitive to regional location, it can also be mitigated by choosing a more central location for the project.

Used as a transportation metric under CEQA, VMT could encourage reduction of motor vehicle travel, increase transit and active mode transportation, and increase infill development.

**Automobile Trips Generated**

*Per capita for residential, per employee for employment centers*

Automobile trips generated (ATG) is one of two metrics specified by SB 743 for consideration. ATG counts the number of motor vehicle trips that are generated by or attracted to the project. ATG thereby accounts for the effects of project features and project surroundings (i.e., the availability of transit). It does not, however, account for the length of the trip, and therefore it does not account for regional location, the most important determinant of vehicle travel. Although ATG counts only motor vehicle trips, not trips taken by other modes, it registers the benefits of transit and active transportation trips insofar as they reduce motor vehicle trips taken. In this way, ATG captures some of the environmental benefits of transit and active mode trips.

Of all the metrics considered, ATG is the easiest to calculate. It does not require counts of existing traffic, estimation of project trip distribution, or traffic microsimulation for determining congestion. In fact, calculating ATG is simply the first step in calculating most of the other metrics, including LOS.

Mitigation for ATG can include locating a project in an area that facilitates transit or active mode transportation, such as an infill or transit oriented location, and including transportation demand management features in the project.

Used as a transportation metric under CEQA, ATG could encourage reduction of motor vehicle travel, increased active mode transportation, and increased infill development. Because it omits regional location, however, it may be less effective at achieving those ends than VMT.

**Multi-Modal Level of Service**

Multi-Modal Level of Service (MMLOS) is a metric of user comfort for travelers on various modes. Along with the traditional motor vehicle LOS metric, MMLOS includes additional ratings for transit, walking
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7 For more information on the ATG metric, see *Automobile Trips Generated: CEQA Impact Measure & Mitigation Program*, City of San Francisco, October 2008.
and biking modes. It rates intersections and roadway segments, delivering an A through F grade for each mode at each location. However, like LOS, MMLOS does not account for the total extent of motor vehicle travel, just its effect near the project. It also does not examine the transportation system on the scale of an entire trip length for other modes. The most commonly used MMLOS methodology is that put forth by the 2010 Highway Capacity Manual.

Assessing MMLOS requires detailed data on existing conditions for each mode of travel at intersections and roadway segments analyzed, plus trip generation and distribution by mode from the project. MMLOS is more difficult to calculate than LOS. Further, the methodology for non-motorized modes continues to develop. MMLOS is the subject of expert debate. For example, increased pedestrian traffic may be a desirable environmental outcome rather than an impact to be mitigated. Meanwhile, reducing the number of motor vehicle lanes on a street with bicycle lanes can benefit cyclists, but can degrade MMLOS under the Highway Capacity Manual’s methodology.

Impacts determined by MMLOS can be mitigated by adding motor vehicle capacity, improving transit service, and/or adding amenities for transit and active mode travelers. Since transportation facilities near infill projects often already support a variety of modes, projects in these locations may require more mitigation than projects further from these amenities, potentially discouraging infill development.

MMLOS could act either to increase or reduce motor vehicle travel, depending on the relative weight of ratings between modes. It could encourage development of transit and active mode facilities, potentially increasing use of those modes. However, because it would assign the burden of those mitigations to development, it has the potential to raise infill costs and thereby reduce infill development.

**Fuel Use**

*Per capita for residential, per employee for employment centers, per trip for commercial*

Fuel use counts the amount of fuel used by vehicle trips generated by or attracted to the project. In doing so, it captures motorized trip generation rates, thereby accounting for the effects of project features and surrounds. It also captures trip length, and so can also account for regional location, which is the most important single determinant of vehicle travel. Finally, it also captures fuel efficiency, which is affected by vehicle mix and traffic conditions. Although fuel use counts only motor vehicle trips, not trips taken by other modes, it registers the benefits of trips taken by other modes insofar as they reduce motor vehicle travel. In this way, Fuel Use captures the environmental benefits of transit and active mode trips.

Assessing Fuel Use with precision would require the application of microsimulation tools over the area affected by project motorized vehicle traffic. Alternately, a fuel efficiency multiplier could be applied to VMT, but that would eliminate sensitivity to roadway operations, rendering this metric equivalent to the VMT metric.
Mitigation for Fuel Use can include building in transportation demand management (TDM) features as part of the project, locating the project in neighborhoods that supply transit or active mode transportation opportunities. Also, because Fuel Use traces the full extent of motor vehicle trips and therefore is sensitive to regional location, it can also be mitigated by choosing a more central location for the project. Mitigation measures for Fuel Use might also include improving motor vehicle traffic operations and speeds. However, to the extent that these mitigation measures would induce demand, they would lose effectiveness. In the coming years, fuel efficiency improvements will necessitate shifting thresholds, and zero emissions vehicles could eventually render the metric irrelevant. Also, permeation of electric-drive vehicles with regenerative braking reduces the effect of traffic operations improvements on fuel use.

Used as a transportation metric under CEQA, Fuel Use would act to reduce motor vehicle travel, except where transportation operations improvements or capacity expansions induce more travel in the long run. It would tend to increase transit and active mode transportation, although it could penalize their operation if they have a negative effect on motor vehicle traffic operations. Finally, it would tend to increase infill development, with the same caveats.

**Motor Vehicle Hours Traveled**

*Per capita for residential, per employee for employment centers, per trip for commercial*

Motor Vehicle Hours Traveled (VHT) counts the time taken by motor vehicle trips generated by or attracted to the project. In doing so, it captures motorized trip generation rates, thereby accounting for the effects of project features and project surroundings. It also captures trip length, and so can account for regional location, which is the most important single determinant of vehicle travel. Finally, it also captures travel time, which is affected by traffic conditions. Although VHT counts only motor vehicle trips, not trips taken by other modes, it registers the benefits of trips taken by other modes insofar as they reduce motor vehicle travel. In this way, VHT captures the environmental benefits of transit and active mode trips.

Assessing VHT with precision would require the application of more sophisticated modeling tools than those needed to assess VMT. In some areas, those tools may not be available or data might not be available to support them.

Mitigation for VHT can include building in transportation demand management (TDM) features as part of the project, locating the project in neighborhoods that supply transit, or active mode transportation opportunities. Because VHT traces the full extent of motor vehicle trips and therefore is sensitive to regional location, it can also be mitigated by choosing a more central location for the project. In the near term, VHT could be mitigated by increasing travel speeds, e.g. by increasing vehicle capacity. In the long run, however, increased travel speeds generate additional vehicle travel, eventually re-congesting the roadway and congesting traffic. Increased vehicle speeds may also adversely affect bicycle and pedestrian travel.
As a metric, VHT could act to reduce motor vehicle travel, except if it were used to justify roadway expansion to create short-run benefit without considering long-run induced demand. VHT would in many cases tend to increase transit and active mode transportation, although it would penalize their operation if they have a negative effect on traffic operations. Finally, in some cases VHT would remove a barrier to infill development, although mitigation measures that increase roadway capacity could have the opposite effect.

**Presumption of Less Than Significant Transportation Impact Based on Location**

Development in centrally-located areas and areas served by transit generally impacts the regional transportation network substantially less than outlying development. Given the lower motor vehicle trip generation rates and shorter trip distances that have been shown for projects in such areas compared with projects elsewhere, project location could serve as predetermined “transportation-beneficial development” areas. Such areas might be presumed to cause less than significant regional transportation impacts. These areas could be mapped so as to be easily identified. Projects outside of such areas may require additional analysis, and mitigation if necessary, using one of the metrics described above.

**VIII. Open questions and next steps**

The discussion above described OPR’s initial impressions of several suggested transportation metrics. Many open questions remain at this point. Some of those open questions, as well as next steps, are set forth below.

1. SB 743 requires that whatever metric is developed, it must promote reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. Increases in roadway capacity for automobiles may lead to increases in noise, greenhouse gas emissions and other air pollutants. SB 743 similarly provides that air quality, noise, safety and other non-delay effects related to transportation will remain a part of a CEQA analysis.

   a. Are there environmental impacts related to transportation other than air quality (including greenhouse gas emissions), noise and safety? If so, what is the best measurement of such impacts that is not tied to capacity?

   b. Are there transportation-related air quality, noise and safety effects that would not already be addressed in other sections of an environmental analysis (i.e., the air quality section or noise section of an initial study or environmental impact report)? If so, what is the best measurement of such impacts that is not tied to capacity?

   c. Would consistency with roadway design guidelines normally indicate a less than significant safety impact?
2. What are the best available models and tools to measure transportation impacts using the metrics evaluated above? SB 743 allows OPR to establish criteria “for models used to analyze transportation impacts to ensure the models are accurate, reliable, and consistent with the intent of” SB 743. Should OPR establish criteria for models? If so, which criteria?

3. SB 743 provides that parking impacts of certain types of projects in certain locations shall not be considered significant impacts on the environment. Where that limitation does not apply, what role, if any, should parking play in the analysis of transportation impacts?

OPR will continue conducting research and meeting with stakeholders while this preliminary evaluation is being publicly reviewed. Following the close of the comment period, OPR will evaluate the input it receives, and develop a discussion draft of the alternatives to LOS and relevant changes to the CEQA Guidelines. The public will be invited to provide input on that discussion draft. If necessary, OPR may further revise the discussion draft based on that input. OPR intends to transmit a final draft of the changes to the CEQA Guidelines to the Natural Resources Agency by July 1, 2014.
The Transportation Agency is responsible for improving the mobility, safety, and sustainability of California’s transportation system. The Agency consists of the following six state entities:

- Department of Transportation
- California Transportation Commission
- High-Speed Rail Authority
- Department of Motor Vehicles
- California Highway Patrol
- Board of Pilot Commissioners

The Office of Traffic Safety operates within the Office of the Secretary for Transportation and the New Motor Vehicle Board operates within the Department of Motor Vehicles. The Agency’s budget also includes the State Transit Assistance item, which supports local transit operators.

The Budget includes total funding of $15.3 billion ($83 million General Fund and $15.2 billion other funds) for all programs administered within the Agency.

**Transportation Infrastructure Priorities**

Last year’s Governor’s Budget directed the Transportation Secretary to form a workgroup to prioritize transportation expenditures, explore long-term pay-as-you-go revenue options, and evaluate the most appropriate level of government to deliver high-priority investments to meet the state’s infrastructure needs. To meet that charge, a stakeholder group met throughout 2013. Informed by the workgroup effort, the Administration recommends focusing on three areas: maintaining existing transportation infrastructure, modernizing rail, and supporting local governments as they implement sustainable communities plans pursuant to Chapter 728, Statutes of 2008 (SB 375).

To make progress on these priorities, the Budget includes new investments in transportation from Cap and Trade proceeds, the remaining allocation of Proposition 1B bond funds, and early loan repayments from the General Fund. In total, these resources reflect a $1.7 billion investment in transportation infrastructure above current levels.

The stakeholder workgroup helped establish investment priorities, and will continue into 2014. Future efforts will focus on the implementation of reforms, many of which will be outlined in an upcoming external review of the Department of Transportation; implementation of goods-movement strategies, which are being developed through separate state and federal panels; and continuing the discussion on long-term stable transportation revenues to address declining revenues from fuel excise taxes.

**Department of Transportation**

The Department of Transportation (Caltrans) has almost 20,000 employees and a budget of $10.9 billion. Caltrans designs and oversees the construction of state highways, operates and maintains the highway system, funds three intercity passenger rail routes, and provides funding for local transportation projects. The Department maintains 50,000 road and highway lane miles and 12,559 state bridges, and inspects 402
public-use and special-use airports and heliports. The largest sources of funding for transportation projects are excise taxes paid on fuel consumption, federal funds also derived from fuel taxes, and weight fees on trucks.

**Significant Adjustments:**

- **Cap and Trade Funding for Transportation**—The Budget includes Cap and Trade funds for programs that will be administered in full, or in part, by Caltrans. Additional information on the overall Cap and Trade program is in the Environmental Protection Agency chapter.

  - **Rail Modernization** — The Budget proposes $300 million in new funding or rail modernization; including $50 million for Caltrans and $250 million for the High-Speed Rail Authority. This continues the work begun in 2012, when Chapter 152, Statutes of 2012 (SB 1029), provided $7.8 billion in state and federal funds to start construction of high-speed rail and to modernize existing rail systems across the state. The $50 million in the Caltrans budget will fund competitive grants for existing rail operators to integrate rail systems and to provide connectivity to high-speed rail. The program will be managed by the Transportation Agency, and the work of southern and northern California rail partner groups will be considered in making project selections.

  - **Sustainable Communities Strategies** — The Budget proposes $100 million for the Strategic Growth Council for a broad set of investments to support implementation of SB 375 sustainable communities strategies. The program will include the following types of projects: transit and transit-oriented development that includes low-income housing; active transportation; agricultural-land preservation; and related planning.

- **Repayment of General Fund Loans**—The Budget includes $351 million in early General Fund loan repayments. Of the total to be repaid, $337 million will be used to accelerate preservation and maintenance projects on both state highways and local roads that would otherwise be funded in 2015-16 or thereafter. Accelerating existing projects will allow for new projects to be added to the State Highway Operations and Protection Program in future years to make further investments in the state highway system. Preservation projects include pavement, traffic management mobility projects, bridge projects, and drainage system rehabilitation projects. Additionally, the proposed repayment includes support for sustainable communities through funding of active transportation and environmental mitigation. Funds from the repayment of General Fund loans will be allocated as follows:

  - $110 million to fund pavement rehabilitation projects on state highways.
  - $100 million to cities and counties for preservation of local streets and roads.
  - $100 million for traffic management mobility projects.
  - $27 million for highway pavement maintenance.
  - $9 million for active transportation projects.
  - $5 million for environmental mitigation.

- **Appropriation of Proposition 1B Bond Funds**—The Budget proposes $1.1 billion in bond funds and administrative cost savings that Caltrans has generated in its management of the bond program. The funding includes $793 million to support local transit operators, $160 million for intercity rail, and $113 million for additional state highway projects. Expenditures in these areas support the regional implementation of SB 375 sustainable communities plans.
Zero-Base Budget Review—Executive Order B-13-11 directs the Department of Finance to modify the state budget process to increase efficiency and focus on accomplishing program goals. Pursuant to this Executive Order, Finance and Caltrans developed a multi-year plan to conduct a zero-base analysis of all Caltrans programs. The Capital Outlay Support and Aeronautics Programs were reviewed in the fall of 2013. The Budget includes the following proposals that reflect the outcome of the zero-base review:

Capital Outlay Support Program

COS provides the resources necessary for design, environmental review, right of way, and construction oversight work for Caltrans’ capital projects. As part of last year’s Budget, Finance and the Legislative Analyst’s Office were directed to review the program in collaboration with Caltrans. This review focused on current operations and methods to improve estimates of project-direct workload. While Caltrans will continue to explore longer term improvements to both its processes and its internal controls, the Administration is putting forward the following recommendations based on the review by the workgroup: (1) Improve project budgets through the development of a predictive tool to help establish initial project budgets that account for various factors like project types, environmental permits, and location, (2) Create a methodology for the use of flexible resources to meet overall staffing needs, (3) Increase accountability and transparency by aligning support cost guidelines currently used for the State Transportation Improvement Program and the State Highway Operation and Protection Program, (4) Consolidate and streamline statewide program management manuals and directives to increase project management efficiency and consistency across all 12 districts.

Aeronautics Program—The Aeronautics Program promotes development of a safe, efficient, dependable, and environmentally compatible air transportation system. It issues permits for general aviation airports and heliports, integrates aviation into statewide transportation planning, considers environmental issues related to aviation, and administers grant and loan programs. Based on a workload analysis, the current staffing level is appropriate and adequate to perform aeronautics duties. The Budget proposes to transfer $4 million from the Local Airport Loan Account to the grant program to provide state matching funds for 55 federal grants. The Budget also proposes statute authorizing future transfers between these funds upon approval of the California Transportation Commission and Finance. The loan program currently has an $18 million fund balance and is undersubscribed. State and local funds bring California $275 million annually in federal aviation grants.

High-Speed Rail

The High-Speed Rail Authority is responsible for the development and construction of a high-speed passenger train service between San Francisco and Los Angeles/Anaheim (Phase I), with extensions to San Diego and Sacramento and points in-between (Phase II). Proposition 1A, enacted in November 2008, authorizes $9 billion in bond proceeds for

the high-speed rail lines and equipment, and an additional $950 million for state and local feeder lines. The federal government has also awarded the state nearly $3.5 billion to design and fund portions of the project in the Central Valley. The Authority’s 2012 Business Plan identifies a $31.3 billion capital cost for the initial operating segment from Merced to the San Fernando Valley.

In 2012, approximately $7.8 billion (Proposition 1A and federal funds) was appropriated for the high-speed rail project as follows:
• $5.8 billion for construction from Madera to Bakersfield.
• $1.1 billion for early improvement projects to upgrade existing rail lines in Northern and Southern California, which will lay the foundation for future high-speed rail service as it expands into these areas.
• $819.3 million for connectivity projects to enhance local transit and intercity rail systems that will ultimately link to the future high-speed rail system.

Recent court decisions have delayed the use of Proposition 1A bond funds which were appropriated to support a portion of the overall capital funding for this segment.

Significant Adjustment:

• Cap and Trade Funding—The Budget includes $250 million in Cap and Trade expenditures for Phase I project planning ($58.6 million) and construction and right of way acquisition for the first phase of the Initial Operating Section ($191.4 million). As indicated in the Caltrans section, this is part of Rail Modernization, which also includes $50 million for urban, commuter and intercity rail operators. Proposed legislation establishes an ongoing state commitment of Cap and Trade proceeds to high-speed rail, which will facilitate future phases of the initial operating segment.

In addition to previously identified federal and Proposition 1A bond funds, the new Cap and Trade funds are critical to addressing the overall funding needs for the initial operating segment, leveraging additional funding opportunities, and moving the project forward while legal issues surrounding Proposition 1A are being resolved. Moving the project forward with Cap and Trade funds will help meet the state matching requirements in the federal grant agreement and will help avoid long-term project escalation costs. Refer to the Environmental Protection Agency chapter for additional information on the overall Cap and Trade program.

Department of Motor Vehicles

The Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) promotes driver safety by licensing drivers, and protects consumers and ownership security by issuing vehicle titles and regulating vehicle sales. The Budget proposes $1.1 billion, all from non-General Fund sources, and 9,030 positions for support of DMV.

Expanded Eligibility for Driver’s Licenses

Chapter 524, Statutes of 2013 (AB 60), requires, beginning January 1, 2015, DMV to accept driver’s license applications if a driver does not have a Social Security Number but can instead provide other valid identification documents and proof of California residency. DMV estimates that 1.4 million undocumented immigrants will apply for driver’s licenses using alternative types of valid identification documents. The implementation timeline will cover three years, assuming 38 percent of applicants request driver’s licenses in 2014-15, 50 percent in 2015-16, and 12 percent in 2016-17.

Based on estimated timelines to secure new field offices, recruit and train 822 staff, make necessary system changes, and obtain federal approval of the redesigned driver’s licenses, the Budget proposes $64.7 million to implement the program beginning January 1, 2015. This assumes staff will be hired by September 2014 for training in advance of the implementation date. The Budget also provides a mechanism to increase DMV resources if a significantly higher number of applicants request driver’s licenses in 2014-15. DMV plans to establish five temporary offices in key locations throughout the state to address the influx of new applicants. Existing field offices will also accept driver’s license applications by appointment. If necessary, DMV will offer appointments on Saturdays at specified locations. The five
new temporary locations will be located in Santa Clara/San Jose, Los Angeles, Orange County, San Diego, and the South.

Central Coast. Offices are expected to be in place for two to three years. A newly constructed office in Fresno and a new leased facility in Lancaster/Palmdale will address the increased application workload in those areas.

**California Highway Patrol**

The California Highway Patrol (CHP) promotes the safe, convenient, and efficient transportation of people and goods across the state highway system and provides the highest level of safety and security to the facilities and employees of the State of California. The Budget proposes $2 billion, all from non-General Fund sources, and 11,051 positions for support of CHP.

Significant Adjustments:

- **Air Fleet Replacement**—The Budget proposes $16 million for the replacement of four aircraft (two helicopters and two airplanes), representing the second year of a long-term replacement plan to replace CHP’s aging air fleet.
- **Radio Console Replacement Project**—The Budget proposes $4.9 million in one-time funding to replace dispatch radio consoles. The pilot will replace 12 dispatch radio consoles at two CHP communication centers. If the pilot is successful, it will be expanded to 25 communication centers throughout the state over a five-year period.
Staff Report

To: Sonoma County Transportation Authority – Technical Advisory Committee
From: Seana L.S. Gause, Program/Project Analyst
Item: 7.0 – Project Initiation Documents – Status Update
Date: January 23, 2014

Issue:
What is the status of Caltrans’ Three Fiscal Year Work Plan for Project Initiation Documents (PIDs) in Sonoma County? Shall the TAC provide direction to staff on the next priority PID?

Background:
In May of 2011, staff reported that the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) was prepared to enter into agreements with project sponsors (City of Santa Rosa and the SCTA) to provide oversight and approval of PIDs in the SCTA work plan. Caltrans was required by gubernatorial action to have cost recovery agreements for any oversight provided by Caltrans’ staff. Such requirements necessitated having cooperative agreements with Caltrans in order for funds to be exchanged. Further, Caltrans required its’ districts to have a three year work plan for production of PIDs, and if a project is to be considered for the work plan, it should be listed in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), and have secured funding sources through the Environmental Phase.

Last year SCTA staff, at the Board’s direction, submitted a three year work plan. In anticipation of Caltrans’ request for the upcoming fiscal year 14/15, SCTA is seeking input from the TAC regarding new/additional PIDs that may be needed. There is one currently active project, the cross town connector/pedestrian bridge in Santa Rosa. Three other PIDs were completed within the last year: Hearn Avenue I/C, Forestville SR116 @ Mirabel, and 116/121 intersection improvements.

The existing three year list includes four other projects: Forestville Bypass, Railroad Avenue, improvements at Fourth Street and Farmers Lane and Hwy 12 right of way in Santa Rosa.

The City of Petaluma has been working directly with Caltrans to complete a PID for an undercrossing of US 101 at Rainier, thus that project is not included on the SCTA list currently.

Staff is soliciting direction from the TAC regarding the priority of the remaining projects and any additional projects that may need to be added to the list. There is a requirement that PIDs be developed and paid for with local funds, and that projects have committed funding sources through at least the environmental phase in order for Caltrans to enter into a cooperative agreement for oversight on PID development.

Staff requests that potential project sponsors provide proposed projects via email by February 28 to Seana Gause sgause@sctainfo.org.

Policy Impacts:
None, it is within policy for the SCTA to identify countywide priorities for PID development.
**Fiscal Impacts:**
Caltrans has been working on streamlining the PID process, and providing estimates for duration and costs, since sponsors are responsible for funding the production of PIDs. Caltrans estimates that developing a PID takes about 16-18 months, and the equivalent work of one person/year (1758 hours). This works out to about $200,000 per PID for oversight. In addition, each PID will cost a certain amount to develop – ranging from $150,000 and up depending on project complexity.

**Staff Recommendation:**
Staff recommends that the TAC consider the remaining projects in the work plan and any additional projects that may need to be added to the list and make a recommendation to staff as to the next appropriate priority for PID development (to be funded by project sponsor). Staff will represent the TACs recommendation to the SCTA Board prior to submitting to Caltrans.
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January 3, 2014

Mr. James Ghielmetti, Chairman  
California Transportation Commission  
1120 N Street, MS-52  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Chair Ghielmetti:

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the draft Active Transportation Program (ATP) Guidelines. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is the programming agency for the large urbanized area 40% pool of ATP funds for the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area. In July 2013, MTC adopted Plan Bay Area, the regional transportation plan/sustainable communities strategy (RTP/SCS) for the Bay Area. Plan Bay Area includes strategies and investments for active transportation in order to improve air quality and public health. The ATP will help MTC implement these goals and objectives.

Over the last few months, MTC staff actively participated in the ATP workshops held by CTC staff. We appreciate that CTC staff has addressed several of our comments in the most recent draft ATP Guidelines (released December 30, 2013). Below are our remaining comments.

Streamline project delivery through a lump sum allocation

The current allocation process developed for state highway projects is not a good fit for smaller bicycle/pedestrian projects. We recommend the CTC allocate ATP funds to Caltrans as a ‘lump sum allocation’ avoiding the need for a second CTC vote on each individual bicycle/pedestrian project. This approach is recommended as a means to reduce process and improve project delivery, while supporting the CTC in its oversight role of this program. This “lump sum allocation” approach is preferable for the following reasons.

- The project delivery timeline would be shortened by two to three months, which can be critical when delivering projects for the following construction season and/or in environmentally sensitive areas that require a specific construction window.
- Local agencies are familiar with the federal-aid process, but are often unfamiliar with the CTC allocation vote process. This dual allocation/obligation process adds additional complexity to the funding authorization process. Sub-allocating to Caltrans allows for a seamless allocation/obligation process, thus providing efficiencies for all agencies involved.
• The regions have demonstrated a strong record of delivering of similar programs, having consistently over-delivered their STP/CMAQ program since enactment of AB 1012.

A sub allocation of ATP program funds to Caltrans still meets the intent of SB 99 which states: "Funds for the program shall be appropriated to the department, for allocation by the commission." Further, consultation requirements of SB 99 and MAP-21 would be met through MPO, CTC, and Caltrans staff review, with the focus on ensuring compliance with federal regulations, state statute and CTC guidance. The CTC would retain review and approval of ATP programming requiring any revisions in ATP cost and scope from the adopted CTC program to be re-approved by the CTC prior to subsequent allocation. Finally, project and program transparency would be maintained through regular reporting to the CTC on all allocations made to-date.

**Strengthen flexibility for the large MPO (40%) Program**

The current draft guidelines would require CTC approval for any deviation from the statewide program in the areas of project selection criteria and disadvantage community definitions.

To better align with the RTP/SCS, MTC recommends that the ATP function more like the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) in the development of statewide guidance, with flexibility for the MPOs to develop their own guidelines, within the framework and broad eligibility requirements established by the CTC. The regional agencies are in the best position to establish project selection criteria and define disadvantaged communities consistent with their adopted planning efforts. This approach provides the MPOs the ability to move forward with criteria consistent with their RTP/SCS and other programming policies, as well as CTC guidelines.

**Allow all small/rural areas to compete in small/rural (10%) program.**

Under the "Funding/Distribution" section on page 3, the draft guidelines state: 

"Projects within the boundaries of a MPO with an urban area with a population of greater than 200,000 are not eligible for funding in the Small Urban or Rural programs."

MTC recommends that small urbanized areas within the boundaries of a large MPO be eligible to compete in the small urban/rural 10% program. Over 55 percent of the state's population of small-urban and rural communities is within the large MPO boundaries. In the Bay Area alone, over 1 million people reside outside the large urbanized limits. Under the current draft guidelines, these jurisdictions would be unable to compete in this program. MTC encourages allowing jurisdictions in all small urbanized areas, regardless of location, to be eligible applicants. This is consistent with federal Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) guidelines which specifically allow these small urban areas within the large MPO boundaries to compete for the small urban TAP program.

**Allow savings to return to MPO share**

Under the "Allocations" section on page 12, the draft guidelines state:

"Unallocated funds in one fiscal year will carry over and be available for projects in the following fiscal year, except that unallocated funds will not carry over into a subsequent fund estimate."

Project allocation savings in the large MPO program should be returned to that MPO's share in the subsequent fund estimate. While engineer's estimates at the time of programming closely approximate project cost, they are regularly revised based on updates to environmental and design, market conditions, and unit pricing. Therefore, MPO savings at allocation should be carried over into the following year and into a subsequent fund estimate as applicable.
Further, under the “Project Delivery” section on page 13, the draft guidelines state:

“If the amount of a contract award is less than the amount allocated, or if the final cost of a component is less than the amount awarded, the savings generated will not be available for future programming or allocation.”

Similar to allocation savings, excessive savings at contract award in the large MPO program should be returned to the MPO’s share in the subsequent fund estimate so as to not punish project sponsors and MPOs for favorable bidding climates.

In addition, for both allocation and award savings, the ATP guidelines should be consistent with federal TAP guidelines, which specify that each large urbanized area will receive its share of TAP funds.

**Allow case-by-case exceptions to matching requirements**

Under the “Matching Requirements” section on page 3, the draft guidelines state:

“Additionally, match funds must be expended after Commission Active Transportation Program allocation [off funds, and concurrently and proportionally to the Active Transportation Program funds.”

MTC appreciates the flexibility retained in the current draft ATP Guidelines allowing a large MPO to set its own matching requirements in the large MPO program. We recommend allowing exceptions to the above policy on a case-by-case basis to allow for unforeseen circumstances and to recognize potential spending restrictions in matching fund sources.

Thank you for your consideration of our comments. We look forward to working with you and your staff in finalizing the ATP guidelines and delivering ATP projects. Should you have any questions, please contact Alix Bockelman, Director of Programming and Allocations Section, at (510) 817-5850 or abockelman@mtc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Ann Flemer
Deputy Executive Director, Policy

cc: Commissioner Carl Guardino
Commissioner Bob Alvarado
Andre Boutros, Executive Director, California Transportation Commission
Malcolm Dougherty, Director, California Department of Transportation
Mitchell Weiss, CTC staff
Rachel Falsetti, Caltrans staff
Bay Area CMA Directors
## Measure M Maintenance of Effort - Policy 14

Local transportation fund expenditures converted to a percentage of general fund expenditures

Required for all Local Street Rehabilitation (LSR) Recipients - Reporting Status as of 1/14/2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>FY11/12</th>
<th>FY12/13</th>
<th>FY13/14</th>
<th>FY14/15</th>
<th>FY15/16</th>
<th>FY16/17</th>
<th>FY17/18</th>
<th>FY18/19</th>
<th>FY19/20</th>
<th>FY20/21</th>
<th>FY21/22</th>
<th>FY22/23</th>
<th>FY23/24</th>
<th>FY24/25</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cloverdale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotati</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healdsburg</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petaluma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rohnert Park</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Specify “Other” Fund Sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastopol</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Base Year for Comparison - SCTA board approved Policy 14 on July 11, 2011. Past due if red
2 Due February 15, 2014 to allow for completion of audits.

### 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.

### Submittal to SCTA Requires:

1. Source of local funds used in FY for transportation purposes (general fund, mitigation fees, sales tax)
2. Amount of local funds used for transportation purposes in FY
3. Total amount of general fund expenditures in FY.
4. Local transportation fund expenditures in FY, converted to a percentage of general fund expenditures.
Memorandum

To: Technical Advisory Committee Members

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

Date: January 23, 2014

Subject: Measure M LSR Distribution Ratios and Allocation Estimates and LBT Distribution Ratios for Fiscal Year 2014-15

Attached are the Measure M Local Street Rehabilitation (LSR) Program distribution ratios and estimated allocations for Fiscal Year (FY) 2014-15. Estimates for FY 2014-15 are based on actual revenues collected over the last 12 months. Also attached are the Local Bus Transit (LBT) distribution ratios for FY 2014-15.

If you have any questions, please contact me at 565-5377 or jcameron@sctainfo.org.
# Measure M Allocation for LSR
## Fiscal Year 2014-15
### Estimated Disbursements

#### Local Road Rehab Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index Code</th>
<th>Project Code</th>
<th>Measure M Project</th>
<th>Revised Percentage Share*</th>
<th>Total Estimate for FY 2014/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>793208</td>
<td>M20001</td>
<td>Cloverdale</td>
<td>1.55864809903%</td>
<td>$66,929.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>793208</td>
<td>M20002</td>
<td>Cotati</td>
<td>1.20848945296%</td>
<td>$51,893.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>793208</td>
<td>M20003</td>
<td>Healdsburg</td>
<td>2.08506509088%</td>
<td>$89,534.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>793208</td>
<td>M20004</td>
<td>Petaluma</td>
<td>9.59567231951%</td>
<td>$412,046.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>793208</td>
<td>M20005</td>
<td>Rohnert Park</td>
<td>6.06481370572%</td>
<td>$260,428.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>793208</td>
<td>M20006</td>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>27.68524763904%</td>
<td>$1,188,829.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>793208</td>
<td>M20007</td>
<td>Sebastopol</td>
<td>1.26015244605%</td>
<td>$54,112.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>793208</td>
<td>M20008</td>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>1.78677170305%</td>
<td>$76,725.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>793208</td>
<td>M20009</td>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>4.54366367593%</td>
<td>$195,109.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>793208</td>
<td>M20010</td>
<td>Sonoma County</td>
<td>44.21147586784%</td>
<td>$1,898,481.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100.00000000000% $4,294,091.88

*Board of Equalization Actual Receipts - 2/27/2013 to 1/1/14

**Updated Percentage Share 1/14/2014 includes January 1, 2013 DOF population numbers.

**Total Estimated for FY13/14** $4,294,091.88

**Pending TTD BOE Receipts as of 1/31/14** $4,169,021.24

3% Projected Total Growth $125,070.64

**Total Estimated for FY13/14** $4,294,091.88

**Approved FY13/14 Final Measure M Budget reflects 3% increase in revenue.**

---

**Local Road Rehab Funding**

**Index Code**

**Project Code**

**Measure M Project**

**Revised Percentage Share**

**Total Estimate for FY 2014/15**

**Updated Percentage Share 1/14/2014 includes January 1, 2013 DOF population numbers.**

**LSR Deposits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Posted</th>
<th>Actual Receipts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/27/2013</td>
<td>$339,640.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/25/2013</td>
<td>$371,117.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/16/2013</td>
<td>$243,840.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/23/2013</td>
<td>$473,902.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/27/2013</td>
<td>$372,499.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/15/2013</td>
<td>$274,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/23/2013</td>
<td>$351,260.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/1/2013</td>
<td>$415,659.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/14/2013</td>
<td>$283,060.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/21/2013</td>
<td>$377,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/31/2013</td>
<td>$381,122.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pending $284,620.00

**Total Estimated for FY13/14** $4,294,091.88

**Total Measure M FY12/13 Final LSR Budget*** $4,220,104.50

**Approved FY13/14 Final Measure M Budget reflects 3% increase in revenue.**
## Population As of January 1, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Population¹</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>50%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cloverdale</td>
<td>8,669</td>
<td>1.77%</td>
<td>0.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotati</td>
<td>7,310</td>
<td>1.49%</td>
<td>0.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healdsburg</td>
<td>11,509</td>
<td>2.35%</td>
<td>1.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petaluma</td>
<td>58,804</td>
<td>11.99%</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rohnert Park</td>
<td>41,034</td>
<td>8.37%</td>
<td>4.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>170,093</td>
<td>34.68%</td>
<td>17.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastopol</td>
<td>7,445</td>
<td>1.52%</td>
<td>0.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>10,731</td>
<td>2.19%</td>
<td>1.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>27,132</td>
<td>5.53%</td>
<td>2.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>147,696</td>
<td>30.12%</td>
<td>15.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>490,423</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
<td><strong>50.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ California Department of Finance - January 1, 2013 - Based on published population by entity.

## Road Mileage (Center Line Miles)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Center Line Miles</th>
<th>Percent Center Line Miles</th>
<th>50%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cloverdale</td>
<td>32.05</td>
<td>1.35%</td>
<td>0.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotati</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>0.93%</td>
<td>0.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healdsburg</td>
<td>43.30</td>
<td>1.82%</td>
<td>0.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petaluma</td>
<td>171.00</td>
<td>7.20%</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rohnert Park</td>
<td>89.35</td>
<td>3.76%</td>
<td>1.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>491.27</td>
<td>20.69%</td>
<td>10.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastopol</td>
<td>23.80</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>32.90</td>
<td>1.39%</td>
<td>0.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>84.42</td>
<td>3.55%</td>
<td>1.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>1,384.62</td>
<td>58.31%</td>
<td>29.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,374.71</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
<td><strong>50.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Local Street and Road Rehabilitation (LSR) Program Distribution Ratios

**Combined Population / Road Mile Formula (50/50 Split)**

### As of January 2014 for FY2014/15 Distributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>50/50 Split Percent Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cloverdale</td>
<td>1.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotati</td>
<td>1.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healdsburg</td>
<td>2.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petaluma</td>
<td>9.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rohnert Park</td>
<td>6.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>27.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastopol</td>
<td>1.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>1.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>4.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>44.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Population As of January 1, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>% Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cloverdale</td>
<td>8,669</td>
<td>1.7677%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotati</td>
<td>7,310</td>
<td>1.4905%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healdsburg</td>
<td>11,509</td>
<td>2.3467%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petaluma</td>
<td>58,804</td>
<td>11.9905%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rohnert Park</td>
<td>41,034</td>
<td>8.3671%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>170,093</td>
<td>34.6829%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastopol</td>
<td>7,445</td>
<td>1.5181%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>10,731</td>
<td>2.1881%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>27,132</td>
<td>5.5324%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>147,696</td>
<td>30.1160%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>490,423</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0000%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. California Department of Finance - January 1, 2013 - Based on published population by entity.
2. See below for adjusted calculation for TDA formula.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Sponsor</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Measure M Program</th>
<th>Prior Appp</th>
<th>13/14 Amt Prog'd</th>
<th>13/14 Amount Apprp</th>
<th>Appropriation Date</th>
<th>Last Invoice Date</th>
<th>Balance Remaining</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>Hearn Avenue (Phase 1)</td>
<td>LSP</td>
<td>$530,640</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>6/14/10</td>
<td>1/3/14</td>
<td>$528,683</td>
<td>$0 attack appropriation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SoCo TPW</td>
<td>Arnold Dr Ph 1</td>
<td>LSP</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
<td>9/9/13</td>
<td>11/19/13</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Fully expended appropriation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SoCo TPW</td>
<td>Airport</td>
<td>LSP</td>
<td>$445,090</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>3/12/12</td>
<td>12/8/12</td>
<td>$445,090</td>
<td>$0 attack appropriation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>Santa Rosa Creek Trail - Stmsd to Mission</td>
<td>Bike/Ped</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$375,000</td>
<td>12/9/13</td>
<td>12/8/13</td>
<td>$375,000</td>
<td>圣罗莎圣罗莎小径-州立到使命</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>Access Across 101 Comm Conn</td>
<td>Bike/Ped</td>
<td>$159,056</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>9/12/11</td>
<td>4/18/11</td>
<td>$159,056</td>
<td>$0 attack appropriation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCBC</td>
<td>SRTS</td>
<td>Bike/Ped</td>
<td>$15,463</td>
<td>$19,000</td>
<td>$19,000</td>
<td>4/8/13</td>
<td>1/8/14</td>
<td>$1,142</td>
<td>$0 attack appropriation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCBC</td>
<td>BTW</td>
<td>Bike/Ped</td>
<td>$5,174</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>4/8/13</td>
<td>5/20/13</td>
<td>$5,174</td>
<td>$0 attack appropriation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SoCo Regional Pks</td>
<td>Sonoma Schellville</td>
<td>Bike/Ped</td>
<td>$57,262</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>5/14/12</td>
<td>12/29/13</td>
<td>$54,426</td>
<td>$0 request rec'd, invoice to be revised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petaluma</td>
<td>Petaluma River Tr</td>
<td>Bike/Ped</td>
<td>-$45,956</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>5/14/12</td>
<td>4/11/12</td>
<td>-$46,956</td>
<td>$0 advanced funding approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMART</td>
<td>NWP RR</td>
<td>Bike/Ped</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>4/8/12</td>
<td>4/11/12</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0 advanced funding approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMART</td>
<td>IOS Construction (Bond)</td>
<td>Rail</td>
<td>$1,166,729</td>
<td>$34,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>10/10/11</td>
<td>10/11/12</td>
<td>$1,729,894</td>
<td>$0 advanced funding approved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>