ITEM

1. Introductions
2. Public Comment
3. Approval of Minutes, July 24, 2014 – DISCUSSION / ACTION
4. Comprehensive Transportation Plan Update – DISCUSSION / ACTION
   4.1 2015 CTP Performance Measures, Current Conditions
   4.2 CTP Guidelines – presented to MTC Planning Committee on September 5. Commission will consider item on September 24.
   4.3 Ad hoc subcommittee to choose online engagement tool for 2015 CTP –recruitment.
5. Measure M DISCUSSION
   5.1 Measure M Annual Reporting Status Update
   5.2 Measure M Invoicing / Appropriation Status
6. Highway 101 Ramp Metering Schedule Update – DISCUSSION
7. Regional Information Update – DISCUSSION
   7.1 SPOC training September 30, 2014 9:30-3:30
   7.2 FFY14/15 Annual Obligation Plan
   7.3 Final Pavement Condition Summary Report to be released in Mid October.
8. Rail Update – DISCUSSION
9. Other Business / Comments / Announcements – DISCUSSION
10. Adjourn – ACTION

*Materials attached.
**Handout at meeting
Copies of the full Agenda Packet are available at www.sctainfo.org

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

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

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

### TAC Voting member attendance – (6 Month rolling 2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sep</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cloverdale Public Works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotati Public Works</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Sonoma DHS</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Sonoma PRMD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Sonoma Reg. Parks</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Sonoma TPW</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healdsburg Public Works</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petaluma Public Works &amp; Transit</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rohnert Park Public Works</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa Public Works</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa Transit</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastopol Public Works</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMART</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma County Transit</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma Public Works</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor Public Works</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Call to Order/Introductions
   The meeting was called to order by Chair Kelly.

   Members: Nancy Adams, Santa Rosa, Norine Doherty, Sonoma County DHS, Stuart Hayre, Windsor, Sue Kelly, Sebastopol, Mario Landeros, Healdsburg, Joanne Parker, SMART, Eydie Tacata, Rohnert Park, Steve Urbanek, Sonoma County TPW, Larry Zimmer, Petaluma.

   Guests: None

   Staff: Chris Barney, James Cameron, Marge Fernandez, Seana Gause, Dana Turrey.

2. Public Comment
   None.

3. Approval of Minutes, June 26, 2014
   The minutes were approved as submitted.

4. TFCA/TDA3 Quarterly Report
   The staff report provides the status of projects not fully expended and those that will expire on June 30, 2014.

5. Update on SB 743
   Staff is waiting on the final recommendation to be released. It will be a VMT based measure statewide. The recommendation is not intended to interfere with any local use of level of service. It is CEQA only.

6. Measure M
   6.1. Programming and Appropriation Status (FY13/14 and FY14/15)

   In an ongoing effort to maintain transparency to both the TAC and the public Staff provided a table of programmed, appropriated, and expended funds in the last cycle for the 2014 Strategic Plan. Additionally, staff is requesting the TAC provide direction on how diligent staff should be on applying policy to projects that fail to deliver are addressed.

   A suggestion was made that project sponsors come forward to the next meeting with projects ready to go that can be substituted with projects that have appropriated funds but not delivered.

   The TAC recommended that a dashboard notification be included on the invoice tracking spreadsheet to alert of outstanding appropriation status in January. Formal documentation will be required of the TAC of the status of these projects in January.

   6.2. Invoicing Status
   A current invoice status report is included in the agenda packet. This month all the programmed funds were included on the report for transparency.

   An informational handout of the schedule to produce the Measure M FY13-14 Annual Report was distributed to the TAC.

7. Sonoma County Road Safety and Improvement Act
   The County has been evaluating a quarter cent sales tax for road maintenance. On July 14, 2014 the SCTA Board of Directors approved that the SCTA would administer the measure if passed. The distribution of the funds would be in accordance with the
Local Streets Rehabilitation (LSR) formula. This item is on the agenda to circulate the document that will be on the Board of Supervisor's (BOS) calendar for the BOS meeting on Tuesday. However, the document is continually changing and is not finalized at this time. It has been determined that it will go to the BOS as a recommendation for a general tax, and the alternate available action for the BOS would be the special tax (2/3.rds voter threshold).

8. ADA Curb Ramp Requirements in relation to Microsurfacing vs. Slurry Seal (Nancy Adams)

The TAC member from Santa Rosa requested this item be placed on the agenda for discussion. A question was posed as to the difference between Microsurfacing and a Slurry Seal. The discussion is summarized as follows: The materials are the same, the only difference between the two methods are; water break, which is when water evaporates from the material applied, and a chemical break. The difference between the two materials is time to cure. Micro seal breaks and is available to traffic within an hour. A slurry seal depends on the relative humidity, temperature, and road temperature. Because of this temperature dependency, use on the coast, can take up to 8 hours. The two products are effectively the same materials.

9. Highway 101 Ramp Metering Schedule Update

An updated schedule is included in the agenda packet.

10. Regional Delivery Update

The MTC Draft Final 2013 Regional Pavement Condition Summary Report was handed out to the TAC. Staff recommended that TAC review this document and notify Sui Tan by August 18 if corrections or more information is needed for your jurisdiction.

11. Rail Update

Joanne Parker gave the following report: the albino redwood tree has been moved across the street to the corner lot that SMART owns adjacent to the Cotati intermodal facility on the east side of the track.

SMART will be handing off the station design plans to the city managers for each of the jurisdictions.

SMART received a Transit Sustainable Planning Grant from Caltrans to do a bicycle parking facility plan. SMART will begin a process in late fall to engage stakeholders.

In the fall SMART will be engaging Transit Operators to discuss business rules.

SMART will be conducting a ridership phone survey of the public.

12. Other Business / Comments / Announcements

The County Transportation Public Works department researched the bonded wearing pavement course product and will forward the product research to SCTA staff to distribute to the TAC.

13. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 3:05 pm. The next meeting in August may be cancelled.
Staff Report

To:      Planning Advisory Committee
From:  Chris Barney, Senior Transportation Planner
Item:       2015 CTP Performance Measures, Current Conditions
Date:   9/25/2014

Issue

SCTA has directed staff to assess project performance as part of the 2015 CTP. Performance Measures have been identified that indicate progress in achieving Comprehensive Transportation Plan goals. This staff report summarizes current conditions for these performance measures.

Performance Measures:

The following five goals have been identified for the 2015 CTP:

- Reduce GHG Emissions
- Relieve Traffic Congestion
- Maintain the System
- Plan for Safety and Health
- Promote Economic Vitality – NEW FOR 2015 CTP

Performance measures that evaluate progress in achieving CTP goals are summarized in the table below. Some of the performance measures will be extracted from the Sonoma County Travel Model and others will be developed using post-processing tools and methods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CTP GOAL</th>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduce GHG Emissions</td>
<td>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</td>
<td>SCTM, EMFAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relieve Traffic Congestion</td>
<td>Person Hours of Delay</td>
<td>SCTM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain the System</td>
<td>PCI, Transit System Condition</td>
<td>Credit assigned for Maintenance Projects only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan for Safety and Health</td>
<td>a. Share of trips made by walking, bicycling, and transit (50%)</td>
<td>SCTM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Accident Rates (50%)</td>
<td>SCTM, SMARTGAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote Economic Vitality</td>
<td>a. Average Peak Period Motorized Travel Time (per trip)</td>
<td>SCTM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Economic Equity - Does the project serve a Community of Concern?</td>
<td>Communities of Concern Map</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. 2015 CTP Goals and Associated Performance Measures.
Performance Current Conditions:
Countywide baseline conditions (2010 + more recent data where available) for each 2015 CTP performance measure are summarized below.

Performance Measure 1: Reduce GHG Emissions – Transportation Sector GHG Emissions

In Sonoma County the transportation section contributes roughly 52% of all county greenhouse gas emissions. New estimates for past, current, and future greenhouse gas emissions have been developed for the countywide climate action plan, Climate Action 2020 (CA 2020). New GHG estimates from CA 2020 are lower than GHG estimates developed by SCTA and the Sonoma County Climate Protection Campaign. CA 2020 estimates where developed using EMFAC 2011, which considers vehicle speeds in GHG emissions calculations. EMFAC 2011 also includes more detailed vehicle fleet information. Transportation related GHG emissions in Sonoma County have increased since 1990 and CA 2020 estimates show that it will be difficult to meet 2015 and 2035 GHG reduction targets if current trends continue.

The 2009 CTP indicates that significant future GHG reductions will be realized due to changes in vehicle fuel economy as required by state and national CAFÉ standard improvements. Staff expects that improved vehicle fuel economy will have a significant impact on future transportation GHG emissions. GHG reductions from improved vehicle fuel economy have not been reflected in the figure below.

CURRENT 2009 CTP TARGET for 2035: Reduce GHG emissions to 25% below 1990 levels by 2015, and 40% below 1990 levels by 2035.

![GHG Emissions Graph](source)

Performance Measure 2: Relieve Traffic Congestion - Person hours of delay (PHD).

Congestion has been consistently identified as an important public concern in Sonoma County. Traffic congestion has significant impacts on the county’s economic performance and quality of life. Travel demand routinely exceeds highway capacity during peak periods in many areas of the county. Traffic flow is also often impacted by accidents, vehicle breakdowns, road work, adverse weather conditions, and local operational issues. Person Hours of Delay (PHD) is a common aggregate measure of congestion. PHD represents the average number of hours that travelers are stuck in traffic due to recurring (due to demand) and non-recurring (due to incidents, construction, etc) congestion.

Daily PHD has remained relatively static since the adoption of the 2009 CTP. PHD dropped slightly in 2010 to 52,938 from the 2005 estimate of 53,226. 2012 estimated PHD has risen slightly since 2010 to 55,535. Recent congestion measurements suggest that congestion is staying relatively constant in Sonoma County but that future housing and employment growth will have significant impacts on countywide delay by 2040. No observable progress has been made towards reducing countywide congestion levels since the last CTP.

CURRENT 2009 CTP TARGET for 2035: Reduce Person Hours of Delay by 20% below 2005 levels by 2035.

![Daily Person Hours of Delay](image-url)

*Figure 3. Sonoma County Daily Person Hours of Delay (Congestion) – 2005, 2010, and 2012 Estimates and 2035 Reduction Target (Sources – Caltrans/SCTA).*
Performance Measure 3a: Maintain the System - Pavement Condition Index

Transportation funding shortages and aging transportation infrastructure are contributing to the continued degradation of the countywide road network. Many jurisdictions are forced to defer needed preventative maintenance or rehabilitation projects due to budget shortfalls and increasing competition for transportation and general fund dollars.

Local jurisdictions provide road condition field survey data on to the Metropolitan Transportation System for inclusion in the Regional Pavement Management Program. Roadways are assigned a 1-100 Pavement Condition Score and MTC compiles jurisdiction, county, and regional weighted pavement condition scores. It is most efficient to maintain roads at higher PCIs, with the optimum PCI being 80. Current countywide and local PCIs are below the optimal PCI level. Countywide PCI has dropped slightly since 2005 from 53 to 52, with slight improvements observed at the countywide and jurisdiction level in 2010. Current trends indicate that SCTA will be unable to meet its target of improving countywide PCI to 80 by 2035.

CURRENT 2009 CTP TARGET for 2035: Improve countywide PCI to 80 by 2035, with a minimum road PCI of 70 by 2035.

Figure 4. Sonoma County Daily Pavement Condition Index (PCI) – 2005, 2010, and 2012 Estimates and 2035 Reduction Target (Source – MTC Regional Pavement Management Program)
Performance Measure 3b: Maintain the System - Transit System Average Fleet Age

Sonoma County’s transit network is an important part of the countywide transportation system. Transit provides an important travel option for county travelers and serves as a transportation “lifeline” for many people in the county.

Local transit agencies provide estimates on the average age of bus fleets to the National Transit Database. The Federal Transit Administration estimates that the average useful life of transit buses varies between 4-12 years depending on vehicle size and type. Adequate funding is needed to ensure that older transit vehicles can be replaced when necessary and to guarantee that bus service is not negatively impacted by equipment failure and breakdowns.

Data extracted from the National Transit Database for Sonoma County transit providers indicates that the average age of bus fleets in the county has improved since 2010.

Transit System Average Fleet Age is a new performance measure in the 2015 CTP and a target for this metric needs to be set for the plan horizon year of 2040.

RECOMMENDED TARGET FOR 2040: Reduce the average bus fleet age by 25% below 2010 average fleet age by 2040.

![Figure 5. Average Age of Bus Fleets for Sonoma County Transit Providers (Source – National Transit Database).](image-url)
**Performance Measure 4a: Plan for Safety and Health – Share of Trips made by walking, biking, and taking transit**

Shifting travel to active transportation modes such as walking, biking, or riding transit can help decrease obesity, improve neighborhood air quality conditions, and improve overall community health. Active transportation mode share or the percentage of trips being made by bike, transit, or foot will be used to estimate how CTP 2015 projects, project groupings, or transportation programs can improve or degrade health conditions in Sonoma County.

Daily mode shares can be extracted from the Sonoma County Travel Model. In 2010 8.38% of all trips (including commute, school, recreation, shopping, and other trips purposes) were made using active transportation modes. Mode share for active transportation modes is expected to decrease slightly by 2040 if current trends continue.

Active transportation mode share is a new performance measure in the 2015 CTP and a target for this metric needs to be set for the plan horizon year of 2040.

**RECOMMENDED TARGET FOR 2040:** Reduce Drive Alone Mode share to 33.3% by 2040. Increase Active Transportation (Walk, Bike, Transit) mode share to 15% by 2040.

![Figure 6. 2010 Sonoma County Mode Shares for ALL TRIP Purposes (Source – Sonoma County Travel Model)](image-url)
Performance Measure 4b: Plan for Safety and Health – Traffic Accident Rates

Traffic accidents impose a significant social and financial impact on county residents, and SCTA identified safety as a priority for the 2015 CTP. Traffic accident rates will be used to assess how a CTP 2015 project, project grouping, or program impacts countywide traffic safety.

Current and past traffic accident rates are available from the Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS). Future daily countywide accident rates will be estimated using the SMARTGAP transportation and land use post-processing tool developed with funding from the Transportation Research Board. SMARTGAP uses daily VMT to estimate accidents using historic county level accident rates.

Daily traffic accident rate is a new performance measure in the 2015 CTP and a target for this metric needs to be set for the plan horizon year of 2040.

RECOMMENDED TARGET FOR 2040: Reduce total daily accident rates by 1 accident per day below 2010 levels by 2040.

![Daily Accidents](Image)

Figure 7. Sonoma County Collisions - Daily (Source – California Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System/SWITRS).
Performance Measure 5a: Promote Economic Vitality – Average Peak Period Travel Time per Trip

SCTA has recognized that transportation is an important component of countywide economic health and has made promoting economic vitality a goal for the 2015 CTP. Increased travel times and congestion can have a negative impact on job creation, tourism, commerce, and goods movement, while an efficient and effective transportation system can help improve local economic conditions and make working and doing business in Sonoma County more profitable.

Average PM peak period travel time will be used to estimate how well Sonoma County’s transportation system is working and how easy it is to do business, move goods, get to work, or travel in the county. This metric can be extracted from the Sonoma County Travel Model.

Average Peak Period Travel Time per Trip is a new performance measure in the 2015 CTP and a target for this metric needs to be set for the plan horizon year of 2040.

RECOMMENDED TARGET FOR 2040: Reduce 2010 Average Peak Period Travel Time per Trip by 1 minute by 2040.

2010 Estimated Average PM Peak Period Travel Time per Trip:
11.31 Minutes

Performance Measure 5b: Promote Economic Vitality – Communities of Concern

SCTA recognizes that certain vulnerable communities should be recognized when making decisions about transportation improvements in Sonoma County. These vulnerable communities have been identified by highlighting census block groups in which 30% or more of households have incomes between 0 – 200% of the federal poverty level ($21,600 - $74,020 total household income depending on family size). Projects located in or serving a Community of Concern will be identified as part of the 2015 CTP Performance Assessment.

Other metrics

The following additional metrics will be reported as part of the performance assessment for informational purposes:

- **VMT**: VMT, vehicle miles traveled or miles traveled by a vehicle, is a standard measure of transportation activity. VMT can be used to measure automobile trip frequency, trip length, and vehicle occupancy rates. VMT per person, or the average miles traveled per person per day, has leveled off since 2005. Since 2005, VMT per capita dropped from just over 23 VMT per person/day to 21.8 VMT per person/day in 2012. During this period total VMT has risen slightly but is outpaced by population growth, leading to a reduction of daily per capita VMT.
- **Percentage of household income spent on transportation**: Transportation can be a significant household expense. The Center for Housing Policy has reported that Bay Area families with annual incomes of under $70,000 spend an average of 22% of their household incomes on
transportation. Staff will use the methods developed by the Center for Neighborhood Technology to estimate project and project group impacts on transportation affordability.

- **Land Use:** SCTA and Sonoma County jurisdictions have prioritized growth in Priority Development Areas, Rural Community Investment Areas, or Economic Investment Areas as part of the regional Sustainable Communities Strategy. Projects located within or serving these areas will be identified in the 2015 CTP Performance Assessment.

**Policy Impacts:** CTP projects and project groupings will analyzed using these performance measures, and impacts will be compared to current conditions and “Business as Usual” future conditions for each category. Some performance measures have existing targets that were set for the 2009 CTP. New performance measures including: Transit Average Fleet Age, Active Transportation Mode Share, Daily Accident Rates, and Average Peak Hour Travel Time per Trip have been added for the 2015 CTP. Staff has recommended a draft performance target for each of the new performance measures.

**Fiscal Impacts:** None at this time.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends extending performance targets that were set for 2035 in the 2009 CTP to 2040. Staff has provided draft performance targets for performance measures that have been added to the 2015 CTP. Please provide feedback on the recommended targets.
Staff Report

To: Sonoma County Transportation Authority – Technical Advisory Committee
From: Seana L. S. Gause, Senior – Programming and Projects
Item: Measure M Annual Reporting Letter Status Update
Date: September 25, 2014

Issue:
What is the status of the annual reporting for expenditures of Measure M funds this past fiscal year (FY13/14)?

Background:
The Traffic Relief Act of Sonoma County requires that agencies receiving Measure M funds report on how those funds were spent in a given fiscal year. Reporting letters are due on September 15 of each year, reporting on the previous fiscal year. This requirement is outlined in the 2014 Strategic Plan, Policy 4.12. Reporting letters are required for the following programs:

- Transit/Rail (LBT/Rail)
- Local Streets Rehabilitation (LSR)
- Local Streets Projects (LSP)
- Bicycle/Pedestrian Projects (Bike/Ped)

If an agency fails to submit Measure M reporting letters by the deadline, the Strategic Plan states that the next fiscal year’s allocation or reimbursements for expenditures (in the case of Local Streets or Bike/Ped Projects) may be withheld until the reporting letter is received. Upon the suggestion of the auditor, governing bodies of any Measure M recipients delinquent in submitting annual reporting letters will be notified in writing.

The LSR program allows cities to carry over funds for up to three years in order to amass funds for larger projects. The program also requires that if an agency has chosen to carry over funds from previous fiscal year’s allocation, interest on the sum must be reported. Banked funds must be spent in the third year, or SCTA reserves the right to withhold the next year’s allocation until the jurisdiction’s balance is drawn down, as is outlined in the Strategic Plan, Policy 4.1. One jurisdiction had banked Measure M funds for three years and reported lack of expenditure in the third year but provided justification for the lack of expenditure. Further, the jurisdiction has plans to spend the funds within nine months but was unable to expend the funds within FY14/15. Several jurisdictions show a partial expenditure of funds, but are banking some portion of balance for future expenditures.

Three LSR reporting letters (Cloverdale, Cotati, Healdsburg) were submitted after the 9/15/14 deadline. Two letters have since been received and one remains outstanding as of the writing of this staff report.
LBT program funds are distributed on a quarterly basis. All transit agencies receiving Measure M funding are required to submit an annual audit to accompany their reporting. Because the annual audits usually take some months to produce after the close of the fiscal year, they are not always complete by the reporting deadline of September 15, thus transit agencies are given until December 31 to submit the required audit. Reporting letters remain due on September 15. One transit agency has not submitted their annual reporting letter as of the writing of this staff report.

All other reporting letters for the LSP, Bike/Ped and Rail programs were submitted on time. This summary will be provided to the Citizens Advisory Committee in September and the SCTA Board in October.

**Policy Impacts:**

None, these procedures are consistent with the policy established in the Traffic Relief Act of Sonoma County, and the 2011 Strategic Plan.

**Fiscal Impacts:**

None

**Staff Recommendation:**

None, this is an informational item only.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Sponsor</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Measure M Program</th>
<th>Prior Apprp Balance</th>
<th>14/15 Amt Apprp</th>
<th>14/15 Amount Apprp'd</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>8/6/14</td>
<td>$135,528</td>
<td></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>9/10/14</td>
<td>$121,741</td>
<td>Inv not processed bc Coop needs amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>Santa Rosa Creek Trail - Stmsd to Mission</td>
<td>Bike/Ped</td>
<td>$375,000</td>
<td>$340,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,168</td>
<td></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>9/10/14</td>
<td>$1,511</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SoCo DHS</td>
<td>SRTS (DHS)</td>
<td>Bike/Ped</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
<td>10/14/13</td>
<td>8/15/14</td>
<td>$8,168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCBC</td>
<td>SRTS (SCBC)</td>
<td>Bike/Ped</td>
<td>$15,463</td>
<td>$19,000</td>
<td>$19,000</td>
<td>4/14/14</td>
<td>9/8/14</td>
<td>$4,034</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCBC</td>
<td>BTW (SCBC)</td>
<td>Bike/Ped</td>
<td>$5,174</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>4/14/14</td>
<td>6/19/14</td>
<td>$1,511</td>
<td></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>10/19/09</td>
<td>7/3/14</td>
<td>$52,183</td>
<td>Approp req submitted. Need coop amend?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SoCo Regional Pks</td>
<td>Central Sonoma Valley Trail</td>
<td>Bike/Ped</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastopol</td>
<td>Street Smart Sebastopol</td>
<td>Bike/Ped</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
<td>9/8/14</td>
<td></td>
<td>$951,913</td>
<td>Advanced Funding Apprvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healdsburg</td>
<td>Foss Creek Trail</td>
<td>Bike/Ped</td>
<td>$474,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>9/8/14</td>
<td></td>
<td>$-951,913</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healdsburg</td>
<td>Foss Creek Trail</td>
<td>Bike/Ped</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$341,000</td>
<td>$341,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$-281,883</td>
<td>Authorized for Advanced Funding (bal estimate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petaluma</td>
<td>Petaluma River Tr</td>
<td>Bike/Ped</td>
<td>$-45,956</td>
<td>$995,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>5/14/12</td>
<td>3/12/14</td>
<td>$-30,242</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMART</td>
<td>NWPRR</td>
<td>Bike/Ped</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>4/24/14</td>
<td>4/17/14</td>
<td>$-281,883</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMART</td>
<td>IOS Construction (Bond)</td>
<td>Rail</td>
<td>$1,570,639</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>10/10/11</td>
<td>4/17/14</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Single Point of Contact (SPOC) Training

What is a “Single Point of Contact”?

It is a regional requirement that every Local Public Agency (LPA) that receives FHWA-administered funds will need to identify and maintain a staff position that serves as the “single point of contact” for the implementation of all FHWA-administered funds within the agency. Learn what your roles and responsibilities are as a SPOC.

The person in this position:
• Must have sufficient knowledge and expertise in the federal-aid delivery process to coordinate issues and questions that may arise from project inception to project close-out.
• Has the ability to work closely with FHWA, Caltrans, MTC and the respective CMA on all issues related to federal funding for all FHWA-funded projects implemented by the recipient agency.

Join Caltrans District Local Assistance Engineers, MTC and CMA staff for a Day of Mutual Understanding, September 30, 2014
See attached agenda and examples of issues to be addressed.
Come with your ideas and suggestions the day of the meeting.

Meeting Details

Date: Tuesday, September 30, 2014
Time: 9:30 am - 3:30 pm
Location: Metropolitan Transportation Commission MetroCenter - Auditorium
101 8th Street, Oakland, California

To register: Email Marcella Aranda at MAranda@mtc.ca.gov

RSVP no later than September 24, 2014. Due to limited space, please limit attendance to one attendee per local jurisdiction, registered SPOCs will get preference.

DLAE Roundtable with SPOCs

➢ Learn how MTC develops funding and programming cycles.

➢ Learn what the CMAs are and the CMA role in funding and programming projects.

➢ Learn about the role of Caltrans in the delivery process. Learn what their delegated role is from FHWA and what they need from you.

➢ Opportunity for you to discuss with Local Assistance Area Engineers your local process for approving, advertising, awarding, projects.

➢ Discuss delivery challenges and work together to develop solutions and ideas to make delivery smoother for everyone.

Organized by the Federal Efficiencies Subcommittee
Hosted by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission
DLAE Roundtable with SPOCs - A Day of Mutual Understanding

Tuesday, September 30, 2014   9:30 am - 3:30 pm
Metropolitan Transportation Commission
MetroCenter – 1st Floor, Auditorium
101-8th Street, Oakland, 94607

Morning Session 9:30 am - ~ 12:00 noon

I. Self-introduction of attendees
   a. Responsibilities of a SPOC
   b. What are your priorities associated with federal aid projects
   c. What they hope to get out of this workshop

II. General overview of process from programming to implementation
   a. MTC – How they develop cycles, develop the TIP, and make TIP amendments
   b. CMAs – How they use Cycle guidelines, set up calls for projects, get projects through committees and approved by their Boards, submit to MTC, and then work with jurisdictions to program/deliver projects
   c. DLAE outlines responsibilities and hours spent on invoicing reviews, E-76 Processing, etc. What is needed in order to set up field review? Top five list of tips for getting your package through CT.

III. Ground rules for Breakout session: This is not a gripe fest. The intent is to provide mutual understanding and constructive ideas to possibly improve the process.

Break for Lunch ~12:00 noon – 1:00 pm

Afternoon Session ~1:00 pm - ~3:30 pm

IV. Breakout session: by regional DLAE and his/her represented jurisdictions
   a. Roundtable introductions (everyone should be familiar with their DLAE)
   b. SPOCs outline their local government process for advertise/award/approve:
      • What items have to go to council for approval?
      • How long does that take?
      • What kind of development review is involved in submitting a package to Caltrans?
      • How do consultant invoices get reviewed by local jurisdiction prior to CT submittal?
      Who does the review?
• Explain the percent of time they spend on these projects vs other work (e.g. building permits, storm water, waste water, solid waste, and other capital improvements).

  c. Area Engineer can explain the biggest challenges in processing projects:
     • What sort of information is often missing from submittals
     • How many projects they have to process
     • What types of issues are the hardest to resolve
     • How it is up to the agencies to follow up and how much follow up is considered too much?

V. Wrap it up: Brainstorm of challenges and potential improvements.

  a. How can we help each other in the era and environment of cutbacks?
     • Examples of simple corrections area engineers can make without bouncing a whole package back?
     • Discuss when it is appropriate to elevate issues or get clarification on unclear processes or how to “dig deeper” for answers without offending the other party.
     • Would it save time/effort for everyone if CT scheduled group field reviews together similar to ARRA?
     • Checklist for first and last invoices only? Or expedited/streamlined review for proven “good” players?
     • Would posting example “model” submittals help?
     • Electronic filing of documents to prevent lost documentation and keep history. Similar to FMS document uploads?
     • Involve R/W earlier in the process to avoid last minute R/W cert issues?

VI. Would additional future workshops be helpful?

  a. What would you want out of future workshops?
The following examples are provided to help you start thinking of topics to discuss at the SPOC workshop. Please bring your thoughts to the workshop.

Expectations that Local Assistance and MTC has of the SPOC and/or the Project sponsor

- Read the OB and LPP publications so you are aware of changes that are occurring.
- Know how to program your projects into FMS. Get schedules for your projects, be aware of AQ requirements and task force meeting dates if not exempt.
- Be knowledgeable about funding program cycles and when to program funds. Understand how to program your funds, match rates, pro-rata and lump sum.
- Know what program your funds are in: Federal vs. State, FHWA vs. FTA, etc.
- Meet with the LPA staff that handles invoicing and review with them what the Caltrans expectations are for billing summaries, back up data, etc.

Expectations that Local Assistance has of the Local Public Agency Project Managers

- Should be prepared for their project prior to a field review meeting and prior to filling out PES forms and Field Review forms, etc.
- Should know what’s expected by environmental or right of way or cultural folks at Caltrans.
- Gather early information. E.G. Download your FIRM maps, check your floodplains, visit your site, take pictures and bring this information to your field review meeting.
- Check what easements you have or what right of way constraints on a project are before you meet with the Caltrans folks so you can explain what may be an issue and how to resolve it early in the process.

Do you think this expectation is appropriate? What is your agency’s expectation from your SPOC and/or your agency’s project manager?

If your expectations are vastly different from Caltrans Local Assistance expectations, do you have ideas to get reach the same expectations?
Expectations that Local Public Agencies have of their DLAE

- DLAE should only be enforcing what the LAPM publishes as the appropriate process.
- DLAEs should return phone calls and emails promptly.
- DLAEs should be knowledgeable about changes occurring in the local assistance process and procedures.
- Many of the processes and procedures are open to interpretation. If DLAEs do not know the answers to specific questions they should take the initiative to investigate and find answers to those questions.

What are your expectations from your DLAE? Do you think your DLAE will think this expectation is appropriate? Do you have ideas to reach the same expectations?

Example of topics for discussion on what you think Caltrans could improve on.

- Don’t require some new process that was published in an OB or LPP after a project phase has already been authorized. For instance, if consultant contract selection requirements change after a project has authorized for PE, the LPA shouldn’t have to modify an existing RFP to meet the new requirement that was put in after their authorization date. (This would have exceptions; E.G. a legal requirement)

- Have the proper forms on the website! Don’t leave old versions of forms on the Local Assistance site for download and then send them back saying the LPA filled out the wrong form. This drives our PMs crazy and wastes tremendous amounts of time.

- Utility Relocations during R/W phase vs. Utility Relocations during construction phase seems to always be a hang up when programming money. DLAE should be versed in what is appropriate to consider part of R/W and what is part of construction phase. For instance, non-franchise relocations which require specific authorization create tremendous headaches for LPA staff.

An example of this is we were told to program utility relocation funding in the R/W and then move it to CON phase at a later time. However, in this example the funding was to raise iron (MH lids and water valves). It makes no sense to program the funding in the R/W phase when we would never be spending it in that phase regardless of whether or
not we needed prior approval before getting reimbursement for the activity. This just adds process and creates more paperwork to an already cumbersome federal process.

**What ideas do you have to improve or streamline the process? We are looking for suggestions and/or improvements.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>TIP ID</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Fund Code</th>
<th>STP ID</th>
<th>Appn</th>
<th>Prog</th>
<th>STP Amt</th>
<th>CMAQ Amt</th>
<th>Total Amt</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>STP Amt</th>
<th>CMAQ Amt</th>
<th>Total Amt</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>Cotati</td>
<td>Cotati - Old Redwood Highway S.</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>SON130008</td>
<td>PROPOSED</td>
<td>STP-T4-2-OBAG</td>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>Healdsburg</td>
<td>Healdsburg Pedestrian Safety and Access</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>SON110054</td>
<td>PROPOSED</td>
<td>CMAQ-T4-1-LIFE</td>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>202,937</td>
<td>202,937</td>
<td>202,937</td>
<td>202,937</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>Healdsburg</td>
<td>Healdsburg Various Streets &amp; Roads</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>SON130005</td>
<td>PROPOSED</td>
<td>STP-T4-2-OBAG</td>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>Rohnert Park</td>
<td>Rohnert Park Various Streets</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>SON130009</td>
<td>PROPOSED</td>
<td>STP-T4-2-OBAG</td>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>1,103,000</td>
<td>1,103,000</td>
<td>1,103,000</td>
<td>1,103,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>Downtown Santa Rosa Streetscape</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>SON130006</td>
<td>PROPOSED</td>
<td>CMAQ-T4-2-OBAG</td>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>126,000</td>
<td>126,000</td>
<td>126,000</td>
<td>126,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>Santa Rosa</td>
<td>Roseland Area / Sebastopol Rd Priority</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>SON130021</td>
<td>PROPOSED</td>
<td>STP-T4-2-PDA-CO</td>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>647,000</td>
<td>647,000</td>
<td>647,000</td>
<td>647,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>Sebastopol</td>
<td>Sebastopol Various Streets and Roads</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>SON130004</td>
<td>PROPOSED</td>
<td>STP-T4-2-OBAG</td>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>Son Co Reg</td>
<td>Central Sonoma Valley Trail</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>SON110090</td>
<td>PROPOSED</td>
<td>CMAQ-T4-1-LIFE</td>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>340,000</td>
<td>340,000</td>
<td>340,000</td>
<td>340,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>Sonoma City</td>
<td>Sonoma Various Streets and Roads</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>SON130011</td>
<td>PROPOSED</td>
<td>STP-T4-2-OBAG</td>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>Sonoma County</td>
<td>Sonoma County - Safe Routes to School</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>SON130014</td>
<td>PROPOSED</td>
<td>STP-T4-2-RSRRTS-REG</td>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>1,379,000</td>
<td>1,379,000</td>
<td>1,379,000</td>
<td>1,379,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>Sonoma County</td>
<td>Sonoma County - PDA Planning - Springs Area Plan</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>SON150001</td>
<td>PROPOSED</td>
<td>STP-T4-2-OBAG-PL</td>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>Sonoma County</td>
<td>Sonoma County - PDA Planning - Airport Station/Specific</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>SON150002</td>
<td>PROPOSED</td>
<td>STP-T4-2-OBAG-PL</td>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>Conde Ln/Johnson St Pedestrian</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>SON130012</td>
<td>PROPOSED</td>
<td>CMAQ-T4-2-OBAG</td>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>Bell Rd/Market St/Windsor River Rd Ped</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>SON130013</td>
<td>PROPOSED</td>
<td>CMAQ-T4-2-OBAG</td>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>14/15</td>
<td>81,000</td>
<td>81,000</td>
<td>81,000</td>
<td>81,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sonoma County Totals
- Report totals:
  - STP: 4,929,000
  - CMAQ: 824,937
  - Total: 5,763,937

Report totals:
- STP: 82,551,752
- CMAQ: 66,926,005
- Total: 149,477,757
### Division of Local Assistance

**Additional STP and/or CMAQ Federal-Aid Projects for FFY 2015**

**LSRPDWG 09/15/14: Item 5E**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Category</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Project Location</th>
<th>Project Scope / Description</th>
<th>Proposed State of Project</th>
<th>ISTP</th>
<th>CMAQ</th>
<th>Federal STP</th>
<th>HSP</th>
<th>SRTS</th>
<th>Total Obligation</th>
<th>All Fund Sources</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MTC</td>
<td>5920(075)</td>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>Build new bridge &amp; widening on existing bridge (Sonoma)</td>
<td>ISTP</td>
<td>$310,000</td>
<td>$1,043,000</td>
<td>Solano</td>
<td>Solano</td>
<td>310,000</td>
<td>1,043,000</td>
<td>Solano</td>
<td>1,043,000</td>
<td>Addition of new bridge &amp; widening on existing bridge (Sonoma)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTC</td>
<td>5030(054)</td>
<td>Vallejo</td>
<td>Build new bridge &amp; widening on existing bridge (Sonoma)</td>
<td>ISTP</td>
<td>$2,450,000</td>
<td>$2,450,000</td>
<td>Solano</td>
<td>Solano</td>
<td>2,450,000</td>
<td>2,450,000</td>
<td>Solano</td>
<td>2,450,000</td>
<td>Addition of new bridge &amp; widening on existing bridge (Sonoma)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<td>Solano</td>
<td>310,000</td>
<td>1,043,000</td>
<td>Solano</td>
<td>1,043,000</td>
<td>Addition of new bridge &amp; widening on existing bridge (Sonoma)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTC</td>
<td>5030(054)</td>
<td>Vallejo</td>
<td>Build new bridge &amp; widening on existing bridge (Sonoma)</td>
<td>ISTP</td>
<td>$2,450,000</td>
<td>$2,450,000</td>
<td>Solano</td>
<td>Solano</td>
<td>2,450,000</td>
<td>2,450,000</td>
<td>Solano</td>
<td>2,450,000</td>
<td>Addition of new bridge &amp; widening on existing bridge (Sonoma)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPO/RTA</td>
<td>Local Agency</td>
<td>Project Number</td>
<td>Project Location</td>
<td>Project Scope / Description</td>
<td>Required State or Federal Funding</td>
<td>Federal Fund Type</td>
<td>STIP $</td>
<td>CMAQ $</td>
<td>HSP</td>
<td>SRTS</td>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>Total Obligation</td>
<td>All Fund Sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>MTC</td>
<td>Sonoma County</td>
<td>360(1)(64)</td>
<td>Sonoma County</td>
<td>BRIDGE NO. 20C0114, KING RIDGE RD, OVER SF 101 RB. Widen 1 lane bridge to 2 lanes and rehabilitate/widen countermains. 4/1/2010: Toll Credits programmed for R/W, A, CON.</td>
<td>270,000</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4/1/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTC</td>
<td>Sonoma County</td>
<td>360(1)(1)</td>
<td>Sonoma County</td>
<td>BRIDGE NO. 20C0084, SHELTER CREEK, 1.4 MI N OF SF 101 RB. Replace 1 lane bridge with 2 lane bridge. (CSPF Seismic) 10/21/2015: Toll credits used for R/W, A. Toll credits used for DEP.</td>
<td>627,135</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3/31/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTC</td>
<td>Sonoma County</td>
<td>360(1)(16)</td>
<td>Sonoma County</td>
<td>BRIDGE NO. 20C0135, ROBIN DILLON RD OVER SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA RIVER, 1.3 MI N SF 101 RB. Replace existing one-lane bridge with a new two-lane bridge. 10/4/2010: Toll Credits programmed for PC, R/W, A, CON.</td>
<td>275,000</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3/31/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTC</td>
<td>Sonoma County</td>
<td>360(1)(35)</td>
<td>Sonoma County</td>
<td>BRIDGE NO. 20C0147, SHELTER CREEK, 1.4 MI N OF SF 101 RB. Replace deficient 2 lane bridge with new 2 lane bridge meeting current geometrics standards. 3/14/2010: Toll credits for all phases.</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3/31/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTC</td>
<td>Sonoma County</td>
<td>360(1)(38)</td>
<td>Sonoma County</td>
<td>BRIDGE NO. 20C0124, HUGHES MILL LANE OVER CALABASAS CREEK, NEAR ARNOLD DR. Replace existing historic bridge. 9/5/2010: Toll Credits programmed for R/W, A, CON.</td>
<td>220,000</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3/31/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTC</td>
<td>Sonoma County</td>
<td>360(1)(45)</td>
<td>Sonoma County</td>
<td>BRIDGE NO. 20C0151, RIVERSIDE DR OVER PENA CREEK, 8.7 MI W OF SF 101 RB. Replace one lane bridge with new lane bridge. Formerly LSRP Seismic Retrofit. 4/28/2010: Toll Credits programmed for PC, R/W, A, CON.</td>
<td>2,391,760</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3/31/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTC</td>
<td>Sonoma County</td>
<td>360(1)(18)</td>
<td>Sonoma County</td>
<td>BRIDGE NO. 20C0098, SHELTER CREEK, OVER SHELTER CREEK, 0.7 MI N OF SF 101 RB. Replace one lane bridge with new lane bridge. Formerly LSRP Seismic Retrofit. 4/28/2010: Toll Credits programmed for PC, R/W, A, CON.</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3/31/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTC</td>
<td>Sonoma County</td>
<td>360(1)(63)</td>
<td>Sonoma County</td>
<td>BRIDGE NO. 20C0093, SHELTER CREEK, OVER SHELTER CREEK, 0.7 MI N OF SF 101 RB. Replace one lane bridge with new lane bridge. Formerly LSRP Seismic Retrofit. 4/28/2010: Toll Credits programmed for PC, R/W, A, CON.</td>
<td>142,000</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3/31/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| MTC     | Sonoma County | 260(1)         | Sonoma County   | SPRINGHILL FOREST PARK - SR 128 
SPRINGHILL FOREST PARK - SR 128 | 1,279,000         | 2015  |        |        |     |        | 3/31/2015       |              |        |
| MTC     | Sonoma County | 160(1)         | Sonoma County   | AIRPORT STATION - AIRPORT STATION | 450,000          | 2015  |        |        |     |        | 3/31/2015       |              |        |
| MTC     | Sonoma County | 180(1)         | Sonoma County   | AIRPORT STATION - AIRPORT STATION | 160,000          | 2015  |        |        |     |        | 3/31/2015       |              |        |
| MTC     | Sonoma County | 0900004         | Sonoma County   | BRIDGE NO. PM0101, BRIDGE PREVENTIVE MAINTENANCE PROGRAM (PMP) for existing bridges in the County of Sonoma. See Caltrans Local Assistance HBP website for backup list of projects. | 141,694           | 2015  |        |        |     |        | 3/31/2015       |              |        |
| MTC     | Sonoma County | 0900003         | Sonoma County   | BRIDGE NO. PM0101, BRIDGE PREVENTIVE MAINTENANCE PROGRAM (PMP) for existing bridges in the County of Sonoma. See Caltrans Local Assistance HBP website for backup list of projects. | 5,000            | 2015  |        |        |     |        | 3/31/2015       |              |        |
| MTC     | Sonoma County | 0900002         | Sonoma County   | BRIDGE NO. PM0101, BRIDGE PREVENTIVE MAINTENANCE PROGRAM (PMP) for existing bridges in the County of Sonoma. See Caltrans Local Assistance HBP website for backup list of projects. | 8,000            | 2015  |        |        |     |        | 3/31/2015       |              |        |
| MTC     | Sonoma County | 0900001         | Sonoma County   | BRIDGE NO. PM0101, BRIDGE PREVENTIVE MAINTENANCE PROGRAM (PMP) for existing bridges in the County of Sonoma. See Caltrans Local Assistance HBP website for backup list of projects. | 11,244,725        | 2015  |        |        |     |        | 3/31/2015       |              |        |
| MTC     | Sonoma County | 0900000         | Sonoma County   | BRIDGE NO. PM0101, BRIDGE PREVENTIVE MAINTENANCE PROGRAM (PMP) for existing bridges in the County of Sonoma. See Caltrans Local Assistance HBP website for backup list of projects. | 14,743,000        | 2015  |        |        |     |        | 3/31/2015       |              |        |
| MTC     | Sonoma County | 0900000         | Sonoma County   | BRIDGE NO. PM0101, BRIDGE PREVENTIVE MAINTENANCE PROGRAM (PMP) for existing bridges in the County of Sonoma. See Caltrans Local Assistance HBP website for backup list of projects. | 17,274,725        | 2015  |        |        |     |        | 3/31/2015       |              |        |
| MTC     | Sonoma County | 0900000         | Sonoma County   | BRIDGE NO. PM0101, BRIDGE PREVENTIVE MAINTENANCE PROGRAM (PMP) for existing bridges in the County of Sonoma. See Caltrans Local Assistance HBP website for backup list of projects. | 22,743,725        | 2015  |        |        |     |        | 3/31/2015       |              |        |

**TOTAL FUNDS PROGRAMMED:** $132,394,135

**TOTAL FUNDS PROGRAMMED:** $14,473,000

**TOTAL FUNDS PROGRAMMED:** $88,425,000

**TOTAL FUNDS PROGRAMMED:** $1,366,471

**TOTAL FUNDS PROGRAMMED:** $2,274,725

**TOTAL FUNDS PROGRAMMED:** $2,274,725