

Technical Advisory Committee

MEETING AGENDA SCTA Headquarters Office

May 25, 2017 – 1:30 p.m.

Sonoma County Transportation Authority
Large Conference Room
490 Mendocino Avenue, Suite 206
Santa Rosa, California 95401

ITEM

1. Introductions
2. Public Comment
3. Approval of Minutes, April 27, 2017*
4. Measure M **DISCUSSION**
 - 4.1. Measure M Invoicing/Obligation Status*
 - 4.2. Potential Measure M Extension/Renewal: Jurisdictional Reporting on possible Pavement Condition Index increase with both the Road Repair and Accountability Act and a possible ½ cent Sonoma County Sales tax for transportation.
 - 4.3 Potential Measure M Extension/Renewal: Jurisdictional Reporting on possible transit service increase with both the Road Repair and Accountability Act and a possible ½ cent Sonoma County Sales tax for transportation.
5. Regional Information Update **DISCUSSION / ACTION**
 - 5.1 Single Point of Contact Sub-regional and Regional Training Workshops, May 31 in Napa and June 6 in Oakland. SPOCs should attend both workshops. If a designated SPOC is unable to attend the regional workshop, it is recommended that another representative from the jurisdiction be sent in place. For those unable to attend the North Bay Sub-regional Workshop, attendance at another Sub-regional workshop is recommended.
 - 5.2 OBAG 2 proposed programming by funding year*
6. SB743 Update **DISCUSSION**
7. Rail Update **DISCUSSION**
9. Draft SCTA Board Meeting Agenda for June 12, 2017 **DISCUSSION**
10. Other Business / Comments / Announcements **DISCUSSION**
11. Adjourn **ACTION**

*Materials attached.

**Materials handed out at meeting

The next **SCTA** meeting will be held **June 12th, 2017**
The next **TAC** meeting will be held **June 22, 2017**

Copies of the full Agenda Packet are available at www.sctainfo.org

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

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

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

TAC Voting member attendance – (6 Month rolling 2016/17)

Jurisdiction	October	December	January	February	March	April	May
Cloverdale Public Works	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	
Cotati Public Works	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	
County of Sonoma DHS		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
County of Sonoma PRMD							
County of Sonoma Regional Parks		✓	✓	✓	✓		
County of Sonoma TPW		✓	✓		✓	✓	
Healdsburg Public Works		✓					
Petaluma Public Works & Transit	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	
Rohnert Park Public Works		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Santa Rosa Public Works	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	
Santa Rosa Transit			✓				
Sebastopol Public Works			✓	✓	✓	✓	
SMART	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	
Sonoma County Transit							
Sonoma Public Works		✓	✓		✓		
Windsor Public Works	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	

NB: September meeting was cancelled. November and December meetings fell on holidays so a single TAC meeting was held in early December.

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Minutes of April 27, 2017

ITEM

1. Introductions

Meeting called to order by Larry Zimmer at 1:33 p.m.

Committee Members: Larry Zimmer, Chair, City of Petaluma; Craig Scott, City of Cotati; Eydie Tacata, City of Rohnert Park; Brittany Lobo, Sonoma County Department of Health Services; Nancy Adams, City of Santa Rosa; Steve Urbanek, Sonoma County Transportation and Public Works; Alejandro Perez, Town of Windsor; Joanne Parker, SMART; Eric Jansen, City of Cloverdale; Henry Mikus, City of Sebastopol.

Guests: Sui Tan, MTC; Theresa Romell, MTC; Alisha O’Loughlin, Sonoma County Bicycle Coalition; Steve Birdlebough, Sonoma County Transportation and Land Use Coalition.

Staff: Seana Gause; Suzanne Smith; James Cameron; Chris Barney; Dana Turrey; Brant Arthur; Drew Nichols.

2. Public Comment

N/A

3. Approval of Minutes, March 23, 2017*

Approved with changes to reflect Larry Zimmer, City of Petaluma, and Anthony Taylor, Sonoma County Department of Health Services, as present under Committee Members.

4. Measure M - DISCUSSION / ACTION

4.1. Measure M Invoicing Status*

Seana Gause described the invoicing status of Measure M. This is included in the agenda packet.

4.2. Potential Measure M Extension/Renewal:

James Cameron provided reviewed information on the proposed sales tax extension to the committee. The information was from the March 27th SCTA board meeting agenda.

The TAC was notified that SB 1 will require each jurisdiction to compile a detailed list of projects annually which could be funded with Senate Bill 1 (SB1). The SCTA would also like specific street maintenance projects and streets that will benefit from the proposed sales tax extension.

MTC provided a handout describing how SB1 funds will affect Sonoma County roads; noting, SB1 is not enough to maintain Sonoma County roads.

Mr. Cameron described information received from jurisdictions on how funding from the proposed sales tax extension would affect local roads compared to the existing funding with SB 1.

Seana Gause commented on the graphics from the City of Santa Rosa, stating the visual is valuable and expressed an interest for the committee to use the same format.

Joanne Parker expressed the need for bus operators to compile a similar list of needs and analysis.

Nancy Adams inquired on the vision on these lists.

Mr. Cameron responded the vision is to synthesize the information to make it easier to understand.

Suzanne Smith added that examples can be used in a description of an expenditure plan, highlighting the number of miles each jurisdiction could potentially pave over the life of Measure M.

Theresa Romell added that jurisdictions should factor in the cost of not doing anything.

Mr. Cameron suggested jurisdictions should start with examples of what can be done each year.

Larry Zimmer clarified an example of what could be done with the Measure M extension plus SB 1.

The TAC agreed it would best for Santa Rosa to standardize their results then share with the TAC, so all jurisdiction can provide a similar analysis before the next TAC meeting.

5. Regional Information Update **DISCUSSION / ACTION**

5.1. Pavement Technical Assistance Programs (PTAP) round 17 reminder:

Seana Gause reminded the committee that the certification letter is due on April 30th if one participated in PTAP 17.

The letter must be submitted to MTC.

5.2. Single Point of Contact (SPOC) Verification*:

A current SPOC list is included in the agenda packet. Committee members needs to look at the list for accuracy. If any changes are needed, they are to be updated in FMS and to inform Seana Gause and Adam Crenshaw at MTC regarding the changes.

5.3: MTC Local Streets and Roads working Group Work Plan Discussion:

MTC staff were present to discuss the local streets and roads working group work plan.

MTC staff is seeking input and engagement from local public works departments.

Discussion began on how to build advocacy for needs, and to build attendance at MTC meetings.

Committee members exchanged their experiences and techniques in road rehabilitation.

Feedback was given to assist in making the meetings more worthwhile and proactive.

Seana Gause announced regional SPOC workshops. The first one will be May 31 in Napa County; second, June 6 at Caltrans in Oakland. The second workshop will be mostly with Caltrans staff, who will describe the necessary steps to deliver on projects.

5.4. State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)

STIP funding is anticipated to grow due to SB1. Sonoma County is currently in a negative balance. When the balance is positive, the Board has focused on highway 101. Should the balance increase, the fund will be allocated towards Programming Project Monitoring and Highway 101.

There will be no call for STIP projects.

5.5. Inactive Obligation List:

The link is provided on the agenda.

MTC is seeking input on a set of questions listed on FMS. This requirement is dictated by the State performance assessment.

5.6. System Performance Final Rule:

5.7. OBAG 2 proposed programming by funding year

Seana Gause reported on continued work on OBAG 2. Information will be presented as it develops, and a proposal will be presented once created.

A handout was given to the committee.

6. SCTA Travel Model Update Schedule and Overview - **DISCUSSION**

Chris Barney updated the committee on the travel model. The last time it was updated was several years ago, and currently is working with the planning departments to update land uses.

In May and June, Mr. Barney will be reaching out to Transportation and Public Works staff to make sure information is reflected correctly and then

will reach out to TAC members to provide documents to review.

A schedule is included in the staff report.

7. TFCA/TDA3 Quarterly Reports

7.1. TFCA

Included in the agenda packet, and lists all the projects not fully expended by the last quarter.

For FY 17/18, the call for projects was issued in February.

This has been approved by the Transit-TAC.

Larry Zimmer moves for approval, Nancy Adams seconded.

The TFCA was approved unanimously.

7.2. TDA3

This is annual program for bicycle projects, and has been approved by the CBPAC.

This item is included in the agenda packet for information.

8. Rail Update DISCUSSION

Joanne Parker briefly noted the SMART train will be at the Butter and Eggs parade with Petaluma Transit.

MTC has allocated bridge funds for the Larkspur extension.

Seana Gause spoke on the pathway presentation by SMART at the recent CAC meeting.

9. Draft SCTA Board Meeting Agenda for May 8, 2017 – DISCUSSION*

Included in the agenda packet.

10. Other Business / Comments / Announcements - DISCUSSION

N/A

11. Adjourn ACTION

The meeting adjourned at 3:32 p.m.

Sonoma County Transportation Authority
Measure M Appropriation/Invoice Status Report
FY 16/17

Project Sponsor	Project Name	Measure M Program	Prior Apprp Balance	16/17 Programmed	16/17 Amount Apprp	Appropriation Date	Last Invoice Date	Balance Remaining	Notes
Cotati	116 Landscaping	101	\$0	\$50,000	\$50,000	9/12/2016	10/21/2016	\$0	
Santa Rosa	Hearn Avenue (Phase 3)	LSP	\$429,916	\$1,800,000	\$1,800,000	2/6/17	12/22/16	\$2,187,484	
Santa Rosa	Fulton Road Improvements	LSP	\$387,614		\$0		12/22/16	\$311,225	
Sonoma County	Airport Blvd	LSP	\$0	\$2,047,000	\$0				
Sonoma County	Airport Blvd Landscaping PS&E	LSP	\$270,560	\$0	-\$114,000	3/27/17	4/17/17	\$82,728	4/17/17 FINAL Invoice
Sonoma County	Airport Blvd Landscaping CON	LSP	\$0	\$695,000	\$740,000	3/27/17		\$740,000	March Board action
Sonoma County	Airport Blvd Landscaping CON SUP	LSP	\$0	\$0	\$69,000	3/27/17		\$69,000	March Board action
Sonoma County	Airport Blvd Landscaping CON	101	\$0	\$50,000	\$0	3/27/17		\$50,000	March Board action
Santa Rosa	Access Across 101 Comm Conn	Bike/Ped	\$2,019	\$0	\$0		12/22/16	\$0	
Rohnert Park	Access Across 101	Bike/Ped	\$0	\$250,000	\$0				
Windsor	Access Across 101	Bike/Ped	\$0	\$250,000	\$0		1/23/2017	\$106,679	
SoCo DHS	SRTS (DHS)	Bike/Ped	\$20,603	\$26,000	\$0		3/20/17	\$0	
SCBC	SRTS (SCBC)	Bike/Ped	\$10,157	\$20,000	\$19,000		12/13/16	\$20,973	
SCBC	BTW (SCBC)	Bike/Ped	\$3,988	\$15,000	\$0		6/27/16	\$3,988	
SoCo Regional Pks	Sonoma Schellville	Bike/Ped	\$24,059	\$0	\$0		2/3/17	\$17,438	
Petaluma	Petaluma River Trail	Bike/Ped	\$0	\$32,000	\$0			\$0	
SMART	NWPRR	Bike/Ped	\$585,777	\$0	\$0		3/24/17	\$414,896	

\$5,185,000 \$714,000 \$4,004,410 *total remaining*

projects that are approaching or past 6 months for invoicing
or projects that are programmed for 16/17 funds that have
not appropriated said funds.

\$563,974 Bike Ped Remaining
\$2,581,436 LSP Remaining

Staff Report

To: Sonoma County Transportation Authority – Technical Advisory Committee

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

Item: One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) 2 Fund Programming Schedule Revision

Date: May 25, 2017

Issue:

Shall the TAC recommend the following proposed revision to requested OBAG fund schedule programming to the SCTA Board?

Background:

The TAC and the SCTA board previously approved the requested programming for OBAG 2 with the understanding that not all projects would be funded in the year requested, based on the regional requirement that CMAs program 50% of county share by 2020 and the other 50% 2022. The funds showed the bulk being requested by year 2020 and thus needed some projects to shift out in order to balance the requested funds to fit the regional requirement. Attached is a spreadsheet proposing two OBAG 2 projects having the construction funds shifted out one year from FFY2020 to FFY2021.

The first three years of funding and were oversubscribed by nearly 30 % by request. The FFY2020 being the most heavily over subscribed. There are two projects requesting Preliminary Engineering funds in 2020, the Crocker Bridge Bike lane and the County's Federal Aid Secondary (FAS) program. The Crocker Bridge is considered a safety project as well as a bike/ped project and was deemed not preferable to move out. The County's FAS project is under the County's discretion and thus not available for moving. There are six projects requesting construction funding in 2020: Petaluma's Road Diet, Windsor's Intersection Improvement Project, SMART's Payran Pathway Project, the Pavement Rehabilitation Projects for the City of Santa Rosa and the County of Sonoma, and Sonoma's Fryer Creek Bridge project. The SMART project is receiving several other grants and changing the funding year is unfeasible given the other grants' requirements. Sonoma's Fryer Creek Bridge project could be moved, but was not large enough to move the needle sufficiently to make a difference to the balancing of funds. The Pavement Rehabs for the City of Santa Rosa and the County of Sonoma were seen as unfavorable for moving since both had already had funding reduced in order to make the OBAG funds balance within the County Share. This left the City of Petaluma and the Town of Windsor's projects as the most likely candidates for adjustment. SCTA staff is recommending that the Petaluma and Windsor projects' construction funds be shifted out one year in order to balance the requested funding by the OBAG 2 requirements per MTC's Resolution 4202.

Policy Impacts:

None.

Fiscal Impacts:

Shifting the funding from the requested dates means that two projects will not receive funding until a year later than requested. Both projects will continue to receive Preliminary Engineering funds in the original year requested and will be able to develop “ready to go” projects should other projects in the region fail to deliver and an opportunity arises for earlier delivery. Additionally, the project sponsors could if cash flow allows, request Advanced Construction to maintain the original delivery schedule. This method would have the sponsors request federal authorization to proceed on the original schedule and complete construction with local funds. The federal construction funding would then become available the following fiscal year and would be immediately reimbursed with priority, reducing the risk of funding shortage due to any over-demand on regional obligation authority.

Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommends that the TAC consider recommending the proposed change to program funding schedule for the two highlighted projects to the SCTA Board for approval.

RBP
TLC
SR25

Bike/Ped	\$664,000	\$2,683,000		\$3,347,000
LSR	\$3,250,000	\$86,000		\$3,336,000
TLC	\$0	\$0		\$0
SRTS	\$0	\$1,655,000		\$1,655,000
PCA	\$2,050,000	\$0		\$2,050,000
Planning	\$5,000,000	NA		\$1,178,000
Total	\$10,964,000	\$4,424,000		\$11,566,000

+PCA \$2,050,000 \$770,000 \$1,280,000
\$19,854,000

% of Total Programmed To Date			
	STP - OBAG	CMAQ - OBAG	Total OBAG
Bike/Ped	6%	61%	29%
LSR	30%	2%	29%
TLC	0%	0%	0%
SRTS	0%	37%	14%
PCA	19%	0%	18%
Planning	46%	NA	10%
Total	100%	100%	100%

Staff Report

To: Technical Advisory Committee
From: Chris Barney, Senior Transportation Planner
Item: SB 743 Update, Metrics and Application
Date: 5/25/2017

Issue: SB 743 final guidance is still pending. Staff attended training on metrics and analysis techniques that could be used for implementation. A summary is provided in this report.

Background:

SB 743 directed the California Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to amend CEQA guidelines for analyzing transportation impacts. OPR has recommended using vehicle miles travelled (VMT) to replace level of service (LOS) for measuring transportation impacts in CEQA.

OPR's most recent guidance for implementation was released January 20, 2016 and can be viewed on the OPR website.

https://www.opr.ca.gov/docs/Revised_VMT_CEQA_Guidelines_Proposal_January_20_2016.pdf

OPR has indicated that final guidance will be released soon and will be forwarded to the Natural Resource Agency for review.

Metrics and Application Approaches:

SCTA staff attended a statewide training on SB 743 metrics, analysis, and implementation. This training was attended by government engineering and planning staff and private traffic and transportation consulting staff.

Major take-aways from the training include:

- Care should be taken to make sure VMT analysis is done using the same tool or methods across all portions of an EIR. Using different methods and techniques and having different VMT estimates in an EIR could pose legal risks and make EIRs more difficult to defend.
- VMT estimation has a large margin of error, but many believe it is very precise since models and tools are used to generate this metric. Some amount of education will be necessary to avoid issues with data quality associated with VMT estimation.
- There is no good source of observed data for VMT at this point. Mobile device and GPS data from vendors such as AirSage and Streetlight are probably the best we have currently and will become more important as VMT is being used as a more important metric.
- SB 743 VMT estimates should be estimated for light personal vehicle only. Truck/freight traffic will need to be removed from many models (including the Sonoma County Travel Model).

- Model boundary truncation of trip lengths is going to be an issue with the Sonoma County Travel Model and other models. In model or off model methods will need to be used to account for more accurate trip lengths for trips beginning and ending out of the county. Travel survey data, census data, regional or statewide travel model outputs, or other data sources could be used to do this.
- Current models don't consider the impacts of autonomous vehicles or other improvements in technology adding a ton of uncertainty to forecasting.
- Model defensibility is going to be more important and is going to make model documentation and model validation documentation more important.
- For threshold setting, the unincorporated counties can compare average VMT to the average VMT in incorporated cities in the county, not the region as a whole. Cities can compare project VMT to citywide average VMT.
- Data used to check and screen thresholds will need to be interpolated to the actual base year being considered for each project. Models typically have a set base year (2010 for Sonoma County Travel Model which is being updated to 2015).
- CAPCOA's "Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures" document is a good source for mitigation strategies to consider:

<http://www.capcoa.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/11/CAPCOA-Quantification-Report-9-14-Final.pdf>

Policy Impacts:

Delay or LOS was the primary metric for measuring transportation impacts in CEQA previously. SB 743 has changed how transportation impacts will be analyzed and assessed under CEQA. New transportation impacts will be assessed based on project and plan based VMT increases.

Fiscal Impacts:

Additional analysis will be required to estimate VMT impacts of projects as part of the CEQA process. Environmental analysis costs could change based on new requirements.

Staff Recommendation: Information item only, no action requested.