Planning Advisory Committee
Thursday, November 16, 2017 – 9:30 a.m.
Sonoma Clean Power conference room
50 Santa Rosa Avenue, 5th Floor
Santa Rosa, CA 95404

ITEM
1. Introductions
2. Administrative
   2.1. Approval of the agenda – changes, additional discussion items- ACTION
   2.2. Review Meeting Notes from November 2, 2017* – ACTION
3. Immediate needs and options for temporary, small scale housing - DISCUSSION/ACTION
   3.1. Status of immediate housing production
   3.2. Jurisdiction updates on housing production, emergency response
4. SCTA Modeling and Data collection- DISCUSSION/ACTION
   4.1. Travel Model Revalidation and Travel Behavioral Study*
   4.2. Countywide Pending Development and Permitted Projects Database*
5. Finance options - DISCUSSION/ACTION
   5.1. Joint meeting SR/County presentation of Enhanced Infrastructure Financing District concept
6. Other Business /Next agenda - DISCUSSION
7. Public Comment
8. Adjourn

*Attachment

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

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

Pagers, cellular telephones and all other communication devices should be turned off during the committee meeting to avoid electrical interference with the sound recording system. TO REDUCE GHG EMISSIONS: Please consider carpooling or taking transit to this meeting. For more information check www.511.org, www.srcity.org/citybus, www.sctransit.com or https://carmacarpool.com/sfbay
ITEM

1. Introductions
   Meeting called to order at 9:33 a.m. by Suzanne Smith.

David Guhin, City of Santa Rosa; Mark Bramfitt, Sonoma LAFCO; Ada Chan, MTC/ABAG; Jerry Lahr, MTC/ABAG; Alix Bockelman, MTC/ABAG; Ken Kirkey, MTC/ABAG; Caroline Judy, GSD; Kraig Tamborini, City of Healdsburg; Kenyon Webster, City of Sebastopol; Leah Zippert, MTC/ABAG; Dana Brechwald, MTC/ABAG; David Goodison, City of Sonoma; Gillian Hayes, Graton Rancheria; Jenny Berg, MTC/ABAG; Jennifer Barrett, Permit Sonoma; Scott Duiven, City of Petaluma; Amy Lyle, Permit Sonoma; Michelle Gervais, Gervais Associates; Ed Sheffield, Assembly member Jim Wood; Bonnie Petty, North Bay Jobs with Justice; Teri Shore, Greenbelt Alliance; Dave Alden, Urban Community Partnership; Tom Conlon, Sierra Club; Thomas Elson, Sonoma County Transportation and Land Use Coalition.

Suzanne Smith; Janet Spilman; Lauren Casey; Chris Barney; Dana Turrey; Carolyn Glanton; Drew Nichols; Julian Ruzzier-Gaul (CivicSpark Fellow).

2. October 26, 2017 meeting minutes
   Included in the agenda packet.

3. Funding and Finance issues
   The agenda items were discussed out of order.

Alix Bockelman said MTC is currently in the process of assembling a matrix of the funding opportunities available, such as SB-1, SB-2, Air District, MTC grants. The list is currently under review for all options available, the application deadlines, and the general processes for the grant funding applications.

Jennifer Barrett asked if these funds are available for construction.

Ms. Bockelman responded the affordable housing sustainability communities and the HCB may have some funding, as well as the some transportation infrastructure project funds, but there is still uncertainty to the exact requirements. MTC Staff will continue to explore the grant funds available.

Dana Brechwald asked how the housing task force has connected with the state and federal housing task forces.

Caroline Judy responded the Housing Task Force is integrated with the CalOES and FEMA team.

Suzanne Smith asked about integration efforts with the insurance industry, whether there are connections with local government, or if property owners are one-on-one with the insurance industry.

Ms. Judy responded there have been some conversations with how the insurance industry is navigating the reimbursement process for temporary and transitional housing, and how that related to the availability of units – either private homes or hotels. The conversations are ongoing.

David Guhin noted there will be a gap in how to maintain the community, keep residents in the County, as well as the gap with fee reductions.

Ms. Smith added the Regional Climate Protection Agency would be able to provide legislative support.
Ms. Bockelman shared to the committee the experience of Henry Gardner, the city manager of Oakland during the 1991 firestorm and earthquake, navigating the insurance industry and mentioned he is available to talk to the City and County. MTC would be able to coordinate a meeting.

The committee also cited experience from the Valley Fire of 2015.

Ms. Barrett recalled the idea to offer case management fire victims and also highlighted the significance of the fiscal impact of the waived fees. There are differences in building codes and there will be a need to explore different ways to backfill funding/financing shortages.

Suzanne Smith opened for public comment.

Dee Swanhuyser wondered to whom she can speak about the affordable housing component of the rebuilding efforts and how to understand the definition.

Ed Sheffield spoke on the legislation element and lessons learned from previous emergencies. Emergency legislation is being introduced in certain areas, be it insurance regulation, or financial backfilling among others. Come January, legislation in relation to these fires will be ready in the state legislature and will move quickly. Mr. Sheffield urged planners to be ready and have ideas ready sooner rather than later.

Tom Conlon suggested individuals to not overlook philanthropic money that may be available.

4. Identifying immediate needs for temporary, small scale housing

Suzanne Smith commenced the meeting by providing comments and requesting an update from the County of Sonoma and the City of Santa Rosa.

Caroline Judy explained the newly formed housing task force goal is to provide safe, immediate, transitional, and long term housing to keep residents in Sonoma. 5,000 transitional housing are hoped to become available by November 15th. This goal can be made possible by the collaborative approaches with the cities, CalOES, HUD, FEMA, and various other remaining organizations.

The task force was formed within the past week, and during this period, have been working on objectives and are looking at the County and City owned property sites which could accommodate recreational vehicles. To date, various organizations have contacted the City with potential properties for RVs and Staff are working through these ideas to help identify immediate housing solutions.

David Guhin added the task force is working with FEMA to be as creative as possible and FEMA has been receptive to these ideas. Staff continues to explore how to best identify traditional housing options that could have added value after the 18 month period.

Kenyon Webster wondered if there has been an established site criteria and where to send information about potential sites.

Ms. Judy responded there is an immediate criteria where was established and to send locations to the task force.

Ms. Smith asked if the task force is looking at the transitional sites to be placed on the existing burn areas, or off-site while rebuilding.

Mr. Guhin responded both on- and offsite placement for transitional housing are being
entertained. Currently, the task force is looking at these options.

All forms of housing are being entertained. An initial phase needs to be outside the burn area until debris management is contained.

The conversation shifted to debris removal, and the set of options available to property owners: they can choose to opt out of the government sponsored debris removal, or choose to have the debris removed on their own choice.

An evaluation of the utilities have been studied, specifically noting the water and sewer infrastructure. One concern with the water infrastructure is the process for water and waste water clean outs. Two main elements are of concern: water and wastewater facilities on properties and also erosion controls against the winter rains.

Jennifer Barrett added the County has granted allowance for RVs to use their own hook up tanks for 45 days. Long term temporary permits – which will be set to expire in late 2019 – have been approvals to allow RVs to be placed on residential and agricultural parcels both inside and outside the burn area. A hand out is available online with current information.

As far as rebuilding, constraints exist on water supply and sewer line connections in the Larkfield and Airport areas.

Vicki Parker suggested all jurisdictions to have similar timeframes and criteria.

Ms. Smith introduced the CEQA streamlining topic, which is in effect in the burn areas, but is not elsewhere.

Ms. Barrett noted a request to extend the CEQA streamlining outside the burn areas has been made and added that areas with water and sewer hook ups are available, but requires statutory changes.

An existing categorical change is available for cities, and there is a wish this could be available for the county, as unincorporated areas of the county have city services. Requests have been made to the State Legislature.

Kenyon Webster recalled from the previous meeting a conversation around a statutory exemption County wide, not just within the burn areas, and wondered the progress of this idea.

Ms. Barrett responded there is push back against it for being too broad.

Ms. Smith recalled the conversation around accessory dwelling units (ADUs) and junior dwelling units (JDUs) – how these could become more permanent housing opportunities – and wondered if there has been additional movement around the policies.

David Guhin responded the City Council took action to allow ADUs on properties if of interest to the home owner. City Staff is currently exploring options around the fee structure and timing to be ADUs on lots. ADUs are capped at 750 sq.-feet.

Clare Hartman added that due to the urgency ordinance, the fee policy is only applied within the burn area; however, residents have expressed interest in ADUs city-wide. The city-wide ordinance is currently stalled, but will be presented to the city council in December.

Mr. Guhin reiterated the need to look at the entire housing stock within the City of Santa Rosa.

Ms. Hartman continued on the topic of ADUS and expressed the wonder of what to do after the houses are rebuilt. If residents want to keep the
temporary housing they have invested in, the City needs to be prepared.

In the context of this meeting, fees are defined as Impact Fees, i.e. water, sewer, etc.

Jennifer Barrett noted the County has already established an ADU ordinance, and recalled the recent Urgency Ordinance, inside and outside the burn areas, which streamlines the process and reduces the fees to allow the building of the ADUs. The county has also adopted a similar fee structure like the City of Santa Rosa.

Conversation shifted to financing options, affordability issues, and the challenges currently being addressed.

Ms. Barrett express concern for the interest to build dwellings at 1200sq-feet, in which then these homes will be priced at market value and/or converted into vacation rentals. A covenant has been established that when a lease is available, the home must be available to be rented.

Gillian Hayes asked about multi-level homes and garage conversions, citing the areas around Guerneville as an example.

Ms. Barrett acknowledged the flood zone within the Russian River area prevents construction; otherwise, if outside the flood zone, converting garages and multi-level homes can be permitted.

Ada Chan wondered how MTC/ABAG can assist in the long term planning in relation to ADUs. Ms. Chan cited an example from the City of Berkeley and their experience.

Ms. Hartman added that a finance fee tip sheet for home owners is needed.

Ms. Smith asked about the City’s and County need for additional staffing.

Mr. Guhin responded there is an immediate need for planners. The City is currently in the process of establishing a fire response department and staff would include engineers, plan checker, inspectors, planners, admin support, IT, and public information.

The committee discussed labor shortages and how to house workers during the rebuilding phase.

Ms. Barrett added an ordinance for workforce housing and micro apartments is currently being worked on.

Ms. Smith opened for public Comment:

Teri Shore, Greenbelt Alliance, thanked City and County staff for the work done in addressing the housing shortage. First, Ms. Shore expressed the need for more public input in the response and requested notice when the Housing Task Force meets and expressed to be involved with addressing the California Tiger Salamander protections. Furthermore, Ms. Shore noted the satisfaction on the reconsideration for the county wide CEQA exemption.

In regards to affordable housing, there is concern when the jurisdictions change their affordable housing policies – temporary to long term permit structures, for example – to make it easier for developers to meet lower thresholds, and cited Rohnert Park’s recent inclusionary policy change.

Thomas Elson, Sonoma County Transportation and Land Use Coalition, suggested annexation for county areas that are being developed, such as Larkfield. Density is a problem in county development, for the wildfires were in the wildlands and density should be within urban areas.

Bonnie Petty, North Bay Jobs with Justice, expressed concern with the opt-out program for
the debris removal. There is concern for the workers who would be involved with the debris removal, and asked what the protections for these workers are, what agency is certifying the different companies, what the certification process is, and where one would be able to report possible abuses.

Dave Ransom, Sonoma Valley Housing Group, spoke on workforce. Before the fires, there has been difficulty finding construction workers, and noted that the carpenters union should be in these conversations. Additionally, emergency housing should be open to everyone, both for those affected by the fires and those who were already facing homelessness.

County and the city communication should be other than the Press Democrat, and suggested a neighborhood email system.

5. Community development master planning – 3, 10 years out
Tabled to postpone this item for another meeting.

6. Countywide action needed
Suzanne Smith asked the committee the status of urgency ordinances within the partner cities.

David Goodison, City of Sonoma, announced the City of Sonoma had adopted ADU ordinances several months ago. A subcommittee with two council members have been established to assist with the housing element. Recommendations on ordinances from this subcommittee are expected within the following week to the city council.

Kraig Tambornini announced the City of Healdsburg has also adopted an ADU ordinance previously and will be amending it to allow garage conversations without the parking requirement.

Scott Duiven announced the City of Petaluma had adopted an ADU ordinance within the past two months, as well, the JDU ordinance does not have fee impact associated. However, permit fees are proportioned and construction costs are increasing, with the increasing cost of materials and labor. 1,000 units are currently in the pipeline, with 100+ dedicated to affordable housing.

Vicki Parker announced within the City of Cotati, 160 units are currently approved, but are waiting for the city to complete its own infrastructure project. The City of Cotati has drafted an ADU ordinance and are exploring an urgency ordinance for RVs.

Kenyon Webster announced the City of Sebastopol had an existing housing subcommittee, who will be tasked with urgency ordinances type provisions similar to the City of Santa Rosa and County of Sonoma. There is no timeline established to produce recommendations.

Additionally, a major zoning update is currently being addressed, which will include number of housing friendly amendments.

Caroline Judy requested, if possible, to receive a list of current projects.

Ms. Smith added to have the housing projects list sent to Suzanne Smith or Janet Spilman.

Jennifer Barrett asked about traffic model data being gathered.

Chris Barney send the data is still available and can continued to be gathered.

A master list can be created and sent to the planning directors.

Jenny Berg added that Frontier Energy can assist with exploring ZNEs.
Clare Hartman spoke on the next phase moving forward on a city wide frame. There will be more public vetting during this next process.

7. Data collection and management
SCTA can be available to assist in collecting, aggregating, and distributing data.

8. Resilience planning, identifying and addressing vulnerabilities
Deferred unless immediately needed to be discussed.

Suzanne Smith opened for public comment.

Thomas Elson, Sonoma County Transportation and Land Use Coalition, suggested the committee to consider all forms of long term planning.

9. Adjourn

The committee adjourned at 11:08 a.m.
Staff Report

To: Planning Advisory Committee

From: Chris Barney, Senior Transportation Planner

Item: Sonoma County Travel Model – Scope of Work for Model Validation and Sonoma County Travel Behavior Study

Date: 11/16/2017

Issue:
The Sonoma County Travel Model (SCTM) was last updated and revalidated in 2012 preceding the 2016 Comprehensive Transportation Plan Update. SCTM base year land use inputs have been updated from 2010 to 2015 and model forecasts are being updated to incorporate the most recent regional forecasts and local planning information. Staff proposes revalidating, or ground truthing, the travel model using a 2015 base year and 2015 real world transportation activity data. This update would support the next CTP update and other local plan updates and would ensure that the travel model reflects recent travel patterns. Staff recommends collecting additional data and information on local travel behavior and trends as part of the model validation effort which would also support other SCTA and local planning activities. A scope of work covering model validation, a travel behavior study, and model enhancements is attached for your review.

Background:
The Sonoma County Travel Model is used to evaluate the performance of the Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP), to estimate travel demand impacts of transportation improvements, and to forecast the travel demand impacts of population and employment growth. The model is routinely used to analyze transportation impacts of development projects, road improvements, and local planning documents. This analysis is often performed to support project development work as part of the environmental review process. State requirements, such as pending SB 743 requirements, may require that the model be used to analyze additional transportation impacts with a focus on broader regional impacts to the transportation system and vehicle miles traveled.

The travel model is updated every 4-5 years preceding each CTP update. The travel model was last updated and revalidated in 2012 using a base year of 2010. Current estimates of housing and employment growth, land use distributions, traffic counts, transit ridership estimates, travel survey data, census, and other demographic data are used to update the travel model as part of this regular update cycle. Model forecasts are revised so that they accurately represent the most recent general plans and the regional transportation plan. Model representations of road, highway, transit, and non-motorized transportation facilities are revised as part of the model update cycle so that recent improvements and changes to the transportation system are represented in the travel model.

SCTA has worked with local planning and public works/engineering staff over the past year to update the base year land use and transportation system inputs for the travel model from 2010 to 2015. Model forecasts...
of population and employment are being updated to reflect the most recent Plan Bay Area 2040 forecasts and to be in line with current local general and area specific plans. Staff has worked with the SCTA Planning Advisory Committee and local planning staff to develop a countywide database of permitted and pending development projects. Projects in this database will be included in travel model forecasts.

Staff recommends that SCTA retain the services of an independent consultant team to validate, or ground-truth, the updated travel model using observed data such as traffic counts and transit ridership data. Staff recommends that the consultant team also conduct a study of Sonoma County travel behavior to be used to enhance the travel model and to support other SCTA and local transportation and land use planning activities. The consultant team would be asked to provide estimates on possible model enhancements which would improve the scope and scale of the model, and would improve the model’s ability to support SB743 implementation and climate protection planning.

Travel Model Validation and Reasonableness Checking:

The SCTM was last calibrated and validated using a base year of 2010. The model will be recalibrated and revalidated to a base year of 2015. Sensitivity and reasonableness checks will be performed in order to ensure that the model is able to accurately represent current and future travel conditions in Sonoma County.

Model calibration is the process of adjusting model formulas and constants until predicted travel matches the observed travel within a study area for the base year. Model validation tests the ability of the model to predict current and future travel behavior and highlights possible errors that should be corrected. As part of the validation process, model forecasts will be compared to real world observations of travel behavior such as traffic counts, travel surveys, and transit ridership counts. Calibration and validation is an iterative process, and model parameters are adjusted based on model validation comparisons. Once model output and observed data are in acceptable agreement, the model is considered validated. Staff will work with local and regional staff to gather recent traffic count, transit ridership, and travel survey information to be used to validate the model.

Travel Behavioral Study:

Staff proposes that SCTA conduct a Travel Behavior Study to gather information on travel behavioral trends in Sonoma County. This study would provide information to be used in the travel model update and would provide information and analysis that would inform other transportation planning activities in the county. The study would investigate Sonoma County travel flows, trends and traveler behavior using emerging methods and data sources. Valuable information on countywide trip origins and destinations, commute and non-work travel flows, visitor and tourist travel, freight and goods movement, travel modes, weekend travel, seasonal travel variation, vehicle occupancies, congestion, and travel bottlenecks would be collected as part of this project. Staff recommends that a baseline study be conducted in 2018, and that smaller scale studies refreshing this baseline data be conducted as part of the future model update cycle (every 4-5 years) or as local needs may dictate.

Similar studies have been recently completed in Napa and Marin counties. Links to reports summarizing the results of these studies are provided below:

Napa County Travel Behavior Study:

http://www.nvta.ca.gov/sites/default/files/Napa%20County%20Travel%20Behavior%20Study.pdf
Model Enhancement and Improvement:

Staff recommends that the following model improvements be investigated as part of the model update:

1. **Weekend Model**: The Sonoma County Travel Model currently estimates travel for average workdays (Tues-Thurs). A consultant would be directed to develop weekend daily and weekend peak travel estimates and to develop a weekend sub-model.

2. **Enhanced representation of Visitor/Tourism travel**: Visitor destinations in Sonoma County are not explicitly represented by a specific tourism/visitor use type in the travel model and are represented in the model as commercial, institutional, or park/recreational area land uses. A consultant would be directed to gather information and data on visitor travel in Sonoma County and to assess how this could be represented in the travel model.

3. **Enhanced representation of Winery/Agricultural uses**: Wineries and agricultural uses are currently represented as industrial, retail, or special generator uses in the SCTM. A consultant would incorporate winery, agri-tourism, and agricultural land uses and trip generation rates into the travel model.

4. **SB743 Reporting and Analysis**: SB 743 has changed the way transportation impacts are required to be analyzed in CEQA. This legislation is shifting the focus of transportation analysis away from congestion and roadway level of service to concentrate on overall travel/system usage using Vehicle Miles Traveled as the preferred metric to measure transportation impacts. Consultants would be directed to recommend possible features that may be necessary to meet SB743 analysis requirements and that could streamline SB743 reporting.

5. **Expanded model boundaries**: The Sonoma County Travel Model currently extends to the Sonoma County line with a basic representation of a limited number of external zones. County gateway flows from external zones are used to estimate travel into and out of Sonoma County in the model. A consultant would be directed to recommend and provide cost estimates for expanding model boundaries while not significantly increasing model run times or impacting staff’s ability to run the model internally. Recommendations could include but would not necessarily be limited to including regional detail from the MTC regional model in the SCTM.

Timing:

The Sonoma County Travel Model has been historically updated and revalidated in conjunction with the 4-5 year CTP update cycle. The last major Sonoma County Travel Model update and validation effort was completed in 2012 proceeding the last SCTA CTP update. Countywide land use, travel, and planning conditions have changed since the last model update, and the proposed model update project would capture these changes and bring model assumptions in line with recent regional, state, and local planning documents. SCTA and local data analysis and modeling needs have changed since the last model update. The
recommended model improvements and enhancements will help SCTA's modeling program better meet these needs and requirements.

The project scope of work will be circulated for comment at SCTA advisory committees during November and December. SCTA board review and possible approval is tentatively scheduled for January 2018. Consultant selection and project work would proceed after board approval. Staff recommends that all model update, model validation and improvements, and data collection be completed by the winter of 2018 so that the updated and enhanced travel model and travel behavior study would be available to support the next SCTA CTP update and local general plan and other planning document updates.

**Policy Impacts:**

The SCTM is used to measure Comprehensive Transportation Plan performance, to provide information on the current and future performance of the countywide transportation system, and to analyze transportation and emissions impacts of projects and planning documents. When it is completely updated and revalidated, the updated version of SCTM will be used for all SCTA travel demand modeling activities.

**Fiscal Impacts:**

Staff has completed a portion of the travel model update in-house and has coordinated with local planning and public works staff to review updated model inputs including existing land use, housing and employment forecasts, transportation networks, and local travel trends. Consultants would be retained to assist with model recalibration and validation, with the implementation of recommended model improvements, and with the preparation of a travel behavioral study for Sonoma County. The previous travel model improvement and validation contract was completed with a budget of $50,000. The cost of a travel behavior study will depend on the final scope of work and proposals received.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Provide feedback on the travel model validation and travel behavioral study scope of work.
PROJECT OBJECTIVE

The Sonoma County Transportation Authority (SCTA) uses a combination of digital databases, computer software, and scientific theory to replicate the real world transportation system in the Authority’s travel demand modeling program. SCTA’s travel demand model is used to forecast future travel patterns and demand based on changes to the transportation system (new roads, changes in capacity, etc.), housing and employment growth (changes in residential densities, or locations, new job sites, etc.), and changing demographics and travel preferences.

SCTA is currently updating base year land use inputs for the Sonoma County Travel Model (SCTM) from 2010 to 2015. Model forecasts of population and employment are currently based on 2040 estimates from Plan Bay Area 2040 and local general and area specific plans. Model traffic analysis zones and highway/road and transit networks have been updated to reflect changes to the transportation system and to reflect future changes to the countywide road and transit network.

SCTM was last calibrated and validated, or ground truthed using observed data, for a base year of 2010. SCTA proposes recalibrating and revalidating the model to a base year of 2015 and performing sensitivity and reasonableness checks on updated future year model scenarios.

SCTA wishes to gather information on trends and changes to travel behavior in Sonoma County to support the travel model update and to provide information and analysis that will inform other planning efforts in the county. New methods and data sources are available that could streamline the process of providing updated information on travel, traveler behavior, and use of the Sonoma County Transportation System. Proposing organizations are asked to consider and discuss how these methods and data could be used to enhance the Sonoma County Travel Model and provide valuable information on Sonoma County travel flows, trends, and traveler behavior that can help SCTA and other local organizations meet their transportation and planning goals.

TASK 1: 2015 MODEL CALIBRATION/VALIDATION

Travel demand models are calibrated and validated in order to ensure that they provide reasonable estimates of current and future travel. Model calibration is the adjustment of constants and other model parameters in estimated or asserted models in order to make the models replicate observed data for a base year. Model validation is the application of the calibrated model and comparison of the results against observed data. SCTM was last calibrated and validated to a base year of 2010 using data from that year. SCTM should be calibrated and validated to a base year of 2015 using travel and traffic data from that year.

A number of evaluation and reasonableness checks should be performed to enhance the model’s forecasting ability, and validation work should follow the guidelines provided in Travel Model Validation and Reasonableness Checking Manual Second Edition (Federal Highway Administration 2010).

Before work begins on the SCTM 2015 update the consultant and SCTA staff shall review this scope of work and revise as necessary based on the recommendations of the consultant.
**Calibration:**

Each step of the SCTM should be recalibrated using the most recent available versions of the US Census (TPP, Journey to Work, etc), CA SWTS, National Travel Survey, Bay Area Travel Survey, HPMS, Caltrans traffic counts, local traffic counts, local transit ridership data and other travel data as recommended by the consultant.

Sonoma County has experienced significant economic “boom” and “bust” periods over the past decade. The consultant should account for abnormal economic conditions that may be observed for the calibration/validation year and the past decade and propose a method for ensuring that the base year validation can reasonably be used to forecast the future under a variety of economic conditions.

**Validation:**

Upon completion of the first round of calibration, the consultant should perform a model validation by comparing the calibrated model to year 2015 observed traffic counts and transit boarding data. Upon evaluating the first round of validation results, model components may need to be adjusted. The consultant should recommend and implement model revisions in all rounds of calibration and validation, and recommend the number of model revision iterations that should be performed to ensure adequate model validation. Model validation should include static and dynamic validation testing.

Sonoma County has experienced significant economic “boom” and “bust” periods over the past decade. The consultant should account for abnormal economic conditions that may be observed for the calibration/validation year and the past decade and propose a method for ensuring that the base year validation can reasonably be used to forecast the future under a variety of economic conditions.

Static validation tests should include evaluation of the following along with other static validation tests as recommended by the consultant:

- Trip length frequency by purpose
- Average travel times by purpose
- Mode split by purpose
- Roadway segment model-to-count ratios
- Screenline ratios
- Model speed vs. observed speed
- Transit system ridership

Dynamic validation tests should include testing model input changes of the following with other dynamic validation tests as recommended by the consultant:

- Household location, density, diversity, and other household attributes
- Employment location, density, diversity, and type
- Roadway network
- Transit service
- Parking and other pricing policies
- Travel demand management programs

**Forecast Year Reasonableness/Sensitivity Testing:**
The Sonoma County Travel Model currently includes a future forecast year of 2040 based on regional Plan Bay Area 2040 estimates of future housing and employment growth. SCTA and local jurisdiction planning staff are updating SCTM’s future forecast year to 2040 using current local planning estimates and the most recent Plan Bay Area Sustainable Communities Strategy population and employment estimates being developed by the MTC and ABAG. The consultant should perform reasonableness and sensitivity tests on the future forecast year scenario, recommend, and then execute model revisions based on future year model testing.

Deliverables:
- Recalibrated and revalidated travel model
- Model validation report documenting the final model parameters, model calibration results, model validation results, as well as the basic process followed for model calibration and validation, and major decisions made during the process. This validation report should include base year validation and should include a chapter discussing future year reasonableness and sensitivity testing. Two (2) hard copies and one (1) digital copy of this report should be provided.
- Digital media copies of model files including all travel data collected as part of this project.

OPTIONAL TASKS:
The project proposal should provide cost estimates and project approaches for Tasks 2-4. Tasks 2-3 and elements of Task 4 may be combined into a single effort if it makes sense to combine these tasks into a single work effort.

TASK 2: ORIGIN-DESTINATION AND TRAVEL BEHAVIOR ANALYSIS
The collection of detailed origin-destination data for Sonoma County and surrounding areas will provide insights on regional travel patterns on highway and road systems, transit, travel flows and trends, and highlight areas county residents are traveling from and where they and other travelers are travelling to.

Proposed origin-destination analysis project tasks:
- Meet with agency staff to finalize project scope and solidify a schedule for completing the project. Elements of the project must be completed on a timely basis and data must be captured on specific intervals in order to understand seasonal travel and school travel.
- Work with agency staff and SCTA advisory committees to gather feedback on project approach and deliverables of the project.
- Gather existing available data for Sonoma County including: transportation, employment, school, freight, and tourism data, and review with staff and committees to identify data gaps.
- With input from agency staff and committees, design a data approach for obtaining countywide origin-destination and travel flow information; data sources may include but are not limited to the following:
  - Vehicle counts at county gateways and other important intersections
  - License plate scanning
  - Mobile device data
  - Onboard GPS data
  - Video detection
• Travel monitoring data
  - The study should summarize daily and peak hour trips by Sonoma County Travel Model traffic analysis zone (TAZ), and jurisdiction.
  - The study should identify external and internal travel flows and identify concentrations of specific activities by trip purpose (work, school, visitor, other trips).

• Collect data and analyze:
  - The number of trips per day and origins and destinations that are associated visitors, residents, and workers;
  - The number of trips by travel mode – car, bus, bike, etc.
  - The number of trips per day produced by and attracted to origins and destinations that are associated with major employers in Sonoma County.
  - The number of work and visitor trips observed on weekdays and weekends.
  - Identify internal and external commute flows, summarize by county and jurisdiction.
  - Summaries of other trips coming into Sonoma County, leaving Sonoma County, and passing through the county (i.e. XI, IX, and XX trips).
  - The travel characteristics associated with major tourist destinations in the county which could include: number of trips per day, origins and destinations, seasonal variations, etc.
  - The number of trips per day, origins and destinations, that are associated with Santa Rosa Junior College, Sonoma State University, and other schools to be identified by staff and advisory committees.
  - Vehicle occupancies by trip purpose.
  - Temporal and seasonal variations of travel including peak travel times of each day/week and seasonal variations of travel.
  - Summary of trip purpose including work, school, non-home based, other, and visitor trips.
  - Percentage of commuters/visitors traveling to Sonoma County separated by the county of origin and vice versa.

• Review the collected data and proposed conclusions with agency staff and committees.
• Prepare and provide edits for an Administrative Draft report for review and comment, a Public Draft, and a Final Report for approval by the SCTA Board.

The proposed work should build on other related work performed recently in the Sonoma County area including:
  - Sonoma County Transportation Authority – Highway 37 Origin and Destination Analysis
  - Sonoma County Transportation Authority – Comprehensive Transportation Plan
  - Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency – Napa County Travel Behavior Study
  - Caltrans – Integrated Traffic, Infrastructure and Sea Level Rise Analysis (Hwy 37)
  - California Statewide Travel Survey
  - Plan Bay Area 2040
• Transportation Authority of Marin – TAM Origin-Destination Data Collection Draft Report
• Wine Country Interregional Partnership – Origin and Destination Study

TASK 3: TRAVEL SURVEYS

SCTA seeks to gather additional information on travel behavior in Sonoma County. Data collected and presented as part of work performed in Task 2: Origin-Destination and Travel Behavior Analysis could be enhanced by collecting additional traveler information through in-person, online, or other survey techniques. The proposal should assess the possible benefits and costs of collecting additional traveler behavioral information using surveys or similar approaches.

Proposed project tasks:

• Meet with agency staff to determine the benefits of obtaining survey information in addition to data collected as part of Task 2. Finalize scope and solidify a schedule for completing the project. Elements of the project must be completed on a timely basis and data must be captured on specific intervals in order to understand seasonal travel and school travel.

• The consultant should present new technologies and data methods that are cost effective in obtaining the desired travel behavioral data in place of surveying such as travel data generated from cell phones, GPS, and other mobile devices etc.

• Work with agency staff and advisory committees to gather feedback on project approach and deliverables of the project.

• With input from agency staff and committees, design a data approach for obtaining countywide travel behavioral information which should include information collected as part of other tasks and additional approaches including but not limited to:
  ▪ Online or in person surveys
  ▪ Traffic counts at important visitor locations
  ▪ Use of data from public and private tourist destinations

• Survey tools should include basic demographic information (gender, race, income)

• Surveys should include basic questions about willingness to use alternative modes for work and non-work trips (transit, vanpool, private excursion services such as limousine, etc.)

• Surveys should include follow-up on why drivers have not shifted to alternate modes, and what would incentivize them to use transit, vanpool/carpool, or other options.

• Review the collected data and proposed conclusions with agency staff and committees.

• Prepare and provide edits for an Administrative Draft report for review and comment, a Public Draft, and a Final Report for approval by the SCTA Board.

The proposed work should build on other related work performed recently in the Sonoma County area including:

• Sonoma County Transportation Authority – Comprehensive Transportation Plan
• California Statewide Travel Survey
• Plan Bay Area 2040
• Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency – Napa County Travel Behavior Study
TASK 4: TRAVEL MODEL ENHANCEMENTS

SCTA requests that the consultant provide estimates for the following optional model upgrades or improvements:

1. **Weekend Model:** The Sonoma County Travel Model currently estimates travel for average workdays (Tues-Thurs). The consultant should provide estimates for providing weekend daily and weekend peak travel estimates by developing a full weekend sub-model, or by factoring workday travel estimates.

2. **Enhanced representation of Visitor/Tourism travel:** Visitor destinations in Sonoma County are not explicitly represented by a specific tourism/visitor use type in the travel model and are coded as primarily commercial, institutional, or large scale park/recreational area land uses. The consultant should provide an estimate for gathering information and data on visitor travel in Sonoma County and how this could be represented in the travel model.

3. **Enhanced representation of Winery/Agricultural uses:** Wineries and agricultural uses are currently represented as industrial, retail, or special generator uses in the SCTM. The consultant should provide an estimate for incorporating winery, agri-tourism, and agricultural land uses and trip generation rates into the travel model.

4. **SB743 Reporting and Analysis:** SB 743 has changed the way transportation impacts are required to be analyzed in CEQA. This legislation is shifting the focus of transportation analysis away from congestion and roadway level of service to concentrate on overall travel/system usage using Vehicle Miles Traveled as the preferred metric to measure transportation impacts. Consultants should recommend possible features that may be necessary to meet SB743 analysis requirements and that streamline SB743 reporting.

5. **Expanded model boundaries:** The Sonoma County Travel Model currently extends to the Sonoma County line with a basic representation of a limited number of external zones. County gateway flows from external zones are used to estimate travel into and out of Sonoma County in the model. SCTA desires to include a more detailed representation of external travel and external trip origins and destinations in the model. The consultant should recommend and provide cost estimates for expanding model boundaries while not significantly increasing model run times. Recommendations could include but should not necessarily be limited to including Bay Area Metro Travel Model One or Two TAZs for all other Bay Area counties, and using land use inputs from these models for these areas in SCTM.
Staff Report

To: Planning Advisory Committee
From: Chris Barney, Senior Transportation Planner
Item: Sonoma County Travel Model Pending and Permitted Development Database – Jurisdictional Summaries
Date: 11/16/2017

**Issue:**

SCTA staff has developed a database of countywide pending development and permitted projects in order to ensure that these projects are represented in the Sonoma County Travel Model and in order to support other SCTA planning efforts such as updates to the SCTA Comprehensive Transportation Plan and PDA Investment and Growth Strategy. This database has been identified by the Planning Advisory Committee as having benefits outside of SCTA’s modeling program and will be maintained as a resource that could support local planning activities.

**Background:**

The Sonoma County Travel Model is used to evaluate the performance of the Comprehensive Transportation Plan, estimate travel demand impacts of new development and transportation improvements, and forecast the travel demand impacts of population and employment growth. The model is routinely used to analyze transportation impacts of development projects, road improvements, and local planning documents. This analysis is often performed to support project development work, to support local planning, or as part of the environmental review process. State requirements, such as pending SB 743 requirements, may require that the model be used to analyze additional transportation impacts with a focus on broader regional impacts to the transportation system and vehicle miles traveled. See Attachment A for a more detailed description of the Sonoma County Travel Model.

As part of the countywide travel demand modeling program, staff maintains land use scenarios which represent existing conditions (2015) and future development conditions. The model forecast scenario currently uses a planning horizon year of 2040 and has been developed using countywide and jurisdictional housing and job growth control totals that have been adopted as part of the Bay Area Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) by the Metropolitan Planning Commission. SCS growth forecasts and associated control totals are based on national, state, and regional growth forecasts, and consider local general plans and zoning codes, but have been adjusted so that the SCS is consistent with SB 375 targets and Plan Bay Area 2040 performance goals. SCTA staff have developed a supplemental forecast scenario which estimates general plan buildout conditions.

Care has been taken to include pending and permitted projects in SCTM forecast scenarios, but in past versions of the travel model these inclusions have been made on a case-by-case basis using information provided by local planning staff. In order to provide a more robust process for cataloging, tracking, and
including these “pipeline” projects in travel model forecasts, staff developed a countywide pending development and permitted projects tracking database.

**Database format:**

The pending development and permitted projects database is a simple Access database that catalogues, tracks, and summarizes local development activity. The database identifies the project location (jurisdiction, address and/or parcel number), project status (approved, pending, etc.), possible completion year, project type (housing, commercial, industrial, etc.), project size (number and type of units, square feet of the project, etc.), and project description. Additional data fields can be added to the database if requested. Data can be summarized or filtered at the jurisdictional level, by development type, or by SCTM Traffic Analysis Zone, and the data can be used in a geographic information system (GIS) using TAZ location or project address.

*A summary of pending development and projects that are included in the database are attached to this staff report.*

**Frequency of Updates:**

SCTA staff will work with local planners to review and update the database at least once per year. The database will be updated more frequently for jurisdictions that have existing processes in place to regularly summarize and provide information about project completion and permitting activity or to support specific planning projects.

**Policy Impacts:**

By maintaining a countywide pending development and permitted projects database SCTA staff is able to ensure that pipeline projects have been included in travel model estimates of future growth and have been considered in travel model forecasts of future travel demand, congestion, emissions, and travel. The database can also be used to support other SCTA and local planning efforts.

**Fiscal Impacts:**

Staff time only. No additional fiscal impacts at this time.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Information item only. No action requested at this time.
SCTM is a conventional four-step travel demand forecasting model that is similar in structure and implementation to most regional models used for traffic forecasting. Estimates of land use, socioeconomic conditions, and transportation networks are used to forecast travel patterns, traffic volumes and congestion, and transit ridership.

The Sonoma County Travel Model has been developed with a focus on the Highway 101 corridor and the larger regional transportation system. The modeling program’s primary focus has remained on the analysis of countywide regional travel demand impacts and supporting SCTA’s long range transportation planning efforts. The focus on model improvement has been on long-range planning, but SCTA staff has worked with local planning and engineering staff to improve model detail and performance so that the model can be more effectively applied to more localized areas of the county. This work has allowed SCTM to be used to provide the modeling data required for project level analysis, including environmental work, and the preparation of local traffic studies.

SCTA staff works with Bay Area modelers to ensure that SCTM is consistent with other regional models. Model output, assumptions, and methodologies are compared to other local and regional modeling efforts.

The model covers all of Sonoma County, and is divided into over 900 traffic analysis zones (TAZs). Model land use inputs (estimates of population and employment) are summarized by TAZ. Population inputs are represented by housing units. Employment inputs are represented by square footage of various employment related uses such as retail, office, or industrial activities. Additional inputs are used to represent recreation and tourism attractors (hotel rooms, recreation acres, or other special destination types) and education related uses. Activity outside of the county is captured by existing and projected travel at the county line.
The regional transportation system is represented by a simplified network of roadways, transit routes, and non-motorized pathways. Represented roadways include freeways, highways, arterials, and local collectors. Local residential streets are not represented in the model unless a local jurisdiction specifically requests that it be included, and is able to demonstrate that the requested facility is an important connector locally or regionally. The model includes road attribute information such as topography, uncongested travel speed, and if the roadway is an urban or rural facility. Transit service is represented as a simplified system of transit routes and stops, and includes information on headways and transfers. Sonoma County Transit, Golden Gate Transit, Santa Rosa CityBus, Petaluma Transit, SMART, and some smaller regional providers are represented in the model.

SCTA uses a traditional, four-step travel demand forecasting process to estimate existing and future travel behavior (see Figure 6). These four sequential steps, or sub-models, are included in the travel demand forecasting process:

- **Trip Generation: How much travel?** In the trip generation step, the model estimates the number of trips going to and from each TAZ. Trips are divided by purpose – work trips, shopping trips, etc. Each TAZ produces and attracts a certain number of trips based on the amount of residential and employment development in the zone. Zones with high levels of residential development produce many trips, and zones with high levels of job related development attract many trips.

- **Trip Distribution: Who goes where?** In this step, produced trips are allocated to zones or destinations. A mathematical gravity model determines flows between zones based on travel time, distance, and cost, and the amount of population or employment in each zone. The output of this step is an origin/destination table, which is a large matrix showing the number of trips moving between different zones.

- **Mode Choice: How Do People Travel?** This step estimates the proportion of total person trips using drive-alone or shared-ride auto, transit, or non-motorized modes for travel. The model calculates the utility, or attractiveness, of each mode for each trip and uses this to determine which mode will be used for each trip.

- **Trip Assignment: What Routes Do People Take?** In this final step, the model selects the best path for each trip. The model assumes that people will take the fastest route, avoiding traffic and congestion where possible. Each trip is examined and a best path or route is determined which minimizes the time, distance, and cost needed to travel from zone to zone.

SCTM estimates travel demand and traffic and transit volumes for an average weekday day, along with traffic volumes and congestion for the AM and PM peak commute hours.

The travel demand model can be used to forecast future travel patterns and travel demand by assessing the impact changes in the transportation system (new roads, changes in capacity, new transit service, etc.), population (number and density of housing, demographic changes), and employment (new job sites, new construction) have on traffic and travel in the county. Potential model applications include:
- Identifying existing and future traffic “hot spots”
- Forecasting the effectiveness of major road or transit improvements
- Assessing the impact of land use changes
- Comparing land use or transportation policy alternatives using regional performance measures such as vehicle miles traveled, greenhouse gas emissions, delay or congestion, and average travel time.

Model output can include the following:

- Traffic volumes for sections of roadways, highways, or streets
- Congested speeds and travel time
- Level of Service (LOS) or volume to capacity ratios (V/C ratios)
- VMT generated by TAZ or specific developments or sub-regions
- Transit ridership on bus routes and transit systems
- Traffic volumes by vehicle occupancy (single, two-person, 3+ persons)
- Travel mode summaries (auto, transit, bike, walk)
- Countywide measure of effectiveness (MOE) summaries such as vehicle miles traveled, person/vehicle hours of delay, average speed by road type, and greenhouse gas emissions
Figure 6: Travel Modeling Process

**INPUTS**
- **LAND USE DATA**
  - Housing
  - Employment

**NETWORK INPUTS**
- **SHORTEST PATHS**
  - Estimated Travel Times

**FACTORS**
- **Trip Generation Rates**
- **Distribution Factors**
- **Mode Choice Coefficients/**
  - Zone-to-Zone Person Trips
- **Auto Occupancy Factors**
- **Time of Day Factors**
- **Speed-Congestion Curves**

**TRIP GENERATION**
- Person Trips by Zone

**TRIP DISTRIBUTION**
- Zone-to-Zone Person Trips

**MODE CHOICE**
- Zone-to-Zone Trips by Mode

**TRIP ASSIGNMENT**
- Zone-to-Zone Vehicle Trips by Time Period

**RESULTS**
- **Volumes**
- **Speeds**
- **LOS**
- Daily Traffic
- AM Peak Traffic
- PM Peak Traffic
- Daily Transit
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Land Use Type</th>
<th># of Projects</th>
<th>Housing Units</th>
<th>Non-Residential Project Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cloverdale</td>
<td>Hotel/Lodging</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>262 rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36000 sqft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-Family Residential</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40000 sqft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parks and Recreational Areas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shopping Center</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>304255 sqft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior/Group Housing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strip Commercial</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>287860 sqft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotati</td>
<td>Light Industrial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41850 sqft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-Family Residential</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shopping Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6184 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heavy Industrial</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>546052 sqft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hotel/Lodging</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1034 rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>329623 sqft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Light Industrial</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1855401 sqft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-Family Residential</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>527380 sqft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parks and Recreational Areas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>520 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shopping Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27450 sqft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior/Group Housing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strip Commercial</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>281037 sqft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warehousing</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>575715 sqft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Land Use Type</td>
<td># of Projects</td>
<td>Housing Units</td>
<td>Non-Residential Project Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Petaluma</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>132 students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel/Lodging</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>372 rooms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>440 square fee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Residential</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1252</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>86724 square fee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping Center</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>755000 square fee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strip Commercial</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>86813 square fee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehousing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40000 square fee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rohnert Park</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel/Lodging</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>232 rooms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10000 square fee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Residential</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreational Areas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34300 square fee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior/Group Housing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strip Commercial</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4000 square fee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehousing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10000 square fee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Santa Rosa</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel/Lodging</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>89 rooms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>194300 sqft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Residential</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1513</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>98500 sqft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2195</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior/Group Housing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strip Commercial</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>145242 square fee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehousing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>130912 sqft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sebastopol</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel/Lodging</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>143 rooms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Residential</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strip Commercial</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18645 square fee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Land Use Type</td>
<td># of Projects</td>
<td>Housing Units</td>
<td>Non-Residential Project Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sonoma</strong></td>
<td>Hotel/Lodging</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>105 rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-Family Residential</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4396 square fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strip Commercial</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17096 square fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Windsor</strong></td>
<td>Hotel/Lodging</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100 rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Light Industrial</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>134275 square fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-Family Residential</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>898</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parks and Recreational Areas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior/Group Housing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strip Commercial</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19500 square fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Warehousing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>121045 square fee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ITEM 3
INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING AND HOUSING DEVELOPMENT

Enhanced Infrastructure Financing Districts

County of Sonoma
City of Santa Rosa
ENHANCED INFRASTRUCTURE DISTRICTS (EIFD)

- Authorizing legislation SB628 (Beall).
- Creates Public Finance Authority.
- Requires plan for infrastructure improvements. District size dependent upon public goals. Can fund all types of infrastructure investment except school facilities.

**PROS**
- Size of district dependent upon goals
- Tax increment financing from wide range of revenue sources:
  - Revenue on Vehicle License Fee backfill
  - Fees and assessment revenue
  - County Loans
  - User fees and public private partnership from Infrastructure Finance Act
  - Federal and State grants
- 55% voter approval for bonds
- 45 year bond term

**CONS**
- All taxing entities must adopt resolution to join and approve plans
- Redevelopment activities within Enhanced Infrastructure Finance District must be complete
ENHANCED INFRASTRUCTURE DISTRICTS (EIFD)

PROPERTY TAXES ON NEW DEVELOPMENT:
SPLIT BETWEEN IMPROVEMENTS AND CITY AND COUNTY

TAXES ON EXISTING PROPERTY:
PAID TO CITY GENERAL FUND

EXISTING PROPERTY VALUE  FUTURE PROPERTY VALUE  CITY CENTER IMPROVEMENT FUND  GENERAL FUND
HOW CAN EIFD’S BE USED?

Parking Facilities
Transit Stations
Affordable Housing
Sewage and Water Facilities
Flood Control and Drainage
Parks and Libraries
Environmental Mitigation
Transit Oriented Development Projects
Sustainability Projects
EIFD DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

Step 1 – Feasibility Analysis

• Analysis of anticipated new development

• Known infrastructure projects on the books (including affordable housing)

• Analysis of the potential tax generation

• Boundary development

• Typical time to compete this process is 1-2 months depending on data availability and input from stakeholders

• Need consultant to determine feasibility

Step 2 – Development of Infrastructure Finance Plan

• Financial impact analysis

• Completion approximately 6 months +

Sample Sources of EIFD Funds

Cities/Counties
  • Property Taxes

Special Districts
  • Mello-Roos
  • Utility User Fees
  • Hotel Room Tax

Vehicle License Fees
  • Tax Increment