
**SONOMA COUNTY
TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY**

**SCTA MEETING
AGENDA PACKET**

**Monday, April 8, 2002
3:15 p.m.**

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

SONOMA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

A G E N D A

April 8, 2002

3:15 p.m.

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

Directors

Jake Mackenzie, Chair
Rohnert Park

Paul Kelley, V. Chair
Sonoma County

Steve Allen
Windsor

Joe Costello
Sonoma

Geoffrey Fox
Cotati

Mike Healy
Petaluma

Robert Jehn
Cloverdale

Mike Kerns
Sonoma County

Lisa Schaffner
Healdsburg

Tim Smith
Sonoma County

Sam Spooner
Sebastopol

Sharon Wright
Santa Rosa

SCTA Staff

Suzanne Wilford
Executive Director

Janet Spilman
Transportation Planner

Jeanette Wood
Executive Assistant

ITEM

- I. Public Comment
- II. Consent Item (Attachment) - **ACTION**
 - A. Minutes of the March 18, 2002 Meeting
- III. Reports - **INFORMATION/ACTION**
 - A. Executive Committee Report (Chair Mackenzie)
 - B. North Coast Rail Authority (NCRA) Report (Chair Mackenzie)
 - C. Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Report (Dir. Wright)
 - D. SCTA Staff Report (Suzanne Wilford, Exec. Dir.)
 1. Bay Area Partnership Activities
 2. Joint Marin/Sonoma Activities
 3. SCTA Committee Reports
 4. Staff Report
- IV. FY02/03 TDA Article 3 Program for Bicycles – **DISCUSSION/ACTION**
 - A. Amendment request to previously approved program of projects
 - B. Resolution No. 2002-005
 - C. Letter of support for Highway 116 bike lanes
- V. FY02/03 Coordinated Claim for Transit – **DISCUSSION/ACTION**
 - A. Staff Report
 - B. Resolution No. 2002-006
- VI. FY02/03 TFCA Program of Projects – **DISCUSSION/ACTION**
 - A. Staff Report
 - B. Resolution No. 2002-007
- VII. FY02/03 FTA Section 5310 Paratransit Projects – **DISCUSSION**
- VIII. SMART Report – **DISCUSSION/ACTION**
 - A. Update on AB2224 – SMART District
- IX. Caltrans Report – **DISCUSSION**
 - A. 2002 STIP Update
 - B. Status Report on Highway 101 Projects
 - C. Status Report on the RFP for Highway 101 EIR/EIS

- OVER -

- X.** State Legislation Related to Transportation – **DISCUSSION/ACTION**
 - XI.** Third Quarter SCTA Budget Report – **DISCUSSION**
 - XII.** Other Business/Director Announcements – **DISCUSSION**
 - XIII.** Adjourn – **ACTION**
-

The next **SCTA** meeting will be held on **May 13, 2002**.

SONOMA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

MINUTES

March 18, 2002

ATTENDEES

Director Mackenzie
Director Kelley
Director Allen
Director Barnett
Director Gilardi
Director Healy

Director Jehn
Director Schaffner
Director Smith
Director Spooner
Director Wright

Chair Mackenzie called the meeting to order.

ITEM

I. Public Comments

Chair Mackenzie introduced Steve Allen as the new SCTA representative from the Town of Windsor. He also welcomed Pat Gilardi, the alternate from the City of Cotati and Larry Barnett, the alternate from the City of Sonoma.

There were no other comments.

Consent Item

A. Minutes of the February 25, 2002 Meeting

Director Wright made the motion to approve the minutes.

Director Spooner seconded the motion and the minutes were approved as written with Directors Barnett, Gilardi and Allen abstaining.

III. Reports

A. Executive Committee

Chair Mackenzie gave a report on the activities of the Executive Committee. They discussed the 2002 STIP update, SMART Legislation and November 2002 Ballot Measure. Chair Mackenzie requested a meeting between himself, Vice-chair Kelley, Director Kerns, Suzanne Wilford, Director Healy, Mayor Thompson, and City Manager Fred Stouder to discuss Petaluma's ability to deliver projects.

B. North Coast Railroad Authority (NCRA)

Chair Mackenzie stated that there was an offer from Mr. Niemeyer & Associates from Chicago, who wishes to purchase the whole railroad. The NCRA notified Mr. Niemeyer that it was not their intention to sell the railroad. The next meeting of the NCRA will be at the Healdsburg City Hall at 10 a.m. There they will discuss sending out a request for proposals for an operator for service on the NCRA. The NCRA found the previous operator, John Darling, to be in default last fall. Doug Christi stated that the upgrading of the tracks from Windsor to Willits have been completed. The CTC has expressed some concerns about NCRA's budget and their ability to function administratively. The NCRA will demonstrate to the CTC their ability to do that. The NCRA is considering the consolidation of some

administrative functions in the Cloverdale Depot.

C. Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Report

Director Wright stated that MTC approved the Bay Area Ozone Attainment Plan, which lifted the conformity freeze on the 2001 RTP. Several MTC Commissioners, Ms. Wilford, and other CMA Executive Directors traveled to Washington D.C. for TEA 21 reauthorization meetings and to attend the American Public Transit Association (APTA) Conference. Copies of the TEA 21 report prepared by MTC were presented to Congress. The report lays out the region's transportation plan. The recommendations for the reauthorization of TEA 21 were to keep it flexible and maintain local control. Copies of this book were distributed to the SCTA Directors.

D. SCTA Staff Report

Suzanne Wilford presented the following reports.

1. Bay Area Partnership Activities

Staff has been working with MTC on the final submittal of the 2002 STIP.

2. Joint Marin/Sonoma Activities

Chair Mackenzie met with Steve Kinsey of the Marin County Congestion Management Agency and discussed the status of sales measures. Both agencies will be discussing whether or not a measure is likely in the November election.

Last week, Assemblymember Joe Nation held a hearing of the Select Committee on Transportation and Housing in the North Bay. The panel consisted of Ms. Wilford, her counterpart from Marin County Farhad Mansourian, Alix Bockleman from MTC, Director of Caltrans Jeff Morales and Al Zahradnik of the Golden Gate Bridge District. The main topic of discussion was Prop 42 and the projections of revenue for the North Bay as well as some potential projects the funds could be used for. The funding does not begin until 2008.

Another topic discussed at the hearing was the revival of SCA 5. SCA 5 is the Senate Constitutional Amendment introduced by Senator Torlakson that seeks to allow a retail tax to be put on the ballot for transportation purposes that could be passed with a simple majority vote. There are a few differences between this and SCA 3 introduced by Senator Burton a couple of years ago. One is that this is for a retail tax and not a transaction & use tax. The other difference is the requirements on what the funding would need to be spent on. In the past SCA 3 had a broad ability to spend it on any transportation project. SCA 5 calls for 25% of the revenues generated to be spent on Smart Growth projects or planning, such as open space items, air pollution reduction projects and housing in proximity to transit. Staff will continue to monitor this bill and county counsel will research what the difference is between a retail tax and a transaction & use tax.

Chair Mackenzie asked if Assemblymember Nation supported SCA 5.

Ms. Wilford responded that he does support the bill and he is signing on as a co-author.

Director Healy stated that according to the bill any jurisdiction that imposes this tax would have to give up all ad valorem property taxes. Would that include a parcel tax?

Ms. Wilford responded that she did not know but would ask county counsel to look into.

Director Jehn asked if SCA 3 still exists?

Ms. Wilford responded that SCA 3 was never reintroduced to the Senate so this is the only bill that addresses lowering the voter threshold for transportation related taxes.

Chair Mackenzie requested that this item be agendaized for full discussion with a draft resolution of support at the April SCTA meeting.

3. SCTA Committee Reports

Chair Mackenzie attended the last TAC meeting and expressed his interest in becoming more involved with the SCTA committees. He requested that the chairs of those committees give regular presentations of the committees activities to the full SCTA board.

4. Staff Report

On March 6th Chair Mackenzie and Ms. Wilford gave a presentation to LAFCO on the activities of the SCTA and their role in transportation planning.

IV. FY02/03 TDA Article 3 Program for Bicycles

Sue Kelly, Engineering Director for the City of Sebastopol and Chair of the Countywide Bicycle Advisory committee (CBAC) gave a presentation on the recent activities of the committee. The CBAC meets every other month or more often if needed. Last year they met with representatives from MTC and provided input to the Regional Transportation Plan as well as the Countywide Transportation Plan. They spent some time last year discussing the current allocation process for TDA Article 3 funding and although they did not change the process, the discussion was a good review for the newer members of CBAC. Maps of bike plans have been added to the SCTA website. The CBAC also sends letters of advocacy to various agencies regarding bicycle issues around the county. One letter was sent to Caltrans regarding the Hwy 116 SHOPP project for safety improvements, urging them to include full bicycle stripes throughout the entire segment between Sebastopol and Cotati. CBAC will forward a copy of the letter to the Authority for their consideration of sending a similar letter of support.

Ms. Kelly commended Janet Spilman for all her efforts in sorting out the past years expenditures of TDA Article 3 and creating spreadsheets for the jurisdictions.

Chair Mackenzie thanked Ms. Kelly for her longtime service as Chair of the CBAC. He encouraged her to come back to the Authority with any requests that would promote bicycling and walking in this county.

Janet Spilman gave a brief report of TDA Article 3. Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds are generated from a tax of $\frac{1}{4}$ of 1% on retail sales in the county. TDA is primarily used for operations of public transit, but approximately 2% of it is set aside for bicycle and pedestrian paths for the county. This set aside is called TDA Article 3 and amounts to over \$300,000 every year. This year Sonoma County will receive \$324,000. This money is divided between the jurisdictions based on a population formula and jurisdictions can accumulate these funds over time if necessary. This year's allocation is down from last year's and for the first time in ten years the amount of TDA funds has not increased. Estimates have been revised downward twice since the call for projects was sent out in January. Fortunately most communities have been accumulating their funds and can still do projects. CBAC received project applications for TDA Article 3 funds from Cotati, Petaluma, Santa Rosa, Sebastopol, Sonoma and the County. Jurisdictions are allowed to borrow ahead 3 years out, if 1) they borrow within their projected entitlement and 2) if the overall countywide allocation can support it. This year Sonoma, Sebastopol and Cotati are all requesting to borrow ahead. The CBAC had approved Cotati's request for the March Creek Trail, which exceeds its entitlement by \$2,646 because the application was received before the revenues were adjusted and their request was within their original entitlement. On March 4 the CBAC reviewed all submissions and approved the list in Resolution No. 2002-004. The City of Santa Rosa has submitted a letter offering to allow Cotati to borrow \$2,646 from Santa Rosa in lieu of programming funds beyond their entitlement.

Director Jehn made the motion to approve the list of projects for FY 2002/03 TDA Article 3 and adopt Resolution No. 2002-004.

Director Wright seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

V. November 2002 Sales Tax Measure Status report

Ms. Wilford stated that at the last SCTA meeting it was decided the full Authority should have a discussion about whether or not a sales tax measure in November 2002 was a viable idea and whether or not to conduct a public survey. Late last year the SCTA hired Data Trends to do some preliminary work related to

a poll but it was decided to wait until after the March elections before moving forward with a poll. The Citizen's Advisory Committee met last week and after much discussion they made the recommendation to not support polling and spending the money at this time. They were somewhat divided as to whether or not to have a measure in 2002 versus 2004. They could support either but leaned toward a 2004 measure.

Prop 42 election results. Statewide - 69% in support, Sonoma County - 70.5% and Marin County - 64.6%.

Throughout the Bay Area it went from a low of 60% in San Francisco to a high of 70.9% in Contra Costa but the level of support in the area was mostly in the mid to low 60's.

The recent poll conducted by Marin County indicated that Marin voters would be reluctant to support a local sales tax measure if Prop 42 were to pass. Marin County will be meeting on April 4th to discuss whether they will go forward with a measure this year.

Director Kelley was concerned about Sonoma County putting a sales tax measure on the ballot this year. In regards to the rail project, work can still continue on that project while a tax is being looked at. If Marin County is not going to put a tax on the ballot related to rail then Sonoma County voters may be reluctant to support it. If there is not going to be a tax this year then polling should not be done either.

George Ellman, member of CAC, stated that a poll should be done because there has not been a poll done in Sonoma County for several years. Marin County has done their poll but Sonoma County voters may think differently. He congratulated Chair Mackenzie and Director Smith regarding the transportation article in Sunday's Press Democrat.

Director Jehn asked what the cost of the poll would be.

Ms. Wilford responded that it was approximately \$25,000.

Gig Hitao, Director of Data Trends, stated that the purpose of the poll is to help a campaign to sway voters that there is value in this. He agreed that if there is not going to be a tax measure put on the ballot then there is nothing to gain from the poll. But if there will be a measure then definitely do the poll.

Fred Levine, Executive Director of the Sonoma County Taxpayers Assn., expressed his concern that the purpose of the poll was to sway the voters towards approval of a tax measure. The poll should be unbiased and not slanted. As a taxpayers organization they object to spending \$25,000 for a biased poll. He urged the SCTA to reject it and redevelop the poll so that it is not biased. They feel a poll should be taken and probably for the 2004 election.

Mr. Hitao clarified that the poll is not biased. It could easily show that the people do not want a train and they don't associate the poll with the train and that they won't vote for a transportation sales tax. He just assumed that there was some interest out there and if so that could be used for a campaign.

Director Smith stated that the Marin poll was certainly not good news. It showed that if there were support for a Marin sales tax it would be for streets and roads improvements. If the SMART governance legislation passes and a transit district is created, it would be able to put an identical sales tax measure in both Marin and Sonoma Counties for the first time. The SMART project is underway and there are several aspects that will take time to complete. The EIR process will take at least two years to complete. So the time is not being wasted if a tax is deferred. The TCRP money will see SMART through the EIR process. It would be better to not do the poll and wait until 2004 to do the sales tax.

Director Jehn agreed with Director Smith. He expressed his concerns about experiencing another failure and the ramifications of that. SMART's progress will continue for at least the next two years. He supports moving back the sales tax measure and not doing the poll.

Director Smith stated that Senator Torlakson has introduced SCA 5, which may ease the 2/3 voter support issue in the future.

Director Barnett stated that a regional approach is always a better approach. On a project of this size, if Marin is not going to do the tax then it's a waste of time to try to pass a tax in Sonoma County. This kind of project needs regional approval and acceptance in order to get complete.

Director Healy stated that the feeling from the last Policy Advisory Group was that if Marin were going to proceed with a poll it would be for streets and roads projects only. And Petalumans are not likely to vote for a project that would end at the city limits.

Director Wright made the motion to not proceed with a poll or a ballot measure this year.

Director Jehn seconded and it passed unanimously.

Director Wright wanted to clarify that the Ad Hoc Committee's intent was that the poll was to gather information only and not to sway voters.

Chair Mackenzie stated that this issue, the Countywide Transportation Plan, what it will take to implement that plan and what community outreach efforts need to take place will need to be discussed by the Authority over the next several months. The Authority will also be meeting jointly with the Marin CMA to discuss this issue and look at the regional aspects of the transportation problem solving efforts.

VI. 2002 Sonoma County General Plans

Ms. Wilford introduced Greg Carr the Comprehensive Planning Manager for Sonoma County.

Mr. Carr along with Angus Latta, Cate Braschi, and Steve Coleman of Dowling & Associates are working on the General Plan Update. This is the first update of the plan in 12 years. Circulation is the main focus of the update. Since the SCTA did modeling in 1995 no one has done one and the County has not done one since 1986. Several public meetings were held and throughout the county there were several comments regarding transportation and transit. The County has decided not to change much in the land use designations. The County intends to use Tranplan as the model, which was used by SCTA in the past. They are building a countywide database for the unincorporated area using Census 2000 data. It will be a GIS database with traffic counts that currently match with all the population and Assessor housing data compiled for that Census 2000 period. This will be a big improvement in accuracy. They have formed a Citizen's Advisory Committee with 3 representatives from each of the five supervisorial districts. Three of those members are part of a subcommittee that focused specifically on circulation. They will be using SCTA information so as not to duplicate any efforts. Modeling work will begin this summer. The target completion date for the General Plan update is July 2003. Staff is aware of the Penngrove Corridor issue and the circulation problem there. They are looking into creating a south county working group to develop interjurisdictional solutions for that area.

Chair Mackenzie stated that he and Ms. Wilford gave a presentation to LAFCO because the resolution by LAFCO expanding the Rohnert Park sphere of influence was very specific in that it asked that the SCTA take the lead in working on this subregional activity. Chair Mackenzie has been invited to attend the next meeting of the Circulation Subcommittee on April 8th.

VII. Caltrans Report

A. 2002 STIP Update

Ms. Wilford stated that at the last meeting she described the cash flow problems that the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) was having and that in the early years when everyone wanted to do their projects, there was no money available and in the outer years when there was plenty of money available, no one had projects programmed. At the request of MTC, the region has moved projects to the outer years with the hope that this will not result in an actual delay and that there will be some ability to move projects back into earlier years when it comes to construction. This proposal was approved by MTC and will go before the CTC on April 4th.

B. Status Report on Highway 101 Projects

Manny Caluya, Caltrans Project Manger, gave an update on the following projects.

Highway 101 widening Wilfred Avenue to Route 12 – 43% of the work is complete with 48% of time elapsed. Although the project completion date is winter 2002, the opening of the HOV lanes (weather

permitting) is end of October 2002. Electrical work is being done throughout the project limits. Once the K-rail has been shifted the excavation work will begin. Phase 2 of this project is the sound walls. The design is ongoing with construction to begin in spring 2003.

Highway 101 Petaluma southbound Auxiliary Lane – environmental document is schedule to be complete this summer. Prior to that Caltrans will hold a public meeting to consider sound walls for the northbound side of the project.

Southbound Highway 101/116 Bridge Separation project – design is continuing with construction scheduled for spring 2003.

Highway 101 Rohnert Park Expressway park and ride lot and southbound loop ramp – project is schedule to begin construction in spring 2003.

Marin/Sonoma Narrows – the environmental and engineering studies are continuing. Tomorrow Caltrans will hold a meeting in Petaluma to establish early coordination with local planning agencies and regulatory agencies. The next PAG meeting is April 19th in Petaluma.

Highway 101 Wilfred Avenue – environmental studies are continuing, most notably the wet season survey for the California Tiger Salamander within the project limits.

Highway 101 widening – Route 12 to Steele Lane – environmental studies and design are continuing.

C. Status Report on the RFP for Highway 101 EIR/EIS

The RFP was released for the two EIR documents on Highway 101. There will be a preproposal meeting tomorrow at 1:30 p.m. and proposals are due April 9th. Interviews will be conducted on May 8th and work should begin on July 1st.

VIII. SMART Report

Chair Mackenzie invited Sally McGough, County Counsel, to advise the Authority on rules of procedure.

Ms. McGough stated that SCTA has adopted an administrative code, which does not include rules of procedure. Robert's Rules of Order can be used or something similar. In terms of the motion that was previously made related to SMART governance, the Authority could make a motion to reconsider that previous motion.

Chair Mackenzie stated that at some juncture in the future the Authority should establish some rules of procedure. Ms. McGough was asked to come advise the Authority because at the last SCTA meeting the motion was made to leave the membership language as it is under section 9 of the draft rail legislation. That motion passed six to five. Chair Mackenzie had previously asked Director Healy to take this issue to the Mayors and Council Members meeting for discussion.

Director Smith commended Ms. McGough for helping draft the legislation as well as the attorneys from Marin County and the Golden Gate Bridge District. Ms. McGough prepared a memo for the Authority on the Technical Advisory Committee's comments and suggested changes to the proposed rail legislation. One of particular note was concerning labor and the possible displacement of employees due to the implementation of commuter rail service. Both Boards of Supervisors in Sonoma and Marin County will be reviewing any suggested changes to the proposed legislation. The Boards of Supervisors of both Marin and Sonoma Counties created the Ad Hoc Subcommittee to address the issue of governance for commuter rail service along the NWP. The committee is made up of Supervisors Cale and Smith of Sonoma County, Supervisors Rose and Kress of Marin County and Jim Eddy and Al Boro representing the Golden Gate Bridge District.

The Authority accepted the TAC's recommendations as set forth in Ms. McGough's memo and will forward them to the Board of Supervisors.

Director Healy gave a brief report of the last Mayors and Council Members meeting stating that they had voted 15 to 9 in favor of having the three city members appointed by the Mayors and Council Members without a requirement that they be SCTA members. There was also direction that each city would agendize

it for discussion with their councils and come back to the next meeting on April 11th.

Director Spooner stated that one of the concerns was that to be a director for the SCTA and SMART might be a difficult task for someone since both agencies are very demanding. Another point that was made was that city appointments to the SCTA can be very volatile and the members of SMART should have some tenure. He feels that the SCTA does not have the monopoly on the understanding of regional transportation issues and concerns.

Director Healy made the motion to reconsider the membership language in terms of the selection and qualifications of the three city members.

Director Barnett seconded the motion

Chair Mackenzie stated that since he was conducting the last meeting under time constraints, he was more abrupt than he might have been with the debate that took place and he didn't even state his own position in the matter. He had been part of the committee that helped draft the language and he has been in support of the language being submitted. He recognized that Director Costello at the last meeting had asked for a compromise of the language but Chair Mackenzie called the vote so there wasn't the full deliberation that he might have liked at that time. He's mindful of the fact that this legislation will go from the two Boards of Supervisors and the Golden Gate Bridge District to Assemblyman Nation and will be discussed by a committee the first week in April. There clearly exists a split in opinions here, which will probably be conveyed to Assemblymember Nation during the course of legislative discussion.

Director Jehn clarified that this motion is to reconsider the last motion and reopen the item for discussion.

Chair Mackenzie responded yes.

Director Barnett stated that in an Authority such as this where each city has representation, it is quite clear that a council can meet, provide direction on issues that are brought back to the council in terms of the vote of that member of an authority or commission. Therefore the workings of the democratic process are quite clear. He was unclear on the chain of command on the structure being proposed for this agency because you end up with only three representatives of the cities and not all nine. Clearly certain cities in Sonoma County have a greater degree of both stake and interest in issues pertaining to this rail corridor. For example the City of Sonoma is not going to be a part of this plan at this point and it would not make sense to have a representative from Sonoma be a part of that authority. He was struck by the fact that this authority was being created with a somewhat less logical decision making chain. That is to say the decisions are not going to flow from councils to a representative on this commission in a uniform way for all the cities that are going to be impacted by this decision. He sensed that the Mayors and Council Members wanted to broaden the representation as opposed to restricting it on this new and additional public body. Who is chosen will be to be a function of whether or not the Mayors and Council Members feel comfortable with a member who is already on this Authority and want to continue to have that person take that additional role or whether they feel that there is a benefit to broadening that membership and getting more ideas, more voices and different personalities represented on an additional body.

The motion to reconsider failed five to five with Directors Kelley, Allen, Jehn, Smith and Wright opposing and Director Schaffner abstaining.

Chair Mackenzie stated that people can address the Board of Supervisors at their meeting on March 26 as they consider this matter.

IX. Other Business/Director Announcements

Director Smith suggested that the Authority look into developing a strategy to deal with regional road issues such as the Penngrove area. There currently is no funding set aside to deal with these off site road problems.

Chair Mackenzie directed staff to agendaize the LAFCO resolution and SCTA's lead role as a discussion item so that these regional road issues could be addressed.

Director Smith stated that the County of Sonoma has front loaded some of the costs for SMART activity.

He would like the Authority to discuss how these costs might be funded out of SCTA.

Chair Mackenzie directed staff to agendaize that for the executive committee for discussion before bringing it to the full Authority.

X. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 5:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeanette Wood
Executive Assistant

| |
|--|
| SONOMA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY STAFF REPORT |
|--|

DATE: April 8, 2002
TO: Sonoma County Transportation Authority (SCTA)
FROM: Suzanne Wilford, Executive Director
SUBJECT: ITEM III: Reports

A. NCRA Report

See updated report at <http://www.northcoastrailroad.org>.

B. Metropolitan Transportation Commission Report

Information will be provided at the SCTA meeting.

C. SCTA Staff Report

1. Bay Area Partnership Activities

Staff continued to work with MTC and the Partnership on the 2002 STIP final submittal. Staff also helped develop working papers on specific policy issues that will be addressed by the Partnership.

2. Joint Marin/Sonoma Activities

The Marin County Congestion Management Agency and the Marin Board of Supervisors met on April 4 to discuss a possible sales tax measure. A full report of the meeting will be given at the SCTA meeting.

The Mineta Transportation Institute will hold a Transportation Hot Spot Forum on the Marin/Sonoma 101 Corridor on April 11 from 8:30AM to 2:00PM.

The next SMART Commission meeting will be held April 17 in Novato at 2:00PM.

The next Narrows Policy Advisory Group meeting will be held on April 19 at 9:30 AM in Novato.

3. Committee Reports

The TAC met on March 28 and discussed project delivery issues, the 2002/03 TFCA program, and SMART governance. The next TAC meeting is scheduled for April 25.

The next CAC meeting is scheduled for April 29.

The next PCC meeting is scheduled for May 14.

The CBAC met on April 1 and discussed an amendment to the TDA Article 3 funds program of projects and the Highway 116 bike path under consideration between Sebastopol and Cotati.

**SONOMA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
STAFF REPORT**

DATE: April 8, 2002
TO: Sonoma County Transportation Authority (SCTA)
FROM: Janet Spilman, Transportation Planner
SUBJECT: **ITEM IV** FY02/03 TDA Article 3 Amended Program of Projects

ISSUE

Shall the SCTA approve the Amended FY 2002/2003 TDA Article 3 Program of Projects?

BACKGROUND

FY 2002/2003 TDA Article 3 Projects

Last month the SCTA approved a list of projects to be funded through Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3. Since then there has been a request for a change in the list.

The City of Santa Rosa, at the request of their Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC) requests that the following project originally approved for 03/04 be moved to 02/03 funding cycle.

| <u>Project</u> | <u>TDA 3 funds requested</u> |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Franklin /North Bike Lane ----- | \$100,000 |

This change will not delay reimbursement for any projects already approved.

The CBAC would also like to clarify the transfer from Santa Rosa to Cotati of \$2,646 as per Santa Rosa's correspondence to this body last month, to cover the amount of Cotati's project that is in excess of their three year allotment.

REQUESTED ACTION

Review the attached Resolution and amended list of projects and, if in accordance, adopt Resolution No. 2002-005, thus adopting the project list for FY 2002/2003 TDA Article 3 funds and directing Staff to submit this resolution and list of projects to MTC.

Exhibit A

TDA Article 3 – Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities

Amended Project List

| | |
|--|-----------|
| ▪ Cotati | |
| Marsh Creek Trail | \$16,036 |
| ▪ Petaluma | |
| Washington Creek Bike/Ped Path | \$196,350 |
| ▪ Santa Rosa | |
| Santa Rosa Ave Bike lanes – phase 2..... | \$50,000 |
| Franklin Ave/North Ave Bike Lanes..... | \$100,000 |
| Transfer to Cotati..... | \$2,646 |
| ▪ Sebastopol | |
| Railroad Forest Bike Path | \$42,800 |
| ▪ Sonoma | |
| Bicycle Path crossing at W. MacArthur | \$49,000 |
| ▪ County of Sonoma | |
| Old Redwood Highway Class 2 Bike lanes | \$200,000 |
| Bicycle Traffic Caution Signs | \$15,000 |

Total for all jurisdictions \$671,832

Resolution No. 2002-005

Sonoma County Transportation Authority
Santa Rosa, California

April 8, 2002

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE SONOMA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY, COUNTY OF SONOMA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, ADOPTING AMENDMENT TO THE PROJECT LIST FOR THE FY 2002/2003 ALLOCATION OF TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT (TDA) ARTICLE 3, PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE FUNDS FOR SONOMA COUNTY

WHEREAS, the cities and County of Sonoma are eligible for Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 funds; and

WHEREAS, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission has adopted Resolution No. 875 establishing procedures and project evaluation criteria for these funds; and

WHEREAS, the Sonoma County Transportation Authority requires the appointment of local bicycle advisory committees and has established the Sonoma County Countywide Bicycle Advisory Committee with representatives from each jurisdiction in Sonoma County; and

WHEREAS, City and County bicycle advisory committees have been appointed, have met and have reviewed bicycle and pedestrian projects submitted for TDA Article 3 funds and recommended them for consideration by the Countywide Bicycle Advisory Committee; and

WHEREAS, the Countywide Bicycle Advisory Committee is required to recommend a TDA Article 3 project list to the Sonoma County Transportation Authority for their approval; and

WHEREAS, the Countywide Bicycle Advisory Committee finds these projects to be consistent with those requirements and criteria set forth for TDA Article 3 projects by the SCTA, and

WHEREAS, the Countywide Bicycle Advisory Committee endorses the amended TDA Article 3 project list for Fiscal Year 2002/2003 attached as "Exhibit A";

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Sonoma County Transportation Authority does hereby find the projects attached hereto as "Exhibit A" suitable for funding under TDA Article 3;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Sonoma County Transportation Authority does hereby authorize the distribution of TDA Article 3 funds to the above projects and directs the Executive Director to submit these projects to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission for TDA Article 3 funding.

THE FOREGOING RESOLUTION was introduced by Director _____, who moved its adoption, seconded by Director _____, and adopted by the following vote:

| | | | |
|-------------------|-------|--------------------|-------|
| Director Allen | _____ | Director Kerns | _____ |
| Director Costello | _____ | Director Mackenzie | _____ |
| Director Fox | _____ | Director Schaffner | _____ |
| Director Healy | _____ | Director Smith | _____ |
| Director Jehn | _____ | Director Spooner | _____ |
| Director Kelley | _____ | Director Wright | _____ |

Ayes: _____ Noes: _____ Absent: _____ Abstain: _____

SO ORDERED

I, the undersigned, certify that the foregoing resolution was duly adopted at a regular meeting of the Board of Directors of the Sonoma County Transportation Authority held on April 8, 2002.

Suzanne Wilford, Executive Director
Clerk, Sonoma County Transportation Authority

SONOMA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY STAFF REPORT

DATE: April 8, 2002

TO: Sonoma County Transportation Authority (SCTA)

FROM: Suzanne Wilford, Executive Director

SUBJECT: **ITEM V:** FY02/03 Coordinated Claim for Transit

ISSUE:

Should the SCTA adopt the TDA/STA Coordinated Claim for FY 2002/2003 as recommended by the Transit Technical Advisory Committee and the Paratransit Coordinating Committee?

BACKGROUND:

Each year a Coordinated Claim for Transportation Development Act (TDA) and State Transit Assistance (STA) funds is developed by the jurisdictions of Sonoma County. These funds are the **primary source of operating funds** for all of Sonoma County's transit operators. Because the service areas of transit operators in Sonoma County cross jurisdictional boundaries, MTC requires that a Coordinated Claim for these funds be prepared and adopted annually by each jurisdiction in Sonoma County and by the Sonoma County Transportation Authority.

The Coordinated Claim documents inter-jurisdictional funding agreements for transit services in Sonoma County. The Claim describes the distribution of TDA and STA funds. The process of developing the Coordinated Claim each year is the primary mechanism for establishing contribution agreements for services provided by transit operators to local jurisdictions.

The Coordinated Claim must be reviewed by the Transit Technical Advisory Committee and the Paratransit Coordinating Committee (PCC).

Fiscal Year 2002/2003 Revenues:

Transportation Development Act (TDA) Funds: TDA funds are derived from ¼ % of the state sales tax and are therefore, subject to volatility based on the local economy. Due to the current economic slowdown, TDA revenues for FY 2002 are projected to be approximately \$1,000,000 less than anticipated in last year's adopted Coordinated Claim. Due to the decrease in FY 2002's revenue, FY 2003's TDA distribution has been adjusted to compensate for this anticipated shortfall.

FY 2002's TDA estimate has been revised down from \$18,200,000 to \$17,200,000. The County Auditor and MTC project a modest 3.5% increase for FY 2003 revenues over the adjusted FY 2002 base of \$17,200,000. Therefore, the recommended FY 2003 TDA Coordinated Claim distributes \$17,800,000.

From the \$17,800,000, FY 2002's shortfall is applied across all jurisdictions on a population basis. In comparison with the FY 2002 Coordinated Claim, FY 2003's projected TDA distribution is approximately 7.41% less than last year.

With the exception of Solano and Napa counties, each of the remaining seven Bay Area counties are experiencing reductions in available TDA funds for FY 2003. Projections for San Francisco and San Clara counties indicate FY 2003 TDA reductions exceeding 15% over FY 2002.

State Transit Assistance Funds (STA): STA funds are a second source of transit operating funds available to qualifying operators. STA funds are derived from the sales tax on the sale of fuel. Due to the steep decline in fuel costs over the past year, revenue from STA has declined significantly. In comparison with FY 2002's Coordinated Claim, FY 2003's projected distribution has decreased from \$1,544,070 to \$1,044,837, or approximately 32%.

Combined, FY 2003's TDA and STA reductions pose a serious problem for Sonoma County's transit operators. As a result, service cuts and/or fare increases may be necessary to compensate for decreased operating revenues.

Fiscal Year 2002/2003 Coordinated Claim:

In general, most jurisdictions provide TDA funding to Sonoma County Transit for a variety of contract transit services. For a complete listing of all contracted services, please refer to the Coordinated Claim.

Since FY 1997/1998, Santa Rosa has claimed TDA funds generated within the Roseland area per agreement with Sonoma County. Roseland funds claimed by Santa Rosa are used to support CityBus services in the Roseland Area.

Based on a contribution formula established in FY 1996/1997, all Sonoma County entities contribute to Golden Gate Transit (GGT). Petaluma, Cotati, Rohnert Park and Sebastopol will contribute an amount equal to 28.09% of their 2002/2003 TDA apportionments to support GGT. Santa Rosa will contribute 25% of its FY 2002/2003 TDA apportionment and the cities of Windsor, Healdsburg and Cloverdale will each contribute 11.50% of their FY 2002/2003 TDA apportionments. Collectively, as required by MTC resolution 2858, these contributions provide an amount equal to 25% of Sonoma County's FY 2002/2003 TDA funds.

In an effort to fund complementary paratransit services required by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, each entity that contracts with Sonoma County Transit contributes an additional 20% of their fixed-route contributions to support ADA required paratransit services. Currently, Sonoma County and the city of Santa Rosa contract with Volunteer Wheels to provide paratransit services within their respective service areas.

TDA funds can also be used for non-transit purposes if MTC makes a finding that "all transit needs which are reasonable to meet are being met" in those jurisdictions claiming funds for other purposes. Recognizing the increased need for paratransit services and continuing unmet transit needs, the SCTA determined that use of TDA funds for non-transit purposes be phased out by 2002 (Resolution 2001-008). Therefore, beginning in FY 2002/2003 Sonoma County TDA funds are apportioned for transit purposes only.

State Transit Assistance (STA) Funds: State Transit Assistance Funds are allocated from three subcategories; (1) STA Population Formula Funds, (2) STA Regional Paratransit Funds, and (3) STA Revenue Based Funds. Each category has a slightly different set of requirements for its distribution.

The three categories are described in brief as follows:

Population Formula Funds are allocated to local jurisdictions on a population basis and can only be used on transit projects. Entities may claim from current year and prior year funds.

Regional Paratransit Funds are available at MTC's discretion for paratransit projects submitted through this coordinated process. Eligible claimants are Sonoma County Transit, Petaluma Transit and Santa Rosa Transit. As in prior years, 10% of FY 2002/2003 Regional Paratransit funds have been dedicated to Golden Gate to support regional ADA paratransit services.

Revenue Based Funds are allocated only to eligible TDA Article4 transit operators. In Sonoma County, the cities of Healdsburg, Cloverdale, Santa Rosa, and the County are eligible for these funds.

REQUESTED ACTION;

The SCTA should review the enclosed 2002/2003 Coordinated Claim for TDA and STA Funds and adopt Resolution No. 20021-006 which sets forth the TDA/STA Coordinated Claim for FY 2002/2003.

**Sonoma County Transportation Authority
Santa Rosa, California**

April 8, 2002

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE SONOMA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY, COUNTY OF SONOMA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, ADOPTING THE 2002/2003 SONOMA COUNTY COORDINATED CLAIM FOR TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT (TDA AND STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE (STA) FUNDS

WHEREAS, the Cities and County of Sonoma are eligible for Transportation Development Act (TDA) and State Transit Assistance (STA) funds; and

WHEREAS, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission has adopted rules and regulations governing the administration of these funds; and

WHEREAS, consistent with the adopted rules regulations the Sonoma County Transportation Authority (SCTA) is required to adopt a Sonoma County Coordinated Claim for Transportation Development Act (TDA) and State Transit Assistance (STA) funds developed in coordination with all the Cities and the County; and

WHEREAS, consistent with the adopted rules and regulations of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, the Paratransit Coordinating Committee (PCC) has endorsed the Coordinated Claims.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of the Sonoma County Transportation Authority does hereby adopt the attached "Sonoma County TDA/STA Coordinated Claims Fiscal Year 2002/2003",

THE FOREGOING RESOLUTION was moved by Director _____, who moved its adoption, seconded by Director _____, and adopted by the following vote:

| | | | |
|-------------------|-------|--------------------|-------|
| Director Allen | _____ | Director Kerns | _____ |
| Director Costello | _____ | Director Mackenzie | _____ |
| Director Fox | _____ | Director Schaffner | _____ |
| Director Healy | _____ | Director Smith | _____ |
| Director Jehn | _____ | Director Spooner | _____ |
| Director Kelley | _____ | Director Wright | _____ |

Ayes: _____ Noes: _____ Absent: _____ Abstain: _____

SO ORDERED

I, the undersigned, certify that the foregoing resolution was duly adopted at a regular meeting of the Board of Directors of the Sonoma County Transportation Authority held on April 8, 2002.

Suzanne Wilford, Executive Director
Clerk, Sonoma County Transportation Authority

SONOMA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY S T A F F R E P O R T

DATE: April 8, 2002

TO: Sonoma County Transportation Authority (SCTA)

FROM: Janet Spilman, Transportation Planner

SUBJECT: **ITEM VI:** FY02/03 TFCA Program of Projects

ISSUE

Shall the SCTA approve the FY 2002/2003 TFCA Program of Projects recommended by the TAC?

BACKGROUND

As the program manager for the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) 40% Funds, the Sonoma County Transportation Authority (SCTA) is required to adopt a program of projects for these funds each year. The projects that can be funded with these funds are limited by rules, adopted by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), that focus on projects known to provide a benefit to air quality. These funds are generated through a \$4 surcharge on vehicle registrations in the Bay Area. Each county receives 40% of the funds generated within their county as "guarantee funds." The SCTA is the project manager for the 40% funds and is responsible for programming the funds and overseeing project delivery.

In Sonoma County only the southern portion of the County is within the Air District. Therefore, Cloverdale and Healdsburg and the unincorporated area north of Windsor do not receive funds from the TFCA program administered by the SCTA. The funds received are divided on a population basis among the eligible jurisdictions. The SCTA receives the funds in two installments and these funds are maintained in a separate account until requests for payment are received from project sponsors. Funds are paid on a reimbursement only basis upon the SCTA's receipt of a bill from the project sponsor.

FY 2002/2003 Program

This year two jurisdictions are proposing projects. The attached list of projects shows the proposed projects as well as the amount of funds available for each jurisdiction. The total amount of funds available for programming this year is \$876,111. The SCTA receives 5% of the newly generated funds and the interest earned for administration. This totals \$31,191 for FY 2002/2003.

Sonoma County Transit has requested that Sebastopol and Windsor contribute all or a portion of their available funds for FY 2002/2003 to the County's CNG bus purchase. With their contributions Sonoma County Transit will program a total of \$187,711 for new buses and \$57,096 for construction on the Windsor Downtown Park & Ride lot. Santa Rosa has submitted projects for FY 2002/2003 totaling \$287,120. Cotati, Rohnert Park, Petaluma, and Sonoma did not submit projects but were allocated funds that will be rolled forward to next year for programming. The total amount of funds not programmed is \$344,184.

Because of the downturn in the economy actual 2001 generation was lower than estimated. As a result, all requests for funding are slightly more than their actual allotment. This does not pose a problem as the unprogrammed amount is fairly high. Negative balances will be carried forward next year.

REQUESTED ACTION

Review the TAC's recommendation for the FY 2002/2003 TFCA Program of Projects and consider adoption of Resolution No. 2002-007.

Proposed Projects for TFCA FY 02/03

| Jurisdiction | Project(s) | Funding Requested |
|---|---|--|
| Cotati \$10,981 available | No Project | |
| Petaluma \$256,302 available | No Project | |
| Rohnert Park \$70,634 available | No Project | \$ - |
| Santa Rosa \$282,198 available | Student Pass Subsidy | \$80,000 |
| | Voluntary Trip Reduction Program | \$156,841 |
| | Bike Improvement - Franklin/North | \$50,279 |
| | total | \$287,120 |
| Sebastopol \$25,903 available | Contribution to Sonoma Co. Transit Bus Purchase | \$26,150 |
| City of Sonoma \$15,463 available | No Project | |
| Windsor \$38,987 available | Contribution to Sonoma Co. Transit Bus Purchase | \$39,731 |
| County of Sonoma \$175,643 available | CNG Bus Purchase for Sebastopol, Windsor | \$51,830 |
| | CNG Bus Purchase | \$70,000 |
| | Windsor Park & Ride | \$57,096 |
| | total | \$178,926 |
| Total available \$876,111 | | Total Requested \$531,927 |

Sonoma County Transportation Authority
Santa Rosa, California

April 8, 2002

**RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE SONOMA COUNTY
TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY, COUNTY OF SONOMA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
ADOPTING A PROGRAM OF PROJECTS FOR THE FY 2002/2003 TRANSPORTATION FUND
FOR CLEAN AIR (TFCA) PROGRAM FOR THE COUNTY OF THE SONOMA**

WHEREAS, the Sonoma County Transportation Authority is the program manager for the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) Funds in Sonoma County; and

WHEREAS, each year the eligible jurisdictions prepare a program of projects for the TFCA funds received by Sonoma County based on a vehicle registration surcharge assessed on those vehicles registered within the Bay Area Air Quality Management District air basin; and

WHEREAS, the Sonoma County Transportation Authority holds the funds received through this program in a separate interest bearing account; and

WHEREAS, the interest generated on these funds must be programmed to clean air projects and the SCTA is responsible for programming these funds.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of the Sonoma County Transportation Authority does hereby adopt the list of projects shown as "Attachment A" as the TFCA Program of Projects for FY 2002/2003,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the SCTA does hereby direct the Executive Director to submit an application for the attached program of projects to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District for funding with the FY 2002/2003 TFCA funds.

THE FOREGOING RESOLUTION was introduced by Director _____, who moved its adoption, seconded by Director _____, and adopted by the following vote:

| | | | |
|-------------------|-------|--------------------|-------|
| Director Allen | _____ | Director Kerns | _____ |
| Director Costello | _____ | Director Mackenzie | _____ |
| Director Fox | _____ | Director Schaffner | _____ |
| Director Healy | _____ | Director Smith | _____ |
| Director Jehn | _____ | Director Spooner | _____ |
| Director Kelley | _____ | Director Wright | _____ |

Ayes: _____ Noes: _____ Absent: _____ Abstain: _____

SO ORDERED

I, the undersigned, certify that the foregoing resolution was duly adopted at a regular meeting of the Board of Directors of the Sonoma County Transportation Authority held on April 8, 2002.

Suzanne Wilford, Executive Director
Clerk, Sonoma County Transportation Authority

SONOMA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY STAFF REPORT

DATE: April 8, 2002
TO: Sonoma County Transportation Authority (SCTA)
FROM: Janet Spilman, Transportation Planner
SUBJECT: **ITEM VII:** FTA Section 5310 Projects

ISSUE

What is the status of FY 2002/2003 FTA Section 5310 funds for Sonoma County?

BACKGROUND

Federal Transit Act Section 5310 provides funds to non-profits and public agencies for the purchase of paratransit vans and related equipment for the disabled and elderly. This is an annual process that involves project sponsors, the Paratransit Coordinating Committee, MTC and Caltrans.

Projects were submitted by February 26. Each request was scored by a subcommittee of the PCC based on evaluation guidelines and scoring criteria prescribed by Caltrans. Generally, projects that score in at least the high 70s will be funded.

MTC is scheduled to adopt the final listing on April 24, 2002. The approved list will be forwarded to the CTC, which will adopt the program this summer.

FTA Section 5310 FY 2002/2003 Scoring Table

| Applicant | Project | Cost | Request = 80%Cost | Project Score |
|--------------------------|----------------|-------------|--------------------------|----------------------|
| Becoming Independent | Medium Bus | \$56,000 | \$44,800 | 88 |
| | Medium Bus | \$56,000 | \$44,800 | 88 |
| Petaluma Peoples Service | Modified Van | \$47,000 | \$37,600 | 83 |
| Council on Aging | Modified Van | \$47,000 | \$37,600 | 76 |
| Friends House | Small Bus | \$45,000 | \$36,000 | 69 |

REQUESTED ACTION

This item is for information only. No action is required.

**SONOMA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
S T A F F R E P O R T**

DATE: April 8, 2002

TO: Sonoma County Transportation Authority (SCTA)

FROM: Suzanne Wilford, Executive Director

SUBJECT: **ITEM VIII:** SMART Report

ISSUE

What is the status of AB2224 (Nation) related to the creation of a rail transit district?

BACKGROUND

An updated version of the legislation will be presented at the SCTA meeting along with information regarding hearing dates.

REQUESTED ACTION

None requested at this time.

**SONOMA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
S T A F F R E P O R T**

DATE: April 8, 2002

TO: Sonoma County Transportation Authority (SCTA)

FROM: Suzanne Wilford, Executive Director

SUBJECT: **ITEM IX:** Caltrans Report

ISSUE

What is the status of the 2002 STIP? What is the status of previously programmed projects on Highway 101?

BACKGROUND

The CTC met on April 3 and 4 to approve the 2002 STIP. An updated report will be provided to the SCTA at the meeting.

Caltrans will provide a report on the active projects on Highway 101.

REQUESTED ACTION

None requested at this time.

SONOMA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY STAFF REPORT

DATE: April 8, 2002

TO: Sonoma County Transportation Authority (SCTA)

FROM: Suzanne Wilford, Executive Director

SUBJECT: **ITEM X:** State Legislation Related to Transportation

ISSUE

Shall the SCTA take a position on various pieces of State legislation related to transportation?

BACKGROUND

Several bills related to transportation have been introduced that the SCTA may want to consider taking a position on. Below is a very brief summary of each bill. A copy of the most recent bill text is attached.

AB2535 (Diaz)

This bill will require Caltrans to continue to compile data and publish an annual Highway Monitoring Report that documents the traffic performance of the freeway system in the Bay Area region. The report reflects the levels of congestion on Bay Area freeways and is the only measure that provides continuity of data from county to county, particularly during the peak commute times.

Staff Recommendation: Support

SB1491 (Perata)

This bill will create a new regional entity called the San Francisco Bay Area Regional Transit Policy Board, which would provide advice to MTC on regional transit planning and expansion issues. The bill calls on agencies like the SCTA to participate and requires a financial contribution of \$12,500 and in kind contribution of staff time valued at \$15,000.

Staff Recommendation: Oppose

SB1262 (Torlakson)

This bill will alter the manner in which STIP funding can be used. Under SB45 counties control 75% of available STIP funds and the CTC controls 25%. Under this bill, the first 10% of STIP funds would be set aside for new development programs that reduce traffic congestion and are transit oriented. This bill would mandate a net reduction of 13% of Sonoma County's share of STIP funds and sets a precedent that SB45 can be altered.

Staff Recommendation: Oppose

SB1827 (Torlakson)

This bill will require that TFCA funds be awarded to a specific project in Alameda County. This would circumvent the local decision making process that currently exists and set a precedent that would enable the state to dictate the use of these local funds.

Staff Recommendation: Oppose

SCA5 (Torlakson)

This bill will reduce the vote requirement for transportation sales tax measures to a simple majority but will require at least 25% of the revenues derived from the tax be used for smart growth planning and projects.

Staff Recommendation: Watch

REQUESTED ACTION

Consider the proposed pieces of legislation and provide direction to staff as needed.

**SONOMA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
S T A F F R E P O R T**

DATE: April 8, 2002

TO: Sonoma County Transportation Authority (SCTA)

FROM: Suzanne Wilford, Executive Director

SUBJECT: **ITEM XI:** Third Quarter SCTA Budget Report

ISSUE

What is the status of the FY01/02 SCTA budget?

BACKGROUND

Staff will provide a report on the status of the budget through the third quarter.

The budget cycle for the SCTA is such that a preliminary budget is adopted in May and a final budget is adopted in October. The budget year runs from July through June.

REQUESTED ACTION

None required at this time.