
**SONOMA COUNTY
TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY**

**SCTA MEETING
AGENDA PACKET**

**Monday, February 10, 2003
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

February 10, 2003

3:15 p.m.

Permit and 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

Patricia Gilardi
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

ITEM

- I. Public Comment
- II. Consent Item (Attachment) - **ACTION**
 - A. Minutes of the January 13, 2003 Meeting
- III. Reports – **INFORMATION/ACTION**
 - A. Executive Committee Report (Chair Mackenzie)
 - B. Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Report (Dir. Wright)
 - C. SCTA Staff Report (Suzanne Wilford, Exec. Dir.)
 1. Bay Area Partnership Activities
 2. Joint Marin/Sonoma Activities
 3. SCTA Committee Reports
 - a. CBAC – Countywide Bicycle Plan Update
 - b. PCC – Section 5310 Funding
 4. Staff Report
 - a. State Budget & State Legislative Activities
 - b. New Funding Cycles – TFCA & TDA(3)
- IV. Countywide Transportation Capital Funding Partnership – **DISCUSSION/ACTION**
 - A. Presentation on Contra Costa model
 - B. CAC recommendation
 - C. Board discussion & direction to staff
- V. Caltrans & Highway 101 Report – **DISCUSSION/ACTION**
 - A. TEA-21 Reauthorization – Project Request Form
 - B. Parsons Report on EIR/EIS
 - C. Status Report on Highway 101 Projects
 1. HOV lane hours for Wilfred to Hwy 12
 2. Biology report on Wilfred Avenue
 3. Rohnert Park Expressway Co-Op Agreement
- VI. Other Business/Director Announcements – **DISCUSSION**
- VII. Adjourn – **ACTION**

SCTA Staff

Suzanne Wilford
Executive Director

Janet Spilman
Transportation Planner

Angela Caruso
Executive Assistant

520 Mendocino Avenue
Suite 240
Santa Rosa, CA 95401
PH: 707-565-5373
FAX: 707-565-5370

<http://www.sonoma-county.org/scta>

The next **SCTA** meeting will be held on **March 17, 2003**,
at the Sonoma County Board of Supervisors.

Copies of the full agenda packet are available at the SCTA web site:
<http://www.sonoma-county.org/scta> and click on "Agendas"

SONOMA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

MINUTES JANUARY 13, 2003

ATTENDEES

Chair Mackenzie
Vice Chair Kelley
Director Allen
Director Costello
Director Gilardi
Director Healy

Director Jehn
Director Kerns
Director Schaffner
Director Smith
Director Spooner
Director Wright

Chair Mackenzie called the meeting to order.

ITEM

I. Public Comments

Chair Mackenzie introduced Patricia Gilardi who represents the City of Cotati. She has been the alternate for Director Fox in 2002. The Cotati City Council will finalize their appointments this Wednesday and Ms. Gilardi is expected to be named the new director for SCTA. All other directors remain the same for 2003.

There were no public comments.

II. Consent Item

A. Minutes of the December 9, 2002 Meeting

Director Jehn made the motion to approve the December 9, 2002 meeting minutes. Director Costello seconded the motion and the minutes were unanimously approved as written.

III. SCTA Reorganization/Election of Officers

Director Smith nominated Councilman Mackenzie from Rohnert Park as Chair and Supervisor Paul Kelley as Vice Chair. Director Jehn seconded the motion. There were no other nominations and the motion was unanimously approved.

Chair Mackenzie expressed thanks to his fellow directors for the re-nomination and he looks forward to the coming year.

Vice Chair Kelley thanked his colleagues and said it should be an enjoyable year.

Director Kerns noted that the Executive Committee members should be appointed as well.

Chair Mackenzie said the Chair and Vice Chair are appointed ex officio to that committee. Last year, Directors Kerns and Wright were the other two members, with Director Smith as the alternate.

Director Allen made the motion to retain the same members as 2002. Director Gilardi seconded the motion. There were no other nominations and the motion was unanimously approved.

Chair Mackenzie said the Executive Committee would meet next on February 10, 2003.

IV. Reports

A. Executive Committee Report

Chair Mackenzie said the previous Executive Committee had not met so there was nothing to report.

B. Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Report

This item will be covered in Suzanne Wilford's staff report.

C. SCTA Staff Report

1. Bay Area Partnership Activities

Ms. Wilford reported on the latest TIP update. MTC held a public hearing on January 8 on the new draft 2003 TIP. The TIP is in process now and will not cause any further delays to projects. For Bridge Toll Authority activities, a Tier One project list was presented to the SCTA Board last month. The Board made comments on the inclusion of the Marin/Sonoma Narrows project as an important element. Nothing else has happened on a regional level. We do anticipate that Senator Perata will introduce a spot bill sometime this month. The projects should be added in February or March. On TEA-21, discussions with Congresswoman Woolsey and her staff continue related to an earmark for the Marin/Sonoma Narrows project. The congresswoman's request has been that Marin and Sonoma Counties make a unified submittal for an earmark for the Narrows project. An item will likely come before the Board in February or March on this.

2. Joint Marin/Sonoma Activities

Ms. Wilford reported that the SMART II District members have been appointed. Their first meeting is set for January 15 in Novato. The Policy Advisory Group meeting set for January 17 has been canceled and moved to February 21. Another item is the Marin County sales tax proposal that their Board of Supervisors and Congestion Management Agency have been discussing.

Chair Mackenzie noted the arrival of Director Wright and asked if there were any MTC activities she wished to report on.

Director Wright said the main topic of discussion now is about money and that's what they're focusing on. There are ongoing conversations between MTC and ABAG about a potential merger. Her newsletter will be mailed out within the next week or so. Also, both Santa Rosa and Healdsburg were successful in obtaining grants from the TLC program and if anyone needs help with their projects for planning or capital grants to let her know and she would be glad to assist. Lastly, information will be sent out soon on the new 511 Bay Area Travel Guide, which is now up and operational.

Chair Mackenzie noted that the Caltrans District 4 Director was in attendance today. Staff has asked to move the Caltrans report, Item VI, up to Item V.

Chair Mackenzie then reported on a meeting he attended last week related to Marin/Sonoma activities. He attended a meeting of the Marin County Board of Supervisors and Congestion Management Agency. Next month they formally create the Marin County Transportation Authority, consisting of all five supervisors and eleven representatives. They were considering a proposal to put a sales tax on the November ballot this year for the purposes of obtaining revenues for local transportation issues. Chair Mackenzie said we've been asked what effect we think that sales tax might have on any possible future funding proposals that the Sonoma County Board of Supervisors might put on the ballot or what SMART II might be proposing to do in 2004 and would what Marin is doing have any impact on that. At the meeting, most of the city representatives were still interested in moving forward with a local sales tax measure. The final action taken by this group was to ask their staff to be prepared to do further work moving towards the possibility of a fall 2003 measure in Marin.

Marin County Supervisor Kinsey has since been quoted as saying that the Governor's announcement of the budget proposal has dealt a serious blow to the possibility of getting voters to approve a sales tax measure for local transportation efforts. Chair Mackenzie said he told the group that he wanted the SCTA and the Sonoma County Board of Supervisors to meet formally with the newly formed group in Marin once the impacts of the proposed budget are known.

Vice Chair Kelley added that if we want to have a joint meeting with Marin, it might be better to have some representation from the SCTA Board meet with some of their members instead of having one large group meeting. It's not surprising, he said, that they, as any other jurisdiction, would try to find a way to fund local road improvements. We all know how challenging it is to make sure our road infrastructure stays up. When you stop maintenance, it comes back to hurt you even worse in the future. Discussions with them on the impacts of the state budget and how we would work together on transportation items in the future needs to be on the table and he concurs with Chair Mackenzie.

Director Healy said he concurs with the statements made by both Chair Mackenzie and Vice Chair Kelley. He asked whether Marin County has done any polling around the potential tax measure.

Chair Mackenzie said they used old data, but that they were thinking about doing some polling this spring.

Director Costello agreed with the idea of a joint meeting with Marin County. He said it would be preferable if the opportunity were there for the other directors to attend the meeting if they so desired. He reminded the Board that the last time they tried to have a joint meeting they did not have a quorum.

3. SCTA Committee Reports

Ms. Wilford said the CAC met in December at the request of the SCTA Board to discuss the concept of a countywide transportation funding program. A specialist in regional mitigation fees attended the meeting and presented a great deal of information to the CAC members. They will meet again in January and report back to this body in February. Also, Bob McClary, Executive Director for Contra Costa Transportation Authority, has agreed to attend the February Board meeting. Contra Costa has implemented a regional mitigation fee in their county.

Vice Chair Kelley noted that in relation to TEA-21 reauthorization, there was a mention that Chair Mackenzie and he had some discussions with Marin and Congresswoman Woolsey. He believes that the applications have to be in by the end of February for the reauthorization requests. If anything needs to be brought back on this item, it should be at the February 10 meeting.

4. Staff Report

Ms. Wilford said a SCTA cash flow report and cost accounting report were provided as handouts. The cost accounting report is for informational use. The cash flow report shows a negative cash flow for the last few months, primarily due to waiting for reimbursements from the state. She said Caltrans staff proposed to the CTC that they halt all contracts with outside consultants, especially related to TCRP projects. The CTC wasn't willing to go that far. Caltrans has since submitted a letter to TCRP sponsors that indicated they were advising contracts be suspended or they couldn't guarantee that reimbursements would occur. Ms. Wilford said we're still operating as if we'll get reimbursed for STIP projects because we haven't been told directly that we won't be. Hopefully, on Friday, the CTC will provide a sense of what they anticipate doing with both TCRP and STIP projects. Included in today's agenda packet are some advocacy principles that MTC has adopted. This ties to another agenda item having to do with the legislative program for the SCTA. Ms. Wilford is seeking guidance on how to proceed at the meeting in Sacramento on Friday where she may be asked how this body feels about funding for transportation projects, especially the existing ones. Some options that are being considered for the transportation area include fuel tax increases, switching MTC's authority from a gas tax to a sales tax on gasoline, a constitutional amendment to lower the vote threshold for local transportation taxes, and distribution of approved revenue enhancements. There are a lot of different

revenue options that MTC has put on the table for the state to consider. She noted the letter submitted to the budget subcommittee where she identified three key concerns: the ability to maintain funding for projects that are currently under contract, preserving the existing transportation system, and the concern about creating a competitive dynamic between STIP projects and TCRP projects. What the Governor is proposing is eliminating the funding for the TCRP projects and putting the projects in the STIP where there's a significant cash flow problem.

Chair Mackenzie said that when we get to Item VII, Legislative Program, the directors should be mindful of what Ms. Wilford has said and to be prepared to formulate some guidance for her, particularly for when she goes to this first workshop on Friday. Also, the budget language is available on the Internet under dof.ca.gov on pages 172 thru 177. It might be worthwhile making this available to the directors.

V. Caltrans Report

Mr. Bijan Sartipi, the new Director for District 4 at Caltrans, said he was happy to attend today and meet the SCTA Board. He wanted to reaffirm Caltrans' commitment with respect to working in a cooperative manner and in partnership with the transportation agencies, including the SCTA, with respect to delivering all transportation projects in the Bay Area. They've had a number of reorganizations in the district, adding additional project managers. He said they're going through a difficult time with the transportation funding being so scarce and they want to make sure they're providing the best information they have available so that the decision makers have the best opportunity in making choices with respect to the lack of funding from the TCRP.

Chair Mackenzie thanked Mr. Sartipi for attending today and complimented him on his staff that attends the monthly meetings to provide updates on the various projects.

A. Parsons Report on EIR/EIS

Ms. Wilford said two reports were handed out for each of the projects for the reporting period of December. These updates will be provided monthly. The base contract amount for each project is listed along with what has been expended to date. Things are moving along fairly well. We have our first official project development team meeting later this week.

Vice Chair Kelley asked whether the funding for the Parsons contract was safe.

Ms. Wilford replied that we do have the co-op agreement, which identifies the funding. CTC could choose to move projects. One of the messages Ms. Wilford will deliver on Friday will be that a blanket approach to this will not work. The CTC and Caltrans need to allow the regions and the counties to figure out what their priorities are. So right now, she would not say the money is safe and there is some potential that these projects could be delayed.

B. Status Report on Highway 101 Projects

Mr. Jit Pandher of Caltrans reported on two projects: Wilfred Avenue interchange and Steele Lane. On the Wilfred Avenue interchange project, at the last meeting, three possible schedules were discussed for the environmental document depending on whether they find the tiger salamander and the plants. Last month they did find the salamander which means they don't have to worry about the schedule for 2005. They will have the environmental document now at the end of 2004 or 2003 depending on what they do with the second issue, which are the plants. If they find the plants this spring/early summer, they can deliver the document by the end of this year. If not, they'll have to look for the plants next year, so the document would be delivered in 2004.

Director Smith asked why they needed two cycles for the plants.

Mr. Pandher said that per FHWA guidelines, they have to look for it in two consecutive seasons.

Ms. Wilford said that if they find the plant this spring, the document could be delivered at the end of 2003. If they don't find it, they'll have to look for it in the spring of 2004 and can deliver the document at the end of 2004.

Mr. Pandher said this was correct.

Director Smith asked whether we could stipulate that the plants existed and do whatever mitigation is necessary.

Mr. Pandher said there is a list of plants they are to look for and he's not sure they can do mitigation for all those plants. He would have to ask the environmental department exactly how many plants they are looking for. He thinks there are at least eight.

Chair Mackenzie asked if the Board could receive specific biological information at the February meeting so they'll know whether there will be financial stumbling blocks involved or not.

Mr. Pandher said he would bring their specialist to the next meeting. He moved on to the Steele Lane project. He referred to a January 8 letter sent to Ms. Wilford from Yader Bermudez at Caltrans.

Ms. Wilford explained that the letter is requesting that the funding that is programmed for the construction of the Highway 12 to Steele Lane project, programmed in fiscal year 2003/04, be moved to fiscal year 2004/05. This has been discussed before. She said we've been concerned that if the funds were moved one year there is no capacity and we'd have to move it out a couple of years. Caltrans had agreed that was a concern and didn't want to force that to happen. Ms. Wilford asked for a letter from Mr. Pandher and Mr. Bermudez explaining the schedule is such that the project has been delayed by a couple of months which pushes it into the next fiscal year of 2004/05 and that is the reason the funds need to be moved to that year. Her concern is that if they move the funds from 03/04 to 04/05, that's not a two-month delay, that's a 12-month delay. It opens the window for 12 months for the funds to be spent. She appreciates the commitment from Caltrans to make it in two months, but it still opens the door to a 12-month delay. Another concern is tied to the budget conditions. Given that the CTC has to start prioritizing projects most likely, if we move this out a year, there's some concern it may get moved out a couple of years.

Mr. Pandher said there is a delay in delivering the project. The funding is being moved from one fiscal year to another and it could be seen as a 12-month delay. But the schedule they proposed in the letter is the schedule they intend to meet and he's sure they can meet it. They're still trying to keep the project completion date the same, however.

Vice Chair Kelley asked if the project is kept in the current programming and if the money comes and if the project is not able to start until 2005, what kind of impact would it have. He asked whether the money just sits until the project is started.

Mr. Pandher said this was correct.

Vice Chair Kelly said he has some concerns about when you allow a change in the funding cycle year. He doesn't want to "get out of line" with the funding and would rather work with Caltrans on the construction schedule.

Director Smith said it doesn't add up to risk 12 months over a 2-month problem. He would be much more comfortable keeping the money where it is and work around the rest of the issues.

Chair Mackenzie agreed. He said that given the current circumstances, he would not want the SCTA to take an action that would expose them to as yet unknown perils with these monies.

Ms. Wilford said she understands that Caltrans has had to deal with some things beyond their control. SHPO has not helped and FHWA has not helped. If Caltrans can stick to the schedule laid out, then we would be in good shape. She's more nervous about the state budget and whether or not CTC will tell

everybody to move projects out a year regardless. If we've already done it, do they push it out yet another year on top of that.

Director Healy concurred and said that unless there's a need to acquiesce to this today, it's an issue to be revisited down the road.

Mr. Pandher said the draft EIR is due in April. On the SHPO issue, they'll find out before April if they'll help us or not. The request to go to the CTC has to be done before June, otherwise it will go to the next fiscal year.

Director Smith asked that, in other words, if we miss the deadline to request 2004/05 they could throw us into 2005/06.

Mr. Pandher said yes, that is correct.

Ms. Wilford asked what the drop-dead date would be if the SCTA were to agree to moving the funds.

Mr. Sartipi said that in this current fiscal year, they're recognizing that this project, which is in the next fiscal year, cannot be delivered in that timeline. They're asking from a programming standpoint to go to CTC and change the delivery time for that project to the following fiscal year. With respect to their performance record, they want to deliver projects when they said they would deliver them. This is very important to them. January 9 is when they submitted their plan. He's not sure what they submitted. They probably submitted the other schedule with respect to the resources they get. They probably have a little bit of time to wait and see what happens at the CTC and the workshop. He would ask the Board to allow them to program with the best information they have which is a few months outside of the fiscal year. That's what they're asking for. That's what they're measured on and they want to make sure that what they're committing to, they can deliver. Mr. Sartipi said they would not go to the CTC and ask for a change if this Board says not to change it. What they would say to CTC is that they don't think they can make it on schedule. CTC won't take any action until the February meeting.

Director Kerns wanted to clarify the timeline. He said Caltrans is saying they can't meet the current plan and they need two more months to complete it by September 1st.

Mr. Sartipi said it is a four-month delay. October is what they're looking at.

Director Kerns said that at this point it would be premature to move the money and to wait until after the February CTC meeting. That would still give us enough time at the March meeting to move the funding into the next fiscal year if necessary.

Mr. Sartipi said this would be okay.

Director Costello made a motion to table the decision until the March meeting. Director Kerns seconded the motion and it was unanimously approved.

Ms. Lillian Acorda of Caltrans reported on five projects. On the Sonoma 101 HOV widening project, the work is 94% completed with a 79% time lapse. The work to be done is striping, paving ramps, some electrical work and striping the median in the northbound direction. On the Sonoma 101 sound wall project, they've discussed the hydraulics issue. They might have to eliminate some of the sound wall. On the Petaluma southbound 101 auxiliary lane project, the project report is expected to be signed this week and design will follow after that. On the 101/116 separation bridge replacement project, they recently met with the City of Petaluma and gave a presentation. The clearance issue with SMART has been resolved and the project is back on schedule. On the Rohnert Park Expressway Park and Ride Lot project, the co-op agreement was not executed due to a funding shortfall.

Chair Mackenzie said Toni Bertolero, acting City Engineer for the City of Rohnert Park, and Bill Stephens, Director of Public Works, were in attendance. The former city engineer, Joe Gaffney, retired in December and Toni Bertolero is now in that position.

Director Kerns inquired about the current HOV project on Wilfred Avenue to Highway 12. He said there has been some concern about the hours of operation in the carpool lanes and wanted to know if Caltrans will consider reducing the hours at some time in the future.

Ms. Acorda said their highway operations staff monitor the lanes and make the counts and if they need to be limited or extended, it would be based on their study.

Director Kerns said some people, including him, already think that the times should be reduced.

Chair Mackenzie asked whether there was a length of time that Caltrans operations required to do their counts.

Ms. Acorda replied that they just opened the lanes, but she would find out and report back at the February meeting.

Mr. Saaid Fakhazadeh of Caltrans discussed the co-op agreement for the Rohnert Park, Park and Ride Lot and the southbound loop on-ramp. Two issues have prevented it from being signed. The first issue is how to take care of any construction cost increases during the contract. They have discussed this with the City of Rohnert Park and Ms. Wilford. The SCTA agreed to pledge up to \$400,000. He explained how they take care of cost increases during construction. Each project has a contingency. This is dipped into first. The second pot of money available is from the G12 capacity. Above and beyond that, Caltrans requests supplemental funds from CTC, which would require money from the county's share towards that cost increase. The second issue is the construction support for the project. It was programmed at \$175,000. They're now estimating it to be closer to \$500,000. They need an additional \$325,000 to be programmed to cover construction support. He noted that Ms. Wilford had prepared a summary outlining four options to solve this.

Chair Mackenzie asked if a resolution was required at this time on this item.

Ms. Wilford said that in order for the schedule to be maintained and the project to go to construction, the co-op agreement needed to be signed.

Mr. Fakhazadeh said this was correct. For this project to be ready to list in order for it to be advertised, all the constraints on the project had to be met. The co-op agreement is one of those constraints. We have to agree on how to tackle the construction support cost increase and get the agreement signed. The project is in this fiscal year and needs to be ready to list by the end of June 2003 for Caltrans to get credit for the delivery of the project.

Director Costello asked Mr. Fakhazadeh to briefly summarize the cause of the cost overrun.

Mr. Fakhazadeh said this project has a very long history. When the construction support was estimated and programmed, it was programmed at the time based on a project cost of a little over \$1 million. This project, because of different scopes, increased to almost \$4 million. The construction support increased as well. When we had the cost increase for the capital side of it, both Rohnert Park and Caltrans requested additional CMAC money. We did not, however, request an increase in construction support costs. We received the capital dollars from CMAC but we don't have the construction support increase.

Ms. Wilford said she was seeking direction from the Board as to whether there is a level of commitment to increase the SCTA's role in this project. She discussed the four options listed in her December 31 memo. One is that the SCTA and/or Rohnert Park agree to commit to whatever cost increase may come about related to the project and they would work out a cost-sharing agreement at a later date. The second option of downsizing is probably somewhat unrealistic in that the project is ready to go and it would delay the project. It may even cost more to have it redesigned if you eliminate some elements of it. Abandoning the project is a third option. It would cause us to lose some of the funds and we would still have to pay \$1.2 million for the environmental and design work. The last option had to do with potential cost savings on the auxiliary lane project and using those funds to help pay for this project.

Mr. Fakharzadeh said that in terms of downsizing, it would significantly delay the project. It would pretty much have to be redesigned because it's ready to go. In terms of using the auxiliary lane project, there's a potential for cost savings. It has a sound wall as part of the scope on the east side of 101. At this point, it's not going to be part of the project due to environmental reasons. That would be a savings. But this project is programmed in 2003/04. The Rohnert Park project is in 2002/03. In terms of moving the project, the savings can be directly moved due to the difference in fiscal year. The savings does involve RTIP and ITIP funding. RTIP money will go back to the county's share but it wouldn't be available now because of the fiscal year for the Rohnert Park Expressway project.

Director Healy said when we discussed this before, the \$400,000 backup was something that was anticipated not to be needed. Now that it's assumed to be available and will be used, he doesn't look at this as a \$324,000 jump from where the Board was before. He looks at it as a \$724,000 jump from where the Board expected to be. He asked staff whether, given the current turmoil in the whole fiscal scene, if the Board were to agree to chip in the extra funds, what projects would be left by the waste side and what would be delayed.

Ms. Wilford said that a commitment of future STIP funds, for example, could be identified in the co-op agreement. The 2004 STIP programming will start at some point this year but it may be a zero fund estimate or a negative fund estimate, which means we don't have any money. We don't have a STIP balance at this juncture.

Mr. Fakharzadeh said his understanding is that as long as this body commits to the construction support cost increase from future STIP, they can make it work.

Ms. Wilford said what it would essentially do is take the \$400,000 contingency commitment and make it a real commitment of \$324,000 and then a possibility that the additional \$400,000 may be in play. It's a potential of \$724,000.

Mr. Fakharzadeh said that in terms of whether the \$324,000 has to be an immediate commitment, he would like to check on that and get back to Ms. Wilford.

Chair Mackenzie asked if the Board could then come to a resolution at the February meeting on this matter and if Ms. Wilford could have a document in front of them that would enable them to move forward.

Director Jehn said he supports bringing it back in February. It looks like they will have a closer number as well by then. He thinks at some point, between now and then, that they should direct staff to engage the City of Rohnert Park in this discussion. He would like to see all the options come back with as much detail as possible.

Chair Mackenzie asked staff from Rohnert Park whether this would be something they could agendaize for a City Council meeting. They replied in the affirmative.

VI. Smart Growth Strategy Presentation

A. MTC/ABAG Report

Mr. Alex Amaroso, Association of Bay Area Governments, has been working on the Smart Growth project. The Board has received a copy of the final report. The report outlines some ideas of what the Smart Growth vision of the region would be out 20, 30 or 50 years and how the region might look different if there were different patterns of development occurring throughout the region. Mr. Amaroso said Valerie Knepper from MTC was also in attendance in support of this project. The report provides a vision and implications about various policies that might improve on infill, preservation of open space and agriculture, improved transit, focusing growth in urbanized areas, and looking at jobs/housing relationships and where jobs and households are distributed throughout the region. The intent now is to go from that vision of how the region might look different, take some policies, and apply them to various pieces of the puzzle. Mr. Amaroso distributed a handout that listed Smart Growth policies that they believe have perked their way

up from various workshops and from discussions with regional agencies leadership. These policies seem to enhance the potential for Smart Growth in the region. They're now taking these policies and applying them to an outreach program, a set of policy-based projections, and going after incentives that might bring about Smart Growth in the region. Also included in the handout were some policy-based projections on housing units, household creation and employment growth throughout the region.

Chair Mackenzie said that in terms of the Board's task as a transportation authority and MTC and ABAG, that there were some documents put forward about this by Ms. Wilford and he asked her to address them.

B. Principles Related to Potential Transportation/Land Use Legislation

Ms. Wilford said there is a pretty close relationship between this study and how transportation projects could likely be funded in the future if the land use and population numbers are projected differently. It could have an effect on the regional transportation plan and affect how funds get distributed. At the state level, MTC and ABAG have been discussing merging the two entities or having something that resembles a merged entity. In response to that, ABAG had a policy position that they supported a merger bill last year. MTC did not take such a position formally. In December, they took up transportation/land use integration principles where they laid out ideas related to transportation and land use. They stated at the end that they opposed a merger because they didn't believe it would affect the pattern of growth since neither agency has land-use control. The congestion management agencies' executive directors started talking about what role, if any, do the CMAs have in these discussions. They came up with some draft principles. Should future legislation be proposed about merging the two entities, or on issues related to transportation and land use, they put together some concepts that they are hopeful everyone can agree on in the nine Bay Area counties so there is some uniformity in any kind of lobbying effort from the local transportation community. Those are the two documents that she included in the agenda packet.

Chair Mackenzie suggested that the Board take a position at some point on what has been proposed so they can give some direction to their MTC representative. This will be an ongoing discussion as there will be legislative discussions on it as well. It may not be at the February meeting, but he would like to revisit this item at the March or April meeting in order to provide some direction to the MTC representative.

VII. SCTA Policies and Activities for 2003

Chair Mackenzie said that due to time constraints he was reluctant to discuss the overall work program at this time. It will have to be revisited. In terms of direction for Ms. Wilford at the Friday meeting, he solicited input from the directors, in particular, on issues dealing with funding for transportation projects.

Director Smith suggested that they arm Ms. Wilford with as much as they possibly can and he doesn't find any of the suggestions made something that he can't live with at this stage.

Chair Mackenzie noted that they now have a former Assembly Member on the Sonoma County Board of Supervisors who was actively involved in this. He has asked for a meeting with her to discuss gas tax increases. He said we should be open to different possibilities, particularly given what might happen with a sales tax increase statewide. He would give Ms. Wilford broad latitude in terms of exploration of other mechanisms. He asked that the Board be sent an email about what happens this Friday.

Ms. Wilford announced that the annual MTC trip to Washington, DC to lobby is scheduled for March 10, so the March SCTA meeting has been moved to March 17.

Chair Mackenzie reiterated that the upcoming schedule for the next two Board meetings would be February 10 and March 17.

A. 2002 Legislative Program

B. 2002 Overall Work Program

VIII. Other Business/Director Announcements

There was no other business.

IX. Adjourn

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

Respectfully submitted,

Angela Caruso
Executive Assistant

SONOMA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY STAFF REPORT

DATE: February 10, 2003

TO: Sonoma County Transportation Authority (SCTA)

FROM: Suzanne Wilford, Executive Director

SUBJECT: **ITEM III:** Reports

A. Executive Committee Report

Information will be provided at the SCTA meeting.

B. Metropolitan Transportation Commission Report

Information will be provided at the SCTA meeting.

C. SCTA Staff Report

1. Bay Area Partnership Activities

Information will be provided at the SCTA meeting.

2. Joint Marin/Sonoma Activities

The next SMART District meeting will be held February 19, in Petaluma.

The next Narrows Policy Advisory Group meeting will be in March in Novato.

3. Committee Reports

The CBAC met in early February to discuss the Countywide Bike Plan Update. It is anticipated that a draft of the document will be brought to the SCTA in June.

The PCC met in January and established a scoring committee for the Section 5310 federal funding process.

The CAC met in January and continued the discussion on the concepts of a countywide transportation capital funding program. More information on this will be covered in Item IVB.

4. Staff Report

a. State budget and legislative activities will be reported on at the SCTA meeting.

b. The Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) program and Transportation Development Act Article 3 funds (TDA3) for bicycle projects will soon be available for programming for FY03/04. A call for projects has been issued by SCTA staff to local jurisdictions and this item will come before the SCTA again in April.

SONOMA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY STAFF REPORT

DATE: February 10, 2003

TO: Sonoma County Transportation Authority (SCTA)

FROM: Suzanne Wilford, Executive Director
Janet Spilman, Transportation Planner

SUBJECT: **ITEM IV:** Countywide Transportation Capital Funding Partnership

ISSUE

How shall the SCTA proceed with the concept of a regional mitigation fee or similar program to address countywide transportation capital funding needs?

BACKGROUND

The SCTA has expressed interest in developing alternatives for a funding program that can generate revenue for projects that are affected by growth and are on a multi-jurisdictional scale. The SCTA has agreed to the basic need for a new funding mechanism and has also agreed that recipient projects would be taken from the list of projects in the 2001 Countywide Transportation Plan for Sonoma County.

At the November SCTA meeting the CAC was directed to meet and consider the issue of a countywide transportation capital funding partnership. The CAC will report back to the SCTA today and a guest speaker from Contra Costa will discuss the models used in his county to generate regional fees for regional projects. At the December CAC meeting, members heard from Bob Spencer, a consultant with expertise in implementing transportation mitigation fee. In January the CAC meeting was dedicated to discussion about the proposal. There was no consensus reached at the CTC meeting, but the Chair will report in more detail at the SCTA meeting.

The following is a summary of information gathered to date.

The Need

The SCTA has adopted the prioritized list of projects included the 2001 Countywide Transportation Plan for Sonoma County (CTP). Projects were only included in the CTP if it was agreed that their impact was of countywide significance. The CTP has a 25 year horizon. Many of the projects listed are considered crucial, but many of the projects have not yet been clearly defined (or costs assessed).

There are 11 projects that were ranked as highest priority. Many of the costs are estimated and some are yet to be determined, but the rough total is \$117,200,000. If the next highest ranked projects are considered the list grows to 23 projects for a total of \$193,715,000 (see attached lists).

It is in the spirit of the law and highly recommended that a funding mechanism determined through this process should not be the only source of funding for a project. These projects are eligible for traditional funding. It is understood though, that given current and projected funding sources that the pace will be extremely slow, and may well put us behind as more needs are identified.

The Funding Mechanism

Jurisdictional Funding Agreements:

This would be a negotiated process. Every jurisdiction would negotiate funding responsibilities for the projects listed. Based on modeling estimates a percentage of the countywide need is attributed to each jurisdiction. More specifically, it may be determined that a particular project may benefit different

jurisdictions by different proportions. In order to complete the project every jurisdiction must contribute that amount of the funding at the time of project development or construction.

This process does not specify any new source of revenue. Each jurisdiction must determine on its own how to fund the projects within the agreement.

Jurisdictional funding agreements could be the first critical step that leads to the fee based option discussed below.

Fee Based:

Every jurisdiction would impose a countywide traffic mitigation fee. There are many different ways to structure a fee. Revenue could be contributed to a single pool administered by the SCTA and used solely for the projects agreed upon by the member jurisdictions. Details of how the fee can be developed are discussed below.

The Nexus

Growth, whether it is homes, stores or office buildings will cause traffic on the street in front of the development. But it may also cause traffic on streets miles away. This is because people rarely live, work, and shop within a small constrained area. There is clear evidence around the county of congestion that is caused by through traffic.

Reasonable Relationship Requirement

There must be a reasonable relationship between:

- the use of the fee and the type of development on which it is imposed (the “benefit”)
- the need for a (transportation) facility and the type of development on which the fee for that facility is imposed (the “impact”)
- the amount of the fee and the facility cost attributable to the (development) project on which the fee is imposed (“proportionality”).

Policy Development

- Public outreach and participation would be critical
- Contracting with consultants for expertise would be necessary
 - Fee structure development and implementation
 - Traffic modeling

Technical Steps to Implementation

1. Agree on a list of projects. Attach real costs to the projects. Examine other funding possibilities for those projects in order to determine countywide contribution.
2. Determine type(s) of development on which to attach a fee.
3. Determine connection of development to projects. Agree on fee structure.
4. Calculate the amount of revenue generated. Will it cover the costs of the projects? Adjust list if necessary.
5. Collect money until project can be built. Funds can be held over time as long as they are used only for their intended purpose.

Concerns and Considerations

- Should projects benefiting from this new revenue be limited to road projects?
- Will different levels of participation will create disparity
- Is there a negative impact on new housing?
- Will amount of revenue be worth the effort?
- Will a regional fee be more successful if coupled with a sales tax measure?

- Can concessions or incentives be offered to developers who agree to build according to negotiated traffic reduction standards?

REQUESTED ACTION

Consider the general merits and options for a Countywide Transportation Capital Funding Partnership and provide direction to staff.

2001 CTP #1 Ranked Road Projects

North/South Subarea Roads			
Rank	Jurisdiction	Project	Cost
1	County	Penngrove Traffic Circulation Improvements	\$15,000,000
1	Santa Rosa	Farmers Lane Extension - construct 3 or 4 new lanes from Yolanda Ave to Hwy 12	\$20,000,000
1	Santa Rosa	Fulton Road Improvements (combined)	\$18,000,000
1	County	Airport Blvd Widening to 4 Lanes	\$10,800,000
		North/South #1 projects total	\$63,800,000
Northeast Subarea Roads			
Rank	Jurisdiction	Project	Cost
1	County	Mark West Springs-Porter Creek Rd -Improve & widen narrow sections, increase shoulder width	\$4,800,000
		Northeast #1 projects total	\$4,800,000
Southeast Subarea Roads			
Rank	Jurisdiction	Project	Cost
1	County	Hwy 116 Adobe to Arnold	\$15,000,000
1	County	Hwy116/Hwy 121 intersection	\$5,000,000
1	County	5 signals mid valley (2 on Arnold Dr., 3 on Hwy 12)	TBD
		Southeast #1 projects total	\$20,000,000
West Subarea Roads			
Rank	Jurisdiction	Project	Cost
1	County	River Rd Channelization & Signals - Fulton to Guernville	\$10,000,000
1	Santa Rosa	Highway 12 - construct an I/C at Fulton Road	\$15,000,000
1	County	Forestville Bypass - bypass Hwy 116 through Forestville	\$3,600,000
		West #1 projects total	\$28,600,000
11 projects		Grand Total for #1 Roads	\$117,200,000

2001 CTP High Priority Projects

North/South Subarea			
Rank	Jurisdiction	Project	Cost
1	County	Penngrove Traffic Circulation Improvements	\$15,000,000
1	Santa Rosa	Farmers Lane Extension - construct 3 or 4 new lanes from Yolanda Ave to Hwy 12	\$20,000,000
1	Santa Rosa	Fulton Road Improvements (combined)	\$18,000,000
1	County	Airport Blvd Widening to 4 Lanes	\$10,800,000
5	Multi	Old Redwood Hwy improvements from Petaluma to Cotati	\$6,000,000
5	Santa Rosa	Stony Point Rd widen & reconstruct from Hwy 12 to Northpoint Pkwy	\$10,000,000
5	County	Brickway Blvd Connect Airport Blvd.-River Rd	\$7,500,000
North/South high priority projects total			\$87,300,000
Northeast Subarea			
Rank	Jurisdiction	Project	Cost
1	County	Mark West Springs-Porter Creek Rd -Improve & widen narrow sections, increase shoulder width	\$4,800,000
2	County	Alexander Valley Rd - shoulder widening for bikes & sight distance, eliminate safety issues	\$4,100,000
2	SR/Co	Calistoga Rd -Montecito to Hwy 12 - traffic calming	\$250,000
Northeast high priority projects total			\$9,150,000
Southeast Subarea			
Rank	Jurisdiction	Project	Cost
1	County	Hwy 116 Adobe to Arnold	\$15,000,000
1	County	Hwy116/Hwy 121 intersection	\$5,000,000
1	County	5 signals mid valley (2 on Arnold Dr., 3 on Hwy 12)	TBD
4	County	Lakeville Rd Widen to 4 Lanes from Hwy 37 to Hwy 116	\$22,000,000
4	County	Arnold Drive - construct center turn lane Country Club to Madrone	\$2,500,000

4	Santa Rosa	Hwy 12 - widen from Los Alamos to Pythian	\$15,000,000
4	County	Arnold Drive - Verano to Petaluma	\$2,300,000
		Southeast high priority projects total	\$61,800,000
West Subarea			
Rank	Jurisdiction	Project	
1	County	River Rd Channelization & Signals - Fulton to Guernville	10,000,000
1	Santa Rosa	Highway 12 - construct an I/C at Fulton Road	15,000,000
1	County	Forestville Bypass - bypass Hwy 116 through Forestville	3,600,000
4	County	Bodega Hwy, W of Sebastopol, Upgrade unimproved sect to 36' - full reconstruct	5,500,000
4	County/Sebastopol	Hwy 116 Cotati -Sebastopol 3rd lane & signals	TBD
4	Sebastopol	Intersection Control on Hwy 116 at 4 locations in Sebastopol	\$1,365,000
		West high priority projects total	35,465,000
23 projects		Grand total for high priority projects	\$193,715,000

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

DATE: February 10, 2003

TO: Sonoma County Transportation Authority (SCTA)

FROM: Suzanne Wilford, Executive Director

SUBJECT: **ITEM V:** Caltrans & Highway 101 Report

ISSUE

- A. What earmarks shall the SCTA request from Congress as part of TEA-21 reauthorization?
- B. What is the status of the EIR/EIS work being done by Parsons?
- C. What is the status of Caltrans projects on highway 101?

BACKGROUND

A. Representatives from SCTA, the Marin CMA and the business community met with Congresswoman Woolsey's staff to discuss the earmark request for the Marin/Sonoma Narrows. The Congresswoman has been very clear in her support for the Narrows project and has asked that it be the only project she is asked to submit for an earmark. In prior actions the SCTA agreed the Narrows was the highest priority for an earmark and asked for \$160M. Marin CMA took similar action but asked for \$30M for the 101 Corridor.

Congresswoman Woolsey asked the two counties to agree on a dollar amount for the request and to concur with the request language her staff has developed (attached). The discussion centered on a compromise position of \$60M and requesting authorization for funds for the Petaluma Bridge, the Narrows bicycle path and SMART through specific programs in the legislation. If these authorizations are obtained, the counties can seek appropriations over the life of the bill from specific programs such as New Starts. More research is being done on this and information will be presented at the SCTA meeting.

At a prior SCTA meeting staff was directed to pursue an earmark from Congressman Mike Thompson for the Highway 101 project from Steele Lane to Windsor River Road. Since that time staff has had discussions with the Congressman's staff and they have indicated support for the project. Additionally, Congressman Thompson has been appointed to the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee that will oversee crafting TEA-21 reauthorization.

A draft Member Request Form is attached for the Narrows and the Steele to Windsor River Road projects.

- B. Monthly reports from Parsons will be distributed at the SCTA meeting.
- C. Caltrans will provide updates on all the active STIP projects. The project managers have been requested to provide updated information on the status of the HOV lane hours and to provide additional data on the biological studies for the Wilfred Avenue project.

A report from Caltrans staff on HOV lane usage is attached. They are planning to do a second round of study in the spring when conditions are more amenable.

REQUESTED ACTION

- A. Consider reducing the amount requested for an earmark for the Marin/Sonoma Narrows to \$60M and approving the proposed request language. Consider requesting funds (\$20M) from Congressman Thompson for the Steele Lane to Windsor River Road project. Consider requesting authorization language for the Petaluma River Bridge, the Narrows bicycle path and SMART passenger rail.
- B. None required.
- C. Provide direction as appropriate.

Proposed TEA-21 Request Language

“Sonoma and Marin County transportation agencies agree that there is a need for at least \$160 million in federal funding for their regional priority project, the widening of Highway 101 in a seventeen mile stretch connecting the two counties called the Marin/Sonoma Narrows. Realizing the budget constraints of this Congress, I am requesting \$60 million in this cycle of transportation funding for the project.

I am also requesting that the Sonoma/Marin Area Rail Transit (SMART) District, which will provide passenger rail service in the 101 Corridor, be placed on the eligibility list for construction and final design in the New Starts program.”

**TRANSPORTATION PROJECT EVALUATION CRITERIA,
COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,
Subcommittee on Highways and Transit**

1. Name and Congressional District of the primary Member of Congress sponsoring the project.

Congresswoman Lynn Woolsey, 6th District, California

2. Other Members supporting the project.

Congressman Mike Thompson, 1st District, California

3. If the project is a highway project, identify the State or other qualified recipient responsible for carrying out the project.

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)

4. If the project is a transit project, please identify the project sponsor (must be an eligible recipient of Federal transit funds).

Not applicable.

5. Please categorize the project. (Check one)

Highway or bridge_XXX_	Intermodal facility (passenger)_____
Transit rail new start_____	Intermodal facility (freight)_____
Bus, bus equipment, or bus facility_____	Bicycle & Pedestrian_____
Other (please identify)_____	

6. Is the project eligible for the use of Federal-aid highway or transit funds under Title 23 or Title 49 of the United States Code?

Yes.

7. If the project is a highway or bridge project, is it on the National Highway System?

No.

8. Briefly describe the total project.

The Marin/Sonoma Narrows project is a 17 mile congestion relief and safety improvement project on Highway 101. The project includes adding a carpool (HOV) lane in each direction, improving safety by limiting direct access, and a continuous bicycle/pedestrian path. The project will strive to minimize environmental impacts by staying within the existing right-of-way as much as possible.

a. Is it part of a larger system of projects?

Yes. Highway 101 in Sonoma and Marin Counties has been divided into seven phases for widening and improvement. The Narrows represents the final phase.

b. What is the total estimated cost of the project?

The total estimated project cost is \$450 Million, including environmental review, engineering, right of way, project support and construction. The project currently has \$50.8 Million in funding for project development (environmental, design, right-of-way, project support).

9. Please identify the specific segment for which project funding is being sought, including terminus points.

Construction funding is being sought and the project limits are from Highway 37 in Novato north to Old Redwood Highway in Petaluma.

10. What dollar amount are you requesting in the authorization for this project or segment of a project?

\$60 Million.

11. Project Schedule

a. What is the proposed schedule and status of work on the project?

EIR/EIS 2004

Design & Right-of-Way 2006

Construction 2008

b. What is the current stage of development of the project? (If the project is a transit new start, please specify whether the project is in alternative analysis, preliminary engineering, final design, has been issued a record of decision, under environmental review, or already has a current full funding grant agreement.)

The EIR/EIS is underway and a draft document is due in 2004. Funding has been secured for environmental, design/engineering, right-of-way and project support.

c. Will the requested funding for the project be obligated within the next six years?

Yes - 2008.

12. Project Plan

a. Is the project part of the State's long-range plan?

Yes.

b. Is the project included in the metropolitan and/or State Transportation Improvement Program(s)?

Yes, it is included in the 2001 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) and in the State (Inter-regional) Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP).

13. Is the project considered by the State and/or regional transportation officials as critical to their needs? Please provide a letter of support from these officials, and if you cannot, explain why not.

Yes. The project has been the recipient of state discretionary funding on three separate occasions and is listed as a Focus Route in California's 1998 Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan. The project is also included in the 2001 Regional Transportation Plan and the

2002 Key Transportation Corridors in the Bay Area Region. The Narrows has been designated an inter-regional route of significance by the state and is ranked as the 4th most congested highway in the Bay Area in 2000.

14. Does the project have national or regional significance? Describe.

Yes. The Narrows is a critical project in the Bay Area as Highway 101 is the main highway link between the Bay Area and Oregon via the Redwood Coast. It is a key route for the movement of goods as well as people. The Narrows is the gateway from the Bay Area to all point north.

Sonoma & Marin Counties have funded or are planning to fund with State money over \$520 million in improvements to Highway 101. The Narrows project will fill a gap in HOV lanes.

15. Has the proposed project encountered, or is it likely to encounter, any significant opposition or other obstacles based on environmental or other types of concerns? If yes, please describe.

This project has been under consideration for over a decade. Throughout that period there has been concern about the impacts to the environment and growth, but as a result of an exhaustive public process during the EIR/EIS phase many if not all issues have been resolved. It is the stated goal of the project to minimize the environmental impacts and promote transit and bicycle/pedestrian activities as elements of the project.

16. Describe the economic, environmental, congestion mitigation, and safety benefits associated with completion of the project.

At present, the Narrows is not a freeway and has direct ingress and egress. This makes for an extremely unsafe roadway that has a very high accident rate. This project is also subject to significant congestion as a result of a bottleneck in the northbound direction – this negatively impacts air quality as well as travel times. With the congestion comes an impact to the movement of goods.

Peak hour delays are approximately 15 minutes. Truck traffic accounts for 7.5% of the average daily travel and the Narrows is a designated route for truck travel.

Conversion of this expressway section of the highway to freeway status will reduce congestion, promote the use of express buses and carpools, provide operational improvements, and greatly enhance safety.

17. Has the project already received funding through the State's federal-aid highway or transit formula apportionments or from other Federal, State, local, or private funds? If yes, how much and from what source?

Yes, the project has received STIP funding and a federal earmark in TEA-21.

18. Has the project received funding in a previous authorization act?

Yes, Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21).

19. If the project has received funding in a previous authorization act, please cite the act(s) and amount(s) authorized.

Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21), 1998, \$8.8 Million.

20. Has the project received funding in a previous appropriations act?

No.

If the project has received funding in a previous appropriations act, please cite the act(s) and amount(s) appropriated.

Not applicable.

**TRANSPORTATION PROJECT EVALUATION CRITERIA,
COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,
Subcommittee on Highways and Transit**

1. Name and Congressional District of the primary Member of Congress sponsoring the project.

Congressman Mike Thompson, 1st District, California

2. Other Members supporting the project.

To be determined.

3. If the project is a highway project, identify the State or other qualified recipient responsible for carrying out the project.

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)

4. If the project is a transit project, please identify the project sponsor (must be an eligible recipient of Federal transit funds).

Not applicable.

5. Please categorize the project. (Check one)

Highway or bridge_XXX_	Intermodal facility (passenger)_____
Transit rail new start_____	Intermodal facility (freight)_____
Bus, bus equipment, or bus facility_____	Bicycle & Pedestrian_____
Other (please identify)_____	

6. Is the project eligible for the use of Federal-aid highway or transit funds under Title 23 or Title 49 of the United States Code?

Yes.

7. If the project is a highway or bridge project, is it on the National Highway System?

No.

8. Briefly describe the total project.

This project represents the fourth phase of widening on Highway 101 in Sonoma County. The project includes adding a carpool (HOV) lane in each direction, adding auxiliary lanes where appropriate and improving interchange ramps. The project will strive to minimize environmental impacts by staying within the existing right-of-way as much as possible. The project length is just over 7.5 miles.

a. Is it part of a larger system of projects?

Yes. Highway 101 in Sonoma County has been divided into six phases for widening and improvement. The Steele Lane to Windsor segment represents the fourth phase.

b. What is the total estimated cost of the project?

The total estimated project cost is \$100 Million, including environmental review, engineering, right of way, project support and construction. The project has received adequate funding to complete the environmental and engineering phases (\$10 million) but needs an estimated \$90 million to fund construction.

9. Please identify the specific segment for which project funding is being sought, including terminus points.

Construction funding is being sought for widening Highway 101 from Steele Lane in Santa Rosa north to Windsor River Road in Windsor.

10. What dollar amount are you requesting in the authorization for this project or segment of a project?

\$20 Million.

11. Project Schedule

a. What is the proposed schedule and status of work on the project?

EIR/EIS 2005

Design & Right-of-Way 2006

Construction 2007

b. What is the current stage of development of the project? (If the project is a transit new start, please specify whether the project is in alternative analysis, preliminary engineering, final design, has been issued a record of decision, under environmental review, or already has a current full funding grant agreement.)

The EIR/EIS is underway and a draft document is due in 2004. Funding has been secured for environmental and design/engineering.

c. Will the requested funding for the project be obligated within the next six years?

Yes - 2007.

12. Project Plan

a. Is the project part of the State's long-range plan?

Yes.

b. Is the project included in the metropolitan and/or State Transportation Improvement Program(s)?

Yes, it is included in the State Transportation Improvement Program.

13. Is the project considered by the State and/or regional transportation officials as critical to their needs? Please provide a letter of support from these officials, and if you cannot, explain why not.

Yes. The project is part of a six-phase improvement project for Highway 101 in Sonoma County that includes carpool lanes, ramp improvements and safety improvements. This

project is included in the 2001 Regional Transportation Plan and the 2002 Key Transportation Corridors in the Bay Area Region.

14. Does the project have national or regional significance? Describe.

Yes. As mentioned above, this project is part of a larger improvement effort for the entire Highway 101 corridor which serves as the main highway link between the Bay Area and Oregon via the Redwood Coast. It is a key route for the movement of goods as well as people. The Steele Lane to Windsor segment is the northern terminus for the improvement project and represents the gateway into the Bay Area from the north.

15. Has the proposed project encountered, or is it likely to encounter, any significant opposition or other obstacles based on environmental or other types of concerns? If yes, please describe.

It is the goal of the project to minimize the environmental impacts by staying within the existing right-of-way as much as possible. There has been no vocal opposition to the project to date.

16. Describe the economic, environmental, congestion mitigation, and safety benefits associated with completion of the project.

Highway 101 is the main highway link between the Bay Area and Oregon via the Redwood Coast. Conversion of the highway from a four lane north/south corridor to six lanes, including HOV lanes, has long been the goal of the SCTA and its member agencies. Expanding the capacity of Highway 101 will reduce congestion, promote the use of express buses and carpools, provide operational improvements, and enhance safety.

Sonoma & Marin Counties have funded or are planning to fund over \$520 million in state money for improvements to Highway 101 by 2010. Obtaining construction funds for phase four of the corridor project is an integral part of reaching that goal.

Highway 101 has been designated an inter-regional route of significance by the state and is ranked as the 4th most congested highway in the Bay Area. Truck traffic accounts for 7.5% of the average daily travel.

17. Has the project already received funding through the State's federal-aid highway or transit formula apportionments or from other Federal, State, local, or private funds? If yes, how much and from what source?

No.

18. Has the project received funding in a previous authorization act?

No.

19. If the project has received funding in a previous authorization act, please cite the act(s) and amount(s) authorized.

Not applicable.

20. Has the project received funding in a previous appropriations act?

No.

If the project has received funding in a previous appropriations act, please cite the act(s) and amount(s) appropriated.

Not applicable.

HOV Counts Son-101

HOV Lane Trav

Travel times fr

SB AM Counts

Time	7/31/02 HOV ELIGIBLE	9/25/02 HOV ELIGIBLE	HOVL Volume 11/4/2002*	HOVL Volume 11/5/02	HOVL Volume 12/10/02
0630-0730	413	295	DID	405	344
0730-0830	332	312	NOT	454	415
0830-0930	540	290	OPEN	397	442

Date 11/5/02

Time
6:30
7:00
7:30
8:15
9:00
9:20

NB AM Counts

Time	7/31/02 HOV ELIGIBLE	9/25/02 HOV ELIGIBLE	HOVL Volume 11/4/2002*	HOVL Volume 11/5/02	HOVL Volume 12/5/02
0630-0730	302	142	356	307	253
0730-0830	365	316	438	441	403
0830-0930	363	342	405	394	366

Date 11/8/02

Time
6:30
7:00
8:10
8:45
9:20

SB PM Counts

Time	7/30/02 HOV ELIGIBLE	9/24/02 HOV ELIGIBLE	HOVL Volume 11/4/2002*	HOVL Volume 12/10/02
1500-1600	808	730	748	788
1600-1700	773	720	521	756
1700-1800	860	718	827	477
1800-1900	754	796	666	214

Bottleneck peri

Date:11/4/02

Time
6:45
7:15
7:55
8:35
9:05
9:35

NB PM Counts

Time	7/30/02 HOV ELIGIBLE	9/24/02 HOV ELIGIBLE	HOVL Volume 11/4/2002*	HOVL Volume 12/5/02
1500-1600	680	540	671	834
1600-1700	605	436	741	782
1700-1800	552	499	769	715
1800-1900	460	480	652	204

Date:11/5/02

Time
6:30
6:50
7:20
7:55
8:35
9:10

* Southbound HOV lane was not opened for the AM commute on 11/4/02 but was available for the PM commute
 * Northbound HOV lane was opened for the AM & PM commutes on 11/4/02

Estimated HOV Vilation rates:

We were unable to determine actual violation rates due lack of visibility during some HOV lane hours in November and December

Direction	Peak	Violation Rate
Southbound	AM	5.80%
Northbound	AM	6.50%
Southbound	PM	2.90%
Northbound	PM	1.90%

12/17/02

Time
6:45
7:15
7:30
7:45
8:15
8:55
9:15

Bottleneck at S

Travel Time Comparisons between SR-12 and Wilfred Avenue

Travel times for HOV and mixed-flow traffic obtained on 11/4, 11/5, 12/12 and 12/17

Southbound AM Peak Period

HOV Travel Time	Mixed-Flow Travel Time	HOV Time Savings
3.8	4	0.2
3.8	3.8	0
3.8	4.3	0.5
3.8	4.1	0.3
3.8	3.8	0
3.8	3.8	0

HOV Travel Time	Mixed-Flow Travel Time	HOV Time Savings
3.8	4.5	0.7
3.8	4.5	0.7
3.8	4.79	0.99
3.8	5.39	1.59
3.8	4.27	0.47

Congestion develops south of the Wilfred Avenue on-ramp and results in minor delays for mixed-flow lane vehicles

Northbound AM Peak Period

HOV Travel Time	Mixed-Flow Travel Time	HOV Time Savings
3.6	3.6	0
3.6	4.1	0.5
4.1	11.5	7.4
4.1	5.5	1.4
3.6	4.1	0.5
3.6	3.6	0

HOV Travel Time	Mixed-Flow Travel Time	HOV Time Savings
3.6	3.6	0
3.6	3.6	0
3.6	4.8	1.2
4.1	14.5	10.4
3.8	7.2	3.4
3.6	3.6	0

HOV Travel Time	Mixed-Flow Travel Time	HOV Time Savings
3.6	4	0.4
3.8	4	0.2
3.7	4.75	1.05
3.7	6.6	2.9
4	8	4
3.6	4.4	0.8
3.6	3.6	0

SR-12 results in mixed-flow lane congestion south of SR-12. HOV lane allows carpools to bypass this congestion.

HOV Lane Travel Times

Travel times for

Southbound PI

Date: 11/4/02

Time
3:20
4:00
4:45
5:50
6:30
6:55

Date: 12/2/02

Time
3:00
3:45
4:15
5:00
5:55
6:40

Minor bottleneck

Northbound PI

Date: 11/5/02

Time
3:05
3:40
4:20
5:10
6:10
6:45

Date: 12/12/02

Time
3:10
3:40
4:05
4:40
5:05
5:35
6:10
6:40
7:10

Bottlenecks at HOV lane allow. However, some current left-side

Travel Time Comparisons between SR-12 and Wilfred Avenue

for HOV and mixed-flow traffic obtained on 11/4, 11/5, 12/12 and 12/17

VI Peak Period

HOV Travel Time	Mixed-Flow Travel Time	HOV Time Savings
3.8	3.8	0
3.8	4.3	0.5
3.8	4.3	0.5
3.8	4.2	0.4
3.8	3.8	0
3.8	3.8	0

HOV Travel Time	Mixed-Flow Travel Time	HOV Time Savings
3.8	4.39	0.59
3.8	4.89	1.09
3.95	5.3	1.35
3.8	5	1.2
4.3	6.6	2.3
3.8	4.4	0.6

Block South of the Wilfred on-ramp results in minor delays for mixed-flow traffic.

VI Peak Period

HOV Travel Time	Mixed-Flow Travel Time	HOV Time Savings
3.6	7.6	4
4.2	7.5	3.3
4.7	13.1	8.4
5.5	22.3	16.8
6.1	14.1	8
3.6	4.1	0.5

2

HOV Travel Time	Mixed-Flow Travel Time	HOV Time Savings
5	12.63	7.63
5	17.2	12.2
5.7	17	11.3
4.9	14	9.1
5.5	18.5	13
5.6	17.3	11.7
6	17.5	11.5
6	10.7	4.7
3.6	3.7	0.1

SR-12 and College result in mixed-flow lane congestion south of SR-12. HOV carpools to bypass most of this congestion. Slowing does occur in northerly section of the HOV lane. The lane drop adds to HOV slowing