



**Citizens Advisory Committee**

**AGENDA**

**April 26, 2004 – 4:00 p.m.**

Sonoma County Transportation Authority  
520 Mendocino Avenue, Suite 240A, Santa Rosa, California

**Directors**

**Paul Kelley, Chair**  
Sonoma County

**Robert Jehn, V. Chair**  
Cloverdale

**Steve Allen**  
Windsor

**Bob Blanchard**  
Santa Rosa

**Joe Costello**  
Sonoma

**Patricia Gilardi**  
Cotati

**Mike Healy**  
Petaluma

**Linda Kelley**  
Sebastopol

**Mike Kerns**  
Sonoma County

**Lisa Schaffner**  
Healdsburg

**Tim Smith**  
Sonoma

**Vicki Vidak-Martinez**  
Rohnert Park

**SCTA Staff**

**Suzanne Wilford**  
Executive Director

**Patrice Siefers**  
Deputy Director of  
Projects & Programming

**Janet Spilman**  
Sr. Transportation Planner

**Elijah Henley**  
Sr. Transportation Planner

**Marge Franco**  
Executive Assistant

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

**ITEM**

- I.** Introductions
- II.** Consent Items - **DISCUSSION/ACTION**
  - A. Approval of Minutes from March 22, 2004
  - B. Approval of Agenda
- III.** Announcements/Reports – **DISCUSSION/ACTION**
- IV.** Regional Transportation Plan – **DISCUSSION/ACTION**
  - A. List of projects
  - B. Regional Bike and Pedestrian Program
- V.** Transportation Funding Programs – **DISCUSSION/ACTION**
  - A. Cycle Two Federal Funds – update on process
  - B. Update on 2004 STIP
  - C. Update on federal transportation bill
- VI.** Highway 101 Project Update – **DISCUSSION/ACTION**
  - A. Airport Blvd. and Fulton Road
  - B. Railroad Avenue
  - C. Highway 116 in Cotati
- VII.** Report on SCTA Traffic Modeling – **DISCUSSION**
- VIII.** Announcements / Other Business - **DISCUSSION**
- IX.** Adjournment - **ACTION**

---

The next **S C T A** meeting will be held **May 10, 2004**  
The next **C A C** meeting will be held **May 31, 2004**

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

---

# SONOMA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

---

## MINUTES Monday, March 22, 2004

### ATTENDEES

Bob Anderson, United Winegrowers	John McHugh, Santa Rosa Chamber of Commerce
Charles Aver, League of Woman Voters	Len Swenson, Sonoma County Conservation Council
George Ellman, Transportation & Land Use Coalition	Pat Siefers, SCTA
Maddy Hirshfield, 5th District	Janet Spilman, SCTA
Jim Killean, Local Union Operating Engineer #3	Suzanne Wilford, SCTA

#### ITEM

##### I. Introductions

Introductions were made.

##### II. Consent Items - **DISCUSSION/ACTION**

###### A. Approval of Minutes from January 26, 2004

The minutes were unanimously approved.

###### B. Approval of Agenda

Mr. Ellman asked to add the Schellville.railway to item VI.

##### III. Announcements/Reports – **DISCUSSION/ACTION**

Ms. Wilford handed out a letter from the SCTA addressed to the National Indian Gaming Commission and gave a brief review on the background of this request to control traffic impacts.

##### IV. Transportation Funding Update – **DISCUSSION/ACTION**

###### A. FY2004/05 State Budget Update

No report given at this time.

###### B. 2004 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)

Ms Wilford stated that the number one priority in STIP is the 12 to Steele Project. Construction will not be done in FY03/04 given the cash flow issues with the state. However, Caltrans District 4, the CTC and MTC are making significant efforts to try keeping the project on schedule for delivery in FY04/05.

C. TEA-21 Reauthorization Update

Ms. Wilford handed out a report on her trip to Washington briefing the CAC members on TEA-21. The Senate passed its bill at \$318 billion level and the House is going to pass a bill of \$275 billion. That is significantly less than proposed of \$375 billion.

V. Marin Sales Tax Measure – **DISCUSSION/ACTION**

Ms. Wilford gave a brief summary of the third version of the Marin County Transportation Sale Tax Expenditure Plan.

Mr. Ellman asked about the process for getting this tax measure on the ballot. Ms. Wilford responded that it would be the Board of Supervisors that would put it on the ballot. The process is to finalize the expenditure plan and then do an environmental document for the plan. The board of supervisors would act to put it on the ballot by August 2004.

There was discussion about Sonoma County being the only county that does not have a tax measure on the ballot to help with transportation costs.

Mr. McHugh brought up the subject of self-help and educating the community on how it would help us.

Mr. Ellman mentioned that we should get organized to get a tax measure on the ballot and to educate the community.

VI. SMART Project Update – **DISCUSSION/ACTION**

Ms. Wilford briefed the CAC on the presentation that Bryan Albee presented to the SCTA Board on the development of Sonoma County station sites that includes multi-modal stations that are situated right next to the rail lines and will serve as a rail stations in the future.

The other good news is that the rail project is continuing to move forward despite the Governor's proposal for eliminating the TCRP, which funds SMART. If that happens the project will be in trouble and will not be able to continue to move on the environmental document.

The other good news is that the assets have transferred and the North West Pacific Railroad Authority no longer owns the rail lines. The right of way from Healdsburg to Novato is now owned by SMART. The remaining segments are in negotiations with the Golden Gate Bridge District and Marin County to transfer those assets. All of the lease revenues now go to SMART that will allow SMART to continue to function in terms of having a Project Director and someone to deal with the real estate. However it will not be enough to continue the environmental document process and Project development costs.

Mr. Ellman introduced the Schellville Railway into item VI and announced that they tried to get some trains over to Sonoma County for a demo and was told that the tracks in Schellville were out. They were offered the option of trucking to transport a rail car to Sonoma County. Mr. Ellman's questioned the status and whereabouts of the Schellville railway.

Ms. Siefers stated that Schellville is located in Sonoma and is a junction point for the North West Pacific Railroad and the Northern Sacramento line. The railroad maps still show it as still being in use.

**VII. Caltrans Update – DISCUSSION/ACTION**

A. Hwy 101

Ms. Wilford stated the Policy Advisory Group will be meeting on April 6, 2004 at 6 p.m. at the Petaluma City Council Chambers and the topic will be aesthetics as well as funding and phasing of the Marin Sonoma Narrows.

B. Hwy 116

Ms. Wilford reported that Caltrans gave a good presentation on the proposed improvements on Stage Gulch Road at the February 2004 SCTA Board Meeting.

**VIII. Announcements / Other Business - DISCUSSION**

**IX. Adjournment - ACTION**

Meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted  
Marge Franco  
Executive Assistant

**DRAFT**  
**2005 RTP Project List**

Note: Proposed New RTP Projects or projects that have increased in cost by more than 30% Are shaded in gray

	Investment Type	RTP Reference Number	Project/Program	Cost (mil. \$)
<b>TRANSIT</b>				<b>TOTAL TRANSIT COST</b>
				<b>\$1,082.6</b>
	Committed	21436	Regional Express Bus Program: US 101/Santa Rosa to San Rafael/San Francisco	\$2.1
	Committed	98572	Golden Gate Transit (Sonoma County share) - Transit operating and capital improvement program (including replacement, rehabilitation, and minor enhancements for rolling stock, equipment, fixed facilities and other capital assets; does not include expansion)	\$366.0
	Committed	94695	Sonoma County, Santa Rosa, Petaluma, Healdsburg, and Cloverdale Transit - transit operating and capital improvement program (including replacement, rehabilitation, and minor enhancements for rolling stock, equipment, fixed facilities and other capital ass	\$605.7
	Committed	94167	Sonoma-Marin Rail station site acquisitions/upgrades	\$5.0
				<b>Committed Subtotal</b>
				<b>\$978.8</b>
	Regional Track 1	21901	Golden Gate Transit (Sonoma County share) capital replacement program shortfall (see Committed projects)	\$5.8
				<b>Track 1 Subtotal</b>
				<b>\$5.8</b>
	Big Tent	22196	Park & Ride Lots for the support of Regional Express Bus service	
	Big Tent	22538	Santa Rosa - S.F. BRT (Bus Rapid Transit)	
	Big Tent	21905	Sonoma County Transit Operators (excluding GGBHTD) - service expansion	
	Big Tent	22113	SMART Commuter Rail (includes Bicycle Path)	\$98.0
	Big Tent	21908	Ferry service from Port Sonoma	
				<b>Big Tent Subtotal</b>
				<b>\$98.0</b>
<b>HIGHWAY</b>				<b>TOTAL HIGHWAY COST</b>
				<b>\$655.7</b>
	Committed	94165	US 101 northbound and southbound HOV lanes from Route 12 to Steele Lane in Santa Rosa; includes interchange modifications at Steele Lane and College Avenue	\$77.5
	Committed	98183	Widen US 101 HOV Lanes: Rohnert Park Exp. To Santa Rosa Ave.	\$39.4
	Committed	21338	US 101 southbound auxiliary lane between Route 116 to East Washington	\$7.0
	Committed (SHOPP)	21346	US 101/Route 116 separation: improve Route 116 onramp to southbound US 101	\$9.9
	Committed (SHOPP)	21070	Realign Route 116 (Stage Gulch Road) along Champlin Creek and widen the remaining segments	
	Committed (SHOPP)	21998	Rehabilitate and widen Route 116 between Elphick Road to Redwood Drive in Sebastopol and Cotati	\$17.0
	Committed	94689	US 101/Arata Lane interchange improvements in Windsor (Phase 2)	\$2.5
				<b>Committed Subtotal</b>
				<b>\$153.3</b>
	Local Track 1	98183	Widen US 101 HOV lanes: Steele Lane - Windsor River Rd	\$90.0
	Local Track 1	21902	Widen US 101 for HOV lanes: Old Redwood Hwy - Rohnert Park Expressway	\$90.0
	Local Track 1	98147	Widen US 101 (adding an HOV lane in each direction) from Marin County line north to Old Redwood Highway in Petaluma and convert some portions from expressway to freeway	\$125.0
				<b>Track 1 Subtotal</b>
				<b>\$305.0</b>
	Big Tent	22205	Hearn Avenue / Hwy 101 Interchange	\$8.8
	Big Tent	22190	Hwy 116/Hwy 121 Intersection Improvements: signalize and channelize	\$5.0
	Big Tent	22206	Hwy 12 Interchange at Fulton Road	\$15.0
	Big Tent	22195	Old Redwood Hwy / Hwy 101 Interchange	\$20.0
	Big Tent	22191	Airport Boulevard / Hwy 101 Interchange	\$20.0
	Big Tent		Mendocino Ave/Hopper Ave -Hwy 101 I/C	\$5.3
	Big Tent		Todd Road -Hwy 101 I/C	TBD
	Big Tent		River Road -Hwy 101 I/C	\$18.0
	Big Tent		Mill St. -Hwy 101 I/C	\$1.4
	Big Tent	21884	Petaluma cross town connector/interchange	\$33.0
	Big Tent		Bellevue Ave -Hwy 101 I/C	\$15.0
	Big Tent		Dry Creek -Hwy 101 I/C	\$1.5
	Big Tent		Baker Avenue -Hwy 101 I/C	TBD
	Big Tent		Shiloh Road - Hwy 101 I/C	\$9.4
	Big Tent	22200	Sonoma County 101 Ramp Metering and fiber optic cable	\$27.7
	Big Tent	22199	Sonoma County 101 Corridor TOS Project	\$17.3
				<b>Big Tent Subtotal</b>
				<b>\$197.4</b>
<b>LOCAL STREETS &amp; ROADS</b>				<b>TOTAL STREETS &amp; ROADS COST</b>
				<b>\$916.2</b>
	Committed	21870	Local bridge maintenance (committed revenues shown)	\$26.1
	Committed	94691	Route 121 traffic signal system and channelization at 8th Street	\$0.4
				<b>Committed Subtotal</b>
				<b>\$26.5</b>
	Regional Track 1	94155	Metropolitan Transportation System (MTS) streets and roads pavement rehabilitation	\$233.5
				<b>Track 1 Subtotal</b>
				<b>\$233.5</b>
	Big Tent	94156	Non-MTS streets and roads pavement rehabilitation shortfall	\$574.0
	Big Tent	22192	Airport Boulevard Widening	\$10.8
	Big Tent	22207	Farmers Lane Extension - Bellevue Avenue to SR 12	\$20.0
	Big Tent	22193	Forrestville By-Pass (on existing Rte. 116)	\$3.6
	Big Tent	22204	Fulton Road Improvements	\$18.0
	Big Tent	22194	Mark West Springs Road / Porter Creek Road Safety Improvements	\$4.8
	Big Tent	22197	Penngrove Traffic Circulation Improvements	\$15.0
	Big Tent	22203	River Rd. Channelization & Signals From Fulton Rd. to Town of Guernville	\$10.0
	Big Tent	98000	Sonoma County SR 37 TOS and Fiber Communication Project Son 37 0.0-6.25	
	Big Tent	98510	Streets and roads non-pavement maintenance (shortfall) (MTS and non-MTS)	
				<b>Big Tent Subtotal</b>
				<b>\$656.2</b>
<b>BIKE/PED</b>				<b>TOTAL BIKE/PED COST</b>
				<b>\$278.2</b>
	Committed	98213	Bicycle and pedestrian projects	\$15.7
				<b>Committed Subtotal</b>
				<b>\$15.7</b>
	Regional Track 1	98557	Transportation for Livable Communities	\$15.3
	Regional Track 1		Regional Bike/Ped Plan	\$13.6
				<b>Track 1 Subtotal</b>
				<b>\$28.9</b>
	Big Tent	94163	Bicycle and pedestrian projects	\$25.1
	Big Tent	21862	Non-pavement maintenance (sidewalk, lighting, drainage, landscaping, etc. - committed revenues shown)	\$208.5
				<b>Big Tent Subtotal</b>
				<b>\$233.6</b>
<b>ADMINISTRATION</b>				<b>TOTAL ADMIN COST</b>
				<b>\$6.5</b>
	Committed	98566	Surface Transportation Program planning funds for the SCTA	\$6.5



## Agenda Item 4c (i)

METROPOLITAN  
TRANSPORTATION  
COMMISSION

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter  
101 Eighth Street  
Oakland, CA 94607-4700  
Tel: 510.464.7700  
TDD/TTY: 510.464.7769  
Fax: 510.464.7848

### *Memorandum*

TO: Programming and Allocations Committee

DATE: April 14, 2004

FR: Executive Director

W.I.:

RE: Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Programming Policies

#### **Background**

In December 2003 the Commission created a \$200 million Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Program to fund the construction of the Regional Bicycle Network (as outlined in the Regional Bicycle Plan, adopted by the Commission in December 2001) and regionally significant pedestrian projects (to be determined). With the passage of Resolution 3609, the Commission requested that staff develop a proposal to “allow counties to credit some percentage of flexible dollars back to any county that has dedicated local funds to implementing elements of that county’s portion of the regional bike plan and regional pedestrian projects.”

In January 2004, the Bay Area Partnership requested that a task force comprised of CMA staff and bike/pedestrian advocates explore options for funding the Regional Bicycle/Pedestrian Program established by Resolution 3609. This group met on February 4<sup>th</sup> and 23<sup>rd</sup> to discuss program alternatives, including whether this program would be a regionally discretionary program or if it would be a return-to-source program run by the counties. The Task Force also discussed options for crediting regional funds back to counties.

#### **Synopsis of Task Force Agreements**

The Task Force reached consensus on four points outlined below:

1. The Regional Bicycle/Pedestrian Program will fund regionally significant projects (projects in the Regional Bike Plan and regional pedestrian projects to be determined).
2. The Task Force members will work together in the future to develop criteria to prioritize projects for funding through the Regional Bicycle/Pedestrian Program.
3. Allocation of program funds should ensure geographic equity over time (see table below).
4. The Task Force would review the project selection and delivery process after one complete cycle of STP/CMAQ funding is complete.

#### **Regional Bicycle/Pedestrian Program Structure**

There are two elements of the program structure that were discussed at greater length with the Task Force and partner agency groups:

1. Program administration
2. Crediting

*Program Administration*

The group generally agreed that, given the relatively small amount of annual funding in the Regional Bike/Ped Program, it should either be administered by the counties or MTC. During subsequent discussions with individual Task Force members and the Partnership, a compromise on program administration was reached as outlined below:

- CMAs will develop prioritized project lists with review from their Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committees (BPAC)
- CMAs priorities would be adhered to up to the 75% county minimum (see below)
- Projects above the identified county minimum will be recommended by an advisory group from the prioritized project lists submitted by CMAs and selected by the Commission
- Counties that offer excess local match to projects would receive higher priority for the discretionary portion of the program and be programmed in early years
- Counties will be allowed to pool STP/CMAQ funds for early project delivery of large projects and still maintain geographic equity

Given the annual amount of funding available, staff recommends that funding in the second and third programming cycles be programmed at the same time, as a single four-year program covering FY 2006 to FY 2009. Partner agencies agreed to a 75% county minimum based on county population for the four-year funding cycle. The following table shows minimum guaranteed funding for each county in the upcoming four-year funding cycle totaling \$32 million.

<b>COUNTY</b>	<b>POP SHARE</b>	<b>4-Year Minimum 75%</b>
ALAMEDA	21%	\$ 5,107,755
CONTRA COSTA	14%	\$ 3,356,779
MARIN	4%	\$ 874,874
NAPA	2%	\$ 439,682
SANTA CLARA	25%	\$ 5,952,752
SAN FRANCISCO	11%	\$ 2,747,973
SAN MATEO	10%	\$ 2,501,837
SOLANO	6%	\$ 1,395,835
SONOMA	7%	\$ 1,622,513
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>\$ 24,00,000</b>
REGIONAL		\$ 8,000,000
<b>Total Four-Year Programming</b>		<b>\$ 32,000,000</b>

Counties would be guaranteed 100% of their county share based on population over a 12-year programming period (two federal authorization periods). This would allow more regional programming flexibility and still guarantee counties their population share over time. Attachment 1 includes a table of additional bicycle and pedestrian funds available over the span of *Transportation 2030*. The vast majority of these other funds feature a return-to-source guarantee for each county.

*Crediting*

After two Task Force meetings and subsequent partner agency discussions, consensus was not reached on an approach to crediting. At March's Planning and Operations Committee meeting, several Commissioners indicated they did not support the swapping of STP/CMAQ funds away from the Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Program. Based on the divergence of views, staff proposes two options for this Committee's consideration:

1. No Credit Option: Counties offering sales tax funds as a larger proportion of total project cost would be given higher priority and would be able to construct more bicycle and pedestrian projects in their county. This alternative allows counties to leverage Regional Bicycle/Pedestrian Program funds and deliver more projects in a shorter amount of time. The advocacy community supports this alternative.
2. Credit Option: Counties that commit 3% or more to bicycle and pedestrian needs in transportation sales tax programs would be eligible to swap a portion of their 75% guaranteed minimum of Regional Bicycle/Pedestrian Program STP/CMAQ funds. Sales tax dollars programmed to eligible Regional Bicycle or Pedestrian projects could be swapped for STP/CMAQ funds for other eligible transportation projects at the CMA's discretion. The Partnership Board supports this option and
3. recommends a sliding scale that ties the amount of the swap to a county's sales tax expenditure plan set-aside for bicycle and pedestrian needs as outlined below:

<b>Sales Tax Set-aside to Bicycle &amp; Pedestrian Projects</b>	<b>Allowable Swap of 75% County Minimum</b>
3%	30%
4%	45%
5%	60%

Attachment 2 outlines the potential impact swapping could have on the Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian program; \$5.5 million of the \$32 million 4-year program could be swapped out based on current and proposed sales tax measures.

**Staff Recommendation**

Staff requests that the Committee recommend that the Commission approve the Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Program policy outlined in this memo and select one of the crediting options. Final actions will be incorporated as part of MTC Resolution No. 3615.

---

Steve Heminger

**Attachment 1**

**T-2030 Plan - Dedicated Bicycle and Pedestrian Fund Sources**  
 (2004\$ in millions)

	<b>BTA</b>	<b>TDA 3</b>	<b>TFCA (regional)</b>	<b>TIP</b>	<b>Sales Tax</b>	<b>Total</b>
Alameda	\$ 9.8	\$ 38.5	\$ 2.7		\$ 85.0	\$ 136.0
Contra Costa	\$ 6.5	\$ 22.3	\$ 1.9	\$ 0.2		\$ 31.0
Marin	\$ 1.6	\$ 6.7	\$ 0.5			\$ 8.8
Napa	\$ 0.9	\$ 3.3	\$ 0.3			\$ 4.5
San Francisco	\$ 5.2	\$ 19.8	\$ 1.1		\$ 163.0	\$ 189.1
San Mateo	\$ 4.7	\$ 19.7	\$ 1.6			\$ 25.9
Santa Clara	\$ 11.4	\$ 51.2	\$ 3.3	\$ 5.7	\$ 1.2	\$ 72.8
Solano	\$ 2.7	\$ 10.2	\$ 0.8			\$ 13.7
Sonoma	\$ 3.1	\$ 11.8	\$ 1.0			\$ 15.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 46.0</b>	<b>\$ 183.5</b>	<b>\$ 13.2</b>		<b>\$ 249.2</b>	<b>\$ 497.8</b>

**BTA** - Bicycle Transportation Account: Assumes population share of statewide program

**TDA3** - TDA Article 3 Bike/Ped program: Projected shares per statute

**TFCA** - Transportation for Clean Air: Assumes historical shares to bikes from regional program (about 5%) apportioned by vehicle registration share

**TIP** - 2003 TIP programming amounts for bike projects from FY 2005 and beyond (includes TEA, STIP)

**Sales Tax** - County transportation sales tax bicycle program apportionments beyond FY 2005;

**Alameda:** Combined funds for bike and pedestrian projects, education and planning with funds split evenly between modes over length of the program. 75% of the funds are returned to local cities on a population basis; 25% of the funds are reserved for for planning and regional projects.

**Santa Clara:** \$12 million in Measure B funds from 1996-2005. \$1.2 million will be programmed during *Transportation 2030* time frame.

**San Francisco:** \$56 million for bicycle circulation and safety. Eligible projects include education, outreach, bicycle parking and lanes and path identified in the city's bicycle plan. \$52 million for pedestrian projects.

**Other Counties:** Other counties, including Contra Costa (1%, or \$20 million), San Mateo (3%, or \$36 million), Marin, Napa (\$10-20 million) and Solano, are developing sales tax measures that may include funding for non-motorized users.

Notes:

- 1) An unknown amount of road funding is routinely spent on bike/ped. projects that are included in larger road rehabilitation and expansion projects.
- 2) Does not include potential T-2030 new investments from STP/CMAQ, TEA, TFCA (local), RTIP

**Attachment 2**

Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Program: Funding over 4-Years

	<u>County Minimum</u>		<b>Bike/Ped Sales Tax</b>	<b>Rate of Swap</b>	<b>Max Swap*</b>
	<b>SHARE</b>	<b>75%</b>			
ALA	21%	\$ 5,107,755	5%	60%	\$3,064,653
COCO	14%	\$ 3,356,779			
MAR	4%	\$ 874,874			
NAP	2%	\$ 439,682			
SC	25%	\$ 5,952,752			
SF	11%	\$ 2,747,973	5%	60%	\$1,648,784
SM (proposed)	10%	\$ 2,501,837	3%	30%	\$750,551
SOL	6%	\$ 1,395,835			
SON	7%	\$ 1,622,513			
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>\$24,000,000</b>			<b>\$5,463,988</b>
REGIONAL		\$ 8,000,000			
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$32,000,000</b>			<b>\$5,463,988 (17%)</b>

\*Swap assumes 30% swap for 3% sales tax allocation to bike/ped, 40% for 4% counties, and 50% for 5% counties based on current (Alameda and San Francisco) and proposed (San Mateo) sales tax measures.