



## Planning Advisory Committee

### Directors

Robert Jehn, Chair  
Cloverdale

Mike Kerns, V. Chair  
Sonoma County

Steve Allen  
Windsor

Bob Blanchard  
Santa Rosa

Stanley Cohen  
Sonoma

Patricia Gilardi  
Cotati

Mike Healy  
Petaluma

Linda Kelley  
Sebastopol

Paul Kelley  
Sonoma County

Jake Mackenzie  
Rohnert Park

Mike Reilly  
Sonoma County

Lisa Schaffner  
Healdsburg

## AGENDA

**Thursday, January 19, 2006**

9:00am – 11:00 am  
Sonoma County Transportation Authority  
520 Mendocino Ave., Suite 240  
Santa Rosa, CA 95401

- 
- I. Introductions and public comment on items not on agenda
  - II. Consent Items – DISCUSSION/ACTION
    - A. Approval of Minutes\*
  - III. Reports – INFORMATION/DISCUSSION
    - A. SCTA\*
    - B. Members
    - C. MTC – James Corless will discuss the SMART Corridor Planning Study
  - IV. TLC Application process\*
  - V. SMART Draft EIR
  - VI. Community Based Transportation Plan\*
  - VII. Adjourn – ACTION

\* Attachments included

---

Suzanne Wilford  
Executive Director

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

Staff: Janet Spilman 707-565-5373  
jspilman@sctainfo.org

The next **SCTA** meeting will be held **February 6, 2006**  
The next **PAC** meeting will be held **February 16, 2006**

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

Planning Advisory Committee  
Technical Advisory Committee

**MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETING**

**Thursday November 10, 2005**

**ATTENDEES**

Nancy Adams	City of Santa Rosa
Ron Bendorff	City of Rohnert Park
John Bonnoitt	City of Sonoma
Greg Carr	County of Sonoma PRMD
Peter Chamberlin	Town of Windsor
Fabian Favila	City of Santa Rosa
Wayne Goldberg	City of Santa Rosa
Gary Helfrich	County of Sonoma PRMD
Michael Ivory	City of Santa Rosa
Sue Kelly	City of Sebastopol
Mike Moore	City of Petaluma
John Nemeth	SMART
Richard Spitler	City of Healdsburg
Eydie Tacata	City of Rohnert Park
David Woltering	City of Cotati

SCTA Staff Present: Chris Barney, Nina Donofrio, Guy Preston, Janet Spilman, Suzanne Wilford

I. Introductions and public comment on items not on agenda:

Introductions were made. There were no public comments.

II. Consent Items – DISCUSSION/ACTION:

A. Approval of the Agenda

The agenda was approved as submitted.

B. Approval of Minutes:

The minutes were approved as submitted.

III. Reports – INFORMATION/DISCUSSION:

A. SMART

Ms. Spilman reported that the EIR will be released and printed at the next SMART Board Meeting next week, on November 16.

B. SCTA

Ms. Spilman had no new activity to report.

### C. Members

Peter Chamberlin of the Town of Windsor reported that they are now allowing a housing density of 33 units per acre. This is double the prior density, and has resulted in 400 extra units downtown, and in planning for Windsor's first underground parking facility. Mr. Chamberlin noted that they are considering a parking ratio of one space per unit, for low income housing, and one and one-half spaces for senior housing. Downtown parking is problematic, and the under parking situation could become significant. Podium parking is also under discussion.

### IV. Determination of Local TLC Criteria – DISCUSSION/ACTION

Ms. Spilman announced that the TLC program has been implemented by the MTC and noted that the criteria they updated last year is comprehensive. They are allowing this criteria to be augmented, but are not allowing the essential program content to be changed. Most counties are choosing to accept the TLC guidelines as presented. Ms. Spilman noted that she has gathered the criteria that MTC has created under "Suggested SCTA TLC Criteria" and added issues identified by the staff. She stated that, with regard to the HIP Program, she had made no changes or additions to their criteria, and had no suggestions. Density thresholds, transit headways, and system transit must be met, all of which are fairly prohibitive for Sonoma County. Application will be through the SCTA.

The MTC requires that applicants for TLC/HIP funding demonstrate their knowledge of these programs. Applications are subject to federal funding guidelines.

Ms. Spilman presented a summary of TLC available funding, showing funding from three sources – SCTA TE, CMAQ, and MTC TE, for a total of \$4 million for TLC in three years. The MTC is encouraging the SCTA to program these funds this coming year, all at once, for the three-year period of fiscal year 2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09.

Ms. Spilman explained that the TLC is Transportation for Livable Communities. The types of projects eligible for this funding are only capital projects, and include transit-oriented development, and walkable communities. Some examples of these projects in Sonoma County include bike paths, the State Park in Sebastopol, and the underpass at Third Street, as well as at Railroad Square.

Ms. Spilman opened the discussion to questions by the Committee. In response to Mr. Chamberlin's inquiry, she confirmed that all basic eligibility criteria must be met for each project for this program. She cited issues with regard to this program. One of these is grant size. The recommended grant size is \$150,000 to \$2 million per project. There is a minimum grant recommendation because it becomes less effective for less than \$150,000. Mr. Chamberlin recommended that jurisdictions be as flexible as possible. Ms. Spilman concurred; however, she noted that there are dangers in having a project that is too small in size – she recommended having different amounts for different kinds of projects; \$200,000 for project development, \$400,000 for project right-of-way and construction, and an upper limit of \$1 million.

Mr. Goldberg asked how the failed project money found its way to Sonoma County. Ms. Spilman responded that this is the regional program.

Sue Kelly of the City of Sebastopol said she would view this as a portion of planning to leverage Measure M funding for the Street Smart project, and would argue for the top level of the funding range. She noted that she would not consider asking for less than \$200,000.

In response to Mr. Goldberg's observation of the needs of smaller communities, Ms. Spilman

noted that the SCTA recognizes this need. She observed that a \$75,000 grant is not always cost effective, given the effort involved.

John Bonnoitt stated that a \$150,000 grant would be the smallest requested. Mr. Goldberg asked whether there were some way to keep some portion of the available funding available for smaller communities. Suzanne Wilford suggested using a scoring system based on the regional nature of the project. Discussion followed regarding the distribution of grants based on size of the project and region, and upper grant limit. Ms. Kelly suggested the formation of a subcommittee. Mr. Bonnoitt noted that it is doubtful that any of the smaller cities would have large projects; most of these would be simple projects. Mr. Carr voiced concern regarding the upper end of this grant range; he noted that he would not want to have to refuse a \$2 million project. Ms. Spilman responded that a \$2 million project would tie up funding for two years. Ms. Spilman polled the Committee to identify any projects that would be over \$1 million in size. David Woltering of the City of Cotati reported that Cotati is working on a downtown plan, to make this area more walkable. This would include traffic calming, bicycle lanes, and bus pullouts. He anticipates this project to be \$1 million or more in size.

Ms. Wilford noted that part of the next issue is to create a list of eligible projects. The object is to generate a longer list than what there is funding for. In light of this, she recommended expanding and being more flexible in what projects are allowed. Project sponsors would present proposals with the understanding that there is \$4 million available, and if they are proposing a \$2 million project and are required to have that full amount in order to go forward, it may be a riskier project.

Ms. Spilman reported that the next issue to be addressed is whether the SCTA should limit local TLC funding to TOD projects, and whether any projects are planned that would be within ¼ mile of a bus stop or ½ mile of a railroad station.

Gregg Carr of the Sonoma County PRMD asked if this had to be limited to TOD projects and noted that projects exist that would benefit transit-oriented development – an example of this is a possible project for pedestrian-friendly traffic diversion in Penngrove. He said that the objective should be to promote forms of transportation other than the automobile, and that there should be no limitations other than what is necessary, to promote these projects.

Nancy Adams of the City of Santa Rosa suggested that this presents an opportunity for a project sponsor to get bonuses if they are in a TOD area. The Committee concurred with this idea.

Ms. Spilman confirmed with the Committee that project criteria would be for projects to be located within ½ mile of a railroad station and ¼ mile of a bus stop.

Ms. Spilman next addressed the Housing Incentive Program (HIP) issue and reviewed the program criteria. Discussion followed regarding the various criteria – among these, that a project be within a certain density (20 units per acre) and must be within ½ mile of a railroad station or ¼ mile of a bus stop. The consensus was that this program be kept open.

Ms. Spilman then asked if the SCTA should compile a list of projects that would probably exceed the funding amount and then, as funding becomes available, projects would be funded, based on a scoring process. She also asked for feedback as to whether the funding should be tied to Measure M (i.e.; jurisdictions receive more points if the project is a Measure M project). Mr. Moore recommended treating it as an extra credit project. Ms. Kelly noted that the only difficulty with this is that the Measure M funds are not coming to all sponsors at the same time. Ms. Spilman suggested that consideration might be given to those projects that are

already federalized. She stated that the SCTA would make every effort to make the application procedure as simple as possible. She anticipates a quick turnaround, and then will have the criteria emailed so that these can be considered at another meeting in the near future (perhaps the next PAC meeting).

She asked if any of the Committee members had any projects in mind that would be applicable to this program. Mr. Moore responded that an issue exists with a development near Highway 101 where there is an old pedestrian walkway. Discussions are taking place regarding replacing this walkway.

Mr. Woltering added that Cotati is currently working on a downtown specific plan, which would include installing roundabouts, bus stops, and bike paths. They also have a specific plan area in conjunction with their railroad station that would also provide opportunities. Ms. Adams reported that the City of Santa Rosa has some possible projects, which include a pedestrian bridge and Courthouse Square.

Ron Bendorff of the City of Rohnert Park reported that they are trying to build the downtown and make streetscape improvements and plaza improvement.

Ms. Spilman asked if any Committee members might be considering applying for the first cycle funding. She said she would draft two documents: (1) a comprehensive document that would include all the criteria; and (2) a briefer document that would include those issues the Committee has agreed to. She indicated she would put together a call for projects and anticipates a quick turnaround for this, to be discussed at the next regularly scheduled PAC meeting on December 15, 2005.

Ms. Kelly recommended the appointment of a scoring committee of no more than six members. Discussion ensued regarding how this committee would be formed. Mr. Carr suggested having committee members who are not involved in the application process (i.e., who would not be allowed to work on their own project). Ms. Spilman announced that the call for projects would be mid-December; and that all applications would be due late January, with scoring to be completed in February (to go to the committees to be evaluated by PAC and TAC), and that this would then go to the SCTA Board in March.

#### V. Modeling Update – DISCUSSION

Chris Barney of the SCTA provided an update of progress on project models. He announced that a Modeling Subcommittee would be meeting on a quarterly basis to discuss these issues. They will be examining the best way of getting the data and what sorts of products should be purchased. They are looking at a three-year update of published results, and are working on updating the data. He noted the importance of support from various organizations and the Committee in order to produce the best results. What is of primary interest is land use data. He will be continuing to work with the Committee on the best way of getting this data. He expressed the need to be informed of the location of roads that may have regional significance and where future projects are anticipated to occur. He noted that traffic count data can be used to calibrate modeling. Mr. Carr observed that mixed use and wineries need to be addressed in terms of projecting what would be taking place in these areas. Richard Spittler of the City of Healdsburg inquired as to whether the modeling is relevant to what is taking place internally in Healdsburg. Ms. Spilman suggested that this might be a good opportunity for Mr. Barney to visit Healdsburg and review their maps.

#### VI. Regional Mitigation Fee – Rohnert Park has requested LAFCO that the SCTA reopen discussion of a regional transportation fee mitigation program.

Mr. Bendorff reported that the City of Rohnert Park is implementing their General Plan which was approved in 2000. 4,500 units are shown in this Plan – the Plan commits the City to help promote and fund regional traffic improvements to meet the needs created by these and other developments. EIR's are in process and a regional traffic fee is still not in place. A placeholder fee has been implemented as part of the development agreement for one EIR that is currently in process, which is intended to address what they think some of these improvements are on a fair-share basis. At this time, they still do not know what regional transportation fees are, what the fair share would be to the various City developments, etc., and are requesting help in determining this. A presentation was made by City staff to LAFCO (Local Agency Formation Commission) on existing specific plan areas. LAFCO determined that the SCTA would be the logical facilitator in this issue. Discussion followed regarding the process of determining fare share for transit and road improvements. It was noted that if regional transportation is a regional problem in that it is generated by certain types of development, a better way to share funding and get those improvements needs to be identified. Mr. Goldberg noted that a nexus study would identify projects and distribution of responsibility, and that this would be the first step to take. Mr. Moore stated that the SCTA could take the lead in initiating the nexus study, and that this would be an easy tie-in with the MTC. Mr. Goldberg suggested that the SCTA consider more expansive use of development agreements.

The following items are to be continued to the next meeting:

- VII. MTC – Regional Transportation Plan process evaluation
- VIII. Community Based Transportation Plan – Scope of Work
- IX. Adjourn

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:50 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Nina Donofrio



## Staff Report

**To:** Planning Advisory Committee

**From:** Janet Spilman, Deputy Director, Planning and Public Outreach

**Re:** Item IIIA: SCTA Committee Reports

**Date:** January 19, 2006

### **Countywide Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee (CBPAC)**

The CBPAC met last week (January 10)

Key task for the committee is programming TDA Article 3 funding to bicycle and pedestrian projects. The CBPAC also received information about the TLC and TFCA programs, that are programmed by other committees.

The CBPAC also addressed the update to the Countywide Bicycle Plan – now the Countywide Bicycle & Pedestrian Plan. Several jurisdictions including the County and the City of Santa Rosa are beginning the updates to their Plans. Staff will begin the process of updating the maps. It has yet to be decided whether to delay the completion of the Plan so that input from the jurisdictions is most current.

Timing on the production of the CBP Plan is important because it precedes the Comprehensive Transportation Plan and a delay would affect its production schedule.

### **Transit/Paratransit Coordinating Committee (TPCC)**

The TPCC met Tuesday, January 17 to discuss the programming of FTA Section 5310, the upcoming Coordinated Claim and update of the Committees Bylaws.

### **Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)**

The TAC meets next Thursday, January 26. The agenda includes updates of the Hwy 101 and other Caltrans projects, the DEIR of the Hwy 101 – Santa Rosa to Windsor project, Measure M information, DBE New Requirements and changes in the programming of TFCA.

### **Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC)**

On the agenda for the next CAC meeting on Monday January 30 are the following Measure M updates, Caltrans information, update on the modeling program, the Community Based Transportation Plan and the 2006 Legislative Agenda.

The SCTA meets again Monday February 6.



## Staff Report

**To:** Planning Advisory Committee  
**From:** Janet Spilman, Deputy Director, Planning and Public Outreach  
**Re:** TLC local program  
**Date:** January 19, 2006

**Issue:**

What is the status of the Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) County program?

**Background:**

MTC has created programs to implement specific policy areas. The TLC program has historically (since its inception in 1997) directed its funding toward “Smart Growth’ type projects. In Sonoma County these capital projects have included enhancements at Railroad Square, Street Smart Sebastopol, Pedestrian linkages on Third Street in Santa Rosa, and the Cloverdale Boulevard Redesign project. This program has traditionally been programmed by MTC. The Housing Incentive Program (HIP) is a category of TLC that focuses on transportation projects integrated into high density housing (e.g. pedestrian and bicycle facilities that connect the housing project to adjacent land uses and transit; improved sidewalks and crosswalk linking the housing to a nearby community facility such as a school or a public park; or streetscape improvements that support increased pedestrian, bicycle, and transit activities and safety).

Since the program was developed in 1998 MTC has funded several capital projects in Sonoma County, including Street Smart Sebastopol, Third Street Connection in Santa Rosa, and Railroad Square improvements in Santa Rosa. Attached is a list of projects funded through TLC.

For the first time, in addition to the regional component, TLC will be programmed locally by the SCTA. TLC funds may be used for Capital TLC or HIP projects.

A total of \$4,293,000 is available to program for the 3-year cycle 06/07 – 08/09.

FY06-07	FY 07-08	FY 08-09
\$937,000	\$1,598,000	\$1,758,000

The fund sources for this program are Transportation Enhancement (TE) funds and Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) funds. Use of these funds must be consistent with MTC’s Guiding Principles for County TLC Programs (attached), and each fund source’s eligibility requirements. In addition the SCTA TAC has recommended that special consideration be given to applications with the following features:

- Projects that are within ½ mile of a SMART station site or within ¼ mile of a bus stop
- Measure M projects
- Projects with a larger match.

The TAC has agreed that in an attempt to create a list of eligible projects, applications will be accepted for all grant amounts. As a practical matter, applicants are advised to keep in mind the yearly and overall allocation of funds. A federal local match of 11.5 percent of the total TLC project cost is required. Grant recipients will be required to take the TLC capital project through the federal-aid process with Caltrans Local Assistance, and obligate, or commit, the federal funds by the regional obligation deadline specified by MTC. In addition, grant recipients will be required to attend a training workshop on project implementation and the federal-aid process.

**Next steps:**

The SCTA approved the criteria as presented. The Call for Project was released on January 11, 2006. The TAC agreed to the following schedule, which is tight if funds are to be programmed in the first cycle.

Review Team will be assembled in January.

Project applications are due February 9.

Applications are delivered to Review Team on February 13.

February 16 - Review Team scores projects.

February 23 - TAC reviews list

March 13 - SCTA approves list

Week of March 13 - Funding agreements are finalized with project sponsors.

## TLC Capital projects in Sonoma County

Sponsor(s)	Project Title	Project Description	TLC Funds
City of Santa Rosa, CityVision 1999	Urban Design & Vision - Phase I Downtown Pedestrian Linkage (Downtown Santa Rosa)	Creates a pedestrian connection between the east and west sides of downtown Santa Rosa and establishes a food/wine and cultural arts market at the Santa Rosa Plaza. Project elements include improved crossings under Highway 101 and downtown intersections.	\$500,000
City of Santa Rosa, CityVision 1999	Downtown Santa Rosa Urban Design and Vision - Phase II Pedestrian Linkages	Provides pedestrian linkages between east and west downtown and Historic Commercial/Residential Districts, social service centers and Market District. TLC funding for Phase II would focus on Wilson Street between 3rd and 6th Streets.	\$400,000
City of Cloverdale 1999	Cloverdale Boulevard Redesign Project	Streetscape improvements and narrowing of Cloverdale Boulevard in downtown to reduce the number of traffic lanes, and provide bicycle lanes and wider sidewalks.	\$1,000,000
City of Sebastopol, Sonoma County Transit 2001	Street Smart Sebastopol*	Implements bike and pedestrian safety improvements along Main Street and within the downtown core, which includes several intersection and crosswalk improvements (including bulbouts, street lighting, and possibly embedded crosswalk flashing lights and refuge island), sidewalk gap closures, pedestrian safety improvements in vicinity of the recently built Downtown Plaza, transit shelters, new bike lanes on Gravenstein Highway South and on South Main Street, bike route signage and detector loops, and signal timing revisions for pedestrians.	\$500,000
City of Petaluma/Eden Housing Inc. 2004	Downtown River Apts Riverwalk and Streetscape Improvements		\$358,000
		Total TLC Capital funding for Sonoma County 1999-2005	\$2,758,000



## Staff Report

**To:** Planning Advisory Committee (PAC)  
**From:** Janet Spilman  
**Re:** **ITEM VI:** Community Based Transportation Plan  
**Date:** January 19, 2006

---

### **Issue:**

What is the status of the Community Based Transportation Plan?

### **Background:**

In October the SCTA directed staff to engage in a contractual agreement with MTC to draft a Community Based Transportation Plan for the Roseland Area in Sonoma County.

The CBTP program is designed to study the transportation challenges of residents of low-income and minority communities. The process requires significant public outreach with the participation of residents, groups and agencies that serve these communities, including transportation agencies, such as transit operators, SCTA and MTC. This is intended to result in locally identified transportation needs and solutions. Ideally, solutions will be funded through the Lifeline Transportation Program that the SCTA agreed to administer.

MTC has set aside \$55,000 in Transportation Development Act funds toward a consultant to study the Roseland area through the CBTP process with oversight by the SCTA.

The full scope of work can be found in the RFP attached, but is summarized as:

- Task 1: Determine Budget and schedule
- Task 2: Initiate Collaborative Planning Process
- Task 3: Summarize transit gaps in the Roseland Area
- Task 4: Establish community outreach strategy
- Task 5: Conduct community outreach to prioritize community-identified transportation gaps. Identify solutions to close gaps.
- Task 6: Evaluate feasibility of implementing proposed solutions and recommend implementation strategies
- Task 7: Prepare final Community-Based Transportation Plan

Since approval of the contract, the RFP was released December 13 and staff has received comments and questions from several consultants. Copies of the RFP will be handed out at the meeting and are available online at the SCTA website [www.sctainfo.org](http://www.sctainfo.org). Proposals are due on January 18. By the time of this meeting staff will have more information. Interviews will commence the last week of January and the selected firm will be recommended to the Board in February. At that point staff will seek authority to negotiate a contract from the Board in March.

### **Next Steps:**

Consultants will be interviewed on January 30 with final selection occurring during the week of February 6, and Board approval of a contract in March.