



Directors

Robert Jehn, Chair
Cloverdale

Mike Kerns, V. Chair
Sonoma County

Bob Blanchard
Santa Rosa

Stanley Cohen
Sonoma

Pat Gilardi
Cotati

Mike Harris
Petaluma

Paul Kelley
Sonoma County

Jake Mackenzie
Rohnert Park

Warin Parker
Windsor

Sam Pierce
Sebastopol

Mike Reilly
Sonoma County

Lisa Schaffner
Healdsburg

Planning Advisory Committee

Monday, September 17 - Special Meeting

9:30 – 11:00

SCTA conference room – 490 Mendocino Avenue, #206, Santa Rosa

- I. Introductions & Public Comment
- II. Consent
 - a. Approval of Minutes of June 4, 2007 ACTION
 - b. Approval of the Agenda ACTION
- III. FOCUS –Priority Development Areas – update DISCUSSION
- IV. SCTA Bicycle/Pedestrian Master Plan*
- V. Comprehensive Transportation Plan update* DISCUSSION/ACTION
- VI. Regional Traffic Mitigation fee update* DISCUSSION/ACTION
- VII. Announcements
- VIII. Adjournment

* materials attached

Suzanne Smith
Executive Director

490 Mendocino Avenue
Suite 206
Santa Rosa, CA 95401
PH: 707-565-5373
FAX: 707-565-5370

The next SCTA meeting will be held October 8, 2007

The next **PAC** will be held **October 29, 2007**

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

The agenda packet is available online at www.sctainfo.org

Planning Advisory Committee

MINUTES OF MEETING

Monday, June 4, 2007

ATTENDEES

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Peter Chamberlin | Town of Windsor |
| James Corless | Metropolitan Transportation Commission |
| Gary Helfrich | PRMD |
| Mike Moore | City of Petaluma |
| Rick Tooker | City of Healdsburg |
| Alan Zahradnik | Golden Gate Bridge Highway & Transportation District |

SCTA Staff Present: Chris Barney, Nina Donofrio, Lynne March, Janet Spilman

I. **Introductions & Public Comment**

Introductions were made.

II. **Consent**

Approval of Minutes of April 30, 2007 ACTION

- A. This item is deferred to the next meeting, as a quorum was not present to approve the meeting minutes of April 30, 2007.
- B. Approval of the Agenda ACTION

Approved as submitted.

III. **FOCUS –Priority Development Areas – James Corless (MTC) DISCUSSION/ACTION:**

James Corless of MTC presented a memo from the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) to the Joint Policy Committee regarding the Priority Development Area Evaluative Criteria and Priority Conservation Area Adoption Process, inviting applications for priority development area designation under the FOCUS program. He explained that this represents an effort to adopt a Smart growth strategy for the region. A previous iteration of this effort, called Smart Growth Vision, which was completed in 2002, did not result in a regional strategy with input from local government. Approximately 18 months ago, a grant was received from Caltrans to update and re-think a Smart growth strategy for the region.

Mr. Corless noted that many changes have taken place in the region, and one significant change was the many local efforts related to Smart growth, and looking at development along the Smart corridor. Technical initial modeling exercises were conducted approximately 9 or 10 months ago. Mr. Corless observed that because of the many local efforts taking place the approach taken for this study was to begin with an application process by the jurisdictions.

Another reason for this procedure was that, with the many propositions (particularly 1C) there are a number of new Transit Oriented Development and in-fill accounts, and grants.

Mr. Corless explained that this process is in two parts. The first part is the application process itself. Applications are due June 29. Three criteria have been established. These

are: (1) the proposed priority development area must be within an existing community, not a Greenfield development; (2) it must be near existing or planned fixed transit (or served by comparable bus service); and (3) the area must be planned, or must be planning, for more housing (e.g., downtown Petaluma or Santa Rosa, the 101 SMART corridor rail station areas). The MTC is looking for geographically defined areas that meet the three criteria outlined above.

A “planned area” refers to an area where a good deal of planning has been done below the General Plan level. Other areas under these criteria include those for which planning is anticipated, and for which funds are being sought to do a specific plan.

These applications will be reviewed by regional staff (MTC and ABAG), and adopted, with identification of incentives, hopefully by October. It is hoped to use the plan to obtain State bond funds, as well as Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), and Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) programs. Those funds would be directed from the regional programs into the PDA’s. These are locally designated areas where there is local consensus for in-fill and TOD should be planned.

The first phase, identifying these areas, is critical in the process of establishing PDA’s. Mr. Corless also noted that the reverse component to PDA is that of establishing priority conservation areas, and access to open space. He invited questions from the Committee.

Rick Tooker of the City of Healdsburg observed that for smaller communities, such as Healdsburg, this process is not as helpful as they would like it to be. Although Healdsburg has properties around transit areas, it has very limited housing planned (no more than 30 units per year) and, realistically, this is not likely to be a viable option for their jurisdiction. Mr. Corless recommended that Healdsburg put in a “place holder” as a priority development area in order to have the option in the future to be part of this process if they choose to do so. He noted that this will be amended and change over time, and that they may be interested in being included in this process in the future. He said that in order to be eligible for State and regional level incentives, they must be included in this first phase, although there will be opportunities again in the future.

Mike Moore cited concerns with parking structure financing as part of downtown development during the transition of trying to reduce reliance on automobiles. He also reported that other regions have the same difficulty, as he learned from attending a transportation conference held in Portland, Oregon – other regions want to encourage this type of development, but are having difficulty with financing of parking structures for this type of development. He suggested the possibility of establishing a structured parking bond pool as a resource at the regional level.

Mr. Corless acknowledged that this is a common issue heard frequently by MTC, and that this would be noted.

In response to Peter Chamberlin’s questions, Mr. Corless confirmed that there will be other opportunities in a later cycle (to be determined), but that putting in an application now would ensure a place in the future in this program if they change their mind.

IV. SCTA - SCTA Bicycle/Pedestrian Master Plan*

Lynne March announced a series of evening public meetings regarding this plan, to be held as follows:

Windsor: September 18 at the Huerta Gym

Cotati: September 20 at in the Cotati Room at Civic Center

Sonoma: September 26 at the Sonoma Community Center

Sebastopol: September 27 at the Sebastopol Veterans Building, in the Fireside Room

These meetings will likely be held at 6:30 p.m. to 9:00 p.m., but this is not yet confirmed.

V. Comprehensive Transportation Plan update* DISCUSSION/ACTION

Mr. Moore asked if there would be a component of the Plan that would address greenhouse gas emissions.

Ms. Spilman responded in the affirmative, adding that this is a primary concern of the Steering Committee and, as noted in the staff report on this item, this is one of the five goals identified to be addressed. It is not known as of yet how these would be measured.

Mr. Chamberlin noted that Windsor is small and is accommodating too many vehicles for its size; it is therefore difficult to argue that this would not impact greenhouse gas emissions.

Mr. Moore concurred and voiced these same concerns. He added that the difficulty is not just a matter of keeping greenhouse gas emissions at a static level, and preventing their increase, but reducing them to 1990 levels.

Suzanne Smith stated that transportation planners recognize and can identify the issue; the real change would have to come from getting people to change their behavior. No precedent has been set and there are no established guidelines or standards.

Gary Helfrich acknowledged that this is a primary issue in updating the General Plan, and has generated the most comment of all issues being addressed.

Mr. Chamberlin reported that he had attended a conference which concluded that it would be up to local governments and regions to establish standards and guidelines for reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

Mr. Helfrich added that if local agencies do not establish a set of guidelines or standards this would be decided at the court level, and that it is important to establish some type of threshold locally.

Mr. Chamberlin reported that Windsor has adopted a "green" building program, but the transportation component is difficult to address, as Windsor does not have mass transit, and is not likely to have it in the future. The underlying issue is how behavior can be influenced to get the public to use alternate forms of transportation.

Mr. Moore concurred, acknowledging that Petaluma faces similar challenges. Capital funding has been going to streets and roads rather than alternative forms of transportation.

Discussion ensued regarding land use as an impact on greenhouse gas emissions, and that part of the issue is to quantify how this affects transportation and the resulting greenhouse gas emissions. Mr. Helfrich stated that he would be happy to share ideas from the PRMD in their update of the General Plan. Mr. Moore asked if the CTP could serve this purpose, and provide cities with a base to work from in establishing their guidelines for reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.

Alan Zahradnik of the Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District reported that he had recently attended a local workshop on this issue, and stated that the public must be convinced to change their behavior, and be educated to consider other forms of transportation.

Ms. Spilman confirmed that this challenge is being addressed in the CTP. The Steering Committee suggested that transit be included explicitly in the CTP. The issue of greenhouse gas emissions is a major priority.

Ms. Spilman then explained that the CTP project has been assigned into four segments. These are (1) Model enhancement (to include alternative transportation in mode split); (2) public participation; (3) content development; and (4) environmental review. The contract with Dowling Associates has been amended. Requests for Proposals for public participation and for the content development have been released, and a pre-submittal meeting was held May 31. Proposals are due June 11 and 12, respectively. Ms. Spilman invited volunteers to assist in reviewing proposals and to participate in the interviews, which will be held June 18 through June 22.

In response to questioning about addressing greenhouse gas emissions in the proposals, Ms. Spilman responded that staff has already provided a document showing the goals. She noted that this is anticipated to be a hands-on process by the SCTA.

Ms. Smith confirmed that this was approved by the Board, and will be going out for public comment.

VI. Regional Traffic Mitigation fee – methodologies* DISCUSSION/ACTION

Ms. Spilman reported that this is an item that has come before the Committee routinely for the past few years. The most recent case addressing this arose from the City of Rohnert Park's annexation of the University District property for development.

The Rohnert Park City Council agreed to implement a regional traffic mitigation fee, with the SCTA to act as custodian of the fees. The Board asked staff to pursue this issue and return with some options and methodologies for establishing a regional traffic mitigation fee program.

Ms. Spilman summarized previous attempts to draft and implement this type of program. This was attempted five years ago, prior to Measure M being in place.

Ms. Spilman reported that Chris Barney has drafted a few options. Staff is seeking input from the Committee.

Mr. Chamberlin confirmed with Ms. Spilman that the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) implemented this as a condition of Rohnert Park's annexation request.

Ms. Spilman also noted that Rohnert Park, LAFCO, and the County have specific projects in mind (e.g. Penngrove) for this program.

Mr. Helfrich reported that extensive detail, analysis, and origin and destination studies have been completed. He also confirmed with Mr. Chamberlin that fees would be paid by developers. They would pay the City.

Ms. Spilman added that the SCTA was made a party to the Agreement as per LAFCO. Mr. Helfrich observed that prior to being submitted to LAFCO, there was good collaboration from the County and Rohnert Park.

Ms. Spilman reported that there has been a good deal of interest in this issue over the years. The Board now wishes to look at options and their impacts.

Mr. Moore suggested the possibility of using these funds to respond to the issue of greenhouse gas emissions. He felt that if funding was for this purpose, this program may be more acceptable to various jurisdictions. Mr. Chamberlin concurred.

Mr. Helfrich added that part of this issue deals with the effect each jurisdiction has on another; e.g., the University District will be using County roads. He suggested the possibility of establishing a threshold for the size of a particular project, and its regional impact, and establish fees accordingly.

Discussion continued regarding establishing equitable thresholds for growth and project size, as well as methods for funding mitigation of traffic and reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Among suggestions were to establish a unit-by-unit fee. Ms. Smith observed that the County does not grow enough to be able to generate sufficient fees.

Mr. Barney explained that the process followed by other jurisdictions has been to draft a list of congestion mitigation projects, and to determine a cost for this project list. A determination would then be made as to how costs are shared by the developers and jurisdictions. Total project costs, projected new units to be built, and fees for square footage of retail space would be assessed. Determination would be made as to the methodology to be used in evaluation of impact fees; e.g., based on the number of units developed, vehicle miles traveled (trips generated), or how much growth potential each jurisdictional general plan permits.. These are examples of starting points for establishing an equitable fee program.

Ms. Spilman thanked the Committee for their input, noting that analysis conducted for the CTP and the policy connected with it will assist in addressing this issue.

VII. Announcements

There were no further announcements.

VIII. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:25 p.m.

Staff Report

To: Planning Advisory Committee (PAC)

From: Lynne March, Transportation Planner

Re: *SCTA Countywide Bicycle & Pedestrian Master Plan*

Date: September 17, 2007

Status Report: The *SCTA Countywide Bicycle & Pedestrian Master Plan* is being advised by the Countywide Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee (CBPAC). The planning effort has been underway since late November. W-Trans, the consultant, has been gathering data from all participating jurisdictions and meetings have been held with all.

W-Trans is working with SCTA to map the resulting updates for bicycle and pedestrian facilities. One objective for the coordinated effort has been to identify a countywide bicycle network of through routes in Sonoma County. A safety analysis has also been completed.

Existing plans' goals, objectives and policies have been reviewed. The intent for the new plan is the setting of a mutually-agreed upon high-level vision, goal and objectives for the countywide plan; as well as the setting of objectives and policies for the individual jurisdictional plans.

Other SCTA committee members were both invited to the CBPAC and invited to submit comments to the CBPAC pertaining to the high-level vision, goal and objectives. The Steering Committee formed from the CBPAC is to make recommendations regarding the draft plan, because its members are charged with bringing forth the consensus recommendations of the agency they represent. This recommendation is envisioned as reflecting the collaborative process utilized in synthesizing the inputs from multiple sources.

Following are the vision, goal and objectives:

VISION: In Sonoma County bicycling and walking are:

- Important to residents' quality of life
- Integral parts of an interconnected transportation system
- Safe and convenient for all user groups
- Viable means of reaching desired destinations
- Routinely accommodated
- Encouraged by easy connections to transit
- Fostered by education and enforcement
- Advanced by actions of government, schools and the private sector
- Promoted as tourism and recreation attractions
- Mode choices that contribute to personal health
- Options that reduce traffic congestion and greenhouse gas emissions

GOAL:

- To develop and maintain a comprehensive countywide non-motorized transportation system that includes projects, programs, and policies, which work together to provide safe and efficient opportunities for bicyclists and pedestrians to access public transportation, school, work, shopping, services, recreation and residences.

OBJECTIVES:

Objective 1.0: The Countywide Non-Motorized Network*

Establish a comprehensive countywide non-motorized transportation system.

Objective 2.0: Design

Utilize accepted design standards and “best practices” for the development of bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

Objective 3.0: Multimodal Integration

Develop and enhance opportunities for bicyclists and pedestrians to easily access public transit.

Objective 4.0: Comprehensive Support Facilities

Encourage the development of comprehensive support facilities for walking and bicycling.

Objective 5.0: Education and Promotion

Develop programs and public outreach materials to promote bicycle and pedestrian safety and the positive benefits of non-motorized transportation.

Objective 6.0: Safety and Security

Create countywide pedestrian and bicycle networks that are, and are perceived to be, safe and secure.

Objective 7.0: Land Use

Encourage smart growth land use strategies by planning, designing and constructing new development to celebrate and invite walking and bicycling.

Objective 8.0: Planning

Continue to support non-motorized efforts with ongoing planning.

Objective 9.0: Maintenance

Maintain and/or improve the quality, operation, and integrity of non-motorized infrastructure.

Objective 10.0: Funding

Maximize the amount of funding for bicycle and pedestrian projects and programs throughout Sonoma County, with an emphasis on implementation of this plan.

* The ‘network’ is defined as the physical improvements that establish bicycle and pedestrian routes.

Other project components:

An update will be provided by W-Trans at the CBPAC regarding the status of the remaining tasks. Briefly, these consist of:

- Summarizing existing plans
- Providing legislative background
- Addressing ADA compliance
- Recommendations for data collection
- Documenting funding sources and implementation challenges
- Providing cost estimates for identified projects
- Describing community benefits
- Conducting public workshops

Staff Report

To: Planning Advisory Committee (PAC)

From: Janet Spilman, Deputy Director Planning and Public Outreach

Re: **SCTA Comprehensive Transportation Plan Update**

Date: September 17, 2007

Issue:

What is the status of the SCTA Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) Update?

Background

The SCTA approved the following for the CTP update:

Plan Goals

- 1) Reduce Greenhouse Gas emissions
- 2) Maintain the existing transportation system
- 3) Relieve congestion
- 4) Develop resources to collect relevant data
- 5) Pursue funding to implement CTP

Metrics or benchmarks

- | | |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1) Customer Satisfaction | 6) Neighborhood Vitality |
| 2) Economic Well-Being | 7) Reliability |
| 3) Environmental Quality | 8) Safety/Security |
| 4) Equity | 9) Sustainability |
| 5) Mobility/Accessibility | |

Plan Task Areas

Consultants have been hired to assist in the following task areas:

1. Model enhancement (to include alternative transportation in mode split) – Dowling Associates
2. Public Participation – The Results Group
3. Content Development - Dowling Associates
4. Environmental Review – RFP has not yet been released.

The Scope of work for each task area has been revised and is being merged into a Project Timeline. Attached are the individual scopes and the timeline.

The Timeline

- Significant on the timeline is the **poll**, currently scheduled for the 2nd week of November.

- Leading up to the poll are focused **interviews** and Advisory Committee **meetings** and approval by the SCTA in October and November of the poll direction and questions.
- As per the Goals an expressed direction of the Ad Hoc committee, a **Working Paper** will be developed on the topic of **Transportation and GHG Reduction**.
- A **second Working Paper** topic and paper will be developed through the process.
- **Modeling** data is being gathered simultaneously and the model itself is being enhanced to better analyze alternative modes.
- Staff will model a variety of **scenarios** based on the poll results.
- **Public meetings** will commence in February, kicked off by a summit of elected officials.
- Over the next few months goals **and strategies will be finalized, leading to a draft CTP** in July.

Next Steps

Work on poll question protocols

Interviews

Information to follow



Comprehensive Transportation Plan Update Opinion Poll Implementation Protocol

Preliminary Poll Objectives:

1. Establish benchmarks for transportation demographics
2. Identify issues and concerns from public perspective
3. Identify behavior change levers to support mode shift

Poll Development Individual and Group Interview Questions:

1. What objectives would you like to see SCTA accomplish through a public opinion poll?
2. What information would you like to see SCTA gather through a public opinion poll?
3. What issues do you think will be surfaced through a public opinion poll?
4. What do you think SCTA should focus on as it updates the CTP?

Poll Implementation Timeframe:

| Task: | Timeframe: |
|--|------------------------|
| Determine Poll Objectives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meet with various advisory groups - Conduct individual and group interviews | September 17-October 5 |
| Develop and Finalize Poll Questions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meet with pollster - Meet with Ad Hoc Committee and SCTA Board | October 8-November 6 |
| Conduct Poll | November 7-17 |
| Draft Poll Findings Report (Crosstabs and PPT presentation) | Nov 19-December 7 |

Poll Implementation Meeting List:

| Name: | Poll Related Task: | Meeting Date: |
|---------------------------------|---|-------------------|
| PAC | Review polling plan, discuss poll objectives | Sept. 17, 9:00 AM |
| CAC | | Sept. 24, 4:00 PM |
| TAC | | Sept. 27, 1:30 PM |
| Individual and group interviews | Discuss poll objectives | Sept. 17 – Oct. 5 |
| SCTA Ad Hoc Committee | Finalize poll objectives and timeline, discuss protocol | Oct. 8, 1:00 PM |
| SCTA Board of Directors | Review poll objectives and timeline | Oct. 8, 3:00 PM |
| SCTA Ad Hoc Committee | Review and finalize draft poll | TBD Oct. 24- 26 |
| CAC | Review and discuss final draft poll | Oct. 29, 4:00 PM |
| SCTA Board of Directors | Finalize/approve poll questions | Nov. 5, 3:00 PM |

Staff Report

To: Planning Advisory Committee (PAC)

From: Janet Spilman, Deputy Director Planning and Public Outreach

Re: **Regional Traffic Mitigation Fee concept**

Date: September 17, 2007

Issue

What is the status of initiating a policy regarding a regional traffic mitigation fund program?

Background

The PAC saw this item at the June meeting, where it was suggested that staff look at a connection between the Regional Mitigation Fee idea and the GHG reduction goal identified by the SCTA Board. The following staff report was presented to the SCTA July 9.

The Board agreed that there is or could be a connection between the two issues and directed the Ad Hoc CTP Committee to study it farther. Subsequently, the Ad Hoc Committee asked staff for further analysis of potential costs and revenues. Staff will prepare rough projections based on various build out scenarios. Due to workload and staff leave this issue has not been developed any farther.

Next Steps

Staff will prepare rough revenue and cost analyses, and requests input from the PAC at the October 29 meeting for review by Ad Hoc Committee in November.

Staff Report

To: Sonoma County Transportation Authority

From: Janet Spilman, Deputy Director, Planning & Public Outreach
Chris Barney, Transportation Planner

Re: **Item 3.1:** Regional Traffic Mitigation Fee concepts

Date: July 9, 2007

Issue:

What is the status of initiating a policy regarding a regional traffic mitigation fund program?

Background:

In February the SCTA moved to accept funds paid through development fees from the developer of the University District Specific Plan. These funds will be directed at appropriate Measure M project(s) that meet criteria associated with regional traffic impacts of the proposed development. The impetus for this came from LAFCo's requirement that Rohnert Park provide some sort of regional transportation funding as a condition of the annexation of the University District property for development.

At the same time the SCTA directed staff to begin development of a regional traffic mitigation fee policy.

Projected Growth

A quick assessment based on ABAG projections 2007 indicates that in 25 years the population of Sonoma County will grow by 15%, while the number of jobs is forecasted to grow by over 45%. The most recent *Bay Area Transportation: State of the System 2006*, a report published by MTC and Caltrans, reports that daily vehicle hours of delay have increased by 34% from 2004-2005 and 61% since 2001 (from 4,400 hours of delay in 2001 to 7,100 in 2005). This is the highest increase in the Bay Area.

The SCTA considered the concept of a regional traffic mitigation fund in 2002/2003. The 2001 Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) provided a long list of under funded regional transportation projects. The mitigation fee idea was dropped because the existing need was not being addressed by any local funding source and outside resources were inadequate. The passage of Measure M created a fund source (1/4 cent sales tax) for the high priority projects named in the CTP.

Traditional mitigation fee strategies

Regional traffic impact mitigation fees have traditionally followed some variation of the following strategy.

- Develop a list of regionally significant transportation projects with known costs that will help reduce congestion
- Based on the costs of the transportation project, assess the costs to each jurisdiction (or development project).

This approach works best when the universe of possible solutions (a list of projects) most closely benefits the greatest number people and when the development project (impact) is closely linked to

the transportation project (solution). For example – if a land use development was directly benefited by specific transportation improvements, such as a by-pass.

In discussions of a possible traffic mitigation fee Measure M has been set forth as a possible standard for the list of projects because 1) the projects have already been approved by the public, 2) there is an existing, but not complete fund source and 3) the list is finite and able to be valued.

A nexus study would be required to assess the level of contribution per project or jurisdiction once an approach is generally agreed upon by the SCTA.

The Planning Advisory Committee (PAC) was presented with three methods as to how a fee could be assessed, but no agreement or consensus was reached on what might be the most appropriate to look at in this county.

Method 1: Regional General Plan Build-out Percentage

This method provides a simple way to calculate growth potential by jurisdiction based on locally approved planning documents (adopted general plans).

1. Assemble existing conditions for the following land use categories by jurisdiction and total county:

Residential, Single-Family (dwelling units)

Residential, Multi-Family (dwelling units)

Residential, Senior/Group (dwelling units)

Commercial, Retail (sq. feet GFA)

Commercial, Office (sq. feet GFA)

Industrial (sq. feet GFA)

Note: "GFA" is "gross floor area"

2. Calculate build-out potential for the previously listed land use categories based on most recently adopted jurisdictional general plan by jurisdiction and total county.
3. Calculate the percentage of total county growth, by land use category, that is contributed by the build-out of each jurisdiction's general plan.
4. Determine composite value representing combined growth (Residential + Commercial + Industrial) by jurisdiction and total county.
5. Determine percentage of total growth the growth in each jurisdiction represents as part of total county growth.
6. Provide a list of transportation projects that have been proposed to address countywide transportation impacts, and mitigate congestion caused by new growth (regional

transportation project list – RTPL). This list should include estimated costs for each project and a total cost for all mitigation projects.

7. The percentages calculated in step 5 can then be multiplied by the project cost total provided in step 6 to determine overall mitigation share of the cost of the RTPL.

III. Method 2: Regional VMT (Vehicle Miles Traveled) Growth

This method provides an estimate of VMT growth by jurisdiction. VMT calculations are based on local general plan build-out numbers.

1. Assemble existing conditions for the following land use categories by jurisdiction and total county:

Residential, Single-Family (dwelling units)

Residential, Multi-Family (dwelling units)

Residential, Senior/Group (dwelling units)

Commercial, Retail (sq. feet GFA)

Commercial, Office (sq. feet GFA)

Industrial (sq. feet GFA)

Note: "GFA" = "gross floor area"

2. Calculate build-out potential for the previously listed land use categories based on most recently adopted jurisdictional general plan by jurisdiction and total county.
3. Calculate trip generation/VMT for new units based on ITE (Institute of Transportation Engineers) or other trip generation/VMT calculation rates by total county and jurisdiction.
4. Determine percentage of total trip generation/VMT growth each jurisdiction contributes to total growth.
5. Provide a list of transportation projects that have been proposed to address countywide transportation impacts, and mitigate congestion caused by new growth (regional transportation project list - RTPL). This list should include estimated costs for each project and a total cost for all mitigation projects.
6. The percentages calculated in step 5 can then be multiplied by the project cost total provided in step 6 to determine local share of RTPL cost .

IV. Method 3: Land use fee calculation method

This method would be used to calculate a fee representing a cost of development for different development types based on regional transportation project cost need, forecasted future development, and trip generation for this development.

1. Assemble existing conditions (2005) for the following land use categories by jurisdiction and total county:

Residential, Single-Family (dwelling units)

Residential, Multi-Family (dwelling units)

Residential, Senior/Group (dwelling units)

Commercial, Retail (sq. feet GFA)

Commercial, Office (sq. feet GFA)

Industrial (sq. feet GFA)

Note: "GFA" = "gross floor area"

2. Generate forecast scenario using these land use codes for 2030 (using the Sonoma County Travel Demand Model).
3. Provide a list of transportation projects that have been proposed to address countywide transportation impacts, and mitigate congestion caused by new growth (regional transportation project list - RTPL). This list should include estimated costs for each project and a total cost for all mitigation projects.
4. Determine trip generation rates associated with new development by land use type using ITE (Institute of Transportation Engineers) or other trip generation/VMT calculation rate.
5. Determine the total number of peak-hour trips associated with new development for each land use category using the SCTM (Sonoma County Travel Model). The increase in peak-hour trips by land use class can be determined by using the following formula:

2030 trips by land use classification – 2005 trips by land use classification

6. Determine a per-trip cost by dividing the total amount to be funded by the mitigation program (RTPL) by the total number of trips associated with new development.
7. Determine a cost per unit of development for each land use type. This cost is calculated by multiplying the per-trip cost by the peak-hour trip generation rate for each land use class (dwelling units for residential and 1,000 sq. feet for other land uses) as determined in step 4.

8. Calculate regional mitigation fee for new development by multiplying the cost per unit by the number of units being proposed or built.

Regional Transportation Generated Greenhouse Gas

In conjunction with the project specific discussion of regional fees, the PAC also discussed the connection between the regional transportation system and the Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) goal of reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. It was suggested that the benefits of a GHG reduction program or project would be of benefit to the entire county and that staff should investigate an alternative to the Measure M list of projects.

Attached is a list of programs and projects that could be implemented to help reduce GHG emissions.

Requested Action

This report is intended to continue the discussion about possible regional traffic mitigation fee methodologies. Staff is seeking direction from the Board as to how to proceed on this policy issue.

Overarching principles to reduce GHG in the transportation system

- Focus on managing Travel Demand not Supply. Don't try to build out of congestion, address travel demand that current supply is not sufficiently addressing.
- Focus on Activities and Travel, not Facilities and Vehicles. Transportation decisions should be made with accessibility (access to jobs, activities, etc.) in mind, not vehicular mobility (capacity expansion). Optimize multi-modal accessibility, not movement of vehicles through an unsustainable system.
- Balance transportation funding to support trip-reducing projects and programs.
- Reduce GHG emissions by reducing consumption (use of the transportation system, or need to make so many trips), and reducing travel-related emissions for trips that are still being made.

REDUCE CONSUMPTION (Modify Behavior)

- I. Reduce VMT
 - a. Implement Park-and-Ride Facilities
 - b. HOV Lanes
 - c. Rideshare/Vanpool
 - d. Improve Bike/Ped Facilities
 1. Measure M Bike projects
 2. Fund Safe Routes to School
 3. SMART bike path
 - e. Enhance Transit Service
 1. Improve transit marketing, information, and amenities (improve quality/attractiveness of transit trips)
 2. Lower transit pricing
 3. Add to Measure M transit operations fund
 - f. Implement employer-based Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs (incentives) for reducing trips or changing modes
 1. Promote Telecommuting/Conference calling for meetings
 2. Promote Carpool/Vanpools
 3. Provide incentives for alternative mode use (free transit passes, bike storage, shower facilities, prize/\$\$ incentive, etc.)
 4. Housing assistance programs (help fund appropriate housing near employer – mortgage/rent subsidies, listings of near-by available housing, vanpool provided for near-by residents)
 - g. Non-employer-based TDM programs (incentives for reducing trips or changing modes)
 - h. Promote multi-use trip making
 - i. Increase Light Vehicle Use Pricing (parking, road, congestion, and fuel pricing changes, lower automobile subsidies)
 - j. Land Use Strategies such rezoning for high density transit oriented development

- II. Reduce Trip Length
 - a. Promote high density smart growth and companion open space land uses
 - 1. Fund transit oriented development projects (such as MTC Priority Development Areas)
 - b. Promote trip linking
 - c. Increase personal vehicle use pricing (parking, road, congestion, and fuel pricing changes, lower automobile subsidies)
- III. Shift Travel Times
 - a. Increase Light Vehicle Use Pricing (parking, road, congestion, and fuel pricing changes, lower automobile subsidies) – use time sensitive pricing mechanisms
 - b. Employer-based and non-employer-based TDM programs as above
 - c. Promote Flex-time

REDUCE EMISSIONS (Modify Technology)

- I. Reduce Vehicle Idling
 - a. Synchronize traffic signals, improve intersections
 - b. Implement incident management programs
 - c. Implement/improve traveler information programs
 - d. Enact vehicle idling restrictions/programs
 - e. Implement technology that reduces idle emissions (electric/hybrid vehicles, idle emission controls, etc.)
- II. Improve (not necessarily increase!) Traffic Speeds or Flow
 - a. Expand HOV lanes
 - b. Signal Synchronization, Intersection Improvements, Roundabouts
 - c. Incident Management Programs
 - d. Traveler Information Programs
 - e. Speed Control (Speed Limits, Vehicular Speed Limits)
 - f. Shifting/Separating Freight Movements (Implement Rail Freight, restrict Freight to selected routes, shift freight traffic to off-peak times)
- III. Alter Vehicle Fleet
 - a. Increase use of alternative fuels such as CNG
 - b. Increase fuel pricing
 - c. Accelerated retirement/replacement of buses/other transit vehicles
 - d. Accelerated retirement/replacement of heavy duty trucks
 - e. Diesel engine retrofits
 - f. Clean diesel fuel
 - g. Inspection and maintenance programs
 - h. Provide subsidies for clean vehicles
 - i. Remove subsidies for polluting vehicles
- IV. Polluting Vehicle Buy Back program – modeled on Bay Area Air Quality Management District program