



Directors

Mike Kerns, Chair
Sonoma County

Lisa Schaffner, V. Chair
Healdsburg

Bob Blanchard
Santa Rosa

Valerie Brown
Sonoma County

Stanley Cohen
Sonoma

Pat Gilardi
Cotati

Mike Harris
Petaluma

Bob Jehn
Cloverdale

Sam Pierce
Sebastopol

Paul Kelley
Sonoma County

Jake Mackenzie
Rohnert Park

Sam Salmon
Windsor

Planning Advisory Committee

Monday, January 28

9:30 – 11:30

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

-
- I. Introductions & Public Comment
 - II. Consent
 - a. Approval of Minutes of September 17, 2007 ACTION
 - b. Approval of the Agenda ACTION
 - III. SCTA Bicycle/Pedestrian Master Plan
 - IV. Comprehensive Transportation Plan update
 - a. Public Outreach – survey results
 - b. Content Development
 1. working paper concepts, GHG emissions reduction, finance
 2. draft outline
 - c. List of projects
 1. Committed list
 2. New project submittals
 - d. Modeling Scenarios
 - V. Announcements
 - VI. Adjournment
-

The next SCTA meeting will be held February 4, 2008

The next **PAC** will be held **April 28, 2008 or as needed**

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

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

Suzanne Smith
Executive Director

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

Planning Advisory Committee

MINUTES OF MEETING

Monday, September 17, 2007

ATTENDEES

Jennifer Barrett	County PRMD
Greg Carr	County PRMD
Scott Duiven	City of Petaluma
Wayne Goldberg	City of Santa Rosa
Gary Helfrich	County PRMD
Mike Moore	City of Petaluma
Matt Stevens	The Results Group
Rick Tooker	City of Healdsburg

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

I. Introductions & Public Comment

Introductions were made.

VII. Consent

a. Approval of Minutes of June 4, 2007 ACTION

The minutes were approved with the following changes:

Per Gary Helfrich, page 4, under Item V, paragraph 6, to be corrected to read "Gary Helfrich acknowledged that this is a primary issue in updating the General Plan EIR and has generated the most comment of all issues being addressed."

b. Approval of the Agenda ACTION

The agenda was approved as presented.

VIII. FOCUS – Priority Development Areas – update DISCUSSION

Mr. Moore presented handouts from the FOCUS staff, the ABAC/MTC regional planning process, regarding Pilot Planning Grant Development and Planned v. Potential Priority Development Area Determinations. A request for applications was published, and the handout for Pilot Planning Grant Development and Planned v. Potential Priority Development Area Determinations is the current status of the application process. A subsequent Joint Policy Committee meeting was attended by Mr. Moore and Janet Spilman.

The intent is that by the ABAG November General Assembly, the Executive Committee will make a final decision as to whom will be the designated Priority Development areas. This would imply that there will be funding; however, where this will come from has not as yet been identified. Discussion between MTC and ABAG has been indicating that most of this may come from the MTC Regional Transportation Program for the long term. There are a number of applications from Sonoma County; as of this date, the City of Petaluma is the only designated Planned status. The remaining applications are still Potential, pending further steps that are needed for qualification.

Mr. Moore reported that at the September Joint Policy Committee meeting, it was noted that the regional agencies had not expected the volume of applications that were received. There was considerable discussion regarding how these would be funded.

A FOCUS sub-committee meeting is scheduled for November. In response to Wayne Goldberg's question, Mr. Moore reported that there has been some discussion regarding open space conservation, and that they have begun review of proposals. Greg Carr added that the County has been working with the Open Space District, and submitted a list of 15 or 16 conservation areas. Mr. Goldberg observed that, given the emphasis on city-centered growth, it was appropriate that the County did not apply for the first category, and that the cities did not apply for the second category.

IX. SCTA Bicycle/Pedestrian Master Plan*

Lynne March reported that this planning effort has been under way since November, and is scheduled for completion the end of this calendar year.

Staff is now soliciting public input; public workshops have been scheduled and noticed in local newspapers. Concurrence has been reached regarding the high-level vision, goal and objectives by all ten jurisdictions. Draft plans will be drawn up in October. Chris Barney has prepared draft maps. These will be presented at the workshops and then after revisions to the participating City/Town Councils and Board of Supervisors for approval by winter or spring. The policies still need to be firmed up by the local jurisdictions after public input is received. There is a link for public input at the SCTA website. Staff is also encouraging transit and paratransit users' input, as they have an interest in the pedestrian component of the plan.

Mr. Moore asked if this Plan would be addressing the issue of greenhouse gas emissions. Ms. Spilman responded that the plan is for the Board to adopt this when they adopt the Comprehensive Transportation Plan. Any jurisdiction would need to consider environmental issues as part of this when they adopt the Plan. It is likely that many cities will do this as part of their General Plan update.

X. Comprehensive Transportation Plan update* DISCUSSION/ACTION

Ms. Spilman reviewed the history of this item, noting that since the last meeting, the Request for Proposal had been issued, and interviews with consultants were conducted. She noted that the four elements of the plan included (1) public participation; (2) content development; (3) model enhancement; and (4) environmental review. Contracts were awarded to The Results Group for the public participation element and to Dowling Associates for the content development element of the Plan.

Ms. Spilman presented a project timeline.

Content development, as conducted by Dowling Associates, will include greenhouse gas reduction. They are currently drafting this working paper.

Several phases of public input will take place in the course of this update. The topic of the second working paper is yet to be determined.

The Ad Hoc Subcommittee, comprised of Board directors Bob Blanchard, Jake Mackenzie, Stanley Cohen, and Sam Pierce, will be meeting again.

Ms. Spilman then introduced Matt Stevens of The Results Group to address the Committee and summarize their timeline and goals.

Mr. Stevens announced that the next step would be to conduct a public opinion poll in collaboration with the SCTA. In contrast to public meetings, which typically attract the same group of interested people, it was determined that a poll would likely result in gathering a broader demographic range. This poll is scheduled to take place in early November. The Results Group is in the process of talking to a select group of people about what they think the objective of the poll should be, and what they think the SCTA should learn from the poll.

Mr. Stevens referred back to the timeline. He noted that the first draft of the instrument should be developed by the first week of October, in time for the Ad Hoc Steering Committee meeting on October 8. It is hoped that this draft will be ready and approved by the November SCTA Board meeting, to be followed by administering the poll for a ten-day period, hopefully November 6 or 7. After the poll takes place, it would take approximately two weeks to evaluate, analyze, and issue a report and presentation of their findings (by approximately the end of November).

A series of two, and possibly three, public meetings will be scheduled beginning early next year, where outcomes will be presented, and feedback will be gathered. Mr. Stevens referred to a revised work plan for public participation and content development, noting that interviews and focus groups will also be conducted following the poll.

A truncated version of the poll will also be posted on the SCTA website for those members of the public to respond who were not contacted in the polling, or who did not attend a public meeting.

Public outreach will also take place at public events such as the Amgen Tour, and Wednesday Night Market.

The Results Group is working with the graphic design firm that will be doing the layout for the CTP document.

Ms. Spilman reported that Chris Barney is working on the modeling update concurrently with this project, and that there are several decision points along the way in this process, and invited PAC input. It was determined that the poll should be conducted as soon as possible, and that the remainder of the project would be based on this information. Meetings will also be conducted.

Ms. Spilman referred to the Opinion Poll Implementation Protocol for the Committee's review.

Mr. Stevens reviewed the four questions regarding the public opinion poll, as follows: (1) what objectives would you like to see SCTA accomplish through a public opinion poll; (2) what specific 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; and (4) what do you think SCTA should focus on as it updates the CTP?

Rick Tooker of the City of Healdsburg asked what the Committee feels the purpose of the CTP is; e.g.; eliminating use of the automobile as much as possible.

Ms. Spilman observed that this may be the right time and context for addressing this issue; given the passage of Measure M and the approval of the SCTA Board to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. She cited the need to get the public involved in transportation planning, educating the public about transportation and the environment, and reduce automobile trips.

Mr. Tooker noted that the transportation plan needs to help support the Land Use Plan, and that he would like to see the Countywide Transportation Plan provide support for the County Land Use Plan.

Mr. Stevens stated that questions in the poll need to address change in behavior on the part of the public; what would it take to effect a mode shift in transportation from the automobile?

Jennifer Barrett stated that it would be beneficial to try to find out what improvements would facilitate more use of the bicycle and pedestrian plan; e.g., completion of a shoulder on a road, wider sidewalks or trails for pedestrians, or additional bicycle trails.

Gary Helfrich expressed the need to understand what is preventing people who do have transportation options other than their car from using alternative transportation.

Mr. Goldberg stressed that this project needs to be distinguished from other local plans and programs that will be taking place at the same time, that this is a regional plan, and is not to be confused with transportation elements of the General Plan, and other local programs such as SMART. He stated that he would not want this to merely be a compilation of all the local plans. He also noted that polling information input should be based on some basic background information; e.g., a train is not currently budgeted for, and if you want this, it will cost. Mr. Stevens concurred that baseline information will be obtained from this poll, and questions will be asked accordingly.

In response to Mr. Stevens' question as to what kinds of issues should be communicated in the poll, Mr. Tooker cited the need for a regional traffic fee. As an example of a question to be included in the poll, he referred to Measure M, and that its passage provided half the funding for transportation improvement projects. Does the public think it would be appropriate to charge developers the other half of these costs in a regional traffic fee?

Ms. Barrett stated that there would no doubt be a good deal of public comment regarding the need for maintenance of County roads outside the city limits, and that there are insufficient funds to adequately maintain them.

Mr. Barney suggested including a question in the poll relating to mode split, and vehicle miles traveled; e.g., what would it take for the polled individual; to use an alternate mode for a trip or to make shorter trips? A reduction in vehicle miles traveled would reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Mr. Goldberg suggested questions that would help get information regarding where people live, where they travel to work, and how many members in a household work.

Ms. March stated that key to the polling should be questions regarding what it would take for people to shift their individual choice of mode from driving.

Mr. Helfrich cited the need to also approach groups that are not necessarily primarily transportation advocates, (e.g. NASCAR) in order to get a broader, and different, viewpoint. Ms. Barrett suggested approaching the tourist and hospitality industry, also (e.g. wineries). The Wednesday Night Market was mentioned as another venue for public outreach.

Mr. Moore also noted that polling should include questions relating to the transport of goods and materials by trucking companies, which could also be related to the wine industry. Contacts could include the United Wine Growers, Syar Industries, and the generators of the transport of goods, not solely trucking companies. Ms. Spilman reported that all advisory committees will meet a variety of business groups, and will conduct individual interviews with community leaders and transportation advocates in the next two weeks. Staff will then come back to the CAC and PAC with the draft poll for review. If the PAC Committee is interested,

a special meeting may need to be scheduled. It could also be addressed at the regular PAC meeting to be held October 29.

Mr. Tooker referred Ms. Spilman to contact Ben Stone of the Innovation Council for their input.

Ms March questioned whether the methodology of using telephone listings would diminish the participation of some demographics. Discussion ensued regarding the selection of random telephone numbers and how these are gathered (currently by voter registration) and whether this may be or should be gathered from driver's licenses, in an effort to get a broader representative sampling of the public.

Discussion continued regarding the issue of bussing children to school, and how to encourage parents to have their children walk, bike, or bus to school. The need to include school districts in the polling was cited, as generators of automobile traffic, with parents taking children to and from school.

VI. Regional Traffic Mitigation fee update* DISCUSSION/ACTION

Ms. Spilman presented a report on the status of initiating a policy regarding a regional traffic mitigation fund program. She noted that this report was based on many of the suggestions of the Committee at the June meeting, and the report was presented to the SCTA Board. Per the Committee's suggestion, this report suggests focusing on the greenhouse gas emission issue instead of the traditional regional mitigation fee for traffic, since the CTP has the goal of reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

Ms. Spilman noted that the staff report is comprehensive, and then introduced Chris Barney, who summarized three different proposed strategies for determining regional traffic mitigation fees. These were presented to the SCTA Board and the Ad Hoc CTP Subcommittee. Following their direction, staff conducted an analysis of what kinds of funds could be generated, and whether this would be cost effective.

Staff has drafted a list of projects and approaches that could be implemented to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, based on the Committee's suggestions. These include reducing vehicle miles traveled; enhancement of transit service; implementation of employer-based Transportation Demand Management (TDM) incentives for reducing trips or changing modes; non-employer-based TDM incentives for reducing trips or changing modes; promotion of multi-use trip making, increasing light vehicle use pricing; and implementing land use strategies, such as rezoning for high density transit oriented development; reduction of trip length; and shifting of travel times.

Emissions could also be reduced by modifying technology to reduce vehicle idling, improve flow of traffic, alter vehicle fleet with alternative fuel use, and by implementing a Polluting Vehicle Buy Back program modeled on the Bay Area Air Quality Management District Program.

Mr. Barney presented a rough first estimate of proceeds that could be raised based on household growth. This was based on household projections from ABAG 2007 projections. Calculations were made in changes of households for 2020, 2030, and 2035, and then the change in households was multiplied by a \$3,500 per-household-unit model fee, which was the figure used for the City of Rohnert Park University District mitigation fee. By 2020, this fee would theoretically raise \$63 million to spend on transportation fees or greenhouse gas mitigation fees.

A nexus study still needs to be done to determine the point of nexus between the fee and the development. Mr. Barney said he would flesh out the mitigation fee estimate further; breaking down households into single and multiple-family units; as well as commercial and job-related roads, and determine a fee estimate based on trip generation. Staff will also determine a list of possible future capital and other congestion mitigation projects.

This information will be presented to the Ad Hoc Steering Committee at their next meeting.

Mr. Goldberg addressed the issue of where the other funding would come from; and potential inability of the Cities and County to match what the nexus study indicates is the fair share of funding for existing residences. He also cited the complications of separating cities that have impact fees and those that do not, and which roads of regional significance are on the list for those fees to be used. His concern was that, while raising \$63 million is beneficial, this raises issues as to complications in the modeling, and where matching funds would come from.

Mr. Moore acknowledged these concerns, and stated that one strategy is to use Measure M as the existing residences' and businesses' contribution, and for the regionally significant projects. He cited the example of Rohnert Park; they took the Measure M amount, and Rohnert Park agreed to pay half of this through developer's fees.

Ms. Barrett concurred with Mr. Goldberg's comments regarding the nexus study, and noted that there are deficiencies in the system. The new growth would require additional capacity, and in addition to capacity, there are safety-related improvements, such as the shoulder, site lines, and bypass projects. She felt the best method is to have a list, run a model, and then look at those roads to determine what the difference in growth is contributing as far as their share. She stated that staff utilizes the Caltrans model, which shows incremental growth.

Ms. Barrett suggested that the planting of trees be included as part of reducing greenhouse gas emissions, as a carbon offset, but also as an aesthetic design issue. Often urban and suburban planning is automobile-oriented, and does not encourage pedestrian use. The elimination of trees and paving of the landscape adversely affects the emission of greenhouse gases by reducing carbon sinks, and is also less inviting to pedestrians. She stressed the importance of pedestrian and bicycle safety. Mr. Helfrich also stressed the need to tie in all these projects with the transportation network.

VII. Announcements

There were no further announcements.

XI. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:08 a.m.

Staff Report

To: Planning Advisory Committee (PAC)

From: Lynne March, Transportation Planner

Re: *SCTA Countywide Bicycle & Pedestrian Master Plan*

Date: January 28, 2008

Status Report: The *Countywide Bicycle & Pedestrian Master Plan* effort has been underway since November 2006 and was initially anticipated to be completed by the end of December 2007. A number of staffing and workload issues have contributed to delays, however, the consultant, W-trans, is nearing completion of the project. This planning effort is being advised by the Countywide Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee (CBPAC), and a Steering Committee formed from the CBPAC charged with bringing forth the consensus recommendations of each agency.

Tasks accomplished to date include:

- Setting an overall vision, goal and objectives approved by all 10 county jurisdictions.
- Reviewing and summarizing existing plans
- Examining the legislative background
- Documenting the setting of each jurisdiction
- Referencing interface with ADA
- Examining the interface with transit and other attractors
- Setting recommendations for data collection
- Documenting funding sources and implementation challenges
- Drawing up, and ongoing refinement of, lists of existing and proposed projects
- Providing cost estimates for identified bicycle projects
- Describing the array of benefits associated with walking and bicycling
- Analyzing collision/safety data for each jurisdiction
- Conducting four public workshops in September
- Participating at project and advisory group meetings
- Providing a template of policies to each jurisdiction for customization
- Providing project lists for validation and ranking of proposed facilities
- Creating a template for organization and layout of master and individual plans

Remaining tasks include:

- Compiling each individual plan and submitting draft plans to each entity

Draft plans will include the lists of existing and ranked proposed projects (All drafts are anticipated to be complete by mid-March)

Completing the “overview” section (Anticipated to be complete by mid February)

Final compilation, editing, and formatting of the master plan, individual plans and maps (by the end of March) ready for the reviews of decision-maker bodies in April.

Staff Report

To: Sonoma County Transportation Authority

From: Janet Spilman, Deputy Director – Planning & Public Outreach

Re: Comprehensive Transportation Plan - Poll Results

Date: January 14, 2008

Issue:

What are the findings of the SCTA poll?

Background:

The SCTA Board approved conducting a public opinion poll as part of the public input process for the update to the Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP). The poll was developed by J Moore Methods and the CTP ad hoc committee and presented to the SCTA in December. The goal of the poll was to identify how residents feel about various transportation modes and funding as well as identify demographics related to travel patterns of Sonoma County residents.

The poll was conducted from December 11 through December 17.

SCTA Transportation Poll results:

Attached is a power point presentation of the poll results. Jim Moore will make the presentation and answer questions.

In summary, Sonoma County voters are currently most concerned about safety and security, however when questioned about transportation there was overwhelming support for a balanced approach to relieving congestions through a multimodal plan. While there is support for public transit, especially SMART, there is not yet general acceptance of the need to change behavior and personal driving habits.

The poll made clear that the CTP should include a variety of strategies and a full complement of transportation options. It was also evident that a broad range of options will need to be developed to demonstrate how we as a community will address reducing GHG emissions from the transportation sector. An educational and marketing component to encourage a shift to transit appears to be one of the elements to consider in the plan as well as recognizing the role of technology.

Recommended Action:

Review and accept the poll results from J Moore Methods

Staff Report

To: Technical Advisory Committee

From: Janet Spilman

Re: CTP List of Projects

Date: January 24, 2008

Issue

The SCTA is in the process of updating the Comprehensive Transportation Plan and anticipates adoption in spring of 2008. The CTP has a 25 planning horizon. The TAC was asked for the following:

- 1 Update the existing list of projects
- 2 Recommend new projects
- 3 Assist in development of ranking process

Existing Projects

The 2004 project list was largely carried over from the list developed in 2001. Since the implementation of Measure M in 2004 there has been progress made on some projects. That, changing costs and priorities require a re-examination of the list as it stands.

New Projects

Any jurisdiction with a new project is encouraged to submit a new project application with a budget and timeframe included.

Ranking Process

The ranking process used by the TAC in 2001 can be best described as a consensus exercise. At that time, applicants presented projects to the TAC, discussed readiness, viability and benefits, and then solicited support. Those projects with more support moved higher on the list, which was subsequently approved by the TAC and SCTA.

The ranking developed in 2001 remained effectively intact in 2004.

Staff recommends that the entire project list (minus #1 ranked projects) be considered for re-prioritizing.

Policy Impacts:

The prioritized list of projects will guide SCTA funding decisions.

Staff Recommendation:

The TAC is being asked for the following:

- 1 Update the existing list of projects
- 2 Recommend new projects
- 3 Assist in development of ranking process

Staff Report

To: TAC

From: Chris Barney – Transportation Planner

Re: SCTA Comprehensive Transportation Plan Working Model Scenarios

Date: 1-24-2007

SCTA's 2007 Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) update will include an analysis of "Visioning Scenarios" that represent different transportation planning policy strategies within the county and region. These Scenarios will be analyzed using the SCTA Travel Demand Model (TDM) to determine the future (2020 and 2030) performance of the transportation system under each set of scenario assumptions. The primary measure of system performance will be Travel Mode Split Percentages, Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT), Vehicle Hours of Delay (measure of congestion and mobility), and Green House Gas (GHG) production. These measures can be used to determine how well each scenario, and included transportation improvement strategies, meet SCTA's goals as laid out in the CTP and can be included as transportation improvement strategies.

Outline scenarios are described below:

1. Baseline:
 - Includes capital improvements listed in the 2004 CTP, and/or listed in the Measure M Strategic Plan.
 - Transit improvements listed in 2004 CTP as well as SMART rail.
 - Uses baseline land use projections (Based on ABAG Projections 2005 and Local Estimates).
 - Pricing (fuel, parking, toll, vehicle operation costs) follows current trends. Not sure what this means...
2. Wish List/Blue Print Scenario:
 - Same as Baseline scenario with additional non-CTP/Measure M projects added. Looks at all possible desired/proposed projects.
3. VMT Reduction Scenario 1 (transit/smart growth focused):
 - Includes baseline CTP capital improvements.
 - Increased transit headways and route expansion.
 - Increased SMART rail headways.
 - Possible Port Sonoma Ferry connection.
 - Land use focused around County Priority Development Areas and Rail Stations.
 - Higher percentage of future development at higher densities.
 - Pricing follows current trends or minor pricing increases.
4. VMT Reduction Scenario 2 (pricing focused):
 - Includes baseline CTP capital improvements.
 - Possible conversion of HWY 101 HOV lanes to HOT lanes.
 - Increased parking costs.
 - Increased tolls.

- Increased per mile driving cost (gas tax, carbon fee, registration based on miles driven, etc).

Scenario specifics will be determined once the outline scenarios have been approved by the Ad Hoc steering committee and the SCTA board.