

Technical Advisory Committee AGENDA

February 26, 2009 1:30 P.M.
Sonoma County Transportation Authority
SCTA Large Conference Room
490 Mendocino Avenue, Suite 206
Santa Rosa, California 95401

ITEM

1. Introductions
2. Public Comment
3. Approval of Minutes, January 22, 2008 – **DISCUSSION / ACTION**
4. Planning – **DISCUSSION / ACTION**
 - 4.1. TFCA Report
5. Programming – **DISCUSSION / ACTION**
 - 5.1. State Local Partnership Programming
 - 5.2. American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 update
6. Measure M – **INFORMATION / DISCUSSION**
7. Other Business / Comments / Announcements
8. Adjourn - **ACTION**

*Materials attached.

The next **SCTA** meeting will be held **March 9, 2009**
The next **TAC** meeting will be held **March 26, 2009**

Copies of the full Agenda Packet are available at www.sctainfo.org

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

SB 343 DOCUMENTS RELATED TO OPEN SESSION AGENDAS: Materials related to an item on this agenda submitted to the **Technical Advisory Committee** after distribution of the agenda packet are available for public inspection in the Sonoma County Transportation Authority office at 490 Mendocino Ave., Suite 206, during normal business hours.

Pagers, cellular telephones and all other communication devices should be turned off during the committee meeting to avoid electrical interference with the sound recording system.

Board of Directors

- ◆ Mike Kerns, Chair, Sonoma County ◆ Jake Mackenzie, Vice Chair, Rohnert Park ◆
◆ Valerie Brown, Sonoma County ◆ Pat Gilardi, Cotati ◆ David Glass, Petaluma ◆ Sarah Gurney, Sebastopol ◆ Paul Kelley, Sonoma County ◆
◆ Mike McGuire, Healdsburg ◆ Carol Russell, Cloverdale ◆ Sam Salmon, Windsor ◆ August Sebastiani, Sonoma ◆ Gary Wysocky, Santa Rosa ◆

**TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
 MINUTES
 January 22, 2009**

ATTENDEES

Abrams, Josh, W-Trans	Maitland, John, SCTA
Adams, Nancy, Santa Rosa	March, Lynne, SCTA
Barney, Chris, SCTA	Melody, Leslie, Cloverdale
Birdlebough, Steve, Friends of SMART	Nemeth, John, SMART
Culver, Christine, SCBC	Nutt, Jason, Santa Rosa
Daida, Bill, Windsor	Obid, Damien, Cotati
Ferguson, Colleen, Santa Rosa	Parker, Joanne, Santa Rosa CityBus
Gause, Seana, SCTA	Penry, Frank, Sonoma
Gordon, Andrea, BAAQMD	Perez, Alejandro, Windsor
Howze, Kevin, SoCo TPW	Smith, Suzanne, SCTA
Jenkins, Darrin, Rohnert Park	Tacata, Eydie, Rohnert Park
Kelly, Sue, Sebastopol	Tam, Ken, SoCo Reg. Parks
Landeros, Mario, Healdsburg	Zimmer, Larry, Petaluma

ITEM

I. Introductions

Round table introductions were made.

II. Public Comment

There were no public comments.

III. Approval of December 18, 2008 Minutes – **DISCUSSION / ACTION**

The minutes were approved as stated.

IV. Programming – **DISCUSSION / ACTION**

a. State Local Partnership Program (SLPP)

Mr. Maitland reported that the Proposed SLPP Distribution (*handout*) was amended and submitted to the SCTA Board of Directors for approval of programming for the five-years. The first year's shows programming of; \$1.2 million for Santa Rosa CityBus purchase, \$93,000 for City of Sonoma Rehab project, and \$330,000 for the Arnold Drive Shoulder project (County Rehab). The following years money is not important at the moment, the allocation is, but not actually the programming. This can change from year-to-year. Staff needs to work with the County, the City of Sonoma, and the Santa Rosa CityBus, on the applications that will go to Caltrans Local Assistance.

Staff is waiting to hear back from Local Assistance on how the process will work. This is Prop 1B money, and Prop 1B money is up in the air at the moment in terms of what is going on with it because the State can't sell bonds. As far as we know we still have the February 17, deadline for the three projects programmed in the FY08/09 year.

Ms. Gause reported that when she requested the Measure M programming for the next two year's out for FY12/13, and FY13/14, and to revise any programming for the next three year's FY09/10, and FY10/12, she also asked for applications for SLPP. Those applications have not been reviewed yet. The ratio distributions have been approved by the Board, and Staff still has to review. Staff will bring back to the TAC next month what everyone has applied for in terms for SLPP for the outgoing years FY 09/10 through FY12/13.

The FY09/10 is due to the State August 15 and we will have to come back. It fits in with the Strategic Plan programming. Project Sponsors should look at the Small City Rehab. It needs to have one-to-one match with Measure M funds. Sponsors will have to look at their cash flow with Measure M and what projects they might want to do with that money. Sponsors should be prepared to come back soon to discuss. This program is not a use-it or lose-it so; if one year is low and one year is high the money can be adjusted to that extent, if a project is ready to go.

There was discussion about the situation with the State and Prop 1B and the Measure M LSR requirements of expending Measure M funds within a three-year period. The issue is that smaller cities would have to bank more than one-year's worth of Measure M funds. A possible scenario is that Measure M is banked, ready to go, and the State is not selling bonds. Therefore the smaller cities are out the money. It would seem that there would have to be relief from Measure M requirements.

There was a question about whether there is maintenance of effort in the Strategic Plan. Staff will check the Strategic Plan and report back to the TAC.

b. Potential Stimulus Package Update

Mr. Maitland reported that staff received from MTC late yesterday an email (*handout*) outlining the stimulus program with the dates, timeframes, amounts, and required forms, to date.

Ms. Gause reported that the LSR Draft Economic Stimulus Project List (*handout*) dated January 21, 2009, is based on the email staff sent out a week ago with the spreadsheet attached from MTC. There are a number of requests for projects for this Economic Stimulus bill. MTC and Caltrans tried to put together a pavement roadway list that would combine several of those sources into one location. That was what was emailed out to project sponsors. They also requested that the CMAs and the project sponsors look at the list and make sure that what was listed is deliverable, based on the criteria that were in the email from SCTA staff. Some of the criteria have now changed; the project must be awardable in 90 days from the time the bill is enacted.

Staff attended a meeting at Caltrans this morning called by the Local Streets and Roads Working Group. The intent was to meet with Caltrans to make sure that everyone's level of effort was going to be about the same; what was Caltrans going to do to staff up, was there going to be any streamlining involved in this process, how were they going to handle the workload, were

the sponsors going to get any sort of regulatory relief. A number of those questions have been answered in the MTC email (*handout*). The key points are: one project per jurisdiction, it must be a minimum of \$500,000; it must have NEPA compliance, or it must be achievable to get NEPA compliance in 30-days. Essentially it is a pavement project that has nothing other than curb-to-curb overlay. There cannot be: any Federal permits required, any cultural resources involved, any endangered species anywhere close by. They want a list of projects that are deliverable by January 28. What we need to do whittle the list down to the projects that are actually deliverable in 90-days, and that meet the rest of the criteria.

They did say that we would get one-lump sum TIP amendment. Sponsors would not be able to get an E-76 until the TIP amendment is approved and processed sometime in February or March. There is 100% funding for construction. The one lump sum TIP amendment will have the entire Stimulus Package for the Bay Area. There will be line items, one for each county to be distributed. The SCTA will decide on how that money will be distributed; which project is to be put forward based on deliverability, and they need to be prioritized.

The MTC email states that sponsors can initially lump projects into a broad based description. However, between January 28 and February 9 sponsors will need to provide project limits. Sponsors can have a number of project limits as jurisdiction's one project if the work to be done in different locations is the same. It can be multiple projects under a generic description where sponsors can remove one of them if need be and still be able to deliver the project. Sonoma County's lump sum would be for all of the projects.

Also by Feb 9 sponsors will need to have a complete Preliminary Environmental Study (PES) form and a complete Field Review form. Sponsors need to be using all the templates and forms, and the local assistance procedures manual that is found on-line, do not use the LAPM that is not online as it may not be current.

Caltrans staff is suggesting that as long the project has no federal permits, no requirement of a Natural Environment Study (NES), and no technical studies it is okay. If a project needs a technical memorandum such as biological technical memorandum stating that no studies are necessary, or if a project needs a cultural resources technical memorandum stating that this project has been screened and there are no cultural resources to speak of then the project is likely to be deliverable. However, if the project needs to have an Archeological Survey Report, or a NES, or a Biological Assessment (BA), then it is likely to be undeliverable in the time frame allotted.

Caltrans Local Assistance indicated that anything required by this Stimulus Package is going to require more than the staff that is available to their department. Local Assistance will have to appeal to other functional units of Caltrans. However, other functional units of Caltrans are not budgeted to be charging against the Local Assistance budget.

Therefore, they are going to exceed their budget. They are not going to be able to pay this additional staff. If they go into furloughs (to cover the budget

deficit) it will be a big problem. Thus, Caltrans staff is requesting that the CMA's send a letter to either the District Director or the Director of Caltrans that something is done along the lines of re-budgeting in an emergency situation in order to allow for the functional units; the Cultural Resources staff, and Biology staff, to charge against the Local Assistance budget. Caltrans anticipates that they will be able to provide NEPA clearance within 30-days if the projects meet the restrictions listed earlier.

There is some question as to how the money will be laid out. MTC had originally thought that it would be about 80% towards LS&R rehabilitation (STP), and 20% would go to "other" category. There would be lump sums for each type. It would be prioritized differently. The projects have to be Federally Aid eligible. Projects must be delivered within 90-days.

Projects that do not fit the 80% category criteria such as; rehabilitation of a class I bike lane network, new construction on a parking lot, and are not on the Federal Aid System, yet have the potential to be awarded in 90-days, can be submitted in the 20% "other" category.

Caltrans offered to streamline the process; instead of an on-site Field Review they are suggesting that the more complete PES form and Field Review forms are the better. They are also suggesting that project sponsors provide photos and or videos of the project area. Everything should be submitted through the CMA (SCTA) first. After the SCTA reviews the submittals they will be sent to MTC and Caltrans at the same time. Once it is determined that a submittal is complete, and a project is on the final list, then Caltrans will schedule a meeting to go over the project in their office. Sponsors should have as much information about their project with them at that time.

The SCTA role is to determine the priority of projects and the final list that will be submitted to MTC and Caltrans. All forms including the PES and Field Review forms should be submitted to the SCTA for review.

Staff will send an email to project sponsors that will provide a schedule and timeframe for submittals.

There was discussion about how to prioritize the expenditure of Sonoma County's regional percentage of 80%. The decision will be made at the Partnership meeting on February 6, which is why the list has to be prioritized. So that we know that if we get less money things at the bottom of the list will drop off. MTC and Caltrans are looking for each project to be at the minimum \$500,000. If you have a project that is over the \$500,000, submit the project in a form that is segmentable. Therefore, if amounts are to be reduced sponsors will still have a project that is deliverable.

There was discussion about the TAC setting the criteria for these projects. As stated earlier, there are minimum requirements of deliverability in 90-days, project cost of \$500,000 per project. The project amounts must be within Sonoma County's percentage share amount. On the list that was assembled before this meeting, there are also two jurisdictions that do not have a project listed.

Ms. Gause asked the group about its' preferred method of distributing the county share to the jurisdictions. A discussion ensued about using an allocation ratio formula, like STP, or Measure M.

There was further discussion about Caltrans commitment and the timing of the 90-day deliverable. Ms. Gause stated that a Field Review approval takes about 30-days, E-76 approval takes additional 30-days, and advertising is at least 21-days, which leaves 9-days, assuming that everything goes as expected. If Caltrans can't commit to that, then a lot of the projects will not be deliverable. Only projects that have started the system will be deliverable. It is important to know what Caltrans commits to do.

Ms. Gause stated that the intent from the management of Caltrans is there, however, the implementation and overload of Caltrans staff to deal with the process is what is in question.

The question arose whether a project is eligible if the jurisdiction has an E-76 to proceed and the funds are no longer available.

Staff assumes that the same policies will apply to this as the Local Street & Roads. The stimulus package will be administered under the Surface Transportation Program policies at MTC and Caltrans. Until a bill is passed there is no way to know which requirements are going to change. For the 101 highway jobs; the North job which has been awarded is not eligible for Federal funds because it was awarded. Even though it could be suspended or terminated because there is no bond money, the funds can not be used to back fill it. Bids were opened on the Wilfred job but no contract was awarded, thus it would be a good candidate for Stimulus funds, except that the Federal boilerplate wasn't in the construction package, because there were no Federal funds in construction. Therefore Stimulus funds can not be used for that job. If a job has been awarded,, the project will not be eligible for stimulus funds.

MTC suggests that jurisdictions can streamline some of the process by getting authority from their Board/city councils to the Public Works Directors or City Engineers to advertise and award the project.

There was further discussion about an equitable distribution of the \$12 million allotment to Sonoma County projects. A question came up, if a jurisdiction is requesting a project that is \$2.5 million for one road, and they were to get \$500,000, could they really deliver that project? Would they need to get \$2.5 million to make that project reality? Priority wise, how does that project fit on the list if that jurisdiction can't get the full \$2.5 million?

Ms. Gause referred back to the list of potential projects that had been generated for the TAC meeting. The cities of Cloverdale and Cotati did not submit. Several of the jurisdictions submitted projects over the 90-day delivery criteria now being considered. Ms. Gause asked if those projects should be removed from the list. Staff suggests submitting the projects that meet the key criteria requirements; the project must be awardable in 90-days from the time the bill is enacted, and a minimum project cost of \$500,000, the project has NEPA compliance, or a categorical exclusion, or a CE is easy to

obtain. Ms. Gause asked the pleasure of the TAC as to what other criteria should be used to select projects for stimulus funds.

A suggestion was made to take the Measure M LSR allocation ratios and apply to the Sonoma County share, with a minimum amount of \$500,000 for the smaller jurisdictions.

Another suggestion was proposed that jurisdictions submit their projects for amounts over what is anticipated as the right amount in order to be prepared for jurisdictions that drop out in Sonoma County and in the Bay Area.

Staff stated that Caltrans insists that the primary contact has to be a jurisdiction representative. It cannot be a consultant. Project sponsors need to make sure the title for project contact states "City Engineer" if a consultant has been delegated that position by resolution as City Engineer that is also acceptable.

There was further discussion about applying the Measure M LSR allocation ratios to the allotment amount of \$10 million, with a minimum floor amount of \$500,000 for the smaller jurisdictions, then adding 50% more to the larger jurisdictions to allow for projects that drop out. Assume a jurisdiction's target is \$2 million, based on the \$10 million. They submit \$3 million worth of projects, and they are ranked in order, and it totals 150% of their target.

A concern was stated that there is a timing issue because the list is needed by January 28. When should projects be reviewed and removed and how is that to be accomplished if the amount of County Share is different in the federal bill?

Ms. Gause suggested that any projects failing to submit the complete PES form and Field Review by the February 4 could be removed from the list as not ready to deliver. She also reminded attendants that the projects should be treated as one project with multiple locations on the PES, and the Field Review forms when they are submitted to SCTA.

There was discussion about what happens if the project bids come in lower or higher than project estimates. Staff was told to make sure that you submit with a big project that can have things dropped off if bids come in high. If the base bid is lower or higher that price would be award price. Then, after award, the TIP will be amended again with the actual numbers. The assumption would be to package the contract with ad alternates to bid the award.

Discussion ensued regarding assurances that the program is successful for Sonoma County. What should the strategy be if a jurisdiction individually fails, or if the County fails, or whether Caltrans fails? Such as if the jurisdiction(s) are unable to deliver their projects due to circumstances entirely beyond the control of the jurisdictions. CMA's were informed that failure was not an option, and were assured that Caltrans is on board.

Caltrans assured CMA's that DBE is will not be a problem, even though goals have been changed.

A Resolution of Local Support is required for the submittal package. The Resolution of Local Support is similar to those used for the Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds. The resolution should be called American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009.

Joanne Parker, of Santa Rosa CityBus posed a question as to how CMAQ funds are going to be handled. If there has been any discussion with MTC about prioritizing CMAQ money.

Staff indicated that there is amount for FHWA, and amount for FTA, other than that CMAQ has not been mentioned at the Local Streets and Roads meeting or the meeting with Caltrans Local Assistance.

Staff was asked if the CMA's been asked for their priorities a same issue on FTA set aside for 5307, 5309, and the other programs. If not, will the SCTA be including those project requests from the Transit Operators in any discussions with the SCTA Board?

Further, for projects that are in the RTP 2035 that are expansion related have there been any discussions on funding phases like PAED?

Staff pointed out that the only discussion has been on construction for the FHWA amounts.

Staff summarized that the Measure M LSR allocation ratios will be used to establish how much money each jurisdiction will get in this Economic Stimulus package, with a floor of \$500,000 for the smaller jurisdictions, doing the math upwards until the County share total allotment is reached. From that amount the jurisdictions will be submitting projects that will be prioritized. There will be some sort of ranking in the submittals. Therefore, if the jurisdiction submits above their allocation, then SCTA would not include that portion in the initial list, so that the target could be met.

Once the final list is determined, then staff can determine whether any projects need to be added in.

Jurisdictions will be turning in a list with information on the "American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 List of Projects to be amended into the TIP with Revisions 09-05" (*handout*) spreadsheet. This list should be to SCTA staff by close of business day January 27. Staff will email spreadsheet form to project sponsors. The criteria that must be met are a \$500,000 minimum, and is awardable in 90-days. That means that there are no Federal Permits involved, there are no significant technical studies involved, you either have NEPA clearance, or you can get NEPA clearance within 30-days, you will be submitting a PES form and a Field Review form to SCTA staff by February 4.

There was discussion about the requirement of bringing curb ramps up to date with the American Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements with Federal Funds. When Federal money is received there is a requirement that the project sponsor retrofit any curbside facility such as ramps to meet current ADA standards. In some cases, a project sponsor would have to retrofit ramps to provide the detectable warning surface if ramps are older than 2-years old.

Caltrans also indicated that if a project has thermoplastic yellow striping that needs to be removed it is considered hazardous material and will stymie the 30-day environmental.

SCTA staff will send to the TAC the spreadsheet form titled "American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 List of Projects to be amended into the TIP with Revisions 09-05" (*handout*), and the allocation calculation based on the Measure M ratios.

V. Measure M – **DISCUSSION**

a. Revenue Projections for Local Streets & Roads Maintenance

Mr. Maitland referred to the SCTA Sales Tax Revenue Forecast (*handout*) and reported that the Measure M Sales Tax Revenue projection for FY2009/10 is down by a negative 7%. The Measure M Allocation for LSR FY2009/10 (*handout*) reflects this estimated projection of negative 7%.

b. Strategic Plan Programming – First Round

Ms. Gause reported that the First Draft of the 2009 Measure M Strategic Plan Programming for the LSP program (*handout*), and Bike/Ped program (*handout*), reflects what was requested by project sponsors. The second page of each document reflects prior appropriations which filter into the prior column on the first page of each document.

The LSP total programming has a positive available balance. However, the Bike/Ped total programming has a shortfall in FY2009/10 which requires a loan from the LSP program. On the LSP spreadsheet the line item for Airport Boulevard does not include the Interchange. Staff has not received a request; however staff is under the impression that it will need \$8 million. Therefore \$8 will need to be added into the LSP spreadsheet and there will be enough to cover the Bike/Ped shortfall.

The City of Santa Rosa is looking at considering a request on the SRJC Overcrossing Bike/Ped project for Measuring M funds for a PSR. The timing is likely between FY09/10 and FY11/12. This would increase the amount of the Bike/Ped shortfall.

The SLPP advance match comes out of LSR portion and come out of the LBT. The Santa Rosa CityBus will need an advance out of FY09/10 into 08/09 as the transit balances are zero and fully expended each year. The Santa Rosa CityBus will be requesting the inter-program if the State becomes solvent in April.

The Strategic Plan is the programming document that allows us to determine how we want to spend our money in a five-year period. We started in 2005, we are required to update it every 2-years. We updated it in 2007, and now we are updating it for 2009. This brings is to fiscal years 12/13 and 13/14 and it also adjusts if those requests were made to the fiscal years 09/10 and 11/12.

It is the intention of staff to meet with project sponsors for each of the jurisdiction next month to determine project scope, schedule, and total project

costs; which should be represented in the project information sheets, and fund sheets that were submitted to staff.

The SLPP requests will be discussed at the next TAC meeting.

This is the first round of programming and we have to address how to fund the shortfall in the Bike/Ped program.

It was pointed out that the County indicated that they were going to be requesting SLPP funds for the Central Sonoma Valley Trail project. However, the first draft of the 2009 Measure M Strategic Plan Programming for Bike/Ped does not reflect any programming.

Staff indicated that the SLPP requests have not been reviewed as of yet. If they will be submitting a request for Measure M funds then the numbers on the spreadsheet will change.

The County indicated that they would know in a couple of months if they are going to ask for those funds.

Staff clarified that if the County has to match SLPP funds with Measure M funds and they have not requested Measure M funds in FY09/10 through 13/14 then does that mean that the County is not asking for SLPP funds?

The County confirmed that they are requesting SLPP funds.

Ms. Gause pointed out that staff would like to receive the final program by February. After staff has met with the project sponsors to determine needs and scope, staff will put together a final proposal for the TAC which will be presented to the CAC.

VI. Planning – **DISCUSSION / ACTION**

a. TFCA & TDA3 status update

Ms. March reported that included in the agenda is a quarterly report as of January 13, 2008, which reflects the status of the expenditures for TFCA and TDA3.

Staff is still waiting for the final estimate for TDA3. The call will go out as soon as the final estimate is received.

The TFCA competitive benefit was said to be due primarily to Sebastopol and Sonoma, which are submitting projects. Out of the \$226,000, \$113,000 would be half for each one of the most eligible jurisdictions, however, it is understood that Sebastopol will be asking for about \$40,000, thus \$73,000 would be leftover on the table. Sonoma has indicated they will be asking for about half of the competitive portion. Staff has encouraged other jurisdictions to submit projects. We don't want to leave money on the table.

Project submittals are due February 20, 2008.

VII. Presentation – Bay Area Air Quality Management District **DISCUSSION**

a. Funding Programs, Andrea Gordon

This item was postponed until the March meeting.

VIII. Other Business / Comments / Announcements **DISCUSSION / ACTION**

The City Santa Rosa has been going through budget cutting scenarios trying to reduce General Funds. The City is running into a brick wall of Maintenance of Effort to gain the Prop 42 funds. The City is struggling with this and would like to know what others agencies are doing about it?

It was determined that the City of Santa Rosa is the only jurisdiction that is affected by this issue.

IX. Adjourn – **ACTION**

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 pm.

Staff Report

To: SCTA’s Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
From: Lynne March, Transportation Planner
Re: Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) 2009/2010 “Program of Projects”
Date: February 26, 2009

Issue: The TAC is charged with making a recommendation to the SCTA Board for the FY09/10 TFCA “Program of Projects.”

Background:

As the “Program Manager” for the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) Program Manager Funds, the Sonoma County Transportation Authority (SCTA) is required to adopt a program of projects for TFCA funds each year. The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), awards funding to projects known to provide a benefit to air quality. These funds are generated through a \$4 surcharge on vehicle registrations in the Bay Area. Each county is guaranteed 40% of the funds generated within their county for the Program Manager Program.

In Sonoma County, only the southern portion of the County is within the Air District. Therefore, Cloverdale and Healdsburg and the unincorporated areas north of Windsor do not receive funds from the TFCA program administered by the SCTA. Funds received are to be distributed according to the criteria adopted by the SCTA Board on October 16, 2006. The criteria gives Santa Rosa and the County guaranteed funds according to their population, with the remainder of the funds to be applied for on a competitive basis. Due to legislative changes, no forward balances are allowed from prior programming cycles. The SCTA receives the funds in two installments and these funds are maintained in a separate account until requests for payment are received from project sponsors. Funds are paid on a reimbursement only basis upon the SCTA’s receipt of a bill from the project sponsor.

A “Call for Projects” was issued on December 29, 2008. Applications were due February 20, 2009. Eight (8) applications were received, all of which met the minimum cost-effectiveness thresholds set by BAAQMD.

The following table shows the available funding, by category:

FINAL FUND ESTIMATE			
FOR THE 2009/2010 TFCA FUNDING CYCLE			
Santa Rosa	County	Competitive	Total Allocation
38.14%	25.57%	36.29%	100%
\$238,932	\$160,186	\$227,341	\$626,460

Board of Directors

◆ Mike Kerns, Chair, Sonoma County ◆ Jake MacKenzie, Vice Chair, Rohnert Park ◆
 ◆ Valerie Brown, Sonoma County ◆ Pat Gilardi, Cotati ◆ David Glass, Petaluma ◆ Sarah Gurney, Sebastopol ◆ Paul Kelley, Sonoma County ◆
 ◆ Mike McGuire, Healdsburg ◆ Carol Russell, Cloverdale ◆ Sam Salmon, Windsor ◆ August Sebastiani, Sonoma ◆ Gary Wysocky, Santa Rosa ◆

Action Requested:

The TAC is requested to consider the proposed project list, and subsequently reach agreement on a recommendation to the SCTA Board. The sum for the submitted competitive projects exceeds the available funding and will need to be adjusted. Approval of the “Program of Projects” will be an action item for the March 9th SCTA Board.

Please see below:

- ✓ List of proposed projects.
- ✓ Project information for each proposal

List of Proposed TFCA 2009/2010 Projects:

	Project Sponsor	SANTA ROSA & COUNTY PORTIONS: Project Name	Funding Requested
1	Sonoma County	09SON01:Replacement CNG Bus Purchase	\$160,186
		County share SUBTOTAL	\$160,186
2	Santa Rosa	09SON02: Santa Rosa Free Ride Trip Reduction Program	\$158,932
3	Santa Rosa	09SON03 FY2009 Student/Youth Bus Pass Subsidy	\$80,000
		Santa Rosa share SUBTOTAL	\$238,932
TOTAL			\$399,118

	Project Sponsor	COMPETITIVE PORTION: Project Name	Funding Requested
4	Sebastopol	09SON04: City of Sebastopol Bike Rack Program and Bike Route Signage	\$20,000
5	Petaluma	09SON05: Washington St & Petaluma Blvd Corridor Signal Timing	\$45,000
6	Sonoma	09SON06: Comprehensive Class III Route Sign Program and South Fifth Street West Class II Lanes.	\$150,000
7	Rohnert Park	09SON07: Commerce Boulevard Bike Lane Gap Closure	\$13,000
8	Rohnert Park	09SON08: Redwood Drive Bike Lane Gap Closure	\$13,000
Competitive SUBTOTAL TOTAL			\$241,000

Available COMPETITIVE portion is \$227,341, therefore, projects are over by \$13,659

PROJECT INFORMATION

- A. Project Number: 09SON01
 - B. Project Title: Replacement CNG Bus Purchase
 - C. TFCA Funds Allocated: \$ 160,186 (this request)

 - D. Project Description: Sonoma County Transit requests \$160,186 in TFCA – 40% funds to assist with the replacement of 10 - 40' Heavy-Duty Compressed Natural Gas (CNG) powered transit coaches. The buses to be replaced are 10 - 1996, 40' Heavy-Duty CNG coaches with a passenger capacity of 41. Expected award to a vehicle manufacturer will occur during the first quarter of calendar year 2009 and delivery of the new coaches is expected in May 2010. At that time, all funds associated with this request will be expended. Other funds associated with this purchase that are obligated or under contract include FTA - 5307 and 5309 grants, BAAQMD – TFCA Regional Funds, and State - Prop 1B. The new buses will operate approximately 50,000 per year and operate for a minimum of 13.5 years.
-

- A. Project Number: 09SON02
 - B. Project Title: Santa Rosa Free Ride Trip Reduction Program
 - C. TFCA Funds Allocated: \$ 158,932

 - D. Project Description:
Maintenance and expansion of a comprehensive incentive program offered to employers within Santa Rosa City limits to reduce single-occupied vehicles trip cause by employees commuting to and from work. The incentives include a Guaranteed Ride Home Program, transit pass subsidies for Santa Rosa CityBus and Sonoma County Transit, incentives for carpooling, walking and bicycling, and bicycling parking facilities at employer sites. Additional information may be found on the program Web site: www.santarosafreeride.org. Project management and administrative costs will be funded through other sources.
-

- A. Project Number: 09SON03
- B. Project Title: FY2009 Student/Youth Bus Pass Subsidy
- C. TFCA Funds Allocated: \$ 80,000

- D. Project Description:
This project will provide a \$10 subsidy for all Santa Rosa CityBus Student/Youth Bus Passes sold during FY 2009-2010. In doing so, the cost per pass will be reduced from \$30 per month to \$20 per month. Staff studies have found that reducing the cost from \$30 to \$20 effectively encourages parents/guardians of students to allow them to take public transit as a means of primary travel around the City before and after school hours. In fact, City streets during those hours before and after school bell times when traffic

congestion is at its worse. Therefore, by shifting student travel behavior from the automobile to public transit serves to mitigate traffic congestion on City streets, thereby improving air quality in the region. Bus passes are intended to be used by students to travel to and from school, however they have the added benefit of use after school for other activities, such as jobs, shopping and recreational activities. Additional benefits include omitting the back and forth trips parents need to make when taking their children to and picking them up from school. Teaching youth the convenience and advantages of using public transit encourages life long environmental behavior.

- A. Project Number: 09SON04
- B. Project Title: City of Sebastopol Bike Rack Program and Bike Route Signage
- C. TFCA Funds Allocated: \$20,000.00

D. Project Description:

Bike Rack Program:

Project sponsor will use TFCA funds to purchase and install bike racks on private property in Sebastopol at up to 55 locations. Property/business owners will be required to comply with all of the requirements of the program and enter into a Bike Rack Request and Agreement with the City.

The primary goals of this program are to

- Increase the ease and convenience for travelers commuting, shopping and using business services in Sebastopol by bike, in hopes of decreasing the number of single-occupancy vehicle trips;
- Increase awareness of alternatives to the automobile for commuting;
- Improve air quality in Sebastopol by encouraging “zero emission” mode of transportation.

Bike Route Signage

Project sponsor will use TFCA funds to purchase and install bike route signage along the City’s Railroad Forest Bike Path, Morris Street, Eddie Lane Bike Path and North Main Street, linking the Joe Rodota Trail and the West County Trail through central Sebastopol.

All installation of racks and signs will be performed by Sebastopol staff (force account).

- A. Project Number: 09SON05
- B. Project Title: Washington Street and Petaluma Boulevard Corridor Signal Timing
- C. TFCA Funds Allocated: \$ 45,000

D. Project Description:

Project sponsor will use TFCA funds to coordinate signal timing at 11 intersections during AM, MD, and PM peak hours. Recent lane reduction along Petaluma Boulevard and Geometric/Phasing changes to the intersection of Petaluma Boulevard/Washington Street require further coordinated signal timing to improve traffic flow and reduce emissions. Both corridors are located within the Central Business District (Downtown) and move a majority of the traffic on the west side of town. Corridors include:

- Five intersections along Petaluma Boulevard, from Lakeville to D Street plus two closely spaced intersections on both D Street and Western Avenue. Specific intersections on Petaluma Boulevard are Lakeville, Washington, Western (at Kentucky), B Street, and D Street (at 1st).
 - Five intersections along Washington Street from Lakeville Street to Howard Street. Specific intersections on Washington at Lakeville, Copeland, Petaluma, Kentucky and Howard.
-

- A. Project Number: 09SON06
- B. Project Title: Comprehensive Class III Route Sign Program and South Fifth Street West Class II Lanes.
- C. TFCA Funds Allocated: \$150,000

D. Project Description:

Project sponsor will use TFCA funds for six related bicycle projects within the City of Sonoma that create continuity with existing Class I trails bordering the City to the north and south. Initially, the project would consist of installing Class III way-finding signs and route signage along key street segments as a means of highlighting routes for bicycles and improving awareness of bicycling on the part of drivers. The addition of “sharrows” (share the road arrow legends) to augment route signage along proposed Class III routes. In addition, the funds would be used to highlight Third Street West and Second Street East as north/south “spine routes”, while maintaining much needed on-street parking within the neighborhoods. The routes would provide a link between the Class I facilities on the north and south and an existing lighted crosswalk that has already been installed at the crossing of Third Street West at West Napa Street. These routes are proposed as part of a larger concept of creating links between Class I facilities on the east side and the west side of town, in conjunction with Class III designation of Second Street East. The funds would be used to install Class II striped bicycle lanes on Fifth Street West, from Andrieux Street to LaQuinta Lane and Class III routes on Andrieux Street and Napa Street. These additional routes and lanes split off the spines, reaching out to shopping, schools, and recreational facilities. This affectively creates an interconnected system, as highlighted in the recently adopted Bike Plan. Additionally, Curtain Lane Class III route would extend the existing Sonoma Creek Trails out to 5th Street West.

- A. Project Number: 09SON07
- B. Project Title: Commerce Boulevard Bike Lane Gap Closure
- C. TFCA Funds Allocated: \$13,000

D. Project Description:

The City of Rohnert Park will use TFCA funds to install bike lane striping, signage, pavement markings and bike detection for a new Class II bike facility on both sides of an approximately 3650’ segment of Commerce Boulevard between Rohnert Park Expressway and State Farm Drive. The proposed project will install bike lanes between the existing bike lanes at the following locations:

- Commerce Blvd (northbound): Rohnert Park Expressway to Hinebaugh Creek
 - Commerce Blvd (northbound): 285’ north of Professional Center Drive to State Farm Drive
 - Commerce Blvd (southbound): State Farm Drive to Professional Center Drive
 - Commerce Blvd (southbound): Hinebaugh Creek to 200’ north of Rohnert Park Expressway. (From 200’ north of Rohnert Park Expressway, there will be a shared lane marking (sharrow) and bike detection.
-

- A. Project Number: 09SON08
- B. Project Title: Redwood Drive Bike Lane Gap Closure
- C. TFCA Funds Allocated: \$13,800

D. Project Description:

The City of Rohnert Park will use TFCA funds to install bike lane striping, signage, and pavement markings for a new Class II bike facility on both sides of an approximately 3400' segment of Redwood Drive from 400' north of Martin Avenue to 700' south of Willis Avenue.

G. Comments (if any):

This project implements Transportation Control Measure 9: Improve Bicycle Access and Facilities, of the Bay Area 2005 Ozone Strategy. According to the Ozone Strategy, short distance trips of 5 miles or less are the majority of bicycle trips in this region. This proposed bike lane project addresses this market, providing a convenient facility for local trips between existing residential uses south of the proposed bike facility to major shopping, restaurants and services situated along the entire corridor. The proposed Class II bike lanes will fill an approximately bicycle facility gap in the middle of Redwood Drive, between existing Class II facilities both north and south of the proposed segment. This project will complete an on-street bike lane from the current northwestern City limits at Millbrae Avenue to the southern City limits adjacent to the City of Cotati. The proposed bike lane gap closure will complete a 2.1 mile facility along the full length of Redwood Drive that serves both local travel as well regional, providing a north-south connection from unincorporated Sonoma County lands north of Rohnert Park, through the City, and connecting to Cotati.



490 Mendocino Avenue, Suite 206
 Santa Rosa, CA 95401
www.sctainfo.org
 (707) 563-5373

Staff Report

To: Sonoma County Transportation Authority – Technical Advisory Committee
From: Seana L. S. Gause, Program Project Analyst
Re: State Local Partnership Program - Requested Programming
Date: February 26, 2009

Issue:

What are the requested fund amounts for the State Local Partnership Program (SLPP) to be matched with upcoming Measure M programming for the Local Streets Projects and the Bike/Ped Projects in the *2009 Measure M Strategic Plan*? How shall the balance of SLPP funds not requested to date be distributed?

Background:

In January, it was reported to this body that the SCTA Board approved the proposed distribution method (below) for the SLPP.

Type	Project	Jurisdiction	FY08/09	FY09/10	FY10/11	FY11/12	FY12/13
LSP/LSR							
	Forestville	County			\$2,000,000		
	Farmers	Santa Rosa			\$2,000,000		
	Old Redwood	Petaluma					\$3,000,000
	County Rehab	County	\$330,000	\$670,000		\$1,000,000	
	Small City Rehab*	Multi	\$93,000	\$907,000			
LBT							
	Bus Purchase	Santa Rosa	1,200,000				
Bike/Ped							
	TBD	TBD		\$1,200,000			
Totals			\$623,000	\$2,777,000	\$4,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$3,000,000
Cash Flow			\$2,480,000	\$2,480,000	\$2,480,000	\$2,480,000	\$2,480,000
Yearly Carry Over/Deficit			\$857,000	\$(297,000)	\$(1,520,000)	\$1,480,000	\$(520,000)
Running Total			\$857,000	\$560,000	(\$960,000)	\$520,000	\$0

The program requires that funds requested be matched by transportation sales tax funds. Attached to this report are two spreadsheets indicating the amount of funds requested through this program for individual projects.

SCTA staff collected these requests at the same time as the requests for programming of the 2009 Measure M Strategic Plan update. Below is a summary of the total funds requested by jurisdictions through that process.

State Local Partnership Funds Requested (per fiscal year and program) (\$ in thousands)

FISCAL YR	08/09	09/10	10/11	11/12	12/13	Total
LSP	\$430	\$150	\$2150	\$4800	\$0	\$7530
BIKE/PED	\$0	\$300	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$300

As shown above, the total amount requested to match the Bike/Ped program is \$300K, but the amount approved by the SCTA board was \$1.2M, leaving \$900K un-programmed. A portion of these funds could be used to cover the \$530K overage requested for LSP program. This would leave \$370K un-programmed, but would be contrary to the SCTA approved distribution of SLPP funds.

Policy Impacts:

Any change in the distribution of the SLPP funds would need to be brought before the SCTA Board for approval

Fiscal Impacts:

The funds originally intended for Bicycle and Pedestrian projects, if not requested, would be reprogrammed to other uses

Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommends that the TAC consider the requested programming for the 2009 Measure M Strategic Plan and discuss how to either fully program the bike/ped portion of SLPP or redistribute the un-programmed funds. The TAC recommendation will then be submitted to the SCTA as part of the 2009 Measure M Strategic Plan .

2009 Measure M Strategic Plan Programming
Local Streets Projects
First Draft

Local Street Projects	Sponsor	M#	Phase	SLPP Prior	Prior	SLPP9-10	FY09/10	SLPP10-11	FY 10/11	SLPP11-12	FY 11/12	SLPP12-13	FY12/13	FY 13/14	TOTAL	Maximum
Penngrove	Co DPW	30110			400	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	400	19,000
		30110	0		400										400	
		30110	1		0										0	
		30110	2		0										0	
		30110	3		0										0	
Airport Blvd	Co DPW	30210			375	100	100	100	650		0		0	0	1,325	15,000
		30210	1		125										125	
		30210	1A		250										250	
		30210	2		0										0	
		30210	3		0	100	100	650	650						1,500	
		30210	4		0										0	
		30210	5		0										0	
Rte 121/116	Co DPW	30310			330		0		0		0		0	0	330	7,000
Arnold Dr-South of Glen Ellen		30310	0	330	330										330	
Arnold @ Agua Caliente Signal		30310	1		0										0	
Arnold 121 & 116		30310	2		0										0	
Arnold @ Madrone		30310	4		0										0	
Forestville Bypass	Co DPW	30510		100	100	50	50	50	50	1,800	1,800		0	0	3,900	2,000
Signal @ Mirabel		30510	1		100		50		50		1,800				2,000	
Bypass		30510	2		0										0	
Old Redwood Hwy I/C	Petaluma	30604			0					3,000	5,000		5,000		13,000	10,000
Hearn Avenue	Santa Rosa	30706			469		1,431		500		0		0	0	2,400	9,000
		30706	1		319		981								1,300	
		30706	2		50		450								500	
		30706	3		100				500						600	
Farmers Lane Ext	Santa Rosa	30806			437			2,000	5,867		3,696				12,000	10,000
Mark West Springs	Co DPW	31010			0		0		0		0		0	0	0	1,000
Ursaline to Quietwater		31010	1		0										0	
Michelle Way		31010	2		0										0	
River Road	Co DPW	31110			0										0	1,000
Fulton Rd	Co DPW	30406			0										0	19,000
Bodega Hwy	Co DPW	30910			0										0	1,000
Other Program Expenditures	SCTA	None			57										57	
Totals					\$2,168		\$1,581		\$7,067		\$10,496		\$5,000	\$0	\$33,412	\$94,000
2009 Programming Cash Flow					PRIOR		FY09/10		FY 10/11		FY 11/12		FY12/13	FY 13/14		
Start Balance					0		13,915		16,472		13,538		7,144	6,133		
Interest on Pooled Cash					974		557		659		542		286	245		
Sales Tax Revenue					15,109		3,581		3,474		3,561		3,703	3,870		
Inter Program Loan					0		0		0		0		0	0		
Appropriations/Expenditures (Estimated based on 2007 Programming)					2,168		1,581		7,067		10,496		5,000	0		
End Balance					\$13,915	\$150	\$16,472	\$2,150	\$13,538	\$4,800	\$7,144	\$0	\$6,133	\$10,249		

Bike / Ped Projects	Sponsor	M#	Phase	Prior SLPP	Prior	SLPP09/10	FY09/10	SLPP 10-11	FY 10/11	SLPP 11/12	FY 11/12	SLPP 12/13	FY12/13	SLPP 13/14	FY 13/14	TOTAL	Maximum	
Santa Rosa Cr Tr	Santa Rosa	70106			140		697		0		0		0		0	837	1450	
Santa Rosa Cr Tr - Phase 1		70106	1		75		162									237		
Santa Rosa Cr Tr - Dutton		70106	2		65		535									600		
Old Red/Mendo/SR	Santa Rosa	70206			157											157	500	
Central Sonoma Valley Tr	Co Reg Pk	70310			163	150	150									463	1900	
Sonoma/Schellville Tr	Co Reg Pk	70410			0		50		50							100	650	
Arnold Dr	Co DPW	70510			0											0	2000	
Petaluma River Tr	Petaluma	70604			415		200		200		200		200		200	1415	2000	
Copeland Creek Tr	Rohnert Prk	70705			350											350	350	
Street Smart Sebastopol	Sebastopol	70807			680		600		720							2000	2000	
West County Tr	Co DPW	70910			0		0		0		0		0		0	0	500	
Mirabel		70910	1		0											0		
Mirabel		70910	2		0											0		
Mirabel		70910	3		0											0		
McCray Road	Co DPW	71010			0											0	250	
Highway 1 in Bodega Bay	Co Reg Pk	71110			100	150	220				150		200			820	950	
Foss Creek Tr	Healdsburg	71203			595		760		1650		0		0		0	3005	3250	
		71203	1		380											380		
		71203	2		215											215		
		71203	3		0		360									360		
		71203	5		0		400									400		
		71203	6		0				1650							1650		
		71203	8		0											0		
NWPRR Various	Various	71301			0											0	1000	
Access Across 101 (SR)	Various	71302			50											50	1000	
Bike Safety and Education	Various				60		60		60		60		60		60	360	1200	
Other Program Expenditures					\$11													
Totals					\$0	\$2,721	\$300	\$2,737	\$0	\$2,680	\$0	\$410	\$0	\$460	\$0	\$260	\$9,557	\$19,000
2009 Programming Cash Flow					PRIOR		FY09/10		FY 10/11		FY 11/12		FY12/13		FY 13/14			
Start Balance					-		409		(1,593)		(3,650)		(3,512)		(3,389)			
Interest on Pooled Cash					108		18		(72)		(164)		(158)		(153)			
Sales Tax Revenue					3,022		716		695		712		741		774			
Inter Program Loan					-		-		-		-		-		-			
Capital Expenditures					2,721		2,737		2,680		410		460		260			
End Balance					\$409		(\$1,593)		(\$3,650)		(\$3,512)		(\$3,389)		(\$3,028)			