



## Citizens Advisory Committee **AGENDA**

*March 30, 2009 – 4:00 p.m.*

Sonoma County Transportation Authority  
490 Mendocino Avenue #206, Santa Rosa, CA

### **ITEM**

- I. Introductions
- II. Consent Items – **DISCUSSION/ACTION**
  - A. Approval of Minutes from February 23, 2009\*
  - B. Approval of Agenda
- III. Measure M – **DISCUSSION/ACTION**
  - A. Project Update – Bodega Bay Trail, Central Sonoma Trail – Co. Regional Parks
  - B. Programming update
  - C. Financial Report\*
- IV. Project & Programming Updates – **DISCUSSION/ACTION**
  - A. Highway 101 – update
  - B. Status of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act
- V. Planning Updates – **DISCUSSION/ACTION**
  - A. CTP – EIR update\*
  - B. Sonoma County Travel Model 2009 Validation Report\*
- VI. Adjournment – **ACTION**

---

The next **SCTA** meeting will be held **April 13, 2009**  
The next **CAC** meeting will be held **April 27, 2009**

**Copies of the full Agenda Packet are available at [www.sctainfo.org](http://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 **Citizens 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.

**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING  
 MINUTES  
 February 23, 2009**

**ATTENDEES**

Barney, Chris	SCTA
Birdlebough, Steve	Sierra Club
Donofrio, Nina	SCTA
Gause, Seana	SCTA
Harrington, Craig	Fourth District
Harter, Dennis	Sonoma County Alliance
Howze, Kevin	Sonoma County Transportation & Public Works
Maitland, John	SCTA
March, Lynne	SCTA
Nichols, Curt	Home Buyers Association
O'Halloran, Pat	North Bay Labor Council
Rhodes, Dusty	Seniors
Richards, Willard	League of Women Voters of Sonoma County
Smith, Suzanne	SCTA
Spilman, Janet	SCTA

Suzanne Smith called the meeting to order at 4:07 p.m. in the absence of Chair Bob Anderson.

**ITEM**

**I. Introductions**

Round table introductions were made.

**II. Consent Items – DISCUSSION/ACTION**

- A. Approval of Minutes from January 26, 2009\*
- B. Approval of Agenda

The minutes of January 26, 2009 were approved with the following changes: Page 3, paragraph 2, to be corrected to read “North Coast Rail Authority” (NCRA) in place of “Northwest Pacific Railroad” (NWP); e.g., “Ms. Hames clarified that North Coast Railroad Authority (NCRA) has a perpetual freight easement...SMART will be negotiating this with NCRA...north of Healdsburg NCRA controls dispatch...this is controlled by NCRA.” Also, “...freight service has always been considered to be part of the SMART rail service” to be corrected to read “freight service has always shared the right-of-way with SMART rail service.”

The agenda was approved as submitted.

**III. Measure M – DISCUSSION/ACTION**

- A. Project Update – Airport Interchange, Forestville Bypass
- B. Programming update
- C. Financial Report\*

Kevin Howze of the Sonoma County Transportation and Public Works Department reported on the Highway 101 Airport Boulevard Interchange; Arnold Drive Measure M projects and the Forestville Bypass projects.

Staff has been working with Caltrans on the Highway 101 project for this agency to be the engineer, consultant and designer on the project. Modifications have been made to proposals included in the study by Parsons Engineering and have also worked on an amendment to the environmental document, which would result in slight changes in the footprint of the project.

John Maitland explained further that preliminary design involves closing the Fulton interchange and diverting all traffic through the Airport Boulevard interchange. A connector/distributor road would connect the Airport Interchange to Fulton Road for southbound traffic. This is conceptual in design at present. A very preliminary estimate for the project is \$51 million. This design will require Airport Boulevard improvements, including signalization, at the Fulton Road intersection, which will be a County Measure M project. Therefore, these two projects are linked.

In response to Steve Birdleough's question, Mr. Maitland confirmed that public information meetings would be held. He also confirmed that an environmental document is in place for Highway 101 North; the Airport Interchange at the Fulton Road intersection was not included in this and will be addressed in a separate environmental process.

Mr. Maitland noted that Caltrans' design policy calls for no less than one mile between interchanges; the Fulton Road and Airport Boulevard interchanges are less than a mile apart, resulting in traffic congestion.

Mr. Howze reported on Arnold Drive (Highway 121/116); currently staff is working on plans for a shoulder widening project in Glen Ellen from the Glen Ellen Market south approximately to Hill Street. The estimated project cost is approximately \$600,000. Staff hopes to go to bid in late spring or early summer and has applied for State and Local Partnership (SLPP) funds to match Measure M funds.

Mr. Howze next reported that several bicycle groups have contacted the Sonoma County Public Works Department regarding additional improvements on Arnold Drive. The highest priority bicycle lane projects are from just north of the Verano area on Arnold Drive. The bicycle community is advocating widening a one-mile gap along this road where there is no shoulder. Mr. Howze explained that the issue with this project is the controversy over removing oak trees, which has resulted in keeping this area undeveloped.

Discussion followed regarding the oak trees at this site; whether they are on private property or in the County right-of-way (they are in both) and the potential danger they pose. Staff is also looking into traffic control, possibly signalization or a roundabout, at the intersection of Agua Caliente and Arnold Drive. This intersection currently has a three-way stop and becomes congested at certain times of day. Mr. Maitland added that the plans also indicate signals being installed at Madrone on Arnold Drive; this also comes under the Highway 121/116 project description. He also noted that Caltrans had reported on the possibility of installing a roundabout some years ago; this did not progress any further due to funding issues.

Mr. Howze next reported on the Forestville Bypass project, noting that this is in two phases. One phase is developing intersection control at Highway 116 and Mirabel Road. This was originally planned to be a signalized intersection; however, there is considerable community support for a roundabout. Drawings show a leg to the south that is part of proposed land development on either side of the southeast and southwest quadrant. A public meeting is scheduled Thursday, February 26, 2009 from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. at Forestville Elementary School to solicit public input for the preferred intersection plan. From an engineering and cost perspective the roundabout would likely be preferable.

Discussion followed regarding pedestrian safety at signalized intersections vs. roundabouts; Mr. Howze noted that statistics indicate greater pedestrian safety using roundabouts; referring to the handout and information compiled by HDR and other sources. Mr. Maitland observed that there are not enough roundabouts yet in the United States and California to make a clear conclusion as to effectiveness and safety; however, in Europe these work very well. Mr. Howze added that roundabouts are designed to allow the driver to enter and merge with traffic and keep pedestrians visible to motorists. Further discussion involved accommodating trucks on roundabouts and vehicle size. Mr. Maitland added that this project has \$2 million of Measure M funds which will be matched by \$2 million of SLPP funds. Mr. Howze reported that once

the public hearing is held, the environmental process takes place over a period of 12 to 18 months. By this time it is anticipated that design can be finalized and within 18 to 24 months construction could begin. In response to questions from the Committee as to whether this would be consistent with the schedule for construction of the southbound road for the land development projects, Mr. Howze noted that the southwest quadrant project has been submitted several times and withdrawn; staff will be working with the developer on the southeast quadrant project. He reported that they should be able to build their project to have access to Highway 116. He stated that the roundabout would benefit both projects and would allow greater access to Highway 116 for both developments.

Seana Gause reported that the programming effort for the Strategic Plan has been in progress for approximately two months. However, SCTA staff and jurisdictional staff have been heavily involved in responding to submittal requirements for the economic stimulus plan and gathering the required information. This has caused a delay in the Strategic Plan, but staff expects to present the final programming to the Board in April. The Strategic Plan Update draft document would then be available in July and it would then be finalized when the Board meets in either August or September. She will bring the proposed programming to the Committee at the next meeting, when it is completed.

Ms. Gause explained that projections were used based on the most recent revenue, in response to Mr. Birdlebough's query as to whether there were issues due to loss of tax revenues. Mr. Maitland added that a 5% reduction in sales tax revenue had been projected over last year. Ms. Gause confirmed that the projects would still be allocated the same amount of funding and that she had not seen any loss.

Ms. Smith then referred to the Measure M Financial Reports. These indicate year-to-date figures, which include revenues and expenditures. Approximately \$10 million in sales tax revenues has been received thus far, with five months remaining of the fiscal year. Mr. Maitland compared figures for last year at this time; at that time \$10.5 million had been received; thus, figures are currently at the 5% projection.

#### **IV. Project & Programming Updates – DISCUSSION/ACTION**

##### **A. Economic stimulus\***

Ms. Smith reported that the bill for the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act was signed into legislation. This plan does provide funding for transportation; debate is still taking place at the State level over how the State's portion will be allocated. However, MTC has been very aggressive with the portion being allocated directly to the regions; therefore, SCTA staff and local sponsors have had to be very aggressive due to the very short turnaround time for projects.

Ms. Gause referred to a list of projects for local streets and roads finalized by MTC. Targets that MTC had provided to the regions have had to be reduced slightly. Staff made the decision to give smaller jurisdictions a \$500,000 floor and then allocate remaining funds to larger jurisdictions based on the Measure M Local Streets and Roads distribution formula. When final figures showed less funding than originally projected under the stimulus plan (\$12.49 million countywide vs. the original \$14.8 million) all amounts were reduced based on percentage of the reduction of the final funding amount. Caltrans is planning for all jurisdictions to meet with them to expedite the process; holding meetings at their office with projects being presented via documentation, photographs and videos of the various proposed job sites. These meetings are scheduled for February 25 and March 5. All projects submitted are straightforward, "shovel ready," and must be able to qualify for a categorical exclusion under NEPA, a categorical exception under CEQA, and have no special permits from federal or State agencies. Most of the projects, therefore, are rehabilitation (e.g. overlays, etc.).

Ms. Smith added that this aggressive 90-day approach requires that 50% of the allocation from the federal government to the State be obligated within 120 days, or the funding will be allocated to another State. Therefore, California is diligently pursuing its share of federal funding and MTC has a tight turnaround for submittal of proposals. This could potentially result in more funding for California if other states have not submitted proposals on a timely basis and miss federal deadlines.

Ms. Gause explained that Tier 2 is the potential “bump-up” in response to Mr. Birdleough’s questions. The cities and County also have secondary projects should additional funding become available if other regions/states do not meet their deadlines. Mr. Maitland announced that Tom O’Kane of the Sonoma County Transportation & Public Works Department is coordinating a meeting through the Builders Exchange to address the issue of timing of these projects.

Ms. Smith explained that under the Bill the State gets a percentage of funds and regions throughout the State get a percentage. MTC applied a formula for allocation of funds they receive based loosely on their Regional Transportation Plan. This basically splits funds into 80% for rehabilitation projects and 20% for new capacity/expansion/other types of projects. The list being considered represents the 80% fund.

Ms. Smith also noted that funding allocated to Transit will be addressed at the upcoming Transit TAC Meeting.

Ms. Smith then referred to the updated MTC proposal, identifying Transit as the 80% funding that will be allocated for System Preservation, and the 20% expansion funding will be allocated to the Oakland Airport Connector and the Trans Bay Terminal Box (a part of the larger Trans Bay Terminal project, preparing the facility for future high speed rail).

Referring to the Local Road Rehabilitation funding, Ms. Smith noted that this would be allocated under the 80% split. She observed that the Safety and Smart Highways, which includes the Freeway Performance Initiative (HOT lanes) and which is allocated as a priority by the MTC under the 20% expansion funding, does not include any projects in the North Bay. It was suggested at the previous California Transportation Committee (CTC) meeting that funding be set aside for some priority North Bay projects. This is proposed to be addressed at the upcoming CTC meeting February 25, 2009. She also noted that it is possible Sonoma County may get an additional \$750,000 under the “Other” category for the City of Santa Rosa for their Integrated Transportation System (ITS) project on Mendocino Avenue, which will also be considered at the February 25<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Ms. Smith commented on the benefits of being part of a region and how this has enabled Highway 101 construction to progress. It has also resulted in being given deadlines and information related to how the stimulus funds are to be spent.

B. Highway 101 – update

Mr. Maitland reported that continued construction on the Highway 101 North project was funded by a \$94 million loan from MTC, which will allow construction to continue for at least another year. Work is slowed down due to weather.

The contractor with the low bid for the Highway 101 Wilfred Avenue Exchange extended the bid to mid-March, at which time staff anticipates awarding the contract.

Ms. Smith then explained that the \$94 million loan was the result of private placement bonds, through an arrangement between the MTC Department of Finance and the Bay Area Toll Authority. The Bay Area Toll Authority and Caltrans have an arrangement whereby bonds are purchased and the terms of the bond agreement are that the funds are received by the Department of Finance to be used for specific projects in the region. She pointed out that neither of the Highway 101 projects were eligible for federal funds.

Mr. Maitland next reported that the Central B project, from Pepper Road to Old Redwood Highway on Highway 101, has passed the 65% design level. It is hoped that this will be completed by June or July. Information has begun to be submitted for permits for construction. Staff is also coordinating with the City of

Petaluma on the Old Redwood Highway Interchange project. Construction funds have not yet been identified for the Central B project, but staff is attempting to have this ready to begin as soon as there is funding.

Staff is also working with the City of Petaluma on the East Washington Avenue Interchange and the design of Marin-Sonoma Narrows (MSN) Segment C. The Washington Interchange is fully funded through construction; it will go into final design and the environmental process; utility, and right-of-way design. It is hoped that construction will begin in two years. PS & E design is being pursued for the entire MSN C corridor. This will expend the remaining Measure M funds for this corridor.

Discussed continued regarding the Rainier Avenue overpass. This is where the railroad would go beneath Highway 101 and options for upgrading it

Mr. Maitland summarized the following three projects; B1 by Novato, the Petaluma Boulevard South Interchange (B2) and the San Antonio Creek curb remedification to resolve flooding issues at the County line. All projects are progressing and are under design. Staff is developing budget estimates for the projects. Issues identified due to relocation in utilities include relocating a 24" or 30" existing water line that runs through a significant course of the corridor in the least costly manner possible; environmental mitigation on the projects which includes the California Red Legged Frog, wetlands, salt marsh harvest mouse, tree mitigation, and hydro modification and storm water treatment.

This summarizes work on Highway 101 from the Sonoma County line north to Windsor. Total estimated cost for the Highway 101 corridor is over \$1 billion. Mr. Maitland noted that interchanges are funded; the HOV lanes are not. Frontage roads will be constructed along with the interchanges.

There was no news on the Stage Gulch Road project. Mr. Maitland reported that the College Avenue PDT project for surface street improvements is starting again. Ms. Gause announced she would be attending a meeting on this project for the portion that includes improvements at downtown College Avenue, from Cleveland Avenue to Morgan Street, on February 24. Caltrans is working on design and they are funding for at least the right-of-way. Ms. Smith explained that this had been deferred because costs increased and elements had to be taken out. Now those elements have to be restored. The City of Santa Rosa has a project on Sixth Street.

## V. Planning Updates – **DISCUSSION/ACTION**

### A. CTP – EIR update

Ms. Gause reported that the consultant has provided an administrative draft of this document, which is being reviewed by staff. This was scheduled to be reviewed previously; however, was deferred due to the economic stimulus proposal preparation. Comments have been received from legal counsel. Staff will provide the consultant their comments by the end of the week. The consultant will then provide a draft to be released to the public at the end of March. There will be a 30-day comment period once the document is released to the public; a public meeting will be held to accept comments, followed by approximately six to eight weeks to respond to comments, after which it will be presented to the Board.

### B. Legislation

Ms. Smith had nothing to report.

### D. Projections 2009\*

Chris Barney reported that the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) publishes forecasts for population and employment every two years. Their latest report uses a different approach. They have two different scenarios; (1) is the "business as usual" approach; (2) is the "focused future" scenario, which takes all development in the outlying areas (San Francisco, Oakland and San Jose). Many comments were received from the jurisdictions. The final scenario will be somewhere mid-way between these scenarios. Adjustments have been made for reasonableness, current economic impacts (which results in lowering employment figures). The first draft has been taken to the jurisdictions for comments, which were due by

February 20. The final figures are being taken back to ABAG for the April 2009 report. These will be available online at the City level for review. This is a critical report in travel demand modeling and is used in the General Plan of many jurisdictions, as well as by MTC in their planning. As part of SB 375, ABAG will be required to tie the projections into regional housing figures. Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) figures will be required to be more consistent with ABAG forecasts.

Ms. Smith confirmed that Mr. Barney that figures have been scaled back since ABAG presented this to the SCTA Board. He noted that biggest impacts were in the East Bay and not so much in the North Bay. Basically everything was moved from the suburban eastern communities to Oakland and San Francisco, and was moved back after objections were made to this.

In response to Curt Nichols' question, Mr. Barney stated that future projections that are expected to be in alignment with SB 375 are anticipated in 2011. The current report will be adopted in April, 2009.

Willard Richards noted that the October version of the CTP needs editing and inquired about the schedule for finalization of this document. Ms. Spilman responded that it will be brought to the Board for approval at the same time the EIR is presented; it cannot be approved prior to the EIR approval.

Ms. Gause reported that project updates would be presented at the next meeting. These will include the Bodega Bay Trail and Central Sonoma Valley Trail, to be presented by Regional Parks staff. Other agenda items will include the CTP EIR and status of the federal stimulus plan.

**VI. Adjournment – ACTION**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:37 p.m.



**Measure M Cash Flow  
FY 08-09 Year to Date**

Description	Admin	LSR	LSP	Hwy 101	Hwy 101 Bond	Hwy 101 2008	Transit	Rail	Bike & Ped	Total
	793109	793208	793307	793406	Resrve 793448	Bonds 793455	793505	793604	793703	
Petaluma	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	340,784.08	340,784.08
Rohnert Park	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Santa Rosa	-	-	(5,181.00)	-	-	-	-	-	24,516.99	19,335.99
Sebastopol	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sonoma	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Windsor	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sonoma County Public Works	-	848,195.46	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	848,195.46
Sonoma County Regional Parks	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Caltrans	-	-	-	1,079,315.17	-	3,027,367.77	-	-	-	4,106,682.94
MTC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sonoma County Transit	-	-	-	-	-	-	499,132.75	-	-	499,132.75
Santa Rosa Citybus	-	-	-	-	-	-	309,141.19	-	-	309,141.19
Petaluma Transit	-	-	-	-	-	-	111,528.50	-	-	111,528.50
Healdsburg Transit	-	-	-	-	-	-	22,906.23	-	-	22,906.23
SMART	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sonoma County Bicycle Coalition	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	19,821.92	19,821.92
<b>TOTAL EXPENSES</b>	<b>152,337.41</b>	<b>848,195.46</b>	<b>(5,181.00)</b>	<b>1,605,811.58</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>9,587,351.56</b>	<b>942,708.67</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>385,122.99</b>	<b>13,516,346.67</b>
<b>ADJUSTMENTS</b>										
103 Cash with Trustee	-	-	-	-	-	(371,379.74)	-	-	-	(371,379.74)
109 Other Receivables	7,635.83	152,707.65	152,707.65	189,529.56	-	115,885.45	76,354.16	38,177.50	30,541.66	763,539.46
132 Due from Other Governments	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
201 Vouchers Payable	-	-	(147,353.00)	(220.26)	-	(233,433.26)	(206,905.88)	-	(8,438.45)	(596,350.85)
203 Accounts Payable	-	-	(5,181.00)	-	-	(196,671.22)	-	-	(6,000.00)	(207,852.22)
205 Due to Other Governments	-	-	-	(349,378.84)	-	-	-	-	-	(349,378.84)
209 Contract Retention Payable	-	-	-	(199,014.39)	-	(143,305.02)	-	-	-	(342,319.41)
Rounding	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>TOTAL ADJUSTMENTS</b>	<b>7,635.83</b>	<b>152,707.65</b>	<b>173.65</b>	<b>(359,083.93)</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>(828,903.79)</b>	<b>(130,551.72)</b>	<b>38,177.50</b>	<b>16,103.21</b>	<b>(1,103,741.60)</b>
<b>ENDING CASH BALANCE</b>	<b>41,323.56</b>	<b>2,114,099.40</b>	<b>13,583,415.05</b>	<b>21,198,372.89</b>	<b>4,740,068.48</b>	<b>30,183,275.48</b>	<b>283,038.68</b>	<b>2,848,726.27</b>	<b>1,454,641.35</b>	<b>76,446,961.16</b>

FUND : 80 OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES  
 SUBFUND : 100 MEASURE M

G/L	ACCOUNT TITLE	BEGINNING BALANCE	----- YEAR TO DATE -----		ENDING BALANCE
			DEBITS	CREDITS	
101	EQUITY IN POOLED CASH	78,546,507.23	30,502,956.87	32,602,502.94	76,446,961.16
103	CASH WITH FISCAL AGENT/TRUSTEE	185,750.91	1,475,551.90	1,104,172.16	557,130.65
107	ACCOUNTS RECEIVABLE	.01	.00	.01	.00
109	OTHER RECEIVABLES	763,539.45	325,595.81	1,089,135.26	.00
182	AMT TO BE PROVIDED FOR DEBT RETIREMENT	46,075,000.00	.00	.00	46,075,000.00
201	VOUCHERS PAYABLE	-596,350.85	12,376,640.96	11,780,290.11	.00
203	ACCOUNTS PAYABLE	-196,671.22	430,644.90	233,973.68	.00
205	DUE TO OTHER GOVERNMENTS	-360,559.84	360,559.84	.00	.00
209	CONTRACT RETENTION PAYABLE	-342,319.41	342,319.41	.00	.00
234	REVENUE BONDS PAYABLE	-46,075,000.00	.00	.00	-46,075,000.00
320	UNRESERVED/UNDESIGNATED FUND BALANCE	-70,078,857.61	.00	7,921,038.67	-77,999,896.28
322	FUND BALANCE RESERVED FOR ENCUMBRANCES	-7,921,038.67	3,463,977.68	.00	-4,457,060.99
400	BUDGETARY FUND BALANCE	.00	47,362,202.67	19,329,736.00	28,032,466.67
401	ESTIMATED REVENUE	.00	19,317,836.00	.00	19,317,836.00
411	REVENUE	.00	1,085,724.92	13,606,267.12	-12,520,542.20
420	APPROPRIATIONS	.00	.00	39,429,264.00	-39,429,264.00
421	BOARD RESOLUTIONS	.00	11,900.00	11,900.00	.00
422	PRIOR YEAR APPROPRIATIONS	.00	.00	7,921,038.67	-7,921,038.67
431	EXPENDITURES	.00	27,985,755.31	14,469,408.64	13,516,346.67
441	ENCUMBRANCES - CONTRACTS	.00	7,921,038.67	3,463,977.68	4,457,060.99
	TOTAL SUBFUND 100	.00	152,962,704.94	152,962,704.94	.00

FUND : 80 OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES  
 SUBFUND : 100 MEASURE M  
 PROJECT : 100 ADMINISTRATION

G/L	ACCOUNT TITLE	BEGINNING BALANCE	YEAR TO DATE		ENDING BALANCE
			DEBITS	CREDITS	
101	EQUITY IN POOLED CASH	70,809.17	132,319.21	161,804.82	41,323.56
109	OTHER RECEIVABLES	7,635.83	915.79	8,551.62	.00
201	VOUCHERS PAYABLE	.00	54,686.68	54,686.68	.00
320	UNRESERVED/UNDESIGNATED FUND BALANCE	-78,445.00	.00	.00	-78,445.00
400	BUDGETARY FUND BALANCE	.00	199,800.00	193,566.00	6,234.00
401	ESTIMATED REVENUE	.00	181,666.00	.00	181,666.00
411	REVENUE	.00	8,551.62	123,767.59	-115,215.97
420	APPROPRIATIONS	.00	.00	187,900.00	-187,900.00
421	BOARD RESOLUTIONS	.00	11,900.00	11,900.00	.00
431	EXPENDITURES	.00	152,337.41	.00	152,337.41
	TOTAL PROJECT 100	.00	742,176.71	742,176.71	.00

FUND : 80 OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES  
 SUBFUND : 100 MEASURE M  
 PROJECT : 200 LOCAL STREET REPAIRS

G/L	ACCOUNT TITLE	BEGINNING BALANCE	YEAR TO DATE		ENDING BALANCE
			DEBITS	CREDITS	
101	EQUITY IN POOLED CASH	504,668.35	2,646,983.66	1,037,552.61	2,114,099.40
109	OTHER RECEIVABLES	152,707.65	18,324.75	171,032.40	.00
320	UNRESERVED/UNDESIGNATED FUND BALANCE	-657,376.00	.00	.00	-657,376.00
400	BUDGETARY FUND BALANCE	.00	4,290,795.00	3,615,094.00	675,701.00
401	ESTIMATED REVENUE	.00	3,615,094.00	.00	3,615,094.00
411	REVENUE	.00	171,032.40	2,475,951.26	-2,304,918.86
420	APPROPRIATIONS	.00	.00	4,290,795.00	-4,290,795.00
431	EXPENDITURES	.00	848,195.46	.00	848,195.46
	TOTAL PROJECT 200	.00	11,590,425.27	11,590,425.27	.00

FUND : 80 OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES  
 SUBFUND : 100 MEASURE M  
 PROJECT : 300 LOCAL STREET PROJECTS

G/L	ACCOUNT TITLE	BEGINNING BALANCE	YEAR TO DATE		ENDING BALANCE
			DEBITS	CREDITS	
101	EQUITY IN POOLED CASH	11,122,084.96	2,803,221.24	341,891.15	13,583,415.05
109	OTHER RECEIVABLES	152,707.65	18,324.75	171,032.40	.00
201	VOUCHERS PAYABLE	-147,353.00	147,353.00	.00	.00
205	DUE TO OTHER GOVERNMENTS	-5,181.00	5,181.00	.00	.00
320	UNRESERVED/UNDESIGNATED FUND BALANCE	-11,122,258.61	.00	.00	-11,122,258.61
400	BUDGETARY FUND BALANCE	.00	2,365,000.00	3,824,392.00	-1,459,392.00
401	ESTIMATED REVENUE	.00	3,824,392.00	.00	3,824,392.00
411	REVENUE	.00	171,032.40	2,627,007.84	-2,455,975.44
420	APPROPRIATIONS	.00	.00	2,365,000.00	-2,365,000.00
431	EXPENDITURES	.00	.00	5,181.00	-5,181.00
	TOTAL PROJECT 300	.00	9,334,504.39	9,334,504.39	.00

FUND : 80 OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES  
 SUBFUND : 100 MEASURE M  
 PROJECT : 400 HIGHWAY 101

G/L	ACCOUNT TITLE	BEGINNING BALANCE	YEAR TO DATE		ENDING BALANCE
			DEBITS	CREDITS	
101	EQUITY IN POOLED CASH	19,436,735.33	4,528,269.78	2,766,632.22	21,198,372.89
107	ACCOUNTS RECEIVABLE	.01	.00	.01	.00
109	OTHER RECEIVABLES	189,529.55	36,649.38	226,178.93	.00
201	VOUCHERS PAYABLE	-220.26	2,097,530.87	2,097,310.61	.00
205	DUE TO OTHER GOVERNMENTS	-349,378.84	349,378.84	.00	.00
209	CONTRACT RETENTION PAYABLE	-199,014.39	199,014.39	.00	.00
320	UNRESERVED/UNDESIGNATED FUND BALANCE	-19,077,651.40	.00	.00	-19,077,651.40
400	BUDGETARY FUND BALANCE	.00	5,281,500.00	5,378,096.00	-96,596.00
401	ESTIMATED REVENUE	.00	5,378,096.00	.00	5,378,096.00
411	REVENUE	.00	226,178.93	3,952,712.00	-3,726,533.07
420	APPROPRIATIONS	.00	.00	5,281,500.00	-5,281,500.00
431	EXPENDITURES	.00	1,955,190.42	349,378.84	1,605,811.58
	TOTAL PROJECT 400	.00	20,051,808.61	20,051,808.61	.00

FUND : 80 OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES  
 SUBFUND : 100 MEASURE M  
 PROJECT : 440 HWY 101 BOND RESERVE 2008 BNY TT

G/L	ACCOUNT TITLE	BEGINNING BALANCE	YEAR TO DATE		ENDING BALANCE
			DEBITS	CREDITS	
101	EQUITY IN POOLED CASH	4,673,673.04	66,395.44	.00	4,740,068.48
320	UNRESERVED/UNDESIGNATED FUND BALANCE	-4,673,673.04	.00	.00	-4,673,673.04
411	REVENUE	.00	.00	66,395.44	-66,395.44
	TOTAL PROJECT 440	.00	66,395.44	66,395.44	.00

FUND : 80 OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES  
 SUBFUND : 100 MEASURE M  
 PROJECT : 450 HWY 101 2008 BOND ISSUE BNY TT

G/L	ACCOUNT TITLE	BEGINNING BALANCE	YEAR TO DATE		ENDING BALANCE
			DEBITS	CREDITS	
101	EQUITY IN POOLED CASH	38,979,299.37	17,763,534.02	26,559,557.91	30,183,275.48
103	CASH WITH FISCAL AGENT/TRUSTEE	185,750.91	1,475,551.90	1,104,172.16	557,130.65
109	OTHER RECEIVABLES	115,885.45	233,973.68	349,859.13	.00
182	AMT TO BE PROVIDED FOR DEBT RETIREMENT	46,075,000.00	.00	.00	46,075,000.00
201	VOUCHERS PAYABLE	-233,433.26	9,033,027.17	8,799,593.91	.00
203	ACCOUNTS PAYABLE	-196,671.22	430,644.90	233,973.68	.00
209	CONTRACT RETENTION PAYABLE	-143,305.02	143,305.02	.00	.00
234	REVENUE BONDS PAYABLE	-46,075,000.00	.00	.00	-46,075,000.00
320	UNRESERVED/UNDESIGNATED FUND BALANCE	-30,786,487.56	.00	7,921,038.67	-38,707,526.23
322	FUND BALANCE RESERVED FOR ENCUMBRANCES	-7,921,038.67	3,463,977.68	.00	-4,457,060.99
400	BUDGETARY FUND BALANCE	.00	31,103,312.67	2,823,080.00	28,280,232.67
401	ESTIMATED REVENUE	.00	2,823,080.00	.00	2,823,080.00
411	REVENUE	.00	346,448.79	1,966,680.25	-1,620,231.46
420	APPROPRIATIONS	.00	.00	23,182,274.00	-23,182,274.00
422	PRIOR YEAR APPROPRIATIONS	.00	.00	7,921,038.67	-7,921,038.67
431	EXPENDITURES	.00	23,696,200.36	14,108,848.80	9,587,351.56
441	ENCUMBRANCES - CONTRACTS	.00	7,921,038.67	3,463,977.68	4,457,060.99
	TOTAL PROJECT 450	.00	98,434,094.86	98,434,094.86	.00

FUND : 80 OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES  
 SUBFUND : 100 MEASURE M  
 PROJECT : 500 TRANSIT

G/L	ACCOUNT TITLE	BEGINNING BALANCE	YEAR TO DATE		ENDING BALANCE
			DEBITS	CREDITS	
101	EQUITY IN POOLED CASH	208,649.72	1,318,681.75	1,244,292.79	283,038.68
109	OTHER RECEIVABLES	76,354.16	9,162.04	85,516.20	.00
201	VOUCHERS PAYABLE	-206,905.88	650,481.80	443,575.92	.00
320	UNRESERVED/UNDESIGNATED FUND BALANCE	-78,098.00	.00	.00	-78,098.00
400	BUDGETARY FUND BALANCE	.00	1,889,795.00	1,802,535.00	87,260.00
401	ESTIMATED REVENUE	.00	1,802,535.00	.00	1,802,535.00
411	REVENUE	.00	85,516.20	1,233,165.55	-1,147,649.35
420	APPROPRIATIONS	.00	.00	1,889,795.00	-1,889,795.00
431	EXPENDITURES	.00	942,708.67	.00	942,708.67
	TOTAL PROJECT 500	.00	6,698,880.46	6,698,880.46	.00

FUND : 80 OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES  
 SUBFUND : 100 MEASURE M  
 PROJECT : 600 PASSENGER RAIL

G/L	ACCOUNT TITLE	BEGINNING BALANCE	YEAR TO DATE		ENDING BALANCE
			DEBITS	CREDITS	
101	EQUITY IN POOLED CASH	2,204,245.50	691,819.47	47,338.70	2,848,726.27
109	OTHER RECEIVABLES	38,177.50	4,580.60	42,758.10	.00
320	UNRESERVED/UNDESIGNATED FUND BALANCE	-2,242,423.00	.00	.00	-2,242,423.00
400	BUDGETARY FUND BALANCE	.00	1,000,000.00	945,335.00	54,665.00
401	ESTIMATED REVENUE	.00	945,335.00	.00	945,335.00
411	REVENUE	.00	42,758.10	649,061.37	-606,303.27
420	APPROPRIATIONS	.00	.00	1,000,000.00	-1,000,000.00
	TOTAL PROJECT 600	.00	2,684,493.17	2,684,493.17	.00

FUND : 80 OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES  
 SUBFUND : 100 MEASURE M  
 PROJECT : 700 BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN

G/L	ACCOUNT TITLE	BEGINNING BALANCE	YEAR TO DATE		ENDING BALANCE
			DEBITS	CREDITS	
101	EQUITY IN POOLED CASH	1,346,341.79	551,732.30	443,432.74	1,454,641.35
109	OTHER RECEIVABLES	30,541.66	3,664.82	34,206.48	.00
201	VOUCHERS PAYABLE	-8,438.45	393,561.44	385,122.99	.00
205	DUE TO OTHER GOVERNMENTS	-6,000.00	6,000.00	.00	.00
320	UNRESERVED/UNDESIGNATED FUND BALANCE	-1,362,445.00	.00	.00	-1,362,445.00
400	BUDGETARY FUND BALANCE	.00	1,232,000.00	747,638.00	484,362.00
401	ESTIMATED REVENUE	.00	747,638.00	.00	747,638.00
411	REVENUE	.00	34,206.48	511,525.82	-477,319.34
420	APPROPRIATIONS	.00	.00	1,232,000.00	-1,232,000.00
431	EXPENDITURES	.00	391,122.99	6,000.00	385,122.99
	TOTAL PROJECT 700	.00	3,359,926.03	3,359,926.03	.00
	TOTAL SUBFUND 100	.00	152,962,704.94	152,962,704.94	.00

## Staff Report

**To:** Sonoma County Transportation Authority  
**From:** Seana L. S. Gause and Janet Spilman  
**Re:** Item 5.A: 2009 Comprehensive Transportation Plan Environmental Impact Report  
**Date:** March 30, 2009

### **Issue:**

What is the status for developing an environmental impact report for the *2009 Comprehensive Transportation Plan* (CTP)? What is the schedule for completion?

### **Background:**

On July 14, 2008 the Board authorized the Executive Director to execute a contract with Pacific Municipal Consultants (PMC) to write an environmental impact report for the 2009 CTP. PMC has held scoping meetings for agencies and the public to seek input on the impacts to be covered in the EIR. The consultant is now preparing environmental settings and defining the alternatives based on the modeling scenarios that have been developed by the Ad Hoc committee through public outreach, input from the Board and input from the advisory committees.

The final EIR is expected to be brought before the Board for approval in June. When the EIR is certified, the Board may use the document to approve the final CTP based on the findings.

<b>Task</b>	<b>Deadline</b>
Release EIR for Public Review	March 30, 2009
Public meeting	Mid April
Respond to comments	May 2009
Final EIR to Board for Certification	June 2009 or July 2009

### **Policy Impacts:**

None

### **Fiscal Impacts:**

The contract to prepare the EIR has been approved by the board and will not exceed \$225,000.

### **Staff Recommendation:**

None, this item is informational.

## Staff Report

**To:** Citizen's Advisory Committee  
**From:** Chris Barney, Transportation Planner  
**Re:** Sonoma County Travel Model Validation Report  
**Date:** 3/30/2009

---

### **Issue:**

Sonoma County Travel Model output has been compared to existing travel information to ensure that the model is able to accurately predict travel in Sonoma County. This process of comparing observed travel patterns to predicted or modeled travel patterns is known as model validation.

### **Validation Reports:**

#### *Road Type Validation:*

Sonoma county roads have been divided into 7 different road type categories. The Federal Highways Administration (FHA) recommends the following validation targets for each road type:

1. Freeways, +/- 7% variation from traffic counts
2. Highways, +/- 10% variation from traffic counts
3. Expressways, +/- 10% variation from traffic counts
4. Arterials, +/- 15% variation from traffic counts
5. Arterials w/ center turn lane, +/- 15% variation from traffic counts
6. Collectors, +/- 25% variation from traffic counts
7. Ramps, +/- 25% variation from traffic counts

The road type validation table shows daily, and am/pm peak hour traffic count totals (provided by local jurisdictions and Caltrans) for each of these road types. Staff has collected over 3000 traffic counts for locations throughout the county and entered them into a countywide traffic count database as part of this validation exercise.

The validation table shows modeled results for each of these road types by time period and provides the margin of error (percentage difference) between traffic count and modeled count.

RMSE or Root Mean Square Error is also provided for each time period. This statistic is a measure how well model results match observed traffic counts. The model output is within the recommended FHA RMSE target (35%) for all time periods.

Model output for expressways and arterials with center turn lanes fall outside of the recommended FHA targets because of very small sample sizes for these two road categories.

*Transit Validation:*

The validation process for ensuring that modeled transit ridership estimates are reliable is similar to that used for road type validation. Transit ridership data provided by Sonoma County transit providers (Sonoma County Transit, Santa Rosa City Bus, Golden Gate Transit, Petaluma Transit) is compared to model estimated transit ridership.

The transit validation table compares 2005 ridership counts provided by transit providers to modeled transit ridership. Modeled ridership is further broken down by mode of access (walk or drive access), and time period.

Modeled ridership at the countywide level and for larger transit providers is very good, but a lack of data for the smaller transit systems made calibrating and validating ridership estimates for these systems difficult.

**SONOMA MODEL ROAD TYPE VALIDATION**

Output from Mode Choice with ODME

Road Type	Validation Target	DAILY				AM PEAK HOUR				PM PEAK HOUR				FACTYP
		Count	Model	Percent	RMSE	Count	Model	Percent	RMSE	Count	Model	Percent	RMSE	
Freeways	+/- 7%	3,220,200	3,098,838	- 3.8%		173,243	180,406	+ 4.1%		191,360	196,960	+ 2.9%		5
Highways	+/- 10%	1,378,932	1,333,517	- 3.3%		22,727	23,095	+ 1.6%		24,525	24,411	- 0.5%		2
Expressways	+/- 10%	22,608	18,721	- 17.2%		2,367	1,627	- 31.3%		2,311	1,720	- 25.6%		4
Arterials	+/- 15%	4,882,882	4,632,395	- 5.1%		406,366	379,210	- 6.7%		459,359	410,457	- 10.6%		3
Arterials w/ 2-way Left Turn Lane	+/- 15%	175,311	132,196	- 24.6%		14,246	12,086	- 15.2%		15,363	12,357	- 19.6%		8
Collectors	+/- 25%	310,954	271,826	- 12.6%		28,226	24,360	- 13.7%		26,826	23,312	- 13.1%		7
Ramps	+/- 25%	129,430	155,292	+ 20.0%		11,906	13,849	+ 16.3%		13,980	14,737	+ 5.4%		6
Subtotal Arterials		5,080,801	4,783,312	- 5.9%		422,979	392,923	- 7.1%		477,033	424,534	- 11.0%		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>+/- 5%</b>	<b>10,120,317</b>	<b>9,642,785</b>	<b>- 4.7%</b>	<b>22.9%</b>	<b>659,081</b>	<b>634,633</b>	<b>- 3.7%</b>	<b>33.6%</b>	<b>733,724</b>	<b>683,954</b>	<b>- 6.8%</b>	<b>33.0%</b>	

Validation Target for Percent Root Mean Square Error (RMSE) is 35%

## SCTM 07 - 2005 Transit Validation

System	Count	Model Estimated					
		Walk Peak	Walk Off-Peak	Drive Access	Total	Increment	Percent
SONOMA COUNTY TRANSIT	4,906	2,459	2,363	58	4,837	-69	-1%
GOLDEN GATE TRANSIT	2,959	1,057	329	1,821	3,207	248	8%
SANTA ROSA CITY BUS	9,415	3,348	6,107	22	9,477	62	1%
PETALUMA TRANSIT	623	110	188	13	310	-313	-50%
OTHER TRANSIT							
Cloverdale	n/a	63	85	0	148		
Healdsburg	n/a	2	0	0	2		
Mendocino	n/a	0	0	0	0		
Vine	n/a	1	1	0	2		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>17,903</b>	<b>7,040</b>	<b>9,073</b>	<b>1,914</b>	<b>17,984</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>0%</b>