
Citizens Advisory Committee**MEETING AGENDA****Monday, January 25, 2010**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 from September 28 2009* (a quorum was not achieved at the Oct 26 meeting)- ACTION
4. Measure M – DISCUSSION/ACTION
 - 4.1. Project Update – Sebastopol – Street Smart Sebastopol
 - 4.2. Annual Report
 - 4.3. Audit Proposal
 - 4.4. Financial Reports*
5. Planning – INFORMATION
 - 5.1. Community Based Transportation Plans*
 - 5.2. SB 83
6. Highway 101 projects update – INFORMATION
7. Public Outreach – CycleTracks, Twitter, Clo drawing
8. Other Business / Comments / Announcements
9. Next meeting – Election of Officers
10. Adjourn

*Materials attached.

The next **SCTA** meeting will be held **February 8, 2010**The next **CAC** meeting will be held **February 22, 2010**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 **CAC** 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
 September 28, 2009**

ATTENDEES

Anderson, Bob	United Winegrowers
Arthur, Brant	Climate Protection Campaign
Barney, Chris	SCTA
Birdlebough, Steve	Sierra Club
Donofrio, Nina	SCTA
Gause, Seana	SCTA
Griffin, Bob	Williams, Adley & Associates
Harter, Dennis	Sonoma County Alliance
Hirshfield, Maddy	Fifth District
Maitland, John	SCTA
Nichols, Curt	Home Builders Association
Rhodes, Dusty	Seniors
Richards, Willard	League of Women Voters of Sonoma Co.
Smith, Suzanne	SCTA
Spilman, Janet	SCTA

Chair Bob Anderson called the meeting to order at 4:06 p.m.

ITEM

1. Introductions

Round table introductions were made.

2. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

3. Approval of Minutes from July 27, 2009* - ACTION

Bob Anderson moved for approval of the minutes of July 27, 2009. Willard Richards seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

4. Measure M – DISCUSSION/ACTION

4.1. Annual Report update

Seana Gause explained that each Measure M recipient is to submit an annual report; the Annual Report is compiled from this information. She referred to the status report, which shows the amounts that were reported and date of submittal of each report. Since the staff report was written, the County has submitted their reporting letter (on September 25) and the one remaining outstanding reporting letter, Sonoma County Bicycle Coalition, for the Bicycle Safety and Education Program, was submitted September 22.

Ms. Gause reported that each project sponsor is required to submit a reporting letter. In addition, local bus transit is also required to submit an annual audit. This is usually required to comply with TFCA regulations. These are due the end of December.

Ms. Gause noted that last year's audit identified an issue on the part of some project sponsors in failing to comply with the reporting deadline. Therefore, upon the recommendation of the auditors, staff decided to send letters to the governing bodies of those jurisdictions who have late submittals. These letters will be sent out based on the status of the reporting letters. The Annual Report is anticipated to be completed in November or December.

Ms. Gause further explained, in response to Chair Anderson's inquiry, that the reporting cycle begins with the new fiscal year, on July 1, and the deadline for reporting letters is September 15. Letters will be sent to the respective City Councils, as well as to the Board of Supervisors, and, in the case of the Sonoma County Bicycle Coalition, a letter will be sent to the Board of Directors. She confirmed that all reporting letters have been received. Ms. Gause responded to further questions regarding appropriated funding and expenditures, and those jurisdictions where programmed funding is approaching the three-year deadline for expenditure before funds are rescinded.

4.2. Strategic Plan

Ms. Gause announced the completion of the 2009 Measure M Strategic Plan. It was approved by the Board at the September 14, 2009 meeting. She acknowledged the contribution of Chris Barney and John Maitland in updating maps for the project information sheets and writing some of the chapters, respectively. Ms. Gause summarized chapter contents. Chapter 6 includes project information sheets. One of these information sheets is for Rail, which was not previously included in the 2007 Plan. The Appendices include Resources for Project Sponsors and the Measure as published in the ballot. The Plan will be updated online shortly. She confirmed with Chair Anderson that this is a five-year plan and that it will be updated in two years.

Mr. Birdlebough asked if there had been discussion regarding problems in the bond market and whether there may be an early extension of the sales tax measure. Mr. Maitland replied that a second bond is included in the Plan, for Highway 101, and that discussion will take place in the future regarding the possibility of extending the term of the tax measure. Ms. Smith explained that at the previous SCTA Board meeting Director Kelley had suggested the possibility of having a future discussion regarding adjustments (particularly in cash flow needs) and a possible sales tax extension. Discussion continued regarding bond proceeds and addressed the Committee's questions regarding future issuing of bonds and adjustments in the sales tax measure.

4.3. Project Update – County projects

Ms. Gause introduced Kevin Howze of the Sonoma County Public Works Department to present a status report on all County projects. She noted that project sponsor presentations are now scheduled to include all the sponsor's projects.

Mr. Howze began his presentation on five current County Public Works projects with a status report on the Forestville Bypass Project Phase 1, at Highway 116 and Mirabel Road. Project development work has been conducted and the project is now at the environmental stage. This began as a traffic signalization project but in response to public call for a roundabout, a determination was made following engineering studies, in cooperation with Caltrans, to change to a roundabout treatment for the intersection. Studies showed that installation of a roundabout is technically feasible and would have fewer right-of-way impacts, fewer environmental impacts, lower cost and greater safety. The current project cost estimate is \$4.8 to \$5 million. As noted, the project is at the environmental stage and it is anticipated that right-of-way acquisition activity should begin in approximately one year. The project is being designed to accommodate future improvements at this intersection (a fourth lane and bypass).

Discussion ensued regarding visual standards for roundabouts and safety. Mr. Howze emphasized that this project had met stringent requirements in its design.

Mr. Howze responded to Committee questions regarding the need for environmental review and time frame for completing this. He explained that the project touches on an environmentally sensitive area, involving air quality concerns and wetlands existing in the area. This requires a review of possible endangered species in order to satisfy Environmental Protection Agency standards.

Mr. Howze next reported on the West County Trail, or Mirabel Bicycle Trail/shoulder widening project. This is a continuation of West County Trail going northward from its termination just south of Highway 116. Phase 1 goes through the Forestville Youth Park. This is to continue as a Class 1 trail as much as possible, thereby separating it from the main roadway and making it 18 ft. wide to allow for two-way bicycle and pedestrian traffic. Reduced staff has delayed progress in surveying and designing this project. Preliminary right-of-way has been completed.

In response to questions from the Committee, Mr. Howze explained that the project will connect from Santa Rosa to Sebastopol, up to River Road.

Ms. Gause explained that funding for this project is allocated to be expended within the five year plan. Mr. Howze confirmed that expenditures are below allocation for the current fiscal year.

In response to Mr. Birdleough's inquiry, Mr. Howze confirmed that Phases 2 and 3 of this project would have no separation or curb.

The next County project Mr. Howze reported on was the Airport Boulevard Interchange. Caltrans had proposed to do the design for this project utilizing their staff. A study was made to revalidate the original environmental document.

John Maitland explained that the initial environmental document for the Highway 101 North HOV lane project, which included an interchange, was revalidated and applied to this project. Part of this revalidation includes making additional studies, which identified potential environmental issues (e.g. the California Tiger Salamander) that need to be addressed. Caltrans is proceeding with preliminary design.

Mr. Howze added that with proposed modifications there will be less to construct and lower costs for the interchange, which is Phase 4 of the North Highway 101 construction project. There is general public support for the project.

Mr. Rhodes inquired as the difference in cost for design if it is done by Caltrans vs. a contractor. Mr. Howze noted that Caltrans has had a prompt turnaround in making needed modifications, which reduces costs. Mr. Maitland added that Caltrans also designed the HOV portion of the project, which also makes utilizing their services more cost effective.

Mr. Maitland confirmed how Measure M funds would be allocated for this project, at Chair Anderson's request.

Mr. Howze next summarized status of the Penngrove area projects. An extensive origin and destination study was conducted. The next step will be for a consultant to make an analysis of this data and draft a comprehensive plan that recommends projects. A few projects are already identified as “placeholders” for the future; the comprehensive plan will determine their timing and details. Staffing issues have caused a delay in releasing a request for proposals.

Chair Anderson asked if the County General Plan had resulted in closing some roads and if this was a part of the project area. Mr. Howze and Ms. Gause replied that these projects were dropped.

Mr. Howze then reported on the final project, State Route 116/121 Intersection Improvements. This project includes a roundabout and improvements for parking at the Park ‘n Ride lot.

Ms. Gause noted that in addition to Highway 121 and 116, Measure M funds cover additional sections of Arnold Drive. Mr. Howze confirmed that the County does have shoulder projects in Glen Ellen, near the Glen Ellen Market. One of these is ready to bid; the environmental and right-of-way acquisition has been completed. Staff is waiting to find out if they will receive State and Local Partnership (SLPP) funds; if this is not granted, Proposition 1B funding will be utilized. Mr. Howze reported that two additional intersections on Arnold Drive are scheduled for either signalization or a roundabout. One of these is at the intersection of Arnold Drive and Agua Caliente, which is currently a three-way stop and at Arnold Drive and Madrone Road.

Mr. Howze responded to questions regarding the process for determining that a roundabout would be installed vs. a traffic signal, and the impact of a roundabout on businesses in the vicinity of the intersection vs. a traffic signal.

Mr. Anderson asked whether the issue of altering Highway 116 from being a State route was still under discussion. Mr. Howze replied in the affirmative, noting that there did not appear to be any benefit to the County to alter Highway 116 as a State route, trading it to make another route a State Highway. He observed that this would require acquisition of a good deal more right-of-way land rights.

4.4. Financial Reports*

Chair Anderson confirmed that these reflect adjustments in reduced revenues and lowered payments.

4.5. Draft Measure M Audited FY 08/09 Financial Statements*

Bob Griffin of Williams Adley Associates, auditors, presented handouts of required communications. These included responsibilities of the auditor, the auditor’s opinion of the statements, and timing of the audit. The audit will be presented to the SCTA Board for final approval, which will be followed by a final report from the auditor within two weeks following final approval. Mr. Griffin next referred to a draft communication indicating significant audit findings and qualitative aspects of the audit. He noted that there are no estimates that have unusual subjective judgments. No difficulties were encountered in conducting the audit and no intentional misstatements were identified. No issues were identified with management. The final letter will be issued concurrently with the statements. He referred to the budgetary comparison. The management response brings up the possibility of implementing a check box procedure that would ensure when new funds are expended; this will be checked to see where they are going.

Discussion followed regarding the format for presenting comparable data for the prior year, showing summary totals for all the activities. Mr. Griffin said it is possible the data could be modified so that this could be done and that he would report back.

Mr. Harter moved for approval of the audited FY 2008/09 financial statements, with the request that formatting include comparable prior year data, if possible; if not, the audit would be accepted as presented. Mr. Richards seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.

5. Planning – INFORMATION

5.1. The proposed CTP and EIR will be presented to the SCTA on October 19
Janet Spilman reviewed a summary of the process that began two years ago with a poll that was taken near the end of the year and the draft that was completed in October. She presented the final draft, stating that this is not available online yet. She explained that the Board will first be asked to certify the EIR approving the CTP, and then will be asked to approve the CTP itself. The Draft EIR was released in early summer, and staff is currently working on the response to comments and exhibits for the Draft EIR. These documents have also been made available on CD.

Ms. Spilman next presented a milestone chart for the next Regional Transportation Plan, which is expected to be adopted March 13, 2013. It outlines an ambitious process because of the implementation of SB375, which calls for sustainable community strategies and for establishing air quality targets and GHG targets. MTC will be asking for projects by early 2011.

5.2. Way to Go Expo recap*

Ms. Spilman reported that this was well attended and was very successful. It took place in conjunction with the Wednesday Night Market and was a great opportunity to demonstrate alternative modes of transportation.

5.3. Commute information*

Chris Barney referred a chart showing commute information from Sonoma County to San Francisco and Alameda County. Data is broken down by jurisdiction to show personal and work commutes for 2005 and 2035. The current percentage of total work trips going to San Francisco and Alameda County is 5.5 and this decreases to 4.48% in 2035, primarily due to increased job creation in Sonoma County.

Mr. Barney responded to the Committee's questions regarding where the information comes from, and methodology for gathering census data. Mr. Barney explained that information is taken from MTC model results and is based on a combination of travel diaries and origin and destination studies.

6. Highway 101 projects update – INFORMATION

Ms. Smith referred to a table used as a project management tool for construction projects on Highway 101. The first large group of projects shows all phases of those related to Highway 101 widening that are either completed, are in some phase of development, or need funds. Projects are listed showing those that are under construction, and those that will go to construction, sequentially, in 2010, 2011 and 2012.

Highway 101 Central B data shows where funds are needed, where partial funding for design and right-of-way has been secured (for the next four projects), and a description showing how much funds are needed vs. what has been secured.

The next data shows information on follow up landscaping and sound wall construction.

Chair Anderson suggested adding a column to show Measure M contributions, to show what funds are available and what has been spent.

Ms. Gause reported that construction on the Wilfred Avenue Interchange project is ongoing. She announced that this project is now officially on Twitter. Anyone interested in receiving real time announcements (e.g.,

ramp closures) on this project can register at www.twitter.com/sonoma101. Tree removal is taking place. Traffic will be shifted soon, and bridge demolition will begin the first week of October.

Ms. Gause next reported that the Stage Gulch project is postponed. The project will probably be awarded in December, and will likely start construction in spring.

Mr. Maitland reported that the Highway 101 North project has been progressing, and, depending on weather, may have three lanes by this fall. There is a good deal of ramp work to be done. Bridge work has to be out of the creek by October 15.

On the Highway 101 Central A project, from Rohnert Park Expressway to Pepper Road, bidding has been postponed until October 14. A new specification has been made that will allow the contractor on the site sooner.

The Highway 101 Central B, from Pepper Road to Old Redwood Highway (a TIGER fund project) has been included on the project list for the State of California for this grant. Staff is awaiting notification as to its approval.

The Highway 101 Central C project, the Old Redwood Highway Interchange, is at the geometric design phase. The environmental document is expected to be completed by late fall.

The East Washington Interchange project plans are at 65% design level and are being reviewed by Caltrans.

The Airport Interchange project is going through revalidation of the environmental document.

Reporting on the Marin-Sonoma Narrows corridor, Mr. Maitland announced that the environmental record of decision is due this week. There is pending litigation against this project. Three of the projects; the HOV lanes in Marin County, the landfill interchange in Novato, and B2 project (Petaluma Boulevard South Interchange) are all at 65% design level. The B3 project (the San Antonio Curve) is at the 35% design level, because it was funded later.

7. Other Business / Comments / Announcements

There was no further business.

8. Adjourn

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:58 p.m.

Staff Report

To: SCTA – Citizens Advisory Committee
From: Seana L. S. Gause, Program/Project Analyst
Item: Measure M Annual Report FY08/09
Date: January 25, 2010

Issue:

What is the status of the Measure M Annual Report for FY08/09?

Background:

Each year, SCTA staff prepares an Annual Report for how Measure M funds have been spent during the fiscal year. This year's report includes information not only on Measure M projects that expended funds during the fiscal year, but also on project that progressed without the use of Measure M funds. Also of note, the first Measure M project to complete construction was achieved in FY08/09. The Copeland Creek Trail in the City of Rohnert Park came in under budget and offers a paved path for multiple users, including bikes, pedestrians, strollers, skateboards and wheel chairs.

Policy Impacts:

None, completing an annual report is within established policy.

Fiscal Impacts:

None, annual report is a budgeted line item.

Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommends that the CAC approve and send the Annual Report to the SCTA Board.

Staff Report

To: SCTA - Citizens Advisory Committee

From: Seana L. S. Gause, Program/Project Analyst

Item: Proposed Audit of Measure M Recipients

Date: January 25, 2010

Issue:

Shall the SCTA initiate random audits of Measure M recipients?

Background:

Of the six non-administration programs within Measure M, two are considered apportionment programs in that the funds are apportioned to designated sponsors within the program based on a formula. The expenditure plan does not call for specific projects within these programs. Local jurisdictions administer these funds and report on Measure M spending by submitting annual reporting letters. For the Local Bus Transit program, operators are required to also submit annual audits, however, no audits have yet been required for the Local Streets and Roads program.

The four remaining programs are considered project programs, in that the Measure M Expenditure Plan calls for one or more specific projects within the program. The Highway 101 projects are managed within SCTA and are subject to annual audits performed on SCTA records. In the three remaining programs (Local Streets Projects, Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects and Rail) project sponsors are required to submit annual reporting letters to the SCTA, however, no accounting audits of these programs have yet been conducted by SCTA.

As was established in the first Strategic Plan for Measure M, SCTA has always intended to perform random sample audits of the Measure M projects and maintenance programs (*2005 Strategic Plan, p7*). Since four full years have passed since the initiation of sales tax collection and distribution, adequate data will be available for auditing purposes.

An accounting firm such as Piseni & Brinker could be retained to conduct random audits of Measure M recipients. Such an audit would need to be paid for from the administration category of Measure M funds collected. As such, limiting the number of audits performed in a given year, but conducting audits for several years in a row, should provide the necessary level of review for all programs and project sponsors. Given that M recipients do not all receive the same types or amounts of funding (not all jurisdictions have LSP projects, for example), an audit conducted of Measure M recipients should review all programs where funds were received.

Policy Impacts:

None, as this is within policy established in the Measure M Strategic Plan.

Fiscal Impacts:

Funds to accomplish an audit would need to be used from the administration category of Measure M dollars collected. Limiting the number of M recipients audited in a given year should allow for sufficient funds to be available each fiscal year.

Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommends that the CAC consider forwarding a recommendation to the TAC and the SCTA Board to conduct audits of two Measure M recipients per year for four consecutive years. The need for further audits could be assessed at the end of the first four years.

Staff Report

To: Citizens Advisory Committee

From: Lynne March, Transportation Planner

Item: Community Based Transportation Plans

Date: January 25, 2010

Status of SCTA's CBTPs

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) identified four "Communities of Concern" in Sonoma County based on low-income status. MTC is providing funding to SCTA for the preparation of Community Based Transportation Plans (CBTPs) for each of these areas. CBTPs create transportation plans based on community input. Planning focuses on involving the target community in the identification of transportation problems, as well as potential solutions.

- 1) The Roseland Community Based Transportation Plan was adopted in 2007, and can be found on the SCTA website at www.sctainfo.org under "Reports."
- 2) The Lower Russian River Community Based Transportation Plan was the second CBTP to be completed for Sonoma County and can now be found in its final version on the SCTA website at www.sctainfo.org under "Reports." It was adopted in May 2009.
- 3) The Healdsburg CBTP was adopted by the SCTA Board on January 11, 2010. The final version is to be posted at www.sctainfo.org under "Reports."
- 4) The last of the four CBTPs is currently underway. The plan's public outreach component has been conducted and finalization of The Springs Community Based Transportation Plan (for part of the Central Sonoma Valley) is anticipated in early 2010.

Each plan provides historic and demographic information; describes existing and projected conditions; analyzes existing transit services and Lifeline objectives; presents the public outreach methodology and findings; and culminates in an action plan aimed at facilitating implementation of ideas to improve transportation access and mobility for each area's low-income residents. Each CBTP includes a prioritized list of transportation "solutions."

The associated funding to MTC's CBTP Program is MTC's Lifeline Transportation Program (Lifeline). Solutions arising from the CBTP process are favored for funding by the Lifeline source.

Staff Report

To: Citizens Advisory Committee
From: Suzanne Smith, Executive Director
Item: 5.2 – SB 83 (Hancock) – potential funding opportunity for transportation related projects – continued discussion
Date: January 25, 2010

Issue:

The SCTA considered SB 83 to address transportation funding needs in November 2009 and requested staff to revisit the issue in February. Does the CAC have a recommendation for the SCTA?

Background:

SB 83 (Hancock) authorizes a countywide transportation planning agency such as the SCTA, by a majority vote of board, to propose an annual fee of up to \$10 on motor vehicles registered within the county for transportation programs and projects. The bill requires simple majority voter approval of the measure. The bill requires the DMV, if requested, to collect the additional fee and distribute the net revenues to the agency, after deduction of specified costs, and would limit the SCTA administrative costs to not more than 5% of the distributed fees.

The bill requires that the fees collected be used only to pay for programs and projects bearing a relationship or benefit to the owners of motor vehicles paying the fee and are consistent with a regional transportation plan, and requires the agency's board to make a specified finding of fact in that regard. The bill requires the governing board of the countywide transportation planning agency to adopt an expenditure plan.

Several Bay Area transportation agencies are considering placing the vehicle registration fee measure on the November 2010 ballot. SCTA staff has been considering the process needed to put a measure before the voters should the SCTA desire to pursue this idea. There are a few key items that will require work over the next several months:

- An expenditure plan would need to be developed
- Public outreach and a possible poll to gather information on a preferred approach
- Preparation of a nexus analysis

A copy of the bill can be found at:

http://info.sen.ca.gov/pub/09-10/bill/sen/sb_0051-0100/sb_83_bill_20091011_chaptered.pdf

A hard copy is attached.

Policy Impacts:

The SCTA has placed measures before the voters of Sonoma County. In 2004 Measure M, a quarter cent sales tax was developed by the SCTA and placed on the ballot by the Board of Supervisors. It was approved by over 2/3rds of the voters. SB83 provides a new funding option to the SCTA that does not require a 2/3 vote threshold for approval.

Fiscal Impacts:

With a brief analysis of registered vehicles in Sonoma County, staff has developed the following revenue projections that could be generated from a vehicle registration fee. Registered vehicle information is derived from MTC, DMV and ABAG data. A 20-year program of \$8/year per vehicle would generate approximately \$90M.

Estimated Annual Revenue Generated							
	2008	2010 Range		2020 Range		2030 Range	
Registered Vehicles		Low	High	Low	High	Low	High
	486,827	494,214	502,607	517,684	542,850	543,549	573,083
\$2 fee	\$ 973,654	\$ 988,428	\$1,005,215	\$1,035,368	\$1,085,700	\$1,087,098	\$1,146,166
\$5 fee	\$2,434,135	\$2,471,070	\$2,513,037	\$2,588,421	\$2,714,250	\$2,717,745	\$2,865,416
\$8 fee	\$3,894,616	\$3,953,712	\$4,020,859	\$4,141,473	\$4,342,800	\$4,348,393	\$4,584,666
\$10 fee	\$4,868,270	\$4,942,140	\$5,026,073	\$5,176,841	\$5,428,500	\$5,435,491	\$5,730,832

The potential costs associated with developing a ballot measure and placing it before the voters would likely range from \$400,000-\$600,000. These costs include staff time, public outreach, expenditure plan development, and the Registrar of Voters fees for ballot placement.

Staff Recommendation:

Consider whether the CAC can recommend a position on SB 83, a vehicle license fee for transportation purposes, and if so, what timing might be most appropriate.

Senate Bill No. 83

CHAPTER 554

An act to add Section 65089.20 to the Government Code, and to add Section 9250.4 to the Vehicle Code, relating to traffic congestion.

[Approved by Governor October 11, 2009. Filed with
Secretary of State October 11, 2009.]

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

SB 83, Hancock. Traffic congestion: motor vehicle registration fees.

Existing law provides for the imposition by certain districts and local agencies of fees on the registration of motor vehicles in certain areas of the state that are in addition to the basic vehicle registration fee collected by the Department of Motor Vehicles for specific limited purposes.

The bill would authorize a countywide transportation planning agency, by a majority vote of the agency's board, to impose an annual fee of up to \$10 on motor vehicles registered within the county for programs and projects for certain purposes. The bill would require voter approval of the measure. The bill would require the department, if requested, to collect the additional fee and distribute the net revenues to the agency, after deduction of specified costs, and would limit the agency's administrative costs to not more than 5% of the distributed fees. The bill would require that the fees collected may be used only to pay for programs and projects bearing a relationship or benefit to the owners of motor vehicles paying the fee and are consistent with a regional transportation plan, and would require the agency's board to make a specified finding of fact in that regard. The bill would require the governing board of the countywide transportation planning agency to adopt a specified expenditure plan.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. (a) The Legislature finds and declares all of the following:

(1) Motor vehicle congestion negatively impacts businesses and commuters, inhibits the efficient movement of goods, and elevates pollutants that impact the quality of the state's air.

(2) There are transportation improvements that will reduce congestion, including those that improve signal coordination, traveler information systems, intelligent transportation systems, highway operational improvements, and public transit service expansions.

(3) There are measures available to lessen the impact of motor vehicle-related pollution, including congestion management programs,

stormwater runoff best management practices, and transportation control measures aimed at reducing air pollution.

(b) It is the intent of the Legislature to establish a program that allows countywide transportation planning agencies or their counterparts to address congestion through transportation services and improvements and to mitigate the impacts of motor vehicles on air and water quality, and improve the business climate and natural environment.

SEC. 2. Section 65089.20 is added to the Government Code, to read:

65089.20. (a) A countywide transportation planning agency may place a majority vote ballot measure before the voters of the county to authorize an increase in the fees of motor vehicle registration in the county for transportation-related projects and programs described in this chapter. The agency may impose an additional fee of up to ten dollars (\$10) on each motor vehicle registered within the county. The ballot measure resolution shall be adopted by a majority vote of the governing board of the countywide transportation planning agency at a noticed public hearing. The resolution shall also contain a finding of fact that the projects and programs to be funded by the fee increase have a relationship or benefit to the persons who will be paying the fee, and the projects and programs are consistent with the regional transportation plan adopted pursuant to Section 65080. The finding of fact shall require a majority vote of the governing board at a noticed public hearing.

(b) The ballot measure described in subdivision (a) shall be submitted to the voters of the county and if approved by the voters in the county, the increased fee shall apply to the original vehicle registration occurring on or after six months following the adoption of the measure by the voters and to a renewal of registration with an expiration date on or after that six-month period.

(c) (1) The governing board of the countywide transportation planning agency shall adopt an expenditure plan allocating the revenue to transportation-related programs and projects that have a relationship or benefit to the persons who pay the fee. The transportation-related programs and projects include, but are not limited to, programs and projects that have the following purposes:

(A) Providing matching funds for funding made available for transportation programs and projects from state general obligation bonds.

(B) Creating or sustaining congestion mitigation programs and projects.

(C) Creating or sustaining pollution mitigation programs and projects.

(2) For the purposes of paragraph (1), the following terms have the following meanings:

(A) “Congestion mitigation programs and projects” include, but are not limited to, programs and projects identified in an adopted congestion management program or county transportation plan; projects and programs to manage congestion, including, for example, high-occupancy vehicle or high-occupancy toll lanes; improved transit services through the use of technology and bicycle and pedestrian improvements; improved signal coordination, traveler information systems, highway operational

improvements, and local street and road rehabilitation; and transit service expansion.

(B) “Pollution mitigation programs and projects” include, but are not limited to, programs and projects carried out by a congestion management agency, a regional water quality control board, an air pollution control district, an air quality management district, or another public agency that is carrying out the adopted plan of a congestion management agency, a regional water quality control board, an air pollution control district, or an air quality management district.

(d) Not more than 5 percent of the fees distributed to a countywide transportation planning agency shall be used for administrative costs associated with the programs and projects.

(e) For purposes of this section, “countywide transportation planning agency” means the congestion management agency created pursuant to Chapter 2.6 (commencing with Section 65088) or the agency designated pursuant to Section 66531 to submit the county transportation plan.

SEC. 3. Section 9250.4 is added to the Vehicle Code, to read:

9250.4. (a) The department shall, if requested by a countywide transportation planning agency, collect the fee imposed pursuant to Section 65089.20 of the Government Code upon the registration or renewal of registration of a motor vehicle registered in the county, except those vehicles that are expressly exempted under this code from the payment of registration fees.

(b) The countywide transportation planning agency shall pay for the initial setup and programming costs identified by the department through a direct contract with the department. Any direct contract payment by the board shall be repaid, with no restriction on the funds, to the countywide transportation planning agency as part of the initial revenues available for distribution.

(c) (1) After deducting all costs incurred pursuant to this section, the department shall distribute the net revenues pursuant to subdivision (a) of Section 65089.20 of the Government Code.

(2) The costs deducted under paragraph (1) shall not be counted against the 5-percent administrative cost limit specified in subdivision (d) of Section 65089.20 of the Government Code.

O

CycleTracks now available to Sonoma County Users -> www.sfcta.org/content/view/666/375



<http://bit.ly/CycleTracks> Download CycleTracks, the free app that generates maps and statistics of your rides that you can share with friends now available on Android phones and iPhones. Time and route data is saved for you—and also transmitted to the San Francisco County Transportation Authority and forwarded to the Sonoma County Transportation Authority to improve the bicycle component of their travel forecasting models, helping planners better understand and serve the needs of cyclists.

You will be promoting Bay Area and Sonoma County cycling with each ride you record! (All data collected will be kept confidential). For more information and links to downloads visit:

www.sfcta.org/content/view/666/375

Follow SFTA on Twitter! ->
<http://twitter.com/sctainfo>

Twitter is a free service that lets you keep in touch with people through the exchange of quick, frequent answers to one simple question: What's happening? **Join today** to start receiving **sctainfo's** tweets.