



TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)

MEETING AGENDA

1:30 p.m., Wednesday, February 23, 2011

Solano Transportation Authority

One Harbor Center, Suite 130

Suisun City, CA 94585

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>STAFF PERSON</u>
I. CALL TO ORDER	Daryl Halls, Chair
II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA	
III. OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT	
IV. REPORTS FROM CALTRANS, METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION (MTC), AND STA STAFF (1:30 – 1:35 p.m.)	
V. CONSENT CALENDAR <i>Recommendation: Approve the following consent items in one motion.</i> (1:35 – 1:40 p.m.)	
A. Minutes of the TAC Meeting of January 26, 2011 <i>Recommendation:</i> <i>Approve TAC Meeting Minutes of January 26, 2011.</i> Pg. 1	Johanna Masielat
B. Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) Consultant Scope of Work <i>Recommendation:</i> <i>Forward a recommendation to the STA Board to authorize the Executive Director to release a Request for Proposal (RFP) and enter into an agreement in an amount not-to-exceed \$125,000.</i> Pg. 5	Robert Macaulay

TAC MEMBERS

Charlie Knox	Royce Cunningham	George Hicks	Morrie Barr	Dan Kasperson	Rod Moresco	David Kleinschmidt	Paul Wiese
City of Benicia	City of Dixon	City of Fairfield	City of Rio Vista	City of Suisun City	City of Vacaville	City of Vallejo	County of Solano

- C. Solano Countywide Bicycle Locker Study** Robert Guerrero
Recommendation:
Forward a recommendation to the STA Board to approve STA to conduct a Solano Countywide Bicycle Locker Study.
Pg. 17

VI. ACTION – FINANCIAL ITEMS

- A. Solano County Clean Air Grant Priorities** Robert Guerrero
Recommendation:
Forward a recommendation to the STA Board to program the Solano Napa Commuter Information (SNCI) Rideshare Incentives Program and Solano Safe Routes to School (SR2S) Program for the following clean air funding amounts:
1. \$200,000 from TFCA for SNCI's Rideshare Incentives Program; and
 2. \$30,000 from TFCA and \$30,000 from the Clean Air Program for the Solano SR2S Program (\$60,000 total).
- (1:40 – 1:50 p.m.)
Pg. 19

VII. ACTION NON-FINANCIAL ITEMS

- A. Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Update and Solano Call for Projects Draft List** Robert Macaulay
Recommendation:
Forward a recommendation to the STA Board to release the Draft Solano RTP Project List for public review.
(1:50 – 2:00 p.m.)
Pg. 21
- B. Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) Update** Robert Macaulay
Recommendation:
Forward a recommendation to the Alternative Modes Committee to approve the Land Use Chapter of the Solano CTP.
(2:00 – 2:10 p.m.)
Pg. 33
- C. Solano Rail Crossing Inventory and Improvement Plan** Robert Macaulay
Recommendation:
Forward a recommendation to the STA Board to adopt the Solano Rail Crossing Inventory and Improvement Plan.
(2:10 – 2:20 p.m.)
Pg. 45
- D. STA Project Delivery Policy** Sam Shelton
Recommendation:
Forward a recommendation to the STA Board to adopt the STA Project Delivery Policy as shown in Attachment B.
(2:20 – 2:30 p.m.)
Pg. 47

The complete STA TAC packet is available on STA's website: www.solanolinks.com

VIII. INFORMATIONAL

- A. **Project Delivery Update** Jessica McCabe
Informational
(2:30 – 2:35 p.m.)

Pg. 57

NO DISCUSSION

- B. **Legislative Update** Jayne Bauer
Informational
Pg. 63

- C. **FY 2011-12 Transportation Development Act (TDA) and State Transit Assistance Funds (STAF) Fund Estimates** Elizabeth Richards
Informational
Pg. 77

- D. **Funding Opportunities Summary** Sara Woo
Informational
Pg. 83

- E. **STA Board Meeting Highlights of January 19, 2011 and February 9, 2011** Johanna Masielat
Informational
Pg. 91 and Pg. 97

- F. **STA Board and Advisory Committee Meeting Schedule for Calendar Year 2011** Johanna Masielat
Informational
Pg. 103

IX. ADJOURNMENT

The next regular meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee is scheduled at **1:30 p.m. on Wednesday, March 30, 2011.**

This page intentionally left blank.



TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Minutes for the meeting of
January 26, 2011

I. CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was called to order at approximately 1:30 p.m. in the Solano Transportation Authority's Conference Room 1.

Present:

TAC Members Present:	Melissa Morton	City of Benicia
<i>Arrived at 1:40 p.m.</i>	Royce Cunningham	City of Dixon
	George Hicks	City of Fairfield
	Alyssa Majer	City of Suisun City
	Rod Moresco	City of Vacaville
	David Kleinschmidt	City of Vallejo
	Paul Wiese	County of Solano

STA Staff Present:

(In Alphabetical Order by Last Name)

Janet Adams	STA
Susan Furtado	STA
Daryl K. Halls	STA
Robert Macaulay	STA
Johanna Masiclat	STA
Jessica McCabe	STA
Elizabeth Richards	STA
Sam Shelton	STA
Sara Woo	STA

Others Present:

(In Alphabetical Order by Last Name)

<i>By phone</i>	Grace Cho	MTC
<i>By phone</i>	Ashley Nguyen	MTC
	Matt Tuggle	County of Solano

II. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

On a motion by George Hicks, and a second by Melissa Morton, the STA TAC approved the agenda.

III. OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

None presented.

IV. REPORTS FROM CALTRANS, MTC AND STA STAFF

Caltrans: None presented.

MTC: None presented.

STA: None presented.

Other: None presented.

V. CONSENT CALENDAR

On a motion by Rod Moresco, and a second by David Kleinschmidt, the STA TAC approved Consent Calendar Items A and B.

A. Minutes of the TAC Meeting of November 17, 2010

Recommendation:

Approve TAC Meeting Minutes of November 17, 2010.

B. SolanoExpress Intercity Transit Consortium 2011 Work Plan

Recommendation:

Forward a recommendation to the STA Board to approve the SolanoExpress Intercity Transit Consortium 2011 Work Plan as shown on Attachment B.

VI. ACTION FINANCIAL ITEMS

A. None.

VII. ACTION NON-FINANCIAL ITEMS

A. Congestion Management Program Traffic Data

Robert Macaulay reviewed the process to update the traffic counts in the CMP. He cited that the traffic counts from 2010 are sufficiently up-to-date, however, it is recommended that the local CMP roadway and intersection counts be brought up to date for the 2011 CMP. He added that in recognition of the significant impacts to local public works department budgets due to the economic downturn and state budget, it is recommended that STA conduct the traffic counts for the 2011 CMP update.

Recommendation:

Recommend the following:

1. Local jurisdictions with CMP roadway segments notify the STA if there are 2010 counts no later than January 31, 2011; and
2. STA to prepare an RFP and budget for the required traffic counts for the February 2011 TAC and March 2011 STA Board meetings.

On a motion by Paul Wiese, and a second by Melissa Morton, the STA TAC unanimously approved the recommendation.

B. Safe Routes to Transit Plan – Consultant Scope of Work

Robert Macaulay reviewed the development of a Safe Routes to Transit (SR2T) Plan contained in the STA’s Overall Work Plan. He indicated that the development of the SR2T would take advantage of lessons learned in creation of the Solano SR2S Plan. He also indicated that the scope of work envisions identifying existing barriers to safe access to transit centers and gathering statistics regarding crime and accidents around them.

Recommendation:

Forward a recommendation to the STA Board to approve the Scope of Work for creation of the Safe Routes to Transit Plan in Attachment A.

On a motion by David Kleinschmidt, and a second by Royce Cunningham, the STA TAC unanimously approved the recommendation.

VIII. INFORMATIONAL

A. Highway Projects Update

Janet Adams provided an update to major highway and reliever route projects in Solano County. She provided a status report to the following: 1.) I-80/I-680/SR 12 Interchange, 2.) I-80 EB Cordelia Truck Scales Relocation, 3.) North Connector, 4.) I-80 Ramp Metering: Red Top Rd. to Air Base Pkwy, 5.) Redwood Pkwy – Fairgrounds Drive Improvements, 6.) Jepson Parkway, 7.) State Route (SR) 12 Jameson Canyon, 8.) SR 12 East SHOPP Project, and 9.) I-80 SHOPP Rehabilitation Projects.

B. Project Initiation Document (PID) Budgeting & Selection Process

Sam Shelton reviewed the available resources and prioritization process for the Project Initiation Document (PID).

C. Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) Update

Robert Macaulay provided an update to the CTP. He identified new projects that can help expand and better connect the local and regional bicycle networks to Solano’s transportation system. He also reviewed the next steps for development of the CTP which are cost estimates for selected projects, revenue projections, and development of policies and text that make up the individual elements. He indicated that staff intends to hire a consultant to develop CTP cost estimates from the Bike and Ped plans and from existing transit and corridor studies.

D. Solano Sustainable Communities (SCS) Strategy Update/Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Projects Submittal Update

Via teleconference, MTC’s Ashley Nguyen reviewed the development of the SCS Performance Measures and the process to submit RTP projects.

E. Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 Abandoned Vehicle Abatement (AVA) Program First Quarter

Susan Furtado provided a report to the first quarter for FY 2010-11 of the AVA Program. She noted that the STA carried forward the unexpended and unallocated funds from FY 2009-10 in the amount of \$91,808.27 for the continuation of the program. She added that the \$91,808.27 will be disbursed in FY 2010-11 utilizing the funding formula.

NO DISCUSSION

F. Legislative Update

G. Project Delivery Update

H. Funding Opportunities Summary

I. STA Board Meeting Highlights of December 8, 2010

J. STA Board and Advisory Committee Meeting Schedule for Calendar Year 2011

K. Funding Opportunities Summary

IX. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 2:45 p.m. The next meeting of the STA TAC is scheduled at **1:30 p.m. on Wednesday, February 23, 2010.**



DATE: February 16, 2011
TO: STA TAC
FROM: Robert Macaulay, Director of Planning
RE: Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) Consultant Scope of Work

Background:

The STA's Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) was adopted in 2001 and updated in 2005. The CTP consists of 3 elements: Arterials, Highways and Freeways; Transit; and, Alternative Modes.

In 2008, the STA Board authorized a comprehensive update of the CTP. Since that time, the STA Board has approved:

- New Purpose Statement and Goals for each element
- A State of the System report for each element
- A Goal Gap Analysis for each element, identifying which Goals are or are not being met; and
- A CTP Project List to identify projects and programs that can help address the identified gaps.

The structure of the new CTP is different from the existing CTP. A new Land Use chapter has been added, and Ridesharing has been moved from the Alternative Modes to the Transit Element.

Concurrently, STA has been updating the Countywide Bicycle Master Plan and Countywide Pedestrian Master Plan (the Bike and Ped Plans). The STA Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC) and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (PAC) have been instrumental in these Plan updates, and have reviewed and approved project selection criteria, prioritized project lists and preliminary policies and text for the final versions of the Bike and Ped Plans.

At its January 2011 meeting, the STA Board approved a draft scope of work and schedule for update of the Solano Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) Plan. At its February 2011 meeting, the Board approved a scope of work for the development of a Safe Routes to Transit (SR2T) Plan.

Discussion:

STA staff is proposing to combined four separate CTP support projects into a single scope of work, and to issue a Request for Proposals to complete that scope (Attachment A). The four areas of work are:

1. CTP Cost Estimates. Develop a general estimate of the cost of the CTP project and program list developed in 2010, and a detailed cost estimate for a subset of those projects and programs that are either reasonably deliverable in the timeframe of the CTP or are critical projects with a long-term delivery schedule.

2. CTP Mapping and Graphics Support. Provide general mapping and graphics support for the CTP update and the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan updates.
3. Safe Routes to Transit Plan. SR2T Plan based upon the Board-approved scope of work.
4. TLC Plan Update. Develop the update of the Solano TLC Plan, based upon the preliminary Board-approved scope of work.

Fiscal Impact:

The Fiscal Year 2010-11 budget includes the following funds that can be used for CTP consultant services: \$47,000 in TLC, \$106,538 in CTP Update and \$20,000 for ST2T plan development. Combined, this totals \$173,538 available for CTP Update consultant services. STA staff is proposing to allocate \$125,000 for completion of the attached Scope of Work, and to carry the remaining \$48,538 over to Fiscal Year 2011-12 for additional CTP consultant services that will be needed.

Recommendation:

Forward a recommendation to the STA Board to authorize the Executive Director to release a Request for Proposal (RFP) and enter into an agreement in an amount not-to-exceed \$125,000.

Attachments:

- A. Scope for Work for CTP Update Consultant Support

SOLANO TRANSPORTATIONM AUTHORITY
COMPREHENSIVE TRANSPORTATION PLAN CONSULTANT
SCOPE OF WORK

The Solano Transportation Authority (STA) is in the process of updating its Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP). The CTP provides a 25-year outlook on transportation goals, projects and programs that are of a county-wide or regional nature.

In 2008, the STA Board authorized a comprehensive update of the CTP. Since that time, the STA Board has approved:

- New Purpose Statement and Goals for each element
- A State of the System report for each element
- A Goal Gap Analysis for each element, identifying which Goals are or are not being met; and
- A CTP Project List to identify projects and programs that can help address the identified gaps.

Approval of a new Land Use Chapter is pending before the STA Board.

In order to complete the CTP update, STA seeks consultant support to complete one or more of the following tasks:

- A. CTP Cost Estimates (see Attachment A)
- B. CTP Mapping and Graphics Support (see Attachment B)
- C. Safe Routes to Transit Plan (see Attachment C)
- D. TLC Plan Update (see Attachment D)

This page intentionally left blank.

CTP Project Cost Estimation
Consultant Scope of Work

The Solano Transportation Authority (STA) wishes to hire a consultant to assist in the development of cost estimates for projects and programs identified in the Solano Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) Project List.

A. The STA will provide the selected Consultant with the following:

1. A list of all projects proposed for inclusion in the CTP, including existing project descriptions
2. Where available, existing schedules, engineering and environmental details and cost estimates for such projects.
3. A list of all programs proposed for inclusion in the CTP, including existing program descriptions
4. Details of existing programs, including costs and service delivery, and projected levels of service delivery.
5. Historical, existing and projected demographic data necessary to determine future populations that may use services identified in A.3 above.

B. The Consultant will perform the following tasks:

1. Provide a preliminary estimate of costs for all projects identified in A.1 above. The estimate shall be prepared using a cost estimation formula provided by STA. Cost estimates shall include:
 - a. Engineering design and environmental clearance
 - b. Right-of-way acquisition
 - c. Construction
 - d. Maintenance for 25 years

Deliverable Product: Preliminary Cost Estimate for CTP Project List

2. Consultant, in conjunction with STA staff, will identify a subset of projects identified in A.1 above for the development of more detailed cost estimates.

Deliverable Product: List of Selected Projects and Programs for Detailed Evaluation

3. Provide an estimate of capital and operational costs for programs identified in A.3 above, based upon existing program costs, projected levels of service delivery, and a cost escalation schedule to be developed by the Consultant. For transit services, STA and the Consultant will jointly develop the performance measures to be used in projecting future needs. These standards may include, but are not limited to, passengers carried per capita and vehicle hours of service per capita.

Deliverable Product: Detailed Cost Estimate for Selected Projects and Programs

CTP Mapping and Graphics Support
Consultant Scope of Work

The Solano Transportation Authority (STA) wishes to hire a consultant to assist in the development mapping and other graphics for the Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP). This work may extend to sub-plans, such as the Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC), Countywide Bicycle and Countywide Pedestrian Plans. The consultant must be able to use ArcView GIS software and ArcView files provided by STA, and to be able to produce mapping and graphic output in formats useable by the STA in current and future publications, including as web content.

A. The STA will provide the selected Consultant with the following:

1. Existing mapping and graphics data prepared for the Solano CTP and sub-documents, including:
 - a. Electronic copies of existing documents.
 - b. ArcView files relevant to producing Solano CTP maps and graphics
 - c. Access to aerial photos that are useable with ArcView files
 - d. Access to the library existing STA photo and graphic images
2. STA and the Consultant will work together to produce a master list of maps and descriptive graphics, such as bar and pie charts, for inclusion in the Solano CTP and sub-plans.
3. Upon completion of individual chapters of the Solano CTP and of each sub-plan, STA and the Consultant shall develop a list of presentation graphics, such as pictures illustrating a point addressed in the text of the document.

B. The Consultant will perform the following tasks:

1. The Consultant shall produce all maps and graphics identified in A.2, A.3 and/or A.4 above.
Deliverable Products: Master list of maps and graphics; maps and graphics.

**Safe Routes to Transit
Consultant Scope of Work**

The Solano Transportation Authority (STA) wishes to hire a consultant to assist in the development of a Safe Routes to Transit (SR2T) plan. The consultant will primarily be responsible for gathering and organizing data related to safety in the area of Transit Facilities of Regional Significance (TFORS) identified by the STA.

A. The STA will provide the selected Consultant with the following:

1. List of all TFORS, including both existing and proposed facilities
2. A list of all streets and paths within a ½ mile radius of each TFORS
3. A contact name, phone number and e-mail for each jurisdiction having identified TFORS

B. The Consultant will perform the following tasks:

1. Gather all available accident and safety data for the streets and paths identified in A.2. This will include:
 - a. Traffic accidents, with a special emphasis on identifying incidents involving pedestrians and bicyclists
 - b. Crimes against persons

Deliverable product: Database of accident and safety data
2. Work with STA staff to develop a SR2T Steering Committee. The Steering Committee will be responsible for providing review and recommendations regarding the development of the planning document. Develop a planning and walking audit form to be used in subsequent steps. Deliverable products: Planning and walking audit form.
3. Work with STA staff to develop a SR2T task force committee for each TFORS. Jurisdictions with multiple TFORS may form a single task force. Task force participants will include but not be limited to transit riders, pedestrians, bicyclists, city planners, engineers, police and transit staff. Responsibilities will include conducting a planning and walking audits of each existing TFORS with the SR2T Task Force.
4. Work with STA staff and each SR2T task force committee to perform a field audit of each TFORS, and subsequently develop recommendations for improvements at each TFORS. Special emphasis will be placed on how pedestrian and bicycle users access each Center. Including a survey of the number of users and how and when users arrive at and depart from each Center. Deliverable products: Planning and walking audit of each TFORS
5. Using the planning and walking audit forms, meet with each SR2T Task Force Committee to develop a SR2T Report for each TFORS, which includes:
 - a. Description of how transit users access and use the TFORS
 - b. Incidents of accidents, including those involving pedestrians or cyclists
 - c. Incidents or clusters of criminal activity
 - d. Physical barriers or deteriorated infrastructure that restrict access to TFORS

Deliverable products: SR2T report for each TFORS

6. Take digital photos of each TFORS, covering the items listed below. The photos shall be stored in a database designed so that it can be searchable, can be expanded to include future-year photos, and can be incorporated into STA's Geographic Information System (GIS):
 - a. General site photos
 - b. All direct access ways
 - c. Parking lots
 - d. Bicycle parking and storage facilities
 - e. Anecdotal photos of patrons using the facility

Deliverable products: Site photos; photo database
7. A database of all incidents or barriers identified above, including a unique identification number. The list shall be designed so that it can be stored in a searchable database, can be expanded to include future-year incidents and/or barriers, and can be incorporated into the STA's GIS.

Deliverable product: incident and barrier database
8. Recommendations for improvements to each TFORS in order to improve bicycle, pedestrian and ADA accessibility and safety, including the following:
 - a. Standard design elements that can be incorporated into both existing and future TFORS.
 - b. Signage consistent with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Transit Connectivity Study findings, showing safe access to local and regional destinations.
 - c. A prioritization plan, both county-wide and for each facility examined.

Deliverable product: Recommendation of improvements for each TFORS

Solano Transportation for Livable Communities Plan Update
Consultant Scope of Work

The Solano Transportation Authority (STA) wishes to hire a consultant to assist in the update of the existing Solano Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) Plan.

A. The STA will provide the selected Consultant with the following:

1. The existing Solano TLC Plan and all related sub-plans:
 - a. Jepson Parkway TLC Concept Plan
 - b. North Connector TLC Corridor Concept Plan
2. STA will develop a TLC Working Group, made up of local jurisdiction staff, to help guide development of the Solano TLC Plan.

B. The Consultant will perform the following tasks:

1. Conduct a background analysis of TLC Program and its Relationship to The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAGs) Priority Development Area (PDA) program. The Consultant shall produce a TLC Background Report that addresses, at a minimum, the following issues:
 - a. Local and regional benefits of a TLC Program
 - b. Summary of the Solano TLC Program policies, projects and funding as of December 31, 2010
 - c. Regional TLC Program and its relationship to the County Program
Deliverable product: TLC Background Report
2. Assist STA staff in development of goals and objectives for the County TLC/PDA Plan. The Consultant will prepare a Goals and Objectives Report, which will include the following:
 - a. The goals and objectives recommended by the TLC working group.
 - b. Minutes of the TLC Working Group meetings where goals and objectives were discussed and approved. The purpose of the minutes is to document the development of the Goals and Objectives, including those proposals that are not ultimately included in the adopted document.
Deliverable product: TLC Goals and Objectives Report
3. Develop a Suburban TLC Successful Projects and Best Practices Report. The Report will include:
 - a. Examples of TLC projects in suburban communities that have been financially successful and accepted by their communities.
 - b. A descriptive list of best practices for TLC projects, including both process (such as public outreach, entitlement and financial support) and design/capital elements.
 - c. Information from active developers of TLC projects identifying aspects of TLC plans and projects that act as either obstacles or expeditors for delivery of TLC development.
Deliverable Product: Suburban TLC Successful Projects and Best Practices Report

4. Develop a Solano PDA and TLC Capital Project Report. The report will include:
 - a. A description of all PDAs designated in Solano County, as well as those areas proposed for future PDA designation. The description shall include the PDA boundaries, existing land uses, a summary of land use regulations, development potential within each PDA, transit facilities within or adjacent. The description will include maps and photos of each PDA.
 - b. A description of all TLC capital projects within or adjacent to each PDA. This will be an update of the information found in STA's State of the System Report – Alternative Modes. The description will include maps and photos of each TLC capital project.
Deliverable product: PDA and TLC Capital Project Report

5. Develop a Solano PDA/TLC Priority Project List. The consultant will work with STA staff and the TLC committee to develop a prioritized list of TLC and/or PDA projects.
 - a. Develop a list of projects in PDAs that are eligible for TLC funds. The PDA/TLC projects shall be taken from the Solano CTP project list, the Countywide Bicycle Plan list and/or the Countywide Pedestrian Plan list.
 - b. Develop criteria for prioritizing PDA and TLC projects listed in step a.
 - c. Develop a prioritized PDA/TLC project list.
Deliverable products: PDA project list; PDA/TLC project prioritization criteria; prioritized PDA/TLC project list.

6. Develop a Potential TLC/PDA Site Report. Consultant will investigate areas in each City and the unincorporated County that could produce Transit Oriented Developments, could use TLC type projects to increase bicycle, pedestrian and/or transit access, and/or could be submitted at a future date potential PDA's currently not part of ABAG's PDA designation. Consultant will also develop strategies for these locations to begin introducing TLC/PDA design concepts and policies. The intent of this report is to spotlight opportunities in cities and the unincorporated County without PDA designations. The report is not intended to recommend or direct local jurisdictions on changes to land use designations or regulations.
Deliverable product: Potential TLC/PDA Site Report

7. Develop a TLC/PDA Performance Measure tool. Working with STA staff and the TLC working group, the Consultant will develop performance measures and reporting criteria so that STA and its member agencies can track the implementation of TLC projects and the success in meeting TLC Goals.
Deliverable product: TLC/PDA Performance Measure Tool.

8. Final Plan. The Consultant will develop a final Solano TLC Plan, taking all of the products previously produced and integrating them into a single document, including an executive summary. The final Solano TLC Plan shall also place the Plan in the larger context of the Solano Comprehensive Transportation Plan and of similar plans from regional agencies with which STA and the local jurisdictions work. The consultant will develop a Draft Solano TLC Plan. STA will be responsible for obtaining public review of the Draft Solano TLC Plan. The Consultant shall subsequently develop a Final Solano TLC Plan. STA shall be responsible for final adoption of

the Solano TLC Plan.

Deliverable products: Draft and Final Solano TLC Plans; reproducible copies of the Draft and Final Solano TLC Plans in a format to be specified by STA.

9. Solano TLC Brochure. The Consultant will develop a single-page Solano TLC brochure for subsequent distribution by STA.

Deliverable product: Solano TLC Brochure

This page intentionally left blank.



DATE: February 14, 2011
TO: STA TAC and Consortium
FROM: Robert Guerrero, Senior Planner
RE: Solano Countywide Bicycle Locker Study

Background:

The STA has been contacted by Cities of Fairfield and Suisun City and on several occasions by bicyclists to help coordinate information for how cyclists can obtain a locker and who to contact if a locker user loses their key. There is not a comprehensive document that identifies how cities and the County of Solano are requiring, maintaining, and monitoring bicycle lockers. This is particularly true for lockers that are enclosed, leased or rented.

Discussion:

STA staff proposes to evaluate what policies are in place and report how each city and the county addresses bicycle lockers in planning and project implementation. In addition, there is a potential opportunity to have the Solano Napa Commuter Information (SNCI) program help manage and advertise the availability of these lockers. There are also potential marketing opportunities to map where lockers exist; for example: Safe Routes to School maps and the Solano Bikelinks Map. There is also clean air funding available for these types of activities.

This effort is proposed to be a joint planning project with SNCI staff, Solano Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC) and local agencies. The study is proposed to include the following elements:

- Report on locker users
- Inventory and map bicycle locker facilities
- Report on city policies related to bicycle lockers
- Report on current trends in bicycle lockers
- Management and maintenance options

A summary of each element is included in a Draft Scope of Work outlined in Attachment A. The intent is to have the study be incorporated as part of the STA Countywide Bicycle Plan Update and the overall Solano Comprehensive Transportation Plan. STA staff anticipates completion of the study by January 2012, before the next cycle of available clean air funds.

Fiscal Impact:

None to the STA Budget. The proposed study will be completed in-house as part of the Solano Bicycle Plan Update.

Recommendation:

Forward a recommendation to the STA Board to approve STA to conduct a Solano Countywide Bicycle Locker Study.

Attachment:

- A. Solano Countywide Bicycle Locker Study Draft Scope of Work

Solano Countywide Bicycle Locker Study Draft scope of work:

- Report on locker users
 - Discuss cost effective methods of estimating users of the facilities
 - Discuss current and anticipated types of users
 - How can we get more users?
- Inventory and map bicycle locker facilities
 - Surveying sites will be time consuming. The BAC will be requested to recommend specific location types to focus countywide surveying efforts (e.g. survey public facilities, shopping centers, and transit facilities)
 - Determine what lockers types are available
- Report on city policies related to bicycle lockers
 - General Plan
 - Transit
 - Others?
- Report on current trends in bicycle lockers
 - Identify new, innovative, cost-effective lockers
 - Identify opportunities for public private partnerships
 - Identify funding opportunities
- Management and maintenance options
 - Determine who is maintaining lockers
 - Recent reported problems? How are they addressed?
 - Opportunities



DATE: February 14, 2011
TO: STA TAC
FROM: Robert Guerrero, Senior Planner
RE: Solano County Clean Air Grant Priorities

Background:

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) and the Yolo Solano Air Quality Management District (YSAQMD) annually provides clean air funding to cities and counties within their jurisdictions for projects that reduce air pollution from motor vehicles, such as clean air vehicle infrastructure, clean air vehicles, shuttle bus services, bicycle projects, and alternative modes promotional/educational projects. The two Air Districts divide Solano County. The cities of Benicia, Fairfield, Suisun City, Vallejo, and southwestern portions of Solano County are located in the Bay Area air basin and are eligible for BAAQMD funding. The cities of Dixon, Rio Vista, Vacaville, and the unincorporated area located in northeastern Solano County are part of the Sacramento air basin, and are eligible for YSAQMD funding.

Funding for both clean air programs are provided by a \$4 vehicle registration fee collected from counties within the BAAQMD air basin. The YSAQMD also has funds to allocate from a fee collected with property taxes in areas within its air basin. The STA is responsible for programming the BAAQMD Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) funding for Solano County. A slightly different process is implemented for programming YSAQMD Clean Air Funds. The YSAQMD is directly responsible for programming the Clean Air Funds; however, they have set up a review process which includes participation from STA Board members to review and recommend projects to the YSAQMD Board. Both grant programs had funding levels shrink over the last two years as a result of the reduction in the number of motor vehicles registered.

In 2009, the STA Board adopted a policy prioritizing the Solano Napa Commuter Information's (SNCI) Rideshare Incentives Program, the Solano Safe Routes to School Program (SR2S), and Implementation of Sustainable Communities Strategy for clean air grant funding. This was due in part to the limited air quality funds. The total amount prioritized for both programs last year were \$200,000 for SNCI and \$60,000 for SR2S. Any remaining air quality funds were made available to other eligible clean air projects.

Discussion:

Both Air Districts are in the process of finalizing actual funding amounts available to program. However, STA staff estimates \$280,000 from the BAAQMD Transportation Fund for Clean Air Program (TFCA) and \$260,000 from the YSAQMD Clean Air Program to program this year.

STA staff recommends continuing to prioritize investment commitments of the clean air funds into SNCI's Rideshare Incentives Program and the Solano SR2S Program.

Both programs directly benefit member agencies by providing marketing of commute alternatives, capital for bike and pedestrian projects, and strategies for implementing SB 375 and have been identified as priorities by the STA Board.

SNCI's Rideshare Incentives Program Summary

SNCI's Rideshare Incentives Program continues to be a cost effective and successful program in terms of air emission benefits as calculated through the BAAQMD's TFCA program. Benefits of the program include marketing and promotion of commute alternatives through transit brochure distribution, vanpool formations, bicycle and pedestrian education, employer presentations, marketing events, and incentives campaigns (e.g. Bike to Work Day and Commute Challenge). STA staff is recommending \$200,000 from the TFCA program this year. Funding for this program is balanced with funding from Eastern Solano CMAQ funds.

Solano Safe Routes to School Summary

STA began the development of its Safe Routes to School (SR2S) Program in 2005, in response to the growing childhood obesity epidemic, student travel safety concerns, growing air pollution, and traffic congestion near schools in Solano County. The program works to encourage more students to walk and bike to school by identifying a balance of traffic calming and safety engineering projects, student education & safety training, encouragement contests & events, and enforcement coordination with police. STA staff is recommending \$30,000 from Bay Area TFCA and \$30,000 from Yolo Solano Clean Air Funds this year.

STA staff's recommendation is consistent with the last year's STA Board approved funding levels. The funds recommended for both programs will continue to assist in providing local cash contributions for other grant sources available to each program. Given the most recent funding estimates, a remaining balance of \$50,000 of TFCA funding and \$230,000 of YSAQMD will be potentially available for programming. STA staff will begin the process for programming the remaining TFCA in March when estimates become refined by the BAAQMD. The remaining YSAQMD funds will be approved in April by a subcommittee of the YSAQMD Board.

Fiscal Impact:

A total of \$260,000 of BAAQMD TFCA and YSAQMD Funding are recommended to be prioritized for SNCI's Rideshare Incentives Program and the Solano SR2S Program. The funding will be used for local match contributions to other grant sources.

Recommendation:

Forward a recommendation to the STA Board to program the Solano Napa Commuter Information (SNCI) Rideshare Incentives Program and Solano Safe Routes to School (SR2S) Program for the following clean air funding amounts:

1. \$200,000 from TFCA for SNCI's Rideshare Incentives Program; and
2. \$30,000 from TFCA and \$30,000 from the Clean Air Program for the Solano SR2S Program (\$60,000 total).



DATE: February 16, 2011
TO: STA TAC
FROM: Robert Macaulay, Director of Planning
RE: Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Update and Solano Call for Projects
Draft List

Background:

Assembly Bill (AB) 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 is intended to substantially reduce the emission of Greenhouse Gases (GHG), primarily carbon dioxide. Senate Bill (SB) 375, approved in 2008, is designed to implement a portion of AB 32 by integrating regional decisions on land use planning and transportation investment. This is primarily accomplished by requiring regional Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) to develop a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) that:

- Accommodates all of the region's growth, both in total numbers and by economic groups;
- Specifies the general location and density of housing development; and
- Ties transportation investments through the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) to new development or redevelopment, in order to reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT), the proxy measure for GHG emissions.

SB 375 only addresses emission reductions from reductions in VMT for cars and light trucks. Other initiatives under AB 32 deal with improved vehicle fleet fuel economy, lower carbon fuels, and reduced emissions from heavy trucks, transit and non-transportation sources.

In order to provide a transportation network for the SCS analysis and the next RTP (which will use a horizon year of 2040, and will be known as T2040), MTC has already begun the process of updating the current RTP (T2035).

In addition to its use in developing the next RTP, the SCS will determine the base numbers for the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA). The Cities and the County are required to develop General Plan Housing Elements that accommodate their share of the RHNA. In previous years, the RHNA and RTP processes were separate.

At its meeting of February 9, 2011, the STA Board approved a schedule for review of the draft RTP Project List, including a public outreach component. That schedule is included as Attachment A. Because of the SCS/RTP update schedule, only a short amount of time is allocated by MTC for STA to develop Solano County's RTP project list. All projects must be submitted to MTC by April 29, 2011.

The Metropolitan Transportation (MTC) has adopted Performance Measures to be used in development of the SCS and RTP. These measures will be used to compare the base case (business as usual) land use development and transportation network with several alternative scenarios. The adopted Performance Measures are included as Attachment B.

Discussion:

Attachment C is the Draft Solano RTP Project List. Projects are listed in four categories:

- A. Projects in T2035 that have been completed.
- B. Projects that are in T2035 that have not been completed.
- C. Projects proposed by STA staff for inclusion in T2040.
- D. Projects that fit into exempt categories, such as operations and maintenance.

Projects that receive federal and/or state financing must be listed in the RTP. In addition, local projects that have no federal or state funds may still be listed in the RTP in order to undergo air quality conformity analysis as part of the RTP review. It is therefore beneficial to have a project included in the RTP.

MTC has not yet provided STA with its fund estimates for the RTP. Because the RTP is a fiscally constrained document, only projects that, in total, will cost no more than the available funds can be included in the RTP. With the substantial reduction in state and federal transportation funds and the on-going economic downturn, STA anticipates a lower fiscal forecast than the \$600 million for Solano County available in the preparation of T2035. Projects that are funded entirely with local funds may be listed in the RTP without being counted against Solano County RTP fiscal limits.

In preparing the proposed RTP Project List, STA staff began with projects currently included in the T2035 list and projects proposed by the member agencies in 2010 for inclusion in the Solano Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP). From that master list, STA staff then identified projects that; a) have a reasonable likelihood of completion in the next 10 years; b) support efficient use or improvements to safety for the existing system, rather than major capacity expansion; c) that help improve the overall capacity of the Solano system, rather than act as stand-alone components; and d) are consistent with the existing RTP goals and the RTP and SCS Performance Measures.

Some programs are designed to maintain the current system, such as local streets and roads or transit maintenance. Other projects are individually small, but together make up a larger regional program, such as development of the Regional Bicycle Network. Programs and projects that fit into those categories do not have to be submitted individually by local agencies and the CMAs. The Programmatic Categories are listed in Attachment D.

All projects must be submitted to MTC by April 29, 2011. To meet this timeline, the Draft Solano RTP Project List must be released for public comment by March 9, and approved by the STA Board by April 13. The document released by the Board will be presented to the public via the STA website and at meetings targeting low income and senior and disabled transit users and other STA Advisory Committees. STA staff is also available to provide presentations at local jurisdiction Planning Commission or Board or Council meetings to assist in obtaining public input.

Fiscal Impact:

None at this time. However, the RTP project list will identify those projects that are covered under the RTP federal air quality attainment conformity analysis and which projects are eligible for state or federal funds, both of which strongly influence STA and member agency spending options.

Recommendation:

Forward a recommendation to the STA Board to release the Draft Solano RTP Project List for public review.

Attachments:

- A. RTP Draft Project List Review Schedule
- B. MTC Adopted RTP Performance Measures
- C. Draft Solano RTP Project List
- D. Programmatic Categories

This page intentionally left blank.

DRAFT

Schedule of Actions to Select STA's Projects for Submittal to MTC for the next RTP:

Action	Date
MTC issues formal Call for Projects to CMAs (and major transit providers)	February 10
STA Technical Advisory Committee and Solano Express Intercity Transit Consortium review Preliminary Solano Prioritized Project List – <i>public input meeting</i>	February 23
STA Board reviews Preliminary Solano Prioritized Project List – <i>public input meeting</i>	March 9
MTC Release of County-Level Financial Projections	March 11
Community Outreach Meeting for Low Income Users on Preliminary Solano Prioritized Project List (combination of Lifeline, CBO committees) – <i>public input meeting</i>	March
Community Outreach Meeting for Senior and Disabled Transit Users on Preliminary Solano Prioritized Project List (combination of Senior and Disabled Transit Committee and Paratransit Coordination Council) – <i>public input meeting</i>	March
Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committees review Preliminary Solano Prioritized Project List – <i>public input meeting</i>	March
STA Technical Advisory Committee and Solano Express Intercity Transit Consortium meetings Recommendation of Prioritized Solano Project List – <i>public input meeting</i>	March 23
STA Board Adoption of Prioritized Solano Project List – <i>public input meeting</i>	April 13
Completion of Project Submittal to MTC	April 29

This page intentionally left blank.

Date: January 26, 2011
 W.I.: 1121
 Referred by: Planning Committee

Attachment A
 Resolution No. 3987
 Page 1 of 2

Performance Targets for the Sustainable Communities Strategy/Regional Transportation Plan

GOAL/OUTCOME	#	RECOMMENDED TARGET <i>Unless noted, all targets are for year 2035 compared to a year 2005 base</i>
CLIMATE PROTECTION	1	Reduce per-capita CO ₂ emissions from cars and light-duty trucks by 15% <i>Statutory - Source: California Air Resources Board, as required by SB 375</i>
ADEQUATE HOUSING	2	House 100% of the region's projected 25-year growth by income level (very-low, low, moderate, above-moderate) without displacing current low-income residents <i>Statutory - Source: ABAG adopted methodology, as required by SB 375</i>
HEALTHY & SAFE COMMUNITIES	3	Reduce premature deaths from exposure to particulate emissions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce premature deaths from exposure to fine particulates (PM_{2.5}) by 10% • Reduce coarse particulate emissions (PM₁₀) by 30% • Achieve greater reductions in highly impacted areas <i>Source: Adapted from federal and state air quality standards by BAAQMD</i> Associated Indicators <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incidence of asthma attributable to particulate emissions • Diesel particulate emissions
	4	Reduce by 50% the number of injuries and fatalities from all collisions (including bike and pedestrian) <i>Source: Adapted from California State Highway Strategic Safety Plan</i>
	5	Increase the average daily time walking or biking per person for transportation by 60% (for an average of 15 minutes per person per day) <i>Source: Adapted from U.S. Surgeon General's guidelines</i>

Attachment A
Resolution No. 3987
Page 2 of 2

GOAL/OUTCOME	#	RECOMMENDED TARGET <i>Unless noted, all targets are for year 2035 compared to a year 2005 base</i>
OPEN SPACE AND AGRICULTURAL PRESERVATION	6	Direct all non-agricultural development within the urban footprint (existing urban development and urban growth boundaries) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scenarios will be compared to 2010 urban footprint for analytical purposes only. <i>Source: Adapted from SB 375</i>
EQUITABLE ACCESS	7	Decrease by 10% the share of low-income and lower-middle income residents' household income consumed by transportation and housing <i>Source: Adapted from Center for Housing Policy</i>
ECONOMIC VITALITY	8	Increase gross regional product (GRP) by 90% – an average annual growth rate of approximately 2% (in current dollars) <i>Source: Bay Area Business Community</i>
TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM EFFECTIVENESS	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decrease average per-trip travel time by 10% for non-auto modes • Decrease automobile vehicle miles traveled per capita by 10% <i>Source: Adapted from Caltrans Smart Mobility 2010</i>
	10	Maintain the transportation system in a state of good repair: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase local road pavement condition index (PCI) to 75 or better • Decrease distressed lane-miles of state highways to less than 10% of total lane-miles • Reduce average transit asset age to 50% of useful life <i>Source: Regional and state plans</i>

SOLANO COUNTY

RTP Reference Number	Project/Program	Total Project Cost	Committed Funds1	Discretionary Funds2	Project Notes
CATEGORY A - COMPLETED PROJECTS					
22631	Construct Route 12 westbound truck climbing lane at Red Top Road	\$13.2	\$13.2	\$0.0	COMPLETED
22634	Construct an adjacent 200-space, at-grade parking lot at the Vacaville intermodal Station (Phase 1)	\$12.9	\$12.9	\$0.0	COMPLETED
22700	Construct parallel corridor north of I-80 from Red Top Road to Abernathy Road	\$69.0	\$60.5	\$8.5	3 segments completed; segment 4 is part of 230326, I-80/I-680/SR 12 Interchange
230650	Widen I-80 from Red Top Road to Airbase Parkway to add HOV lanes in both directions (includes pavement rehabilitation and ramp metering)	\$94.9	\$94.9	\$0.0	COMPLETED
22629	Construct new Vallejo Baylink Ferry Terminal (includes additional parking, upgrade of bus transfer facilities and pedestrian access improvements) - Phase A				COMPLETED
CATEGORY B - PROJECTS IN T2035 NOT COMPLETED					
21341	Construct new Fairfield/Vacaville multimodal train station for Capitol Corridor intercity rail service (Phase 1)	\$39.6	\$29.6	\$10.0	Partially funded with Regional measure 2 Toll Bridge Program funds
22629	Construct new Vallejo Baylink Ferry Terminal (includes additional parking, upgrade of bus transfer facilities and pedestrian access improvements) - Phase B	\$85.6	\$75.6	\$10.0	Partially funded with Regional measure 2 Toll Bridge Program funds, project under construction.
22630	Improve Dixon facilities associated with the Dixon Rail Station: 1) Parkway Boulevard overcrossing, 2) B Street Ped Undercrossing, 3) West A Street Undercrossing	\$12.4	\$12.4	\$0.0	
22632	Widen American Road overpass at I-80	\$10.7	\$10.7	\$0.0	
22633	Widen Azuar Drive/Cedar Avenue on Mare Island, Vallejo, from 2 to 4 lanes between P Street and Residential Parkway (includes bicycle lanes, railroad signals and rehabilitation improvements)	\$11.7	\$11.7	\$0.0	
94151	Construct 4-lane Jepson Parkway from Route 12 to Leisure Town Road	\$194.0	\$134.0	\$60.0	CEQA clearance completed.
230311	Widen and improve Peterson Road (south gate to Travis AFB) with the addition of a truck-stacking lane (includes drainage improvements)	\$2.6	\$2.6	\$0.0	
230322	Rebuild and relocate eastbound Cordelia Truck Scales Facility (includes a new 4-lane bridge across Suisun Creek and new ramps at eastbound Route 12 and eastbound I-80)	\$100.9	\$100.9	\$0.0	Scheduled for construction 2011.
230326	Improve I-80/I-680/Route 12 Interchange, including connecting I-680 northbound to Route 12 westbound (Jamieson Canyon), adding connectors and reconstructing local interchanges (Phase 1) and including west end of the North Connector and conversion of HOV to Express Lane	\$487.9	\$134.4	\$353.5	Partially funded with Regional Measure 2 Toll Bridge Program funds, scheduled for construction in 2012.
230468	Provide auxiliary lanes on I-80 in eastbound and westbound directions from I-680 to Air Base Parkway (includes a new eastbound mixed-flow lane from Route 12 east to Air Base Parkway)	\$50.0	\$0.0	\$50.0	
230635	Construct new 400-space parking garage at the Vacaville Intermodal Station (Phase 2)	\$10.0	\$0.0	\$10.0	for Phase 1, see Solano project #22634
230708	Improve local interchanges and auxiliary lanes and make local streets and roads improvements (includes street channelization, overcrossing, bicycle and pedestrian access, and safety improvements)	\$15.0	\$15.0	\$0.0	

CATEGORY C NEW PROJECTS PROPOSED FOR ADDITION TO RTP

Fairfield Transportation Center Expansion - construct additional parking structure for net addition of _____ spaces

Curtola Park and Ride Expansion - construct parking structure at site of existing surface parking lot to support express bus and rideshare. Net increase of _____ spaces.

Redwood Parkway/Fairgrounds Interchange -

I-505/Vaca Valley Parkway Interchange - reconstruct existing overcrossing from 2 to 4 lanes plus Class II bike lane; reconstruct ramps to modified cloverleaf design.

I-80/I-505 Interchange redesign to accommodate Express Lane and eliminate lane drop from WB I-80 at I-505.

I-80 California Drive Overcrossing in Vacaville - construct new overcrossing with no freeway connection

I-80 Lagoon Valley Road interchange - reconstruct existing overcrossing from 2 to 4 lanes; rebuild ramps

SR-12/SR-113 intersection - non-capacity improvements to existing intersection to add turn lanes and signalize intersection

SR-12/Church Intersection - non-capacity improvements to realign existing roadways and add turn lanes; may also include park-and-ride lot

PSR approved.

\$0.0 Local Development Impact Fees fully fund project

\$0.0 Local Development Impact Fees fully fund project

\$0.0 Local Development Impact Fees fully fund project

May be SHOPP Eligible

May be SHOPP Eligible

CATEGORY D PROGRAMATIC PROJECTS

230699	Local streets and roads maintenance	\$2,559.0	\$716.0	\$524.0 Shortfall remains
--------	-------------------------------------	-----------	---------	---------------------------

Attachment A.2 Programmatic Categories

Programmatic categories are groups of similar projects, programs, and strategies that are included under a single group for ease of listing in the RTP/SCS. Projects within programmatic categories must be exempt from regional transportation conformity. Many projects which address the concerns of communities, such as pedestrian bulbouts, bicycle lanes, transit passenger shelters, ridesharing, etc. are often taken into account in a programmatic category. Therefore individual projects of this nature do not need to be specified. Projects grouped in a programmatic category are viewed as a program of multiple projects. Projects that add capacity or expand the network are not included in a programmatic category. Projects that do not fit within the identified programmatic categories are listed separately in the RTP/SCS. Programmatic categories to be used include, but are not limited to the following:

1. **Bicycle/Pedestrian Expansion** (new facilities, expansion of existing bike/pedestrian network)
2. **Bicycle/Pedestrian Enhancements** (enhancements, streetscapes, TODs, ADA compliance, mobility and access improvements)
3. **Bicycle/Pedestrian Facilities Rehabilitation**
4. **Lifeline Transportation** (Community Based Transportation Plans projects such as information/outreach projects, dial-a-ride, guaranteed ride home, paratransit, non-operational transit capital enhancements (i.e. bus shelters). Does not include fixed route transit projects.)
5. **Transit Enhancements** (ADA compliance, mobility and access improvements, passenger shelters, informational kiosks)
6. **Transit Management Systems** (TransLink[®], Transit GPS tracking systems (i.e. Next Bus))
7. **Transit Safety and Security Improvements** (Installation of security cameras)
8. **Transit Guideway Rehabilitation**
9. **Transit Station Rehabilitation**
10. **Transit Vehicle Rehabilitation/Replacement/Retrofit**
11. **Transit O&M** (Ongoing non-capital costs, preventive maintenance)
12. **Transit Operations Support** (purchase of operating equipment such as fareboxes, lifts, radios, office and shop equipment, support vehicles)
13. **Local Road Safety** (shoulder widening, realignment, non-coordinated signals)
14. **Highway Safety** (implementation of Highway Safety Improvement Program, Strategic Highway Safety Program, shoulder improvements, guardrails, medians, barriers, crash cushions, lighting improvements, fencing, increasing sight distance, emergency truck pullovers)
15. **Non-Capacity Increasing Local Road Intersection Modifications and Channelization**
16. **Non-Capacity Increasing State Highway Enhancements** (noise attenuation, landscaping, roadside rest areas, sign removal, directional and informational signs)
17. **Freeway/Expressway Incident Management** (freeway service patrol, call boxes)
18. **Non-Capacity Increasing Freeway/Expressway Interchange Modifications** (signal coordination, signal retiming, synchronization)
19. **Freeway/Expressway Performance Management** (Non-ITS Elements, performance monitoring, corridor studies)
20. **Non-Capacity Increasing Local Road Rehabilitation** (Pavement resurfacing, skid treatments)
21. **Non-Capacity Increasing Local Bridge Rehabilitation/Replacement/Retrofit**
22. **State Highway Preservation** (Caltrans SHOPP, excluding system management)
23. **Toll Bridge Rehabilitation/Replacement/Retrofit**
24. **Local Streets and Roads O&M** (Ongoing non-capital costs, routine maintenance)
25. **State Highway O&M** (Caltrans non-SHOPP maintenance, minor 'A' and 'B' programs)
26. **Regional Air Quality and Climate Protection Strategies** (outreach programs and non-capacity projects specifically targeting regional air quality and climate protection strategies)
27. **Local Air Quality and Climate Protection Strategies** (outreach programs and non-capacity projects specifically targeting local air quality and climate protection strategies)
28. **Regional Planning and Outreach** (regionwide planning, marketing, and outreach)
29. **Transportation Demand Management** (continuation of ridesharing, shuttle, or vanpooling at current levels)
30. **Parking Management** (Parking cash out, variable pricing, etc.)

This page intentionally left blank.



DATE: February 16, 2011
TO: STA TAC
FROM: Robert Macaulay, Director of Planning
RE: Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) Update

Background:

The STA's Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) was adopted in 2001 and updated in 2005. The CTP consists of 3 elements: Arterials, Highways and Freeways; Transit; and, Alternative Modes.

In 2008, the STA Board authorized a comprehensive update of the CTP. Since that time, the STA Board has approved:

- New Purpose Statement and Goals for each element
- A State of the System Report for each element
- A Goal Gap Analysis for each element, identifying which Goals are or are not being met; and
- A CTP Project List to identify projects and programs that can help address the identified gaps.

The structure of the new CTP is different from the existing CTP. A new Land Use Chapter has been added, and Ridesharing has been moved from the Alternative Modes to the Transit Element.

On January 14, 2011, the Draft Land Use Chapter of the Solano CTP was provided to the city and county planning directors with a request for review and comments. At its meeting of January 26, 2011, the TAC reviewed the Draft Solano CTP Land Use Chapter. No comments have been received from either the planning directors or the TAC members.

Discussion:

The Land Use Element is the first portion of the new CTP to be completed in draft form, and is included as Attachment A. This element lays out the existing and anticipated land uses in the 7 cities and Solano County, as well as setting the regional context. As noted in the introduction to this element, land use and transportation decisions interact with each other – neither strictly precedes or follows the other.

The Land Use Chapter is based upon existing statistical information, including the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAGs) Projections 2009 and the 2000 federal census. Depending upon the date of final adoption of the CTP, newer statistical information may be available, including the 2010 federal census and new ABA G projections. If that information is available, the tables will be updated. It is not expected that the updated information will substantially alter the past or projected trends of land use in Solano County. Finally, because chapter numbers have not been assigned yet, tables are designated with an "X" and a sequential number. When the final CTP organization is complete, appropriate table (and graphic) designations will be inserted.

The final CTP, including the Land Use Chapter, will have additional display and data graphics that are not included in the chapter at this time. These maps and graphics will be developed with consultant assistance, so no placeholders are shown in the Chapter.

The Land Use Chapter will be presented to the Alternative Modes Committee prior to being presented to the full STA Board. However, at their next meetings, the Land Use Chapter will be provided to each Committee as an informational item.

Fiscal Impact:

None.

Recommendation:

Forward a recommendation to the Alternative Modes Committee to approve the text of the Land Use Chapter of the Solano CTP.

Attachments:

- A. Solano CTP Land Use Chapter

2010 SOLANO CTP – LAND USE CHAPTER

Which comes first – the chicken or the egg?

Land use and transportation decisions are much like the chicken and the egg (neither really proceeds the other). They influence and react to each other, and develop as a system, rather than as individual, unrelated topics. Since the Solano CTP is primarily a transportation document, the majority of the Plan will address that topic. But given the close association of land use and transportation, it is important to start out with an overview of existing and projected local and regional land uses.

LOCAL

The STA has 8 member agencies: Solano County, and the cities of Benicia, Dixon, Fairfield, Rio Vista, Suisun City, Vacaville and Vallejo. Their existing and planned land uses have the greatest influence on Solano’s countywide transportation system. Each of the eight jurisdictions is statistically described in this Chapter, with a more detailed community profile found in Appendix ____.

Solano County is part of the San Francisco Bay Area, and is also part of the larger Northern California Mega Region. The Northern California Mega Region covers the San Francisco Bay and Sacramento regions, with strong connections to San Joaquin County and lesser connections to the Monterey, North Coast and upper and lower Central Valley areas, and even to the Lake Tahoe/Reno region to the east. Because of the concentration of economic, governmental and cultural resources in the San Francisco Bay Area and Sacramento, those areas and their land uses are also described below.

One of the most fundamental facts regarding the connection of land use and transportation decisions is that local governments have the statutory authority for land use decisions within their jurisdiction, subject to the requirements of state law. This is established in both the fundamental state land use laws regarding general plans, zoning and subdivision maps, as well as issue-specific legislation such as SB 375. This fundamental principle is recognized in the Solano CTP Goal #4:

“The Solano CTP will identify a transportation system that supports the existing and planned land uses of Solano County’s seven cities and the County of Solano.

- a) The Solano CTP recognizes that land use decisions are the responsibility of the local agencies.
- b) Recognize the interaction between land use and transportation plans, with neither taking precedence over the other.
- c) The CTP will help identify regional and state land use initiatives linked to transportation, and support local land use plans and projects that seek to take advantage of those programs.”

Solano County and the 7 Cities

Population

The population information below is taken from the decennial census for 1990 and 2000, and from the California Department of Finance annual population estimate for 2010. The raw population numbers are:

Table X1 – Solano Population, 1990 to 2010

Jurisdiction	1990	2000	2010	% of Total Population	20-year # growth	20-year % Growth
Benicia	24,437	26,865	28,086	6.6%	3,649	14.9%
Dixon	10,417	16,103	17,605	4.1%	7,188	69.0%
Fairfield	78,650	96,178	105,955	24.8%	27,305	34.7%
Rio Vista	3,316	4,571	8,324	1.9%	5,008	151.0%
Suisun City	22,704	26,118	28,962	6.8%	6,258	27.6%
Vacaville	71,476	88,642	97,305	22.7%	25,829	36.1%
Vallejo	109,199	117,148	121,435	28.4%	12,236	11.2%
Balance Of County	19,272	19,305	20,165	4.7%	893	4.6%
TOTAL	339,471	394,930	427,837	100.0%	88,366	26.0%

Vallejo is the largest city in the county, with 28.4% of the 2010 population. Benicia and Vallejo, which share a three and a half mile common border, account for 35% of the county total, while Fairfield (the County seat), Suisun City and Vacaville, all located in the center of the county, account for 54.3% of the county population. More than 89% of the County population is located on one of two urban clusters in the southwest and central portions of the county.

The low population figure for the unincorporated County is largely a result of the Solano Orderly Growth Initiative (aka Proposition A), approved by the voters in 1984 and subsequently renewed in 2008. The Solano Orderly Growth Initiative assigns urban growth almost exclusively to the incorporated cities, and severely limits rezoning of agricultural lands in the unincorporated County.

The two smallest communities in the county – Dixon and Rio Vista – are also not ‘clustered’ with other communities. Dixon is located on I-80, approximately half-way between Vacaville and Davis. Rio Vista is located on SR 12, approximately 20 miles east of Fairfield/Suisun City, and adjacent to the Sacramento River. Dixon’s access to I-80 provides it with good regional mobility, but Rio Vista’s almost complete reliance on SR 12 significantly restricts access to and from (as well as within) the city. In addition, year-round agricultural and interregional goods movement traffic on SR 12, and summer-season recreational traffic accessing the Delta, further impact SR 12 and access to Rio Vista. Dixon’s growth since 1990 has in part been limited by local ordinance, and by a City decision to not allow urban development on the north side of I-80. Rio Vista has entitled ___ residential units, but has not seen development of many of these created lots.

Employment

Until the mid-1990s, Vallejo was the employment center of the county as well as the population center. As seen in the table below, Vallejo accounted for ___ % of the county's jobs.

Table X2 – Solano Employment, 1990 to 2010

Jurisdiction	1990	2000	% of Total 2000 Employment	2010	% of Total 2010 Employment	20-year # growth	20-year % Growth
Benicia		14,400	10.5%	13,680	9.8%	13,680	
Dixon		4,790	3.5%	5,290	3.8%	5,290	
Fairfield		45,810	33.5%	45,120	32.2%	45,120	
Rio Vista		2,250	1.6%	2,870	2.0%	2,870	
Suisun City		3,390	2.5%	3,870	2.8%	3,870	
Vacaville		25,660	18.8%	28,380	20.3%	28,380	
Vallejo		31,260	22.9%	32,190	23.0%	32,190	
Balance Of County		9,140	6.7%	8,720	6.2%	8,720	
TOTAL		136,700	100.0%	140,120	100.0%	140,120	

In 1996, the Mare Island Naval Ship Yard in Vallejo was closed, and approximately ___ jobs disappeared. With this closure, the county employment center shifted from Vallejo to Fairfield, with almost one-third of the county-wide jobs located in Fairfield in 2000, and almost four in ten by 2010. Vallejo and Benicia combined account for 32.8% of the county's 2010 jobs, while Fairfield, Suisun City and Vacaville account for 55.3% of the jobs.

Although small, Dixon is well balanced between county wide population and employment, with 4.1% of the county population and 3.8% of the county jobs. Rio Vista has 1.9% of the county population and 2% of the county jobs. While Rio Vista lacks any regional job centers, Dixon has regionally-important retail and employers such as Genentech and Gymboree.

Projected Changes

There are two views of future development for Solano County and the 7 cities; those in each jurisdiction's general plans, and those of the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). Since 2007, ABAG has changed its Projections series of documents to reflect a policy choice giving preference to household and job creation in the inner Bay Area, in communities served by high-capacity, high frequency public transit. The following table shows each Solano jurisdiction's projected 2035 population and employment, based upon ABAG's Projections 2009. While the projections are not the certain result of 25 years of development and change by each jurisdiction, they do provide a reasonably-possible future image of Solano County and the 7 cities.

Table X3 – Solano Population and Employment Projections, 2035

Jurisdiction	2035 Population	% of Total 2035 Population	2035 Employment	% of 2035 Employment
Benicia	30,100	5.9%	18,850	8.9%
Dixon	23,900	4.7%	10,440	4.9%
Fairfield	127,000	25.1%	70,520	33.3%
Rio Vista	15,300	3.0%	5,990	2.8%
Suisun City	34,300	6.8%	6,090	2.9%
Vacaville	111,100	21.9%	42,110	19.9%
Vallejo	138,900	27.4%	45,920	21.7%
Balance Of County	25,900	5.1%	11,960	5.6%
TOTAL	506,500		211,880	

The projected 2035 distribution of population and employment is not significantly different from the existing conditions. Vallejo will remain the largest city in terms of population at 27.4%, and Fairfield will have the largest number of jobs at 33.3%. Population and jobs will be centered in the two city clusters of Benicia-Vallejo and Fairfield-Suisun City-Vacaville.

As with population, Dixon and Rio Vista are stand-alone communities with job growth prospects influenced by their access to the larger region. Dixon, with its close proximity to Davis and the University of California campus there, and its easy access by rail and freeway, has significant job growth potential. Rio Vista, however, has significant employment growth challenges because of its relative isolation. Because of the low base from which it starts, however, Rio Vista’s relative growth is substantial.

Even though the general location and proportion of residential and employment development are not expected to change over the next 25 years, the type of development may change. This is especially true of residential development. The primary reason for this is the current emphasis from MTC, ABAG and even national agencies on transit-oriented development (TOD). TOD is more than just housing near transit; it is communities designed to emphasize transit use over single-occupant auto trips. Typical features of TOD are higher density residential developments, easy access to public transit and to bicycle and pedestrian networks, and reductions in parking requirements (often upper limits on the number of parking spaces rather than lower limits.)

In the Bay Area, MTC and ABAG support TOD projects through the FOCUS program’s Priority Development Area (PDAs) designation, Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) planning and capital grants, and Station Area Plan grants.

There are 9 PDAs designated in Solano County. Each PDA is described in more detail in the Alternative Modes element of the Solano CTP, and in the Solano TLC Plan, a separate document that is being updated in 2011. The Solano TLC Plan focuses on the existing and potential PDAs, but will also recognize

that there are areas in the County and cities that can accommodate development that supports transit and bicycle and pedestrian use, but that do not qualify for PDA designation.

Table X4 – Solano Priority Development Areas, Population and Employment, 2035

	Population			Jobs		
	2010	2035	Change	2010	2035	Change
Downtown Benicia	1,447	1,673	226	1,789	2,087	298
Fairfield Downtown South	1,581	2,352	771	1,494	4,479	2,985
Fairfield-Vacaville Train Station	2,309	9,773	7,464	183	1,167	984
Fairfield North Texas Street Core	3,628	5,505	1,877	560	2,617	2,057
Fairfield West Texas Street Gateway	2,485	3,770	1,285	836	2,700	1,864
Suisun City Downtown & Waterfront District	3,839	7,258	3,419	764	1,444	680
Downtown Vacaville	1,298	4,538	3,240	1,807	6,261	4,454
Vacaville Allison Area	1,457	1,885	428	739	1,755	1,016
Vallejo Downtown & Waterfront	4,165	12,775	8,610	1,727	6,671	4,944
Total Solano County PDAs	22,209	49,529	27,320	9,899	29,181	19,282

The nine PDAs have the potential to account for almost 35% of the projected 25-year growth in Solano County and the 7 cities, as shown in Table X5 below. More important than the county-wide figure is the PDA proportion in 4 of the 5 cities that have PDAs: Fairfield, 54.2% of potential growth, Suisun City 64.1% of potential growth, Vacaville 26.6% of potential growth and Vallejo 49.3% of potential growth.

Table X5 – Solano Priority Development Areas, Population and Employment Growth, 2010 to 2035

Jurisdiction	2010 Population	2035 Population	25 Year Growth	PDA 25 Year Growth	PDA % of 25-Year Growth
Benicia	28,086	30,100	2,014	226	11.2%
Dixon	17,605	23,900	6,295	0	0.0%
Fairfield	105,955	127,000	21,045	11,397	54.2%
Rio Vista	8,324	15,300	6,976	0	0.0%
Suisun City	28,962	34,300	5,338	3,419	64.1%
Vacaville	97,305	111,100	13,795	3,668	26.6%
Vallejo	121,435	138,900	17,465	8,610	49.3%
Balance Of County	20,165	25,900	5,735	0	0.0%
TOTAL	427,837	506,500	78,663	27,320	34.7%

Most of these PDAs are centered around existing transit centers. The Fairfield Downtown and Suisun City Downtown and Waterfront District PDAs are immediately adjacent to the Suisun City Capitol Corridor train station. The Fairfield West Texas Gateway PDA includes the Fairfield Transportation

Center. The Downtown Vacaville PDA is a quarter mile from the Davis Street park-and-ride lot, while the Vacaville Allison Area PDA includes the Vacaville Transit Center. The Vallejo Downtown and Waterfront PDA includes the Water Emergency Transportation Authority (WETA) ferry terminal and the Vallejo Station parking garage. Finally, the Fairfield-Vacaville Train Station PDA is centered around a planned transit center that includes a Capitol Corridor train stop, bus connections and a park-and-ride lot.

This means that about one-third of the projected 2010 to 2035 residential growth can be accommodated in areas that provide immediate access to transit. By giving funding priority to projects in or directly supporting PDAs, STA has the opportunity to support those decisions that help create a more efficient use of the transportation system.

REGION

Solano County is part of the 9-county San Francisco Bay Area. The other counties are Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara and Sonoma. The eastern segment of Solano County is also functionally a part of the Central Valley, with close connections to the Sacramento and San Joaquin metropolitan areas and the Sacramento/San Joaquin Delta.

San Francisco Bay Area

As of the beginning of 2010, the Bay Area population was 7.3 million, with 5.1 million of those residents in Santa Clara, Alameda and Contra Costa counties and the city of San Francisco. The region's employment is similarly concentrated in those areas, with 2.6 million of the region's 3.5 million jobs in those areas.

The Bay Area's demographics and transportation are in large part shaped by geology. The mountain ranges of the Coast Range run north-south. The San Francisco Bay has both north-south and east-west portions. The result is a series of barriers that focus traffic on a few choke points, such as toll bridges and passes or tunnels through mountains. When the combination of concentrated jobs and traffic choke points is brought together, the Bay Area produces severe gridlock in some areas, especially those approaching the jobs centers in San Francisco and San Jose.

ABAG projects an 80% growth in the Bay Area's population from 2010 to 2035, and a 74% increase in employment. The rate of population growth in two of the core Bay Area cities – Oakland and San Francisco – will be less than that in outlying areas such as Solano County, but the total number of both new residents and new jobs in these areas will still be greater than the comparable aggregate total for all eight Solano jurisdictions. The concentration of jobs in the inner Bay Area, and inability to create new, high-capacity means of transporting workers in to those jobs, means that existing in-commute and resultant congestion will only get worse.

As noted above, ABAG and MTC are working on a program to concentrate growth in identified nodes that are served by frequent, high-density transit. This program, if carried out to its full potential, would substantially decrease the growth of in-commuting to the inner Bay Area and the related production of greenhouse gasses. However, many PDAs in the inner Bay Area are either at risk from projected sea level rise or are in areas with a high concentration of small particulate air pollution (PM 2.5), primarily

related to diesel engines. In addition, there are a number of non-transportation infrastructure deficiencies that impact these PDAs, as well as potential local political opposition. It appears unlikely that the Bay Area PDAs will be developed to their full potential.

Central Valley

The Sacramento metropolitan area is the largest urban concentration in the northern Central Valley, with Stockton and its environs being a distant second. Solano County's association with the Sacramento area is in some ways as strong as that with the Bay Area.

The Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) covers the counties of El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo and Yuba. SACOG projects the region's population will grow from a 2005 total of just over 2 million to a 2035 total of 3.4 million. Sacramento County has the largest number of residents, both at the current time and in the 2035 projections. Unlike many Bay Area communities, however, much of Sacramento County's population lives in the unincorporated county (527,790 of 1,283,234 in 2005). By 2035, the proportion of residents in the unincorporated county will have fallen from 41% to 38%, but will still be larger than any of the incorporated cities.

Sacramento holds a similar preponderance of regional jobs. In 2005, Sacramento County was home to 678,503 out of the region's 1,000,157 total jobs (68%). In 2035, the proportion is projected to be 63% (967,986 out of 1,536,097).

The SACOG area does not have the same physical constrictions of transportation routes as does the Bay Area. Although the Sacramento and American rivers transverse the area, they are much easier to cross than is the San Francisco bay. None of the bridges require a toll. In addition, the region is not divided by the steep hills that characterize the Bay Area.

One result of this lack of obstacles has been a lower density urban development pattern, with a higher proportion of single family homes and a lower density downtown business core. This lower density makes it harder for public transportation to achieve a high farebox recovery rate. In addition, the Sacramento Area is served by a limited number of freeways: Interstates 80 and 5, State Highways 99 and 50 and the Capitol City Freeway. Sacramento's freeway congestion is generally not considered as bad as that of the Bay Area, but the region does experience significant commute-hour delays, as well as non-commute delays from seasonal recreational traffic traveling to and from the Lake Tahoe region.

San Joaquin County is projected to grow from a 2010 population of 681,600 to a 2035 population of 1,000,200, with Stockton and Lodi remaining the two largest communities in the county. Employment for San Joaquin County is expected to grow from a 2010 total of 214,000 to a 2035 figure of 293,400.

San Joaquin County faces geographical, population density and transportation issues similar to those of Sacramento. Few Solano residents commute to San Joaquin County for employment. However, important recreational and agricultural traffic travels to and through both Solano and San Joaquin Counties on Highway 12.

Local and Regional Projection Differences

Projections for growth are a frequent source of tension between local and regional governments, and the Solano County relationship with ABAG is no exception. Many communities seek to emphasize retail and industrial expansion and minimize residential growth for a number of reasons, with impact to the local tax base being a common concern. In the 1990s and early 2000's most Solano County communities objected to ABAG's projections for residential growth as being too high, essentially forcing suburban Solano County to accept residential growth that the inner Bay Area communities were unwilling to accept. Residential growth projections are especially important because they form the basis of the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) process required by the State, and the subsequent development of local General Plan Housing Elements that must be in conformance with the RHNA numbers. At the same time, ABAG job projections were typically lower than local communities desired. This lower employment projection lacks the impact of the housing projections because there is no requirement or obstacle placed in the way of retail and industrial growth to match the RHNA and Housing Element requirements.

Since ABAG's Projections 2007, the situation has begun to reverse itself. ABAG is now projecting significantly lower population growth in Solano County as a matter of policy, and has revised its employment projections to: a) reflect a lower expected rate of employment growth, and b) concentrate more of that growth in the inner Bay Area.

One result of these differences in growth projections is that the local general plans have different projected population and employment numbers than do the ABAG projections. In the case of retail and industrial growth, local governments (both in Solano County and elsewhere in the Bay Area) typically aggressively seek out new development.

CONCLUSION

No matter which projections are used, Solano County will see continued residential, retail and industrial growth from 2010 to 2035. The location and type of this growth will be important, but will probably not change the fundamental traffic patterns that exist today. This is because the projected 25-year growth of population is about 18% - meaning that 82% of the population producing trips on local and regional roads already resides in Solano County. New land use development can change the type and volume of traffic growth, but is unlikely to substantially change that patterns that exist.

There are two possible exceptions to this conclusion. First, ABAG's growth projections could lead to a re-ordering of regional transportation investments, with more money going into the inner Bay Area communities projected to take on more residential growth. If the actual growth continues to happen in suburban communities such as Solano County – as has been the pattern for more than 20 years – but the transportation investments change to reflect ABAG's projections, then the impact of actual growth on Solano's transportation system will be worse, because the county and local jurisdictions will lack resources to improve the system.

The other potential change is a significant increase in the rate of employment growth in Solano County. Local residents drive to Bay Area and Sacramento jobs because that is where the major employment centers are located; and, in the case of many inner Bay Area jobs, that is where the high salary jobs are. If Solano County and the seven cities are successful in attracting new, good-paying jobs at a faster rate than ABAG projects, the need for Solano residents to commute on I-80 to the inner Bay or to Sacramento will be reduced. The potential to improve both the local and regional transportation pattern, as well as to provide other economic and sociological benefits to local jurisdictions, is significant.

This page intentionally left blank.



DATE: February 16, 2011
TO: STA TAC
FROM: Robert Macaulay, Director of Planning
RE: Solano Rail Crossing Inventory and Improvement Plan

Background:

Railroads provide both passenger and freight service to Solano County. Rail traffic also disrupts the flow of traffic on surface streets, and occasionally is involved in vehicle and/or pedestrian accidents. STA's Fiscal Year (FY) 2009-10 Overall Work Plan includes a task to conduct a Countywide rail crossing and accident inventory. The purpose of the inventory is to help STA identify and prioritize improvements to rail crossings located throughout Solano County in order to reduce congestion, improve transit and improve safety. The STA hired Wilson and Company to prepare a comprehensive database of rail crossings and accidents. Wilson and Company has completed the inventory work.

In May and June of 2010, TAC members received and provided comments on the crossing and accident inventory. In September, a Draft of the complete plan, minus the appendices, was provided to the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) for review and comment.

At its meeting of December 8, 2010, the STA Board released the Draft of the Solano Rail Crossing Inventory and Improvement Plan for public comment.

Discussion:

Attachment A is the Final of the Solano Rail Crossing Inventory and Improvement Plan (Rail Plan), including the appendices.

The Rail Plan identifies the Dixon West B Street pedestrian crossing as the highest priority for a grade separation project based upon safety concerns. Since this project is not fully funded, the plan recommends that STA and the partnering agencies seek additional funds to implement this project. The Rail Plan identifies the existing at-grade Peabody Road crossing as the highest priority for a grade-separation project based upon traffic congestion. The crossing will be grade-separated as part of the Fairfield Vacaville Intermodal Transportation Center Project.

Because of the cost of grade-separation projects, the Rail Plan does not recommend seeking out existing at-grade crossings for improvement, except as part of a larger development project. Instead, the Rail Plan recommends focusing on restricting unauthorized access to the rail corridor between crossings, making crossings sufficiently safe and attractive, and providing good linkage from crossings to destinations such as schools, so that bicyclists and pedestrians do not attempt to cross an undesignated locations.

The Final Solano Rail Crossing Inventory and Improvement Plan has been posted on the STA web site. The Plan was reviewed by staff from the Capitol Corridor JPA. No comments have been received since the Plan was released for public review.

Fiscal Impact:

No direct impacts. However, adoption of the Rail Plan will guide funding decisions for STA-programmed money.

Recommendation:

Forward a recommendation to the STA Board to adopt the Solano Rail Crossing Inventory and Improvement Plan.

Attachment:

- A. Solano Rail Crossing Inventory and Improvement Plan (The Plan is posted and may be downloaded by visiting STA's website at <http://www.sta.dst.ca.us/plans2.html#railxing>)



DATE: February 11, 2010
TO: STA TAC
FROM: Sam Shelton, Project Manager
RE: STA Project Delivery Policy

Background:

The STA's Project Delivery Department is responsible for the delivery of STA led projects (e.g., I-80/I-680/State Route (SR) 12 Interchange project, SR 12 Jameson Canyon project, Jepson Parkway, etc.) and monitors the delivery of STA supported & funded projects (e.g., local street rehabilitation projects, bridge toll funded transit center projects, bicycle and pedestrian projects, etc.). With a staff of three, the STA Project Delivery Department currently monitors and assists in the delivery and monitoring of over \$660 million in active federal, state, regional, and locally funded transportation projects countywide.

STA Project Delivery Assistance

Most project funding does not come directly from the STA itself, it is approved by the STA and then comes from either federal, state, or regional agencies. STA project delivery staff helps local agency project sponsors secure their funding from a variety of funding agencies, which often involves supporting local project managers through complex federal, state, regional and local funding program procedures.

As an ongoing activity, STA staff monitors all transportation funding and projects in a series of STA staff reports and regular Solano Project Delivery Working Group (PDWG) meetings:

- Project Delivery Update Reports
To aid in the delivery of locally sponsored projects, the STA continually updates the STA's Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Solano Project Delivery Working Group (Solano PDWG) on changes to State and Federal project delivery policies and reminds the TAC about upcoming project delivery deadlines. This report is in the process of being modified to include a comprehensive set of grant-assisted transportation projects.
- Solano Project Delivery Working Group (Solano PDWG)
Composed of local project managers from across the county, this working group has met monthly for the past 3 years to discuss project delivery issues and resolve them in a collaborative and proactive manner.

The purpose of the Solano Project Delivery Working Group (Solano PDWG) is "To provide a project delivery forum between STA Staff and local project managers."

The goals of the Solano PDWG are as follows:

1. Educate all project managers regarding project delivery planning, programming and allocation procedures and deadlines.
2. Regularly update STA staff regarding project delivery status.

3. *Insure that all project delivery deadlines are met by local project sponsors.*
4. *Discuss and resolve project delivery issues cooperatively.*
5. *Recommend improvements to the project delivery process and project delivery solutions to the STA TAC.*

When met with critical project delays or deadlines, STA staff assists local sponsors through various avenues of recourse, providing a forum between local staff, MTC, Caltrans, and other funding or oversight agencies. When project sponsors are unable to secure funds or a project's deliverability is in jeopardy, STA staff develops options, such as funding swaps, delivery options, or reprogramming of funding to protect funding from being lost from Solano County and to maintain equity between STA's member agencies.

Discussion:

Advanced Deadlines Without Additional Resources

STA staff worked closely with local project managers to deliver \$31 million in projects in the last cycle of Federal "Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act (SAFETEA-LU) and \$31 million in Federal American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funded projects under tight deadlines set by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Caltrans, and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). Despite the STA staff and the Solano PDWG's best efforts, some local project sponsors have occasionally been unable to meet various project delivery deadlines. Several of these project sponsors may face the loss of future federal funding as described in MTC's project delivery Resolution 3606, which is summarized below.

Project-Funding Delivery Policy (MTC Resolution No. 3606)

<http://www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/delivery/#IV>

Key elements of the revised policy include:

- Obligation requests must be submitted to Caltrans Local Assistance by February 1 of the year the funds are programmed in the federal Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).
- Funds must be obligated by April 30 of the year programmed in the TIP.
- The agency must execute and return the Program Supplement Agreement (PSA) to Caltrans within 60 days of receiving the PSA from Caltrans.
- Once obligated, funds must be invoiced against at least once every six months.
- For funds contracted out, a contract must be awarded within 9 months of obligation.
- Projects must be closed out within six months of final invoice.
- Funds that do not meet these deadlines are subject to deprogramming by MTC, or deobligation by Caltrans/FHWA. There is no guarantee the funds will be available once deprogrammed or deobligated.

In addition, implementing agencies that have projects that fail to meet the requirements of the regional project delivery policy, regardless of federal fund source, will have Obligation Authority (OA) limited for subsequent projects and restrictions placed on future programming.

The intent of this regional delivery policy is to ensure implementing agencies do not lose any funds as a result of missing a federal or state funding deadline, while providing maximum flexibility in delivering transportation projects. MTC has purposefully established regional deadlines to provide the opportunity for implementing agencies, the Bay Area Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs), Caltrans, and MTC to solve potential problems in advance of losing funds due to a missed state or federal deadline.

MTC, Caltrans, and FHWA have a strong argument for establishing project delivery deadlines. Each fiscal year, there are only so many available tax dollars, or Obligation Authority (OA), for transportation projects. Some deadlines have to do with developing a project (e.g., field reviews, environmental clearance, right-of-way clearance, etc.) to the point where a project sponsor can request OA (e.g., Request for Authorization to Proceed, E-76 Request, Allocation Request, etc.). Other deadlines have to do with time periods during the later part of the fiscal year where time runs out to make a request and OA is transferred from Solano County for other counties to spend, then to other regions, then to other states. This is the basis for “use it or lose it” project funding policies. Attached is a table of MTC’s Resolution 3606 deadlines with associated consequences (Attachment A).

Despite the intent of MTC’s Resolution 3606, it does not give local project sponsors the tools they need to deliver projects in an expedited manner to meet expedited deadlines. MTC does offer a Pavement Management Technical Assistance Program (P-TAP) which assists local agencies prioritize pavement maintenance projects using MTC’s StreetSaver software and awards grants for pavement project design assistance. However, this MTC grant program does not assist local agencies with managing the delivery of other projects.

Recent Applications of MTC’s Resolution 3606 & Delayed Projects

TAC Item VIII.C, “Project Delivery Update” discusses how STA staff helped project sponsors, who missed the February 1, 2011 obligation request deadline, develop realistic project delivery schedules and remain in MTC and Caltrans’s FY 2010-11 federal obligation plan. Project sponsors who failed to meet the February 1st deadline were subject to being removed from the obligation plan and losing their funding. More details on STA’s response and delayed projects can be found in the Project Delivery Update.

Request for Project Management Assistance

At the February 24, 2010 TAC meeting, TAC members asked that the STA consider funding some form of project management assistance beyond restrictive delivery policies. On July 9, 2010, the STA Board adopted the FY 2010-11 Budget, which included \$50,000 for the development of a “Program Manager Application”, which is discussed in the August 2010 TAC agenda item “Solano Project Mapper & Management Webtools”. No funds have budgeted for other forms of assistance, such as a STA Technical Assistance Program for Project Management, similar to MTC’s P-TAP. STA staff is still looking at options to further help local agencies in this effort.

The TAC also discussed reasons why project sponsors and engineers wait until delivery deadlines approach before speaking with responsible funding agencies, such as the reluctance to admit failure and the potential of losing their agency’s grant funds.

Developing STA Project Delivery Policies

In the absence of and prior to the development of a STA Technical Assistance Program for Project Management, STA staff is recommending that the TAC recommend the adoption of STA project delivery policies drafted with the following goal:

- To protect transportation funding for Solano County projects from being lost to other agencies due to project sponsors failing to meet project delivery deadlines set by MTC, Caltrans, and FHWA.

The attached draft policies help achieve this goal based on the following principles (Attachment B):

- Provide overburdened project sponsors with clear consequences for failing to meet MTC, Caltrans, and FHWA deadlines.
- Provide clear decision points for the STA Board to and the TAC provide project funding alternatives to project sponsors struggling with delivery deadlines, such as fund swaps and deferment of fund shares.
- Structure incentives into funding alternatives for projects sponsors who request to exercise these alternatives earlier in the process rather than later. The farther a project is from a deadline, the easier it is to create more lucrative funding alternatives. The closer a project sponsor is to failing to meet a deadline, funding alternatives become harder to structure and may result in the complete loss of funds from the struggling project sponsor.

Based on how early in the planning and programming process a project sponsor realizes they cannot meet funding agency delivery deadlines, the STA stands a better chance of creating funding alternatives. Other funding alternatives generally require another project sponsor to be able to use the struggling project sponsor's funds for a project that can meet the deadlines attached to the fund source.

Those funding alternatives include:

- *Rescope a project into smaller phases or reprogram funding to another project within the same local agency*
This method is preferable to others as it offers the greatest amount of flexibility to shift funding sources and manage project costs, but can only take place earlier in a project's development and early in the funding programming cycle, usually before the fiscal year in which the funding is programmed.
- *Deferment of funding shares to later years or grant cycles*
This method can preserve equity but will delay the delivery of a project. This can only take place if other projects can spend the deferred funds in earlier years. Reprogramming funds in this nature requires early notice. This is essentially a funding swap without an incentive and can take place as late as October or November of any given fiscal year.
- *Funding swaps on sliding scales from \$0.90/\$1.00 to as low as \$0.50/\$1.00 in high-pressure circumstances*
Funding swaps for federal funds in exchange for local funds can keep a smaller project sponsor's project moving and create an incentive for a larger project sponsor to enter into a swap. The longer a project sponsor waits, the worse the return ratio becomes. This creates incentives for both fund swap parties to enter the swap sooner rather than later. This method can take place as late as February or March of any given fiscal year for STP/CMAQ funded projects.
- *Reprogramming of funding without the possibility of the funding returning to the project sponsor*
This method is the default method of ensuring a project's funding stays within the county or region. It is the standard method cited in MTC's Resolution 3606. If a project sponsor is too close to an Obligation Authority critical deadline, this is often the only option remaining. This method is often used between March and May of any given fiscal year.

STA staff requests that the TAC review and recommend adoption of the STA Project Delivery Policies that will help guide the delivery of Cycle 1 funded projects.

Fiscal Impact:

This policy is intended to initiate STA staff and committee project review processes and potential to recommend the reprogramming of funding between local agency projects.

Recommendation:

Forward a recommendation to the STA Board to adopt the STA Project Delivery Policy as shown in Attachment B.

Attachments:

- A. MTC Resolution No. 3606, Page 11, Table of Milestones, Deadlines, and Consequences
- B. Draft STA Project Delivery Policy, 02-11-2011

This page intentionally left blank.

Milestone	Deadline	Authority	Consequence of Missed Deadline
Programming in TIP	Agency committed to obligate funds by April 30 of the year listed in TIP	Regional	Deprogramming of funds and redirection to other projects that can use the OA.
Field Review (If applicable)	Within 12 months of inclusion in TIP	Regional	Restrictions on future programming, obligations and OA until deadline is met.
Pre-Draft Environmental Document Submittal (Non-Cat Ex)	12 months prior to obligation of Right of Way or Construction funds	Regional	Reprogramming of funds.
MTC Annual Obligation Plan	Beginning of each federal fiscal year	Regional	Funds not identified in MTC's annual Obligation Plan do not receive priority for OA and may need to wait until after May 1 to receive obligation/ transfer of funds.
Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) Goals (If Applicable)	Start by January 1, complete by February 1, of year programmed in TIP	Regional	Deprogramming of funds and redirection to other projects that can use the OA if not obligated by April 30.
Obligation/ FTA Transfer Request Submittal	February 1 of year programmed in TIP	Regional	Project loses priority for OA. Other projects in region may be given OA.
Obligation/ Transfer to FTA	April 30 of year programmed in TIP	Regional	Deprogramming of funds and redirection to other projects that can use the OA.
Release of Unused OA	May 1	Caltrans	Unused OA is made available for other regions to access.
End of Federal Fiscal Year. - OA no Longer Available	August 30	Caltrans, Federal	FHWA Obligation system shut down. Unused OA at the end of the fiscal year is taken for other projects. No provision that the funds taken will be returned.
Program Supplement Agreement (PSA)	60 days after receipt from Caltrans 6 months after obligation	Caltrans	Restrictions on future programming, obligations and OA until deadline is met. De-obligation by Caltrans after 6 months.
Construction Advertisement	6 months after obligation	Regional	Restrictions on future programming, obligations and OA until deadline is met
Construction Award	9 months after obligation	Regional	Restrictions on future programming, obligations and OA until deadline is met
Invoicing & Reimbursement	Agency must invoice and receive reimbursement at least once every 6 to 12-months following obligation of funds	Caltrans, Federal, Regional	Explanation in writing if funds not invoiced in past 6-month period. (Caltrans) Deobligation if project inactive for 12 months. (FHWA) Restrictions on future programming, OA and obligations if agency has not invoiced and received reimbursement at least once every 12-months after obligation. (MTC)
Liquidation	6 years after obligation	State of California	Loss of State Budget Authority and de-obligation by State of California
Project Close-Out	6 months after final invoice	Caltrans, Regional	Explanation in writing. (Caltrans) Restrictions on future programming, obligations and OA. (MTC)

This page intentionally left blank.

Solano Transportation Authority Project Delivery Policy DRAFT 02-11-2011

Introduction

Most project funding does not come directly from the STA itself, it is approved by the STA and then comes from either federal, state, or regional agencies. STA project delivery staff helps local agency project sponsors secure their funding from a variety of funding agencies, which often involves supporting local project managers through complicated federal, state, regional and local funding program procedures.

When met with critical project delays or deadlines, STA staff assists local sponsors through various avenues of recourse, providing a forum between local staff, MTC, Caltrans, and other funding or oversight agencies. When project sponsors are unable to secure funds or a project's deliverability is in jeopardy, STA staff develops options, such as funding swaps, delivery options, or reprogramming of funding to protect funding from being lost from Solano County and to maintain equity between STA's member agencies.

This project delivery policy formalizes the STA's procedures regarding the programming and monitoring of STA funded projects. Other comparable agency project delivery policies focus on strict adherence to earlier and earlier deadlines in an attempt to avoid the next level of government's funding request or project monitoring deadlines. These policies focus on clear decision points and funding alternatives to implement the funding recommendations taken by the STA Board without earlier deadlines or additional administrative burdens.

Project Delivery Policy Goal:

"To protect transportation funding for Solano County projects from being lost to other agencies due to project sponsors failing to meet project delivery deadlines set by MTC, Caltrans, and FHWA."

This project delivery policy is design to accomplish this goal in several ways:

1. Provide overburdened project sponsors with clear consequences for failing to meet MTC, Caltrans, and FHWA deadlines.
2. Provide clear decision points for the STA Board to and the TAC provide project funding alternatives to project sponsors struggling with delivery deadlines, such as fund swaps and deferment of fund shares.
3. Structure incentives into funding alternatives for projects sponsors who request to exercise these alternatives earlier in the process rather than later. The farther a project is from a deadline, the easier it is to create more lucrative funding alternatives. The closer a project sponsor is to failing to meet a deadline, funding alternatives become harder to structure and may result in the complete loss of funds from the struggling project sponsor.

Based on how early in the planning and programming process a project sponsor realizes they cannot meet funding agency delivery deadlines, the STA stands a better chance of creating funding alternatives. Other funding alternatives generally require another project sponsor to be able to use the struggling project sponsor's funds for a project that can meet the deadlines attached to the fund source.

Project funding alternatives include:

- *Rescope a project into smaller phases or reprogram funding to another project within the same local agency*
This method is preferable to others as it offers the greatest amount of flexibility to shift funding sources and manage project costs, but can only take place earlier in a project's development and early in the funding programming cycle, usually before the fiscal year in which the funding is programmed.
- *Deferment of funding shares to later years or grant cycles*
This method can preserve equity but will delay the delivery of a project. This can only take place if other projects can spend the deferred funds in earlier years. Reprogramming funds in this nature requires early notice. This is essentially a funding swap without an incentive and can take place as late as October or November of any given fiscal year.
- *Funding swaps on sliding scales from \$0.90/\$1.00 to as low as \$0.50/\$1.00 in high-pressure circumstances*
Funding swaps for federal funds in exchange for local funds can keep a smaller project sponsor's project moving and create an incentive for a larger project sponsor to enter into a swap. The longer a project sponsor waits, the worse the return ratio becomes. This creates incentives for both fund swap parties to enter the swap sooner rather than later. This method can take place as late as February or March of any given fiscal year for STP/CMAQ funded projects.
- *Reprogramming of funding without the possibility of the funding returning to the project sponsor*
This method is the default method of ensuring a project's funding stays within the county or region. It is the standard method cited in MTC's Resolution 3606. If a project sponsor is too close to an Obligation Authority critical deadline, this is often the only option remaining. This method is often used between March and May of any given fiscal year.

Programming Policies

1. Prior to the STA Board recommending or approving funding for a project, the STA's Project Delivery Department must receive a reasonable project

Monitoring Policies



DATE: February 11, 2011
TO: STA TAC
FROM: Jessica McCabe, Project Assistant
RE: Project Delivery Update

Background:

As the Congestion Management Agency (CMA) for Solano County, the Solano Transportation Authority (STA) coordinates project funding commitments between project sponsors and funding agencies. This coordination includes recommendations for programming, allocating, and obligating federal, state, and regional funds for a variety of transportation projects. These recommendations are based on the current and projected status of projects recommended for funding by the STA.

This project delivery update is provided to the Solano Project Delivery Working Group (Solano PDWG), the STA's Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), and the STA Board for their review before considering any changes to prior project funding recommendations.

Discussion:

STA Board Recommendations and Improvement Programs

Between January and July of 2010, the STA Board recommended funding for a variety of transportation projects included in currently approved plans. Other funding agencies program funding for Solano projects in their own improvement programs, such as the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's (MTC) Draft 2011 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for federal and regional funds, the California Transportation Commission's (CTC) 2010 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) for state funds, and other regional and local grant funding actions (e.g., air district grant programs and local funding swaps). These improvement programs contain the details of how much funding each project receives in specific fiscal years over the next four to five years.

Programmed Funding Does Not Guarantee Project Funding

Despite the approved nature of improvement programs, they are based on estimates of available tax dollars, meaning that improvement programs can over-program funding for projects should tax receipts be smaller than expected. In addition to the chance of funding being limited, funding agency "Use it or lose it" project delivery policies contain strict deadlines for current fiscal year programmed funds, which are put in place to expedite the delivery of projects and protect against the loss of funds to other agencies who can spend funds in a timely manner. For example, MTC usually programs more funding than they have available, counting on Bay Area project sponsors being ready to take advantage of funds from other regions who miss delivery deadlines. The STIP has a history of running low on funds, forcing the CTC to create additional "allocation plans" that further prioritize STIP funds, leaving programmed projects waiting until later fiscal years for funding, adding to project delays and cost increases.

Staying on Top of Deadlines and Making Timely Choices

Attached is a list of projects with programmed funding, which connects project fund sources to delivery deadline policies (Attachment A). Projects that are highlighted have Surface Transportation Program (STP) and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) funds programmed in the TIP for FY 2010-11 and are therefore subject to the provisions of the Regional Project Delivery Policy (MTC Resolution 3606), including the Request for Authorization (E-76) submittal deadline of February 1st and the obligation deadline of April 30th. In order to ensure funds are obligated or transferred to Federal Transit Administration (FTA) in a timely manner, the implementing agency is required to deliver a complete funding obligation / FTA Transfer request package to Caltrans Local Assistance by February 1 of the year the funds are programmed in the TIP. Funding for which an obligation/ FTA transfer request is submitted after the February 1st deadline will lose its priority for Obligation Authority (OA), and be viewed as subject to reprogramming.

Projects outlined with a dashed border are programmed in the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) for FY 2010-11 and are required to submit an allocation request to MTC and Caltrans Local Assistance. Projects programmed in the STIP must receive an allocation from the California Transportation Commission (CTC) or Caltrans by the end of the fiscal year in which the funds are programmed. Funds not allocated or extended by the CTC within this deadline are deleted from the STIP with the funds returned to the county in the next share period. In order to receive an allocation at the May 2011 CTC meeting, allocation requests must be submitted by March 14, 2011. To receive an allocation at the June 2011 CTC meeting, an allocation request must be submitted by April 25, 2011, which is the last chance to submit a request for this fiscal year.

Delayed Projects and STA Deadline Assistance

Projects outlined with a solid border such as, Benicia's Columbus Parkway Overlay, Fairfield's Linear Park Alt Route – Nightingale Drive and Vacaville's Ulatis Creek Bike Path (Ulatis to Leisure Town Rd.), are experiencing project delays and project sponsors have indicated that they will not be able to meet the Request for Authorization (E-76) submittal deadline of February 1st. Benicia is working towards scheduling a field review for the Columbus Parkway Overlay. Fairfield is working on completing its design for the Linear Park Alt Route – Nightingale Drive. Vacaville is working on environmental clearance for the Ulatis Creek Bike Path. To help projects stay on track with meeting the next deadline, STA staff worked with project sponsors to help them convey to MTC that progress was made and that the April 30th obligation deadline would be met. Specifically, STA staff collected project schedules from Benicia, Fairfield, and Vacaville, and sent them to MTC on February 1, 2011 as an extension request.

MTC's project delivery policies are also attached (Attachment B). This project information is collected by STA staff and reported to Solano PDWG, STA TAC, and STA Board members as they review the feasibility of spending programmed transportation funds and consider project funding alternatives. The earlier a project sponsor realizes that implementing the current funding recommendation for their project is not feasible, the easier it is for the STA and its partner agencies to consider alternative funding scenarios. Project sponsors that wait until deadlines approach or miss deadlines have far fewer options available and may risk losing these funds.

Recommendation:

Informational.

Attachments:

- A. Programmed funding in Solano County, 2-11-11
- B. MTC Resolution 3606, "Milestones, Deadlines, and Consequences", pg 11, 07-23-08

Solano Transportation Authority (STA)

Project Delivery Update, 2-11-2011

Projects listed by agency, including known available funding by delivery phase noting total shortfall.

Agency	TIP ID	Project name	Primary Funding Programs	Est. Year Built	Total Available Project Funding (Prior Years to 2014/15)					Status	Next Task and Deadlines
					Preliminary Engineering (PE)		Right-of-Way	Construction	Shortfall		
				Environmental	Design						
Benicia	SOL070045	State Park Road Bridge Widening	CMAQ/ARRA	2010				\$ 2,406	\$ -	Complete	Closeout Project
Benicia	SOL010031	Benicia Intermodal Trans Stations (Military)	RM2	2011	\$ 92	\$ 224	\$ 170	\$ 2,514	\$ -	Concept	Request RM2 & start PE
Benicia	SOL110008	Benicia Industrial Pk Multi-Modal Trans Study	RM2	Future	\$ 125	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Concept	Request RM2 & start PE
Benicia	REG090032	East 2nd Street Overlay	ARRA	2010	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 197	\$ -	Complete	Closeout Project
Benicia	N/A	Park Road Sidewalk	RM1 (Proposed)	2011	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 450	Concept	Complete concept plan
Benicia	SOL110015	Columbus Parkway Overlay	STP (LS&R C1)	2011	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 371	\$ -	PE	Request E76 by Feb 2011
Dixon	SOL030001	Dixon Multimodal Transportation Center	STIP	Future	\$ -	\$ 1,330	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 26,152	PE	Review Earmarks & Design
Dixon	SOL050007	I-80/Pedrick Road Interchange Modification	Local Impact Fee	Future	\$ 150	\$ 200	\$ 500	\$ -	\$ 19,120	Concept	N/A
Dixon	SOL050009	Parkway Blvd/UPRR Grade Separation	Earmark (TEA-21)	Future	\$ 1,260	\$ 290	\$ 1,243	\$ -	\$ 11,070	PE	Clear NEPA, Review Earmarks
Dixon	SOL070045	SR-113 Pedestrian Improvements	ECMAQ (SR2S)	2010	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 105	\$ -	Complete	Closeout Project
Dixon	N/A	West B Street Bicycle and Ped Undercrossing	ECMAQ (Ped)	2015	\$ -	\$ 543	\$ -	\$ 1,415	\$ 4,685	PE	Enter Fund swap with Vaca
Dixon	REG090032	Stratford Avenue Rehabilitation	ARRA	2009	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 218	\$ -	Complete	Closeout Project
Dixon	REG090033	Various Street and Road Rehab (N. Almond)	ARRA	2009	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 300	\$ -	Complete	Closeout Project
Fairfield	SOL030002	Fairfield/Vacaville Intermodal Rail Station	RM2/STIP/Earmark	2013	\$ 125	\$ 4,731	\$ 2,060	\$ 21,831	\$ -	PE	Request \$4M STIP FY 11/12
Fairfield	SOL991068	Fairfield Transportation Center Phase III	RM2/CMAQ	2013	\$ -	\$ 1,030	\$ -	\$ 6,150	\$ -	PE	CON in FY 10/11
Fairfield	SOL070027	W. Texas St. Gateway Project Phase I & II	STP (CMAQ Bike)	2010	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 85	\$ -	Complete	Closeout Project
Fairfield	SOL090004	McGary Road Safety Improvement	ARRA (Safety)	2010	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,500	\$ -	Complete	Closeout Project
Fairfield	SOL110013	Linear Park Alt Route - Nightingale Dr	CMAQ/TDA	2012	\$ -	\$ 29	\$ -	\$ 221	\$ -	PE	Request E76 by Feb 2011
Fairfield	SOL110010	Local Streets and Roads (cycle 1)	STP (LS&R C1)	2012	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,370	\$ -	PE	Request E76 by Feb 2012
Fairfield	REG090032	East Tabor Ave Resurfacing	ARRA	2010	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 475	\$ -	Complete	Closeout Project
Fairfield	REG090032	Gateway Blvd. Resurfacing	ARRA	2010	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 692	\$ -	Complete	Closeout Project
Fairfield	REG090032	Suisun Valley Rehabilitation	ARRA	2010	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 538	\$ -	Complete	Closeout Project
Rio Vista	SOL070019	Rio Vista Signage Improvement Program	Earmark (SAFETEA-LU)	2010	\$ -	\$ 11	\$ -	\$ 261	\$ -	PE	Request E76 for CON
Rio Vista	SOL050062	SR 12 Rio Vista Bridge Study	Earmark (SAFETEA-LU)	2010	\$ 453	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Complete	Adopted, Closeout project
Suisun City	SOL110012	Grizzly Island Trail	CMAQ (Bike/SR2S)	2013	\$ 50	\$ 250	\$ -	\$ 1,764	\$ -	PE	Request Field review
Suisun City	REG090032	Main Street Rehabilitation	ARRA	2010	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 670	\$ -	CON	invoice every 6 months
Suisun City	SOL110011	Pintail Dr. Resurface (cycle 1)	STP (LS&R C1)	2012	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 437	\$ -	CON	Request E76 by Feb 2011
Suisun City	REG090032	Sunset Avenue Rehabilitation	ARRA	2010	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 700	\$ -	Complete	Closeout Project
Vacaville	SOL050013	Vacaville Intermodal Station (Allison Dr)	RM2/CMAQ	2010	\$ 620	\$ 990	\$ 2,950	\$ 8,219	\$ -	Complete	Closeout Project
Vacaville	NEW	Vacaville Intermodal Station Phase 2	Earmark/RM2/CMAQ	Future	\$ 975	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 925	\$ 7,923	PE	Request E76 by Feb 2011
Vacaville	SOL070028	Vacaville Downtown Creekwalk	ECMAQ (Ped)	2010	\$ 85	\$ 60	\$ -	\$ 784	\$ -	Complete	Closeout Project
Vacaville	SOL070029	Ulatis Creek - Allison to I-80	ECMAQ/YSAQMD	Future	\$ 191	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,220	PE	Fund CON by 20
Vacaville	SOL070026	Ulatis Creek Bike Path (Ulatis Dr to L Town Rd)	ECMAQ/YSAQMD	2013	\$ 66	\$ 195	\$ 180	\$ 630	\$ -	ROW	Request E76 by Feb 2011
Vacaville	SOL070047	Peabody/Marshall Rd Ped Safety	ECMAQ/YSAQMD	2009	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 396	\$ -	Complete	Closeout Project
Vacaville	REG090032	Various Streets Overlay (Allison, Alamo, etc.)	ARRA	2010	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,376	\$ -	Complete	Closeout Project
Vacaville	SOL110016	Local Streets and Roads (cycle 1)	STP (LS&R C1)	2012	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,324	\$ -	PE	Request E76 by Feb 2012
Vacaville	SOL050057	Jepson Pkwy Gateway Enhancement	STIP-TE	2012	\$ -	\$ 120	\$ -	\$ 230	\$ -	Amend	CTC Allocation by Apr 2011
Vacaville	REG090032	GPS EVP System Project	ARRA	2010	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 320	\$ -	Complete	Closeout Project
Vacaville	SOL050059	Nob Hill Bike Path	ECMAQ	2008	\$ 91	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 350	\$ -	Complete	Closeout Project
Vallejo	SOL010027	Lemon Street Rehabilitation	STP	2009	\$ -	\$ 29	\$ -	\$ 759	\$ -	Complete	Closeout Project
Vallejo	SOL050048	Vallejo Downtown Streetscape, Ph 1	ARRA/TE/CMAQ	2009	\$ 664	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,196	\$ -	CON	Invoice every 6 months
Vallejo	REG090032	Sereno Dr/Tennessee St. Overlay	ARRA	2009	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,020	\$ -	Complete	Closeout Project
Vallejo	SOL110014	Local Streets and Roads (cycle 1)	STP (LS&R C1)	2012	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,595	\$ -	PE	Request E76 by Feb 2012
Vallejo	SOL050012	Vallejo Curtola Transit Center	RM2	Future	\$ 705	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 11,045	\$ -	PE	Clear CEQA, req't RM2 for CON
Vallejo	SOL050023	Vallejo Station Pedestrian Links	CMAQ (TLC)	2012	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,340	\$ -	CON	Invoice every 6 months
Vallejo	SOL950035	Vallejo Station Intermodal	STIP/RM2/5309	2012	\$ 200	\$ 5,800	\$ 9,000	\$ 64,128	\$ -	CON	Invoice every 6 months

Agency	TIP ID	Project name	Primary Funding Programs	Est. Year Built	Total Available Project Funding (Prior Years to 2014/15)					Shortfall	Status	Next Task and Deadlines
					Preliminary Engineering (PE)							
					Environmental	Design	Right-of-Way	Construction				
Vallejo	SOL990018	I-80/American Canyon Rd overpass Improv	Local Impact Fee	Future	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,230	\$ -	PE	Complete PSR
Vallejo	SOL991032	Vallejo Ferry Maintenance Facility	STIP-PTA	2012	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,300	\$ -	PE	CTC Allocation by Apr 2011
Solano County	SOL050046	Old Town Cordelia Enhancements	ARRA/STIP-TE/CMAQ	2010	\$ 265	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 465	\$ -	\$ -	Complete	Closeout Project
Solano County	SOL050061	I-80 HOV Lanes Turner Overcrossing	Earmark (SAFETEA-LU)	2010	\$ 1,400	\$ 2,359	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Complete	Study Complete
Solano County	SOL070012	Cordelia Hills Sky Valley Ped Corridor	Earmark (SAFETEA-LU)	2013	\$ -	\$ 175	\$ 2,475	\$ 50	\$ -	\$ -	PE	Clear NEPA
Solano County	SOL070021	Travis AFB: South Gate Improvement Project	Earmark (SAFETEA-LU)	2014	\$ -	\$ 187	\$ 160	\$ 2,617	\$ -	\$ -	PE	Clear NEPA
Solano County	SOL070048	Travis AFB: North Gate Improvement Project	Earmark (SAFETEA-LU)	Future	\$ 558	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,050	\$ -	PE	Clear NEPA
Solano County	SOL090015	Redwood Fairgrounds Dr. I/C Imp (STUDY)	Earmark (SAFETEA-LU)	Future	\$ 1,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	PE	Clear NEPA
Solano County	SOL090035	Vacaville Dixon Bike Route (Phase 5)	ECMAQ/TDA	2012	\$ -	\$ 362	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8,050	\$ -	PE	Request E76 by Feb 2011
Solano County	SOL090027	2011 Pavement Overlay Program	FAS	2011	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,807	\$ -	\$ -	PE	Request E76 by Feb 2011
Solano County	SOL110017	Solano County:STP overlay 2012 (cycle 1)	LS&R, BP Flex, TDA	2012	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,255	\$ -	\$ -	PE	Send MTC TDA Phase out info
Solano County	REG090032	2009 ARRA Various Streets Overlay (Phase 1)	ARRA	2009	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,000	\$ -	\$ -	Complete	Closeout Project
Solano County	REG090032	2009 ARRA Various Streets Overlay (Phase 2)	ARRA	2010	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 360	\$ -	\$ -	Complete	Closeout Project
STA	SOL070020	I-80/I-680/SR 12 Interchange Project	RM2, STIP, CMIA, TCRP	2015	\$ 30,000	\$ 75,036	\$ 26,525	\$ 73,264	\$ -	\$ -	PE	Clear NEPA/CEQA
STA	SOL090003	EB I-80 Cordelia Truck Scales Relocation	RM2, TCIF	2014	\$ 5,800	\$ 17,700	\$ 3,000	\$ 74,400	\$ -	\$ -	ROW	invoice every 6 months
STA	SOL030003	I-80/I-680/SR12 North Connector	RM2, STIP, TCRP	2010	\$ 5,500	\$ 2,000	\$ -	\$ 28,964	\$ -	\$ -	Complete	Closeout project
STA	SOL110002	I-80 HOV conversion to Express Ln (Fairfield)	Bridge Tolls	2015	\$ 500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 39,600	\$ -	PE	begin study
STA	SOL110001	I-80 Express Lanes (Vacaville)	Bridge Tolls	2020	\$ 600	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 190,600	\$ -	PE	begin study
STA		<i>Jepson Parkway: Phases shown below</i>	STIP	Varies	\$ 2,499	\$ 2,400	\$ 3,800	\$ 30,457	\$ 157,000	\$ -	Varies	
STA	SOL110003	Jepson: Vanden Rd from Peabody to LT	STIP	2015	\$ 2,499	\$ 2,400	\$ 3,800	\$ 30,457	\$ -	\$ -	PSE	complete design
STA	SOL11005/6	Jepson: LT Road from Vanden to Orange	STIP	Future	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 65,900	\$ -	PE	N/A
STA	SOL110004	Jepson: Walters Rd Ext - Peabody Rd Widen	STIP	Future	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 91,100	\$ -	PE	N/A
STA	NAP010008	SR 12 (Jamieson Canyon Road) Widening	CMIA, STIP, TCRP	2015	\$ 7,300	\$ 7,550	\$ 18,391	\$ 105,700	\$ -	\$ -	ROW	acquire ROW
STA	REG090071	STA Safe Routes to School Program	CMAQ	Prgm	\$ 1,029	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	ongoing	request E76 for PE
STA	SOL991066	Eastern Solano / SNCI Rideshare Program	CMAQ, AQ	Prgm	\$ 445	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	ongoing	request E76 for PE
STA	SOL970033	CMA Planning Activities	STP, 4% planning	Prgm	\$ 500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	ongoing	N/A
*GRAND TOTAL					\$ 66,247	\$ 126,001	\$ 74,254	\$ 507,183	\$ 626,920			

* Total project funding exceeds 2011 TIP totals because prior year funds are included.

\$773,685

** Caltrans SHOPP projects and various Caltrans grant projects are not yet included in this report.

Milestone	Deadline	Authority	Consequence of Missed Deadline
Programming in TIP	Agency committed to obligate funds by April 30 of the year listed in TIP	Regional	Deprogramming of funds and redirection to other projects that can use the OA.
Field Review (If applicable)	Within 12 months of inclusion in TIP	Regional	Restrictions on future programming, obligations and OA until deadline is met.
Pre-Draft Environmental Document Submittal (Non-Cat Ex)	12 months prior to obligation of Right of Way or Construction funds	Regional	Reprogramming of funds.
MTC Annual Obligation Plan	Beginning of each federal fiscal year	Regional	Funds not identified in MTC's annual Obligation Plan do not receive priority for OA and may need to wait until after May 1 to receive obligation/ transfer of funds.
Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) Goals (If Applicable)	Start by January 1, complete by February 1, of year programmed in TIP	Regional	Deprogramming of funds and redirection to other projects that can use the OA if not obligated by April 30.
Obligation/ FTA Transfer Request Submittal	February 1 of year programmed in TIP	Regional	Project loses priority for OA. Other projects in region may be given OA.
Obligation/ Transfer to FTA	April 30 of year programmed in TIP	Regional	Deprogramming of funds and redirection to other projects that can use the OA.
Release of Unused OA	May 1	Caltrans	Unused OA is made available for other regions to access.
End of Federal Fiscal Year. - OA no Longer Available	August 30	Caltrans, Federal	FHWA Obligation system shut down. Unused OA at the end of the fiscal year is taken for other projects. No provision that the funds taken will be returned.
Program Supplement Agreement (PSA)	60 days after receipt from Caltrans 6 months after obligation	Caltrans	Restrictions on future programming, obligations and OA until deadline is met. De-obligation by Caltrans after 6 months.
Construction Advertisement	6 months after obligation	Regional	Restrictions on future programming, obligations and OA until deadline is met
Construction Award	9 months after obligation	Regional	Restrictions on future programming, obligations and OA until deadline is met
Invoicing & Reimbursement	Agency must invoice and receive reimbursement at least once every 6 to 12-months following obligation of funds	Caltrans, Federal, Regional	Explanation in writing if funds not invoiced in past 6-month period. (Caltrans) Deobligation if project inactive for 12 months. (FHWA) Restrictions on future programming, OA and obligations if agency has not invoiced and received reimbursement at least once every 12-months after obligation. (MTC)
Liquidation	6 years after obligation	State of California	Loss of State Budget Authority and de-obligation by State of California
Project Close-Out	6 months after final invoice	Caltrans, Regional	Explanation in writing. (Caltrans) Restrictions on future programming, obligations and OA. (MTC)

This page intentionally left blank.



DATE: February 10, 2011
TO: STA TAC
FROM: Jayne Bauer, Marketing and Legislative Program Manager
RE: Legislative Update

Background:

Each year, STA staff monitors state and federal legislation that pertains directly to transportation and related issues. On December 8, 2010, the STA Board adopted its 2011 Legislative Priorities and Platform to provide policy guidance on transportation legislation and the STA's legislative activities during 2011.

Discussion:

State

The Governor's Proposed 2010-11 State Budget released on January 10th paints a bleak fiscal picture for California in general, and local government and transportation in particular, as summarized by Gus Khouri of STA's State Legislative Advocacy firm Shaw/Yoder/Antwih (Attachment A). Of particular concern is the recent discussion about delaying the next state bond sale from Spring 2011 to the Fall of this year, which could delay the construction of SR 12 Jameson Canyon and the I-80 Eastbound Cordelia Truck Scales Relocation projects.

Shaw/Yoder/Antwih has scheduled meetings on March 2 between STA Board members and STA's State representatives in Sacramento to urge protection of critical funding for transportation projects in Solano County. The STA delegation will focus on urging our State legislators to support the following priorities:

1. Reenactment of the gas tax swap and use of truck weight fees for bond debt service
(STA 2011 Legislative Priority #4: Oppose efforts to reduce or divert funding from transportation projects.)
2. Sale and acceleration of bond allocations
(STA 2011 Legislative Platform #VII.4 Funding: Support state budget and California Transportation Commission allocation to fully fund projects for Solano County included in the State Transportation Improvement Program and the Comprehensive Transportation Plans of the county.)
3. Lower the voter threshold for local sales tax measures
(STA 2011 Legislative Priority #5: Support initiatives to pursue the 55% voter threshold for county transportation infrastructure measures.)

Shaw/Yoder/Antwih has been working with a broad coalition of stakeholders including the League of Cities, California State Association of Counties, California Alliance for Jobs, and California Transit Association, among others, to push for the reenactment of the gas tax swap. On February 9, the STA Board approved support of the coalition's efforts (letter included in Attachment B), and will forward letters of support to the Governor and members of Solano's State legislative delegation. Further information can be found in the Gas Tax Swap Reenactment Q&A (Attachment C) prepared by Shaw/Yoder/Antwih.

Federal

With the debate continuing on how to fund the federal surface transportation account, the House of Representatives and Senate has issued a no-earmarks stance for appropriations. President Obama also expressed strong sentiment against earmarks in his State of the Union speech on January 25. For further information, see the January Federal Legislative Update (Attachment D).

Congressman John Garamendi did, however, solicit Appropriations requests, and STA staff submitted two earmark requests for projects located in his district:

- Fairfield/Vacaville Intermodal Station, \$2 million
- Dixon Station: West B Street Bicycle and Pedestrian Undercrossing Project, \$2 million

Staff is working with STA's federal advocate, Susan Lent, of Akin Gump to restructure our approach to meeting with our Congressional representatives in Washington DC on April 13-14. While STA project priorities will remain as outlined in the 2011 STA Legislative Priorities and Platform, funding will likely come from federal agencies (Federal Highway Administration, Federal Transit Authority, Department of Housing and Urban Development), and not from Congressional earmarks. The STA Board will meet with a range of key officials at federal departments and agencies to discuss competitive grant opportunities, public private partnerships, and discretionary funding programs. The focus this year will be to demonstrate local and regional support for STA's priority projects as they reinforce Solano's regionally significant transportation network.

Recommendation:

Informational.

Attachments:

- A. State Legislative Update - January (Shaw/Yoder/Antwih)
- B. Coalition Letter Urging Reenactment of Gas Tax Swap
- C. Gas Tax Swap Reenactment Q&A
- D. Federal Legislative Update – January (Akin Gump)



SHAW/YODER/ANTWIH, inc.
 LEGISLATIVE ADVOCACY • ASSOCIATION MANAGEMENT

January 27, 2011

TO: Board Members, Solano Transportation Authority
 FROM: Gus Khouri, Legislative Advocate
 Shaw / Yoder / Antwih, Inc.

RE: STATE LEGISLATIVE UPDATE- JANUARY

On January 10, Governor Brown released his FY 2011-12 State Budget. Describing an 18-month \$25.4 billion General Fund deficit, which includes a current year (FY 10-11) shortfall of \$8.2 billion, and a budget year (FY 11-12) shortfall of \$17.2 billion, the governor cites unrealistic assumptions, including the reliance on federal funds which have not materialized, the sunset of tax extensions, one-time solutions, and a stagnant housing market and economy in general as reasons for the shortfall. As a result, Governor Brown proposes \$12.5 billion in cuts, \$12 billion in revenues, and \$1.8 billion in shifts to close the deficit and provide a \$1 billion reserve.

The proposed reductions include cuts to most major programs such as \$1.7 billion to Medi-Cal, \$1.5 billion to California's welfare-to-work program, \$1 billion to the University of California and California State University, \$750 million to the Department of Developmental Services, \$580 million to state operations and employee compensation, and the elimination of redevelopment agencies (\$1.7 billion).

With respect to revenues, the Governor proposes extending existing tax rates for the next five years upon voter approval on the June ballot for the following items:

- **Personal Income Tax (PIT) Rate Surcharge:** Effective for tax years on or after January 1, 2011 but before January 1, 2016, maintain the .25% surcharge for PIT tax rate and the Alternative Minimum Tax Rate. If extended, this proposal is expected to generate revenues of \$1.187 billion in FY 10-11 and \$2.077 billion in FY 11-12.
- **PIT Dependent Exemption Credit:** Maintain the dependent exemption credit in effect in 2009 until 2015. If extended, this proposal is expected to generate revenues of \$725 million in FY 10-11 and \$1.248 billion in FY 11-12.
- **Sales & Use Tax:** Effective July 1, 2011, the 6-cent sales and use tax would continue for 5 years. The rate would sunset on June 30th to 5-cents without voter approval. If extended, the proposal is expected to generate \$4.549 billion in FY 11-12 and \$5.5 billion in FY 14-15.
- **Vehicle License Fee (VLF):** Effective July 1, the 1.15% VLF rate would continue for five years. Of the 1.15% rate, 0.5% would be used to fund local programs including public safety. If extended, this proposal is expected to generate \$1.382 billion in FY 11-12 and nearly \$1.7 billion in FY 14-15.

Realignment

In addition, the Governor's budget proposes a major shift in the state-local partnership by proposing to realign control and budget authority of certain governmental services such as

fire and emergency response activities, court security, mental health services, the transfer of low-level offenders to county jails, substance treatment programs, and foster care to the locals, among other things. When fully implemented, this proposal will restructure how and where more than \$10 billion in a wide range of services are delivered. The first phase of the proposal will be a \$5.9 billion transfer of programs from the state to counties funded by maintaining the current 1-percent sales tax and the .50-percent Vehicle License Fee (VLF) that are currently set to expire on June 30, 2011. As mentioned above, the Governor proposes to make these revenue streams available to fund programs if they are approved by the voters in June.

Impact on Transportation

The Governor's Budget acknowledges the passage of Proposition 26 threatens the transportation and transit revenues enacted in last March's "gas tax swap" and that the passage of Proposition 22 makes it harder for the state to use excise tax on gasoline revenue for purposes of paying transportation bond debt service (a method used in the gas tax swap to achieve General Fund savings).

In response, the Governor proposes to use truck weight fees from the State Highway Account (SHA) – which may not be as restricted by Proposition 22 – to pay remaining FY 2010-11 and new FY 11-12 bond debt service; additionally, remaining truck weight fees are proposed to be loaned to the General Fund. Truck weight fees generate roughly \$800 to \$900 million annually.

He would also use certain other SHA revenues not restricted by Article XIX to pay for Proposition 116 (rail transit) bond debt service.

Gas Tax Swap Reenactment

The Governor also proposes to "reenact" the gas tax swap, with the new 2/3 vote threshold as required by Proposition 26 to pass a tax increase by the legislature. Despite the fact that the gas tax swap was passed as a revenue-neutral package, several legal minds have opined that while the legislature can reduce taxes with a majority vote, increasing a tax necessitates a 2/3 vote.

Governor Brown recommends pursuing budget trailer bill language to clear the ambiguity associated with complying with Proposition 26. This suggests reenactment of the excise tax increases for highways and streets & roads, as well as the sales tax on diesel fuel for public transit. While we have yet to see language, we presume that the same spending priorities as in the original swap are being contemplated, with the addition that some of the new excise gas tax would be used to backfill the SHA (i.e. for its loss of the truck weight fees for bond debt service and General Fund loans) in the event that weight fees cannot cover the debt service.

If both the reenactment of the gas tax swap and weight fee proposal is approved, the net impact of the package would result in a nearly identical amount of transportation/transit spending and General Fund relief to pay down bond debt service as originally contemplated in the gas tax swap.

Impact on Transit Funding

The Governor also acknowledges the impact on local public transit spending of the passage of Proposition 22; namely, that Proposition 22 would require all sales tax on diesel fuel revenues to be split 50% between the State Transit Assistance (STA) program (local transit grants) and 50% for non-STA state transit priorities, such as the intercity rail program. He notes that the gas tax swap created a 75%/25% split, favoring the STA program, so he proposes trailer bill language appropriating additional funds from the Public Transportation Account (PTA) fund balance to ensure that local transit agencies continue the equivalent of

75% of the sales tax on diesel fuel, plus the \$23 million in FY 11-12 and \$12 million in FY 12-13 that local transit agencies were to have received from non-Article XIX revenues as a part of the 2010 gas tax swap. This is expected to offset the effect on local transit of shifting of \$77.5 million in non-Article XIX revenues to fund debt service in FY11-12.

Given lower diesel sales revenues, the total amount of state funding for local transit agencies from PTA resources – i.e. the STA program – is estimated to be \$329.6 million for FY 11-12.

Proposition 1A Funding

The total amount of funding available, including state bond and federal funds, for state operations and capital outlay in FY 10-11 is \$220.9 million and \$192 million in FY 11-12. These funds are for continued project management, environmental and engineering work.

The Governor states that while the High-speed Rail Authority has been awarded billions of dollars in federal funding for construction, details of the grants have not been finalized and appropriation of these funds may not be needed until FY 12-13. Therefore, only \$89.7 million in federal funds for partial design and environmental work is reflected in the budget, with the same amount in bond funds for the state match.

Proposition 1B Funding

An appropriation of \$2.3 billion for capital funding of bond projects is made available for the following programs within Proposition 1B:

- \$631.2 million for the Corridor Mobility Improvement Account
- \$972.3 million for the Trade Corridors Improvement Fund
- \$117 million for the Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement, and Service Enhancement Account
- \$200 million for the State and Local Partnership Program
- \$22 million for the Local Bridge Seismic Retrofit Program
- \$391.9 million for State Route 99

Department of Finance Director Ana Matasantos mentioned during the Governor's press conference that the state will not have a Spring bond sale for the first time since 1988, meaning that allocations for bond programs will be delayed even further.

Planning Program Project Initiation Document (PID) Workload Justification

The Governor proposes an increase of \$2.4 million and 18 positions to complete PIDs for state and locally funded projects on the state highway system. This includes a decrease of \$4.9 million in SHA resources and an increase of \$7.2 million in reimbursements from locals to complete PIDS on locally funded projects.

Board Action Requested

We have been working with a broad coalition of stakeholders including the League of Cities, California State Association of Counties, California Alliance for Jobs, and California Transit Association, among others, to push for the reenactment of the gas tax swap. Please see the attached material to the board packet to view materials that have been distributed by the coalition. It would be helpful for the STA Board to support the coalition's efforts so that we can communicate this to our legislative delegation.

Lobby Day

Each year, members of the STA Board have visited Sacramento to speak with our legislative delegation about issues of concern. This year, we would like to visit our delegation to ask for reenactment of the gas tax swap and use of weight fees for bond debt service, supporting the sale and acceleration of bond allocations, and lowering the local vote threshold for local sales tax measures. We are working with STA staff to determine the best possible date for our annual Lobby Day.

This page intentionally left blank.



CALIFORNIA STATE
ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES



LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES



REGIONAL COUNCIL OF RURAL
COUNTIES



ASSOCIATED GENERAL
CONTRACTORS (AGC)



January 4, 2011

To: Members of the Legislature

From: Associated General Contractors
California Alliance for Jobs
California State Association of Counties
California Transit Association
League of California Cities
Regional Council of Rural Counties
Transportation California

Re: **Comprehensive Fix to Address Propositions 22 & 26 and the March 2010
Transportation Tax Swap**

The Problem

The passage of Proposition 22 and Proposition 26 have many implications for the Transportation Tax Swap (AB 8X 6: Tax Provisions and AB 8X 9: Allocation Formulas) enacted in March 2010. Recall, the swap made the following major changes:

1. Eliminated the sales tax on gas and replaced it with a 17.3-cent excise tax increase on gasoline, indexed to keep pace with what the sales tax on gasoline would have generated in a given fiscal year to ensure true revenue neutrality. Revenues are allocated as follows:
 - 44% State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)
 - 44% Local Streets and Roads
 - 12% State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP)
2. Reduced the excise tax on diesel to 13.6-cents and replaced it with an increase in the sales tax rate on diesel by 1.75 percent, and provided an exemption to hold harmless entities that would be impacted from the change (SB 70).

A primary reason for enacting the swap was to remove transportation funding from the general fund and the annual budget debate. Equally important is the state general fund savings estimated at approximately \$1 billion annually from the replacement 17.3-cent excise tax or Highway User Tax Account (HUTA) dedicated to transportation bond debt service.

However, Prop 22 limits the use of HUTA funds for bond debt and general fund relief as required in the swap. Further, Proposition 26 invalidates the replacement taxes contained in AB 8X 6 within 12-months of its passage and is self-executing in November 2011.

The Solution

In order to address these issues with the Transportation Tax Swap, we urge the Legislature to enact a comprehensive solution that addresses state general fund, state and local transportation, and transit concerns. The comprehensive package should:

1. Validate the replacement tax provisions as contained in AB 8X 6 with a 2/3rds vote of the Legislature (Prop 26 fix);
2. Approve the transfer of Transportation Weight Fees from the State Highway Account (SHA) to a fund to provide the General Fund relief and backfill any losses to the SHA with a portion of the replacement 17.3-cent excise tax (Prop 22 fix); and
3. Reenact a revised AB 8X 9 (Allocations Formulas) that allows the new 17.3-cent gas excise tax and 1.75 percent sales tax rate increase on diesel to be allocated for its intended uses and achieves the same fiscal results anticipated in March 2010 (Prop 22 fix). This includes:
 - a. Language to allocate the new Section 2103 Highway User Tax Account (HUTA) funds for the STIP, SHOPP, and Local Streets and Roads; and
 - b. Language to achieve something closer to the originally-intended split of Public Transportation Account revenues that recognized the importance of funding local transit operations.

The Imperative

The loss of \$2.5 billion in revenue jeopardizes transportation projects across California, threatens thousands of jobs, and negatively impacts the overall economic wellbeing of the State given the multiplier affects from infrastructure investment. This loss of transportation revenue would be devastating to California's transportation programs effecting state, regional and local projects across all systems and modes.

The most effective path to provide certainty and avoid the risk of losing these transportation funds and provide the State this much needed and promised general fund relief is to pass a comprehensive package to fix the issues with the Transportation Tax Swap from Propositions 22 and 26.

Contact Information

Dave Ackerman, Associated General Contractors – dackerman@theapexgroup.net or (916) 444-9601

Jim Earp, California Alliance for Jobs – jearp@rebuildca.org or (916) 446-2259

DeAnn Baker, California State Association of Counties – dbaker@counties.org or (916) 650-8104

Josh Shaw, California Transit Association – josh@caltransit.org or (916) 446-4656

Jennifer Whiting, League of California Cities – jwhiting@cacities.org or (916) 658-8249

Paul Smith, Regional Council of Rural Counties – psmith@rcrcnet.org or (916) 445-4806

Mark Watts, Transportation California – mwatts@smithwattsco.com or (916) 446-5508

cc: The Honorable Jerry Brown, Governor, State of California
Anna Manasantos, Director, Department of Finance
Mark Hill, Program Budget Manager, Department of Finance

Gas Tax Swap Re-enactment Q&A

1. Why was the gas tax swap enacted?

In October 2009, the California Supreme Court upheld a lower court ruling in the *Shaw v. Chiang* case that annual raids on transit funding, which diverted billions of dollars of sales tax revenue for General Fund purposes, was illegal. As a result, the legislature enacted the gas tax swap proposal in order to acquire General Fund relief to pay down bond debt service by converting the sources of state funding for state highway and local streets and roads programs to rely on an increase in the excise tax, while eliminating the sales tax on gasoline. Essentially, Proposition 42 was traded for a 17.3 increase in the excise tax.

2. What is the impact of the gas tax swap?

The gas tax swap allowed the legislature to acquire a dedicated, ongoing source of revenue to pay down General Obligation (G.O.) debt service on transportation bonds, essentially converting G.O. bonds into revenue bonds. In addition, funding for highways, transit, and local streets and roads was increased over historic allocations.

3. Why is reenactment of the gas tax swap necessary?

The passage of Proposition 26 has called into question the legality of gas tax swap due to the requirement that taxes and fee increases be passed by a 2/3 vote. Despite the fact that the gas tax swap was passed as a revenue-neutral package in one bill (AB 6, Chapter 11, Statutes of the 2009-10 8th Extraordinary Session) several legal minds have opined that while the legislature can reduce taxes with a majority vote (elimination of sales tax on gas), increasing a tax (excise tax) necessitates a 2/3 vote. The swap was approved by the legislature on a majority vote.

4. Why is enactment of the proposal to dedicate weight fees to bond debt service necessary?

Proposition 22 restricts the legislature's ability to utilize excise tax revenues for bond debt service. The dedication of weight fees (\$800 to \$900 million annually) for bond debt service would help alleviate the pressure caused by the restriction imposed by Proposition 22.

5. Does the gas tax swap need to be reenacted in tandem with the weight fee proposal?

Yes. Both proposals need to be enacted as a package in order to maintain the integrity of the gas tax swap package as approved last March.

6. Why can't the weight fee proposal be adopted alone?

Weight fees are intended to pay for bond debt service that accrues when the state is able to sell bonds. Therefore, the proposal would create capacity for bond debt service which was intended to provide *supplemental* funding for the state's transportation infrastructure needs but it does not protect the historic sources of funding which are necessary in many cases to fully fund projects.

Without swift action, \$2.5 billion in traditional funding for transportation programs would be in severe jeopardy, compromising over 40,000 jobs, adding to the state's 12% unemployment rate, and eroding the tax base to fund vital programs such as education and public safety, while potentially exposing the state and local jurisdictions to liability claims by contractors.

7. What happens to transit funding without reenactment of the gas tax swap?

It shrinks considerably. The gas tax swap retained the sales tax on diesel (at an increased rate) as the only source of state funding for transit operations and capital through the State Transit Assistance (STA) program. Proposition 22 splits revenues 50/50, while the gas tax swap split revenues 75/25 to favor STA. Without the reenactment of the swap, fewer resources would be available to maintain current local transit service.

MEMORANDUM

January 27, 2011

To: Solano Transportation Authority
From: Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld LLP
Re: January Report

We assisted STA in preparing appropriations submissions for Congressman Garamendi in January. We also monitored developments in Washington regarding surface transportation funding and SAFETEA-LU reauthorization.

Surface Transportation Reauthorization

The President spoke in his State of the Union address in support of continuing investment in highways, bridges, rail and transit to keep the country competitive and “win the future” despite his call for freezing federal discretionary spending from fiscal year 2011 through fiscal year 2015. Although he did not identify new revenue sources, he stated that the transportation program would be fully paid for, attract private investment, select projects based on merit, and be free of earmarks. He threatened to veto any bill that Congress sends to him that contains earmarks.

The President’s Budget, which is to be released the week of February 14, will outline a comprehensive, six year surface transportation reauthorization plan. According to a White House release, it will be front-loaded so that most of the spending will occur in the early years and contain a proposal for an infrastructure bank to support funding for projects of national and regional significance. The bill also will authorize the expansion of the high speed rail program. During the address, the President set a goal of providing 80 percent of Americans access to high-speed rail in the next 25 years.

Both Senate Environment and Public Works Committee Chair Barbara Boxer (D-CA) and House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Chair John Mica (R-FL) have stated that the surface transportation reauthorization is one of their top priorities this year. Chair Mica is planning to draft a bill this spring in an effort to send the bill to the Senate by this summer. His priorities are stabilizing the trust funds without increasing the gasoline tax, reprogramming unspent transportation funds, expanding innovative finance and public private partnerships, and streamlining project delivery. In February, Chair Mica will embark on a nationwide multi-city listening tour to hear from stakeholders. While plans have not been finalized, a listening session has been scheduled for Fresno, California, and a congressional field hearing has been scheduled

Solano Transportation Authority

January 27, 2011

Page 2

in Southern California, which EPW Chair Boxer is expected to attend. A second listening tour may be scheduled for March.

Chair Boxer has promised to work closely with EPW Ranking Member James Inhofe (R-OK) and with Chair Mica to enact a bill in 2011. She endorsed the President's proposal to invest in infrastructure to create jobs and expand the economy. Although she has not outlined additional priorities, Chair Boxer has indicated that she will examine ways to leverage local funding as a means of securing funding sources for infrastructure projects, including potentially expanding the Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (TIFIA) loan program.

Although he prides himself on being the most conservative Senator, Sen. Inhofe believes in infrastructure spending as one of a few roles for the federal government. He has recommended that spending should be focused on the core transportation programs and away from tourist ferry boat services or recreational bike trails, because they offer an opening for critics of the program as wasteful and misguided.

Despite agreement in the White House and the leadership of the congressional authorizing committees, enactment of legislation to authorize a six-year highway program still faces great difficulties due to a lack of sufficient revenues in the Highway Trust Fund and possible shortfalls. The Congressional Budget Office predicted that the Highway Trust Fund will run a deficit of \$7 billion in 2011, compared with a surplus of \$11 billion in 2010, on January 26. Chair Mica has stated his commitment to hold spending under the 6-year bill to projected revenue or about \$250 billion in new budgetary authority. Some Democrats have suggested that because the outlook for funding is not favorable that it may be preferable to adopt a 2-3 year bill.

House Rule Change

Further clouding the future of transportation spending is a House Rule change that eliminated a point of order against appropriations bills that do not guarantee spending to the authorized levels under the transportation act. Adopted by the House on January 5, the rule requires that spending from the Highway Trust Fund be limited to authorized highway and transit programs and bars funding of unauthorized programs like the Obama Administration's Transportation Infrastructure Generating livable communities program. With the rule change, the House Budget and Appropriations Committees can allow surpluses to build in the highway trust fund to mask the size of the federal deficit, a practice that was routine before Congress passed the surface transportation law (TEA-21) in 1998.

The rule change was vigorously opposed by the transportation lobby, as well as Chair Mica and the House Committee's Ranking Member, Rep. Nick Rahall (D-WV). A group of 21 transportation groups and supporters, including the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, the American Road and Transportation Builders Association and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, sent a letter to House leadership opposing the rule change and

Solano Transportation Authority

January 27, 2011

Page 3

warning that it would make annual federal highway and transit investments subject to the whims of the appropriations process.

Fiscal Year 2011 Continuing Resolution

During the week of February 14, the House is expected to consider a continuing resolution (CR) to fund the federal government through the end of fiscal year 2011. The current continuing resolution expires on March 4 and provides funding for most government programs at fiscal year 2010 levels. It was adopted in December after Congress was unable to pass the appropriations bills by the end of the last Congress. The February 14 debate is intended to allow the House and Senate sufficient time to reach agreement on the funding and prevent a government shutdown. If the House and Senate fail to reach an agreement, they may adopt another short-term funding bill.

The House floor debate appears to be timed to coincide with the release of President Obama's fiscal year 2012 budget. Republican leaders have said that his proposal to freeze federal spending for the next five years does not go far enough and instead want non-security discretionary spending reduced to 2008 levels or lower. On January 25, the House passed a resolution directing the appropriations committees to make the reductions in spending in the CR to move toward that funding level. The Republican Leadership called this a "down payment" on plans to further reduce federal spending. Members and staff of the House Appropriations Committees are working on a line-by-line review of federal programs to identify spending cuts. The Republican leadership plans to adopt an open rule to allow additional amendments to reduce spending during the House floor debate on the CR.

The conservative House Republican Study Committee (RSC) proposed eliminating funding for the new starts and high speed rail programs in their proposal to reduce fiscal 2011 non-security discretionary spending to fiscal 2008 levels. Their proposal also calls for spending to be rolled back to 2006 levels for a total savings of \$2.5 trillion by 2021. It is unlikely that these and most other programs will be eliminated, however, since most programs have support from constituencies that will insist on continuation of the programs.

Spending reductions adopted by the House are likely to be modified in negotiating a proposal with the Senate that the President will sign into law. The Democratic-controlled Senate and President likely will push back against some of the spending cuts, including in transportation.

This page intentionally left blank.



DATE: February 14, 2011
TO: STA TAC
FROM: Elizabeth Richards, Director of Transit and Rideshare Services
RE: FY 2011-12 Transportation Development Act (TDA) and State Transit Assistance Funds (STAF) Fund Estimates

Background:

The Transportation Development Act (TDA) of 1971 established two sources of funds that provide support for public transportation services statewide – the Local Transportation Fund (LTF) and the Public Transportation Account (PTA). Solano County receives TDA funds through the LTF and State Transit Assistance Funds (STAF) through the PTA. State law specifies that STAF funds be used to provide financial assistance for public transportation, including funding for transit planning, operations and capital acquisition projects.

For a number of years, TDA funds had been modestly increasing. TDA is generated from a percentage of countywide sales tax. With the economic downturn of the last couple years, TDA revenues have been decreasing.

In FY2007-08 and FY2008-09, Solano's share of all types of STAF funds (revenue-based; population-based/Northern Counties-Solano; Regional Paratransit-Solano; Lifeline STAF) has been about \$3 million per year. STAF funds had been used for a wide range of activities, including providing funds for STA transit programs administration, transit studies, transit marketing activities, matching funds for the purchase of new intercity buses and covering new bus purchase shortfalls on start-up new intercity services when the need arises.

Discussion:

The new TDA and STAF FY 2011-12 revenue projections are in the process of being approved by Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). The estimates have been approved by MTC's Programming and Allocations Committee (PAC) and are scheduled for Commission approval on February 23rd. It would be highly unusual for the estimate to change at this point.

TDA:

After several years of growth, Solano TDA revenue began to decline after FY2006-07. At its peak in FY2006-07, the TDA available countywide was \$15.9m and then modestly declined for two years. In FY2008-09 it made its first significant drop of nearly 5% to \$14.7m and in FY 2009-10 Solano TDA decreased by even a larger percentage (10.7%) to \$13.1m. For FY2011-12, the current projection is that TDA will remain flat and result in \$12.9 for Solano transit operators. See Attachment A for draft Solano FY 2011-12 TDA fund estimate by jurisdiction.

MTC is required to use County Auditor estimates for TDA revenues. TDA is generated from a percentage of countywide sales tax and distributed to local jurisdictions based on population share. Given the economic downturn, sales tax and TDA have decreased and will remain suppressed until the economy improves. Staff reemphasizes that these TDA figures are revenue *estimates*. Especially with all the existing uncertainty, the amounts are not guaranteed and should not be 100% claimed to avoid fiscal difficulties if the actual revenues are lower than the projections.

STAF

The FY2009-10 State budget eliminated the funding of STAF. This decision was contested in court and a ruling was made in favor of restoring STAF. In the Spring of 2011, the STAF was funded through a fuel tax swap. The recently released FY2011-12 State Budget by the Governor proposes the funding of STAF at only a slightly reduced statewide level of \$330m as compared to FY2010-11's \$350m. It remains vulnerable as the impact of the passage of Proposition 26 in November 2010 on the fuel tax swap is being analyzed. STA staff will continue to monitor this issue. STAF revenue-based and population-based estimates are shown on Attachments B and C.

Recommendation:

Informational.

Attachments:

- A. Draft FY 2011-12 TDA Solano fund estimate (Feb 9, 2011)
- B. FY2011-12 STAF Solano fund estimate (Jan 2010) Revenue-based (Feb 9, 2011)
- C. FY2011-12 STAF Solano fund estimate Population-based (Feb 9, 2011)

FY 2011-12 FUND ESTIMATE
TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT FUNDS
SOLANO COUNTY

Column	A 6/30/10 Balance (w/o interest) ¹	B FY 2009-10 Interest	6/30/10 Balance (w/interest)	D FY 2009-11 Outstanding Commitments ²	E FY 2010-11 Transfers/ Refunds	F FY 2010-11 Original Estimate	G FY 2010-11 Revenue Adjustment	H=Sum(C-G) 6/30/11 Projected Carryover	I FY 2011-12 Revenue Estimate	J=H+I Total Available For Allocation
FY 2010-11 TDA Revenue Estimate Adjustment										
FY 2010-11 Generation Estimates Adjustment										
1. Original County Auditor Estimate (Feb, 10)			13,880,128							13,416,183
2. Revised County Auditor Estimate (Feb, 11)			13,416,183							
3. Revenue Adjustment (Line 2-1)			(463,945)							
FY 2010-11 Planning and Administration Charges Adjustment										
4. MTC Administration (0.5% of line 3)			(2,320)							67,081
5. County Administration (0.5% of line 3)			(2,320)							67,081
6. MTC Planning (3.0% of line 3)			(13,918)							402,485
7. Total Charges (Lines 4+5+6)			(18,558)							536,647
8. Adjusted Generations Less Charges (Line 3-7)			(8,908)							12,879,536
FY 2010-11 TDA Adjustment By Article										
9. Article 3 Adjustment (2.0% of line 8)			(45,479)							257,591
10. Funds Remaining (Line 8-9)			-							-
11. Article 4.5 Adjustment (5.0% of line 10)			(436,429)							12,621,945
12. Article 4 Adjustment (Line 10-11)										12,621,945

TDA APPORTIONMENT BY JURISDICTIONS

Column	A 6/30/10 Balance (w/o interest) ¹	B FY 2009-10 Interest	6/30/10 Balance (w/interest)	D FY 2009-11 Outstanding Commitments ²	E FY 2010-11 Transfers/ Refunds	F FY 2010-11 Original Estimate	G FY 2010-11 Revenue Adjustment	H=Sum(C-G) 6/30/11 Projected Carryover	I FY 2011-12 Revenue Estimate	J=H+I Total Available For Allocation
Article 3	427,945	9,323	437,268	(642,350)	-	266,498	(8,908)	52,509	257,591	310,100
Article 4.5	427,945	9,323	437,268	(642,350)	-	266,498	(8,908)	52,509	257,591	310,100
SUBTOTAL										
Article 4/8										
Benicia	-	3,939	3,939	(36,597)	-	856,130	(28,615)	794,857	828,586	1,623,443
Dixon	-	340	340	(299,140)	-	537,755	(17,977)	220,977	519,379	740,356
Fairfield	5,262,415	66,523	5,328,938	(2,807,956)	-	3,257,193	(109,185)	5,668,990	3,125,859	8,794,849
Rio Vista	138,742	3,374	142,116	(216,700)	-	251,603	(8,255)	168,764	245,573	414,337
Suisun City	-	401	401	(24,031)	-	883,029	(28,835)	830,563	854,430	1,684,993
Vacaville	2,850,482	41,674	2,892,156	(5,157,865)	-	2,951,487	(99,113)	586,665	2,870,669	3,457,334
Vallejo	1,652,843	10,473	1,663,316	(147,179)	-	3,704,430	(123,856)	5,096,711	3,582,546	8,679,257
Solano County	-	976	976	(24,853)	-	616,798	(20,643)	572,278	594,903	1,167,181
SUBTOTAL³	9,904,482	127,699	10,032,181	(8,714,321)	-	13,058,424	(436,479)	13,939,805	12,621,945	26,561,750
GRAND TOTAL	10,332,427	137,023	10,469,450	(9,356,671)	-	13,324,923	(445,387)	13,992,315	12,932,045	26,871,851

1. Balance as of 6/30/10 is from MTC FY 2009-10 Audit, and it contains both funds available for allocation and funds that have been allocated but not disbursed.
2. The outstanding commitments figure includes all unpaid allocations as of June 30, 2010, and FY 2010-11 allocations, transfers and refunds as of December 31, 2010.
3. Where applicable by local agreement, contributions from each jurisdiction will be made to support the Intercity Transit Funding Agreement.

FY 2011-12 FUND ESTIMATE
STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE
POPULATION-BASED FUNDS (PUC 99313)

Column	FY 2010-11 Original Revenue Estimates		FY 2010-11 Projected Carryover		FY 2010-11 Total	
	A	B	F	G	I	J
	6/30/10	FY 2009-11	6/30/11	FY 2011-12	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12
	Balance ^{1,3}	Outstanding Commitments	Actual Revenue	Revenue Estimate ⁶	Revenue Estimate ⁶	Revenue Estimate ⁶
Apportment Jurisdictions						Available For Allocation
Northern Counties/Small Operators						
Marin	1,159,279	57,652		1,027	949,961	951,588
Napa	836,362	(1,191)		8,171	506,293	514,464
Solano ⁴	3,262,792	(2,191)		3,241,816	1,559,282	4,801,098
Sonoma	2,792,986	(1,775,607)		1,017,347	1,797,812	2,815,159
CCCTA	2,987,971	(2,987,971)		6,169	1,846,771	1,852,940
ECCTA	1,767,770	(558,485)		3,485	1,081,006	1,085,091
LAVTA	1,229,811	(28,619)		2,170	750,523	752,693
Union City	329,434	(28,619)		869	273,570	274,439
WestCAT	422,087	(421,216)		868	253,822	256,690
Vallejo ⁴	103,093	(421,216)		105,093	253,822	105,093
SUBTOTAL	893,297	(10,505,682)		4,387,615	9,021,639	13,409,234
Regional Paratransit						
Alameda	974,206	(1,765,720)		102,689	1,154,363	1,257,052
Contra Costa	161,639	(972,204)		2,002	596,548	598,550
Marin	142,148	(161,394)		245	133,275	133,520
Napa	1,106,298	(1,414,115)		733	87,034	87,767
San Francisco	612,562	(1,103,827)		2,471	911,400	913,871
San Mateo	1,822,065	(611,118)		1,444	504,645	506,089
Santa Clara	496,924	(1,817,775)		4,290	1,045,570	1,049,860
Solano	381,046	(233,483)		147,563	248,274	248,274
SUBTOTAL	7,565,387	(6,807,026)		758,361	4,957,143	5,715,504
Lifeline						
Alameda	3,503,762	(513,000)		2,990,762	2,344,730	5,535,492
Contra Costa	2,121,360	(664,402)		1,456,958	1,160,917	2,617,875
Marin	307,955	(306,195)		1,760	250,758	252,518
Napa	264,694	(380,844)		(116,150)	157,885	41,735
San Francisco	6,457,131	(3,071,710)		3,385,421	1,402,388	4,787,809
San Mateo	2,191,963	(1,823,040)		368,923	659,401	1,028,324
Santa Clara	4,102,827	(222,685)		4,102,827	2,015,352	6,118,179
Solano	1,152,997	(594,824)		930,312	510,804	1,441,116
Sonoma	1,646,505	(594,824)		1,051,681	585,102	1,636,783
SUBTOTAL	21,749,194	(7,576,700)		14,172,494	9,287,337	23,459,831
BART to Warm Springs	322,247	-		322,247	-	322,247
eBART	322,247	-		322,247	-	322,247
SanTrans	37,985	-		37,985	-	37,985
MTC Regional Coordination Program ⁵	22,135,362	(5,701,569)		16,433,793	8,543,593	24,977,386
GRAND TOTAL	67,025,719	(30,590,977)		36,434,742	31,809,712	68,244,454

1. Balance as of 6/30/10 is from MTC FY 2009-10 Audit, and it contains both funds available for allocation and funds that have been allocated but not disbursed.
 2. The outstanding commitments figure includes all unpaid allocations as of June 30, 2010, and FY 2010-11 allocations, transfers and refunds as of December 31, 2010.
 3. In July 2010 the state paid a lump sum covering STA revenue for both FY 2009-10 and FY 2010-2011. Any STA funds that were not claimed in FY 2009-10 are recorded as part of the balance.
 4. Beginning in FY 2008-09, the Vallejo revenue apportionment is combined with Solano, as per MTC Resolution 3637.
 5. Committed to TransLink® and other MTC Customer Service projects.
 6. The FY 2011-12 STA Estimates reflect the \$329.6 million proposed in the Governor's budget.

This page intentionally left blank.



DATE: February 11, 2011
TO: STA TAC
FROM: Sara Woo, Associate Planner
RE: Funding Opportunities Summary

Discussion:

Below is a list of funding opportunities that will be available to STA member agencies during the next few months. Attachment A provides further details for each program.

	FUND SOURCE	AMOUNT AVAILABLE	APPLICATION DEADLINE
1.	Carl Moyer Memorial Air Quality Standards Attainment Program (for San Francisco Bay Area)	Approximately \$20 million	Due On First-Come, First Served Basis
2.	Carl Moyer Off-Road Equipment Replacement Program (for Sacramento Metropolitan Area)	Approximately \$10 million	Due On First-Come, First-Served Basis
3.	Air Resources Board (ARB) Clean Vehicle Rebate Project (CVRP)*	Up to \$5,000 rebate per light-duty vehicle	Due On First-Come, First-Served Basis
4.	Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) Hybrid Electric Vehicle Purchase Vouchers (HVIP)*	Approximately \$10,000 to \$45,000 per qualified request	Due On First-Come, First-Served Basis
5.	Station Area and Land Use Planning Program*	Approximately \$750,000	Due On March 1, 2011
6.	FTA Section 5310 Elderly and Disabled Specialized Transit Program*	Approximately \$25 million for FFY 2010/11	Due On March 4, 2011
7.	Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District (YSAQMD) Clean Air Funds (CAF)*	Approximately \$260,000	Due On March 25, 2011
8.	Caltrans Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA) Grant	Estimated \$7 million based on previous cycles	Anticipated Date: March 25, 2011
9.	Caltrans Community-Based Transportation Planning Grants	Budget is \$3 million , each project not to exceed \$300,000 for 2011/12	Anticipated Date: April 1, 2011
10.	Caltrans Environmental Justice: Context-Sensitive Planning	Budget is \$3 million , each project not to exceed \$300,000 for 2011/12	Anticipated Date: April 1, 2011

*New funding opportunity

Fiscal Impact:

None.

Recommendation:

Informational.

Attachment:

- A. Detailed Funding Opportunities Summary

This page intentionally left blank.

Attachment A

The following funding opportunities will be available to the STA member agencies during the next few months. Please distribute this information to the appropriate departments in your jurisdiction.

Fund Source	Application/Program Contact Person**	Application Deadline/Eligibility	Amount Available	Program Description	Additional Information
Carl Moyer Memorial Air Quality Standards Attainment Program (for San Francisco Bay Area)	Anthony Fournier Bay Area Air Quality Management District (415) 749-4961 afournier@baaqmd.gov	Ongoing. Application Due On First-Come, First Served Basis Eligible Project Sponsors: private non-profit organizations, state or local governmental authorities, and operators of public transportation services	Approximately \$20 million	Carl Moyer Memorial Air Quality Standards Attainment Program provides incentive grants for cleaner-than-required engines, equipment, and other sources of pollution providing early or extra emission reductions.	Eligible Projects: cleaner on-road, off-road, marine, locomotive and stationary agricultural pump engines http://www.baaqmd.gov/Divisions/Strategic-Incentives/Funding-Sources/Carl-Moyer-Program.aspx
Carl Moyer Off-Road Equipment Replacement Program (for Sacramento Metropolitan Area)	Gary A. Bailey Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (916) 874-4893 gbailey@airquality.org	Ongoing. Application Due On First-Come, First-Served Basis Eligible Project Sponsors: private non-profit organizations, state or local governmental authorities, and operators of public transportation services	Approximately \$10 million , maximum per project is \$4.5 million	The Off-Road Equipment Replacement Program (ERP), an extension of the Carl Moyer Program, provides grant funds to replace Tier 0, high-polluting off-road equipment with the cleanest available emission level equipment.	Eligible Projects: install particulate traps, replace older heavy-duty engines with newer and cleaner engines and add a particulate trap, purchase new vehicles or equipment, replace heavy-duty equipment with electric equipment, install electric idling-reduction equipment http://www.airquality.org/mobile/moyererp/index.shtml

*New Funding Opportunity

**STA staff, Sara Woo, can be contacted directly at (707) 399-3214 or swoo@sta-snci.com for assistance with finding more information about any of the funding opportunities listed in this report.

Fund Source	Application/Program Contact Person**	Application Deadline/Eligibility	Amount Available	Program Description	Additional Information
Air Resources Board (ARB) Clean Vehicle Rebate Project (CVRP)*	Meri Miles ARB (916) 322-6370 mmiles@arb.ca.gov	Application Due On First-Come, First-Served Basis	Up to \$5,000 rebate per light-duty vehicle	The Zero-Emission and Plug-In Hybrid Light-Duty Vehicle (Clean Vehicle) Rebate Project is intended to encourage and accelerate zero-emission vehicle deployment and technology innovation. Rebates for clean vehicles are now available through the Clean Vehicle Rebate Project (CVRP) funded by the Air Resources Board (ARB) and implemented statewide by the California Center for Sustainable Energy (CCSE).	Eligible Projects: Purchase or lease of zero-emission and plug-in hybrid light-duty vehicles http://www.arb.ca.gov/msprog/aqip/cvrp.htm
Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) Hybrid Electric Vehicle Purchase Vouchers (HVIP)*	To learn more about how to request a voucher, contact: info@californiahvip.org	Application Due On First-Come, First-Served Basis	Approximately \$10,000 to \$45,000 per qualified request	The California Air Resources Board (ARB) created the HVIP to speed the market introduction of low-emitting hybrid trucks and buses. It does this by reducing the cost of these vehicles for truck and bus fleets that purchase and operate the vehicles in the State of California. The HVIP voucher is intended to reduce about half the incremental costs of purchasing hybrid heavy-duty trucks and buses.	Eligible Projects: Purchase of low-emission hybrid trucks and buses http://www.californiahvip.org/

*New Funding Opportunity

**STA staff, Sara Woo, can be contacted directly at (707) 399-3214 or swoo@sta-snci.com for assistance with finding more information about any of the funding opportunities listed in this report.

Fund Source	Application/Program Contact Person**	Application Deadline/Eligibility	Amount Available	Program Description	Additional Information
Station Area and Land Use Planning Program*	Therese Trivedi MTC (510) 817-5767 ttrivedi@mtc.ca.gov	March 1, 2011 Eligible Applicants: Local jurisdictions with 1) areas approved as planned or potential PDAs and 2) station areas in transit extension projects identified under MTC's resolution 3434 that don't meet MTC's TOD policy for minimum housing thresholds	Approximately \$750,000	City-sponsored planning efforts for the areas around future transit extension stations. These station-area and land-use plans are intended to address the range of transit-supportive features that are necessary to support high levels of transit ridership.	Eligible Projects: Land use plans and policies that will substantially increase transit ridership around public transit hubs and bus and rail corridors in the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/smart_growth/stations/
FTA Section 5310 Elderly and Disabled Specialized Transit Program*	Liz Niedziela STA (707) 399-3217 eniedziela@sta-snci.com One Harbor Center Suite 130 Suisun City, CA 94585	March 4, 2011 Eligible Applicants: Private non-profit corporations, and public agencies approved by the State	Approximately \$25 million	Provides capital grants for projects that meet the transportation needs of elderly persons and persons with disabilities where public mass transportation services are otherwise unavailable, insufficient or inappropriate.	Eligible Projects: Accessible vans and buses, mobile radios and communication equipment, computer hardware and software http://www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/FTA/5310.htm
Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District (YSAQMD) Clean Air Funds (CAF)*	Jim Antone YSAQMD (530) 757-3653 jantone@vsqmd.org 1947 Galileo Court Suite 103 Davis, CA 95616	March 25, 2011 Eligible Applicants: Eastern Solano County jurisdictions (Dixon, Rio Vista, Vacaville, and surrounding unincorporated areas)	Approximately \$260,000	The YSAQMD CAF Program is designed to reduce emissions from motor vehicles by supporting cleaner vehicle technologies, alternative modes of transportation, and public education.	Eligible Projects: Clean technologies/low-emission vehicles, alternative transportation (bicycle and pedestrian projects), transit services, and public education http://www.vsqmd.org/Incentives10.php
Caltrans Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA)	Ann Mahaney Caltrans (916) 653-0036	March 25, 2011 Eligible Applicants:	\$7.2 million total expected to be allocated, max for	This program provides state funds for city and county projects that improve safety	Eligible Projects: (1) new bikeways serving major transportation

*New Funding Opportunity

**STA staff, Sara Woo, can be contacted directly at (707) 399-3214 or swoo@sta-snci.com for assistance with finding more information about any of the funding opportunities listed in this report.

Fund Source	Application/Program Contact Person**	Application Deadline/Eligibility	Amount Available	Program Description	Additional Information
Grant*	ann.mahaney@dot.ca.gov P.O. Box 942874 Sacramento, CA 94274-0001	Cities and Counties with an adopted Bicycle Transportation Plan (BTP)	one applicant is \$1.8 million	and convenience for bicycle commuters.	corridors; (2) new bikeways removing travel barriers; (3) secure bicycle parking; (4) bicycle-carrying facilities on public transit; (5) installation of traffic control devices to improve safety; (6) elimination of hazardous conditions on existing bikeways; (7) planning; (8) improvement and maintenance of bikeways http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/bta/BTA/CallForProjects.htm

Community-Based Transportation Planning Grants*	Russ Walker Caltrans (916) 651-6886 russ_walker@dot.ca.gov	Grants for 2011/2012 due April 1, 2011 (anticipated deadline) Eligible Applicants: Cities and Counties	Budget is \$3 million , each project not to exceed \$300,000; this grant requires a local 20% match with a maximum 10% in-kind contribution allowed	This program provides planning funds that support livable communities (such as long-term economic development, multimodal linkages, and jobs/housing balance), coordinate land-use and transportation planning, reflect community values, and include non-traditional participants in transportation decision making.	Eligible Projects: Long-term sustainable community studies/plans, blueprint planning follow-up or refinement, rural smart growth, transit oriented/adjacent development or “transit village” studies/plans, infill studies/plans, etc http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/grants.html
--	---	---	--	---	---

*New Funding Opportunity

**STA staff, Sara Woo, can be contacted directly at (707) 399-3214 or swoo@sta-snci.com for assistance with finding more information about any of the funding opportunities listed in this report.

Fund Source	Application/Program Contact Person**	Application Deadline/Eligibility	Amount Available	Program Description	Additional Information
Environmental Justice: Context-Sensitive Planning*	Jorge Rivas Caltrans (916) 654-6236 jorge_rivas@dot.ca.gov	Grants for 2011/2012 due April 1, 2011 (anticipated deadline) Eligible Applicants: Cities and Counties	Budget is \$3 million , each project not to exceed \$300,000; this grant requires a local 10% match with a maximum 5% in-kind contribution allowed	This program provides funding for transportation planning-related projects that promote environmental justice in local planning; contribute to the early and continuous involvement of low-income and minority communities in the planning and decision-making process; improve mobility and access for under-served communities; and create a business climate that leads to more economic opportunities, services and affordable housing.	Eligible Projects: Transit Innovation studies/plans, comprehensive mobility studies/plans, context-sensitive streetscapes or town center studies, complete street studies, context-sensitive community development planning, community-friendly goods movement transportation corridors, ports, and airports studies, etc http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/grants.html

*New Funding Opportunity

**STA staff, Sara Woo, can be contacted directly at (707) 399-3214 or swoo@sta-snci.com for assistance with finding more information about any of the funding opportunities listed in this report.

This page intentionally left blank.



STA Board Meeting Highlights
4:00 p.m., January 19, 2011
(Special Time/Date)

TO: City Councils and Board of Supervisors
(Attn: City Clerks and County Clerk of the Board)
FROM: Johanna Masiclat, STA Clerk of the Board
RE: Summary Actions of the January 19, 2011 STA Board Meeting

Following is a summary of the actions taken by the Solano Transportation Authority at the Board Meeting of January 19, 2011. If you have any questions regarding specific items, please call me at (707) 424-6008.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

Pete Sanchez, Chair	City of Suisun City
Harry Price, Vice Chair	City of Fairfield
Elizabeth Patterson	City of Benicia
Jack Batchelor, Jr.	City of Dixon
Jan Vick	City of Rio Vista
Len Augustine	City of Vacaville
Jim Spering	County of Solano

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:

Osby Davis	City of Vallejo
------------	-----------------

SWEARING IN OF NEW STA BOARD MEMBER AND ALTERNATE MEMBER

- 1. Steve Hardy**
Board Member Representing the City of Vacaville
- 2. Ron Rowlett**
Alternate Board Member Representing the City of Vacaville
- 3. John Vasquez**
Alternate Board Member Representing the County of Solano

ACTION – FINANCIAL ITEMS

A. Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 Mid-Year Budget Revision

Recommendation:

Adopt the FY 2010-11 Mid-Year Budget Revision as shown in Attachment A.

On a motion by Vice Chair Price, and a second by Board Member Spring, the STA Board unanimously approved the recommendation.

B. Solano County Transit (SolTrans) Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) Transition Team and Contract Support Funding Agreement

Recommendation:

1. SolTrans Transition Team Project Manager John Harris and Transition Team of consultants and member agency staff as identified on Attachment A; and
2. Authorize the Executive Director to enter into an agreement with SolTrans to provide transitional management, grants, administration, financial and legal service as outlined on Attachment B in an amount not to exceed \$130,000.

On a motion by Board Member Patterson, and a second by Board Member Spring, the STA Board unanimously approved the recommendation.

ACTION – NON-FINANCIAL ITEMS

A. Conduct Public Hearing and Adopt Resolution of Necessity to Acquire Property by Eminent Domain, if necessary, for the I-80 Eastbound Cordelia Truck Scales Relocation Project

Recommendation:

Approve the following:

1. Conduct a Public Hearing; and
2. Adopt the Resolution of Necessity to acquire by eminent domain, if necessary, the property needed for the I-80 Eastbound Cordelia Truck Scales Relocation Project as shown on the Property Map (Attachment A) and specified in the Resolution of Necessity (Attachment B).

Chairman Sanchez opened the Public Hearing at 4:33 p.m.

Richard Gidden, Suisun City Resident, provided some critical comments against the expensive role of government.

The Chair closed the Public Hearing at 4:35 p.m. and referred the matter to the Board for action.

On a motion by Vice Chair Price, and a second by Board Member Batchelor, the STA Board unanimously approved the recommendation.

B. Selection of 2011 STA Chair and Vice Chair

Recommendation:

Approve the following:

1. Selection of the STA Chair for 2011 Commencing with the STA Board Meeting of February 9, 2011;
2. Selection of the STA Vice-Chair for 2011 Commencing with the STA Board Meeting of February 9, 2011; and
3. Request the new Chair Designate the STA Executive Committee for 2011.

Board Comments:

Board Member Patterson requested the following to be noted for the record. Since 1991 through the year 2015, the amount of times the following cities have served as STA Chair: Benicia: 1x, Dixon: 3x, Fairfield: 4x, Rio Vista: 3x, Suisun City: 3x, Vacaville: 3x, Vallejo: 3x, and Solano County: 3x.

On a motion by Board Member Spring, and Board Member Batchelor, the STA Board unanimously approved the selection of Harry Price (City of Fairfield) as Chair.

On a motion by Vice Chair Harry Price, and Board Member Spring, the STA Board unanimously approved the selection of Jack Batchelor (City of Dixon) as Vice-Chair.

STA's new Chair Price designated the STA Executive Committee for 2011 as:

- Vice Chair Jack Batchelor (City of Dixon)
- Board Member Steve Hardy (City of Vacaville)
- Board Member Jim Spring (County of Solano)

CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS

On a motion by Vice Chair Price, and a second by Board Member Batchelor, the STA Board approved Consent Calendar Items A through O as amended.

A. STA Board Meeting Minutes of December 8, 2010

Recommendation:

Approve STA Board Meeting Minutes of December 8, 2010.

B. Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 First Quarter Budget Report

Recommendation:

Review and file.

C. Contract Amendment for Transit Project Management Consultant - John Harris Consulting

Recommendation:

Authorize the Executive Director to amend the consultant contract with John Harris Consulting for Transit Project Management for SolTrans Transition Plan by \$30,000 for an amount not-to-exceed of \$45,000.

- D. I-80 Eastbound Cordelia Truck Scales Relocation Project - Contract Amendment for HDR Engineering, Inc.**
Recommendation:
Approve a contract amendment with HDR in the not-to-exceed amount of \$718,104, to complete PS&E and R/W engineering services for the I-80 Eastbound Cordelia Truck Scales Relocation Project.
- E. I-80 Eastbound Cordelia Truck Scales Relocation Project – Fund Reallocation**
Recommendation:
Approve the attached Resolution 2011-01 and Funding Allocation Request from Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) that would transfer \$4.5 million in Regional Measure 2 funds from the Design Phase to the Right-of-Way phase for the I-80 Eastbound Cordelia Truck Scales Project.
- F. I-80 Express Lanes Project Implementation**
Recommendation:
Approve the following:
1. Authorize the Executive Director to amend contracts with PDM Group;
 2. Mark Thomas Company; and
 3. HDR Engineering, Inc. such that the total of all three contracts not exceed \$16,400,000 for environmental document phase for the I-80 Express Lanes Project.
- G. I-80 Ramp Metering Contract Amendment for the Mark Thomas/Nolte Joint Venture (JV)**
Recommendation:
Approve a contract amendment for the MTCo/Nolte team in a not-to-exceed amount of \$50,000 to cover additional design services during construction that may be required for the I-80 HOV Lanes - Ramp Metering Project.
- H. Monitoring Services for the Mitigation Planting and Irrigation Project for the North Connector**
Recommendation:
Authorize the Executive Director to enter into a contract with HT Harvey for an amount not-to-exceed \$123,000 to provide mitigation monitoring services for the Mitigation Site.
- I. Jepson Parkway Project Update**
Recommendation:
Authorize the Executive Director to:
1. Release a Request for Proposals for Design Services for the Jepson Parkway Project; and
 2. Enter into an agreement with a consultant for Design Services for an amount not-to-exceed \$2.4 million.
- J. Appointment of STA Legal Counsel – Bernadette Curry**
Recommendation:
Approve the following:
1. Appoint Bernadette Curry to serve as STA Legal Counsel; and
 2. Authorize the Executive Director to negotiate and enter into a contract with Solano County County Counsel for legal services for the STA.

K. SolTrans Logo and Branding Request for Proposal (RFP)

Recommendation:

Authorize the Executive Director to:

1. Release a Request for Proposal (RFP) in an amount not-to-exceed \$40,000 to secure a consultant firm to develop a SolTrans logo and branding. and
2. Enter into an agreement with a consultant for SolTrans logo, design and branding for an amount not-to-exceed \$40,000.

L. Solano Countywide Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) Plan Update

Recommendation:

Authorize the Executive Director to:

1. Release a Request for Proposals (RFP) which includes a scope of work for the Solano Countywide Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) Plan Update consistent with Attachment A; and
2. Enter into an agreement with a consultant for the development of the Solano Countywide TLC Plan update for an amount not-to-exceed \$50,000.

M. I-80/I-680/I-780/State Route (SR) 12 Transit Corridor Study

Recommendation:

Approve the following:

1. The Scope of Work for the I-80/I-680/I-780/Hwy 12 Transit Corridor Study as shown an Attachment A;
2. Authorize the Executive Director to release of a Request for Proposals; and
3. Authorize Executive Director to enter into an agreement for consultant services for an amount not-to-exceed \$140,000.

N. SolTrans Financial Services and Human Resources Request for Proposals (RFP)

Recommendation:

Authorize the Executive Director to:

1. Release a Request for Proposal (RFP) to secure an agency or firm to perform financial and human resources services for SolTrans; and
2. Execute a contract(s) for SolTrans financial management and human resources services in an amount not-to-exceed \$70,000.

O. Renewal of Membership with Solano Economic Development Corporation (EDC) for 2011

Recommendation:

Approve the renewal of STA's membership with the Solano Economic Development Corporation (SolanoEDC) at the ~~Executive Premier Member~~ "Stakeholders Chairman's Circle" level of ~~\$5,000~~ 7,500 for the Annual Investment Year 2011.

COMMENTS FROM METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION (MTC), CALTRANS, AND STAFF:

A. MTC Report:

None presented.

B. Caltrans Report:

Board Member Patterson requested staff follow-up with Caltrans regarding the delays and cutbacks of the planting along I-780.

C. STA Reports:

1. State Legislative Update presented by Gus Khouri, Shaw Yoder
2. STA Board Year-End Highlights presented by Jayne Bauer
3. Directors Report:
 - a. Planning – Robert Guerrero provided an update on the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) Performance Measures. He cited that this item would be brought back for further discussion at a later date.
 - b. Projects – None provided.
 - c. Transit/Rideshare – Elizabeth Richards

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

A. Presentation on Proposed Modifications to STA Retirement Benefits Plan

Joy Apilado, STA’s HR Consultant, evaluated options for considering a restructuring and reallocation of its benefit plans to accomplish four specific objectives: consideration of investment strategies, retention of quality employees, strives to maintain staff continuity, and control financial costs. She indicated that at the February meeting, the STA Board will consider approving the modification of its investment in its 401a defined contribution plan to a Public Agency Retirement (PARS) managed defined plan.

Public Comments:

Richard Giddens, City of Suisun City resident, commented on the pension system of public employees.

NO DISCUSSION

B. Solano Sustainable Communities Strategy Update

C. Funding Opportunities Summary

D. STA Board Meeting Schedule for Calendar Year 2011

BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

ADJOURNMENT

The STA Board meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m. The next regular meeting of the STA Board is scheduled for Wednesday, February 9, 2011, 6:00 p.m., Suisun City Hall Council Chambers.

Attested by:


Johanna Masielat
Clerk of the Board

January 31, 2011
Date



**STA Board Meeting Highlights
6:00 p.m., February 9, 2011**

TO: City Councils and Board of Supervisors
(Attn: City Clerks and County Clerk of the Board)
FROM: Johanna Masiclat, STA Clerk of the Board
RE: Summary Actions of the February 9, 2011 STA Board Meeting

Following is a summary of the actions taken by the Solano Transportation Authority at the Board Meeting of February 9, 2011. If you have any questions regarding specific items, please call me at (707) 424-6008.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

Pete Sanchez, Chair	City of Suisun City
Harry Price, Vice Chair	City of Fairfield
Elizabeth Patterson	City of Benicia
Jack Batchelor, Jr.	City of Dixon
Jan Vick	City of Rio Vista
Len Augustine	City of Vacaville
Jim Spering	County of Solano

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT:

Osby Davis	City of Vallejo
------------	-----------------

SWEARING IN OF NEW STA BOARD MEMBER AND ALTERNATE MEMBER

1. Janith Norman

Alternate Board Member Representing the City of Rio Vista

ACTION – FINANCIAL ITEMS

A. Proposed Modification to STA's Retirement Benefit Plan

Recommendation:

Authorize the Executive Director to:

1. Replace the 401(a) Defined Contribution Plan to a Defined Benefit Plan with PARS for an annual savings of approximately \$50,000;
2. **Approve Resolution 2011-04;**
3. Award contract to PARS for the administration and management of the PARS Plan for an annual amount of \$9,000; and
4. Increase PARS annual payment towards the payoff of the Actuarial Liability in the amount of \$25,000 for the next five to ten years.

On a motion by Vice Chair Batchelor, and a second by Board Member Sanchez, the STA Board unanimously approved the recommendation as amended shown above in *bold italics*.

ACTION – NON-FINANCIAL ITEMS

A. Solano Sustainable Communities Strategy Update/ Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Projects Submittal Update

Recommendation:

Adopt the STA RTP Call for Projects methodology and schedule in Attachment D.

On a motion by Board Member Davis, and a second by Board Member Patterson, the STA Board unanimously approved the recommendation.

B. Safe Routes to Transit Plan – Scope of Work

Recommendation:

Approve the following:

1. Approve the Scope of Work for creation of the Safe Routes to Transit Plan in Attachment A; and
2. Authorize the Executive Director to release a Request for Proposal for Safe Routes to Transit Plan consultant services.

On a motion by Vice Chair Batchelor, and a second by Board Member Patterson, the STA Board unanimously approved the recommendation.

C. Legislative Update

Recommendation:

Approve the following:

1. Support of three State priorities as specified:
 - a) Reenactment of the gas tax swap and use of truck weight fees for bond debt service
 - b) Sale and acceleration of bond allocations
 - c) Lower the voter threshold for local sales tax measures
2. Authorize the STA Chair to forward letters to the Governor and members of Solano's State legislative delegation to support the reenactment of the gas tax swap.

On a motion by Board Member Vick, and a second by Vice Chair Batchelor, the STA Board unanimously approved the recommendation.

CONSENT CALENDAR

On a motion by Board Member Patterson, and a second by Board Member Sanchez, the STA Board approved Consent Calendar Items A through J.

A. STA Board Meeting Minutes of January 19, 2011

Recommendation:

Approve STA Board Meeting Minutes of January 19, 2011.

- B. Draft TAC Meeting Minutes of January 26, 2011**
Recommendation:
Approve Draft TAC Meeting Minutes of January 26, 2011.
- C. SolanoExpress Intercity Transit Consortium 2011 Work Plan**
Recommendation:
Approve the SolanoExpress Intercity Transit Consortium 2011 Work Plan as shown on Attachment B.
- D. 2011 Paratransit Coordinating Council (PCC) Work Plan**
Recommendation:
Approve the 2011 PCC Work Plan as shown in Attachment A.
- E. Appointment of Pedestrian Advisory Committee (PAC) Member**
Recommendation:
Appoint Ms. Carol Day, Bay Area Ridge Trail Council and Mr. William Paul, City of Dixon, to the Pedestrian Advisory Committee for a three-year term.
- F. Safe Routes to School (SR2S) Public Safety Enforcement Grant**
Recommendation:
Approve the following:
1. Approve the STA's SR2S Public Safety Enforcement Grant Application process; and
2. Release a Request for Letters of Intent for the STA's Safe Routes to School Public Safety Enforcement Grant as described in Attachment A.
- G. Regional Measure 2 (RM 2) Benicia Intermodal Resolution of Support**
Recommendation:
Approve Resolution No. 2011-03 authorizing the funding allocation for Regional Measure 2 funds to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission for the City of Benicia for the Solano County Express Bus North Intermodal Facilities – Benicia Intermodal Facility.
- H. Congestion Management Program Traffic Data**
Recommendation:
Authorize the Executive Director to release a Request for Proposal (RFP) for the traffic counts required for the update of the Solano CMP for an amount-not-to-exceed \$10,000 and to execute a contract to obtain the required traffic counts.
- I. Regional Housing Needs Allocation Consultant Contract**
Recommendation:
Authorize the Executive Director to provide \$10,000 to Solano County in order to hire David Early to assist in the development and implementation of a Solano County Sub Regional RHNA effort.
- J. Public Private Partnership Feasibility Study**
Recommendation:
Authorize the Executive Director to execute a Project Management contract with Gray-Bowen Consulting for an amount-not-to-exceed \$20,000.

COMMENTS FROM METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION (MTC), CALTRANS, AND STAFF:

- A. MTC Report:**
None presented.
- B. Caltrans Report:**
None presented.
- C. STA Reports:**
Directors Report:
 - a. Planning – Robert Macaulay provided an update on upcoming SR 12 Public Meetings
 - b. Projects – None provided.
 - c. Transit/Rideshare – None provided.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

- A. Highway Projects Update**
 - 1. I-80/I-680/SR 12 Interchange**
 - 2. I-80 EB Cordelia Truck Scales Relocation**
 - 3. North Connector**
 - 4. I-80 Ramp Metering: Red Top Rd. to Air Base Pkwy**
 - 5. Redwood Pkwy - Fairgrounds Drive Improvements**
 - 6. Jepson Parkway**
 - 7. State Route 12 (Jameson Canyon)**
 - 8. State Route 12 East SHOPP Project**
 - 9. I-80 SHOPP Rehabilitation Projects**

Janet Adams provided a detailed update on two projects scheduled to start construction in 2011; the construction of Jameson Canyon and the relocation and update of the Eastbound Cordelia Truck Scales.

NO DISCUSSION

- B. Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 Abandoned Vehicle Abatement (AVA) Program First Quarter Report**
- C. Project Delivery Update**
- D. Funding Opportunities Summary**
- E. STA Board Meeting Schedule for Calendar Year 2011**

BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

ADJOURNMENT

The STA Board meeting was adjourned at 6:55 p.m. The next regular meeting of the STA Board is scheduled for Wednesday, March 9, 2011, 6:00 p.m., Suisun City Hall Council Chambers.

Attested by:



**Johanna Masielat
Clerk of the Board**

January 31, 2011
Date

This page intentionally left blank.



DATE: February 11, 2011
TO: STA TAC
FROM: Johanna Masielat, Clerk of the Board
RE: STA Board and Advisory Committee Meeting Schedule for 2011

Background:

Attached are the STA Board and Advisory Committee Meeting Schedule for 2011 that may be of interest to the STA TAC.

Fiscal Impact:

None.

Recommendation:

Informational.

Attachments:

- A. STA Board and Advisory Committee Meeting Schedule for 2011



**STA BOARD AND ADVISORY
COMMITTEE MEETING SCHEDULE
CALENDAR YEAR 2011**
(Last Updated: February 2011)

SUMMARY:	
STA Board:	Meets 2 nd Wednesday of Every Month
Consortium/TAC:	Meets Last Wednesday of Every Month
BAC:	Meets 1 st Thursday of every <i>Odd</i> Month
PAC:	Meets 3 rd Thursday of every <i>Odd</i> Month
PCC:	Meets 3 rd Thursdays of every <i>Odd</i> Month

DATE	TIME	DESCRIPTION	LOCATION	STATUS
Wed., February 23	10:00 a.m.	Intercity Transit Consortium	STA Conference Room	Confirmed
	1:30 p.m.	Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)	STA Conference Room	Confirmed
Thurs., March 3	6:30 p.m.	Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC)	STA Conference Room	Tentative
Wed., March 9	3:30 p.m.	RTIF Policy Committee	Suisun City Hall	Confirmed
Wed., March 9	6:00 p.m.	STA Board Meeting	Suisun City Hall	Confirmed
Thurs., March 17	1:00 p.m.	Paratransit Coordinating Council (PCC)	Solano Comm. College, FF	Confirmed
Thurs., March 17	6:00 p.m.	Pedestrian Advisory Committee (PAC)	STA Conference Room	Tentative
Wed., March 30	10:00 a.m.	Intercity Transit Consortium	STA Conference Room	Confirmed
	1:30 p.m.	Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)	STA Conference Room	Confirmed
Thurs., April 7	1:30 p.m.	RTIF Working Group	STA Conference Room	Confirmed
Wed., April 13	6:00 p.m.	STA Board Meeting	Suisun City Hall	Confirmed
Thurs., April 21	1:30 p.m.	RTIF Stakeholders Committee	Suisun City Hall	Confirmed
Wed., April 27	10:00 a.m.	Intercity Transit Consortium	STA Conference Room	Confirmed
	1:30 p.m.	Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)	STA Conference Room	Confirmed
Thurs., May 5	6:30 p.m.	Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC)	STA Conference Room	Tentative
Wed., May 11	3:30 p.m.	RTIF Policy Committee	Suisun City Hall	Confirmed
Wed., May 11	6:00 p.m.	STA Board Meeting	Suisun City Hall	Confirmed
Thurs., May 19	1:00 p.m.	Paratransit Coordinating Council (PCC)	Ulatis Comm. Ctr., VV	Confirmed
Thurs., May 19	6:00 p.m.	Pedestrian Advisory Committee (PAC)	STA Conference Room	Tentative
Wed., May 25	10:00 a.m.	Intercity Transit Consortium	STA Conference Room	Confirmed
	1:30 p.m.	Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)	STA Conference Room	Confirmed
Thurs., June 2	1:30 p.m.	RTIF Working Group	STA Conference Room	Confirmed
Wed., June 8	6:00 p.m.	STA Board Meeting	Suisun City Hall	Confirmed
Thurs., June 16	1:30 p.m.	RTIF Stakeholders Committee	Suisun City Hall	Confirmed
Wed., June 29	10:00 a.m.	Intercity Transit Consortium	STA Conference Room	Confirmed
	1:30 p.m.	Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)	STA Conference Room	Confirmed
Thurs., July 7	6:30 p.m.	Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC)	STA Conference Room	Tentative
Wed., July 13	3:30 p.m.	RTIF Policy Committee	Suisun City Hall	Confirmed
Wed., July 13	6:00 p.m.	STA Board Meeting	Suisun City Hall	Confirmed
Thurs., July 21	1:00 p.m.	Paratransit Coordinating Council (PCC)	Fairfield Comm. Center	Confirmed
Thurs., July 21	6:00 p.m.	Pedestrian Advisory Committee (PAC)	STA Conference Room	Confirmed
July 27 (No Meeting)	SUMMER RECESS	Intercity Transit Consortium	N/A	N/A
		Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)	N/A	N/A
August 10 (No Meeting)	SUMMER RECESS	STA Board Meeting	N/A	N/A
Wed., August 31	10:00 a.m.	Intercity Transit Consortium	STA Conference Room	Confirmed
	1:30 p.m.	Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)	STA Conference Room	Confirmed
Thurs., September 1	6:30 p.m.	Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC)	STA Conference Room	Confirmed
Wed., September 7	6:00 p.m.	STA Board Meeting	Suisun City Hall	Confirmed
Thurs. September 15	1:00 p.m.	Paratransit Coordinating Council (PCC)	Benicia City Hall	Confirmed
Thurs., September 15	6:00 p.m.	Pedestrian Advisory Committee (PAC)	STA Conference Room	Confirmed
Wed., September 28	10:00 a.m.	Intercity Transit Consortium	STA Conference Room	Confirmed
	1:30 p.m.	Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)	STA Conference Room	Confirmed
Wed., October 12	6:00 p.m.	STA Board Meeting	Suisun City Hall	Confirmed
Wed., October 26	10:00 a.m.	Intercity Transit Consortium	STA Conference Room	Confirmed
	1:30 p.m.	Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)	STA Conference Room	Confirmed
Thurs., November 3	6:30 p.m.	Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC)	STA Conference Room	Confirmed
Wed., November 9	6:00 p.m.	STA's 14 th Annual Awards	TBD - Rio Vista	TBD
Thurs., November 17	1:00 p.m.	Paratransit Coordinating Council (PCC)	Suisun City Hall	Confirmed
Thurs., November 17	6:00 p.m.	Pedestrian Advisory Committee (PAC)	STA Conference Room	Confirmed
Wed., November 30	10:00 a.m.	Intercity Transit Consortium	STA Conference Room	Confirmed
	1:30 p.m.	Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)	STA Conference Room	Confirmed
Wed., December 14	6:00 p.m.	STA Board Meeting	Suisun City Hall	Confirmed
Wed., December 28	10:00 a.m.	Intercity Transit Consortium	STA Conference Room	Tentative
	1:30 p.m.	Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)	STA Conference Room	Tentative