



Regional Planning Partnership

Item #2

October 28, 2009

Action Summary Minutes

Attendance

Azadeh Doherty, City of Sacramento
Beth Eggerts, ICF Jones & Stokes
Brian Wright, Psomas Engineering
Brigette Tollstrup, SMAQMD
Bruce Griesenbeck, SACOG
Christine Scherman, SACOG
Dan Bolster, EDCTC
David Melko, PCTPA
Jason Crow, SACOG
Jennifer Dzakowic, Placer County
José Luis Cáceres, SACOG
Karina O'Connor, EPA Region 9
Lacey Symons, SACOG
Larry Robinson, SMAQMP

Laura Walsh, Caltrans District 3 Environmental
Mark Thomas, City of Rancho Cordova
Mary Poole, City of Citrus Heights
Mike Brady, Caltrans
Nader Kamal, City of Sacramento
Nina Buelna, City of Roseville
Robert McCrary, SACOG
Shannon Hatcher, ICF Jones & Stokes
Stew Sonnenberg, FHWA
Susan Wilson, Caltrans District 3
Tiffany Lathrop, YSAQMD
Troy Holt, City of Rancho Cordova
Will Schilling, Caltrans District 3

- 1. Introductions and Information Sharing.** None
- 2. Action Summary of the August 26, 2009 Meeting.** The summary was approved by consensus.
- 3. PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀ Qualitative Analysis for Access Improvements from Railyards to Richards Boulevard and Interstate 5 Project.** Mr. Kamal discussed the Access Improvement Project. The project proposes widening lanes and sidewalks on Jibboom Street, Bercut Drive, and Railyards Drive and adding off-ramps at Richards Boulevard/Interstate 5. No comments or discussion.

The recommendation that the RPP make the finding that the Access Improvements from Railyards to Richards Boulevard and Interstate 5 Project is not a project of air quality concern was approved by consensus.

- 4. PM_{2.5} Qualitative Analysis for Washington Boulevard Frontage Improvements/ Washington Boulevard Improvement Project.** Mr. Siviligia discussed the Washington Boulevard Improvement Project. The project proposes making intersection improvements on Washington Boulevard at Junction Boulevard, Sawtell Road, and All American Boulevard. Improvements include class II bike lanes and sidewalks. No comments or discussion.

The recommendation that the RPP make the finding that the Washington Boulevard Frontage Improvements/ Washington Boulevard Improvement Project is not a project of air quality concern was approved by consensus.

- 5. PM_{2.5} Qualitative Analysis for Eureka Boulevard Project.** Ms. Buelna discussed the Eureka Boulevard Project. The project proposes improvements to the Eureka Road corridor between North Sunrise Avenue and the eastbound I-80 on-ramp in the northeast area of Roseville. Improvements include widening a bridge over Eureka Boulevard, adding a northbound thru lane, adding an eastbound on-ramp to I-80, and making pedestrian improvements.

Mike Brady (Caltrans) noted that adding an additional on-ramp lane could be considered a capacity increase, requiring the project to be modeled into the next air quality conformity consideration. However, an additional on-ramp lane does not mean that the project is a project of air quality concern. Mr. Crow and SACOG staff are to determine if the project will be modeled in the next conformity consideration.

The recommendation that the RPP make the finding that the Eureka Boulevard Project is not a project of air quality concern was approved by consensus.

- 6. 2009 Delivery Plan Results.** Mr. Cáceres discussed 2009 project delivery results. The region delivered its entire apportionment and obligation authority targets. As a result, the region avoided losing apportionment as part of the recent rescission. Another result was that the region received a bonus of "free" money through the August Redistribution of Obligation Authority.

Delivery as whole was strong, even though some agencies did not obligate according to their plans. According to the 2009 Delivery Plan, the region delivered 85 percent of its Tier 1 projects, 40 percent of its Tier 2 projects, 40 percent of its Tier 3 projects, and 10 percent of its Reserve projects.

- 7. SACOG Policy: Reprogramming Delivery Failure.** Mr. Cáceres explained the process for reprogramming Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) and Regional Surface Transportation (RSTP) funds that become available due to delivery failure. When a project fails to get obligated, the funds are applied to a new project that was programmed for a future year. However, the failed project is not guaranteed reprogramming to the following year, but rather the project is reprogrammed based on funding capacity in future years. The selection of replacement projects and reprogramming of failed projects is a subjective process for several reasons. One reason is that different pots of money can only be used for certain types of projects or need to be used within a certain time frame. Another reason is that programming staff need to balance the capacity of funds within our two partner planning agencies, Placer County Transportation Planning Agency and El Dorado County Transportation Commission. The take home messages are to get paperwork in to Caltrans as soon as possible to maximize the chances of your project being obligated with delivery failure funds and, second, if you fail to obligate your project in the year it is programmed, you should not expect your project to be carried over to the next year.

- 8. SB 375 Statewide MPO Data Summary.** As part of SACOG's involvement in the SB 375 Regional Targets Advisory Committee, SACOG staff assisted the California Air Resources Board in assembling land use, transportation system, and transportation performance data for all 18 MPO's in the state. Mr. Griesenbeck presented a summary of the data. Key highlights include:

- The San Joaquin valley is seeing the most rapid population growth. MTC/SCAG are seeing their shares of the population decreasing.

- SACOG and Kings County are the only regions to show both an interim and horizon (based on regional transportation plan models) decrease in CO₂ emissions per capita. This is significant because CO₂ emissions will be used to measure SB 375 implementation.
- In the jobs/housing balance, most MPOs are diverging from “balance.” For example, areas with lots of jobs are getting more jobs and areas with lots of housing are getting more housing (or losing more jobs).

Ms. Symons will email a PDF of Mr. Griesenbeck’s PowerPoint presentation. The consolidated data for all 18 MPOs is available as a spreadsheet on CARB’s website.

<http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/sb375/rtac/meetings/meetings.htm>

Look under the “August 18, 2009” meeting, “Data Spreadsheet” item.

9. Rural-Urban Connections Transportation Update. Mr. McCrary gave an update on the Rural-Urban Connections Strategy (RUCS) transportation work. SACOG recently hosted two RUCS workshops (8/27 and 10/8). The first was a joint workshop with land use and transportation exercises that asked participants to identify innovations that would help to sustain the rural economy. Participants intuitively made the connection between land use and transportation planning and provided good insights. Some key themes were that non-traditional roadway investments, like wayfinding signage, are important infrastructure; there needs to be a greater emphasis on the education of young farmers and the public; and good data are critical in understanding rural transportation issues. The second RUCS workshop was a local markets workshop. Again, participants were asked to rank innovations, but this time from a local markets perspective. As part of the RUCS implementation strategy, SACOG has already produced some deliverables:

- County safety summaries and a rural funding guide are available on the SACOG website.
- SACOG is currently working on an agricultural worker transportation program. A business plan is expected to come through the November/December committee cycle.
- SACOG is working on a goods movement network

Q: Does the network use information from the SACOG Goods Movement Study?

A: Yes, data from the study and new data are informing the RUCS project

Q: Will the RUCS project change funding priorities from urban to rural areas?

A: The SACOG Board of Directors decides funding priorities. For now, the RUCS project aims to bring to light opportunities and challenges in our region’s rural areas, and the Board will decide how to incorporate RUCS principles into future planning.

10. Other Matters. None

11. Adjournment. The next meeting is Wednesday, December 2, 2009