



**NOTICE OF REGULAR MEETING
OF THE
TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**Butte County Association of Governments
Conference Room
2580 Sierra Sunrise Terrace, Suite 100, Chico CA
(530) 879-2468**

*****Thursday*** – February 5, 2015 – 10:00 A.M.**

1. INTRODUCTIONS

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY ADDRESS ANY ITEM ON THE AGENDA DURING CONSIDERATION OF THAT ITEM.

2. ORAL COMMUNICATION

PERSONS WISHING TO ADDRESS AGENDA ITEMS OR COMMENT ON ANY ITEM NOT ON THE AGENDA MAY DO SO AT THIS TIME. COMMENTS ARE LIMITED TO THREE MINUTES PER PERSON. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS FOR THE RECORD.
FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA, NO ACTION WILL BE TAKEN AT THIS TIME. IF IT REQUIRES ACTION, IT WILL BE REFERRED TO STAFF AND OR PLACED ON THE NEXT AGENDA.

COPIES OF STAFF REPORTS OR OTHER WRITTEN DOCUMENTATION RELATING TO ITEMS OF BUSINESS REFERRED TO ON THE AGENDA ARE ON FILE IN THE OFFICE OF BUTTE COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS (BCAG). PERSONS WITH QUESTIONS CONCERNING AGENDA ITEMS MAY CALL BCAG TO MAKE INQUIRIES REGARDING THE NATURE OF THE ITEM DESCRIBED ON THE AGENDA.

ITEM

STAFF

3. Minutes from August 7, 2014 TAC Meeting

Ivan Garcia

For review and approval

4. 2016 MTP/SCS Development

Ivan Garcia
Information

Informing committee of development of Policy, Financial and Action
Elements

5. Active Transportation Program

Ivan Garcia
Information

Informing committee of next round of ATP Cycle 2

6. Transit and Non-Motorized Transportation Plan

Ivan Garcia
Information

Verbal update of project development and relationship to
The MTP/SCS

7. Other Items



**Butte County Association of Governments
Transportation Advisory Committee
Draft Summary Meeting Minutes
for August 7, 2014**

The following minutes are a summary of the Transportation Advisory Committee.
The Transportation Advisory Committee Meeting of the Butte County Association of Governments was held at their office, 2580 Sierra Sunrise Terrace, Suite 100, Chico CA. The meeting started at 10:00 a.m.

Item #3 – August 7, 2014 TAC Meeting

No comments were received.

Item #4 – 2015 Federal Transportation Improvement Program Amendment #02 and 2012 MTP/SCS Amendment #06

Staff presented the draft 2015 FTIP and 2012 MTP/SC Amendments to identify new programming on behalf of Caltrans for the SHOPP program and to adjust minor programming for the HBP Grouped listing program. Staff indicated that the amendment did not impact BCAG's air quality conformity analysis. In addition, staff stated that the amendment makes any adjustments necessary to the MTP/SCS to ensure all 2015 FTIP projects are identified.

Staff indicated that the amendments were scheduled to be approved by the BCAG Board at their December 11, 2014 Board meeting.

Item #5 – Draft Long Term Regional Growth Forecasts

The purpose of this agenda item was to present the draft long term regional growth forecasts that were going to be used in preparing the 2016 MTP/SCS. Staff indicated that federal air quality conformity regulations require BCAG updating the land use planning assumptions every four years. As part of the agenda item, staff included a separate attachment with Butte County Long-Term Growth Forecasts for 2014-2040. Staff also stated that the growth forecasts were developed in consultation with the BCAG Planning Directors Group.

Item #6 – State Route 162 Corridor Plan – City of Oroville

Staff informed the committee that BCAG and the City of Oroville were beginning the development of a corridor plan for a portion of SR 162 between SR 70 and Foothill Blvd. The plan will focus on creating a roadway that is planned, designed to provide for safe mobility for all users including bicycles, pedestrians, transit, trucks and vehicles. BCAG's role will be administrative and project oversight. A consultant team is expected to be selected in January 2015 with expected project completion by December 2016.

This agenda item was presented to keep the committee informed. Funding for this project was secured by the City of Oroville with a Caltrans Transportation Planning grant.

Item #7 – Chico to Sacramento Commuter Express Service Pilot

Staff informed the committee of progress concerning the completion of the Chico to Sacramento Commuter Express transit planning study. With Caltrans transit planning grant funds, BCAG with the assistance of LSC consultants completed a commuter feasibility study with potential service route alignments and schedule. Staff indicated that the draft results indicated that the service may be feasible, however, it would be up to the BCAG Board of Directors whether or not to pursue. Staff indicated the only option at this time for staff to support moving forward would be if other demonstration or bond funds would become available and not existing regional funds or any local funding. Staff indicated that staff would not jeopardize any funding earmarked for the local agencies. As part of the committee meeting, staff had available Technical Memorandum TM that detailed the setting for transportation, including demographic factors, current transportation services, infrastructure and estimated transit demand for the service. In addition, a copy of the proposed route schedule and billable hours from Transdev and draft financial plan from LSC consultants.

Staff indicated that each year, residents in the region typically request for transit service to Sacramento as part of the Unmet Transit Needs process.

Item #8 – Other Items

No other items were presented.



BCAG Transportation Advisory Committee

Item # 4 Information

February 5, 2015

2016 METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN / SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT

PREPARED BY: Ivan Garcia, Programming Manager

ISSUE: BCAG is required to prepare and update the Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy by 2016.

DISCUSSION: At the December committee meeting, staff made available for discussion the draft long-term regional growth forecasts. At the committee meeting, staff will have available the next sections that are currently being worked on including the Policy, Financial and Road elements.

Policy Element

The purpose of the Policy Element is to identify legislative, planning, financial and institutional issues and requirements, as well as any areas of regional consensus. The Policy Element presents guidance to decision-makers of the implications, impacts, opportunities, and foreclosed options that will result from implementation of the MTP. The Policy Element is a resource for providing input and promoting consistency of action among state, regional and local agencies.

Financial Element

The Financial Element identifies the current and anticipated revenue sources and financing techniques available to fund the planned transportation investments described in the Action Element (Highways, Local Streets & Roads, Bike and Pedestrian etc.). The intent of the Financial Element is to define realistic transportation financial constraints and opportunities with current available data. Discussion will center on three main topics: current funding revenues, transportation expenditures, and potential funding sources for the future.

The purpose of the Financial Element is to:

- Identify financial forecasts for funding through BCAG
- Estimate the costs and revenues to implement the projects identified in the Action Element
- Identify funding shortfalls
- List the candidate projects if funding becomes available

BCAG Transportation Advisory Committee
February 5, 2015
Agenda Item # 4
Page 3

Staff will have available a copy of the 2012 financial projections used in the last MTP/SCS. Updated draft projections will be presented at the March TAC meeting. Below is a summary of the previous financial sources to the region. As a result of MAP 21, these may change.

Federal Funding Sources

Fund Source	Abbreviation	Primary Mode
Surface Transportation Program	STP	Streets (Local)
Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality	CMAQ	Air Quality
Transportation Enhancements	TE	Bicycle, Pedestrian, Landscaping
Federal Transit Administration Section 5307	FTA 5307	Urban transit
Federal Transit Administration Section 5311	FTA 5311	Rural transit
Federal Transit Administration Section 5309	FTA 5309	Discretionary transit
Federal Transit Administration Section 5316	FTA 5316	Discretionary transit
Federal Transit Administration Section 5317	FTA 5317	Discretionary transit
Highway Bridge Program	HBP	Bridges (Local)
Highway Safety Improvement Program	HSIP	Streets (Local)
Federal Airport Improvement Program	FAIP	Aviation

State Funding Sources

Fund Source	Abbreviation	Primary Mode
Interregional Improvement Program/STIP	IIP	State Highways – SR 70
Regional Improvement Program/STIP	RIP	Regional Needs
State Highways Operations and Protection Program	SHOPP	State Highways – Safety/Rehab
TDA: Local Transportation Fund	LTF	Transit needs first, streets (Local)
TDA: State Transit Assistance Fund	STA	Transit
State Fuel Tax	Fuel Tax	Streets (Local)
Bicycle Transportation Account	BTA	Bicycle Projects
State – Safe Routes To Schools Program	SR2S	Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects
State Aeronautics	SA	Aviation

Action Element – State Highways and Local Streets and Roads

Of particular interest at this time is to give thought as to what projects will need to be included in the regional emissions analysis for air quality conformity. These particular projects are those which are required to be included in the regional transportation model and are capacity increasing. Capacity increasing for this purpose is defined as an additional thru lane of travel. Center turn lanes, right turn pockets, roundabouts are not included. In most cases it would a road or bridge widening project from 2 lanes to 4 lanes.

The following local projects were included in the 2012 MTP/SCS and considered to be “financially constrained”.

Table 6-8
 Projects Included in Regional Emissions Analysis
 By Air Quality Analysis Year “Groups”

MTP AIR QUALITY GROUP 1 FY '12/13 - 15/16 15/16 (4 years)	PLANNED FINANCIALLY CONSTRAINED PROJECT
BCAG	SR 70 Passing Lane - Segment 1 Ophir Rd to .1 mi south of Palermo Rd
BCAG	SR 99, Chico Aux lanes, Phase 2 & 3
Chico	Bruce Rd - between Skyway and SR 32. Widen from 2 to 4 lanes
Chico	Eaton Rd Extension - East Ave to Foothill Park East Subdivision. New 4 lanes
Chico	MLK Blvd - E. Park Ave to 20th St. Widen 2 to 4 lanes
Chico	Eaton/SR99 Interchange Improvements. Widen 2 to 4 lanes
Chico	SR 32 from 2 to 4 lanes from SR 99 to El Monte

BCAG TAC
February 5, 2015
Agenda Item # 4
Page 5

MTP AIR QUALITY GROUP 2 16/17-17/18 3 Fiscal Years	PLANNED FINANCIALLY CONSTRAINED PROJECT
Chico	SR 32, Eaton Road extension to SR 32 - New 4 lane facility
Chico	SR32 Widening Phase 3 - El Monte Ave to Yosemite Dr
Chico	SR99 Auxy Lanes Phase 1 - Skyway to 20th Street
Chico	SR99/East Ave Interchange Improvements
Paradise	NEW ROAD - Clark Rd to Bennet Rd. New 2 lane road w/ Class 2 lanes (1.5 miles)

MTP AIR QUALITY GROUP 3 19/20-20/21 2 Fiscal Years	PLANNED FINANCIALLY CONSTRAINED PROJECT
BCAG	SR 70 Passing Lane Project - PHASE 2. Termini @ Segment 1 . 1 mi south of Palermo to north termini of SR 70 E. Gridley Rd. Passing Lane north of Cox Rd.
Chico	Norte Dame Extension from Comanche Creek to Southgate Ave. New 2 lane road
County	<i>Kittyhawk Dr. Extension (SR-99 to Garner Ln.)</i>
Chico	SR99/Southgate Interchange Phase 1 - New Interchange to replace at grade intersection. Modify at grade interchange. Add frontage roads.

MTP AIR QUALITY GROUP 4 21/22-25/26 5 Fiscal Years	PLANNED FINANCIALLY CONSTRAINED PROJECT
Chico	Esplanade Reconstruction - From Eaton Rd to SR 99 Widen from 2 to 4 lanes
County	Southgate Ave Extension

MTP AIR QUALITY GROUP 5 26/27-34/35 9 Fiscal years	PLANNED FINANCIALLY CONSTRAINED PROJECT
BCAG	SR 70 Passing Lane Project - Phase 3. Termini at Passing lanes at E Gridley Rd to Yuba County Line. Includes 2 of 3 bridges at Co. line

Unfunded Regional Priorities Beyond Financial Constraints

BCAG also identifies projects that fall outside of its financial projections. The following list of projects were included in the 2012 MTP/SCS:

SR 99 Corridor Projects - The scope of the projects is to provide a continuous merging lane to improve the traffic operations along the main corridor. The estimated cost for these improvements is \$100 million.

SR 99 Passing Lane Projects - The scope of these projects is to provide for passing lanes between Gridley and the junction at SR 149. The estimated cost for these improvements is \$80 million.

SR 99 Neal Road Interchange – The scope of this project is to provide for a new interchange at Neal Road and SR 99. The estimated cost for a new interchange is \$30 million.

SR 70 Ophir Rd Interchange Project – The scope of this project is to provide for a new interchange at Ophir Rd near Oroville. The estimated cost for a new interchange is \$30 million.

BCAG Transportation Advisory Committee
February 5, 2015
Agenda Item # 4
Page 7

SR 70 Georgia Pacific Interchange – The scope of this project is to provide for a new interchange. The estimated cost for a new interchange is \$30 million.

The Skyway over the Magalia Dam Project - The scope of this project is to add an additional two lanes of roadway over the Magalia Dam on the Skyway. This section of roadway is located between the Town of Paradise and the community of Magalia. A key concern is the number of traffic accidents that shut down traffic in both directions, causing significant delays. Emergency vehicles are also affected when accidents occur. The estimated cost for this project is \$80 million.

As information is developed, staff will be posting all relevant information online at: <http://www.bcag.org/Planning/MTP--SCS/index.html> for the MTP/SCS

REQUESTED ACTION: While this item is not an action item, staff is requesting the local agencies examine their local plans and or capital improvement programs to ensure those projects that need to be included in the MTP/SCS, in particular, the regional emissions analysis are accounted for. This will help reduce any future potential amendment processing time. The BCAG Board is scheduled to adopt the 2015 FTIP at the December 11, 2014 Board meeting. Because the base year of the traffic model and emissions model is January 1 2014, all capacity changing projects need to be included. Even lane reduction (traffic calming from 4 to 2 lanes like Paradise) need to be accounted for.

Key staff: Ivan Garcia, Programming Manager
Brian Lasagna, Senior Planner



BCAG Transportation Advisory Committee

Item # 5 Information

February 5, 2015

ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM

PREPARED BY: Ivan Garcia, Programming Manager

ISSUE: Applications for the first round of the Active Transportation Program (ATP) are due no later than May 21, 2014

DISCUSSION: On September 26, 2013, Governor Brown signed legislation creating the Active Transportation Program (ATP) in the Department of Transportation ([Senate Bill 99, Chapter 359](#) and [Assembly Bill 101, Chapter 354](#)). The ATP consolidates existing federal and state transportation programs, including the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP), Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA), and State Safe Routes to School (SR2S), into a single program with a focus to make California a national leader in active transportation.

The purpose of ATP is to encourage increased use of active modes of transportation by achieving the following goals:

- Increase the proportion of trips accomplished by biking and walking,
- Increase safety and mobility for nonmotorized users,
- Advance the active transportation efforts of regional agencies to achieve greenhouse gas reduction goals,
- Enhance public health,
- Ensure that disadvantaged communities fully share in the benefits of the program, and
- Provide a broad spectrum of projects to benefit many types of active transportation users.

Staff will present the current draft amended guidance from Caltrans for Cycle 2. Staff has been informed that complete final draft will be completed by the end of February with approval by the CTC in March. A call for projects is anticipated for March 25th with applications due in June.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: This item is presented for information and comment. Draft ATP Cycle 2 material will be provided at the committee meeting. Attached for the committee's awareness are notes from the last ATP workshop.

Key staff: Ivan Garcia, Programming Manager

The following notes from the last ATP Guidelines Workshop are being provided for the committee's information.

Notes from December 2, 2014 ATP Guidelines Workshop

CTC staff proposed changes were discussed in order of appearance in the discussion draft.

Timeline, page 2:

The proposed timeline is already a bit out of date, with the fund estimate likely to be adopted in March instead of January. Also, two hearings may not be held – one hearing, at the January CTC meeting, was proposed. SACOG staff proposed a change to the staff recommendation date for statewide and small urban & rural components. The proposed date of September 30 is too late for some MPOs to prepare their recommendations in time for adoption in December.

There was discussion regarding sequential programming (statewide first, with small urban & rural and MPO later). Some liked the current, sequential process, and some proposed changes to either concurrent or sequential with small urban & rural and MPOs first, then statewide. MPOs with supplemental calls for applications may want to have the application deadlines be the same. With the, again, short timeline for adoption of this program, CTC staff is reluctant to change the programming process in this second program cycle.

There was a request to amend the project application deadline to allow more time to prepare applications. Also, it was mentioned that the deadline date should be a postmark deadline rather than a received deadline.

Caltrans activities are not shown here, but they will be holding multiple training sessions that are anticipated to **begin in March**.

Matching Requirements, page 4:

CTC staff proposed to eliminate the match requirement. There was really no discussion about elimination, but instead some comments about whether to award points to those projects that leverage other funds. Also, how would points be awarded – for total project leveraged funds or for leveraged funds only in the component being proposed for ATP funds? This was not determined at the workshop and is still open for comment.

Funding for Active Transportation Plans, page 4:

There was concern about the proposed language added – “community wide” (CTC staff would like to concentrate on plans for communities rather than small areas such as one street) and “predominantly” disadvantaged. We should define these terms – regarding “predominantly” we should perhaps point to the definition of disadvantaged later in the guidelines. Requiring community wide plans may preclude plans such as first mile, last mile. Also, we need to re-examine the language in the last paragraph on page 4 where it lists all the agencies. Tribes are not mentioned, and is it really necessary to list all types of eligible agencies when we could just say “eligible agencies”?

In addition, this section mentions first priority for agencies with no pedestrian, bicycle, safe routes to school or active transportation plans at all and second priority for those agencies that may have either a bicycle or pedestrian plan, but not both. There was discussion about adding an additional second priority to include agencies that need to update a plan that is older than 3 to 5 years (number of years still to be determined).

Eligible Projects, page 6:

CTC staff added language to say that a capital project that is required to receive other permit or development approval is not an eligible project. This language is not clear and needs to be rewritten. Staff intent is to not fund a project in the case where a developer is required to do that project as a condition of other development where the developer will make a profit. ATP funds should not be used to pay the Developer’s required costs. Staff will work on this wording to clarify the meaning.

Disadvantaged Communities, page 8:

There was discussion about the definitions of disadvantaged communities. The first bullet, regarding median household income, may not work for some rural communities because it is based on census tract level data. Also a level of 80% of the statewide median is used, but statewide median is not defined. Staff should put in a number or perhaps a link to where the number can be found.

The second bullet, regarding CalEnviroScreen, was discussed in terms of whether these guidelines should mirror guidelines for cap and trade programs. Those programs use a level of 25% instead of 10%. There was concern that the lower percentage gave an unfair advantage to Southern California. CTC staff found that there is a long list of identified disadvantaged areas – by census tract – on CalEPAs website (including maps). Perhaps that list should be linked or referenced here.

There was discussion about the “fourth” option of letting the applicant explain why their community is disadvantaged even though it does not meet the aforementioned definitions. Some thought this should be removed, while others felt it is appropriate to allow for other definitions. This assumes the evaluators and/or CTC staff will verify the information provided prior to awarding any points. Backup data should be required to be included in the application if this option is kept.

Scoring Criteria, page 13:

This section of the guidelines was not discussed in detail, but will likely be part of the agenda for the second workshop in January. What was discussed was the requirement to use the benefit/cost model developed by Caltrans. The model may not be complete in time for this second program cycle. There was also concern that the model would not

work for non-infrastructure or plans. Perhaps this should not be required for plans. Language may need to be added to allow for use of a different method/model if the Caltrans model does not work. Also, should staff include points for leveraging of other funds?

Other scoring criteria items that came up briefly include extra points for project readiness (construction ready), for multi-jurisdictional projects, for gap projects, and for projects that contribute to the regions GHG reduction strategy. There was discussion of how disadvantaged communities received the bulk of approved projects, leading to a question of whether the definition was too loose or whether too many points are being awarded. There was concern raised about making changes that could lead to the unintended consequence of leaving too many disadvantaged communities out of the running. It was suggested to be careful of any changes here.

Allocations, page 16:

There was a request to clarify the difference between PA&ED (environmental) and PS&E (design). The Commission does not follow the federal PE definition but instead breaks it down into two phases. It is important that an agency program sufficient funds in PA&ED to complete CEQA and NEPA, including any preliminary design that is required to complete these. PS&E will not be allocated until CEQA and NEPA are done and should be for completion of final design.

Project Delivery, page 16:

The language regarding how long funds are available after allocation needs to be clarified. For construction, allocated funds are available for award of a contract for 6 months. This can be extended by the Commission. Once a construction contract is awarded, the funds are available for 36 months. This can also be extended.

Design Standards, page 18:

The design standards narrative should be updated to take into account recently approved legislation such as AB 1193 that amended Streets and Highways Code Section 891.

Roles and Responsibilities, pages 20, 21 and 22:

Caltrans roles should include administration of the Technical Assistance Resource Center contracts.

MPO roles should include language regarding contingency lists. The language regarding amendments that CTC staff proposed to delete would instead be changed to incorporate changes per the contingency list. This language will also need to include what the contingency list limitations are. CTC staff suggested that contingency lists should expire at the next call for projects, while an MPO representative suggested they should expire at the next program adoption.

RTPAs and MPOs outside the nine large MPOs roles will not change, but staff will clarify the title. There was discussion of RTPA review or pre-selection of ATP applications from their area. The role described here covers that. CTC staff does not want applications to be eliminated from the Statewide program by the regional agency, but instead wants input/recommendations on the proposed projects.

Discussion Items for Next Workshop:

Revised discussion draft – staff will make changes and clarifications and bring an updated draft to the January workshop.

How criteria will be scored – points for match, etc.

Draft application, including the requirement for a workplan for non-infrastructure projects.



BCAG Transportation Advisory Committee

Item # 6 Information

February 5, 2015

TRANSIT AND NON-MOTORIZED TRANSPORTATION PLAN DEVELOPMENT

PREPARED BY: Ivan Garcia, Programming Manager

ISSUE: Staff will provide a project status concerning the development of the Transit and Non-Motorized Transportation Plan nearing completion and discuss the relationship of this project and the update to the Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable communities Strategy.