

# Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency

625 Burnell Street  
Napa, CA 94559



## Agenda - Final

Thursday, January 7, 2016  
2:00 PM

NCTPA/NVTA Conference Room

### Technical Advisory Committee

All materials relating to an agenda item for an open session of a regular meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) which are provided to a majority or all of the members of the TAC by TAC members, staff or the public within 72 hours of but prior to the meeting will be available for public inspection, on and after at the time of such distribution, in the office of the Secretary of the TAC, 625 Burnell Street, Napa, California 94559, Monday through Friday, between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., except for NCTPA holidays. Materials distributed to a majority or all of the members of the TAC at the meeting will be available for public inspection at the public meeting if prepared by the members of the TAC or staff and after the public meeting if prepared by some other person. Availability of materials related to agenda items for public inspection does not include materials which are exempt from public disclosure under Government Code sections 6253.5, 6254, 6254.3, 6254.7, 6254.15, 6254.16, or 6254.22.

Members of the public may speak to the TAC on any item at the time the TAC is considering the item. Please complete a Speaker's Slip, which is located on the table near the entryway, and then present the slip to the TAC Secretary. Also, members of the public are invited to address the TAC on any issue not on today's agenda under Public Comment. Speakers are limited to three minutes.

This Agenda shall be made available upon request in alternate formats to persons with a disability. Persons requesting a disability-related modification or accommodation should contact the Administrative Assistant, at (707) 259-8631 during regular business hours, at least 48 hours prior to the time of the meeting.

This Agenda may also be viewed online by visiting the NCTPA website at [www.nctpa.net](http://www.nctpa.net), click on Minutes and Agendas – TAC or go to <http://www.nctpa.net/technical-advisory-committee-tac>.

Note: Where times are indicated for agenda items they are approximate and intended as estimates only, and may be shorter or longer, as needed.

**NOTE: TAC meeting is from 2:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.**

1. Call To Order
2. Introductions
3. Public Comment
4. Committee Member and Staff Comments
5. Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Commissioner's Update

**6. STANDING AGENDA ITEMS**

- 6.1 Congestion Management Agency (CMA) Report (Danielle Schmitz)
- 6.2 Project Monitoring Funding Programs\* (Alberto Esqueda)
- 6.3 Caltrans' Report\* (Ahmad Rahimi)
- 6.4 Vine Trail Update (Rick Marshall)

Note: Where times are indicated for the agenda items they are approximate and intended as estimates only, and may be shorter or longer, as needed.

**7. CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS**

- 7.1 Approval of Meeting Minutes of November 5, 2015 TAC (Kathy Alexander) *Pages 5-9*
- Recommendation:** Staff recommends approval of the meeting minutes of November 5, 2015.
- Estimated Time:** 2:15 p.m.
- Attachments:** [TAC 7.1\\_Draft TAC Minutes 11-5-2015.pdf](#)

**8. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS**

- 8.1 Local Match Recommendation for the Napa Valley Vine Trail Project St. Helena to Calistoga Segment (Danielle Schmitz) *Pages 10-15*

**Recommendation:** TAC will recommend a potential funding shortfall strategy for the Napa Valley Vine Trail project St. Helena to Calistoga segment.

**Estimated Time:** 2:15 p.m.

**Attachments:** [8.1 Local Match on Vine Trail.pdf](#)

- 8.2 One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) 2 Update (Danielle Schmitz) *Pages 16-26*

**Recommendation:** Information only. Staff will provide an update on the OBAG 2.

**Estimated Time:** 2:30 p.m.

**Attachments:** [8.2 OBAG 2 Update.pdf](#)

- 8.3 Vision Zero (Diana Meehan)

**Recommendation:** Information only. Staff will provide a review of the Vision Zero strategy. *Pages 27-29*

**Estimated Time:** 2:40 p.m.

**Attachments:** [8.3 Vision Zero.pdf](#)

- 8.4 Legislative Update\* (Kate Miller)

**Recommendation:** Information only.

**Estimated Time:** 2:50 p.m.

- 8.5 Draft Napa Valley Transportation Authority (NVTA) Board Agenda January 20, 2015\* (Kate Miller)

**Recommendation:** Information only.

**Estimated Time:** 2:55 p.m.

## **9. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

## **10. ADJOURNMENT**

**10.1** Approval of Next Regular Meeting Date of February 4, 2016 at 2:00 p.m.  
and Adjournment

**Estimated Time:** 3:00 p.m.

\* Item will be provided at meeting

**Note: The Napa Valley Vine Trail meeting will immediately follow the TAC meeting.**

I, Kathy Alexander, hereby certify that the agenda for the above stated meeting was posted at a location freely accessible to members of the public at the NCTPA offices, 625 Burnell Street, Napa, CA by 5:00 p.m., on December 21, 2015.

---



625 Burnell Street  
Napa, CA 94559

# Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency Meeting Minutes Technical Advisory Committee

Thursday, November 5, 2015

2:00 PM

NCTPA/NVTA Conference Room

## 1. Call To Order

Chair Kirn called the meeting to order at 2:04 p.m.

## 2. Introductions

## 3. Public Comment

No public comment.

## 4. Committee Member and Staff Comments

**NCTPA (Danielle Schmitz)** announced Matthew Wilcox will be returning to NCTPA as the new Transit Manager.

Staff will recommend transitioning NCTPA's VINE Consumer Advisory Committee to a multi-modal Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) at the November NCTPA Board meeting.

**County of Napa (Rick Tooker)** Held the first public meeting regarding Dwight Murray Plaza and surrounding area with a possible partial street closure and shared road for pedestrians and bicyclists.

**Caltrans (Ahmad Rahimi)** - Handed out the 2016 State Highway Operation and Protection Program Draft Project List, Version 2.

**City of Calistoga (Erik Lundquist)** - Their Active Transportation Advisory Committee is now going strong with five members.

**City of Napa (Eric Whan)** - Completed two-way street conversion on 4th Street, and two-way traffic opened on 3rd Street this morning. Roundabouts are in process. Next public meeting on the 5-way intersection November 19th at 5:30 p.m.

**NCTPA (Diana Meehan)** - The Pedestrian Plan Administration Draft will be released in late November and presented to the committees in January 2016.

Reviewed upcoming Transportation for Clean Air (TFCA) changes - program managers must enforce the 2-year time limit - extensions will not be allowed after 2017.

Caltrans District 4 Bicycle Committee is reviewing a bikeways guidance document for Class 4 bikeways and has invited comments. Eric Whan asked Diana to send the document to the Committee.

**City of Calistoga (Mike Kirn)** - Completing a \$500,000 resurfacing project, received a very good price from a pavement coatings company out of Sacramento.

Mike announced the Calistoga City Manager is out on medical leave, Calistoga City Council voted Mike as Interim City Manager.

The Silver Rose Hotel held its formal groundbreaking ceremony on Tuesday.

**NCTPA (Kate Miller)** – The NCTPA Board approved NCTPA's participation in a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for the four counties to work together on the State Route 37 project. The first meeting was this morning. Discussed respective county commitments for project in the Regional Transportation Plan joint application for a Feasibility Study. The Solano Transportation Authority is completing the Caltrans Strategic Plan Grant application. They are inviting Caltrans to the next meeting to discuss tolling options and what is involved in forming a public/private partnership. The Committee now falls under the Brown Act and the meeting agendas will be posted on NCTPA's website and kiosk.

## 5. STANDING AGENDA ITEMS

### 5.1 Congestion Management Agency (CMA) Report (Danielle Schmitz)

Danielle Schmitz noted the flyer on the Value Capture Workshop on December 14, 2015 hosted by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and encouraged the TAC to attend.

MTC has released their list of recommended Regional Active Transportation Program (ATP) awards. Included in the handouts (1b) is the Preliminary Statewide ATP Awards Analysis. The Bay Area region comprises approximately 20% of California's population, however it only received 8% of the funds. The California Transportation Commission informed the CMA directors many of the Bay Area region's ATP applications submitted were incomplete, contributing to the low award rate. Danielle encouraged the jurisdictions to have NCTPA review their ATP applications for completeness before submitting them.

A 2016 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) project funding amendment will be presented at the November NCTPA Board meeting to accommodate net zero funding project changes requested by a couple project sponsors.

Danielle reminded the Committee 2016 STIP PPRs are due this week.

Kate reported she met with Steve Heminger - MTC is seriously considering a regional gas tax. Existing statute requires a 90% return to the county the gas was purchased in, which may not benefit Napa County due to the high volume of tourists purchasing gas outside the county.

### 5.2 Project Monitoring Funding Programs\* (Alberto Esqueda)

Alberto Esqueda reviewed the updates (highlighted in yellow) to the Project Monitoring Funding Programs.

### 5.3 Caltrans' Report (Ahmad Rahimi)

Ahmad Rahimi reviewed the updates (highlighted in yellow) to the monthly Caltrans report.

Rick Tooker thanked Ahmad for coordinating the trash cleanup on SR29 between Yountville and Napa. Rick asked Ahmad if there was a plan for shoulder maintenance, particularly weed mowing.

Kate noted NCTPA meets with Caltrans monthly, and invited Rick to email concerns to her. Additionally, she said she would add weed abatement to the list.

Rick Tooker also stated there are remaining earthquake damaged sound walls (east side of 29, north of Sierra) on private property that are propped up. The City is concerned that if a car hits the wall, the wall will fall on the car and possibly in Caltrans' right of way. Rick suggested discussing this issue in the future.

Ahmad noted maintenance crews have been short staffed and are gearing up for winter - it may take a little while before some projects or maintenance are completed.

Rick Marshall noted it would be helpful to include any impacts the construction projects may have on traffic (i.e. traffic control) in either the written or verbal report.

Ahmad provided the traffic impacts he was aware of that were related to the construction projects on the report.

#### 5.4 Vine Trail Update (Rick Marshall)

Rick Marshall reported Oak Knoll segment is under construction and going well. The missing easement has been obtained, the challenge is securing funding for the Trower to Wine Country section. The Tulocay Creek Bridge is under construction.

Eric Whan added the Tulocay bridge is installed and the revision to the contract is going before City Council to add the finishing approach to the bridge.

Rick Marshall announced the St. Helena to Calistoga segment was selected for ATP funding.

Mike Kirn stated the alignment follows the old railroad grade, a preschool in a modular building is located in the middle of alignment, they are working on finding an alternate location for the preschool.

Philip Sales informed the Committee the School Superintendent has received a formal request from the Office of Education to relocate to a junior/senior high school site.

Rick Marshall stated he is providing a comprehensive presentation on the Vine Trail to the County of Napa Board of Supervisors on December 8<sup>th</sup>.

## 6. CONSENT AGENDA

**MOTION made by MARSHALL, SECONDED by TOOKER, with WEIR, BRAULIK, and LUNDQUIST ABSTAINING, to APPROVE Consent Agenda Items 6.1-6.3**

6.1 Approval of Meeting Minutes August 6, 2015 TAC Meeting (Kathy Alexander)

**The August 6, 2015 TAC Meeting Minutes were approved.**

6.2 Approval of Meeting Minutes September 3, 2015 TAC Meeting (No Quorum) (Kathy Alexander)

**The September 3, 2015 TAC Meeting Minutes were approved.**

6.3 Meeting Minutes of October 1, 2015 Special TAC Meeting (Kathy Alexander)

**The October 1, 2015 TAC Meeting Minutes were approved.**

## 7. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS

### 7.1 Davis Tour Recap and Presentation (Diana Meehan)

Information Item. Diana Meehan provided a recap of the Davis Bicycle Tour which included possible solutions that could be implemented to increase bicycle safety in Napa County.

### 7.2 TAC 2016 Chair/Vice Chair Nominations (Danielle Schmitz)

**MOTION by WHAN, SECOND by COOPER to elect Rick Marshall as 2016 TAC Chair and Nathan Steele as 2016 TAC Vice Chair, starting with the January 2016 TAC meeting. Motion was unanimously approved.**

### 7.3 TAC Work Plan (Danielle Schmitz)

Danielle briefly reviewed the Work Plan and invited the Committee to provide comments, noting minor changes could be incorporated into the plan today, however, major changes would require tabling the Work Plan until the December meeting in order to update the plan.

Erik Lundquist noted Bicycle Plan standards have changed and asked about including a pedestrian plan element.

Danielle responded NCTPA is currently working on the Pedestrian Plan. The Bicycle Plan and Pedestrian Plan would be combined to create the Active Transportation Plan. Danielle will amend the reference to Bicycle Plan in the Work Plan to read "Bicycle Plan element of the Active Transportation Plan will be updated".

Eric Whan requested SR37 be added as a topic of interest under the Work Plan.

**MOTION by MARSHALL, SECOND by WHAN to approve the 2016 TAC Work Plan with the addition of the edits as noted. Motion was unanimously approved.**

### 7.4 State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) (Asset Management Plan) (Kate Miller)

Kate Miller updated the Committee on the State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP). Additionally, she encouraged the Committee members to start using SHOPP priorities to leverage funds for projects.

### 7.5 One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) 2 Update (Danielle Schmitz)

Danielle Schmitz provided an update on the three One Bay Area Grant 2 funding proposals (Napa County's percentage is the same for all three proposals), noting that for the next five-year cycle (Fiscal years 2017/2018 through 2021/2022), Napa County will receive almost \$4 million in funding. Additionally, she reviewed new requirements and restrictions for several programs. Staff is working with Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) for more equitable fund apportionment.

Eric Whan commented that it seems there is a trend to allocate an increasing amount of Federal funding to planning which leaves very little funding for delivering physical projects, and asked if there is a way to increase funding for physical projects.

Kate and Danielle noted that NCTPA pushed back on the original OBAG 2 allocation which was over 50% planning funds and were successful in having more money allocated to Napa County.

Kate and Danielle noted housing advocates are attempting to have transportation funds reallocated to housing.

Eric Whan asked staff to send more information on the three funding proposals and the impact on Napa County to the Committee.

Kate suggested inviting MTC Commissioner Mark Luce to the TAC meetings a couple of times per year to discuss programs.

#### 7.6 NCTPA Name Change and Rebranding Effort (Kate Miller)

Kate Miller reported the NCPTA Board approved changing NCTPA's name to Napa Valley Transportation Authority, and concepts on a new look. The transition will take place at the January board meeting.

#### 7.7 Legislative Update (Kate Miller)

Kate Miller provided a review of the Legislative Update.

#### 7.8 NCTPA Board Meeting Agenda for November 18, 2015 (Kate Miller)

Kate Miller provided a review of the November 18, 2015 NCTPA Board Meeting Agenda.

### **8. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

Invite MTC Commissioner Mark Luce to the January TAC meeting.

### **9. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:04 p.m.



January 7, 2016  
TAC Agenda Item 8.1  
Continued from: New  
**Action Requested: ACTION**

## NAPA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AND PLANNING AGENCY TAC Agenda Letter

---

**TO:** Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)  
**FROM:** Kate Miller, Executive Director  
**REPORT BY:** Danielle Schmitz, Planning Manager - Planning  
(707) 259-5968 / Email: [dschmitz@nctpa.net](mailto:dschmitz@nctpa.net)  
**SUBJECT:** Local Match Recommendations for the St. Helena to Calistoga  
Segment of the Vine Trail

---

### **RECOMMENDATION**

That TAC recommend a funding option to meet the matching requirements committed in the Active Transportation Program (ATP) application for the Vine Trail: St. Helena to Calistoga segment.

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

On October 28<sup>th</sup> MTC approved NCTPA's application in the amount of \$6.106 million for the Vine Trail segment from Calistoga to St. Helena. The CTC is scheduled to approve ATP projects in January. NCTPA is required to adopt a resolution of local support, at its January meeting, committing to deliver a fully funded project. The Calistoga to St. Helena segment was successful in securing ATP funding in part because of the large non-federal match (over 20%) that was committed in the application. The application stipulated matching funds as follows:

County of Napa - \$350,000  
City of St. Helena - \$150,000  
City of Calistoga - \$150,000  
Bay Area Ridge Trail - \$100,000  
Vine Trail Coalition - \$2.3M

The application obligates the three jurisdictions to a total of \$650,000 in matching funds. Staff has met with the jurisdictions to discuss local commitments. The jurisdictions would like to have a discussion about potentially using Transportation Development Act

Article 3 (TDA 3) and/or Transportation For Clean Air (TFCA) funds to meet at least a portion of these local match commitments, as well as fulfill Measure T requirements that direct local jurisdictions to expend the equivalent of 6.67% of funds generated by the ordinance on class I facilities.

### **FINANCIAL IMPACT**

Is there a Fiscal Impact? Yes, future TDA-3 funds and/or TFCA funds

### **BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION**

NCTPA was successful in securing \$6.106 million in ATP funds under the regional ATP program. The ATP application committed a combined \$650,000 in local funding from the cities of St. Helena and Calistoga and the County of Napa. NCTPA staff met with the jurisdictions to discuss the matching funds committed in the application. During these meetings, at least one of the jurisdictions, St. Helena, has no funds to commit and the City of Calistoga and County of Napa may be challenged to identify funds to be delivered on the proposed years committed in the application. It was suggested that TDA 3 and/or TFCA funds could be used to meet at least some of the matching requirements.

There are some advantages and restrictions to committing local discretionary funds to this project. Matching funds used in FY 2018-19 and beyond can count toward the Measure T requirement that local jurisdictions expend eligible discretionary funding, equivalent to 6.67% of funds generated by Measure T over the 25-year life of the ordinance, on class I facilities. Funds expended prior to July 1, 2018 cannot be counted towards meeting the Measure T requirement. TFCA funds can only be used for construction which means it must also be programmed in the outer year(s) of the project.

TDA-3 funds are generated through a ¼ cent statewide sales tax for bicycle and pedestrian projects. Annual revenues can be rolled over to accrue for future projects. NCTPA receives approximately \$140,000 in TDA-3 funds annually. Currently there is \$272,787 in TDA-3 funds of which \$160,000 is reserved for the Vine Trail Oak Knoll segment, leaving approximately \$112,000 in funds available. NCTPA will receive the next TDA-3 allocation for FY 2016-17 in February 2016. Staff estimates approximately \$530,000 in TDA-3 funds can be reserved for the project between now and FY 2018-19. Jurisdictions can choose to use a portion or all of the TDA-3 funds over the next several years as a Vine Trail match.

TFCA funds come from a \$4 per Department of Motor Vehicle registration fee. Forty percent of the funds are distributed to the 9-Bay Area counties and 60% is retained by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). The latter are competitive. BAAQMD is reintroducing a program specifically for bicycle and pedestrian programs

and the Vine Trail would likely compete well in that program. However, as stated above, the TFCA funds can only be used for construction purposes.

NCTPA staff has developed several options for discussion to meet the Vine Trail application matching commitment and is interested in receiving TAC's feedback on alternative solutions:

**Option 1** – The 1/3 option would split each jurisdiction's commitment as follows: 1/3 local, 1/3 TDA-3, and 1/3 Vine Trail. It would also move all local commitments to FY 2018-19.

\$ in thousands				
Jurisdiction	Application Total Commitment	1/3 Local Share	1/3 TDA 3 Share	1/3 Vine Trail Share
Napa County	\$350	\$117	\$117	\$116
Calistoga	150	50	50	50
St. Helena	150	50	50	50
		Total	\$217	\$216

**Option 2** – The Vine Trail Coalition funds the City of Calistoga/City of St. Helena's contribution.

\$ in thousands				
Jurisdiction	Application Total Commitment	Local Share	TDA 3 Share	Vine Trail Share
Napa County	\$350	\$350	\$0	\$0
Calistoga	150	\$0	0	150
St. Helena	150	\$0	0	150
		Total	\$0	\$300

**Option 3** – Local match is made up of 100% TDA-3 and TFCA or other discretionary source. TDA 3 funds will not cover the entire \$650,000 local match needed. The match would be approximately \$120,000 short. Staff would then suggest supplementing the shortfall with TFCA regional and program manager funds if no additional local or Vine Trail funds are programmed. It is important to note this option obligates all local TDA-3 funds for the next 4 years through FY 2018-19.

\$ in thousands				
Jurisdiction	Application Total Commitment	Local Share	TDA-3 Share	Vine Trail Share
Napa County	\$350	\$0	\$310	\$0
Calistoga	150	0	110	0
St. Helena	150	0	110	0
		Total	\$530	\$0

**SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS**

Attachment: (1) State of California Department of Transportation ATP Project  
Programming Request – Napa Valley Vine Trail St. Helena to Calistoga  
Project dated May 17, 2015

Date: May 17, 2015

Project Information:					
<b>Project Title:</b> Napa Valley Vine Trail - St Helena to Calistoga					
District	County	Route	EA	Project ID	PPNO
4	NAPA	SR29			

**Funding Information:**  
**DO NOT FILL IN ANY SHADED AREAS**

Proposed Total Project Cost (\$1,000s)									Notes:
Component	Prior	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20+	Total	
E&P (PA&ED)	200			60				260	
PS&E		50	50	120	480			700	
R/W		20	30	10	40			100	
CON					1,304	6,842		8,146	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>1,824</b>	<b>6,842</b>		<b>9,206</b>	

ATP Funds		Infrastructure Cycle 2							Program Code
Proposed Funding Allocation (\$1,000s)									
Component	Prior	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20+	Total	Funding Agency
E&P (PA&ED)				48				48	
PS&E					480			480	Notes:
R/W					40			40	
CON						5,538		5,538	
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>48</b>	<b>520</b>	<b>5,538</b>		<b>6,106</b>	

ATP Funds		Non-infrastructure Cycle 2							Program Code
Proposed Funding Allocation (\$1,000s)									
Component	Prior	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20+	Total	Funding Agency
E&P (PA&ED)									
PS&E									Notes:
R/W									
CON									
<b>TOTAL</b>									

ATP Funds		Plan Cycle 2							Program Code
Proposed Funding Allocation (\$1,000s)									
Component	Prior	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20+	Total	Funding Agency
E&P (PA&ED)									
PS&E									Notes:
R/W									
CON									
<b>TOTAL</b>									

ATP Funds		Previous Cycle							Program Code
Proposed Funding Allocation (\$1,000s)									
Component	Prior	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20+	Total	Funding Agency
E&P (PA&ED)									
PS&E									Notes:
R/W									
CON									
<b>TOTAL</b>									

ATP Funds		Future Cycles							Program Code
Proposed Funding Allocation (\$1,000s)									
Component	Prior	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20+	Total	Funding Agency
E&P (PA&ED)									
PS&E									Notes:
R/W									
CON									
<b>TOTAL</b>									

**ATP PROJECT PROGRAMMING REQUEST**

Date: May 17, 2015

Project Information:					
<b>Project Title:</b> Napa Valley Vine Trail - St Helena to Calistoga					
District	County	Route	EA	Project ID	PPNO
4	NAPA	SR29			

Funding Information:									
DO NOT FILL IN ANY SHADED AREAS									
<b>Fund No. 2:</b>		Future Source for Matching							Program Code
Proposed Funding Allocation (\$1,000s)									
Component	Prior	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20+	Total	Funding Agency
E&P (PA&ED)	200			12				212	Napa Valley Vine Trail Coalition
PS&E		50	50	120				220	Notes:
R/W		20	30	10				60	
CON					1,054	804		1,858	
TOTAL	200	70	80	142	1,054	804		2,350	
<b>Fund No. 3:</b>		Future Source for Matching							Program Code
Proposed Funding Allocation (\$1,000s)									
Component	Prior	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20+	Total	Funding Agency
E&P (PA&ED)									Napa County
PS&E									Notes:
R/W									
CON						350		350	
TOTAL						350		350	
<b>Fund No. 4:</b>		Future Source for Matching							Program Code
Proposed Funding Allocation (\$1,000s)									
Component	Prior	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20+	Total	Funding Agency
E&P (PA&ED)									City of Calistoga
PS&E									Notes:
R/W									
CON					150			150	
TOTAL					150			150	
<b>Fund No. 5:</b>		Future Source for Matching							Program Code
Proposed Funding Allocation (\$1,000s)									
Component	Prior	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20+	Total	Funding Agency
E&P (PA&ED)									City of St Helena
PS&E									Notes:
R/W									
CON						150		150	
TOTAL						150		150	
<b>Fund No. 6:</b>		Future Source for Matching							Program Code
Proposed Funding Allocation (\$1,000s)									
Component	Prior	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20+	Total	Funding Agency
E&P (PA&ED)									Bay Area Ridge Trail
PS&E									Notes:
R/W									
CON					100			100	
TOTAL					100			100	
<b>Fund No. 7:</b>		Future Source for Matching							Program Code
Proposed Funding Allocation (\$1,000s)									
Component	Prior	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20+	Total	Funding Agency
E&P (PA&ED)									
PS&E									Notes:
R/W									
CON									
TOTAL									



January 7, 2016  
TAC Agenda Item 8.2  
Continued from: November 5, 2015  
**Action Requested: INFORMATION**

## NAPA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AND PLANNING AGENCY TAC Agenda Letter

---

**TO:** Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)  
**FROM:** Kate Miller, Executive Director  
**REPORT BY:** Danielle Schmitz, Program Manager - Planning  
(707) 259-5968 or [dschmitz@nctpa.net](mailto:dschmitz@nctpa.net)  
**SUBJECT:** One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) 2 Update

---

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Information only

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Approximately every six (6) years, U.S. Congress enacts a surface transportation reauthorization act. The transportation authorization legislation, Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (MAP-21) was originally scheduled to expire on September 30, 2014 but was extended through several legislative extensions. Most recently on December 4, 2015 President Obama signed the latest transportation authorization bill Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST). The FAST Federal Highways Administration (FHWA) funding provided to the MTC region includes Surface Transportation Program (STP) and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds.

The One Bay Area Grant Program (OBAG-1) was approved by MTC in 2012 to better integrate the region's federal highway funding program with the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS). The latter was a requirement of SB 375 which requires regions to integrate AB 32 greenhouse gas reductions into regional long range transportation plans. OBAG supports the goals of Plan Bay Area, the region's SCS, by directing investments into the region's priority development areas and rewarding housing production.

OBAG-1 covered a 5-year period FY 2011-12 to FY 2016-17 and funded projects totaling \$4 million dollars for Napa County. OBAG-1 projects included the California Roundabouts at First/Second Streets, California Boulevard Class II bicycle lane, and the

Silverado Trail Phase H rehabilitation. OBAG-1 projects are well underway with just two years remaining in the cycle.

As part of its effort to update Plan Bay Area, MTC has begun the funding cycle process for OBAG-2. Like the Regional Transportation Plan update, Plan Bay Area 2040, MTC is only suggesting minor revisions to OBAG-2. The funding period for OBAG-2 is 5 years, FY 2017-18 through FY 2021-2022.

### **FINANCIAL IMPACT**

Is there a Fiscal Impact? No

### **BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION**

On November 18 2015 the Metropolitan Transportation Commission adopted resolution No. 4202 the One Bay Area Grant 2 program. The funding allocation formula that was adopted considers very-low, low, and moderate income levels in housing production and caps values at total RHNA allocations.

	Population	Housing Production	Housing RHNA	Housing Affordability*
OBAG 1	50%	25%	25%	50%
OBAG 2	50%	30%	20%	60%

\*Note: The OBAG 1 formula included weighting for very-low and low-income levels for RHNA housing production. The formula for OBAG 2 includes weighting for very-low, low and moderate income levels.

The county total distribution includes Safe Routes to School and Federal-Aid Secondary:

Total County Distribution*	\$7,644,000
CMA Planning Base	3,822,000
SRTS Base	515,000
FAS Share (lumped in to overall dist. Napa County receives FAS separately)	0
Total county discretionary funds subject to Priority Development Area (PDA) requirement	3,307,000
Min. discretionary funds to PDAs	1,653,500

\*Total county distribution including SRTS, FAS and planning adjustment

STP	CMAQ	Total	SRTS Base	PDA Min. Requirement
\$2,656,000	\$1,166,000	\$3,822,000	\$515,000	\$1,653,000

Additionally, the North Bay counties will receive approximately \$2 million in non-competitive Priority Conservation Area (PCA) funds under OBAG 2. PCA funds have a 2:1 match requirement meaning for every \$1 in federal funds there must be \$2 in non-federal funds or a 66.6% match under the OBAG 2 program.

PCA Program	Total OBAG 2
<b>North Bay Program</b>	
Marin	\$2,050,000
<b>Napa</b>	<b>2,050,000</b>
Solano	2,050,000
Sonoma	2,050,000
Subtotal	\$8,200,000
<b>Remaining Counties Competitive Program</b>	
Subtotal	\$8,200,000
<b>Grand Total</b>	
	\$16,400,000

The county discretionary funding for Napa County combined with the PCA funds totals \$5.872 million in project funding for the 5 year OBAG 2 cycle. Program eligibility is very similar to OBAG 1. County fund distribution under OBAG 2 can be used on any of the following transportation improvement projects:

- Planning and outreach
- Local streets and roads preservation
- Bicycle and pedestrian improvements
- Transportation for livable communities
- Safe Routes to School
- Priority Conservation Areas
- Federal Aid Secondary (FAS) Improvements

### **Next Steps:**

Many advocates encouraged MTC to address affordable housing and anti-displacement policies in OBAG 2. MTC will develop potential anti-displacement and affordable housing policies for consideration and hold a workshop with local jurisdictions and stakeholders in early 2016. Options will include ways to create a fund for "Naturally Occurring Affordable Housing" (NOAH). The OBAG 2 timeline has been pushed back to

---

accommodate this work. Detailed OBAG 2 guidelines are being drafted by MTC and will be shared with the CMAs in early 2016. A call for projects will most likely go out in the Spring with project submittals due to MTC by December 2016.

### **SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS**

- Attachments: (1) December 4<sup>th</sup> 2015 MTC OBAG 2 Update Memorandum  
(2) Full OBAG 2 Resolution can be found at:  
[http://www.mtc.ca.gov/sites/default/files/OBAG\\_2\\_Commission\\_11-18-15.pdf](http://www.mtc.ca.gov/sites/default/files/OBAG_2_Commission_11-18-15.pdf)



METROPOLITAN  
TRANSPORTATION  
COMMISSION

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter  
101 Eighth Street  
Oakland, CA 94607-4700  
TEL 510.817.5700  
TDD/TTY 510.817.5769  
FAX 510.817.5848  
E-MAIL [info@mtc.ca.gov](mailto:info@mtc.ca.gov)  
WEB [www.mtc.ca.gov](http://www.mtc.ca.gov)

## *Memorandum*

TO: CMA Executive Directors

DATE: December 4, 2015

FR: Anne Richman, Director, Programming and Allocations, MTC

RE: OBAG 2 Update

### **Purpose**

The purpose of this memo is to provide an update on the One Bay Area Grant (OBAG 2) program, adopted on November 18, 2015 by the Commission (MTC Resolution No. 4202). The adopted resolution can be viewed on the OBAG 2 website at: [www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/obag2/](http://www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/obag2/).

### **Updates**

The OBAG 2 project selection and programming policy document was presented to the Programming and Allocations Committee on November 4, 2015. The Committee made some recommendations and deferred others to the full Commission.

Highlights of the Commission action on OBAG 2 are discussed below.

**1) *Extend the deadline for four jurisdictions that did not have their housing elements certified by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) by May 31, 2015 to June 30, 2016.***

Four jurisdictions in the Bay Area did not meet the 2015 deadline for a state-certified housing element: Fairfax, Dixon, Monte Sereno, and Half Moon Bay. Given the progress made to date and the limited resources of these smaller jurisdictions, the Commission approved a modification to the proposal to extend the deadline for the four jurisdictions to have their housing elements certified by HCD to June 30, 2016 in order to be eligible to received OBAG 2 funding.

**2) *Develop recommendation for anti-displacement policies and provide additional information on housing preservation funding.***

The Committee asked staff to develop potential anti-displacement and affordable housing policies for possible consideration for OBAG 2, and return to the Committee in February 2016. A placeholder has been added to Resolution No. 4202. The Committee also requested that staff investigate the possibility of a housing preservation fund that could potentially be used to keep affordable units affordable. In early 2016, staff will convene a workshop with local jurisdictions and stakeholders to further consider anti-displacement strategies, and will also develop options for a "Naturally Occurring Affordable Housing" (NOAH) fund. Given that this possible addition could affect the county call for projects, the resolution has also been modified to delay the schedule for project submittal by 3 months. This revision to add a placeholder and modify the schedule for the call for projects accordingly was approved by the Commission and has been incorporated into Resolution No. 4202.

**3) Adopt a county distribution formula that considers housing that is affordable at the moderate-, low-, and very low-income levels, and cap housing production values to total RHNA allocations.**

The Committee referred three alternative county distribution formulas to the Commission without recommendation. After discussion, the Commission approved a distribution formula that considers housing that is affordable at the moderate-, low-, and very low-income levels for RHNA and housing production, with total housing production capped at the total RHNA allocation.

**Table 1. OBAG Distribution Factors**

	<b>Population</b>	<b>Housing Production</b>	<b>Housing RHNA</b>	<b>Housing Affordability*</b>
OBAG 1	50%	25%	25%	50%
<b>OBAG 2</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>60%</b>

\*Note: The OBAG 1 formula included weighting for very low- and low-income levels for RHNA and housing production. The formula for OBAG 2 includes weighting for very low-, low- and moderate-income levels.

In selecting a distribution formula, the Commission also voted to cap housing production values within the distribution formula to total RHNA allocations. The total county distribution incorporates the Safe Routes to School and Federal-Aid Secondary program funding, includes an adjustment to ensure that a CMA's base planning is no more than 50% of its total distribution, and is rounded to \$1,000's (Table 2).

**Table 2. OBAG 2 County Total Distribution**

<b>County</b>	<b>OBAG 2 Base Distribution</b>	
	<b>% Share</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Alameda	19.9%	\$70,243,000
Contra Costa	14.6%	\$51,461,000
Marin	2.8%	\$10,025,000
Napa	2.2%	\$7,644,000
San Francisco	12.4%	\$43,906,000
San Mateo	8.4%	\$29,846,000
Santa Clara	26.9%	\$95,268,000
Solano	5.5%	\$19,499,000
Sonoma	7.2%	\$25,620,000
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$353,512,000</b>

MTC Resolution No. 4202 Appendices A-1 and A-2 have been updated to incorporate the adopted county distribution formula and are attached to this memo for informational purposes (Attachments 1 and 2).

### **Other Program Updates**

- OBAG 2 consists of Surface Transportation Program (STP) and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) funds. The STP/CMAQ fund source targets are provided in Attachment 3.
- The deadline for compliance of the complete streets requirement has been extended from January 2016, to when the CMA submits the county OBAG 2 program to MTC for programming consideration and approval. Staff has been reviewing individual complete streets resolutions and circulation elements for compliance with OBAG 2 requirements, and has notified the CMAs and local jurisdictions of the staff recommendation regarding compliance. The preliminary list of non-compliant jurisdictions will be posted on the OBAG 2 website in December 2015, and is also provided as Attachment 4.
- Detailed instructions to the CMAs on OBAG 2 implementation is currently being developed.

Additional information on the program can be found on the OBAG 2 website:

<http://www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/obag2/>

Attachment 1: OBAG 2 Program Categories

Attachment 2: OBAG 2 County Distribution

Attachment 3: OBAG 2 County STP/CMAQ Distribution

Attachment 4: Preliminary list of jurisdictions non-compliant with complete streets requirement

J:\PROJECT\Funding\T4-MAP21\MAP21 - STP-CMAQ\MAP21 Programming\MAP21 OBAG 2\OBAG 2 Development\Outreach\CMA Executive Directors\Dec 4 2015 - CMA\OBAG 2 Update.docx

# Attachment 1

## OBAG 2

### Program Categories

FY 2017-18 through FY 2019-22

November 18, 2015

#### Program Categories

Regional Program		OBAG 1		OBAG 2	
		Regional Distribution		% Share	Amount
<b>Regional Categories</b>		<b>\$499.3</b>		<b>436.5</b>	
1	Regional Planning Activities	2%	\$8.5	2%	9.6
2	Pavement Management Program	2%	\$9.1	2%	9.3
3	Regional PDA Planning & Implementation	4%	\$20.0	5%	20.0
4	Climate Initiatives	4%	\$22.3	5%	22.0
5	Priority Conservation Area	2%	\$9.5	4%	16.4
6	Regional Active Operational Management	37%	\$183.5	39%	170.0
7	Transit Capital Priorities	40%	\$201.4	43%	189.3
		<b>\$454.3</b>		<b>Regional Program Total: 55% 436.5</b>	
Local PDA Planning (within county program for OBAG 2)		4%	\$20.0		
Safe Routes To School (Moved to county program for OBAG 2)		5%	\$25.0		
Federal-Aid Secondary - FAS (within county program for OBAG 2)		-	-		
		<b>9% \$45.0</b>			
<b>Regional Program Total:</b>		<b>\$499.3</b>		<b>OBAG 2 Total: 55% 436.5</b>	

County Program			OBAG 1				OBAG 2					
			Base Formula STP/CMAQ/TE *		Final Distribution Including SRTS & PDA		Base Formula **		SRTS ***	FAS ***	Final Adjusted Distribution Including SRTS & FAS ****	
<b>Counties</b>												
1	Alameda	21.2%	19.6%	\$64.1	19.7%	\$73.4	20.0%	\$63.3	\$5.3	\$1.8	19.9%	\$70.2
2	Contra Costa	14.6%	14.1%	\$46.0	14.2%	\$52.9	14.6%	\$46.2	\$4.1	\$1.3	14.6%	\$51.5
3	Marin	3.4%	3.3%	\$10.7	3.3%	\$12.3	2.6%	\$8.3	\$0.9	\$0.8	2.8%	\$10.0
4	Napa	1.9%	2.3%	\$7.4	2.3%	\$8.7	1.6%	\$5.0	\$0.5	\$1.2	2.2%	\$7.6
5	San Francisco	11.3%	12.0%	\$39.3	11.7%	\$43.5	13.4%	\$42.2	\$1.8	\$0.0	12.4%	\$43.9
6	San Mateo	10.0%	8.3%	\$27.2	8.4%	\$31.2	8.4%	\$26.6	\$2.4	\$0.9	8.4%	\$29.8
7	Santa Clara	25.2%	27.3%	\$89.3	27.2%	\$101.4	27.5%	\$87.0	\$6.9	\$1.7	26.9%	\$95.3
8	Solano	5.7%	6.0%	\$19.5	5.9%	\$22.1	5.2%	\$16.6	\$1.5	\$1.5	5.5%	\$19.5
9	Sonoma	6.6%	7.3%	\$23.8	7.2%	\$26.9	6.6%	\$20.8	\$1.7	\$3.3	7.2%	\$25.6
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$327.4</b>		<b>\$372.4</b>		<b>\$316.0</b>		<b>\$25.0</b>	<b>\$12.5</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>\$353.5</b>

J:\SECTION\ALLSTAFF\Resolution\TEMP-RES\MTC\RES-4202\_ongoing\{tmp-4202\_Appendix-A1-A6.xlsx}A-2 County Distribution

<b>OBAG Total:</b>	OBAG 1:	<b>\$827</b>	OBAG 2:	<b>\$790</b>
--------------------	---------	--------------	---------	--------------

\* **OBAG 1:** In OBAG 1, the county CMAAs received \$327 M with \$18 M in RTIP-TE and \$309 M in STP/CMAQ. RTIP-TE funding is no longer part of OBAG 2

\*\* **Base:** Unadjusted raw county base formula amount

\*\*\* **SRTS:** SRTS moved to County Program and distributed based on FY 2013-14 K-12 school enrollment

\*\*\* **FAS:** Federal-Aid Secondary (FAS) distributed based by statutory requirements. San Francisco has no rural roads and therefore is not subject to State Statute requirements

\*\*\*\* **OBAG2:** Final county distribution rounded to nearest \$1,000 and includes SRTS & FAS and adjusted so a county CMA's base planning is no more than 50% of total

## Attachment 2

### OBAG 2 County Fund Distribution FY 2017-18 through FY 2021-22 November 18, 2015

#### OBAG 2 - County Funding Formula Distribution

County	Total County Distribution *	OBAG 2 Adjusted Base **	PDA Percentage	PDA/Anywhere Split	PDA	Anywhere
Alameda	\$70,243,000	\$63,124,000	70%	70/30	\$44,187,000	\$18,937,000
Contra Costa	\$51,461,000	\$46,030,000	70%	70/30	\$32,221,000	\$13,809,000
Marin	\$10,025,000	\$8,323,000	50%	50/50	\$4,162,000	\$4,161,000
Napa	\$7,644,000	\$5,940,000	50%	50/50	\$2,970,000	\$2,970,000
San Francisco	\$43,906,000	\$42,109,000	70%	70/30	\$29,476,000	\$12,633,000
San Mateo	\$29,846,000	\$26,560,000	70%	70/30	\$18,592,000	\$7,968,000
Santa Clara	\$95,268,000	\$86,689,000	70%	70/30	\$60,682,000	\$26,007,000
Solano	\$19,499,000	\$16,524,000	50%	50/50	\$8,262,000	\$8,262,000
Sonoma	\$25,620,000	\$20,701,000	50%	50/50	\$10,351,000	\$10,350,000
<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$353,512,000</b>	<b>\$316,000,000</b>			<b>\$210,903,000</b>	<b>\$105,097,000</b>

J:\SECTION\ALLSTAFF\Resolution\TEMP-RES\MTC\RES-4202\_ongoing\[tmp-4202\_Appendix-A1-A6.xlsx]A-2 County Distribution

\* Total county distribution including SRTS, FAS and planning adjustment

\*\* OBAG 2 adjusted base county amount subject to PDA investment - does not include SRTS, FAS or PCA. Rounded to thousands and adjusted to ensure a county's base planning activity is no more than 50% of the total distribution

## Attachment 3

### OBAG2 Fund Source Distribution

November 18, 2015

#### OBAG 2 STP/CMAQ Fund Source Distribution

	Amount	%	STP	CMAQ	Total	STP	CMAQ
<b>County</b> 45%	<b>\$328,512,000</b>	<b>44.7%</b>	<b>\$196,893,000</b>	<b>\$156,619,000</b>	<b>\$353,512,000</b>	<b>55.7%</b>	<b>44.3%</b>
Alameda	\$70,243,000	19.9%	\$42,343,000	\$27,900,000	\$70,243,000	60.3%	39.7%
Contra Costa	\$51,461,000	14.6%	\$31,181,000	\$20,280,000	\$51,461,000	60.6%	39.4%
Marin	\$10,025,000	2.8%	\$7,649,000	\$2,376,000	\$10,025,000	76.3%	23.7%
Napa	\$7,644,000	2.2%	\$6,478,000	\$1,166,000	\$7,644,000	84.7%	15.3%
San Francisco	\$43,906,000	12.4%	\$26,226,000	\$17,680,000	\$43,906,000	59.7%	40.3%
San Mateo	\$29,846,000	8.4%	\$18,712,000	\$11,134,000	\$29,846,000	62.7%	37.3%
Santa Clara	\$95,268,000	26.9%	\$56,508,000	\$38,760,000	\$95,268,000	59.3%	40.7%
Solano	\$19,499,000	5.5%	\$13,221,000	\$6,278,000	\$19,499,000	67.8%	32.2%
Sonoma	\$25,620,000	7.2%	\$17,409,000	\$8,211,000	\$25,620,000	68.0%	32.0%
<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$353,512,000</b>	<b>44.7%</b>	<b>\$219,727,000</b>	<b>\$133,785,000</b>	<b>\$353,512,000</b>	<b>62.2%</b>	<b>37.8%</b>

### OBAG2 Fund Source Distribution

**OBAG 2 Complete Streets Requirements****Preliminary List of Jurisdictions Currently Non-compliant with OBAG 2 Complete Streets Requirement****November 18, 2015**

	<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>County</b>	<b>MTC Comments</b>
1	Contra Costa County	Contra Costa	No qualifying Complete Streets Resolution or update to circulation element of General Plan after 1/1/10
2	El Cerrito	Contra Costa	No qualifying Complete Streets Resolution or update to circulation element of General Plan after 1/1/10; 2014 General Plan amendments to implement San Pablo Specific Plan do not constitute a compliant circulation element update
3	Moraga	Contra Costa	No qualifying Complete Streets Resolution or update to circulation element of General Plan after 1/1/10
4	Walnut Creek	Contra Costa	No qualifying Complete Streets Resolution or update to circulation element of General Plan after 1/1/10
5	Marin County	Marin	No qualifying Complete Streets Resolution or update to circulation element of General Plan after 1/1/10
6	Corte Madera	Marin	No qualifying Complete Streets Resolution or update to circulation element of General Plan after 1/1/10
7	Novato	Marin	No qualifying Complete Streets Resolution or update to circulation element of General Plan after 1/1/10; Novato's white paper on Complete Streets should guide the update of the circulation element that is currently underway
8	Sausalito	Marin	No qualifying Complete Streets Resolution or update to circulation element of General Plan after 1/1/10
9	San Rafael	Marin	No qualifying Complete Streets Resolution or update to circulation element of General Plan after 1/1/10
10	Portola Valley	San Mateo	No qualifying Complete Streets Resolution or update to circulation element of General Plan after 1/1/10; 2015 update to General Plan does not affect the circulation element
11	Los Altos	Santa Clara	No qualifying Complete Streets Resolution or update to circulation element of General Plan after 1/1/10
12	Palo Alto	Santa Clara	No qualifying Complete Streets Resolution or update to circulation element of General Plan after 1/1/10
13	Solano County	Solano	No qualifying Complete Streets Resolution or update to circulation element of General Plan after 1/1/10
14	Benicia	Solano	No qualifying Complete Streets Resolution or update to circulation element of General Plan after 1/1/10
15	Dixon	Solano	No qualifying Complete Streets Resolution or update to circulation element of General Plan after 1/1/10
16	Cloverdale	Sonoma	No qualifying Complete Streets Resolution or update to circulation element of General Plan after 1/1/10
17	Petaluma	Sonoma	No qualifying Complete Streets Resolution or update to circulation element of General Plan after 1/1/10
18	Santa Rosa	Sonoma	No qualifying Complete Streets Resolution or update to circulation element of General Plan after 1/1/10



January 7, 2016  
TAC Agenda Item 8.3  
Continued From: NEW  
**Action Requested: INFORMATION**

## NAPA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AND PLANNING AGENCY TAC Agenda Letter

---

**TO:** Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)  
**FROM:** Kate Miller, Executive Director  
**REPORT BY:** Diana Meehan, Associate Program Planner/Administrator  
(707) 259-8327 / Email: [dmeehan@nctpa.net](mailto:dmeehan@nctpa.net)  
**SUBJECT:** Vision Zero

---

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Information Only

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

NCTPA is interested in coordinating a Vision Zero campaign locally to reduce traffic-related casualties in the county. Vision Zero is a strategy that seeks to reduce traffic related fatalities (bike/pedestrian/vehicle) by adopting and implementing policies and dedicating resources that commit to building better and safer streets, educating the public on traffic safety, and enforcing traffic laws. Successful Vision Zero strategies are being implemented in many cities across the nation and should be considered for Napa County in order to provide the safest user experience possible on all our roadways.

### **FISCAL IMPACT**

Is there a Fiscal Impact? No

### **BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION**

Vision Zero was first launched in Sweden in 1997 to address the serious issue of traffic related fatalities on public roadways. When Vision Zero was initiated, Sweden recorded seven traffic fatalities per 100,000 people; today, despite a significant increase in traffic volume, that number is fewer than three. This strategy is now gaining momentum in the United States where several cities have adopted policies and action plans in order to achieve similar results. To implement successful Vision Zero strategies, there must be commitment and support from multiple stakeholders, including

but not limited to City Government, Transportation Officials, Public Works, Law Enforcement and Public Health. Vision Zero strategy goals and policies are very much in alignment with Complete Streets concepts of providing safe mobility for all users. These strategies require a strong commitment from stakeholders to accelerate change in areas where safety improvements are most needed.

Vision Zero action plans are made up of four major components:

- Education
- Engineering
- Enforcement
- Evaluation

Each component requires a citywide effort in order to achieve citywide results. Educating the public on the issue of traffic related fatalities and the roles and responsibilities of each user of the transportation network is a key feature of a successful Vision Zero program. The responsibility for this component is with all stakeholders and establishes the level of commitment for accomplishing the goal of improved safety and reduction of transportation related fatalities through greater understanding. This can be achieved using various methods:

- Pledge of commitment to reduce fatalities (See US DOT Mayors Challenge link)
- Safe Routes to School Programs
- Media Safety Campaigns
- Education Forums
- Public Outreach

Engineering better, safer streets takes the commitment of city/county staff to use best practices whenever feasible for all modes. A proactive rather than reactive approach to designing transportation systems for all users and all modes can drastically improve safety and function. This step can be achieved by focusing improvements in areas with the highest safety concerns. Some treatments include:

- Road Diets
- Enhanced Crossings
- Reduced Traffic Speed
- Separated Bike Lanes
- Pedestrian Scale Street Lighting
- Bulb Outs

Public Safety can achieve an effective level of enforcement, not only through citation for infractions among all users, but also by taking the opportunity to educate them on the severity of the impacts when not taking personal responsibility. Focusing on violations that have potential for the most catastrophic outcomes such as:

- Speeding
- Distracted Driving
- Failure to Yield
- Red Lights/Stop Signs
- Violations by Pedestrians & Cyclists

Evaluation of existing conditions in high conflict zones within the network and a comprehensive view of opportunities for improvement will maintain focus on the ultimate goal of reducing traffic related fatalities. Often times, only a small percentage of streets have the highest rate of accidents. In San Francisco an inventory of traffic data showed that 70% of severe and fatal traffic related injuries occurred on just 12% of the streets. This allowed the city to focus resources and improvements in those areas. Establishing benchmarks and monitoring progress will keep focus on the vision.

Many participant jurisdictions have been effective at reducing auto-related incidents by also launching Vision Zero campaigns and using marketing techniques to encourage drivers to adhere to traffic laws.

NCTPA so far has queried the County Sherriff and Health and Human Services. Both have indicated a desire to coordinate efforts. NCTPA will make additional inquiries to other jurisdictions and departments.

For more information on Vision Zero, go to:

<http://www.visionzeroinitiative.com/>

<https://www.transportation.gov/mayors-challenge>

## **SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS**

None