



AGENDA

TRANSPORTATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TTAC)

Thursday, April 17, 2014, 9:00 a.m.

Camarillo City Hall, Administrative Conference Room
601 Carmen Drive, Camarillo, CA

- | | |
|----------------|--|
| Item #1 | CALL TO ORDER |
| Item #2 | PUBLIC COMMENTS |
| Item #3 | APPROVAL OF MARCH 20, 2014 MEETING MINUTES – PG. 2 |
| Item #4 | CALTRANS LOCAL ASSISTANCE UPDATES
Receive updates from Caltrans Local Assistance Staff. |
| Item #5 | REVISION TO THOUSAND OAKS CMAQ FUNDS – PG. 6
Approve shifting \$250,000 in Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) funds from the Thousand Oaks Hillcrest Bike Lanes project to the Thousand Oaks Erbes Road Project. |
| Item #6 | ROUTE 101 PROJECT STUDY REPORT – PG. 7
Discuss Caltrans Route 101 Project Study Report and presentation to Commission. |
| Item #7 | FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Periodic Highway Construction Updates

Regional Transportation Funding & Planning

Congestion Management Program

Highway Monitoring Cameras Demonstration Project

Route 1-Rerouting to Rice Avenue, Oxnard

Bicycle Wayfinding Project

VCTC/CTC Programming Procedures Revision |
| Item #8 | ADJOURN |

**MINUTES OF THE
VENTURA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
TRANSPORTATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
March 20, 2014**

Item # 1 Call to Order

Chair Ken Matsuoka of Camarillo called the meeting to order at 9:06 a.m. The following people were present:

Fred Bral	Caltrans
Mazen Dabboussi	Caltrans
Ashraf Hanna	Caltrans
Rafael Molina	Caltrans
Kirk Patel	Caltrans
Robert Wong	Caltrans
Morris Zarbi	Caltrans
Bill Golubics	Camarillo
Thang Tran	Camarillo
Dave Klotzle	Moorpark
Glenn Hawks	Ojai
Jason Samonte	Oxnard
Chris Birkelo	Port Hueneme
Kit Nell	Port Hueneme
Robert Krock	Simi Valley
Cliff Finley	Thousand Oaks
Tom Mericle	Ventura
Ben Emami	Ventura County
David Fleisch	Ventura County
Peter De Haan	VCTC
Kara Elam	VCTC
Mohammed Hasan	Hasan Consultants
Carlos Hernandez	COH & Associates

Item # 2 Public Comments

None

Item # 3 Approval of February 20, 2014 Minutes

Tom Mericle of Ventura moved to approve the March 20, 2014 minutes. Jason Samonte of Oxnard seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Item # 4 Caltrans Local Assistance Updates

Robert Wong of Caltrans Local Assistance gave updates on the following:

- District 7 Region Planning Study on Operational Improvement Report will be available in April.
- Caltrans would like to form work groups to address issues, problems or needs. Caltrans Local Assistance budgets are overused for submittal processing, so he wants to make sure submittals are correct so appropriate time is spent on processing project information.

Morris Zarbi of Caltrans advised if the projects are to be obligated this fiscal year, they should be submitted, with all required documents completed, by mid-July 2014 as Caltrans has to transmit all Requests for Authorization (RFA). He then noted that before RFA is submitted, agencies need to contact VCTC because the Project amounts can't be rounded and often are. He also mentioned that Caltrans can come periodically, if needed, and dedicate time and assistance to each Agency, with paperwork, to discuss issues, and generally conduct informal workshops.

Mazen Dabboussi of Caltrans mentioned that they will conduct three days of workshops in Ventura County, pertaining to RFA processes (Preliminary Engineering, Right of Way and Construction subtopics), Award/Post Award and Invoicing/Project Competition processes. Dates, times & locations are TDB.

Also mentioned was the ATP District 7 Training. This training is scheduled for Tuesday, April 8 from 1p.m. to 4p.m. at LA METRO in the Board Room in Los Angeles.

Item # 5 Revision to Camarillo STP Funds

Peter De Haan of VCTC presented this item. Tom Mericle of Ventura moved to approve the recommendation; a voice vote was taken and passed unanimously.

Item # 6 Route 101 Final Project Study Report

Peter De Haan of VCTC presented this item, which is a continuance of discussion from TTAC January and February Meetings. Rafael Molina of Caltrans explained the PSR-PDS provides preliminary engineering analysis on alternatives (not conceptual approval of a preferred alternative) and future additional, detailed traffic studies could be required. Ashraf Hanna of Caltrans prepared the Traffic Engineering Performance Assessment (TEPA) and addressed concern regarding the Level of Service (LOS) conflicts between Auxiliary Lanes and High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Lane alternatives, noting that:

- When over saturated flow of traffic is on corridor, taking a portion of traffic away does not remedy the oversaturated flow. In Los Angeles County, Caltrans (with minimum funding) has dealt with this by managing existing facilities, which increases safety levels, therefore adding Auxiliary lanes is an effective measure to manage facilities and considerably increase LOS.
- Additional studies (following the TEPA) contained comparative analysis of data on other routes where Caltrans had added either one HOV lane or two HOT lanes. Oversaturated flow, as well as LOS lower than F0 rating, was still experienced. Caltrans discovered the two main reasons were that existing facilities lack Auxiliary lanes (resulting in bottlenecks) or a measure to mitigate bottleneck was absent. Based on this comparative route data, Caltrans feels Auxiliary lanes are as good as HOV lanes, as capacity in HOV lane is limited to maximum of 65%-70% of a mixed flow lane and the alleviation of this 65% from the main lines does not equal free flow corridor.
- The LOS determination was based on two data sets. Firstly, the 101 Corridor (twenty seven miles) was divided into nine segments, about three miles per segment, and a demand versus capacity analysis was applied, based on Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) figures and forecasted increase in demand expected for the design year (2035). Caltrans concluded that some segments will still flow at F0-F1 because of over saturated flow; other segments will remain at current LOS. The second data set was obtained by a delay and tachometer analysis done via a comparative analysis on 405 and 10 freeways (which had capacity added). Caltrans saw there still significant delay, attributed to discharge issues, they will need to add capacity and manage existing facilities. Caltrans considers the better way to do that is to add Auxiliary lanes.

David Fleisch of Ventura County then asked why, if the TEPA recommends adding Auxiliary lanes only as opposed to adding one nonstandard HOV lane, is the LOS is better adding only the Auxiliary lane and not the nonstandard lane and additionally, why was the PSR-PDS structured with four alternatives and not a recommendation of Auxiliary lanes with the three remaining alternatives listed instead as “options” for increasing LOS in the future? Ashraf Hanna of Caltrans said the Auxiliary lanes manage existing facilities, however HOV lanes (in addition to adding capacity) promote rideshare so it is Caltrans policy to include for consideration as it might not be considered in a Traffic Study.

Peter De Haan of VCTC mentioned CTC supported (and approved in the STIP) VCTC’s submittal of \$14 million for Project Approval & Environmental Document (PAED) phase for the entire 101 corridor for FFY 17/18, and the Auxiliary lane option will be a part of the PAED however this option does not apply to Thousand Oaks.

David Fleisch of Ventura County discussed the need to consider Auxiliary lanes initially and that the project should be planned as one project, completed in phases due to funding sources, with the second phase including further analysis on what kind of HOV lane should be included. Tom Mericle of Ventura mentioned that some Auxiliary lanes are potential safety improvements. Carlos Hernandez of COH & Associates noted that SHOPP funds could be possible, in the future.

Tom Mericle of Ventura mentioned that Auxiliary lane placement in Ventura does not seem logical, specifically the inclusion at Seaward and Vista del Mar and exclusion at Victoria to Telephone. He asked Caltrans, if PA&ED does not re-configure the placement of Auxiliary lanes, he would like to see more analysis on their placement at certain locations in his jurisdiction. Ashraf Hanna of Caltrans said placement is based on weaving and merging analysis and Rafael Molina of Caltrans further explained that Ventura County is not locked into locations for Auxiliary lanes and there is future flexibility to study placement in PA&ED. Cliff Finley of Thousand Oaks said TTAC should recommend planning the overall project as one, with the intent to construct in phases, and recommend the Board proceed with the Auxiliary lane alternative initially.

The recommendation resulting from discussions was for staff to provide a consent item to the Board in April, form a subcommittee with intent to meet before the next TTAC Meeting, and for TTAC to complete analysis and present recommendations to the Commission at the VCTC Meeting in May. Members who volunteered to be a part of the subcommittee were: David Fleisch of Ventura County, Tom Mericle of Ventura, Cliff Finley of Thousand Oaks, Bill Golubics of Camarillo, Jason Samonte of Oxnard. Subsequent to the meeting, Tom Fox of Camarillo asked to be in the subcommittee. Tom Mericle of Ventura moved to approve the recommendation. A voice vote was taken and passed unanimously.

Item # 7 ATP Regional Guidelines

Peter De Haan of VCTC presented this item. Staff recommended TTAC approve the scoring methodology for Ventura County’s share of ATP funds. He explained that per CTC guidelines (to be adopted today), the call for projects is March 21 and applications are due to Caltrans in May 2014. The CTC will select projects based on their criteria; unselected projects for the Ventura County region go to SCAG, which will then make the project selections from what the CTC did not fund. Kit Nell of Port Hueneme asked if approval through SCAG is discretionary and Peter De Haan of VCTC advised yes. Tom Mericle of Ventura moved to approve the recommendation. A voice vote was taken and passed unanimously.

Item # 8 Status of Federal STP and CMAQ Projects

This item was a discussion item; no action was required of TTAC however Peter De Haan of VCTC presented this item and advised that Staff needs specific, clarified planned obligation dates to provide to Caltrans by April 1. In providing an obligation date, time should be allowed for design should be complete and Request for Approval (RFA) processed, so that the obligation date is the anticipated E-76 approval. Morris Zarbi of Caltrans mentioned submittals for construction phase will require completed environmental, design and right of way document(s); and encroachment or cooperative agreement(s) are required based on the size of projects.

Item # 9 Future Agenda Items

The Route 101 Project Study Report further discussions and Bike Wayfinding Project will occur at the next meeting.

Item # 11 Meeting adjourned at 10:33 a.m.



Item #5

April 17, 2014

MEMO TO: TRANSPORTATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FROM: STEPHANIE YOUNG, PROGRAM ANALYST
SUBJECT: REVISION TO THOUSAND OAKS CMAQ FUNDS

RECOMMENDATION:

- Approve shifting \$250,000 in Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) funds from the Thousand Oaks Hillcrest Bike Lanes project to the Thousand Oaks Erbes Road Project.

BACKGROUND:

The Hillcrest Bike Lanes project in Thousand Oaks was awarded \$250,000 in CMAQ from the SAFETEA-LU Call for Projects. The project has been delayed and the city would now like to shift those CMAQ funds to the Erbes Road project to cover cost increases. The city would seek alternate funding to complete the Hillcrest Bike Lanes at a later time. The Erbes Road project is partially funded with CMAQ funds from the 2012 Mini Call for Projects and STP cost savings from the Wendy Drive project. There will be no change in scope to the Erbes Road project.



Item #6

April 17, 2014

MEMO TO: TRANSPORTATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

FROM: PETER DE HAAN, PROGRAMMING DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: ROUTE 101 PROJECT STUDY REPORT

RECOMMENDATION:

- Discuss Caltrans Route 101 Project Study Report and presentation to Commission.

BACKGROUND:

At the January meeting the Commission requested that TTAC analyze and evaluate the Route 101 PSR prepared by Caltrans and present a report on the possible alternatives for Ventura County based on technical and fiscal realities within each alternative, including recommendation of future studies that need to occur to move the project forward. Specifically, the Board wanted to consider the benefits of auxiliary lanes relative to the other alternatives, since auxiliary lanes were projected to achieve a 2035 LOS of D-F0, at a cost of approximately \$130 million.

At the last meeting, Caltrans discussed its further evaluation of the PSR. After extensive discussion, staff was requested to write a report summarizing the Committee's discussions, for the Committee to review and use as a basis for the presentation to the Commission. That report is attached for review.

The PSR is still posted on line for review at <http://www.goventura.org/?q=meetings/ttac/current>

TTAC REVIEW OF THE ROUTE 101 PROJECT STUDY REPORT

INTRODUCTION

In December, 2013, Caltrans completed a Project Study Report (PSR) on the project to improve Route 101 from Moorpark Road in Thousand Oaks to Route 33 in Ventura. This planning effort was funded by VCTC to provide the state-required documentation to program the Preliminary Analysis and Environmental Document (PAED) phase. At VCTC's direction, the PSR contained four alternatives: (1) No Build; (2) One Non-Standard High-Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Lane in each direction; (3) One Standard HOV Lane in each direction; and (4) Two Standard HOV Lanes in each direction. As the PSR was being developed Caltrans also at VCTC's request did a cursory review of the potential for adding auxiliary lanes at locations in the corridor where they do not already exist.

The Ventura County Transportation Commission, at its January 10, 2014 meeting, requested that VCTC Transportation Technical Advisory Committee review the PSR and present its findings to the Commission. Particular issues that the Commission asked to be addressed include:

- Consideration of auxiliary lanes, which the PSR indicated would have a better Level-of-Service (LOS) in 20 years (E-F0) than the non-standard HOV lane alternative (E-F1).
- Future steps to implement Route 101 improvements.

Based on the discussion at the March TTAC meeting, VCTC staff has prepared this report for TTAC review in April and presentation to the Commission in May. The report begins with a review of the project development process, to assist the Commission with understanding how the Caltrans PSR fits into the overall program for implementing Route 101 improvements. The next section of the report provides TTAC's understanding of the PSR's traffic analysis, and how this analysis should be utilized given the current stage of project development. The report then describes steps for moving forward with the project, concluding that the auxiliary lanes will likely be an important part of any overall improvement, but should be planned with other improvements as part of a larger project, which can then be implemented in phases with auxiliary lanes possibly being in the first phase.

BACKGROUND – PROJECT DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

For a major highway improvement such as that proposed for Route 101, there are numerous project development steps, with the Project Study Report being only the first. The flow-chart diagram summarizes these steps, which can extend over as many as 10 years. Completion of the PSR allows a project to move to the next step, the PAED phase, which includes the preliminary engineering and environmental study required to select the preferred alternative and complete the project environmental documentation. Typically, the PAED phase will begin with a "scoping document" which will evaluate in greater detail than the PSR the potential alternatives to determine which alternatives will be considered in the actual environmental document.

Subsequent to the completion of the scoping document, the draft environmental document will be prepared, released for public comment, and then finalized. The Commission would be expected to review the completed scoping document, the draft environmental document, and the final document, providing the Commission with numerous opportunities to weigh in on the consideration of alternatives. Upon the adoption of the final environmental document, a single preferred alternative would be adopted and move forward into final design and construction.

REVIEW OF THE PROJECT STUDY REPORT'S TRAFFIC ANALYSIS

The item in the PSR that attracted the most attention on the part of the Commission was the following comparison between two alternatives:

Non-Standard HOV Lanes: LOS in 20 years of E-F1, estimated construction cost of \$575-\$690 million

Auxiliary Lanes: LOS in 20 years of E-F0, estimated construction cost of \$120 - \$130 million

The discussions between TTAC, Caltrans, and VCTC staff have confirmed that the analysis contained in the PSR was never intended to be detailed enough for use in comparing alternatives. Rather, the PSR develops the scope of the alternatives with sufficient detail to establish the cost of the next project phase, the PAED. So, the PSR finding strongly leads to the conclusion that since auxiliary lanes are likely to be more cost-effective than other strategies, they should be considered as part of any alternative for Route 101. However, at this time it would be premature to abandon the other alternatives and only consider auxiliary lanes. Due to the complexity of the Route 101 facility and the proposed improvements, all of the improvements should be planned as one project, and then implemented in phases based on available funding.

Although Caltrans traffic staff has acknowledged that their analysis was at a preliminary level in keeping with the purpose of a PSR, they have confirmed that in their professional opinion the auxiliary lanes would be slightly more effective at relieving traffic, when compared with non-standard HOV lanes. The analysis, which forecasts 2035 traffic and congestion using current volumes, compounded annually by 5% to account for future growth, forecasts saturated traffic flow in 20 years. Experience in other corridors has indicated that oversaturated flow is not necessarily relieved by adding HOV lanes. Caltrans discovered the two main reasons were that existing facilities lack auxiliary lanes, resulting in bottlenecks, and other measures to mitigate the bottlenecks were absent. However, implementation of auxiliary lanes alone would not necessarily relieve the saturated flow condition either.

There are several other considerations for the implementation of HOV lanes. It is very important to understand that the LOS figures in the PSR are for the existing general-purpose freeway lanes only. All of HOV lanes alternatives would also provide a new facility for buses and carpools that would operate at a superior LOS, while the auxiliary lanes alternative would provide no such facility with a superior LOS. HOV lanes would also have the added advantage of encouraging carpool formation thus providing a positive air quality benefit. It should also be noted that since the Thousand Oaks segment already has auxiliary lanes at all locations, an alternative consisting of auxiliary lanes alone would bring no improvement to Thousand Oaks and Newbury Park.

RECOMMENDED NEXT STEPS

Based on the availability of upcoming State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds, the Commission has programmed \$14 million in Fiscal Year 2017/18 for the PAED phase of the Route 101 improvements. In this same year, the Commission has programmed \$3 million for PAED for the completion of the Route 118 Freeway widening. According to the Route 101 PSR, the PAED phase could take 3 years, and more time will be required subsequent to PAED for Final Design. Based on the financial forecasts in the Long Range Transportation Plan, there could be as much as \$100 million available by 2022 to construct the initial phase of one more selected alternatives, but there will be insufficient time to have a project ready to construct if the next project development phase does not begin until 17/18. However, should the federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) be reauthorized at the current level, and these funds reserved for the PAED for the state highway projects, funds would be available to expedite the PAED start date until 15/16, which would likely provide enough time to have a project ready to build by 2022. TTAC has noted that auxiliary lanes, being defined as an operational and safety project, would be eligible for SHOPP funds at the discretion of Caltrans which would be beyond the amount of available funding identified in the Comprehensive Transportation Plan.

Regarding the possible auxiliary lanes, further traffic studies would be required to establish the specific priority locations. Since the PAED phase is intended to thoroughly evaluate all viable alternatives, it would be appropriate to include those traffic studies in an early part of the PAED work. It is important that the auxiliary lanes be evaluated and planned in coordination with the other potential improvements such as HOV or HOT lanes, since the traffic effects, environmental impacts and right-of-way requirements of the various improvements could be very different if implemented in a coordinated manner rather than piecemeal. Therefore, over the course of Fiscal Year 2014/15 it might be appropriate for VCTC to develop detailed PAED scopes and funding arrangements for both the Route 101 and 118 projects to facilitate initiation of those documents in the fall of 2015 using STP funds.