

BOARD COMMUNICATION: YOLO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT

350 Industrial Way, Woodland, CA 95776---- (530) 661-0816

Topic: Approve YCTD Board Minutes for Regular Meeting of February 13, 2023	Agenda Item#: Agenda Type:	3c Action
		Attachments: <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Prepared By: H. Cioffi		Meeting Date: March 13, 2023

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve the Minutes for the Regular Meeting of February 13, 2023.

January 9, 2023 BOARD MEETING MINUTES:

**YOLO TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT
BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING
February 23, 2023
Yolo County Transportation District
350 Industrial Way, Woodland, CA 95776**

Chair Stallard called the meeting to order at 7:02 pm and requested roll call to confirm quorum was in attendance through Zoom remote participation.

The following individuals were in attendance:

Board Member	Jurisdiction	In Attendance	Absent
Tom Stallard (Chair)	City of Woodland	X	
Josh Chapman (Primary)	Davis		X
Dawntè Early (Primary)	West Sacramento	X	
Jesse Loren (Primary)	City of Winters	X	
Lucas Frerichs	Yolo County	X	
Matt Dulcich (Ex-Officio)	UC Davis		X
Manpreet Ark (Ex-Officio)	Caltrans	X	

YCTD staff in attendance were Executive Director Autumn Bernstein, Clerk to the Board Heather Cioffi, Brian Abbanat, Erik Reitz, Courtney Williams, Brenda Lomeli, Kassandra Barrientos, Chad Mikula.

Additional attendee(s) included: Hope Welton, Kimberly Hood

Chair Stallard asked for public comments for items not on the agenda; Alan Hirsch provided public comment.

Agenda Items 3a, 3b, 3c, 3d — Consent Calendar*

Chair Stallard asked if any directors or staff would like to remove anything off the consent calendar; there were no changes to the consent calendar agenda items.

Chair Stallard asked for a motion to approved items on the consent calendar; Director Frerichs made the motion, seconded by Director Loren to approve the following items on the Consent Calendar:

3a.	Approve Agenda for February 13, 2023 meeting
3b.	Resolution approving continuation of hybrid meetings (<i>Cioffi</i>) (pp 5-6)
3c.	Approve YCTD Board Minutes for Regular Meeting of January 9, 2023 (<i>Cioffi</i>) (pp 7-10)
3d.	FY 22-23 2 nd Quarter financial Status Report (<i>Levenson</i>)(pp 11-17)

Roll Call for Agenda Items 3a, 3b, 3c, 3d,— Consent Calendar

AYES	NOES	ABSENT	ABSTAIN	STATUS OF MOTION
Stallard	X			Motion passed
Early	X			
Chapman		X		
Loren	X			

Agenda Item 4 — Status report on Microtransit fare changes

Item 4 is a non-action item and for informational purposes only.

Erik Reitz provided a background report on recent fare changes for the microtransit service in Knights Landing and Winters. Mr. Reitz reviewed the timeline and summarized public comment received. Next steps include:

- Planning for service changes and expansions in Woodland.
- Reviewing microtransit fare policies.
- Receiving feedback from YoloTD Board of Directors.

Public comment: Several microtransit users from Knights Landing spoke on their views of the microtransit fare change. Comments included:

- Raising the fare from \$1 to \$4 is to steep of an increase.
- Too many riders are on a fixed income and cannot afford the increase.
- The transit does not run at appropriate times. It does not allow enough time in the mornings for those that need to be at their place of employment by 8 am.

Agenda Item 5 — Administrative reports

Item 5 is a non-action item and for informational purposes only.

Erik Reitz gave a report on the article published in the Woodland Daily Democrat. The article referenced the 215 route that services the Cache Creek Resort employees. Erik reported that staff are evaluating ridership and crowding conditions and working on potential. The location of the current bus stop is also being evaluated.

- Ms. Bernstein gave a monthly update on the Yolo 80 managed lanes project.
- Staff are organizing a tour of Yolo County on March 17 for senior transportation officials.
- Ms. Bernstein reviewed the long-range calendar.

Chair Stallard asked for public comments for the director reports; Mr. Hirsch provided comment.

Agenda Item 6 — 10 -Year Strategic Planning Process

Item 6 is a non-action item and for informational purposes only.

Ms. Bernstein gave a report on the 10- year strategic planning process. The report included progress up to date:

- Included development of a Strategic Plan in our Board-approved 2023 workplan.
- Worked with the YoloTD Board, Citizens Advisory Committee and Technical Advisory Committee to update our statement of Vision, Values and Priorities in November 2022.
- Held preliminary discussions with Executives from the cities and counties, as well as leadership from other partner agencies, to gauge their interest and solicit their input on priorities for YoloTD's evolving role.

Ms. Bernstein asked for input from the board on a list of questions and advised next steps.

- What would a successful strategic planning process accomplish? What outcomes and/or work products are most important to the Board?
- Does the list above capture the right set of key issues to prioritize in strategic planning? What is missing, if anything?
- What is the right planning horizon for a strategic plan? Is it 3 years, 5 years, 10 years?
- What are the appropriate roles for the YoloTD Board, advisory committees, member jurisdictions, and other stakeholders?
- Should strategic planning discussions take place only during the regular monthly board meetings, or should we plan a half-day retreat?
- Feb: Develop a scope of work and timeline for strategic planning, based on input from the Board and other stakeholders
- March: Hire a strategic planning and facilitation consultant

Comments from the board included:

- A request for a board brief in the coming months on where YCTD is and what it has done over the last year.
- A request to bring the new board members more information before taking on any new tasks.

Agenda Item 8 — Adjournment

There being no further regular business, Chair Stallard adjourned the regular meeting at 8:50 pm.

Respectfully submitted:



Heather Cioffi, Clerk to the Board

The recordings of the YCTD Board of Directors meeting can be viewed on our website at the following link: [Agenda & Minutes - Yolobus](#)

What's Up With That: Building Bigger Roads Actually Makes Traffic Worse

The concept is called induced demand, which is economist-speak for when increasing the supply of something (like roads) makes people want that thing even more. Though some traffic engineers made note of this phenomenon at least as early as the 1960s, it is only in recent years that social scientists have collected enough data to show how this happens pretty much every time we build new roads.

By Adam Mann 6/17/2014

<https://www.wired.com/2014/06/wuwt-traffic-induced-demand/>

I grew up in Los Angeles, the city by the freeway by the sea. If there's one thing I've known ever since I could sit up in my car seat, it's that you should expect to run into traffic at any point of the day. Yes, commute hours are the worst, but I've run into dead-stop bumper-to-bumper cars on the 405 at 2 a.m.

As a kid, I used to ask my parents why they couldn't just build more lanes on the freeway. Maybe transform them all into double-decker highways with cars zooming on the upper and lower levels. Except, as it turns out, that wouldn't work. Because if there's anything that traffic engineers have discovered in the last few decades it's that you can't build your way out of congestion. It's the roads themselves that cause traffic.

The concept is called induced demand, which is economist-speak for when increasing the supply of something (like roads) makes people want that thing even more. Though some traffic engineers made note of this phenomenon at least as early as the 1960s, it is only in recent years that social scientists have collected enough data to show how this happens pretty much every time we build new roads. These findings imply that the ways we traditionally go about trying to mitigate jams are essentially fruitless, and that we'd all be spending a lot less time in traffic if we could just

be a little more rational.



But before we get to the solutions, we have to take a closer look at the problem. In 2009, two economists—Matthew Turner of the University of Toronto and Gilles Duranton of the University of Pennsylvania—decided to compare the amount of new roads and highways built in different U.S. cities between 1980 and 2000, and the total number of miles driven in those cities over the same period.

“We found that there's this perfect one-to-one relationship,” said Turner.

If a city had increased its road capacity by 10 percent between 1980 and 1990, then the amount of driving in that city went up by 10 percent. If the amount of roads in the same city then went up by 11 percent between 1990 and 2000, the total number of miles driven also went up by 11 percent. It's like the two figures were

Induced Demand on freeways is settled science -- Article from 2014...

moving in perfect lockstep, changing at the same exact rate.

Now, correlation doesn't mean causation. Maybe traffic engineers in U.S. cities happen to know exactly the right amount of roads to build to satisfy driving demand. But Turner and Duranton think that's unlikely. The modern interstate network mostly follows the plan originally conceived by the federal government in 1947, and it seems incredibly coincidental that road engineers at the time could have successfully predicted driving demand more than half a century in the future.

A more likely explanation, Turner and Duranton argue, is what they call the fundamental law of road congestion: New roads will create new drivers, resulting in the intensity of traffic staying the same.

Intuitively, I would expect the opposite: that expanding a road network works like replacing a small pipe with a bigger one, allowing the water (or cars) to flow better. Instead, it's like the larger pipe is drawing more water into itself. The first thing you wonder here is where all these extra drivers are coming from. I mean, are they just popping out of the asphalt as engineers lay down new roads?

The answer has to do with what roads allow people to do: move around. As it turns out, we humans love moving around. And if you expand people's ability to travel, they will do it more, living farther away from where they work and therefore being forced to drive into town. Making driving easier also means that people take more trips in the car than they otherwise would. Finally, businesses that rely on roads will swoop into cities with many of them, bringing trucking and shipments. The problem is that all these things together erode any extra capacity you've built into your street network, meaning traffic levels stay pretty much constant. As long as driving on the roads remains easy and cheap, people have an almost unlimited desire to use them.

You might think that increasing investment in public transit could ease this mess. Many railway and bus projects are sold on this basis, with politicians promising that traffic will decrease once ridership grows. But the data showed that even in cities that expanded public transit, road congestion stayed exactly the same. Add a new

subway line and some drivers will switch to transit. But new drivers replace them. It's the same effect as adding a new lane to the highway: congestion remains constant. (That's not to say that public transit doesn't do good, it also allows more people to move around. These projects just shouldn't be hyped up as traffic decongestants, say Turner and Duranton.)

Interestingly, the effect works in reverse, too. Whenever some city proposes taking lanes away from a road, residents scream that they're going to create a huge traffic snarl. But the data shows that nothing truly terrible happens. The amount of traffic on the road simply readjusts and overall congestion doesn't really increase.

For instance, Paris in recent decades has had a persistent policy to dramatically downsize and reduce roadways. "Driving in Paris was bad before," said Duranton. "It's just as bad, but it's not much worse."



A freeway interchange in Los Angeles.

So where did those other drivers go? Many of them switched to public transit, which in Paris has increased by 20 percent in the last two decades. Other trips have simply been avoided, or done on foot. It's not just Europeans who are eager to get out of their cars. San Francisco removed a highway section, called the Central Freeway, that carried nearly 100,000 cars per day in 1989. The boulevard that replaced it now only carries around 45,000 daily cars and yet they move. (Yes, I've been stuck in traffic on Octavia Boulevard, but it's not like you never get through.) Perhaps the biggest success story has been in Seoul, South Korea, where the city tore down a highway that was considered a vital roadway corridor, carrying 168,000 cars per day.

Induced Demand on freeways is settled science -- Article from 2014...

After replacing the cars with a river, parkland, and some smaller roads, traffic didn't get worse and many other things, including pollution, got better.

Now, there's a limit to all of this. Turn a 10-lane highway into a 1-lane road and you might bring cars to a standstill. Extend that same 10-lane highway to 100 lanes and you might never see traffic again (or your city). While Turner and Durantón have claimed to find a fundamental rule, it's not exactly like the universal law of gravity.

"We can only claim that this is a rule within the range of data we can observe," said Turner.

So what can be done about all this? How could we actually reduce traffic congestion? Turner explained that the way we use roads right now is a bit like the Soviet Union's method of distributing bread. Under the communist government, goods were given equally to all, with a central authority setting the price for each commodity. Because that price was often far less than what people were willing to pay for that good, comrades would rush to purchase it, forming lines around the block.

The U.S. government is also in the business of providing people with a good they really want: roads. And just like the old Soviets, Uncle Sam is giving this commodity away for next to nothing. Is the solution then to privatize all roads? Not unless you're living in some libertarian fantasyland. What Turner and Durantón (and many others who'd like to see more rational transportation policy) actually advocate is known as congestion pricing.

This means raising the price of driving on a road when demand is high. During rush hour, drivers would have to pay a fee to use the most congested roads. A few people will balk at the price and say to themselves, "I don't really need to make this trip right now, I'll go later." Roads in your city actually have a great deal of underused capacity. Think about how they sit mostly empty, in the early afternoon, late evening, and at night. If we gave drivers some extra incentive to avoid the most congested hours, we could better utilize the roads' capacities. The extra cost of driving would also make public transit a more attractive option, leading to more people using it.

Congestion pricing has been tried successfully in places like London, Stockholm, and Singapore. Other cities are starting to look at it as a solution. Legislators in New York rejected a plan for congestion pricing in New York City in 2008 and San Francisco periodically toys with introducing the idea in downtown. The problem? Voters. Nobody wants to pay for something that was previously free, even if it would be in their best interests to do so.

Durantón said that if congestion pricing is a non-starter, a more rational approach to parking could be a good secondary step in easing congestion. Parking in most cities is far cheaper than it should be, and it's too often free.

"Because it's free, people will misuse it and it will be full all the time," said Durantón. Drivers searching for parking contribute significantly to road congestion. "There are some estimates that say in the central part of cities up to 30 percent of driving is people just cruising around for parking," Durantón said.

Increasing the price of a parking spot when demand is high would encourage people to leave sooner, letting more drivers occupy the same spot during the day. San Francisco did exactly this starting in 2011 and the results have been a boon to retailers because more customers are able to park in front of their stores. And because prices go down when demand is low, the program has actually saved motorists money. In a move to expand the meters outside of downtown and a few other areas, the city conducted a recent parking census and found that it has more than 440,000 public parking spots, which, if placed end to end, would stretch longer than California's entire coastline. Try dropping that little factoid during your next cocktail party conversation with city planners and traffic engineers.

So remember, the reason you're stuck in traffic isn't all these jerks around you who don't know how to drive; it's just the road that you're all driving on.

Marin flooding prompts Highway 37 closure

<https://www.marinij.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/01/MIJ-L-RAIN-0116.jpg?w=587>

<https://www.marinij.com/2023/01/15/marin-flooding-prompts-highway-37-closure-into-monday/>

: January 15, 2023

Highway 37 in Marin County was closed Sunday because of rain-fueled flooding and was expected to remain closed at least part of Monday, according to Caltrans.

Caltrans said the closure started late Saturday afternoon after the Novato Creek overflowed a levee. On Sunday, the agency said crews were pumping water from the road, but with continuing creek flow and high tides, it could not say when the highway would reopen.

Authorities prohibited driving on the highway between Atherton Avenue and Highway 101 in Novato and also blocked the connector ramps along Highway 101.

Jeff Weiss, a Caltrans representative, said that while the highway was relatively free of water Sunday afternoon, it was "unsafe and unwise" to reopen the road with more rain expected during the night. He said it was difficult to predict the severity of the flooding as the rain worked its way down from the mountains and into the tributaries that feed Novato Creek.

"It's a wait-and-see affair, given the amount of rain we're expecting," he said.

The National Weather Service forecast about a half-inch to 1 inch of rain in the lower elevations of Marin County from Sunday night into Monday afternoon, with 1 to 2 inches possible at higher terrains.

The Highway 37 closure was one of several problems in the county Sunday as the pattern of copious rain that started in December headed into another week.

Caltrans closed the left lanes of northbound Highway 101 near San Antonio Road on Sunday afternoon for emergency pothole repair. Earlier in the day, a mudslide blocked the northbound lane of Highway 1 north of Marshall, according to the California Highway Patrol.

On the Golden Gate Bridge, the west walkway was closed to bicyclists until storm-related debris could be cleaned up on Monday.

Sonoma-Marín Area Rail Transit reported train delays of up to 30 minutes at various points in the day on Sunday because of flooding.

Chris Outler, a meteorologist with the National Weather Service, said the rain was unexpected to continue overnight into Monday in Marin County before tapering off in the afternoon.

Ouler said the agency's 72-hour rainfall totals through 5 p.m. Sunday included 5.06 inches at Woodacre, 4.8 inches on Mount Tamalpais, 4.49 inches in Lagunitas and 3.98 inches in Kentfield.

The forecast for Tuesday is dry, followed by a weak rain system on Wednesday and then a more sustained dry period later in the week, Outler said.

By Sunday morning, Oakland International Airport had already surpassed the total amount of water it usually gets from Oct. 1 through Sept. 30 — 19.25 inches compared with its usual 18.68 inches in that time, according to data provided by the National Weather Service.

Other nearby cities are closing in on their yearly averages, with downtown San Francisco less than 3 inches away from that mark. San Jose needs roughly 6 more inches to break its yearly normal.

Another half-inch to 1 inch of rain was expected to fall across San Francisco and Oakland from Sunday afternoon through Monday evening, while 1 to 1.5 inches of rain was forecast to fall over San Jose, Livermore and Half Moon Bay. Forecasters predicted another 1 to 2 inches of rain would fall over the Santa Cruz Mountains and the Central Coast.

A flood watch remains in effect for almost the entire Bay Area through Monday evening. In addition, a coastal flood advisory also is in effect for areas along the Pacific Coast due to a combination of high tides, strong winds and heavy runoff.

Winds during the storm are expected to be less ferocious than previous atmospheric river storms, with gusts over the urban centers expected to hit 10 to 20 mph, while the higher elevations and coastal regions could have gusts of 20 to 30 mph.

"This is, thankfully, not quite as mean of a system as the last several events," said Colby Goatley, a National Weather Service meteorologist.

As of about 3:30 p.m. Sunday, about a quarter to two-thirds of an inch of rain fell over most lower-lying portions of the Bay Area during the previous 24 hours, according to rain gauges maintained by the

National Ocean and Atmospheric Administration. San Jose received up to 0.27 inches of rain in that span, while up to 1.37 inches fell in the Oakland hills. The Santa Cruz Mountains received anywhere from 0.59 to 1.34 inches of rain in that time.

To the east, the Sierra should once again get hammered with snow, with

12 to 18 inches of fresh powder expected to fall over Donner and Echo passes through Monday evening. Up to 2 feet of snow could fall over Ebbetts, Sonora and Tioga passes.

Snowfall totals across the Sierra Nevada in recent weeks have pushed the area's snowpack to twice

its normal average for this time of year.

About 7.5 feet of snow fell at the University of California Berkeley Central Sierra Snow Lab near Donner Summit during the week leading up to Sunday morning, the weather outpost reported. That included 3.5 feet of snow from Friday through Sunday morning.

Caltrans project to raise highway 37 to cope with sea level rise:

www.scta.ca.gov/projects/highway37/

<https://www.mercurynews.com/2022/09/25/caltrans-favors-elevating-highway-37-to-address-flood-risks/>

“New Bay Area maps show hidden flood risk from sea level rise and groundwater,”

by the Los Angeles Times' Rosanna Xia:

“Communities that consider themselves “safe” from sea level rise might need to think otherwise, said Kris May, a lead author of the report and founder of Pathways Climate Institute, a research-based consulting firm in San Francisco that helps cities adapt to climate change. ‘I started working on sea level rise, then I went into extreme precipitation, and then groundwater ... but it’s all connected,’ May said.”

Please avoid Tahoe: Nature Needs a break (11-17-23)

SJ Mercury News <https://www.mercurynews.com/2022/11/17/dont-go-to-tahoe-tourists-are-warned-the-10-places-on-fodors-no-list-for-2023/>

Lake Tahoe is one of 10 destinations that the Fodors travel experts are warning tourists away from in the coming year.

The travel guide publisher released its 2023 No List, “highlighting destinations to reconsider visiting.” It is not a boycott or ban, it says, but a call for travelers to be aware of the impact of crowds on these areas.

Tahoe is included in the category of “nature that needs a break,” primarily because of the effect that sediment and emissions from heavy traffic have on the lake’s clarity.

The Fodors article quoted Andy Chapman of Travel North Tahoe as saying tourism and hospitality leaders

are trying to find “creative solutions to take cars off the road” without telling people to stay away.

Also on the list was the drought-stricken American West, with a specific mention of Mendocino.

THE NO LIST:

Nature that needs a break

1. Lake Tahoe
2. France’s cliffs and calanques; suffering from erosion.
3. Antarctica; warming temperatures and wildlife declines.