Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission

AGENDA

Thursday, January 24, 2013
9:00 a.m.

NOTE SPECIAL DATE & LOCATION THIS MONTH
Watsonville City Council Chambers
275 Main St. Suite 400
Watsonville, CA 95076

NOTE
See the last page for details about access for people with disabilities and meeting broadcasts.

En Español
Para información sobre servicios de traducción al español, diríjase a la última página.

AGENDAS ONLINE
To receive email notification when the RTC meeting agenda packet is posted on our website, please call (831) 460-3200 or email info@sccrtc.org to subscribe.

COMMISSION MEMBERSHIP

Caltrans (ex-officio) Tim Gubbins
City of Capitola Dennis Norton
City of Santa Cruz Don Lane
City of Scotts Valley Randy Johnson
City of Watsonville Eduardo Montesino
County of Santa Cruz Greg Caput
County of Santa Cruz Neal Coonerty
County of Santa Cruz Zach Friend
County of Santa Cruz John Leopold
County of Santa Cruz Bruce McPherson
Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District Dene Bustichi
Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District Ron Graves
Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District Lynn Robinson

The majority of the Commission constitutes a quorum for the transaction of business.
Article 8 Transportation Development Act Claims – only City and County representatives vote
Article 4 Transportation Development Act Claims, Policy Issues, and SAFE – all 12 members vote
1. Roll call

2. Oral communications

Any member of the public may address the Commission for a period not to exceed three minutes on any item within the jurisdiction of the Commission that is not already on the agenda. The Commission will listen to all communication, but in compliance with State law, may not take action on items that are not on the agenda.

Speakers are requested to sign the sign-in sheet so that their names can be accurately recorded in the minutes of the meeting.

3. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agendas

CONSENT AGENDA

All items appearing on the consent agenda are considered to be minor or non-controversial and will be acted upon in one motion if no member of the RTC or public wishes an item be removed and discussed on the regular agenda. Members of the Commission may raise questions, seek clarification or add directions to Consent Agenda items without removing the item from the Consent Agenda as long as no other Commissioner objects to the change.

MINUTES

4. Approve draft minutes of the December 6, 2012 Regional Transportation Commission meeting

5. Accept draft minutes of the December 10, 2012 Bicycle Committee meeting

6. Accept draft minutes of the December 20, 2012 Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC) meeting

POLICY ITEMS

No consent items

PROJECTS and PLANNING ITEMS

No consent items

BUDGET AND EXPENDITURES ITEMS

7. Accept status report on Transportation Development Act (TDA) revenues

8. Approve Proposition 1B Transit Security Funds for Santa Cruz METRO (Resolution)
9. Approve proposed amendments to the Fiscal Year (FY) 2012-13 Budget and Work Program (Resolution)

ADMINISTRATION ITEMS

10. Approve extension of the Watsonville Office Lease contract (Resolution)

11. Approve reappointment of representative to the Coast Rail Coordinating Council (CRCC)

INFORMATION/OTHER ITEMS

12. Accept monthly meeting schedule

13. Accept correspondence log

14. Accept letters from RTC committees and staff to other agencies
   a. Letter to Deborah Lynch, Caltrans Bicycle Transportation Account Coordinator, to certify 2012 City of Watsonville Trails and Bicycle Master Plan
   b. Letter to Christopher J. Murphy, Director of the California Office of Traffic Safety, in support of the County of Santa Cruz Health Services Agency 2014 OTS grant

15. Accept miscellaneous written comments from the public on RTC projects and transportation issues

16. Accept information items
   e. Sarah Rohrs, “Solano transportation needs may get funded through new state bill,” Vallejo Times-Herald, January 9, 2013

REGULAR AGENDA

17. Commissioner reports – oral reports

18. Welcome new Commissioners – oral report
   (Neal Coonerty, Commission Chair and George Dondero, Executive Director)
19. Director’s report – oral report  
*(George Dondero, Executive Director)*

20. Caltrans report and consider action items  
   a. District Director’s report  
   b. Construction projects update

21. Highway 1 Soquel/Morrissey Auxiliary Lane project update  
   *(Kim Shultz, Senior Transportation Planner)*  
   a. Staff report  

22. Draft 2013 Legislative Program and Legislative Updates  
   *(Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner)*  
   a. Staff report  
   b. Draft State legislative program  
   c. Draft Federal legislative program

23. Article 8 Transportation Development Act (TDA) Allocation Claim from the City of Santa Cruz  
   *(Karena Pushnik, Senior Transportation Planner)*  
   a. Staff report  
   b. Resolution to approve the City of Santa Cruz’s Article 8 Transportation Development Act Allocation Claim

24. Review of items to be discussed in closed session

25. Oral and written communications regarding closed session

**CLOSED SESSION**

26. Conference with Real Property Negotiator pursuant to Government Code 54956.8 for lease of Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line property within the Santa Cruz wye  
   
   Agency Negotiator: George Dondero and Luis Pavel Mendez  
   Negotiating Parties: SCCRTC, City of Santa Cruz  
   Under Negotiation: Price and Terms

27. Conference with Real Property Negotiator pursuant to Government Code 54956.8 for lease of Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line property within the Santa Cruz wye
Agency Negotiator: George Dondero and Luis Pavel Mendez
Negotiating Parties: SCCRTC, Golden Gate Railroad Museum
Under Negotiation: Price and Terms

28. Conference with Labor Negotiators pursuant to Government Code 54957.6

Commission Negotiators: Yesenia Parra and George Dondero

Bargaining Units: RTC Association of Middle-Management and Community of RTC Employees

OPEN SESSION

29. Report on closed session

30. Adjourn to special meeting of the Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies
   
   *No agenda items this month*

31. Next meetings

   The next RTC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, February 7, 2013 at 9:00 a.m. at the Santa Cruz City Council Chambers, 809 Center Street, Santa Cruz, CA.

   The next Transportation Policy Workshop meeting is scheduled for Thursday, February 21 at 9:00 a.m. at the RTC Offices, 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA.

HOW TO REACH US

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA 95060
phone: (831) 460-3200 / fax (831) 460-3215

Watsonville Office
275 Main Street, Suite 450, Watsonville. CA 95076
(831) 768-8012
email: info@sccrtc.org / website: www.sccrtc.org

HOW TO STAY INFORMED ABOUT RTC MEETINGS, AGENDAS & NEWS

Broadcasts: Many of the meetings are broadcast live. Meetings are cablecast by Community Television of Santa Cruz. Community TV’s channels and schedule can be found online (www.communitytv.org) or by calling (831) 425-8848.
Agenda packets: Complete agenda packets are available at the RTC office, on the RTC website (www.sccrtc.org), and at the following public libraries:

- Aptos Branch Library
- Central Branch Library
- Branciforte Library
- Scotts Valley Library
- Watsonville Library

For information regarding library locations and hours, please check online at www.santacruzpl.org or www.watsonville.lib.ca.us.

On-line viewing: The SCCRTC encourages the reduction of paper waste and therefore makes meeting materials available online. Those receiving paper agendas may sign up to receive email notification when complete agenda packet materials are posted to our website by sending a request to info@sccrtc.org. Agendas are typically posted 5 days prior to each meeting.

Newsletters: To sign up for E-News updates on specific SCCRTC projects, go to www.sccrtc.org/enews.

HOW TO REQUEST

❖ ACCOMMODATIONS FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission does not discriminate on the basis of disability and no person shall, by reason of a disability, be denied the benefits of its services, programs, or activities. This meeting location is an accessible facility. If you wish to attend this meeting and require special assistance in order to participate, please contact RTC staff at 460-3200 (CRS 800/735-2929) at least three working days in advance of this meeting to make arrangements. People with disabilities may request a copy of the agenda in an alternative format. As a courtesy to those person affected, Please attend the meeting smoke and scent-free.

❖ SERVICIOS DE TRADUCCIÓN/ TRANSLATION SERVICES

Si gusta estar presente o participar en esta junta de la Comisión Regional de Transporte del Condado de Santa Cruz y necesita información o servicios de traducción al español por favor llame por lo menos con tres días laborables de anticipó al (831) 460-3200 para hacer los arreglos necesarios. (Spanish language translation is available on an as needed basis.) Please make advance arrangements (at least three days in advance) by calling (831) 460-3200.
1. Roll call

The meeting was called to order at 9:06 a.m.

Members present:

Greg Caput                   Don Lane
Dave Reid (Alt.)             Lynn Robinson
Kirby Nicol                  Andy Schiffrin (Alt.)
Ellen Pirie                  Ron Graves
Eduardo Montesino            Randy Johnson
Brandy Rider (ex officio)

Staff present:

George Dondero               Luis Mendez
Karena Pushnik                Kim Shultz
Yesenia Parra                 Jason Laning

2. Oral communications

None

3. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agendas

Executive Director George Dondero said there was a replacement page for Item 9 and handouts for Items 17 and 20. He recommended changing the order of the closed session items to consider Item 26 last. Item 26 was renumbered to become Item 28a.

CONSENT AGENDA
(Caput, Schiffrin) Unanimous
MINUTES

4. Approved draft minutes of the November 1, 2012 RTC meeting

5. Accepted the draft minutes of the September 12, 2012 Joint Meeting of the Santa Cruz County Traffic Operations System Oversight Committee and Safe on 17 Task Force

6. Accepted draft minutes of the October 9, 2012 Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&DTAC) meeting

7. Accepted draft minutes of the October 18, 2012 Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC) meeting

POLICY ITEMS

No consent items

PROJECTS and PLANNING ITEMS

No consent items

BUDGET AND EXPENDITURES ITEMS

8. Accepted status report on Transportation Development Act (TDA) revenues

ADMINISTRATION ITEMS

No consent items

INFORMATION/OTHER ITEMS

9. Accepted monthly meeting schedule

10. Accepted correspondence log

11. Accepted letters from RTC committees and staff to other agencies - none

12. Accepted miscellaneous written comments from the public on RTC projects and transportation issues

13. Accepted information items
   a. Letter from Congressman Sam Farr regarding the MBSST Draft Master Plan
   b. Letter to Commissioner Joseph Tavaglione, Chair of the California Transportation Commission, from members of the Central Coast Coalition regarding the town hall meeting held in Santa Cruz on October 10, 2012
   c. Right on Track Rail Corridor Ribbon Cutting Event Thank You Ad
REGULAR AGENDA

14. Commissioner reports – oral reports

Commissioner Lane reported that the City of Santa Cruz is receiving a large volume of emails from community members on the Westside of Santa Cruz regarding the train horn from the Train to Christmas Town operation and asked that the issue be discussed during Item 18.

15. Appreciation of departing Commissioners for their service – oral presentation

Commission Chair Nicol presented certificates of appreciation to departing Commissioners Stone and Pirie.

Executive Director George Dondero presented a certificate of appreciation to departing Commissioner Nicol.

Commissioner Johnson and Commission Ex-Officio Alternate Brandy Rider arrived to the meeting.


Commission Chair Nicol reported that the election committee nominates current Commissioner Neal Coonerty to be the new Chair for 2013.

Commissioner Pirie moved, and Commissioner Robinson seconded, to appoint Commissioner Neal Coonerty as Chair for 2013. The motion passed unanimously.

Commission Chair Nicol reported that the election committee nominates Commissioner Eduardo Montesino to be the Vice Chair for 2013. Commissioner Graves moved and Commission Alternate Schiffrin seconded to appoint Commissioner Eduardo Montesino as Vice Chair for 2013. The motion passed unanimously.

17. Director’s report – oral report

Executive Director George Dondero reported that the California Transportation Commission is considering the allocation of $5.35 million in State Transportation Improvement funds to the RTC for structural repairs on the rail line. He reported that four public workshops were held the previous week regarding the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network Draft Master Plan. He also noted that RTC staff is pleased to be working with AMBAG on the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, describing their staff as focused, experienced, and energized. He announced that the RTC offices will be closed December 24th through January 1st for required repair to the floor and installation of new carpet.
Commissioner Montesino commended staff on the MBSST public workshops.

Commissioner Johnson asked if the RTC office closing is a furlough. Mr. Dondero said that it is not, but that staff had agreed to use holiday and vacation days to cover the time period.

18. November 17 Right on Track Rail Corridor Ribbon Cutting Event – oral report

Senior Transportation Planner Karena Pushnik described the goals of the November 17 Right on Track Rail Corridor Ribbon Cutting event. She presented a slideshow of images for each of the whistle stops. She said staff worked diligently to include the history of the rail line, including numerous history displays and presentations. She said over 1400 people rode the train during the event. She also acknowledged the successful partnerships involved in making the rail event a success.

Commissioners commended the success of the event and thanked staff and event organizers for their work. Executive Director George Dondero announced that the RTC received a certificate of commendation for the Right on Track event from Assemblyman Alejo.

Commissioners discussed community feedback regarding horn noise resulting from the Train to Christmas town operation, including: federal regulations that require horn blowing at every crossing; the installation of a new horn by SC&MB Railway; positive feedback about the new horn; testing of the decibel level of the new horn; required decibel levels of train horns according to federal regulations; placement of the train horn on the locomotive and the direction of sound projection; the adjustability of the horn volume; appreciation for the sound of the horn; the possibility of the newness of the train service contributing to the amount of community feedback; and the current ridership and sales status for the operation.

19. Caltrans report and consider action items

Brandy Rider of Caltrans, District 5, announced that Santa Cruz County was awarded a $200,000 grant for a Community Bridges project. She said Aileen Loe will return as Planning Deputy Director effective December 17th, and Sara von Schwind will become the new Deputy Director of Programming and Project Management.

20. Presentation from the County of Santa Cruz Assistant Director of Public Works, Steve Wiesner

Steve Wiesner, County of Santa Cruz Assistant Director of Public Works, gave a presentation on recent transportation projects in the unincorporated areas of the County in which the RTC played a role in funding. Recently completed projects included: Soquel-San Jose Road Overlay; Soquel Drive Overlay; and
Green Valley Rd/Airport Blvd/Holohan Rd Intersection Improvements. Projects currently in the construction phase include: Graham Hill Road Improvement Project and Calabasas Road Improvements. Projects still under development include: State Park Drive/Seacliff Village Improvements; Green Valley Road Pedestrian Safety Project; Corralitos Road Left Turn Lane – Bradley Elementary; Davenport Resurfacing; Nelson Road PM 2.0 Storm Damage Repair; Redwood Lodge Road PM 1.65 Storm Damage Repair. Finally, he described future needs for the County road system.

Commissioner Pirie asked about the cost of pavement overlay. Mr. Wiesner said the cost varies but normally is about $200,000 per mile.

Responding to questions, Mr. Wiesner talked about road repair taxes, gas tax, disposal fees, and pavement management.

21. Highway 1 Soquel/Morrissey Auxiliary Lane project update

Senior Transportation Planner Kim Shultz said the project is on schedule according to the timeframe anticipated during the final design phase of the project but has slipped on the aggressive schedule of the contractor’s winning bid. He said RTC staff, the contractor, and Caltrans are working together on a range of methods to accelerate the construction effort. He said the change order ad hoc committee is losing two departing commissioners that need to be replaced. Commissioner Lane volunteered and Commissioner Montesino also agreed to sit on the committee.

RTC Resident Engineer Bruce Shewchuk said that work continues to focus on the completion of the retaining walls on the northbound side of the highway. He said work is also progressing on the bridge abutments for the new La Fonda Avenue Overcrossing. He said that work continues on the south side of the highway on grading the slopes, hauling away excess dirt, and grinding down the existing deteriorated asphalt from the outside lane currently behind the barrier. He said preparatory actions are underway to address storm water drainage in the project area.

Mr. Shewchuk responded to project schedule questions stating that the current delay is approximately one month behind the contractor’s aggressive schedule, but that methods to accelerate the project are under consideration. Commissioners asked that future contracts take into consideration rain days.

22. Santa Cruz County Unified Corridor Investment Plan Grant Award

Transportation Planner Ginger Dykaar recommended that the RTC accept a Partnership Planning grant of $211,085 from Caltrans to develop a Santa Cruz County Unified Corridor Investment Plan analyzing three primary transportation routes in Santa Cruz County: Highway 1, Soquel Avenue/Drive and the recently purchased Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line. She said the plan will
provide Caltrans, the RTC, and other partner agencies the ability to prioritize limited funds to those projects and programs that provide the greatest benefits toward achieving local, state and federal transportation goals.

Commission Alternate Dave Reid asked that the public be invited to participate earlier in the process of developing goals.

Commissioner Pirie moved and Commissioner Montesino seconded to:

1. Authorize the Executive Director to accept the grant award from the CA Department of Transportation (Caltrans) to develop a Unified Corridor Investment Plan for Santa Cruz County and enter into the necessary agreements and contracts to complete the plan; and
2. Approve the work program element for the Unified Corridor Investment Plan as required by Caltrans.

The motion (Resolution 08-13) passed unanimously.

23. Amendments to the Fiscal Year (FY) 2012-13 Budget and Work Program and Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line Property Management

Deputy Director Luis Pavel Mendez recommended that the RTC amend the Fiscal Year 2012-13 Budget and Work Program to incorporate completion of the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line purchase, modification of the 511 system planning work, the Highway 1 HOV Lanes Environmental Document, and other changes. Additionally, he recommended that the RTC approve receipt of a fee paid by Caltrans for a temporary construction easement on the rail line to replace existing guardrails on Highway 1 where the rail line crosses the highway. Mr. Mendez also recommended that the RTC authorize its Executive Director to manage the rail line right-of-way property in order to provide law enforcement agencies with permission to implement trespass rules, authorization for entities to do work on the rail line right-of-way, collect rents, and address tenant issues as necessary.

Commissioners discussed the procedure for contacting local jurisdictions regarding trespassing issues; the specific language of a trespassing agreement with local law enforcement agencies; public comments about high ticket pricing and night scheduling for the Train to Christmas Town operation; the possibility for a designated staff person to be the public contact for questions and concerns regarding the rail line; concern over the language in the proposed resolution regarding granting “management” of the rail line; the updated release date for the draft EIR for the HOV lanes highway project; whether the RTC should use the County’s property management services; and funding and methodology of the 511 program.

Commission Alternate Schiffrin proposed to amend staff’s recommendation by requiring staff to create a procedure manual for management of the rail line within three months, and adding a $10,000 per year threshold over which
amount any requested new agreements would be brought before the Commission for consideration.

Commission Alternate Schiffrin moved and Commissioner Graves seconded to:

1. Approve the proposed amended FY 2012-13 Budget and Work Program;
2. Authorize the Executive Director to manage the rail line right-of-way property now owned by the RTC, such that any suggested, required or requested changes to existing agreements and requests for new agreements exceeding the amount of $10,000 per year would be presented to the RTC for consideration; and
3. Accept the Caltrans offer of $1,500 for a temporary construction easement.

The motion (Resolution 09-13), as amended, passed unanimously.

24. Review of items to be discussed in closed session

Commissioner Nicol said that negotiations for lease of rail property within the Santa Cruz right of way, labor negotiations, and the annual performance review for the Executive Director would be discussed in closed session.

25. Oral and written communications regarding closed session

None. Commissioners adjourned to closed session at 11:38 a.m.

CLOSED SESSION

26. Conference with Real Property Negotiator pursuant to Government Code 54956.8 for lease of Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line property within the Santa Cruz wye

Agency Negotiator: George Dondero and Luis Pavel Mendez
Negotiating Parties: SCCRTC, City of Santa Cruz
Under Negotiation: Price and Terms

27. Conference with Labor Negotiators pursuant to Government Code 54957.6

Commission Negotiators: Yesenia Parra and George Dondero
Bargaining Units: RTC Association of Middle-Management and Community of RTC Employees

28. Annual Performance Review for Executive Director pursuant to Government Code 54957

OPEN SESSION
29. Report on closed session

Commissioners returned to open session at 1:03 p.m. and there was no report on closed session.

30. Adjourn to special meeting of the Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies

No agenda items this month

31. Meeting adjourned at 1:04 p.m. Next meetings

The next RTC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, January 24, 2013 at 9:00 a.m. at the Watsonville City Council Chambers, 275 Main St., Watsonville, CA.

The next Transportation Policy Workshop meeting is scheduled for Thursday, February 21 at 9:00 a.m. at the RTC Offices, 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA.

Respectfully submitted,

Jason Laning, Staff

Attendees:

Bruce Shewchuck Parsons  Brinckerhoff
Michael Gresham Iowa Pacific Holdings
Steve Wiesner Santa Cruz County Dept. of Public Works
1. Call to Order at 6:37 pm

2. Introductions

**Members Present:**
- Kem Akol, District 1
- Holly Tyler, District 1 (Alt.)
- David Casterson, District 2, Chair
- Eric Horton, District 2 (Alt.)
- Peter Scott, District 3
- Will Menchine, District 3 (Alt.)
- Rick Hyman, District 5
- Bill Fieberling, City of Santa Cruz
- Andy Ward, City of Capitola
- Myrna Sherman, City of Watsonville
- Leo Jed, CTSC
- Piet Canin, Ecology Action/Bike-to-Work

**Unexcused Absences:**
- Lex Rau, Scotts Valley None

**Excused Absences:**
- Jim Langley, CTSC (Alt.)
- Daniel Kostelec, City of Capitola (Alt.)
- Carlos Garza, City of Santa Cruz (Alt.)
- Gary Milburn, City of Scotts Valley (Alt.)

**Vacancies:**
- District 4 – Voting and Alternate
- District 5 – Alternate
- City of Watsonville – Alternate

**Guests:**
- Amelia Cohen, People Power
- Cheryl Schmitt, City of Santa Cruz

3. Announcements – Cory Caletti made the following announcements: 1) Myrna Sherman was appointed as the City of Watsonville voting representative; 2) the City of Watsonville Trails and Bicycle Master Plan was adopted recently qualifying the City of Watsonville for Bicycle Transportation Account funding; 3) the County of Santa Cruz Public Works Department will be installing Bikes May Use Full Lanes signs at both approaches of the Aptos Creek Bridge, at the top of Felton Empire Grade as part of a resurfacing project, and on Soquel/San Jose Road; 4) a January meeting will be needed so that the Bike Committee may review a few time sensitive items; and 5) that the Bike Secure bicycle parking subsidy program fund is now completely expended and that staff is preparing the Final Report to the Monterey Bay Air Pollution Control District, the program’s funder.
4. Oral Communications – Bike Committee Chair David Casterson indicated that there’s much interest in discussing the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network project and thus requested that the bulk of the time be allocated to that presentation.

5. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agendas – None

**CONSENT AGENDA**

A motion (Fieberling/Scott) to approve the consent agenda as amended passed unanimously.

6. Approved draft minutes of the August 13, 2012 Bicycle Committee meeting

7. Accepted State and Federal Legislative Updates staff report presented at the August 2nd RTC meeting

8. Approved Bikes Secure parking subsidy applications from Chrystal Properties, Day Worker Center and Capitola Plaza and return of excess racks from Wave Crest Development and Ristorante Avanti

9. Accepted Bicycle Committee Roster

10. Accepted Summary of Bicycle Hazard Reports

**REGULAR AGENDA**

11. City of Santa Cruz Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 8 Claim – Cheryl Schmitt, City of Santa Cruz Transportation Coordinator, summarized the TDA funding allocation request for bicycle parking ($1,000), minor bikeway maintenance and striping ($20,000) and West Cliff Path Repaving Phase 2 ($150,000). Ms. Schmitt detailed plans for the West Cliff project indicating that widening the pathway is not possible and therefore the City will instead be maximizing the existing footprint by paving all the way to the fence line on the highly used multi-use facility. A motion was made (Fieberling/Canin) to recommend to the RTC that the City TDA allocation request be approved. The motion passed unanimously. A discussion followed regarding what criteria the City uses for prioritizing improvements and if there are other higher priority needs. Cheryl Schmitt indicated that different funding sources are used for different high priority projects and West Cliff Drive makes this an important improvement appropriate for TDA funds. Committee member Leo Jed made a motion to write a letter to the City of Santa Cruz requesting that the Committee take part in the City’s prioritization of maintenance and striping for all of the City’s projects. Based on concern that such a request would be too far reaching, the motion failed due to a lack of a second. Cheryl Schmitt welcomed members to review the City’s yearly Capital Improvement Program and provide feedback.

12. Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSST) Network Draft Master Plan – Cory Caletti, RTC Senior Transportation Planner/MBSST Project Manager, outlined the contents and objectives of the Draft Master Plan for the broad bicycle/pedestrian project that will see the rail right-of-way as the spine of the approximately 50 mile system of trails. Ms. Caletti summarized the staff report and discussed the Draft Master Plan development process, its contents, funding availability, the anticipated timeline and concurrent development of a Draft Environmental Impact Report. She
indicated that the right-of-way will be shared with the rail service, freight and/or passenger, and that planning for the document is framed by the RTC’s commitment to dual use of the right-of-way. She indicated the RTC held four public workshops in late November attended by over 300 members of the public who provided valuable input on the Draft Master Plan. Following Ms. Caletti’s presentation, Will Menchine provided a summary of the MBSST Ad-Hoc Committee’s written recommendations that were included in the packet. The Bike Committee discussed the most significant recommendation dealing with trail development without the presumption that train service would co-exist with a trail. After further discussion, a motion was made (Akol/Jed) to recommend prioritizing segments in the most urbanized areas. The motion passed unanimously. Another motion was made (Akol/Jed) to recommend that trail design chapter of the Master Plan be amended to address temporary trail development utilizing decomposed granite. The motion passed with a majority voting in favor. A third motion was made (Jed/Casterson) to recommend adding population density to the prioritization criteria. The motion passed unanimously.

13. Member updates related to Committee functions - None

14. Meeting Adjourned at 9:00 pm.

**NEXT MEETING:** The next Bicycle Committee meeting is scheduled for Monday, January 14, 2013 at the special meeting time of 6:30 pm at the RTC office, 1523 Pacific Ave, Santa Cruz, CA.

Minutes respectfully prepared and submitted by:

Cory Caletti, Senior Transportation Planner

\Rtcserv2\shared\Bike\Committee\BC2012\BCDecember12\BCMinutes_December10.docx
1. Call to Order – Chair Chris Schneiter called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m.

2. Introductions – Self introductions were made.

3. Oral communications – Rachel Moriconi announced that AMBAG will be hosting a workshop on the Land Use Initiative component of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan Sustainable Communities Strategy following the January 17, 2013 ITAC meeting.

4. Changes to consent and regular agendas – A list of Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) grant applicants was distributed for Item 10.

CONSENT AGENDA (Rodriguez/ Dettle) approved unanimously

5. Approved minutes of the October 18, 2012 ITAC meeting

6. Received Caltrans District 5 SHOPP Updates

REGULAR AGENDA

7. Status of ongoing transportation projects, programs, studies and planning documents - Verbal updates from project sponsors
Ecology Action: Piet Canin reported that they are finishing work for installation of 40 electric vehicle (EV) stations in the Monterey Bay Area.

UCSC: Teresa Buika reported that the University is working on the AB2766-funded CNG slowfill fuel project and EV charging stations in parking areas project.

MBUAPCD: Alan Romero reported that the Air District awarded $1.8 million in AB2766 grants in late September. Approved projects included a roundabout at Pennsylvania and Cliff Street in Watsonville, fleet vehicle replacements for the County of Santa Cruz, projects noted above, as well as bus rapid transit and roundabout projects in Monterey County. Phase 2 of the AMBAG Bike Travel Demand Model was also funded, with the Phase 1 model update expected to be rolled out with a web-based tool available for everyone in early 2013. To improve data, he encouraged everyone to use the Cycle Tracks application developed by San Francisco MTA.

SCCRTC: Rachel Moriconi reported that Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) project lists will be presented at the January meeting. A Request for Proposals (RFP) for Construction Management of the Rail Line Improvements project has been released.

Watsonville: Maria Rodriguez reported that work is underway on Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) and Safe Routes to Schools-funded projects, as well as the Airport Boulevard project. Five people, including Director David Koch, are retiring from Public Works today.

County of Santa Cruz: Russell Chen reported that several storm damage repair projects are underway; work on Soquel-San Jose Road and bond-funded culvert replacements countywide are done; the Graham Hill Road project is essentially complete; work on Calabasas Road was started, though requires gas line relocation, and the project will restart towards the end of January 2013. A construction contract for storm damage repairs on Empire Grade was recently awarded, with tree removal to start in January and the majority of construction to begin in April. The Lockwood Lane/Graham Hill Road signal is to be operational in mid-January. Sanitation work in the Freedom Boulevard area continues. Pavement management program work is on hold through the winter.

Santa Cruz: Chris Schneiter reported that the City Hall solar project is underway; the Chestnut Street hill opened. The City is awarding a contract for the downtown Electric Vehicle stations project. The City will be doing a sewer replacement project on Ocean Street from Ocean St. Extension to Water Street which will impact traffic, especially northbound lanes. Due to weather, the Front St./River St./Soquel Dr rehabilitation project has been delayed. The Gault Elementary School SRTS project is to begin in February.

8. Draft 2013 State and Federal Legislative Programs

Rachel Moriconi provided an overview of the RTC’s Draft State and Federal Legislative Programs and requested that Committee members identify any additional legislative issues that the RTC should pursue or monitor in 2013. Key issues for 2013 include implementation of MAP-21 and legislation to lower the voter threshold for transportation ballot measures. Piet Canin expressed disappointment that the Governor vetoed the 3-foot passing bicycles bill and noted that statewide bicycle groups will be pushing for passage this year. Ms. Moriconi noted that the RTC has not taken a position in the past on the issue, but that the legislative program includes support for legislation that would improve conditions for bicyclist and pedestrians, including safety and access. She noted that as specific bills are introduced staff will evaluate and make recommendations for any RTC positions where appropriate. She encouraged ITAC members to inform staff of relevant bills throughout the year.
9. Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network Draft Master Plan

Cory Caletti provided an overview of the MBSST Master Plan. She emphasized that implementation and maintenance of the trail system is expected to be done by local jurisdictions, resource agencies such as State Parks, and others, with the RTC possibly managing construction of some sections. She noted that local jurisdictions will be requested to accept and/or adopt the plan, which will act as a guiding document for implementation. She requested input on options for selecting sections to receive funds that are currently programmed for construction and components of the plan.

Local jurisdictions indicated interest in implementing sections of the trail. Issues raised for RTC staff consideration included:

- Have the RTC act as the lead for environmental review and permitting for some sections
- Minimize sections subject to federal requirements
- Provide clarification on how involved the Coastal Commission and PUC will be in approving trail construction
- Consider prioritizing sections that fill gaps, recognizing that in urban areas already have some parallel infrastructure and therefore may not be the most critical
- Cutting trees may raise concerns for adjacent neighbors along the rail line
- Consider constructing some segments that can be completed quickly, even if they rank as lower priorities
- Sections along the rail line that provide access to schools may be eligible for Safe Routes to Schools grants
- Provide clarification that rail bridges will not be able to accommodate the trail, but rather new structures would be needed. Right-of-way constraints for bridge landings will be a challenge for constructing parallel structures in some areas.

Several attendees noted that the document is very well done, easy to use by the public, and provides a good amount of detail. Piet Canin noted that Ecology Action is helping FORT identify private funding options also.

12. Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) Update

Rachel Moriconi distributed a list of applications received for the current Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) cycle. Preliminary staff recommendations will be presented at the January ITAC meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m. The next ITAC meeting is scheduled for January 17, 2013 at 1:30 PM in the SCCRTC Conference Room, 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA.

Minutes prepared by: Rachel Moriconi
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## SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
### TDA REVENUE REPORT
#### FY 2012-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>FY11-12 ACTUAL REVENUE</th>
<th>FY12-13 ESTIMATE REVENUE</th>
<th>FY12-13 ACTUAL REVENUE</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE AS % OF PROJECTION</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE % OF ACTUAL TO PROJECTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JULY</td>
<td>499,800</td>
<td>499,800</td>
<td>533,900</td>
<td>34,100</td>
<td>6.82%</td>
<td>106.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUGUST</td>
<td>666,400</td>
<td>666,400</td>
<td>711,800</td>
<td>45,400</td>
<td>6.81%</td>
<td>106.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPTEMBER</td>
<td>699,895</td>
<td>699,895</td>
<td>718,257</td>
<td>18,362</td>
<td>2.62%</td>
<td>105.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTOBER</td>
<td>486,400</td>
<td>486,400</td>
<td>556,500</td>
<td>70,100</td>
<td>14.41%</td>
<td>107.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOVEMBER</td>
<td>648,500</td>
<td>648,500</td>
<td>742,000</td>
<td>93,500</td>
<td>14.42%</td>
<td>108.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECEMBER</td>
<td>804,308</td>
<td>804,308</td>
<td>733,930</td>
<td>-70,378</td>
<td>-8.75%</td>
<td>105.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANUARY</td>
<td>510,100</td>
<td>488,844</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEBRUARY</td>
<td>680,100</td>
<td>851,792</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCH</td>
<td>625,667</td>
<td>638,135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRIL</td>
<td>441,300</td>
<td>404,586</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>588,400</td>
<td>591,173</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE</td>
<td>756,557</td>
<td>636,515</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>7,407,427</td>
<td>7,216,348</td>
<td>3,996,387</td>
<td><strong>191,084</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.65%</strong></td>
<td><strong>55%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**

\[:\\FISCAL\\TDA\\MonthlyReceipts\\FY12-13.xlsx\\FY2012\]
TO: Regional Transportation Commission (RTC)

FROM: Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner

RE: Proposition 1B Transit Security Funds for Santa Cruz METRO

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) adopt a resolution (Attachment 1) designating the RTC’s share of FY12/13 Proposition 1B California Transit Security Grant Program (CTSGP) funds to the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (Santa Cruz METRO), approving Santa Cruz METRO’s proposed projects, authorizing staff to submit applications for the funds on behalf of Santa Cruz METRO, and authorizing staff to execute any agreements necessary to receive and pass-through funds to Santa Cruz METRO.

BACKGROUND

On November 7, 2006 State voters approved Proposition 1B, authorizing $19.9 billion in bonds for a variety of transportation programs. $1 billion of the Proposition 1B funds are designated for the California Transit Security Grant Program - California Transit Assistance Fund (Proposition 1B Transit Security Funds) to be distributed to transit agencies (Section 99314) and Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (Section 99313), using the same formula used to allocate State Transit Assistance (STA) funds. As required by state guidelines, applications to the California Emergency Management Agency (Cal-EMA) for these projects must be submitted through, and approved by, county transportation commissions.

Proposition 1B Transit Security funds can be used on a wide range of capital projects that provide increased protection against a security or safety threat, or that increase the capacity of transit operators to prepare disaster-response transportation systems that can move people, goods, emergency personnel and equipment in the aftermath of a disaster. The funds can be used on planning, engineering, construction management, architectural, and other design work, environmental impact reports and assessments, required mitigation expenses, appraisals, legal expenses, site acquisitions, and necessary easements, construction, and acquisition. Management and Administration (M&A) costs are not allowable expenses for Proposition 1B Transit Security funds.

As part of the annual State Budget, the legislature determines how much funding to appropriate to Proposition 1B programs. In FY13, the State Controller’s Office allocated $212,337 to the RTC and $228,168 to Santa Cruz METRO, for a Santa
Cruz County total of $440,505 in Proposition 1B California Transit Security Grant Program (CTSGP) funds.

Since inception of this Proposition 1B program, the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) has designated its share of Proposition 1B Transit Security funds to Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (Santa Cruz METRO) for comprehensive transit security improvements and video surveillance systems.

DISCUSSION

Santa Cruz METRO requests (Attachment 2) that the RTC designate its FY13 funds ($212,337) for Santa Cruz METRO transit security projects as it has done since 2008. Santa Cruz METRO proposes to use this year’s funds to complete installation of lighting and video surveillance equipment at METRO facilities, including Park and Ride lots, as described in Attachment 3.

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) approve a resolution (Attachment 1) designating the RTC’s share of Proposition 1B Transit Security Funds to the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (Santa Cruz METRO); authorizing staff to submit applications for the funds on behalf of Santa Cruz METRO to the California Emergency Management Agency; and authorizing staff to execute any agreements necessary to receive and pass funds through to Santa Cruz METRO.

SUMMARY

Proposition 1B included $1 billion in bonds for transit security projects. Staff recommends that the RTC designate the RTC’s share of funds to Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District.

Attachments:
1. Resolution Designating Prop. 1B Transit Security Funds to Santa Cruz METRO
2. Request Letter from Santa Cruz METRO
3. Investment Justification

\RTCSERV2\Shared\RTC\TC2013\TC0113\TransitSecGrant\SCMTDProp1Bsecurity2013sr.doc
RESOLUTION NO.

Adopted by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
on the date of
on the motion of Commissioner
duly seconded by Commissioner

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING SUBMITTAL OF AN APPLICATION
AND EXECUTION OF AGREEMENTS FOR
PROPOSITION 1B CALIFORNIA TRANSIT SECURITY GRANT PROGRAM FUNDS
FOR SANTA CRUZ METROPOLITAN TRANSIT DISTRICT

WHEREAS, the Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air quality, and Port
Security Bond Act of 2006 (Proposition 1B) and its enabling legislation in California
Government Code Section 8879.23 designated $600 million in Proposition 1B bond
funds for the California Transit Security Grant Program (CTSGP); and

WHEREAS, the CTSGP funds are available to Regional Transportation
Planning Agencies (RTPAs) and transit operators eligible to receive State Transit
Assistance funds pursuant to Sections 99313 and 99314 of the Public Utility Code
(PUC); and

WHEREAS, the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission and
the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (Santa Cruz METRO) are the eligible
recipients of CTSGP funds in Santa Cruz County; and

WHEREAS, Santa Cruz METRO requests that the Santa Cruz County Regional
Transportation Commission designate its allocation of FY13 CTSGP funds to Santa
Cruz METRO; and

WHEREAS, Santa Cruz METRO proposes to use the region’s entire allocation
of FY13 CTSGP funds for security enhancement projects that are consistent with
the Regional Transportation Plan and in conformance with the CTSGP Guidelines; and

WHEREAS, applications to the California Emergency Management Agency
(Cal EMA) for FY13 CTSGP funds must be approved by and submitted through the
RTPA; therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE Santa Cruz COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION THAT:

1. The FY13 allocation of Proposition 1B California Transit Security Grant
Program funds for Santa Cruz County in FY13 Proposition 1B, Grant #6561-0002 are hereby programmed to Santa Cruz METRO for projects that
increase protection from security or safety threats against public transit
riders, stations, facilities and equipment;

2. The Executive Director or his designee is authorized to submit an application
for FY13 CTSGP funds to the Cal EMA on behalf of Santa Cruz METRO;

3. The Executive Director is hereby authorized to execute on behalf of the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission any actions and agreements necessary for the purpose of obtaining financial assistance for Santa Cruz METRO as provided by the Cal EMA from the FY13 CTSGP funds.

AYES: COMMISSIONERS

NOES: COMMISSIONERS

ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS

ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS

______________________________
Neal Coonerty, Chair

ATTEST:

_____________________________
George Dondero, Secretary

Distribution: Cal-EMA; Thomas Hiltner, SCMTD; RTC Programming
December 12, 2012

Mr. George Dondero, Executive Director  
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission  
1523 Pacific Avenue  
Santa Cruz, CA 95060-3911

RE: Authorize an Application for FY13 California Transit Security Grant Program Funds

Dear George:

This purpose of this letter is to request that the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) adopt a resolution to submit an application on behalf of Santa Cruz METRO to the California Emergency Management Agency for FY13 California Transit Security Grant Program (CTSGP) funds. The Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality and Port Security Bond Act of 2006 (Proposition 1B) established $600 million for the CTSGP within the California Transit Assistance Fund. Each year, the State Controller’s Office allocates CTSGP funds to eligible agencies for transit security projects. The RTC must adopt a new resolution each year for the ongoing program and submit the application on behalf of Santa Cruz METRO for the CTSGP funding allocation to Santa Cruz County.

In accordance with Government Code Section 8879.58, the State Controller’s Office allocated FY13 CTSGP funds to the RTC and to Santa Cruz METRO in the same proportion that STA funds are allocated under Public Utilities Code 99313 and 99314. Accordingly, the RTC will receive $212,337 and Santa Cruz METRO will receive $228,168 for a total of $440,505 in FY13 CTSGP funds, the same amount as last year. Santa Cruz METRO requests that the RTC designate its FY13 funds for Santa Cruz METRO transit security projects as it had done in each of the previous five years, FY08 – FY12.

The Santa Cruz METRO Board of Directors will consider a resolution on 1/11/13 to authorize the General Manager to submit an application from Santa Cruz METRO for the FY13 CTSGP funds. Santa Cruz METRO requests that the RTC designate its allocation of FY13 CTSGP funds to Santa Cruz METRO and authorize an application on behalf of Santa Cruz METRO to the California Emergency Management Agency (Cal-EMA) contingent upon Santa Cruz METRO’s Board adopting its resolution on 1/11/13.

110 Vernon Street, Santa Cruz, CA 95060 (831) 426-6080, FAX (831) 426-6117
Santa Cruz METRO OnLine at http://www.scmtd.com
Santa Cruz METRO will apply the FY13 CTSGP funds to complete installation of video surveillance and security lighting at all METRO facilities. The following table shows the single project proposed by Santa Cruz METRO for FY13 CTSGP funds:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>GC 8879.58(a)(2)</th>
<th>GC 8879.58(a)(3)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY12 Allocation</td>
<td>$212,337</td>
<td>$228,168</td>
<td>$440,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting and Video Surveillance</td>
<td>212,337</td>
<td>228,168</td>
<td>440,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Projects</strong></td>
<td><strong>$212,337</strong></td>
<td><strong>$228,168</strong></td>
<td><strong>$440,505</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the RTC concurs with the proposed transit security projects using FY13 CTSGP funds, please provide a resolution authorizing the allocation of RTC’s funds to Santa Cruz METRO and an application through the RTC to the Cal EMA. In order to meet the submission deadline of 1/15/13, I would appreciate the RTC’s consideration of Santa Cruz METRO’s request at its January 2013 meeting. If approved, Santa Cruz METRO will then prepare an application for the RTC to submit to Cal-EMA in accordance with the FY 2012-13 Program Guidelines.

Please call me if you have any questions about this request.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

LESLIE R. WHITE
General Manager
FY 2012-13 California Transit Security Grant program
California Transit Assistance Fund
(CTSGP-CTAF)

Investment Justification
Comprehensive Security and Surveillance System

to the
California Emergency Management Agency

January 15, 2013
A. Investment Heading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Submitted</th>
<th>1/11/13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grant Year Applying For</td>
<td>FY 2012-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Allocation</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Name</td>
<td>Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Name</td>
<td>Comprehensive Security and Surveillance System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Phase</td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount Requesting</td>
<td>$440,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIPS Number</td>
<td>087-91033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Projects</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Contact Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Point of contact’s (POC) name and title:</th>
<th>Thomas Hiltner, Grants/Legislative Analyst <a href="mailto:thiltner@scmtd.com">thiltner@scmtd.com</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POC’s email address:</td>
<td>Leslie R. White, General Manager <a href="mailto:lwhite@scmtd.com">lwhite@scmtd.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA’s name and title:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA’s e-mail address:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA/POC’s full mailing address;</td>
<td>110 Vernon St. Santa Cruz, CA 95060 ph. (831) 426-6080 fax (831) 426-6117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA/ POC’s telephone number;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA/POC’s fax number;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Investment Funding plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment YEAR 2013</th>
<th>CTAF Request Total</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8879.58(a)(2)</td>
<td>8879.58(a)(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>$212,337</td>
<td>$ 7,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$220,253</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$212,337</td>
<td>$228,168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

****NOTE – Label each project alphabetically and provide the following questions per project.

Santa Cruz METRO submits only one project with this application and no lettering precedes the project title.
The Santa Cruz METRO Comprehensive Security and Surveillance project is a continuation of previous years’ projects to establish interconnected security systems throughout Santa Cruz METRO facilities.

A new interoperable radio network will connect all vehicles with dispatch and security and enable emergency responders to patch into the system at any point for incident management. The installed radio network will use the latest FCC-mandated narrow-band frequencies and enable bi-directional communication between the fixed sites and mobile equipment.

Emergency electrical generators, lighting, video surveillance/monitoring/archiving and an authorized access control system at all Santa Cruz METRO facilities will provide safety for employees and passengers at operating facilities and transit centers and will provide physical security for vulnerable equipment during routine operations and during emergency conditions.

The Comprehensive Security and Surveillance System is a capital project designed to improve the physical security of transit operating yards and capital equipment used both for routine passenger transportation and emergency response evacuation.

New surveillance systems will increase the security of transit facilities and improve employee and passenger safety at transit centers through the addition of lighting, monitoring, surveillance equipment and emergency power generators to sustain operations during an incident.

The interoperable radio communication network is a capital project which links remote and mobile equipment to dispatch and a security office. The radio system enables emergency responders to patch into the network to facilitate effective, coordinated incident management for the protection of personnel and equipment.

The Comprehensive Security and Surveillance System will deliver an interoperable radio system and will enhance public safety and security through installation of surveillance equipment, access control and emergency generators to improve safety and security during routine operations and for incident management.
A new, interoperable radio network linking dispatch and operating personnel with dispatch and security will enable continuous, effective, coordinated incident management with the ability to communicate with all positions at any time and to patch emergency responders into the network during an incident.

New video surveillance cameras and security lighting at transit centers will improve passenger, employee and general public safety at transit facilities by improving facilities monitoring and threat detection.

Installation of emergency electrical generators at transit centers and operating facilities will ensure uninterrupted operation of all radio and security equipment during an incident.

G. Describe how this investment specifically meets the useful life for capital assets specified in subdivision (a) of section 16727.

The Comprehensive Security and Surveillance System will purchase and install lights, video cameras, archival equipment, access control equipment, microphones, speakers, radios, wired and wireless networks and monitoring consoles with a useful lifespan of 3 years or more. Emergency generators have a useful lifespan of at least 15 years.

The security and communications capital equipment funded by this project will provide safety and security at the Santa METRO facilities described below, all of which have a useful life exceeding the specifications of subdivision (a) of section 16727. Construction will begin in January 2013 on a new, replacement bus operations yard on River Street, which will have a useful life of at least 35 years. The Administration and Maintenance buildings were renovated or constructed new in 2005 through 2009 and have a useful life of 30 years. Pacific Station, the Watsonville Transit Center and Soquel Park & Ride lots have a useful lifespan of 5 to 15 years with routine maintenance and repair.

No CTGSP funds in this project will be used for the construction, repair or renovation of any of the facilities to be monitored with the equipment funded by the Cal-EMA in this project.
H. Provide a high-level timeline, milestones and dates, for the implementation of this investment. Possible areas for inclusion are: stakeholder engagement, planning, major acquisitions/purchases, training, exercises, and process/policy updates. Up to 10 milestones may be provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Specifications</td>
<td>2/26/2010</td>
<td>8/10/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Procurement</td>
<td>5/31/12</td>
<td>12/31/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMR, CCTV, Lighting Installation</td>
<td>12/3/12</td>
<td>6/30/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install Emergency Generators</td>
<td>9/30/14</td>
<td>9/30/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems Operation</td>
<td>12/31/13</td>
<td>12/31/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Closeout</td>
<td>12/31/15</td>
<td>3/31/16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGENDA: January 24, 2013

TO: Regional Transportation Commission (RTC)
FROM: Luis Pavel Mendez, Deputy Director
RE: Proposed Amendments to the Fiscal Year (FY) 2012-13 Budget

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) adopt the attached resolution (Attachment 1) approving the proposed amended FY 2012-13 Budget (Exhibit A to Attachment 1) to incorporate work of a recently secured grant for a unified corridor investment plan as approved by the RTC in December 2012.

BACKGROUND

The RTC was awarded a partnership planning grant of $211,085 from Caltrans to develop a Santa Cruz County unified corridor investment plan. At its December 6, 2012 meeting, the RTC authorized the Executive Director to accept the grant and enter into the necessary agreements to complete the work, and approved the work program element for this unified corridor investment plan. Caltrans has processed the required overall work program agreement amendment to receive the funds and begin the work. Therefore, the RTC may now incorporate the associated funding and expenditures into its FY 2012-13 budget.

DISCUSSION

As approved by Caltrans through the grant award and by the RTC at its December 6, 2012 meeting, the unified corridor investment plan will analyze Highway 1, Soquel Drive and the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line and will assist Caltrans, the RTC and other partner agencies in prioritizing limited funds to those projects that provide the greatest benefits towards achieving local, state and federal transportation goals. The proposed FY 2012-13 budget amendment incorporates the work to be done during this fiscal year. The remainder of the funds, work and expenditures associated with the unified corridor investment plan will be incorporated into the next fiscal year. For the work to be done in fiscal year 2012-13 it will be necessary to have existing staff that is working part time work full time and result in adding the equivalent of a ¼ full time equivalent entry level planner position for fiscal year 2012-13. The cost of this staff work is covered by the grant funds. The grant funds also include consultant work.

Staff recommends that the RTC adopt the attached resolution (Attachment 1) approving the proposed amended FY2012-13 Budget (Exhibit A to Attachment 1)
**Attachment 1** to incorporate work of a recently secured grant for a unified corridor investment plan as approved by the RTC in December 2012.

**SUMMARY**

The proposed amended FY 12-13 Budget (Exhibit A to Attachment 1) incorporates the work of a recently secured planning grant per the work program element approved by the RTC at its December 6, 2012 meeting. Staff recommends adoption of the attached resolution.

**Attachments:**

1. Resolution approving the proposed amended FY 2012-13 RTC Budget
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RESOLUTION NO.

Adopted by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
on the date of January 24, 2013
on the motion of Commissioner
duly seconded by Commissioner

A RESOLUTION AMENDING THE FY 2012-13 BUDGET
FOR THE SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

WHEREAS, the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) was awarded a
planning grant by Caltrans in the amount of $211,085 for the production of a unified corridor
investment plan; and

WHEREAS, at its December 6, 2012 meeting, the RTC authorized the Executive Director to accept
the grant funds and enter into the necessary agreements to complete the plan and approved the work
program element for the work to be done;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION:

1. The FY 2012-13 Budget for the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission is
hereby amended as shown in Exhibit A.

AYES: COMMISSIONERS

NOES: COMMISSIONERS

ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS

ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS

______________________________
Neal Coonerty, Chair

ATTEST:

______________________________
George Dondero, Secretary

Attachments: Exhibit A - SCCRTC FY 2012-13 Budget as amended

Distribution: RTC Fiscal
### PROJECTED REVENUE SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCES</th>
<th>FY12-13 APPROVED</th>
<th>FY12-13 PROPOSED</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation Development Act (TDA):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Auditor's 1/4 Cent Sales Tax Estimate</td>
<td>7,216,348</td>
<td>7,216,348</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 FY 2011-2012 Surplus Revenues Budgeted</td>
<td>394,728</td>
<td>394,728</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Interest Estimate</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total TDA Apportioned</strong></td>
<td>7,619,076</td>
<td>7,619,076</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Transit Assistance (STA)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 State Transit Assistance (STA)</td>
<td>3,305,170</td>
<td>3,305,170</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning Grant Funds/Others:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Rural Planning Assistance (RPA)</td>
<td>316,933</td>
<td>316,933</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 STIP for Planning (PPM)</td>
<td>163,537</td>
<td>163,537</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 RSTP Exchange - Eco Act, CTSC, &amp; Bike Signage</td>
<td>120,824</td>
<td>120,824</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 FHWA - Earmark</td>
<td>220,000</td>
<td>220,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 FHWA - Planning (PL) - from AMBAG</td>
<td>250,411</td>
<td>250,411</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Coastal Conservancy</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 SCMTD</td>
<td>4,136</td>
<td>4,136</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 New Freedom Grant</td>
<td>165,000</td>
<td>165,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 SGC Grant</td>
<td>42,584</td>
<td>42,584</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Transit intern and planning grants</td>
<td>15,217</td>
<td>137,413</td>
<td>122,196 - Incorporate work of newly secured grant per work program approved by RTC in Dec 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Other Revenues</td>
<td>9,750</td>
<td>9,750</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 RTC Funds Budgeted</td>
<td>347,692</td>
<td>347,692</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning/Other Total</strong></td>
<td>1,906,084</td>
<td>2,028,280</td>
<td>122,196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rideshare:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 RSTP Exchange &amp; AMBAG funds</td>
<td>143,641</td>
<td>143,641</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 CMAQ - Rideshare</td>
<td>164,300</td>
<td>164,300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 AB2766</td>
<td>78,784</td>
<td>78,784</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service Authority for Freeway Emergency (SAFE):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 DMV Fees and interest</td>
<td>239,000</td>
<td>239,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Other - MTC SAFE and Partnership Planning Grant</td>
<td>140,800</td>
<td>140,800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 SAFE Funds Budgeted</td>
<td>83,350</td>
<td>83,350</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freeway Service Patrol (FSP):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Caltrans Grant</td>
<td>206,370</td>
<td>206,370</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Hwy 1 Aux Lanes project TMP funds</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 FSP Reserves Budgeted and Interest</td>
<td>70,630</td>
<td>70,630</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rail/Trail Authority:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Proposition 116 and STIP</td>
<td>19,550,000</td>
<td>19,550,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Leases and Union Pacific</td>
<td>446,500</td>
<td>446,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Federal Earmark and RSTP Exchange</td>
<td>431,584</td>
<td>431,584</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Transfer - in from TC Planning</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 Rail/Trail Funds Budgeted</td>
<td>114,860</td>
<td>114,860</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highway 1:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 RSTP Exchange</td>
<td>1,961,056</td>
<td>1,961,056</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 Federal Earmark</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 STIP</td>
<td>1,537,236</td>
<td>1,537,236</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 CMIA (state bond)</td>
<td>10,462,198</td>
<td>10,462,198</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 RSTP Exchange Program</td>
<td>4,702,603</td>
<td>4,702,603</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>53,383,242</td>
<td>53,515,438</td>
<td>122,196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# APPORTIONMENT SUMMARY

## FY 2012-2013 BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLAIMANTS</th>
<th>APPROVED 12/06/12</th>
<th>PROPOSED 01/24/13</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Development Act (TDA): (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA Reserve Fund</td>
<td>22,253</td>
<td>22,253</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC Reserve Fund</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA Administration</td>
<td>475,657</td>
<td>475,657</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning: General Planning</td>
<td>280,186</td>
<td>280,186</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike to Work</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike &amp; Pedestrian Safety (CTSC)</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>905,843</td>
<td>905,843</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCMTD</td>
<td>5,507,038</td>
<td>5,507,038</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Transit (Community Bridges/CTSA)</td>
<td>541,042</td>
<td>541,042</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Center</td>
<td>64,410</td>
<td>64,410</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Capitola</td>
<td>12,327</td>
<td>12,327</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Cruz - Non Transit</td>
<td>76,515</td>
<td>76,515</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Scotts Valley</td>
<td>14,377</td>
<td>14,377</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Watsonville</td>
<td>63,740</td>
<td>63,740</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>161,531</td>
<td>161,531</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>6,440,980</td>
<td>6,440,980</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL TDA APPORTIONED</strong></td>
<td>7,619,076</td>
<td>7,619,076</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Transit Assistance (STA) - SCMTD</td>
<td>3,305,170</td>
<td>3,305,170</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning Grant Funds/Others:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rideshare</td>
<td>386,725</td>
<td>386,725</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFE</td>
<td>463,150</td>
<td>463,150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway Service Patrol (FSP)</td>
<td>397,000</td>
<td>397,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail/Trail Authority</td>
<td>20,652,944</td>
<td>20,652,944</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 1</td>
<td>13,960,490</td>
<td>13,960,490</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP Exchange Program</td>
<td>4,702,603</td>
<td>4,702,603</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>53,393,242</td>
<td>53,515,438</td>
<td>122,196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) TDA apportionments are based on the formulas in the RTC's Rules and Regulations. Balance not used for Planning and Administration is allocated to other TDA claimants as follows:

- 85.5% is appropriated to SCMTD, 8.4% to Community Bridges and 1% to the Volunteer Center; the remaining funds are proportionally allocated to cities and the County according to population.
## BUDGET SUMMARY

### FY 2012-2013 BUDGET

#### OPERATIONS PROGRAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>FY 11-12 Adopted</th>
<th>FY 12-13 Adopted</th>
<th>FY 12-13 Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC - Administration</td>
<td>648,350</td>
<td>718,250</td>
<td>718,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rideshare</td>
<td>416,991</td>
<td>386,725</td>
<td>386,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFE</td>
<td>598,633</td>
<td>463,150</td>
<td>463,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway Service Patrol</td>
<td>362,000</td>
<td>397,000</td>
<td>397,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC Planning</td>
<td>2,821,434</td>
<td>2,093,677</td>
<td>2,215,873</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Operations Programs:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 11-12 Adopted</th>
<th>FY 12-13 Adopted</th>
<th>FY 12-13 Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,847,408</td>
<td>4,058,802</td>
<td>4,180,998</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CAPITAL PROGRAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>FY 11-12 Adopted</th>
<th>FY 12-13 Adopted</th>
<th>FY 12-13 Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rail/Trail Authority</td>
<td>21,007,359</td>
<td>20,652,944</td>
<td>20,652,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 1 Env Docs &amp; Design</td>
<td>2,807,022</td>
<td>1,961,056</td>
<td>1,961,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 1 Construction</td>
<td>15,933,000</td>
<td>11,999,434</td>
<td>11,999,434</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Capital Programs:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 11-12 Adopted</th>
<th>FY 12-13 Adopted</th>
<th>FY 12-13 Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39,747,381</td>
<td>34,613,434</td>
<td>34,128,848</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total All Programs:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 11-12 Adopted</th>
<th>FY 12-13 Adopted</th>
<th>FY 12-13 Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44,594,789</td>
<td>38,672,236</td>
<td>38,794,432</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### BUDGET COMPARISON

**PRIOR YEAR AND BUDGET YEAR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>FY 11-12 Adopted</th>
<th>FY 11-12 Actual Less</th>
<th>FY 12-12 Adopted</th>
<th>FY 12-12 Adopted VS FY 11-12 ADOPTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC - Administration</td>
<td>648,350</td>
<td>495,198</td>
<td>718,250</td>
<td>69,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rideshare</td>
<td>416,991</td>
<td>179,767</td>
<td>386,725</td>
<td>(30,266)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFE</td>
<td>598,633</td>
<td>197,579</td>
<td>463,150</td>
<td>(135,483)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway Service Patrol</td>
<td>362,000</td>
<td>397,000</td>
<td>397,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail/Trail Authority</td>
<td>21,007,359</td>
<td>469,161</td>
<td>20,652,944</td>
<td>20,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 1 Env Docs &amp; Design</td>
<td>2,807,022</td>
<td>921,236</td>
<td>2,093,477</td>
<td>(865,949)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 1 Construction</td>
<td>15,933,000</td>
<td>290,206</td>
<td>11,999,434</td>
<td>230,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC Planning</td>
<td>2,821,434</td>
<td>1,589,272</td>
<td>2,215,873</td>
<td>626,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Operating Budget:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 11-12 Adopted</th>
<th>FY 12-12 Adopted</th>
<th>FY 12-13 Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44,594,789</td>
<td>38,672,236</td>
<td>38,794,432</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** (1) Includes staffing shown on page 16
## SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
### PLANNING REVENUES SUMMARY
#### FY 2012-2013 BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCES</th>
<th>FY12-13 APPROVED 12/06/12</th>
<th>FY12-13 PROPOSED 01/24/13</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TDA Planning</td>
<td>430,186</td>
<td>430,186</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Planning Assistance (RPA)</td>
<td>316,933</td>
<td>316,933</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP for Planning (PPM)</td>
<td>163,537</td>
<td>163,537</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP Exchange - Eco Act, CTSC, &amp; Bike Signage</td>
<td>120,824</td>
<td>120,824</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA - Earmark</td>
<td>220,000</td>
<td>220,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA - Planning (PL) - from AMBAG</td>
<td>250,411</td>
<td>250,411</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Freedom Grant</td>
<td>165,000</td>
<td>165,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Professional Development Grant</td>
<td>13,568</td>
<td>13,568</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal transit planning grant</td>
<td>1,649</td>
<td>1,649</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership Planning Grant</td>
<td>122,196</td>
<td>122,196</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>- Incorporate work of newly secured grant per work program approved by RTC in Dec 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCMTD</td>
<td>4,136</td>
<td>4,136</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Conservancy</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGC Grants (AMBAG &amp; SC County)</td>
<td>42,584</td>
<td>42,584</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB2766/Air District Funds:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Secure - RTC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC Funds Budgeted</td>
<td>114,849</td>
<td>114,849</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,093,677</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,215,873</strong></td>
<td><strong>122,196</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
### PLANNING EXPENDITURES: 721600/721700/721750

#### FY 2012-2013 BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENDITURES</th>
<th>FY12-13 APPROVED 12/06/12</th>
<th>FY12-13 PROPOSED 01/24/13</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 Staff &amp; Overhead by Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Plan Coordination</td>
<td>95,471</td>
<td>95,471</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Land Use/Transportation Coordination</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Complete streets plan</td>
<td>47,584</td>
<td>47,584</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 SC County sustainable comm and transit corridor plan</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Work Program</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Unified Corridor Investment Plan</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23,489</td>
<td>23,489</td>
<td>Incorporate work of newly secured grant per work program approved by RTC in Dec 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Bicycle/Pedestrian Planning</td>
<td>47,929</td>
<td>47,929</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Bike Secure</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Bike Signage Plan</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSST) Network</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Specialized Transportation</td>
<td>48,459</td>
<td>48,459</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Safe Paths to Transit</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>-1,000</td>
<td>Incorporate work of newly secured grant per work program approved by RTC in Dec 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Regional Transportation Plan for MTP</td>
<td>233,450</td>
<td>233,450</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Regional Travel Demand Model</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 On-board transit study</td>
<td>1,748</td>
<td>1,748</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Transit Planning Intern grant</td>
<td>15,629</td>
<td>15,629</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)</td>
<td>157,618</td>
<td>157,618</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Highway &amp; Roadway Planning</td>
<td>69,000</td>
<td>65,302</td>
<td>-3,698</td>
<td>Incorporate work of newly secured grant per work program approved by RTC in Dec 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Staff and Overhead</strong></td>
<td>990,888</td>
<td>1,009,679</td>
<td>18,791</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Services &amp; Supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Bike To Work Program (Ecology Action)</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Bike &amp; Ped Safety (Community Traffic Safety Coalition)</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Safe Paths to Transit</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Bike Signage Program</td>
<td>61,024</td>
<td>61,024</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Professional Services (contracts)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Sacramento Assistant</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Washington Assistant</td>
<td>44,600</td>
<td>44,600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Engineering and Other Technical Consultants</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 STARS for Regional Transportation Plan</td>
<td>51,800</td>
<td>51,800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 On-board transit study</td>
<td>6,260</td>
<td>6,260</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 SC Metro for on-board transit study</td>
<td>1,105</td>
<td>1,105</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 MBSST Network Master Plan Consultant</td>
<td>310,000</td>
<td>310,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Unified Corridor Investment Plan Consultant</td>
<td>103,405</td>
<td>103,405</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Services &amp; Supplies</strong></td>
<td>1,102,789</td>
<td>1,206,194</td>
<td>103,405</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>2,093,677</td>
<td>2,215,873</td>
<td>122,196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Subtotal: 103,405*
## PLANNING DETAIL: 721600/721700/721750

### SALARIES, Benefits & Overhead

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>EXPENDITURES</th>
<th>FY12-13 PROPOSED</th>
<th>TDA</th>
<th>RTC FUND</th>
<th>RPA</th>
<th>FHWA PL - AMBAG</th>
<th>SGC Grant AMBAG</th>
<th>SGC Grant County</th>
<th>STIP PPM</th>
<th>FHWA Earmark</th>
<th>Fed 5304 Part Plng</th>
<th>Fed 5304 Intern Grant</th>
<th>Fed 5304 Transit Grant</th>
<th>SCMTD</th>
<th>New Freedom Grant</th>
<th>Coastal Conserv</th>
<th>RSTPX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>01/2/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Plan Coordination</td>
<td>95,471</td>
<td>9,422</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>86,049</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Land Use/Transportation Coordination</td>
<td>47,584</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37,584</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Complete streets plan</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SC County sustainable comm and transit corridor plan</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>6,882</td>
<td>20,118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Unified Corridor Investment Plan</td>
<td>23,489</td>
<td>4,698</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18,791</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian Planning</td>
<td>47,929</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,929</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Bike Secure</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Bike Signage Plan</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSST) Network</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Safe Paths to Transit</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan for MTP</td>
<td>233,450</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>78,198</td>
<td>132,219</td>
<td>23,033</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Regional Travel Demand Model</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>544</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>On-board transit study</td>
<td>1,748</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>782</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Transit Planning Intern grant</td>
<td>15,629</td>
<td>1,738</td>
<td>323</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,568</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Highway &amp; Roadway Planning</td>
<td>65,302</td>
<td>11,015</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Salaries, Benefits &amp; Overhead Subtotal</td>
<td>1,009,674</td>
<td>45,295</td>
<td>10,909</td>
<td>310,933</td>
<td>250,411</td>
<td>37,584</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>145,644</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>18,791</td>
<td>13,568</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Services & Supplies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>19</th>
<th>EXPENDITURES</th>
<th>FY12-13 PROPOSED</th>
<th>TDA</th>
<th>RTC FUND</th>
<th>RPA</th>
<th>FHWA PL - AMBAG</th>
<th>SGC Grant AMBAG</th>
<th>SGC Grant County</th>
<th>STIP PPM</th>
<th>FHWA Earmark</th>
<th>Fed 5304 Part Plng</th>
<th>Fed 5304 Intern Grant</th>
<th>Fed 5304 Transit Grant</th>
<th>SCMTD</th>
<th>New Freedom Grant</th>
<th>Coastal Conserv</th>
<th>RSTPX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Bike To Work Program (Ecology Action)</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Bike &amp; Ped Safety (Community Traffic Safety Coalition)</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Safe Paths to Transit</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Bike Signage Program</td>
<td>61,024</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61,024</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Sacramento Assistant</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Engineering and Other Technical Consultants</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>39,941</td>
<td>30,059</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>STARS for Regional Transportation Plan</td>
<td>51,800</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>On-board transit study</td>
<td>6,260</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,124</td>
<td>4,136</td>
<td>39,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>SC Metro for on-board transit study</td>
<td>1,105</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>103,405</td>
<td>103,405</td>
<td>103,405</td>
<td>103,405</td>
<td>103,405</td>
<td>103,405</td>
<td>103,405</td>
<td>103,405</td>
<td>103,405</td>
<td>103,405</td>
<td>103,405</td>
<td>103,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>MBSST Network Master Plan Consultant</td>
<td>310,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Unified Corridor Investment Plan Consultant</td>
<td>103,405</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Traffic Monitoring services</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>7,721</td>
<td>44,386</td>
<td>17,893</td>
<td>30,059</td>
<td>103,405</td>
<td>103,405</td>
<td>103,405</td>
<td>103,405</td>
<td>103,405</td>
<td>103,405</td>
<td>103,405</td>
<td>103,405</td>
<td>103,405</td>
<td>103,405</td>
<td>103,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Printing RTP, RTIP, other Documents and Pub Info Materials</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>MBSST Network Plan Outreach</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Transfer to Rail/Trail Authority</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>98,629</td>
<td>11,371</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Subtotal Services &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>1,206,194</td>
<td>384,891</td>
<td>103,940</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17,893</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>103,405</td>
<td>1,105</td>
<td>4,136</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</td>
<td>2,215,875</td>
<td>340,186</td>
<td>114,849</td>
<td>316,933</td>
<td>250,411</td>
<td>37,584</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>163,537</td>
<td>220,000</td>
<td>122,196</td>
<td>13,568</td>
<td>1,649</td>
<td>4,136</td>
<td>165,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>125,824</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
### STAFF POSITIONS
#### FY 2012-2013 BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAFF POSITIONS:</th>
<th>FY12-13 12/06/12</th>
<th>FY12-13 01/24/13</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POSITIONS</td>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>FTE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Executive Director</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Deputy Director</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Fiscal Officer SCCRTC</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Administrative Services Officer</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Transportation Planner I-IV</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Accounting Technician</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Administrative Assistant I-III</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Transportation Planning Technician</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Paid Intern</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL POSITIONS</strong></td>
<td><strong>16.75</strong></td>
<td><strong>16.75</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: FTE= full-time equivalent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAFF POSITIONS:</th>
<th>FY12-13 12/06/12</th>
<th>FY12-13 01/24/13</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POSITIONS</td>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>FTE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Executive Director</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Deputy Director</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Fiscal Officer SCCRTC</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Administrative Services Officer</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Transportation Planner I-IV</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>- Incorporate work of newly secured grant per work program approved by RTC in Dec 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Accounting Technician</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Administrative Assistant I-III</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Transportation Planning Technician</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Paid Intern</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL POSITIONS</strong></td>
<td><strong>15.75</strong></td>
<td><strong>16.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.25</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Regional Transportation Commission
FROM: Yesenia Parra, Administrative Services Officer
RE: Watsonville Satellite Office

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission approve a resolution (Attachment 1) authorizing the Executive Director to extend the lease agreement for the Watsonville satellite office.

BACKGROUND

At its March 3, 2011 RTC meeting, the Commission authorized the Executive Director to enter into a lease agreement with the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District (Air District) to establish an RTC satellite office in Watsonville. The Watsonville satellite office is located at 475 Main St., suite 450. At its May 3, 2012 RTC meeting, the Commission authorized the Executive Director to extend the lease for 1 year (by Resolution No. 18-12) to expire on June 30, 2013.

DISCUSSION

At the time that the RTC approved the extension of the Watsonville Office lease, the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District (Air District) had not negotiated their new lease contract with the City of Watsonville. The Air District informed staff that they could only extend the RTC sublease through December 2012 pending their lease negotiations.

The Air District concluded their lease negotiations and has accepted the RTC’s request to extend the RTC sublease. The Air District has requested that the RTC align their lease with the Air District and that it be done on a calendar year not a fiscal year basis. The Air District also requested an increase on the sublease of $100 per month effective January 1, 2013. The proposed increase is due to the fact that the City of Watsonville increased the base lease rate for the Air District by 25% from $1.00 to $1.25 per square feet. The current sublease cost is $400 per month the increase of $100 would increase the cost to $500 per month.

The approved FY12-13 RTC budget includes sufficient funds for this cost and it is anticipated that there will be sufficient funds in FY13-14 RTC budget.
Four RTC employees currently rotate to staff the Watsonville office which is open on Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays from 9:00 am-5:00 pm and by appointment as needed. Working in the Watsonville satellite office has provided staff opportunities to participate in South County community meetings and events. In addition to serving as a convenient space for staff to meet with partner agencies in a location more centralized within the Monterey Bay region. It has also proven to be an excellent location from which to conduct trainings and workshops.

Staff has regularly attended Freedom Rotary meetings where they have distributed information, discussed RTC projects and received feedback. Staff has attended South County Bike and Pedestrian Work group meetings and Pajaro Valley Chamber events. The South County Bike and Pedestrian Work group use the RTC office for their bi-monthly meetings. RTC staff, Association of Monterey Bay Area governments (AMBAG) and San Benito Council of Governments (COG) have met on several occasions to plan and coordinate joint regional marketing campaigns for rideshare programs and projects.

Now that the office is established and staff has had the opportunity to get to know the community better, several outreach projects are planned for South County. Projects include: meeting face-to-face with business owners in Watsonville to encourage their participation in RTC projects, making workplace presentations, inviting the community to workshops about using alternative transportation modes, and meeting with various property owners and business representatives about potential sites for new park and ride facilities.

During the year and a half that the RTC has had a Watsonville office, staff has learned that Watsonville residents and businesses need and want a more direct connection to the RTC in order to provide feedback on RTC projects and to apply for and participate in the wide range of Commute Solutions services that the RTC has to offer for individuals and employers. Staff recommends that the RTC authorize the Executive Director to extend the lease agreement for the Watsonville satellite office and align it with the Air District lease to end on a calendar year not a fiscal year, thus extending the lease through December 2013.

SUMMARY

In March 2011, the RTC entered into a one year office lease with the Air District for office space in their Watsonville office location. The sublease was extended through December 31, 2012. The Air District has asked the RTC to align the sublease agreement with the Air District to run on a calendar year rather than on a fiscal year basis. The Air District has also proposed an increase of the sublease amount by $100 per month because the City of Watsonville increased the lease rate by 25%.

Staff has been working in the RTC Watsonville satellite office 3 days per week. Having staff working in the Watsonville satellite office has opened up opportunities to work more closely with South County organizations and for RTC staff to
participate in activities and community meetings. It has also provided a more centralized place to meet with partner agencies from throughout the Monterey Bay region and to conduct trainings.

**Attachment**

1. Resolution authorizing the Executive Director to extend the Watsonville satellite office sublease
2. Letter from the Air District
RESOLUTION NO.

Adopted by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission on the date of January 24, 2013
on the motion of Commissioner
duly seconded by Commissioner

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO AMEND THE CONTRACT WITH THE MONTEREY BAY UNIFIED AIR POLLUTION CONTROL DISTRICT (AIR DISTRICT) TO EXTEND THE SUB-LEASE CONTRACT FOR OFFICE SPACE IN WATSONVILLE TO DECEMBER 31, 2013.

WHEREAS the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC) entered into a contract on June 1, 2011 with the Air District for a sub-lease of office space in Watsonville; and

WHEREAS the current contract expired on December 31, 2012;

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION:

1. The Executive Director is authorized to extend the current sublease for an additional one-year to end on December 31, 2013; and

2. The Executive Director is authorized to extend the term of the sublease, negotiate, and execute amendments to the agreement provided that the amendments are within the adopted RTC budget.

AYES: COMMISSIONERS

NOES: COMMISSIONERS

ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS

ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS

_____________________________
Neal Coonerty, Chair

ATTEST:

_____________________________
George Dondero, Secretary
January 10, 2013

George Doncerro
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Avenue
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Re: Sublease for Watsonville office

Dear George,

The District recently renewed its lease with the City of Watsonville for the office located in the Watsonville Civic Building. The lease was renewed for a three year period starting January 4, 2013. The rent is increasing from $1.00 to $1.25 per square foot, a 25% increase.

We understand that your agency is interested in renewing the sublease for the Watsonville office. With the sublease renewal, we propose raising the monthly rent from $400 to $500, which is in line with the 25% rent increase on the main lease.

Please confirm that you intend to renew the sublease and that you accept the new rent amount. Feel free to call me if you would like to discuss this issue with me. I can be reached at 831-647-9411, ext 206.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Richard A. Stedman
Air Pollution Control Officer
AGENDA: January 24, 2013

TO: Regional Transportation Commission (RTC)
FROM: Luis Pavel Mendez, Deputy Director
RE: Reappointment of Representative to the Coast Rail Coordinating Council (CRCC)

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) reappoint Commissioner John Leopold as its representative to the Coast Rail Coordinating Council (CRCC).

BACKGROUND

In April 2011, the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) appointed Commissioner John Leopold as representative to the Coast Rail Coordinating Council (CRCC). The CRCC advocates for increased passenger rail service between Los Angeles and the San Francisco Bay Area and has been successful in securing regular intercity passenger rail service between Los Angeles and San Luis Obispo.

DISCUSSION

The CRCC is composed of representatives of the Caltrans Rail Program, Amtrak and counties along the coast rail corridor between Los Angeles and San Francisco. The CRCC advocates for increased passenger rail service along this route, including the initiation of a new Coast Daylight train which would connect northern and southern California. Attachment 1 is a brochure which provides information on the work of the CRCC and its proposed Coast Daylight train. The RTC has been a member of the CRCC since its formation and at different times has adopted resolutions expressing support for the efforts of the CRCC. The CRCC meets every three months in different parts of the state along the proposed route for the Coast Daylight. Attachment 2 is the proposed 2013 meeting schedule for the CRCC.

In 2011, Commissioner John Leopold was appointed as the RTC’s representative to the CRCC and is interested in continuing to serve as the RTC representative to the CRCC; therefore, staff recommends that the RTC reappoint Commissioner John Leopold to the CRCC.
SUMMARY

The CRCC advocates for increased passenger rail service between Los Angeles and the San Francisco Bay Area. Commissioner John Leopold is interested in continuing to serve as representative to the Coast Rail Coordinating Council (CRCC) and staff recommends that the RTC reappoint him to the CRCC.

Attachments:

1: CRCC Brochure on Proposed Coast Daylight Train
2: Proposed 2013 Meeting Schedule for the CRCC

\Rtcserv2\shared\RTC\TC2013\TC0113\CRCC\CRCC ReAppoint012013.docx
Coast Rail Coordinating Council (CRCC)

The CRCC is a coalition of coastal county transportation planning agencies organized to improve passenger rail services. The primary focus of the CRCC is to improve the frequency and speed of passenger trains on the Coast Route between San Francisco and Los Angeles.

The CRCC is comprised of the agencies listed on the back of this pamphlet. Current Elected Officials leading the CRCC include Dave Potter (Transportation Agency for Monterey County), John Shoals (San Luis Obispo Council of Governments), and Lupe Alvarez (Santa Barbara County Association of Governments).

California Rail Program

California's forward looking passenger rail program is designed to provide travel alternatives and decrease highway congestion. Californians have chosen rail travel in growing numbers. The Coast Daylight will be a very important new link in California's rail corridors, and will bring new riders to California's passenger rail system.

Proposed Daylight Schedule

The proposed schedule of the Coast Daylight is shown below, along with the current schedule of the Coast Starlight. Service to stations in italics will begin when station facilities are completed. Connections to San Diego are also shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>Morning</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Coast Daylight</th>
<th>Coast Starlight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td></td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>Early Evening</td>
<td>To Oakland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:07</td>
<td></td>
<td>Millbrae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10:27</td>
<td>Palo Alto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:48</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td>18:36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12:46</td>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:58</td>
<td></td>
<td>Salinas</td>
<td>18:45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15:13</td>
<td>Soledad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:20</td>
<td>Mid-day</td>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
<td>15:43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grover Beach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:17</td>
<td></td>
<td>Guadalupe</td>
<td>17:48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:28</td>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>19:55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:38</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cerritos</td>
<td>21:23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:05</td>
<td></td>
<td>Moorpark</td>
<td>22:45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:00</td>
<td>Early Evening</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>06:50</td>
<td>Morning 10:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:10</td>
<td></td>
<td>LAX</td>
<td>08:45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06:30</td>
<td></td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>06:10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prepared for the Coast Rail Coordinating Council

Transportation Agency for Monterey County
San Luis Obispo Council of Governments
Santa Barbara County Association of Governments
Ventura County Transportation Commission
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Caltrans Rail Program and Amtrak

For further information, please contact:

Coast Rail Coordinating Council
1150 Osos Street, Suite 202
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401
Tel: 805-781-5712
http://coastrailplan.slocog.org

Caltrans Photo by Don Sims
What is Proposed?
Begin daily operation of new state-sponsored Amtrak service along the Coast Route between downtown Los Angeles and downtown San Francisco.

- Estimated annual ridership is 216,000 passengers.
- Projected annual operating cost is $12 million.
- Projected annual revenue (first year) is $7 million.
- Initial travel time is about 11 hours. (To be incrementally improved to 8 hours.)
- Trains to depart at approximately 8:00 a.m., arrive at approximately 7:00 p.m.
- Train will serve principal communities along the route (see map at left), with connections to Caltrain, Capitol Corridor, Surfliner Corridor, Merrolink, and Amtrak long distance trains.
- Estimated fares to be 5-10% less than the Coast Starlight. (Up to about $60 San Francisco to Los Angeles and $40 San Francisco to San Luis Obispo.)
- The Coast Daylight will offer food service.
- Service initiation is subject to 1) acquisition of equipment, 2) negotiation with railroads, and 3) securing state operating funds.

Why is it justified?
To close a gap in existing train services and increase statewide mobility.
State supported Capital Corridor trains reach south to San Jose, and Surfliner trains go north to San Luis Obispo. Amtrak's Coast Starlight train on the Coast Route is the only through service, and it operates at capacity during summer and holiday travel periods. At present, there is no intercity rail service to and from San Francisco. The Coast Route between Los Angeles and San Jose sees only one round trip per day.

To serve travel demand between Los Angeles and San Francisco.
The new Coast Daylight will directly serve cities in San Mateo County and downtown San Francisco (at 4th and Townsend Streets) for the first time since 1971. It will expand intercity travel options along the Central Coast.

To directly benefit millions of Californians living in counties that will be served by the new train.

To provide transportation alternatives.
The Coast Daylight will provide an affordable, comfortable transportation alternative to limited and expensive air service and congested freeways.

To enhance travel options for tourists to see and visit scenic Central Coast attractions.
Citizens, local governments, and regional transportation agencies support the Coast Daylight. Caltrans has included the Coast Daylight in its Passenger Rail Program Report, and Amtrak has incorporated the service into its strategic plan for improving California's rail corridors.

What are the benefits?
Increased travel choices for local, regional, and interregional travel.
Rail transportation provides an alternative to highway and air travel.

Point-to-point connections from downtown to downtown of the two premier cities in the state.
Connecting San Francisco and Los Angeles along the scenic coastal route will serve business, family, vacation, and visitor travelers.

Enhanced Goods Movement and economic development at stations along the route.
Environmentally sound transportation serving a variety of travel markets and transportation needs.

March 2007
Coast Rail Coordinating Council

Proposed Meeting Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY MEETING</th>
<th>Thursday, January 10, 2013</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>Monterey (Portola Inn) 11:00-12:30pm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TECHNICAL MEETING</td>
<td>Friday, March 15, 2013</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>San Luis Obispo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY MEETING</td>
<td>Friday May 17, 2013</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECHNICAL MEETING</td>
<td>Friday, August 23, 2013</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>San Francisco/Oakland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY MEETING</td>
<td>Friday October 18, 2013</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>Soledad or San Jose</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional meeting(s) may be added subject to need.

Notes:

1) Most meeting are normally scheduled for the 3rd or 4th Friday of the month, if significant conflicts occur, it is rescheduled.
2) Meetings occur every 2-3 months alternating between the Policy Committee and Technical Committee
3) Meetings will be canceled one month in advance as necessary
4) Biennial Joint Meeting with LOSSAN Board (even numbered years)
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
THREE MONTH MEETING SCHEDULE

January 2013
Through
March 2013

All meetings are subject to cancellation when there are no action items to be considered by
the board or committee
Please visit our website for meeting agendas and locations
www.sccrtc.org/meetings/

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Meeting Day</th>
<th>Meeting Type</th>
<th>Meeting Time</th>
<th>Meeting Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/24/13</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Commission</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Watsonville City Council Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Note Location Change and Special Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/7/13</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Commission</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Santa Cruz City Council Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Note Location Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/11/13</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Bicycle Committee</td>
<td>6:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/12/13</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Elderly &amp; Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/14/13</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Budget &amp; Administration/Personnel Committee</td>
<td>3:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/21/13</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Transportation Policy Workshop</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/21/13</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Interagency Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/7/13</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Commission</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>County Board of Supervisors Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/11/13</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Bicycle Committee</td>
<td>Canceled</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/21/13</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Transportation Policy Workshop</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/21/13</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Interagency Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commission Offices - 1523 Pacific Ave - Santa Cruz, CA
Board of Supervisors Chambers/CAO/RDA Conference room - 701 Ocean St, 5th floor - Santa Cruz, CA
City of Capitola - Council Chambers - 420 Capitola Ave - Capitola, CA
City of Santa Cruz - Council Chambers - 809 Center St - Santa Cruz, CA
City of Scotts Valley - Council Chamber - 1 Civic Center Dr - Scotts Valley, CA
City of Watsonville - Council Chambers - 275 Main St Ste 400 - Watsonville, CA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Letter Rec'd/Sent</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Incoming/Outgoing</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>TO First</th>
<th>TO Last</th>
<th>TO Organization</th>
<th>FROM First</th>
<th>FROM Last</th>
<th>FROM Organization</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/13/12</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Phil Wowak</td>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Trespass Arrest Authorization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/20/12</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>11/20/12</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>John Thompson</td>
<td>MBSSTN</td>
<td>Draft Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/21/12</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td>11/21/12</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Melinda McEvoy</td>
<td>Highway 1</td>
<td>Soquel/Morrissey</td>
<td>Auxiliary Lanes Update</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/22/12</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>11/22/12</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Gary Harrold</td>
<td>Bicycle Safety Along the Bike-Pedestrian-Rail Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/23/12</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>11/23/12</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Patti U</td>
<td>Monterey Bay Trail Suggestions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/27/12</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>11/27/12</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Kandra Lippert</td>
<td>MBSSTN Workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/27/12</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>11/27/12</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Kandra Lippert</td>
<td>S.C. Railway/Bike/Walk Path</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec’d/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>TO First</td>
<td>TO Last</td>
<td>TO Organization</td>
<td>FROM First</td>
<td>FROM Last</td>
<td>FROM Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/27/12</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CC 11/27/12</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Gloria</td>
<td>Wells</td>
<td>MBSSTN Draft Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/28/12</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ 11/28/12</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Valerie</td>
<td>Egland</td>
<td>MBSSTN Draft Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/28/13</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>LM 11/28/12</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Hopper</td>
<td>Railroad Bridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/28/13</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ 11/28/12</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>Bosworth</td>
<td>MBSSTN Draft Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/28/12</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CC 11/28/12</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Geddes</td>
<td>MBSSTN Draft Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/30/12</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Sigrid</td>
<td>McLaughlin</td>
<td>MBSSTN Draft Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/30/13</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>C. Garth Scott</td>
<td>Hopkins</td>
<td>Eades</td>
<td>Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Rural Planning Assistance (RPS) and Consolidated Planning Grant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec’d/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/30/12</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>Jed</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td></td>
<td>Park Avenue Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/02/12</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>Curt</td>
<td>Coleman</td>
<td></td>
<td>MBSSTN Draft Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/02/12</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>KP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>Barry</td>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td></td>
<td>Train to Christmastown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/03/12</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Ledoux</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tourist Train</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/03/12</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>Walter</td>
<td>Heady</td>
<td></td>
<td>MBSSTN Draft Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/04/12</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Geddes</td>
<td></td>
<td>MBSSTN Draft Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/04/12</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>Carl</td>
<td></td>
<td>MBSSTN Draft Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec'd/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>TO First</td>
<td>TO Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>FROM First</td>
<td>FROM Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/05/12</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Land Trust of Santa Cruz County</td>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>Largay</td>
<td>MBSSTN Draft Master Plan</td>
<td>Draft Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/05/12</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Land Trust of Santa Cruz County</td>
<td>Dr. Stephen</td>
<td>Hynes</td>
<td>MBSSTN Draft Master Plan</td>
<td>Draft Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/05/12</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Land Trust of Santa Cruz County</td>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>Largay</td>
<td>MBSSTN Draft Master Plan</td>
<td>Draft Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/05/12</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seacliff Improvement Association</td>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>Downing</td>
<td>MBSSTN Draft Master Plan</td>
<td>Draft Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/06/12</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MBSSTN Draft Master Plan</td>
<td>Jerry</td>
<td>Finney</td>
<td>MBSSTN Draft Master Plan</td>
<td>Draft Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/07/12</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Charlene R</td>
<td>Palmer</td>
<td>JL Patterson &amp; Associates, Inc.</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Amendment 1 to Contract for Engineering Services for Improvements to the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/07/12</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>KP</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Highway 1 Soquel/Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes Update</td>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>Giberson</td>
<td>MBSSTN Draft Master Plan</td>
<td>Draft Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec'd/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>TO First</td>
<td>TO Last</td>
<td>TO Organization</td>
<td>FROM First</td>
<td>FROM Last</td>
<td>FROM Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/08/12</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Peoples</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MBSSTN Draft Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/10/12</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Crystal</td>
<td>Presley-Willis</td>
<td>California Energy Commission</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Program Opportunity Notice 12-502 Funding Proposal Monterey Regional Waste Management District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/10/12</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>LR</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Alexandra</td>
<td>Sanders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Train</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/10/12</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Marty</td>
<td>Schrank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tourist Train</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/11/12</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>KP</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Melinda</td>
<td>McEvoy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Highway 1 Soquel/Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes Update</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/11/12</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>Graham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Volunteer Opportunity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/12/12</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Gail</td>
<td>Pellerin</td>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>A. John</td>
<td>Daugherty</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>Accessibility of Polling Places</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec’d/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>TO First</td>
<td>TO Last</td>
<td>TO Organization</td>
<td>FROM First</td>
<td>FROM Last</td>
<td>FROM Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/12/12</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>KP</td>
<td>Andy</td>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CA2</td>
<td>Rail Corridor Improvements Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/12/12</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>Dale</td>
<td>Barnhart</td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HP Communications</td>
<td>Encroachment Permit Railroad Crossing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/14/12</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>KP</td>
<td>Barry</td>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Train to Christmastown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/14/12</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>Connie</td>
<td>Gabriel Wilson</td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MBSSTN Draft Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/15/13</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Duazo</td>
<td>Caltrans, District 5</td>
<td>Luis Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Invoice #11 Bond - corridor Mobility Improvement (CMI) and STIP/RIP Funds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/17/12</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>Department of Transportation</td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Certification of 2012 City of Watsonville Trails and Bicycle Master Plan (Contained Within the Urban Greening Plan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/17/12</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>Amelia</td>
<td>Conlen</td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MBSSTN Draft Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec’d/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>TO First</td>
<td>TO Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>FROM First</td>
<td>FROM Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/17/12</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>12/17/12</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Schoellhamer</td>
<td>MBSSTN Draft Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/18/12</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>12/18/12</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Wichelmann</td>
<td>MBSSTN Draft Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/18/12</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>JL</td>
<td>12/18/12</td>
<td>JL</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Linda G.</td>
<td>McIntyre</td>
<td>Moss Landing Harbor District</td>
<td>MBSSTN Draft Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/18/12</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>12/18/12</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>Sawhill</td>
<td>MBSSTN Draft Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/18/12</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>12/18/12</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Heather</td>
<td>Adamson</td>
<td>AMBAG</td>
<td>MBSSTN Draft Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/18/12</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>JL</td>
<td>12/19/12</td>
<td>JL</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Kimlin</td>
<td>McDaniel Keith</td>
<td>MBSSTN Draft Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/18/12</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>12/18/12</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Cynthia</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>MBSSTN Draft Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec'd/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/18/12 Email I</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>KP 12/20/12</td>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Kinst</td>
<td>Train to Christmastown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/18/12 Email I</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>CJ 12/18/12</td>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>Norton</td>
<td>MBSSTN Draft Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/18/12 Email I</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>KP 12/18/12</td>
<td>Ronald L</td>
<td>Perrigo</td>
<td>Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line Right-of-Way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/18/12 Email I</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>CJ 12/18/12</td>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>Byron</td>
<td>MBSSTN Draft Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/19/12 Email I</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>CJ 12/19/12</td>
<td>Marty</td>
<td>Ackerman</td>
<td>MBSSTN Draft Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/19/12 Email I</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>CC 12/19/12</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Pearlman</td>
<td>MBSSTN Draft Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/19/12 Email I</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>KP 12/20/12</td>
<td>Ron</td>
<td>Marquez</td>
<td>Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Correspondence Log
### January 24, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Letter Rec'd/Sent</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Incoming/Outgoing</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Last</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Last</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/19/12</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>12/20/12</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Wilshusen</td>
<td>MBSSTN Draft Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/19/12</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>12/19/12</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Gina</td>
<td>Bliss</td>
<td>MBSSTN Draft Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/19/12</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>KP</td>
<td>12/20/12</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Lash</td>
<td>La Fonda Bridge Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/19/12</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>12/19/12</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Laura Jean</td>
<td>Kasa</td>
<td>Save Our Shores</td>
<td>MBSSTN Draft Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/19/12</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>12/19/12</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>MBSSTN Draft Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/20/12</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>12/20/12</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Cruz County Farm Bureau</td>
<td>MBSSTN Draft Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/20/12</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>JL</td>
<td>12/21/12</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>Barrett Heffington</td>
<td>MBSSTN Draft Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Copyright © 2013.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Letter Rec'd/Sent</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Incoming/Outgoing</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Last</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Last</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/20/12</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>JL</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Ketley</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>City of Watsonville</td>
<td>MBSSTN Draft Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/20/12</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>JL</td>
<td>Suzanne</td>
<td>Haberman</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>MBSSTN Draft Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/20/12</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>JL</td>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Geddes</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>MBSSTN Draft Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/20/12</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>JL</td>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>Pirie</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>MBSSTN Draft Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/20/12</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>JL</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Nockleby</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary</td>
<td>MBSSTN Draft Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/21/12</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>JL</td>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary</td>
<td>MBSSTN Draft Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/21/12</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>JL</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Michel</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary</td>
<td>MBSSTN Draft Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec'd/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>TO First</td>
<td>TO Last</td>
<td>FROM Organization</td>
<td>FROM First</td>
<td>FROM Last</td>
<td>FROM Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/21/12</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>JL 12/21/12</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Underwood</td>
<td>MBSSTN Draft Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/21/12</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>JL 12/21/12</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Bruce &amp; Concepcion</td>
<td>Duncan Munoz</td>
<td>MBSSTN Draft Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/21/12</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>JL 12/21/12</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>John D</td>
<td>Akerman</td>
<td>MBSSTN Draft Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/21/12</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>JL 12/21/12</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Theresia</td>
<td>Rogerson</td>
<td>MBSSTN Draft Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/21/12</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>JL 12/21/12</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Hal H</td>
<td>Bolen</td>
<td>MBSSTN Draft Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/21/12</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>JL 12/21/12</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Judy</td>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>Law Offices of Timothy J. Morgan</td>
<td>MBSSTN Draft Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/21/12</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>JL 12/21/12</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Otter</td>
<td>California Coastal Commission</td>
<td>MBSSTN Draft Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec’d/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>TO First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>FROM First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/21/12</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>JL 12/21/12</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Pearman</td>
<td>Sanctuary Inter-Agency Task Force</td>
<td>MBSSSTN Draft Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/21/12</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>JL 12/21/12</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Bike Map/License</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/08/13</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Maura Twomey</td>
<td>AMBAG</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>FY2012/13 Invoice #2 - Partial First Quarter CMAQ Invoice for Indirect Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/08/13</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Mark McCumsey</td>
<td>Caltrans, District 5</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Contract No. 74A0141 Monterey Bay Area Travel Information System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/08/13</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Rachel Zack</td>
<td>MTC</td>
<td>Ginger</td>
<td>Dykaar</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Safe on 17 Invoice: July 1, 2012 - September 30, 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/09/13</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Mark McCumsey</td>
<td>Caltrans, District 5</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Invoice #1 for the Rural Planning Assistance Funds (State Highway Account)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec’d/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/11/13</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>McCumsey</td>
<td></td>
<td>Caltrans, District 5</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Invoice #3 for the Transit Planning Intern Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/13/13</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Patterson</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
December 17, 2012

Deborah Lynch
Bicycle Transportation Account Coordinator
Office of Special & Discretionary Programs
Division of Local Assistance, Caltrans
1227 "O" Street, Veteran's Building, 5th Floor, MS #83
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Certification of 2012 City of Watsonville Trails and Bicycle Master Plan (contained within the Urban Greening Plan)

Dear Ms. Lynch:

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission’s (RTC) Bicycle Committee received the 2012 City of Watsonville Trails and Bicycle Master Plan (see Section 4 of the Urban Greenways Plan) on August 13, 2012 and offered feedback. Additionally, RTC staff provided detailed review. All comments were considered in the production of the final plan.

The RTC hereby certifies the 2012 City of Watsonville Trails and Bicycle Master Plan (contained in the Urban Greening Plan) after finding it to be in compliance with Section 891.2 of the California Streets and Highways Code of the Bicycle Transportation Act. Attached you will also find the City of Watsonville resolution adopting the plan.

RTC staff finds the City of Watsonville Trails and Bicycle Master Plan to be a comprehensive planning document that proposes multiple strategies and projects for moving the City to achieve a balanced transportation mode split. If you have any questions, please contact me at (831) 460-3201.

Sincerely,

Cory Caletti
Senior Transportation Planner/Bicycle Coordinator

Encl.

cc: Bob Geyer, City of Watsonville
    Maria Rodriguez, City of Watsonville
    Regional Transportation Commission
    Regional Transportation Commission' Bicycle Committee
RESOLUTION NO. 142-12 (CM)


BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WATSONVILLE, CALIFORNIA, AS FOLLOWS:

That the City of Watsonville Urban Greening Plan-September 2012, the City of Watsonville Trails and Bicycle Master Plan for the Watsonville Scenic Trail Network Element-November 2012 and the Habitat Restoration & Enhancement for Trail Corridors Element, a copy of which is on file in the Office of the City Clerk, is hereby accepted and approved.
The foregoing resolution was introduced at a regular meeting of the Council of the City of Watsonville, held on the 13th day of November, 2012, by Member Dodge, who moved its adoption, which motion being duly seconded by Member Hurst, was upon roll call carried and the resolution adopted by the following vote:

AYES: COUNCIL MEMBERS: Billicich, Dodge, Hernandez, Hurst, Montesino

NOES: COUNCIL MEMBERS: None

ABSENT: COUNCIL MEMBERS: Martinez, Rios

Eduardo Montesino, Mayor

ATTEST:

City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

City Attorney
January 14, 2013

Christopher J. Murphy, Director
Office of Traffic Safety
2208 Kausen Drive, Ste. 300
Elk Grove, CA 95758-7115

RE: Letter of Support for the County of Santa Cruz Health Services Agency 2014 OTS grant

Dear Mr. Murphy:

On behalf of the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission’s Bicycle Committee, I wish to extend our support to the Santa Cruz County Health Services Agency (HSA) in their application for the FFY 2014 Office of Traffic Safety grant proposal **End Distracted Driving: Traffic Safety Education Project**. These funds will be utilized to support our collaborative efforts to improve traffic safety and reduce distracted and impaired driving and the consequences associated, including injuries and fatalities to bicyclists in Santa Cruz County.

The Regional Transportation Commission’s Bicycle Committee serves to assist in the development and maintenance of a complete, convenient and safe regional bicycle and pedestrian network. Such a network increases the opportunity and attractiveness of bicycle and pedestrian trips for transportation purposes. The HSA grant complements the Bicycle Committee’s goals by providing enhanced safety awareness and education resulting in increased and safer bicycle trips. The RTC also provides direct funding to the HSA’s ‘Ride ’n Stride Program, the Community Traffic Safety Coalition, and the coalition’s South County Bicycle and Pedestrian Work Group to address community wide bicycle and pedestrian safety education and inter-jurisdictional collaboration on traffic safety needs.

Please feel free to contact the Regional Transportation Commission’s Bicycle Coordinator and staff to the Bicycle Committee, Cory Caletti at (831) 460-3201 or by email at ccaletti@scrtc.org, for this and any other Bicycle Committee related matters.

Sincerely,

David Casterson
Chair, RTC Bicycle Committee

cc: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
    Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission’s Bicycle Committee
Cory,

It appears that the City of Capitola will be moving forward with the Park Ave sidewalk project in the summer of 2013. Is it at all possible or has it been looked at to combine both the Park Ave Sidewalk project and RTC plan for that area? It seems like it would be a great start to making sure funds were utilized in the most efficient manner.

Jed Wilson (Jakes Buddy)
530-356-2005

******************************************************************************

Hello Jed: Please accept my apologies for the delayed reply.

We have not consulted with the City of Capitola about coordinating projects since planning for the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network has not yet concluded, nor has the RTC determined which segments will be constructed first. Having said that, coordination is always very important and something we consider, especially when cost savings can be realized as a result.

See you on the next ride, Cory

Cory Caletti, Senior Transportation Planner
Regional Transportation Commission
831.460.3201
From: Jan Ledoux [mailto:janfun002@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, December 03, 2012 6:42 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Cc: CAM-GMAIL Mons
Subject: What is the schedule and cost per ticket for the new train that comes through Santa Cruz

To: Luis Mendez

My family would like to take a train ride on the new train that goes from Watsonville to Davenport.

I have looked on the web and found numerous links to the grand opening (November 17th) and a link to the Regional Transportation Commission but I have not found any links to the train schedule or to cost per ticket.

Is the train open to the public at this time? If so, please provide a link that provides the schedule, the train stops, and the cost per ticket.

Thanks. Jan

*********************************************************

12/12/12

Dear Jan Ledoux,

Your request for passenger train service information was received. Currently there are no plans for passenger train service between Watsonville and Santa Cruz. Before passenger train service can be implemented from Watsonville to Santa Cruz, the track must be upgraded and funding is not currently available for that work.

Best regards,


Cathy Judd, Administrative Assistant
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Santa Cruz 831.460.3200 | Watsonville 831.768.8012
1523 Pacific Avenue | Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Follow our social networks for the latest RTC news
From: Marty Schrank [mailto:martyfixit@earthlink.net]  
Sent: Monday, December 10, 2012 4:23 PM  
To: General Info  
Subject: Re: Railway

Thanks for responding,

Where does the train go? Couldn’t find any info on web site. Maybe it doesn’t go anywhere. I’m interested in riding the train from Watsonville to S.C. Boardwalk and beyond, up to Davenport if possible. Don’t really care about the Christmas Town experience.

Thanks,

Marty

******************************************************************************

Dear Marty,

Your request for passenger train service information was received. Currently there are no plans for passenger train service between Watsonville and Santa Cruz. Before passenger train service can be implemented from Watsonville to Santa Cruz, the track must be upgraded and funding is not currently available for that work.

Best regards,

Cathy Judd, Administrative Assistant  
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission  
Santa Cruz 831.460.3200 | Watsonville 831.768.8012  
1523 Pacific Avenue | Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Follow our social networks for the latest RTC news

******************************************************************************

From: Marty Schrank [mailto:martyfixit@earthlink.net]  
Sent: Saturday, December 08, 2012 6:15 PM  
To: info@sccrtc.org  
Subject: Railway

I couldn’t find out on the website when or how we can buy tickets and ride. Please send Info link.

Thanks,

Marty

******************************************************************************

on 12/10/12 8:05 AM, General Info at info@sccrtc.org wrote:

Dear Marty,

I hope that I am not mistaken and what you are requesting is information about the Train to Christmastown. If so, you can log on to www.traintochristmastown.com <http://www.traintochristmastown.com> for ride times and booking information or you can call the Iowa Pacific reservation office at 877 726 7245.

Best regards,

Cathy Judd, Administrative Assistant  
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission  
Santa Cruz 831.460.3200 | Watsonville 831.768.8012  
1523 Pacific Avenue | Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Follow our social networks for the latest RTC news
From: Barry Phillips [mailto: t]
Sent: Friday, December 14, 2012 10:19 AM
To: Karena Pushnik
Cc: Martin Bernal; David Terrazas; Don Lane; Hilary Bryant; Katherine Beiers; Lynn Robinson; Ryan Coonerty
Subject: Re: Train to Christmas Town? (resending with all CCd this time)

Hi Karen,

Thank you for the email response.

Please respond to one more question if you would.
Did the RTC understand the noise issue fully? If yes or no, please explain. I do get the feeling some are surprised by the level and frequency.

As I have been researching info on the train since the horn began, I finally found the RTC website, and that the train was approved by the RTC and the meetings are open, but I'm sure you realize that most (I will guess nearly 100%) of the public is unaware of these meetings and simply working and unable to attend if they did, and IF they could have attended, and IF they knew of the coming noise pollution they would have fought. In my view, there simply was no fight because we the public did not know of the impact of this train horn.

I spoke with Amy Helstrup of Iowa Pacific and there is, in the long run, no such "marked decrease" in train/horn activity she could speak to - it could in fact be an increase in train and horn activity starting in the spring. We are at 5 days a week now, it will drop as you say but only until the Spring, but then it's back and it is unknown at what frequency according to Amy and that means they can run it continually if they want to - 7 days a week if they want.

Karen, this train was "approved" but the public did not approve it as they did not know about it, and the few in the public may not have known what they were getting into.

I am taking about a lot of "what ifs" and such, but here's the bottom line - this train is forcing me to sell my house and leave my business that I have grown here for over 20 years. I am extremely upset about this! You would be too if it happened to you. I am in a way fighting for my life here.

Obviously, decisions have been made, a lot of people are outraged and lives are turned upside down. I'll be at future meetings until I lose my house and have to move. I rather hate to think there are people in the train organization just waiting for people like me to leave, so that the aggressor can prevail under the cloak of "approval".

Thank you,

Barry Phillips
112 Plateau Avenus
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
barryp@got.net
831-331-1069
Barry Phillips—
Your response will be made available to the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) for their consideration.

In 1990 a majority of the voters in the state of California along with a majority of the voters in Santa Cruz County approved Proposition 116, which made $11 million available to Santa Cruz County for passenger rail projects. Since then, the RTC has been working on behalf of the Santa Cruz County community to implement that voter decision. Since then there have been many public meetings of the RTC and RTC committees including some evening meetings to discuss purchase of the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line and rail projects on the rail line, which has been in continuous operation for over 130 years. There have also been many newspaper articles, editorials and letters to the editor during that time.

Increased noise, due to additional train service on the rail line did come up as a concern for some members of the community. However, even with such concern there has been significant support from the community for public purchase of the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line for increased transportation uses.

The last day of the currently operating seasonal train service will be December 23.

Thank you.

. . . . . . .
Karena Pushnik
RTC | 831.460.3210

***********************************************

-----Original Message-----
From: Barry Phillips [mailto:barryp@got.net]
Sent: Sunday, December 02, 2012 8:05 PM
To: City Council
Subject: Train to Christmas Town?

Dear Santa Cruz City Council,

I would like to learn all I can about this new train and how it came to Santa Cruz - do they pay the City a fee? - how did this come about?

Primarily, I am writing you to be sure the City knows there is a problem with this new train for many many people on the Westside.

Here's the way I see it - We have a wonderful Christmas train in Santa Cruz (Roaring Camp) - it has a small town feel, low noise impact - it's sweet and it is already here, already providing a great holiday train ride if that's what you are looking for.

Suddenly (as far as I knew) an industrial freight train is blowing it's horn very very loudly, unrelentingly all across the Westside for 6 or 7 hours a day on the weekends. My dB meter peaks at 102dB and both the horn they used last week and the new one this week peaked the meter. I have no idea how much over 102dB the horn is (I wish I had a better meter - sorry about that).

Who are they?
The website they run has a phone number for tickets and a phone number for public relations.
I have finally, through a long Google search found they are from the Chicago area.
What service do they provide?
Not only nothing that we don't already have, but they are driving many Westside residents up a wall with the horn that is extremely loud and is relentlessly used.

They sell their book and charge for the train that I'm sure make some people happy, but also upsets the neighborhood. It sort of seems to me that they are a business that is taking Santa Cruz money out of Santa Cruz and leaving a noise harassed neighborhood.

Did they need "permission to run the train?"
Did the City "approve" them?
What was involved for them to be able to run this business?

Everyone I have mentioned the train to (including two police officers I spoke with during noise complaints I called in) are upset by the train noise. One officer's child was woken up from a nap by the horn, and other just said "I'm with you on this train thing".

There has been a back and forth on the trains facebook page, first with the trains spokesperson saying the horn's loudness and frequency is federal regulation.

My wife Shelley Phillips did some research and found that it is a regulation at the streets with "crossings" (Almar and Fair Streets), but the others are not clearly indicated in the regulation. We believe they do not need to sound the horn at streets without a "crossing" (the arms that come down across the road).

The trains spokesperson states that horn loudness need be between 96dB and 106dB. I believe they may be over 106.

From my point of view, even if they bring it down to 96dB, even if they somehow blow the horn a little less often, it is still a disruption of our neighborhood. The noise they bring to our quiet town is not acceptable to me. It's not acceptable to many people. To be quite direct about what I want to know is, please tell me why it is acceptable to the City of Santa Cruz.

What is the City's position on this new train?

Sincerely,

Barry Phillips
112 Plateau Ave.
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
(cell)831-331-1069

On Dec 14, 2012, at 9:17 AM, Karena Pushnik wrote:

Barry Phillips –
Your email to the Santa Cruz City Council was forwarded to the Regional Transportation Commission for responses to your questions.

- The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC), on behalf of the community, has been working for more than a decade to acquire ownership of the 32-mile, 135-year old rail corridor to pursue a range of transportation options within the corridor including freight and passenger rail service, and a bicycle/pedestrian path (adjacent to the operating rail service). For more information about the rail corridor acquisition and due diligence, please see this page of the RTC website: http://sccrtc.org/projects/rail/

- Membership of the RTC includes representatives from each of the five supervisorial districts, each of the four cities and the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District. The current board,
includes three representatives from your area. For a current list of board members, please see this page of the RTC website: http://sccrtc.org/about/commission-members/

- Iowa Pacific, doing business locally as the Santa Cruz and Monterey Bay Railway, was selected from a field of five proposers as the local train operator for freight and passenger rail service. Although the company is based in Chicago, they hired over 80 local people and purchased local goods for this seasonal and other train services. They have successful experience preserving small branch rail lines and operating integrated freight and passenger rail services in many other areas.

- As in the agreement between Iowa Pacific/Santa Cruz & Monterey Bay Railway and the RTC, plans for passenger rail service are approved by the RTC. The seasonal train service was approved by the RTC at their September 20, 2012 meeting. All RTC meetings are noticed and open to the public. Roaring Camp attended this meeting and supported the new seasonal train service.

- Federal regulations require that trains use their horn for safety purposes. Stiff penalties are assessed to railroads and their individual employees for violations. As you stated, federal regulations dictate that the train horn must sound at each crossing and be between 96 and 110 decibels at 100 feet in front of the locomotive. The federal regulations make no distinction between crossings protected by active warning systems (lights, bells, and gates) and passive protection devices (signs and pavement lane marking). These nation-wide regulations, developed over 8 years in response to a 1988 law passed by Congress, provide railroads with no options other than closing streets or implementing quiet zones, which have a different set risks, noise issues and are generally cost prohibitive. Part of the challenge of the neighborhoods between Bay Avenue and Almar is that there are many crossings in a short space.

- Rail traffic frequencies between Bay and Almar will decrease markedly after the Holiday period.

Thank you for your comments.

Karena Pushnik
RTC | 831.460.3210
Dear SCCRTC,

Along with many other residents I was dismayed by the very large, very noisy train that went by during the "grand opening" celebration. The sheer size of it (much larger than the freight trains) looming over our backyard, the noise, the horn, the shaking of the house - not to mention the fact that the windows were eye level with our bedroom window - was enough to cause me to be very skeptical about the care that has been taken in thinking through the impact of this "rail trail." Was this even included in the environmental impact report?

I have been completely behind the hike and bike trail but if it is going to be supported by or include a passenger train I’ll fight it every step of the way. I have been in touch with Dennis Norton and will continue to be a voice for sanity and good planning when it comes to this endeavor.

So put that in your pipe and smoke it.

Judith Kinst, Capitola

12/20/12

From: Karena Pushnik
Sent: Thursday, December 20, 2012 3:15 PM
To: 'Daijaku@aol.com'
Subject: FW: Kinst,J - Rail and Trail Comments -

Hello Judith Kinst –

Your comments regarding the rail line were received and will be made available for the Regional Transportation Commission for their consideration.

- The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC), on behalf of the community, has been working for more than a decade to acquire ownership of the 32-mile, 135-year old rail corridor to pursue a range of transportation options within the corridor including freight and passenger rail service, and a bicycle/pedestrian path (adjacent to the operating rail service). For more information about the rail corridor acquisition and due diligence, please see this page of the RTC website: http://scrtc.org/projects/rail/

- Membership of the RTC includes representatives from each of the five supervisory districts, each of the four cities and the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District. The current board, includes three representatives from your area. For a current list of board members, please see this page of the RTC website: http://scrtc.org/about/commission-members/

- As in the agreement between Iowa Pacific/Santa Cruz & Monterey Bay Railway and the RTC, plans for passenger rail service are approved by the RTC. All RTC meetings are noticed and open to the public.

- A draft Master Plan for the bicycle and pedestrian path is available for review and can be found on the RTC website: http://scrtc.org/projects/multi-modal/monterey-bay-sanctuary-scenic-trail/mbsst-master-plan/. Comments are due by Friday, December 21, 2012.

Thank you.

Karena Pushnik, Senior Planner/Public Information Coordinator
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Santa Cruz Office (main) 831.460.3210 | Watsonville 831.768.8012
1523 Pacific Avenue | Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Follow our social networks for the latest RTC news
Your comments on the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network (and rail trail) were received and have been forwarded to Cory Caletti, Project Manager. Consideration of your comments regarding interface between the trail and rail service will be considered the development of Draft Environmental Impact Report. The Draft EIR will be released in Spring of next year.

Please note that the deadline for comment on the Trail Network Draft Master Plan is today. The project website at http://sccrtc.org/projects/multi-modal/monterey-bay-sanctuary-scenic-trail/ contains for information about this project as well as the link to the Draft Plan document. You may also visit the RTC general website at www.sccrtc.org for information about the Commission’s other activities.

Thank you.

Jason Laning, Administrative Assistant
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Avenue | Santa Cruz, CA 95060
Main Office 831.460.3200 | Watsonville 831.768.8012
Direct 831.460.3206

Follow our social networks for the latest RTC news
This Contact Request Form has been submitted by a member of the public to http://sccrtc.org/contact-us/.

Name
RONALD L JR PERRIGO

Email
rperrigojr@gmail.com

Subject
RTC RIGHT OF WAY, MESSAGE TO MR. DONEDRO

Your Message

MR. DONEDRO, I APPRECIATED EVERYTHING YOU HAD TO SAY LAST NIGHT, AT THE CITY PUBLIC SAFETY COMMISSION MEETING. THE TRESPASS LETTER IN MY BELIEF, IS A MAJOR STEP IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION. I WOULD STRONGLY URGE RTC TO MOVE QUICKLY, TO CUT DOWN EXCESSIVE VEGETATION ALONG YOUR RAILROAD RIGHT OF WAY, THAT HARBOR ILLEGAL CAMPS, AND DANGEROUS BEHAVIOR, INCLUDING ILLEGAL DRUG USE, THAT DIRECTLY AFFECTS NEIGHBORHOODS, AND THE GENERAL PUBLIC. I THINK A POLICY THAT MIRRORS THAT OF THE CLASS A RAILROADS, A NO TOLERANCE POLICY OF ILLEGAL BEHAVIOR, INCLUDING TRESPASSING, IS EXTREMELY WISE, AND MAY ALSO SAVE LIVES. NOTABLY, A COUPLE OF SPOTS COME TO MIND, THE ALMAR AVENUE CROSSING NEAR FAIR, AND THE BOARDWALK TRESTLE APPROACH, CLOSEST TO THE SOUTH END OF MOUNTAIN VIEW AVENUE, BOTH IN SANTA CRUZ.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME.

**********************************************************************************************************

RONALD L JR PERRIGO –

Your comments regarding the railroad right of way were received and will be made available to the Commission for their review.

In addition, by copy of this email we are forwarding your input about specific high crime locations within the rail right of way to the City of Santa Cruz Police Department, although I suspect that they are well aware of this activity. The RTC is looking at a number of ways to maintain the 32-mile property, including the use of volunteers through citizen’s advocacy groups such as the Friends of the Rail & Trail or something similar to an adopt-a-highway program. In situations where major vegetation or tree removal is needed, the RTC will need to prioritize high-crime areas for contract trimming and/or removal.

Please visit the SCCRTC website at www.sccrtc.org for information on the Commission and its activities. For information specific to our rail projects, please visit www.sccrtc.org/projects/rail.

Thank you.

--------------------------------------

Karena Pushnik, Senior Planner/Public Information Coordinator
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Santa Cruz Office (main) 831.460.3210 | Watsonville 831.768.8012
1523 Pacific Avenue | Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Follow our social networks for the latest RTC news
Hello,

My name is Jason Wielchmann and I grew up in Santa Cruz, am now a Firefighter/Paramedic in Santa Cruz, and a father of two. I have been very interested in the County being able to obtain the rights of the “Rail Corridor” through the county borders. I see this as a HUGE potential and opportunity for our community to support non motorized travel as well as an alternative means of public transit. My job has made me keenly aware of how incredibly dangerous it is to have pedestrians and bicyclists trying to share the roads with vehicles and the number of collisions seem to be only getting worse over the years. We advertise that we are a “Bike Destiny Region” and we do really have some beautiful terrain to offer for tourists but, safety is really questionable once you leave the mountains and enter the city streets! Here is my proposal for a “Safety First/ Multi-Use Trail” that will benefit ALL of our community as well as those who visit our cities!

1. Create a wide paved trail that will eventually run down the entire Coast from San Mateo to Monterey County. This has to be designated with great detail to make it “The Priority Passage” over motorists as it passes through the neighborhood streets. I see light signals with gates that come down as they do for trains with warning signs and blinking lights across the road and anything else that can establish a priority of non motorized traffic as it passes through these intersections. Major streets such as Seabright, 7th, 17th, 41st, etc should really emphasize the presence of the trail and motorists should “Know Clearly” that they are passing through sacred grounds. Those using the trail could push a button to safely close the street and proceed easily and confidently. Where traffic signals are present, such as Seabright, the rail trail should automatically be part of the timing of the intersection lights to streamline the movement of the trail users. I see a 12 foot wide trail between the Main Santa Cruz Wharf and Capitola Wharf with multiple lanes for a heavy flow of a variety of users. After that, maybe an 8 foot wide trail to continue on in both directions.

2. Now what about the train aspect. This one I really had to think about and I think I have the suggestion that would be the pride of the entire coast of California!

A Solar Powered Monorail System....

This would be an independent system from the street traffic being an elevated train and running freely over the top of streets. The trains would be quiet with no need for whistles or horns and move quickly and safely across the county. My vision is for there to be a duel track between the two Wharves and then switching to a single track as it extends to Aptos in the South and somewhere around Swift street to the North. These trains could carry about 50 passengers and perhaps a dozen bikes running East bound and West bound roughly every 30 minutes throughout the day and into the night. This system would benefit locals and tourist alike as we create a 21st century alternative means of public transit benefiting commuters, students, elderly and youth and families that want to get around the county without the use of their motorized vehicles. There could be daily, weekly, monthly and annual passes to fit every users individual needs. Stations could be built at Swift, Bay, Main Wharf, Seabright, 17th, 41st, Capitola Wharf, New Brighton and Sate Park. The trains would pass by each other with the duel track. The solar panels would run between the duel track that runs roughly six miles between the two wharves. These solar panels would provide a bit of a roofing as they span the recreation trail below and lights would safely illuminate the trail from the tracks above. The stations would provide ramps for the handicap and bike access below and also contain solar panels for extra power and roofs to sit under. The businesses and residents along the track would immediately benefit from their close proximity upping the value of their property with the flow of shoppers, diners, and desire to have access to this wonderful trail corridor. Less parking, less traffic, and conserving fuel are all benefits of having a flow of non motorized travel. The raised train would have beautiful views and quick access across town for all users. This would be something the County residents would be proud to support and here is the clincher.... Offer a “buy in plan” of varying amounts that the community could purchase to help pay for costs. A five thousand dollar donations could buy a personalized bench at one of the stations. A $2500 dollar donation could buy a 12 inch tile that could be personalized at
petroglyph to be used to create the floors at the train stations. A $1000 dollar donation could buy a 4 inch tile to be used in the walls of the trains station. I’m sure the public would be proud to be part of the history and get their tile or bench placed at the station of their choice as the monorail comes to life and is forever remembered for generations to enjoy.

The monorail in Disneyland was an Global icon over 50 years ago and a Solar Powered Monorail for public transport with its quiet and scenic ride would be something other communities would probably emulate as the trail continues towards its ultimate goal of running between Canada and Mexico. The solar panels and steel rail could be produced in California and installed with home state pride. The extra power generated from the solar panels could run city vehicles and run city office buildings further freeing up monies to be spent on the community and its environment. It’s a win–win situation that prioritizes the use of non combustion alternative fuels, inviting the world to enjoy traversing the coastline safely away from cars as well as enhancing the community it serves.

Thanks for your efforts and consideration.

Jason Wichelmann

******************************************************************************

Dear Jason Wichelmann,

Your comments on the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network Draft Master Plan were received and have been forwarded to Cory Caletti, Project Manager, for consideration in the development of the Final Master Plan. Your comments have also been forwarded to Luis Mendez, Rail Operations Program Manager/Deputy Director for consideration in planning for future services on the rail corridor.

Please visit the Trail Network project website at http://sccrtc.org/projects/multi-modal/monterey-bay-sanctuary-scenic-trail/ for information about this project, and the RTC general website at www.sccrtc.org for information about the Commission’s other activities.

Thank you.

-----------------------------------------

Cathy Judd, Administrative Assistant
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Santa Cruz 831.460.3200 | Watsonville 831.768.8012
1523 Pacific Avenue | Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Follow our social networks for the latest RTC news
Reflections on the Recent Local Tax Elections

By Eileen Goodwin

Apex Strategies

Everyone has heard the old adage: "If at first you don’t succeed try, try again." Do you know who coined it? The proverb has been traced back to "Teacher’s Manual" (1840) by American educator Thomas H. Palmer and is also found in "The Children of the New Forest" (1847) by English novelist Frederick Maryat. The original phrase is 'Tis a lesson you should heed, try, try again. If at first you don’t succeed, try, try again.'

W.C. Fields had his version too: "If at first you don’t succeed, try, try again. Then quit. No use being a damn fool about it."

Thankfully for the fields of engineering and surveying, as well as related industries, local agencies have not given up the quest to fund transportation programs through local sales tax measures. However, the results of this past November’s elections require us to take a closer look at whether continuing to try is a sign of acting like a damn fool.

There are currently 21 counties with transactions and use taxes for public transportation or transit in California. With the recent passage of a measure in Napa County, there are now 20 so-called "self-help counties," in which a local tax is used to fund long-term transportation improvement programs and projects. In addition, these local taxes allow these self-help counties to have the often-required "local match" to qualify for state and federal funds.

All but two of these countywide taxes are at the 1/2-percent rate. Sonoma County’s transportation tax is at the 1/4-percent rate and Los Angeles County voters have approved three 1/2 percent transportation sales taxes for a combined rate of 1.5 percent.

Since 1995, local voters have considered 47 countywide transportation sales tax measures. Twelve of the 47 were to extend existing transportation sales taxes; the remaining 35 involved a sales tax increase for a new countywide transportation or transit funding program.

From 1995 through the November 2012 election, 345 proposals for local transactions and use taxes have been submitted to the voters in California.

Special taxes, those earmarked for a specific purpose, require two-thirds voter approval. General tax proposals not linked to a specific purpose require only a majority vote for approval. Historically, special tax measures have been more common than general tax measures. However the proportion of general tax proposals has been
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significantly higher in recent years. Since 2008, 83 percent of proposals were submitted under the general purpose majority vote. In contrast, from 1995 through 2008, just 45 percent were general purpose.

Among the special taxes, the most common proposed specific use is for countywide transportation. Measures targeting libraries, police/fire services and city streets/roads (less than countywide) have also been common. Other uses have included waste collection and disposal, zoos, emergency medical services, flood control, jails and parks.

Prior to 2004, most special tax proposals were for countywide programs. Since then, citywide proposals are more common. Just 19 of the 70 proposals prior to 2004 were by cities. Since then, 72 percent have been from cities. This is changing the landscape, making it more challenging to time elections for transportation taxes so that they do not compete with other tax measures. There is also fear of tax fatigue, particularly for those counties who would be adding to the tax rate not just extending an existing tax.

The record of transportation sales tax elections demonstrates how difficult two-third voter approval is to achieve. According to a study by California City Finance, among the 34 measures for new taxes as of 2010, just seven garnered 66.67 percent of the vote for passage. Sonoma County’s success in November 2004 came after failure in March 2000. The Los Angeles County and Santa Clara County measures were for additional rates on top of existing transportation sales taxes. The Madera County measure restored a rate that had expired years earlier.

Prior to this last election, measures to continue an existing sales tax have fared far better with 14 out of 17 proposals succeeding. Moreover, all three failing measures succeeded in later attempts for a 17 out of 17 record.

In the just completed November 2012 election, there were 60 city tax measures on the ballot, including increases and extensions. Of those, 80 percent passed. There were six county measures general purpose tax increases needing a majority vote; 67 percent passed.

There were seven sales tax measures on the November ballot earmarked for specific purposes, five of these were countywide measures. All seven received more than 60 percent yes votes, but four appear to have fallen short of the two-thirds approval needed. The measures that failed include transportation measures in Alameda and Los Angeles counties and two measures related to roads and water quality in Lake County. Alameda County’s effort failed, even though it got 66.5 percent of the vote; slightly shy of the 66.7 percent needed. LA County also failed but got 65 percent yes vote – so close.

In the winning column, Fresno County passed a library tax and Marin County passed a tax for open space by two-thirds this past November and Napa County was able to garner 74 percent support to extend a tax that had been used for flood control projects for 25 years. The Napa County measure changed the focus of the tax to street and sidewalk repair. So, while that measure could be construed as a new tax for streets and sidewalks, the fact it did not cause a higher tax rate likely explains the strong support for the measure.

The two-thirds majority requirement for passing special tax measures is a significant obstacle. Many counties that have tried and failed to pass transportation taxes are getting positive votes of 60 percent or even 65 percent yet still not the required two-thirds. As noted above, the Alameda County measure failed while garnering 66.5 percent of the vote.

What are counties without dedicated transportation sales taxes or counties with dedicated taxes that will expire and thus need to go to the ballot for renewal thinking about the current climate of two-thirds requirement? Do they "try, try again" or follow W.C. Fields and decide they would be damn fools for trying to meet that difficult requirement?
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Many have pinned their hopes on efforts to reduce the super majority from 66.67 percent down to 55 percent or some other more achievable threshold. County transportation agencies would certainly try again with a more realistic threshold. Because Proposition 13 enshrined the two-thirds supermajority requirement in the California Constitution, it will take another voter-approved amendment to the Constitution to change it. There is precedent for such a constitutional amendment. In November 2000, California voters approved Proposition 39, which lowered the threshold from 66.7 percent to the 55 percent mark for approval of school bonds. Prior to the passage of Proposition 39, about 60 percent of local school bond ballot measures succeeded in getting the previously required two-thirds vote. In the wake of its passage, about 75 percent of local school district tax measures are passing with the 55 percent requirement.

Existing and potential self-help counties are finding hope in a new supermajority of Democrats controlling the Assembly and the Senate, as well as the Democratic Party also holding the Governor's Office. It is hoped that the Democrats – traditionally less tax adverse – would send to the voters a proposal for a new, lower threshold for special taxes. What remains to be seen is whether the threshold would be for transportation tax measures or would include other categories.

In the meantime, the "aspiring" counties continue to trade tips on leveraging state and federal resources, taxing development and increasing vehicle registration fees. They also are taking positions in support of the lower threshold to pass transportation tax measures. They'd be fools not to.

Eileen Goodwin is president of Apex Strategies located in Santa Cruz, Calif. She has 30 years of leadership experience in building consensus and in completing complex projects involving numerous parties on time and within budget. As executive director of the Santa Clara County Traffic Authority, Goodwin successfully delivered the $1.2 billion Measure A Highway Improvement Program in Silicon Valley, the first local sales tax measure in the state.

After completing the mission of the Traffic Authority, Goodwin founded Apex Strategies in 1997. She is recognized statewide and nationally as an expert and innovator in the field of community participation, strategic planning and sales tax programs. Goodwin encourages all ACEC firms to write letters to their state representatives supporting the lower threshold for passage of transportation infrastructure tax measures.
Lowering the Voter Threshold for Local Transportation Taxes by Robert Phipps

Alive at 55: Lowering the Voter Threshold for Local Transportation Taxes

By Robert Phipps

Kern Council of Governments

In early 2012, Assemblyman Henry Perea (D-Fresno) accepted a plea from Kern Council of Governments to author a state constitutional amendment that would lower the voter threshold for local transportation-related sales tax measures to 55 percent from the present two-thirds requirement.

In September, Assembly Constitutional Amendment 23 was moved to that house’s inactive file, another casualty of a weak economy and pressure from competing tax-related measures. Nevertheless, based on the wide range of support the bill received from different interests and constituencies throughout the state, Assemblyman Perea vowed to bring the bill back in the 2013 session.

Local transportation measures can take several forms, most commonly a half-cent sales tax, but also as a vehicle license fee or property tax increase allowed under current law. Over the last 25 years, voters in 20 different California counties have approved local transportation sales taxes to pay for transportation projects. Today, 19 regions are “self-help counties” that have voted to increase their sales taxes by anywhere from 1½ percent to 1.5 percent to fund a program of transportation improvements.

Additionally, five Bay Area counties have successfully passed ballot measures to increase vehicle registration fees by $10 for transportation purposes. The revenues have been used for a variety of improvements, including highway and road capacity, maintenance, capital construction/system expansion, system management and maintenance, public transportation capital and operations, and bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure.

Since 1990, court rulings and a relatively new constitutional amendment requiring two-thirds voter approval of tax measures have made it extremely difficult for counties without an existing program to enact such a program. Most of the counties that have failed to achieve a two-thirds vote are smaller, urbanizing or rural counties that do not have as high a level of traffic but still have substantial transportation needs.

Kern is the largest — both geographically and in population — of California’s counties to not have such a measure. Its last attempt in 2006, Measure I, garnered 56 percent of the vote countywide and would have generated approximately $1 billion for capacity, maintenance and public transit projects over its 20-year lifetime. With a network of
3,300 road miles to maintain and a population expected to exceed 1 million by 2030, Kern County was a natural choice to sponsor such an amendment. Kern Council of Governments, the metropolitan planning organization, approached Assemblyman Perea, even though the largest urban area in his own district — Fresno — already benefited from a self-help measure.

Support for the amendment grew quickly from north to south, and from such organizations as the American Council of Engineering Companies, California Construction and Industrial Materials Association, League of Cities, California Association of Counties, Move-L.A., California Transportation Commission, California Transit Association and several cities, counties and transportation agencies.

On a statewide basis, the indirect yield potential for such a policy change is up to $570 million annually, depending on which counties enact local transportation special taxes and at what level. While the change in the threshold would not directly generate more revenues, it would substantially increase the likelihood of adding new self-help counties in California. According to the Self-Help Counties Coalition, existing transportation sales taxes as of 2007-2008 generated more than $4.5 billion per year in revenues. According to 2009-2010 estimates by 17 of the "aspiring counties" actively seeking a new transportation measure, a one-half cent sales tax across all of these counties would generate $314.6 million annually.

With a newly elected two-thirds majority in the California Legislature, already other interests have begun chimming in about the need to reduce the voter threshold for a variety of issues, not just transportation. ACA 23’s future may be caught up in a larger statewide effort or it may continue to stand on its own. Most likely, time and polling will determine which.
Bay Area transportation officials support lowering sales tax threshold to 55 percent

By Gary Richards, San Jose Mercury News
January 7, 2013

Faced with a potential $296 billion shortfall over the next decade to maintain and expand California's aging highway and transit systems, Bay Area leaders are throwing their full support behind an attempt to reduce the voter-approval threshold from two-thirds to 55 percent for transportation sales taxes.

In a memo to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, director Steve Heminger said: "While MTC has supported legislative efforts to seek voter approval to lower the vote threshold for transportation taxes, with Democrats now controlling two-thirds of the seats in both houses, 2013 is the first year that the proposal has some real potential to pass the Legislature and be placed on the ballot."

If the proposed constitutional amendment by state Sen. Carol Liu, D-Pasadena, is approved by the Legislature, it would be placed on the statewide ballot in 2014 and could be adopted by a simple majority vote. The Legislature can place constitutional amendments on the ballot without the governor's signature. The two-thirds mandate is an offshoot of Prop. 13, the landmark 1978 measure that rolled back property taxes and capped yearly increases until a property is sold. In 1995, the two-thirds requirement was extended to include taxes for transportation projects listed on the ballot.

Jon Coupal, president of the Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association, said he thinks a ballot battle is possible, especially after Proposition 30 won last fall. That temporary measure increased the state sales tax rate for all taxpayers and the personal income tax rates for upper-income taxpayers. "It could happen," Coupal said of the possibility that Liu's bill could be approved by the Legislature and go before voters. "Prop. 30 has whetted the appetite of those who want more government revenue, even though California now has the highest income tax and sales tax in America, and now they want to make it easier to impose more. But it's not good public policy."

Carl Guardino, head of the Silicon Valley Leadership Group, has led several sales tax efforts in the South Bay and supports a 55 percent threshold, but he said, "Past polling makes it look rocky."

The effort comes at a time when funding sources are drying up. Last year, the California Transportation Commission released a report saying it expects to get $242 billion in federal, state and local funds through 2020 -- about 45 percent of what is needed, or a $296 billion shortfall. Stimulus funds have been spent to repave hundreds of miles of streets and freeways in the Bay Area, and a $20 billion bond measure approved by voters seven years ago to widen highways has also been spent. In addition, the state gas tax has not been raised in nearly 20 years, and the
increased popularity of electric vehicles and hybrid cars, along with higher federal fuel efficiency requirements, mean gas tax revenues are declining.

"There is nothing in the pipeline to fill the gap," said Russell Snyder, executive director of the California Asphalt Pavement Association. "It also doesn't help matters much that Congress can't seem to get it together on one of the most mom and apple pie issues -- transportation funding. It's a pretty grim scenario."

Several Bay Area counties have managed to pass transportation sales taxes despite the two-thirds mandate, and BART and AC Transit have enacted parcel taxes to support their systems. In 2008, Santa Clara County voters approved by a razor-thin margin a one-eighth-cent sales tax increase to pay to operate the BART extension into the county. Without that tax, the Federal Transit Administration would not have allocated $900 million in federal funds for the extension, and work would not have begun.

Last fall, an Alameda County measure to raise sales tax by a penny failed by about 700 votes, killing funds for widening northbound I-680 through Fremont, replacing the I-580-I-680 interchange and upgrading BART. Alameda County Supervisor Scott Haggerty said the narrow defeat provides a strong argument for changing the passage threshold to 55 percent. "I still believe we live in a world where majority rules," said Haggerty, a longtime MTC board member. "You can talk a lot about what is the magic number for a threshold. I think 55 percent is reasonable."

Making matters more pressing, said Heminger, was the passage of Prop. 26 in 2010, as it applied the two-thirds requirement to virtually all forms of transportation revenue that might be pursued at the local level -- such as vehicle registration fees." This hurdle only exacerbates the funding shortfalls," Heminger said.

- Solano County: 60 percent of voters supported a sales tax proposal in 2002 and 64 percent in 2004.
- Alameda County: November measure received 66.53 percent support -- about 700 votes short of passage.
- Los Angeles County: Another November proposal fell 2 percentage points shy of the 66.7 percent required.

Source: Metropolitan Transportation Commission
Editorial: Taxing for transit

Transportation officials would be forgiven if they found new hope after the Nov. 6 election.

Voters, though, did not agree to pay for needed improvements to the state's crumbling highways and transit systems. Instead, a winning majority was persuaded by Gov. Jerry Brown and school leaders to approve higher taxes to deter any further cuts to public education.

But Nov. 6 was a game-changer, not only because voters approved a tax hike, but also because Democrats -- who for the most part support higher taxes to fund needed programs and improvements -- finally gained two-thirds majorities in both the state Assembly and Senate. That means Republicans have lost their ability to block tax increases. Nor can they block the Legislature sending to voters a constitutional amendment changing the threshold for voter-approved tax increases from the current two-thirds to 55 percent.

The two-thirds requirement came out of 1978's landmark Proposition 13 vote -- which happened, ironically, while the governor of the state was ... Jerry Brown -- which changed almost everything about tax revenue in California. Prop. 13 not only rolled back property taxes in the state, it also set a limit on how much local governments could annually raise the taxes.

The net effect was not only to limit the amount of money that agencies such as transportation departments could tap, but to make it more difficult to get permission to raise other taxes for their programs.

But a bill sponsored by Sen. Carol Liu, D-Pasadena, would, if approved by legislators, give voters in 2014 a chance to change this law, lowering the threshold for transportation and other tax hikes to 55 percent, which would make it easier to impose levies to pay for the considerable backlog of projects throughout the state and Santa Cruz County.

If approved, Liu's bill, supported by Senate leader Darrell Steinberg, D-Sacramento, would not need Brown's approval to get onto the 2014 ballot -- not insignificant, considering that the 2013 incarnation of Gov. Brown is vowing fiscal discipline.

The state Transportation Commission released a report last year that said putting together state, local and federal funds available for transportation projects would amount to $242 billion, or only about 45 percent of the overall need. Stimulus funds are spent and the state gas tax hasn't been raised for nearly two decades.

For local jurisdictions, the 55 percent threshold would also apply to increases in vehicle registration fees -- which are taxes and currently need two-thirds voter approval. Last year, the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission considered, then dropped, an idea to put a measure on the November 2012 ballot to impose an annual fee of up to $10 on vehicles registered within the county to fund transportation programs and projects in each of the cities and in the unincorporated area of the county. Although polling showed strong support for the measure, the RTC felt it would get lost on the 2012 ballot amid other revenue measures. The thought of losing another transportation measure was too risky -- a sales tax measure to pay for widening Highway 1 was trounced in 2004.

Deferred maintenance on local roads is pegged at $300 million. The vehicle registration fee hike would have raised a modest $2.2 million a year, hardly a sum to get that enthused about.

But with a 55 percent threshold, no doubt the RTC, like the state, could be more ambitious in finding more revenue.

Californians are already highly taxed, but considering the sorry state of roads and highways in Santa Cruz County and throughout the state, something has to break the logjam. Lowering the voter approval threshold to 55 percent at least gives transit leaders a chance to make their case with a reasonable expectation at finally addressing our crumbling roads and highways.
Solano transportation needs may get funded through new state bill

/By Sarah Rohrs/Times-Herald staff writer

Posted: 01/09/2013 01:01:12 AM PST

Solano County voters have been asked three times in the last decade to pass sales tax measures to pay for transportation improvements and road repairs. Not one passed, although a majority of voters favored them. Those measures failed, due to a two-thirds voter approval threshold required by the state constitution. As a result, Solano County remains the only Bay Area county without a local transportation tax. That may change if newly introduced state legislation is passed in Sacramento, and then by state voters.

The proposed constitutional amendment, introduced by state Sen. Carol Liu, D-Pasadena, would lower the voter approval rate for such taxes from two-thirds, or 66-2/3rds percent, to 55 percent. The new bill is a bright spot on the horizon for Solano Transportation Authority Executive Director Daryl Halls and other local transportation planners. "We've tried on three occasions to get local sales tax measures for transportation," Halls said. "Twice we got over 60 percent of the vote but we were not able to get two-thirds."

Without a local transportation tax, Solano County and its cities are often hard-pressed to raise funds for transportation improvements and to provide local matches to secure federal and state money, Halls said. "Transportation is not well funded by the state," Halls said. "To better maintain our roads you have to have a local funding source. In the Bay Area, we're the only county which does not have that."

Without a local source of revenue, cities must take on a greater burden of maintaining their roads and highways, he said. Further, Solano cannot be as competitive as other counties in securing state and federal transportation funding, he added.

Such a scenario can be difficult in places like Vallejo which has miles of streets in disrepair, Halls said. In October, an annual Metropolitan Transportation Commission index gave Vallejo a grade of 51 -- just one step above the poor category. Overall, Solano's roads and highways have received grades of between 70 and 80 on the MTC index, Halls said.

Should Liu's proposed constitutional amendment pass both the Senate and the Assembly, it would then be placed on the ballot, most likely in 2014, for voter approval. Should voters then approve the amendment, Solano transportation planners would likely consider placing another local sales tax measure on the ballot, Halls said.

Local projects in need of funding include the addition of more Interstate 80 carpool lanes between Vallejo and Vacaville, improvements at the I-80/I-680 interchange, various Highway 12 improvements and better services for seniors and handicapped riders. More funding could also pay for the second phase of the Vallejo parking structure, Halls said.
One of the largest outstanding needs, however, is basic maintenance and rehabilitation of local streets and roadways, he said. In other counties, proposed transportation sales tax increases on recent ballots would have easily passed under a lower voter approval threshold but were defeated by a "minority" of those casting ballots, MTC spokesman John Goodwin said. "A two-thirds requirement allows a minority of voters to control the agenda rather than a majority," Goodwin said.

MTC officials have also indicated that 2013 would be a good year to pursue the constitutional amendment as Democrats control both houses. Further, voter passage of Proposition 30 last year indicate that Californians are more receptive to new taxes.

The two-thirds mandate stems from Proposition 13. Passed in 1978, the measure capped yearly property tax increases until properties are sold. Later, courts ruled the two-thirds requirement would apply to transportation taxes, as well.

*Gary Richards of the Bay Area News Group contributed to this report. Contact staff writer Sarah Rohrs at srohrs@timesheraldonline.com or (707) 553-6832. Follow her on Twitter @SarahVTH.*
NEWSWORTHY

- The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), Division of Transportation Planning is now accepting applications for the Transportation Planning Grant Program. The Division will award approximately $9 million in funding through six Grant Programs for Fiscal Year 2013-14. These programs provide monetary assistance for transportation planning projects to improve mobility and lead to the programming or implementation phase for a community or region.

The Fiscal Year 2013-14 Transportation Planning Grant Application Guide is posted on the Division of Transportation Planning (DOTP) Grants website at: [http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/grants.html](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/grants.html)

Applications are due via email by 5:00pm, Tuesday, April 2, 2013.

- The California Transportation Commission has allocated $306 million to 44 projects that will help ease traffic congestion, improve safety, and support economic growth. "From one end of the state to the other, transportation projects are providing jobs and improving roads, bridges, and transit for people and businesses in California," said Caltrans Director Malcolm Dougherty.

The allocations include $114 million from Proposition 1B, a transportation bond approved by voters in 2006. In total, $14.7 billion in Proposition 1B funds have been distributed statewide. The remaining $192 million in allocations came from assorted transportation accounts funded by state and federal dollars.

Among the projects that received funding were:

$5.3 million to the Santa Cruz Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC) to improve rail improvements from Davenport to Watsonville for existing freight and recreational rail service and to facilitate the implementation of new recreational passenger service.

- Caltrans announced it is awarding nearly $18 million to 105 public transit projects across California under the Job Access & Reverse Commute and New Freedom programs. The projects are designed to help low-income people and those with disabilities to access employment and employment-related activities such as job training and job interviews more easily. This includes transporting people to employment opportunities in suburban areas and city centers.

Some notable examples include:

Community Bridges - Operating Assistance to provide Same Day Transportation Options Program which is on-demand, door-to-door accessible transportation to medical destinations in nearly counties for low-income disabled residents. Service Areas: Aptos, Seaside, Monterey, Palo Alto, Santa Clara, San Francisco. (Award: $ 200,000).

Monterey-Salinas Transit - Operating and Capital Assistance - Monterey Bay Inter-County Commuter service is a new service between Monterey Bay and Santa Cruz during morning and evening peak commute periods for employment. Service Area: Monterey, Seaside, Marina, Castroville, Watsonville, Capitola, Santa Cruz.

Please Submit Maintenance Service Requests at the Following Link: [http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/maint/msrsubmit/](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/maint/msrsubmit/)
• The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) is pleased to host a series of open houses for the California State Rail Plan (CSRP). Caltrans will be presenting the Draft of the CSRP, which establishes a statewide vision, sets priorities, and develops implementation strategies to enhance passenger and freight rail service in the public interest.

To review the Draft Plan and comment, please join us at one of the five Open House meetings (Feb. 12, 14, 19, 20 and 21) throughout the state. Comments may be submitted at any of the Open House meetings. The public comment period will begin on February 8, 2013 and end on March 11, 2013. The Draft CSRP will be available on February 8, 2013 at: http://californiastaterailplan.com/project-materials

If you have any questions in advance of the meetings, please contact us through the website at: http://californiastaterailplan.com/contact/

Please Submit Maintenance Service Requests at the Following Link: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/maint/msrsSubmit/
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Construction Timeline</th>
<th>Construction Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Implementing Agency</th>
<th>Project Manager (Resident Engineer)</th>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hwy. 1 Watsonville (CAPM) Rehab. (0M7504)</td>
<td>Hwy 1 (PM 0.0-10.2) In Santa Cruz County in Watsonville and Apts from Pajaro River Bridge to North Apts Underpass</td>
<td>Pavement Rehabilitation (hot mix asphalt on existing pavement)</td>
<td>April 15, 2012-Winter 2012</td>
<td>$12M</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Luis Duazo (BR)</td>
<td>Pavex Construction Division, Watsonville</td>
<td>Night work with alternating lane and ramp closures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz Highway 1 Median Barrier (0S3104)</td>
<td>Highway 1 in Santa Cruz (17.5-18.2)</td>
<td>Construct colored and textured Median Barrier</td>
<td>April 23, 2012-Winter 2012</td>
<td>$1.6 M</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Doug Hessing (FK)</td>
<td>Toms Septic Construction, Salinas</td>
<td>Alternating lane closures, primarily overnight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy. 9 Grind and Replace (0S0804)</td>
<td>In Santa Cruz from so. of the Rte 01/09 junction to just no. of Vernon St. (PM 0.0-PM 0.6)</td>
<td>Cold plane and hot mix asphalt and repaving</td>
<td>Spring 2012-December 2012</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>Highway Maint.</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Kelly McClain (TL)</td>
<td>Pavex Construction Div., San Jose</td>
<td>Work completed, pending final items &amp; approval. Completion scheduled for January 8, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy. 9 Holiday Lane Improvements (0K2304)</td>
<td>Highway 9 between Ben Lomond and the Highland Co. Park; S. of Holiday Lane (PM 8.4-8.6)</td>
<td>Construct Viaduct, Upgrade guard rail</td>
<td>Summer 2012 - Summer 2013</td>
<td>$1.3 M</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Steve DiGrazia (AN)</td>
<td>Pavex Construction Div., Watsonville</td>
<td>Work began in September. Traffic control consists of one-way traffic control with a temporary signal 24/7.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Construction Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Construction Timeline</th>
<th>Construction Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Implementing Agency</th>
<th>Project Manager (Resident Engineer)</th>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

## Projects in Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Construction Timeline</th>
<th>Construction Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Implementing Agency</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Hwy. 1 Guardrail Upgrade, Concrete Barrier, Retaining Wall (05-0R9101)</td>
<td>Highway 1 from S of South Aptos Underpass to 1 Mi N. of Rt 9 (PM 9.0-17.6)</td>
<td>Upgrade Metal Beam Guard Rail, other improvements</td>
<td>Fall/ Winter 2013</td>
<td>$2.3 Million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Doug Hressing</td>
<td>PS&amp;E/RW</td>
<td>Scheduled to be advertised early 2013.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Hwy. 1 Guardrail/ Crash Cushions (0M970_)</td>
<td>Highway 1, various locations from San Lorenzo R. Bridge to Waddell Creek (PM 17.4-26.0)</td>
<td>Upgrade guard rail, end treatments</td>
<td>Winter / Summer 2013</td>
<td>Total $2.8M</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Doug Hressing</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>Bids opened; pending award of contract</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Regional Transportation Commission

FROM: Kim Shultz, Senior Transportation Planner

RE: Highway 1 Soquel/Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes Project

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) accept the monthly report on construction activities for the Highway 1 Soquel/Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes Project.

BACKGROUND

On January 5, 2012, the RTC authorized a construction contract for work to begin on the Highway 1 Soquel/Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes project. A Notice to Proceed was issued to the contractor on February 3, 2012, following receipt of performance bonds and insurance certificates.

DISCUSSION

RTC Resident Engineer, Bruce Shewchuk, will present an oral report on current construction activities and will respond to questions. Work has continued to focus on the completion of the retaining walls on the northbound side of the highway in front of the shoring system along the cut slope section of the project. Through the Christmas period, rain slowed progress on the retaining walls, and additional stormwater protection actions were necessary to avoid erosion in the cut slope areas. With the recent sunny weather, work has resumed on the northbound retaining walls and excavation of excess soil on the southbound side of the highway.

As previously reported, the contractor continues to claim that differing site conditions required more extensive shoring system than originally anticipated on the northside of the highway. RTC’s construction engineer continues to closely monitor the work to assist in resolving any potential claims of extra costs associated with this work.

Project Schedule

At the December RTC meeting there was some discussion regarding the construction project schedule developed by the design team and the aggressive construction project schedule offered by the contractor and it was suggested that this be explained.
The project schedule developed in the final design phase of the project anticipated construction duration of 18-24 months. This project schedule was developed by the design team working with Caltrans representatives and taking into consideration potential rain days, potentially different staging of the construction process, and the potential of unforeseen for situations that could come up and cause delay. The design team considered this a realistic schedule. The winning construction bidder proposed a much more aggressive project construction schedule of approximately 12 months worth of work days. This schedule did not include any projected delays due to rain or anything else.

After considering the contractor’s proposed project schedule with the construction management firm, RTC legal counsel and the design team, the RTC construction management team and staff adopted the schedule offered by the contractor to allow greater accountability, flexibility and convenience in managing the construction process. The construction team meets on a weekly basis to review progress to date with a focus on the next 3 weeks “look ahead” while efforts are continually taken to advance the entire project effort as close as possible to the original schedule proposed by the contractor. With the rain delays encountered early this winter season, the project team has continued to evaluate mutually acceptable methods to advance the construction process within the allowed project budget, while avoiding risks to public or worker safety.

While adopting the aggressive construction project schedule proposed by the contractor is helpful for the management of the construction contract, it is not the best schedule to provide the public a realistic expectation of project progress and completion. As suggested by Commissioners at the December RTC meeting, staff will work to provide the public more realistic information regarding project completion and not fully rely on the contractor’s aggressive construction schedule. At this time, completion of the La Fonda Avenue Overcrossing is projected for late spring or early summer. Completion of the entire project including installation of landscaping is anticipated for late summer. This would be ahead of the design team’s more realistic schedule and behind the aggressive schedule proposed by the contractor.

**Construction Financial Status**

As of this writing, four contract change orders (CCO’s) have been approved on the project. Three of the four CCO’s were under $50,000 threshold and were approved by the Executive Director. A change order for the multi-use path between La Fonda and Park Way in the amount of $61,000 was approved following consultation with the RTC Chair. Funding for the multi-use path is provided in the supplemental project budget as part of the transportation management plan and does not count against the available contingency balance reported below. Through 10 months of construction activity, the approved progress payments total $4,858,976. As of this writing the progress payment for the current period is still under review by the construction engineer and will be reported at the next meeting.

Following is the current contractor cost accounting:
Updated Contract Amount $ 10,056,131
Contingency Balance $ 937,372
Approved Contract Budget $ 10,993,503
Progress Payments To Date $ 4,858,976
Remaining Contract Budget $ 6,134,527

Additional contract change orders are anticipated in the coming weeks, including: unexpected extra work associated with the different site conditions and drainage needs on the north slope including connection to the drainage system on Oak Street and installation of a new drainage system crossing the freeway west of La Fonda; striping and signage for the revised circulation system at Harbor High School; and K-rail openings on the northbound and southbound side of the highway for the removal of dirt. Before construction activities began, the RTC approved a set of policies for contract change orders and established a contract change orders ad-hoc committee composed of five Commissioners. It has not been necessary to convene the ad-hoc committee up to this point but if any contract change order is over $100,000, the ad-hoc committee will be convened.

As a result of the recent elections there are currently three Commissioners on the ad-hoc committee (Attachment 1). At the December RTC meeting, Commissioner Lane expressed interest in serving on the committee. This means that there is room for one more Commissioner. Commissioners interested in serving on the ad-hoc committee should contact the RTC Chair.

SUMMARY

The winter rains through the Christmas period slowed progress on the northbound retaining walls and additional stormwater protection actions were necessary to avoid erosion. Work has resumed on the northbound retaining walls and excavation on the southbound side of the highway. The original project schedule anticipated an 18-24 month construction period. The contractor offered a 12 month work day construction schedule that did not include rain delays. The construction management team adopted the schedule offered by the contractor to allow greater accountability and flexibility in managing the construction process. With rain delays encountered early this season, the project team continues to evaluate mutually acceptable methods to advance construction within the project budget while avoiding risks to public or worker safety. Completion of the La Fonda Avenue Overcrossing is projected for late spring or early summer. Completion of the entire project, including landscaping, is anticipated late summer. The contractor is claiming differing site conditions required installation of a shoring system, now in place, more extensive than originally envisioned on the northside of the highway. RTC’s construction engineer is closely monitoring activities to aid in quickly resolving any potential claims of extra costs associated with this work.

Attachment:
1. Contract Change Order Ad-Hoc Committee Composition for 2013
Highway 1 Soquel/Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes Project

Contract Change Order Procedure

Ad-Hoc Committee Composition

Calendar Year 2013

Members: Neal Coonerty, RTC Chair (County Supervisor)
           Eduardo Montesino, RTC Vice-Chair (City of Watsonville)
           Dene Bustichi (Metro Rep)

In absense of the appointed Commissioner, that Commissioner’s Alternate to the RTC may represent the appointed Commissioner.

Prepared by: Kim Shultz
TO: Regional Transportation Commission (RTC)

FROM: Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner

REGARDING: Draft 2013 Legislative Program and Legislative Updates

---

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) approve State and Federal Legislative Programs for 2013 (Attachments 1 & 2, respectively), to assist in analyzing the transportation impacts of legislative activities.

---

BACKGROUND

Each year the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) adopts legislative programs to guide its analysis of state and federal legislative or administrative actions. Working with the Central Coast Coalition and other transportation entities in the state, the RTC develops and implements the RTC legislative program, notifying state representatives of the RTC’s analysis on key issues, and monitoring bills and other federal and state actions that could impact transportation in Santa Cruz County.

---

DISCUSSION

Draft 2013 Legislative Programs

The Draft 2013 State and Federal Legislative Programs for the RTC are attached (Attachments 1 & 2, respectively). Staff recommends that RTC provide input on the legislative programs at this meeting, identify any additional issues the RTC should monitor or pursue in 2013, and approve the 2013 Legislative Programs. Proposed additions and deletions from the 2012 Legislative Program are shown in underline and strikeout. The Draft Legislative Programs include key issues identified by RTC's advisory committees, local entities, the Central Coast Coalition, and other transportation agencies statewide.

Focus areas for 2013 are noted in the Legislative Programs. As transportation revenues continue to fall far below the needs of the multi-modal transportation system, the RTC will continue to focus on preserving funds dedicated to transportation and generating new, more stable revenue sources.

Key issues in 2013 include implementation of MAP-21 at the state and federal level; the next federal transportation act; and efforts at the state level that could result in increased funding for transportation projects -including proposals for cap-and-trade revenues, a new state transportation bond initiative, a statewide vehicle license fee, and lowering the voter threshold for local transportation ballot measures to 55% (including SCA 4 which has been introduced by State Senator Liu).

State Budget

On January 10, 2013 Governor Jerry Brown released his proposed FY14 State Budget. The Governor has declared that the state’s budget deficit is gone, but does not plan to restore funding to programs
previously cut in an attempt to maintain a reserve fund. The Governor proposes to continue to use approximately 13% of annual state transportation revenues to repay debt service on transportation bonds. These revenues come primarily from truck weight fees that were historically used for the State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP).

The Governor’s budget assumes $400 million in revenues from Cap and Trade auction proceeds. While the expenditure plan for Cap and Trade proceeds is still under development, the Governor’s budget suggests that reducing transportation emissions should be a top priority (through mass transit, high speed rail, electrification of heavy duty and light duty vehicles, sustainable communities, and electrification and energy projects that complement high speed rail). For Caltrans, the Budget reflects changes to the Local Assistance and Planning Programs within Caltrans, including the consolidation of five programs into a single Active Transportation Program meant to simplify and enhance funding for pedestrian and bicycle projects. This could include consolidation of multiple grant programs. Sales Tax revenues for the Public Transit Account are forecasted to drop from $636 million in FY13 to $611 million in FY14. It is unclear at this point how the budget may specifically impact transportation projects in Santa Cruz County.

Federal Budget

At the beginning of the month Congress approved a bill averting the “fiscal cliff”. The bill includes a one-year extension of the Railroad Track Maintenance Tax Credit, commuter tax benefits for transit on par with parking, and the alternative fuels tax credit (which will save Santa Cruz Metro over $500,000 annually).

MAP-21: Federal Transportation Act

Implementing the new federal transportation act (MAP-21) will continue to be a priority for both the State and Federal Legislative Programs. RTC staff participates in the statewide MAP-21 implementation working group, as a representative of the Central Coast and mid/small regions.

Since MAP-21 is only a 2 year bill, Senator Boxer (CA) who chairs the Senate Environment and Public Works (EPW) Committee has already indicated plans to introduce a successor bill in early 2013. The RTC’s Federal Legislative Assistants, Capital Edge, will be assisting staff at communicating principles for the next act that would protect and increase funding to advance transportation planning and projects in Santa Cruz County. Of concern are proposals to direct funds to large regions at the expense of smaller counties, including Santa Cruz.

While MAP-21 includes no earmarks, in the event that new special federal funding opportunities arise in 2013, the RTC’s Federal Legislative Program includes a list of projects to prioritize for special funding opportunities (Item 5.a. of the Federal Legislative Program).

SUMMARY

This report provides the Draft 2013 State and Federal Legislative Programs for review and approval.

Attachment 1 - Draft State Legislative Program
Attachment 2 - Draft Federal Legislative Program
FOCUS AREAS FOR 2013:

1. **Fund Priority Projects**: Seek and preserve funding for priority transportation projects and programs in Santa Cruz County, including:
   - Projects on Highway 1
   - Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line
   - Transit projects
   - Local Street and Roadway Preservation
   - Bicycle and Pedestrian facilities, including the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network (MBSST)

2. **Expand revenue-raising opportunities** and innovative financing options beyond the traditional gas tax.
   - **Expand the authority of the RTC** and local entities to increase taxes and fees for transportation projects, including new gas taxes and vehicle registration fees, and increase Service Authorities for Freeway Emergencies (SAFE) vehicle registration fees by $1 for motorist aid programs.
   - **Lower Vote Threshold**: Support legislation that lowers the voter threshold for local transportation funding measures, such as local transportation sales tax or vehicle registration fee ballot measures, from the 2/3 supermajority to a simple majority, 55% or 60% majority vote.
   - **Increase Transportation Funding**: Support increased funding for transportation projects, as highlighted in the statewide needs assessment reports.
   - **Support options to replace the loss of redevelopment funding**, to support economic development and affordable housing consistent with sustainable communities strategies.

3. **Address Air Quality/Climate Change**:
   - Support legislation to provide funding to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, including funds to implement SB375 and AB32.

4. **Stabilize and Augment Transportation Funding**: Pursue policy and/or legislative changes to preserve, restore, and augment funding for all modes of transportation:
   - **MAP-21 Implementation**: Ensure state implementation of the Federal Transportation Act does not reduce funds available for Santa Cruz County projects.
   - **Stabilize Funding**: Support legislation and other efforts to increase and stabilize funding for transit, local streets and roads, and State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) projects. Protect transportation funds, including HUTA funds, from diversion to the State General Fund.
   - **Cap-and-Trade**: Support legislation that ensures revenues generated from the implementation of the Cap-and-Trade program are allocated to transportation projects that reduce pollution and greenhouse gas emissions.
   - Oppose proposals which would restrict or redirect state and federal transportation funds to “megaregions.”

**Central Coast**: Raise awareness of Central Coast transportation corridors.
General Legislative Platform

1. **Support New Transportation Funding.** Support countywide and statewide efforts to raise needed funds to maintain and enhance the transportation system, ensuring funds are distributed equitably statewide and not disproportionately distributed to large regions.
   a) Support legislation that lowers the voter threshold for local transportation funding measures, including local transportation sales tax ballot measures from the 2/3 supermajority to a simple majority, 55% or 60% majority vote. (*Focus area for 2013*)
   b) Increase and index state gas and fuel taxes and other sources of transportation revenues so that transportation revenues keep pace with inflation/increased cost. Dedicate revenues to transportation projects and programs.
   c) Support efforts to address and expand revenue-raising opportunities and innovative financing options beyond the traditional gas tax, especially in recognition of the fact that growth in vehicle miles traveled often exceeds growth in fuel consumption, as highlighted in the statewide needs assessment reports. May include new statewide initiatives for transportation bonds, vehicle license fees. (*Focus are for 2013*)
   d) Cap-and-Trade: Support legislation that ensures revenues generated from the implementation of the Cap-and-Trade program are allocated to transportation projects that reduce pollution and greenhouse gas emissions. (*Focus area for 2013*)
   e) Support the development of a steady stream of new transportation funds dedicated to local road rehabilitation and maintenance, especially for roadways utilized by bicyclists.
   f) Support legislative efforts to expand the authority of the RTC and local jurisdictions to increase taxes and fees for transportation projects, including gas taxes and fees, vehicle registration fees, congestion pricing, and fees relating to the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. (*Focus area for 2013*)
      • Seek amendment to SB 83 (2009) to ensure all regional transportation agencies, not just Congestion Management Agencies (CMA), are authorized to seek voter approval to increase vehicle registration fees to fund transportation programs and projects and seek amendments to increase the maximum fee amount from $10 to $100 per vehicle. (*Focus area for 2013*)
      • Support options to replace the loss of redevelopment funding, to support economic development and affordable housing consistent with sustainable communities strategies. (*Focus are for 2013*)
   g) Support legislation that would allow the County of Santa Cruz to pursue a sales tax measure for transportation improvements in the unincorporated areas.
   h) Ensure that any new regional tax or fee authorization is not restricted to federally-designated Metropolitan Planning Organizations or Congestion Management Agencies, but rather available to regional transportation planning agencies representing counties statewide.
   g) Work with local elected officials, local agencies and interest groups to address continuing gaps in funding for local transportation projects and pursue new local funding sources.
   h) Work to ensure that state transportation programs provide the maximum amount of revenues for the Santa Cruz County region. If special state funding programs are developed, support funding of projects in Santa Cruz County.
   i) Advocate that any new state revenues created for transportation support “bottoms-up” regional governance that respects local decision making authority, assures regional flexibility, and include safeguards to prevent diversion to the State General Fund.

2. **Stabilize and Preserve Existing Transportation Funding and Formulas.**
   Preserve and protect against deferral, borrowing or taking of state funding designated for the transportation system. Retain and enhance California’s funding formulas based on the increased costs to maintain and address deficiencies to the existing transportation system. Specifically:
a) Support legislation and other efforts to ensure stable funding for transit, local streets and roads, and State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) projects. Could include increased per gallon excise tax or state sales tax on gasoline dedicated to transportation.

b) Support early and timely sale of bonds for transportation, including allocation of Proposition 1B for projects in Santa Cruz County. Support extension of legislative deadlines previously established for bond programs to coincide with the state’s bonding ability.

c) Oppose proposals to shift transportation funds to non-transportation purposes and the State General Fund.
   - Protect existing highway and transit funds, including Highway Users Tax Revenue (gas tax), sales taxes for transportation, Public Transportation Account (PTA) revenues, against suspension, transfer or expenditure for non-transportation uses.
   - Support legislation that expedites repayment of transportation funds previously diverted to the State General Fund.

d) Support State Budget Reform that will bring fiscal discipline and predictability to the state budget.

e) Ensure that transportation planning funds are available to agencies throughout the year and are not withheld due to delays in enacting the state budget.

f) Support the continuation of state transportation funding programs dedicated to projects such as transit, Safe Routes to Schools, Bicycle Transportation Account, paratransit and Freeway Service Patrol.

g) STIP Modernization
   - Ensure State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds are equitably programmed and allocated to regions, based on SB 45 (1998) formulas and regions’ priorities, which may include local road rehabilitation and transit projects.
   - Ensure the State Budget and STIP Fund Estimate allow flexibility to fund all modes of projects in the STIP; increase flexibility for funding STIP projects.
   - Ensure that transit and bicycle/pedestrian projects remain eligible for regional STIP funds, even if the STIP does not include Public Transit Account and federal Transportation Alternatives Program funds, respectively.

h) Oppose proposals which would restrict or redirect state and federal transportation funds to “megaregions”

i) Support legislation that would trigger an increase in the state excise tax on gasoline, to replace the federal gas tax, in the event that the federal tax expires or is reduced.

3. **Support Efforts that Improve Government Efficiency and Expedite Project Delivery.**
   a) Support organizational reform efforts that streamline and otherwise improve transportation funding, programming or project delivery processes and eliminate unnecessarily and/or duplicative requirements.

b) Support greater flexibility in contracting methods.

c) Support initiatives that increase opportunities to trade federal funds for state funds, as currently exists for Santa Cruz County’s share of Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds.

d) Grant preaward spending authority for transit projects, especially those funded by STIP.

e) Support efforts to streamline Project Initiation Documents (PIDs) for projects on the State Route System in order to lower the overall cost of PID development. Oppose efforts to transfer the State costs of PID development and oversight to local entities that take the lead on highway projects. **(Focus area for 2013)**

f) Oppose unfunded mandates on local and regional government.

4. **Air Quality/Climate Change** **(Focus area for 2013)**
   a) Support efforts to reduce the number of vehicle miles traveled and encourage smart-growth practices, which also preserve the authority and flexibility of local agencies. Ensure that the region’s needs are incorporated in emerging climate change and sustainability programs, legislation, and
regulations, including meeting the goals of AB 32 – the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, and SB 375.

b) Ensure adequate funding is made available to fulfill the requirements of AB 32 and SB 375, including funds for transit, bicycle, pedestrian, and other projects that reduce greenhouse gas emissions and resources to prepare plans in compliance with SB 375.

5. Specifics
   a) Transit:
      • Support efforts to restore, protect, and enhance funding for public transit, especially in light of AB32 and SB375 goals to reduce greenhouse gases (GHG).
      • Support introduction and passage of legislation designed to preserve and enact additional sources of transit operating and capital assistance, including legislation aimed at reducing greenhouse gas emissions.
      • Support funding programs that promote transit-oriented development and transit villages. Ensure that state-supported housing projects near transit facilities provide safe and convenient access for disabled persons to transit and are available to all regions.
      • Support measures to allow the use of gas taxes for transit capital purposes, including purchase of rolling stock.
      • Support expansion of passenger and freight rail on the Central Coast, including development and operation of the Coast Daylight Train and Transportation Agency for Monterey County’s commuter train extension projects, increases in intercity rail operation funds, support use of HSR connectively funds for Coast Daylight
      • Increase flexibility to use state transit funds on both operations and capital expenses.
      • Support modifications to design standards that would reduce the cost for bus stops improvements on state highways.

   b) Transportation for Seniors and People with Disabilities
      • Support transportation programs that are beneficial to communities with limited means.
      • Increase funding levels for elderly and disabled transportation, including operating and capital funds for ADA paratransit service and vehicles.
      • Support continuation of a competitive process, rather than formula distribution, of FTA5310 funds.
      • Support funding transportation to dialysis and other medically necessary appointments
      • Support and expand Medicaid funding for transit and paratransit and oppose reductions in Medi-Cal funding for transportation. Modify eligibility criteria to increase the number of people eligible for Medi-Cal transportation reimbursement, currently restricted to only the most severely disabled enrollees. Allow public transit agencies to become Medi-Cal transportation providers.
      • Support funding to ensure universal access, including access for paratransit vehicles within new developments, fully accessible transit stops and safe travel paths (accessible pedestrian facilities, including audible pedestrian signals, access ramps), especially between senior and/or disabled living areas, medical facilities, educational facilities, employment locations, and bus stops.
      • Support measures that require Medi-Cal to provide adequate transportation assistance and funding to ensure access to Medi-Cal funded Adult Day Health Care/Community-Based Adult Services (ADHC/CBAS) centers and services.

   c) Bicycling & Walking
      • Support legislative initiatives and modifications to the California Vehicle Code that would improve conditions for bicyclists and pedestrians, including safety and access.
      • Support legislation and local ordinances prohibiting parking in designated bicycle lanes, to allow law enforcement to ticket vehicles parked in bicycle lanes even if specific “no parking” signage is absent.
• Support measures that would require bicycle and pedestrian facilities as a part of newly constructed roads and streets.
• Support increased funding for bicycle and pedestrian projects and programs, including education and awareness programs, the Bicycle Transportation Account, Safe Routes to Schools, Complete Streets programs, universal access, especially to transit stops, audible pedestrian signals, and programs that educate enforcement personnel regarding best practices.
• Support the inclusion and expansion of bicycle education programs (e.g. helmet laws, how to ride safely, etc.) in public and private schools, including high schools.
• Support Incentive Programs for bicycle and pedestrian commuters. Support efforts to extend the transportation fringe benefits in the state tax code to bicycle and pedestrian commuters.

d) Transportation Demand Management/ Carpooling:
• Oppose measures to remove existing or restrict future High Occupancy Vehicle lanes.
• Support legislation to provide incentives for both employers and employees, to encourage use of alternatives to driving alone, such as state tax incentives.
• Support efforts to secure new funding for regional rideshare programs.
• Support programs that would provide incentives for students to use transit and support revision of state laws that restrict Community Colleges’ ability to implement transportation fees for transit.

e) SAFE Callbox and Freeway Service Patrol
• Support proposals to increase state funding of Freeway Service Patrol programs.
• Support increased flexibility for compatible expenditures of SAFE funds.
• Support continuation of the $1 SAFE vehicle registration fee and seek authorization to increase the fees by $1.00 to fund Freeway Service Patrol and other motorist aid programs. (Focus area for 2013)

f) Safety
• Support legislative initiatives to improve safety for motorists, bicyclists and pedestrians.
  • Authorize local jurisdictions to reduce speed limits, based on what that jurisdiction determines is most appropriate for their facility.

6. Coordinate with Local, Regional and State Agencies and Organizations on legislative principles of mutual interest and raise awareness of Central Coast transportation corridors.

Please contact us at 831-460-3200 with any questions about the RTC Legislative Program.
1. **MAP-21 Implementation** (Focus Area for 2013)
   a) **Maximize Funding:** Support implementation of MAP-21 in a manner which provides a fair share of federal funding for transportation projects within Santa Cruz County and does not restrict or direct funds to large regions at the expense of smaller regions.
   b) **Appropriations:** Maximize federal transportation appropriations for MAP-21 programs. Partner with local, regional, statewide, and nationwide transportation agencies to ensure that Congress appropriates funding consistent with amounts authorized in MAP-21.
   c) **Performance Measures:** Support development of performance measures which are consistent with RTC approved goals, policies, and targets and which recognize data limitations of many regions.
   d) **Streamline Project Delivery:** Support regulations to streamline federal project delivery requirements (including cooperative agreements, pre-award audits, disadvantaged business enterprise regulations and duplicative federal environmental review laws) while maintaining the substance of environmental laws, either through regulatory or statutory changes. Support provisions that better and integrate federal project delivery requirements for state and federal environmental laws; project planning, development, review, permitting, and environmental processes in order to reduce project costs and delays.

2. **Freight and Passenger Rail**
   a) Support funding and incentives that could be used for freight and passenger railroad maintenance, capacity expansion and safety improvement projects on the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line.
   b) Support full funding for the combined Federal and State funding program for rail capital projects in which federal funds are used for 80% of the project’s cost and state funds for the remaining 20%, as provided for highway capital projects.
   c) Support the ongoing extension of Section 45G Railroad Track Maintenance Credit that provides 50 percent tax credit to short line railroads conducting qualified railroad track maintenance.
   d) Support measures that will facilitate the shared use of tracks by passenger and freight rail.

3. **Next Federal Transportation Reauthorization:** (Focus Area for 2013)
   Work with congressional representatives, local entities, regional agencies, the State of California and federal agencies to advance RTC’s policy priorities in development of the next Federal Transportation Act. Priorities include:
   a) Increase funding levels for all modes, as needed to bring transportation infrastructure up to a good state of repair and meet growing transportation needs in Santa Cruz County. Provide sufficient funds to allow agencies in Santa Cruz County to replace crumbling infrastructure, minimize traffic congestion, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, improve safety, and expand travel options available to citizens and visitors. Give top priority to preservation and maintenance of the existing system of roads, highways, bridges, sidewalks, and transit.
   b) Support development of a formula funding program targeting greenhouse gas emissions and air quality. Should include changes to the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Improvement Program that expand recipient eligibility to regions in attainment of air quality standards, including Santa Cruz County, in order to receive funds for vehicle emissions reductions in Santa Cruz County.
   c) Ensure equitable distribution of funds to California and Santa Cruz County, which may include direct subventions to counties and Metropolitan Planning Organizations. Oppose proposals which restrict, redirect or otherwise disproportionally direct funds to large metropolitan areas or “megaregions” or...
National and Interstate Highways. Ensure that proposals for innovative financing, including infrastructure banks, do not result in diversion of funds from or negatively impact small regions.

d) Support extension of the Small Transit Intensive Cities Program (STIC).

e) Support development of funding mechanisms for transportation to ensure the financial integrity of the Highway Trust Fund and Mass Transportation Account. Given that current per-gallon gasoline fees are insufficient to address transportation infrastructure needs, this may include increasing, indexing, and making permanent gas taxes and fees and collecting fees based on vehicle miles traveled.

f) Provide procurement preference for building and paving materials that have a lower emissions footprint than conventional materials but demonstrate comparable performance and cost.

g) Preserve federal funding programs most commonly utilized in Santa Cruz County, such as the Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP), funds for bicycle and pedestrian projects, transit programs, Highway Safety program (HSIP), local on and off-system bridge projects and federal Planning (PL); or provide replacement programs that will continue to provide essential funding to Santa Cruz County projects at least at current levels.

h) Include funding programs for rail line maintenance and rail goods movement that could be used to address needs on the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line.

i) Maintain the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) urbanized area threshold at 50,000. Oppose efforts which phase out small MPOs.

4. **Job Creation.** Spending on improving our nation’s infrastructure is particularly important at this time, given its decaying state and its ability to support an economic recovery through the movement of goods and people and the creation of jobs.

a) Support efforts to boost the economy and create jobs through targeted, short term infrastructure spending proposals that supplement current spending levels.

b) Oppose any reductions to key Department of Transportation programs in deficit reduction packages or annual appropriations.

c) Prioritize funding for ongoing system maintenance, including transit operations.

5. **Maximize Funding for Local Area Projects.** Support increased revenues for transportation projects in the Santa Cruz County region. Oppose any efforts to reduce transportation funding to California or the region. Work with congressional representatives to obtain additional funding for Santa Cruz County highways, rail corridor, transit operations and capital projects, paratransit service, local streets and roads, transportation demand management, and pedestrian and bicycle facilities and programs.

a) Seek federal funds for high priority projects in Santa Cruz County through the next federal transportation authorization, annual appropriations, stimulus, infrastructure investment, or other special funding bills or programs. Priority projects include (not shown in priority order):

   - Projects on Highway 1
   - Local road repair and sidewalk projects
   - Infrastructure improvements to the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line
   - Intelligent Transportation System (ITS)/511 program
   - Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District’s priority transit projects
   - Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSST)
   - Watsonville/Pajaro Rail Station

b) Promote inclusion of funding for transportation infrastructure and transit operations in any new national funding programs, including climate change, cap and trade, economic stimulus/jobs bills, or infrastructure investment legislation. Ensure that those funds are available to deliver state, regional, and local projects. Ensure flexibility to use the funds to accelerate delivery of existing projects.

c) Support timely annual allocations at the maximum levels allowed for programs authorized by the federal transportation act in order to meet growing transportation needs for local streets and roads, improving transit, relieving traffic congestion, encouraging alternative modes of transportation, and
meeting increased paratransit demands. Allow for flexibility to use Federal Transit Administration urban and non-urban funds for both capital and operations.
d) Oppose unfunded mandates on local and regional governments, in order to reduce project costs and maximize funding for infrastructure projects.
e) Support restoration of the Alternative Fuel Tax Credit, which provides approximately $800,000 annually to Santa Cruz METRO.

6. **Air Quality and Climate Change:**
a) Support federal action on climate change and energy policy and ensure that any legislation to reduce greenhouse gas emissions be structured in such a way as to assist the region and the state in achieving greenhouse gas reduction and mobility goals, not dilute state efforts. Ensure that any new environmental requirements are accompanied by additional funding necessary to implement those requirements.
b) Support research and development of renewable energy sources that reduce the amount of emissions from the combustion of fossil fuels and support the development of more fuel efficient vehicles.
c) Support a multi-pronged approach to addressing global warming, including carbon taxes or cap-and-trade systems and direct revenues to transportation and land use projects that reduce reliance on automobiles, including but not limited to public transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

7. **Support Improved Elderly and Disabled Transportation.**
a) Support increased funding for transportation services for seniors and people with disabilities, including those required by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and services beyond those required by ADA.
b) Support federal rule changes to reimburse non-emergency medical transportation through Medicare as a less costly alternative to ambulances and provide funding for medical dialysis transportation.
c) Require that all interstate transportation providers comply with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) provisions, including wheelchair accessibility requirements.

8. **Support Simplification and Expansion of Incentive Programs for Bicycle, Pedestrian, Carpool, and Transit Commuters.** In an effort to reduce congestion, pollution, wear and tear on roads, and vehicle miles traveled:
a) Expand grant programs to decrease single-occupancy vehicle trips.
b) Expand and simplify transportation fringe benefits in the tax code (Commuter Choice Tax Benefit): permanently increase pre-tax transportation benefits for public transit and vanpooling to at least the level allowed for parking expenses and make it easier for commuters to access the benefits.

*Please contact us at 831-460-3200 with any questions about the RTC Legislative Program.*
To: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
From: Karena Pushnik, Senior Transportation Planner
Re: City of Santa Cruz Article 8 Transportation Development Act Allocation Request

RECOMMENDATION

The Regional Transportation Commission’s Bicycle Committee, Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee and staff recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission approve by resolution the City of Santa Cruz’s Article 8 Transportation Development Act Allocation Claim for the following projects:
   a. Bikeway Striping and Minor Improvements - $20,000
   b. Bicycle Parking Program - $1,000
   c. West Cliff Drive Path Paving Phase 2 - $150,000

BACKGROUND

The Transportation Development Act (TDA) was established by the State Legislature in 1971. The TDA provides one of the major funding sources for public, specialized, bicycle and pedestrian transportation in California.

Each year the Regional Transportation Commission allocates Article 8 TDA funds for bikeway and pedestrian projects to local jurisdictions according to the RTC Rules & Regulations using a population formula. TDA funds allocated to a local jurisdiction may be rolled over from one fiscal year to the next.

As stated in the Rules and Regulations, a TDA Article 8 claim from local jurisdictions shall include a description of the project adequate for review by the RTC and its advisory committees; justification for the project including a statement regarding its consistency and relationship with the Regional Transportation Plan; estimated cost of the project including other funding sources; and a statement agreeing to maintain the funded project in the condition outlined in the submitted plans for a period of 20 years.

Allocation requests with pedestrian components must be reviewed by the Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee and requests for bicycle facilities must be reviewed by the Bicycle Advisory Committee prior to consideration by the RTC. According to the RTC Rules and Regulations, only Commissioners representing the County and the Cities are eligible to vote on Article 8 allocation requests.
DISCUSSION

The City of Santa Cruz submitted an allocation request and claim forms (Exhibits A-C) detailing the three projects for which funds are being requested:

1. **Bikeway Striping and Minor Improvements** – provides annual re-striping of the city’s 30 miles of bikeways, maintenance of bikeways, and minor improvements ($20,000);
2. **Bicycle Parking Program** – develops bicycle parking facilities at high use areas in the public right of way ($1,000);
3. **West Cliff Drive Path Paving Phase 2** – paving and minor widening of the multi-use path from Lighthouse Field to Almar Ave ($150,000).

At their December meeting, the Bicycle Committee reviewed all three claims which include bicycle components. The Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee reviewed only the West Cliff Drive Path claim at their December meeting which is the only one with pedestrian components.

**Both the Bicycle Committee and E&D TAC recommend that the RTC approve by resolution all three TDA claims (Attachment 1).**

SUMMARY

The City of Santa Cruz submitted three TDA Article 8 allocation requests for bicycle striping/minor improvements, bicycle parking program, and the West Cliff Drive path Paving Phase 2. The allocation requests from the city total $171,000, funds which are currently available from their TDA fund apportionment.

Attachment:
1. Resolution

Exhibits:
A. Article 8 TDA Allocation Request Letter from the City of Santa Cruz
B. City of Santa Cruz Allocation Claim Form for Bikeway Striping and Minor Improvements, and Bicycle Parking Program
C. City of Santa Cruz Allocation Claim Form for West Cliff Drive Path Paving Phase 2
RESOLUTION NO.

Adopted by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
on the date of January 24, 2013
on the motion of Commissioner
duly seconded by Commissioner

A RESOLUTION ALLOCATING $171,000 IN ARTICLE 8 TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT (TDA) FUNDS TO THE CITY OF SANTA CRUZ FOR BIKEWAY STRIPING/IMPROVEMENTS, BICYCLE PARKING PROGRAM, and WEST CLIFF DRIVE PATH PAVING PHASE 2

WHEREAS, the City of Santa Cruz has sufficient unallocated Article 8 TDA revenues and has submitted three TDA allocation request (Exhibit A) for a total of $171,000 for the following projects:
- Bikeway Striping and Minor Improvements - $20,000 (Exhibit B)
- Bicycle Parking Program - $1,000 (Exhibit B); and
- West Cliff Drive Path Paving Phase 2 - $150,000 (Exhibit C)

WHEREAS, the Bicycle Committee has reviewed all three TDA project funding requests pertaining to their charge and recommend their approval; and

WHEREAS, the Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee has reviewed the West Cliff Drive Path Paving TDA request pertaining to their charge to review pedestrian projects and recommend approval; and

WHEREAS, the proposed projects are consistent with the 2010 Regional Transportation Plan and the claimant agrees to maintain funded projects for a period of 20 years;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION:

1. $171,000 in TDA Article 8 funds is hereby allocated to the City of Santa Cruz for the following projects:
   a. $20,000 for Bikeway Striping and Minor Improvements to the city’s 30 miles of bikeways;
   b. $1,000 for the Bicycle Parking Program to provide bicycle parking at high use areas in the public rights of way; and
   c. $150,000 for West Cliff Drive Paving Phase 2 to provide paving and minor widening from Lighthouse Field to Almar Avenue.

AYES: COMMISSIONERS
NOES: COMMISSIONERS
ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS
ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS

____________________________
Neal Coonerty, Chair

ATTEST:

____________________________
George Dondero, Secretary

Exhibit A-C: TDA Article 8 Allocation Request Letter from the City of Santa Cruz and Claim Forms

Distribution: City of Santa Cruz Public Works
RTC Fiscal
RTC Bicycle Planner
RTC Pedestrian Planner
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October 16, 2012

Mr. George Dondero  
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission  
1523 Pacific Avenue  
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

RE: City of Santa Cruz – FY 2012-13 TDA Article 8 Allocation Request

Dear Mr. Dondero:

Please accept this letter as a FY 2012-13 TDA Article 8 allocation request for the following projects:

1. Bikeway Striping and Minor Improvements ($20,000): This project provides for the annual re-striping of the City’s 30 miles of bikeways, maintenance of bikeways and minor bikeway improvements. This project is entirely supported with TDA funds.

2. Bicycle Parking Program ($1,000): This program provides for the development of bicycle parking facilities at high use areas in the public right of way.

3. West Cliff Drive Path Paving Phase 2 ($150,000): The project provides for the paving and minor widening of the multi-use path from Lighthouse Field to Almar Avenue. The first phase was completed in the last two fiscal years and included the path pavement and minor widening between Bay Street and Lighthouse Avenue. The remaining balance of approximately $9,608 in the first phase will be expended in the second phase.

The City’s remaining small unallocated balance will be used to match existing grant applications, under funded projects, and future bikeway striping and parking projects.

As with all City claims, the City will commit to maintain any facilities provided with these funds for 20 years and will prepare all necessary environmental review for these projects. All of the projects above are consistent with the City Bicycle Transportation and Pedestrian Plans and the RTP.

Please call me at 420-5422 if you have any questions or need additional information.

Sincerely,

Christophe J. Schneiter  
Assistant Public Works Director/City Engineer  

Attachments: Claim Forms (2)  
cc: Transportation Coordinator (CS)  
Finance Department (SH)
Transportation Development Act (TDA) – Local Transportation Funds
CLAIM FORM
for Bike/Ped Projects
Submit a separate form for each project.

If you have any questions about this claim form or would like an electronic copy of the form, please contact the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission at 460-3200.

Project Information

1. Project Title: (1) Bikeway Striping and Minor Improvements
   (2) Bicycle Parking Program
2. Implementing Agency: City of Santa Cruz
3. Sponsoring Agency (if different) – must be a TDA Eligible Claimant:
4. TDA funding requested this claim: $ (1) $20,000 (2) $1,000
5. Fiscal Year (FY) for which funds are claimed: FY 12 / 13
6. General purpose for which the claim is made, identified by the article and section of the Act which authorizes such claims (ex. Article 8 Bicycle project): Article 8 Bicycle and/or Pedestrian Facilit
7. Contact Person/Project Manager: James Burr
   Telephone Number: (831) 420-5426 E-mail: jbur@cityofsantacruz.com
   Secondary Contact (in event primary not available): Rich Smith
   Telephone Number: (831) 420-5522 E-mail: rsmith@cityofsantacruz.com
8. Project/Program Description/Scope (use additional pages, if needed, to provide details such as work elements/tasks): Annual re-striping of the City's 30 miles of bikeways and minor bikeway improvements. Bike racks as needed.
9. Number of people to be served/anticipated number of users of project/program:
10. Project Location/Limits (attach a map and/or photos if available/applicable, include street names):
    Those streets most in need will be striped. Bike parking as needed.
11. Justification for the project. (Why is this project needed? Primary goal/purpose of the project; problem to be addressed; project benefits; importance to the community)
    (1) Traffic safety  (2) Convenience for bicyclists to park bicycles
12. Consistency and relationship with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) – please reference Project or Policy number:
    Policy 1.1: ensure that adequate support is provided to maintain and operate existing transportation system.
13. Measures of performance, success or completion to be used to evaluate project/program:
    Traffic safety
14. Impact(s) of project on other modes of travel, if any (ex. parking to be removed):

15. Project Cost/Budget, including other funding sources, and Schedule: (complete "10a" OR "10b")

**10a. Capital Projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Design/ Engineering</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Other *</th>
<th>Contingency</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCHEDULE (Month/Yr)</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>$4/13</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>$20,000 Bike</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>Striping as needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost/Phase</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>$1,000 Bike</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>Parking as needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$STDA requested
Source 2:
Source 3:
Source 4:

*Please describe what is included in “Other”:

**10b. Non-Capital Projects – Cost/Schedule:** List any tasks and amount per task for which TDA will be used. Can be substituted with alternate budget format.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Element/Activity/Task</th>
<th>SCHEDULE (Month/Yr)</th>
<th>Total Cost per Element</th>
<th>STDA requested</th>
<th>$ Source 2:</th>
<th>Source 3:</th>
<th>Source 4:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration/Overhead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 3:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 4:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex. Consultants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex. Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Preferred Method and Schedule for TDA fund distribution, consistent with the RTC Rules and Regulations (a. 90% prior to completion/10% upon completion; or b. 100% after completion):

17. Proposed schedule of regular progress reports:

18. TDA Eligibility:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>YES?/NO?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Has the project/program been approved by the claimant's governing body? Attach resolution to claim. (If &quot;NO,&quot; provide the approximate date approval is anticipated.)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Has this project previously received TDA funding?</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. For capital projects, have provisions been made by the claimant to maintain the project or facility,</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
or has the claimant arranged for such maintenance by another agency for the next 20 years? (If an agency other than the Claimant is to maintain the facility provide its name:)

| D. Has the project already been reviewed by the RTC Bicycle Committee and/or Elderly/Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee? (If "NO," project will be reviewed prior to RTC approval.) | yes |

**Documentation to Include with Your Claim:**

**All Claims**
- A letter of transmittal to SCCRTC addressed to the Executive Director that attests to the accuracy of the claim and all its accompanying documentation.
- Resolution indicating TDA eligible claimants’ roles and responsibilities and commitment to maintain facilities as indicated in the submitted plans for a period of 20 years.

**Article 3 & 8 Bicycle/Pedestrian Claims**
- Evidence of environmental review for capital projects
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Transportation Development Act (TDA) – Local Transportation Funds

CLAIM FORM

for Bike/Ped Projects

Submit a separate form for each project.

*If you have any questions about this claim form or would like an electronic copy of the form, please contact the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission at 460-3200.*

**Project Information**

1. Project Title: West Cliff Drive Path Paving Phase 2

2. Implementing Agency: City of Santa Cruz

3. Sponsoring Agency (if different) – must be a TDA Eligible Claimant:

4. TDA funding requested this claim: $150,000

5. Fiscal Year (FY) for which funds are claimed: FY 12 / 13

6. General purpose for which the claim is made, identified by the article and section of the Act which authorizes such claims (ex. Article 8 Bicycle project): Article ___ ______________________________

7. Contact Person/Project Manager: Chris Schneider
   Telephone Number: 420-5422
   E-mail: cschneider@cityofsantacruz.com

   Secondary Contact (in event primary not available): Josh Spangrud
   Telephone Number: 420-5178
   E-mail:jspangrud@cityofsantacruz.com

8. Project/Program Description/Scope (use additional pages, if needed, to provide details such as work elements/tasks): Paving and minor widening of multi-use path

9. Number of people to be served/anticipated number of users of project/program:

10. Project Location/Limits (attach a map and/or photos if available/applicable, include street names): Lighthouse Field to Almar Avenue

11. Justification for the project. (Why is this project needed? Primary goal/purpose of the project; problem to be addressed; project benefits; importance to the community)
   Maintenance for bicyclists' and pedestrians' safety

12. Consistency and relationship with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) – please reference Project or Policy number: Policy 1.1: ensure that adequate support is provided to maintain and operate existing transportation system

13. Measures of performance, success or completion to be used to evaluate project/program:
   Traffic safety
14. Impact(s) of project on other modes of travel, if any (ex. parking to be removed):

15. Project Cost/Budget, including other funding sources, and Schedule: (complete "10a" OR "10b")

### 10a. Capital Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHEDULE (Month/Yr)</th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Design/Engineering</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Contingency</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>JULY 13</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>SEPT 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost/Phase</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>135,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STDA requested

Source 2:

Source 3:

Source 4:

*Please describe what is included in "Other":*

### 10b. Non-Capital Projects – Cost/Schedule: List any tasks and amount per task for which TDA will be used. Can be substituted with alternate budget format.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Element/Activity/Task</th>
<th>SCHEDULE (Month/Yr)</th>
<th>Total Cost per Element</th>
<th>STDA requested</th>
<th>$ Source 2:</th>
<th>Source 3:</th>
<th>Source 4:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration/Overhead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 3:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 4:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex. Consultants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex. Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Preferred Method and Schedule for TDA fund distribution, consistent with the RTC Rules and Regulations (a. 90% prior to completion/10% upon completion; or b. 100% after completion):

17. Proposed schedule of regular progress reports:

18. TDA Eligibility:

| A. Has the project/program been approved by the claimant's governing body? Attach resolution to claim. (If "NO," provide the approximate date approval is anticipated.) | YES?/NO? |
| B. Has this project previously received TDA funding? | No |
| C. For capital projects, have provisions been made by the claimant to maintain the project or facility, | |
or has the claimant arranged for such maintenance by another agency for the next 20 years? (If an agency other than the Claimant is to maintain the facility provide its name: __________________________ )  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D. Has the project already been reviewed by the RTC Bicycle Committee and/or Elderly/Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee? (If &quot;NO,&quot; project will be reviewed prior to RTC approval).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. For &quot;bikeways,&quot; does the project meet Caltrans minimum safety design criteria pursuant to Chapter 1000 of the California Highway Design Manual? (Available on the internet via: <a href="http://www.dot.ca.gov">http://www.dot.ca.gov</a>).</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Documentation to Include with Your Claim:**

**All Claims**

- A letter of transmittal to SCCRTC addressed to the Executive Director that attests to the accuracy of the claim and all its accompanying documentation.
- Resolution indicating TDA eligible claimants' roles and responsibilities and commitment to maintain facilities as indicated in the submitted plans for a period of 20 years.

**Article 3 & 8 Bicycle/Pedestrian Claims**

- Evidence of environmental review for capital projects
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