AGENDA

Thursday, May 5, 2011
9:00 a.m.

NOTE LOCATION THIS MONTH
Board of Supervisors Chambers
701 Ocean St., Fifth Floor
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

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)      Rich Krumholz
City of Capitola          Kirby Nicol
City of Santa Cruz        Don Lane
City of Scotts Valley     Randy Johnson
City of Watsonville       Eduardo Montesino
County of Santa Cruz      Ellen Pirie
County of Santa Cruz      John Leopold
County of Santa Cruz      Mark Stone
County of Santa Cruz      Neal Coonerty
County of Santa Cruz      Greg Caput
Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District Dene Bustichi
Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District Lynn Robinson
Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District Norm Hagen

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 April 7, 2011 regular SCCRTC meeting

   5. Approve draft minutes of the April 7, 2011 Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (SAFE) meeting

   6. Approve draft minutes of the April 21, 2011 Transportation Policy Workshop

   7. Accept draft minutes of the April 4, 2011 Bicycle Committee meeting

   8. Accept draft minutes of the April 12, 2011 Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee meeting

   **POLICY ITEMS**

   *No consent items*

   **PROJECTS and PLANNING ITEMS**

   9. Approve FY 2011-12 Section 5310 Scores

   10. Accept third quarter FY 10-11 Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) work program progress report
BUDGET AND EXPENDITURES ITEMS

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

ADMINISTRATION ITEMS

12. Accept reappointments to the Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee

INFORMATION/OTHER ITEMS

13. Accept monthly meeting schedule
14. Accept correspondence log
15. Accept letters from SCCRTC committees and staff to other agencies
   a. Letter from the Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee to the Santa Cruz Metro Transit District regarding proposed 12% service cuts
   b. Letter from the RTC to Senator Christine Kehoe regarding amendments to SB 468 – Increasing State Highway Projects: Coastal Zone
16. Accept miscellaneous written comments from the public on SCCRTC projects and transportation issues - None
17. Accept information items
   a. Letter from the Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors to the RTC regarding the 2010 California Statewide Local Streets and Roads Assessment (LSRA) report
   b. Article from Progressive Planning titled “Just Transportation Planning” by Richard Marcantonio

REGULAR AGENDA

18. Commissioner reports-oral reports
19. Director’s report – oral report  
   (George Dondero, Executive Director)
20. Caltrans report and consider action items
   a. Construction projects report
21. Sidewalk Maintenance Public Outreach Campaign  
   (Veronica Elsea, Pedestrian Safety Work Group Chair)
   a. Staff report
b. Sidewalk Maintenance Outreach Campaign including 4 key messages and outreach components

22. **10:00 A.M. PUBLIC HEARING**: 2011 unmet specialized transportation and transit needs  
   *(Karena Pushnik, Senior Transportation Planner)*

   a. Staff report
   b. Draft SCCRTC list of unmet specialized transportation/transit needs for 2011

23. FY 2011-12 Article 8 Transportation Development Act (TDA) claim for the Volunteer Center  
    *(Karena Pushnik, Senior Transportation Planner)*

   a. Staff report
   b. Resolution approving TDA funds for the City of Santa Cruz on behalf of the Volunteer Center
   c. TDA claim form and background information from the Volunteer Center

24. FY 2011-12 Article 8 Transportation Development Act (TDA) claim for Community Bridges  
    *(Karena Pushnik, Senior Transportation Planner)*

   a. Staff report
   b. Resolution authorizing FY 2011-12 TDA funds for the City of Santa Cruz on behalf of Community Bridges
   c. TDA claim form and background information from Community Bridges

25. Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District FY 11/12 Claim for Article 4 Transportation Development Act Funds and State Transit Assistance funds  
    *(Karena Pushnik, Senior Transportation Planner)*

   a. Staff report
   b. Resolution for TDA claim
   c. TDA claim from SCMTD
   d. SCMTD annual report

26. Review of items to be discussed in closed session

   **CLOSED SESSION**

27. Conference with Real Property Negotiator Pursuant to Government Code 54956.8 relating to the freight easement: Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line from Watsonville Junction to Davenport

   Agency Negotiator: Kirk Trost, Miller Owen & Trost
Negotiation Parties: SCCRTC, Union Pacific
Under Negotiation: Price and Terms

OPEN SESSION

28. Report on closed session

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

30. Next Meetings

   The next Transportation Policy Workshop meeting is scheduled for Thursday, May 19, 2011 at 9:00 a.m. at the SCCRTC Offices, 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA.

   The next SCCRTC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, June 2, 2011 at 9:00 a.m. at the Watsonville City Council Chambers, 275 Main St., Watsonville CA 95067

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
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
   - Branciforte Library
   - Central Branch 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 anticipo 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.
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission

MINUTES

Thursday
April 7, 2011
9:00 a.m.

Cit of Capitola Chambers
420 Capitola Avenue
Capitola CA 95010

1. Roll call

The meeting was called to order at 9:01 am.

Members present:
Greg Caput
Neal Coonerty
Daniel Dodge
Donald Hagen
Donna Lind (Alt)
Don Lane
John Leopold
Eduardo Montesino
Kirby Nicol
Ellen Pirie
Lynn Robinson
Mark Stone
Aileen Loe (ex officio)

Staff present:
George Dondero
Gini Pineda
Karena Pushnik
Cory Caletti
Ginger Dykaar
Luis Mendez
Yesenia Parra
Rachel Moriconi
Grace Blakeslee

2. Oral communications

Jack Nelson referred to a book titled “Mistakes Were Made (but not by me)” by Elliot Aronson adding that Japan is suffering the consequences of ignoring a problem with a nuclear reactor. Mr. Nelson also mentioned “With Speed and Violence: Why Scientists Fear Tipping Points in Climate Change” that says climate change will put places like Santa Cruz under water.

3. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agendas

Executive Director George Dondero said that there were handouts for Items 19, 20 and 21.
Commissioner Nicol asked to pull Items 8 and 10 from the consent agenda. Chair Stone designated them as 24.1 and 24.2 respectively.

CONSENT AGENDA (Pirie/Leopold as amended)

MINUTES

4. Approved draft minutes of the March 3, 2011 regular SCCRTC meeting

5. Approved draft minutes of the March 17, 2011 Transportation Policy Workshop meeting

6. Accepted draft minutes of the February 15, 2011 Bicycle Committee meeting

7. Accepted draft minutes of the March 17, 2011 Interagency Technical Advisory Committee meeting

POLICY ITEMS

No consent items

PROJECTS and PLANNING ITEMS

No consent items

BUDGET AND EXPENDITURES ITEMS

8. Accept status report on Transportation Development Act (TDA) revenues – Removed from consent agenda

9. Accepted semi-annual internal financial report (enclosed separately for Commissioners)

ADMINISTRATION ITEMS

10. Accept recommendation for the reappointment of representatives to the California Association of Councils of Governments (CalCOG) and the Coast Rail Coordinating Council (CRCC) - Removed from consent agenda

11. Approved Bicycle Committee membership appointments

12. Approved Memoranda of Understanding extensions

INFORMATION/OTHER ITEMS

13. Accepted monthly meeting schedule
14. Accepted correspondence log

15. Accepted letters from SCCRTC committees and staff to other agencies
   a. Letter from the Bicycle Committee to Caltrans District 5 Local Assistance regarding support for the City of Capitola’s Bicycle Transportation Account
   b. Letter from the Bicycle Committee to Caltrans District 5 Local Assistance regarding support for the City of Santa Cruz’ Bicycle Transportation Account
   c. Letter from RTC to Caltrans Bicycle Facilities Unit regarding certification of 2011 Santa Cruz County Bicycle Plan

16. Accepted miscellaneous written comments from the public on SCCRTC projects and transportation issues - None

17. Accepted information items - None

REGULAR AGENDA

18. Commissioner reports-none

19. Director’s report – oral report

   Executive Director George Dondero reported that the Pedestrian Safety Workshop held in Watsonville on March 25th was a success with about 25 attendees. He thanked Commissioners Caput, Montesino and Dodge for participating in the workshop.

   Mr. Dondero announced that the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network project is officially underway now that the notice to proceed was issued to RRM Design Group, the firm selected to conduct the Master Plan and Environmental Review for the project.

   In addition, Mr. Dondero said that the Watsonville satellite office is almost ready for use and that the 511 Traveler Information Systems project had a kick-off meeting last Tuesday which was well-attended.

20. Caltrans report and consider action items

   Aileen Loe, Caltrans District 5, said that state bond sales are critical to funding the auxiliary lanes. Ms. Loe reported that Highway 1 at Big Sur should be open by the end of April and noted that April is Safety Awareness Month.

   Dan Herron, Caltrans District 5, presented a PowerPoint describing a concrete barrier safety project which will be constructed on Highway 1 between the pedestrian overcrossing near Mission Street and the railroad tracks near the Harvey West area. The purpose of the project is to prevent cross-median collisions and is scheduled to start construction in mid-January 2012. The project will also include minor drainage improvements and improve the
shoulder in some locations. The estimated project construction cost is $1,365,500, not including support costs.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Leopold, Mr. Herron said that Caltrans is responsible for graffiti removal.

21. Presentation on Salinas Road Interchange by Debbie Hale, Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC)

Debbie Hale, Executive Director of the Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC), made a presentation on the status of construction of the new interchange at Salinas Road and Highway 1, just south of Watsonville and the Santa Cruz county line. The new interchange consists of a 3 lane bridge-structure (Salinas Road) over Highway 1 with on-and off-ramps. This project will make vital safety improvements to an interchange with high collision rates, reduce delays for 43,000 vehicles that travel the corridor daily, and support interregional travel between Highways 1 and 101. Construction is scheduled to be complete in July 2013.

Commissioners expressed support for the safety project.

22. Presentation from City of Capitola Public Works

Steve Jesberg, City of Capitola Public Works Director, gave an update on recently completed, current and future transportation projects. In addition to addressing recent storm damage, the Public Works department has been working on RTC-funded improvements to 38th Avenue near Capitola Road to add a new sidewalk, bicycle lanes, and reconstruct the roadway, as well as several traffic calming projects. In addition, plans are underway for a parking structure in the Pacific Cove parking lot that would have the uppermost level at the same level as the rail line, with the possibility of a rail station in the future.

23. Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line acquisition project

Deputy Director Luis Mendez gave a status report detailing the steps necessary to complete the purchase since obtaining funding approval from the state in January. The steps include approval by the federal Surface Transportation Board (STB). He noted that Caltrans approval had been completed. Close of escrow is dependent on receipt of the STB ruling. A community commemoration event will be held after the purchase is complete.

Mr. Mendez said that Sierra Northern is working on the washout in the Aptos area and that RTC staff has been out to inspect the slide off Buena Vista. Full service should resume in 2-3 weeks.

**Jack Nelson** said the acquisition is exciting and hopes that planning for bike trails will begin soon.
Peter Haworth asked if the $5 million in State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds will cause cuts for other projects. Executive Director Dondero said that STIP funding has been around for 20 years and is expected to continue and that the funding for the rail line improvements is already programmed and should be available in the near future.

24. Agreements with Caltrans and other agencies to receive funds

Executive Director George Dondero said that, periodically, funding agreements with Caltrans need to be updated. He added that the resolution would also allow the Executive Director to sign other agreements to receive regional, state and federal funds.

Commissioner Pirie moved and Commissioner Nicol seconded to approve the staff recommendations that the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) approve a resolution authorizing the Executive Director to sign and enter into Master Fund Transfer Agreements and other funding agreements with Caltrans and other regional, state or federal agencies, as may be necessary, to receive regional, state and federal funds, consistent with the RTC Budget and Work Program.

The motion (Resolution 20-11) passed unanimously.

24.1 Accept status report on Transportation Development Act (TDA) revenues – Formally Item 8

Commissioner Nicol asked about an apparent decline in TDA revenues for March. Deputy Director Mendez clarified that adjustments are made to the revenue amount every three months providing a more accurate report. It was noted that revenues are up slightly over last year.

Commissioner Leopold moved and Commissioner Robinson seconded to accept the report. The motion passed unanimously.

24.2 Accept recommendation for the reappointment of representatives to the California Association of Councils of Governments (CalCOG) and the Coast Rail Coordinating Council (CRCC) – Formally Item 10

Commissioner Nicol said that he favored the staff recommendations but wanted to call attention to the Coast Daylight plan which shows low ridership numbers and questions whether millions will be served by the train. Commissioner Leopold committed to bringing that to the attention of the CRCC.

Commissioner Lane moved and Commissioner Pirie seconded to accept the recommendation. The motion passed unanimously.

25. Adjourn to special meeting of the Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies
The Commission adjourned to the Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies meeting at 10:02 am.

The Commission reconvened to the regular RTC meeting at 10:21 am.

26. Next Meetings

The meeting adjourned at 10:22 am.

The next Transportation Policy Workshop meeting is scheduled for Thursday, April 21, 2011 at 9:00 a.m. at the SCCRTC Offices, 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA.

The next SCCRTC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, May 5, 2011 at 9:00 a.m. at the City of Board of Supervisors Chambers, 701 Ocean St., Santa Cruz CA.

Respectfully submitted,

Gini Pineda, Staff

ATTENDEES

Dan Herron
Debbie Hale
Steve Jesberg
Jack Nelson
Jack Haworth

Caltrans
TAMC
City of Capitola
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The meeting was called to order at 10:01 am by Chair Stone.

1. Oral communications - None

2. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agendas - None

**CONSENT AGENDA**

*No consent items*

**REGULAR AGENDA**

3. Freeway Service Patrol Program on Highway 17 – Extension of Contract Term

Transportation Planner Ginger Dykaar gave the staff report saying that the Freeway Service Patrol operates in partnership with Caltrans and the California Highway Patrol (CHP) and provides tow services with the goal of reducing congestion due to highway incidents. It is primarily funded by state funds and provides about 2,000 assists annually.

Commissioners discussed the hourly rate of the current contract, the rate of the proposed contract rejected at February’s SAFE meeting, whether the route along Highway 1 could be extended to Rio del Mar and if lower costs could be negotiated.

Deputy Director Mendez said that extending the Highway 1 route could make it too long for the trucks to make their rounds but that the CHP will call for assistance if needed south of the existing limit.

**Jack Ladd**, Ladd’s Towing, thanked the Commission for choosing Ladd’s to provide FSP service for the last 12 years.

Commissioner Leopold moved and Commissioner Hagen seconded to approve
the staff recommendations that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) serving as the Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (SAFE):

1. Approve a resolution to extend the current contract with Ladd’s Towing for Freeway Service Patrol (FSP) on Highway 17 for two years to July 7, 2013; and
2. Direct staff to return to RTC SAFE prior to initiating the next FSP towing service procurement process with proposed recommendations for the procurement process and to obtain RTC SAFE direction.

The motion (Resolution 21-11) passed unanimously.

4. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 10:21am.

Respectfully submitted,

Gini Pineda, Staff
MINUTES
Thursday, April 21, 2011
9:00 a.m.

NOTE LOCATION THIS MONTH
SCCRTC Conference Room
1523 Pacific Ave
Santa Cruz Ca

1. Introductions

Commissioner Nicol called the meeting to order at 9:03 am. Self-introductions were made.

Members present:
Dene Bustichi  Kirby Nicol
Greg Caput    Lynn Robinson
Norm Hagen    Andy Schiffrin (Alt)
Randy Johnson Mark Stone
John Leopold  David Terrazas (Alt)

Members absent:
Eduardo Montesino Ellen Pirie

Staff present:
George Dondero Karena Pushnik
Luis Mendez Yesenia Parra
Gini Pineda Cory Caletti
Rachel Moriconi Tegan Speiser
Ginger Dykaar

Federal legislative assistants Carolyn Chaney and Chris Giglio joined the meeting via phone.
2. Oral communications

Jack Nelson said that he attended Earth Day festivities last Saturday and noted several electric vehicles displayed, including the Nissan Leaf which he said is on the road to being a zero emissions vehicle.

Deputy Director Luis Mendez said that the rail acquisition commemoration may be postponed to September 17th or later.

3. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agendas - None

CONSENT AGENDA (Leopold/Schiffrin unanimous)

4. Monterey Bay Area 511 Traveler Information Plan project schedule

Commission Alternate Schiffrin asked for a memo containing the dates of the public meetings on the project.

REGULAR AGENDA

5. Federal legislation update

Senior Planner Rachel Moriconi introduced federal legislative assistants Carolyn Chaney and Chris Giglio of Capital Edge.

Ms. Chaney reviewed the continuing resolution that will take the federal budget through the end of September, noting that funding for high speed rail has been cut along with reductions in funding for projects to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Chris Giglio reported on the conflicting 2012 budget proposals from the administration and the House Republicans in which the President has indicated support for high speed rail and new starts rail projects and the House is proposing decreases in rail funding and increases in highway funding.

Commissioner Alternate Schiffrin asked if TIGER Recovery Act grants could be used for rail renovation. Ms. Chaney said they could be used for track rehabilitation, but that they are a highly competitive funding source. She added that higher priority is given to multi-agency programs or unique projects. Mr. Giglio confirmed that receiving STIP funds would qualify as multi-agency collaboration.

Ms. Chaney continued with an update on the federal transportation reauthorization bill, saying that Chairman Mica of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee is pushing for a 6-year bill consisting of less than half the funding contained in the previous SAFETEA-LU transportation bill, although the administration has requested more funding. In the Senate, Senator Boxer is trying to increase the TIFIA (Transportation Infrastructure
Finance and Innovation Act) loans which leverage local money for surface transportation projects, emphasizing that infrastructure is an important economic development tool. Ms. Chaney added that a reauthorization bill will probably not be passed prior to the November elections and said she would follow up on the RTC’s filing with the Surface Transportation Board to determine if it will be a 30 or 90 day filing.

6. Consolidation of Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) and Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (Santa Cruz Metro)

Executive Director George Dondero said that the item was put on the agenda at the request of Commissioner Bustichi. He said that issues to discuss might include commission expectations of a merger in addition to possible cost saving, protecting Metro’s ½ cent sales tax, and deciding whether to hire a consultant or to use staff to research the pros and cons of a merger.

Commissioner Stone said that he is concerned about threshold questions like preserving the Metro’s sales tax revenue and offered, if the Commission is interested in moving forward, to connect with counsel from both agencies and then work on a timeline and process before investing staff time.

Commissioners raised several issues including that mergers of planning agencies and transit agencies have happened in other areas; that there are possible benefits to coordinating transit operations and planning; that Metro is in the middle of cutbacks and negotiations; that funding to both agencies could be at risk; that the governing board of a merged agency should be representative of all citizens; that there are concerns about funding to other programs; that there are assumptions of cost savings and efficiencies given the goals of the two agencies; and that a merger wouldn’t fix the transit district’s current financial difficulties. It was noted that the many agencies in the region coordinate planning to try to eliminate duplication of efforts.

Bonnie Morr said that transit is part of multiple projects that the RTC oversees and supported a holistic approach.

Commissioners discussed whether to hire a consultant, if both boards would have to agree to a merger, and if enough cost savings and/or efficiencies would be realized by a merger.

Commissioner Alternate Schiffrin moved to request the RTC chair to meet with the attorneys for both agencies and return as soon as reasonable with a report on the potential effects of the proposed consolidation on the funding sources for the two agencies. Commissioner Terrazas seconded.

Commissioner Robinson asked for a friendly amendment to include the Metro chair in discussions with the legal counsels. Commissioner Alternate Schiffrin added that his motion includes the Metro Chair.
The motion passed unanimously.

7. Next meetings

The meeting adjourned at 10:14am.

The next regular SCCRTC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, May 5, 2011 at 9:00 a.m. at the Board of Supervisors Chambers, 701 Ocean St., Fifth Floor, Santa Cruz, CA.

The next Transportation Policy Workshop is scheduled for Thursday, May 19, 2011 at 9:00 am at the SCCRTC Offices, 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA.

Respectfully submitted,

Gini Pineda, Staff

ATTENDEES

Angela Aitken  SCMTD
Mike Keogh
Bonnie Morr  UTU
Jack Nelson
Daniel Dodge  City of Watsonville
1. Call to Order at 6:33 pm

2. Introductions

Members Present:
Kem Akol, District 1
David Casterson, District 2, Vice Chair
Bill Fieberling, City of Santa Cruz
Eric Horton, District 2 (Alt.)
Rick Hyman, District 5
Leo Jed, CTSC (Alt.)
Jim Langley, CTSC
Will Menchine, District 3 (Alt.)
Lex Rau, Scotts Valley (Alt.)
Peter Scott, District 3
Holly Tyler, District 1 (Alt.)
Andy Ward, City of Capitola (Alt.)

Vacancies:
District 4 – Alternate
District 5 – Alternate
City of Watsonville – Alternate
Bike to Work – Alternate

Unexcused Absences:

Excused Absences:

Excused Absences:
Brandon Kett, District 4
Bob Montague, City of Watsonville
Carlos Garza, City of Santa Cruz (Alt.)
Daniel Kostelec, City of Capitola, Chair
Gary Milburn, City of Scotts Valley

Guests:
Cathy Crowe, UC Santa Cruz
Katie LeBaron, Santa Cruz County HSA
Shane Moutafian, Guest/Watsonville resident
Nick Mucha, Ecology Action/Bike-to-Work

Staff:
Cory Caletti, Senior Transportation Planner

3. Announcements – Cory Caletti announced that Bicycle Committee appointments for three year terms will be considered by the RTC at the April 7th, 2011 meeting, that the RTC is finalizing purchase of the Santa Cruz branch rail line and that a commemoration event is being planned following the close of escrow. The day and time of the event is yet to be decided.

4. Oral Communications – none

5. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agenda - none
CONSENT AGENDA

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

6. Approved draft minutes of the February 15, 2011 Bicycle Committee meeting
7. Accepted Hazard Reports
8. Accepted Bicycle Committee Roster
9. Accepted letter to Caltrans regarding RTC certification of the 2011 Santa Cruz County Bicycle Plan
10. Accepted letters to Caltrans in support of Bicycle Transportation Account grant applications from the City of Santa Cruz for Mission Street Extension improvements and from the City of Capitola for video detection sensors and bicycle parking
11. Accepted letter of support for the County of Santa Cruz Health Service Agency’s Office of Traffic Safety grant application
12. Accepted letter to Mayor Coonerty and City of Santa Cruz Council Members regarding the proposed Market Street/Isbel housing development and recommendations for off-site transportation improvements
13. Accepted correspondence from People Power reporting on City of Santa Cruz Council action on transportation improvement decisions for the Market Street corridor in the vicinity of the proposed housing development
14. Accepted letter to Mayor Coonerty and City of Santa Cruz Council Members regarding the City’s bicycle licensing ordinance
15. Approved Bikes Secure/Bicycle Parking Subside Program applications from Second Harvest Food Bank and Encina Investment Group

REGULAR AGENDA

16. Officer Elections - Cory Caletti gave an overview of the officer election process as defined in the RTC Rules and Regulations. Cory Caletti thanked departing chair Daniel Kostelec and Vice-Chair, David Casterson, for their dedicated service. Nominations were opened for Chair and Vice-Chair. A motion (Akol/Scott) to nominate David Casterson as Chair passed unanimously. A motion (Langley/Akol) to nominate Andy Ward as Vice-Chair passed unanimously.

17. Community Traffic Safety Coalition (CTSC) and Ride ‘n Stride FY 11/12 Transportation Development Act (TDA) Funding Request – Cory Caletti gave an overview of the TDA allocation process. HSA submitted their FY 11-12 TDA funding allocation requests, budgets, work programs and claim forms for review and consideration by the Bicycle Committee and the RTC. While sales tax revenue reductions in recent years required reduced TDA apportionments, HSA requested restoration of the RTC’s full funding commitment of $100,000 due to upward trends in TDA revenues. RTC staff recommends that the Bicycle Committee review the proposed programs and approve the claim for $100,000 in FY 11/12 TDA funds.
Katie LeBaron, County of Santa Cruz Health Services Agency, shared information about the CTSC mission and work program. The CTSC functions to promote biking and walking as alternative transportation modes and provides safety education. The 5 focus areas for the upcoming fiscal year are: 1) public media campaign, 2) education and training, 3) advocacy and encouragement, 4) engineering, and 5) enforcement. These goals were arrived at by the member agencies, law enforcement, and individual advocates who come together to further the coalition’s mission. Katie also addressed the Ride ‘n Stride elementary school program which provides presentations to school children on safe bicycling and walking practices. A motion (Scott/Fieberling) to recommend approval of the CTSC and Ride ‘n Stride programs’ TDA funding requests passed unanimously.

18. Bike to Work FY 11/12 Transportation Development Act Funding Request – Nick Mucha of Ecology Action summarized accomplishments for the 2010 Bike-to-School/Bike-to-Work program and reviewed participation rate increases. Nick provided detailed information pertaining to the number of participating schools and students and mentioned the need for further outreach to the South County area. He said that over the course of 2011 he will be sending out over 40 e-news blasts for events and commuter tips in addition to a sub-enews group of novice riders to receive information relevant to their new cyclists. Nick mentioned that Bike-to-School/Bike-to-Work received $22,000 in cash support with food and goods provided as in kind donations along with hundreds of volunteer hours. Ecology Action is submitting its TDA claim for $50,000 to support ongoing events and expanded outreach efforts, reflecting restoration of the full amount the RTC has committed to providing prior to sales tax revenue shortfalls, as well as a $10,000 increase. A motion (Langley/Scott) to approve Ecology Actions TDA funding claim for $50,000 passed unanimously.

19. Review Subcommittee Memberships - Cory Caletti gave an overview of the existing subcommittees and their composition and indicated that each year the Bicycle Committee reviews the continued relevance of each committee and makes any necessary changes to membership. All committees remain intact with the same members except for the following:
   - City of Santa Cruz Project Tracking: Bill Fieberling and Rick Hyman remain as members. Cory will check with Carlos Garza regarding his continued interest.
   - City of Capitola Project Tracking: Andy Ward remains as the only representative.
   - City of Scotts Valley project Tracking: Lex Rau remains. Lex will check with Gary Milburn regarding his continued interest in participating.
   - City of Watsonville Project Tracking: Cory will check with Bob Montague regarding his continued interest.
   - Bike to Work: Nick Mucha will be the primary member and Piet Canin will act as the back-up contact.
   - CTSC and the South County Bike/Pedestrian Work Group Update: Jim Langley and Leo Jed will continue as members. Cory will check with Bob Montague regarding his continued interest.
   - Legislative Tracking: Leo Jed is the primary member, followed by Andy Ward.
   - Committee Effectiveness: Disbanded
   - Technical Subcommittee: Change membership to Will Menchine, Rick Hyman, Andy Ward and Kem Akol
   - Bicyclist/Motorist Safety Education: Leo Jed, Will Menchine, Bob Montague

20. Project Tracking/Subcommittee Tasks: Oral Reports
   a. City of Santa Cruz Project Tracking: Rick Hyman discussed the traffic circle project
near Pacific Avenue. He discussed the City Council’s actions on the Market Street bicycle facility requests and the upcoming decision regarding the Capital Improvement Program which will determine if a project will be programmed. He also reported that the City is beginning conceptualizing of the Branciforte River Crossing and that a subcommittee will meet with Kim Shultz, RTC Senior Planner, to review Highway 1 Auxiliary Lanes plans and a bicycle/pedestrian path feasibility study related to the HOV lane project.

b. City of Capitola Project Tracking: no report

c. City of Scotts Valley Project Tracking: Lex Rau reported that he met with Majid Yamin regarding the City’s implementation of a street sweeping schedule, wide longitudinal cracks on Glen Canyon Road, and continued development of the Bike Plan. In response to a question, Cory Caletti said that the City did not submit a Bicycle Transportation Account application because no matching funds are available.

d. City of Watsonville Project Tracking: No report

e. County of Santa Cruz Project Tracking: Kem Akol discussed Redevelopment Association bicycle projects threatened by the Governor’s budget proposal. Kem will investigate which projects are in danger and report back at the next meeting.

f. Bike-to-Work Update: Nick Mucha said that there will be no commuter race this year for Bike Week but many other activities are being planned.

g. CTSC and the South County Bike/Pedestrian Work Group Update: Discussed earlier

h. UCSC: Peter Scott reported on a number of bicycle parking improvement projects on campus, including submission of bicycle locker grant and installation of additional lightning bolt bicycle parking racks.

i. Legislative Tracking: Leo Jed said that there are 26 bills introduced in the legislature that mention bicycling of which only 9 are of significance and will be monitored by the statewide California Bicycle Coalition. A bill introduced by the City of Los Angeles for 3 foot minimum passing distance is being monitored closely.

j. Sanctuary Scenic Trail: Cory Caletti indicated that the contract with RRM Design, the consultant engaged to develop the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network Master Plan and environmental document, has been signed. The “notice to proceed” was issued and consultants will initially be focusing on data collection and base mapping. Public workshops and stakeholders meetings are planned for August 2011.

k. Committee Effectiveness: No report

l. Technical Subcommittee: No report

m. Bicyclist/Motorist Safety Education: No report

n. RTC Packet Monitoring Subcommittee: No report

o. Safe Routes to School: Will Menchine is working on bicycle safety improvements at Mission Hill School.

21. Meeting adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

NEXT MEETING: The next Bicycle Committee meeting is scheduled for Monday, June 13th, 2011 at the Special Meeting Time of 6:30 p.m. at the RTC office, 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA.

Minutes respectfully prepared and submitted by:

Cathy Judd, Administrative Assistant II and Cory Caletti, Senior Transportation Planner
MINUTES-DRAFT
Tuesday, April 12, 2011

1. Call to Order

John Daugherty called the meeting to order at 1:39 pm

2. Introductions

Members Present:
Hal Anjo, Social Service Provider-Seniors (County)
Lisa Berkowitz, CTSA-Community Bridges
Debbi Brooks, Persons of Limited Means (Volunteer Center)
John Daugherty, Metro
Veronica Elsea, 3rd District
Sally French, Soc. Serv. Prov.-Disabled (Hope Services)
Clay Kempf, Soc. Serv. Prov.-Seniors Council
Mike Molesky, Social Service Provider - Disabled
Catherine Patterson Valdez, CTSA/Comm. Bridges, by phone
Patti Shevlin, 1st District
Robert White, 5th District

Alternates Present:
Kirk Ance, CTSA Lift Line
Sharon Barbour, 5th District

Staff Present:
Karena Pushnik

Others Present:
Tove Beatty, SCMTD

3. Oral Communications

Veronica Elsea commented on the ticket machine at the Metro station saying that the credit card feature is not accessible and that she contacted Metro to let them know.

Mike Molesky said that IHSS Commission has two openings, that they hold meetings every other month on the first Friday of the month at the offices on Emeline Street, Building K from 1:30 to 3:30 pm.

John Daugherty told members that Metro has modified its service reduction to a 12% cut. Metro Board will consider the service reduction proposal on Friday April 22, and will make its final decision at its second meeting June 24 with the service reduction taking place in September 2011. Tove Beatty also noted that Metro has a $3.8 million funding gap, and that the $1.4 million in proposed service cuts will still leave a $2.4 million budget hole to solve. Karena Pushnik volunteered to forward information to E&D TAC members about the public hearings that Metro will hold on the service cuts once the dates are available.

Action: The motion (Kempf/Elsea) -- to add Metro’s Service Reduction Plan as Item 19 to the agenda, an urgency action item regarding Metro service cuts – carries with one abstention.

4. Additions and Deletions

John Daugherty announced an agenda change to move Item 16 after Item 12.
Karena Pushnik told members that there would be a commemoration event when escrow closes for acquisition of the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line and that an invitation will be sent out to members once the day and time have been determined.

CONSENT AGENDA

**Action:** The motion (Kempf/Anjo) -- to approve and accept the consent agenda -- carries with Mike Molesky abstaining.

5. Approved Minutes from February 8, 2011 meeting
6. Received Transportation Development Act Revenues Report as of March 2011
7. Received RTC Highlights through March 2011
8. Received Information Items
   a. Article in 2/11/11 Contra Costa Times titled *DMV comes to aid of older drivers*
9. Received Agency Updates
   a. Volunteer Center
   b. Community Bridges/CTSA
   c. Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (METRO)
      - ParaCruz Operations Status Report: Feb & Mar 11
      - Staff Report re: Taxi Renewals for ParaCruz Service
   d. Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
   e. Private Operators

REGULAR AGENDA

10. Approve TDA Claim from the Volunteer Center
    Karena Pushnik supplied an overview of TDA funding, noting that there are three claims on the agenda for the region’s share of the ¼-cent sales tax as allocated according to established formulas in the Commission’s Rules and Regulations.

    Debbi Brooks provided information about the Volunteer Center’s transportation program, which also supplies transportation to some individuals who do not qualify for ParaCruz services.

    **Action:** The motion (Elsea/Molesky) -- to approve the TDA Claim for $61,345 for the Volunteer Center -- passes with Debbi Brooks abstaining.

11. Approve TDA Claim from Community Bridges
    Kirk Ance gave an overview of the TDA Claim from Community Bridges saying that Community Bridges serves low income and disabled individuals, many of whom are unable to use traditional public transit or the complementary paratransit. The TDA funds are projected to provide 23,500 of the almost 74,000 rides to be provided by Community Bridges in FY 2011-12. Mr. Ance explained the details of Community Bridges TDA funded transportation services and Karena Pushnik helped direct members to relevant ride projections in Community Bridges’ TDA claim.

    Members discussed the Elderday program funding which is now a State optional Medicare program and is in danger of being eliminated. Clay Kempf said that this would create transition from existing services to something else or a new service that has greater income testing to determine who may attend.
Members questioned why TDA funds would be allotted to the Interface Satellite Shelter Program (ISSP) and Mr. Ance responded that the program falls within the scope of the E&D TAC due to the many senior and disabled clients, as well as low-income individuals. Karena Pushnik said that ISSP had previously been funded by TDA, then funded by other means, and now is back on the list of TDA funded projects by Community Bridges.

Catherine Patterson Valdez was contacted by phone to determine more information about ISSP rides relative to Meals-on-Wheel or Elderday, which are more in alignment with the direction of the E&D TAC. Members questioned whether ISSP rides could be served by other non-TDA sources. Ms. Valdez said that ride-funding sources could be shifted as desired by the E&D TAC and RTC, however she made the case for why ISSP recipients meet the TDA funding criteria and the quantity of rides provided due to the low cost per unit. She said that she pursued ISSP funding which comes from the County of Santa Cruz and the county has cut funding.

Members also asked Ms. Valdez at Community Bridges why the cost per unit of TDA service under medical rides is higher than other rides. Ms. Valdez said that, of the past four years, the cost is lower than in previous years but the higher cost for this service versus other rides is due to lift accommodations needed for riders, the time it takes for drivers to accommodate those needs and the remote areas serviced.

In response to a member questions, Ms. Valdez clarified that one chart in the report shows TDA funding and the second chart shows rides provided with non-TDA funding sources and a third chart shows the total number of rides provided with all funding sources. The cost per service unit stays the same regardless of the funding source. Ms. Valdez also noted that the CEO of the Elderday program told her that the program would probably be restructured, but not cut.

Action: The motion (Elsea/French) -- for the E&D TAC to recommend to the RTC to approve the TDA Claim for $515,295 for Community Bridges as presented and reassess regularly whether needs are being met per the quarterly reports provided to the E&D TAC -- passes unanimously with Kirk Ance and Lisa Berkowitz abstaining.

Action: The motion (Anjo/Molesky) -- for the E&D TAC to request documentation regarding unserved riders by fiscal year 2011-2012 from Community Bridges -- passes unanimously with one abstention.

12. Approve TDA Claim from the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (Metro)

Tove Beatty provided an overview for Metro’s TDA claim for $5,244,963 for operating paratransit and fixed routes. She supplied details on fixed routes and ParaCruz rides for the last fiscal year saying that of the bus rides, approximately 135,406 used senior/disabled passes and 24,196 were wheelchair users. Ms. Beatty informed members that, as reported to the Metro board in March 2011, Metro is anticipating a continued drop in revenues in FY11/12 and in order to balance the budget, Metro is considering service cuts, layoffs, contract amendments, and new revenue options.

Bob White asked if the complementary paratransit program operated by Metro (ParaCruz) is federally mandated and Ms. Beatty replied that it is within ¾ miles of fixed route service.

Karena Pushnik noted that Metro provides paratransit beyond the federal requirements by providing door-to-door and extended hour service.

Action: The motion (Elsea/Kempf) -- for the E&D TAC to recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission approve the TDA funding request from the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District for $5,244,963 -- passes with John Daugherty abstaining.
Action: The motion (Kempf/White) -- for the E&D TAC to send a letter to Metro expressing its appreciation of Metro’s effort to maintain the geographical area of service in order to minimize the impact on seniors, people with disabilities and paratransit -- passes with one abstention.

13. Recommend RTC Approval of Section 5310 Local Review Committee Recommendation

Karena Pushnik provided an overview of the FY 2011-2012 Section 5310 Grant Application noting that federal funds are available for capital equipment for specialized transportation for seniors and people with disabilities to eligible entities. The grant is allocated on a statewide competitive basis and historically has been a major source of funding for new paratransit vehicles and equipment for Santa Cruz County. She said that a local committee comprised of representatives from the Senior’s Council and the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District convened on March 28 to score the applications. Ms. Pushnik supplied the details about the two applications and said that staff recommends that the E&D TAC recommend that the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission approve the local review committee’s scores for the two Section 5310 fund applications submitted by Community Bridges.

Action: The motion (Daugherty/Elsea) -- to recommend to the SCCRTC to approve the local review committee’s scores for the two Section 5310 fund applications submitted by Community Bridges -- passes with one abstention.

14. Recommend RTC Approval of Annual Report and Unmet Needs List

Karena Pushnik provided an overview of the 2010 E&D TAC Annual Report and Unmet Paratransit and Transit Needs List. She noted that no input has been received from the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District on the Unmet Needs list.

Action: The motion (Molesky/Elsea) – that the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission receive the review of the 2010 E&D TAC Annual Report and Unmet Need List – passes unanimously.

15. Recommend RTC Approval of Member and Alternate Positions

Three applications were received for renewing member positions on the E&D TAC: Lisa Berkowitiz representing Community Bridges/Consolidated Transportation Services Agency, Clay Kempf representing Social Service Providers for Seniors, and Debbi Brooks representing Social Service Provider for persons of Limited Means.

Action: The motion (Molesky/Elsea) -- to recommend that the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission approve renewing three members to the E&D TAC -- passes with one abstention.

16. Receive Update on Bus Stop Improvements

Tove Beatty provided an overview of Metro’s Bus Stop Improvement Plan and mentioned that she is waiting for the signature page to the Master Agreement with Caltrans so that the contract can be signed to start work. She has secured a contractor to begin some awning repair work ahead of the signed contract to be assured that the CTC does not revoke funding if the project does not start within the required timeframe and Caltrans has approved this contractor. Tove also gave detailed information about an easement procured by Metro in front of the County offices on Emeline for a complete bus stop and pad, and that Metro will build bus stop benches at the improvement locations to accommodate ADA accessibility.

Ms. Beatty informed members know that there is a set of bus stop criteria to which Metro is bound and any changes to improvements requires approval by the Board. Ms. Beatty supplied handouts about current bus stop structures, lighting for the bus stops and Simme-Seat information.
Veronica Elsea expressed concern that the proposed Simme-Seat bus seating accommodates the needs of all riders and asked if Metro would publicize for sight-impaired riders that there will be these new types of seats at certain locations. Ms. Elsea also asked about the installation of lighting and Ms. Beatty explained that it is for comfort and visibility at night. Ms. Beatty said that Metro would conduct awareness activities including working with Ms. Elsea to identify outreach mechanisms and getting the information to the Vista Center for the Blind.

Ms. Beatty said that she would bring information back to the E&D TAC and that the proposed deadline for the completion of the bus stop improvements is June 30, 2012.

17. **Receive Pedestrian Safety Work Group Update – Work Group Chair**

Veronica Elsea told members that the Pedestrian Safety Work Group co-sponsored a Pedestrian Workshop on March 26 in Watsonville and the event was a success in spite of inclement weather. She said that participants were very involved in the presentations.

Ms. Elsea also said that the Pedestrian Safety Work Group is continuing with an outreach component for getting the word out about sidewalk maintenance responsibilities for property owners. She said that the group is working with local jurisdictions and that they are getting ready to present their process to the RTC in May and then to the boards for the local jurisdictions.

18. **Receive Nominations for Chair and Vice Chair**

Hal Anjo nominated John Daugherty for the position of Char. With no other nominations, John accepted the position of Chair.

Patti Shevlin nominated Veronica Elsea for the position of Vice Chair. With no other nomination, Veronica accepted the position of Vice-Chair.

19. **Meeting Adjourned @ 3:55 pm**

*Prepared by: Cathy Judd, SCCRTC Staff*
TO: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
FROM: Karena Pushnik, Senior Transportation Planner
RE: FY 2011-12 Section 5310 Scores

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E/D TAC) and staff recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) approve the attached resolution (Attachment 1) for FY 2011-12 Section 5310 grant application scores confirming the scoring (Exhibit A) determined by the Local Evaluation Committee (LEC) and approved by the Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee.

BACKGROUND

Federal Section 5310 funds are available to eligible entities for capital equipment for specialized transportation for seniors and people with disabilities. This grant is administered by Caltrans and allocated on a statewide competitive basis. Historically, Section 5310 funds have been a major source of funding for new paratransit vehicles and equipment to facilitate specialized transportation services in Santa Cruz County.

DISCUSSION

The state allowed each agency to submit two applications this year for Section 5310 grant funds, due to the lack of an application process in 2010. In addition, the state waived the matching fund requirements due to excess toll revenues. Two grant applications were submitted this year, both from Community Bridges, the agency serving as the Consolidated Transportation Services Agency for our region.

One application was for 8 vehicles, 21 two-way radios, 4 mobile two way radios and one base station. The other was for 6 desktop computers, 6 monitors, 1 network server and 1 Trapeze mapping software. The vehicles Community Bridges is seeking to replace are 10 to 14 years old. In addition, the vehicles requested are larger and would expand the carrying capacity.

Based on direction from the E/D TAC, a Local Review Committee (LRC) -- comprised of representatives from the Seniors Council, Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District, Disabilities Commission and the Regional Transportation Commission -- met in March to score the applications. As in the past, the applicant had an opportunity to amend their applications based on the initial review by the Regional Transportation Planning Agency and their LRC. The LRC determined initial scores for the application...
as submitted and determined potential scores for the application if amended to highlight more of the details and benefits of the vehicle and equipment use. Revised applications were received from Community Bridges and were reviewed by staff per the specific direction from the LRC. Below is a chart listing the application items and scores for each application.

Application #1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost Each</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Initial Score</th>
<th>Revised Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medium Buses (12 ambulatory, 2 wheelchair)</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$445,000</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Buses (16 ambulatory, 2 wheelchair)</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Way Radios</td>
<td>$1,291</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>$27,109</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Way Radios - Hand Held</td>
<td>$895</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$3,578</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Station</td>
<td>$1,896</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,896</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Application #2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost Each</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Initial Score</th>
<th>Revised Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desktop PC Computers</td>
<td>$1,780</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$10,683</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Server</td>
<td>$8,604</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$8,604</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Monitors</td>
<td>$258</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$1,550</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trapeze Mapping Software</td>
<td>$13,800</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$13,800</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At its April meeting, the E&D TAC took action to recommend that the RTC approve the revised scores. Attached are excerpts from both applications summarizing the purpose and need for the vehicles and equipment (Attachment 2).

The Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee and staff recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission approve the revised scores by resolution and forward them to Caltrans (Attachment 1). Caltrans staff will check scores for those projects up to the limit of available funds. There will be an appeals process and the final scores will be formally adopted by the California Transportation Commission later this year.

Included in Attachment 1 are two exhibits required by Caltrans. Exhibit A shows the project scores on the Regional Priority List and Exhibit B is the Section 5310 (16) Certification and Assurance - Form 2 showing that all program applications meet applicable federal statutory and program regulations.
SUMMARY

Community Bridges has applied for Section 5310 funds for vehicles and equipment that will enrich the accessible transportation services provided to the community. The Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee and staff recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission approve, by resolution, the Section 5310 grant application scores for the Consolidated Transportation Services Agency/Community Bridges.

Attachments:
1. Resolution Adopting the FY 2011-12 Section 5310 Scores for Santa Cruz County
   Exhibit A: Section 5310 FY11-12 Project Rating Worksheet
   Exhibit B: MPO/RTPA Section 5310 Certification and Assurances
2. Excerpt from Section 5310 Grant Application from Community Bridges

\RTCSERV2\INTERNAL\E&DTAC\SECT5310\2011\S5310RTC2011.DOC
RESOLUTION NO.
Adopted by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
on the date of May 5, 2011
on the motion of Commissioner
duly seconded by Commissioner

A RESOLUTION CERTIFYING SANTA CRUZ COUNTY’S
SCORING OF FY 2011-12 SECTION 5310 GRANT APPLICATIONS

WHEREAS the Regional Transportation Commission serves as the Regional
Transportation Planning Agency for Santa Cruz County;

WHEREAS the Regional Transportation Commission is charged with reviewing
and scoring local applications for the Section 5310 grant program for
specialized transportation;

WHEREAS two applications were received for FY 2011-12 from the
Consolidated Transportation Services Agency/Community Bridges for
vehicles and equipment related to the provision of specialized
transportation services;

WHEREAS the Local Review Committee met on March 28, 2011 to score the
applications, the Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory
Committee met on April 12, 2011 to review their recommendation, and
the Commission held their regularly noticed meeting on May 5, 2011
to approve the final scores for local Section 5310 applications;

WHEREAS the projects are consistent with the most current adopted Regional
Transportation Plan (2010);

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

1. The scores drafted by the Local Review Committee and recommended by
the Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee are hereby
adopted.

2. The projects in Exhibit A shall be forwarded to Caltrans to be included by
the Statewide Review Committee into the Statewide Prioritized List.

3. The Regional Transportation Planning agency Certification and Assurance
in Exhibit B shall be forwarded to Caltrans assuring that the projects meet
the requirements and conditions of 49 U.S.C, that the recommendations
were included in the region’s public participation process and that, by this
resolution, the projects are consistent with the local Regional
Transportation Plan.
AYES: COMMISSIONERS

NOES: COMMISSIONERS

ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS

ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS

____________________________
Mark Stone, Chair

ATTEST:

____________________________
George Dondero, Secretary

Exhibit A: Section 5310 Project Rating Worksheet
Exhibit B: MPO/RTPA Section 5310 Certification and Assurances

Distribution: Caltrans HQ
Community Bridges
AMBAG
### SECTION 5310 – FY 2011-12
Project Rating Worksheet

**Regional Transportation Planning Agency:** Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission

**Applicant:** Community Bridges/Consolidated Transportation Services Agency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Project Request</th>
<th>If Replacement Vehicle - VIN</th>
<th>Sect I (Max 32pts)</th>
<th>Sect II (Max 18pts)</th>
<th>Sect III (Max 20pts)</th>
<th>Sect IV (Max 30pts)</th>
<th>Total (Max 100pts)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Vehicles: Medium Buses</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Vehicles: Two Large Buses</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Two-Way Radios</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Two-Way Mobile Radios</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Base Station</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Desktop PC Computers</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Network Server</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Computer Monitors</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Trapeze Mapping Software</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission certifies and assures that the requirements and conditions of 49 U.S.C. 5310 have been met by all applicants recommended for funding.

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission certifies by resolution, attached, that the projects recommended for funding are consistent with the local area’s most current Regional Transportation Plan. In an urbanized area, the projects recommended for funding will also be included in the Federal Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP).

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission certifies that prior to finalizing the Regional Priority List, applicants have been notified of their regional score and provided information about the appeal process.

Certifying Representative:

Name: George Dondero

Signature:

Title: Executive Director

Date: May 5, 2011
Replacement Vehicles Cont.13a

Certainly all of the vehicles show signs of wear to varying degrees, including more frequent maintenance and rough or undependable driving performance. They have all certainly surpassed their usefulness as appropriate vehicles to provide transportation for our sensitive and fragile clientele. In addition, we provide service for morbidly obese residents which alone increases wear and tear on the suspension of the vehicles.

The vehicles we hope to replace range in mileage from 130,000 miles to 194,000 miles. With the expected arrival time for the replacements to be no earlier than summer of 2013, the mileage on them will range from at least 156,000 miles to 220,000 miles.

Additionally, many of the clients who require this service live in the rural areas of the county, where public transit is more difficult to obtain. Much of this area is in the treacherous redwood forest mountain area, which is more damaging to vehicles due to steep inclines and poor road conditions. An additional 15 to 25 thousand miles of stop and go travel on the hills in this environment will create a great deal of wear and tear, and maintenance expenses for these vehicles are expected to double within the following year.

There is also wear and tear on the vehicles that cannot be prevented through regular maintenance and is not repairable. This is the type of damage that happens to strained vehicles, and results in overall poor condition, rough ride, and frequent breakdowns. Frequent passenger traffic has well worn the interiors of these vehicles as well. The performance and condition of these vehicles show us that these vans have served us well, but are in need of retirement to back up status.

The sensitive nature of many of our passengers requires us to pay close attention to their safety. To this end, Drivers perform safety pre-trips to ensure that the vehicles are in safe operating condition before taking them into service. Vehicles that are not dependable can create a safety hazard. Delicate individuals may suffer health problems and undue stress from being trapped in a downed vehicle. Although it is impossible to prevent these occurrences from happening altogether, it is our responsibility to reduce the chances as much as possible. Considering the increased frequency of breakdowns that these vehicles are beginning to incur, it is in our best judgment to discontinue their active use before these types of problems increase any further. The passengers being transported are by definition in need of services beyond that of the general public; as such, it is essential that the equipment used to provide this service be in adequate and dependable condition.

Three of the eight vehicles to be replaced will be made available as back-up vans, at the present time we have one backup van. Three will be made available for sale to other agencies in need of paratransit vehicles as soon as their replacements are received through the 11/12 Section 5310 grant application. When this happens, two of those in current service will be placed out of service; due to the fact their conditions are quite inappropriate for paratransit, or any other public service.

Additionally, the three proposed back up vehicles currently have range from 136,000 miles to 194,000 miles and are on the maintenance service schedule on a regular basis. Drivers frequently hear complaints of passengers riding in these vehicles that they are uneasy riding in such obviously outdated and/or worn vehicles. These vehicles will be replaced within the next two 5310 grant cycles.
Other Equipment Cont. 14a

In one recent emergency incident, a fight erupted among passengers on one of our vehicles. The driver called in to dispatch but could not connect since he was in a "dead zone" in the Santa Cruz foothills. Similar interruptions in our communications occur regularly from our service areas within Santa Cruz County as well as areas we drive in every day including Monterey County and Santa Clara County.

This problem is not one of inadequacy, but rather effectively leaves our program with "no dispatch equipment."

Formerly, we had a two way radio system in every vehicle, plus hand held units which had operated on the 800 frequency. Then Nextel bought up frequencies in that range leaving our system useless. Community Bridges looked into and tested the 400 frequency which didn't have enough range for our service area. Community Bridges staff met with Nextel, and decided to go to Nextel push to talk aka PTT, walkie talkie type system. Lift Line converted to using Verizon cell phones as a new way to communicate with the dispatcher. Unfortunately, the new system has many dead zones in our mountain and rural services area. During Lift Line's annual CHP inspection in November 2010 we were informed cell phone would soon be against the law even for commercial drivers. Lift Line continued using Verizon cell phone but with blue tooth to be hands free because of a two-year contract. This system has proven inappropriate and inefficient.

Problems with the current cell phone system are many and will be remedied by the new equipment we are requesting:

Safety -- With our current system, drivers are sometimes distracted by needing to look at the cell phone to find the right number and make a call. With the new two-way radios, the mounted system will require a simple push of a switch to call dispatch. No other calls can be made on the radio.

Improved Communication -- While the current cell phone system only allows calls to a single caller, the new system will have all drivers and dispatch able to hear each other simultaneously. This feature helps our dispatcher to increase efficiency when information needs to be shared with more than one driver.

Efficiency -- Not only can calls be made more quickly with the new system, but they cannot be lost or left at home or lose a charge like the cell phones have been. Currently, drivers often experience dead zones, background noise, loss of communication between the blue tooth and phone device. Additionally, many times drivers’ calls roll over to the dispatch voice mail since the reception for the Verizon system at our Apto's dispatch office is poor.

Verizon problems include: dispatch office area is a Verizon dead zone, drivers call in, but the phone doesn’t ring and rolls over to voice mail. Also, there is an issue with being able to actual hear the other person on the phone as well as the pollution of background noise when using the blue tooth equipment including lost communication between dispatch and drivers phones while using blue tooth ear pieces. While our service is designated as non-emergency service, we need to be prepared for emergencies when clients are on board and the need for drivers to have immediate transmission to dispatch is critical. The new Mobile Radio Communications system will allow the operation to maximize the best use of the most appropriate vehicle by allowing driver communication and scheduling/vehicle changes if conditions change.

The two-way radio unit’s will be mounted in the vehicle in areas that are hidden to the general view, to avoid possible theft. The face plate can be mounted on the dash for convenient visibility and driver access. These two way radios are digital making coverage much wider in SC County and Monterey County, including our tri-county region area of dead zones, which are mountainous and along the ocean side communities.

We expect the new system to be reliable, easy to use, and safer for our drivers and therefore our passengers. The new system will improve the quality of our services for clients to have safe, efficient service.

The four hand held devices will be assigned to our mobile mechanic, fleet manager, program director, and computer information specialist to obtain information for data collection and reporting. The mobile devices can also be used to dispatch off site if needed, as well as serve as a back up if one of the vehicle mounted units fails.

The Base unit is stationary and would be located at the dispatcher's station. This system would improve safety, communication, allow for an all call communication in the case of an emergency and save time. Our community experienced a major equipment failure, when an optic cable was cut. This led to all computer and cell phone reception to be cut completely. This radio communication system would not be affected if this communication situation should arise again in the future.
PART II – FUNDING REQUEST

Other Equipment

OTHER EQUIPMENT

This category includes communication and computer equipment, hardware and/or software, or any other miscellaneous equipment (maintenance, cameras, and mobile radios). The equipment must be used to support your transportation operation in proportion to the number of vehicles you operate in your transportation program for elderly and disabled clients.

The applicant must submit 3 like-kind estimates of equipment with this application. The average of these 3 estimates will be the requested funding amount. This information and sole source request instructions are on page 12 of this application. Note: If the project is selected and the agency receives Section 5310 approval, the agency will purchase the equipment using 100% of their funds. Once the equipment is received, the agency will invoice Caltrans for reimbursement of the Federal portion (88.53%). No fixed route equipment will be funded.

Agency Inventory (Required for ALL other equipment requests)

1. Complete table for the requested other equipment, expand this table if necessary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment Type to be replaced</th>
<th>Quantity/Purchase Date of Exciting Equipment within Agency</th>
<th>Quantity of Requested Equipment (from page 12)</th>
<th>Current Fleet Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Computer 6403818 &amp; 645518</td>
<td>4  08-10-2007  09-24-2007</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Monitors</td>
<td>4  08-10-2007  09-24-2007</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Network Servers</td>
<td>2  03-31-2006</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trapeze Mapping Software</td>
<td>1  05-31-2001</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Describe the type of equipment you are requesting and specifically identify the components.

The 6 new monitors will be wide screen with HDMI technology allowing for a clear display as well as split screen functionality. The 6 new computers we are requesting have the latest Microsoft operating system, better virus protection, as well as a fast 64bit processor. The new network server we are requesting will consolidate the two servers into one with a RAID-5 four (500GB) data storage capacity capability. It will also have the latest Microsoft operating system as well as twice the amount of RAM and processor speed. The Trapeze mapping system will include an updated Santa Cruz County map, as well as maps for Santa Clara County and Monterey County.

3. Discuss how the requested equipment will be used to support the transportation program. Include any expected improvements in service delivery or coordination, any reduction in the cost of providing service and the current method of collecting and tracking information.

The computers we are replacing use a second generation Microsoft operating system that is slow, no longer supported by Microsoft, very susceptible to viruses and malware infiltration. The new computers we are requesting have the latest Microsoft operating system, better virus protection, as well as a fast 64BIT processor. The monitors we are currently using have a small screen size and the display is somewhat fuzzy. The new monitors will be wide screen with HDMI technology allowing for a clear display as well as split screen functionality. (continued on page 14a)
101 Work Program and Budget

Staff electronically certified the FY2010 financial audit with the Federal Audit Clearinghouse. Staff reconciled the Social Security taxes and answered inquiry from the Social Security Administration (SSA) regarding the discrepancy between SSA and IRS tax figures. Staff continued to work with the Caltrans Auditor regarding FY2011 Indirect Cost Allocation Plan (ICAP) in which the RTC requested approval of an indirect cost rate of 79%.

Staff and the RTC completed the March 2011 budget and work program amendment to the FY 2011 budget; and produced the FY2012 original budget and work program, which were approved by the Budget and Administration/Personnel (B&A/P) Committee on February 17, 2011 and by the full RTC Board on March 3, 2011. Staff reviewed the TDA revenues estimate from the County Auditor before inclusion in the FY2012 budget. Staff billed various grants and prepared the final expenditures reports as required.

General Administration

The Budget and Administration/Personnel Committee, met once during this period and approved the quarterly warrants and credit card reports, amendments to the FY 2011 RTC budget and work program and the initial FY 2012 budget and work program. Staff began the recruitment process to fill two staff positions vacated by staff members who left the RTC.

112 Plan Coordination

During this period, staff attended meetings of the California Transportation Commission (CTC), the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) Group, the California Association of Councils of Government (CalCOG), the Caltrans Regional Coordination Group, the Rural Counties Task Force (RCTF), the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (SCMTD) and monitored agendas for the SCMTD Board of Directors, the County of Santa Cruz, the area’s city councils and the Air District (MBUAPCD). Staff participated in regional coordination meetings with staff from the Association of Monterey Bay Area
Governments (AMBAG), the Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC), the San Benito Council of Governments (SBCOG), the Air District, and the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA). The Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC) met twice this quarter.

With the assistance of its state and federal legislative assistants, staff continued to monitor and report on various state and federal legislative issues, including bills introduced this year, the State Budget, and SAFETEA-LU Reauthorization. Staff shared the RTC’s adopted 2011 State and Federal Legislative Programs with our representatives.

113 Public Information

The RTC sent information to the media about the following: California Transportation Commission’s approval of the Santa Cruz Branch Rail purchase, and an announcement about the airing of the RTC’s Transportation Café television show on Community Television on the rail acquisition activities. In addition, RTC staff worked with a reporter at the local paper on a variety of topics for her Street Smarts column.

During this period, the RTC taped its third transportation talk show on Community TV. The subject was the acquisition of the Santa Cruz Branch Rail line. The format includes an interview segment, a two minute spot about the Updated Guide for Specialized Transportation that can also be loaded on YouTube or the RTC’s website, an update about the last program (bicycle and pedestrian projects/programs) and a calendar of RTC events. The program will be rebroadcast over the course of the next 2-3 months and is available via the stations website.

In addition, the RTC continues to broadcast through Community TV its regular monthly meetings and place agendas and packets for its meetings on the RTC website. The RTC also provides summary actions from the meetings and sends out highlights to the media and interested recipients. Current agendas for committee meetings and other information such as audit reports, approved budgets and work programs, and project information are also placed on the RTC website and regularly maintained. The public may request “enews” on specific RTC projects/projects and staff sends out bulletins, as developments arise.
During this period, the project to redesign and refresh the Commission and Commute Solution websites moved forward with staff providing final input on the page content and design for projects, programs and services.

**175 Monterey Bay Area 511 Traveler Information System**

In response to an RFP, an evaluation committee of staff from the RTC, TAMC, and Caltrans, and technical advisors from MTC and SACOG, reviewed and evaluated proposals submitted by consulting firms to conduct a 511 Feasibility Analysis and Implementation Plan for the Monterey Bay Area. Three firms were interviewed and a contract with ICx Transportation Group was awarded by the RTC. A notice to proceed was issued in late March, with consultant work on the project to be conducted between March 2011 and April 2012. Updates to the website established for this project were made.

**177 Freeway Service Patrol (FSP)**

RTC continued to administer the FSP contracts for Highways 1 and 17. The procurement for FSP service for Highway 17 continued into the 3rd quarter of FY10/11. Staff formed an evaluation committee composed of staff from RTC, CHP, and Caltrans and reviewed three proposals (Extreme Towing, Ladd’s Towing and Lima Towing) based on the tow contractor’s ability to provide FSP services on Highway 17, the company’s ability to manage their company and FSP services, and the company’s price proposal. RTC staff made a recommendation to the RTC that was not approved due to concerns that the preferred bidder in terms of quality of service was not recommended. RTC staff met with Commissioner Johnson to review the procurement process and to make recommendations to the RTC.

Staff is coordinating refresher training classes for FSP drivers with TAMC. Training occurred in February, 2011 for FSP tow operators in Santa Cruz and Monterey Counties. Presenting the refresher training class locally allows for the CHP officers and the tow operators to more readily discuss scenarios that are unique to Santa Cruz and Monterey.

Staff completed all monthly reporting requirements for the FSP ARRA funds. Staff received and reviewed monthly FSP assist data used to monitor program effectiveness.
178 Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (SAFE)/Call Boxes

RTC staff worked with the RTC’s call box service providers, including Case Systems Inc., AT&T and CDSNet Inc to maintain and provide service for the call boxes in Santa Cruz County. Staff reviewed invoices and reports submitted by CASE Systems, AT&T and CDSNet to assure accuracy.

Staff is working with CASE SYSTEMS and Caltrans to perform site retrofits at some of the callboxes to make them ADA accessible. Staff has been working with CASE Systems to put up new signs where the current signs are difficult to read due to fading or graffiti. Staff has been working with AT&T on billing issues and with CDSNet to provide all the necessary reports with their invoices.

Staff held a Safe on 17/Traffic Operations System meeting at the San Jose CHP in March, 2011. Topics discussed included collision and citation statistics for Hwy 17, current and proposed Caltrans projects on Hwy 17, an update on the Highway Advisory Radio run by Caltrans TMC in Oakland and an update on the TOS equipment in Santa Cruz County. Staff continued to administer the Safe on 17 Program including reviewing invoices for CHP extra enforcement, tracking injury and fatal collisions on Highway 17 and mapping TOS elements in Santa Cruz County.

179 Transportation Demand Management (TDM) – Commuter Services

Through employer contacts, the website, the 429-POOL phone line, and email, Commute Solutions produced carpool matchlists, provided personalized trip planning services and referrals, and served as a clearinghouse for information about transportation demand management. Through its integrated suite of commute program planning tools such as facility site assessments, commute surveys of employees and residential density maps, staff helped employers to design effective workplace commute programs. Work on a needs assessment of local park and ride lots commenced and oversight of these facilities continued.

Staff continued collaborating with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and its contractor, Parsons Brinckerhoff, to provide web-based carpool/vanpool and bike-buddy matching services to Santa Cruz County residents and commuters.
Work with employers and local, regional and state partner agencies including: Caltrans, the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG), Ecology Action (EA), the Pajaro Valley Transportation Management Association (PVTMA), the Transportation Agency for Monterey County, San Benito County Council of Governments and the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District (MBUAPCD), Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (SCMTD) and local jurisdictions on general sustainable transportation outreach continued. In cooperation with other regional rideshare agencies, staff began planning for a regional Rideshare Month campaign to be held during October 2011.

The RTC continued the implementation and marketing of the countywide carpool incentive program "Cash for Carpools". Ridesurance, the guaranteed ride home program previously administered by Ecology Action, was transferred to the RTC.

Staff continued distributing Santa Cruz County Bikeways maps to area bicycle shops, community agencies and transportation partners.

**231 Transportation Monitoring and Evaluation**

Staff continued to work with AMBAG staff to identify data needs for the next regional model and Regional Transportation plan updates. Staff monitored and provided input on the forthcoming California Household Travel Survey.

**411 Land Use/Transportation Coordination**

Staff participated in meetings with AMBAG staff and adjacent regional transportation planning agencies regarding planning for the implementation of SB 375 Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) for future RTP updates and on grants to fund this state-mandated work. The RTC reviewed and accepted the Monterey Bay Area Regional Blueprint which is designed to better coordinate land use and transportation.

**614 Bicycle and Pedestrian Planning Program**

RTC Staff held threeo meetings of the Pedestrian Safety Work Group this quarter. Attendees included representatives from the Transit District, the Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee,
Hope Services for developmentally disabled adults, vision impaired individuals and a former member of the Commission on Disabilities. The group discussed components and implementation of a public information campaign about safe and accessible sidewalks, which is one of the next steps outlined in their sidewalk maintenance document regarding responsibilities of private property owners and local jurisdictions. In addition, the group discussed ways that the Complete Streets requirements could be coordinated with the group’s efforts. Maps of all pedestrian facilities in the county are non-existent, yet would be beneficial. The Work Group discussed coordination with the Community Traffic Safety Coalition to develop the maps.

This quarter the Work Group also worked with California Walks and SafeTrec and other local groups to plan and implement a Pedestrian Safety Workshop. Despite the challenging weather, 26 people attended the workshop including elected officials, families with children, seniors, teens, and people with disabilities. The workshop was held in south county, in an area with a high rate of pedestrian injuries and fatalities.

The Bicycle Committee met once during this quarter. Subcommittees continued to work towards Committee goals and staff facilitated their work by providing resources or information. Staff provided the Bicycle Committee with a monthly packet of information on current issues and followed up on projects as directed. Staff worked with local jurisdiction representatives to review design elements of new projects, signs or roadways needing improvement. Staff also wrote letters regarding bikeway facilities, policies or funding issues on behalf of the Bicycle Committee. Staff continued to recruit new members to fill vacancies and processed appointments for expiring seats, as is done in March of each year.

Staff continued planning work on the RSTP funded Countywide Bicycle Route Signage Program. The way-finding or guide signage program will direct bicyclists to safe and convenient facilities when navigating through the county’s roadways. A Draft Implementation Plan was circulated to local jurisdictions for their review and feedback in anticipation of scheduling a meeting to select sign types, placement guidelines and administrative scenarios, and public outreach mechanisms.

As part of ongoing mapping projects, staff continued coordinating with Caltrans and City of Santa Cruz staff to re-designate the Pacific Coast...
Bicycle Route (PCBR) off of Mission St in Santa Cruz and define alternate roadways as the preferred alignments due to the thoroughfare’s high commercial truck and personal vehicle traffic, as well as the number of bicyclist fatalities on that segment. After completing all of Caltrans’ requirements for official re-designation, staff coordinated with Caltrans staff to forward the new route alignment to the American Cycling Association. The Association is the main distributor of maps for the Pacific Coast Bicycle Route system, as well as many other routes across the county. Additionally, staff continued work on the annual collection of new bikeway miles completed in the prior calendar year and began another mapping project to identifying sites where bicycle collisions and fatalities have occurred.

RTC staff continued assisting local jurisdictions with updates of their Bicycle Plans in anticipation of Caltrans’ March 2011 deadline. Adopted bicycle plans allow jurisdictions to apply for the Bicycle Transportation Account funding. Staff worked with the City of Capitola and the County of Santa Cruz to finalize their respective plans and, as the agency responsible for ensuring that plans are in compliance with the Streets and Highways Code, provided certification as to that compliance. Staff also provided a letter of support for the City of Capitola’s Bicycle Transportation Account grant application. Finally, staff provided assistance to the City of Scotts Valley in the development of their outdated plan and scheduled a presentation of the plan to the RTC’s Bicycle Committee. The City of Scotts Valley Bicycle Plan has been scheduled for adoption before the next Bicycle Transportation Account funding cycle.

Staff attended monthly meetings of the Community Traffic Safety Coalition (CTSC) coordinating with this group on issues relating to bicycle and pedestrian safety. RTC staff also provided assistance to the CTSC’s South County Bicycle/Pedestrian Work Group. RTC staff worked with Ecology Action’s Bike to Work/School Program and the Health Service Agency’s Community Traffic Safety Coalition and Ride ‘n Stride Programs to administer and process invoices for RTC allocated Transportation Development Act funding. The FY 11/12 TDA allocation request process was initiated with inclusion of funding in the RTC’s annual budget and Bike Committee review prior to RTC consideration late Spring.

Staff communicated with public works department’s staff regarding Bicycle Hazard Report and Pedestrian Access Report forms submitted
by members of the public. Members of the public submit reports regarding bicycle or pedestrian hazards or access issues and RTC staff informs public works staff members for follow up action. RTC staff continued promotion of the reporting program and fielded inquiries regarding the online submission form to be integrated into the upcoming RTC website update.

Staff processed applications and distributed bike racks through the Bikes Secure Phase IV Program and advertised the program to community organizations. The program is funded through the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District’s A2766 program.

Staff finalized negotiations and contract details with the consultant firm RRM Design for the production of a Master Plan and Environmental Review for the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSST) Network, a planned bicycle and pedestrian pathway network spanning the length of the Monterey Bay coastline. RTC’s Executive Director signed the contract with RRM Design and issued a notice to proceed. RTC staff also finalized contract details and signed the final agreement with the Coastal Conservancy for receipt of supplemental funds to extend planning work to the northern boundary of the Santa Cruz/San Mateo county line. Data collection and base mapping efforts were initiated in anticipation of a kick-off meeting and comprehensive field review.

After updating the Bicycle Licensing fact sheet that is provided to the public via the RTC’s website, staff followed up on the Bicycle Committee’s direction to present the licensing regulations to the Interagency Technical Advisory Committee and request that local jurisdictions consider voluntary bicycle licensing programs to establish uniformity throughout the county.

621 Specialized Transportation

The Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC) met once this quarter. Meeting topics included: consideration of the funding implications for the proposed Census Bureau designation for the area, review of Transportation Development Act claims from the Volunteer Center and Community Bridges to provide transportation to seniors and people with disabilities, review of the region’s Public Participation Plan, development of the draft Unmet Paratransit and Transit Needs List, and designation of the local review committee for the Section 5310 grants.
This quarter, a subcommittee of the E&D TAC reviewed two grant application submitted by Community Bridges for vehicles, radios, computers and other equipment.

622 Regional Transportation Plan

Staff continued working with regional partners to prepare for the next update of the RTP, with an emphasis on new requirements set forth by SB375, including the work program for a Strategic Growth Council grant for addressing transportation components of the sustainable communities strategy. The RTC approved and staff prepared grant applications to apply the Sustainable Transportation Access Rating System (STARS) to the Regional Transportation Plan and to collect transit ridership data to better support transit planning within the RTP.

Staff continued to work with local agencies to implement the projects and policies included in the Regional Transportation Plan through their planning and capital improvement program actions and staff continued to monitor projects to ensure consistency with the RTP.

631 Transportation System Management

Staff continued to investigate applications of TSM elements to relieve congestion in Santa Cruz County. Staff reviewed usage of existing TSM elements and tracked the detection and reporting of incidents by Caltrans Traffic Management Centers to plan for a better system.

641 Transportation Improvement Program

Staff met with project sponsors, Caltrans, and CTC staff several times this quarter to discuss funding needs of proposed and existing state and federally-funded projects.

Staff worked with project sponsors and Caltrans to continue to implement and report on projects selected to receive federal American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funds.

Staff worked with project sponsors, Caltrans, Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) and the California Transportation Commission (CTC) to implement funding amendments, extensions, allocations, and obligations, including amendments to the 2010 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) and allocation of
state funds for STIP projects. Staff continued to work with project sponsors to ensure that state and federal funding deadlines and other requirements were met.

Staff attended meetings of the California Transportation Commission and regional agencies centered on State Budget proposals, STIP funding availability, Proposition 1B programs, and various state and federal regulations.

682 Rail/Trail Authority

During this period, the RTC, its staff and consultants embarked on a comprehensive communication campaign to communicate to California Transportation Commission (CTC) commissioners, their staff and Caltrans that the RTC had met all of the funding conditions and requirements established by the CTC and funding statutes and regulations. After the successful communication campaign, on January 19, 2011, the CTC approved funding for purchase of the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line. RTC staff and consultants produced necessary amendments to agreements, opened escrow, and drafted the required Surface Transportation Board filing to gain federal regulatory approval for the rail line purchase. Caltrans and RTC staff completed the funding agreement necessary to complete the rail line purchase.

683 Highway 1 HOV Lane - Project Approval/Environmental Document (PA/ED)

During this period work continued incorporating all updated environmental technical studies in creation of an administrative draft environmental document (DED). Target date for completion of the DED is the latter part of next quarter. The consultant team and RTC are currently reviewing the required number of review cycles required by Caltrans Environmental Division including technical, management and legal review, followed by review by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). Only after the DED has been reviewed by all these parties is the document been deemed suitable for release to public for comment. The current target date for public release of the DED is Winter 2012.

As part of the environmental documentation, the FHWA requires that all projects with an estimated construction cost in excess of $500 million include submittal of a realistic project implementation and funding plan within 90 days following approval of the Final Environmental Document (FED). The HOV Lane alternative meets that
threshold, moreover, the majority of the funds to construct the HOV Lane project are assumed to be generated through a transportation sales tax measure, as stipulated in the 2010 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Because the sales tax measure is not yet in place, the FHWA requires that the project implementation and funding plan be reviewed separately and included in the DED. The draft document has been reviewed by FHWA’s regional representatives and submitted to Washington DC for approval prior to inclusion in the DED and release to the public. The Plan will include a phased construction program that provides the best congestion relief in the most cost effective manner.

As part of the preliminary design phase the RTC is working with the North American Sustainable Transportation Council (NASTC) in the development and application of the Sustainable Transportation and Access Rating System (STARS) to the HOV Lane project. The goal of the STARS evaluation process is to: improve access for the movement of people and goods; cut transportation and climate and energy pollution; and, maximize benefit-cost.

In January, the RTC authorized a contract with the NASTC to guide in the members of the Highway 1 HOV Lanes Project Development Team in applying the 12 credits developed in the STARS Pilot Project Application Manual to the HOV Lane project. RTC staff and the consultant team are in review of available data and effort required to comply with the respective credits. The availability of the updated 2005 Base Year Regional Travel Demand model is critical to this work effort. Recommendations developed as part of the STARS evaluation process can be considered and integrated into the project as part of comments received from resource agencies and the public upon review of the DED.

684 Highway 1 Soquel Avenue to Morrissey Boulevard Auxiliary Lanes Project

With comments received from Caltrans and the construction management consultant (Parsons Brinkerhoff), the design consultants (Nolte Associates) responded and prepared 100% design plans, specifications, and estimates (PS&E) at the end of quarter. Caltrans technical staff will review these final design documents in combination with the status of right-of-way and utility relocation work, for determination that the project is “Ready To List” (RTL) or eligible to seek an allocation of construction funds from the California Transportation Commission.
The actual availability of funds is subject to the sale of state transportation bonds which has currently been put on hold by the Governor’s office due to the status of the state’s budget. The RTC finds itself like many other regional agencies with major highway projects on hold pending the availability of state transportation funds.

Meanwhile, all design details have been resolved, including placement of soundwalls, drainage on Oak Way, internal circulation at Harbor High School during the period that the La Fonda Overcrossing is out of service, all utility relocation work, and all environmental permits have been received from state and federal resource agencies.

683 Highway and Roadway Planning

Coordination with Caltrans on implementation of various highway projects, such as SHOPP projects and Highway 1/17 landscaping. Staff also participated in local and statewide meetings regarding Project Initiation Documents (PID) that are required for projects on state highways. This included meetings on projects initiated by local jurisdictions on the State Route System (SRS). The RTC reviewed commented on and accepted the Highway 1 Corridor System Management Plan (CSMP) produced by Caltrans.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM (STP) EXCHANGE PROGRAM

Staff made payments to projects previously approved to receive RSTPX funds and continued to monitor projects receiving those funds.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>FY09-10 ACTUAL REVENUE</th>
<th>FY10-11 ESTIMATE REVENUE</th>
<th>FY10-11 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>454,800</td>
<td>410,500</td>
<td>410,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUGUST</td>
<td>539,000</td>
<td>539,000</td>
<td>547,300</td>
<td>8,300</td>
<td>1.54%</td>
<td>100.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPTEMBER</td>
<td>719,093</td>
<td>719,093</td>
<td>819,955</td>
<td>100,862</td>
<td>14.03%</td>
<td>106.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTOBER</td>
<td>490,500</td>
<td>490,500</td>
<td>458,300</td>
<td>-32,200</td>
<td>-6.56%</td>
<td>103.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOVEMBER</td>
<td>555,900</td>
<td>555,900</td>
<td>611,000</td>
<td>55,100</td>
<td>9.91%</td>
<td>104.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECEMBER</td>
<td>625,785</td>
<td>625,785</td>
<td>776,432</td>
<td>150,647</td>
<td>24.07%</td>
<td>108.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANUARY</td>
<td>465,300</td>
<td>465,300</td>
<td>502,700</td>
<td>37,400</td>
<td>8.04%</td>
<td>108.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEBRUARY</td>
<td>620,400</td>
<td>620,400</td>
<td>670,300</td>
<td>49,900</td>
<td>8.04%</td>
<td>108.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCH</td>
<td>607,400</td>
<td>607,401</td>
<td>510,760</td>
<td>-96,641</td>
<td>-15.91%</td>
<td>105.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRIL</td>
<td>385,100</td>
<td>385,100</td>
<td>412,600</td>
<td>27,500</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
<td>105.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>562,700</td>
<td>562,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE</td>
<td>605,859</td>
<td>605,859</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>6,631,837</td>
<td>6,587,538</td>
<td>5,719,847</td>
<td>300,868</td>
<td>4.57%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
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RECOMMENDATION

The Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC) and staff recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission approve four reappointments to the E&D TAC (Attachment 1) as shown in the revised membership roster (Attachment 2).

BACKGROUND

The Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC) functions best when all committee membership and alternate positions are filled. Committee members, staff, Commissioners and the community are partners in this endeavor.

DISCUSSION

At its April 2011 meeting, the E&D TAC recommended that the RTC approve reappointments for four positions:

- Reappointment to the member position representing Consolidated Transportation Services Agency-Community Bridges: Lisa Berkowitz – Ms. Berkowitz is the program manager for Meals on Wheels at Community Bridges and manages both group dining at senior meal sites as well as meals delivered to home-bound seniors.

- Reappointment to the member position representing Social Service Provider for persons of Limited Means: Debbi Brooks – Ms. Brooks has been with the Volunteer Center since 1989 working on the Transportation and other programs.

- Reappointment to the member position representing Social Service Provider for Seniors: Clay Kempf – Mr. Kempf is the Executive Director of the Seniors Council, the local Area Agency on Aging responsible for funding and delivering a wide range of services for seniors in Santa Cruz and neighboring counties.

- Reappointment to the alternate position representing Social Service Provider for Seniors: Patty Talbot – Ms. Talbot is the Associate Director of the Seniors Council.
Attached are the applications submitted by these individuals (Attachment 1) and a revised roster (Attachment 2) showing the recommended reappointments in bold.

**The E&D TAC and staff recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission approve reappointments for member positions for Lisa Berkowitz, Debbi Brooks, Clay Kempf and Patty Talbot.**

In addition, staff is in the process of actively recruiting for other vacant member and alternate positions. Vacant member positions include those representing:
- Private Operators
- 2nd Supervisorial District
- 4th Supervisorial District

Staff would appreciate assistance from commissioners filling the vacant positions. An E&D TAC membership application is attached (Attachment 3) and can also be found on the RTC’s website.

**SUMMARY**

The E&D TAC and staff recommend that the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission approve three reappointments for the positions representing the Consolidated Transportation Services Agency/Community Bridges, Social Service Provider for Persons of Limited Means, and the Social Service Provider for Seniors.

Attachments:
1. Committee Reappointment Applications for:
   - Lisa Berkowitz
   - Debbi Brooks
   - Clay Kempf
   - Patty Talbot
2. E&D TAC Roster
3. Member/Alternate Application
COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT APPLICATION

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC)
Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E/D TAC)

Meetings are scheduled for the second Tuesday of each month at 1:30 p.m. in the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission conference room, located at 1523 Pacific Avenue in downtown Santa Cruz. At least one meeting each year will be scheduled for an alternate location. Please refer to the Committee description, bylaws and recruitment process for more information.

If you are interested in serving on this committee, please complete this application, and return it to the Regional Transportation Commission office. Applications are due by the end of February, unless other arrangements have been made.

PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY

Name: Lisa Berkowitz
Home address: 316 Ocean View Avenue Santa Cruz, CA 95062
Mailing address (if different): ________________________________

Phone: (home) (831) 429-5188 (business/message) (831) 464-3180 Ext. 15
E-mail: lisab@cbridges.org

Length of residence in Santa Cruz County: 30 years

Position(s) I am applying for: □ Any appropriate position
X CTSA representative / Senior Services □

Previous experience on a government commission or committee (please specify)
7 years experience on the Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee
### Relevant Work or Volunteer Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Town or Address</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Bridges-Meals on Wheels for Santa Cruz County</td>
<td>1777- A Capitola Road</td>
<td>Program Director</td>
<td>1/1997-present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Cruz, CA  95062</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Bridges (formerly Food &amp; Nutrition Services) Meals on Wheels for Santa Cruz County (formerly The Golden Age Nutrition Program)</td>
<td>1777- A Capitola road</td>
<td>Food Services Director</td>
<td>7/1979-1/1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Cruz, CA  95062</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Statement of Qualifications:** Please attach a brief statement indicating why you are interested in serving on this committee and why you are qualified for the appointment. If you have served on this committee in the past, please summarize your accomplishments on the committee and indicate which of the committee’s potential future endeavors most interest you.

**Certification:** I certify that the above information is true and correct and I authorize the verification of the information in the application in the event I am a finalist for the appointment.

![Signature]

**Return Application to:**
SCCRTC  
Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee  
1523 Pacific Avenue  
Santa Cruz, CA 95060  
fax: 460-3215  
email: trc042@co.santa-cruz.ca.us

**Questions or Comments:** (831) 460-3200
Since 1976 I have worked in the field of aging. I have worked for organizations whose mission it has been is to address the challenges faced by adults as we age. Maintaining independence is a key component of many of those challenges. Transportation services are a key concern and frequently play a pivotal role in determining the success of many other life choices and decisions. I hope to stay involved in the committee's efforts to ensure that transportation services for seniors and disabled adults remain an important issue in our community.

Lisa Berkowitz
Meals on wheels for Santa Cruz County
COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT APPLICATION

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC)  
Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E/D TAC)

Meetings are scheduled for the second Tuesday of each month at 1:30 p.m. in the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission conference room, located at 1523 Pacific Avenue in downtown Santa Cruz. At least one meeting each year will be scheduled for an alternate location. Please refer to the Committee description, bylaws and recruitment process for more information.

If you are interested in serving on this committee, please complete this application, and return it to the Regional Transportation Commission office. Applications are due by the end of February, unless other arrangements have been made.

PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY

Name: Debbi Brooks
Home address: 4546 Arden Way, Aptos, Ca 95003
Mailing address (if different):

Phone: (home) 685-9246 (business/message) 427-5070
E-mail: RSVPPVoelsCUC volunteer center.org

Length of residence in Santa Cruz County: 45 years

Position(s) I am applying for: ☐ Any appropriate position
☐ E/D TAC alternative

Previous experience on a government commission or committee (please specify)

________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________
### Relevant Work or Volunteer Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Town or Address</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Center of S.C. County</td>
<td>1010 Ermine Ave Bldg C</td>
<td>Program Director - Retired Seni</td>
<td>12-05 to Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Cruz, CA 95060</td>
<td>Volunteer Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Center of S.C. County</td>
<td>Son, Lorenzoal Valley Center - Felton</td>
<td>Program Coord. Transportation Program</td>
<td>5-1989 thru 12-00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Statement of Qualifications:
Please attach a brief statement indicating why you are interested in serving on this committee and why you are qualified for the appointment. If you have served on this committee in the past, please summarize your accomplishments on the committee and indicate which of the committee’s potential future endeavors most interest you.

### Certification:
I certify that the above information is true and correct and I authorize the verification of the information in the application in the event I am a finalist for the appointment.

**Signature:**

**Date:**

### Return Application to:
SCCRTC
Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee
1523 Pacific Avenue
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
fax: 460-3215  email: trc042@co.santa-cruz.ca.us

### Questions or Comments:
(831) 460-3200

I/E&D/Members/Committee Appointment Application.doc
To Whom It May Concern:

I am requesting interest in serving on this board as an alternate for Lois Connell, Associate Director, Volunteer Centers of Santa Cruz County. I have been employed by the Volunteer Center since 1989 and was the coordinator for the Transportation Program for San Lorenzo and Scotts Valley areas for 15 years.

I appreciate your consideration.

Sincerely,

Debbi Brooks
RSVP Program Director
COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT APPLICATION

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC)
Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E/D TAC)

Meetings are scheduled for the second Tuesday of each month at 1:30 p.m. in the
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission conference room, located at
1523 Pacific Avenue in downtown Santa Cruz. At least one meeting each year will
be scheduled for an alternate location. Please refer to the Committee description,
bylaws and recruitment process for more information.

If you are interested in serving on this committee, please complete this application,
and return it to the Regional Transportation Commission office. Applications are due
by the end of February, unless other arrangements have been made.

PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY

Name: Clay Kempf

Home address: Santa Cruz Arc, Apt. 307

Mailing address (if different): 

Phone: (home) (business/message) 688-0400 ext 15

E-mail: clayk@seniorscouncil.org

Length of residence in Santa Cruz County: ~30 years

Position(s) I am applying for: □ Any appropriate position

□ Social Service Provider for Seniors □ 

Previous experience on a government commission or committee (please specify)

□ E&D TAC since 1990

Long Term Care Interagency Commission – Santa Cruz 1991-1998; 2000-present

SSTAC – San Benito County 2000-present

Long Term Care Commission – San Benito County 2000-present

Transportation Funding Task Force – Santa Cruz County - current
### Relevant Work or Volunteer Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Town or Address</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seniors Council</td>
<td>Serving Santa Cruz, San Benito &amp; Monterey Counties</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>2000-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lift Line/Food &amp; Nutrition Services</td>
<td>236 Santa Cruz Ave. Aptos, CA</td>
<td>Director of Transportation</td>
<td>1988-1998</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Statement of Qualifications:** Please attach a brief statement indicating why you are interested in serving on this committee and why you are qualified for the appointment. If you have served on this committee in the past, please summarize your accomplishments on the committee and indicate which of the committee’s potential future endeavors most interest you.

Past member - Served as E&DTAC rep for Section 5310 applications, 1999-2006
Accepted State Innovative Project Award on behalf of committee in 1990 for Temporary Accessible Parking Project
1998 SCCRTC Transportation Award Recipient
CTAA Institute for Transportation Coordination Scholarship Recipient 2006
Member of California Mobility Action Plan Oversight Committee

**Certification:** I certify that the above information is true and correct and I authorize the verification of the information in the application in the event I am a finalist for the appointment.

Signature: [Signature]
Date: 12-9
COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT APPLICATION

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC)
Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E/D TAC)

Meetings are scheduled for the second Tuesday of each month at 1:30 p.m. in the
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission conference room, located at
1523 Pacific Avenue in downtown Santa Cruz. At least one meeting each year will
be scheduled for an alternate location. Please refer to the Committee description,
bylaws and recruitment process for more information.

If you are interested in serving on this committee, please complete this application,
and return it to the Regional Transportation Commission office. Applications are due
by the end of February, unless other arrangements have been made.

PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY

Name: Patty Talbot

Home address: ________________________________

Mailing address (if different): ________________________________

Phone: (home) ____________________ (business/message) 688-0400 x19

E-mail: patty@seniorscouncil.org

Length of residence in Santa Cruz County: 20 years

Position(s) I am applying for: □ Any appropriate position
☑ Alternate for Clay Lenz

Social Service Prov. Seniors

Previous experience on a government commission or committee (please specify)
Staff to Seniors Council Advisory Council
Board of Directors, Planner for
Agency - develops 5 yr. plan for Senior Services

12-10
### Relevant Work or Volunteer Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Town or Address</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seniors Council</td>
<td>Aptos</td>
<td>Associate Director</td>
<td>1/2005 - Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liftline</td>
<td>Aptos</td>
<td>Analyst</td>
<td>1995-1997</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Statement of Qualifications:
Please attach a brief statement indicating why you are interested in serving on this committee and why you are qualified for the appointment. If you have served on this committee in the past, please summarize your accomplishments on the committee and indicate which of the committee's potential future endeavors most interest you.

### Certification:
I certify that the above information is true and correct and I authorize the verification of the information in the application in the event I am a finalist for the appointment.

**Signature**: [Signature]

**Date**: 4/13/11

### Return Application to:
SCCRTC  
Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee  
1523 Pacific Avenue  
Santa Cruz, CA 95060  
fax: 460-3215  email: trc042@co.santa-cruz.ca.us

### Questions or Comments:
(831) 460-3200
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Representing</th>
<th>Alternate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clay Kempf</td>
<td>Social Service Provider</td>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>Patty Talbot (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hal Anjo</td>
<td>Social Service Provider</td>
<td>Seniors (County)</td>
<td>vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally French</td>
<td>Social Service Provider</td>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>Sheryl Hagemann (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Molesky</td>
<td>Social Service Provider</td>
<td>Disabled (County)</td>
<td>vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Brooks</td>
<td>Social Service Provider</td>
<td>Persons of Limited Means</td>
<td>Lois Connell (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Berkowitz</td>
<td>CTSA (Community Bridges)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bonnie McDonald (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Patterson</td>
<td>CTSA (Lift Line)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kirk Ance (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Daugherty</td>
<td>SCMTD (Metro)</td>
<td></td>
<td>April Warnock (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vacant</td>
<td>Private Operator</td>
<td></td>
<td>vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donella Bloebaum</td>
<td>Potential Transit User (60+)</td>
<td></td>
<td>vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vacant</td>
<td>Potential Transit User (Disabled)</td>
<td></td>
<td>vacant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Year in Parentheses) = Membership Expiration Date
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Representing</th>
<th>Alternate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patti Lou Shevlin (2014)</td>
<td>1st District</td>
<td>Michael Lewis (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Leopold)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vacant</td>
<td>2nd District</td>
<td>vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Pirie)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Coonerty)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vacant</td>
<td>4th District</td>
<td>vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Caput)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Stone)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karena Pushnik, Transportation Planner, RTC, 460-3210, <a href="mailto:kpushnik@sccrtc.org">kpushnik@sccrtc.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT APPLICATION

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC)
Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E/D TAC)

Meetings are scheduled for the second Tuesday of every other month at 1:30 p.m. in the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission conference room, located at 1523 Pacific Avenue in downtown Santa Cruz. At least one meeting each year is scheduled for an alternate location. Please refer to the Committee description, bylaws and recruitment process for more information.

If you are interested in serving on this committee, please complete this application, and return it to the Regional Transportation Commission office.

PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY

Name: _____________________________________________________________

Home address: _______________________________________________________

Mailing address (if different): ___________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

Phone: (home) __________________ (business/message) _____________________

E-mail: _____________________________________________________________

Length of residence in Santa Cruz County: _______________________________

Position(s) I am applying for: □ Any appropriate position

□ __________________________________________ □ _______________________

Previous experience on a government commission or committee (please specify)

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________
## Relevant Work or Volunteer Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Town or Address</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Statement of Qualifications:

Please attach a brief statement indicating why you are interested in serving on this committee and why you are qualified for the appointment. If you have served on this committee in the past, please summarize your accomplishments on the committee and indicate which of the committee’s potential future endeavors most interest you.

### Certification:

I certify that the above information is true and correct and I authorize the verification of the information in the application in the event I am a finalist for the appointment.

__________________________  __________________________
Signature       Date

### Return Application to:

SCCRTC
Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee
1523 Pacific Avenue
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
fax: 460-3215   email: kpushnik@sccrtc.org

### Questions or Comments:

(831) 460-3200
### Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
### THREE MONTH MEETING SCHEDULE
### MAY 2011 through JULY 2011
### (Revised 4/22/11)

**All meetings are subject to cancellation when there are no action items to be considered by the board or committee.**

<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>05/05/11</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Commission</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/09/11</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td><strong>Bicycle Committee - Cancelled</strong></td>
<td>7:00 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/19/11</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Transportation Policy Workshop</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/19/11</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td><strong>Interagency Technical Advisory Committee - Note Special Time</strong></td>
<td>1:00 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/02/11</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Commission</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Watsonville City Council Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/09/11</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Budget and Administration/Personnel Committee</td>
<td>3:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/13/11</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td><strong>Bicycle Committee - Note Special Time</strong></td>
<td>6:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/14/11</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Elderly &amp; Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/16/11</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Transportation Policy Workshop</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/16/11</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td><strong>Interagency Technical Advisory Committee - Note Special Time</strong></td>
<td>1:00 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THERE ARE NO MEETINGS SCHEDULED FOR JULY**

---

Commission Offices - 1523 Pacific Ave - Santa Cruz CA 95060  
Board of Supervisors Chambers/ CAO Conference Room/ RDA Conf Room - 701 Ocean St - Santa Cruz CA 95060  
City of Watsonville - 275 Main St - Watsonville CA 95076  
S:\RTC\TC\20110511\3month meeting schedule.xlsx@sheet1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Letter Rec'd/Sent</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Incoming/Outgoing</th>
<th>Recipient First</th>
<th>Recipient Last</th>
<th>Recipient Organization</th>
<th>Sender First</th>
<th>Sender Last</th>
<th>Sender Organization</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03/30/11</td>
<td>Letter I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>2010 California Statewide Local Streets and Roads Assessment (LSRA) Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/30/11</td>
<td>Letter O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mike Sherrod</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network Master Plan and Environmental Review - Notice to Proceed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/01/11</td>
<td>Letter O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kimberleigh</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Escrow for the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line, Monterey and Santa Cruz Counties, California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/06/11</td>
<td>Letter I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jack Dilles</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Robins</td>
<td>Community Bridges</td>
<td>2010-2011 TDA Claim for CTSA Operations Exhibit D Amendment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/07/11</td>
<td>Letter O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Request for Amendments - Senate Bill 468 (Kehoe): Department of Transportation: Capacity-Increasing State Highway Projects Coastal Zone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/13/11</td>
<td>Invoice O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Donn Miyahara</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Invoice #16, Final, Project No. HP21L-6149(040)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/14/11</td>
<td>Letter I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>George Dondero</td>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Klemz</td>
<td>SEIU Local 521</td>
<td>Notification of Ratification of MOU Extension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/20/11</td>
<td>Letter O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCMTD</td>
<td>A John</td>
<td>Daugherty</td>
<td>SCCRTC E&amp;D TAC</td>
<td>Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District’s Proposed 12% Service Cuts</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>04/21/11</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>City of Capitola</td>
<td>Karena</td>
<td>Pushnik</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Sidewalk Maintenance Public Outreach Plan and Messages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>City of Capitola</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>City of Capitola</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cheryl</td>
<td>Cheryl</td>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>David</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rosemary</td>
<td>Rosemary</td>
<td>City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City of Watsonville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City of Watsonville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City of Watsonville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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April 20, 2011

Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District
Board of Directors
110 Vernon Street
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

RE: Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District’s Proposed 12% Service Cuts

Dear Chair Pirie:

The Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC) advises the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC), the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (Metro), and other service providers on transportation needs for people with disabilities, seniors and persons with limited means.

At their April 12 meeting, the E&D TAC approved the following motion relative the Santa Cruz Metro’s 12% bus service cut proposal:

Send a letter to the Metro board and staff acknowledging the funding challenges ahead and expressing appreciation for taking care to maintain as much geographical coverage throughout Santa Cruz County as possible and reducing fixed route service in a manner that minimizes impacts to the complimentary paratransit service known as ParaCruz-- in recognition of the negative impacts to seniors, people with disabilities and other transit dependent individuals.

Thank you for considering input from the E/D TAC on this important issue.

Sincerely,

A. John Daugherty, Chair
Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee
April 7, 2011

The Honorable Christine Kehoe  
California State Senator  
State Capitol, Room 5050  
Sacramento, CA 95814

SUBJECT: Request for Amendments - Senate Bill 468 (Kehoe): Department of Transportation: Capacity-Increasing State Highway Projects: Coastal Zone.

Dear Senator Kehoe:

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) is very concerned about the negative implications Senate Bill 468 (SB 468) could have on addressing mobility needs throughout Santa Cruz County. The legislation would inhibit the region’s ability to address traffic congestion, safety, and mobility issues comprehensively and would usurp local control of transportation planning, halt the construction of critical highway projects, and fail to provide the additional revenue necessary to enhance public transportation service along the coast. We respectfully request that SB468 be significantly amended to address our concerns. Without such amendments, the RTC board is anticipated to take an opposed position to the bill.

If enacted as currently written, SB 468 would impose additional requirements on the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) for the development of capacity-increasing state highway projects in the coastal zone. The RTC supports several goals of the bill, such as ensuring collaboration between Caltrans, regions, and others agencies to develop traffic congestion reduction goals; expanding transit options in the region; reducing vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions; and promoting efforts to ensure that transportation investments in the coastal zone do not compromise or diminish existing natural resources. We strongly disagree, however, that construction of all highway projects should be postponed until all other transit service and facilities investments and local street and road investments related to increased traffic are completed. This is not practical or feasible, and would be in conflict with key goals of our Highway 1 HOV lanes project, which include improving transit service and taking traffic off of local roads.

In Santa Cruz County, the most heavily traveled corridor (between the cities of Santa Cruz and Watsonville) suffers severe congestion through much of the day. After evaluation of a wide variety of options via a Major Transportation Investment Study, the RTC developed a multimodal plan for improving automobile, bus, bicycle, and pedestrian travel. This included widening Highway 1 to add High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes. SB 468 would be very detrimental to this project, which is aimed at improving transit and local streets and roads. With construction of the HOV lanes, a significant amount traffic currently choking local streets and roads will be redirected to the highway, making local streets and roads more functional for local buses, bicyclists, pedestrians, and residents. RTC has been working with Caltrans and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to develop this project and the draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for this project is nearing completion.
Requested Amendments to SB 468:

1. Completing all transit investments first: Amend SB 468 to delete language that would prohibit construction of capacity-increasing highway projects in the coastal zone until after all transit service and facility investments are complete. Mandating that coastal regions fully build public transit improvements prior to highway construction is unreasonable, especially during a time when capital funding for transit improvements is severely restricted. The state Legislature has repeatedly eliminated funding to improve and operate transit service, such as repeated diversion of State Transit Assistance (STA) funds to the State General Fund. Through the “gas tax swap” flexible gasoline sales tax revenues, which previously could be used for State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) transit projects, were eliminated, thereby restricting most STIP funds to road projects. Additionally, definitions of a “transit investment program” and the meaning of such a program to be “complete” are not provided in the bill. The vagueness of the language leaves open-ended the requirement to invest in public transit. Holding up any improvements to the freeway corridor while open-ended transit improvements are “built out” will guarantee traffic congestion for decades.

2. Expanding Local Roads: We also ask that the bill be amended to delete language which would require Caltrans to pay for expansion of the local roads to address increased traffic prior to widening highways. This would result in increased traffic capacity on the local road system, shifting vehicles from highways.

3. Expanding the scope of highway projects: We are concerned about the requirement to include in the environmental analysis for the proposed project, other proposed state highway projects or proposed projects on local streets and roads that are parallel to the proposed project. It is unclear how this provision of the bill would affect the definition of the proposed project. Typically, the project purpose and need is explicitly defined in a project’s environmental document, and project alternatives are developed that meet that defined purpose and need. Including additional parallel projects in a project’s environmental analysis appears to expand the scope of the proposed project, without thought to how to address the original need and intent for the project. Expanding the environmental analysis to this level is the opposite direction the state should go, especially in terms of streamlining project delivery, and it would make coastal highway projects much more bureaucratic and expensive, resulting in less funding for other projects.

4. We also request that the bill be amended to eliminate the requirement to identify traffic congestion reduction goals on a project-by-project basis. Highway widening projects are part of a multimodal transportation system. When selecting a program of projects through both the Regional Transportation Plan and specific funding programs, the RTC seeks to make progress and balance a number of goals, including mobility, access, reliability, system preservation & safety. Requiring Caltrans to focus solely on traffic congestion at the project level highlights a single objective to the detriment of other regional goals.

5. Eliminate language that would require construction to take place sequentially. Practically speaking, the bill’s provisions requiring sequential construction of projects mean huge inefficiencies that will delay construction and significantly drive up costs. The bill would set a precedent by prescribing how Caltrans must construct state highway improvements, without regard to efficiency, economies of scale, and impacts to the traveling public. With the state
budget deficit, and California and local economies coming out of one of the worst recessions, now is not the time for new legislation that drives infrastructure costs higher.

Bill Proposals Already Being Addressed

Regarding elements of the bill which we support in concept and practice, we do not believe that separate legislation is necessary to achieve most of those purposes.

a. The collaboration called for under SB 468 is already being done as part of our region’s comprehensive transportation planning and programming process. The priority for highway improvements in Santa Cruz County is driven not by Caltrans, but by local and regional stakeholders and the public.

b. Furthermore, the RTC is in the process of analyzing our Highway 1 HOV Lanes project using a Sustainable Transportation Access Rating System (STARS), in order to maximize multimodal transportation and environmental solutions.

c. There are sufficient federal and state laws already in place to ensure capacity-increasing transportation improvements are properly vetted and environmental and community impacts are addressed.

This bill would prevent timely, needed highway improvements from being built in the coastal zone. While the bill speaks to providing balanced transportation options and enhancing the coastal zone, it would have negative effects on residents living in the coastal areas by limiting transportation access to adjacent communities, and by ensuring that intolerable freeway congestion continues to build while we work solely on transit and local streets and roads. It is inappropriate to apply a statewide mandate that poses a very serious threat to local and regional transportation planning in coastal areas. We need to invest in a combination of highway, transit, and other congestion reduction strategies in the coastal corridor, and they should go hand-in-hand, not one before the other.

Thank you for your consideration of these concerns. We look forward to working with you in addressing these and other issues as the bill proceeds. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me, or Rachel Moriconi of my staff at 831-460-3203

Sincerely,

George Dondero

Cc: SCCRTC board
    Members, Santa Cruz County Legislators
    Chair and Members, Senate Transportation and Housing Committee
    Chair and Members, Senate Natural Resources and Water Committee
    Art Bauer, Consultant, Senate Transportation and Housing Committee
    Bill Craven, Chief Consultant, Senate Natural Resources and Water Committee
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March 30, 2011

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

Dear Members of the Commission:

On March 15, 2011, the Board of Supervisors received an update on the 2010 California Statewide Local Streets and Roads Assessment (LSRA) Report. The LSRA is a comprehensive statewide study of California's local street and road system and provides critical analysis and information on the local transportation network's condition and funding needs.

The results of the LSRA show that California's local streets and roads are in jeopardy of further deterioration if current funding levels remain the same. On a scale of zero (failed road) to 100 (excellent road), the statewide average pavement condition index (PCI) has deteriorated from 68 in 2008 to 66 in 2010, placing roads statewide in the "at risk" category. Unfortunately, the local picture is even worse. The countywide PCI score is currently 48.

The LSRA report also documents an overall decline in funding for road maintenance and repair and points to other sources that have been used to backfill the decline in State funds. Unfortunately, one of those pools of funds in our county has been funds from local Redevelopment Agencies which are currently slated for elimination by the Governor. As an example, for the past few years, $1 million to $3 million has been spent on roads within the Santa Cruz County Redevelopment Agency area, which has resulted in a PCI of around 70 in the Live Oak and Soquel areas. With the potential loss of these funds, as well as the loss of one-time ARRA stimulus funds, we could easily see a reduction of more than $10 million in essential road maintenance funds. Clearly, the County General Fund is not healthy enough to support a massive repair of our local roads. Therefore, we have to look for all available resources to repair our local roads.
March 30, 2011
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Another resource to repair and maintain the County's 600 miles of roads comes from funds from the Regional Surface Transportation Program. Over the past five years, RSTP and RSTPX funds have provided nearly $2 million in funds to repair roads in the unincorporated areas. In light of the low level of pavement condition index scores on the County's road system, our Board believes that the first priority for the use of RSTP funds should be to maintain and repair our local road system. This, in turn, would mean that other funds could be used to pay for maintenance on local residential streets and rural roads.

Accordingly, our Board urges that when planning for the use of Regional Surface Transportation Program funds, the Commission's first priority should always be for the repair and maintenance of our local road systems. During this time of budgetary crisis, the community needs to be ensure that we provide all necessary funds to maintain local roads.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
MARK W. STONE, Chairperson
Board of Supervisors

MWS:ted

cc: Clerk of the Board
Public Works Department

1252A6
TRANSPORTATION has long been at the heart of our nation's civil rights struggle. The struggle against Jim Crow transportation was more than half a century old when Rosa Parks refused to give up her seat to a white passenger on the bus and sparked the modern civil rights movement. But today, the most prominent civil rights fights around transportation focus not on desegregation but on planning and funding of transportation in our metropolitan regions. Transit, civil rights and environmental justice (EJ) activists are asking a new question: Are low-income and minority communities receiving a fair share of the benefits of public spending on transportation in their regions?

The unfortunate answer is no. Minority and low-income populations not only are systematically denied that fair share, but often end up worse off for the expenditure of large sums on transportation improvements in their communities.

In California, bus riders have added legal strategies to their efforts to win a fair share of transportation benefits. These legal tools have included federal lawsuits in Los Angeles and the Bay Area. More recently, the success of an administrative civil rights complaint against Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) resulted in a victory for EJ communities when the federal government took $70 million in stimulus funds away from BART's Oakland airport connector project due to civil rights violations. This article documents how efforts like these have succeeded in exposing the civil rights violations of transit funding schemes, and considers the lessons of these campaigns for transportation justice struggles in other metropolitan regions.

The Los Angeles Bus Riders Union

In 1992, The Labor/Community Strategy Center saw an organizing opportunity. Equating city buses to "factories on wheels," it created the Los Angeles Bus Riders Union (BRU). BRU inaugurated a new era in transportation justice in the 1990s by combining bus rider organizing with legal tools. Its legal tool, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, prohibits recipients of federal funds from discriminating on the basis of race, color or national origin. Prohibited discrimination under Title VI includes a denial of or delay in receipt of the benefits of public investment.

L.A. bus riders were overwhelmingly people of color earning under $12,000 a year. African-American janitors, Latino hotel workers and Korean garment workers were standing on overcrowded buses at the end of an exhausting day at work. Fare hikes added to the injury.

BRU turned its eyes on the Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA), which runs both bus and rail service in Los Angeles County. In 1994, BRU was watching when MTA adopted yet another fare hike, amounting to $126 million in revenue. At the same time, MTA budgeted nearly the same sum, $123 million, to serve higher income and lower-minority suburban commuters through expansion of its Pasadena light rail line.

The inequality in the benefits and the burdens of MTA's actions was unmistakable. Transit improvements
were proposed that not only failed to benefit minority bus riders, but actually came at their expense. BRU used this evidence to file a landmark Title VI federal class action lawsuit which ended in a negotiated settlement. BRU then carefully monitored MTA's compliance with the terms of the resulting consent decree.

BRU’s efforts resulted in more than $1 billion in bus service improvements over ten years. MTA added hundreds of thousands of hours of bus service, kept fares affordable and took steps to reduce overcrowding. BRU also paid close attention to the links between buses, public health and the environment, and as a result the MTA now runs the largest fleet of clean fuel buses in the nation.

Minority Bus Riders vs. the Bay Area’s Metropolitan Transportation Commission

The success of organized bus riders wielding Title VI in L.A. brought both hope and a new lens to the struggles of EJ communities across the country. In the San Francisco Bay Area, bus riders from Oakland to Richmond were seeing a clear, but somewhat less direct, correlation between bus service cuts and rail expansion. In the Bay Area, unlike L.A., bus and rail service are provided by a hodgepodge of transit agencies.

Still, the same patterns were clear. Service levels for AC Transit bus riders had fallen by 30 percent from 1986 to 2005, even as service levels for riders of BART and Caltrain rail service had more than doubled (see Figure 1). As in L.A., bus and rail ridership is demographically very distinct—50 percent of AC Transit riders are minorities, while 50 to 60 percent of BART and Caltrans riders are white (see Figure 2).

2. Public Subsidies and Race of Riders

![Graph showing the percentage of white riders and subsidy amount per rider.]

Data from the National Transit Database, 1989-2003

While it was immediately clear how L.A.'s MTA played “Robin Hood in reverse,” the task facing the bus rider advocates in the Bay Area was more complicated, requiring a close analysis of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's (MTC) funding policies, transit expansion program and long-range transportation plan. That analysis showed that in each of its long-range regional transportation plans since 1992, MTC built in bus service cuts and fare hikes at the planning stage. At the same time, MTC's plans devoted 94 percent of its transit expansion funds to rail projects, and less than five percent to bus projects. MTC was, in effect, starving bus systems of operating revenue and shifting those funds to capital projects benefiting rail systems.

In 2005, with analysis in hand, Amalgamated Transit Union (ATU) Local 192 (the bus drivers union) joined several minority bus riders and an EJ organization in filing a federal class action civil rights lawsuit, Durenberg vs. Metropolitan Transportation Commission. The plaintiffs asserted that MTC's planning and funding policies prioritized rail expansion for riders who were more affluent and while reducing levels of service for bus riders.

After trial in October 2008, the District Court issued a mixed ruling. On the one hand it found that "AC Transit has been forced to cut urban bus service to the detriment of [minority bus riders] in the past due
to funding shortfalls within the control of MTC. It also concluded that MTC could take additional steps to allocate funding in a way that would help alleviate AC Transit’s shortfalls. The Court also agreed with the plaintiffs that MTC’s transit expansion program had a discriminatory impact by excluding projects that would have benefited minority bus riders. The Court, however, ruled that MTC met its burden of proof regarding an appropriate justification for that discriminatory impact. The plaintiffs’ appeal (supported by an amicus curiae brief from Planners Network) is now pending before the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.

The Unequal Benefits and Burdens of Capital Expansion Projects

These bus rider lawsuits brought to light an important general principle: When capital expansion comes at the expense of basic transit operations, low-income communities suffer economically, as studies have shown. First, funding transit operations creates 40 percent more jobs than transit capital spending. Second, transit service automatically translates into green union jobs for bus drivers and mechanics who live in the local community. And third, operating funds have a huge economic multiplier effect. For example, investing $1 billion dollars in operating bus service yields $3 billion dollars in increased local business sales.

But beyond the economics is the fundamental question of who benefits from capital projects. Expensive capital projects often provide little benefit to low-income families who, instead, often bear the brunt of the burdens of those projects. In addition to environmental burdens, these burdens include cuts to their local transit service and displacement fueled by gentrification.

Analyzing the fair sharing of benefits and burdens by race and income has become central to EJ efforts. On top of Title VI, Presidential Executive Order 12898 on EJ adopted in 1994 requires each federal agency to “identify and address disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies and activities on minority and low-income populations.” This obligation extends to recipients of federal transportation funding, like MTA and MTC.

The requirement to “identify and address” inequities gave birth to the Federal Transit Administration’s policy of conducting an “equity analysis” of planned projects and then taking steps necessary to avoid or mitigate identified inequities. The purpose of the equity analysis is to determine whether low-income and minority populations are receiving a fair share of the benefits and the burdens of transportation projects and programs. The equity analysis gives bus riders a potent new legal tool.

Challenging the Oakland Airport Connector

In early 2009, more than $1 billion in federal stimulus money—two-thirds of which had to be used for capital projects for the Bay Area—arrived at MTC’s doorstep. The remainder of the funds could be spent on preservation of existing transit and new construction projects. Bus riders were eager to take advantage of that portion to shore up declining bus service
which, for AC Transit riders, had declined by another 15 percent during the current economic crisis.

MTC, however, proposed to divert $70 million in transit stimulus funds to BART’s proposed Oakland Airport Connector. A three-mile, $500 million dollar project to link the airport to BART’s Coliseum station in East Oakland, the Connector would replace a $3 bus shuttle with a tram costing twice as much.

Genesis, a social justice community organizing group, turned out at an MTC meeting to protest the proposed diversion of funds. More than one hundred members packed a room seating only fifty. They did not carry the day, however, and the MTC committed the $70 million to the rail project. That might have been the end of the matter, but Genesis, and advocates from non-profits Urban Habitat and TransForm, huddled with civil rights lawyers from Public Advocates Inc. to craft a new strategy.

Like East Oakland as a whole, the demographics of the station area are predominantly minority and low income. Two neighborhoods in the station area have minority populations of over 95 percent, with poverty rates ranging from 25 percent to 33 percent. An honest equity analysis would have shown that these low-income and minority residents would not benefit from a slightly faster trip to the airport. But advocates learned that BART had not conducted any equity analysis of the Connector.

In September 2009, citing the lack of equity analysis, the groups filed an administrative Title VI complaint with FTA against BART. FTA investigated the allegations and concluded that BART had indeed not complied with the equity analysis requirement. FTA also found a range of other agency-wide shortcomings. As a result, FTA required BART to adopt and implement a comprehensive “corrective action plan” to remedy these civil rights violations.

But there was another outcome: The same $70 million that MTC had awarded to rail expansion was now back on the table. Last February, in a victory for Genesis, the communities of East Oakland and transit riders, FTA Administrator Peter Rogoff ordered MTC to reallocate those funds to shore up existing transit operations.

**Lessons Learned**

The success of the administrative complaint was a victory for Bay Area transit riders, but it was also a warning shot across the bow of transportation agencies all over the country. For the first time in years, the federal government was open for the business of civil rights enforcement. And organized communities fighting for a fair share of the benefits of public spending on transportation now find they have a powerful strategy to add to their toolkit.

These legal strategies also brought to the surface a template for analyzing transportation inequity that advocates in many other places are now applying. Communities are now looking at proposed transit expansion projects to determine if they will leave low-income and minority transit riders behind. And many advocates are actively asking Congress to restore federal operating assistance for transit, rather than funding solely capital projects.

As local advocates become more sophisticated in watchdogging transit agencies, they will continue to find effective strategies to begin to serve up fair portions of the transportation funding pie. And while the fight for transportation justice has come a long way since Ms. Parks’ battle to retain her seat, the campaign continues.
Transit-Oriented Development and Communities of Color: A Field Report

By Gen Fujioka

Transit-oriented development (TOD) has become a leading policy prescription for reversing America’s sprawling path of growth. The Obama administration, through its Sustainable Communities Initiative, state and local agencies and progressive think-tanks all emphasize TOD as a means to achieve housing, transportation and environmental goals, often through public-private partnerships. But as TOD has been justifiably promoted as the cleaner alternative to auto-dependent development, gaps have appeared in the discourse that understate its costs. This report seeks to fill in some of those gaps with snapshots from four communities of color that have been impacted by various stages of TOD in the cities of Seattle, San Francisco, Los Angeles and Minneapolis–Saint Paul.

What is a TOD?

Non-profit community development organizations were early innovators in building TOD projects, seeking to link affordable housing with transit. Today, TOD projects vary but they can be generally defined as mixed-use, higher density development oriented toward nearby public transit. In its varying forms, TOD is being promoted by a growing range of government programs, The largest federal transit program, New Starts, strongly favors projects that incorporate TOD, and many state and local governments have created expedited approval processes, incentives and zoning and land use policies that foster TOD.

As the concept has been embraced by some market-rate developers, even some TOD proponents concede there may be social costs of such development. The federally funded Center for Transit-Oriented Development and others have published a number of policy toolkits and best practice guides for equitable TOD. While these publications describe individual exemplary projects, missing is an evaluation of the impacts at scale. The experiences described below suggest that much more needs to be done to ensure that TOD does not become a greener version of gentrification.

Affordable Housing Fuzzy Math in Seattle

The multi-ethnic and historic International District of Seattle (also known as the “ID”) lies on the southern edge of the city’s financial district. A majority of the neighborhood’s residents are very low income and people of color. Originally Seattle’s Chinatown, the neighborhood became a business and residential district for successive waves of Asian immigrants. In addition to housing, it offers a range of ethnic restaurants, shops and services. The ID is now also the central nexus of the region’s transit, including light rail, buses, Amtrak and the future high-speed rail station connecting Seattle with Portland.

The convergence of new rail lines and downtown growth led the city to adopt a transit-oriented upzoning that will allow more than a doubling of housing units in the already high-density district. On paper, the plan’s goals would create 4,500 units of housing affordable for lower income households. However, the new zoning does not ensure the affordable
units will ever be built. Over the next six years the city’s estimated $145 million housing fund will support the production of 1,800 affordable units for the entire city. If the ID received a proportionate share of the projected funding, it would only support several hundred new affordable units. “So far, smart growth in Seattle doesn’t add up,” says Ken Katahira, housing development staff for InterIm Community Development Association, a nonprofit that has built affordable housing and a community garden in the neighborhood. “Zoning for higher densities does not necessarily create more affordable housing.”

Upzoning the ID for taller buildings and greater densities has compounded the development pressure already generated by the new transit infrastructure. And as a practical matter, taller buildings cost more. Concrete and steel construction, required for structures over six stories, is unaffordable to even moderate-income families without deep public subsidies. In the absence of more prescriptive regulation and more robust funding, the city’s plan to foster TOD through zoning in the ID threatens existing affordable housing and small businesses located in “underdeveloped” buildings without ensuring affordable housing within new construction.

Transit-Oriented Displacement in the Mission District of San Francisco

Compared to many other urban centers, San Francisco has maintained a strong commitment to transit and affordable housing. With a dense urban core, regional transit hubs and an expanding network of light rail, a majority of San Franciscans take transit or walk to work. San Francisco has also pioneered many of the housing and land use policies that are now proposed by policy guides as innovative models for equitable smart growth, from inclusionary zoning to demolition and conversion controls. One test of San Francisco’s affordable housing policies came in the 1990s during the dot-com boom. Amidst a hot real estate market, development pressures grew particularly in transit-rich areas. Evictions reached record levels and entire neighborhoods were transformed in a few years. According to research by UC Berkeley’s Center on Community Innovation, during the period between 1995 and 2000, the out-migration of low-income households exceeded 9,800 each year while the numbers of upper income households grew. Proximity to transit was a significant factor in explaining the pattern of displacement. Neighborhoods within a half-mile of major transit were particularly at risk of gentrification and displacement, suffering marked declines in the number of households of color.

1999 San Francisco rally protesting rapid gentrification particularly in the Mission District, the heart of the city’s Latino community. Subsequent research in the Bay Area finds a strong correlation between displacement in such neighborhoods of color and proximity to transit.
The heart of the city’s Latino community, the Mission District, was ground zero for displacement. Located between two major BART stations (the city’s regional rail system), near new tech enterprises and overall transit rich, the primarily working-class neighborhood experienced widespread evictions in which entire buildings were cleared for young professionals attracted to urban, transit-accessible living. In the midst of this crisis and despite the booming market, city administrators regularly provided developers with exemptions from inclusionary housing requirements and zoning controls.

“The original challenge wasn’t a lack of affordable housing policies—that we had were not being followed. The first challenge was about building community power so that we could have policies enforced when they mattered,” recalls Nick Pagoulatos, then an activist with the Mission Agenda Coalition (MAC), a grassroots anti-displacement organization, and now a planner at Dolores Street Community Services, an organization that continues to serve the neighborhood.

Over the objections of overflow crowds mobilized by MAC, the city’s commissions repeatedly approved ever larger development projects fueling more displacement in or within walking distance of the Mission. With both established policies and neighborhood concerns being ignored, MAC and a citywide coalition turned to the ballot and elected an anti-displacement majority on the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. Voters also amended the city’s charter, breaking up the mayor’s exclusive control over the land use process. These changes led to the adoption of an extraordinary moratorium on new development in the Mission.

The moratorium stopped the largest abuses but led to a grueling eight-year planning process. “In the end we did not get the full protections we wanted,” says Pagoulatos. “The extended process itself wore the community down. And we did not have the community-based institutions that could provide the technical expertise to take on the developers at every step. But we did change the rules of the game so that development became more transparent and potentially more democratic—it's still a question of power.”

**Putting TOD in Context in Boyle Heights, Los Angeles**

In contrast with Seattle or San Francisco, Los Angeles is still in the early phases of rebuilding its regional transit system. One of the first new light rail lines runs through the predominantly Latino Boyle Heights neighborhood. Even before it opened, the line spurred the start of gentrification.

“After they started construction we had a wave of evictions near the station,” reports Isela Gracian, director of community organizing for the East Los Angeles Community Corporation (ELACC). “Landlords were looking for any excuse to evict tenants. Fortunately, many families contacted us so we were able to help them assert their rights. The recession also hit so the soft market has helped slow the evictions.”

With years of prior organizing and investments in the neighborhood, ELACC was in a position to proactively challenge the transit agency in other ways. ELACC worked to keep the neighborhood’s small business community in place. “The transit agency did not understand the community that was here before they started the project,” Gracian recalls. “It wasn’t just that they didn’t speak the language. They didn’t appreciate what we had that would be lost.” One of the specific enterprises threatened by the line was space along the main business corridor where Mariachi musicians gathered and promoted their services. ELACC helped bring public and media attention to the issue—ultimately ensuring that merchants, musicians and the community will still be able to keep the streets as their own.

ELACC also pressed the transit agency to ensure that the properties it acquired for the construction of the line would provide a long-term public benefit. On one of those sites, ELACC has completed the community’s own version of mixed-use TOD: affordable housing and community services, including offices for the newly formed Mariachi musician’s association. “TOD is much more than building some affordable housing,” observes Gracian. “It needs to be a part of supporting the whole neighborhood . . . we need to be positioned to help address the changes that are coming ahead.”
Regionalism's Challenge in St. Paul

MAC's impact on the city planning process and ELACCC's impact on shaping TOD in one neighborhood were based upon neighborhood and community-based organizing. But the shift towards regional governance may favor large developers while undermining public engagement.

Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) have long played a central role in directing regional transportation investments. But as transit investments begin to drive land use planning and the allocation of other scarce public resources, MPOs wield greater power. The shift towards regionalism is reinforced by progressive initiatives such as HUD's Sustainable Communities Regional Planning Grant Program and California's greenhouse gas reduction legislation (SB 375), each giving MPOs more influence over local processes. But MPOs are more insulated than city governments from local and neighborhood-based organizing and are often governed by a mix of elected and unelected appointees and agency representatives. Furthermore, their structure and highly technical forms of discourse pose new challenges for democratic participation.

For example, the federally funded Central Corridor Light Rail Transit project, designed to connect the Twin Cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis, runs through the predominantly African-American and Asian-American neighborhoods known as the Rondo and Frogtown districts, respectively. The original plans provided the fewest number of stations relative to the number of transit riders in those neighborhoods. While offering little service, the project threatened years of construction disruptions and the elimination of most street parking. Only after each community filed a civil rights complaint with the Federal Transportation Agency did the region's MPO, known as the Met Council, agree to install additional station stops in the minority communities. Now with the stations approved, the communities are being offered little to ensure that market-driven TOD does not displace existing small businesses and low-income residents. "We've basically been shut out of the planning process," says Veronica Burt, organizer with the Preserve and Benefit Historic Rondo Committee, a coalition that includes the local NAACP church groups and community development organizations. "The Met Council went through the motions of holding meetings but didn't listen to community concerns. There has been no way to make them accountable."

The Need for Critical Assessment

Making regional agencies more accountable is an inherent challenge for communities of color in part because of demographics. While African Americans, Latinos and Asians may have gained local representation in many urban areas, they remain electoral minorities in almost all regions. Less obvious but no less daunting for organizers is the need for a common language to convey what is at stake in regional planning—what David Harvey describes as the need for translation. Such translation is not merely for non-native English speakers; even in plain English the abstract and dislocated language of regional planning is generally indecipherable to all but professionals and developers. For communities to become engaged and participate on a regional level requires a radical reinterpretation of planning proposals in terms of real, place-based experience—an approach that organizations such as New York's Center for Urban Pedagogy have begun to develop but needs to be widely expanded.

Despite these and other challenges, efforts are underway to engage communities in regional policy discussions. This is driven in part because transit itself is connecting communities, creating shared needs and interests. For example, ELACCC has participated in the formation of the Los Angeles Neighborhood-Based Community Development Coalition to connect Latino, African-American, and Asian Pacific Islander neighborhoods to proactively engage in the future planning of LA's new light rail stations. And in Seattle, Interlil and other community organizations have joined the newly created Regional Equity Network to directly participate in their MPO's planning process, which has received the support of HUD's Sustainable Communities Regional Planning Grant Program. What remains to be developed across regions is a community-based agenda, reinterpreting the meaning of TODs to benefit existing diverse neighborhoods and incorporating a sharper critique of the dominant paradigm.
## RECENTLY COMPLETED PROJECTS

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

## CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Construction Timeline</th>
<th>Construction Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>Project Manager (Resident Engineer)</th>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HWY. 1 Salinas Road</td>
<td>North of Moss Landing at Salinas Road (PM 99.9-101.5)</td>
<td>Construct new interchange</td>
<td>4/15/2010-Fall 2012</td>
<td>$12 Million</td>
<td>STIP/CMIA</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Richard Rosales (JW)</td>
<td>Desilva Gates Construction LP, Dublin</td>
<td>Work consists of utility relocation and bridge work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWY. 17 Guardrail Upgrades</td>
<td>Near Scotts Valley at various locations from Santa’s Village Rd. to the Santa Clara County Line (PM 6.0-12.6)</td>
<td>Upgrade guardrail, crash cushions, end treatments and retaining walls for guardrail</td>
<td>1/13/2010-Spring 2012</td>
<td>$5.5 Million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Doug Hessing (PD)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Future contract re-bidding due to contractor default</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWY. 17 Santa’s Village Road Guardrail</td>
<td>Near Scott’s Valley from just north of Santa’s Village to Crescent Drive (PM 6.1-6.6)</td>
<td>Construct concrete guardrail</td>
<td>1/31/2011-Spring 2012</td>
<td>$3 Million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Doug Hessing (PD)</td>
<td>Gordon N. Ball Inc., Alamo</td>
<td>Alternating lane closures both northbound and southbound at various hours primarily overnight 7 days a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWY. 17 Vinehill Wet Weather Improvements</td>
<td>Near Scotts Valley from south of West Vinehill Rd. to south of Vinehill Rd.(PM 7.0-7.3)</td>
<td>Construct soldier pile wall</td>
<td>6/20/2009-TBD</td>
<td>$1.5 Million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Doug Hessing (PD)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>In suspension</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PROJECTS IN DEVELOPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Construction Timeline</th>
<th>Construction Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HWY. 1</td>
<td>In Santa Cruz from San Lorenzo River Bridge to just north of Western Street (PM 17.5-20.2)</td>
<td>Place micro-surfacing on existing pavement</td>
<td>Project advertised on 3/7/2011</td>
<td>$630,000</td>
<td>Highway Maintenance</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Kelly McClain</td>
<td>Advertise and Bid</td>
<td>Bids opened on 4/13/2011, pending award and approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Regional Transportation Commission

FROM: Karena Pushnik, Senior Transportation Planner

RE: Sidewalk Maintenance Public Outreach Campaign

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission receive information about the Pedestrian Safety Work Group’s Public Outreach Campaign regarding Sidewalk Maintenance.

BACKGROUND

The Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC) designated a subcommittee to work on pedestrian issues called the Pedestrian Safety Work Group. The dynamic 5-member committee completed an in-depth analysis of jurisdiction and property owner responsibilities and practices for improving sidewalk safety and accessibility in Santa Cruz County. A presentation of this report was provided to the RTC in June 2010.

DISCUSSION

Following up on action items from the Sidewalk Maintenance Report, the Pedestrian Safety Work Group has met with all five local jurisdictions. In December 2010, the Work Group secured agreement about the use of common maintenance standards to define the scope and magnitude of “tip and trip” hazards on sidewalks such as vertical and horizontal separation, obstacles, and surface conditions.

The next step is to take this information out to the general public to help increase awareness of criteria for safe and accessible sidewalks, their value to the community, responsibility for maintenance, and avenues for resolving unsafe conditions. The majority of the community is unaware that, by state law, property owners are responsible for maintaining the sidewalks adjacent to their property.

The Pedestrian Safety Work Group has developed an outreach campaign including four sequential sets of messages, and ideas about various outreach components. The Work Group met with local jurisdictions to review the plan including the draft messages. Input from the local jurisdictions was incorporated into the attached “final draft” (Attachment 1). Local jurisdictions were sent this draft with a request to provide any final comments, to share the plan with their administrative staff and elected officials, and to assist with identifying additional outreach components.

The Work Group offered to do presentations, similar to this one for the RTC, to each city council and county board of supervisors as a way to ensure that top officials
and decision makers are aware of the outreach campaign, as well as inform residents in attendance or remotely viewing the meeting.

The outreach campaign including messages and components is expected to begin in late spring and continue through the prime walking seasons, summer and fall.

**SUMMARY**

The Pedestrian Safety Work Group recommends that the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission receive and assist in the promotion of the Sidewalk Maintenance Outreach Campaign.

**Attachments:**

1. Sidewalk Maintenance Outreach Campaign including 4 Key Messages and Outreach Components
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Sidewalk Safety & Maintenance Outreach Plan
April 2011

1. Meet with Local Jurisdictions (March - done)
   a. Reviewed 4-step message plan
   b. Reviewed/amended messages
   c. Determined outreach components/mechanisms
   d. Renewed commitment to assist with outreach

2. Final Draft Message Content Review and Approval Process (April-May)

3. Present Outreach Plan to RTC and Local Jurisdiction Boards (May)

4. Pedestrian Safety Work Group Implements Outreach Plan (May – September)

Sidewalk Safety & Maintenance Outreach Messages

The following is a list of topics to be covered in various outreach formats. Messages could be expanded or decreased depending on the communication channel.

1st Set of Messages – Community Value of Good Pedestrian Network
   - Everyone is a pedestrian
   - Community value of safe and accessible sidewalks
   - Everyone benefits from good sidewalks: seniors, children, pets, families, people with disabilities, etc.
   - Walkability a key component of a healthy community
   - Walking is a low-cost, environmentally-friendly way to get around
   - Good sidewalks increase attractiveness and property value of your home
   - Good neighborhoods, including sidewalks, are our collective responsibility
   - Experiencing your community via the sidewalk network is enriching
   - Local weather conditions create an ideal walking environment

2nd Set of Messages – Attributes of Good Sidewalks
   - No matter where you are, you have a right to expect the sidewalk to be in good condition, i.e. safe and accessible
   - Goal is to minimize “tip and trip” hazards on sidewalks
   - Common sidewalk design and maintenance standards exist throughout the county
   - Elements of good sidewalks include:
     - Smooth surfaces: no gaps or uplifts of ½ inch or more
     - Clear path/walkways (4’ wide x height clearance of 7’)
       i. Control overgrown trees, shrubs and roots
       ii. Remove barriers from pathways (cars, recreation vehicles, realtor signs, trash cans, etc)
     - Minimal slopes that constitute tipping hazards
• Non-slip surfaces
• Controlled Tree Roots
  i. Plant trees using root barriers
  ii. Most Local jurisdictions have sidewalk friendly tree recommendations

3rd Set of Messages – Maintenance Responsibilities
- The California Streets and Highways Code requires property owners to maintain sidewalks adjacent to their properties in safe and accessible condition. They may be held liable for incidences resulting from unsafe sidewalk conditions.
- Maintenance standards exist for safe and accessible sidewalks
- Fix sidewalks to avoid unnecessary legal hassles and costs
- Sometimes jurisdictions are able to provide resources to assist with: grinding, tree selection, shared contractors and zero interest loans.
- The repair of some sidewalk conditions may be covered by homeowners insurance.
- Consult with your local jurisdiction or insurance agent for clarification.

4th Set of Messages – Report Sidewalk Conditions
- Report sidewalk problems, ideas, and suggestions directly to your local jurisdiction or to the RTC
- Report sidewalks that need maintenance, lack of sidewalks, access barriers/hazards, and street crossing issues (cross walks, signals, curb ramps, etc.)
- Refer to standards (2nd message) for tip and trip hazards (uplifts, gaps, surface, clearance)
- Contact your local jurisdiction Public Works Department if you’re unsure about problems with sidewalks adjacent to your property
- Use the Pedestrian Access Report or new Hazard Report on RTC website
- Renters are encouraged to contact their landlord or use hazard reports about issues with sidewalks adjacent to their residences.
- Get involved in pedestrian advocacy groups (Mission Pedestrian, E&D TAC, CTSC) to help identify unmet needs and work toward solutions
- Highlight of businesses/property owners throughout the county that take positive actions to improve the safety and accessibility of adjacent sidewalks as an expression of a community value.

Outreach Components

General for all areas of the county:
- RTC’s Transportation Café
- PSA’s on TV or YouTube (tape through Transportation Café)
- Public Service Announcements (PSA) on Radio
- Articles in media (local and guest reporters)
- Notice in property tax bills
- Presentations to Realtor Boards
- Disclosure language for property sales
• Contractor education of best practices
• List on RTC website
• Search word optimization for internet sites

Specific to LJ’s, agencies or areas:
• Inserts in utility bills
• E-news blasts
• List or link on agency websites
• Presentations to neighborhood meetings (Santa Cruz Neighbors, etc)
• Work with local advocacy groups (Mission Pedestrian, etc)
• Inclusion in community/business/neighborhood/environmental group newsletters
TO: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
FROM: Karena Pushnik, Senior Transportation Planner
RE: 10:00 am Public Hearing –
2011 Unmet Specialized Transportation and Transit Needs

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC):

1. Consider public input on Unmet Specialized Transportation and Transit Needs;
2. Adopt the 2011 Unmet Specialized Transportation and Transit Needs List (Attachment 1), with revisions as appropriate;
3. Consider the list of Unmet Needs as funding becomes available.

BACKGROUND

Local sales taxes in the amount of ¼ cent per dollar are collected by the State and allocated to the region according to the Transportation Development Act (TDA). The Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) allocates these funds according to formula as adopted in its Rules and Regulations with funds for the RTC’s planning activities and the majority of remaining funding apportioned to the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District, and other amounts to Community Bridges, the Volunteer Center and to local jurisdictions for bicycle and pedestrian projects.

According to section 99401.5 of the TDA statutes, transportation planning agencies are required to consult with their designated social services transportation advisory councils (the Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee) to identify transit needs as part of the Unmet Needs process. Transportation planning agencies interested in allocating funds to local streets and roads must conduct an annual Unmet Specialized Transportation and Transit Needs assessment and an extensive analysis of whether the needs are reasonable to meet. Our county’s local TDA funds are not used for streets and roads; therefore, the RTC does not need to perform this level of analysis. However the RTC, as the local transportation planning agency, endeavors to solicit input annually to provide a useful tool to assess and prioritize the unmet transit and paratransit needs in the region.

DISCUSSION

Attached for the Regional Transportation Commission’s consideration is the Draft Unmet Specialized Transportation and Transit Needs List for 2011 (Attachment 1).
Development of the Unmet Needs List

As in years past, and to be consistent with the TDA statute, the RTC’s Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee reviewed the first draft of the unmet specialized transportation and transit needs list which was based on the previous list. This took place at their February 2011 meeting. This list was then forwarded to the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (METRO) for their input. At the time of this writing, no input has been received from METRO; however, given the challenges faced by METRO to address budget shortfalls, unavailability of time to comment on the draft unmet transit needs is understandable.

The Draft List of Unmet Specialized Transportation and Transit Needs for 2011 includes the suggested amendments shown in underline/strike out format (Attachment 1). The Unmet Needs list is prioritized using high, medium and low rankings, and within the high category there are three levels, with H1 being the top priority.

This public hearing was advertised in local English and Spanish newspapers, public service announcements were sent to both English and Spanish language radio stations and an enews bulletin was sent to E&D stakeholders. The Draft Unmet Needs List has also been posted on the RTC website with a solicitation for comments.

**Staff recommends that the RTC consider input on the Unmet Specialized Transportation and Transit Needs List and adopt the list, with amendments as appropriate, and consider the Unmet Needs list when funding is available.**

**SUMMARY**

The Transportation Development Act (TDA) statutes requires that regional transportation planning agencies hold an annual unmet specialized transportation and transit needs process including extensive “reasonableness” analysis for those counties who allocate TDA funds to local streets and roads. Although the RTC does not allocate TDA funds to streets and roads, it has determined that the unmet needs process is a useful tool and conducts the process including holding a public hearing, to solicit broad community input. The draft unmet needs list was updated by the E/D TAC and input was solicited from other transportation providers, and relevant entities. Staff recommends adoption of the proposed list with revisions as appropriate.

**Attachments:**
1. Draft SCCRTC List of Unmet Specialized Transportation/Transit Needs for 2011
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Draft 2011

Unmet Specialized Transportation/Transit Needs List

To be considered by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) at a Public Hearing at 10:00 am on May 5, 2011 at the County Government Center, 701 Ocean Street, 5th Floor, Santa Cruz. Changes from last year are shown in underline/strike-out.

For more information, call the RTC at 831.460-3200.

Prioritization:
H - High priority items are those items that fill a gap or absence of service. There are three levels of High priority with H1 being the top priority.

M - Medium priority items are items that supplement existing service.

L - Low priority items should become more specific and then be planned for, as funds are available.

General

1. H1 - Lack of fully accessible transit stops and safe travel paths between senior and/or disabled living areas, medical facilities, educational facilities, employment locations, retail centers, entertainment venues and/or bus stops (examples: Capitola Road and side streets, trailer park at Antionelli, Santa Cruz County Nursing facility)

2. H2 - Expanded publicity necessary about existing specialized transportation services including ADA paratransit, non-ADA paratransit, Medi-Cal rides and mobility training for people to use regular fixed route buses

3. H2 - Shortage of transportation services for low-income children and their families, including a lack of transportation for people transitioning from welfare to work

4. H2 – Availability of accessible local taxi services for seniors and disabled persons

5. H2 - Lack of direct paratransit and accessible transit connections with neighboring counties — including Monterey (Pajaro), San Benito, Santa Clara and other points north

6. M - Expansion of the program currently in place in some jurisdictions to all jurisdictions in the county that requires homeowners to make improvements to sidewalks adjacent to their property when the property is sold

7. M - Amend local taxi ordinances to facilitate improved service to seniors and individuals with disabilities

Paratransit/Specialized Transportation

8. H1 - Lack of specialized transportation for all areas outside the ADA Paratransit service area, with special emphasis on priority destinations

9. H1 - Need for coordinated and seamless-to-the-public system of specialized transportation with a Mobility Management Center (central information point, one stop shop)
10. **H1** – Lack of transportation for dialysis and other medical appointments

11. **H2** - Shortage of projected funding for all specialized transportation (including fixed route, ADA and non-ADA Paratransit) to meet the needs of the senior population expected to increase over the next 15 to 30 years

12. **M** - Shortage of programs and operating funds for 'same day' medical trips on paratransit

13. **M** - Shortage of programs and operating funds for ‘same day’ non-medical trips

14. **M** - Shortage of volunteer drivers in Santa Cruz County including for the Volunteer Center Transportation Program and the out-of-county medical ride program, particularly in south county

15. **M** - Shortage of affordable special care trips and gurney vehicles for medically fragile individuals and those needing “bed to bed” transportation

16. **M** - Provide transportation for all senior meal sites in the county to meet unmet needs

17. **M** - Assure the availability of taxi scrip to meet need for “safety net” services

18. **L** - Need for the Consolidated Transportation Services Agency to acquire an improved operations and maintenance facility

19. **L** – Need for Ongoing provision of ADA Paratransit certification, provided by Metro, at group facilities

**Transit**

20. **H1** – Restore transit service to 2009 levels.

21. **H1** - Complete MetroBase Facility Phase 1 and Phase 2 including Operations Building and Parking Structure.

22. **H1** - Restore service to Gault Street and La Posada, Blackburn Street (Santa Cruz), Independence Square (Watsonville), simultaneously with the restoration of service to senior residences and centers and areas of high density concentrations of mobility-challenged individuals.

23. **H1**- Need to prioritize bus stop improvement and shelter replacement based on high usage by seniors and people with disabilities

24. **H2** - Redevelop Santa Cruz Metro Center as mixed use facility incorporating local transit service, regional transit service, paratransit service, intercity bus service, commercial office functions, passenger service facilities, parking facilities, and both market rate and affordable housing and potentially for child-care facilities.

25. **H1** - Funding to maintain existing services and facilities.

26. **H2** - Complete conversion of vehicles (revenue and non-revenue) to alternate fuels.

27. **H2** - Four (4) small fixed route replacement buses for rural service.

28. **H2** - Fourteen (14) full sized fixed route replacement buses.
29. **H2** - Identify and obtain funding to support the future levels of paratransit service that will be required.

30. **H2** - Increased frequencies for Route 71 evening service: 2x an hour until 9PM vs. 7PM.

31. **H2** - Acquire and develop permanent operation and maintenance facility for ParaCruz to accommodate increased fleet size and growth in future service.

32. **H2** - Replace thirty (30) 1998 fixed route buses.

33. **H3** - Implement “yield to bus” program to improve travel times.

34. **H3** - Extend highway 17 service to Watsonville.

35. **H3** - Add AM/PM and weekend Route 79 service.

36. **H3** - Purchase Automated Vehicle Location/Passenger (AVL) Counting System.

37. **H3** - Installation of Transponders on all buses for Preemptive Signal Control on major corridors improving traffic flow, reducing travel time, and improving on-time performance.

38. **H3** - Increase weekend Hwy 17 service frequencies.

39. **H3** - Add early morning Route 70 service to Cabrillo College.

40. **H3** - Additional night UCSC service, including Route 20.

41. **H3** - Extension of Highway 17/Amtrak service to UCSC at key times.

42. **H3** - East/West Express service to UCSC and Cabrillo and from Watsonville on 69W.

43. **H3** - Express service between San Lorenzo Valley and both UCSC and Cabrillo College.

44. **H3** - Expanded service between UCSC and Westside University activity centers such as Long Marine Lab, Wrigley building offices, Texas Instruments building offices.

45. **H3** - Service from the UC Inn to UCSC.

46. **H3** - Expanded service to new residential and commercial areas in Watsonville.

47. **H3** - Continue to improve bus stops to be ADA accessible.

48. **H3** - Route 66 using 7th Avenue inbound and outbound (between Capitola Road and Soquel Avenue).

49. **H3** - Add early morning Route 35 service.

50. **H3** - Implement circulator service in Santa Cruz, Watsonville, Capitola, and Scotts Valley.

51. **H3** - Service from Santa Cruz County to Los Gatos.

52. **H3** - Expanded bicycle capacity and access on the fixed route system by promoting the Folding Bikes in Buses Program to complement the recently installed 3-position bike racks on all fixed route service. *(completed)*

53. **H3** - Increase window of service on Route 4.
54.53. ___ H3 - Equip ParaCruz Vehicles with Mobile Data Terminals (MDT) for improved manifest display, immediate additions/deletions/confirmations to trips, improved communication and tracking.

55.54. ___ H - Continued need for transit to unserved low income and senior housing areas in south county (examples: Stonecreek Apartments in Watsonville and the San Andreas Migrant Labor Camp)

56.55. ___ H/M – Bus and ParaCruz service on all holidays

57.56. ___ M - Expanded evening and late night service on major fixed routes to improve service accessibility.

58.57. ___ M - Automated phone-based trip planning providing Metro route information and or trip planning coordination via telephone and voice activated menu.

59.58. ___ M - Install bus shelters at high usage stops. (underway)

60.59. ___ M - 30-minute peak frequencies on collector and arterial routes.

61.60. ___ M - Braille and raised numbers on bus signage at bus stops indicating which bus routes are being offered at each stop.

62.61. ___ L - Install audio and video surveillance system for all buses.

63.62. ___ L - Bi-directional service on local Watsonville and Aptos/Rio Del Mar routes.

64.63. ___ L - Fare free service to students under the age of 13.
TO: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission  
FROM: Karena Pushnik, Senior Transportation Planner  
RE: FY 2011-12 Article 8 Transportation Development Act (TDA) Claim for the Volunteer Center  

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee and staff recommend that the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) approve by resolution (Attachment 1) the attached claim for $61,345 in FY 2011-12 Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds contingent upon the City of Santa Cruz agreeing at their May 2011 meeting to act as the claimant on behalf of the Volunteer Center to provide transportation for seniors and people with disabilities. [This is a roll call vote by local jurisdiction representatives.]

BACKGROUND

TDA local transportation funds (LTF) are derived from 1/4 cent of the retail sales tax collected statewide, returned to each county according to the amount of tax collected in that county. Based on the RTC’s adopted budget -- approved at the March 2011 Regional Transportation Commission meeting -- Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds were apportioned to transportation agencies as well as local jurisdictions based on priorities and formulas in the RTC Rules and Regulations. As in years past, the Volunteer Center is a recipient of TDA funds. The approved FY 2011-12 apportionment for the Volunteer Center is $61,345.

DISCUSSION

The Volunteer Center operates many programs in the community, one of which is a transportation program that oversees volunteers who provide transportation (and companionship) to ambulatory individuals who may be physically unable to access traditional public transit or ParaCruz. The TDA allocation to the Volunteer Center will fund mileage reimbursement, insurance and administration of their transportation program.

In FY 2009-10, more than 12,000 volunteer hours by 86 volunteers were donated to provide about 5,520 rides to over 235 clients. Many of the people receiving rides from the Volunteer Center’s drivers are the most frail and elderly in our community and live in remote or rural areas not served by transit or paratransit. The highest priority for rides is given to medical trips for low income persons. Other priority trips are rides to medical appointments, shopping and other miscellaneous destinations. A goal of providing 4,600 rides to eligible clients has been set for FY
2011-12. A representative from the Volunteer Center will attend the RTC meeting to present the claim and answer questions.

The TDA claim form submitted by the Volunteer Center is consistent with the RTC’s adopted budget, the RTC’s Rules and Regulations, and state regulations. The funding amount in this claim is consistent with the approved RTC FY 2011-12 budget which is based on estimates provided by the Santa Cruz County Auditor Controller. If the amount of TDA funds changes, the RTC may amend its budget to reflect the new numbers and the RTC would adjust payments to the Volunteer Center accordingly. The claim form and background materials for the Volunteer Center are attached (Attachment 2).

The City of Santa Cruz plans to consider acting as the TDA fund claimant, as is allowed in the statutes and the RTC’s Rules and Regulations at their May 2011 Santa Cruz City Council meeting. The City has agreed to act as the claimant for both the Volunteer Center and Community Bridges for over a decade.

The Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee reviewed the Volunteer Center claim at its April meeting and recommends its approval, contingent upon the City of Santa Cruz’ agreement to act as the claimant.

SUMMARY

State Transportation Development Act funds are directed to the Volunteer Center per the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission’s rules and regulations. The Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee and staff recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission approve the attached resolution authorizing the City of Santa Cruz to receive FY 2009-10 Transportation Development Act funds on behalf of the Volunteer Center, contingent upon the city approving that role at their May 2011 meeting.

Attachments:

1. Resolution approving TDA Funds for the City of Santa Cruz on behalf of the Volunteer Center
2. TDA Claim form and background information from the Volunteer Center
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RESOLUTION NO.

Adopted by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
on the date of May 5, 2011
on the motion of Commissioner
duly seconded by Commissioner

A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE PROPOSED FY 2011-12 ARTICLE 8(c) CLAIM FROM THE CITY OF SANTA CRUZ ON BEHALF OF THE VOLUNTEER CENTER

WHEREAS the Transportation Development Act (TDA) of 1971 provides that the applicant may file an Article 8(c) claim for monies from the Local Transportation Fund; and

WHEREAS the Regional Transportation Commission, in adopting its FY 2011-12 TDA budget, has apportioned $61,345 to be used by the Volunteer Center for providing specialized transportation; and

WHEREAS the Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee, at its April 12, 2011 meeting, recommended that the Regional Transportation Commission approve this claim; and

WHEREAS the City of Santa Cruz is eligible to claim Article 8(c) funds and is expected to agree in May 2011 to act as the claimant for the Volunteer Center;

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

1. The claim submitted in the amount of $61,345 fulfills the requirements as specified in the Transportation Development Act and the Rules and Regulation of the Commission and is consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan, as follows:

   a. The claim includes a proposed budget for the 2011-12 fiscal year;

   b. The claim includes a statement of projected or estimated revenues and expenditures for the prior fiscal year.

   c. The claim will fund specialized transportation services respond to transportation needs not otherwise being met within the community; and

   d. The proposed expenditure of the funds is consistent with the most current Regional Transportation Plan.

2. The City of Santa Cruz is expected to act as a claimant on behalf of the Volunteer
Center, for Article 8(c) claims for specialized transportation programs, at their May 2011 meeting. A claim is hereby approved in the amount of $61,345 consisting of a single lump sum amount paid in the first quarter, contingent upon the City agreeing to act as the claimant.

3. The Executive Director is authorized to modify the payment amounts should the Commission amend the FY 2011-12 Transportation Development Act Article 8 apportionments in the Commissioner’s FY 11-12 Budget.

AYES: COMMISSIONERS

NOES: COMMISSIONERS

ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS

ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS

______________________________
Mark Stone, Chair

ATTEST:

____________________________
George Dondero, Secretary

Distribution: City of Santa Cruz
Volunteer Center
Transportation - Fiscal
TDA File - RTC staff
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Transportation Development Act (TDA) – Local Transportation Funds
CLAIM FORM
Submit a separate form for each project.

This form has been developed in an effort to standardize information required from TDA recipients, based on TDA Statute, RTC Rules and Regulations, and/or RTC board requests.

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: Transportation Program

2. Implementing Agency: Volunteer Center of Santa Cruz

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

4. Funding requested this claim: TDA $61,345

5. STA (transit only) $____________________

6. Fiscal Year (FY) for which funds are claimed: FY_2011___/___2012___

7. General purpose for which the claim is made, identified by the article and section of the Act which authorizes such claims:
   ☒ Article 8 Specialized Transportation
   ☐ Article 8 Bicycle and/or Pedestrian Facility
   ☐ Article 4 Public Transportation
   ☐ Article 3 & 8 TDA Admin or Planning

7. Contact Person/Project Manager
   Name: ___________Debra Brooks_________
   Telephone Number: 831-427-5070 E-mail: rsvpvol@scvolunteercenter.org
   Secondary Contact (in event primary not available): Lois Connell
   Telephone Number: 831-427-5070 E-mail: Lois@scvolunteercenter.org

8. Project/Program Description/Scope (use additional pages, if needed, to provide details such as work elements/tasks. See attached scope of work

9. Project Location/Limits (attach a map and/or photos if available/applicable, include street names): All of Santa Cruz County

10. 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) We know from needs assessments that low or free transportation to elderly and disabled persons outside of the fixed route are in desperate need. The Volunteer Centers Transportation Program is a vital link in providing this service. Volunteer drivers provide the service free of change to clients throughout the county.

11. Project Productivity Goals for this fiscal year:
   a. Measures of performance, success or completion to be used to evaluate project/program (ex. increase use of facility/service, decrease collisions, etc.): The number of rides provided and the number of clients served will measure performance. This will be evaluated through ride reports compiled on each ride that details client, date and time of ride, destination of ride and driver providing ride. These records are entered into a computerized data file.
   b. Number of people to be served/anticipated number of users of project/program (ex. number of new or maintained bike miles; number of people served/rides provided): Our goal is to provide 4,600 one-way trips to eligible clients. Clients will be limited to a maximum of two rides per week. Our priority for filling requests is as follows:
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1st Priority - Medical trips for low-income persons
2nd Priority - Medical trips for other persons
3rd Priority - Shopping for low-income persons
4th Priority - Shopping for other persons
5th Priority - Other eligible destinations

These trips will be targeted for geographic distribution as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rides</th>
<th>% of Rides</th>
<th>#Clients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz/Mid-County/Aptos/Capitola</td>
<td>2600</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Lorenzo/Scotts Valley</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watsonville/Freedom</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures are based on population data derived from the latest census and available transit services for each area of operations. In considering geographic distribution of services, our goal is to provide extra support in those areas which are outside the boundaries of Liftline services, or which receive limited Liftline service and have limited public transit services.

12. Consistency and relationship with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) - Is program/project listed in the RTP and/or consistent with a specific RTP Goal/Policy? This is RTP project #VC-P1. It is consistent with Goals #1 and #2 to maintain the transportation system and increase mobility; Policy 1.3.5 to coordinate specialized transportation services; Policy 1.3.9 to Encourage volunteer, friend and relative-provided transportation for the elderly and disabled, especially in rural areas; Policy 3.5 Promote social equity with all transportation decision, including consideration of income, gender, race, age, physical and mental ability, and transit dependency; Policy 3.5.3 Support programs that address the transportation needs of low-income people; and Policy 5.4.6 Give high priority to currently unmet needs for essential (medical or medically related) transportation for expansion of TDA-funded paratransit service. The Volunteer Center's of Santa Cruz have been receiving TDA funds for over 35 years and was been a member of the Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee. The program is listed in the Specialized Transportation Guide and is included in the Monterey Bay Area Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan providing services listed in the plan.

13. Impact(s) of project on other modes of travel, if any (ex. parking to be removed): This project will have little or no impact on other modes of travel.

14. Estimated Project Cost/Budget, including other funding sources, and Schedule: (attach project budget). Specialized Transportation Claims require 10% local match. Local match can take the form of fares, donations, agency charges, grants, revenue sharing and other non-restricted sources. In kind services many NOT apply toward the local match.

What is the total project cost? $67,479.50

Is project fully funded? Yes

What will TDA (and STA) funds be used on (ex. administration, brochures, engineering, construction)? Funds are used for personnel Cost, Audit fees, Supplies, Telephone, Occupancy, Printing, Postage, Volunteer mileage reimbursement, Administration.

15. Preferred Method and Schedule for TDA fund distribution (see RTC Rules and Regulations for details):

Volunteer Center: ✖ Full approved claim amount in the first quarter

16. TDA Eligibility:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Has the project/program been approved by the claimant's governing body? Form of approval</th>
<th>YES/NO?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>work plans and budget (eg resolution, work program, budget, other document)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If &quot;NO,&quot; provide the approximate date approval is anticipated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| B. Has this project previously received TDA funding? | Yes |
| 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? (If an agency other than the Claimant is to maintain the facility provide its name: ) | NA |
| D. Bike, Ped, and Specialized Transportation Claims: 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). April 2011 E&D meeting | Yes |

**CTSA and Volunteer Center (Article 8) Only**

17. Are these transportation services responding to transportation needs not otherwise being met within the community or jurisdiction of the claimant? Describe. The Volunteer Center’s Transportation Program is a volunteer program providing rides and serves to people who, through age, physical limitations or geographic location, are unable to use other public or private transportation resources. Our goal is to provide extra support in these areas which are outside the boundaries of Lift Line or ParaCruz services, or which receive limited Lift Line or ParaCruz service and have limited public transit services. The service is provided free of charge to clients. There are no other providers of this service in the community.

18. Where appropriate, are these specialized transportation services coordinated with other transportation services? Describe. When possible, the Volunteer Center will refer those callers whose requests cannot be accommodated through our program to other transportation programs.

**SCMTD, CTSC, Volunteer Center & RTC Only**

19. List the recommendations provided in the last TDA Triennial Performance Audit and your progress toward meeting them.

- Describe the work your agency has undertaken to implement each performance audit recommendation and the steps it will take to fully implement the recommendation.
- For any recommendations that have not been implemented, explain why the recommendation has not been implemented and describe the work your agency will undertake to implement each performance audit recommendation.
- Describe any problems encountered in implementing individual recommendations.

A. Provide performance information, as pertinent, such as: verification of the operating cost per passenger, operating cost per vehicle service hour, passengers per vehicle service hour, passengers per vehicle service mile, and vehicle service hours per employee for last fiscal year (definitions available in Section 99247 of TDA Guidelines). (99246) The program has no owned service vehicles or employee drivers. Volunteer driver use private vehicles. It is estimated that each one-way trip is 8.5 miles, with approximately 2800 one way rides provided in the last fiscal year. This is about 21,000 projected service miles per year. Each one-way ride is an average of 1 hour average or a total of 2800 service hours. Volunteers have the option of being paid mileage at a cost of $.31/mile, although not all accept payment. Based on the FY 2010-11 TDA allocation of $56,929 and the service estimates provided by volunteer drivers, the cost per one-way passenger ride as well as the cost per service hour is about $20.33, and the cost per service mile is about $2.71.

B. Discuss the needs and types of the passengers being served and the employment of part-time drivers and the contracting with common carriers of persons operating under a franchise or license to provide services during peak hours. (99246) The Volunteer Center's Transportation
Program is a volunteer program providing rides and services to people whom, through age, physical limitations are unable to use other public or private transportation resources. No drivers are employed. Rides are provided by community volunteers.

C. The SCCRTC should work closely with the Santa Cruz Metro, Community Bridges, and the Volunteer Center to develop an SRTP update, including the following plan elements: financially sustainable public transportation levels; vehicle replacement needs for each agency; and countywide performance goals objectives and measurable standards. The SCCRTC’s involvement in the SRTP effort could include coordination, technical assistance, and partial funding.

   • The Volunteer Center is interested in working with the entities to develop an updated SRTP. To date, work on this document has not yet started due to the lack of funding to undertake a comprehensive long range plan. The Volunteer Center will participate in long range planning efforts as part of the Regional Transportation Plan update underway by the SCCRTC.

D. The SCCRTC should require that the sub-recipients of TDA Article 8 funds report the pertinent performance measures identified in PUC Section 99246(d) at least annually to the City of Santa Cruz and to the SCCRTC. Those performance measures should be evaluated in ensuing triennial performance audits.

   • The SCCRTC has evaluated the performance measures by the Volunteer Center as included above.

Documentation to Include with Your Claim:

All Claims
   • A letter of transmittal addressed to the SCCRTC Executive Director that attests to the accuracy of the claim and all its accompanying documentation.
   • Statement from the TDA Eligible Claimant indicating its role and responsibilities.

Article 8 Bicycle/Pedestrian Claims
   • Evidence of environmental review for capital projects

All Transit and Specialized Transportation Claims (SCMTD, CTSA, and Volunteer Center)
   • A copy of the operating and capital budgets for the coming fiscal year
   • Description of capital projects, including time frame over which project will be funded and implemented
   • Operating Plan for current and upcoming activities – can be within project description

Article 4 Transit Claims
   • A certification from the California Highway Patrol (completed within the last 13 months) indicating that the operator is in compliance with Section 1808.1 of the Vehicle Code.
   • Other Certifications

Local Agency Certification:

This TDA Claim has been prepared in accordance with the SCCRTC’s Budget, SCCRTC’s Rules and Regulations, and Caltrans TDA Guidebook (http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/MassTrans/State-TDA.html). I certify that the information provided in this form is accurate and correct. I understand that if the required information has not been provided this form may be returned and the funding allocation may be delayed.

Signature __________________________ Title: __________________________ Date: __________________________

\Rtcserv\Shared\GRANTS\TDA\TDAClaimForm07.doc
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All Claims
☑️ A letter of transmittal addressed to the SCCRTC Executive Director that attests to the accuracy of the claim and all its accompanying documentation.
☐ Statement from the TDA Eligible Claimant indicating its role and responsibilities.

Article 8 Bicycle/Pedestrian Claims
☐ Evidence of environmental review for capital projects

All Transit and Specialized Transportation Claims (SCMTD, CTSA, and Volunteer Center)
☐ A copy of the operating and capital budgets for the coming fiscal year
☐ Description of capital projects, including time frame over which project will be funded and implemented
☐ Operating Plan for current and upcoming activities – can be within project description

Article 4 Transit Claims
☐ A certification from the California Highway Patrol (completed within the last 13 months) indicating that the operator is in compliance with Section 1808.1 of the Vehicle Code.
☐ Other Certifications

Local Agency Certification:

This TDA Claim has been prepared in accordance with the SCCRTC’s Budget, SCCRTC’s Rules and Regulations, and Caltrans TDA Guidebook (http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/MassTrans/State-TDA.html). I certify that the information provided in this form is accurate and correct. I understand that if the required information has not been provided this form may be returned and the funding allocation may be delayed.

Signature ___________________________ Title: Administrative Director Date: 3-28-2014
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acct No.</th>
<th>Accounts, Sub Account(s)</th>
<th>FY 11-12 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4007</td>
<td>Public Support</td>
<td>$ 6,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Donations Unrestricted Donations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4295</td>
<td>Grants and Contracts Transportation Commission</td>
<td>$ 61,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Program Revenues</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 67,479</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXPENSES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acct No.</th>
<th>Accounts, Sub Account(s)</th>
<th>FY 11-12 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5001</td>
<td>Salaries and Wages</td>
<td>$ 37,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hourly Wages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5012</td>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>$ 2,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medical/Dental Insurance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5025</td>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>$ 375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workers Compensation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5016</td>
<td>Payroll Taxes</td>
<td>$ 2,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Security/Medicare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5018</td>
<td>Payroll Taxes</td>
<td>$ 475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State UI Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6012</td>
<td>Auditing Expense</td>
<td>$ 600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6040</td>
<td>Insurance, General</td>
<td>$ 686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6042</td>
<td>Insurance, Volunteer</td>
<td>$ 723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6050</td>
<td>Postage Expense</td>
<td>$ 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6059</td>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>$ 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6060</td>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>$ 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6061</td>
<td>Rent, Watsonville</td>
<td>$ 4,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6088</td>
<td>Supplies, Program</td>
<td>$ 250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program Supplies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6098</td>
<td>Mileage, Volunteers</td>
<td>$ 6,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6100</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>$ 1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6160</td>
<td>Admin Fees</td>
<td>$ 9,447</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Program Revenues**  
$ 67,479
PROGRAM DESCRIPTION/SCOPE OF WORK
VOLUNTEER CENTER'S TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM
Fiscal Year 2011-2012

A. TARGET POPULATION

The Volunteer Center's Transportation Program is a volunteer program providing rides and serves to people whom, through age, physical limitations or geographic location, are unable to use other public or private transportation resources. Volunteer drivers using their own vehicles provide rides. Our program is limited to ambulatory persons. Our service area is all of Santa Cruz County.

B. SERVICE GOALS

Our goal is to provide 4,600 one-way trips to eligible clients. Clients will be limited to a maximum of two rides per week. Our priority for filling requests is as follows:

1st Priority - Medical trips for low-income persons
2nd Priority - Medical trips for other persons
3rd Priority - Shopping for low-income persons
4th Priority - Shopping for other persons
5th Priority - Other eligible destinations

These trips will be targeted for geographic distribution as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Rides</th>
<th>% of Rides</th>
<th>Client</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz/Mid-County/Aptos/Capitola</td>
<td>2600</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Lorenzo/Scotts Valley</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watsonville/ Freedom</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures are based on population data derived from the latest census and available transit services for each area of operations. In considering geographic distribution of services, our goal is to provide extra support in those areas which are outside the boundaries of Lifeline services, or which receive limited Lifeline service and have limited public transit services.

C. PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

1. The Volunteer Center will maintain volunteer dispatchers Monday-Thursday 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. in Santa Cruz, and from 10:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. in the Watsonville and Valley centers.

2. When possible, the Volunteer Center will refer those callers whose requests cannot be accommodated through our program to other transportation programs.

3. The Volunteer Center will continue its intensive campaign to recruit new drivers and dispatchers for all three offices.
4. Volunteer Center staff will attend all meetings of the Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee of the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission.

D. QUARTERLY REPORTS

Quarterly Reports and a Final Activities Report are due to the Transportation Commission and the City of Santa Cruz according to this schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior Year Annual Report</td>
<td>September 2, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly Activities Report 1</td>
<td>October 28, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly Activities Report 2</td>
<td>February 3, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly Activities Report 3</td>
<td>April 27, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly Activities Report 4</td>
<td>July 29, 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reports will contain the following information for each center and total:

1. Number of rides provided
2. Trip destinations
3. Mileage claimed
4. Estimated mileage donated
5. Estimated total mileage
6. Average length of trip
7. Number of unduplicated passengers
8. Number of requests for service
9. Number of turndowns
10. Reason for turndowns
11. Number of active volunteers
12. Geographic distribution of clients

E. INSURANCE

Comprehensive auto and general liability insurance over and above that held by the driver will be maintained by the Volunteer Center in the amount of $1,000,000 per occurrence.

F. CLAIMS

One claim will be submitted for advance payment for the year:

Annual Advance - July 1, 2011 $61,345
AGENDA: May 5, 2011

TO: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
FROM: Karena Pushnik, Senior Transportation Planner
RE: FY 2011-12 Article 8 Transportation Development Act (TDA) Claim for Community Bridges

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee and staff recommend that the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) approve by resolution (Attachment 1) the attached claim for $515,295 in FY 2011-12 Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds contingent upon the City of Santa Cruz agreeing at their May 2011 meeting to be the claimant on behalf of Community Bridges to provide transportation for seniors and people with disabilities. [This is a roll call vote by local jurisdiction representatives.]

BACKGROUND

TDA local transportation funds (LTF) are derived from 1/4 cent of the retail sales tax collected statewide, returned to each county according to the amount of tax collected in that county. Based on the RTC’s adopted FY 2011-12 budget -- approved at the March 2011 meeting -- Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds were apportioned to transportation agencies as well as local jurisdictions. As in years past, Community Bridges is a recipient of TDA funds per the formula allocation as established in the RTC’s Rules and Regulations and consistent with Public Utilities Code Section 994400(c) pertaining to special transportation assistance claims. The approved FY 2011-12 apportionment for Community Bridges is $515,295.

DISCUSSION

Community Bridges is designated as the Consolidated Transportation Services Agency (CTSA), a role bestowed to one social service or transportation entity in each area by the regional transportation planning agency to ensure that specialized transportation services for seniors and people with disabilities are coordinated and consolidated in a cost effective manner. The transportation program of Community Bridges continues to evolve to meet the coordinated specialized transportation service needs of the elderly, disabled and low income in Santa Cruz County. Transportation mobility options enable individuals with special transportation needs to lead independent, productive lives, rather than be isolated at home.

In FY 2009-10, over 84,449 one-way rides were provided by Community Bridges and their subcontractors through all their funding sources. Complete figures are
unavailable for this fiscal year. The total number of projected rides for FY 2010-11 for all funding sources is 73,833 with approximately 23,747 provided by TDA funding.

FY 2011-12 TDA dollars will fund the Taxi Scrip program (including discounted vouchers for low income individuals), medical transportation services for those ineligible for Medi-Cal and ParaCruz rides, transportation to the five senior meal sites in the county (operated through the Meals on Wheels program), out-of-county medical transportation service which was formerly operated by the Red Cross, and portions of rides to the Elderday Adult Day Care Facility and the Homeless Service Shelters.

This plan addresses the continued need for rides to dialysis patients due to the more strict interpretation of Medi-Cal Title 22 ride eligibility and establishes medical ride trips as a high priority for TDA funds. The Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee reviewed the Community Bridges FY 2011-12 TDA claim at its April meeting and recommend approval.

Background materials for the Community Bridges claim are attached including the TDA Claim Form, a comparison between the proposed fiscal year 11-12 budget and the current fiscal year 10-11 budget, five year capital improvement plan; operating plan; units of service; and schedule of payment; (Attachment 2). The TDA claim form submitted by Community Bridges is consistent with the RTC’s adopted budget, the RTC’s Rules and Regulations, and state regulations. The funding amount in this claim is consistent with the approved RTC FY 2011-12 budget which is based on estimates provided by the Santa Cruz County Auditor Controller. If the amount of TDA funds changes, the RTC may amend its budget to reflect the new numbers and the RTC would adjust payments to Community Bridges accordingly.

Due to the timing of consideration of this item by the City of Santa Cruz, approval of the claim is dependent upon the City agreeing to act as the claimant, as is allowed in the statutes and the RTC Rules and Regulations. The Santa Cruz City Council is scheduled to consider approval of the agreement with Community Bridges to act as their claimant for Transportation Development Act funds at their May 2011 meeting. The City has acted as the claimant for both Community Bridges and the Volunteer Center for over a decade.

**The E/D TAC and staff recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission approve the FY 2011-12 Community Bridges TDA claim contingent upon approval of the City of Santa Cruz to act as the claimant at their May 2011 meeting.** Community Bridges staff will attend the RTC meeting to present their claim and answer questions.

**SUMMARY**

State Transportation Development Act funds are directed to Community Bridges per the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission’s rules and regulations. The Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee and staff recommend that
the Regional Transportation Commission approve the attached resolution authorizing the City of Santa Cruz to receive $515,295 in FY 2011-12 Transportation Development Act funds on behalf of Community Bridges, contingent upon approval of the City to act as the claimant at their May 2011 meeting.

Attachments:
1. Resolution authorizing FY 2011-12 TDA Funds for the City of Santa Cruz on behalf of Community Bridges
2. TDA Claim Form and Background information from Community Bridges
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RESOLUTION NO.

Adopted by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
on the date of May 5, 2011
on the motion of Commissioner
duly seconded by Commissioner

A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE PROPOSED FY 2011-12 ARTICLE 8(c) CLAIM
FROM THE CITY OF SANTA CRUZ ON BEHALF OF COMMUNITY BRIDGES

WHEREAS the Transportation Development Act (TDA) of 1971 provides that the applicant may
file an Article 8(c) claim for monies from the Local Transportation Fund; and

WHEREAS the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) has identified a process for TDA
claims in their Rules and Regulations; and

WHEREAS the Regional Transportation Commission, in adopting its FY 2011-12 TDA budget,
has apportioned $515,295 to be used by the Community Bridges for providing specialized
transportation; and

WHEREAS the Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee, at its April 12, 2011
meeting, recommended that the Regional Transportation Commission approve this claim; and

WHEREAS the City of Santa Cruz is eligible to claim Article 8(c) funds and is expected to agree
on May 2011 to act as the claimant for Community Bridges;

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

1. The claim submitted in the amount of $515,295 fulfills the requirements as specified in the
Transportation Development Act and the Rules and Regulation of the RTC and is consistent
with the Regional Transportation Plan, as follows:

a. The claim includes a proposed budget for the 2011-12 fiscal year;

b. The claim includes a statement of projected or estimated revenues and expenditures for the
prior fiscal year;

c. The claim will fund specialized transportation services respond to transportation needs not
otherwise being met within the community; and

c. The proposed expenditure of the funds is consistent with the most current Regional
Transportation Plan.
2. The City of Santa Cruz will act as a claimant on behalf of the Community Bridges, for Article 8(c) claims for specialized transportation programs. A claim is hereby approved in the amount of $515,295 consisting of quarterly payments as follows:

- July 15, 2011 $180,354
- October 15, 2011 $111,647
- January 15, 2011 $111,647
- April 15, 2011 $111,647

3. The Executive Director is authorized to modify the payment amounts should the RTC amend the FY 2011-12 Transportation Development Act apportionments in the RTC's FY 11-12 budget.

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

Mark Stone, Chair

ATTEST:

George Dondero, Secretary

Distribution: City of Santa Cruz
Community Bridges
Transportation-Fiscal
Staff TDA File
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Transportation Development Act (TDA) – Local Transportation Funds
CLAIM FORM
Submit a separate form for each project.

This form has been developed in an effort to standardize information required from TDA recipients, based on TDA Statute, RTC Rules and Regulations, and/or RTC board requests. 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: Lift Line / CTSA Specialized Paratransit Service for Santa Cruz County

2. Implementing Agency: Community Bridges

3. Sponsoring Agency (if different) – must be a TDA Eligible Claimant: The City of Santa Cruz acts as the eligible TDA claimant for Lift Line. Lift Line receives the TDA funds through a contract with the City of Santa Cruz.

4. Funding requested this claim: TDA $ 515,295
   STA (transit only) $ ________________

5. Fiscal Year (FY) for which funds are claimed: FY ___11___ / ___12___

6. General purpose for which the claim is made, identified by the article and section of the Act which authorizes such claims:
   □ Article 8 Bicycle and/or Pedestrian Facility
   □ Article 4 Public Transportation
   ☑ Article 8 Specialized Transportation
   □ Article 3 & 8 TDA Admin or Planning

7. Contact Person/Project Manager
   Name: Catherine Patterson Valdez
   Telephone Number: 831-688-8840 ext. 244
   E-mail: catherinelp@cbridges.org
   Secondary Contact (in event primary not available): Michael Robins
   Telephone Number: 831-688-8840 ext. 204
   E-mail: michaeln@cbridges.org

8. Project/Program Description/Scope (use additional pages, if needed, to provide details such as work elements/tasks. Please see Exhibit C-1 and C-2 attached.

9. Project Location/Limits (attach a map and/or photos if available/applicable, include street names):
   The TDA funding for CTSA to coordinate and provide specialized transportation for Santa Cruz County residents, including out of county medical clinics and hospitals in San Francisco, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties

10. 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)
    Community Bridges has been the designated Consolidated Transportation Services Agency (CTSA) since 1982. CTSAs are authorized under California Government Code Sections 15975 and 15950-15952 which were enacted pursuant to the Social Service Transportation Improvement Act. The purpose of the CTSA is to improve transportation required by social service recipients by promoting the consolidation and coordinating of social service transportation. As the Consolidated Transportation Service Agency, Lift Line is coordinating
transportation services with other transportation and human service agencies in order to provide the most efficient transportation possible. Some of them are the Santa Cruz County School Districts, Family and Children’s Services of the County of Santa Cruz, County office of Education, Veterans Service Offices in Santa Cruz and Palo Alto, and other hospitals and medical facilities. Lift Line is also working closely with several other non-profit organizations and other Counties to continue to define and create an effective mobility management center to help mobilize resident with various disabilities, low income and senior populations to travel easily throughout our County as well as to travel seamlessly throughout our tri-county region, also now to include the Santa Clara County. This is consistent with the AMBAG Coordinated Plan.

The benefit’s to having CTSA coordination is to improve and identify the need for specialized transportation equipment, if the equipment is funded through Caltrans 5310 and isn’t reaching it’s proposed requirements, as the CTSA, the equipment can be coordinated for use through other identified paratransit services. CTSA roll is to provide adequate training to ensure that not only Lift Line staff operates in a safe and sensitive manner but to provide expertise and training for other transportation providers in the County. Lift Line is currently providing access to transportation tools and training to ensure local human service agencies and local skilled nursing facilities’ are also providing safe transportation service. For example we offer CPR training times as well as diversity and sensitivity training. This also allows all of us to obtain cost savings from centralized scheduling, dispatching, and maintenance and administrative efficiencies.

Pursuant to the CTSA designation for Santa Cruz County, Community Bridges operates the Lift Line transportation program, which works in identifying unmet transportation needs, coordinates and provides social service transportation services to low-income seniors, disabled residents, underserved populations and other persons in Santa Cruz County. Lift Line directly address the issues identified through the unmet needs process by providing rides to medical appointments (including dialysis), alternative care, mental health and various therapy appointments.

11. Project Productivity Goals for this fiscal year:
   a. Measures of performance, success or completion to be used to evaluate project/program (ex. increase use of facility/service, decrease collisions, etc.):

   The majority of our dispatching/scheduling is automated with Mobil Data Computers (MDC) and Automatic Vehicle Locaters (AVL) that integrate with Trapeze, making it easy to make changes if needed and track rides as they occur. As rides are completed, the MDCs tag completed rides with real pickup and drop-off times and highlight these times in blue, making it easier for our dispatchers to monitor all rides. Likewise, uncompleted or unassigned rides (such as will-call returns) are highlighted in red to inform the dispatcher of the priority of pending trips. The addition of the AVLS in the fleet allows Lift Line to monitor and track vehicles at any moment. These systems allow Lift Line to provide accurate monthly encounter data to satisfy data requirements. We will continue to provide our quarterly TDA reports, with the RTC reporting requirements, which are generated directly from the actual rides performed and documented through these systems. Lift Line Dispatch System still has some components that are manual, for back up in case of power loss or technical problems that occasionally occur, when connections through the system can not be made. Since we can not determine in advance when a power or technical problem should arise, we give all drivers a paper manifest to work from daily so as to not lose any information. Daily drivers fill out paper work to let us know if they have any incidents, accidents or mechanical failures. In order to track turnovers and referrals anyone answering the phones keep track daily on a specified phone log.

Performance Measures to be included in Quarterly Reports

The quarterly reports are to include the following:

| 1. | Unduplicated passengers per month |
| 2. | Total passenger trips (units of service) per month |
| 3. | Incidents per month |
| 4. | Accidents per month |
| 5. | Mechanical failures* (including lift failure) per month |
6. No-shows per month
7. Turndowns or referrals per month
8. Cancels per month
9. Donations per month
10. Total operating cost per passenger
11. Total operating cost per vehicle service hour
12. Total passengers per vehicle service hour
13. Total passengers per vehicle service mile
14. Fare box recovery level
15. Van mileage per program
16. % of Rides performed by subcontractors.
17. % of shared trips/ Average vehicle occupancy
18. % of cancellations of total rides

*Mechanical failure means any problem which results in a delay of one hour or longer, or cancellation of service:

b. Number of people to be served/anticipated number of users of project/program (ex. number of new or maintained bike miles; number of people served/rides provided):

Lift Line’s is projecting to provide service to over 500 Santa Cruz residents who will need specialized wheel-chair accessible vans and is projecting to provide and coordinate over 73,000 rides in the 2011/2012 fiscal year. Please see Exhibit C-1 and C-2 Operating Plan for details. Lift Line will continue to provide responsive, non-emergency health and medical paratransportation for seniors and disabled residents of Santa Cruz County, all of which are low-income. Trips are provided to health and medical destinations such as hospitals, medical centers and clinics, doctor’s offices, pharmacies, dialysis centers, and various mental health and physical therapy appointments. In partnership with Central Coast Alliance for Health, rides to medical destinations will be provided for qualified members. Lift Line works closely with Watsonville Dialysis and Santa Cruz Satellite Dialysis to provide flexible services for its clients who are unable to use transit or METRO ParaCruz services. We have increased our ride request for TDA Medical rides to prepare for the loss of funding from the 5317 grant for dialysis and Veterans riders which is ending in September 2011. Also, to service former METRO ParaCruz clients who may lose transportation services due to bus route cuts.

12. Consistency and relationship with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) - Is program/project listed in the RTP and/or consistent with a specific RTP Goal/Policy?

This is RTP project #VC-P1. It is consistent with Goals #1 and #2 to maintain the transportation system and increase mobility; Policy 1.3.5 to coordinate specialized transportation services; Policy 1.3.9 to Encourage volunteer, friend and relative-provided transportation for the elderly and disabled, especially in rural areas; Policy 3.5 Promote social equity with all transportation decision, including consideration of income, gender, race, age, physical and mental ability, and transit dependency; Policy 3.5.3 Support programs that address the transportation needs of low-income people; and Policy 5.4.6 Give high priority to currently unmet needs for essential (medical or medically related) transportation for expansion of TDA-funded paratransit service. Community Bridges and Lift Line staff works with the Regional Transportation Commission and the members of the Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee, In Home Support Service Commission, Commission on Disabilities, Human Care Alliance, and the local Senior Network Agency to identify specialized transportation needs for Santa Cruz County. Lift Line as a program of Community Bridges works closely with local human service and transportation programs on local and regional coordinated plan projects, as required by Federal and State Transportation Agencies. These are included in both the RTP, which is updated every 3-5 years, and the AMBAG Monterey Bay Coordinated Human Services Transportation Plan. Projects/programs in the 2010 RTP within Projected Funds list include: continued non-ADA mandated paratransit services including medical service rides, Elderday adult day health care, senior meal sites, non-emergency same day transportation for medically fragile individuals, and
expanding the non-ADA mandated paratransit system to meet the growing specialized transportation needs of seniors and people with disabilities. In 2010 Lift Line collaborated with San Andreas Region Center in San Jose to help provide rides from Salinas, Seaside, Marina, Castroville and Prunade to an adult day center for developmentally disabled adults in Carmel.

13. Impact(s) of project on other modes of travel, if any (ex. parking to be removed):

Lift Line is a complimentary service to the ADA- mandated METRO ParaCruz service. In addition, Lift Line provides a more flexible specialized transportation service for ongoing identified unmet immediate service needs. Due to the diverse nature of our services, Lift Line is able to group riders in various service categories, which ultimately reduces the number of vehicles needed to perform rides and in turn cuts down on traffic and emissions. In the current fiscal year 2010/2011, Lift Line is optimizing service by scheduling ride in the most efficient manner and projecting to ultimately reduce the cost of each ride by grouping ride types for long distance, cross county rides. Lift Lines goal is to continue to provide service in this manner, however, with the increase of fuel costs, even grouping rides is still projected to increase costs in our overall service.

14. Estimated Project Cost/Budget, including other funding sources, and Schedule: (attach project budget). Specialized Transportation Claims require 10% local match. Local match can take the form of fares, donations, agency charges, grants: revenue sharing and other non-restricted sources. In kind services many NOT apply toward the local match.

What is the total project cost? Total CTSA Transportation Budget = $1,998,232 (TDA only = $515,295)

Is project fully funded? YES

What will TDA (and STA) funds be used on (ex. administration, brochures, engineering, construction)?
These funds will be used for administration, all costs related to provision of paratransit rides, and vehicle/communications acquisition.

This is clearly identified in our Operating Plan Exhibit C-2. Please see TDA Operating Plan, Exhibit C-2.

15. Preferred Method and Schedule for TDA fund distribution (see RTC Rules and Regulations for details):

CTSA: ☒ Quarterly disbursement, with up to 35% in first quarter, and the remaining quarterly payments being one-third of the remaining claim amount;
OR ☐ Quarterly disbursement

16. TDA Eligibility:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES/?NO?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Has the project/program been approved by the claimant's governing body? Form of approval Community Bridges Board Resolution. (eg resolution, work program, budget, other document) If &quot;NO,&quot; provide the approximate date approval is anticipated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Has this project previously received TDA funding?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>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? (If an agency other than the Claimant is to maintain the facility provide its name: )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Bike, Ped, and Specialized Transportation Claims: 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). April 2011 E&amp;D TAC meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17. Improving Program Efficiency/Productivity
   - Describe any areas where special efforts have been made in the last fiscal year to reduce operating cost and/or increase ridership/program usage. Note any important trends.

Currently Community Bridges Lift Line is in UTU negotiations addressing ways to lower more economical issues impacting the operations of the budget. Routes continue to be assessed and re-structured to increase productivity by grouping rides so that the vehicles are serving at capacity as much as possible. The current cost per service unit has gone down this year due primarily from the increase in Lift Line providing more rides to residents both in and out of the METRO service area, which has impacted the shared costs of general operations. Subcontractors continued to be used however, the rates to assist with longer rides to and from North and South County are much higher than previous years, and in order to help cut these costs we are working with physicians and medical groups to work toward grouping their clients. Due to our ability to efficiently group riders, and the increase in outside service contracts, the overall cost of the other 11/12 TDA programs went down. We continue to work on state wide workers comp pool to reduce our premiums. Lift Line also maintained optimum fleet size for services provided. Taking into consideration the national, state and local government financial unbalance, as well as the international fuel issues, which has caused the cost of fuel to fluctuate at a rate that is incredibly hard to forecast, we continue to receive phone calls from concerned residents about available transportation options. Our local residents call Lift Line on a daily basis to voice their concern, and our focus has been on helping these residents identify the most cost effective way for them to move around the County, as well as to Out-of-County medical appointments.

Lift Line Division Director has participated in several outreach forums in the community that are addressing the transportation needs of the local senior and disabled population as well as conducting presentations to local service organizations and senior living facilities. Lift Line annual participates in local business and health fairs to increase community awareness about local transportation service. A new brochure was designed for the Out-of-County Medical volunteer transportation service and an application was also created to help determine eligibility and need for this specialized paratransit service.

A new process that was created from the past years MORE Outreach program is that the County Heath Service Department’s like In Home Health Services and California Children Services, as well as local medical facilities, and the Senior Network Services are assisting their clients to help fill out the TDA Medical Transportation Application and fax them, with the required supporting documents, to our office daily. One notable and visible trend Lift Line is seeing with the new process is the request for service for low-income families of disabled children are requiring the TDA Medical ride services and Out-of-County medical transport.

- Goals for next fiscal year (ex. identify opportunities to maximize economies of scale, planned productivity improvements). Describe any areas where special efforts will be made to improve efficiency and increase program usage/ridership:

The Mobility OutReach and Education (MORE) project grant analysis has supported the need for a mobility management center and identified unmet transportation issues and needs for Lift Line as the CTSA to address. The goal for Lift Line as the CTSA, within the economic stability of the next year and support of the local RTPA, is to procure a supporting grant to support a site and develop a use outline of a Mobility Management Center. We will continue working with the coordinated plan to develop solutions around transportation needs of some of the most disenfranchised populations in our community. The outcomes of this project has enabled us to more effectively carry out our mission to broaden mobility opportunities for all individuals by providing and coordinating the most accessible transportation possible.

18. What is different from last year’s program/claim?

24/11
This year Community Bridges Lift Line/CTSA is asking for increased funds to support the “Out of County” volunteer program. Also, support once again for Homeless Service Center’s Paul Lee Loft Shelter & Winter Shelter Program this is an Emergency-shelter service that is located on the HSC campus for 46 adults, 365 days per year. Lift Line is asking for funds to offset the expenses incurred during the winter months, additional shelter is provided at the National Guard Armory Lift Line’s transportation service operating from the HSC campus, there is at least one wheelchair bound participant transported both ways daily.

19. Schedule of regular progress reports including an evaluation at the end of the year:

☒ CTSA: Specialized Transportation: Quarterly to E/D TAC, RTC: November 2011, January 2012, April 2012, July 2012 and year end report 11/12 (Months/Year)

CTSA and Volunteer Center (Article 8) Only

20. Are these transportation services responding to transportation needs not otherwise being met within the community or jurisdiction of the claimant? Describe.

Yes. For our target population we provide transportation that is otherwise not available. Lift Line paratransit services are provided to seniors and people with disabilities that can’t drive, are not able to use our METRO or METRO ParaCruz services (do not have the financial resources, have origins/destinations out side the service area or have wheelchairs that do not meet the size criteria). Also, the out of county TDA Medical ride services is used for residents who have no other resources, particularly due to financial restraints, to get to critical care treatment. The veterans we are currently providing paratransit services to are funded through the FTA Section 5317 New Freedom (NF) Grants Program. We provided rides to the outpatient clinic in Seaside, these Veterans are 50% or more disabled and can not ride the currently available general public veterans bus service, due to the fact their need require special vehicle type and are not ready for public transport. Our transportation role is to help them get to severely needed resources helping them to rehabilitate and get them back to a place where they can once again use public transportation. Even though the funds for this service are coming to an end Lift Line/CTSA will continue to seek other funding sources to support this service, which will now become an unmet need in the coordinated plan.

21. Where appropriate, are these specialized transportation services coordinated with other transportation services? Describe.

Lift Line, as the CTSA, acts as the safety net transportation service for low-income seniors and disabled individuals unable to secure mobility through other programs. In addition, Lift Line coordinates and refers people daily to other services more suited to their specialized transportation requirements such as: METRO bus or METRO ParaCruz; local taxi services through the taxi scrip program; the Volunteer Center; Veterans Services and our in house “Out of County” volunteer TDA Medical ride service. Lift Line continues coordinates with the Central Coast Alliance for Health in Santa Cruz and Monterey Counties to get Medi-Cal patients to essential medical appointments who cannot transfer from their mobility device to a bus seat or are to large to use local METRO ParaCruz ADA guidelines services. We work closely with Watsonville Dialysis and Santa Cruz Satellite Dialysis to provide flexible service for the clients. We help identify an individual’s specific need for specialized transportation service and coordinate not only services in our County, but also for rides to neighboring counties of San Benito, Monterey and Santa Clara. In addition, Lift Line assists those who call from other parts California as well as callers from out of the state looking for health services as well as public and specialized transportation. Lift Line’s Division Director will continue to participate with local and statewide transportation groups to develop coordinated processes and keep updated on current and new transportation system for our seniors and disabled residents.

22. Provide performance information, as pertinent, such as: verification of the operating cost per passenger, operating cost per vehicle service hour, passengers per vehicle service hour, passengers per vehicle service mile, and vehicle service hours per employee for last fiscal year (definitions available in Section 99247 of
TDA Guidelines. (99246)

Yes. All TDA reports, quarterly and annual are sent directly to the RTPA within the scheduled time schedules. These reports are included in the above listed performance measures.

23. Discuss the needs and types of the passengers being served and the employment of part-time drivers and the contracting with common carriers of persons operating under a franchise or license to provide services during peak hours. (99246)

There are times during the day when it is more cost effective to use taxi to provide some of the TDA Medical rides, especially when they are short rides and more on an individual need basis, while Lift Line buses provided more of the grouped rides. Lift Line has two part-time driver; one works weekends to provide transportation for the Homeless Service Center and the other who provides paratransit transportation 7:45 am to 1:00 pm for the current 5317 funded Veterans transportation service.

SCMTD, CTSC, Volunteer Center & RTC Only
24. List the recommendations provided in the last TDA Triennial Performance Audit and your progress toward meeting them.
   - Describe the work your agency has undertaken to implement each performance audit recommendation and the steps it will take to fully implement the recommendation.
   - For any recommendations that have not been implemented, explain why the recommendation has not been implemented and describe the work your agency will undertake to implement each performance audit recommendation.
   - Describe any problems encountered in implementing individual recommendations.

TDA Triennial Performance Audit Recommendations:
1) The current and future agreements that permit the pass-through of TDA Article 8 funds from the City of Santa Cruz to Community Bridges and the Volunteer Center should be amended to include the requirement that the performance measures identified in PUC Section 99246(d) be reported at least annually to the City and to SCCRTC.

Pulled from the California Public Utilities Code Section 99247 for reference:
For purposes of Section 99246, and as used elsewhere in this article:
   (a) "Operating cost" means all costs in the operating expense object classes exclusive of the costs in the depreciation and amortization expense object class of the uniform system of accounts and records adopted by the Controller pursuant to Section 99243, and exclusive of all subsidies for commuter rail services operated under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission and of all direct costs for providing charter services, and exclusive of all vehicle lease costs.
   (b) "Operating cost per passenger" means the operating cost divided by the total passengers.
   (c) "Operating cost per vehicle service hour" means the operating cost divided by the vehicle service hours.
   (d) "Passengers per vehicle service hour" means the total passengers divided by the vehicle service hours.
   (e) "Passengers per vehicle service mile" means the total passengers divided by the vehicle service miles.
   (f) "Total passengers" means the number of boarding passengers, whether revenue producing or not, carried by the public transportation system.
   (g) "Transit vehicle" means a vehicle, including, but not limited to, one operated on rails or tracks, which is used for public transportation services funded, in whole or in part, under this chapter.
   (h) "Vehicle service hours" means the total number of hours that each transit vehicle is in revenue service, including layover time.
(i) "Vehicle service miles" means the total number of miles that each transit vehicle is in revenue service.

(j) "Vehicle service hours per employee" means the vehicle service hours divided by the number of employees employed in connection with the public transportation system, based on the assumption that 2,000 person-hours of work in one year constitute one employee. The count of employees shall also include those individuals employed by the operator which provide services to the agency of the operator responsible for the operation of the public transportation system even though not employed in that agency.

- Community Bridges complies with all of the above requirements except (j). "Vehicle service hours per employee" we will work with the RTPA of Santa Cruz County to create a performance measuring tool to be included in all quarterly and annual reports.

2) The SCCRTC should work closely with the Santa Cruz Metro, Community Bridges, and the Volunteer Center to develop an SRTP update, including the following plan elements: financially sustainable public transportation levels; vehicle replacement needs for each agency; and countywide performance goals objectives and measurable standards. The SCCRTC’s involvement in the SRTP effort could include coordination, technical assistance, and partial funding.

- Community Bridges enter is interested in working with the entities to develop an updated SRTP. To date, work on this document has not yet started due to the lack of funding to undertake a comprehensive long range plan. Community Bridges will undertake long range planning efforts as part of the Regional Transportation Plan update underway by the SCCRTC.

3) Community Bridges should work their respective annual fiscal and compliance auditors to evaluate the transportation related measures required under the TDA, including annual operating costs and revenues.

- Community Bridges Lift Line has committed to work with our fiscal and compliance auditors to evaluate the transportation related measures required under the TDA, including annual operating costs and revenues.

Documentation to Include with Your Claim:

All Claims
- A letter of transmittal addressed to the SCCRTC Executive Director that attests to the accuracy of the claim and all its accompanying documentation.
- Statement from the TDA Eligible Claimant indicating its role and responsibilities.

Article 8 Bicycle/Pedestrian Claims
- Evidence of environmental review for capital projects

All Transit and Specialized Transportation Claims (SCMTD, CTSA, and Volunteer Center)
- A copy of the operating and capital budgets for the coming fiscal year
- Description of capital projects, including time frame over which project will be funded and implemented
- Operating Plan for current and upcoming activities – can be within project description

Article 4 Transit Claims
- A certification from the California Highway Patrol (completed within the last 13 months) indicating that the operator is in compliance with Section 1808.1 of the Vehicle Code.
- Other Certifications

Local Agency Certification:

This TDA Claim has been prepared in accordance with the SCCRTC’s Budget, SCCRTC’s Rules and Regulations, and Caltrans TDA Guidebook (http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/MassTrans/State-TDA.html). I certify that the information provided in this form is accurate and correct. I understand that if the required information has not been provided this form may be returned and the funding allocation may be delayed.

Signature __________________________ Title: __________________________ Date: __________
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COMMUNITY BRIDGES
Puentes de la Comunidad
236 Santa Cruz Avenue, Aptos, CA 95003
P. 831.688.8840  F. 831.688.8302
www.communitybridges.org

AGENCY BOARD RESOLUTION
RESOLUTION # 2011-03-01

Duly noticed regular meeting of the Community Bridges Board of Directors held on March 16, 2011 the following resolution was made.

Whereas the Board discussed on Community Bridges/Lift Line TDA claim for the 11/12 fiscal year.

Whereas the Board of Directors of Community Bridges (CB) hereby authorizes Community Bridges/Lift Line to make a claim for the 11/12 TDA funds from the Regional Transportation Commission through the City of Santa Cruz.

It is further resolved that the officers and the President/CEO and/or designees are authorized to sign any documents and take any steps necessary to fulfill the intent of this Resolution.

[Signatures]
Barbara Frank, President
Rick Roberts, Secretary

VERIFICATION

Each of the undersigned declares under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the statement in the foregoing certificate are true and correct of his or her own knowledge, and that this declaration was executed on 3/16, 2011, at Aptos, California.

[Signatures]
Barbara Frank, President
Rick Roberts, Secretary
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## Community Bridges - Lift Line / CTSA
### TDA 2011-12 Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCOUNT TITLE</th>
<th>TDA 2011-12 Budget</th>
<th>TDA &amp; MATCH 2011-12 Budget</th>
<th>CTSA 2011-12 Budget</th>
<th>TDA 2010-11 Budget</th>
<th>TDA &amp; MATCH 2010-11 Budget</th>
<th>CTSA 2010-11 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERSONNEL:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALARIES &amp; WAGES</td>
<td>174,331</td>
<td>386,922</td>
<td>489,788</td>
<td>151,862</td>
<td>333,211</td>
<td>472,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRINGE BENEFITS: UNEMPLOYMENT</td>
<td>2,615</td>
<td>5,804</td>
<td>7,347</td>
<td>2,278</td>
<td>4,998</td>
<td>7,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKERS COMP</td>
<td>9,588</td>
<td>21,281</td>
<td>27,163</td>
<td>8,352</td>
<td>18,327</td>
<td>39,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEALTH INSUR.</td>
<td>55,786</td>
<td>123,815</td>
<td>159,913</td>
<td>48,596</td>
<td>106,627</td>
<td>136,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FICA</td>
<td>12,552</td>
<td>27,858</td>
<td>35,020</td>
<td>10,934</td>
<td>23,991</td>
<td>33,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401K PLAN</td>
<td>1,395</td>
<td>3,095</td>
<td>3,803</td>
<td>1,215</td>
<td>2,666</td>
<td>3,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL PERSONNEL COSTS:</strong></td>
<td>256,266</td>
<td>566,775</td>
<td>723,034</td>
<td>223,236</td>
<td>469,819</td>
<td>692,986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SERVICES &amp; SUPPLIES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATING:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEHICLE OPERATIONS-GAS</td>
<td>45,147</td>
<td>82,068</td>
<td>109,424</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEHICLE LICENSES</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>1,960</td>
<td>2,106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEHICLE MAINTENANCE</td>
<td>6,100</td>
<td>17,299</td>
<td>23,065</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEHICLE INSURANCE</td>
<td>22,712</td>
<td>49,587</td>
<td>66,116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNICATIONS-RADIO</td>
<td>5,565</td>
<td>11,268</td>
<td>15,024</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL VEH. OPERATING COSTS:</strong></td>
<td>90,055</td>
<td>161,801</td>
<td>215,735</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER OPERATING &amp; ADMINISTRATION COSTS:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTRACTED SERVICES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSIONAL SERVICES</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>2,332</td>
<td>3,109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANITORIAL SERVICES</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>1,103</td>
<td>1,470</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUNDRAISING COMM RELATIONS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,292</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAFF TRAVEL</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINOR EQUIPMENT</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQUIPMENT MAINT &amp; REPAIR-MENTOR</td>
<td>17,595</td>
<td>17,595</td>
<td>23,460</td>
<td>12,460</td>
<td>18,750</td>
<td>22,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFICE SUPPLIES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>849</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAM SUPPLIES</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>911</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEHICLE MAINT SUPPLIES</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>1,177</td>
<td>1,569</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPUTER SUPPLIES/RELATED</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>732</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSTAGE</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>756</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPACE RENTAL</td>
<td>11,643</td>
<td>33,339</td>
<td>44,452</td>
<td>11,415</td>
<td>35,639</td>
<td>47,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTILITIES</td>
<td>2,544</td>
<td>6,296</td>
<td>8,394</td>
<td>2,494</td>
<td>5,918</td>
<td>7,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPACE MAINTENANCE</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>1,461</td>
<td>1,948</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELEPHONE</td>
<td>1,880</td>
<td>2,759</td>
<td>3,679</td>
<td>1,843</td>
<td>2,458</td>
<td>3,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS FEES</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>3,668</td>
<td>4,919</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>3,952</td>
<td>5,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAFF TRAINING</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSURANCE-GENERAL LIABILITY &amp; FIDELITY</td>
<td>1,036</td>
<td>1,036</td>
<td>1,036</td>
<td>1,013</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEMBERSHIPS/SUBSCRIPTIONS</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRINTING &amp; COPYING</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1,006</td>
<td>1,461</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVERTISING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2,315</td>
<td>2,315</td>
<td>3,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAXI - MOW RIDES</td>
<td>18,887</td>
<td>25,183</td>
<td>25,183</td>
<td>18,413</td>
<td>24,551</td>
<td>24,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBSIDIZED TAXI - LL RIDES</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>42,002</td>
<td>42,002</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>42,404</td>
<td>60,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBSIDIZED TAXI - SCRIP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17,162</td>
<td>17,162</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27,504</td>
<td>27,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSSP SERVICE EXPENSE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13,899</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQUIP FINANCING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10,557</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSF TO EQUIP RESERVE</td>
<td>12,878</td>
<td>12,878</td>
<td>12,878</td>
<td>31,718</td>
<td>31,718</td>
<td>31,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSF FROM EQUIP RESERVE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR EQUIPMENT 5310</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>631,221</td>
<td>631,221</td>
<td>38,776</td>
<td>38,776</td>
<td>38,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGENCY OVERHEAD</td>
<td>72,850</td>
<td>146,070</td>
<td>190,188</td>
<td>61,031</td>
<td>136,906</td>
<td>193,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ADMINISTRATION COSTS:</strong></td>
<td>178,974</td>
<td>962,076</td>
<td>1,059,464</td>
<td>219,089</td>
<td>396,302</td>
<td>532,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>515,295</td>
<td>1,692,651</td>
<td>1,998,232</td>
<td>491,399</td>
<td>1,044,677</td>
<td>1,436,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
<td>515,295</td>
<td>1,692,651</td>
<td>1,998,232</td>
<td>491,399</td>
<td>1,044,677</td>
<td>1,436,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET GAIN (LOSS)</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCOUNT TITLE</td>
<td>TDA 2011-12</td>
<td>TDA &amp; MATCH 2011-12</td>
<td>CTSA 2011-12</td>
<td>TDA 2010-11</td>
<td>TDA &amp; MATCH 2010-11</td>
<td>CTSA 2010-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td></td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BUDGET</td>
<td>BUDGET</td>
<td></td>
<td>BUDGET</td>
<td>BUDGET</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVENUE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA</td>
<td>515,295</td>
<td>515,295</td>
<td>515,295</td>
<td>491,399</td>
<td>491,399</td>
<td>491,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA SECTION 5310</td>
<td>631,221</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34,328</td>
<td>34,328</td>
<td>34,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF SANTA CRUZ</td>
<td>17,454</td>
<td>17,454</td>
<td>17,454</td>
<td>17,454</td>
<td>17,454</td>
<td>17,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF CAPITOLA</td>
<td>44,800</td>
<td>44,800</td>
<td>44,800</td>
<td>44,800</td>
<td>44,800</td>
<td>44,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF SCOTTS VALLEY</td>
<td>2,820</td>
<td>2,820</td>
<td>2,820</td>
<td>2,820</td>
<td>2,820</td>
<td>2,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF WATSONVILLE</td>
<td>2,617</td>
<td>2,617</td>
<td>2,617</td>
<td>2,617</td>
<td>2,617</td>
<td>2,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY OF SANTA CRUZ</td>
<td>8,761</td>
<td>8,761</td>
<td>8,761</td>
<td>8,761</td>
<td>8,761</td>
<td>8,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREA AGENCY ON AGING-TITLE IIIB</td>
<td>39,450</td>
<td>39,450</td>
<td>39,450</td>
<td>39,450</td>
<td>39,450</td>
<td>39,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.O.R.E.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA SECTION 5310</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>631,221</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>154,668</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA SECTION 5317</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39,558</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTEREY PENIN FDN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,844</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOMINICAN HOSPITAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,767</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,844</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDI-CAL (CCAH)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,544</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTSIDE CONTRACTS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>110,700</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100,609</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTSIDE CONTRACTS- ISSP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49,599</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49,599</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTSIDE CONTRACT - ELDERDAY</td>
<td>392,044</td>
<td>392,044</td>
<td>365,289</td>
<td>365,289</td>
<td>365,289</td>
<td>365,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCRIP - CLIENT TAXI PMTS</td>
<td>8,189</td>
<td>8,189</td>
<td>7,759</td>
<td>7,759</td>
<td>7,759</td>
<td>7,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCRIP - MSSP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34,892</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35,799</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOW INTER-PROGRAM CHARGES</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEREST INCOME</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUNDRAISING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,575</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,572</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONATIONS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,433</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAM INCOME - OTHER</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEHICLE INTER-PROGRAM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERPROG-OUTSIDE CONTRACTS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEHICLE SALES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN-KIND REVENUE-OOC VOLUNTEERS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,130</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAD DEBT ALLOWANCE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL REVENUES</td>
<td>515,295</td>
<td>1,692,651</td>
<td>1,998,232</td>
<td>491,399</td>
<td>1,044,677</td>
<td>1,436,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATING FUND SOURCES</td>
<td>CTSA FINAL FY 09-10</td>
<td>CTSA BUDGET FY 10-11</td>
<td>CTSA BUDGET FY 11-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA</td>
<td>531,399</td>
<td>491,399</td>
<td>515,295</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF SANTA CRUZ</td>
<td>15,674</td>
<td>17,454</td>
<td>17,454</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF CAPITOLA</td>
<td>44,800</td>
<td>44,800</td>
<td>44,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF SCOTTS VALLEY</td>
<td>2,820</td>
<td>2,820</td>
<td>2,820</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF WATSONVILLE</td>
<td>2,755</td>
<td>2,617</td>
<td>2,617</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY OF SANTA CRUZ</td>
<td>9,748</td>
<td>8,761</td>
<td>8,761</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AREA AGENCY ON AGING-TITLE IIIB</td>
<td>40,344</td>
<td>39,450</td>
<td>39,450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.O.R.E.</td>
<td>24,023</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA SECTION 5317</td>
<td>90,387</td>
<td>154,668</td>
<td>39,558</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTEREY PENIN FDN</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>19,500</td>
<td>26,001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOMINICAN HOSPITAL</td>
<td>1,880</td>
<td>1,844</td>
<td>2,767</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDI-CAL (CCAH)</td>
<td>15,184</td>
<td>8,544</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTSIDE CONTRACTS</td>
<td>49,807</td>
<td>100,609</td>
<td>110,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTSIDE CONTRACT - ISSP</td>
<td>49,599</td>
<td>49,599</td>
<td>49,599</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTSIDE CONTRACT - ELDERDAY</td>
<td>375,069</td>
<td>365,289</td>
<td>392,044</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAXI SCRIP SALES</td>
<td>7,891</td>
<td>7,759</td>
<td>8,189</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSSP SCRIP</td>
<td>17,635</td>
<td>35,799</td>
<td>34,892</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOW INTERPROGRAM CHGS.</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEREST INCOME</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUNDRAISING</td>
<td>1,572</td>
<td>1,572</td>
<td>5,575</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONATIONS</td>
<td>3,121</td>
<td>5,433</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAM INCOME - OTHER</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEHICLE INTERPROGRAM</td>
<td>10,951</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTRAPRCG. OUTSIDE CONTRACTS</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>490</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEHICLE SALES</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN-KIND REVENUE</td>
<td>14,747</td>
<td>2,130</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAD DEBT ALLOWANCES</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL REVENUES</td>
<td>1,367,253</td>
<td>1,402,537</td>
<td>1,367,011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION 5310 - PASS THRU

TOTAL REVENUES

1,367,253  1,436,865  1,998,232
EXHIBIT B
CTSA FIVE YEAR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN 10/11
FISCAL YEARS: 11/12 THROUGH 14/15

### CAPITAL REVENUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$27,271</td>
<td>$40,150</td>
<td>$45,151</td>
<td>$48,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA Section 5310</td>
<td>$34,328</td>
<td>$631,221</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$6,800</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addition to Fund</td>
<td>$31,718</td>
<td>$12,878</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Interest</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$66,047</td>
<td>$671,371</td>
<td>$45,151</td>
<td>$56,952</td>
<td>$53,453</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CAPITAL EXPENDITURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Purchase</td>
<td>$38,776</td>
<td>$631,221</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$8,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Maintenance</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$38,776</td>
<td>$631,221</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$8,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year-End Balance</td>
<td>$27,271</td>
<td>$40,150</td>
<td>$45,151</td>
<td>$48,452</td>
<td>$53,453</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

1. As Capital Grants are indefinite, and as capital equipment arrival dates vary, projected figures may require adjustment.
2. "Equipment Purchase" in 10/11 includes 3 MDC's, Training Projector, 2 laptop computers and vehicle security cameras.
3. "FTA Section 5310" in 11/12 includes computer server software and equipment, new MDC radios and paratransit vehicles.
4. "Equipment Purchase" in 13/14 is for a brake lathe.
1. **Operating Plan**

The Lift Line program provides demand response, non-emergency health and medical transportation for low-income seniors and disabled residents of Santa Cruz County. Riders are not charged a fare for the service, although donations are accepted. Service is generally offered 5:30 AM to 10:30 PM, seven days a week (with the exception of published holidays). Service is focused on individuals that live outside the METRO ParaCruz service area, those that are unable to afford the METRO ParaCruz fare, those that do not meet the ADA eligibility requirements and those that need a higher level of service than can be provided by METRO ParaCruz. Lift Line operates a fleet of 22 wheel-chair accessible vans, providing responsive specialized transportation to health and medical facilities for low-income seniors and disabled residents of Santa Cruz County. Transportation is provided to destinations such as doctor’s offices, pharmacies, Elderday adult day health care, Senior Dining Centers, Dialysis Sites and various medical therapy appointments. As of September 2009 we also took in house the coordination of the volunteer out-of-county transportation program that provides medical rides to San Francisco, Alameda, Santa Mateo and Santa Clara Counties.

Due to the current demand for service during our peak hours we have been asking our TDA medical clients to work with us and try to book their medical rides between 10:30am and 1:45 pm. Lift Line has been working closely with local medical facilities to optimize this preferred window of service for this select group of Santa Cruz residents.

Community Bridges maintains comprehensive auto and general liability coverage, including the City of Santa Cruz and SCCRTTC as additional insured parties. A copy of each insurance certificate shall be filed with the City and with SCCRTTC.

Lift Line is seeking to both continue the TDA Medical Rides service and to ensure that this service reaches those with the most need. **LiftLines projected TDA Medical Rides for 10/11 was 4,700, we have provided 3,712, and we are currently at 118% of our goal.** These rides include participants that have no other transportation options to and from the Cabrillo Stoke Center (now located on the Aptos Cabrillo College campus), Central Coast Alliance for Health Medi-Cal program, and clients with multiple sclerosis, as well as other low-income seniors and disabled residents with specialized medical transportation needs. Rides would be available to participants outside the METRO service area, those who do not have the means to pay $6.00 round trip METRO ParaCruz fee, those who do not meet or go beyond the ADA parameters and individuals who need door-to-door assistance. With the current proposed route cuts by the METRO, even though minimal, it will increase the demand for service for a new larger service area. Lift Line is planning to ensure service for this new broader request for medical ride services.

In the past our eligibility process was to mail all application to residents who are requesting Lift Line specialized transportation service. However, since the MORE outreach project we have developed a broader collaboration and are now working with the County, medical facilities and human service agencies to assist some of the more hard to reach residents in filling out the TDA applications. The TDA application asks residents for proof of age, and/or disability and income; they return, to Lift Line, a completed and signed application with the appropriate attachments as proof of qualification. At this point we determine if they meet the criteria for service then send
them a letter of eligibility for rides or work directly with the social working that is assisting their clients and their families.

Lift Line also coordinates with the local taxi companies to offer the very popular Taxi Scrip (TS) program. Lift Lines projected rides for 10/11 fiscal year was 2306, we have provided 1,427, and we are currently at 97% of our goal. This program serves as a safety net service for non-medical rides and rides needed outside the ADA-mandated METRO paratransit service areas. Individuals may purchase subsidized taxi scrip so that they can directly schedule taxi rides, and the majority of taxi vehicles are fully accessible for mobility devices. Currently 100% of residents that receive the Taxi Scrip at a discount are low income and below the federal 200% poverty level. Lift Line staff recently updated the TDA applications to reflect the new Federal Government poverty level guidelines. Area taxi service providers include: San Lorenzo Valley Taxi, Deluxe Taxi, Courtesy Cab, and Santa Cruz Yellow Cab. Lift Line provides ongoing monitoring and assessment of the program to ensure that eligibility criteria are met, subcontractors meet safety criteria, and to insure there is no abuse of this vital program. The demand for both Taxi Scrip and medical rides has increased substantially for the third fiscal year in a row, the current average cost per trip has almost doubled since the taxi rate increase in 2009 and the average cost per ride is now $12 to $14, thereby diminishing the amount of rides that can be taken with the scrip. Currently clients can purchase three $10.00 books, for a total of $30.00 worth of scrip, for $8.00 which would give them approximately 1 or 2 rides per book. There is currently a limit to purchase three books each quarter, per person. Tracking the actual ride count and identifying who is using the scrip is virtually impossible. We would like to eliminate these books and replace them with coupons with their name and expiration dates, by quarter, clearly marked on the coupon. Lift Line would like to emulate the process currently being used by the Health Project Center for the multipurpose senior service programs MSSP. Tips are not prohibited, but the population who uses the taxi scrip program essentially doesn’t have the means to provide a tip.

Lift Line began coordinating and provides “Out-of-County” medical transportation this fiscal year. Lift Line projected rides for 10/11 was 1,018, we have provided 886, and we are currently at 87% of our goal. This program is currently running as a volunteer program with four (3) drivers and one (1) transportation coordinator. Through Lift Line we have been providing trips to destinations such as the Veterans Administration Hospital in Palo Alto, Kaiser Hospital in San Jose, Cancer Clinic in San Francisco, and Stanford University Medical Center to name a just a few. Since this program has come under Lift Line the Stanford Children’s Hospital, California Children’s Services and Palo Alto Medical Clinic were at a collaborative presentation by the Division Director, the request for specialized transportation for low-income families with children has become an new service request for this program. Lift Line is able to provide low cost services due to the use of volunteer drivers and low overhead of this program. However, this program was not previously screening clients and or drivers which have driven up costs for operations, as well as the increase in current gas prices. We are currently tracking these rides through a Microsoft access data system and are looking into incorporating these clients into our Trapeze software. Through the 5310 Caltrans grant we have requested a new mapping system for Santa Clara County to better track our rides and performance. Funds to improve this program are needed to recruit new drivers and or hire a part time/on call driver as a back up driver.

Lift Line staff will continue to work with the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission’s Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E/D TAC) in identifying and addressing unmet needs. In addition, Lift Line continues to work with the E/D
TAC in meeting the Unmet Transit and Paratransit Needs as well as the recommendations of the Paratransit Coordination Task Force.

Through our CTSA Outreach questionnaire, that is sent out with every new application, along with a return self addressed stamped envelope, and our annual client survey that is mailed out every April, we have been able to determine the overall consensus that a Mobility Management Center (MMC) would benefit not only seniors and disabled residents, but also general public transit users. It has already been determined by our Coordinated Regional Plan that a mobility management center would benefit our community. The Mobility Management Center will be a one-stop shop and provide transportation services to customers, including older adults, people with disabilities, and individuals with lower incomes. It would also serve the general public by responding to and influencing the demands of the market by undertaking actions and supportive strategies in collaboration with others to provide a full range of options for travel. The center would computerize, plan, develop, and operate travel options as well as provide a variety of training classes, to help residents address the increasing costs of individual travel. Transit coordination training would be beneficial to the community to help determine what specific characteristics of travel experiences are of the greatest importance; collect data regularly on those factors through a combination of customer surveys and independent evaluations; utilize information systems that can continuously track changes in performances at a level that allows meaningful change to occur and most effectively coordinate human service and transportation needs. As the CTSA, a goal of Lift Line is to coordinate the implementation of a MMC. Lift Line is moving forward by identifying funding sources for a 2011/12 implementation of this local area Mobility Management Center; it will be parallel in service coordination to the new Monterey Mobility Center. As of January 2011 Lift Line has move its operations office to a Watsonville location on the corner of Walker and Ford Street. The fleet of vehicles has a new CHP terminal station located at 240 Ford Street.

For those who don't qualify for METRO ParaCruz or Medi-Cal assistance, we will continue to help them complete the required paperwork to make it easier for them to use the current TDA programs that meet their specific needs. In our role as the Coordinated Transportation Service Agency, Lift Line will continue working with other transportation providers to ensure maximum efficiency and coordination.

Lift Line will continue to focus its resources on transportation needs that are not being met by other paratransit services, such as ADA-mandated METRO ParaCruz. Through TDA funding, Lift Line will continue to serve those not eligible for METRO ParaCruz service, specifically low-income individuals who cannot afford the $6.00 round-trip METRO ParaCruz co-pay, those that don't meet the ADA parameters, and those with origins/destinations outside of the METRO ParaCruz service area. Also, because Lift Line provides safety net services to those ineligible or unable to use other services, its goal is to provide flexible programs, scheduling, and dispatching that can respond to the changing needs of medical providers and their clients. Examples include same-day medical services and medical services on weekends.

Lift Line continues to meet with the Meals on Wheels Program Director and site managers of the county's senior meal sites to review unmet transportation service needs. Lift Line projected rides for 10/11 was 5,340, we have provided 3,987, and we are currently at 112% of our goal. After assessing this past year's average daily attendance we can report a stable and consistent ridership for the Watsonville Senior Center dining site and a decrease in the ridership for the Highland Senior Dining Center. Lift Line has been using a large 24 passenger vehicle which eliminates the need for two vehicles and helping to cuts operational ride costs. Lift Line will
continue to coordinate with the Meals on Wheels program to increase attendance at all of the senior dining centers.

We are requesting to continue providing service to participants attending the Elderday Adult Day Health Center Program. Lift Line projected rides for 10/11 was 45,389 rides of which 6,673 were funded by TDA funds. We are currently on track to reach 100% of our goal. This program is a Federally Qualified Health Center that provides day health care to seniors and community residents who need constant care, and/or are diagnosed with dementia or Alzheimer’s type of dementia. Almost all of these participants use wheelchairs or walkers, and require vans with lifts. Generally, these clients are very frail, and need personal, door-to-door assistance, reflecting the specialized training that our Lift Line drivers receive. This level of client service is time consuming and labor intensive. For the fiscal year 10/11 we anticipated providing at least 45,389 rides, including rides funded by Elderday. As of February 2011, we have provided 23,459 rides. Elderday continues to increase their client participation from the current average of almost 80 per day to 90 participants a day. This year, Elderday is again facing possible cuts in the FQHC reimbursement that is currently being driven by the State of California. The State has proposed a five million dollar reduction in reimbursements for service to all FQHC Adult Day Health Centers. Acknowledgment is due to the support of TDA transportation funding, that the Elderday’s increased participation has become a more stable service in our community because of the transportation available from South County to the North County location. TDA funds will again be used to partially subsidize funds for these Elderday rides.

Lift Line/CTSA is also requesting funds to subsidize Lift Line costs to provide transportation for the Homeless Service Center’s Paul Lee Loft Shelter & Winter Shelter Program, this is an Emergency-shelter service that is located on the HSC campus for 46 adults, 365 days per year. Lift Line is asking for funds to offset the expenses incurred during the winter months of November through April of each year when we will provide over 20,000 rides. This additional shelter is provided at the National Guard Armory Lift Line’s transportation service operating from the HSC campus, there are one to three wheelchair bound participants transported both ways daily. The majority of these riders are senior and/or disabled. This program needs transportation every day and every night including all holidays, during that time frame, for at least 145 days of the year.
## OPERATION PLAN SERVICE OF UNITS
### EXHIBIT C - 2
#### 2011 / 2012

### TDA SUPPORTED UNITS OF SERVICE

#### TABLE 1 - TDA 11/12 PROPOSED SERVICE UNITS CALCULATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TAXI SCRIP</th>
<th>Out of County Medical</th>
<th>MEDICAL TDA</th>
<th>MEALS ON WHEELS</th>
<th>ELDERDAY</th>
<th>ISSP</th>
<th>TOTAL UNITS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUND ALLOCATED</strong></td>
<td>$54,941</td>
<td>$36,899</td>
<td>$249,530</td>
<td>$77,355</td>
<td>$69,582</td>
<td></td>
<td>$14,119</td>
<td>$502,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TDA OPERATING COST</strong></td>
<td>$10.69</td>
<td>$11.43</td>
<td>$31.35</td>
<td>$8.32</td>
<td>$12.56</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. ADD PROGRAM MANAGEMENT COSTS</td>
<td>$4.27</td>
<td>$4.56</td>
<td>$6.94</td>
<td>$2.51</td>
<td>$2.49</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.e., Mgmt Personnel, Fleet Mgr, Info. Mgr, Rent, Liability Insur., Phone, Supplies, etc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. ADD ADMINISTRATION COSTS</td>
<td>$2.54</td>
<td>$2.71</td>
<td>$6.50</td>
<td>$1.84</td>
<td>$2.55</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.5% of total cost per unit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL COST PER TDA SERVICE UNIT</strong></td>
<td>$17.50</td>
<td>$18.70</td>
<td>$44.79</td>
<td>$12.67</td>
<td>$17.60</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TDA 11/12 PROPOSED UNITS OF SERVICE</strong></td>
<td>3,140</td>
<td>1,973</td>
<td>5,571</td>
<td>6,107</td>
<td>3,953</td>
<td>3,003</td>
<td>23,747</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comparison Only 10/11 Projected TDA Units of Service</strong></td>
<td>2,306</td>
<td>1,018</td>
<td>4,700</td>
<td>5,340</td>
<td>6,673</td>
<td>6,673</td>
<td>17,731</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EQUIPMENT PURCHASE MATCH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL TDA CLAIM REQUEST</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$515,304</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## NON-TDA SUPPORTED UNITS OF SERVICE

### TABLE 2 - OTHER LIFT LINE/CTSA PROJECTED 11/12 SERVICE UNITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vets/Dialysis Section 5317</th>
<th>Meals on Wheels</th>
<th>Elderday Services</th>
<th>MSSP</th>
<th>Outside Contracts (1)</th>
<th>ISSP</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funds Allocated</td>
<td>$39,558</td>
<td>$115,902</td>
<td>$392,044</td>
<td>$34,892</td>
<td>$110,700</td>
<td>$49,599</td>
<td>$742,695</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue per Service Unit</td>
<td>$49.52</td>
<td>$12.67</td>
<td>$17.60</td>
<td>$16.99</td>
<td>$12.67</td>
<td>$4.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11 Projection Units of Service</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>9,150</td>
<td>32,347</td>
<td>2,054</td>
<td>6,739</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>74,089</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Income
- Total Operating Income
  - FTA Section 5310
  - TDA Claim
  - Total 11/12 Projected Revenues Budgeted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>$1,988,241</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$851,716</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$631,221</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$515,304</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1) **San Andreas Regional Center (SARC) and other outside contracts include higher capacity trips (group rides) which create productivity similar to our MOW rides.**

## TOTAL COMBINED UNITES OF SERVICE PROJECTED

### TABLE 3 - ALL SERVICE UNITS TOTALED (Total tables 1 and 2, units of service, to equal table 3 totals)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vets/Dialysis Section 5317</th>
<th>Taxi Scrip</th>
<th>Out Of County</th>
<th>Medical TDA</th>
<th>Meals on Wheels</th>
<th>MSSP Taxi Scrip</th>
<th>Elderday</th>
<th>Contract Services</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012 Combined Units of Service/Ride Projections</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>3,140</td>
<td>1,973</td>
<td>5,571</td>
<td>15,257</td>
<td>2,054</td>
<td>36,300</td>
<td>8,739</td>
<td>73,833</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exhibit D

Schedule of Payments
FY: 2011-2012 TDA Claim
CTSA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 15, 2011</td>
<td>$180,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 15, 2011</td>
<td>$111,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 15, 2012</td>
<td>$111,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 2012</td>
<td>$111,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$515,295</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXHIBIT E
Lift Line / CTSA
11/12 Statement of Role and Responsibility

Community Bridges has been the designated Consolidated Transportation Services Agency (CTSA) since 1982. CTSAAs are authorized under California Government Code Sections 15975 and 15950-15952 which were enacted pursuant to the Social Service Transportation Improvement Act. The purpose of the CTSA is to improve transportation required by social service recipients by promoting the consolidation and coordinating of social service transportation. As the Consolidated Transportation Service Agency, Community Bridges Lift Line will continue to coordinating and consolidate transportation services with other transportation and human service agencies in order to provide the most efficient transportation possible. Lift Line will continue to work with Santa Cruz County School Districts, Family and Children's Services of the County of Santa Cruz, County office of Education, Veterans Service Offices in Santa Cruz and Palo Alto, Hospice of Santa Cruz County hospitals and medical facilities. Community Bridges Lift Line will also continue working closely with the RTPA and to help with the unmet needs identified in the Tri-County AMBAG Coordinated Plan. Community Bridges Lift Line will also continue working with not only local non-profit organizations but with human service and medical facilities in other Counties to continue to define and create an effective mobility management center to help mobilize resident with various disabilities, low income and senior populations to travel easily throughout our County as well as to travel seamlessly throughout our tri-county region, and also to include the Santa Clara County.

As the CTSA, Community Bridges Lift Line will continue coordination to improve and identify the need for specialized transportation equipment, if the equipment is funded through Caltrans 5310 and isn't reaching its proposed requirements through their contract, the equipment can be recapture and its use coordinate through other identified paratransit service needs. We will continue to offer adequate training to ensure that not only Lift Line staff operates in a safe and sensitive manner but will continue to offer expertise and training for other transportation providers in the County.

Pursuant to the CTSA designation for Santa Cruz County, Community Bridges operates the Lift Line transportation program, which will continue to take a lead, and work closely with the RTPA, to identify unmet transportation needs, coordinate and provide social service transportation services to low-income seniors, disabled residents, underserved populations and other persons in Santa Cruz County. Lift Line will continue to directly address the issues identified through the unmet needs process by providing rides to medical appointments (including dialysis), alternative care, mental health and various medical transportation needs.
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RECOMMENDATION

The Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC) and staff recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) adopt a resolution (Attachment 1) approving the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District’s (METRO) FY 11/12 Transportation Development Act (TDA) and State Transit Assistance claim (Attachment 2) for $5,244,963 and $2,311,643, respectively. [This is a roll call vote by local jurisdiction representatives.]

Staff also recommends that the RTC accept the report on METRO activities (Attachment 3).

BACKGROUND

The Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) oversees the allocation of two major sources of funds for public transportation: Transportation Development Act (TDA) and State Transit Assistance (STA). TDA local transportation funds (LTF) are derived from ¼-cent of the retail sales tax collected statewide, returned to each county according to the amount of tax collected in that county. STA funds are now derived from the sales tax on diesel and can be used this year on public transportation operations or capital. TDA funds can be used to fund public transportation system operations, maintenance, and capital projects (such as vehicles, bus shelters, benches, and communication equipment); specialized transportation; RTC administration, transportation planning and programming; and local pedestrian and bicycle projects. In areas where no unmet transit needs exist or are reasonable to meet, TDA funds can be used to fund street and road projects. Article 4 TDA funds are available to operators of general public transportation systems. The RTC apportions TDA funds to METRO and other claimants based on priorities and formulas established in the RTC Rules and Regulations. The apportionments are included in the RTC budget.

DISCUSSION

At the Regional Transportation Commission’s (RTC) March meeting, the RTC approved the Fiscal Year (FY) 2011-12 budget which includes $5,244,963 in TDA and $2,311,643 in STA allocations to the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (METRO). The METRO’s TDA/STA Claim Form and request letter are attached (Attachment 2). Metro will use the TDA and STA funds to assist with operating the fixed route bus services and the American’s with Disabilities Act (ADA)-mandated paratransit service, ParaCruz.
According to the claim form, METRO provided 5,750,160 bus rides and 94,074 ParaCruz rides last fiscal year. Of the bus rides, approximately 135,406 used senior/disabled passes and 24,196 were wheelchair users. METRO’s Public Transit Highlights for Fiscal Year 2010 (FY10) is attached (Attachment 3).

The RTC is required by TDA statute (PUC Section 99244) to identify, analyze, and recommend potential productivity improvements for METRO. Section 17 of the TDA claim identifies productivity improvements from FY 10/11 which included updates to its new web site, new fareboxes with smart-card technology which reduce customer boarding times, purchase of replacement paratransit vehicles to reduce operating and maintenance costs, and upgrades to bus scheduling software.

METRO is anticipating revenue shortfalls in FY11/12. In order to balance the FY11/12 budget, METRO is considering service cuts, layoffs, contract amendments, and new revenue options. In recognition of the severe budget shortfalls facing METRO, RTC staff recognizes that METRO is currently working on an extensive evaluation of service changes, aimed at minimizing impacts to riders, including transit-dependent riders. Staff supports METRO’s plan to attract riders via increased media and other outreach efforts next year, particularly for routes with excess capacity. As required by TDA statute, Section 22 of the claim identifies the steps METRO has taken to implement recommendations from the most recent Triennial Performance Audit (2010).

Given its consistency with TDA statutes, RTC Rules and Regulations and RTC FY 11/12 budget, staff and the Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC) recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission adopt a resolution (Attachment 1) approving METRO’s FY 11/12 Transportation Development Act Article 4 claim (Attachment 2).

The funding amount in this claim is based on the RTC’s adopted FY 11-12 budget which, as required by TDA statute, employs TDA revenue estimates provided by the Santa Cruz County Auditor Controller. RTC staff will continue to monitor TDA revenues and if revenues do not meet projections, the RTC may amend its budget to reflect the revised revenues. If the TDA revenue amount apportionment to METRO is changed by the RTC through a budget amendment, the RTC will adjust TDA revenue payments consistent with the approved RTC budget and it will not be necessary for METRO to submit a revised TDA claim.

**SUMMARY**

Staff and the Elderly/Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission approve the FY 2011-12 TDA/STA claim from the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District. The claim is consistent with the Commission’s adopted FY11/12 budget and meets the criteria set in the Commission’s Rules and Regulations and state regulations.

**Attachments:**
1. Resolution Approving the METRO TDA Claim
2. TDA Claim from METRO
3. METRO Annual Report

\RTCSERV2\SHARED\RTC\TC2011\0511\METROTDACLAIMFY12\TDAMETROYF2012.DOC
RESOLUTION NO.

Adopted by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission on the date of May 5, 2011 on the motion of Commissioner duly seconded by Commissioner

A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE FISCAL YEAR 2011/12 TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT (TDA) ARTICLE 4 and STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE (STA) CLAIM FROM THE SANTA CRUZ METROPOLITAN TRANSIT DISTRICT

WHEREAS, the Transportation Development Act of 1971, Article 4, Section 99260(a) of the Public Utilities Code provides that transit operators may file a claim for monies from a county's local transportation fund with the transportation planning agency for that county; and

WHEREAS, the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (METRO) is a transit operator in accordance with Article 1, Section 99210 of the Public Utilities Code, and the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) is the transportation planning agency for Santa Cruz County, in accordance with Article 1, Section 99214 of the Public Utilities Code; and

WHEREAS, the RTC apportioned $5,244,963 in Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds and $2,311,643 in State Transit Assistance (STA) funds to METRO in its fiscal year 2011/12 budget; and

WHEREAS, METRO submitted a claim for Transportation Development Act and State Transit Assistance funds in accordance with TDA statutes and the RTC Rules and Regulations;

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

1. The FY 11/12 Transportation Development Act (TDA) and State Transit Assistance (STA) claim by Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (METRO) fulfills the requirements specified in the Transportation Development Act and the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission’s (RTC) Rules and Regulations and the RTC finds that:

a. The proposed expenditures are in conformity with the Regional Transportation Plan.
b. The level of passenger fares and charges is sufficient to enable the METRO to meet the fare revenue requirements of Public Utilities Code sections 99268.1 or 99268.2b as an older operator.

c. METRO is making full use of federal funds available under the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964.

d. The sum of METRO’s allocations from the State Transit Assistance (STA) and the TDA funds does not exceed the amount that METRO is eligible to receive during the fiscal year.

e. The claim funds may be used to offset reductions in federal operating assistance and the unanticipated increase in the cost of fuel, to enhance existing public transportation services, and to meet high priority regional, countywide, or area wide public transportation needs.

f. METRO made a reasonable effort to implement the productivity improvements recommended pursuant to Public Utilities Code section 99244 as specified in sections 17 and 22 of the TDA claim form.

g. A certification by the Department of the California Highway Patrol verifying that METRO is in compliance with section 1808.1 of the Vehicle Code, as required in Public Utilities Code section 99251. The certification shall have been completed within the last 13 months.

2. The Transportation Development Act Article 4 and State Transit Assistance claim submitted by the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District for fiscal year 2011/12 is hereby approved, to be paid in quarterly payments, as specified in the submitted claim.

3. Should the RTC amend its FY 11/12 budget to modify TDA revenue apportionments to METRO, the Executive Director is authorized to modify the payment amounts consistent with the RTC’s approved FY 11/12 budget.

AYES: COMMISSIONERS

NOES: COMMISSIONERS
ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS

ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS

_____________________________
Mark Stone, Chair

ATTEST:

_____________________________
George Dondero, Secretary

Distribution: METRO, RTC Fiscal
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March 31, 2011

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

Dear Mr. Dondero:

The Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District’s FY12 Transportation Development Act (TDA) and State Transit Assistance (STA) Claim Form is enclosed. This is the second year of the temporary suspension of eligibility criteria for the use of STA funding for transit operating expenses as provided in ABx89 of 3/22/10, and Santa Cruz METRO will use the FY12 STA allocation along with the FY12 TDA allocation for operating expenses as shown in the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District FY11 and FY12 Final Budget.

Santa Cruz METRO requests a total of $7,556,606 in the Local Transportation Funds allocated by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission as listed below:

1. Transportation Development Act – FY12 Transit Operations $5,244,963 (Article 4, Section A)

2. State Transit Assistance – FY12 Transit Operations $2,311,643

Total $7,556,606

TDA funding levels may change depending on tax revenue collection and Santa Cruz METRO will receive a revised amount of TDA funds in accordance with the subsequently amended SCCRTC budget.

A copy of the FY12 Consolidated Expenses and the FY11 Capital Budget from the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District FY11 and FY12 Final Budget are included along with the Transit Operator Compliance Certificate from the California Highway Patrol.

The FY12 TDA and STA Claim has been prepared with the most recently available budget information and system performance data. Please call me if you need additional information.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Angela Aitken
Finance Manager and Acting Assistant General Manager

Enclosure

cc: John Doughty, AMBAG

110 Vernon Street, Santa Cruz, CA 95060 (831) 426-6080, FAX (831) 426-6117
Santa Cruz METRO OnLine at http://www.scmid.com
Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District

Transportation Development Act (TDA)
And
State Transit Assistance (STA)
FY 2011-12 Claim

TO THE
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission

March 30, 2011
Transportation Development Act (TDA) – Local Transportation Funds and State Transit Assistance (STA)

CLAIM FORM

Submit a separate form for each project.

This form has been developed in an effort to standardize information required from TDA recipients, based on TDA Statute, RTC Rules and Regulations, and/or RTC board requests.

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: FY12 Public Transit Operations in Santa Cruz County

2. Implementing Agency: Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (Santa Cruz METRO)

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

4. Funding requested this claim:  
   - TDA $5,244,963
   - STA (transit only) $2,311,643

5. Fiscal Year (FY) for which funds are claimed: FY12

6. General purpose for which the claim is made, identified by the article and section of the Act which authorizes such claims:
   - [ ] Article 8 Bicycle and/or Pedestrian Facility
   - [X] Article 4 Public Transportation
   - [ ] Article 8 Specialized Transportation
   - [ ] Article 3 & 8 TDA Admin or Planning

7. Contact Person/Project Manager
   Name: Angela Aitken, Finance Manager and Acting Assistant General Manager
   Telephone Number: (831) 426-6080
   E-mail: aaitken@scmtd.com

   Secondary Contact (in event primary not available) : Thomas Hiltner, Grants/Legislative Analyst
   Telephone Number: (831) 426-6080
   E-mail: thiltner@scmtd.com

8. Project/Program Description/Scope (use additional pages, if needed, to provide details such as work elements/tasks.

   This project provides operating assistance for fixed-route public transit and ADA complementary paratransit operations in Santa Cruz County. Fixed-route public transit operations require a maximum fleet of 85 vehicles serving 38 routes throughout Santa Cruz County. ParaCruz, Santa Cruz METRO’s complementary paratransit service, operates 36 accessible vans in demand-response service for persons who, due to disability, cannot access the fixed-route system.
9. Project Location/Limits (attach a map and/or photos if available/applicable, include street names):

Santa Cruz METRO Service Area

![Map of Santa Cruz METRO Service Area]

10. 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)

This project supports public fixed-route transit and paratransit service in Santa Cruz County. Public transit serves as an alternative transportation mode of choice and as essential lifeline transportation for residents who do not have access to a privately owned vehicle.

11. Project Productivity Goals for this fiscal year:
   a. Measures of performance, success or completion to be used to evaluate project/program (ex. increase use of facility/service, decrease collisions, etc.):
      - Total Annual passenger trips
      - Operating Cost/Hour
      - Farebox Recovery Ratio
   
   b. Number of people to be served/anticipated number of users of project/program (ex. number of new or maintained bike miles; number of people served/rides provided):
      - Santa Cruz METRO projects 4,751,800 trips on its fixed-route and paratransit services.

12. Consistency and relationship with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) - Is program/project listed
in the RTP and/or consistent with a specific RTP Goal/Policy?
Yes, Santa Cruz METRO’s FY12 TDA/STA project conforms to these goals from the 2010 Regional Transportation Plan:

- 2.3 Reduce the automobile’s impact on the region by increasing opportunities for transit use by residents, commuters, students, employees and visitors to the area, in a manner which best achieves a transit ridership goal of 10 percent of all trips.
- 2.6 Provide an integrated and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)-compliant transportation system that is responsive to the special needs of all seniors and persons with disabilities.
- 4.2 Ensure that transportation projects contribute to improved regional air quality, reduce energy consumption or reduce vehicle miles traveled, or, at a minimum, do not worsen existing conditions.

13. Impact(s) of project on other modes of travel, if any (ex. parking to be removed):
- Reduce congestion on local streets and roads by providing alternatives to the private automobile.
- Increase range of travel for bicycles by accommodating bikes on buses.
- Provide feeder service to intercity bus, rail and airline network at San Jose.

14. Estimated Project Cost/Budget, including other funding sources, and Schedule: (attach project budget). Specialized Transportation Claims require 10% local match. Local match can take the form of fares, donations, agency charges, grants, revenue sharing and other non-restricted sources. In-kind services may NOT apply toward the local match.

What is the total project cost?
**$38,627,918** for FY12 as published in the *Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District FY11 and FY12 Final Budget*, 6/25/10.

Is project fully funded? Decreased revenue and increased costs since adopting the *Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District FY11 and FY12 Final Budget* indicate that Santa Cruz METRO will have an operating budget shortfall at the current service and staffing levels.

What will TDA (and STA) funds be used on (ex. administration, brochures, engineering, construction)?
Public transit operations; operating budget

15. Preferred Method and Schedule for TDA fund distribution (see RTC Rules and Regulations for details):
   a. Bike/Ped: □ Up to 90% upon initiation of work OR □ 100% upon project completion
   b. CTSA: □ Quarterly disbursement, with up to 35% in first quarter, and the remaining quarterly payments being one-third of the remaining claim amount; OR □ Quarterly disbursement
   c. Volunteer Center: □ Full approved claim amount in the first quarter
   d. SCMTD: ☒ Quarterly disbursement
16. TDA Eligibility:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Has the project/program been approved by the claimant's governing body? Form of approval (eg resolution, work program, budget, other document) 3/25/11 Board authorization to submit claim. If &quot;NO,&quot; provide the approximate date approval is anticipated.</th>
<th>YES/ NO?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| B. Has this project previously received TDA funding? (This Project is defined as FY12 operations.) | 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? (If an agency other than the Claimant is to maintain the facility provide its name: ________________________________ ) | NA |

| D. Bike, Ped, and Specialized Transportation Claims: 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). | NA |


SCMTD, CTSA, Bike to Work, CTSC Only – PLEASE KEEP ANSWERS BRIEF

17. Improving Program Efficiency/Productivity

- Describe any areas where special efforts have been made in the last fiscal year to reduce operating cost and/or increase ridership/program usage. Note any important trends.

  o Santa Cruz METRO implemented a new web site to improve customer access to information. Greater system understanding and easier access to information demystifies the potential transit trip, helping to turn the potential into an actual trip.
  
  o Santa Cruz METRO purchased new fareboxes with smart-card technology to improve speed and accuracy of processing customer fares and obtaining ridership data from the fareboxes. Reducing customer boarding time with more efficient fare processing reduces overall system operating hours, reducing costs.
  
  o Santa Cruz METRO ParaCruz purchased 27 ADA complementary paratransit vehicles. New vehicles reduce operating and maintenance costs and improve passenger safety.
  
  o Santa Cruz METRO purchased five replacement buses for the Highway 17 Express. New buses reduce operating and maintenance costs and improve passenger safety.
  
  o Santa Cruz METRO purchased upgrades to its bus scheduling software with new modules which will improve the bus operator bid process. The new software will reduce deadhead, improve interlining and eliminate excessive layover times to reduce operating costs. The new bidding module will reduce staff labor for tracking operators’ pay schedules.
  
  o Santa Cruz METRO implemented new purchasing software to improve budget and procurement management.
  
  o Santa Cruz METRO installed new software (MaintStar) for the Maintenance Department (Fleet and Facilities) to improve inventory control, maintenance scheduling and consumables tracking to improve monitoring, productivity and management of limited resources.
  
  o Santa Cruz METRO did not fill authorized positions which became vacant due to resignations and retirement. Fewer employees reduce operating costs.

- Goals for next fiscal year (ex. identify opportunities to maximize economies of scale, planned productivity improvements). Describe any areas where special efforts will be made to improve efficiency and increase program usage/ridership:
o Evaluate service changes which could bring operating costs within available revenue and adjust labor requirements commensurate with service changes.
o Increase outreach through expanded media coverage and greater participation. Emphasize lobbying efforts to sustain or increase transit funding levels in state and federal legislation.

18. What is different from last year’s program/claim?
   a. The TDA claim amount is greater than last year’s
   b. Operating expenses have increased due to employee contractual benefits, increased health insurance costs and increased employer retirement contributions.
   c. This year’s claim includes the State Controller’s Office estimate of the STA allocation proposed for the California FY12 Budget.
   d. This year’s project depends upon either finding additional revenue that could be used for operations or reducing service to meet available revenue.

19. Schedule of regular progress reports including an evaluation at the end of the year:
   ☑ SCMD – April each year
   ☑ Specialized Transportation: Quarterly to E/D TAC, RTC _____________ (Months/Year)
   ☑ CTSA: Bicycle Committee _______________ (Month, year); RTC _____________ (Month, year)
   ☑ B2W: Bicycle Committee ____________ (Month, year); RTC _____________ (Month, year)

**CTSA and Volunteer Center (Article 8) Only**

20. Are these transportation services responding to transportation needs not otherwise being met within the community or jurisdiction of the claimant? Describe.

21. Where appropriate, are these specialized transportation services coordinated with other transportation services? Describe.

**SCMTD & RTC Only**

22. List the recommendations provided in your last Triennial Performance Audit and your progress toward meeting them.
   - Describe the work your agency has undertaken to implement each performance audit recommendation and the steps it will take to fully implement the recommendation.
   - For any recommendations that have not been implemented, explain why the recommendation has not been implemented and describe the work your agency will undertake to implement each performance audit recommendation.
   - Describe any problems encountered in implementing individual recommendations.

1. Santa Cruz METRO should continue to work closely with SCCRTC and AMBAG to secure state and federal funding to replace its aging fleet as soon as feasible. 
   *Santa Cruz METRO has solicited and obtained support from AMBAG and SCCRTC for its successful grant applications which will fund 10-12 new CNG buses. SCCRTC and Santa Cruz METRO’s state and federal legislative agenda seek to increase state and federal funding for public transit.*

2. Santa Cruz METRO should work closely with SCCRTC, Community Bridges and the Volunteer Center to develop an SRTP update, including the following plan elements:
   - Financially sustainable public transportation service levels;
   - Vehicle replacement needs for the Santa Cruz METRO and Community Bridges; and
− Development of comprehensive performance goals, objectives and measurable standards.

Santa Cruz METRO does not currently have funding to undertake a comprehensive Short Range Transit Plan, although it is implementing a transit study funded by AMBAG for the Watsonville/South County transit service area to evaluate current and future service with projected financial needs and expectations.

The FY08-FY12 Short Range Transit Plan established goals, objectives and performance measures for operations, planning and customer service which are applied to current performance measures reported annually to the SCCRTC.

4. Santa Cruz METRO should consider developing a succession plan for its general manager and other possible departures of senior staff.

Santa Cruz METRO will consider this recommendation as staffing needs evolve. The General Manager extended his contract with the Santa Cruz METRO Board of Directors through December 2011. Near term, potential service changes leave required staff levels, including senior management, uncertain at this time.

Santa Cruz METRO has met the duties and responsibilities of a recent management departure with in-house staff.

5. Santa Cruz METRO should continue to work with staff from the SCCRTC and the AMBAG to better align and streamline planning procedures to avoid possible delays in project delivery on future federally funded transit projects.

Santa Cruz METRO will continue to work with SCCRTC and AMBAG staff through the Interagency Technical Advisory Committee and AMBAG’s interregional planning group of state and federal funding agencies to maintain progress on federally funded projects.

Santa Cruz METRO has improved its participation on specific planning grants.

**SCMTD Only**

23. Farebox Recovery Ratio: (split out=urbanized service vs. non-urban service farebox ratios for prior year and year-to-date)

Please see the tables on the following page for Urban vs. Rural Farebox recovery ratios. Because Santa Cruz METRO interlines rural and urban routes, segregating farebox revenue from each service area is not possible. The rural farebox recovery ratio is derived from budget estimates in FTA 5311 applications for rural operating assistance in FY10 and FY11.
### Farebox Recovery Ratio: Urban vs. Rural FY11<sup>(1)</sup>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funds</th>
<th>Urbanized</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fare Revenue</td>
<td>$7,727,523</td>
<td>$252,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local support Revenues</td>
<td>24,393,190</td>
<td>767,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation Costs</td>
<td>31,344,101</td>
<td>1,255,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fare Ratio</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers/Year&lt;sup&gt;(2)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5,361,192</td>
<td>205,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost/Ride</td>
<td>$5.85</td>
<td>$6.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>(1)</sup> FY11 Budget and FY11 FTA 5311 application est. of rural cost. Does not include ParaCruz Dept. costs or revenue

<sup>(2)</sup> Projected from FY11 YTD ridership and FY11 FTA 5311 application ridership estimate.

### Farebox Recovery Ratio: Urban vs. Rural FY10<sup>(3)</sup>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funds</th>
<th>Urbanized</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fare Revenue</td>
<td>$7,509,176</td>
<td>$331,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local support Revenues</td>
<td>22,613,715</td>
<td>943,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation Costs</td>
<td>30,084,605</td>
<td>1,472,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fare Ratio</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers/Year&lt;sup&gt;(4)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5,520,148</td>
<td>230,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost/Ride</td>
<td>$5.45</td>
<td>$6.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>(3)</sup> FY10 Projected Actual Budget and FY10 FTA 5311 application estimate of rural cost. Does not include ParaCruz Dept. costs or revenue

<sup>(4)</sup> FY10 final riderhip with rural ridership based upon FY10 5311 application est.

**Note:** Exemptions for calculating operating costs – **spell out in your operating budget summary.**

- Service extensions are exempt until two years after the end of the fiscal year during which they were established (PUC Sec. 99268.8). This exemption applies only if the new service was not provided nor was funded by LTF/STA during any of the prior three fiscal years.
- The additional operating costs to a transit operator of providing comparable complementary paratransit services, pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, that exceed operator’s prior year costs as adjusted by the CPI are excluded from operating cost.

24. Current fare & local support revenue to operating cost ratio versus FY1978-79 ratio (for services to the general public).

- Current ratio ((sum of fare revenues + local support) ÷ operating cost): **59.2%**
- FY1978-79 Ratio: **56.9%**
25. Did the SCMTD operating budget increase over 15% from the prior fiscal year? NO, the operating budget decreased by 3.6%.

*If the answer is yes, please provide a statement identifying and substantiating the reason or need for the increase in the transit operating budget in excess of 15% above the preceding year, and identify substantial increases or decreases in the scope of operations or capital provisions for major new service - (transit claimants only, if applicable).*

26. Operating statistics (compare current fiscal year to date to last three full fiscal years; *TDA required performance indicators), submit items from the following list.

Please see Santa Cruz METRO Performance Indicators FY08–FY11 YTD on the Following Page

- Annual passengers
  - Rides/passenger trips provided by type (student, senior, adult, pass holders, etc, or however stat’s kept) and amount of TDA $ used for each type of ride.
  - In FY10 TDA paid $0.74 for each fixed-route passenger trip and $8.15 for each ParaCruz trip.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Fixed Route</th>
<th>UC Student</th>
<th>UC Staff</th>
<th>Cabrillo</th>
<th>Full Fare</th>
<th>Tickets</th>
<th>S/D Fare</th>
<th>Day Pass S/D Day Pass</th>
<th>Pacific Shores</th>
<th>Total Ridership</th>
<th>Wheelchair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,252,530</td>
<td>153,509</td>
<td>295,432</td>
<td>1,092,955</td>
<td>84,887</td>
<td>135,406</td>
<td>17,066</td>
<td>1,399,010</td>
<td>5,449,413</td>
<td>24,196</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Annual service hours
- Passengers per vehicle service hour*
- Annual service miles
- # of fixed-route miles
- Passengers per vehicle service mile*
- Average passengers per weekday
- Total operating costs in budget
- Operating cost per vehicle service hour*
- Total operating cost per passenger*
- Average Farebox Revenue per passenger (describe what is included)
- # of FTE employees (all employees, not just drivers)
- Vehicle Service hours/Employee*
- # of routes
- Average route length
- Average travel times/ride
- # of bus stops
- # of vehicles in operation
- # of monthly bus passes in circulation
- Max vehicles in service at any time:
- Hours of service:
- Approximate # of unduplicated passengers
- Cost per unit of service plus text about long range plans to make/keep this low
- Funds and percentage spent on administration/overhead/grantee allocation/etc
- Actual financials compared with budget
- Actual number of rides provided compared with goal and text about whether goal was met and why/why not
### Santa Cruz METRO Performance Indicators FY08 – FY11 YTD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating Expenses</th>
<th>FY08</th>
<th>FY09</th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>FY11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Fixed-Route Expenses</td>
<td>$29,605,178</td>
<td>$29,106,833</td>
<td>$26,692,199</td>
<td>$16,526,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 17</td>
<td>$1,722,320</td>
<td>$1,786,045</td>
<td>$1,783,991</td>
<td>$1,755,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit</td>
<td>$3,602,134</td>
<td>$3,626,157</td>
<td>$3,868,580</td>
<td>$2,448,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL Operating Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>$34,929,632</strong></td>
<td><strong>$34,519,035</strong></td>
<td><strong>$32,344,770</strong></td>
<td><strong>$20,730,457</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating Revenue</th>
<th>FY08</th>
<th>FY09</th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>FY11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fixed-Route Fares</td>
<td>$3,530,971</td>
<td>$3,386,252</td>
<td>$3,240,488</td>
<td>$2,054,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract (Fixed-Route)</td>
<td>$3,127,596</td>
<td>$3,590,053</td>
<td>$3,448,625</td>
<td>$1,773,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 17 Fares</td>
<td>$897,606</td>
<td>$1,034,204</td>
<td>$1,072,469</td>
<td>$584,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 17 Payments</td>
<td>$482,056</td>
<td>$436,551</td>
<td>$427,759</td>
<td>$268,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ParaCruz</td>
<td>$229,769</td>
<td>$322,124</td>
<td>$238,603</td>
<td>$137,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL Passenger Revenue</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,267,998</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,769,184</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,427,944</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,817,890</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Revenue</th>
<th>FY08</th>
<th>FY09</th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>FY11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax</td>
<td>$17,054,736</td>
<td>$14,923,142</td>
<td>$14,320,288</td>
<td>$8,849,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Transit Administration</td>
<td>$3,153,552</td>
<td>$3,615,707</td>
<td>$4,025,687</td>
<td>$3,078,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Development Act</td>
<td>$6,313,334</td>
<td>$5,696,249</td>
<td>$5,001,737</td>
<td>$2,496,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. Revenue</td>
<td>$1,708,562</td>
<td>$719,312</td>
<td>$326,159</td>
<td>$170,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL Non-Passenger Revenue</strong></td>
<td><strong>$28,230,184</strong></td>
<td><strong>$24,954,409</strong></td>
<td><strong>$23,673,871</strong></td>
<td><strong>$14,594,583</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System Information</th>
<th>FY08</th>
<th>FY09</th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>FY11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directional Route Miles</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Bus Stops</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Routes</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Active Fleet</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Bus in-svc. (WD)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total METRO Employees</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Hour Per Employee</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Fixed-Route Performance</th>
<th>FY08</th>
<th>FY09</th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>FY11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ridership</td>
<td>5,522,943</td>
<td>5,708,338</td>
<td>5,449,056</td>
<td>2,980,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Hours</td>
<td>202,108.2</td>
<td>202,148.72</td>
<td>202,645.38</td>
<td>110,840.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Miles</td>
<td>2,733,823.8</td>
<td>2,740,218.24</td>
<td>2,745,456.13</td>
<td>1,497,303.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers Per Hour</td>
<td>27,332,733</td>
<td>28,242,824</td>
<td>26,892,89</td>
<td>26,892,89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers Per Mile</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost Per Passenger</td>
<td>$5.67</td>
<td>$5.41</td>
<td>$5.23</td>
<td>$6.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Per Passenger</td>
<td>$1.21</td>
<td>$1.22</td>
<td>$1.23</td>
<td>$1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farebox Recovery</td>
<td>22.49%</td>
<td>23.97%</td>
<td>25.06%</td>
<td>23.16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highway 17 Performance</th>
<th>FY08</th>
<th>FY09</th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>FY11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ridership</td>
<td>270,044</td>
<td>318,582</td>
<td>301,104</td>
<td>146,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Hours</td>
<td>21,760.9</td>
<td>21,705.1</td>
<td>21,633.4</td>
<td>11,778.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Miles</td>
<td>532,247.6</td>
<td>569,084.7</td>
<td>579,769.3</td>
<td>340,310.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers Per Hour</td>
<td>12.41</td>
<td>14.68</td>
<td>13.92</td>
<td>12.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers Per Mile</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost Per Passenger</td>
<td>$6.38</td>
<td>$5.61</td>
<td>$5.92</td>
<td>$11.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Per Passenger</td>
<td>$3.32</td>
<td>$3.25</td>
<td>$3.56</td>
<td>$3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farebox Recovery</td>
<td>52.12%</td>
<td>57.90%</td>
<td>60.12%</td>
<td>33.31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fixed-Route Totals</th>
<th>FY08</th>
<th>FY09</th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>FY11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ridership</td>
<td>5,792,987</td>
<td>6,026,920</td>
<td>5,750,160</td>
<td>3,127,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Hours</td>
<td>223,869</td>
<td>223,854</td>
<td>224,279</td>
<td>122,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Miles</td>
<td>3,266,071</td>
<td>3,309,303</td>
<td>3,325,225</td>
<td>1,837,614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Per Revenue Hour</td>
<td>$139.94</td>
<td>$138.00</td>
<td>$126.97</td>
<td>$149.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers Per Hour</td>
<td>25.88</td>
<td>26.92</td>
<td>25.64</td>
<td>25.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers Per Mile</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Per Passenger</td>
<td>$1.43</td>
<td>$1.46</td>
<td>$1.47</td>
<td>$1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Per Passenger</td>
<td>$5.41</td>
<td>$5.13</td>
<td>$4.95</td>
<td>$5.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidy Per Passenger</td>
<td>$3.98</td>
<td>$3.67</td>
<td>$3.49</td>
<td>$4.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ParaCruz Performance</th>
<th>FY08</th>
<th>FY09</th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>FY11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ridership</td>
<td>87,713</td>
<td>93,279</td>
<td>94,074</td>
<td>54,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Hours</td>
<td>39,333.0</td>
<td>44,631.1</td>
<td>43,256.2</td>
<td>25,571.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Miles</td>
<td>572,750.0</td>
<td>636,901.0</td>
<td>611,882.4</td>
<td>367,899.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers Per Hour</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers Per Mile</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Per Passenger</td>
<td>$2.62</td>
<td>$3.45</td>
<td>$2.54</td>
<td>$2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farebox Recovery</td>
<td>6.38%</td>
<td>8.88%</td>
<td>6.17%</td>
<td>5.60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Documentation to Include with your Claim:**

**All Claims**
- A letter of transmittal addressed to the SCCRTC Executive Director that attests to the accuracy of the claim and all its accompanying documentation.
- Statement from the TDA Eligible Claimant indicating its role and responsibilities.

**Article 8 Bicycle/Pedestrian Claims**
- Evidence of environmental review for capital projects

**All Transit and Specialized Transportation Claims (SCMTD, CTSA, and Volunteer Center)**
- A copy of the operating and capital budgets for the coming fiscal year
- Description of capital projects, including time frame over which project will be funded and implemented
- Operating Plan for current and upcoming activities – can be within project description

**Article 4 Transit Claims**
- A certification from the California Highway Patrol (completed within the last 13 months) indicating that the operator is in compliance with Section 1808.1 of the Vehicle Code.
- Other Certifications

---

**Local Agency Certification:**

This TDA Claim has been prepared in accordance with the SCCRTC’s Budget, SCCRTC’s Rules and Regulations, and Caltrans TDA Guidebook (http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/MassTrans/State-TDA.html). I certify that the information provided in this form is accurate and correct. I understand that if the required information has not been provided this form may be returned and the funding allocation may be delayed.

Signature: [Signature]

Title: Finance Manager and Acting Assistant General Manager

Date: March 31, 2011
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During FY10, Santa Cruz METRO maintained service on all routes but showed declining ridership on both local fixed-route service and on the Highway 17 Express. ParaCruz ridership increased slightly. Capital projects included ordering replacement buses and paratransit vans, functional operation of the $16 million MetroBase Maintenance Facility and the move of administrative offices to a renovated building on Vernon Street. Santa Cruz METRO maintained all services at the previous year’s level during a second year of depressed revenues resulting from the economic recession. Lower than expected fuel costs in FY10 only partially offset diminished sales tax revenue.

On the local fixed-route service, ridership and performance indicators dropped from the previous year:
- Ridership fell by 259,282, a 4.5% decline from 5,708,338 to 5,449,056 annual passenger trips.
- Passengers per hour declined from 28.2 to 26.9
- The farebox recovery ratio increased from 22.6% to 23.5% due to decreased fuel costs.
- Minor schedule changes adjusted time points.
- Daily adjustments and fill-ins on UCSC service contributed to a 0.2% increase in revenue hours over last fiscal year.

Highway 17 Express ridership showed a significant decline due to continued high unemployment and low fuel prices:
- Ridership dropped from 318,582 to 301,104, a decline of 5.5% from FY09 ridership, which ended the trend of year-over-year ridership increases since FY04 (excluding FY06 due to the operators’ strike).
- The Highway 17 Express operated essentially the same level of service as last year, and Santa Cruz METRO continued its practice of modifying trip schedules to meet the greatest number of Caltrain and Amtrak train departures and arrivals at Diridon Station in San Jose.
- Santa Cruz METRO approved a 25% fare increase for Highway 17 Express beginning June 2010 in order to maintain optimal farebox recovery.
- The farebox recovery ratio rose to 60.1% of operating costs, an increase of 3.8% due to reduced fuel costs and increased passenger revenue.
Santa Cruz METRO ParaCruz ridership showed a typical year-over-year increase, although the rate of increase slowed substantially:

- Ridership grew 0.9% from 93,279 to 94,074 trips.
- Revenue hours dropped from 44,631 to 43,256 and passengers per hour increased, showing good improvements from prior performance measures.
- The farebox recovery ratio dropped from 8.8% to 6.2% even though performance measures improved. This resulted directly from last year’s one-time receipt of contracted fare revenue which dramatically increased the FY09 farebox recovery ratio.

Due to federal regulations regarding charter bus services, Santa Cruz METRO did not operate dedicated special event services. Santa Cruz METRO did run additional open-door service between UCSC and the Boardwalk to accommodate heavier than normal transportation demand during UCSC’s Fall Frolic.

During FY10, Santa Cruz METRO’s capital projects included ordering replacement vans and buses. Santa Cruz METRO ordered 27 ADA new paratransit vans for ParaCruz with ARRA funding. These vans will replace ParaCruz vans which have exceeded their useful life. Five new low-floor CNG buses for the Highway 17 Express service were ordered with Measure A funding made available from the Santa Clara County Valley Transportation Authority (VTA). These buses will replace 1981 diesel buses used for the Highway 17 Express. Santa Cruz METRO now operates 62% of its active fleet on CNG fuel (64 CNG buses in the active fleet of 102 buses).

MetroBase consolidation advanced significantly during FY10 with the addition of two new buildings to the clustered operation in Harvey West Business Park.

- Santa Cruz METRO substantially completed the new Maintenance Facility on Golf Club Drive and began performing maintenance in the new building in April 2010.
- Administrative departments moved into the renovated Administration Facility at 110 Vernon Street on December 4, 2009.
- Bid documents to solicit a construction contract for a new Operations Facility on River Street are ready and waiting, but the delay in receipt of FY10 and FY11 Prop 1B Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement and Service Enhancement Account (PTMISEA) precludes moving forward. Santa Cruz METRO will solicit construction bids for the Operations Facility when PTMISEA revenue becomes available.

Santa Cruz METRO started capturing cost savings from decreased lease payments in the operating budget as MetroBase developed. The impact of owning versus leasing property will become more evident in FY11 with the elimination of some lease payments over an entire year rather than the partial year’s benefit accrued in FY10.

In a favorable change to operating revenue sources, California restored State Transit Assistance (STA) funding above former levels in FY10 by enacting the gas tax swap on March 22, 2010. In order to bolster public transit operating revenue temporarily, the gas tax
swap also suspended through FY12 the limitations on STA revenue, which in the past could be used only in Santa Cruz METRO’s capital budget.

On the other hand, the state and local sales tax revenue for public transit remains depressed. Although local tax revenue seems to be slowly recovering, Santa Cruz METRO’s operating budget projects that sales tax revenue will lag nearly $3 million below FY08 levels through FY12. Transferring reserve funds into the operating budget together with what now is known to have been a temporary reduction in fuel prices enabled Santa Cruz METRO to maintain the same level of service in FY10 as in FY09. Inevitably rising fuel prices and curtailing the unsustainable draw on reserve accounts will exacerbate operating revenue shortfalls.