AGENDA

Thursday, March 4, 2010
9:00 a.m.

NOTE LOCATION THIS MONTH
Board of Supervisors Chambers
701 Ocean St
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            Antonio Rivas
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           Tony Campos
Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District Dene Bustichi
Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District Ron Graves
Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District Marcela Tavantzis

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 February 4, 2010 regular SCCRTC meeting

5. Approve draft minutes of the February 18, 2010 Transportation Policy Workshop meeting

6. Accept draft minutes of the February 9, 2010 Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee meeting

7. Accept draft minutes of the February 11, 2010 Budget & Administration/Personnel 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
9. Approve staff recommendation on Proposition 1B Transit Security Funds for Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (Resolution)

**ADMINISTRATION ITEMS**

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

11. Accept meeting schedules for SCCRTC Committees and invite Commissioners to participate

**INFORMATION/OTHER ITEMS**

12. Accept monthly meeting schedule

13. Accept correspondence log

14. Accept letters from SCCRTC committees and staff to other agencies - None

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

16. Accept information items
   a. Article from *ACCESS*, Fall 2009, Number 35 titled “TOD and Carsharing: A Natural Marriage”
   b. Article from *ACCESS*, Fall 2009, Number 35 titled “Traffic Congestion and Greenhouse Gases”

**REGULAR AGENDA**

17. Commissioner reports-oral reports

18. Appoint Commissioners to Budget & Administration/Personnel Committee – oral report
   *(Randy Johnson, Commission Chair)*

19. Director’s report – oral report
   *(George Dondero, Executive Director)*

20. Caltrans report and consider action items
   a. Construction projects report

21. Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 8 Allocation Claim from the City of Scotts Valley for its citywide sidewalks project
   *(Karena Pushnik, Senior Transportation Planner)*
a. Staff report
b. Resolution approving City of Scotts Valley Article 8 TDA claim

22. State and federal legislation
   (Grace Blakeslee, Transportation Planner)
a. Staff report
b. Questions and answers about the Local Taxpayer, Public Safety and Transportation Protection Act
c. Proposed draft language for the Local Taxpayer, Public Safety and Transportation Protection Act
d. Excerpts from Legislative Analyst Office on Governor’s proposed FY 10-11 budget
e. League of California Cities summary on Senate alternative to gas tax swap proposal

23. Fiscal Year (FY) 09-10 budget and work program
   (Luis Mendez, Deputy Director)
a. Staff Report
b. Resolution amending the FY 09-10 budget and work program as proposed in Exhibit A
c. Actual and estimated Transportation Development Act revenues

24. Fiscal Year (FY) 10-11 budget and work program
   (Luis Mendez, Deputy Director)
a. Staff Report
b. Resolution approving the proposed FY 10-11 budget and work program
c. Actual and estimated Transportation Development Act revenues

25. Review of items to be discussed in closed session

   CLOSED SESSION

26. Conference with Real Property Negotiator Pursuant to Government Code 54956.8 for acquisition of the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line Property: 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

27. Conference with Labor Negotiators Pursuant to Government Code 54957.6
   
   Commission Negotiators: George Dondero and Yesenia Parra
   Bargaining Units: Mid-Management Unit and General Representation Unit
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 is scheduled for March 18, 2010 at 9:00 am at the SCCRTC Offices, 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA.

   The next SCCRTC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, April 1, 2010 at 9:00 a.m. at the Board of Supervisors Chambers, 701 Ocean St., Santa Cruz CA.

HOW TO REACH US

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

Thursday
February 4, 2010
9:00 a.m.

Watsonville City Council Chambers
275 Main St
Watsonville CA 95076

1. Roll call

The meeting was called to order at 9:08 am.

Members present:
Tony Campos  Randy Johnson
Neal Coonerty  Don Lane
Ron Graves  Kirby Nicol
Donald Hagen (Alt)  Ellen Pirie
Michelle Hinkle (Alt)  Antonio Rivas
Rich Krumholz (ex officio)  Mark Stone

Member absent:  John Leopold

Staff present:
George Dondero  Luis Mendez
Kim Shultz  Yesenia Parra
Gini Pineda  Grace Blakeslee
Rachel Moriconi

2. Oral communications

Jack Nelson said that a tiny one watt light bulb, when used by hundreds of millions of people, will generate energy that will eventually warm the ocean and melt the ice sheets, causing sea levels to rise.

3. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agendas

Executive Director George Dondero said that there were add-on pages for Items 6 and 15 and that copies of the February 4th Good Times were
distributed. He asked to pull Item 6 from the consent agenda. Chair Johnson said that it would be taken prior to Item 14 on the regular agenda.

Commission Alternate Hagen said that Cabrillo College is struggling to pay for its bus pass subsidies and asked if the RTC could help. George Dondero said that staff will research the request.

CONSENT AGENDA (Pirie/Rivas) approved unanimously as amended

MINUTES

4. Approved draft minutes of the January 14, 2010 regular commission meeting

5. Accepted draft minutes of the January 21, 2010 Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC) meeting

POLICY ITEMS

No consent items

PROJECTS and PLANNING ITEMS


BUDGET AND EXPENDITURES ITEMS

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

8. Accepted FY08-09 fiscal audit for the SCCRTC

ADMINISTRATION ITEMS

No consent items

INFORMATION/OTHER ITEMS

9. Accepted monthly meeting schedule

10. Accepted correspondence log

11. Accepted letters from RTC committees and staff to other agencies

   a. Letter to the Santa Cruz Metro Transit District from the Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee regarding the draft Title VI policy/programs and the Disadvantaged Business Enterprise goals
b. Letter to the California Coastal Commission from RTC Executive Director George Dondero regarding support for the Arana Gulch Master Plan

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

13. Accepted information items
   b. Excerpt from San Jose Mercury of December 20, 2009 titled “I-880 - the road we love to hate: Mr. Roadshow’s Dirty Dozen”

REGULAR AGENDA

13.1 Approve staff recommendation regarding the Sustainable Transportation and Access Rating System (STARS) Technical Advisory Committee – removed from consent agenda – Taken out of Order from the Consent Agenda

Executive Director George Dondero said that in addition to the two proposed additional members specified in the written staff report, he proposed a third additional member to the STARS Technical Advisory Committee, Paul Schoellhamer, is well qualified with transportation issues, having served as Chief of Staff for the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. Mr. Schoellhamer is interested in joining the committee and lives in south county.

Commissioner Pirie moved and Commission Alternate Hagen seconded to approve the staff recommendations to add Lisa Dobbins, J.C. Jack McKellar and Paul Schoellhamer to the STARS Technical Advisory Committee. The motion passed unanimously.

14. Commissioner reports

Referring to the Commute Solutions article in the February 4 Good Times magazine, Commissioner Pirie shared that the gas mileage of her Toyota Prius improved 5 miles per gallon after properly inflating an underinflated tire on her car.

15. Director’s report – oral report
   (George Dondero, Executive Director)

Executive Director George Dondero said that the Commute Solutions Program was highlighted as the cover story for the February 4, 2010 Good Times weekly magazine. In addition to giving Commute Solutions the lead article and a cover photo, the issue included a pullout Commuter Resource Guide to be used by readers in the future. All commuters can also enter a drawing for prizes by pledging to improve gas mileage, carpooling or riding the bus one day a week. Mr. Dondero congratulated staff members Tegan Speiser and Nathan Luedtke for working with Good Times staff on the issue and recognized
GT publisher Ron Slack for his commitment to sharing information about local commuting resources.

Mr. Dondero said that he and Commissioner Mark Stone would be attending CalCOG Capitol Day on February 17th in Sacramento. They will meet with legislators to discuss the RTC’s legislative priorities. He reported that he and Deputy Director Luis Mendez met with state Senator Joe Simitian to discuss possible sponsorship of a bill to update the Service Authority for Freeways and Expressways (SAFE) statute.

16. Welcome new commissioners and solicit committee preferences
   (George Dondero, Executive Director)

George Dondero welcomed incoming Commissioner Ron Graves who is one of the three representatives from the Santa Cruz Metro Transit District. He asked that Commissioners wishing to serve on the Budget & Administration/Personnel Committee contact Chair Johnson or Executive Director Dondero by February 12th. In addition, he recommended that the Rail Acquisition Committee be disbanded due to the stage of negotiations, the Commission has had regular closed session and there has not been a need for the Rail Acquisition Committee to meet.

Mr. Dondero thanked outgoing Commissioner Pat Spence for her service.

Commissioner Stone moved and Commissioner Pirie seconded to approve the staff recommendations that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC):

1. Disband the Rail Acquisition Committee, and
2. Ask individual Commissioners to inform the RTC Chair or Executive Director by February 12th of their preferences regarding serving on the RTC’s Budget and Administration/Personnel Committee.

The motion passed unanimously.

17. Caltrans report and consider action items

Rich Krumholz, Caltrans District 5, said that the Caltrans budget is sustained in the proposed FY10-11 state budget and that the gas tax swap would pay for bond debt service and help the general fund. He advised that project sponsors be ready for any additional stimulus money coming from the federal government and noted that the $2.3 billion that California received for rail will mainly be used for new high speed rail projects although some funding will be directed towards upgrading existing Caltrain and inter-city rail lines.

18. Housing within Reach Workshop Series – sponsorship

Executive Director George Dondero said that while the Housing Within Reach workshop series includes a workshop where transportation will be discussed
and is a worthwhile project, the RTC’s budget is already overly impacted; therefore, staff recommends that the RTC not sponsor the workshop series.

Rick Longinotti summarized the workshop and emphasized the necessity to improve access to jobs, stores and schools by creating affordable housing so that people are not forced to commute out of the area in order to live in Santa Cruz.

Commissioner Rivas noted that the workshop series was focused on the City of Santa Cruz and did not include the City of Watsonville or the rest of the County and moved to approve the staff recommendations that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) not sponsor the Housing within Reach workshop series of Transition Santa Cruz with a donation of $500.00. Commissioner Campos seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

19. Programming potential Federal Jobs Bill funds

Senior Planner Rachel Moriconi presented the staff report saying that while it is unclear how much, if any, new funding will be available for projects in Santa Cruz County, it is important for the RTC to select projects to receive projected funds so that project sponsors can meet the tight deadlines. She said that under the best case scenario the RTC could receive as much as $13 million in funding and recommended approving the proposed project ready list. Projects that would be ready to award contracts within a 90-day deadline include paving and road repair projects in each jurisdiction, Phase 2 of the Green Valley Road Rehabilitation project and the Graham Hill Road Improvement project.

Commissioners discussed whether requiring project sponsors to add accessibility improvements to project descriptions would impede projects from being ready within the anticipated 90 day deadline. It was noted that this requirement was recommended only “where appropriate and feasible”.

Chris Schneiter, City of Santa Cruz Public Works, said that projects sponsored by the City of Santa Cruz have already incorporated accessibility improvements as part of the design and the feasibility language in the recommendation would not impede any projects from meeting deadlines.

Commissioner Johnson suggested that the language be changed to “feasible within funding deadlines”.

Commissioner Rivas moved and Commissioner Pirie seconded to approve the staff and the Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC) recommendations that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC):
1. Distribute the maximum amount anticipated from a potential new stimulus bill to local jurisdictions by population formula toward projects that could be awarded (under contract) within 90 days of enactment of the bill contingent on provisions of the final bill and with totals for each agency to be adjusted proportionally based on the actual amounts of stimulus funds available to the region;

2. Reevaluate projects if the final bill or state actions include less stringent deadlines for award of funds or make additional funding available to the region, in order to ensure that the most appropriate projects in the region receive these new funds;

3. Authorize staff, in consultation with project sponsors, to redirect funds to backup projects, if projects are at risk of missing deadlines established in the bill or by Caltrans or the CTC; and

4. Require project sponsors to add bicycle lanes, cross-walk striping, curbcuts/access ramps, and other accessibility improvements as part of projects, where appropriate and feasible within funding deadlines.

Additional staff recommendations are that the RTC:

1. Approve $12.7 million in projects to receive potential stimulus funds that come directly to the region (est. $5.8 million), plus the region’s formula share of State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) stimulus funds that would come through the CTC (est. $6.3 million), plus $575,000 of the region’s unprogrammed STIP balance, distributed to local jurisdiction by population formula as shown in Attachment 1 – Scenario A; and

2. Request that the CTC allocate an additional $2,671,000 in STIP stimulus funds to the Graham Hill Road Safety Project to replace STIP funds currently programmed to the project, as a second priority to road repairs (as requested by County Public Works), if some of the funds flow through the STIP.

Jack Nelson said that he would like to see the RTC provide leadership saying that the Commission was willing to fund millions for Highway 1 but could not spare $500 to sponsor the Housing within Reach workshop series.

The motion passed unanimously.

20. Highway 1 Soquel/Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes project – pre-construction activities

Senior Planner Kim Shultz said that the recommendation before the Commission is in response to the June direction that the RTC become responsible for administering the construction phase of the Highway 1 Soquel/Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes project. He said Parsons Brinckerhoff, the construction management consultant, will conduct pre-construction activities associated with administering the construction phase of the project. He described the project’s budget reductions that would allow for the contract to
be implemented this fiscal year. Mr. Shultz said that a full progress report will be presented at the April RTC meeting.

Commissioner Pirie moved and Commissioner Lane seconded to approve the staff recommendations that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) approve a resolution authorizing a contract with Parsons Brinckerhoff in the amount of $22,000 to conduct specified preconstruction activities and to amend the FY 2009/2010 Budget to allocate $22,000 in savings from other line items in the Auxiliary Lanes project budget.

The motion (Resolution 17-10) passed unanimously.

21. Review of items to be discussed in closed session

The meeting adjourned into closed session at 10:17 am.

**CLOSED SESSION**

22. Conference with Real Property Negotiator Pursuant to Government Code 54956.8 for acquisition of the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line Property: 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

23. Conference with Legal Counsel – Anticipated Litigation. Initiation of litigation to be considered pursuant to subdivision (c) of Government Code Section 54956.9 for one case.

**OPEN SESSION**

The meeting reconvened into open session at 12:05

24. Report on closed session

There was nothing to report.

The meeting adjourned at 12:07 pm.

The next Transportation Policy Workshop meeting is scheduled for Thursday, February 18, 2010 at 9:00 a.m. at the SCCRTC office, 1523 Pacific Ave, Santa Cruz, CA
The next SCCRTC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, March 4, 2009 at 9:00 a.m. at the Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors Chambers, 701 Ocean St., 5th floor, Santa Cruz, CA

Respectfully submitted,

Gini Pineda, Staff

ATTENDEES

Jack Nelson
Joel Staker
Chris Schneiter       Santa Cruz City Public Works
Rick Longinotti
1. Introductions

Chair Mark Stone called the meeting to order at 9:03 am. Self introductions were made.

Commissioners present:

Dene Bustichi  
Tony Campos  
Ron Graves  
Norm Hagen (Alt)  
Randy Johnson  
Don Lane

Commissioner absent:  Antonio Rivas

2. Oral communications

Charles Huddleston imagined Santa Cruz in 2025 with the rail line purchased and run by electricity. He encouraged Commissioners to proceed with purchase of the rail line and consider electricity to power future trains.

Jack Nelson expressed concern about government “greenwashing” of environmental issues and quoted author James Hansen who faulted government agencies for saying that they support green policies, but take no action to put the policies in place.

Les White asked that people contact state-level elected officials and ask them to oppose the governor’s proposed gas tax swap because of the devastating effect it will have on transit. Mr. White also said that asking legislators to insist that Regional Transportation Planning Agencies, such as the RTC, become the
repositories for taxes, in the event that the gas tax swap becomes a reality, would protect transit funding more than if the tax revenues were distributed by AMBAG.

3. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agendas

Executive Director George Dondero said that there were add-on pages for Item 6. He said that the closed session will be taken before the open session and that the open session will reconvene with Item 6 followed by Items 4 and 5.

The Commission adjourned into closed at 9:12 am

7. Review of items to be discussed in closed session – Taken out of order after Item 3

CLOSED SESSION

9. Conference with Labor Negotiators Pursuant to Government Code 54957.6 – Taken out of order after Item 7

Commission Negotiators: George Dondero and Yesenia Parra

Bargaining Units: Mid-Management Unit and General Representation Unit

8. Conference with Real Property Negotiator Pursuant to Government Code 54956.8 for acquisition of the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line Property: Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line from Watsonville Junction to Davenport – Taken out of order after Item 9

Agency Negotiator: Kirk Trost, Miller Owen & Trost

Negotiation Parties: SCCRTC, Union Pacific

Under Negotiation: Price and Terms

OPEN SESSION

10. Report on closed session

There was nothing to report.

CONSENT AGENDA

No consent items
REGULAR AGENDA

6. Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line Acquisition – Revised Uniform Transit Application (Luis Mendez, Deputy Director) – Taken out of order after closed session

Deputy Director Luis Mendez delivered the staff report and said that the addition of a passenger rail component to the Proposition 116 application would help make the application stronger. He noted that state law does not require an Environmental Impact Report for an active rail line.

Commissioners discussed the flexibility of the plans once the application is submitted, whether the funds would have to be returned if the agency could not afford to run the passenger rail, and if there was a required amount of time that the recreational rail would have to continue to be in service.

Mr. Mendez said that the Proposition 116 language states that funds are to be used to provide for passenger rail, but just by preserving the rail line it is preserved for future passenger rail. He added that the California Transportation Commission (CTC) has never asked that funds be returned.

Commissioners discussed obtaining a standard agreement to clarify CTC requirements, the business plan and the probability of the STIP funds being available, given the state’s current economic climate.

Mike Hart, Sierra Railroad, said he is very confident that the recreational rail will be successful. He said that Sierra Railroad deals with travel groups for the other dinner trains that they operate and that the basic business plan for the Santa Cruz line is in place. He said that a detailed plan will take a few months to develop and that the rail line will not have to be subsidized.

Public comment was taken.

Bill Comfort presented two alternatives to the staff recommendation to change the policy recommending an environmental impact report for passenger rail. One alternative was to use the existing Big Trees excursion train service and the other was to complete an EIR for the “dinner train” after submitting the Proposition 116 application.

Charles Huddleston encouraged going forward with the acquisition process.

Micah Posner agreed that the RTC should make the strongest proposal possible in applying for funding.

Georgiana Clark, Big Trees Railroad, said that she deals with travel groups and the public and would like to bid on providing the recreational service to Davenport.
Bruce Sawhill said that the railroad has been in Santa Cruz since the 1870s and that it is a resource that should be owned and used by the public.

Marilyn O’Rourke said that she is concerned that the state will consider the Proposition 116 application deceptive. She disagreed with the recommendation to change the RTC policy regarding the Environmental Impact Report and asked if hazardous materials would be carried on the line.

Bill Malone said it is a good idea to add the recreational rail element.

Peter Scott endorsed speedy pursuit of the funding.

Commission Alternate Andy Schifrin said that it would be a mistake to remove the requirement to conduct an environmental impact report on the passenger rail for the mid county area, noting that an EIR was done for the section of rail line from Santa Cruz to Watsonville. He moved to approve the staff recommendations, with a change to the fourth recommendation, that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC):

1. Review and approve with revisions as appropriate the attached revised draft uniform transit application for $10.2 million in Proposition 116 funds and $10 million in State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds for acquisition of the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line right-of-way (ROW) for corridor preservation, rail line improvements & recreational passenger rail service from Santa Cruz to Davenport;
2. Adopt a resolution authorizing the Executive Director to submit a Uniform Transit Application and allocation request for $10.2 million in Proposition 116 funds and $10 million in STIP funds for acquisition of the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line ROW for corridor preservation, rail line improvements and recreational passenger rail service from Santa Cruz to Davenport;
3. Direct staff to seek letters of support from legislators, business groups, community groups, agencies and individuals in support of the above mentioned uniform transit application; and
4. Revise Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy 2.4.6 to state, “Retain the option of future in-county passenger rail service for when it is financially feasible, acceptable to the community and, except for the line segment between the Yacht Harbor in Santa Cruz and Davenport, only after the completion of an environmental impact report.”

Commissioner Leopold seconded the motion.

Commissioners continued to discuss the staff recommendation to remove the self-imposed policy of requiring an environmental impact report for future in-county passenger rail service. It was noted that applying for the Proposition 116 funds does not mean that the RTC is going to buy the rail line.

The motion (Resolution 18-10) passed with Commissioner Johnson voting “no“.
4. Release of the 2010 Draft Regional Transportation Plan – Taken out of order after Item 6

Commissioners Stone and Campos departed the meeting. Commissioner Johnson chaired the remainder of the meeting.

Transportation Planner Grace Blakeslee gave the staff report saying that the 2010 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) is a minor update to the 2005 RTP with a more extensive update planned for 2012. Executive Director George Dondero said that the chapter on greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions recognizes some of the initiatives currently underway to address GHG issues but that significant challenges are posed because specific direction from the state and sufficient modeling information is not available. He noted that the analysis presented by the study *Moving Cooler* was the primary resource used for the GHG chapter.

Commissioners discussed concerns about some of the strategies proposed to meet emissions reductions, saying that certain suggestions from the groundbreaking study *Moving Cooler, an Analysis of Transportation Strategies for Reducing Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, did not apply to Santa Cruz. Concerns included that language regarding HOV lanes applied to existing lanes as opposed to creating new HOV lanes, that Santa Cruz lacked “expressways”, that Santa Cruz already has access to zip cars, that pricing strategies have a higher impact on low income communities and that an equity analysis might be helpful, and that more information was needed before a decision on “bottleneck relief” was made. The executive summary of *Moving Cooler* will be shared with Commissioners.

Executive Director Dondero said that the chapter could be expanded somewhat, but noted that the draft RTP is scheduled to be released March 1st and a public hearing held at the April 1st RTC meeting. He stressed that the Commission is not being asked to adopt the recommendations in the chapter as policies.

Responding to Commissioner concerns, Mr. Dondero said that including a list of goals for the RTC to achieve in order to reduce GHG emissions could be beneficial even if the Commission does not have the funding to put the goals into practice because it shows awareness of the issues and the steps the RTC would take if funding were available.

Commission Alternate Schiffrin moved and Commissioner Pirie seconded to approve the staff recommendations to:

1. Review and provide input on the proposed new greenhouse gas chapter of the RTP;
2. Authorize staff to release the Draft 2010 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Report (SDEIR) for public review March 1- April 15, 2010;
3. Schedule a public hearing on the Draft RTP and EIR for April 1, 2010 with additional direction to consider the comments made by Commissioners today.

Commissioner Graves asked that the Governor’s quote on page 4-5 be removed from the chapter. The maker and second agreed.

**Jack Nelson** said that he sees the chapter as laying a foundation for future RTPs, but that he thought there were factual errors regarding HOV lanes. He added that a vehicle miles traveled (VMT) tax is a regressive tax charging the same rate for gas guzzlers as for more fuel efficient vehicles.

The motion passed unanimously.

5. **Highway 1 HOV Lanes Project Sustainable Transportation and Access Rating System (STARS)**

Senior Planner Kim Shultz said that the STARS Technical Advisory Committee met on February 5th and proposed 12 credits for evaluating the Highway 1 HOV Lanes project. Mr. Shultz said that the committee, using a menu of potential credits, chose 12 credits that would fit within the time and budget constraints of the project and which were not addressing issues already being addressed in the environmental documents required for the project. It was noted that additional credits could be applied for after the project is completed.

Commission Alternate Schiffrin departed the meeting.

After discussion, Commissioner Bustichi moved and Commissioner Pirie seconded to approve the staff recommendations that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) approve development of the twelve credits identified by the STARS Technical Advisory Committee shown in Attachment 1 for evaluation and application to the Highway 1 High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Lanes Project.

**Bill Malone** said that he is concerned that the STARS system could be used as a tool to justify the end product. He said that part of the methodology described when STARS was first introduced to the Commission was that a project was analyzed when it is started and alternative transportation methods investigated. He encouraged the Commission to take this approach with the highway widening saying that credibility depends on it.

The motion passed unanimously.

11. **Next meetings**

The meeting adjourned at 12:03 pm.
The next SCCRTC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, March 4, 2010 at 9:00 a.m. at the Board of Supervisors Chambers, 701 Ocean St, Santa Cruz, CA.

The next Transportation Policy Workshop is scheduled for March 18, 2010 at 9:00 am at the SCCRTC Offices, 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA.

Respectfully submitted,

Gini Pineda

ATTENDEES

Charles Huddleston
Jack Nelson
Howard Sosbee
Les White  SCMTD
Georgiana Clark  Big Trees Railroad
Patrick Mulhearn  Assemblymember Monning
Bill Comfort
Peter Scott  CFST
Spike Alper  CFST
Mike Hard  Sierra Railroad
Bruce Sawhill
Bill Malone
Marilyn O'Rourke
Micah Posner  People Power
Jack Nelson
MINUTES-DRAFT
Thursday, February 9, 2009

1. Call to Order

John Daugherty called the meeting to order at 1:32 pm

2. Introductions

Members Present:
Hal Anjo, Social Service Provider-Seniors (County)
Lisa Berkowitz, CTSA-Community Bridges
Sharon Barbour, 5th District
John Daugherty, Metro
Veronica Elsea, 3rd District
Sally French, Social Service Provider - Disabled (Hope Services)
Clay Kempf, Seniors Council
Mike Molesky, Social Service Provider - Disabled
Catherine Patterson Valdez, Community Bridges

Excused Absences:
Debbi Brooks, Volunteer Center
Tom Crain, Potential Transit User (Disabled)

Others Present:
Charlie Dixon
Harlan Glatt, Metro
MaryLou Goeke, United Way
Theresia Rogerson, County Health Services, CTSC
Majid Yamin, City of Scotts Valley

Alternates Present
Sandra Coley, 4th District
April Warnock, Metro

Staff Present:
Cory Caletti
Cathy Judd
Karena Pushnik

3. Oral Communications

Cory Caletti presented the draft online version of the Hazard Report Form for both bicycle and pedestrian hazards. She requested feedback from E&D TAC members by Friday, February 12th. She pointed out the features of the form including the ability to insert a picture. Cory said that the second phase could include monitoring the feedback from the local jurisdictions and informing members of the public who reported the hazard on actions taken. She addressed why the RTC acts as a clearinghouse for reporting the hazard reports saying that often individuals are confused as to which jurisdictions the hazard they are reporting should be sent. The RTC facilitates this reporting process so that the complaint is submitted to the correct department, jurisdiction or agency.

Lisa Berkowitz told members about classes presented by the Caregiver Action Group available at Cabrillo College Extension from March through May and open to family caregivers or career minded individuals. Individuals will be certified once they have completed all four of the classes.
Lisa also announced the 4th annual Meals on Wheels coin drive which is happening through the end of February. Donations can be made at any Bay Federal Bank branch in the County.

Catherine Patterson Valdez let members know that the steering committee for the Access to Health Care is a direct outcome of the Mobility Outreach and Education Project (MORE) and they are offering transportation, medication, and housing services for individuals with cancer living in the Salinas area.

John Daugherty said that a lawsuit between the California Department of Transportation and Californians with Disabilities Rights along with others has been settled with an agreement to budget for access improvements throughout the state that are under Caltrans jurisdiction.

Charlie Dixon informed members that the Arana Gulch Master Plan and ADA trails will go before the Coastal Commission in March on the 10th, 11th or 12th. He is asking for Chair John Daugherty and Vice-chair Tom Crain to testify in support of the elderly and disabled before the Coastal Commission at that meeting. In light of the committee's earlier position of support for the Master Plan, he supplied sample letters and requested members to submit them individually to the Coastal Commission in support of the Arana Gulch Master Plan by Tuesday, February 16th.

Karena Pushnik informed members that the cover story for the current Good Times is a series of articles regarding the different alternative transportation and commute solutions programs administered by the RTC and other agencies, along with a pull out section resource guide.

4. **Additions and Deletions - None**

CONSENT AGENDA

*Action: The motion (Elsea/Patterson Valdez) to approve and accept the consent agenda carries unanimously.*

5. **Approved Minutes from December 8, 2009 meeting**

6. **Received Transportation Development Act Revenues Report as of January 2010**

7. **Received RTC Highlights from December 09 and January 2010**

8. **Approved letter from E&D TAC to Metro regarding input on the Draft Title VI Policy/ Program and the Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Goals**

9. **Received letter from RTC to Coastal Commission dated 1/21/10 regarding support of Arana Gulch Park Master Plan**

10. **Received Information Items circulated at meeting:**

a. **Easter Seals Project Action Mobility Planning Service**

b. **Governor Schwarzenegger appointment to State Rehabilitation Council**

c. **Santa Cruz Sentinel article dated 12/20/09 titled: Mayor rebuts ‘facts’ on Arana Gulch Plan**

d. **Santa Cruz Sentinel article regarding women cabbies**
11. Received Agency Updates
   a. Volunteer Center
   b. Community Bridges/CTSA
      - FY 09-10 First Quarter Report and January CTSA Board Report
   c. Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (METRO)
      - ParaCruz Operations Status Report: December 09 - January 10
   d. Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
   e. Private Operators

REGULAR AGENDA

12. TDA Claim from City of Scotts Valley

Majid Yamin, City of Scotts Valley Public Works Department, provided an overview of the TDA claim for the City of Scotts Valley in the amount of $93,315 to install sidewalks on Bean Creek Road along the frontage of Scotts Valley Middle School. He said that bike lanes using Bicycle Transportation Accountability funds had been transferred to fund this sidewalk project but there was not enough to complete the project due to the slope of the embankment. He requested that the E&D TAC recommend that the RTC approve Scotts Valley's share of TDA funds to complete the project. Any remaining money will be used to install curb ramps or other sidewalks in locations within the City of Scotts Valley to be decided by the City Council after priorities have been determined.

Action: The motion (Molesky/Elsea) to recommend to the Commission to approve the TDA claim for the City of Scotts Valley for sidewalk installation on Bean Creek Road with the reserve to be used to implement ADA compliant sidewalk projects in Scotts Valley carries unanimously.

13. METRO Website Update - Metro Staff

Harlan Glatt gave a detailed overview of the proposed new Metro website including a new feature which allows the viewer the ability to go from English to Spanish text with the click of a button on the home page. He pointed out details on each page and showed members how to navigate to features of interest and provided the link, http://beta.scmtd.com to access the beta site. Members were informed that they could access the beta version of the website and view all features and provided instructions if they were interested in sending feedback (click the Beta Testers button on the home page and register to join the group once in the Santa Cruz Metro Website Beta Test Community). Harlan added that new laminated stickers showing specific routes, maps and timetables would be installed at all bus stops throughout the county and a new system map would be included in the Headways.
Members voiced concerns pertaining to ADA-compliant color contrast for web pages on the site, the height of the new route/timetable sticker installation at bus stops for ease of viewing by those in wheelchairs, turn-by-turn route information for sight impaired, the name of the customer service/report request form (“ticket” confusing), and problems with the captcha (anti-spam code) at the bottom of the customer support ticket submittal page for the sight impaired to report an incident.

Harlan took notes on items discussed and will take the information back to see what changes, if any, could be implemented. An update will be presented at the May or July E&D TAC meeting.

14. MORE Program Report – Community Bridges

Due to the length of the Metro website update, Catherine Patterson Valdez was not able to stay and present her information but asked members to read the report and call or email her with questions or comments. Her presentation will be rescheduled for the July E&D TAC meeting.

15. Regional Transportation Plan update – RTC staff

Karena Pushnik provided an overview of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update saying that the Draft 2010 RTP and Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (DSEIR) are scheduled for release and public review from March 1st through April 15th. The documents will be available for review on the RTC website and at most public libraries. The RTC will hold a public hearing on the draft plan at its April 1, 2010 meeting. Since the April E&D TAC meeting is two days before the comment period closes, she wanted to give the E&D TAC advanced notice and recommend that members be prepared to review and provide comments on the document before deadline.


Karena Pushnik provided an overview of the updated process for the Unmet Needs list saying that it is not necessarily project specific, but can help identify and prioritize projects to be included in RTP. Included in the list are transit needs also. The committee will have another opportunity to review/augment the list in April with the E&D TAC Annual Report. The Commission will adopt the Unmet Needs list at its May meeting. Members discussed reprioritizing specific needs and matching the high priority ranking to that used by the Transit District.

Action: Motions were taken individually on each of the following items and carry unanimously.
- Item 2 moves from H to H1 priority (Berkowitz/Molesky)
- Item 7 moves from M to H priority and Items 1, 3, 4, 8 move from H to H2 (Kempf/Molesky)
- Item 9 moves from H to H1 priority (Barbour/Anjo) with Clay Kempf abstaining.
- Items 10 and 11 move from H to H1 (Kempf/French)

Action: The motion (Barbour/Elsea) to extend the meeting for an additional 15 minutes carries unanimously.
17. **E&D TAC Position Update – RTC Staff**

Chair John Daugherty said that Ben Morada who represents private operators will be submitting his resignation which will leave his position and his alternate position along with others vacant. RTC Staff Karena Pushnik will be doing some outreach to fill positions. Karena asked for those who opted to renew their committee membership to return their signed renewal applications.

18. **Receive oral status report about Pedestrian Safety Work Group – Work Group Chair**

Veronica Elsea reported that the Pedestrian Safety Work Group is preparing their draft report regarding sidewalk maintenance issues to present to the Commission at its May meeting. She said that it will be brought before the E&D TAC in April for input. She said that there have been 2 rounds of meetings with the all local jurisdictions within the County and that draft report lays out the status of sidewalk networks in the County with primary focus on property owner responsibility for maintenance and how the cities and county oversee the process for ensuring safe and accessible sidewalks. Karena Pushnik mentioned that local jurisdictions will have a chance to review the draft document before it becomes a public document via its inclusion in the April E&D TAC agenda.

19. **Next meeting**: Tuesday, April 13, 2010 at 1:30 pm. **MEETING LOCATION TO BE DETERMINED** (Items: TDA claims, Ped Safety Work Group Draft Report, Finalize Unmet Needs list)

20. **Adjourned at 3:50 pm**

*Prepared by: Cathy Judd, SCCRTC Staff*
Attendees: Members: Commissioner Alternate Donna Ziel
Commissioner Antonio Rivas
Commissioner John Leopold
Commissioner Alternate Andy Schiffrin
Commissioner Ellen Pirie

RTC Staff: George Dondero, RTC staff
Yesenia Parra, RTC staff
Luis Mendez, RTC staff
Daniel Nikuna, RTC staff
Grace Blakeslee, RTC staff

1. Introductions –Self introductions were made

2. Additions or changes to consent and regular agenda

   Deputy Director Luis Mendez distributed replacements for pages for 9-10 and 10-20.

3. Oral communications - None

   CONSENT AGENDA

4. Approved the December 10, 2009 meeting minutes
5. Accepted monthly TDA revenue report

6. Accepted first and second quarter FY 09-10 quarterly warrants reports and monthly credit card reports

**REGULAR AGENDA**

7. Payroll services for RTC staff

Yesenia Parra, Administrative Services Officer presented the staff report. She said that the Santa Cruz County Auditor’s office notified the RTC that effective June 2010, the County would no longer be able to provide payroll services for the RTC. She reported that an RFP has been released and that the goal is to have a payroll service contract in place by May 1, 2010 to allow for some overlap with the County payroll department.

Commissioners discussed various concerns and requested that staff keep the Commission informed throughout the process.

8. Disability insurance for RTC staff

Yesenia Parra, Administrative Services Officer reported that the County General Representative unit voted to switch their current disability coverage from Harford Insurance to the State Disability Program effective immediately. The County Risk Manager notified the RTC that they would not renegotiate the disability insurance coverage with Hartford for the general representative employees therefore the RTC Community of RTC Employees (CORE) will lose their coverage through Hartford Insurance. Mrs. Parra also reported that after the Budget and Administration/Personnel committee packet had been mailed, the RTC learned that the County would no longer be able to provide any of the ancillary benefits currently contracted for all RTC employees.

She reported that staff has begun to request official quotes for all of the ancillary benefits from various vendors including Special District Risk Management Authority (SDRMA). Commissioners directed staff to share all information regarding these benefits with the Commission before making a final decision.

9. Amendments to the fiscal year FY 09-10 budget and work program

*(Luis Mendez, Deputy Director)*

Deputy Director Luis Mendez presented the proposed amendments to the FY 09-10 budget. He reported that the new TDA estimate is 0.55% below the previous estimate and that the January 2009 payment was 13.61% below the new estimate. This does however still leave 2.47% in TDA reserves. He also reviewed some corrections to the Transit Intern
budget, as well as to the AB2766 grant line.

Commissioner asked staff to clearly show the money coming from the reserve.

Commissioner Leopold moved and Commissioner Alternate Ziel seconded the staff recommendation to amend the FY 09-10 budget and work program.

Motion passed unanimously

10. Fiscal Year FY 10-11 budget and work program

(Luis Mendez, Deputy Director)

Deputy Director Luis Mendez reviewed several new grants included in the FY 10-11 budget as well as proposed reductions to the budget including reductions to the bike to work program and the Community Safety coalition’s TDA revenues. He also said that it is anticipated that the construction of the Auxiliary lanes would begin at the end of FY 10-11 so the budget does reflect that. He also reminded commissioners that the fall budget amendment would include any carry over funds.

He reported the loss of a half-time planning intern position due to the full expenditure of grant funds paying for that position. He reviewed the proposal to fill the half-time planning technician position left vacant last year by a retiring employee. He reported that staff continues to look for potential revenue stream, for example, staff is working with SAFE program to increase the DMV fee by $1.00, and staff has also requested the full possible STIP allocation of $300,000.

Commissioners asked that staff show the funds allocated to the Community Safety Coalition more clearly. Commissioners also stated a concern that the proposed budget does not include staff AVTO or furloughs especially given that all the other agencies are still requiring that their employees continue with furloughs.

Commissioner Leopold moved and Commissioner Rivas seconded the staff recommendation to recommend to the RTC that the FY 10-11 budget and work program be approved with the following modifications:

- Bike to Work program and Community Traffic Safety Coalition TDA allocations to remain the same as in Fy09-10
- Change the work program to reflect the management of the rail rather than the purchase of the rail
- Make the corrections to the work program lines for RTP to reflect 2012 not 2010

Motion passed unanimously
Commissioner Pirie departed the meeting at 4:25 pm

11. Review of items to be discussed in closed session

12. Yesenia Parra, Administrative Services Officer reported that the Community of RTC (CORE) and the RTC Association of Middle Management (RAMM) MOU’s would be discussed.

13. Oral and written communications regarding closed session – none

Meeting adjourned into closed session at 4:30 pm

CLOSED SESSION

14. Conference with Labor Negotiators Pursuant to Government Code 54957.6

Commission Negotiators: George Dondero and Yesenia Parra

Bargaining Units: Mid-Management Unit and General Representation Unit

15. Report on closed session -none

OPEN SESSION

16. Adjournment- meeting adjourned at 4:47

The next Budget and Administration/Personnel Committee meeting is scheduled for Thursday, April 8, 2010 at 3:30 p.m. in the CAO Conference Room, 5th Floor, 701 Ocean St., Santa Cruz

Respectfully submitted,

Yesenia Parra, Staff

ATTENDEES

Angela Aitkin
SCMTD

Rahn Garcia
County Counsel
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>FY08-09 ACTUAL REVENUE</th>
<th>FY09-10 ACTUAL REVENUE</th>
<th>FY09-10 ESTIMATE 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>570,200</td>
<td>454,800</td>
<td>454,800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUGUST</td>
<td>760,200</td>
<td>539,000</td>
<td>646,170</td>
<td>-107,170</td>
<td>-16.59%</td>
<td>90.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPTEMBER</td>
<td>634,334</td>
<td>719,093</td>
<td>539,184</td>
<td>179,909</td>
<td>33.37%</td>
<td>104.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTOBER</td>
<td>567,100</td>
<td>490,500</td>
<td>499,048</td>
<td>-8,548</td>
<td>-1.71%</td>
<td>103.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOVEMBER</td>
<td>756,100</td>
<td>555,900</td>
<td>665,368</td>
<td>-109,468</td>
<td>-16.45%</td>
<td>98.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECEMBER</td>
<td>700,859</td>
<td>625,785</td>
<td>616,756</td>
<td>9,029</td>
<td>1.46%</td>
<td>98.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANUARY</td>
<td>538,600</td>
<td>465,300</td>
<td>538,600</td>
<td>-73,300</td>
<td>-13.61%</td>
<td>97.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEBRUARY</td>
<td>590,700</td>
<td>620,400</td>
<td>590,700</td>
<td>29,700</td>
<td>5.03%</td>
<td>98.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCH</td>
<td>578,624</td>
<td>620,400</td>
<td>578,624</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRIL</td>
<td>432,400</td>
<td>464,400</td>
<td>432,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>464,400</td>
<td>464,400</td>
<td>464,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE</td>
<td>606,615</td>
<td>606,615</td>
<td>606,615</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>7,200,133</td>
<td>4,470,778</td>
<td>6,632,665</td>
<td>-79,848</td>
<td>-1.20%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
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AGENDA: March 4, 2010

TO: Regional Transportation Commission (RTC)

FROM: Grace Blakeslee, Transportation Planner

RE: Proposition 1B Transit Security Funds

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC):

1. Adopt a resolution (Attachment 1) designating the RTC’s share of FY09/10 Proposition 1B Transit Security Funds to the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (Metro), approving Metro’s proposed projects, authorizing staff to submit applications for the funds on behalf of Metro, and authorizing staff to execute any agreements necessary to receive and pass-through funds to Metro.

BACKGROUND

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

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

As part of the annual State Budget, the legislature determines how much funding to appropriate to Proposition 1B programs. For the last two years, the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) has designated its share of Proposition 1B Transit Security funds to Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (Metro) for comprehensive transit security improvements and video surveillance systems.
DISCUSSION

In FY10, $60 million in California Transportation Security Grant Program funds (CTSGP) have been appropriated to eligible agencies and transit operators. Of that amount, $440,505 is designated for Santa Cruz County. $212,337 is apportioned to the SCCRTC and $228,168 to Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (Metro). Metro requests that the SCCRTC designate its share of FY09/10 Proposition 1B Transit Security funds to Metro. This will allow Metro to continue security enhancements begun last year, including facilities surveillance, upgrade of interoperable radio communications and a Transit Center emergency alert system, and to move and install an emergency generator (Attachment 2). Project proposals are due to the California Emergency Management Agency by March 8, 2010.

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) approve a resolution (Attachment 1) designating the RTC’s share of FY09/10 Proposition 1B Transit Security Funds to the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (Metro) for a comprehensive transit security project and to facilitate the move and installation of an emergency generator, authorizing staff to submit applications for the funds on behalf of Metro to the California Emergency Management Agency, and authorizing staff to execute any agreements necessary to receive and pass funds through to Metro.

SUMMARY

Proposition 1B included $1 billion in bonds for transit security projects. Staff recommends that the RTC designate the RTC’s share of FY09/10 funds to Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District for a comprehensive transit security project.

Attachments:
1. Resolution Designating Proposition 1B Transit Security Funds to Metro
2. Request Letter from Metro
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RESOLUTION NO.

Adopted by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
on the date of March 4, 2010
on the motion of Commissioner
duly seconded by Commissioner

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

WHEREAS, the Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air
quality, and Port Security Bond Act of 2006 (Proposition 1B) and
its enabling legislation designated $1 Billion in bonds for the
California Transit Security Grant Program (CTSGP or Proposition
1B Transit Security);

WHEREAS, the Proposition 1B Transit Security funds are
available to agencies and transit operators eligible to receive
State Transit Assistance funds pursuant to Sections 99313 and
99314 of the Public Utility Code (PUC);

WHEREAS, applications to the California Emergency Management
Agency (Cal-EMA) for Proposition 1B Transit Security funds must
be submitted through, and approved by, county transportation
commissions;

WHEREAS, the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District
(METRO) requests that the Santa Cruz County Regional
Transportation Commission designate its allocation of Proposition
1B Transit Security funds to METRO; and

WHEREAS, METRO proposes to use all of the region’s FY09/10
Proposition 1B Transit Security funds for security enhancement
projects that are consistent with the Regional Transportation
Plan and in conformance with the CTSGP Guidelines;

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

1. The FY09/10 allocation of Proposition 1B California Transit
   Security Grant Program funds for Santa Cruz County are
   hereby programmed to Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit
   District (METRO) for projects that increase protection from
   security or safety threats against public transit riders,
   stations, facilities and equipment;

2. The Executive Director, or their designee, is authorized to
   submit applications for FY09/10 Proposition 1B Transit
   Security funds to the California Emergency management
   Agency on behalf of METRO;

3. The Executive Director, or their designee, is hereby
   authorized to execute for and on behalf of the Santa Cruz
County Regional Transportation Commission any agreements and actions necessary for the purpose of obtaining financial assistance provided by the California Emergency Management Agency and for allocating the region’s share of FY09/10 Proposition 1B California Transit Security Grant Program funds to METRO.

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

______________________________
Randy Johnson, Chair

ATTEST:

______________________________
George Dondero, Secretary

Distribution: OHS; Tom Hiltner, SCMTD; RTC Programming
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TO: Regional Transportation Commission
FROM: Karena Pushnik, Senior Transportation Planner
RE: Reappointments to the Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee

RECOMMENDATION

The Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC) and staff recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission approve two 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 December 2009 meeting, the E&D TAC directed staff to contact members who’s terms expired and recommend to the RTC that their terms be renewed if they were interested. The following members requested to renew their positions:

- Reappointment to member position representing Social Service Provider representing Disabled Individuals in county: Michael Molesky – Mr. Molesky is a board member of the Central Coast Alliance for Health, a locally governed non-profit health plan that serves over 188,000 members in Santa Cruz, Monterey and Merced counties. The Alliance operates the Medi-Cal, Healthy Families and Healthy Kids program in Santa Cruz County.

- Reappointment to the member position representing the 5th Supervisorial District: Sharon Barbour – Ms. Barbour lives in the San Lorenzo valley and operates an accessible taxi serving many of the community’s seniors and people with disabilities.

Attached are the applications submitted by these individuals (Attachment 1) and a revised roster (Attachment 2) showing the recommended appointments in bold. The E&D TAC and staff recommend that the reappointments for Michael Molesky and Sharon Barbour be approved.
Staff is in the process of actively recruiting for other vacant member and alternate positions. Vacant member positions include those representing: Private Operators, 1st Supervisorial District, 2nd Supervisorial District, and the 4th Supervisorial District. For the latter position, there is an alternate who serves to represent this district. However, the committee currently lacks bilingual/bicultural representatives and is seeking at least one nominee to represent that community. Membership applications can be found on the RTC’s website.

**SUMMARY**

The E&D TAC and staff recommend that the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission approve reappointments for the positions representing the 5th Supervisorial District and Social Service Providers – Disabled (County).

Attachments:
1. Committee Appointment Applications for Michael Molesky and Sharon Barbour
2. E&D TAC Roster
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:  MICHAEL MOLESKY
Home address:  1440 JOSE AVE #315 S.C. CA 95062
Mailing address (if different):  

Phone: (home) 476-9220 (business/message) 
E-mail: 

Length of residence in Santa Cruz County:  22 years
Position(s) I am applying for:  Any appropriate position
   E/D TAC

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

10-3
### 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>CCAH</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vice Chair</td>
<td>92-to-date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IHSS PubAly</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Current 2001-2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDA-TAC</td>
<td>SCCR&amp;C 152-5 PACIFIC SOC. SERV. PROV. CO</td>
<td></td>
<td>97-current</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: [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
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: Sharon L. Barbour
Home address: 13180 Oak St, Boulder Creek, CA 95006
Mailing address (if different): P.O. Box 1355
Boulder Creek, CA 95006
Phone: (home) 338-6647 (business/message) 345-6586
E-mail: SharonLBarbour@Yahoo.com

Length of residence in Santa Cruz County: 16 years

Position(s) I am applying for: □ Any appropriate position
☑ 5th District

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

I was a member of E+DTAC from 1997-2001.
I left because of time conflicts with my job. I was
chair of E+DTAC in 1998, and Transportation Excellence
award from the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation
Commission in 1999.

I have been a member of MASTF since 1995, and MASTF
chair since 2002. I received a MASTF certificate of
appreciation in 1999 and in 2004. 10-5
### 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>E+DTAC</td>
<td>Santa Cruz County</td>
<td>Member - 5th Dist</td>
<td>5-97 - 9-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>chair</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASTF</td>
<td>Santa Cruz County</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>9-95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Accessible Services Transit</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bus services chair, vice</td>
<td>2-98 to 11-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forum</td>
<td></td>
<td>chair, chain</td>
<td>12-01 to 11-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUG</td>
<td>Santa Cruz County</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>10-95 to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Users Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulder Creek</td>
<td>Boulder Creek</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>2000-2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation &amp; Park District</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vice chair, chair</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2001</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](Sharon L Bartlow)  
9 Feb 2010  

**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

1:/E&D/Members/Committee Appointment Application.doc  
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Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission’s
ELDERLY & DISABLED TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE (ED/TAC)
and SOCIAL SERVICES TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COUNCIL (SSTAC)

Membership Roster
March 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Representing</th>
<th>Alternate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clay Kempf</td>
<td>Social Service Provider - Seniors</td>
<td>Patty Talbot (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2011)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hal Anjo</td>
<td>Social Service Provider - Seniors (County)</td>
<td>vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2013)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally French</td>
<td>Social Service Provider - Disabled</td>
<td>vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2012)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Michael Molesky</strong></td>
<td>Social Service Provider - Disabled (County)</td>
<td>vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2009)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Brooks</td>
<td>Social Service Provider - Persons of Limited Means</td>
<td>Lois Connell (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2010)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Berkowitz</td>
<td>CTSA (Community Bridges)</td>
<td>Bonnie McDonald (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2011)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Patterson Valdez</td>
<td>CTSA (Lift Line)</td>
<td>Sam Storey (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2009)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Daugherty, Chair</td>
<td>SCMTD (Metro)</td>
<td>April Warnock (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2012)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Morada</td>
<td>Private Operator</td>
<td>vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2012)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donella Bloebaum</td>
<td>Potential Transit User (60+)</td>
<td>vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2012)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Crain, Vice Chair</td>
<td>Potential Transit User (Disabled)</td>
<td>vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2009)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Year in Parentheses) = Membership Expiration Date
## Membership Roster (March 10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Representing</th>
<th>Alternate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisorial District Representatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vacant</td>
<td>1st District</td>
<td>vacant</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>Veronica Elsea</td>
<td>3rd District</td>
<td>Thom Onan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vacant</td>
<td>4th District</td>
<td>Sandra Coley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Campos)</td>
<td>(2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sharon Barbour</strong></td>
<td>5th District</td>
<td>vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2009)</td>
<td>(Stone)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Staff

Karena Pushnik, Transportation Planner, RTC, 460-3210, kpushnik@sccrtc.org
To: Regional Transportation Commission
From: Yesenia Parra, Administrative Services Officer
RE: Invitation to Attend Meetings of RTC Advisory Committees

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) consider this invitation to periodically attend meetings of its advisory committees.

BACKGROUND

The RTC has three advisory committees who meet regularly and provide input to the RTC on decisions being considered. The RTC advisory committees have suggested that RTC Commissioners periodically attend RTC advisory committee meetings.

DISCUSSION

In light of their suggestion, meeting schedules for the three RTC advisory committees – the Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee, the Bicycle Committee and the Interagency Technical Advisory Committee – are provided in Attachment 1. A brief description of each committee’s role is also provided below. Please Note: Meetings may be subject to change so it is a good idea to verify the meeting date, time, and location when planning to attend.

Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC)  
(Staffed by Senior Planner Karena Pushnik)  
The E&D TAC is a group of transportation providers, social service agencies and members of the public who meet every two months to advise the RTC and its member agencies on planning, funding and policy for specialized transportation to serve the county's seniors and people with physical disabilities and/or limited economic means. The E&D TAC also serves as the Social Services Transportation Advisory Council pursuant to Transportation Development Act (TDA) statutes.

Bicycle Committee (Bike Committee)  
(Staffed by Senior Planner Cory Caletti)  
The Bike Committee is comprised of volunteers from throughout the county and is charged with advising the RTC and its member agencies on bicycle-related activities. The Committee meets monthly to review proposed bike projects, plans, funding applications and legislation; provide input on existing roadway/bikeway conditions affecting cycling; monitor bicycle hazards; approve applications for the RTC’s Bike Secure Program and coordinate with local jurisdictions and bicycle-related organizations to promote cycling projects and programs.
Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC)
(Staffed by Senior Planner Rachel Moriconi)
Made up of members from a variety of jurisdictions and agencies, the ITAC works to coordinate regional transportation capital improvement projects and transportation planning programs. In addition, they serve as a technical and planning forum for local jurisdictions, SCMTD, AMBAG, UCSC and the TMAs. The committee reviews staff recommendations for funding transportation projects through such funding programs as the Surface Transportation Program (STP), the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) Program and the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). This forum enables consideration of technical and policy issues and makes recommendations to the Commission in these areas.

SUMMARY

The RTC has three advisory committees who meet regularly and provide input to the RTC. The advisory committees invite members of the RTC to periodically attend their committee meetings. Staff recommends that the RTC consider this invitation.

Attachment 1: 2010 Committee Meeting Schedules for the E&D TAC, Bike Committee and ITAC

S:\RTC\TC2010\TC0310\MeetingInvite to Commissioners.doc
Meeting Schedule for 2010

Unless otherwise noted, all committee meetings will be held at the Commission offices at 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz.

**E&D TAC**

The E&D TAC meets the second Tuesday of even numbered months at 1:30 pm except July.

- April 13
- June 8
- August 10
- October 12
- December 7

**BIKE COMMITTEE**

The Bike Committee meets the second Monday of each month at 7:00 pm except July.

- March 8
- April 12
- May 10
- June 7
- August 9
- September 13
- October 11 (subject to change for holiday)
- November 8
- December 13

**ITAC**

The ITAC meets the third Thursday of each month at 1:30 pm except July.

- March 18
- April 15
- May 20
- June 17
- August 19
- September 16
- October 21
- November 18
- December 16
### Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission

**THREE MONTH MEETING SCHEDULE**  
**MARCH 2010 through MAY 2010**  
(Revised 2/24/10)

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>03/04/10</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Commission</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/08/10</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td><strong>Bicycle Committee - Cancelled</strong></td>
<td>7:00 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/18/10</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Transportation Policy Workshop</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/18/10</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Interagency Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/01/10</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Commission</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/08/10</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Budget and Administration/Personnel Committee</td>
<td>3:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/12/10</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>4/13/2010</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Elderly &amp; Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/15/10</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Transportation Policy Workshop</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/15/10</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Interagency Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/06/10</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Commission</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Capitola City Council Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/10/10</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td><strong>Bicycle Committee - Cancelled</strong></td>
<td>7:00 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/20/10</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Transportation Policy Workshop</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/20/10</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Interagency Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec’d/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/10</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>John J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/25/10</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Stedman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/22/10</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/27/10</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>Pirie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/28/10</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Francine</td>
<td>Troyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/01/10</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/02/10</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Calate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>TO First</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/03/10</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>02/03/10</td>
<td>CJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/03/10</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/03/10</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>Karen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/04/10</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Steve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/04/10</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Barbara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/04/10</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Barbara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/04/10</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dianne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incomming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/04/10</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dianne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/04/10</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/04/10</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/07/10</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/08/10</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/08/10</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Luis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/09/10</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>David</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Letter Rec’d/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/11/10</td>
<td>Letter O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ingoing</td>
<td>John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/12/10</td>
<td>Letter O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ingoing</td>
<td>Bob</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/12/10</td>
<td>Letter O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ingoing</td>
<td>David</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/12/10</td>
<td>Letter I</td>
<td></td>
<td>Outgoing</td>
<td>Randy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/14/10</td>
<td>Email I</td>
<td></td>
<td>Outgoing</td>
<td>GP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/16/10</td>
<td>Letter O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Outgoing</td>
<td>Donn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/16/10</td>
<td>Letter O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Outgoing</td>
<td>Donn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>TO</td>
<td>FROM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/17/10</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Marilyn O'Rourke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/18/10</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>CTC</td>
<td>George Dondero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/18/10</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Don Heichel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/19/10</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Caltrans, District 5</td>
<td>George Dondero</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From: David Eselius [mailto:deselius@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, February 07, 2010 5:09 PM
To: DG Eselius (envelop)
Subject: eLetter ~ The Tannery bicycle path does nothing to improve the Highway 1 and Highway 9 intersection

Sunday, February 07, 2010

From: David G. Eselius
Santa Cruz, California

To: Santa Cruz County Regional Transition Commission (RTC), members

CC: Santa Cruz City Council, members
Capitola City Council, members
Watsonville City Council, members
Scotts Valley City Council, members
Santa Cruz County Supervisors, members
Santa Cruz Sentinel

Subject: The Tannery bicycle path does nothing to improve the Highway 1 and Highway 9 intersection

Dear, RTC members

The Santa Cruz City Council is building a bicycle path to connect the Tannery 100 unit low income “art” housing units to the downtown area via the San Lorenzo River west levee. The Tannery housing unit cost was over $30 million and it appears the unit was financed and is owned by city taxpayers/bank.

The bicycle path connection is complex to design and build. I estimate that build total cost is over $3-million (or about 10% of the 100-unit housing complex). The path serves only the Tannery 100 unit housing complex.

The complexity and expense of the bicycle path construction is caused by building the path under the Highway 1 Bridge, within the river’s yearly flood zone, and within the Army Core of Engineers’ San Lorenzo River flood control system. The 54-foot bridge over the San Lorenzo River is necessary.

Over the years, the traffic load at the Highway 1 and Highway 9 intersection has increased, the level of service has decreased, and the level of safety has decreased. The Tannery bicycle path does nothing to improve the Highway 1 and Highway 9 intersection.

It is unlikely that the Santa Cruz City Traffic Impact Fee Fund has any money in it. If so, for the City Council to pay for their bicycle path there will be a “loan” to the Traffic Impact Fee Fund from the City General Fund.

"Caltrans scrutiny raises cost of Highway 1 underpass"

15-1
By J.M. BROWN
Posted: 02/07/2010

SANTA CRUZ -- After several delays caused by storms and what public works officials called "unusually high interest" from the state's transportation agency, construction of a new bicycle and pedestrian underpass below Highway 1 is expected to be completed by May.

The 800-foot pathway under Highway 1 from the River Street area to the Tannery Arts Center is designed to make it easier to navigate the busy intersection of Highways 1 and 9. The pathway will include a 54-foot bridge over the San Lorenzo River.

The City Council approved bidding the project in February 2009, and construction was supposed to begin last month. But storms in October, December and in recent weeks delayed the work.

The contractor's $661,000 bid is far under the original [February 2009] $1 million anticipated for the project's total cost, but costs have grown in recent months as crews have had to meet a heightened level of inspection by Caltrans, which governs part of the property and requires permits to make the improvements. Officials did not cite specifics about Caltrans' concerns, but the matter caused city staff to spend additional time providing documents and inspection for the project.

"Caltrans was making sure that the contractor was following their specs to the letter of the law," said Mark Dettle, public works director. "We did not budget enough for that type of specificity."

Susana Cruz, a Caltrans spokeswoman, said, "This is a complicated project, but the city and state are working well together to get the project completed. We are sure the project will provide a great benefit to the community once it's completed."

Tuesday, public works officials will ask the City Council to approve another $200,000 to help offset the additional costs. The city's general fund won't take the hit.

Rather, the money will come from the city's Traffic Impact Fee, which developers pay to help minimize the effects of traffic around town. Fifteen percent of the fund is set aside to pay for alternative transportation, which includes projects that encourage bicycling or walking.

Dettle downplayed the Caltrans conflict as "a minor issue if you take it in context of the whole job." He added, "On the whole, it's been a good project" and that there haven't been any problems since the city, contractor and project manager met with Caltrans a month ago.

The underpass will be paid for with the River Parkways Grant Program stemming from Propositions 40 and 50 and well as from the Redevelopment Agency. With
the additional $200,000 in Traffic Impact Fee funding, there would be $977,000 budgeted for the project, though Dettle said he doesn't anticipate needing to spend all of that.

Sincerely,
David G. Eselius

*****

Thank you for your comments. They will be forwarded to the Commission for their review. Please visit the SCCRTC website at www.sccrtc.org for information on the Commission and its activities.

Thank you again.

<<<<<<<<<><<<<<<<<<<><<<<<<<<<<><<<<<<<<<<><<<<<<<<<<><<<<<<<<<<><<<<<<<<<<><<<<<<<<<<><<<<<<<<<<><<<<<<<<<<><<<<<<<<<<><<<<<<<<<<><<<<<<<<<<>

Cathy Judd
Administrative Assistant II
SCCRTC
1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz CA 95060
cjudd@sccrtc.org
831 460 3206
831 460 3215 (fax)
www.sccrtc.org
From: kiheidon@aim.com [mailto:kiheidon@aim.com]
Sent: Thursday, February 18, 2010 11:49 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Rail-trail

I want you to NOT BUY this worn out track...

Rail is too expensive for this taxpayer.

Don Heichel
3311 Maplethorpe Lane
Soquel

Thank you for your comments. They will be forwarded to the Commission for their review.
Please visit the SCCRTC website at www.sccrtc.org for information on the Commission and its activities.

Thank you again.

Gini Pineda, Administrative Assistant III
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz CA 95060
831 460 3200
831 460 3215 (fax)
www.sccrtc.org
TOD and Carsharing: A Natural Marriage

BY ROBERT CERVERO

TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT (TOD) is arguably the most cogent and acceptable form of smart growth. Almost everyone "gets" TOD. Politicians, professionals, and lay citizens alike understand that if there is any logical place to promote compact, mixed-use development, it is around transit stations.

The benefits of TOD are largely borne out by empirical evidence. People who live near rail transit stops in the US have much higher rates of transit use than the typical resident of a rail-served region. In California, surveys show that residents who live near a transit station use transit for their commutes at a rate four to five times higher than residents of the same region who don’t live near stations. This pattern has held steady over time. In the case of the Pleasant Hill BART station, for instance, 47 percent of station-area residents took transit to work in 1993. Ten years later, in 2003, the share was 44 percent.

Robert Cervero is Professor of City and Regional Planning at the University of California, Berkeley, and Director of the University of California Transportation Center.
SELF-SELECTION

The higher transit use among station-area residents is largely a product of what economists call “self selection.” People who prefer to take a train to work—whether to avoid the stress of fighting traffic or to have time to read a newspaper en route to work—purposely choose to live near a rail stop. That is, they are predisposed to transit commuting; they are not “converted” to transit use simply because of where they live. A recent study led estimated that around 40 percent of the ridership bonus attributed to TOD is due to self selection.

TOD and Traffic

TOD has increased transit ridership, but this has had little influence on how TOD projects are seen and judged by municipal traffic engineers and local planners. Traditionally, engineers and planners evaluate new developments in terms of their impact on automobile traffic, not on how much they might increase transit ridership. That is, practitioners pass judgment on the transportation impact of any new development project, whether near a rail station or not, based on roadway level-of-service rather than on modal splits (the distribution of trips across different modes: car, rail, bike, etc.). In a society where over 90 percent of all trips are by car, planners and engineers who are accountable to local constituents for keeping streets running smoothly care more about traffic congestion than about transit use.

Herein lies a dilemma. Invariably, because not all TOD residents take transit, and many of them drive, dense development will congest the nearby road intersections during peak periods. In the near term, even if it is well served by transit, dense development translates into more congestion.

NIMBY opposition to higher density has stopped TOD plans around a number of middle-income neighborhoods served by BART in the San Francisco East Bay—Rockridge, North Berkeley, Orinda, Lafayette—mainly through building height restrictions. For example, some 2,400 new households have located within a 5-minute walk to the Pleasant Hill BART station over the past twenty years. But TOD dwellers are no more immune to NIMBYism than anyone else. Once a critical mass of TOD residents forms, they create neighborhood associations which, among other things, stop efforts to add more development. In Pleasant Hill, plans to build a massive entertainment complex, with a 20-screen IMAX movie theater, were scuttled due to neighborhood backlash. The lesson is clear: don’t expect to transform middle-income, stable neighborhoods with large-scale infill projects, because residents have the political might to stop such proposals every step of the way. More acceptable are TOD proposals for transitional neighborhoods, redevelopment districts, or greenfields with few people around to oppose new development. Also, forget about large-scale, regional trip generators that bring outsiders to neighborhoods made up of professional-class residents. Only local- and neighborhood-serving land uses will be welcomed in such settings.

The downside of preventing new growth around transit stations is that the development will end up elsewhere and most likely increase vehicle miles traveled (VMT)—the strongest single correlate of greenhouse gas emissions (GHG), air pollution, and energy consumption in the transport sector. Like toothpaste in a tube, if development is squeezed from one area, it simply gets redistributed elsewhere. Shifting growth from TOD to AOD (automobile oriented development) can reduce local traffic congestion at the cost of environmental degradation for a region at large.

There is good and bad congestion, just like good and bad cholesterol. I would argue that congestion caused by TOD is, for the most part, good. There is no avoiding the fact that
denser areas have denser traffic. Dense cities with world-class rail systems, like Paris and London, are often more traffic-choked than sprawling cities. Yet these dense cities are also attractive places to live, work, and visit. Congestion is part of the territory of being an active, vibrant place. TOD, moreover, offers a relief valve to congestion. In a TOD, it is easier to predict when and where congestion will occur, and it is easier to avoid that congestion—e.g., one can hop on a train or ride a bike.

TOD and the De-Generation of Trips and Parking

I recently led a study that probed the traffic implications of TOD. Specifically, the study measured vehicle trip generation rates for 17 TOD projects in five US metropolitan areas (Philadelphia, Northeast New Jersey, Washington, DC, Portland, and the San Francisco Bay Area). Over a typical weekday period, the TOD housing projects averaged 44 percent fewer vehicle trips than that estimated by the Trip Generation manual of the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE), which is widely used as the reference manual for gauging traffic impacts. As Donald Shoup and others have noted, the predictions of the ITE manual are based largely on observing suburban settings with meager transit service. Unsurprisingly, these settings exhibit high levels of car travel. During peak periods, our study showed even higher levels of trip de-generation for TODs—nearly 50 percent fewer vehicle trips than ITE predictions (see figure below).

**Figure 1**  
Comparison of vehicle trip rates: weighted averages of TOD housing and ITE estimates
Comparison of Vehicle Trip Rates: Weighted Averages of TOD Housing and ITE Estimates

A more recent analysis I led extended the study to analyze parking generation for 15 TOD projects in Portland and 16 in the Bay Area. While average vehicle trip generation rates in Portland were 41 percent below the ITE rates for TOD projects, the average use of parking spaces was only 11 percent less. The parking occupancy at three of the 15 surveyed TOD projects in Portland was actually higher than that predicted by the ITE manual. In the Bay Area, owning and parking a car seemed to be even more of a necessity for TOD residents. There, TOD parking rates were equivalent to ITE’s standard of 1.2 spaces per unit. For all seven TOD housing projects surveyed near the Fremont BART station, parking levels were actually higher than the ITE rates—as much as 40 percent above.

What’s going on? One factor may be that most cities do not reduce the parking requirements for TODs. One survey of TODs in California found no reduction in cities’ parking requirements at seven of the 11 sites studied. Planners appear to assume that more transit will not reduce parking demand, and they may be right. In most suburban TODs, residents still need access to a car. They just don’t use them as much. But like most suburbanites, they still need a car to get to most non-work destinations—the vast majority of which are away from rail stops. While transit-oriented housing might mean that more trip origins are near rail stops, as long as most destinations are not, TOD residents will still own cars and use them for shopping, going out to eat, and the like.

TOD and Carsharing

My guess is that a significant share of TOD residents would shed a car if they had carsharing options. My graduate students and I recently completed a four-year study of the impacts of carsharing on travel and car ownership based on experiences with the City CarShare program in San Francisco. From a panel survey, we found that four years into the City CarShare program, 29 percent of carshare members had gotten rid of one or more of their cars. Fully 63 percent of City CarShare members lived in zero-vehicle households.

A predictive model showed that living close to a carshare pick-up spot was strongly associated with car-shedding. By extension, putting shared cars in and around TODs could relieve many households from owning a second car or a vehicle altogether. TOD and carsharing, I contend, are a perfect marriage. Through a combination of proximity advantages and lifestyle predispositions, living near transit can de-generate vehicle trips. And with the option of carsharing, it can likely reduce parking demands as well.

Strangely, as of now, there are few TODs in the US with carsharing options. Perhaps carsharing companies fear the competition of transit. Or maybe transit agencies fear that carsharing will take away customers. In truth, carsharing and transit are more likely complements than competitors. Experiences from Switzerland suggest this is the case. Zurich, for example, has the second highest per capita transit use in the world (over 600 transit trips per capita per year) and the highest per capita carsharing participation anywhere (7 percent of households are members of Mobility Carsharing Switzerland). And in spite of having one of the world’s highest per capita incomes (on a purchasing power parity basis), only one out of three households has an off-street parking space. Zurich, I might add, has the highest commercial real estate prices in Europe (along Bahnhofstrasse) and according to the management consulting firm Arthur D. Little, ranks number one in
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quality-of-life among global cities. In Zurich, world-class transit, carsharing, parking limits, and prosperity go hand-in-hand.

One project in the works that aims to mimic the success of places like Zurich is Greenprint, a TOD pilot project in Richmond, California. Designed by new urbanists with state funding support, the Greenprint housing project aims to cut the carbon emissions of residents 50 percent below that of a traditional apartment building. Besides proximity to transit, a combination of carsharing using electric and hybrid vehicles, on-site childcare, and a state-of-the-art telecommuting center will be introduced. Forward-thinking public policies like carbon-trading credits for projects like Greenprint would go a long way toward ushering along progressive initiatives that marry TOD with demand-management initiatives like carsharing.

Another way for cities to play the role of matchmaker between TOD and carsharing is to allow developers to provide a shared-car parking space instead of several private parking spaces. A convenient carshare option may convince some residents to skip buying a second (or even first) car, and thus reduce the demand for parking in the building. Suppose that making one shared car available for an apartment building leads residents to buy 10 fewer personal cars. In this case, the city’s parking requirements can allow one shared-car parking space to substitute for ten private parking spaces. This arrangement would save money for both the developer (who provides fewer parking spaces) and residents (who own fewer cars) without eliminating anyone’s ability to use a car when needed. The carshare organization would also gain members and would be able to locate its cars in more locations, making membership in the club even more beneficial. Unbundling the cost of a private parking space from the cost of renting an apartment in the building would further reduce car ownership and increase the demand for shared cars. Offering developers the option to provide one shared-car parking space in lieu of several private parking spaces can thus increase the demand for carsharing, reduce development costs, increase transit ridership, and reduce the demand for driving. The arranged marriage between TOD and carsharing can be consummated in a garage. ♦

FURTHER READING
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Traffic Congestion and Greenhouse Gases

by Matthew Barth and Kanok Boriboonsomsin

Surface transportation in the United States is a large source of greenhouse gas emissions, and therefore a large contributor to global climate change. Roughly a third of America's carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions come from moving people or goods, and 80 percent of these emissions are from cars and trucks. To reduce CO₂ emissions from the transportation sector, policy makers are primarily pushing for more efficient vehicles, alternative fuels, and reducing vehicle miles traveled (VMT). Those who promote vehicle improvements have focused on building lighter and smaller vehicles (while maintaining safety), improving powertrain efficiency, and introducing alternative technologies such as hybrid and fuel cell vehicles. Alternative fuel possibilities include many low-carbon options such as biofuels and synthetic fuels.

Policy makers have placed less attention on reducing CO₂ emissions by reducing traffic congestion. As traffic congestion increases, so too do fuel consumption and CO₂ emissions. Therefore, congestion mitigation programs should reduce CO₂ emissions. The key question is how big of an emissions reduction we can get by reducing congestion. This question is difficult to answer, because CO₂ emissions, and the fuel consumption that causes them, are very sensitive to several factors. These factors include individual driving behavior,

Matthew Barth is Professor of Electrical Engineering and Director of the Center for Environmental Research and Technology at the University of California, Riverside (barth@en.ucr.edu) and Kanok Boriboonsomsin is a member of the research faculty at UCR’s Center for Environmental Research and Technology.
vehicle and roadway types, and traffic conditions. Because of these factors, a table that estimates CO₂ emissions based only on a single variable, such as trip distance, cannot provide an accurate estimate. Rather, a comprehensive methodology that takes advantage of the latest vehicle activity measurements and detailed vehicle emission factors can create a more accurate emissions inventory for different types of vehicles and different levels of traffic congestion. With this methodology, we can accurately estimate how congestion mitigation programs will reduce CO₂ emissions.

**Driving Patterns and Emissions**

A typical driving trip consists of idling, accelerating, cruising, and decelerating. The proportion of a trip spent in these different stages will depend on the driver’s behavior (e.g., aggressive vs. mild driving habits), the roadway type (e.g., freeway vs. arterial), and the level of traffic congestion. We can graphically display these factors through a vehicle velocity profile, a chart that shows speed over time (see Figure 1). The amount of CO₂ that is emitted during the trip will differ based on these different factors. Given a specific velocity profile and detailed information on the vehicle, we can estimate the CO₂ emissions using a vehicle emissions model. Researchers at the University of California, Riverside (UCR) have developed these emissions models for different vehicle types. We have collected a large amount of data both in the laboratory and on the road in real-world traffic (see Figure 2). These well-validated models provide the foundation for estimating the CO₂ emissions under different driving conditions with a wide variety of vehicles.

**Figure 1**

Typical vehicle velocity patterns for different roadway types and conditions.

**Figure 2**

Vehicle emissions testing using a) a laboratory dynamometer, and b) on-board portable emissions measurement system.
**Measuring Vehicle Activity**

Travel survey projects carried out around the world have measured typical driving patterns for particular areas. These vehicle activity datasets usually consist of velocity profiles from a sampling of vehicles, typically collected from Global Positioning System (GPS) dataloggers. These dataloggers (see Figure 3) measure a vehicle's position and velocity on a second-by-second basis. The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), for example, conducted a post-census travel survey in 2001 that consisted of 467 representative households with 626 vehicles, where over 28,000 miles of data were collected. UCR researchers have taken this data set, along with several others, and have amassed a large vehicle activity database that represents typical driving patterns.

This large vehicle activity database allows us to directly apply individual representative trip patterns to the comprehensive emissions model and then determine the emission values for each trip. As an example, if we take a large number of car trip patterns in Los Angeles and apply it to an emissions model for a modern passenger car, we can develop a histogram of the CO₂ emissions for each trip in the database. This histogram is shown in Figure 4, which shows that most trips produce about 330 grams per mile (g/mi) of CO₂ emissions, corresponding to approximately 26 miles per gallon of fuel economy. Other trips, however, produced far less or far more CO₂ emissions per mile, depending on the specific driving pattern. This variation comes from the driver’s behavior, the roadway type, and the level of traffic congestion. Further, other vehicle types will have quite different CO₂ emissions depending on their weight, power, and other vehicle factors.

**Speed-Based Emission Factors**

Emission factors are commonly associated with average speed, and researchers often use average speed as a traffic performance measure. It is possible to create these speed-based emission factors (in terms of grams per mile) by simply taking the accumulated vehicle activity database and running each individual trip through the emission models. What results is a single emissions value associated with the average speed of the trip. We can
FIGURE 4
CO₂ emissions histogram for a representative database of trips in Southern California

FIGURE 5
Emission-speed plot of individual trips or trip segments
split the trip into smaller segments representing the time spent on freeways, major surface streets, and residential streets. We can then associate an emissions value with the average speed of that particular trip segment.

If we now take those emission values and plot them against their different average speeds, we get a "U"-shaped pattern as shown in Figure 5. We can then fit a line to this pattern, resulting in a typical emissions-speed curve. The concept of the emissions-speed curve can serve as the foundation for relating emissions to vehicle activity. In fact, a large family of curves can now be established for different roadway types, and even different levels of congestion, given that these factors can be determined and included in the vehicle activity database. Furthermore, we can also establish separate families of emissions-speed curves for different vehicle types by adjusting the emission models. We can even establish an emissions-speed curve for the vehicle fleet composition typically found on the road.

This family of emissions-speed curves illustrates several key ideas. Very low average speeds generally represent stop-and-go driving, and vehicles do not travel far. Therefore, the emission rates per mile are quite high. (When a car's engine is running but it is not moving, its emission rate per mile reaches infinity.) Conversely, when vehicles travel at much higher speeds, they demand very high engine loads, which require more fuel, and which therefore lead to high CO₂ emission rates. As a result, this emissions-speed curve has a distinctive parabolic shape, with high emission rates on both ends and low emission rates at moderate speeds of around 40 to 60 mph.

**Potential Emissions Reductions**

The upper line in Figure 6 shows a representative emissions-speed curve for typical traffic. We can use this curve to examine how different traffic management techniques can affect vehicle emissions such as CO₂. The lower line represents the approximate lower bound of CO₂ emissions for vehicles traveling at a constant steady-state speed.

Several important results can be derived from Figure 6:

- If congestion reduces the average vehicle speed below 45 mph (for a freeway scenario), CO₂ emissions increase. Vehicles spend more time on the road, which results in higher CO₂ emissions. Therefore, in this scenario, congestion mitigation programs will directly reduce CO₂ emissions.
- If moderate congestion brings average speeds down from a free-flow speed over 70 mph to a slower speed of 45 to 55 mph, this moderate congestion can reduce CO₂ emissions. If congestion mitigation raises average traffic speed to above about 65 miles per hour, it can increase CO₂ emissions. And, of course, speeds above 65 or 70 also make the roadway more dangerous.
- Smoothing the stop-and-go pattern of traffic so that cars move at a relatively constant speed will reduce CO₂ emissions.

Figure 6 also illustrates three primary traffic operational improvement techniques that can directly lower CO₂ emissions. Congestion mitigation increases average traffic speeds from slower, heavily-congested speeds; examples of congestion mitigation include ramp metering, incident-management programs, and congestion pricing. Speed management reduces excessively high speeds to safer speeds; examples of this approach include direct enforcement by police and Intelligent Speed Adaptation (ISA) where top speeds are capped.
FIGURE 6
Possible use of traffic operation strategies in reducing on-road CO₂ emissions

based on specific traffic conditions. Traffic smoothing reduces the number and intensity of accelerations and decelerations; examples include variable speed limits, dynamic ISA, and congestion pricing.

Coupling Emissions-Speed Curves to Traffic Performance Data

Estimating emissions as a function of speed allows us to use the resulting emissions-speed curves directly with traffic performance measurements. For example, if loop sensors in a roadway can measure traffic volume and average speed, we can use these parameters in conjunction with the emissions-speed curve to estimate overall traffic-related emissions for that location. The process is relatively simple: the average traffic speed for a link is used to index the emissions-speed curves that correspond to the vehicle fleet mix on that roadway. By weighting the emission values by the vehicle fleet mix and then multiplying by the total volume of traffic, we can estimate the total emissions for that roadway link. If the emissions for all the links are then combined, we can estimate an overall traffic-related emissions inventory for the region.

To illustrate this estimation, we have examined the Los Angeles freeway network. The LA freeway system has a rich set of embedded loop sensors that measure traffic parameters (speed, density, and volume) throughout the network. We used the loop-sensor data to generate emissions-speed curves for the average fleet mix of the region. We then used these emissions-speed curves together with the traffic performance measures to estimate real-time CO₂ emissions along individual freeway segments.
Vehicle Speed Histograms and CO\textsubscript{2} Reductions

Our next research goal was to estimate current levels of congestion and then estimate how much different congestion management programs could reduce CO\textsubscript{2} emissions. To illustrate this, we first develop vehicle-speed histograms for particular locations and timeframes using data from the traffic performance measurement system. For example, in Figure 7 we have examined the average traffic conditions on a downtown LA segment of Interstate 110 northbound between 4 p.m. and 5 p.m., for the month of March 2007. We then created a histogram of average traffic speed, showing the vehicle miles traveled (VMT) in each speed bin. Due to congested conditions, a significant portion of the traffic was moving in the 20 to 30 mph range. For these conditions, we can calculate that the congested traffic for this one-hour time period on this segment of freeway emits approximately 166 metric tons of CO\textsubscript{2}.

Congestion mitigation programs that increase the overall traffic speed should reduce these CO\textsubscript{2} emissions. As shown in Figure 7, if we improve the overall average traffic speed by approximately 20 mph, the speed histogram would change, resulting in a reduction of 21 metric tons of CO\textsubscript{2}, a 12 percent drop. We can then apply this methodology for additional roadway segments in the network.

**Figure 7**

Potential CO\textsubscript{2} emissions savings through congestion mitigation on Interstate-110 in downtown Los Angeles. The curved line indicates incremental improvements from 35 to 55 mph.
Conclusion

There are many reasons to fight traffic congestion. Congestion wastes time and money, and it increases the risks of accidents and localized pollutants like particulate matter. But potentially the most serious, if also the least immediate, consequence of traffic congestion is increased emissions of greenhouse gases.

Although many people understand that driving contributes to greenhouse gas emissions, the measurement of this phenomenon has been surprisingly crude, often associating carbon emissions only with trip distance, without accounting for how carbon emissions change with vehicle speed.

In our research, we have developed a more finely grained way to measure the relationship between driving and carbon emissions, and this allows us to develop better estimates of how congestion-management techniques can help fight global warming. Specifically, we have estimated how three improvements in managing traffic operations can reduce CO₂ emissions:

- **Congestion mitigation** strategies that reduce severe congestion and increase traffic speeds (e.g., ramp metering, incident management, and congestion pricing);
- **Speed management** strategies that bring down excessive speeds to more moderate speeds of approximately 55 mph (e.g., enforcement and ISA); and
- **Traffic smoothing** strategies that reduce the number and intensity of acceleration and deceleration events (e.g., variable speed limits and ISA).

Using typical conditions on Southern California freeways as an example, our research has shown that each of the three traffic-management strategies above could reduce CO₂ emissions by 7 to 12 percent. All three strategies in combination could reduce CO₂ emissions by approximately 30 percent. ♦

Further Reading


CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS REPORT

❖ UPDATED INFORMATION

PRESENTED TO:

SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Information submitted on February 18, 2010
For the meeting of March 4, 2010

HWY. 9 – RETAINING WALL

ABOUT 7 MILES NORTH OF BOULDER CREEK JUST SOUTH OF THE ROUTE 236/9 SEPARATION (PM 20.4)

- Project: Construct retaining wall
- Traffic Controls: One-way traffic control with flagging Mondays through Fridays from 7 am to 3:30 pm. Up to 15-minute delays are anticipated.
- Resident Engineer: Patrick Dussell
- Contractor: Jim Freethy Excavating Inc., Danville
- Construction Cost: $229,000
- Start Date: February 8, 2010
- Estimated Completion: May 2010
- EA: 0P8704
HWY. 9 – SAN LORENZO METAL BEAM GUARDRAIL UPGRADE

- Project: Install metal beam guard rail
- Traffic Controls: One-way traffic control Mondays through Fridays from 8 am to 5 pm.
- Resident Engineer: Patrick Dussell
- Contractor: John Madonna Construction, San Luis Obispo
- Construction Cost: $834,000
- Start Date: October 5, 2009
- Estimated Completion: Work finished Dec. 18, 2009 (In winter suspension to resume/complete in spring 2010, weather permitting)
- EA: 0K2404

HWY. 17 – GUARDRAIL UPGRADES

NEAR SCOTTS VALLEY AT VARIOUS LOCATIONS FROM SANTA’S VILLAGE ROAD TO THE SANTA CLARA COUNTY LINE (PM 6.0 – 12.6)

- Project: Upgrade guardrail, crash cushions, end treatments and retaining walls for guardrail
- Traffic Controls: Alternating lane closures northbound Sundays through Thursdays from 7 pm to 5 am and Fridays 9 pm to 5 am and southbound Sundays through Thursdays from 8 pm to 2 pm and Fridays 8 pm to 12 pm.
- Resident Engineer: Patrick Dussell
- Contractor: K L M Construction Inc., Puyallup, WA
- Construction Cost: $5.5 Million
- Start Date: January 13, 2010
- Estimated Completion: Spring 2011
- EA: 0L70U4
HWY. 17 – VINEHILL WET WEATHER IMPROVEMENTS

- NEAR SCOTTS VALLEY FROM SOUTH OF WEST VINEHILL ROAD TO SOUTH OF VINEHILL ROAD (PM 7.0 – 7.3)

- Project: Construct soldier pile wall
- Traffic Controls: To be resumed after winter suspension. One lane closed in each direction Mondays through Fridays from 8 pm to 5 am. One lane will remain open in each direction at all times. Traffic delays should be less than 15 minutes.
- Resident Engineer: Patrick Dussell
- Contractor: H S R Inc., Santa Clara
- Construction Cost: $1.5 Million
- Start Date: June 20, 2009
- Estimated Completion: Summer 2010 (In winter suspension to resume April 2010, weather permitting)
- EA: 0P8104

UPCOMING PROJECTS

HWY. 1 – TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT SYSTEM – FREEDOM BOULEVARD SOUTH

- NEAR WATSONVILLE AT VARIOUS LOCATIONS FROM SOUTH OF THE 1/129 SEPARATION TO LARKIN VALLEY ROAD UNDERCROSSING (PM 0.5 – R7.7)

- Project: Construct Transportation Management System
- Project Status: Project advertised on February 16, 2010
- Project Manager: Doug Hessing
- Est. Construction Cost: $340,000
- Bid Opening Date: March 10, 2010
- EA: 0N2504
HWY. 1/17 – MERGE LANES LANDSCAPE
IN SANTA CRUZ ON ROUTE 1 FROM LA FONDA AVENUE OVERCROSSING TO ROUTE 1/17 SEPARATION AND ON ROUTE 17 FROM ROUTE 1/17 SEPARATION TO PASATIEMPO (PM 1, 17 15.4 – 17.1, 0.1 – 0.7)

- Project: Highway planting and irrigation
- Project Status: Project awarded February 11, 2010
- Resident Engineer: Bertha Roman
- Contractor: Watkin & Bortolussi Inc., San Rafael
- Construction Cost: $695,000
- Estimated Start Date: Pending approval
- EA: 129114

HWY. 9 – RETAINING WALL

- NEAR SANTA CRUZ SOUTH OF RINCON CREEK BRIDGE (PM 1.8)
- Project: Construct Retaining Wall
- Project Status: Project to advertise March 1, 2010
- Project Manager: Steve DiGrazia
- Est. Construction Cost: $900,000
- Bid Opening Date: April 6, 2010
- EA: 0P6504

HWY. 9 – MICRO-SURFACING

- AT FELTON AND BEN LOMOND FROM RUSSELL AVENUE TO NORTH OF GLEN ARBOR ROAD (PM 6.1 – 8.2)
- Project: Thin overlay to existing roadway
- Project Status: Project to advertise February 22, 2010
- Project Manager: Kelly McClain
- Est. Construction Cost: $370,000
- Bid Opening Date: March 23, 2010
- EA: 0S1604
AGENDA: March 4, 2010

TO: Regional Transportation Commission

FROM: Karena Pushnik, Senior Transportation Planner

RE: Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 8 Allocation Claim from the City of Scotts Valley for its Citywide Sidewalks Project

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee and staff recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission approve the attached resolution (Attachment 1) approving the City of Scott Valley Transportation Development Act Article 8 allocation claim for $93,315 (Exhibit 1 of Attachment 1) for sidewalk construction projects and/or Americans with Disabilities Act-compliant curb ramps.

BACKGROUND

The Transportation Development Act (TDA) was established by the State Legislature in 1971. The TDA provides one of the major funding sources for public and specialized transportation in California. TDA funds are also used by local jurisdictions for bicycle and pedestrian projects. Each year the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) allocates Article 8 Transportation Development Account (TDA) funds to local jurisdictions for bikeway and pedestrian projects.

Funds are obtained by local jurisdictions via a three-step process: (1) apportionment, (2) allocation, and (3) payment (reimbursement). One step does not always imply or require the next. Apportionment to the local jurisdictions in region is according to the RTC Rules & Regulations according to a population formula. Allocation is the discretionary action by the RTC that designates funds for a specific claimant to a specific purpose. Payment is authorized by instructions issued by the RTC in its Rules and Regulations. Unused TDA funds allocated to any project or unallocated balances may be rolled over from one fiscal year to the next.

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

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

**DISCUSSION**

Exhibit 1 of Attachment 1 is a TDA Article 8 allocation request from the City of Scotts Valley Public Works in the amount of $93,315 for the construction of sidewalks and/or ADA-compliant curb ramps on Bean Creek Road, Vine Hill School Road and other locations in the city. These projects are included in the most recent version of the Regional Transportation Plan. The request includes remaining TDA funds redirected from the Glen Canyon Sidewalk project that was completed several years ago. The City of Scotts Valley has adequate funds in its unallocated TDA balance for this claim. The total project cost is estimated to be $169,315. Remaining funds will be secured from the Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP).

**Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee Review**

At the February 9 meeting, the E&D TAC Committee reviewed the City of Scotts Valley allocation request for $93,315 and recommended that the Commission approve the TDA claim.

**SUMMARY**

The City of Scotts Valley submitted a TDA Article 8 allocation request (Exhibit 1) for $93,315 for citywide sidewalk construction and ADA ramps. The Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee and staff recommend that the RTC approve the City of Scotts Valley’s allocation claim.

**Attachment:**

1. Resolution approving City of Scotts Valley Article 8 TDA claim
RESOLUTION NO.

Adopted by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
on the date of March 4, 2010
on the motion of Commissioner
duly seconded by Commissioner

A RESOLUTION ALLOCATING $93,315 IN ARTICLE 8 TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT (TDA)
FUNDS TO THE CITY OF SCOTTS VALLEY FOR CITYWIDE SIDEWALK CONSTRUCTION
AND ADA RAMPS

WHEREAS, the City of Scotts Valley has sufficient unallocated Article 8 TDA revenues and has
submitted a TDA allocation request (Exhibit 1) for a total of $93,315 for pedestrian improvement
projects; and

WHEREAS, the Elderly & Disabled Transportation Committee have each reviewed the request
pertaining to their charge and recommend approval; and

WHEREAS, the proposed projects are consistent with the 2005 Regional Transportation Plan
and the claimant agrees to maintain funded projects for a period of 20 years;

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

1. $93,315 in TDA Article funds is hereby allocated to the City of Scotts Valley for Citywide
Sidewalk Construction and ADA Ramps.

AYES: COMMISSIONERS

NOES: COMMISSIONERS

ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS

ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS

____________________________
Randy Johnson, Chair

ATTEST:

_____________________________
George Dondero, Secretary

Exhibit 1: TDA Article 8 Allocation Request from the City of Santa Cruz

Distribution: City of Scotts Valley Public Works
RTC Fiscal
RTC Planner
January 19, 2010

The City of Scotts Valley hereby submits a claim for $93,315 in TDA revenues for its Citywide Sidewalks Project. This includes the $4,105 balance of TDA that we request to be redirected from the Glen Canyon Road Sidewalk Project which was completed several years ago. I attest that the information provided in the claim form is accurate.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Ken D. Anderson
Public Works Director/City Engineer

ca
Transportation Development Act (TDA) – Local Transportation Funds
CLAIM FORM
for Bike/Ped Projects

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: Citywide Sidewalk Construction and ADA Ramps

2. Implementing Agency: City of Scotts Valley

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

4. TDA funding requested this claim: $93,315

5. Fiscal Year (FY) for which funds are claimed: FY 09/10

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

7. Contact Person/Project Manager: Majid Yamin
   Telephone Number: 831.438.5854   E-mail: myamin@scottsvalley.org

   Secondary Contact (in event primary not available): Ken Anderson
   Telephone Number: 831.438.5854   E-mail: kanderson@scottsvalley.org

8. Project/Program Description/Scope (use additional pages, if needed, to provide details such as work elements/tasks): Construct sidewalk and/or ADA ramps on Bean Creek Road, Vine Hill School Road and other locations within the City

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

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

    Various locations including Bean Creek Road and Vine Hill School Road.

11. Justification for the project. (Why is this project needed? Primary goal/purpose of the project; problem to be addressed; project benefits; importance to the community): To improve safety and reduce congestion.

12. Consistency and relationship with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) – please reference Project or Policy number: Goal No. 2: Increase mobility.

SV-P20 (Vine Hill School Road Sidewalks); SV-P06 (Citywide Access Ramps);
SV-P05 (Citywide Sidewalk Program); SV-P35 (Bean Creek Road)
13. Measures of performance, success or completion to be used to evaluate project/program:

Increase pedestrian, especially school children, traffic.

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

15. Project Cost/Budget, including other funding sources, and Schedule:

**Capital Projects – OR ATTACH PROJECT BUDGET**

**Project Start Date: January 2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Design/Engineering</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Other *</th>
<th>Contingency</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCHEDULE (Month/Yr) Completion Date /</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1/10</td>
<td>1/10-6/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost/Phase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$149,315</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$169,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STDA Requested (this claim)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$84,315</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$94,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior TDA:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 4:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

17. TDA Eligibility:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES?/NO?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Has the project/program been approved by the claimant's governing body? Attach resolution or other board action info (capital improvement program, budget, minutes, etc). If &quot;NO,&quot; provide the approximate date approval is anticipated.</td>
<td>Yes, approved at 12/09 mtg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Has this project previously received TDA funding?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. For capital projects, have provisions been made by the claimant to maintain the project or facility, or has the claimant arranged for such maintenance by another agency for the next 20 years?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Has the project already been reviewed by the RTC Bicycle Committee and/or Elderly/Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee? (If &quot;NO,&quot; project will be reviewed prior to RTC approval).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. For &quot;bikeways,&quot; does the project meet Caltrans minimum safety design criteria pursuant to Chapter 1000 of the California Highway Design Manual? (Available on the internet via: <a href="http://www.dot.ca.gov">http://www.dot.ca.gov</a>).</td>
<td>N/A</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.
☐ Resolution from the TDA Eligible Claimant indicating its role and responsibilities.

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

Local Agency Certification:

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: [Title]
Date: 1/20/09

This TDA Claim Form has been prepared in accordance with the SCCRTC’s Rules and Regulations, and Caltrans TDA Guidebook (http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/MassTrans/State-TDA.html).
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TO: Regional Transportation Commission (RTC)

FROM: Grace Blakeslee, Transportation Planner
Luis Pavel Mendez, Deputy Director

REGARDING: State and Federal Legislation

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC):
1. Support the Local Tax Payer, Public Safety and Transportation Protection Act proposed for the November 2010 ballot and direct staff to submit letters of support;
2. Accept oral report on other state legislative efforts; and,
3. Accept oral report on federal legislative efforts.

BACKGROUND

As the state continues to run major deficits, cash resources remain in jeopardy, and credit ratings steadily decline, the future for state transportation funding remains uncertain at best. Revenue diversion, suspensions, and special “loans” to the State General Fund have resulted in tremendous decreases in funding for transportation, especially transit (Public Transportation Account), local streets and roads (gas tax), and State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)-funded projects and further reductions may be proposed in 2010. Notably, over the past three years, close to $3.5 billion in transit revenues were diverted to the State General Fund.

At the state level discussions continue regarding the FY10/11 budget and potential impacts to transportation funding. At the federal level discussions continue regarding a new jobs stimulus package that may provide funding for transportation projects.

DISCUSSION

Local Taxpayer, Public Safety and Transportation Protection Act

A coalition of local government, transportation and public transit leaders that includes the League of California Cities are proposing an initiative ballot measure called the Local Taxpayer, Public Safety and Transportation Protection Act for the November 2010 ballot to protect local government, including redevelopment, transportation and transit revenues from state raids and loans. The measure prohibits the state from taking or borrowing local taxpayer funds (local taxes, property taxes, redevelopment) dedicated to public safety, emergency response, transportation (Proposition 42 sales tax on gasoline, Highway User Tax on gasoline, and public transit funds) and other vital local government services. The measure would close loopholes to prevent the taking of local taxpayer funds currently dedicated to cities, counties, special districts and redevelopment agencies. It would also revoke the State’s authority to borrow local government property tax funds. **Staff recommends that the RTC support the Local Taxpayer, Public Safety and Transportation Protection Act** in order to protect transportation funds.
Other State Legislative Efforts

Consistent with the RTC’s 2010 legislative agenda RTC staff and legislative assistants have been working diligently on a legislative effort to allow individual Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (SAFEs) to increase the SAFE fee by $1 dollar to $2 dollars. On Friday, February 19th, Senate Bill (SB) 1418 was introduced by Senator Wiggins. The bill includes language that provides individual SAFE(s) the flexibility to increase the SAFE fee by $1 on vehicles registered within their jurisdiction for motorist aid services, modernizes the list of eligible motorist aid services, and authorizes the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) to place call boxes in State and Federal parks. RTC staff will continue to work with its legislative assistants, the MTC for the San Francisco Bay Area, and other SAFE(s) throughout the State to support passage of the bill and hopefully see it signed into law. If the bill is approved, it will provide the RTC an opportunity to generate an additional $240,000 in revenue annually for motorist aid projects and programs. Currently, the RTC funds the Freeway Service Patrol Program, the Call Box Program, and the Safe on 17 extra California Highway Patrol enforcement with SAFE monies.

The State’s budget debate continues with an alternative plan from Senate Democrats to the Governor’s Transportation Funding “SWAP” proposal. The Governor’s proposal would do away with the sales tax on gasoline dedicated to transportation and replace it with a 10.8 cent excise tax (see Attachment 3). This impacts funding for transit, transportation projects funded through the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and schools. The alternative proposed by Senate Democrats would replace the sales tax on gasoline with a 12.9 cent excise tax that would increase to 18 cents and be indexed (see Attachment 4). This proposal also would provide the possibility for regional fees on gasoline for transit, bicycle and pedestrian projects. The Senate Democrat’s proposal is better for transportation than the Governor’s proposal but it still has its drawbacks. The protections for the sales tax on gasoline are stronger than the protections that would apply to the excise taxes. Staff will provide an oral report at the RTC meeting on the latest developments regarding the State’s budget.

Federal Legislative Efforts

At its February meeting, the RTC approved a $12.7 million list of projects for funding through a potential federal jobs bill that was passed by the House of Representatives. The Senate decided to split the Jobs Bill into smaller bills and the bill currently being considered by the Senate does not include funding for transportation but it does include an extension of SAFETEA-LU through December 2010 at existing funding levels. A Jobs Bill with funds for infrastructure, including transportation may be considered later. With the help of the RTC’s federal legislative assistants, staff also submitted two earmark requests. One is for the implementation of a 511 traveler information system and the other is for rehabilitation and improvements for the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line. Given the current situation at the federal level, it is very uncertain whether any earmarks will be approved. Staff will report orally at the RTC meeting on any further developments.

SUMMARY

A statewide coalition is proposing a ballot measure to protect local funds including transportation funds. Staff recommends support of this Local Tax Payer, Public Safety and Transportation Protection Act. Staff also recommends acceptance of oral reports on other state and federal legislative efforts.
Attachments:

1. Questions and Answers about the Local Taxpayer, Public Safety and Transportation Protection Act
2. Proposed draft language for the Local Taxpayer, Public Safety and Transportation Protection Act.
3. Excerpts from Legislative Analyst Office on Governor's proposed FY 10-11 budget
4. League of California Cities summary of Senate Alternative to Gas Tax Swap proposal
Frequently Asked Questions About the Local Taxpayer, Public Safety and Transportation Protection Act

WHAT IS YOUR MEASURE AND WHAT DOES IT PROPOSE TO DO?
The Local Taxpayer, Public Safety and Transportation Protection Act is a constitutional amendment that we are working to place on California’s November 2010 statewide ballot. The initiative would stop the State from raiding or borrowing funding for local public safety, transportation, transit and other essential local government services. Specifically, the measure would:

- Prohibit the State from taking, borrowing or redirecting local taxpayer funds dedicated to public safety, emergency response and other vital local government services. The measure would close loopholes to prevent the taking of funds currently dedicated to cities, counties, special districts and redevelopment agencies. It would also end the State’s fiscally irresponsible practice of borrowing local government property tax funds.

- Protect vital, dedicated transportation and public transit funds from State raids. The measure would prevent State borrowing, taking or redirecting of the state sales tax on gasoline (Prop 42 funds) and Highway User Tax on gasoline (HUTA) funds that voters have dedicated to transportation maintenance and improvements. It would also prevent the State from redirecting or taking public transit funds.

- Protect local taxpayers by keeping more of our local tax dollars local where there’s more accountability to voters, and by ensuring once and for all that our gas taxes go to fund road improvements. The measure also reduces pressure for local tax and fee increases that become necessary when the State redirects local funds.

WHY IS IT NEEDED?
Unfortunately, the State has continued its irresponsible practice of taking and borrowing local taxpayer dollars and dedicated transportation funds. The 2009/10 state budget borrows and takes approximately $5 billion in city, county, transit, redevelopment and special district funds this year despite the fact that voters have overwhelmingly passed ballot measures to keep local funding at the local level to provide essential local services. This year’s raids and previous, ongoing state raids and borrowing jeopardize the services Californians need most, including police, fire and emergency 911 services; local economic development and redevelopment; mass transit like buses and commuter rail; and transportation improvements like road repairs and congestion relief. We need to pass this measure to protect these vital local services from State raids and borrowing.

ISN’T FUNDING FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND TRANSPORTATION ALREADY PROTECTED FROM STATE RAIDS?
California voters have overwhelmingly passed separate measures to prevent the State from raiding local government and transportation funds. However, each and every year the State attempts to take or borrow local government, transportation and transit funding using loopholes, or illegal funding diversions that have only been stopped after expensive and lengthy court battles. This year alone, the Legislature:

- Borrowed approximately $2 billion in property taxes from local governments, despite no clear path to repay these funds. Took $2.05 billion in local redevelopment funds, despite a recent Superior Court ruling that says these types of raids are unconstitutional.
• Shifted $910 million in transit funding away from local transit agencies. The courts have since ruled these types of raids are unconstitutional.
• Voted to take more than $1 billion of the local government share of the Highway User Tax (HUTA) to repay state bond debt (but the measure stalled in Assembly). These are funds that have always been used to finance local road repairs and maintenance.
• Took action to eliminate the state sales tax on gasoline (Prop 42 funds) and HUTA and replace with a gasoline “fee” that would have no constitutional protection from future raids by the legislature (the Governor ultimately vetoed this measure).
• Threatened to borrow Prop 42 transportation funds to address the State’s deficit.
• Our measure would close loopholes in current law that the legislature has exploited to take or divert local funds. And it would tighten sections of the law to prevent illegal State funding raids of local government and transportation funds before they happen.

WHY DOES YOUR MEASURE PREVENT THE STATE FROM BORROWING LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND TRANSPORTATION FUNDS?
The local government revenue protection measure in 2004 (Prop 1A) and the transportation revenue protection measure in 2006 (Prop 1A) included provisions that allow the State to borrow these funds during fiscal emergencies. However, after several budget cycles it is clear that these borrowing provisions are not only bad for local governments and transportation services, but fiscally irresponsible for the State. Borrowing these dedicated funds only plunges our state deeper into debt because the funds must to be repaid, with interest within three years.

The borrowing was meant to provide an outlet in short-term budget emergencies, but it’s instead being used to paper over structural budget problems. For example, the State has no clear way to pay back the $2 billion plus interest in local property taxes that the State is borrowing as part of this year’s 2009-2010 State budget, yet lawmakers borrowed these funds anyway.

What’s more, because the State has the authority to borrow local government and transportation funds, it creates mass uncertainty for cities and counties who need to plan and pass their local budgets, and for transportation and transit planners who aren’t sure if they can rely on these revenues in any given year.

DOES THIS MEASURE INCREASE OR DECREASE REVENUES FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENTS OR FOR TRANSPORTATION AND TRANSIT?
This measure does not increase or decrease the existing revenues that are dedicated to local government, transportation and transit funds. It simply prevents the State from borrowing or raiding existing local government, transportation and transit revenues that voters have dedicated to these services.

WON’T THIS MAKE OUR STATE’S BUDGET SYSTEM EVEN WORSE BY FURTHER PUTTING A LOCK BOX ON BILLIONS OF DOLLARS IN FUNDING?
First, these are revenues that have historically been dedicated to cities, counties and special districts to fund local government services. It’s fiscally irresponsible for State Government to raid funds from local governments.

Second, it’s important to remember that these are funds that voters have ALREADY dedicated to local government, transportation and transit services. We are not dedicating any NEW funding for these services, but instead ensuring that the will of voters is upheld by protecting
This reform is fiscally responsible and a key step in long-term reform for California. The State has gotten itself into this deep fiscal mess in large part because lawmakers have relied on budget gimmicks like tapping into voter-protected funds and borrowing which only pushes our problems into the future.

**HOW DOES THIS MEASURE FIT INTO THE NEED FOR BROAD REFORM OF STATE GOVERNMENT IN CALIFORNIA?**

This measure is a necessary and responsible first step toward fiscal reform in California. Virtually everyone agrees that State reforms must include the restoration of more local control over local tax dollars, and moving services closer to the people at the local level. This measure ensures local control, predictability, and accountability for local tax dollars that are used to provide the most essential local services.

**WILL THIS MEASURE IMPACT FUNDING FOR PUBLIC SCHOOLS, HEALTHCARE OR OTHER SERVICES?**

No. This measure does not take away funding from schools or any other service funded by the State because it only protects EXISTING funds that are already dedicated to local services like public safety and transportation. And this measure in no-way alters Proposition 98, which guarantees funding levels for K-14 schools.

**HOW WILL THIS MEASURE IMPACT TAXPAYERS?**

This measure provides further protections for existing revenues that voters have already dedicated to local government, transportation and transit services. It does not increase taxes. In fact, this measure protects taxpayers by keeping more of our tax dollars local where they’re more accountable. And this measure decreases pressure for local tax and fee increases at the local government level that become needed when the state takes local revenues and local governments are forced to look for new revenues to protect vital services.
SECTION 1. Title.

This act shall be known and may be cited as the “Local Taxpayer, Public Safety, and Transportation Protection Act of 2010.”

SECTION 2. Findings and Declarations.

The people of the State of California find and declare that:

(a) In order to maintain local control over local taxpayer funds and protect vital services like local fire protection and 9-1-1 emergency response, law enforcement, emergency room care, public transit, and transportation improvements, California voters have repeatedly and overwhelmingly voted to restrict state politicians in Sacramento from taking revenues dedicated to funding local government services and dedicated to funding transportation improvement projects and services.

(b) By taking these actions, voters have acknowledged the critical importance of preventing State raids of revenues dedicated to funding vital local government services and transportation improvement projects and services.

(c) Despite the fact that voters have repeatedly passed measures to prevent the State from taking these revenues dedicated to funding local government services and transportation improvement projects and services, state politicians in Sacramento have seized and borrowed billions of dollars in local government and transportation funds.

(d) In recent years, state politicians in Sacramento have specifically:

(1) Borrowed billions of dollars in local property tax revenues that would otherwise be used to fund local police, fire and paramedic response and other vital local services;

(2) Sought to take and borrow billions of dollars in gas tax revenues that voters have dedicated to on-going transportation projects and tried to use them for non-transportation purposes;

(3) Taken local community redevelopment funds on numerous occasions and used them for unrelated purposes;

(4) Taken billions of dollars from local public transit like bus, shuttle, light-rail and regional commuter rail, and used these funds for unrelated state purposes.

(e) The continued raiding and borrowing of revenues dedicated to funding local government services and dedicated to funding transportation improvement projects and services can cause severe consequences, such as layoffs of police, fire and paramedic first
responders, fire station closures, healthcare cutbacks, delays in road safety improvements, public transit fare increases and cutbacks in public transit services.

(f) State politicians in Sacramento have continued to ignore the will of the voters, and current law provides no penalties when state politicians take or borrow these dedicated funds.

(g) It is hereby resolved, that with approval of this ballot initiative, state politicians in Sacramento shall be prohibited from seizing, diverting, shifting, borrowing, transferring, suspending or otherwise taking or interfering with tax revenues dedicated to funding local government services or dedicated to transportation improvement projects and services.

SECTION 3. Statement of Purpose.

The purpose of this measure is to conclusively and completely prohibit state politicians in Sacramento from seizing, diverting, shifting, borrowing, transferring, suspending, or otherwise taking or interfering with revenues that are dedicated to funding services provided by local government or funds dedicated to transportation improvement projects and services.

SECTION 4. Article XVII is added to the California Constitution, to read:

SECTION 1. The Legislature may not reallocate, transfer, borrow, appropriate, restrict the use of, or otherwise use the proceeds of any tax imposed or levied by a local government solely for the local government's purposes.

SEC. 2. On and after the effective date of the measure adding this article, and notwithstanding subparagraphs (B) and (C) of paragraph (1) of subdivision (a) of Section 25.5 of Article XIII of this Constitution or any other law, the Legislature may not suspend subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) of subdivision (a) of Section 25.5 of Article XIII. The Legislature may not change the pro rata shares in which ad valorem property taxes are allocated among local agencies to transfer property taxes to a local government when the Legislature or any state agency mandates a new program or higher level of service on that local government.

SEC. 3. On and after the effective date of the measure adding this article, and notwithstanding Section 15 of Article XI of this Constitution or any other law, the Legislature may not change the allocation of revenues described in Section 15 of Article XI to reimburse a city, county, or city and county when the Legislature or any state agency mandates a new program or higher level of service on that city, county, or city and county.

SEC. 4. On and after the effective date of the measure adding this article, and notwithstanding Article XIX of this Constitution or any other law:

(a) Revenues from taxes imposed by the State on motor vehicle fuels for use in motor vehicles upon public streets and highways, over and above the costs of collection and any refunds authorized by law, shall be deposited into the Highway Users Tax Account (Section 2100 of the Streets and Highways Code) or its successor, which is hereby declared to be a trust
fund, and shall be used solely for the purposes identified in subdivisions (a) and (b) of Section 1 of Article XIX.

(b) The Legislature may, by a two-thirds vote of the membership in each house, modify the statutory allocations in effect on June 30, 2009 only in accordance with the procedures specified in Section 3 of Article XIX. Any bill modifying the statutory allocations in effect on June 30, 2009 must remain in its final form for at least 12 days prior to passage in either house of the Legislature.

(c) Revenues from taxes described in subdivision (a) allocated to cities, counties, and areas of the State may be used solely by the entity to which they are allocated, and solely for the purposes described in Sections 1 and 4 of Article XIX; and Section 5 of Article XIX subject to the requirements of subdivision (e). The Legislature may not take any action that permanently or temporarily borrows, diverts, appropriates for unrelated purposes, or delays, defers, suspends, or otherwise interrupts the payment, allocation, distribution, disbursal, or transfer of revenues from taxes described in subdivision (a) to cities, counties, and areas of the State pursuant to the procedures in effect on June 30, 2009.

(d) If the Legislature reduces or repeals the taxes described in subdivision (a) and adopts an alternative source of revenue to replace the moneys derived from those taxes, the replacement revenue shall be deposited and allocated in the same manner, and dedicated to the same purposes, as the revenues being replaced.

(e)(1) Revenues allocated to any city or county pursuant to Section 3 of Article XIX for the purposes specified in subdivision (a) of Section 1 of Article XIX shall not be used by the State for any purpose, including, but not limited to, payment of principal and interest on voter-approved bonds issued by the State. Up to 25 percent of the revenues allocated to any city or county pursuant to Section 3 of Article XIX for the purposes specified in subdivision (a) of Section 1 of Article XIX may be used by any city or county for the payment of principal and interest on voter-approved bonds issued by that city or county for such purposes.

(2) Up to 25 percent of the revenues allocated to the State pursuant to Section 3 of Article XIX for the purposes specified in subdivision (a) of Section 1 of Article XIX may be pledged or used by the State, upon approval of the voters and appropriation by the Legislature, for the payment of principal and interest on voter-approved bonds issued by the State for such purposes on or after November 2, 2010.

SEC. 5. On and after the effective date of the measure adding this article, and notwithstanding Section 1 of Article XIX A of this Constitution or any other law:

(a) All of the following shall be deposited no less than quarterly into the Public Transportation Account (Section 99310 of the Public Utilities Code), or its successor, which is hereby declared to be a trust fund:
(1) All revenues specified in paragraphs (1) through (3), inclusive, of subdivision (a) of Section 7102 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, as that section read on June 1, 2001.

(2) All moneys in the Transportation Investment Fund that are allocated for public transit and mass transportation pursuant to paragraph (A) of subdivision (c) of Section 1 of Article XIX B.

(b) Funds in the Public Transportation Account may only be used for transportation planning and mass transportation purposes. The Legislature may not take any action that permanently or temporarily borrows, diverts, appropriates for unrelated purposes, or delays, defers, suspends, or otherwise interrupts the quarterly deposit of the funds specified in subdivision (a) into the Public Transportation Account. Funds in the Public Transportation Account may not be loaned or otherwise transferred to the General Fund or any other fund or account in the State Treasury.

(c) For the purposes of subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) of subdivision (e), "transportation planning" means only the purposes described in subdivisions (c) through (f), inclusive, of Section 99315 of the Public Utilities Code, as that section read on July 30, 2009.

(d) For the purposes of this article and Article XIX B, "mass transportation," "public transit," and "mass transit" have the same meaning as "public transportation." "Public transportation" means:

(1)(A) Surface transportation service provided to the general public, complementary paratransit service provided to persons with disabilities as required by 42 U.S.C. 12143, or similar transportation provided to people with disabilities or the elderly; (B) operated by bus, rail, ferry, or other conveyance on a fixed route, demand response, or otherwise regularly available basis; (C) generally for which a fare is charged; and (D) provided by any transit district, included transit district, municipal operator, included municipal operator, eligible municipal operator, or transit development board, as those terms were defined in Article 1 of Chapter 4 of Part 11 of Division 10 of the Public Utilities Code on January 1, 2009, a joint powers authority formed to provide mass transportation services, an agency described in subdivision (f) of Section 15975 of the Government Code, as that section read on January 1, 2009, any recipient of funds under Sections 99260, 99260.7, 99275, or subdivision (c) of Section 99400 of the Public Utilities Code, as those sections read on January 1, 2009, or a consolidated agency as defined in Section 132353.1 of the Public Utilities Code, as that section read on January 1, 2009.

(2) Surface transportation service provided by the Department of Transportation pursuant to subdivision (a) of Section 99315 of the Public Utilities Code, as that section read on July 30, 2009.

(3) Public transit capital improvement projects, including those identified in subdivision (b) of Section 99315 of the Public Utilities Code, as that section read on July 30, 2009.
(e)(1) Revenues deposited into the Public Transportation Account pursuant to paragraph (1) of subdivision (a) are hereby continuously appropriated to the Controller without regard to fiscal years for allocation as follows:

(A) Fifty percent pursuant to subdivisions (a) through (f), inclusive, of Section 99315 of the Public Utilities Code, as that section read on July 30, 2009.

(B) Twenty-five percent pursuant to subdivision (b) of Section 99312 of the Public Utilities Code, as that section read on July 30, 2009.

(C) Twenty-five percent pursuant to subdivision (c) of Section 99312 of the Public Utilities Code, as that section read on July 30, 2009.

(2) Revenues deposited into the Public Transportation Account pursuant to paragraph (2) of subdivision (a) are hereby continuously appropriated to the Controller without regard to fiscal years for allocation as follows:

(A) Twenty-five percent pursuant to subdivision (b) of Section 99312 of the Public Utilities Code, as that section read on July 30, 2009.

(B) Twenty-five percent pursuant to subdivision (c) of Section 99312 of the Public Utilities Code, as that section read on July 30, 2009.

(C) Fifty percent for the purposes of subdivisions (a) and (b) of Section 99315 of the Public Utilities Code, as that section read on July 30, 2009.

SEC. 6. On and after the effective date of the measure adding this article, and notwithstanding any other provision of this Constitution or any other law, the percentage of the tax imposed pursuant to Section 7202 of the Revenue and Taxation Code allocated to local transportation funds shall not be reduced below the percentage that was transmitted to such funds during the 2008 calendar year. Revenues allocated to local transportation funds shall be transmitted in accordance with Section 7204 of the Revenue and Taxation Code and deposited into local transportation funds in accordance with Section 29530 of the Government Code, as those sections read on June 30, 2009.

SEC. 7. (a) On and after the effective date of the measure adding this article, and notwithstanding subdivision (d) of Section 1 of Article XIX B of this Constitution or any other law, all revenues that are collected during the fiscal year from taxes under the Sales and Use Tax Law, or any successor to that law, upon the sale, storage, use, or other consumption in this State of motor vehicle fuel, as defined in Section 7326 of the Revenue and Taxation Code on June 30, 2009, shall be deposited quarterly into the Transportation Investment Fund (subdivision (a) of Section 7104 of the Revenue and Taxation Code) or its successor, which is hereby declared to be a trust fund. The Legislature may not take any action that permanently or temporarily borrows, diverts, appropriates for unrelated purposes, or delays, defers, suspends, or otherwise interrupts the quarterly deposit of these funds into the Transportation
Investment Fund. Funds in the Transportation Investment Fund may not be loaned or otherwise transferred to the General Fund or any other fund or account in the State Treasury.

(b)(1) If the Legislature reduces or repeals the taxes described in subdivision (a) and adopts an alternative source of revenue to replace the moneys derived from those taxes, the replacement revenue shall be deposited and allocated in the same manner, and dedicated to the same purposes, as the revenues being replaced.

(2) In addition to the requirements contained in subdivision (e) of Section 1 of Article XIX B, any bill modifying the percentage shares set forth in subdivision (c) of Section 1 of Article XIX B must remain in its final form for at least 12 days prior to passage in either house of the Legislature.

SEC. 8. (a) The Legislature may not require a community redevelopment agency (1) to pay, remit, loan or otherwise transfer, directly or indirectly, taxes on ad valorem real property and tangible personal property allocated to the agency pursuant to Section 16 of Article XVI to or for the benefit of the State, any agency of the State, or any jurisdiction; or (2) to use, restrict, or assign a particular purpose for such taxes for the benefit of the State, any agency of the State, or any jurisdiction, other than (A) for making payments to affected taxing agencies pursuant to Sections 33607.5 and 33607.7 of Health and Safety Code or similar statutes requiring such payments, as those statutes read on January 1, 2008; or (B) for the purpose of increasing, improving, and preserving the supply of low and moderate income housing available at affordable housing cost.

(b) “Jurisdiction” has the meaning specified in Section 95 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, as that section read on July 1, 2009.

SEC. 9. (a) If any challenge to invalidate an action that violates Sections 4 through 8, inclusive, of this article is successful either by way of a final judgment, settlement, or resolution by administrative or legislative action, there is hereby continuously appropriated from the General Fund to the Controller, without regard to fiscal years, that amount of revenue necessary to restore the fund or account from which the revenues were unlawfully taken or diverted to its financial status had the unlawful action not been taken.

(b) If any challenge to invalidate an action that violates Sections 1 through 3, inclusive, of this article is successful either by way of a final judgment, settlement, or resolution by administrative or legislative action, there is hereby continuously appropriated from the General Fund to the local government an amount of revenue equal to the amount of revenue unlawfully taken or diverted.

(c) Interest calculated at the Pooled Money Investment Fund rate from the date or dates the revenues were unlawfully taken or diverted shall accrue to the amounts required to be restored pursuant to this section. Within thirty days from the date a challenge is successful, the
Controller shall make the transfer required by the continuous appropriation and issue a notice to the parties that the transfer has been completed.

(d) If in any challenge brought pursuant to this section a restraining order or preliminary injunction is issued, the plaintiffs or petitioners shall not be required to post a bond obligating the plaintiffs or petitioners to indemnify the government defendants or the State of California for any damage the restraining order or preliminary injunction may cause.

SECTION 5.

Section 16 of Article XVI of the Constitution requires that a specified portion of the taxes levied upon the taxable property in a redevelopment project each year be allocated to the redevelopment agency to repay indebtedness incurred for the purpose of eliminating blight within the redevelopment project area. Section 16 of Article XVI prohibits the Legislature from reallocating some or all of that specified portion of the taxes to the State, an agency of the State, or any other taxing jurisdiction, instead of to the redevelopment agency. The Legislature has been illegally circumventing Section 16 of Article XVI in recent years by requiring redevelopment agencies to transfer a portion of those taxes for purposes other than the financing of redevelopment projects. A purpose of the amendments made by this measure is to prohibit the Legislature from requiring, after the taxes have been allocated to a redevelopment agency, that the redevelopment agency transfer some or all of those taxes to the State, an agency of the State, or a jurisdiction; or use some or all of those taxes for the benefit of the State, an agency of the State, or a jurisdiction.

SECTION 6. Continuous Appropriations.

The continuous appropriations provided for in this Act are intended to be "appropriations made by law" within the meaning of Section 7 of Article XVI of the California Constitution.

SECTION 7. Liberal Construction.

The provisions of this Act shall be liberally construed in order to effectuate its purposes.

SECTION 8. Conflicting Statutes.

Any statute enacted between October 21, 2009 and the effective date of this measure, that would have been prohibited if this measure were in effect on the date the statute was enacted, is hereby repealed.


In the event that this measure and another measure or measures relating to the direction or redirection of revenues dedicated to funding services provided by local
governments and/or transportation projects or services appear on the same statewide election ballot, the provisions of the other measure or measures shall be deemed to be in conflict with this measure. In the event that this measure shall receive a greater number of affirmative votes, the provisions of this measure shall prevail in their entirety, and the provisions of the other measure or measures shall be null and void.

SECTION 10. Severability.

It is the intent of the People that the provisions of this Act are severable and that if any provision of this Act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid such invalidity shall not affect any other provision or application of this Act which can be given effect without the invalid provision or application.
Governor’s Proposal
The Governor’s budget proposes to significantly change (1) how the state generates revenues to fund transportation programs and (2) what programs would be funded with these revenues. Currently, the state imposes an 18 cents per gallon tax on gasoline and diesel fuel (known as the gas tax). These monies are used for state highways and local streets and roads. The state also charges a sales tax on these fuels, and the revenues are used for public transit and rail, as well as state highway expansion and local street and road improvements. The Governor proposes to:

- Eliminate the state sales tax on fuel and make up most of the lost revenues with an increase in the per gallon gas tax. The gas tax increase would be capped so that in total motorists would not pay more than they do now in gas and sales tax combined.
- Use the revenues from the gas tax increase to (1) pay debt service on transportation bonds and (2) fund state highways and local streets and roads at amounts equivalent to what each would get under current law. The funding for state highways would be available for maintenance and rehabilitation (major repairs), in addition to expansion purposes.

No Funding for Transit and Rail, but Debt–Service Expenditures and a Tax Cut. For 2010–11, the proposal would reduce fuel sales tax revenues by $2.8 billion. The budget proposes to partially offset the revenue loss with a 10.8 cents per gallon gas tax increase, which would generate about $1.9 billion for the following:

- $629 million for state highways.
- $629 million for local roads.
- $603 million for debt service on transportation bonds. (The Governor would use an additional $400 million in transportation funds to pay other General Fund debt–service costs.)

As a result, there would be a net reduction in transportation revenues of about $1 billion in 2010–11. This would effectively provide California motorists a tax cut equivalent to about 5 cents per gallon at the pump. No new state funding would be provided for public transit and rail in the budget year. Under current law, about $1.6 billion would have been provided for these purposes.

Beyond the budget year, the Governor’s proposal would provide an ongoing dedicated source of funding, in addition to the General Fund, to pay transportation debt service. Depending on how the level of transportation debt–service costs changes from year to year, the gas tax rate would be adjusted, up to the proposed cap. As a result, it is uncertain whether motorists would continue to receive a tax cut at the pump in future years. Additionally, there would be no future state funds for transit and rail. Also, as described below in the “Proposition 98” section, the repeal of a General Fund revenue source (the sales tax on fuel) and its replacement with a non–General Fund excise tax would reduce the school funding guarantee.

Issues for Legislative Consideration

While the Governor’s proposal includes some features that have merit, it also raises a number of policy and potential legal issues. We discuss these below.
**Funding State Transportation Based on Road Use Has Benefits.** Under the proposal, the state would rely on the gas tax as the primary funding source for state transportation programs. This is consistent with past recommendations we have made to the Legislature. Because the gas tax is collected based on the amount (gallons) of fuel consumed, the charge is linked to the provision of a service—that is, the use of the roads by a driver. This would also be a more stable source of funding for transportation purposes. In contrast, fuel sales tax receipts fluctuate not only with the amount of fuel consumed, but also with changes in the price of fuel. Moreover, the amount of sales tax paid by a motorist may not closely reflect their use of the highway and road system.

**Proposal Provides Ongoing General Fund Relief.** The Governor’s proposal would provide a substantial and ongoing source of funding—hundreds of millions of dollars a year—to pay transportation debt service. This would significantly lessen the burden on the General Fund. The state has authorized about $30 billion in transportation bonds in recent years. Annual debt service costs on these bonds are projected to exceed $1 billion by 2011–12. A large portion of these costs could be paid for from the new gas tax.

**Constitutional and Statutory Requirements May Pose Legal Problems.** The use of state sales tax on fuel is restricted under provisions of the State Constitution and statute passed by the voters. The Governor’s proposal would not amend or eliminate any of the restrictions. Rather, the proposal would eliminate the source of revenues that are subject to the restrictions. The Legislature should carefully review whether all aspects of the proposal can be implemented in keeping with these legal restrictions.

**What Should Be the State’s Role in Funding Transit?** In recent years, due to increasing fuel prices, the amount of fuel sale tax revenues available to public transportation programs has ballooned to extraordinary sums—hundreds of millions of dollars a year—compared to the amounts historically provided by the state for these purposes. Under current law (and recent court rulings) these revenues cannot be redirected to other purposes. In weighing the Governor’s proposal to eliminate state funding for public transportation, the Legislature should consider whether providing funding assistance to regional and local transit and rail is a policy priority, and the type (capital versus operating) and level of any assistance it chooses to provide. Because the Constitution prohibits using the gas tax to support transit operations, the Legislature would have to identify a different source of funding if the Governor’s package were adopted.

**Proposal Provides No Additional Highways Funding.** As we have noted in past reports, funding for highway maintenance and rehabilitation has not kept pace with cost increases due to an aging system and inflation, and the state faces billions of dollars in highway repair and reconstruction needs. The Governor’s proposal would not provide any additional funding specifically for these activities. Instead, it would allow funding currently available for highway expansion to be used for rehabilitation instead. The Legislature should consider whether the gas tax should be increased beyond the proposed level in order to provide funding for highway rehabilitation.

**Significant Legal Risks for Some Proposals.** …Many of the Governor’s proposed solutions could face court challenges. The Legislature should be careful to draft budget-balancing measures (both budget and trailer bills) that anticipate such lawsuits and attempt to put the state in the strongest possible legal position to win them.
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Senate Vote Expected on Gas Tax Swap Early Next Week

Language Unavailable, Concerns Remain on Impacts to Local Funding

The Senate is expected to vote next week on the Senate Democrat's alternative proposal to Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger's Transportation Funding "Swap" proposal. In January, the League raised concerns about the Governor's plan to raid transit funding because it would threaten the stability of other vital state and local transportation funds. The primary objective for the Swap is motivated by desires to create savings to the state General Fund rather than improvement or stability to state transportation funding or policy.

The actual language of the Senate Democrats' proposal has not yet been made available. The following summary is based on the Senate Committee on Budget hearing on Tuesday, Feb. 16. In brief, the Senate Democratic Transportation Funding Swap Proposal contains four major provisions:

1. Repeals the sales tax on gasoline;
2. Creates a new statewide excise tax on gasoline with an index;
3. Retains the sales tax on diesel and changes the funding formulas; and
4. Authorizes a new locally-imposed fee on gasoline to fund transit, bicycle, and pedestrian projects.

Sales Excise Tax Swap: The sales tax on gasoline is currently 6 percent but will go back down to 5 percent in FY 2011-12. At $3 per gallon, the 6 percent sales tax on gasoline equates to about 18 cents per gallon. The proposal would create a new excise tax of 12.9 cents per gallon in FY 2009-10 and FY 2010-11 which would be increased to 18 cents per gallon starting in FY 2011-12. The proposal includes some kind of index, possibly done every three years and ties to what would have been received if the sales tax on gas had not been repealed. The alternative revenues will be allocated first to pay state transportation debt service, then as follows:

1. 30 percent to the State Transportation Improvement Program;
2. 30 percent to the State Highway Operation and Protection Program; and
3. 40 percent split evenly between cities and counties using current Highway User's Tax Account (HUTA) formulas.

Sales Tax on Diesel: The sales tax on diesel currently provides $313 million to transit programs equally divided between local transit agencies and state transit programs. The Governor proposed to eliminate this tax, but the Senate proposal would retain this funding and alter future allocations to allocate 75 percent to local transit agencies and 25 percent to state transit programs. While this is an improvement over the Governor's proposal, it is far less than what local transit agencies are supposed to receive under current law (note: transit funding has been diverted by the legislature in recent years, and transit has rarely actually seen what they are supposed to receive.) Local transit agencies have indicated that they need a minimum of $350 million annually to continue operations.

Authorizing New Local/Regional "Fee" on Gas: Local or regional agencies would be given the power to impose a local fee on gas with the support of the majority of the voters in the area. There is discussion among legislators regarding which local agencies should have this authorization - the municipal planning organization or county. The fee would be authorized for 30 years, and revenues could be used for operations and capital. It is also believed that the region would be required to adopt an SB 375 (Steinberg)' Sustainable Communities Strategy before the fee could be implemented. Absent language, the League has not had the opportunity to review potential legal issues, or consider the local political dynamics and viability of such a tool.

Vulnerabilities with Gas Tax Swap Proposal Undermines existing voter protections for local funding. Voters adopted Proposition 42 in order to earmark the sales tax on gasoline for capital improvement projects, public transit, and local streets and roads. Since the alternative funding source would no longer be from the state sales tax on gasoline, these funds would no longer receive Prop. 42 protections.

Under Prop. 42, shares can only be changed after a two-thirds vote of the Legislature and revenues can be borrowed only if the following conditions are met:

- An emergency proclamation is issued by the Governor;
- Two-thirds of the Legislature agrees;
- Repayment source is identified;
- Repayment is made within three years; and
- Revenues can be borrowed only twice in 10 years.

Under the new proposal, transportation funding would be "protected" by Article XIX of the state constitution - the same law that protects current 18 cent per gallon Highway Users Tax Account (HUTA) excise tax allocations. This is also the same law under which the Governor's Administration last year believed it was possible to take all local government shares to fund state debt payments, and was
narrowly defeated.

The protections provided by Article XIX are much more limited than the protections provided under Prop. 42 for the gasoline sales tax. Local transportation funds could be more easily borrowed the next time the state runs into difficulties. Only a majority vote of the legislature is required to change the HUTA allocation formulas or to borrow the revenues. While Article XIX requires that borrowed revenues be paid back within three years, the state does not have to pay interest nor is there a restriction on number of times revenue can be borrowed (in other words, the state can borrow the funds every year).

Increasing state debt service could erode local funding. State transportation debt service costs will grow to approximately $1.3 billion annually over the 10 years. In the future, additional transportation debt could be added into this debt service cost paid by the excise tax which could erode funds available for local streets and roads if additional bonds are approved by the voters. The recent history of the state-local relationship with local funding suggests the local shares of HUTA will be at risk for many years.

Take Action

City officials are urged to contact their legislators to ask that any language associated with this proposal be publicly available so that all parties can carefully review details and weigh the full impacts of any "swap" proposal on the long-term transportation policy goals previously set by the legislature and voters of this state. A decision of this importance should not be rushed with little transparency driven by the budget crisis of the hour.

last updated: 2/19/2010
RECOMMENDATIONS

The Budget and Administration/Personnel (B&A/P) Committee and staff recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) adopt the attached resolution (Attachment 1) approving the FY 09-10 Budget and Work Program as shown on Exhibit A of Attachment 1.

BACKGROUND

At its October 2009 meeting, the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) approved the current FY 09-10 budget and has made some project specific amendments since then. Due to expenditure trends and corrected grant amounts, it is necessary to make some amendments to that budget. After reviewing these amendments at their February 11, 2010 meeting, the Budget and Administration/Personnel (B&A/P) Committee recommends approval.

DISCUSSION

FY 09-10 Transportation Development Act (TDA) Revenues

In January 2010, RTC staff received a new FY 09-10 TDA revenue estimate from the Auditor Controller (Attachment 2). The new estimate is 0.55% ($36,247) below the previous estimate. This reduction in the estimate is within the RTC’s adopted TDA reserve of 3%. In addition, recent indicators suggest that the economy has at least stopped declining. The TDA revenue payments for January and February 2010 do match the new estimates. Those payments are advances for the actual November and December 2009 revenues. Recently, revenue advances have generally been lower than actual revenues. Every three months the TDA payment includes an adjustment for the advances of the prior quarter. Therefore, it is not prudent to draw conclusions from the January and February 2010 TDA revenue payments. In March 2010, the RTC will receive a TDA payment with an advance for the month of January 2010 and an adjustment for the advances of October through December 2009 revenues. Therefore, staff does not propose revising TDA apportionments at this time and using the TDA reserve fund to maintain those apportionments to the various recipients. This will leave a TDA reserve of 2.47%, if the estimated revenues are realized. Staff will continue monitoring TDA revenues and if they are still below the estimate request a new estimate from after the March 2010 payment.

Rail/Trail Authority

The RTC is in the final stages of negotiations for acquisition of the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line. In the last few months the RTC’s negotiations consultants and freight service technical
consultants have been doing a lot of work to help finalize negotiations with Union Pacific and Sierra Northern Railroad. To complete negotiations it is necessary to add funds to the budget lines for the negotiations attorney and for the freight service and business and management plan. The funds will be used to increase the contracts with Miller, Owen and Trost and Egan Consulting to complete negotiations for the project. There are sufficient unused funds in the contingency and general inspection budget lines.

**Planning Budget**

The AB2766 grant for the climate change section of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and the grant for the transit rotational intern are greater than originally estimated. The RTC also conducted traffic counts on the UCSC campus and has received reimbursement for those counts. These amounts are added to the corresponding budget lines. In addition, due to actual work trends it is necessary to adjust staff resources within the planning budget. It has taken more work than anticipated to complete the update of the Regional Transportation Plan and less staff work has been necessary for traffic monitoring because fewer traffic counts have been done in FY 09-10 as a cost cutting measure.

**Rideshare Budget**

For the Commute Solutions program, staff goes to various events and presentations to provide services to employers, employees and the community at large. At those events staff provides remote ridematching and commute consulting services to encourage event participants to carpool, vanpool or use other alternative modes of transportation. Staff has been using the general use laptop, which is one of the oldest laptops in the office and has become too slow for such remote services. In addition, one of the older desktop computers broke down recently. Therefore, staff plans to replace the broken down computer with a laptop computer for the Commute Solutions program that can be used for remote ridematching and commute consulting. It is necessary to add $1,000 to the office expense line of the rideshare budget to purchase the laptop computer. The Commute Solutions program has sufficient grant funds for this purchase.

The proposed budget amendments explained above are shown on Exhibit A of Attachment 1 along with notes explaining the proposed amendments. The B&A/P Committee and staff recommend approval of the attached resolution amending the FY 09-10 budget and work program as shown on Exhibit A of Attachment 1.

**SUMMARY**

The proposed FY 09-10 uses TDA reserve funds to maintain apportionments to recipients, corrects some grant revenue amounts, and redistributes resources within the rail/trail authority and planning budgets to reflect work trends. The B&A/P Committee and staff recommend that the RTC amend the FY 09-10 budget as shown on Exhibit A of Attachment 1.

**Attachments:**
1. Resolution amending the FY 09-10 budget as proposed in Exhibit A
2. Actual and estimated Transportation Development Act (TDA) revenues
RESOLUTION NO.

Adopted by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
on the date of March 4, 2010
on the motion of Commissioner
duly seconded by Commissioner

A RESOLUTION AMENDING THE FY 09-10 BUDGET AND WORK PROGRAM
FOR THE SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

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

1. The FY 09-10 Budget and Work Program for the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) are hereby amended as shown in Exhibit A.

AYES: COMMISSIONERS

NOES: COMMISSIONERS

ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS

ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS

______________________________
Randy Johnson, Chair

ATTEST:

______________________________
George Dondero, Secretary

Attachments: Exhibit A - SCCRTC FY 09-10 Budget as amended

Distribution: Auditor-Controller
RTC Fiscal
AMBAG

S:\RESOLUTI\2010\RES0310\BUDWPAMEND FY09-10.doc
## PROJECTED REVENUE SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCES</th>
<th>FY09-10 APPROVED 02/04/10</th>
<th>FY09-10 PROPOSED 02/11/10</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 TDA:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Auditor's 1/4 Cent Sales Tax Estimate</td>
<td>6,632,665</td>
<td>6,596,418</td>
<td>-36,247</td>
<td>- Based on Auditor-Controller estimate of January 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Reserves Budgeted</td>
<td>38,247</td>
<td>38,247</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>- To maintain apportionments to the TDA recipients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Interest Estimate</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 <strong>Total TDA Apportioned</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,660,965</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,660,965</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 STA:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 State Transit Assistance (STA)</td>
<td>78,883</td>
<td>78,883</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Planning Grant Funds/Others:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Rural Planning Assistance (RPA)</td>
<td>315,000</td>
<td>315,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 STIP for Planning (PPM)</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Transit Professional Development Grant - from AMBAG</td>
<td>9,131</td>
<td>10,418</td>
<td>1,287</td>
<td>- Corrected grant amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 RSTP Exchange - Eco Act and Comm Traff Saft Coal</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 CMAQ - Ecology Action</td>
<td>7,993</td>
<td>7,993</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 FHWA - Earmark</td>
<td>532,000</td>
<td>532,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 FHWA - Planning (PL) - from AMBAG</td>
<td>241,011</td>
<td>241,011</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Section 5317 - from AMBAG</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 AB2766/Air District Funds:</td>
<td>90,275</td>
<td>91,275</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>- Corrected grant amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Env. Justice Context-Sensitive Planning Grant</td>
<td>94,384</td>
<td>94,384</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Agricultural Worker Transportation Program</td>
<td>64,051</td>
<td>64,051</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 UCSC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,070</td>
<td>4,070</td>
<td>- Reimbursement for traffic counts on UCSC campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 RTC Funds Budgeted</td>
<td>377,527</td>
<td>377,527</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 <strong>Planning/Other Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,141,373</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,147,730</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,357</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Rideshare:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 RSTP and RSTP Exchange</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 CMAQ - Rideshare</td>
<td>168,100</td>
<td>168,100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 AB2766</td>
<td>118,790</td>
<td>118,790</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Service Authority for Freeway Emergency (SAFE):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 DMV Fees and interest</td>
<td>251,000</td>
<td>251,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Others - MTC SAFE and Partnership Planning Grant</td>
<td>308,210</td>
<td>308,210</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 SAFE Funds Budgeted</td>
<td>47,950</td>
<td>47,950</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Freeway Service Patrol (FSP):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Caltrans Grant</td>
<td>185,530</td>
<td>185,530</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA)</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 SAFE Funds Budgeted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 FSP Reserves Budgeted and Interest</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Rail Trail Authority:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Proposition 116 and STIP</td>
<td>20,481,059</td>
<td>20,481,059</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Leases</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 Federal Earmark</td>
<td>157,784</td>
<td>157,784</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 Transfer - in from TC Planning</td>
<td>102,310</td>
<td>102,310</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 Rail/Trail Funds Budgeted</td>
<td>354,167</td>
<td>354,167</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 Highway 1 PA/ED &amp; PS&amp;E:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 RSTP Exchange</td>
<td>1,373,235</td>
<td>1,373,235</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 CMAQ</td>
<td>111,200</td>
<td>111,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 Federal Earmark - Aux Lanes</td>
<td>772,654</td>
<td>772,654</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 STIP</td>
<td>1,701,000</td>
<td>1,701,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 Aux Lane Reserves</td>
<td>326,000</td>
<td>326,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 RSTP Exchange Program</td>
<td>6,314,924</td>
<td>6,314,924</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 CMAQ to Other Local Jurisdictions</td>
<td>35,769</td>
<td>35,769</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 <strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>42,153,103</strong></td>
<td><strong>42,159,460</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,357</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAIMANTS</td>
<td>FY09-10 APPROVED 02/04/10</td>
<td>FY09-10 PROPOSED 02/11/10</td>
<td>DIFFERENCE</td>
<td>NOTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Development Act (TDA): (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Allocation for Community Bridges transit</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA Administration</td>
<td>436,360</td>
<td>436,360</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>% Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA Planning</td>
<td>374,320</td>
<td>374,320</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>810,680</strong></td>
<td><strong>810,680</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCMTD</td>
<td>5,001,737</td>
<td>5,001,737</td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>0.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Transit (Community Bridges/CTSA)</td>
<td>491,399</td>
<td>491,399</td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>0.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Center</td>
<td>58,500</td>
<td>58,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>0.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Capitola</td>
<td>11,187</td>
<td>11,187</td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>0.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Cruz - Non Transit</td>
<td>65,506</td>
<td>65,506</td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>0.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Scotts Valley</td>
<td>13,065</td>
<td>13,065</td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>0.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Watsonville</td>
<td>57,620</td>
<td>57,620</td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>0.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>150,971</td>
<td>150,971</td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>0.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total TDA Apportioned</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,660,665</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,660,665</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Transit Assistance (STA) - SCMTD</td>
<td>78,883</td>
<td>78,883</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Grant Funds/Others:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC:</td>
<td>2,073,380</td>
<td>2,079,737</td>
<td>6,357</td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz Area TMA &amp; Ecology Action</td>
<td>67,993</td>
<td>67,993</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,141,373</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,147,730</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,357</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rideshare</td>
<td>446,890</td>
<td>446,890</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFE</td>
<td>608,160</td>
<td>608,160</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway Service Patrol (FSP)</td>
<td>367,030</td>
<td>367,030</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Trail Authority</td>
<td>21,215,320</td>
<td>21,215,320</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 1 PA/ED</td>
<td>4,284,089</td>
<td>4,284,089</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP Exchange Program</td>
<td>6,314,924</td>
<td>6,314,924</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ to Other Local Jurisdictions</td>
<td>35,769</td>
<td>35,769</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>42,153,103</strong></td>
<td><strong>42,159,460</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,357</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) TDA apportionments are based on the formulas in the RTC's Rules and Regulations. Balance not used for Planning and Administration is allocated to other TDA claimants as follows: 85.5% is appropriated to SCMTD, 8.4% to Community Bridges and 1% to the Volunteer Center; the remaining funds are proportionally allocated to cities and the County according to population.
## OPERATING BUDGET SUMMARY

### FY 08-09 ADOPTED DETAIL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>TOTAL FY 08-09</th>
<th>SALARIES &amp; BENEFITS</th>
<th>SERVICES &amp; SUPPLIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ADOPTED 5/09</td>
<td>02/11/10</td>
<td>5/09 ADOPTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC - Administration</td>
<td>676,560</td>
<td>201,000</td>
<td>475,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rideshare</td>
<td>271,665</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>91,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFE</td>
<td>372,566</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>297,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway Service Patrol</td>
<td>284,450</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>238,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail/Trail Authority</td>
<td>21,486,154</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>21,366,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 1 - PA/ED</td>
<td>5,178,833</td>
<td>275,000</td>
<td>4,903,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC Planning</td>
<td>1,929,741</td>
<td>807,379</td>
<td>1,122,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Budget</strong></td>
<td><strong>30,199,969</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,704,379</strong></td>
<td><strong>28,495,590</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FY 09-10 PROPOSED DETAIL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>TOTAL FY 09-10</th>
<th>SALARIES &amp; BENEFITS</th>
<th>SERVICES &amp; SUPPLIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02/11/10</td>
<td>02/11/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC - Administration</td>
<td>652,500</td>
<td>201,000</td>
<td>451,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rideshare</td>
<td>294,100</td>
<td>185,500</td>
<td>108,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFE</td>
<td>553,350</td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td>458,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway Service Patrol</td>
<td>331,400</td>
<td>47,500</td>
<td>283,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail/Trail Authority</td>
<td>21,215,320</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>21,095,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 1 - PA/ED</td>
<td>4,004,831</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>3,754,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC Planning</td>
<td>2,305,910</td>
<td>859,326</td>
<td>1,446,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Budget</strong></td>
<td><strong>29,357,411</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>27,599,085</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: (1) Includes staffing shown on page 15 and $7,494 in anticipated funds for a transit rotational intern funded with a Transit Professional Development Grant

---

## OPERATING BUDGET COMPARISON

### PRIOR YEAR AND BUDGET YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>FY 08-09 ADOPTED 5/09</th>
<th>FY 08-09 ACTUAL 6/30/09</th>
<th>FY 08-09 ACTUAL LESS FY 08-09 ADOPTED</th>
<th>FY09-10 PROPOSED 02/11/10</th>
<th>FY 08-09 PROPOSED ADOPTED 5/09</th>
<th>FY09-10 PROPOSED VS FY 08-09 PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC - Administration</td>
<td>676,560</td>
<td>466,489</td>
<td>(210,071)</td>
<td>652,500</td>
<td>676,560</td>
<td>(24,060)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rideshare</td>
<td>271,665</td>
<td>208,445</td>
<td>(63,220)</td>
<td>294,100</td>
<td>271,665</td>
<td>22,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFE</td>
<td>372,566</td>
<td>329,920</td>
<td>(42,646)</td>
<td>553,350</td>
<td>372,566</td>
<td>180,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway Service Patrol</td>
<td>284,450</td>
<td>261,145</td>
<td>(23,305)</td>
<td>331,400</td>
<td>284,450</td>
<td>46,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail/Trail Authority</td>
<td>21,486,154</td>
<td>431,741</td>
<td>(21,054,413)</td>
<td>21,215,320</td>
<td>21,486,154</td>
<td>(270,834)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 1 - PA/ED</td>
<td>5,178,833</td>
<td>1,942,684</td>
<td>(3,236,149)</td>
<td>4,004,831</td>
<td>5,178,833</td>
<td>(1,174,002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC Planning</td>
<td>1,929,741</td>
<td>807,379</td>
<td>(1,122,362)</td>
<td>2,305,910</td>
<td>1,929,741</td>
<td>376,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Budget</strong></td>
<td><strong>30,199,969</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,822,852</strong></td>
<td><strong>(25,377,117)</strong></td>
<td><strong>29,357,411</strong></td>
<td><strong>30,199,969</strong></td>
<td><strong>(842,558)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: (1) Includes staffing shown on page 15 and $7,494 in anticipated funds for a transit rotational intern funded with a Transit Professional Development Grant
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK ELEMENT #179</th>
<th>FY09-10 APPROVED 02/04/10</th>
<th>FY09-10 PROPOSED 02/11/10</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rideshare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP Exchange</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ - Rideshare</td>
<td>168,100</td>
<td>168,100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB2766 - Carryover</td>
<td>118,790</td>
<td>118,790</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB2766 - New</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
<td><strong>446,890</strong></td>
<td><strong>446,890</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rideshare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>185,500</td>
<td>185,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td><strong>446,890</strong></td>
<td><strong>446,890</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
- Computer for off site ride matching from events and presentations
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK ELEMENT #682</th>
<th>FY09-10</th>
<th>FY09-10</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>02/04/10</td>
<td>02/11/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 REVENUES:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 STIP</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Proposition 116</td>
<td>10,481,059</td>
<td>10,481,059</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Leases</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Federal Earmark</td>
<td>157,784</td>
<td>157,784</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Transfer from TC Funds</td>
<td>102,310</td>
<td>102,310</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Rail/Trail Authority Reserve Funds Budgeted</td>
<td>354,167</td>
<td>354,167</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,215,320</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,215,320</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 EXPENDITURES:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Staff and Overhead:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Salaries &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Services and Supplies:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Liability Insurance</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Consulting Services:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Appraisals</td>
<td>55,004</td>
<td>55,004</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Negotiation Attorney</td>
<td>133,938</td>
<td>183,938</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>To complete negotiations with Union Pacific and shortline operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Lease Investigation</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Title Company</td>
<td>20,012</td>
<td>20,012</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Freight Service and Business &amp; Management Plan</td>
<td>44,634</td>
<td>69,634</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>To complete negotiations with shortline operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Legal Review for EIR</td>
<td>22,610</td>
<td>22,610</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Structures Assessment</td>
<td>7,804</td>
<td>7,804</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 STB Filling</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Closing Costs</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 General Inspection</td>
<td>44,832</td>
<td>19,832</td>
<td>-25,000</td>
<td>Moved to freight service and business management plan line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 On Call Consultant for Rail Operations Management</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Phase II Site Assessment</td>
<td>176,153</td>
<td>176,153</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Recreation Rail - Environmental Review</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Title Contingency</td>
<td>5,300</td>
<td>5,300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Title Insurance</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Hazardous Materials and Pollution Insurance</td>
<td>300,791</td>
<td>300,791</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 General Contingency</td>
<td>64,242</td>
<td>14,242</td>
<td>-50,000</td>
<td>Moved to negotiating attorney line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Various Rail Line Improvements</td>
<td>5,735,000</td>
<td>5,735,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Right of Way Acquisition</td>
<td>14,200,000</td>
<td>14,200,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Services &amp; Supplies</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,095,320</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,095,320</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,215,320</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,215,320</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
### REVENUES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCES</th>
<th>FY09-10 APPROVED 02/04/10</th>
<th>FY09-10 PROPOSED 02/11/10</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. TDA Planning</td>
<td>374,320</td>
<td>374,320</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Rural Planning Assistance (RPA)</td>
<td>315,000</td>
<td>315,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. STIP for Planning (PPM)</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Transit Professional Development Grant - from AMBAG</td>
<td>9,131</td>
<td>10,418</td>
<td>1,287</td>
<td>Corrected funding amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. RSTP Exchange - Eco Act &amp; Comm Trafc Saty Coal</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. CMAQ - Ecology Action</td>
<td>7,993</td>
<td>7,993</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. FHWA - Earmark</td>
<td>532,000</td>
<td>532,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. FHWA - Planning (PL) - from AMBAG</td>
<td>241,011</td>
<td>241,011</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Section 5317 - from AMBAG</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Env. Justice Context-Sensitive Planning Grant</td>
<td>94,384</td>
<td>94,384</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Agricultural Worker Transportation Program</td>
<td>64,051</td>
<td>64,051</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. UCSC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,070</td>
<td>4,070</td>
<td>Reimbursement for traffic counts on UCSC campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. AB2766/Air District Funds:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Bike Secure - RTC</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Folding Bikes on Bus Program - Ecology Action</td>
<td>17,066</td>
<td>17,066</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Emergency Ride Home - Ecology Action</td>
<td>34,209</td>
<td>34,209</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Climate change in RTP</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>Corrected funding amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. RTC Funds Budgeted</td>
<td>161,387</td>
<td>161,387</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL REVENUES**

|未标出的行| 2,299,553 | 2,305,910 | 6,357 |

**Note:**

- Reimbursement for traffic counts on UCSC campus
- Corrected funding amount
## SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
### OPERATING BUDGET BY PROGRAM - PLANNING EXPENDITURES
#### FY 2009-2010 BUDGET

### PLANNING EXPENDITURES:

#### 721600/721700/721750

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENDITURES</th>
<th>WORK ELEMENT NUMBER</th>
<th>FY09-10 ADOPTED 02/04/10</th>
<th>FY09-10 PROPOSED 02/11/10</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff &amp; Overhead by Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Coordination</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use/Transportation Coordination</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>35,258</td>
<td>35,258</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Program</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Information</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian Planning</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>59,000</td>
<td>59,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSST) Network</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Transportation</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotational Transit Intern</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>9,131</td>
<td>12,918</td>
<td>3,787</td>
<td>- Corrected funding amount and match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>85,968</td>
<td>98,968</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>- More work than anticipated to produce 2010 RTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Monitoring</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>16,210</td>
<td>1,710</td>
<td>-14,500</td>
<td>- Moved to other lines consistent with work trend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSM</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>11,472</td>
<td>11,472</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>205,000</td>
<td>205,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy &amp; Roadway Planning</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>96,000</td>
<td>96,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Staff and Overhead</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>857,039</strong></td>
<td><strong>859,326</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,287</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services &amp; Supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folding Bikes on Bus Program (Ecology Action)</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>17,066</td>
<td>17,066</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike To Work Program (Ecology Action)</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>34,427</td>
<td>34,427</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Traffic Safety Coalition (Safety Education)</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>86,064</td>
<td>86,064</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm Traffic Safety Coalition (South County Bike/Ped safety)</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion Education Campaign (Ecology Action)</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>7,993</td>
<td>7,993</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go Green Campaign (Ecology Action)</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Ride Home (Ecology Action)</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>34,209</td>
<td>34,209</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green (Hybrid) Vanpool Project (Community Bridges)</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility Outreach and Education Project (Community Bridges)</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>77,384</td>
<td>77,384</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Worker Transp Program (Community Bridges)</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>64,051</td>
<td>64,051</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services (contracts)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento Assistant</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Assistant</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>44,600</td>
<td>44,600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Funding Development Consultants</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>2,356</td>
<td>2,356</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Consultant/Engineer</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan EIR</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBSST Network Master Plan Consultant</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RTC Work Element Related Items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Secure Program</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Monitoring services - counts</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>10,570</td>
<td>4,070</td>
<td>- For traffic counts on UCSC campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing RTP, RTIP, other Documents and Pub Info Materials</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint RTC/METRO Outreach</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBSST Network Plan Outreach</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>146,553</td>
<td>146,553</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to TDA Reserve</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>102,310</td>
<td>102,310</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to Special Allocation for Community Bridges</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Services &amp; Supplies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1,442,514</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,446,584</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,070</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2,299,553</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,305,910</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,357</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK ELEMENT NUMBER</th>
<th>FY 09-10 PROPOSED 02/11/10</th>
<th>TDA</th>
<th>RTC FUND</th>
<th>RPA</th>
<th>FHWA PL - AMBAG</th>
<th>AB2766</th>
<th>STIP</th>
<th>FTA 5305</th>
<th>FHWA Earmark</th>
<th>SECTION 5317 AMBAG</th>
<th>TARC</th>
<th>Env Just Plng Grant</th>
<th>AWTP Plng Grant</th>
<th>CMAQ</th>
<th>RSTPX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Plan Coordination</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>54,000</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Land Use/Transportation Coordination</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>35,258</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>25,520</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Work Program</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Public Information</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian Planning</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>59,000</td>
<td>5,020</td>
<td></td>
<td>25,145</td>
<td>8,328</td>
<td>3,507</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSST) Network</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>52,274</td>
<td>2,701</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>33,993</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Specialized Transportation</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Rotational Transit Intern</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>12,918</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,418</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>98,968</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>52,274</td>
<td>2,701</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>33,993</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Traffic Monitoring</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>1,710</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,710</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>TSM</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>11,472</td>
<td>5,139</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,333</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>205,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>205,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Hwy &amp; Roadway Planning</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>96,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63,851</td>
<td>32,149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td><strong>Salaries, Benefits &amp; Overhead Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>859,326</td>
<td>10,159</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>315,000</td>
<td>241,011</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>243,500</td>
<td>10,418</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td><strong>Services &amp; Supplies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td><strong>Pass-through Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Folding Bikes on Bus Program (Ecology Action)</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>17,066</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17,066</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Community Traffic Safety Coalition (Safety Education)</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>34,427</td>
<td>34,427</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34,427</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Comm Traffic Safety Coal (South County Bike/Ped safety)</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>86,064</td>
<td>86,064</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>86,064</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Congestion Education Campaign (Ecology Action)</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>7,993</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,993</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Go Green Campaign (Ecology Action)</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Emergency Ride Home (Ecology Action)</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>34,209</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34,209</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Mobility Outreach and Education Project (Community Bridges)</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>77,384</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>77,384</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Agricultural Worker Transp Program (Community Bridges)</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>64,051</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>64,051</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Sacramento Assistant</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Washington Assistant</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>44,600</td>
<td>44,600</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>44,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Transportation Funding Development Consultants</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>2,356</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,356</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Technical Consultant/Engineer</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan EIR</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>MBSST Network Master Plan Consultant</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>(Master Plan, environmental, review, preliminary design)</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>RTC Work Element Related Items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Bike Secure Program</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>6,221</td>
<td>3,779</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Traffic Monitoring services - counts</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>10,570</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>4,070</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Printing RTP, RTIP, other Documents and Pub Info Materials</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>MBΣST Network Plan Outreach</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Transfer to TDA Reserve</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>146,553</td>
<td>146,553</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>146,553</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Transfer to Special Allocation for Community Bridges</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Transfer to Rail/Trail Authority</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>102,310</td>
<td>6,296</td>
<td>96,014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td><strong>Subtotal Services &amp; Supplies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,446,584</td>
<td>364,161</td>
<td>161,149</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>81,275</td>
<td>56,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>520,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,070</td>
<td>77,384</td>
<td>64,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>2,305,910</td>
<td>374,320</td>
<td>161,387</td>
<td>315,000</td>
<td>241,011</td>
<td>91,275</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>10,418</td>
<td>532,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,070</td>
<td>94,384</td>
<td>64,051</td>
<td>7,993</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
### FUND BALANCES AND RESERVES
#### FY 2009-2010 BUDGET

### FUND BALANCES & RESERVES: 02/11/10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>TDA FUND (1)</th>
<th>RTC FUND (2)</th>
<th>RIDESHARE</th>
<th>RAIL/TRAIR AUTHORITY FUND</th>
<th>HIGHWAY ONE PA/ED FUND</th>
<th>SAFE OPERATING FUND</th>
<th>FSP FUND</th>
<th>RSTP EXCHANGE FUND</th>
<th>STA (4) FUND</th>
<th>TOTAL ALL FUNDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance 7-01-09</td>
<td>1,761,599</td>
<td>603,506</td>
<td>370,601</td>
<td>1,317,676</td>
<td>482,852</td>
<td>88,246</td>
<td>5,940,620</td>
<td>68,815</td>
<td>10,633,915</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgeted Carryover 08/09 (5)</td>
<td>(1,709,172)</td>
<td>(377,527)</td>
<td>(354,167)</td>
<td>(1,317,676)</td>
<td>(12,000)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(5,938,924)</td>
<td>(9,709,467)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(35,950)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>(35,950)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from RTC</td>
<td>146,553</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve funds budgeted</td>
<td></td>
<td>(36,247)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available Reserve Fund Balance</td>
<td>162,733</td>
<td>225,979</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>888,498</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for Reserves - 8%</td>
<td>(527,713)</td>
<td>(236,673)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(764,386)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus &lt;Deficit&gt; from Target</td>
<td>(364,981)</td>
<td>(10,694)</td>
<td>16,434</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>434,902</td>
<td>88,246</td>
<td>1,696</td>
<td>68,815</td>
<td>124,112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unappropriated Revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>522,488</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fund Balance</td>
<td>(364,981)</td>
<td>(10,694)</td>
<td>152,790</td>
<td>279,258</td>
<td>489,712</td>
<td>123,876</td>
<td></td>
<td>68,815</td>
<td>646,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:
24 - Numbers in parentheses are negative numbers. All other numbers are positive numbers.
25 - Funds within each category (column) are restricted for use on projects/programs within that category.
26 - **Fund Balance (7-01-09)** = Balances of funds not used at the end of prior fiscal year.
27 - **Budgeted Carryover/New** = Portion of Fund Balance used in current fiscal year budget.
28 - **Target for Reserves** = Minimum Fund Balance recommended to cover potential revenue shortfalls. For TDA and RTC Funds see notes 1 & 2 below.
29 - **Unappropriated Revenues** = Amount of revenues designated for specific projects/programs that likely will not be expended in FY09/10, but will be needed in future years.
30
31
32 (1) 8% reserve is established in RTC Rules and Regulations; 2.47%00% available due to use of reserve funds in FYs 07-08, 08-09 and 09-10
33 (2) 8% reserve target consistent with TDA reserve fund; 7.65% available due to reduced revenues
34 (3) Certificate of participation (COP) to borrow funds for call box installation - fully paid in 2002
35 (4) This is a pass-through fund, all receipts are paid to SCMTD.
36 (5) Includes combination of budgeted carryover and budgeted new for RTC Fund
## Transportation Development Act (TDA)

### Estimated and Actual Revenues FYs 07-08, 08-09 & 09-10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>FY 07-08 Actual Revenues</th>
<th>FY 08-09 Auditor Controller Final Estimate</th>
<th>FY 08-09 Actual Revenues</th>
<th>FY 09-10 Auditor Controller Jan 09 Estimate</th>
<th>FY 09-10 Auditor Controller Mar 09 Estimate</th>
<th>FY 09-10 Auditor Controller July 09 Estimate</th>
<th>FY 09-10 Auditor Controller Jan 10 Estimate</th>
<th>FY 09-10 Actual Revenues to Jan 10 Estimate</th>
<th>FY 09-10 Difference as % of Actual to Jan 10 Estimate</th>
<th>FY 09-10 Difference as % of Cumulative</th>
<th>Cumulative % of Actual to Jan 10 Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JULY</td>
<td>543,200</td>
<td>570,200</td>
<td>570,200</td>
<td>570,200</td>
<td>570,200</td>
<td>454,800</td>
<td>454,800</td>
<td>454,800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUGUST</td>
<td>724,300</td>
<td>760,200</td>
<td>760,200</td>
<td>760,200</td>
<td>760,200</td>
<td>646,170</td>
<td>539,000</td>
<td>539,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPTEMBER</td>
<td>863,255</td>
<td>634,334</td>
<td>634,334</td>
<td>634,334</td>
<td>634,334</td>
<td>539,184</td>
<td>719,093</td>
<td>719,093</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTOBER</td>
<td>599,500</td>
<td>567,100</td>
<td>567,100</td>
<td>567,100</td>
<td>567,100</td>
<td>499,048</td>
<td>490,500</td>
<td>490,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOVEMBER</td>
<td>799,300</td>
<td>756,100</td>
<td>756,100</td>
<td>756,100</td>
<td>756,100</td>
<td>665,368</td>
<td>555,900</td>
<td>555,900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECEMBER</td>
<td>638,280</td>
<td>700,859</td>
<td>700,859</td>
<td>700,859</td>
<td>700,859</td>
<td>616,756</td>
<td>625,785</td>
<td>625,785</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANUARY</td>
<td>583,600</td>
<td>538,600</td>
<td>538,600</td>
<td>554,420</td>
<td>538,600</td>
<td>538,600</td>
<td>538,600</td>
<td>465,300</td>
<td>-73,300</td>
<td>-13.61%</td>
<td>98.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEBRUARY</td>
<td>778,200</td>
<td>590,700</td>
<td>590,700</td>
<td>739,290</td>
<td>590,700</td>
<td>590,700</td>
<td>590,700</td>
<td>620,400</td>
<td>29,700</td>
<td>5.03%</td>
<td>99.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCH</td>
<td>543,629</td>
<td>578,624</td>
<td>578,624</td>
<td>516,446</td>
<td>578,624</td>
<td>578,624</td>
<td>578,624</td>
<td>578,624</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRIL</td>
<td>494,300</td>
<td>455,497</td>
<td>432,400</td>
<td>469,585</td>
<td>455,497</td>
<td>432,400</td>
<td>432,400</td>
<td>432,400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>659,000</td>
<td>607,269</td>
<td>464,400</td>
<td>626,050</td>
<td>607,269</td>
<td>464,400</td>
<td>464,400</td>
<td>464,400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE</td>
<td>652,069</td>
<td>600,882</td>
<td>606,615</td>
<td>619,466</td>
<td>600,882</td>
<td>606,615</td>
<td>606,615</td>
<td>606,615</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>7,878,633</td>
<td>7,360,365</td>
<td>7,200,133</td>
<td>7,514,051</td>
<td>7,360,365</td>
<td>6,632,665</td>
<td>6,596,418</td>
<td>4,470,778</td>
<td>-43,600</td>
<td>-0.66%</td>
<td>67.41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% Change

-6.58% -2.18% 4.36% -2.05% -9.89% -0.55%

% Change FY 07-08 to FY 08-09 Actual Revenues -8.61%
% Change FY 08-09 Actual to FY 09-10 Jan 10 Estimated Revenues -8.38%
AGENDA: March 4, 2010

TO: Regional Transportation Commission (RTC)

FROM: Luis Pavel Mendez, Deputy Director

RE: Fiscal Year (FY) 10-11 Budget and Work Program

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Budget and Administration/Personnel (B&A/P) Committee and staff recommend that the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) adopt the attached resolution (Attachment 1) approving the proposed FY 10-11 Budget and Work Program (Exhibits A and B of Attachment 1).

BACKGROUND

At the beginning of each calendar year, staff and the Budget and Administration/Personnel (B&A/P) Committee prepare the draft RTC Budget and Work Program for the following fiscal year and forward it to the RTC for its consideration and adoption. This timing is consistent with the RTC’s Rules and Regulations and with the need to coordinate with the Association for Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) who includes the RTC Budget and Work Program in the Overall Work Program and Budget for the Monterey Bay Region. This early budget approval also allows the RTC to inform claimants of projected Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds for their use in developing their organizations’ budgets for the following fiscal year.

DISCUSSION

The RTC continues to face financial challenges resulting from the worst economic recession in decades. The recession led to reduced Transportation Development Act (TDA) revenues, uncertainty over state revenues, and loss of grant funds for some RTC projects. The proposed FY 10-11 Budget (Exhibit A of Attachment 1) addresses those challenges through continued vigilance of expenditures and the aid of grant funds secured by the RTC. The proposed budget along with the proposed Work Program (Exhibit B of Attachment 1) continue implementation of the RTC’s priority projects and on-going programs, while addressing the work that must be completed with the recently secured grants. The bulk of the work for the secured grants is to be performed in FY 10-11 with some carryover into FY 11-12.

Grants recently secured by the RTC and reflected in this budget are:

- Environmental Justice Planning - $34,000 for work on accessible pedestrian facility planning to and from transit facilities
- Caltrans Partnership Planning - $210,000 to produce a 511 traveler information system feasibility and implementation plan
- AB2766 – $70,000 to implement a carpool incentive program
- Regional Surface Transportation Program – $130,000 to improve, develop and increase use of park and ride lots
- Regional Surface Transportation Program – $40,000 to develop a bicycle route signage program

The grant funds will cover RTC staff costs and consultant costs and amount to a total of $484,000 in the proposed FY 10-11 budget. These grants help to address the loss and reduction of other funds. At the same time the RTC must dedicate the staffing resources to complete the work specified in the grant applications.

**Transportation Development Act (TDA) Apportionments (budget pp. 1, 2 and 11)**

One of the main sources of funding for transportation in Santa Cruz County is the TDA, which established that ¼% of the State sales tax would go to transportation. Attachment 2 shows actual and estimated TDA revenues for FYs 07-08 to 10-11. In FYs 08-09 and 09-10 TDA revenues decreased more than 8% from the prior fiscal year. The estimated TDA revenues available for FY 10-11 are 0.55% lower than available revenues for FY 09-10. Therefore, the FY 10-11 budget proposes that all TDA revenue apportionments be reduced by 0.54% consistent with the revenue estimate with the exception of the apportionments for Bike to Work and the Community Traffic Safety Coalition.

The B&A/P Committee recommends that apportionments for Bike to Work and the Community Traffic Safety Coalition remain at FY 09-10 levels. The corresponding reduction for Bike to Work and the Community Traffic Safety Coalition would total $651. In order to avoid this reduction and to not reduce apportionments for the other TDA recipients any further, that amount is taken from the TDA reserve fund.

For FY 07-08 and FY 08-09 the RTC used some TDA reserve funds to help offset revenue reductions. The Auditor-Controller has recommended a minimum reserve fund of 3% to 5% and in January 2009 the RTC decided to maintain a TDA reserve fund of 3%. The proposed apportionments maintain a 3% reserve; however, it is uncertain whether the current TDA revenue estimates and interest revenues will be realized. Staff will continue to monitor the revenues and report them to the B&A/P Committee and the RTC. If revenues continue to decrease, staff will request revised estimates from the Auditor-Controller and return to the B&A/P Committee and the RTC with any proposed action.

**Other Changes from FY 09-10 Budget**

Throughout the proposed FY 10-11 budget notes indicate the changes from FY 09-10 budget levels. Some of those changes result from reduced revenues, completion of work or updated cost estimates. A number of budget lines will include carryover from FY 09-10 but the carryover levels are not yet known or are challenging to estimate at this point. Those carryovers will be included in the RTC’s fall budget amendment.

**Carryover Funds and RTC Reserve Funds**

Carryover funds are those budgeted in FY 09-10 and not spent in that year. For some revenues and expenditures staff provided possible carryover estimates to ensure that projects can
continue between the end of FY 09-10 and the RTC’s annual fall budget amendment. For other budget items affected by potential carryover funds, staff will provide the actual carryover funds with the proposed fall budget amendment.

The RTC has a reserve target for the RTC fund of 8% of the operations budget. During the current economic downturn it has been difficult to maintain that reserve fund goal. As in the past, RTC reserve funds from the current fiscal year are budgeted for the next fiscal year in this preliminary budget. As a result, the proposed FY 10-11 budget shows a reserve for the RTC fund of 0.20%. In the annual fall budget amendment, a higher reserve will be proposed after the carryover revenues from FY 09-10 are known. It is unlikely that the RTC will be able to meet its 8% goal but staff will work to ensure that at least the established minimum of 3% is met.

**Staff Resources (budget p. 15 and throughout proposed budget)**

In FY 09-10 the RTC budgeted for 14.25 full time equivalent (FTE) staff positions. This included a paid intern for which the RTC had previously secured a grant to specifically fund that position. The FTE positions budgeted in FY 09-10 represent a reduction of a permanent 0.5 FTE from FY 08-09 for a Transportation Planning Technician position vacated after a retirement. Not filling that position along with a furlough and voluntary time off without pay helped the RTC accommodate lower revenues in its FY 09-10 budget.

By the beginning of FY 10-11 the RTC will have exhausted the grant funds for the paid intern. However, the RTC was successful in securing other grants for work which must be delivered in FY 10-11. The grants fund most of the required staff work. Therefore, the FY 10-11 budget proposes the same level of FTE positions (14.25) as were budgeted in FY 09-10. Because the RTC will no longer have the funds for the half-time paid intern, this proposed budget includes filling the half-time Transportation Planning Technician position not filled in FY 09-10. In addition, the FY 10-11 budget does not propose any furloughs or voluntary time off without pay. This level of staffing is necessary to deliver the work promised in the secured grant applications, which provide funding for about 1.5 FTE positions for FY 10-11. If non-grant revenues should fall short of the projections in this budget, management will work with staff and grant providers to develop measures including voluntary time off without pay and/or furloughs and extended project timelines, as needed to maintain a balanced budget.

The proposed FY 10-11 staffing budget represents a 5% increase over the FY 09-10 budget due to cost increases in benefits and the staffing level proposed above. The new grant funds provide about 9.5% of the overall staff funding. The proposed staffing budget does not include any cost of living increases for any staff members and includes a reduction in the management cash out benefit, which reduces staffing costs over 1%. There may be additional cost increases to benefits because due to changes for the Santa Cruz County staff benefits, the RTC can no longer purchase disability insurance and other ancillary benefits through the County. Staff is seeking cost estimates for those benefits from insurance pools to secure the benefits at the lowest possible cost. Staff will return to the B&A/P Committee and the RTC with quotes and recommendations for the RTC to make the final decision.
Proposed Commission Work Program

For next fiscal year, the proposed SCCRTC Work Program (Exhibit B of Attachment 1) includes state-mandated responsibilities and Commission priorities, including:

- Continuation of the Highway 1/HOV Lane project environmental analysis including completion of a STARS analysis
- Completion of the Soquel to Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes project design (PS&E) phase and initiation of project construction
- Coordination with Caltrans and City of Santa Cruz staff for completion of the Highway 1/17 Merge Lanes project with the final landscaping phase of the project
- Management of and planning for the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line after purchase
- Work to develop potential new transportation revenues to help meet continuously increasing transportation needs in the region
- Continued work with project sponsors and funding agencies on securing funds for high priority projects from all modes of transportation including federal stimulus funds
- Continued work on the Master Plan for the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSST) Network
- Tasks associated with ensuring that the RTC operates as effectively and efficiently as possible as an independent agency
- Complete the 2010 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and initiate work on the 2012 RTP
- Monitor and participate in local, state and federal efforts to address global climate change
- Participate in statewide efforts to authorize a new federal transportation funding bill and ensure that California and its regional agencies receive their fair share of federal funds

Recently, the RTC approved switching the format of the work program to the new format used by the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG). Staff is still working on the format conversation; therefore, the work program still uses the RTC format. When staff returns to the RTC in the fall for the annual budget and work program amendment, the work program will be in the new format. The proposed work program includes more details on these priorities and other on-going RTC projects. The B&A/P Committee and staff recommend that the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) adopt the attached resolution approving the proposed FY10-11 Budget (Exhibit A of Attachment 1) and Work Program (Exhibit B of Attachment 1).

Potential Additional Revenue

Staff will continue to explore sources of potential additional revenue for the RTC including grant funding opportunities. As communicated in the staff report on legislative efforts with the help of state and federal legislative assistants, staff secured the introduction of a state bill for additional funding for motorist aid projects and submitted federal earmark requests for two projects. Staff is also participating in a statewide effort to lower the threshold from 67% to 55% for raising local revenues through a sales tax measure.

In addition, the RTC is allowed to use up to 5% of its State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) shares to cover the costs of preparing the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), conducting regional planning efforts, and monitoring the implementation of STIP projects. The RTC has used between
$150,000 and $300,000 per year in STIP funds for this work. For FY 10-11, $150,000 in STIP funds is programmed for this work but the RTC has requested an increase up to $300,000. If the California Transportation Commission (CTC) approves this increase, staff will return to the B&A/P Committee and the RTC with recommendations for corresponding budget amendments.

SUMMARY

The proposed FY 10-11 budget and work program for the RTC includes continued oversight of the Highway 1 projects, management of the rail line right-of-way, MBSST Network planning, continuation of service programs and work promised in grant applications secured by the RTC. Available TDA funds in FY 10-11 are estimated to be slightly lower and TDA apportionments are reduced consistent with the estimate. The B&A/P Committee and staff recommend that the RTC adopt the attached resolution approving the proposed FY 10-11 budget (Exhibit A to Attachment 1) and work program (Exhibit B to Attachment 1).

Attachments:
1. Resolution approving the proposed FY 10-11 budget and work program
2. Actual and Estimated Transportation Development Act Revenues
## PROJECTED REVENUE SUMMARY

### SOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>FY09-10 Approved</th>
<th>FY09-10 Proposed</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Development Act (TDA):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditor's 1/4 Cent Sales Tax Estimate</td>
<td>6,632,665</td>
<td>6,596,418</td>
<td>-36,247</td>
<td>- Based on Auditor-Controller estimate of January 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserves Budgeted</td>
<td>36,247</td>
<td>36,247</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>- To maintain apportionments to the TDA recipients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Estimate</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total TDA Apportioned</strong></td>
<td>6,660,665</td>
<td>6,660,665</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Transit Assistance (STA)</td>
<td>78,883</td>
<td>78,883</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Grant Funds/Others:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Planning Assistance (RPA)</td>
<td>315,000</td>
<td>315,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP for Planning (PPM)</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Professional Development Grant - from AMBAG</td>
<td>9,131</td>
<td>10,418</td>
<td>1,287</td>
<td>- Corrected grant amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP Exchange - Eco Act and Comm Traffic Safety</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ - Ecology Action</td>
<td>7,993</td>
<td>7,993</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA - Earmark</td>
<td>532,000</td>
<td>532,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA - Planning (PL) - from AMBAG</td>
<td>241,011</td>
<td>241,011</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 5317 - from AMBAG</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB2766/Air District Funds:</td>
<td>90,275</td>
<td>91,275</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>- Corrected grant amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Env. Justice Context-Sensitive Planning Grant</td>
<td>94,384</td>
<td>94,384</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Worker Transportation Program</td>
<td>64,051</td>
<td>64,051</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,070</td>
<td>4,070</td>
<td>- Reimbursement for traffic counts on UCSC campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC Funds Budgeted</td>
<td>377,527</td>
<td>377,527</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning/Other Total</strong></td>
<td>2,141,373</td>
<td>2,147,730</td>
<td>6,357</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rideshare:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP and RSTP Exchange</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ - Rideshare</td>
<td>168,100</td>
<td>166,100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB2766</td>
<td>118,790</td>
<td>118,790</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service Authority for Freeway Emergency (SAFE):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMV Fees and Interest</td>
<td>251,000</td>
<td>251,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others - MTC SAFE and Partnership Planning Grant</td>
<td>309,210</td>
<td>309,210</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFE Funds Budgeted</td>
<td>47,950</td>
<td>47,950</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freeway Service Patrol (FSP):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans Grant</td>
<td>185,530</td>
<td>185,530</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA)</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFE Funds Budgeted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSP Reserves Budgeted and Interest</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rail Trail Authority:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 116 and STIP</td>
<td>20,481,059</td>
<td>20,481,059</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leases</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Earmark</td>
<td>157,784</td>
<td>157,784</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer - in from TC Planning</td>
<td>102,310</td>
<td>102,310</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rail/Trail Funds Budgeted</strong></td>
<td>354,167</td>
<td>354,167</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highway I PA/ED &amp; PS&amp;E:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP Exchange</td>
<td>1,373,235</td>
<td>1,373,235</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>111,200</td>
<td>111,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Earmark - Aux Lanes</td>
<td>772,654</td>
<td>772,654</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP</td>
<td>1,701,000</td>
<td>1,701,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aux Lane Reserves</td>
<td>326,000</td>
<td>326,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RSTP Exchange Program</strong></td>
<td>6,314,924</td>
<td>6,314,924</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CMAQ to Other Local Jurisdictions</strong></td>
<td>35,769</td>
<td>35,769</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>42,153,103</td>
<td>42,159,460</td>
<td>6,357</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPORTIONMENT SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLAIMANTS</th>
<th>FY09-10 APPROVED 02/04/10</th>
<th>FY09-10 PROPOSED 02/11/10</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation Development Act (TDA):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Special Allocation for Community Bridges transit</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCCRTC:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 TDA Administration</td>
<td>436,360</td>
<td>436,360</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>% Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 TDA Planning</td>
<td>374,320</td>
<td>374,320</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>810,680</td>
<td>810,680</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCMTD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Specialized Transit (Community Bridges/CTSA)</td>
<td>5,001,737</td>
<td>5,001,737</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Volunteer Center</td>
<td>491,399</td>
<td>491,399</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 City of Capitola</td>
<td>11,187</td>
<td>11,187</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 City of Santa Cruz - Non Transit</td>
<td>65,506</td>
<td>65,506</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 City of Scotts Valley</td>
<td>13,065</td>
<td>13,065</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 City of Watsonville</td>
<td>57,620</td>
<td>57,620</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>150,971</td>
<td>150,971</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total TDA Apportioned</strong></td>
<td>6,660,665</td>
<td>6,660,665</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Transit Assistance (STA) - SCMTD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>78,883</td>
<td>78,883</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning Grant Funds/Others:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 SCCRTC:</td>
<td>2,073,380</td>
<td>2,079,737</td>
<td>6,357</td>
<td>- Corrected grant amounts and reimbursement for UCSC counts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Santa Cruz Area TMA &amp; Ecology Action</td>
<td>67,993</td>
<td>67,993</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>2,141,373</td>
<td>2,147,730</td>
<td>6,357</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rideshare</strong></td>
<td>446,890</td>
<td>446,890</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SAFE</strong></td>
<td>608,160</td>
<td>608,160</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freeway Service Patrol (FSP)</strong></td>
<td>367,030</td>
<td>367,030</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rail Trail Authority</strong></td>
<td>21,215,320</td>
<td>21,215,320</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highway 1 PA/ED</strong></td>
<td>4,284,089</td>
<td>4,284,089</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RSTP Exchange Program</strong></td>
<td>6,314,924</td>
<td>6,314,924</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CMAQ to Other Local Jurisdictions</strong></td>
<td>35,769</td>
<td>35,769</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>42,153,103</td>
<td>42,159,460</td>
<td>6,357</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) TDA apportionments are based on the formulas in the RTC's Rules and Regulations. Balance not used for Planning and Administration is allocated to other TDA claimants as follows: 85.5% is appropriated to SCMTD, 8.4% to Community Bridges and 1% to the Volunteer Center; the remaining funds are proportionally allocated to cities and the County according to population.
### OPERATING BUDGET SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>FY08-09 ADOPTED DETAIL</th>
<th>FY09-10 PROPOSED DETAIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL FY 08-09 ADOPTED 5/09</td>
<td>SALARIES &amp; BENEFITS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5/09 6/30/09 ADOPTED</td>
<td>SERVICES &amp; SUPPLIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC - Administration</td>
<td>676,560</td>
<td>201,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rideshare</td>
<td>271,665</td>
<td>180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFE</td>
<td>372,566</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway Service Patrol</td>
<td>284,450</td>
<td>46,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail/Trail Authority</td>
<td>21,486,154</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 1 - PA/ED</td>
<td>5,178,833</td>
<td>275,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC Planning</td>
<td>1,929,741</td>
<td>807,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Budget</strong></td>
<td>30,199,969</td>
<td>1,704,379</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1. Includes staffing shown on page 15 and $7,494 in anticipated funds for a transit rotational intern funded with a Transit Professional Development Grant

---

### OPERATING BUDGET COMPARISON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>FY 08-09 ADOPTED</th>
<th>FY 08-09 ACTUAL LESS</th>
<th>FY 08-09 PROPOSED</th>
<th>FY09-10 PROPOSED VS FY08-09 ADOPTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC - Administration</td>
<td>676,560</td>
<td>466,489</td>
<td>(210,071)</td>
<td>652,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rideshare</td>
<td>271,665</td>
<td>208,445</td>
<td>(63,220)</td>
<td>294,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFE</td>
<td>372,566</td>
<td>329,920</td>
<td>(42,646)</td>
<td>553,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway Service Patrol</td>
<td>284,450</td>
<td>261,145</td>
<td>(23,305)</td>
<td>331,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail/Trail Authority</td>
<td>21,486,154</td>
<td>431,741</td>
<td>(21,054,413)</td>
<td>21,215,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 1 - PA/ED</td>
<td>5,178,833</td>
<td>1,942,684</td>
<td>(3,236,149)</td>
<td>4,004,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC Planning</td>
<td>1,929,741</td>
<td>1,182,428</td>
<td>(747,313)</td>
<td>2,305,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Budget</strong></td>
<td>30,199,969</td>
<td>4,822,852</td>
<td>(25,377,117)</td>
<td>29,357,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 REVENUES:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 RSTP Exchange</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 RSTP</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 CMAQ - Rideshare</td>
<td>168,100</td>
<td>168,100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 AB2766 - Carryover</td>
<td>118,790</td>
<td>118,790</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 AB2766 - New</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL REVENUES</td>
<td>446,890</td>
<td>446,890</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 EXPENDITURES:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Staff and Overhead:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Salaries &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>185,500</td>
<td>185,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Services and Supplies:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Rideshare:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Telephone</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Membership</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Postage</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Other - Office Expense</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>- Computer for off site ride matching from events and presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Transportation/Travel/Education</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Advertisement &amp; Promotion Materials</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Rideshare Database/Programming</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Carpool Incentive Program</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Park &amp; Ride Lot Project</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Services &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>107,600</td>
<td>108,800</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Unappropriated Revenues:</td>
<td>153,790</td>
<td>152,790</td>
<td>-1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</td>
<td>446,890</td>
<td>446,890</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK ELEMENT #682</th>
<th>FY09-10 APPROVED 02/04/10</th>
<th>FY09-10 PROPOSED 02/11/10</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STIP</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 116</td>
<td>10,481,059</td>
<td>10,481,059</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leases</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Earmark</td>
<td>157,784</td>
<td>157,784</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from TC Funds</td>
<td>102,310</td>
<td>102,310</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail/Trail Authority Reserve Funds Budgeted</td>
<td>354,167</td>
<td>354,167</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,215,320</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,215,320</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff and Overhead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,215,320</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,215,320</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services and Supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liability Insurance</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisals</td>
<td>55,004</td>
<td>55,004</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation Attorney</td>
<td>133,938</td>
<td>183,938</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>- To complete negotiations with Union Pacific and shortline operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease Investigation</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title Company</td>
<td>20,012</td>
<td>20,012</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight Service and Business &amp; Management Plan</td>
<td>44,634</td>
<td>69,634</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>- To complete negotiations with shortline operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Review for EIR</td>
<td>22,610</td>
<td>22,610</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures Assessment</td>
<td>7,804</td>
<td>7,804</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STB Filling</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing Costs</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Inspection</td>
<td>44,832</td>
<td>19,832</td>
<td>-25,000</td>
<td>- Moved to freight service and business management plan line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Call Consultant for Rail Operations Management</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase II Site Assessment</td>
<td>176,153</td>
<td>176,153</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Rail - Environmental Review</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title Insurance</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Materials and Pollution Insurance</td>
<td>300,791</td>
<td>300,791</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Contingency</td>
<td>64,242</td>
<td>14,242</td>
<td>-50,000</td>
<td>- Moved to negotiating attorney line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various Rail Line Improvements</td>
<td>5,735,000</td>
<td>5,735,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way Acquisition</td>
<td>14,200,000</td>
<td>14,200,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Services &amp; Supplies</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,095,320</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,095,320</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,215,320</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,215,320</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCES</th>
<th>FY09-10 APPROVED 02/04/10</th>
<th>FY09-10 PROPOSED 02/11/10</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 TDA Planning</td>
<td>374,320</td>
<td>374,320</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Rural Planning Assistance (RPA)</td>
<td>315,000</td>
<td>315,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 STIP for Planning (PPM)</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Transit Professional Development Grant - from AMBAG</td>
<td>9,131</td>
<td>10,418</td>
<td>1,287</td>
<td>- Corrected funding amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 RSTP Exchange - Eco Act &amp; Comm Trafc Saty Coal</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 CMAQ - Ecology Action</td>
<td>7,993</td>
<td>7,9993</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 FHWA - Earmark</td>
<td>532,000</td>
<td>532,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 FHWA - Planning (PL) - from AMBAG</td>
<td>241,011</td>
<td>241,011</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Section 5317 - from AMBAG</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Env. Justice Context-Sensitive Planning Grant</td>
<td>94,384</td>
<td>94,384</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Agricultural Worker Transportation Program</td>
<td>64,051</td>
<td>64,051</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 UCSC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,070</td>
<td>4,070</td>
<td>- Reimbursement for traffic counts on UCSC campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 AB2766/Air District Funds:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Bike Secure - RTC</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Folding Bikes on Bus Program - Ecology Action</td>
<td>17,066</td>
<td>17,066</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Emergency Ride Home - Ecology Action</td>
<td>34,209</td>
<td>34,209</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Climate change in RTP</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>- Corrected funding amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 RTC Funds Budgeted</td>
<td>161,387</td>
<td>161,387</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL REVENUES**: 2,299,553 2,305,910 6,357

**Note:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENDITURES</th>
<th>WORK ELEMENT NUMBER</th>
<th>ADOPTED 02/04/10</th>
<th>PROPOSED 02/11/10</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff &amp; Overhead by Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Coordination</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use/Transportation Coordination</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>35,258</td>
<td>35,258</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Program</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Information</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian Planning</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>59,000</td>
<td>59,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSST) Network</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Transportation</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotational Transit Intern</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>9,131</td>
<td>12,918</td>
<td>3,787</td>
<td>Corrected funding amount and match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>85,968</td>
<td>98,968</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>More work than anticipated to produce 2010 RTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Monitoring</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>16,210</td>
<td>1,710</td>
<td>-14,500</td>
<td>Moved to other lines consistent with work trend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSM</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>11,472</td>
<td>11,472</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>205,000</td>
<td>205,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy &amp; Roadway Planning</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>96,000</td>
<td>96,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Staff and Overhead</td>
<td></td>
<td>857,039</td>
<td>859,326</td>
<td>2,287</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services &amp; Supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folding Bikes on Bus Program (Ecology Action)</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>17,066</td>
<td>17,066</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike To Work Program (Ecology Action)</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>34,427</td>
<td>34,427</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Traffic Safety Coalition (Safety Education)</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>86,064</td>
<td>86,064</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm Traffic Safety Coal (South County Bike/Ped safety)</td>
<td></td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion Education Campaign (Ecology Action)</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>7,993</td>
<td>7,993</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go Green Campaign (Ecology Action)</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Ride Home (Ecology Action)</td>
<td>34,209</td>
<td>34,209</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green (Hybrid) Vanpool Project (Community Bridges)</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility Outreach and Education Project (Community Bridges)</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>77,384</td>
<td>77,384</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Worker Transp Program (Community Bridges)</td>
<td></td>
<td>64,051</td>
<td>64,051</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services (contracts)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento Assistant</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Assistant</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>44,600</td>
<td>44,600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Funding Development Consultants</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>2,356</td>
<td>2,356</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Consultant/Engineer</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan EIR</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBSST Network Master Plan Consultant</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC Work Element Related Items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Secure Program</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Monitoring services - counts</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>10,570</td>
<td>4,070</td>
<td>For traffic counts on UCSC campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing RTP, RTIP, other Documents and Pub Info Materials</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint RTC/METRO Outreach</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBSST Network Plan Outreach</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to TDA Reserve</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>146,553</td>
<td>146,553</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to Special Allocation for Community Bridges</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to Rail/Trail Authority</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>102,310</td>
<td>102,310</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal Services &amp; Supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,442,514</td>
<td>1,446,584</td>
<td>4,070</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| TOTAL EXPENDITURES | | 2,299,553 | 2,305,910 | 6,357 | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK NUMBER</th>
<th>ELEMENT NUMBER</th>
<th>FY 09/10 PROPOSED 02/11/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>35,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>46,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>115,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>59,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>12,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>98,968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>1,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>11,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>205,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>96,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>859,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,446,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,305,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>859,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,446,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,305,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>859,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,446,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,305,910</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
#### FUND BALANCES AND RESERVES
##### FY 2009-2010 BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>TDA FUND (1)</th>
<th>RTC FUND (2)</th>
<th>RIDESHARE (3)</th>
<th>RAIL/TRAIL AUTHORITY FUND (4)</th>
<th>HIGHWAY ONE PA/ED FUND (5)</th>
<th>SAFE OPERATING FUND (6)</th>
<th>FSP FUND (7)</th>
<th>RSTP EXCHANGE FUND (8)</th>
<th>STA (4) FUND (9)</th>
<th>TOTAL ALL FUNDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance 7-01-09</td>
<td>1,761,599</td>
<td>603,506</td>
<td>370,601</td>
<td>1,317,676</td>
<td>482,852</td>
<td>88,246</td>
<td>5,940,620</td>
<td>68,815</td>
<td>10,633,915</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgeted Carryover 08/09 (5)</td>
<td>(1,709,172)</td>
<td>(377,527)</td>
<td>(354,167)</td>
<td>(1,317,676)</td>
<td>(12,000)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(5,938,924)</td>
<td>(9,709,467)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from RTC</td>
<td>146,553</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve funds budgeted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(36,247)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available Reserve Fund Balance</td>
<td>162,733</td>
<td>225,979</td>
<td>152,790</td>
<td>16,434</td>
<td>434,902</td>
<td>88,246</td>
<td>123,876</td>
<td>68,815</td>
<td>124,112</td>
<td>888,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for Reserves - 8%</td>
<td>(527,713)</td>
<td>(236,673)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(764,386)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus &lt;Deficit&gt; from Target</td>
<td>(364,981)</td>
<td>(10,694)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16,434</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>434,902</td>
<td>88,246</td>
<td>16,434</td>
<td>68,815</td>
<td>124,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unappropriated Revenues</td>
<td>152,790</td>
<td>279,258</td>
<td>54,810</td>
<td>35,630</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>522,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fund Balance</td>
<td>(364,981)</td>
<td>(10,694)</td>
<td>152,790</td>
<td>16,434</td>
<td>279,258</td>
<td>489,712</td>
<td>123,876</td>
<td>1,696</td>
<td>68,815</td>
<td>646,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Numbers in parentheses are negative numbers. All other numbers are positive numbers.
- Funds within each category (column) are restricted for use on projects/programs within that category.
- **Fund Balance (7-01-09)** = Balances of funds not used at the end of prior fiscal year.
- **Budgeted Carryover/New** = Portion of Fund Balance used in current fiscal year budget.
- **Target for Reserves** = Minimum Fund Balance recommended to cover potential revenue shortfalls. For TDA and RTC Funds see notes 1 & 2 below
- **Unappropriated Revenues** = Amount of revenues designated for specific projects/programs that likely will not be expended in FY09/10, but will be needed in future years.

1. 8% reserve is established in RTC Rules and Regulations; 2.4700% available due to use of reserve funds in FYs 07-08, 08-09 and 09-10
2. 8% reserve target consistent with TDA reserve fund; 7.65% available due to reduced revenues
3. Certificate of participation (COP) to borrow funds for call box installation - fully paid in 2002
4. This is a pass-through fund, all receipts are paid to SCMTD.
5. Includes combination of budgeted carryover and budgeted new for RTC Fund
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## SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

### PROJECTED REVENUE SUMMARY

**FY 2010-2011 BUDGET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCES</th>
<th>FY09-10 APPROVED 01/14/10</th>
<th>FY10-11 PROPOSED 03/04/10</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Transportation Development Act (TDA):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Auditor's 1/4 Cent Sales Tax Estimate</td>
<td>6,632,665</td>
<td>6,596,418</td>
<td>-36,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Reserves budgeted</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Interest Estimate</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Total TDA Apportioned</td>
<td>6,660,665</td>
<td>6,625,069</td>
<td>-35,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>State Transit Assistance (STA)</td>
<td>78,883</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-78,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Planning Grant Funds/Others:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Rural Planning Assistance (RPA)</td>
<td>315,000</td>
<td>315,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>STIP for Planning (PPM)</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>-150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Transit Professional Development Grant - from AMBAG</td>
<td>9,131</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-9,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>RSTP Exchange - Eco Act and Comm Traff Saft Coal</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>-70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>CMAQ - Ecology Action</td>
<td>7,993</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-7,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>FHWA - Earmark</td>
<td>532,000</td>
<td>360,000</td>
<td>-172,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>FHWA - Planning (PL) - from AMBAG</td>
<td>241,011</td>
<td>228,231</td>
<td>-12,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Section 5317 - from AMBAG</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>AB2766/Air District Funds:</td>
<td>90,275</td>
<td>53,000</td>
<td>-37,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Env. Justice Context-Sensitive Planning Grant</td>
<td>94,384</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>-60,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Agriculture Worker Transportation Program</td>
<td>64,051</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-64,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>RTC Funds Budgeted</td>
<td>377,527</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-377,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Planning/Other Total</td>
<td>2,141,373</td>
<td>1,180,231</td>
<td>-961,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Rideshare:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>RSTP and RSTP Exchange</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>-30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>CMAQ - Rideshare</td>
<td>168,100</td>
<td>174,100</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>AB2766</td>
<td>118,790</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>-48,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Service Authority for Freeway Emergency (SAFE):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>DMV Fees and interest</td>
<td>251,000</td>
<td>251,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Other - MTC SAFE and Partnership Planning Grant</td>
<td>309,210</td>
<td>260,000</td>
<td>-49,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>SAFE Funds Budgeted</td>
<td>47,950</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-47,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Freeway Service Patrol (FSP):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Caltrans Grant</td>
<td>185,530</td>
<td>185,000</td>
<td>-530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA)</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>RSTP Funds</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>FSP Reserve Budgeted and Interest</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Rail Trail Authority:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Proposition 116 and STIP</td>
<td>20,481,059</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-20,481,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Leases</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>-60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Federal Earmark</td>
<td>157,784</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-157,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Transfer - in from TC Planning</td>
<td>102,310</td>
<td>98,956</td>
<td>-3,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Rail/Trail Funds Budgeted</td>
<td>354,167</td>
<td>44,344</td>
<td>-309,823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Highway PA/ED:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>RSTP Exchange</td>
<td>1,373,235</td>
<td>550,115</td>
<td>-823,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>111,200</td>
<td>55,879</td>
<td>-55,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Federal Earmark - Aux Lanes</td>
<td>772,654</td>
<td>343,591</td>
<td>-429,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>STIP</td>
<td>1,701,000</td>
<td>1,160,888</td>
<td>-540,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Aux Lane Reserves</td>
<td>326,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-326,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>CMIA</td>
<td>2,292,995</td>
<td>2,292,995</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>RSTP Exchange Program</td>
<td>6,217,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-6,217,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>CMAQ to Other Local Jurisdictions</td>
<td>35,769</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-35,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>42,055,179</td>
<td>13,663,667</td>
<td>-28,391,512</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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# APPORTIONMENT SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLAIMANTS</th>
<th>FY09-10</th>
<th>FY10-11</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 Transportation Development Act (TDA): (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Bike to Work and Comm Traffic Safety Coal</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>To maintain at FY 09-10 level as recommended by B&amp;A/P Comm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Special Allocation for Community Bridges transit</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-40,000</td>
<td>One time special allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 SCCRTC:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 TDA Administration</td>
<td>436,360</td>
<td>431,995</td>
<td>-4,365</td>
<td>% Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 TDA Planning</td>
<td>374,320</td>
<td>374,320</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Subtotal</td>
<td>810,680</td>
<td>806,315</td>
<td>-4,365</td>
<td>-0.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 SCMTD</td>
<td>5,001,737</td>
<td>4,974,478</td>
<td>-27,259</td>
<td>-0.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Specialized Transit (Community Bridges/CTSA)</td>
<td>491,399</td>
<td>488,721</td>
<td>-2,678</td>
<td>-0.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Volunteer Center</td>
<td>58,500</td>
<td>58,181</td>
<td>-319</td>
<td>-0.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 City of Capitola</td>
<td>11,187</td>
<td>11,126</td>
<td>-61</td>
<td>-0.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 City of Santa Cruz - Non Transit</td>
<td>65,506</td>
<td>65,149</td>
<td>-357</td>
<td>-0.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 City of Scotts Valley</td>
<td>13,065</td>
<td>12,994</td>
<td>-71</td>
<td>-0.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 City of Watsonville</td>
<td>57,620</td>
<td>57,306</td>
<td>-314</td>
<td>-0.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>150,971</td>
<td>150,148</td>
<td>-823</td>
<td>-0.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Total TDA Apportioned</td>
<td>6,660,665</td>
<td>6,624,418</td>
<td>-36,247</td>
<td>-0.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 State Transit Assistance (STA) - SCMTD</td>
<td>78,883</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-78,883</td>
<td>- State diverted funding due to budget crisis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Planning Grant Funds/Others:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 SCCRTC:</td>
<td>2,073,380</td>
<td>1,402,495</td>
<td>-670,885</td>
<td>- Carryovers determined at end of FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Santa Cruz Area TMA &amp; Ecology Action</td>
<td>67,993</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-67,993</td>
<td>- Availability of RSTP Exchange funds determined at end of FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Subtotal</td>
<td>2,141,373</td>
<td>1,402,495</td>
<td>-738,878</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Rideshare</td>
<td>446,890</td>
<td>374,100</td>
<td>-72,790</td>
<td>- FY 09-10 included some unappropriated revenues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 SAFE</td>
<td>608,160</td>
<td>511,000</td>
<td>-97,160</td>
<td>- Carryovers determined at end of FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Freeway Service Patrol (FSP)</td>
<td>367,030</td>
<td>366,500</td>
<td>-530</td>
<td>- Revenue estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Rail Trail Authority</td>
<td>21,215,320</td>
<td>203,300</td>
<td>-21,012,020</td>
<td>- Rail line purchase in FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Highway 1 PA/ED</td>
<td>4,284,089</td>
<td>4,403,467</td>
<td>119,378</td>
<td>- Construction anticipated to start in FY 10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 RSTP Exchange Program</td>
<td>6,217,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-6,217,000</td>
<td>- Carryover &amp; new revenue determined at end of FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 CMAQ to Other Local Jurisdictions</td>
<td>35,769</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-35,769</td>
<td>- Funds exhausted in FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 TOTAL</td>
<td>42,055,179</td>
<td>13,885,280</td>
<td>-28,169,899</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) TDA apportionments are based on the formulas in the RTC’s Rules and Regulations. Balance not used for Planning and Administration is allocated to other TDA claimants as follows: 85.5% is appropriated to SCMTD, 8.4% to Community Bridges and 1% to the Volunteer Center; the remaining funds are proportionally allocated to cities and the County according to population.
### OPERATING BUDGET SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>FY09-10 ADOPTED DETAIL</th>
<th>FY10-11 PROPOSED DETAIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL 01/10</td>
<td>FY09-10 ACTUAL LESS FY10-11 PROPOSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SALARIES &amp; BENEFITS</td>
<td>SALARIES &amp; BENEFITS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SERVICES &amp; SUPPLIES</td>
<td>SERVICES &amp; SUPPLIES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01/10 03/04/10</td>
<td>01/10 03/04/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC - Administration</td>
<td>652,500</td>
<td>555,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>201,000</td>
<td>201,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>451,500</td>
<td>354,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rideshare</td>
<td>364,600</td>
<td>374,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>185,500</td>
<td>195,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>179,100</td>
<td>179,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFE</td>
<td>553,350</td>
<td>463,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>458,350</td>
<td>343,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway Service Patrol</td>
<td>331,400</td>
<td>341,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47,500</td>
<td>55,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>283,900</td>
<td>286,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail/Trail Authority</td>
<td>21,215,320</td>
<td>203,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21,095,320</td>
<td>103,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 1 - PA/ED</td>
<td>4,004,831</td>
<td>4,124,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>265,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,754,831</td>
<td>3,859,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC Planning</td>
<td>2,299,553</td>
<td>1,653,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>857,039</td>
<td>906,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,442,514</td>
<td>746,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Budget</td>
<td>29,421,554</td>
<td>7,715,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,756,039</td>
<td>1,842,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27,665,515</td>
<td>5,873,162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
(1) Includes staffing shown on page 15 and $7,494 in anticipated funds for a transit rotational intern funded with a Transit Professional Development Grant.

### OPERATING BUDGET COMPARISON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>FY09-10 ADOPTED 01/10</th>
<th>FY09-10 ACTUAL 06/30/10</th>
<th>FY09-10 ACTUAL LESS ADOPTED 01/10</th>
<th>FY10-11 PROPOSED 03/04/10</th>
<th>FY10-11 PROPOSED VS FY09-10 ADOPTED 01/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC - Administration</td>
<td>652,500</td>
<td>(652,500)</td>
<td>555,500</td>
<td>652,500</td>
<td>(97,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rideshare</td>
<td>364,600</td>
<td>(364,600)</td>
<td>374,100</td>
<td>364,600</td>
<td>9,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFE</td>
<td>553,350</td>
<td>(553,350)</td>
<td>463,800</td>
<td>553,350</td>
<td>(89,550)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway Service Patrol</td>
<td>331,400</td>
<td>(331,400)</td>
<td>341,350</td>
<td>331,400</td>
<td>9,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail/Trail Authority</td>
<td>21,215,320</td>
<td>(21,215,320)</td>
<td>203,300</td>
<td>21,215,320</td>
<td>(21,012,020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 1 - PA/ED</td>
<td>4,004,831</td>
<td>(4,004,831)</td>
<td>4,124,209</td>
<td>4,004,831</td>
<td>119,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC Planning</td>
<td>2,299,553</td>
<td>(2,299,553)</td>
<td>1,653,310</td>
<td>2,299,553</td>
<td>(646,243)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Budget</td>
<td>29,421,554</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(29,421,554)</td>
<td>29,421,554</td>
<td>(21,705,985)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** (1) Includes staffing shown on page 15 and $7,494 in anticipated funds for a transit rotational intern funded with a Transit Professional Development Grant.
## SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

### OPERATING BUDGET BY PROGRAM - ADMINISTRATION

#### FY 2010-2011 BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK ELEMENT #101</th>
<th>FY09-10</th>
<th>FY10-11</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADMINISTRATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 TDA Administration</td>
<td>436,360</td>
<td>431,995</td>
<td>-4,365</td>
<td>- Reduction consistent with Auditor-Controller's estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Other Revenues</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 RTC Funds</td>
<td>216,140</td>
<td>123,505</td>
<td>-92,635</td>
<td>- Due to reduced expenses as shown below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
<td>652,500</td>
<td>555,500</td>
<td>-97,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **EXPENDITURES:** |         |         |            |      |
| **Salaries & Benefits** | 201,000 | 201,000 | 0          |      |
| **Rent, Utilities, Insurance** |         |         |            |      |
| 15 Telephone       | 11,500  | 11,500  | 0          |      |
| 16 Liability Insurance | 15,000  | 14,000  | -1,000     | - Based on prior years' costs |
| 17 Video Conferencing Fees | 2,000   | 2,000   | 0          |      |
| 18 Internet/Web Fees | 4,000   | 4,000   | 0          |      |
| 19 Utilities       | 9,000   | 9,000   | 0          |      |
| 20 Office Rent     | 80,000  | 80,000  | 0          |      |
| 21 Carpet Replacement and Repairs | 5,000   | 0       | -5,000     | - one time expense |
| **Services**       |         |         |            |      |
| 22 Travel/Training |         |         |            |      |
| 23 Vehicle Rentals and Service | 1,000   | 1,000   | 0          |      |
| 24 RTC Vehicle     | 3,000   | 3,000   | 0          |      |
| 25 Transportation/Travel/Education | 20,000  | 20,000  | 0          |      |
| **Fixed Assets**   |         |         |            |      |
| 27 Fixed Assets    | 6,000   | 6,000   | 0          |      |
| **Office Expenses** |         |         |            |      |
| 29 Office Expense  | 24,000  | 24,000  | 0          |      |
| 30 Duplicating     | 6,000   | 6,000   | 0          |      |
| 31 Postage         | 6,000   | 6,000   | 0          |      |
| 32 Membership      | 6,000   | 6,000   | 0          |      |
| 33 Sponsorship     | 1,500   | 1,000   | -500       | - Minimized to help reduce overall costs |
| 34 Advertisement/Publication | 4,000   | 4,000   | 0          |      |
| 35 Office Equipment Repair/Maintenance | 5,000   | 5,000   | 0          |      |
| 36 Contingency/Special Expense | 10,000  | 10,000  | 0          |      |
| 37 County Mainframe/Intranet | 7,500   | 6,000   | -1,500     | - Based on prior years' costs |
| 38 Computer Software | 14,000  | 5,000   | -9,000     | - email server software upgrade completed in FY 09-10 |
| **Total Services & Supplies** | 451,500 | 354,500 | -80,000   |      |
| **TOTAL EXPENDITURES** | 652,500 | 555,500 | -97,000   |      |

Note:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK ELEMENT #179</th>
<th>FY09-10</th>
<th>FY10-11</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01/14/10</td>
<td>03/04/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rideshare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP Exchange</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-30,000</td>
<td>Carryover determined at end of FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ - Rideshare</td>
<td>168,100</td>
<td>174,100</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>Match AB2766 funds for Carpool Incentive Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB2766</td>
<td>118,790</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>-48,790</td>
<td>Estimated carryover from FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
<td><strong>446,890</strong></td>
<td><strong>374,100</strong></td>
<td><strong>-72,790</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENDITURES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>185,500</td>
<td>195,000</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>Anticipated work for Park &amp; Ride Lot program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other - Office Expense</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation/Travel/Education</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>Estimate for full implementation of new programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisement &amp; Promotion Materials</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rideshare Database/Programming</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool Incentive Program</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-15,000</td>
<td>Estimated carryover from FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park &amp; Ride Lot Project</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>Estimated expenses for Park &amp; Ride Lot program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Services &amp; Supplies</strong></td>
<td><strong>107,600</strong></td>
<td><strong>179,100</strong></td>
<td><strong>71,500</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unappropriated Revenues:</td>
<td>153,790</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-153,790</td>
<td>Budgeted in this fiscal year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td><strong>446,890</strong></td>
<td><strong>374,100</strong></td>
<td><strong>-72,790</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
## SAFE: 721825

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK ELEMENT #178</th>
<th>FY09-10 APPROVED 01/14/10</th>
<th>FY10-11 PROPOSED 03/04/10</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 DMV Fees</td>
<td>236,000</td>
<td>236,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Interest</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Caltrans Partnership Planning Grant for 511 System</td>
<td>259,210</td>
<td>210,000</td>
<td>-49,210</td>
<td>Estimated carryover from FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Local Financial Assistance (MTC SAFE)</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 SAFE Funds Budgeted</td>
<td>47,950</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-47,950</td>
<td>Carryover determined at end of FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
<td><strong>608,160</strong></td>
<td><strong>511,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>-97,160</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **EXPENDITURES:** |                             |                             |            |      |
| 13 Staff and Overhead: |                             |                             |            |      |
| 14 Salaries & Benefits | 95,000                      | 120,000                     | 25,000 | Includes $55,000 for 511 system planning |
| **Services and Supplies:** |                             |                             |            |      |
| 16 Office Expense | 1,000 | 2,000 | 1,000 | Estimated increase due to 511 system planning |
| 18 Transportation/Travel/Education | 750 | 1,500 | 750 | Estimated increase due to 511 system planning |
| 19 HWY 17 Utility Charges (Electricity) | 1,600 | 1,200 | -400 | Estimated cost decrease due to recent expenditures |
| 24 Liability Insurance | 4,000 | 4,000 | 0 |      |
| 21 Legal Counsel | 500 | 500 | 0 |      |
| 22 Contingency/Special Expense | 2,500 | 2,500 | 0 |      |
| 23 Network Access | 10,000 | 10,000 | 0 |      |
| 24 System Maintenance | 60,000 | 62,000 | 2,000 | Estimated cost increase for maintenance |
| 25 CHP Operations | 600 | 600 | 0 |      |
| 26 Safe on 17 | 125,000 | 100,000 | -25,000 | FY 09-10 includes some carryover |
| 27 Freeway Service Patrol | 0 | 0 | 0 |      |
| 28 Call Answering | 4,000 | 4,500 | 500 | Potential cost increase due to call volume and anticipated new contract |
| 29 Callbox Upgrade | 62,000 | 0 | -62,000 | Carryover determined at end of FY 09-10 |
| 30 511 System Plan - Consultant Services | 150,000 | 140,000 | -10,000 | Estimated carryover from FY 09-10 |
| 31 TAMC for 511 System Planning | 36,400 | 15,000 | -21,400 | Estimated carryover from FY 09-10 |
| **Subtotal Services & Supplies** | **458,350** | **343,800** | **-134,550** |      |
| 33 Unappropriated Revenues | 54,810 | 47,200 | -7,610 |      |
| **TOTAL EXPENDITURES** | **608,160** | **511,000** | **-97,160** |      |

**Note:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVENUES</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>185,530</td>
<td>185,000</td>
<td>-530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA)</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP Funds</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSP Reserve Funds Budgeted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
<td><strong>367,030</strong></td>
<td><strong>366,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>-530</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENDITURES</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff and Overhead:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>47,500</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Services and Supplies:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation/Travel/Education</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liability Insurance</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Counsel</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency/Special Expense</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towing</td>
<td>270,000</td>
<td>270,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Services &amp; Supplies</strong></td>
<td><strong>283,900</strong></td>
<td><strong>286,350</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,450</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unappropriated Revenues:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td><strong>367,030</strong></td>
<td><strong>366,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>-8,030</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVENUES:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WORK ELEMENT #682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/14/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Earmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from TC Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail/Trail Authority Reserve Funds Budgeted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENDITURES:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/14/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff and Overhead:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries &amp; Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services and Supplies:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apraisals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation Attorney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease Investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight Service and Business &amp; Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Review for EIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STB Filing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Inspection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Call Consultant for Rail Operations Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase II Site Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Rail - Environmental Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title Insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Materials and Pollution Insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Contingency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various Rail Line Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way Acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Services &amp; Supplies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
### SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
### OPERATING BUDGET BY PROGRAM - HIGHWAY 1
### FY 2010-2011 BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK ELEMENT #683</th>
<th>FY09-10 APPROVED 01/14/10</th>
<th>FY10-11 PROPOSED 03/04/10</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 RSTP Exchange - HOV Lanes</td>
<td>1,008,231</td>
<td>506,632</td>
<td>-501,599</td>
<td>Estimated carryover from FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 CMAQ - HOV Lanes</td>
<td>111,200</td>
<td>55,878</td>
<td>-55,322</td>
<td>Estimated carryover from FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 STIP - HOV Lanes</td>
<td>1,375,000</td>
<td>690,932</td>
<td>-684,068</td>
<td>Estimated carryover from FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Federal Earmark Aux Lanes: PA/ED (carryover)</td>
<td>95,654</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-95,654</td>
<td>Funds exhausted in FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Federal Earmark Aux Lanes: Design</td>
<td>677,000</td>
<td>343,591</td>
<td>-333,409</td>
<td>Estimated carryover from FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 STIP - Aux Lanes: Design (carryover)</td>
<td>326,000</td>
<td>165,451</td>
<td>-160,549</td>
<td>Estimated carryover from FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 RSTP Exchange - Aux Lanes: Design</td>
<td>85,678</td>
<td>43,483</td>
<td>-42,195</td>
<td>Estimated carryover from FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 RSTP Exchange - Aux Lanes: Design</td>
<td>304,505</td>
<td>2,292,995</td>
<td>2,292,995</td>
<td>Programmed for construction phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 STIP Construction</td>
<td>326,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-326,000</td>
<td>Funds used in FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 CMIA Construction</td>
<td>2,292,995</td>
<td>2,292,995</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Aux Lane Reserves</td>
<td>326,000</td>
<td>2,292,995</td>
<td>2,292,995</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,284,089</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,403,467</strong></td>
<td><strong>119,378</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENDITURES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Salaries and Benefits</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>265,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>Increase in Aux Lane project work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Salaries &amp; Supplies</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,754,831</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,859,209</strong></td>
<td><strong>104,378</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unappropriated Revenues - HOV:</strong></td>
<td><strong>279,258</strong></td>
<td><strong>279,258</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,284,089</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,403,467</strong></td>
<td><strong>119,378</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
### OPERATING BUDGET BY WORK PROGRAM - PLANNING REVENUES BY SOURCES
#### FY 2010-2011 BUDGET

### PLANNING REVENUES: 721600/721700/721750

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCES</th>
<th>FY09-10</th>
<th>FY10-11</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
<td>PROPOSED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01/14/10</td>
<td>03/04/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>TDA Planning</td>
<td>374,320</td>
<td>374,320</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To maintain at FY 09-10 level as recommended by B&amp;A/P Comm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>TDA Reserves for Bike to Work and Comm Traf Sft Coal</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Rural Planning Assistance (RPA)</td>
<td>315,000</td>
<td>315,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>STIP for Planning (PPM)</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>-150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amount programmed for FY 10-11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Transit Professional Development Grant - from AMBAG</td>
<td>9,131</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-9,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grant exhausted in FY 10-11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>RSTP Exchange - Eco Act &amp; Comm Trafc Saty Coal</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>-70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RSTP Exchange funds not yet programmed to some projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>CMAQ - Ecology Action</td>
<td>7,993</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-7,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funds exhausted in FY 10-11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>FHWA - Earmark</td>
<td>532,000</td>
<td>360,000</td>
<td>-172,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated carryover from FY 09-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>FHWA - Planning (PL) - from AMBAG</td>
<td>241,011</td>
<td>228,231</td>
<td>-12,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower federal estimate for FY 10-11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Section 5317 - from AMBAG</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Env. Justice Context-Sensitive Planning Grant</td>
<td>94,384</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>-60,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Carryover determined at end of FY 09-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Agricultural Worker Transportation Program</td>
<td>64,051</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-64,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Carryover determined at end of FY 09-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>AB2766/Air District Funds:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Bike Secure - RTC</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>-10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated carryover from FY 09-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Folding Bikes on Bus Program - Ecology Action</td>
<td>17,066</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>-4,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated carryover from FY 09-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Emergency Ride Home - Ecology Action</td>
<td>34,209</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>-14,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated carryover from FY 09-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Climate change in RTP</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grant exhausted in FY 10-11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>RTC Funds Budgeted</td>
<td>161,387</td>
<td>98,108</td>
<td>-63,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Full carryover determined at end of FY 09-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL REVENUES</td>
<td>2,299,553</td>
<td>1,653,310</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**

-10-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENDITURES</th>
<th>WORK ELEMENT NUMBER</th>
<th>FY09-10</th>
<th>ADOPTED 01/14/10</th>
<th>FY10-11 PROPOSED 03/04/10</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff &amp; Overhead by Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Plan Coordination</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>97,092</td>
<td>-2,908</td>
<td>Based on work trend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Land Use/Transportation Coordination</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>35,258</td>
<td>35,020</td>
<td>-238</td>
<td>Based on work trend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Work Program</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Public Information</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Bicycle/Pedestrian Planning</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>59,000</td>
<td>77,645</td>
<td>18,645</td>
<td>Bike lane signage project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSST) Network</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>MBSST Network master plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Specialized Transportation</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>77,000</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>Ped improvements to transit facilities plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Rotational Transit Intern</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>1,131</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-9,131</td>
<td>Funds exhausted in FY 10-11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Regional Transportation Plan</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>85,968</td>
<td>85,968</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Traffic Monitoring</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>16,210</td>
<td>16,210</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 TSM</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>11,472</td>
<td>11,472</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>205,000</td>
<td>199,000</td>
<td>-6,000</td>
<td>No new RTIP anticipated in FY 10-11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Hwy &amp; Roadway Planning</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>96,000</td>
<td>96,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Staff and Overhead</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>857,039</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>24 Folding Bikes on Bus Program (Ecology Action)</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>17,066</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>-4,066</td>
<td>Estimated carryover from FY 09-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Bike To Work Program (Ecology Action)</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>34,427</td>
<td>34,427</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>RTC funds used to cover TDA reduction to maintain FY 09-10 funding per B&amp;A/P Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Community Traffic Safety Coalition (Safety Education)</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>86,064</td>
<td>86,064</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>RTC funds used to cover TDA reduction to maintain FY 09-10 funding per B&amp;A/P Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Comm Traffic Safety Coal (South County Bike/Ped safety)</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-50,000</td>
<td>2-yr project; availability of FY 10-11 state RSTP Exchange funds determinde at end of FY 09-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Congestion Education Campaign (Ecology Action)</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>7,093</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-7,093</td>
<td>Funds exhausted in FY 10-11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Go Green Campaign (Ecology Action)</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-60,000</td>
<td>2-yr project; availability of FY 10-11 state RSTP Exchange funds determinde at end of FY 09-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Emergency Ride Home (Ecology Action)</td>
<td>34,209</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>-14,209</td>
<td>Estimated carryover from FY 09-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Mobility Outreach and Education Project (Community Bridges)</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>77,384</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-77,384</td>
<td>Carryover determined at end of FY 09-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Agricultural Worker Transp Program (Community Bridges)</td>
<td>64,051</td>
<td>64,051</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-64,051</td>
<td>Carryover determined at end of FY 09-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Professional Services (contracts)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Sacramento Assistant</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Washington Assistant</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>44,600</td>
<td>44,600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Transportation Funding Development Consultants</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>2,356</td>
<td>2,356</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Engineering and Other Technical Consultants</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Regional Transportation Plan EIR</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>-30,000</td>
<td>One time expense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 MBSST Network Master Plan Consultant</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>-200,000</td>
<td>Estimated carryover from FY 09-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RTC Work Element Related Items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Bike Secure Program</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>-15,000</td>
<td>Estimated carryover from FY 09-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Traffic Monitoring services - counts</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Printing RTP, RTIP, other Documents and Pub Info Materials</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 MBSST Network Plan Outreach</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 Transfer to TDA Reserve</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>146,553</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-146,553</td>
<td>One time transfer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 Transfer to Special Allocation for Community Bridges</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-23,000</td>
<td>One time special allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 Transfer to Rail/Trail Authority</td>
<td>102,310</td>
<td>98,956</td>
<td>-3,354</td>
<td>Lower transfer required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Services &amp; Supplies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,442,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,299,553</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
### OPERATING BUDGET BY PROGRAM - PLANNING FUND SOURCE DETAIL
#### FY 2010-2011 BUDGET

### PLANNING DETAIL: 721600/721700/721750

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK ELEMENT NUMBER</th>
<th>FY10-11 PROPOSED 03/04/10</th>
<th>TDA</th>
<th>RTC FUND</th>
<th>RPA</th>
<th>FHWA PL - AMBAG</th>
<th>TDA Reserves</th>
<th>AB2766</th>
<th>STIP</th>
<th>FHWA Earmark</th>
<th>SECTION 5317 AMBAG</th>
<th>Env Just Plg Grant</th>
<th>AWTP Plg Grant</th>
<th>CMAQ</th>
<th>RSTPX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 SALARIES, Benefits &amp; Overhead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Plan Coordination</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>97,092</td>
<td>1,872</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>62,000</td>
<td>33,220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Land Use/Transportation Coordination</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>35,020</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25,520</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Work Program</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Public Information</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Bicycle/Pedestrian Planning</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>77,645</td>
<td>5,020</td>
<td>2,645</td>
<td>18,951</td>
<td>11,029</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Monterey Bay Scenic Coastal Trail (MBSST) Network</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Specialized Transportation</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>77,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Rotational Transit Intern</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Regional Transportation Plan</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>85,968</td>
<td>41,500</td>
<td>44,468</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Traffic Monitoring</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>16,210</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16,210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 TSM</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>11,472</td>
<td>6,139</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,333</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>199,000</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Hwy &amp; Roadway Planning</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>96,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>63,851</td>
<td>32,149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Salaris, Benefits &amp; Overhead Subtotal</td>
<td>906,407</td>
<td>96,531</td>
<td>2,645</td>
<td>315,000</td>
<td>228,231</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Services &amp; Supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 PassThrough Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Folding Bikes on Bus Program (Ecology Action)</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Bike To Work Program (Ecology Action)</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>34,427</td>
<td>34,241</td>
<td>186</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Community Traffic Safety Coalition (Safety Education)</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>86,064</td>
<td>85,599</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>465</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Comm Traffic Safety Coal (South County Bike/Ped safety)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Congestion Education Campaign (Ecology Action)</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Go Green Campaign (Ecology Action)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Emergency Ride Home (Ecology Action)</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Mobility Outreach and Education Project (Community Bridges)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Agricultural Worker Transp Program (Community Bridges)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Professional Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Sacramento Assistant</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Washington Assistant</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>44,600</td>
<td>44,600</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Transportation Funding Development Consultants</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>2,356</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Engineering and Other Technical Consultants</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Regional Transportation Plan EIR</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 MBSST Network Master Plan Consultant</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 (Master Plan, environmental, review, preliminary design)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 RTC Work Element Related Items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Bike Secure Program</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Traffic Monitoring services - counts</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Printing RTP, RTIP, other Documents and Pub Info Materials</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 MBSS Network Plan Outreach</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 Transfer to TDA Reserve</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 Transfer to Special Allocation for Community Bridges</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 Transfer to Rail/Trail Authority</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>98,956</td>
<td>28,849</td>
<td>70,107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 Subtotal Services &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>746,903</td>
<td>277,783</td>
<td>95,463</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>53,000</td>
<td>320,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 TOTAL EXPENDITURES</td>
<td>1,653,310</td>
<td>374,320</td>
<td>98,108</td>
<td>315,000</td>
<td>228,231</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>53,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
### OPERATING BUDGET BY PROGRAM - STP EXCHANGE PROGRAM
#### FY 2010-2011 BUDGET

### RSTP EXCHANGE PROGRAM: 722000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK ELEMENT #101</th>
<th>FY09-10</th>
<th>FY10-11</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stated RSTP Exchange Funds</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>All FY 09-10 funds are assumed spent in FY 09-10; new funds for FY 10-11 not provided by State until end of FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td>Carryover &amp; new revenue determined at end of FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from Hwy 1 PA/ED - Aux Lane</td>
<td>326,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(326,000)</td>
<td>Carryover &amp; new revenue determined at end of FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP Exchange Funds Budgeted - Carryover</td>
<td>5,841,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(5,841,000)</td>
<td>Carryover &amp; new revenue determined at end of FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
<td>6,217,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(6,217,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EXPENDITURES:

| City of Capitola | 906,000 | - | (906,000) | |
| City of Scotts Valley | 350,000 | - | (350,000) | Carryover & new revenue determined at end of FY 09-10 |
| City of Watsonville | 751,000 | - | (751,000) | Carryover & new revenue determined at end of FY 09-10 |
| **City of Watsonville Subtotal** | 751,000 | - | (751,000) | |
| County of Santa Cruz | 3,285,000 | - | (3,285,000) | |
| County of Santa Cruz Subtotal | 3,285,000 | - | (3,285,000) | |
| **TOTAL EXPENDITURES** | 6,217,000 | - | (6,217,000) | |

Note:

- Carryover & new revenue determined at end of FY 09-10

---

### RAW TEXT END
**SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**
**FUND BALANCES AND RESERVED**
**FY 2010-2011 BUDGET**

### Fund Balances 

#### Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>TDA Fund (1)</th>
<th>RTC Fund (2)</th>
<th>Rideshare Authority Fund</th>
<th>Highway One PA/ED Fund</th>
<th>Safe Operating Fund</th>
<th>FSP Fund</th>
<th>RSTP Exchange Fund</th>
<th>STA (3) Fund</th>
<th>Total ALL FUNDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fund Balance 7-01-10</strong></td>
<td>198,980</td>
<td>225,979</td>
<td>44,344</td>
<td>550,115</td>
<td>434,902</td>
<td>88,246</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,542,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserves budgeted</td>
<td>(651)</td>
<td>(221,613)</td>
<td>(44,344)</td>
<td>(550,115)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(594,459)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgeted Carryover 09/10 (4)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from RTC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Available Reserve Fund Balance</strong></td>
<td>198,329</td>
<td>4,366</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>948,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for Reserves - 8%</td>
<td>(527,713)</td>
<td>(176,705)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(704,418)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surplus &lt;Deficit&gt; from Target</strong></td>
<td>(329,384)</td>
<td>(172,339)</td>
<td>279,258</td>
<td>47,200</td>
<td>25,150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>351,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unappropriated Revenues</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>279,258</td>
<td>47,200</td>
<td>25,150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Fund Balance</strong></td>
<td>(329,384)</td>
<td>(172,339)</td>
<td>279,258</td>
<td>482,102</td>
<td>113,396</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>595,297</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:

- Numbers in parentheses are negative numbers. All other numbers are positive numbers.
- Funds within each category (column) are restricted for use on projects/programs within that category.
- **Fund Balance (7-01-10)** = Balances of funds not used at the end of prior fiscal year.
- **Budgeted Carryover/New** = Portion of Fund Balance used in current fiscal year budget.
- Target for Reserves = Minimum Fund Balance recommended to cover potential revenue shortfalls. For TDA and RTC Funds see notes 1 & 2 below.
- **Unappropriated Revenues** = Amount of revenues designated for specific projects/programs that likely will not be expended in FY10/11, but will be needed in future years.
- (1) 8% reserve is established in RTC Rules and Regulations; 300% available due to use of reserve funds in prior fiscal years.
- (2) 8% reserve target consistent with TDA reserve fund; 20% available due to reduced revenues & will be affected by carryovers from FY 09-10.
- (3) This is a pass-through fund, all receipts are paid to SCMTD.
- (4) Includes combination of budgeted carryover and budgeted new for RTC Fund.
### SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

#### STAFF POSITIONS

**FY 2010-2011 BUDGET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positions</th>
<th>FY09-10</th>
<th>FY10-11</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Executive Director</strong></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deputy Director</strong></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fiscal Officer SCCRTC</strong></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative Services Officer</strong></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation Planner I-IV</strong></td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accounting Technician</strong></td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative Assistant I-III</strong></td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation Planning Technician</strong></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paid Intern</strong></td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL POSITIONS** | 16.75 | 16.75 | 0.00 | |

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positions</th>
<th>FY09-10</th>
<th>FY10-11</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Executive Director</strong></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deputy Director</strong></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fiscal Officer SCCRTC</strong></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative Services Officer</strong></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation Planner I-IV</strong></td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>- Retired position not filled in FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accounting Technician</strong></td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative Assistant I-III</strong></td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation Planning Technician</strong></td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
<td>- Grant funding for position exhausted in FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paid Intern</strong></td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL POSITIONS** | 14.25 | 14.25 | 0.00 | |

---

Note: FTE= full-time equivalent
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLAIMANTS</th>
<th>FY10-11 UNSPENT PRIOR ALLOCATIONS</th>
<th>AVAILABLE FUNDS 03/04/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION FY 2010-2011 BUDGET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TDA ALLOCATION BALANCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PROPOSED 03/04/10</th>
<th>UNSPENT PRIOR ALLOCATIONS</th>
<th>AVAILABLE FUNDS 03/04/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TDA Administration</td>
<td>431,995</td>
<td>431,995</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA Planning</td>
<td>374,320</td>
<td>374,320</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>806,315</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>806,315</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demo Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Allocation for Community Bridges transit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCMTD</td>
<td>4,974,478</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,974,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Transit</td>
<td>488,721</td>
<td></td>
<td>488,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Center</td>
<td>58,181</td>
<td></td>
<td>58,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Capitola</td>
<td>11,126</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Cruz - Non Transit</td>
<td>65,149</td>
<td></td>
<td>65,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Scotts Valley</td>
<td>12,994</td>
<td></td>
<td>12,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Watsonville</td>
<td>57,306</td>
<td></td>
<td>57,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>150,148</td>
<td></td>
<td>150,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,624,418</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Allocations for the Cities and the County use the most recent population figures from the Department of Finance.
Glossary of Transportation Funding Terms Used in the SCCRTC Budget

**AB2766:** This bill authorized a Department of Motor Vehicles vehicle registration fee of up to $4.00 to be used by air pollution control districts for planning and incentive programs to reduce motor vehicle emissions. The Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District (MBUAPCD) annually conducts a grant program to distribute approximately $1.5 million in AB2766 funds in Santa Cruz, Monterey, and San Benito counties for this purpose. The SCCRTC has received AB2766 funds for some of its own programs, in addition to serving as a pass-through agency for grants used by some local non-profit organizations.

**AB3090 Loan:** Loan secured with an AB3090 designation from the CTC to be paid with funds eventually available to a project from the STIP.

**ARRA:** American Recovery and Reinvestment Act passed by Congress and signed by the President in 2009 as an economic stimulus package with funds for transportation projects

**CMAQ:** see Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program

**CMIA:** Corridor Mobility Improvement Account – a $4.5 billion program for highway improvements authorized by Proposition 1B, a transportation bond measure approved by California voters in November 2006.

**Coastal Conservancy Funds:** State bond funds available for Coastal Conservancy projects through state ballot measures.

**Commission Reserves:** The SCCRTC maintains a Reserve Fund for its operations. Commission Reserve funds are budgeted as necessary to fully fund the operating budget or for special projects.

**Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program:** A federal funding program specifically for projects and programs which contribute to the attainment of a national ambient air quality standard. The SCCRTC programs CMAQ funds for Santa Cruz County. CMAQ funds for planning projects appear in the SCCRTC budget.

**c/o** Carryover. Funds carried over from prior fiscal years.

**DMV Fees:** Department of Motor Vehicles revenue, used by the SCCRTC for the Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies
SAFE), see Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies funds for more detail.

**Federal Earmark:** Funds for specific projects secured by members of congress through federal legislation.

**Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Planning (PL) Funds from AMBAG:** These funds are derived from one percent "off the top" of the funds available to each State for federal highway projects. PL funds are to be used for metropolitan planning. Funds are available for use by Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) and are allocated by a formula established by Caltrans in consultation with the MPOs. Caltrans is responsible as the "pass through" agency for administering PL funds. AMBAG passes through a portion of its FHWA PL funds to the SCCRTC for regional transportation planning purposes.

**FHWA:** see Federal Highway Administration

**Freeway Service Patrol (FSP) Grants:** Caltrans annually grants funds to the SCCRTC to operate FSP services - a roving tow truck service which helps clear incidents on Highway 17 during peak travel periods. The SCCRTC has a Memorandum of Understanding with the San Francisco Bay Area Metropolitan Transportation Commission to contract for the FSP service for Santa Cruz County.

**FSP:** see Freeway Service Patrol

**FSP Funds:** Funds designated in the annual state budget for FSP programs and distributed by a formula established in the FSP statutes.

**Proposition 116:** Clean Air and Transportation Improvement Act of 1990 passed by the voters in November 1990, provided bond funds for passenger rail and other projects including $11 million for Santa Cruz County.

**Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP):** A federal funding program established by ISTEA to fund mass transit, highway, bicycle, pedestrian and local streets and roads projects. The SCCRTC programs STP funds for Santa Cruz County. Sometimes called RSTP for Regional Surface Transportation Program.

**Regional Surface Transportation Program Exchange (RSTPX):** The annual Federal Apportionment Exchange Program, administered by Caltrans, allows the SCCRTC the option to exchange all or a portion of its annual apportionment of Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds for non-federal (State) funds. State funds have fewer
oversight requirements than Federal funds. The funds pass through the SCCRTC to the local jurisdictions and other eligible public agencies, and therefore appear in the SCCRTC budget.

**Rideshare Funds:** Funds specifically designated for the Rideshare program, oftentimes through the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP).

**RPA:** see Rural Planning Assistance

**RSTP:** see Regional Surface Transportation Program

**RSTPX:** see Regional Surface Transportation Program Exchange

**Rural Planning Assistance (RPA):** These state funds are allocated annually to regional transportation planning agencies in rural areas to support planning programs.

**SAFE:** see Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies

**Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (SAFE) Funds:** Under the provisions of state enabling legislation, the Santa Cruz County SAFE collects a $1-per-year addition to the vehicle registration fee (listed as DMV Fees in the budget) to fund the capital, planning, maintenance, and operation of a call box system on Highways 1, 9, 17, 129, and 152 in Santa Cruz County. SAFE funds can also be used for changeable message signs (CMS), freeway service patrol (FSP) and other selected motorist aid systems.

**STA:** see State Transit Assistance

**State Planning and Research Funds:** These funds are awarded by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) annually on a discretionary basis.

**State Transit Assistance (STA):** State Transit Assistance funds are derived from statewide sales tax on gasoline and diesel fuel as part of the Transportation Planning and Development (TP&D) program. Transit operations and capital improvement projects are eligible uses of STA funds. The SCCRTC receives State Transit Assistance funds and allocates 100 percent annually to the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (SCMTD).
State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP): A portion of State Transportation Improvement Program funds are allocated to our region for programming by the SCCRTC. STIP regional share funds programmed for SCCRTC projects, such as the Freeway Service Patrol, the Rideshare Program and Planning activities, appear in the SCCRTC budget.

STIP: see State Transportation Improvement Program

STP: see Regional Surface Transportation Program

STP Exchange: see Regional Surface Transportation Program Exchange

TDA: see Transportation Development Act

Transportation Development Act (TDA): State law enacted in 1971. Local TDA funds are generated from a State tax of one-quarter of one percent on all retail sales in the county. Revenues are allocated annually by the SCCRTC to support transportation planning and administration, bus transit, transportation for the elderly and handicapped, and bikeway and pedestrian projects.

Transportation Development Act (TDA) Reserves: This reserve fund is maintained in order to provide the full TDA allocations to TDA recipients in the event there is a shortfall in actual versus projected TDA revenues. Occasionally some TDA Reserve funds are allocated to a special project.
RESOLUTION NO.

Adopted by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission

on the date of March 4, 2010

on the motion of Commissioner
duly seconded by Commissioner

A RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE FY 10-11 BUDGET AND WORK PROGRAM
FOR THE SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

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

1. The FY 10-11 Budget and Work Program for the Santa Cruz County
Regional Transportation Commission, as shown in Exhibits A and
B, are hereby adopted.

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

______________________________
Randy Johnson, Chair

ATTEST:

______________________________
George Dondero, Secretary

Attachment: Exhibit A - SCCRTC FY 10-11 Budget
Exhibit B - SCCRTC FY 10-11 Work Program

Distribution: RTC Fiscal
AMBAG
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<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. Freeway Service Patrol (FSP)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. Rail/Trail Authority</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F. Highway 1 PA/ED</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G. SCCRTC – Planning (all other programs)</td>
<td>10,11,12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III.</th>
<th>PASS THROUGH GRANTS AND PROGRAMS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>A. STP Exchange Projects</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV.</th>
<th>FUND BALANCES AND RESERVES</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>A. Status of Reserve Funds</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V.</th>
<th>SUPPLEMENTAL SCHEDULES</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>A. Staff Positions</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. TDA Allocation Balances</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VI.</th>
<th>GLOSSARY OF TRANSPORTATION FUNDING TERMS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td>17 - 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# PROJECTED REVENUE SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>FY09-10 APPROVED 01/14/10</th>
<th>FY10-11 PROPOSED 03/04/10</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Transport Development Act (TDA):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Auditor's 1/4 Cent Sales Tax Estimate</td>
<td>6,632,665</td>
<td>6,596,418</td>
<td>-36,247</td>
<td>- Auditor Controller's estimate of Jan 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Reserves budgeted</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>- To maintain Bike to Work &amp; Comm Traffic Safety Coalition at FY 09-10 TDA funding level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Interest Estimate</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total TDA Apportioned</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,660,665</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,625,069</strong></td>
<td><strong>-35,596</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 State Transit Assistance (STA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Planning Grant Funds/Others:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Rural Planning Assistance (RPA)</td>
<td>315,000</td>
<td>315,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 STIP for Planning (PPM)</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>-150,000</td>
<td>- Amount programmed for FY 10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 RSTP Exchange - Eco Act and Comm Traffic Safe Coal</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>-70,000</td>
<td>- RSTP Exchange funds not yet programmed to some projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 CMAQ - Ecology Action</td>
<td>7,993</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-7,993</td>
<td>- Funds exhausted in FY 10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 FHWA - Earmark</td>
<td>532,000</td>
<td>360,000</td>
<td>-172,000</td>
<td>- Estimated carryover from FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 FHWA - Planning (PL) - from AMBAG</td>
<td>241,011</td>
<td>228,231</td>
<td>-12,780</td>
<td>- Lower federal estimate for FY 10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Section 5317 - from AMBAG</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 State 2766/Air District Funds:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 DMV Fees and interest</td>
<td>251,000</td>
<td>251,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Other - MTC SAFE and Partnership Planning Grant</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>260,000</td>
<td>-40,000</td>
<td>- Estimated carryover from FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 SAFE Funds Budgeted</td>
<td>47,950</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-47,950</td>
<td>- Carryover determined at end of FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Freeway Service Patrol (FSP):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Caltrans Grant</td>
<td>185,530</td>
<td>185,000</td>
<td>-530</td>
<td>- Estimate of state funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA)</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-180,000</td>
<td>- Carryover determined at end of FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 RSTP Funds</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>- Funds programmed for FY 10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 RSTP and RSTP Exchange</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>-30,000</td>
<td>- Estimated carryover from FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 STIP - Rideshare</td>
<td>168,100</td>
<td>174,100</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>- Match AB2766 funds for Carpool Incentive Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 AB2766</td>
<td>118,790</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>-48,790</td>
<td>- Estimated carryover from FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Service Authority for Freeway Emergency (SAFE):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 DMV Fees and interest</td>
<td>251,000</td>
<td>251,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Other - MTC SAFE and Partnership Planning Grant</td>
<td>309,210</td>
<td>260,000</td>
<td>-49,210</td>
<td>- Carryover determined at end of FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 SAFE Funds Budgeted</td>
<td>47,950</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-47,950</td>
<td>- Carryover determined at end of FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Rail/Trail Funds Budgeted</td>
<td>354,167</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>-309,823</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Rail Trail Authority:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Proposition 116 and STIP</td>
<td>20,481,059</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-20,481,059</td>
<td>- Rail line purchase in FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Leases</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>-60,000</td>
<td>- Lease revenue estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Rail/Trail Funds Budgeted</td>
<td>102,310</td>
<td>98,956</td>
<td>-3,354</td>
<td>- Rail/Trail funds for FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Highway 1 PA/ED:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 RSTP Exchange</td>
<td>1,701,000</td>
<td>1,160,888</td>
<td>-540,112</td>
<td>- Estimated carryover from FY 09-10 &amp; programmed funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 CMAQ</td>
<td>111,200</td>
<td>55,878</td>
<td>-55,322</td>
<td>- Estimated carryover from FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Federal Earmark - Aux Lanes</td>
<td>772,500</td>
<td>343,591</td>
<td>-428,909</td>
<td>- Estimated carryover from FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 Transfer - in from TC Planning</td>
<td>102,310</td>
<td>98,956</td>
<td>-3,354</td>
<td>- Carryover determined at end of FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 Rail/Trail Funds Budgeted</td>
<td>354,167</td>
<td>44,344</td>
<td>-309,823</td>
<td>- Carryover determined at end of FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 CMAQ</td>
<td>39,895</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-39,895</td>
<td>- Used in FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 RSTP Exchange Program</td>
<td>2,292,995</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2,292,995</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 CMAQ</td>
<td>2,292,995</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2,292,995</td>
<td>- Programmed funds for construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 RSTP Exchange Program</td>
<td>5,207,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-5,207,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 CMAQ to Other Local Jurisdictions</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-35,000</td>
<td>- Funds exhausted in FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>42,055,179</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,663,667</strong></td>
<td><strong>-28,391,512</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPORTIONMENT SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLAIMANTS</th>
<th>APPROVED 01/14/10</th>
<th>PROPOSED 03/04/10</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation Development Act (TDA): (1)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike to Work and Comm Traffic Safety Coal</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Allocation for Community Bridges transit</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>-40,000</td>
<td>One time special allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA Administration</td>
<td>436,360</td>
<td>431,995</td>
<td>-4,365</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA Planning</td>
<td>374,320</td>
<td>374,320</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>810,680</td>
<td>806,315</td>
<td>-4,365</td>
<td>-0.54% - Reduction consistent with Auditor Controller's estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCMTD</td>
<td>5,001,737</td>
<td>4,974,478</td>
<td>-27,259</td>
<td>-0.54% - Reduction consistent with Auditor Controller's estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Transit (Community Bridges/CTSA)</td>
<td>491,399</td>
<td>488,721</td>
<td>-2,678</td>
<td>-0.54% - Reduction consistent with Auditor Controller's estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Center</td>
<td>58,500</td>
<td>58,181</td>
<td>-319</td>
<td>-0.54% - Reduction consistent with Auditor Controller's estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Capitola</td>
<td>11,187</td>
<td>11,126</td>
<td>-61</td>
<td>-0.54% - Reduction consistent with Auditor Controller's estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Cruz - Non Transit</td>
<td>65,506</td>
<td>65,149</td>
<td>-357</td>
<td>-0.54% - Reduction consistent with Auditor Controller's estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Scotts Valley</td>
<td>13,065</td>
<td>12,994</td>
<td>-71</td>
<td>-0.54% - Reduction consistent with Auditor Controller's estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Watsonville</td>
<td>57,620</td>
<td>57,306</td>
<td>-314</td>
<td>-0.54% - Reduction consistent with Auditor Controller's estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>150,971</td>
<td>150,148</td>
<td>-823</td>
<td>-0.54% - Reduction consistent with Auditor Controller's estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total TDA Apportioned</strong></td>
<td>6,660,665</td>
<td>6,624,418</td>
<td>-36,247</td>
<td>-0.54% - Auditor Controller's estimate of Jan 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Transit Assistance (STA) - SCMTD</strong></td>
<td>78,883</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-78,883</td>
<td>State diverted funding due to budget crisis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning Grant Funds/Others:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC:</td>
<td>2,073,380</td>
<td>1,402,495</td>
<td>-670,885</td>
<td>Carryovers determined at end of FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz Area TMA &amp; Ecology Action</td>
<td>67,993</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-67,993</td>
<td>Availability of RSTP Exchange funds determined at end of FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>2,141,373</td>
<td>1,402,495</td>
<td>-738,878</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rideshare</strong></td>
<td>446,890</td>
<td>374,100</td>
<td>-72,790</td>
<td>FY 09-10 included some unappropriated revenues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SAFE</strong></td>
<td>608,160</td>
<td>511,000</td>
<td>-97,160</td>
<td>Carryovers determined at end of FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freeway Service Patrol (FSP)</strong></td>
<td>367,030</td>
<td>366,500</td>
<td>-530</td>
<td>Revenue estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rail Trail Authority</strong></td>
<td>21,215,320</td>
<td>203,300</td>
<td>-21,012,020</td>
<td>Rail line purchase in FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highway 1 PA/ED</strong></td>
<td>4,284,089</td>
<td>4,403,467</td>
<td>119,378</td>
<td>Construction anticipated to start in FY 10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RSTP Exchange Program</strong></td>
<td>6,217,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-6,217,000</td>
<td>Carryover &amp; new revenue determined at end of FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CMAQ to Other Local Jurisdictions</strong></td>
<td>35,769</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-35,769</td>
<td>Funds exhausted in FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>42,055,179</td>
<td>13,885,280</td>
<td>-28,169,899</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) TDA apportionments are based on the formulas in the RTC's Rules and Regulations. Balance not used for Planning and Administration is allocated to other TDA claimants as follows: 85.5% is appropriated to SCMTD, 8.4% to Community Bridges and 1% to the Volunteer Center; the remaining funds are proportionally allocated to cities and the County according to population.
## Operating Budget Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>FY09-10 Adopted Detail</th>
<th>FY10-11 Proposed Detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Salaries &amp; Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY09-10 Adopted 01/10</td>
<td>FY10-11 Proposed 03/04/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC - Administration</td>
<td>652,500</td>
<td>201,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>201,000</td>
<td>345,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rideshare</td>
<td>364,600</td>
<td>185,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>195,000</td>
<td>179,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFE</td>
<td>553,350</td>
<td>95,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>343,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway Service Patrol</td>
<td>331,400</td>
<td>47,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>286,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail/Trail Authority</td>
<td>21,215,320</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>103,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 1 - PA/ED</td>
<td>4,004,831</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>265,000</td>
<td>3,859,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC Planning</td>
<td>2,299,553</td>
<td>857,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>906,407</td>
<td>746,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Budget</strong></td>
<td>29,421,554</td>
<td>1,756,039</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Operating Budget Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>FY09-10 Adopted 01/10</th>
<th>FY09-10 Actual 6/30/10</th>
<th>FY09-10 Adopted 01/10</th>
<th>FY10-11 Proposed 03/04/10</th>
<th>FY09-10 Proposed 01/10</th>
<th>FY09-10 Adopted 01/10</th>
<th>FY09-10 Adopted 01/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC - Administration</td>
<td>652,500</td>
<td>(652,500)</td>
<td>555,500</td>
<td>652,500</td>
<td>(97,000)</td>
<td>652,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rideshare</td>
<td>364,600</td>
<td>(364,600)</td>
<td>374,100</td>
<td>364,600</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFE</td>
<td>553,350</td>
<td>(553,350)</td>
<td>463,800</td>
<td>553,350</td>
<td>(89,550)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway Service Patrol</td>
<td>331,400</td>
<td>(331,400)</td>
<td>341,350</td>
<td>331,400</td>
<td>9,950</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail/Trail Authority</td>
<td>21,215,320</td>
<td>(21,215,320)</td>
<td>203,300</td>
<td>21,215,320</td>
<td>(21,012,020)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 1 - PA/ED</td>
<td>4,004,831</td>
<td>(4,004,831)</td>
<td>4,124,209</td>
<td>4,004,831</td>
<td>119,378</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC Planning</td>
<td>2,299,553</td>
<td>(2,299,553)</td>
<td>1,653,310</td>
<td>2,299,553</td>
<td>(646,243)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating Budget</strong></td>
<td>29,421,554</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(29,421,554)</td>
<td>7,715,569</td>
<td>29,421,554</td>
<td>(21,705,985)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** (1) Includes staffing shown on page 15 and $7,494 in anticipated funds for a transit rotational intern funded with a Transit Professional Development Grant.
## SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
### OPERATING BUDGET BY PROGRAM - ADMINISTRATION
#### FY 2010-2011 BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK ELEMENT #101</th>
<th>FY09-10 APPROVED 01/14/10</th>
<th>FY10-11 PROPOSED 03/04/10</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 TDA Administration</td>
<td>436,360</td>
<td>431,995</td>
<td>-4,365</td>
<td>- Reduction consistent with Auditor-Controller's estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Other Revenues</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 RTC Funds</td>
<td>216,140</td>
<td>123,505</td>
<td>-92,635</td>
<td>- Due to reduced expenses as shown below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
<td><strong>652,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>555,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>-97,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENDITURES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Salaries &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>201,000</td>
<td>201,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 <strong>Services and Supplies:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Telephone</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Liability Insurance</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>-1,000</td>
<td>- Based on prior years' costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Video Conferencing Fees</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Internet/Web Fees</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Utilities</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Office Rent</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Carpet Replacement and Repairs</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-5,000</td>
<td>- one time expense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL SERVICES &amp; SUPPLIES</strong></td>
<td><strong>451,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>354,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>-80,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 <strong>Fixed Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Fixed Assets</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 <strong>Office Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Office Expense</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Duplicating</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Postage</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Membership</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Sponsorship</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>-500</td>
<td>- Minimized to help reduce overall costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Advertisement/Publication</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Office Equipment Repair/Maintenance</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Contingency/Special Expense</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 County Mainframe/Intranet</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>-1,500</td>
<td>- Based on prior years' costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Computer Software</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>-9,000</td>
<td>- email server software upgrade completed in FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 <strong>Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Commissioners' Stipend</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Fiscal &amp; Triennial Performance Audit</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>-30,000</td>
<td>- triennial performance audit completed in FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Annual Report/Fact Sheets</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 Accounting, Payroll and Auditing Fees</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>- Auditor Controller recommends switching to a private payroll firm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 Human Resources/Employee Relations</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>-8,000</td>
<td>- No labor negotiations anticipated in FY 10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 Administrative Consulting Services</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>-9,000</td>
<td>- GASP45 actuarial completed in FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 Legal Counsel</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 Programming for Computer System and Website</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>-15,000</td>
<td>- website update completed in FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 LAN/Computer Support</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>-5,000</td>
<td>- estimated lower cost with new consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 Custodial - Janitorial Services</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Transfer to Special TDA Allocation</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-17,000</td>
<td>- one time transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td><strong>652,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>555,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>-97,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
## SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
### OPERATING BUDGET BY PROGRAM - RIDESHARE
#### FY 2010-2011 BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RIDESHARE: 721400</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK ELEMENT #179</th>
<th>FY09-10</th>
<th>FY10-11</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01/14/10</td>
<td>03/04/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVENUES:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP Exchange</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-30,000</td>
<td>Carryover determined at end of FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ - Rideshare</td>
<td>168,100</td>
<td>174,100</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>Match AB2766 funds for Carpool Incentive Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB2766</td>
<td>118,790</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>-48,790</td>
<td>Estimated carryover from FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL REVENUES</td>
<td>446,890</td>
<td>374,100</td>
<td>-72,790</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPENDITURES:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff and Overhead:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>185,500</td>
<td>195,000</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>Anticipated work for Park &amp; Ride Lot program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</td>
<td>446,890</td>
<td>374,100</td>
<td>-72,790</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK ELEMENT #178</th>
<th>REVENUES:</th>
<th>EXPENDITURES:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY09-10</td>
<td>FY10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01/14/10</td>
<td>03/04/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMV Fees</td>
<td>236,000</td>
<td>236,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans Partnership Planning Grant for 511 System</td>
<td>259,210</td>
<td>210,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Financial Assistance (MTC SAFE)</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFE Funds Budgeted</td>
<td>47,950</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
<td><strong>608,160</strong></td>
<td><strong>511,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY09-10</td>
<td>FY10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01/14/10</td>
<td>03/04/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Expense</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tranportation/Travel/Education</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWY 17 Utility Charges (Electricity)</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liability Insurance</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Counsel</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency/Special Expense</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Access</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Maintenance</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>62,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHP Operations</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe on 17</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway Service Patrol</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call Answering</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callbox Upgrade</td>
<td>62,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511 System Plan - Consultant Services</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAMC for 511 System Planning</td>
<td>36,400</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Services &amp; Supplies</strong></td>
<td><strong>458,350</strong></td>
<td><strong>343,800</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unappropriated Revenues</td>
<td>54,810</td>
<td>47,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td><strong>608,160</strong></td>
<td><strong>511,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:

- Estimated carryover from FY 09-10
- Estimated increase due to 511 system planning
- Estimated cost decrease due to recent expenditures
- Estimated cost increase for maintenance
- FY 09-10 includes some carryover
- Potential cost increase due to call volume and anticipated new contract
- Carryover determined at end of FY 09-10
- Carryover determined at end of FY 09-10
## SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
OPERATING BUDGET BY PROGRAM - FREEWAY SERVICE PATROL (FSP)
FY 2010-2011 BUDGET

### FREEWAY SERVICE PATROL (FSP) : 721827

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK ELEMENT #177</th>
<th>FY09-10 APPROVED 01/14/10</th>
<th>FY10-11 PROPOSED 03/04/10</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 Caltrans</td>
<td>185,530</td>
<td>185,000</td>
<td>-530</td>
<td>- Estimate of state funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA)</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-180,000</td>
<td>- Carryover determined at end of FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 RSTP Funds</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>- Funds programmed for FY 10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Interest</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 FSP Reserve Funds Budgeted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
<td><strong>367,030</strong></td>
<td><strong>366,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>-530</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EXPENDITURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICES AND SUPPLIES:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff and Overhead:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries &amp; Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation/Travel/Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liability Insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Counsel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency/Special Expense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Services &amp; Supplies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unappropriated Revenues:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVENUES:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 STIP</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-10,000,000</td>
<td>- Rail line purchase in FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Proposition 116</td>
<td>10,481,059</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-10,481,059</td>
<td>- Rail line purchase in FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Leases</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>-60,000</td>
<td>- Lease revenue estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Federal Earmark</td>
<td>157,784</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-157,784</td>
<td>- Rail line purchase in FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Transfer from TC Funds</td>
<td>102,310</td>
<td>98,956</td>
<td>-3,354</td>
<td>- Carrying over determined at end of FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Rail/Trail Authority Reserve Funds Budgeted</td>
<td>354,167</td>
<td>44,344</td>
<td>-309,823</td>
<td>- Carrying over determined at end of FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,215,320</strong></td>
<td><strong>203,300</strong></td>
<td><strong>-21,012,020</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPENDITURES:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Staff and Overhead:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Salaries &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>-20,000</td>
<td>- Rail line purchase in FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,215,320</strong></td>
<td><strong>203,300</strong></td>
<td><strong>-21,012,020</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:

-8-
### SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
### OPERATING BUDGET BY PROGRAM - HIGHWAY 1
### FY 2010-2011 BUDGET

#### HIGHWAY 1: 722200

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK ELEMENT #683</th>
<th>FY09-10 APPROVED 01/14/10</th>
<th>FY10-11 PROPOSED 03/04/10</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 REVENUES:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 RSTP Exchange - HOV Lanes</td>
<td>1,008,231</td>
<td>506,632</td>
<td>-501,599</td>
<td>- Estimated carryover from FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 CMAQ - HOV Lanes</td>
<td>111,200</td>
<td>55,878</td>
<td>-55,322</td>
<td>- Estimated carryover from FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 STIP - HOV Lanes</td>
<td>1,375,000</td>
<td>690,932</td>
<td>-684,068</td>
<td>- Estimated carryover from FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Federal Earmark Aux Lanes: PA/ED (carryover)</td>
<td>95,654</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-95,654</td>
<td>- Funds exhausted in FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Federal Earmark Aux Lanes: Design</td>
<td>677,000</td>
<td>343,591</td>
<td>-333,409</td>
<td>- Estimated carryover from FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 STIP - Aux Lanes: Design (carryover)</td>
<td>326,000</td>
<td>165,451</td>
<td>-160,549</td>
<td>- Estimated carryover from FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 RSTP Exchange - Aux Lanes: Design</td>
<td>85,678</td>
<td>43,483</td>
<td>-42,195</td>
<td>- Estimated carryover from FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 RSTP Exchange - Aux Lanes: PA/ED</td>
<td>279,326</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-279,326</td>
<td>- Estimated carryover from FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 STIP Construction</td>
<td>304,505</td>
<td>304,505</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Programmed for construction phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 CMIA Construction</td>
<td>326,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-326,000</td>
<td>- Funds used in FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Aux Lane Reserves</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 TOTAL REVENUE</td>
<td>4,284,089</td>
<td>4,403,467</td>
<td>119,378</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### EXPENDITURES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services and Supplies:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 1 HOV Lanes PA/ED:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 PA/ED Consultant - Nolte Contract</td>
<td>1,680,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 PA/ED on Call Consultants</td>
<td>36,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 PA/ED Public Information, materials, postage &amp; meetings</td>
<td>31,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 ROW Consultant</td>
<td>40,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 FHWA Project Value Analysis</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Sustainability Analysis (STARS)</td>
<td>88,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Contingencies</td>
<td>128,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 1 Morrissey-Soquel Aux Lane:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 PA/ED Consultant - Nolte Contract</td>
<td>321,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 PA/ED on Call Consultants</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 PA/ED Public Information, materials, Postage &amp; meeting space</td>
<td>3,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 PA/ED Legal Costs</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 1 Morrissey-Soquel Aux Lane Design:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Final Design and Engineering Consultants</td>
<td>1,017,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Design on Call Consultants</td>
<td>15,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Design Public Information, materials, Postage &amp; meeting space</td>
<td>15,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 PS&amp;E Construction Admin Activities</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Transfer to RSTPX Fund</td>
<td>326,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Hwy 1 Morrissey-Soquel Aux Lane Construction:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Contractor - Capital Expenses</td>
<td>2,172,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 Construction - Management Team</td>
<td>325,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 Construction - Public Information</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 Unappropriated Revenues - HOV:</td>
<td>279,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 TOTAL EXPENDITURES</td>
<td>4,284,089</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[\text{Subtotal Services & Supplies:} \quad 3,754,831 - 3,859,209 = 104,378 \]

\[\text{TOTAL EXPENDITURES:} \quad 4,284,089 - 4,403,467 = 119,378 \]
## PLANNING REVENUES: 721600/721700/721750

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCES</th>
<th>FY09-10 APPROVED 01/14/10</th>
<th>FY10-11 PROPOSED 03/04/10</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>TDA Planning</td>
<td>374,320</td>
<td>374,320</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>TDA Reserves for Bike to Work and Comm Traf Sft Coal</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Rural Planning Assistance (RPA)</td>
<td>315,000</td>
<td>315,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>STIP for Planning (PPM)</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>-150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Transit Professional Development Grant - from AMBAG</td>
<td>9,131</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-9,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>RSTP Exchange - Eco Act &amp; Comm Trafc Saty Coal</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>-70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>CMAQ - Ecology Action</td>
<td>7,993</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-7,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>FHWA - Earmark</td>
<td>532,000</td>
<td>360,000</td>
<td>-172,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>FHWA - Planning (PL) - from AMBAG</td>
<td>241,011</td>
<td>228,231</td>
<td>-12,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Section 5317 - from AMBAG</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Env. Justice Context-Sensitive Planning Grant</td>
<td>94,384</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>-60,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Agricultural Worker Transportation Program</td>
<td>64,051</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-64,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>AB2766/Air District Funds:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Bike Secure - RTC</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>-10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Folding Bikes on Bus Program - Ecology Action</td>
<td>17,066</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>-4,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Emergency Ride Home - Ecology Action</td>
<td>34,209</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>-14,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Climate change in RTP</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>RTC Funds Budgeted</td>
<td>161,387</td>
<td>98,108</td>
<td>-63,279</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL REVENUES:** 2,299,553 1,653,310 -646,243

**Note:**

- To maintain at FY 09-10 level as recommended by B&A/P Comm
- Amount programmed for FY 10-11
- Grant exhausted in FY 10-11
- RSTP Exchange funds not yet programmed to some projects
- Funds exhausted in FY 10-11
- Lower federal estimate for FY 10-11
- Carryover determined at end of FY 09-10
- Estimated carryover from FY 09-10
- Estimated carryover from FY 09-10
- Estimated carryover from FY 09-10
- Grant exhausted in FY 10-11
- Full carryover determined at end of FY 09-10
## SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
### OPERATING BUDGET BY PROGRAM - PLANNING EXPENDITURES
### FY 2010-2011 BUDGET

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

### EXPENDITURES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>WORK ELEMENT NUMBER</th>
<th>EXPENDITURES</th>
<th>FY09-10</th>
<th>FY10-11</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Staff &amp; Overhead by Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Plan Coordination</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>97,092</td>
<td>-2,908</td>
<td>- Based on work trend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Land Use/Transportation Coordination</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>35,258</td>
<td>35,020</td>
<td>-238</td>
<td>- Based on work trend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Work Program</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Public Information</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian Planning</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>59,000</td>
<td>77,645</td>
<td>18,645</td>
<td>- Bike lane signage project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSST) Network</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>- MBSST Network master plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Specialized Transportation</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>77,000</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>- Ped improvements to transit facilities plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Rotational Transit Intern</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>9,131</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-9,131</td>
<td>- Funds exhausted in FY 10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>85,968</td>
<td>85,968</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Traffic Monitoring</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>16,210</td>
<td>16,210</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Bike &amp; Roadway Planning</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>11,472</td>
<td>11,472</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>205,000</td>
<td>199,000</td>
<td>-6,000</td>
<td>- No new RTIP anticipated in FY 10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Hwy &amp; Roadway Planning</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>96,000</td>
<td>96,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td><strong>Subtotal Staff and Overhead</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>857,039</td>
<td>906,407</td>
<td>49,368</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td><strong>Services &amp; Supplies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Folding Bikes on Bus Program (Ecology Action)</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>17,066</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>-4,066</td>
<td>- Estimated carryover from FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Bike To Work Program (Ecology Action)</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>34,427</td>
<td>34,427</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>- RTC funds used to cover TDA reduction to maintain FY 09-10 funding per B&amp;A/P Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Community Traffic Safety Coalition (Safety Education)</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>86,064</td>
<td>86,064</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>- RTC funds used to cover TDA reduction to maintain FY 09-10 funding per B&amp;A/P Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Comm Traffic Safety Coal (South County Bike/Ped safety)</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-50,000</td>
<td>- 2-year project; availability of FY 10-11 state RSTP Exchange funds determined at end of FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Comm Safety Campaign (Ecology Action)</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>7,993</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-7,993</td>
<td>- Funds exhausted in FY 10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Go Green Campaign (Ecology Action)</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-60,000</td>
<td>- 2-year project; availability of FY 10-11 state RSTP Exchange funds determined at end of FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Emergency Ride Home (Ecology Action)</td>
<td>34,209</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>-14,209</td>
<td>- Estimated carryover from FY 09-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Mobility Outreach and Education Project (Community Bridges)</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>77,384</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-77,384</td>
<td>- Carryover determined at end of FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Agricultural Worker Transp Program (Community Bridges)</td>
<td>64,051</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-64,051</td>
<td>- Carryover determined at end of FY 09-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Professional Services (contracts)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Sacramento Assistant</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Washington Assistant</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>44,600</td>
<td>44,600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Transportation Funding Development Consultants</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>2,356</td>
<td>2,356</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Engineering and Other Technical Consultants</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan EIR</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-30,000</td>
<td>- One time expense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>MBSST Network Master Plan Consultant</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>-200,000</td>
<td>- Estimated carryover from FY 09-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td><strong>RTC Work Element Related Items</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Bike Secure Program</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>-15,000</td>
<td>- Estimated carryover from FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Traffic Monitoring services - counts</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Printing RTP, RTIP, other Documents and Pub Info Materials</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>MBSST Network Plan Outreach</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>30000</td>
<td>30000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Transfer to TDA Reserve</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>146,553</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-146,553</td>
<td>- One time transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Transfer to Special Allocation for Community Bridges</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-23,000</td>
<td>- One time special allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Transfer to Rail/Trail Authority</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>102,310</td>
<td>98,956</td>
<td>-3,354</td>
<td>- Lower transfer required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td><strong>Subtotal Services &amp; Supplies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,442,514</td>
<td>746,903</td>
<td>-695,611</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,299,553</td>
<td>1,653,310</td>
<td>-646,243</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORK ELEMENT NUMBER</td>
<td>FY10-11 PROPOSED</td>
<td>TDA</td>
<td>RTC FUND</td>
<td>RPA</td>
<td>FHWA PL - AMBAG</td>
<td>TDA Reserves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Plan Coordination</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>97,092</td>
<td>1,872</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>62,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Land Use/Transportation Coordination</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>35,020</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Work Program</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Public Information</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian Planning</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>61,743</td>
<td>5,020</td>
<td>2,645</td>
<td>18,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSST) Network</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Specialized Transportation</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>77,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Rotational Transit Intern</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>85,968</td>
<td>41,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>44,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Traffic Monitoring</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>16,210</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>TSM</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>11,472</td>
<td>6,139</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>199,000</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Hwy &amp; Roadway Planning</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>96,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>63,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Salaries, Benefits &amp; Overhead Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>906,407</td>
<td>96,531</td>
<td>2,645</td>
<td>315,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Services &amp; Supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td>746,903</td>
<td>277,789</td>
<td>95,463</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Professional Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>288,504</td>
<td>68,742</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Sacramento Assistant</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Washington Assistant</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>44,600</td>
<td>44,600</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Bike To Work Program (Ecology Action)</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>34,427</td>
<td>34,241</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Community Traffic Safety Coalition (Safety Education)</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>86,064</td>
<td>85,599</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Comm Traffic Safety Coal (South County Bike/Ped safety)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Congestion Education Campaign (Ecology Action)</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Go Green Campaign (Ecology Action)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Emergency Ride Home (Ecology Action)</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Mobility Outreach and Education Project (Community Bridges)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Agricultural Worker Transp Program (Community Bridges)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan EIR</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>MBSST Network Master Plan Consultant</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Sacramento Assistant</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Washington Assistant</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>44,600</td>
<td>44,600</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Transportation Funding Development Consultants</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>2,356</td>
<td>2,356</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Engineering and Other Technical Consultants</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan EIR</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>MBSST Network Master Plan Consultant</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>RTC Work Element Related Items</td>
<td></td>
<td>360,400</td>
<td>108,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Traffic Monitoring services - counts</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Printing RTP, RTIP, other Documents and Pub Info Materials</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Bike Secure Program</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Traffic Monitoring services - counts</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Printing RTP, RTIP, other Documents and Pub Info Materials</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>MBSST Network Plan Outreach</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Transfer to TDA Reserve</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Transfer to Special Allocation for Community Bridges</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Transfer to Rail/Trail Authority</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>98,956</td>
<td>28,849</td>
<td>70,107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Subtotal Services &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>746,903</td>
<td>277,789</td>
<td>95,463</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</td>
<td>1,653,310</td>
<td>374,320</td>
<td>98,108</td>
<td>315,000</td>
<td>228,231</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

**OPERATING BUDGET BY PROGRAM - STP EXCHANGE PROGRAM**

**FY 2010-2011 BUDGET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK ELEMENT #101</th>
<th>FY09-10 APPROVED 01/14/10</th>
<th>FY10-11 PROPOSED 03/04/10</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RSTP EXCHANGE PROGRAM: 722000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 REVENUES:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 State RSTP Exchange Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td>Carryover &amp; new revenue determined at end of FY 09-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Interest</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Transfer from Hwy 1 PA/ED - Aux Lane</td>
<td>326,000</td>
<td>(326,000)</td>
<td>Carryover &amp; new revenue determined at end of FY 09-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 RSTP Exchange Funds Budgeted - Carryover</td>
<td>5,841,000</td>
<td>(5,841,000)</td>
<td>Carryover &amp; new revenue determined at end of FY 09-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 TOTAL REVENUES</td>
<td>6,217,000</td>
<td>(6,217,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 EXPENDITURES:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 City of Capitola</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Clares Street Traffic Calming</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>(200,000)</td>
<td>Carryover &amp; new revenue determined at end of FY 09-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 38th Avenue Rehabilitation</td>
<td>438,000</td>
<td>(438,000)</td>
<td>Carryover &amp; new revenue determined at end of FY 09-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Capitola Road Traffic Calming/Improvement</td>
<td>268,000</td>
<td>(268,000)</td>
<td>Carryover &amp; new revenue determined at end of FY 09-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 City of Capitola Subtotal</td>
<td>906,000</td>
<td>(906,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 City of Scotts Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Whispering Pines Sidewalk</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>(350,000)</td>
<td>Carryover &amp; new revenue determined at end of FY 09-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 City of Scotts Valley Subtotal</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>(350,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 City of Watsonville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Freedom Blvd Rehab (High - Broadies)</td>
<td>751,000</td>
<td>(751,000)</td>
<td>Carryover &amp; new revenue determined at end of FY 09-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 City of Watsonville Subtotal</td>
<td>751,000</td>
<td>(751,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 San Andreas Road Rehabilitation</td>
<td>278,000</td>
<td>(278,000)</td>
<td>Carryover &amp; new revenue determined at end of FY 09-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Bonny Doon Raod Rehabilitation</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>(600,000)</td>
<td>Carryover &amp; new revenue determined at end of FY 09-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Green Valley Road Rehab</td>
<td>810,000</td>
<td>(810,000)</td>
<td>Carryover &amp; new revenue determined at end of FY 09-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 State Park Drive Improvement</td>
<td>587,000</td>
<td>(587,000)</td>
<td>Carryover &amp; new revenue determined at end of FY 09-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Calabasas Road Bike/Pedestrian</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>(700,000)</td>
<td>Carryover &amp; new revenue determined at end of FY 09-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Graham Hill Road Safety Project</td>
<td>310,000</td>
<td>(310,000)</td>
<td>Carryover &amp; new revenue determined at end of FY 09-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 County of Santa Cruz Subtotal</td>
<td>3,285,000</td>
<td>(3,285,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 County Health Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 South County Based Community Traffic Safety Coalition</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td>Carryover &amp; new revenue determined at end of FY 09-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 CTSC Subtotal</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 UCSC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Replacement Vanpools</td>
<td>66,000</td>
<td>(66,000)</td>
<td>Carryover &amp; new revenue determined at end of FY 09-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 UCSC Subtotal</td>
<td>66,000</td>
<td>(66,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 Go Green-Ecology Action Program</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>(60,000)</td>
<td>Carryover &amp; new revenue determined at end of FY 09-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 Park and Ride Lot Program</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>(30,000)</td>
<td>Carryover &amp; new revenue determined at end of FY 09-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 Bike Route Signage</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>(25,000)</td>
<td>Carryover &amp; new revenue determined at end of FY 09-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 Reserve for Highway 1 Soquel-Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes</td>
<td>326,000</td>
<td>(326,000)</td>
<td>Carryover &amp; new revenue determined at end of FY 09-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 Highway 1 Soquel-Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes</td>
<td>368,000</td>
<td>(368,000)</td>
<td>Carryover &amp; new revenue determined at end of FY 09-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 SCCRTC Subtotal</td>
<td>809,000</td>
<td>(809,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 Unappropriated Revenues:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 TOTAL EXPENDITURES</td>
<td>6,217,000</td>
<td>(6,217,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**

All FY 09-10 funds are assumed spent in FY 09-10; new funds for FY 10-11 not provided by State until end of FY 09-10.
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## Fund Balances and Reserves: 03/04/10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>TDA Fund (1)</th>
<th>RTC Fund (2)</th>
<th>Rideshare Fund</th>
<th>Highway Authority Fund</th>
<th>Safe Operating Fund</th>
<th>FSP Fund</th>
<th>RSTP Exchange Fund</th>
<th>STA (3) Fund</th>
<th>Total All Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance 7-01-10</td>
<td>198,980</td>
<td>225,979</td>
<td>44,344</td>
<td>550,115</td>
<td>434,902</td>
<td>88,246</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,542,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserves budgeted</td>
<td>(651)</td>
<td>(221,613)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(594,459)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgeted Carryover 09/10</td>
<td>(44,344)</td>
<td>(550,115)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from RTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available Reserve Fund Balance</td>
<td>198,329</td>
<td>4,366</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>948,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target for Reserves - 8%</td>
<td>(527,713)</td>
<td>(176,705)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(704,418)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus &lt;Deficit&gt; from Target</td>
<td>(329,384)</td>
<td>(172,339)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>243,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unappropriated Revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>351,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fund Balance</td>
<td>(329,384)</td>
<td>(172,339)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>595,297</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:
- Numbers in parentheses are negative numbers. All other numbers are positive numbers.
- Funds within each category (column) are restricted for use on projects/programs within that category.
- **Fund Balance (7-01-10)** = Balances of funds not used at the end of prior fiscal year.
- **Budgeted Carryover/New** = Portion of Fund Balance used in current fiscal year budget.
- Target for Reserves = Minimum Fund Balance recommended to cover potential revenue shortfalls. For TDA and RTC Funds see notes 1 & 2 below
- **Unappropriated Revenues** = Amount of revenues designated for specific projects/programs that likely will not be expended in FY10/11, but will be needed in future years.

1. 8% reserve is established in RTC Rules and Regulations; 300% available due to use of reserve funds in prior fiscal years
2. 8% reserve target consistent with TDA reserve fund; 20% available due to reduced revenues & will be affected by carryovers from FY 09-10
3. This is a pass-through fund, all receipts are paid to SCMTD.
4. Includes combination of budgeted carryover and budgeted new for RTC Fund
### STAFF POSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positions</th>
<th>FY09-10</th>
<th>FY10-11</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Executive Director</strong></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deputy Director</strong></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fiscal Officer SCCRTC</strong></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative Services Officer</strong></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation Planner I-IV</strong></td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accounting Technician</strong></td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative Assistant I-III</strong></td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation Planning Technician</strong></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paid Intern</strong></td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
<td>Grant funding for position exhausted in FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL POSITIONS**: 16.75  16.75  0.00

---

### BUDGETED STAFF POSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positions</th>
<th>FY09-10</th>
<th>FY10-11</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Executive Director</strong></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deputy Director</strong></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fiscal Officer SCCRTC</strong></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative Services Officer</strong></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation Planner I-IV</strong></td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accounting Technician</strong></td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative Assistant I-III</strong></td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation Planning Technician</strong></td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>Retired position not filled in FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paid Intern</strong></td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
<td>Grant funding for position exhausted in FY 09-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL POSITIONS**: 14.25  14.25  0.00

---

Note: FTE= full-time equivalent
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLAIMANTS</th>
<th>FY10-11 PROPOSED 03/04/10</th>
<th>UNSPENT PRIOR ALLOCATIONS</th>
<th>AVAILABLE FUNDS 03/04/10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TDA Administration</td>
<td>431,995</td>
<td>431,995</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA Planning</td>
<td>374,320</td>
<td>374,320</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>806,315</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>806,315</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demo Program</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Allocation for Community Bridges transit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCMTD</td>
<td>4,974,478</td>
<td>4,974,478</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Transit</td>
<td>488,721</td>
<td>488,721</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Center</td>
<td>58,181</td>
<td>58,181</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Capitola</td>
<td>11,126</td>
<td>11,126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Cruz - Non Transit</td>
<td>65,149</td>
<td>65,149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Scotts Valley</td>
<td>12,994</td>
<td>12,994</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Watsonville</td>
<td>57,306</td>
<td>57,306</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>150,148</td>
<td>150,148</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,624,418</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>6,624,418</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Allocations for the Cities and the County use the most recent population figures from the Department of Finance.
Glossary of Transportation Funding Terms Used in the SCCRTC Budget

**AB2766:** This bill authorized a Department of Motor Vehicles vehicle registration fee of up to $4.00 to be used by air pollution control districts for planning and incentive programs to reduce motor vehicle emissions. The Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District (MBUAPCD) annually conducts a grant program to distribute approximately $1.5 million in AB2766 funds in Santa Cruz, Monterey, and San Benito counties for this purpose. The SCCRTC has received AB2766 funds for some of its own programs, in addition to serving as a pass-through agency for grants used by some local non-profit organizations.

**AB3090 Loan:** Loan secured with an AB3090 designation from the CTC to be paid with funds eventually available to a project from the STIP.

**ARRA:** American Recovery and Reinvestment Act passed by Congress and signed by the President in 2009 as an economic stimulus package with funds for transportation projects

**CMAQ:** see Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program

**CMIA:** Corridor Mobility Improvement Account – a $4.5 billion program for highway improvements authorized by Proposition 1B, a transportation bond measure approved by California voters in November 2006.

**Coastal Conservancy Funds:** State bond funds available for Coastal Conservancy projects through state ballot measures.

**Commission Reserves:** The SCCRTC maintains a Reserve Fund for its operations. Commission Reserve funds are budgeted as necessary to fully fund the operating budget or for special projects.

**Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program:** A federal funding program specifically for projects and programs which contribute to the attainment of a national ambient air quality standard. The SCCRTC programs CMAQ funds for Santa Cruz County. CMAQ funds for planning projects appear in the SCCRTC budget.

**c/o** Carryover. Funds carried over from prior fiscal years.

**DMV Fees:** Department of Motor Vehicles revenue, used by the SCCRTC for the Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies
SAFE), see Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies funds for more detail.

**Federal Earmark:** Funds for specific projects secured by members of congress through federal legislation.

**Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Planning (PL) Funds from AMBAG:** These funds are derived from one percent "off the top" of the funds available to each State for federal highway projects. PL funds are to be used for metropolitan planning. Funds are available for use by Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) and are allocated by a formula established by Caltrans in consultation with the MPOs. Caltrans is responsible as the "pass through" agency for administering PL funds. AMBAG passes through a portion of its FHWA PL funds to the SCCRTC for regional transportation planning purposes.

**FHWA:** see Federal Highway Administration

**Freeway Service Patrol (FSP) Grants:** Caltrans annually grants funds to the SCCRTC to operate FSP services - a roving tow truck service which helps clear incidents on Highway 17 during peak travel periods. The SCCRTC has a Memorandum of Understanding with the San Francisco Bay Area Metropolitan Transportation Commission to contract for the FSP service for Santa Cruz County.

**FSP:** see Freeway Service Patrol

**FSP Funds:** Funds designated in the annual state budget for FSP programs and distributed by a formula established in the FSP statutes.

**Proposition 116:** Clean Air and Transportation Improvement Act of 1990 passed by the voters in November 1990, provided bond funds for passenger rail and other projects including $11 million for Santa Cruz County.

**Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP):** A federal funding program established by ISTE A to fund mass transit, highway, bicycle, pedestrian and local streets and roads projects. The SCCRTC programs STP funds for Santa Cruz County. Sometimes called RSTP for Regional Surface Transportation Program.

**Regional Surface Transportation Program Exchange (RSTPX):** The annual Federal Apportionment Exchange Program, administered by Caltrans, allows the SCCRTC the option to exchange all or a portion of its annual apportionment of Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds for non-federal (State) funds. State funds have fewer
oversight requirements than Federal funds. The funds pass through the SCCRTC to the local jurisdictions and other eligible public agencies, and therefore appear in the SCCRTC budget.

**Rideshare Funds:** Funds specifically designated for the Rideshare program, oftentimes through the *Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP)*.

**RPA:** see Rural Planning Assistance

**RSTP:** see Regional Surface Transportation Program

**RSTPX:** see Regional Surface Transportation Program Exchange

**Rural Planning Assistance (RPA):** These state funds are allocated annually to regional transportation planning agencies in rural areas to support planning programs.

**SAFE:** see Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies

**Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (SAFE) Funds:** Under the provisions of state enabling legislation, the Santa Cruz County SAFE collects a $1-per-year addition to the vehicle registration fee (listed as DMV Fees in the budget) to fund the capital, planning, maintenance, and operation of a call box system on Highways 1, 9, 17, 129, and 152 in Santa Cruz County. SAFE funds can also be used for changeable message signs (CMS), freeway service patrol (FSP) and other selected motorist aid systems.

**STA:** see State Transit Assistance

**State Planning and Research Funds:** These funds are awarded by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) annually on a discretionary basis.

**State Transit Assistance (STA):** State Transit Assistance funds are derived from statewide sales tax on gasoline and diesel fuel as part of the Transportation Planning and Development (TP&D) program. Transit operations and capital improvement projects are eligible uses of STA funds. The SCCRTC receives State Transit Assistance funds and allocates 100 percent annually to the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (SCMTD).
**State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP):** A portion of State Transportation Improvement Program funds are allocated to our region for programming by the SCCRTC. STIP regional share funds programmed for SCCRTC projects, such as the Freeway Service Patrol, the Rideshare Program and Planning activities, appear in the SCCRTC budget.

**STIP:** see State Transportation Improvement Program

**STP:** see Regional Surface Transportation Program

**STP Exchange:** see Regional Surface Transportation Program Exchange

**TDA:** see Transportation Development Act

**Transportation Development Act (TDA):** State law enacted in 1971. Local TDA funds are generated from a State tax of one-quarter of one percent on all retail sales in the county. Revenues are allocated annually by the SCCRTC to support transportation planning and administration, bus transit, transportation for the elderly and handicapped, and bikeway and pedestrian projects.

**Transportation Development Act (TDA) Reserves:** This reserve fund is maintained in order to provide the full TDA allocations to TDA recipients in the event there is a shortfall in actual versus projected TDA revenues. Occasionally some TDA Reserve funds are allocated to a special project.
For fiscal year 2010-11, the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) Work Program includes state-mandated responsibilities and RTC priorities, including:

- continued project management of the Highway 1 HOV Lanes Project Approval/Environmental Document (PA/ED) process
- completion of the PA/ED, and continuation of the final design phase (Plans, Specifications and Estimates (PS&E)), and initiation of the construction management phase for the Highway 1 Soquel-Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes project
- coordination of the Highway 1/17 Merge Lanes Landscape project, the last phase of the project including irrigation, planting and plant establishment, and the development of coordination agreements with the City of Santa Cruz for maintenance on the City side of the soundwalls
- continued work to complete due diligence, negotiations and purchase Management and planning of the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line
- if the Santa Cruz Branch line is purchased, set up Implement contracts and systems to operate the freight service, maintain the line, and manage the ownership of the property including responsibilities, liabilities, rights and potential revenues
- continued development of a master plan and environmental review for the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSST) Network,
- continued work to carry out the RTC’s responsibilities to monitor and coordinate with Caltrans and local agencies on timely implementation of other state highway and local projects with state or federal funding participation
- continued work with project sponsors and funding agencies on securing funds for high priority projects for all modes of transportation
- continued services to Santa Cruz area travelers through the Commute Solutions, SAFE callbox, Safe on 17 and Freeway Service Patrol programs, including coordination with partner agencies to ensure the best possible service
- continued implementation of the Monterey Bay Transit Planning Rotational Intern program
- continuation of the Bike to Work and the Community Traffic Safety Coalition’s bicycle-pedestrian education programs
- continued maintenance and enhancement of a variety of public information outlets
- continued development and implementation of systems necessary to ensure that the RTC continues to function efficiently and effectively as an independent government agency
- monitor and participate in local, state, and federal efforts to address global warming
- participate in statewide efforts to reauthorize the federal transportation law and ensure that California and its regional agencies receive their fair share of federal transportation funds
- initiate the work to update the 2005 Completion of the 2010 Regional Transportation Plan byand initiation of the 2012 Regional Transportation Plan
- improve public outreach activities by maintaining the updating the RTC’s web site and producing new fact sheets
- pursuit of any and all funding sources for transportation projects in the region including the development of local funding sources as well as seeking other new sources
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OWP # WORK PROGRAM ELEMENT

101 TDA Administration

This task involves maintaining day-to-day operations of the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) and implementation of the claims process for TDA funds.

Major Tasks:

- Implement fiscal, personnel and administrative functions for Commission operations
- Manage Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds and claim process
- Conduct recommendations of the triennial performance audit
- Manage other transportation funds that flow through the Commission budget
- Distribute and monitor use of various federal and state transportation funds
- Provide staff support to the Budget and Administration/Personnel Committee
- Produce and distribute an annual report with RTC financial and grant funds information
- Continue to implement administrative and personnel changes to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of Commission operations
- Complete the development of policies, procedures and systems to ensure effective and efficient operation of SCCRTC as independent agency

- Coordinate review of appropriate TDA claims with advisory committees
- Review and revise SCCRTC Rules and Regulations

Major Products:

- Agenda packets for the Budget and Administration/Personnel Committee
- Annual Cost Allocation Plan
- Compliant TDA claims from local jurisdictions and agencies
- TDA Fiscal Audits and Internal Financial Statements
- Triennial performance audit
- Contract with payroll accounting firm
- Implementation, as appropriate, of the recommendations of the Triennial Performance Audit
- Staff Assignments list
- Staff hiring and performance evaluations
- Fiscal, personnel and administrative policies, procedures and systems for the SCCRTC

- Revised SCCRTC Rules and Regulations
- Fiscal Annual Report

Shown on page 4 of the budget
"Commute Solutions" Rideshare Program

Through Commute Solutions, the Commission provides information and direct services to the public and Santa Cruz area individuals and employers to encourage the use of sustainable transportation modes; increase vehicle occupancy through carpooling, vanpooling and riding the bus; eliminate vehicle trips through telecommuting and compressed work weeks; and implements other TDM strategies.

Major Tasks:

- Operate the 429-POOL phone line and coordinate regional participation and access to the 511.org instant online ridematching system
- Provide personalized ridematching, trip planning and transportation information and referral services
- Increase vehicle occupancy by developing and implementing a new countywide carpool incentive program funded by an Air District AB2766 grant
- Maintain content and design of the Commute Solutions website and printed materials to maximize public access to sustainable transportation programs and projects operated by the RTC and other entities
- Expand program focus to include all kinds of trips: to work, school, shopping and recreation
- Promote carpooling, vanpooling, bus riding, bike riding, walking, and other sustainable transportation modes through incentives, information dissemination including bikeway maps, and promotional events
- Assist employers in promoting use of multi-modal travel options and promote Commute Solutions services at on-site transportation fairs, at employment sites and elsewhere
- Conduct targeted community outreach to civic and community groups
- Collaborate, coordinate services, activities and events, and maximize efficiencies with local groups providing TDM services such as the Pajaro Valley Transportation Management Association, the Community Traffic Safety Coalition, Ecology Action, SCMTD, UCSC Transportation and Parking Services, Cabrillo College, and local employers as well as regional partners such as AMBAG, San Benito COG and MTC.
- Support the formation and continuation of carpools, vanpools
- Promote and facilitate access to existing Park and Ride Lots and plan for future P&R facility needs
- Continue to monitor and pass through Air District AB2766 grant funds to Ecology Action for Emergency Ride Home Programs and collaborate with EA on developing a new countywide ERH program available to all sustainable transportation users
- Continue administrative oversight of TDM programs receiving RTC funding
- Participate in transportation-related air quality and climate change activities including those related to implementing the State and Federal Clean Air Acts and other legislation such as AB32 and SB 375
- Investigate the most effective methods and strategies to reduce vehicle trips and vehicle miles traveled and based on findings, plan to -enhance existing and develop new travel-related services.
- Develop and apply a consistent set of evaluation measures for TDM projects and programs operated and funded by the Commission

Major Products:

- Flyers, brochures, advertisements
- New countywide carpool incentive program
- New website design and content
- Presentations and trip planning tools for use at events
- Evaluation tools
- Promotions and incentives

Shown on page 5 of the budget
OWP #                   WORK PROGRAM ELEMENT

178  Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (SAFE)

The Santa Cruz County Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (SAFE) operates the County’s highway callbox system and works with the California Highway Patrol and Caltrans on motorist aid and highway safety projects and programs.

Major Tasks:

- Continue to work with contractors to provide reliable and efficient call box facilities and services
- Complete mobility improvements and other site improvements as needed. Inform the public of changes.
- Continue to administer enhanced CHP enforcement as part of the SAFE on 17 Program.
- Continue the funding partnership with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission to ensure continuation of the enhanced CHP enforcement on Highway 17
- Continue to monitor and track collision and safety issues on Highways 1 and 17
- Continue to work with the CalSAFE organization to coordinate on statewide issues related to Call Box and motorist aid systems
- Provide staff support to the Safe on 17 Task Force
- Seek opportunities to improve the operation of the transportation system, as well as the safety of and service to highway and roadway users including through the funding and implementation of a 511 system

Major Products:

- 2008 Safe on 17 Annual Report
- Safe on 17 Fact Sheet
- Usage and maintenance reports from maintenance and call answering contractors
- Site accessibility analysis and improvements contract
- Agenda packet materials for the Safe on 17 Task Force
- Combined SAFE and FSP annual report
- Funding and implementation for 511 system

Shown on page 6 of the budget
OWP #  WORK PROGRAM ELEMENT

177 Freeway Service Patrol (FSP)

The Freeway Service Patrol (FSP) project involves commute hour and weekend tow truck patrol of Highways 1 and 17 to assist stranded motorists, clear collisions, remove road debris and thereby help maintain traffic flow.

**Major Tasks:**

- Continue to implement and monitor the usage and effectiveness of Freeway Service Patrol tow truck service in cooperation with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, the California Highway Patrol, and Caltrans
- Coordinate FSP towing service and activities with those in neighboring counties
- Administer the Santa Cruz FSP tow truck patrol and manage tow truck contracts
- Continue to work with the FSP programs across the state, Caltrans and the California Highway Patrol to demonstrate the effectiveness of FSP programs and to maintain and increase state funding for FSP programs
- Consider revisions to FSP services based on analysis of usage and availability of funding
- Maintain the FSP data collection system and feed the data into the statewide FSP benefit/cost model to better reflect conditions of smaller FSP programs
- Investigate and pursue potential new funding sources for FSP programs
  - Coordinate with California FSP Programs to improve the FSP benefit/cost model to better reflect conditions of smaller FSP programs

**Major Products:**

- Procurement process and new contract for service on Highway 1
- Improved statewide FSP benefit/cost model
- Combined SAFE and FSP annual report

*Shown on page 7 of the budget*
OWP #  WORK PROGRAM ELEMENT

682 Rail/Trail Authority

This work element involves the Regional Transportation Commission functioning as a Rail/Trail Authority, the lead agency for acquisition of the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line right-of-way. The possibility of potential bicycle and pedestrian paths using the right-of-way adjacent to the rail line is shown within the Bicycle/Pedestrian Planning Work Element.

Major Tasks:

- Identify the rights of way for construction of future transportation projects, including unused rights of way needed for future transportation corridors and facilities.
- Complete due diligence investigations for acquisition of the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line including inspections, appraisals, environmental assessments and financial analyses
- Complete acquisition of the Santa Cruz Branch Line
- Following acquisition, assume responsibilities for ownership of the new property and operation of an active rail line
- Establish contracts and systems to effectively, efficiently and reliably operate the freight service, maintain the rail line and manage the ownership of the property
- Coordinate operation of the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line, including current and future uses, with operators, shippers, partner agencies and local jurisdictions
- Investigate lease possibilities, update old leases and secure new leases
- Participate in the planning for the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSST) Network which could include segments on the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line
- Plan for future potential uses of the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line
- Continue to work with the Transportation Agency for Monterey County, the Coast Rail Coordinating Council, Caltrain, AMTRAK and Caltrans Division of Rail to support the establishment of a rail station at the Pajaro station for any new or expanded rail passenger service on the coast mainline

Major Products:

- Final Purchase Agreement with Union Pacific
- Contract with rail service provider
- Contracts with freight customers
- Contracts with consultants for operation and management of property
- Updated and new leases
- Due diligence reports
- Fund agreements with Caltrans and the California Transportation Commission (CTC)

Shown on pages 8 of the budget
Highway 1/HOV Lane PA/ED and Auxiliary Lane Projects

This work element includes implementation of the Project Approval/Environmental Documents (PA/ED) for the Highway 1 HOV Lanes project and the Highway 1 Soquel-Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes project, and final design engineering for the Auxiliary Lanes project.

Major Tasks:

- Continue to guide the consultant work, in cooperation with the Project Development Team, Caltrans, local, and regional agencies, on the Project Approval/Environmental Document (PA/ED) for the Highway 1 HOV Lanes project and the Highway 1 Soquel-Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes project.
- Continue to guide the consultant work with the Project Development Team, Caltrans, local, and regional agencies, on the final engineering phase (Plans, Specifications, and Estimates (PS&E)), including securing all resource agency permits and coordinate with Caltrans in certifying the right-of-way work for the Highway 1 Soquel-Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes project.
- Participate in the Project Development Team (PDT) overseeing the project development work for the Highway 1 HOV Lane and Highway 1 Soquel-Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes projects.
- Complete the Sustainable Transportation and Access Rating System (STARS) analysis for the Highway 1 HOV Lane project and incorporate recommendations as appropriate.
- Coordinate with Caltrans and the consultant team to meet all funding and project reporting requirements particularly those of the Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA).
- Continue to coordinate with the Highway 1 Construction Authority on the project PA/ED and funding issues for the two projects.
- Implement bilingual public outreach plan including meetings, open houses, newsletters and advertisements to keep the community informed and involved in the project development process and solicit input on the environmental document.
- Coordinate public outreach efforts with other RTC projects and respond to concerns from residents and businesses, and prepare for the beginning of construction of the Auxiliary Lanes project.
- Establish and manage the necessary agreements for pursuit consideration of RTC to assuming construction management role for the Highway 1 Soquel-Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes project.
- Initiate construction of the Highway 1 Soquel-Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes project.

Major Products:

- Public meetings, newsletters, community group presentations and other outreach efforts on the Highway 1 HOV Lanes project and the Highway 1 Soquel-Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes project
- Progress Reports on the status of the projects to the RTC and the Highway 1 Construction Authority
- Highway 1 HOV Lanes project draft environmental documents (2010) and final environmental documents and project report (2011)
- Highway 1 Soquel-Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes project agreements for construction management and construction of project final environmental document and project report (2009)
- Final Design and Right-of-Way Certification of the Highway 1 Soquel-Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes project
- Environmental review and clearance of pedestrian/bicycle crossings of Highway 1 (2011)
- STARS Technical Committee meetings and reports

Shown on page 9 of the budget
OWP #  WORK PROGRAM ELEMENT

112  Plan Coordination

Plan coordination includes a variety of tasks associated with maintaining a coordinated approach to transportation planning on a local, regional, state and federal level.

Major Tasks:

- Participate with regional, local and state agencies, the general public and the private sector in planning efforts to identify and plan policies, strategies, programs and actions that maximize and implement the regional transportation infrastructure. (PL). Coordinate transportation projects and funding with Caltrans, AMBAG, SCMTD, cities, the County, UCSC and other federal, state and local agencies
- Conduct meetings of the Interagency Technical Advisory Committee
- Attend meetings of the Regional Transportation Planning Agencies group, the California Association of Councils of Government (CALCOG), and the California Transportation Commission
- Attend and/or participate in meetings of partner agencies as necessary
- Coordinate with Chambers of Commerce, community groups and task forces, etc., on transportation issues
- Review and provide comments on the transportation aspects of planning documents prepared by other agencies
- Monitor legislation, develop recommendations for RTC positions on state and federal legislation, and meet with state and federal legislators and the RTC’s Washington and Sacramento Assistants to monitor and support federal and state transportation funding and policy initiatives
- Participate in statewide efforts to reauthorize the federal transportation law and ensure that California and its regional agencies receive their fair share of federal transportation funds
- Participate in Federal and State Clean Air Act transportation related air quality planning activities
- Coordinate with AMBAG and the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District on air quality issues
- Monitor and participate in efforts at the federal, state and local level related to global warming
- Continue to work with Interagency Technical Advisory Committee members and other transportation partners to cooperatively develop and pursue grant opportunities for transportation studies, programs and projects
- Participate in technical advisory committee meetings for updating AMBAG’s regional growth projections and updates to the regional travel demand model
- Develop partnerships with local agencies responsible for land use decisions to facilitate coordination of transportation planning with land use, open space, job-housing balance, environmental constraints, and growth management.

Major Products:

- Annual State and Federal Legislative Programs
- Agenda packets for the Interagency Technical Advisory Committee

Shown on pages 10, 11 and 12 of the budget
411  Land Use/Transportation Coordination

This element emphasizes early and continued coordination between the RTC and local agencies on land use development projects and land use plans with transportation implications and on transportation plans and projects with land use implications.

**Major Tasks:**

- Provide staff comments on general plan updates, bicycle plans, major development plans, transit plans and environmental review documents prepared by local agencies and other entities
- Share information with the planning staffs of the local jurisdictions, UCSC, and SCMTD on the coordination of land use and transportation issues and projects
- Forward applicable draft plans and environmental documents to the SCCRTC Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee and Bicycle Committee for their review and comment
- Review Caltrans comments on local and regional plans and projects
- Coordinate with AMBAG to ensure any work on a Regional Blueprint Plan for the Monterey Bay region reflects the goals and policies of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and the priorities of the SCCRTC and its member agencies. Consider alternative growth scenarios that provide information on compact development and related infrastructure needs and costs
- Identify and analyze issues relating to integration of transportation and community goals and objectives in land use, housing, economic development, social welfare and environmental preservation
- Incorporate transit and intermodal facilities, bicycle transportation facilities and pedestrian walkways in plans and programs where appropriate

**Major Products:**

- Comment letters on draft plans and environmental documents
- Quarterly report on document review activities

*Shown on pages 10, 11 and 12 of the budget*
101  Work Program and Budget

Major Tasks:

- Develop the annual and amended work program and budget in cooperation with AMBAG and CALTRANS
- Participate in annual meetings with federal and state agency representatives about the Overall Work Program
- Prepare reports required by funding agencies
- Continue to investigate and pursue new grant and other funding sources for Commission programs and initiatives

Major Products:

- Annual budget and work program (February/March)
- Amended budget and work program (as needed)
- Quarterly progress reports
- Required grant reports

Shown on pages 10, 11 and 12 of the budget
OWP # WORK PROGRAM ELEMENT

113 Public Information and Participation

The overall purpose of this work element is to inform the public and to elicit their participation and input on transportation projects, programs, plans, and policies.

**Major Tasks:**
- Provide information to the public and solicit input from the public and partner organizations on regional transportation issues using the media, internet, advertisements, in-office and partner organization contact distribution mechanisms and presentations to local groups as a means to involve the public in the transportation planning process
- Develop and implement public participation programs for major projects
- Continue to broadcasting regular RTC meetings and public hearings countywide on Community TV of Santa Cruz
- Continue to identify and utilize opportunities for improving the reach of public information materials and services so that low income, minority and marginalized populations are well informed and have the opportunity to provide input on regional transportation projects, programs and policies
- Implement a major overhaul of the RTC’s website to take advantage of new technology to improve its usefulness to the public and the RTC; implement accessibility measures and Spanish language pages
- Continue to enhance the usefulness of the Commission’s website and email notification system for project updates, public hearings, notices and meeting agenda packets
- Continue ongoing acknowledgement of public input received, correspondence logs, and maintenance of mailing/distribution lists
- Update and produce fact sheets for all RTC individual projects
- Expand electronic notification to the public to include the Highlights including consideration of a newsletter format
- Implement recommendations of the RTC’s Public Relations plan
- Partner with the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (SCMTD) to provide outreach and obtain input on improving transportation services, facilities and planning
- Maximize user friendly visual elements into outreach materials
- Develop and implement design standards to achieve a consistent look and image for Commission materials and website

**Major Products:**
- Posting of major reports, the Commission agenda packets and committee agendas and related materials on the Commission’s website
- New and updated public information handouts (Fact Sheets) and website listings for major projects
- Email notifications on major projects and reports, posting of meeting agendas and materials, and RTC actions
- News Releases
- Project fact sheets and/or newsletters
- Database of contact information for media, partner agencies and interested parties
- Agency Report
- Updated Website

Shown on pages 4, 10, 11 and 12 of the budget
614 Bicycle/Pedestrian Planning and Safety Education Program

The focus of this work element is three-fold: 1) coordinating and advancing bicycle and pedestrian projects and programs throughout the county; 2) supporting countywide Bicycle/Pedestrian Safety Education and the Bike to Work/School programs; and 3) developing the master plan for the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSST) Network

Major Tasks:

- Provide staff support for the Commission's two citizens’ advisory committees: the Bicycle Committee and Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee
- Provide staff support for the Pedestrian Safety Work Group tasked with mission to ensure safe and accessible pedestrian travel and access throughout the county for the benefit of all residents
- Coordinate with local, state and federal agencies regarding bicycle and pedestrian projects, plans and funding programs
- Assist local jurisdictions in the development or update of Bicycle Transportation Plans and certify conformance with Streets and Highways Code
- Process bike and pedestrian-related Transportation Development Act claims including coordination of recommendations by the RTC’s advisory committees
- Implement, promote and seek funding for the Bikes Secure bicycle parking subsidy program
- Implement a Bicycle Route Signage system through coordination with local jurisdictions, bicycle advocates and community members. Identify routes and seek funding.
- Prepare a Master Plan for the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSST) Network including portions of the trail that may be developed within the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line right-of-way in coordination with local jurisdictions and Monterey Bay regional agencies
- Continue funding and promoting the bilingual bicycle and pedestrian safety education program (Ride 'N Stride) at schools
- Continue financial support of the Bike to Work/School program, and the Community Traffic Safety Coalition (CTSC)
- Continue to monitor planning for a public use trail in the San Lorenzo Valley
- Continue to monitor pass through Air District AB2766 grant funds to Ecology Action for the Folding Bikes in Buses project
- Continue providing support to entities in their efforts to develop and fund bicycle and pedestrian plans, programs and subsidies
- Continue outreach and administration of Bicycle Hazard and Pedestrian Access Reports to identify network deficiencies
- Investigate methods to reduce vehicle travel (PL) by expanding and enhancing bicycle travel
- Continue updating and distributing the Santa Cruz County Bikeways Map
- Continue to compile and update digitized bikeway information to be provided to the public as a roadway layer through the County’s GIS webpage and to assist in planning efforts
- Compile new bikeway mileage data on an annual basis to be supplied to the Community Assessment Project and the RTC’s Traffic Monitoring Report

Major Products:

- Agenda packets for the Bicycle Committee and the Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee
- Master Plan and Environmental Review of the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network in Santa Cruz County
- Updated Santa Cruz County Bikeways Map
• County Bikeway Miles Data
• Digitized Bikeway layer on the County’s GIS website
• Outreach, distribution and processing of Bicycle Hazard and Pedestrian Access reports
• Additional bicycle parking facilities
• Certification of local jurisdiction Bicycle Transportation Plans
• Develop Pedestrian Improvement Plans for each of the local jurisdictions

Shown on pages 10, 11 and 12 of the budget
OWP #       WORK PROGRAM ELEMENT

621       Specialized Transportation Planning

The coordination of planning for transportation services, funding and programs to serve the County's elderly and disabled communities is the focus of this work element.

Major Tasks:
- Provide staff support to the Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee
- Continue to implement the accessible pedestrian planning program of the Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee through the Pedestrian Safety Work Group (subcommittee) including developing and recommending implementation of priority accessible pedestrian facility improvements based in universal design principals to maximize use of sidewalk and other pedestrian facilities and provide safe paths of travel between origins/destinations and other transportation modes
- Continue to coordinate with local public, private, and non-profit entities involved in providing specialized transportation, including Community Bridges, the Volunteer Center, SCMTD and its Metro Advisory Committee (MAC)
- Process Transportation Development Act claims for specialized transportation services and pedestrian-related facilities
- Facilitate the local review and scoring of FTA Section 5310, Job Access/Reverse Commute (JARC), and New Freedoms applications and review 5311 fund applications
- Conduct an annual Transportation Unmet Needs assessment and hearing
- Coordinate with the Community Traffic Safety Coalition for promotion of Pedestrian Access Reports
- Implement the Paratransit Coordination Task Force recommendations for which the RTC and Elderly/Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee are responsible
- Update the Guide for Specialized Transportation on the web site and collect information for the next printing
- Implement pass through grant agreements with Caltrans and Community Bridges for the Mobility Outreach and Education project funded with an Environmental Justice Context-Sensitive Planning grant and the Agricultural Worker Transportation Program
- Implement pass through grant agreements for New Freedom and Jobs Access/Reverse Commute grants should they be received by the University of California in Santa Cruz, Community Bridges and the Foster Grandparents program

Major Products:
- Agenda packets for the Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee
- Annual Unmet Needs Assessment and Hearing
- Updates to the “Guide for Specialized Transportation”
- Quarterly Reports and other requirements to receive Environmental Justice Context-Sensitive Planning grant funds and implement the Mobility Outreach and Education project
- Agreements to receive Agricultural Worker Transportation Program funds and produce the study and plan for a future program in Santa Cruz County
- Outreach, distribution and processing of the Pedestrian Access Reports
- Annual Report summarizing the Committee’s activities
- Pedestrian Action Plan
- Agreements with New Freedom and Jobs Access/Reverse Commute grant recipients

Shown on pages 10, 11 and 12 of the budget
Regional Transportation Plan

Since the last update of the state-mandated Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) was completed in 2005, the focus of this work element has been on implementation of the plan, coordination on long range planning with our transportation partners and preparation for the required update in 2010. In FY 2009/10 the RTC will complete work on the 2010 RTP update and initiate work for the 2012 RTP update due in 2010. Additionally rules regarding regional transportation plans established by the federal transportation act (SAFETEA-LU), will continue to be implemented. This work element also includes working with local jurisdictions to ensure that regional transportation policies and projects are included in local jurisdiction planning activities. Staff will also continue work on tracking and implementation of AB32 and SB375 requirements for Regional Transportation Plans.

Major Tasks:

- Continue to work with Caltrans and local agencies to implement the Regional Transportation Plan’s projects and policies through their planning and capital improvement programming actions
- Identify and document transportation facilities, projects and services required to meet regional and interregional mobility and access needs
- Coordinate with local jurisdictions, Caltrans, AMBAG, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, and the Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC) on long-range transportation planning activities in our region
- Work to develop potential new transportation revenues to help meet continuously increasing funding shortfalls
- Coordinate with Caltrans and AMBAG on implementing planning requirements enacted through the federal transportation act
- Prepare amendments to the RTP, as needed
- Continue to coordinate with AMBAG on upgrade of the regional transportation model and on its population forecasts
- Coordinate with AMBAG, Caltrans and the Transportation Agency for Monterey County for any requirement or proposal to conduct a freight planning study
- Complete 2010 update of the RTP and initiate 2012 update
- Participate with Caltrans and agencies throughout the State on the development of new state RTP guidelines, including those related to the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions
- Ensure that projects proposed for federal, state or local funding are consistent with the RTP
- Monitor and provide input on AMBAG’s Regional Blueprint plan.
- Involve federal and state permit and approval agencies early and continuously in the regional transportation planning process to identify and examine issues to develop necessary consensus and agreement; collaborate with Army Corps of Engineers, National Fish and Wildlife Service, Environmental Protection Agency and other federal agencies responsible for permits and National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) approvals and with state resources agencies for compliance with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

Major Products:

- 2010 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)

Shown on pages 10, 11 and 12 of the budget
### OWP # 231 Traffic Monitoring

The Commission's traffic monitoring program involves collecting and reporting data on the county's transportation network for use locally and for use by AMBAG in updating the regional travel demand model.

**Major Tasks:**

- Coordinate the collection of traffic volume and vehicle occupancy data at various locations throughout the county, using consultant services as budgeted.
- Post count and historic traffic count data on RTC’s website for easy access and reference by government agencies and members of the public.
- Coordinate traffic data collection and reporting with Caltrans, UCSC, AMBAG, the cities and the County.
- Provide traffic count data to local, state and federal agencies, land use development proponents and members of the public as needed.
- Consider conducting bicycle counts within the established program.
- Prepare reports on related data such as population, housing, employment, land use, vehicle registration, and traffic accidents.
- Continue working with AMBAG and the Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC) on coordinated and/or joint traffic counting services and/or reporting.

**Major Products:**

- Traffic count data produced by consultant.
- Vehicle Occupancy count data.
- GIS data for all traffic count nodes.
- *Traffic Monitoring Report prepared as part of the 2010 RTP*

*Shown on pages 11 and 12 of the budget*
OWP # | WORK PROGRAM ELEMENT

631 | Transportation System Management (TSM)

For this work element, the Commission works with other agencies and businesses to foster relatively low cost improvements to the transportation network such as signal timing, changeable message signs and park and ride lots.

**Major Tasks:**

- Coordinate with Caltrans and the CHP on Traffic Operation Systems (TOS) improvements, relatively low cost projects designed to improve the efficiency and safety of the transportation system
- Monitor and provide input on Caltrans TSM projects
- Continue to work with Caltrans Districts 4 and 5 on coordinating with the San Francisco Bay Area Traffic Management Center and the Central Coast Traffic Management Center
- Provide staff support to the Traffic Operations System Oversight Committee
- Provide information to partner agencies, community organizations and the public on the benefits of Intelligent Transportation System strategies to improve transportation
- Continue to identify potential locations and funding for new, expanded or enhanced park and ride lots, both dedicated and shared-use
- Coordinate with AMBAG, Caltrans District 5 and the RTPAs of the Central Coast to implement the Central Coast Intelligent Transportation System Architecture and Maintenance Plan
- Research establishing a 511 multi-modal travel information system in terms of needs, issues, content, data sources, technology options, institutional coordination, telecommunications requirements and funding

**Major Products:**

- Agenda packets for the Traffic Operations System Oversight Committee
- TOS Fact Sheet
- 511 implementation plan

*Shown on pages 11 and 12 of the budget*
OWP # WORK PROGRAM ELEMENT

641 Transportation Improvement Program

The Transportation Improvement Program work element involves programming funds for transportation projects and programs and working with implementing agencies to encourage appropriate and timely implementation of those transportation projects and programs.

Major Tasks:

- Prepare amendments to the 2010 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) as needed
- Prepare the 2010 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), scheduled for adoption in December 2010, and amendments as needed
- Coordinate RTIP amendments with AMBAG for the Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) and with Caltrans and the California Transportation Commission (CTC) for the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)
- Conduct planning and project activities (including corridor studies, and other transportation planning studies) to identify and develop candidate projects for the Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP).
- Monitor the state transportation budget and work with Caltrans and the California Transportation Commission on obtaining funding for STIP funded projects
- Program funds for projects through state and federal funding programs such as the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), the Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP), the STIP Transportation Enhancement Activities (STIP TE) Program and Proposition 1B programs
- Monitor the implementation of STIP, STIP TE, RSTP, and CMAQ-funded projects, with an emphasis on project delivery, timely use of funds and compliance with State and Federal laws and California Transportation Commission guidelines.
- Monitor the achievement towards regional and state transportation goals
- To better deliver qualifying and approved projects, exchange federal RSTP funds for State funds through the State’s RSTP Exchange program
- Assist local agencies in filing and monitoring STIP allocation requests
- Work with Caltrans to monitor both major and minor state highway projects and to fulfill its STIP project monitoring and project delivery responsibilities
- Work with our counterpart regional agencies, Caltrans and the California Transportation Commission (CTC) on the development of implementation policies and procedures for state and federal funding programs
- Prepare state and federally-mandated reports for Caltrans, FHWA, and the CTC
- Provide information to the public and other agencies regarding funding programs and opportunities
- Project planning, including the development of project study reports or major investment studies
- Incorporate transit and intermodal facilities, bicycle transportation facilities and pedestrian walkways in plans and programs where appropriate.
- Work with local jurisdictions to ensure that all deadlines for all funds designated for Santa Cruz County, including federal stimulus funds, are met and projects are delivered.
Major Products:

- 2008 Regional Transportation Improvement Program amendments
- 2010 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) & amendments
- Caltrans mandated documents and reports
- Project Status Reports

Shown on pages 11, 12 and 13 of the budget
OWP # WORK PROGRAM ELEMENT

683 Highway and Roadway Planning

This work element includes close coordination and monitoring of Caltrans work on projects to improve the Highway 1 freeway, the Highway 1/17 Merge Lanes project and other Highway and roadway improvement projects that are not specifically attributed to implementation of the Highway 1 HOV Lanes or Soquel-Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes projects.

Major Tasks:

- Continue to participate in the Project Development Team (PDT) and work closely with Caltrans and the City of Santa Cruz on Highway 1/17 Merge Lanes landscaping project implementation issues, including the public information process and travel demand management activities, including
- Continue to participate on the Project Development Teams (PDT) and work closely with Caltrans on State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) and other projects on State Highways in Santa Cruz County
- Continue to work with the City of Santa Cruz on the Highway 1/9 Intersection and Highway 1/San Lorenzo River Bridge Widening projects and with the City of Watsonville on the Highway 1/Harkins Slough Road Interchange
- Continue to work with Caltrans, the California Transportation Commission, the Highway 1 Construction Authority and the Project Development Teams to identify and implement ways to secure funding for and expedite Highway improvement projects
- Continue to work with Caltrans and other agencies on developing necessary operational, safety and service improvements on all highways and roadways in Santa Cruz County
- Prepare public information materials related to Highway projects for coordinated outreach efforts
- Assess the operational and physical continuity of transportation system components within and between metropolitan and rural areas, and interconnections to and through regions
- Participate with Caltrans, TMC, AMBAG, and other local agencies and modal operators (i.e Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District) in the creation of a Corridor System Management Plan for the Highway 1 corridor as a requirement of receiving Congestion Management Improvement Account (CMIA) funds for the Highway 1 Soquel-Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes project

Major Products:

- Corridor System Management Plan for the Highway 1 Corridor (2010)
- Factsheets and other public information materials as necessary

Shown on pages 11 and 12 of the budget
670. Monterey Bay Transit Planning Rotational Intern

This work element includes hiring an intern to work on transit related tasks with the RTC and with the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (SCMTD). This is funded through Transit Professional Development Grant funds jointly secured by the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG), SCMTD, Monterey Salinas Transit (MST), the Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC) and the RTC. The goal of the grant is to provide agencies with planning and marketing assistance and transportation students with transit related work experience.

**Major Tasks:**

- Coordinate with AMBAG, and the participating agencies to implement any necessary grant agreements
- In coordination with SCMTD supervise rotational interns to work on a variety of transit related tasks including assistance with updating and distributing of the Guide to Specialized Transportation; monitoring implementation status of recommendations resulting from the Paratransit Task Force; implementing the annual unmet needs process; staffing of the Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee; maintaining and developing website information regarding transit and specialized transportation services; public outreach and marketing efforts to businesses, agencies, community groups and the public for transit and specialized transportation; researching effective low cost strategies implemented elsewhere to better serve the transportation needs of the elderly, disabled and people with limited means; producing grant applications to continue existing programs and implement new programs; coordinating with SCMTD regarding strategies to better serve the elderly, disabled and people of limited means; and reviewing plans and environmental documents for effective strategies to address transportation needs

**Major Products:**

- Transit planning intern services
- Materials for the joint RTC and SCMTD outreach

*Shown on pages 11 and 12 of the budget*
OWP # 175  WORK PROGRAM ELEMENT

Monterey Bay Area 511 Traveler Information System

This work element includes production of a feasibility and implementation plan for a Monterey Bay Area 511 traveler information system in Santa Cruz and Monterey Counties. This will be a coordinated effort between the RTC, the Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC) and Caltrans. The goal is to appropriately design and implement a comprehensive, centralized and multi-modal 511 system that provides up-to-date transportation information including real-time roadway traffic conditions, transit information, carpooling information, bicycling information, and emergency notices. This is funded primarily through a Partnership Planning Grant jointly secured by RTC and TAMC.

Major Tasks:

- Coordinate with Caltrans and TAMC to implement the necessary grant agreements
- Establish appropriate stakeholders group
- Secure the necessary consulting services
- Produce the feasibility and implementation plan

Major Products:

- Executed funding agreements
- Request for proposals (RFP) and contract for consulting services
- Feasibility and implementation plan

Shown on page 6 of the budget
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December 2009 February 2010
For fiscal year 2010-11, the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) Work Program includes state-mandated responsibilities and RTC priorities, including:

- continued project management of the Highway 1 HOV Lanes Project Approval/Environmental Document (PA/ED) process
- continued project management completion of the PA/ED, and continuation of the final design phase (Plans, Specifications and Estimates (PS&E)), and initiation of the construction management phase for the Highway 1 Soquel-Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes project
- coordination of the Highway 1/17 Merge Lanes Landscape project, the last phase of the project including irrigation, planting and plant establishment, and the development of coordination agreements with the City of Santa Cruz for maintenance on the City side of the soundwalls
- continued work to complete due diligence, negotiations and purchase Management and planning of the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line
- if the Santa Cruz Branch line is purchased, set up contracts and systems to operate the freight service, maintain the line, and manage the ownership of the property including responsibilities, liabilities, rights and potential revenues
- continued development of a master plan and environmental review for the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSST) Network
- continued work to carry out the RTC’s responsibilities to monitor and coordinate with Caltrans and local agencies on timely implementation of other state highway and local projects with state or federal funding participation
- continued work with project sponsors and funding agencies on securing funds for high priority projects for all modes of transportation
- continued services to Santa Cruz area travelers through the Commute Solutions, SAFE callbox, Safe on 17 and Freeway Service Patrol programs, including coordination with partner agencies to ensure the best possible service
- continued implementation of the Monterey Bay Transit Planning Rotational Intern program
- continuation of the Bike to Work and the Community Traffic Safety Coalition’s bicycle-pedestrian education programs
- continued maintenance and enhancement of a variety of public information outlets
- continued development and implementation of systems necessary to ensure that the RTC continues to function efficiently and effectively as an independent government agency
- monitor and participate in local, state, and federal efforts to address global warming
- participate in statewide efforts to reauthorize the federal transportation law and ensure that California and its regional agencies receive their fair share of federal transportation funds
- initiate the work to update the 2005 Completion of the 2010 Regional Transportation Plan by and initiation of the 2012 Regional Transportation Plan
- improve public outreach activities by maintaining the updating the RTC’s web site and producing new fact sheets
- pursuit of any and all funding sources for transportation projects in the region including the development of local funding sources as well as seeking other new sources
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RTC PLANNING PROGRAM AND PROJECTS FUNDED THROUGH THE RTC'S OPERATING BUDGET

OWP #                  WORK PROGRAM ELEMENT

101                    TDA Administration

This task involves maintaining day-to-day operations of the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) and implementation of the claims process for TDA funds.

Major Tasks:

- Implement fiscal, personnel and administrative functions for Commission operations
- Manage Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds and claim process
- Conduct implementation recommendations of the triennial performance audit
- Manage other transportation funds that flow through the Commission budget
- Distribute and monitor use of various federal and state transportation funds
- Provide staff support to the Budget and Administration/Personnel Committee
- Produce and distribute an annual report with RTC financial and grant funds information
- Continue to implement administrative and personnel changes to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of Commission operations
- Complete the development of policies, procedures and systems to ensure effective and efficient operation of SCCRTC as independent agency
- Coordinate review of appropriate TDA claims with advisory committees
- Review and revise SCCRTC Rules and Regulations

Major Products:

- Agenda packets for the Budget and Administration/Personnel Committee
- Annual Cost Allocation Plan
- Compliant TDA claims from local jurisdictions and agencies
- TDA Fiscal Audits and Internal Financial Statements
- Triennial performance audit contract with payroll accounting firm
- Implementation, as appropriate, of the recommendations of the Triennial Performance Audit
- Staff Assignments list
- Staff hiring and performance evaluations
- Fiscal, personnel and administrative policies, procedures and systems for the SCCRTC

- Revised SCCRTC Rules and Regulations
- Fiscal Annual Report

Shown on page 4 of the budget
"Commute Solutions" Rideshare Program

Through Commute Solutions, the Commission provides information and direct services to the public and Santa Cruz area individuals and employers to encourage the use of sustainable transportation modes; increase vehicle occupancy through carpooling, vanpooling and riding the bus; eliminate vehicle trips through telecommuting and compressed work weeks; and implements other TDM strategies.

Major Tasks:

- Operate the 429-POOL phone line and coordinate regional participation and access to the 511.org instant online ridematching system
- Provide personalized ridematching, trip planning and transportation information and referral services
- Increase vehicle occupancy by developing and implementing a new countywide carpool incentive program funded by an Air District AB2766 grant
- Update content and design of Maintain the Commute Solutions website and printed materials to maximize public access to sustainable transportation programs and projects operated by the RTC and other entities
- Expand program focus to include all kinds of trips: to work, school, shopping and recreation
- Promote carpooling, vanpooling, bus riding, bike riding, walking, and other sustainable transportation modes through incentives, information dissemination including bikeway maps, and promotional events
- Assist employers in promoting use of multi-modal travel options and promote Commute Solutions services at on-site transportation fairs, at employment sites and elsewhere
- Conduct targeted community outreach to civic and community groups
- Collaborate, coordinate services, activities and events, and maximize efficiencies with local groups providing TDM services such as the Pajaro Valley Transportation Management Association, the Community Traffic Safety Coalition, Ecology Action, SCMTD, UCSC Transportation and Parking Services, Cabrillo College, and local employers as well as regional partners such as AMBAG, San Benito COG and MTC.
- Support the formation and continuation of carpools, vanpools
- Promote and facilitate access to existing Park and Ride Lots and plan for future P&R facility needs
- Continue to monitor and pass through Air District AB2766 grant funds to Ecology Action for Emergency Ride Home Programs and collaborate with EA on developing a new countywide ERH program available to all sustainable transportation users
- Continue administrative oversight of TDM programs receiving RTC funding
- Participate in transportation-related air quality and climate change activities including those related to implementing the State and Federal Clean Air Acts and other legislation such as AB32 and SB 375
- Investigate the most effective methods and strategies to reduce vehicle trips and vehicle miles traveled and based on findings, plan to -enhance existing and develop new travel-related services.
- Develop and apply a consistent set of evaluation measures for TDM projects and programs operated and funded by the Commission

Major Products:

- Flyers, brochures, advertisements
- New countywide carpool incentive program
- New website design and content
- Presentations and trip planning tools for use at events
- Evaluation tools
- Promotions and incentives

Shown on page 5 of the budget
Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (SAFE)

The Santa Cruz County Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (SAFE) operates the County's highway callbox system and works with the California Highway Patrol and Caltrans on motorist aid and highway safety projects and programs.

Major Tasks:

- Continue to work with contractors to provide reliable and efficient call box facilities and services
- Complete mobility improvements and other site improvements as needed. Inform the public of changes.
- Continue to administer enhanced CHP enforcement as part of the SAFE on 17 Program.
- Continue the funding partnership with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission to ensure continuation of the enhanced CHP enforcement on Highway 17
- Continue to monitor and track collision and safety issues on Highways 1 and 17
- Continue to work with the CalSAFE organization to coordinate on statewide issues related to Call Box and motorist aid systems
- Provide staff support to the Safe on 17 Task Force
- Seek opportunities to improve the operation of the transportation system, as well as the safety of and service to highway and roadway users including through the funding and implementation of a 511 system

Major Products:

- 2008 Safe on 17 Annual Report
- Safe on 17 Fact Sheet
- Usage and maintenance reports from maintenance and call answering contractors
- Site accessibility analysis and improvements contract
- Agenda packet materials for the Safe on 17 Task Force
- Combined SAFE and FSP annual report
- Funding and implementation for 511 system

Shown on page 6 of the budget
The Freeway Service Patrol (FSP) project involves commute hour and weekend tow truck patrol of Highways 1 and 17 to assist stranded motorists, clear collisions, remove road debris and thereby help maintain traffic flow.

**Major Tasks:**

- Continue to implement and monitor the usage and effectiveness of Freeway Service Patrol tow truck service in cooperation with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, the California Highway Patrol, and Caltrans
- Coordinate FSP towing service and activities with those in neighboring counties
- Administer the Santa Cruz FSP tow truck patrol and manage tow truck contracts
- Continue to work with the FSP programs across the state, Caltrans and the California Highway Patrol to demonstrate the effectiveness of FSP programs and to maintain and increase state funding for FSP programs
- Consider revisions to FSP services based on analysis of usage and availability of funding
- Maintain the FSP data collection system and feed the data into the statewide FSP benefit/cost model to better reflect conditions of smaller FSP programs
- Investigate and pursue potential new funding sources for FSP programs
- Coordinate with California FSP Programs to improve the FSP benefit/cost model to better reflect conditions of smaller FSP programs

**Major Products:**

- Procurement process and new contract for service on Highway 1
- Improved statewide FSP benefit/cost model
- Combined SAFE and FSP annual report

*Shown on page 7 of the budget*
682  **Rail/Trail Authority**

This work element involves the Regional Transportation Commission functioning as a Rail/Trail Authority, the lead agency for acquisition of the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line right-of-way. The possibility of potential bicycle and pedestrian paths using the right-of-way adjacent to the rail line is shown within the Bicycle/Pedestrian Planning Work Element.

**Major Tasks:**

- Identify the rights of way for construction of future transportation projects, including unused rights of way needed for future transportation corridors and facilities.
- Complete due diligence investigations for acquisition of the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line including inspections, appraisals, environmental assessments and financial analyses
- Complete acquisition of the Santa Cruz Branch Line
- Following acquisition, assume responsibilities for ownership of the new property and operation of an active rail line
- Establish contracts and systems to effectively, efficiently and reliably operate the freight service, maintain the rail line and manage the ownership of the property
- Coordinate operation of the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line, including current and future uses, with operators, shippers, partner agencies and local jurisdictions
- Investigate lease possibilities, update old leases and secure new leases
- Participate in the planning for the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSST) Network which could include segments on the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line
- Plan for future potential uses of the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line
- Continue to work with the Transportation Agency for Monterey County, the Coast Rail Coordinating Council, Caltrain, AMTRAK and Caltrans Division of Rail to support the establishment of a rail station at the Pajaro station for any new or expanded rail passenger service on the coast mainline

**Major Products:**

- Final Purchase Agreement with Union Pacific
- Contract with rail service provider
- Contracts with freight customers
- Contracts with consultants for operation and management of property
- Updated and new leases
- Due diligence reports
- Agreements with Caltrans and the California Transportation Commission (CTC)

*Shown on pages 8 of the budget*
Highway 1/ HOV Lane PA/ED and Auxiliary Lane Projects

This work element includes implementation of the Project Approval/Environmental Documents (PA/ED) for the Highway 1 HOV Lanes project and the Highway 1 Soquel-Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes project, and final design engineering for the Auxiliary Lanes project.

**Major Tasks:**

- Continue to guide the consultant work, in cooperation with the Project Development Team, Caltrans, local, and regional agencies, on the Project Approval/Environmental Document (PA/ED) for the Highway 1 HOV Lanes project and the Highway 1 Soquel-Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes project.
- Continue to guide the consultant work with the Project Development Team, Caltrans, local, and regional agencies, on the final engineering phase (Plans, Specifications, and Estimates (PS&E)), including securing all resource agency permits and coordinate with Caltrans in certifying the right-of-way work for the Highway 1 Soquel-Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes project.
- Participate in the Project Development Team (PDT) overseeing the project development for the Highway 1 HOV Lane and Highway 1 Soquel-Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes projects.
- Complete the Sustainable Transportation and Access Rating System (STARS) analysis for the Highway 1 HOV Lane project and incorporate recommendations as appropriate.
- Coordinate with Caltrans and the consultant team to meet all funding and project reporting requirements particularly those of the Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA).
- Participate in the Project Development Team (PDT) overseeing the project development for the Highway 1 HOV Lane and Highway 1 Soquel-Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes projects.
- Participate in the Project Development Team (PDT) overseeing the project development for the Highway 1 HOV Lane and Highway 1 Soquel-Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes projects.
- Continue to coordinate with the Highway 1 Construction Authority on the project PA/ED and funding issues for the two projects.
- Implement bilingual public outreach plan including meetings, open houses, newsletters and advertisements to keep the community informed and involved in the project development process and solicit input on the environmental document.
- Coordinate public outreach efforts with other RTC projects and respond to concerns from residents and businesses, and prepare for the beginning of construction of the Auxiliary Lanes project.
- Establish and manage the necessary agreements for pursuing consideration of RTC to assuming construction management role for the Highway 1 Soquel-Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes project.
- Initiate construction of the Highway 1 Soquel-Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes project.

**Major Products:**

- Public meetings, newsletters, community group presentations and other outreach efforts on the Highway 1 HOV Lanes project and the Highway 1 Soquel-Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes project.
- Progress Reports on the status of the projects to the RTC and the Highway 1 Construction Authority.
- Highway 1 HOV Lanes project draft environmental documents (2010) and final environmental documents and project report (2011).
- Final Design and Right-of-Way Certification of the Highway 1 Soquel-Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes project.
- STARS Technical Committee meetings and reports.

*Shown on page 9 of the budget*
Plan Coordination

Plan coordination includes a variety of tasks associated with maintaining a coordinated approach to transportation planning on a local, regional, state and federal level.

**Major Tasks:**

- Participate with regional, local and state agencies, the general public and the private sector in planning efforts to identify and plan policies, strategies, programs and actions that maximize and implement the regional transportation infrastructure. (PL). Coordinate transportation projects and funding with Caltrans, AMBAG, SCMTD, cities, the County, UCSC and other federal, state and local agencies
- Conduct meetings of the Interagency Technical Advisory Committee
- Attend meetings of the Regional Transportation Planning Agencies group, the California Association of Councils of Government (CALCOG), and the California Transportation Commission
- Attend and/or participate in meetings of partner agencies as necessary
- Coordinate with Chambers of Commerce, community groups and task forces, etc., on transportation issues
- Review and provide comments on the transportation aspects of planning documents prepared by other agencies
- Monitor legislation, develop recommendations for RTC positions on state and federal legislation, and meet with state and federal legislators and the RTC’s Washington and Sacramento Assistants to monitor and support federal and state transportation funding and policy initiatives
- Participate in statewide efforts to reauthorize the federal transportation law and ensure that California and its regional agencies receive their fair share of federal transportation funds
- Participate in Federal and State Clean Air Act transportation related air quality planning activities
- Coordinate with AMBAG and the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District on air quality issues
- Monitor and participate in efforts at the federal, state and local level related to global warming
- Continue to work with Interagency Technical Advisory Committee members and other transportation partners to cooperatively develop and pursue grant opportunities for transportation studies, programs and projects
- Participate in technical advisory committee meetings for updating AMBAG’s regional growth projections and updates to the regional travel demand model
- Develop partnerships with local agencies responsible for land use decisions to facilitate coordination of transportation planning with land use, open space, job-housing balance, environmental constraints, and growth management.

**Major Products:**

- Annual State and Federal Legislative Programs
- Agenda packets for the Interagency Technical Advisory Committee

*Shown on pages 10, 11 and 12 of the budget*
### Land Use/Transportation Coordination

This element emphasizes early and continued coordination between the RTC and local agencies on land use development projects and land use plans with transportation implications and on transportation plans and projects with land use implications.

**Major Tasks:**

- Provide staff comments on general plan updates, bicycle plans, major development plans, transit plans and environmental review documents prepared by local agencies and other entities
- Share information with the planning staffs of the local jurisdictions, UCSC, and SCMTD on the coordination of land use and transportation issues and projects
- Forward applicable draft plans and environmental documents to the SCCRTC Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee and Bicycle Committee for their review and comment
- Review Caltrans comments on local and regional plans and projects
- Coordinate with AMBAG to ensure any work on a Regional Blueprint Plan for the Monterey Bay region reflects the goals and policies of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and the priorities of the SCCRTC and its member agencies. Consider alternative growth scenarios that provide information on compact development and related infrastructure needs and costs
- Identify and analyze issues relating to integration of transportation and community goals and objectives in land use, housing, economic development, social welfare and environmental preservation
- Incorporate transit and intermodal facilities, bicycle transportation facilities and pedestrian walkways in plans and programs where appropriate

**Major Products:**

- Comment letters on draft plans and environmental documents
- Quarterly report on document review activities

*Shown on pages 10, 11 and 12 of the budget*
101  Work Program and Budget

Major Tasks:

- Develop the annual and amended work program and budget in cooperation with AMBAG and CALTRANS
- Participate in annual meetings with federal and state agency representatives about the Overall Work Program
- Prepare reports required by funding agencies
- Continue to investigate and pursue new grant and other funding sources for Commission programs and initiatives

Major Products:

- Annual budget and work program (February/March)
- Amended budget and work program (as needed)
- Quarterly progress reports
- Required grant reports

Shown on pages 10, 11 and 12 of the budget
OWP # WORK PROGRAM ELEMENT

113 Public Information and Participation

The overall purpose of this work element is to inform the public and to elicit their participation and input on transportation projects, programs, plans, and policies.

**Major Tasks:**
- Provide information to the public and solicit input from the public and partner organizations on regional transportation issues using the media, internet, advertisements, in-office and partner organization contact distribution mechanisms and presentations to local groups as a means to involve the public in the transportation planning process
- Develop and implement public participation programs for major projects
- Continue to broadcasting regular RTC meetings and public hearings countywide on Community TV of Santa Cruz
- Continue to identify and utilize opportunities for improving the reach of public information materials and services so that low income, minority and marginalized populations are well informed and have the opportunity to provide input on regional transportation projects, programs and policies
- Implement a major overhaul of the RTC’s website to take advantage of new technology to improve its usefulness to the public and the RTC; implement accessibility measures and Spanish language pages
- Continue to enhance the usefulness of the Commission’s website and email notification system for project updates, public hearings, notices and meeting agenda packets
- Continue ongoing acknowledgement of public input received, correspondence logs, and maintenance of mailing/distribution lists
- Update and produce fact sheets for all RTC individual projects
- Expand electronic notification to the public to include the Highlights including consideration of a newsletter format
- Implement recommendations of the RTC’s Public Relations plan
- Partner with the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (SCMTD) to provide outreach and obtain input on improving transportation services, facilities and planning
- Maximize user friendly visual elements into outreach materials
- Develop and implement design standards to achieve a consistent look and image for Commission materials and website

**Major Products:**
- Posting of major reports, the Commission agenda packets and committee agendas and related materials on the Commission’s website
- New and updated public information handouts (Fact Sheets) and website listings for major projects
- Email notifications on major projects and reports, posting of meeting agendas and materials, and RTC actions
- News Releases
- Project fact sheets and/or newsletters
- Database of contact information for media, partner agencies and interested parties
- Agency Report
- Updated Website

*Shown on pages 4, 10, 11 and 12 of the budget*
614 Bicycle/Pedestrian Planning and Safety Education Program

The focus of this work element is three-fold: 1) coordinating and advancing bicycle and pedestrian projects and programs throughout the county; 2) supporting countywide Bicycle/Pedestrian Safety Education and the Bike to Work/School programs; and 3) developing the master plan for the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSST) Network

Major Tasks:

- Provide staff support for the Commission's two citizens' advisory committees: the Bicycle Committee and Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee
- Provide staff support for the Pedestrian Safety Work Group tasked with mission to ensure safe and accessible pedestrian travel and access throughout the county for the benefit of all residents
- Coordinate with local, state and federal agencies regarding bicycle and pedestrian projects, plans and funding programs
- Assist local jurisdictions in the development or update of Bicycle Transportation Plans and certify conformance with Streets and Highways Code
- Process bike and pedestrian-related Transportation Development Act claims including coordination of recommendations by the RTC’s advisory committees
- Implement, promote and seek funding for the Bikes Secure bicycle parking subsidy program
- Implement a Bicycle Route Signage system through coordination with local jurisdictions, bicycle advocates and community members. Identify routes and seek funding.
- Prepare a Master Plan for the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSST) Network including portions of the trail that may be developed within the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line right-of-way in coordination with local jurisdictions and Monterey Bay regional agencies
- Continue funding and promoting the bilingual bicycle and pedestrian safety education program (Ride ‘N Stride) at schools
- Continue financial support of the Bike to Work/School program, and the Community Traffic Safety Coalition (CTSC)
- Continue to monitor planning for a public use trail in the San Lorenzo Valley
- Continue to monitor pass through Air District AB2766 grant funds to Ecology Action for the Folding Bikes in Buses project
- Continue providing support to entities in their efforts to develop and fund bicycle and pedestrian plans, programs and subsidies
- Continue outreach and administration of Bicycle Hazard and Pedestrian Access Reports to identify network deficiencies
- Investigate methods to reduce vehicle travel (PL) by expanding and enhancing bicycle travel
- Continue updating and distributing the Santa Cruz County Bikeways Map
- Continue to compile and update digitized bikeway information to be provided to the public as a roadway layer through the County’s GIS webpage and to assist in planning efforts
- Compile new bikeway mileage data on an annual basis to be supplied to the Community Assessment Project and the RTC’s Traffic Monitoring Report

Major Products:

- Agenda packets for the Bicycle Committee and the Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee
- Master Plan and Environmental Review of the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network in Santa Cruz County
- Updated Santa Cruz County Bikeways Map
• County Bikeway Miles Data
• Digitized Bikeway layer on the County’s GIS website
• Outreach, distribution and processing of Bicycle Hazard and Pedestrian Access reports
• Additional bicycle parking facilities
• Certification of local jurisdiction Bicycle Transportation Plans
• Develop Pedestrian Improvement Plans for each of the local jurisdictions

Shown on pages 10, 11 and 12 of the budget
Specialized Transportation Planning

The coordination of planning for transportation services, funding and programs to serve the County's elderly and disabled communities is the focus of this work element.

**Major Tasks:**
- Provide staff support to the Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee
- Continue to implement the accessible pedestrian planning program of the Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee through the Pedestrian Safety Work Group (subcommittee) including developing and recommending implementation of priority accessible pedestrian facility improvements based in universal design principals to maximize use of sidewalk and other pedestrian facilities and provide safe paths of travel between origins/destinations and other transportation modes
- Continue to coordinate with local public, private, and non-profit entities involved in providing specialized transportation, including Community Bridges, the Volunteer Center, SCMTD and its Metro Advisory Committee (MAC)
- Process Transportation Development Act claims for specialized transportation services and pedestrian-related facilities
- Facilitate the local review and scoring of FTA Section 5310, Job Access/Reverse Commute (JARC), and New Freedoms applications and review 5311 fund applications
- Conduct an annual Transportation Unmet Needs assessment and hearing
- Coordinate with the Community Traffic Safety Coalition for promotion of Pedestrian Access Reports
- Implement the Paratransit Coordination Task Force recommendations for which the RTC and Elderly/Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee are responsible
- Update the Guide for Specialized Transportation on the web site and collect information for the next printing
- Implement pass through grant agreements with Caltrans and Community Bridges for the Mobility Outreach and Education project funded with an Environmental Justice Context-Sensitive Planning grant and the Agricultural Worker Transportation Program
- Implement pass through grant agreements for New Freedom and Jobs Access/Reverse Commute grants should they be received by the University of California in Santa Cruz, Community Bridges and the Foster Grandparents program.

**Major Products:**
- Agenda packets for the Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee
- Annual Unmet Needs Assessment and Hearing
- Updates to the “Guide for Specialized Transportation”
- Quarterly Reports and other requirements to receive Environmental Justice Context-Sensitive Planning grant funds and implement the Mobility Outreach and Education project
- Agreements to receive Agricultural Worker Transportation Program funds and produce the study and plan for a future program in Santa Cruz County
- Outreach, distribution and processing of the Pedestrian Access Reports
- Annual Report summarizing the Committee’s activities
- Pedestrian Action Plan
- Agreements with New Freedom and Jobs Access/Reverse Commute grant recipients

*Shown on pages 10, 11 and 12 of the budget*
Regional Transportation Plan

Since the last update of the state-mandated Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) was completed in 2005, the focus of this work element has been on implementation of the plan, coordination on long range planning with our transportation partners and preparation for the required update in 2010. In FY 10/11 the RTC will complete work on the 2010 RTP update and initiate work for the 2012 RTP update due in 2010. Additionally rules regarding regional transportation plans established by the federal transportation act (SAFETEA-LU), will continue to be implemented. This work element also includes working with local jurisdictions to ensure that regional transportation policies and projects are included in local jurisdiction planning activities. Staff will also continue work on tracking and implementation of AB32 and SB375 requirements for Regional Transportation Plans.

Major Tasks:

- Continue to work with Caltrans and local agencies to implement the Regional Transportation Plan’s projects and policies through their planning and capital improvement programming actions
- Identify and document transportation facilities, projects and services required to meet regional and interregional mobility and access needs
- Coordinate with local jurisdictions, Caltrans, AMBAG, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, and the Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC) on long-range transportation planning activities in our region
- Work to develop potential new transportation revenues to help meet continuously increasing funding shortfalls
- Coordinate with Caltrans and AMBAG on implementing planning requirements enacted through the federal transportation act
- Prepare amendments to the RTP, as needed
- Continue to coordinate with AMBAG on upgrade of the regional transportation model and on its population forecasts
- Coordinate with AMBAG, Caltrans and the Transportation Agency for Monterey County for any requirement or proposal to conduct a freight planning study
- Complete 2010 update of the RTP and initiate 2012 update
- Participate with Caltrans and agencies throughout the State on the development of new state RTP guidelines, including those related to the reduction of green house gas emissions
- Ensure that projects proposed for federal, state or local funding are consistent with the RTP
- Monitor and provide input on AMBAG’s Regional Blueprint plan.
- Involve federal and state permit and approval agencies early and continuously in the regional transportation planning process to identify and examine issues to develop necessary consensus and agreement; collaborate with Army Corps of Engineers, National Fish and Wildlife Service, Environmental Protection Agency and other federal agencies responsible for permits and National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) approvals and with state resources agencies for compliance with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

Major Products:

- 2010 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)

Shown on pages 10, 11 and 12 of the budget
OWP #                   WORK PROGRAM ELEMENT

231  Traffic Monitoring

The Commission's traffic monitoring program involves collecting and reporting data on the county's transportation network for use locally and for use by AMBAG in updating the regional travel demand model

Major Tasks:

- Coordinate the collection of traffic volume and vehicle occupancy data at various locations throughout the county, using consultant services as budgeted
- Post count and historic traffic count data on RTC’s website for easy access and reference by government agencies and members of the public
- Coordinate traffic data collection and reporting with Caltrans, UCSC, AMBAG, the cities and the County
- Provide traffic count data to local, state and federal agencies, land use development proponents and members of the public as needed
- Consider conducting bicycle counts within the established program
- Prepare reports on related data such as population, housing, employment, land use, vehicle registration, and traffic accidents
- Continue working with AMBAG and the Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC) on coordinated and/or joint traffic counting services and/or reporting

Major Products:

- Traffic count data produced by consultant
- Vehicle Occupancy count data
- GIS data for all traffic count nodes
- Traffic Monitoring Report prepared as part of the 2010 RTP

Shown on pages 11 and 12 of the budget
OWP # WORK PROGRAM ELEMENT

631 Transportation System Management (TSM)

For this work element, the Commission works with other agencies and businesses to foster relatively low cost improvements to the transportation network such as signal timing, changeable message signs and park and ride lots.

Major Tasks:

- Coordinate with Caltrans and the CHP on Traffic Operation Systems (TOS) improvements, relatively low cost projects designed to improve the efficiency and safety of the transportation system
- Monitor and provide input on Caltrans TSM projects
- Continue to work with Caltrans Districts 4 and 5 on coordinating with the San Francisco Bay Area Traffic Management Center and the Central Coast Traffic Management Center
- Provide staff support to the Traffic Operations System Oversight Committee
- Provide information to partner agencies, community organizations and the public on the benefits of Intelligent Transportation System strategies to improve transportation
- Continue to identify potential locations and funding for new, expanded or enhanced park and ride lots, both dedicated and shared-use
- Coordinate with AMBAG, Caltrans District 5 and the RTPAs of the Central Coast to implement the Central Coast Intelligent Transportation System Architecture and Maintenance Plan
- Research establishing a 511 multi-modal travel information system in terms of needs, issues, content, data sources, technology options, institutional coordination, telecommunications requirements and funding

Major Products:

- Agenda packets for the Traffic Operations System Oversight Committee
- TOS Fact Sheet
- 511 implementation plan

Shown on pages 11 and 12 of the budget
OWP # WORK PROGRAM ELEMENT

641 Transportation Improvement Program

The Transportation Improvement Program work element involves programming funds for transportation projects and programs and working with implementing agencies to encourage appropriate and timely implementation of those transportation projects and programs.

Major Tasks:

- Prepare amendments to the 2010 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) as needed
- Prepare the 2010 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), scheduled for adoption in December 2010, and amendments as needed
- Coordinate RTIP amendments with AMBAG for the Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) and with Caltrans and the California Transportation Commission (CTC) for the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)
- Conduct planning and project activities (including corridor studies, and other transportation planning studies) to identify and develop candidate projects for the Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP).
- Monitor the state transportation budget and work with Caltrans and the California Transportation Commission on obtaining funding for STIP funded projects
- Program funds for projects through state and federal funding programs such as the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), the Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP), the STIP Transportation Enhancement Activities (STIP TE) Program and Proposition 1B programs
- Monitor the implementation of STIP, STIP TE, RSTP, and CMAQ-funded projects, with an emphasis on project delivery, timely use of funds and compliance with State and Federal laws and California Transportation Commission guidelines.
- Monitor the achievement towards regional and state transportation goals
- To better deliver qualifying and approved projects, exchange federal RSTP funds for State funds through the State’s RSTP Exchange program
- Assist local agencies in filing and monitoring STIP allocation requests
- Work with Caltrans to monitor both major and minor state highway projects and to fulfill its STIP project monitoring and project delivery responsibilities
- Work with our counterpart regional agencies, Caltrans and the California Transportation Commission (CTC) on the development of implementation policies and procedures for state and federal funding programs
- Prepare state and federally-mandated reports for Caltrans, FHWA, and the CTC
- Provide information to the public and other agencies regarding funding programs and opportunities
- Project planning, including the development of project study reports or major investment studies
- Incorporate transit and intermodal facilities, bicycle transportation facilities and pedestrian walkways in plans and programs where appropriate.
- Work with local jurisdictions to ensure that all deadlines for all funds designated for Santa Cruz County, including federal stimulus funds, are met and projects are delivered.
Major Products:

- 2008 Regional Transportation Improvement Program amendments
- 2010 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) & amendments
- Caltrans mandated documents and reports
- Project Status Reports

Shown on pages 11, 12 and 13 of the budget
683 Highway and Roadway Planning

This work element includes close coordination and monitoring of Caltrans work on projects to improve the Highway 1 freeway, the Highway 1/17 Merge Lanes project and other Highway and roadway improvement projects that are not specifically attributed to implementation of the Highway 1 HOV Lanes or Soquel-Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes projects.

Major Tasks:

- Continue to participate in the Project Development Team (PDT) and work closely with Caltrans and the City of Santa Cruz on Highway 1/17 Merge Lanes landscaping project implementation issues, including the public information process and travel demand management activities, including
- Continue to participate on the Project Development Teams (PDT) and work closely with Caltrans on State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) and other projects on State Highways in Santa Cruz County
- Continue to work with the City of Santa Cruz on the Highway 1/9 Intersection and Highway 1/San Lorenzo River Bridge Widening projects and with the City of Watsonville on the Highway 1/Harkins Slough Road Interchange
- Continue to work with Caltrans, the California Transportation Commission, the Highway 1 Construction Authority and the Project Development Teams to identify and implement ways to secure funding for and expedite Highway improvement projects
- Continue to work with Caltrans and other agencies on developing necessary operational, safety and service improvements on all highways and roadways in Santa Cruz County
- Prepare public information materials related to Highway projects for coordinated outreach efforts
- Assess the operational and physical continuity of transportation system components within and between metropolitan and rural areas, and interconnections to and through regions
- Participate with Caltrans, TARC, AMBAG, and other local agencies and modal operators (i.e. Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District) in the creation of a Corridor System Management Plan for the Highway 1 corridor as a requirement of receiving Congestion Management Improvement Account (CMIA) funds for the Highway 1 Soquel-Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes project

Major Products:

- Corridor System Management Plan for the Highway 1 Corridor (2010)
- Factsheets and other public information materials as necessary

Shown on pages 11 and 12 of the budget
670 Monterey Bay Transit Planning Rotational Intern

This work element includes hiring an intern to work on transit related tasks with the RTC and with the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (SCMTD). This is funded through Transit Professional Development Grant funds jointly secured by the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG), SCMTD, Monterey Salinas Transit (MST), the Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC) and the RTC. The goal of the grant is to provide agencies with planning and marketing assistance and transportation students with transit related work experience.

Major Tasks:

- Coordinate with AMBAG, and the participating agencies to implement any necessary grant agreements
- In coordination with SCMTD supervise rotational interns to work on a variety of transit related tasks including assistance with updating and distributing of the Guide to Specialized Transportation; monitoring implementation status of recommendations resulting from the Paratransit Task Force; implementing the annual unmet needs process; staffing of the Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee; maintaining and developing website information regarding transit and specialized transportation services; public outreach and marketing efforts to businesses, agencies, community groups and the public for transit and specialized transportation; researching effective low cost strategies implemented elsewhere to better serve the transportation needs of the elderly, disabled and people with limited means; producing grant applications to continue existing programs and implement new programs; coordinating with SCMTD regarding strategies to better serve the elderly, disabled and people of limited means; and reviewing plans and environmental documents for effective strategies to address transportation needs.

Major Products:

- Transit planning intern services
- Materials for the joint RTC and SCMTD outreach

Shown on pages 11 and 12 of the budget
OWP # 175 WORK PROGRAM ELEMENT

Monterey Bay Area 511 Traveler Information System

This work element includes production of a feasibility and implementation plan for a Monterey Bay Area 511 traveler information system in Santa Cruz and Monterey Counties. This will be a coordinated effort between the RTC, the Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC) and Caltrans. The goal is to appropriately design and implement a comprehensive, centralized and multi-modal 511 system that provides up-to-date transportation information including real-time roadway traffic conditions, transit information, carpooling information, bicycling information, and emergency notices. This is funded primarily through a Partnership Planning Grant jointly secured by RTC and TAMC.

Major Tasks:

- Coordinate with Caltrans and TAMC to implement the necessary grant agreements
- Establish appropriate stakeholders group
- Secure the necessary consulting services
- Produce the feasibility and implementation plan

Major Products:

- Executed funding agreements
- Request for proposals (RFP) and contract for consulting services
- Feasibility and implementation plan

Shown on page 6 of the budget
## Transportation Development Act (TDA)
### Estimated and Actual Revenues FYs 07-08, 08-09, 09-10 & 10-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>FY 07-08 Actual Revenues</th>
<th>FY 08-09 Actual Revenues</th>
<th>FY 09-10 Auditor-Controller</th>
<th>FY 09-10 Auditor-Controller</th>
<th>FY 09-10 Auditor-Controller</th>
<th>FY 09-10 Auditor-Controller</th>
<th>FY 09-10 Auditor-Controller</th>
<th>FY 09-10 Auditor-Controller</th>
<th>Difference as % of Jan 10 Estimate</th>
<th>Difference as % of Jan 10 Estimate</th>
<th>Cumulative % of Actual Jan 10 Estimate</th>
<th>FY 10-11 Auditor-Controller</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JULY</td>
<td>543,200</td>
<td>570,200</td>
<td>570,200</td>
<td>570,200</td>
<td>570,200</td>
<td>570,200</td>
<td>570,200</td>
<td>570,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>454,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUGUST</td>
<td>724,300</td>
<td>760,200</td>
<td>760,200</td>
<td>760,200</td>
<td>760,200</td>
<td>760,200</td>
<td>760,200</td>
<td>760,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>539,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPTEMBER</td>
<td>863,255</td>
<td>634,334</td>
<td>634,334</td>
<td>634,334</td>
<td>634,334</td>
<td>639,184</td>
<td>719,093</td>
<td>719,093</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>719,093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTOBER</td>
<td>599,500</td>
<td>567,100</td>
<td>567,100</td>
<td>567,100</td>
<td>567,100</td>
<td>499,048</td>
<td>490,500</td>
<td>490,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>490,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOVEMBER</td>
<td>799,300</td>
<td>756,100</td>
<td>756,100</td>
<td>756,100</td>
<td>756,100</td>
<td>665,368</td>
<td>555,900</td>
<td>555,900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>555,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECEMBER</td>
<td>638,280</td>
<td>700,859</td>
<td>700,859</td>
<td>700,859</td>
<td>700,859</td>
<td>616,756</td>
<td>625,785</td>
<td>625,785</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>625,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANUARY</td>
<td>583,600</td>
<td>538,600</td>
<td>538,600</td>
<td>538,600</td>
<td>538,600</td>
<td>538,600</td>
<td>538,600</td>
<td>538,600</td>
<td>-73,300</td>
<td>-13.61%</td>
<td>98.13%</td>
<td>538,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEBRUARY</td>
<td>778,200</td>
<td>590,700</td>
<td>590,700</td>
<td>590,700</td>
<td>590,700</td>
<td>590,700</td>
<td>590,700</td>
<td>620,400</td>
<td>29,700</td>
<td>5.03%</td>
<td>99.03%</td>
<td>590,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCH</td>
<td>543,629</td>
<td>578,624</td>
<td>578,624</td>
<td>516,446</td>
<td>578,624</td>
<td>578,624</td>
<td>578,624</td>
<td>578,624</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>578,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRIL</td>
<td>494,300</td>
<td>455,497</td>
<td>432,400</td>
<td>469,585</td>
<td>455,497</td>
<td>432,400</td>
<td>432,400</td>
<td>432,400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>432,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>659,000</td>
<td>607,269</td>
<td>464,400</td>
<td>626,050</td>
<td>607,269</td>
<td>464,400</td>
<td>464,400</td>
<td>464,400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>464,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE</td>
<td>652,069</td>
<td>600,882</td>
<td>606,615</td>
<td>619,466</td>
<td>600,882</td>
<td>606,615</td>
<td>606,615</td>
<td>606,615</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>606,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>7,878,633</td>
<td>7,360,365</td>
<td>7,200,133</td>
<td>7,514,051</td>
<td>7,360,365</td>
<td>6,596,418</td>
<td>4,470,778</td>
<td>43,600</td>
<td>-0.66%</td>
<td>67.41%</td>
<td>6,596,418</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% Change: -6.58% -2.18% 4.36% -2.05% -9.89% -0.55%

% Change FY 07-08 to FY 08-09 Actual Revenues: -8.61%
% Change FY 08-09 Actual to FY 09-10 Jan 10 Estimated Revenues: -8.38%