Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission

AGENDA

Thursday, April 1, 2010
9:00 a.m.

NOTE LOCATION THIS MONTH
Board of Supervisors Chambers
701 Ocean St
Santa Cruz CA

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 March 4, 2010 regular Commission meeting

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

6. Accept draft minutes of the February 22, 2009 Bicycle Committee meeting

**POLICY ITEMS**

   No consent items

**PROJECTS and PLANNING ITEMS**

   No consent items

**BUDGET AND EXPENDITURES ITEMS**

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

8. Accept Fiscal Year (FY) 08-09 internal financial statements (enclosed separately for commissioners)
**ADMINISTRATION ITEMS**

9. Approve staff recommendation regarding Bicycle Committee membership appointments

10. Approve Special Districts Risk Management Association application and resolution to renew the Workers’ Compensation self insured status (Resolution)

11. Accept staff recommendation for the reappointment of delegate and representative to the California Association of Councils of Governments (CalCOG) and the Coast Rail Coordinating Council (CRCC)

**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. Unites States Department of Transportation Policy Statement on Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodation Regulations and Recommendations
   b. Summaries of Final Gas Tax Swap from Santa Cruz Metro and California State Association of Counties (CSAC)

**REGULAR AGENDA**

17. Commissioner reports-oral reports

18. Director’s report – Oral report  
   *(George Dondero, Executive Director)*

19. Caltrans report and consider action items
   a. Construction projects report
   b. Highway 1/17 Landscape Project start date information

20. **9:30 AM Public hearing** - 2010 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)  
   *(Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner)*
   a. Staff report
   b. Draft RTP Executive Summary
   c. Draft SEIR Executive Summary
   *Kim Shultz, Senior Transportation Planner*  
   a. Staff report  
   b. Highway 1 Progress Report for the period November 2009 through March 2010

22. Review of items to be discussed in closed session

**CLOSED SESSION**

23. 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

24. 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**

25. Report on closed session

26. Rail Line Acquisition  
   *Luis Mendez, Deputy Director*  
   a. Staff report  
   b. Major Transportation Investment Study Program of Projects  
   c. Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line Acquisition Project due diligence items

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

28. Next Meetings  

*The next Transportation Policy Workshop meeting is scheduled for Thursday, April 14, 2010 at 6:00 p.m. at the Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors Chambers, 701 Ocean St., 5th floor, Santa Cruz, CA*
The next SCCRTC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, May 6, 2010 at 9:00 a.m. at the Capitola City Council Chambers, 420 Capitola Ave., Capitola, 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](http://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](http://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](http://www.santacruzpl.org) or [www.watsonville.lib.ca.us](http://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](http://www.sccrtc.org/enews).

**HOW TO REQUEST**

(Database)

**ACCOMMODATIONS FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES**

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

❖ SERVICIOS DE TRADUCCIÓN/ TRANSLATION SERVICES

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

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

Board of Supervisors Chambers
701 Ocean St
Santa Cruz CA 95060

1. Roll call

The meeting was called to order at 9:07 am.

Members present:
Dene Bustichi
Tony Campos
Neal Coonerty
Ron Graves
Randy Johnson
Don Lane
Dave Murray (ex officio)

Staff present:
George Dondero
Kim Shultz
Gini Pineda
Daniel Nikuna
Cory Caletti

John Leopold
Kirby Nicol
Ellen Pirie
Antonio Rivas
Mark Stone
Marcela Tavantzis
Luis Mendez
Yesenia Parra
Grace Blakeslee
Karena Pushnik
Dave Garti

2. Oral communications

Jack Nelson said that he thought the discussion of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in Chapter 6 of the draft 2010 Regional Transportation Plan was inadequate. He said that his main concern is regarding induced demand and increased vehicle miles traveled resulting from the proposed Highway 1 HOV lanes project and the assumption that decreases in GHG from vehicles traveling at optimum speed would offset these increases.
3. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agendas

Executive Director George Dondero said that there were add-on pages for Item 22 and a news release from Caltrans. He said that Item 27 on the closed session would be removed from the agenda.

**CONSENT AGENDA (Pirie/Coonerty) Unanimous**

Jack Nelson commented on Item 16b-1 saying that while the article tries to quantify how much GHG emissions are reduced when vehicles travel at optimum speed, it is silent on the effects of induced demand.

**MINUTES**

4. Approved draft minutes of the February 4, 2010 regular SCCRTC meeting

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

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

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

9. Approved staff recommendation on Proposition 1B Transit Security Funds for Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (Resolution 19-10)

**ADMINISTRATION ITEMS**

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

11. Accepted meeting schedules for SCCRTC Committees and invite Commissioners to participate
INFORMATION/OTHER ITEMS

12. Accepted monthly meeting schedule

13. Accepted correspondence log

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

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

16. Accepted 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

   Chair Randy Johnson commended former Commissioner Pat Spence for her service and her dedication to the disabled community. He presented a plaque honoring Ms. Spence which was accepted by Commissioner Campos on her behalf.

18. Appoint Commissioners to Budget & Administration/Personnel Committee

   Commissioner Pirie moved and Commissioner Lane seconded to appoint Commissioners Campos, Stone, Leopold, Rivas, Pirie and Coonerty to the Budget & Administration/Personnel Committee. The motion was approved unanimously.

19. Director’s report

   Executive Director George Dondero said that the draft Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and the accompanying Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) have been released. A public hearing will be held at the next Regional Transportation Commission meeting on April 1, 2010 at the Board of Supervisors Chambers. Public comments are due by April 19. The documents are posted to the RTC website at www.sccrtc.org and available at the RTC office and public libraries throughout the county.

20. Caltrans report and consider action items

   Dave Murray, Caltrans District 5, said that landscaping for the Highway 17 Merge Lanes project is scheduled to begin April 1, 2010. He referred to the
Caltrans news release regarding the Adopt-a-Highway program, saying it continues to be a worthwhile and successful program. The program has over 2,500 groups participating in the removal of litter along state highways saving the Department of Transportation over $1 million.

Commissioners discussed the Adopt-a-Highway process.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Rivas about a project on Freedom Boulevard, Mr. Murray said that the transportation management system is a radar system to detect traffic counts and that the project will add sites for data collection.

21. Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 8 Allocation Claim from the City of Scotts Valley for its citywide sidewalks project

Senior Planner Karena Pushnik presented the staff report and described the Transportation Development Act claim from the City of Scotts Valley. Improvement projects are located on Bean Creek Road near the Scotts Valley Middle School, Vine Hill Rd and other locations within the city.

Commissioner Pirie moved and Commissioner Campos seconded to approve the Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee and staff recommendations that the Regional Transportation Commission approve a resolution approving the City of Scott Valley Transportation Development Act Article 8 allocation claim for $93,315 for sidewalk construction projects and/or Americans with Disabilities Act-compliant curb ramps.

A roll call vote was taken and the motion (Resolution 20-10) passed with Commissioners Campos, Coonerty, Johnson, Lane, Leopold, Nicol, Pirie, Rivas and Stone voting “yes”.

22. State and federal legislation

Transportation Planner Grace Blakeslee presented the staff report saying that a statewide coalition of local government, transportation and public transit leaders, including the League of California Cities, are proposing a ballot initiative for the November 2010 ballot to protect local government revenues. The measure, named the Local Taxpayer, Public Safety and Transportation Protection Act, prohibits the state from taking or borrowing local taxpayer funds dedicated to public safety, emergency response, transportation and other vital local government services.

In addition, Ms. Blakeslee said that staff and RTC state legislative assistants were successful in obtaining senate sponsorship for a bill that would modernize SAFE language to expand the list of eligible motorist aid services under the program and authorize the Metropolitan Transportation Commission to place call boxes in state and federal parks. SB 1418 (Wiggins) which was introduced to the state legislature on February 19, 2010 would also allow individual
Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (SAFE) to increase the SAFE fee by $1 to $2 on vehicles registered within their jurisdictions.

Deputy Director Luis Mendez explained the proposed “gas tax swap” alternatives and the impacts on transit and schools. Mr. Mendez also reviewed the status of federal transportation legislation and a federal jobs bill which passed in the House and is waiting to be taken up in the Senate.

Commissioners discussed whether AMBAG or the RTC would be able to impose the local gas tax included in the legislature’s “gas tax swap” proposal and whether approval of the tax increase would need to be placed on a ballot measure.

Les White described some of the different gas tax swap proposals saying that the major issues are tax rates and how the bills are structured. He said that at this time AMBAG would have to adopt a sustainable building scenario as outlined in SB375 and submit it to the state in order to disburse funds. He encouraged the Commission to question whether the funding stream should go through AMBAG or the RTC.

Commissioners discussed gas costs to consumers, transportation projects conforming to SB375 guidelines, and effects of tax swaps on non-drivers.

Responding to an observation by Commissioner Nicol that the proposed SAFE fee increase from $1 to $2 is a 100% increase, Ms. Blakeslee said that the initial 1$ fee was enacted in 1986 and that all funds collected go directly to local SAFE programs.

Commissioner Rivas moved and Commissioner Pirie seconded to approve the staff recommendations 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.

The motion passed with Commissioner Nicol voting “no”.

23. Fiscal Year (FY) 09-10 budget and work program

Deputy Director Luis Mendez reported that the decline in Transportation Development act (TDA) revenues appears to be reaching a plateau and that staff is not proposing reductions to TDA recipients at this time. Mr. Mendez said that there are some changes in the budget due to corrected grant amounts and additional funding for certain items in the budget.
Commissioner Lane moved and Commissioner Stone seconded to approve the Budget and Administration/Personnel (B&A/P) Committee and staff recommendations that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) adopt a resolution approving the amended FY 09-10 Budget and Work Program.

The motion (Resolution 21-10) passed unanimously.

24. Fiscal Year (FY) 10-11 budget and work program

Deputy Director Luis Mendez said that the proposed budget addresses revenue challenges with both continued vigilance of expenditures and additional funding of $484,000 from grant funds secured by the RTC. The FY 10-11 work program continues to implement the RTC’s priorities and on-going projects and also addresses the additional work that must be completed for the recently secured grants.

Mr. Mendez said that the Budget and Administration/Personnel Committee (B&A/P) recommended reducing apportionments to TDA recipients by the .54% consistent with the estimated amount of TDA revenue reductions, except for Bike to Work and the Community Traffic Safety Coalition, which can maintain FY 09-10 levels of funding by using reserve funds. In the event that TDA revenues do not meet estimates, staff will return to the B&A/P and the RTC with any proposed actions.

Mr. Mendez also said that reserve funds should be higher after carry-over funds are calculated; that staff recommends filling an unfilled ½ time tech position to help address the additional work for the secured grants; that no Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA) is anticipated for staff; and that there may be increased revenues if there is an increase in SAFE fees and if the California Transportation Commission (CTC) approves a funding request for State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds for planning, programming and monitoring activities required of the RTC by state and federal law.

Commissioners discussed how carryover funds affect reserve funds and reimbursing Transportation Development Act funds with the additional STIP funding requested from the CTC.

Commissioner Rivas moved and Commissioner Leopold seconded to approve the Budget and Administration/Personnel (B&A/P) Committee and staff recommendations that the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) adopt a resolution approving the proposed FY 10-11 budget and work program.

Commissioners commented on carryover amounts being difficult to ascertain and historical trends showing that there is a precedent for monies to become available from carryovers.
Mr. Mendez noted that while adopting the FY 10-11 budget this early has limitations, it is necessary in order to be included in the AMBAG budget and work program and to provide estimated TDA revenues for recipients to produce their budgets for next year.

Commissioner Pirie asked for updates on both budgets in June and added the recommendation to the motion. Commissioner Tavantzis commented on how the RTC would handle the need for furloughs if the budget required furloughs. Executive Director Dondero responded stating that staff would discuss this if the need was to arise.

The maker and second agreed and the motion (Resolution 22-10) passed unanimously.

25. Review of items to be discussed in closed session

The Commission adjourned into closed session at 10:30 am.

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

The Commission reconvened into open session at 12:27 pm. There was nothing to report

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

There was no SAFE meeting.
30. Next Meetings

The meeting adjourned at 12:28 pm.

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.

Respectfully submitted,

Gini Pineda, Staff

ATTENDEES

Jack Nelson  Patrick Mulhearn  Assemblymember Monning
Les White    SCMTD
MINUTES

Thursday March 18, 2010
9:00 a.m.
SCCRTC Conference Room
1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz

1. Introductions

Chair Johnson called the meeting to order at 9:06 am

Self introductions were made.

Members present:
Dene Bustichi        Kirby Nicol
Tony Campos          Ellen Pirie
Ron Graves           Antonio Rivas
Randy Johnson        Andy Schifferin (Alt)
Don Lane             Marcela Tavantzis
John Leopold

Member absent:       Mark Stone

2. Oral communications

Jack Nelson recommended a report published by the Victoria Transportation Policy Institute on generated travel and induced traffic demand.

Copies of the article will be provided to Commissioners.

3. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agendas

Item 7 was removed from the agenda.

CONSENT AGENDA

No consent items
REGULAR AGENDA

4. State and federal legislative update

Senior Planner Rachel Moriconi gave an update on the gas tax swap proposal negotiations between the state legislature and the governor’s office. The legislature is trying to find ways to preserve funding for transit, in the face of the Governor’s recent veto.

Ms. Moriconi described the recently approved federal jobs bill which mainly consists of tax breaks for employers and an extension of SAFETEA-LU through December 2010. It is unlikely that a federal transportation reauthorization bill will occur before the November 2010 mid-term elections.

Les White, Santa Cruz Metro, said that the state legislature is working hard to negotiate alternative funding for transit because transit agencies all over the state are planning massive service cuts due to severe reductions in funding. In addition to the fact that this is a grave concern for constituents, legislators also realize that a gas tax swap, which allows funds to be diverted to the state for debt servicing, could in turn loosen up general fund monies for other programs.

Mr. White said that the federal jobs bill was shrunk to $15 billion. Among other cuts, a two-year appropriation for operating relief for transit systems undergoing service cuts was stripped out. Between the Governor’s veto and the downsizing of the federal jobs bill, Metro’s operating budget will lose more than $13 million over the next two years.

Commission Alternate Schifrin moved and Commissioner Leopold seconded to approve the staff recommendations that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) accept a report on state and federal legislative efforts. The motion passed unanimously.

5. Review of items to be discussed in closed session

Executive Director Dondero said that Item 8 is on the agenda as a reminder and will not be discussed during the closed session.

The Commission adjourned into closed session at 9:20 am.

CLOSED SESSION

6. 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

7. Conference with Labor Negotiators Pursuant to Government Code 54957.6 – Removed from agenda

Commission Negotiators: George Donovan and Yesenia Parra

Bargaining Units: Mid-Management Unit and General Representation Unit

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

OPEN SESSION

9. Report on closed session

The meeting reconvened into open session at 11:06 am. There was nothing to report.

10. Next meetings

The meeting adjourned at 11:07 am

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.

The next Transportation Policy Workshop is scheduled for April 15, 2010 at 9:00 am at the SCCRTC Offices, 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA.

Respectfully submitted,

Gini Pineda

ATTENDEES

Les White
Jack Nelson
Rahn Garcia
Paul Chrisman

SCMTD
County Counsel
Miller, Owen & Trost
1. Call to Order

2. Introductions

**Members Present:**
- Kem Akol, District 1
- David Casterson, District 2
- Jim Langley, CTSC
- Bill Fieberling, City of Santa Cruz
- Eric Horton, District 2 (Alt.)
- Rick Hyman, District 5
- Leo Jed, CTSC (Alt.)
- Daniel Kostelec, City of Capitola, Chair
- Bob Montague, City of Watsonville
- Lex Rau, Scotts Valley (Alt.)
- Peter Scott, District 3

**Excused Absences:**
- Gary Milburn, City of Scotts Valley
- Saskia Lucas, Bike to Work (Alt.)
- Michael Lewis, District 1 (Alt.)
- Andy Ward, City of Capitola (Alt.)
- Penni Bengtson, District 5 (Alt.)
- Piet Canin, Bike to Work
- Carlos Garza, City of Santa Cruz (Alt.)
- Will Menchine, District 3 (Alt.)

**Unexcused Absences:**

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

**Staff:**
- Cory Caletti, Senior Transportation Planner

**Guests:**
- Blake Northey, UCSC student
- Pat Graves, UCSC student
- Nick Muncha, Bike-to-Work Coordinator
- Brandon Kett, District 4 Applicant

3. Announcements - Cory Caletti announced that some Bicycle Committee members’ terms expire at end of March, that she was working on re-nominations, and that officer elections will take place at the April Bicycle Committee meeting.

Cory informed member that the Arana Gulch Master Plan coastal permit will be heard by the California Coastal Commission on March 11, 2010 at the County of Santa Cruz Board of Supervisor Chambers.
She provided a handout regarding the formation of a U.S. Bicycle Route System which is a joint project between the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials and Adventure Cycling Organization to identify and route an interstate system of cycling networks.

4. Oral Communications - None

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

**CONSENT AGENDA**

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

6. Approved draft minutes of the December 14, 2009 Bicycle Committee meeting

7. Accepted Bike Secure III Final Report as submitted to the Funding Agency: Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District

8. Approved Bike Secure application from Wave Crest Development and correction to previously approved subsidy for Pacific Veterinary Specialists

9. Accepted correspondence from the Bicycle Committee to the California Coastal Commission regarding support for the Arana Gulch Master Plan

10. Accepted Hazard Report

11. Accepted Bicycle Committee Roster

**REGULAR AGENDA**

12. Draft 2010 Regional Transportation Plan Update: Consider Information Item and Forming a Review Subcommittee – Cory Caletti provided members an overview regarding the update of the *2010 Regional Transportation Plan* (RTP). Projects need to be identified in the RTP to secure Federal, State and local funding. The next plan update will be in 2012 and will incorporate greenhouse gas emissions targets. Cory Caletti said that although the current update is a minor one, the Bicycle Committee has the opportunity review and provide feedback. The draft RTP document along with the Draft Supplement Environmental Impact Report will be released to public on March 1st and will be available for public review until April 19th. The Commission is holding a public hearing on April 1st and the next regular Bicycle Committee meeting meets on April 12th. It was suggested that one of the Bicycle Committee sub-committees or a new ad-hoc sub-committee be formed to review and provide feedback for the plan before the April 1st public hearing. In response to a question, Cory Caletti clarified that the plan will not have a prioritized list of projects but will be divided into a constrained list of projects for which funds have been allocated and an unconstrained list. A notification will be sent to members to announce when the draft documents will be posted to the SCCRTC website. A CD containing all documents will also be available. A motion (Akol/Hyman) was made to appoint an ad-hoc sub-committee to review the draft documents and present recommendations to the Bicycle Committee at the April 12th meeting. Bob Montague, Kem Akol, Rick Hyman, and Daniel Kostelec volunteered to serve on the sub-committee. The motion passed unanimously.

Receive Oral Presentation and Consider Draft Aptos Village Master Plan – Bicycle Committee members David Casterson, Will Menchine, Bob Montague met with Glenda Hill from the County Planning Department met with Commissioner Ellen Pirie to discuss the Draft Aptos Village Master
Plan. Mr. Casterson explained to members the details of the plan and the area that encompasses the draft plan. He mentioned that much of the discussion focused on safe bicycle travel, general motor vehicle speeds and treatments such as Shared Lane Pavement Markings (aka “sharrows”). David indicated that the Santa Cruz Sentinel reported that there would be no need for bike lanes due to slow moving auto traffic which is a mis-quote needing correction or retraction. The final decision on the approval of the plan will take place on February 23rd, 2010.

A motion (Hyman/Scott) was made and passed unanimously to appoint Kem Akol to present the following recommendations on behalf of the Bicycle Committee at the February 23rd Public Hearing:

- Speed tables and other methods to slow traffic on Soquel Drive be installed
- A connection for bicycles from Trout Gulch Road to Aptos Creek Road behind the new development be considered
- A mix of enclosed and inverted U-rack bike locking facilities be installed
- Left turn bike pockets on Soquel Drive at Trout Gulch Road and at Aptos Creek Road be provided
- Bike lanes on the east/west road and the two new roads be provided
- A south-bound bike detour off Soquel to Aptos Street be provided

13. Review Draft Online Bicycle/Pedestrian Hazard Report Form – Cory Caletti presented the draft online version of the Hazard Report Form for both bicycle and pedestrian network deficiencies or hazards. She requested feedback from members and pointed out the proposed features of the form, preliminarily including the ability to insert a picture and map. Cory Caletti said that she has gotten comments and feedback from the local jurisdictions and other agencies. She addressed why the RTC receives the hazard reports, in addition to local jurisdictions directly, saying that often individuals are unaware what jurisdictions a hazard is located in and that a central depository for the reports provides a valuable resource to the community. The RTC facilitates this reporting process so that the complaint is submitted to the correct department, jurisdiction or agency. As a second phase, Cory Caletti noted the goal of developing a way to “close the loop” on reporting follow-up action pertaining to the hazard report submitted to the submitter. Members discussed features of the new form and the responsibility of the local jurisdictions to repair hazards.

14. Review Subcommittees and Membership – Committee structure for all existing project tracking/sub-committees will remain the same with the following exceptions:

- Michael Lewis will be removed from all subcommittees as his term is expiring and he is not seeing re-appointment. Lex Rau will be added to City of Scotts Valley subcommittee.
- David Casterson asked to be added to technical sub-committee.

15. Discuss Bicycle Committee Meeting Time - Chair Kostelec asked members of their preference of the 6:30 pm start time for Bicycle Committee meetings and members indicated they appreciated the earlier start time. Cory Caletti said that when the next Rules and Regulations update occurs, a permanent change to a 6:30 pm start time will be considered. In the meantime, the meeting will be announced as being held “at a special time of 6:30 pm”.

16. Project Tracking/Subcommittee Tasks: Oral Reports
a. City of Santa Cruz Project Tracking:
   Bill Fieberling said that many letters in favor of the Arana Gulch Master Plan’s Broadway/Brommer multi-use path connection were submitted to the California Coastal Commission. He said that additional funds were needed to complete the pathway under
Highway 1 to the Tannery Complex. He also mentioned that Sierra Northern has been contracted as the freight short line operator. In response to comments regarding the rail acquisition project, Cory Caletti said that, if possible, she will agendize the item and will invite Deputy Director Luis Mendez to present rail acquisition documents once they are released.

b. City of Capitola Project Tracking: Daniel Kostelec said that a new bike lane has been installed on Monterey Avenue from New Brighton Middle School to Bay Avenue.

c. City of Scotts Valley Project Tracking: Cory Caletti said that construction on Bean Creek Road has been delayed due to heavy rains and is a month behind schedule.

d. City of Watsonville Project Tracking: Bob Montague said that South County Bicycle/Pedestrian Work Group is establishing its priorities and working to develop a Bicycle Plan for the City of Watsonville. Completion of the plan is expected for the end of 2010.

e. County of Santa Cruz Project Tracking: No report was provided

f. Bike To Work Update: New Bicycle Coordinator Nick Muchas indicated that the next Bike-to-Work Week event is scheduled for May 9th through the 15th.

g. CTSC Update: Jim Langley supplied a report from Theresia Rogerson saying that the CTSC is finalizing their work plan for next fiscal year. He mentioned that CTSC and the Santa Cruz Bike/Pedestrian Work Group are considering purchasing a media campaign jointly called Street Smarts and are working to find ways to provide information to teen and young adult drivers. He reported the number of bicycle and pedestrian safety presentations performed at elementary schools and pre-schools.

h. UCSC: No report was provided.

i. Legislative Tracking: No report was provided

j. Sanctuary Scenic Trail: No report was provided.

k. Committee Effectiveness: No report was provided.

l. Technical Subcommittee: No report was provided.

m. Bicyclist/Motorist Safety Education: No report was provided.

n. RTC Packet Monitoring Subcommittee: No report was provided.

o. Shared Lane Pavement Marking (aka Sharrows): No report was provided.

p. Safe Routes to School: Eric Horton reported that he had a meeting with Jack Sohriakoff of the County of Santa Cruz Public Works Department regarding bicycle safety at Rio Del Mar Elementary School. Mr. Sohriakoff recommended that Mr. Norton meet with the school administration to ascertain interest in bicycle and pedestrian improvements. Eric Horton scheduled a meeting with the principal on March 3 to discuss traffic calming, additional bicycle treatments on the roadways approaching the school (such as Sharrows) and the installation of bicycle racks. He will report back to the Bicycle Committee.

17. Meeting adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

NEXT MEETING: The next Bicycle Committee meeting is scheduled for Monday, April 12, 2010 at 6:30 p.m. at the SCCRTC Conference Room, 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA.

Minutes respectfully prepared and submitted by:

Cathy Judd, Administrative Assistant II and Cory Caletti, Senior Transportation Planner
### SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
#### TDA REVENUE REPORT
##### FY09-10
##### REVISED 3/24/10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>FY08-09 ACTUAL REVENUE</th>
<th>FY09-10 ESTIMATE REVENUE</th>
<th>FY09-10 ACTUAL REVENUE</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE AS % OF PROJECTION</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE % OF ACTUAL TO PROJECTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JULY</td>
<td>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>539,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPTEMBER</td>
<td>634,334</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>567,100</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>756,100</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>700,859</td>
<td>625,786</td>
<td>625,785</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANUARY</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>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>578,624</td>
<td>578,624</td>
<td>607,400</td>
<td>28,776</td>
<td>4.97%</td>
<td>99.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRIL</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>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>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>7,200,133</td>
<td>6,596,418</td>
<td>5,078,178</td>
<td>-14,825</td>
<td>-0.22%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**

\Rtserv2\shared\RTC\TC2010\TC0410\[TDAFY09-10revised.xls]FY09-10
TO: Regional Transportation Commission
FROM: Daniel Nikuna, Fiscal Officer
RE: FY 09-10 SCCRTC Semi-Annual Internal Financial Statements

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission review and accept the FY 09-10 Semi-Annual Financial Statements (enclosed separately for Commissioners).

DISCUSSION

The internal financial statements are intended to provide an overview of the financial position of the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) prior to the annual audit report. The statements are intended primarily for internal use; however, they are available for review at the RTC office.

The RTC has 11 funds comprised of five Governmental (operating) funds and six Trust Funds. The In Lieu of Social Security, a temporary trust account, which was set up to receive funds previously contributed to the Social Security System should remain inactive after all the funds are disbursed by year end (6/30/2010). The employees took a vote last spring and the payment to the Social Security Administration has resumed on behalf of the employees who elected to stay in the system. For the employees who opted out, the equivalent of the RTC social security contribution is now being deposited to their respective deferred Comp accounts through the County of Santa Cruz.

In the detailed sections of this internal report, the actual results are compared to the budget. The “Reserve Fund Balance” will be determined at the end of the current fiscal year. As used in these internal financial statements, the Reserve Fund Balance means encumbrances and or prior years’ outstanding allocations. The transmittal letter includes the financial highlights.

SUMMARY

The FY 09-10 annual internal financial statements have been completed and staff recommends review and acceptance by the Commission.

Enclosure: FY 09-10 SCCRTC Annual Internal Financial Statements (enclosed separately for Commissioners)

\Rtcserv2\internal\FISCAL\FINANCE\Internal Financials\FY08-09\FY2009YearEnd\FY2009NovRTC\2009AnnualFinancials.doc
AGENDA: April 1, 2010

TO: Regional Transportation Commission

FROM: Cory Caletti, Senior Transportation Planner/Bicycle Coordinator

RE: Bicycle Committee Membership Appointments

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission make the following appointments to the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission’s Bicycle Committee:

1. Kem Akol (voting) and Holly M. Tyler (alternate) to represent District 1;
2. Peter Scott (voting) and William Menchine (alternate) to represent District 3;
3. Brandon Kett (voting) to represent District 4;
4. Rick Hyman (voting) to represent District 5;
5. Bob Montague (voting) to represent the City of Watsonville; and
6. Piet Canin (voting) and Saskia Lucas (alternate) to represent Bike to Work.

BACKGROUND

Seats on the Regional Transportation Commission’s Bicycle Committee correspond to City and Supervisorial District seats on the Regional Transportation Commission. Commissioners may nominate individuals for Commission consideration. Two additional seats for Bike to Work and the Community Traffic Safety Coalition also exist and appointments are made by the respective agency. Seats for three-year terms on the Bicycle Committee expire on a rotating basis. This March 2010, positions expired for District 1, District 3, District 5, City of Watsonville and Bike to Work. District 4 also has vacancies for the voting and alternate positions.

The Bicycle Committee’s description, role and membership are shown on the 2004 Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission Rules and Regulations (see Attachment 1). A draft roster is also included as Attachment 2.

DISCUSSION

Seats on the Regional Transportation Commission’s Bicycle Committee for District 1, 3, 5, the City of Watsonville and Bike to Work expired in March, 2010. District 4 has had vacancies for the voting and alternate seats for which Commissioner Campos and RTC staff has been working to recruit applicants. Most current Bicycle Committee members and alternates indicated interest in reappointment and their letters and applications were forwarded to the respective Commissioners.

Bicycle Committee Appointments for District 1

For District 1, voting member Kem Akol is seeking reappointment while alternate Michael Lewis did not wish to continue his service. Staff received an application from Holly M. Tyler for the alternate
position. Mr. Akol has served with enthusiasm on the Bicycle Committee since 1993. Ms. Holly M. Tyler has extensive experience in bikeway planning in the public sector and non-profits. Mr. Akol's letter and Ms. Tyler's application were forwarded to Commissioner Leopold who is nominating Mr. Akol and Ms. Tyler for District 1 voting and alternate seats, respectively, for three year terms (Attachment 3 - a). As a new applicant, Ms. Tyler's application is enclosed (Attachment 4) with personal contact information redacted.

**Bicycle Committee Appointments for District 3**

Both voting and alternate District 3 representatives to the Bicycle Committee have requested reappointment. Peter Scott has served as the voting member since 2007 while Mr. Menchine has served either as a voting member or alternate since 2002. Both are active members who serve on a number of sub-committees. Their requests were forwarded to Commissioner Coonerty who is nominating both applicants for reappointment for three year terms as indicated in Attachment 3 - b.

**Bicycle Committee Appointment for District 4**

The Bicycle Committee has had vacancies for District 5 voting and alternate seats for some time. Commissioner Campos and RTC staff have been actively recruiting applicants. Mr. Brandon Kett submitted an application to serve as the District 5 voting member and Commissioner Campos is nominating him for appointment to a three year term (Attachment 3 - c). As a new applicant, Mr. Kett's application is enclosed (Attachment 5) with personal contact information redacted.

**Bicycle Committee Appointment for District 5**

Voting member Rick Hyman has served on the Bicycle Committee since 1989 as the District 5 voting representative and is seeking re-appointment. Mr. Hyman has served with commitment and expertise and is continually providing valuable historical information. His request was forwarded to Commissioner Stone who is nominating Mr. Hyman for reappointment for a three year term (Attachment 3 - d).

**Bicycle Committee Appointment for the City of Watsonville**

Voting member Bob Montague has served on the Bicycle Committee since 2008 as the City of Watsonville voting representative and is seeking re-appointment. Mr. Montague has been an engaged member contributing many hours of volunteer time and is serving on a number of sub-committees. His request was forwarded to Commissioner Rivas who is nominating Mr. Montague for reappointment for a three year term (Attachment 3 - e).

**Bike to Work**

Representation on the Bicycle Committee for Bike to Work also expired in March, 2010. Piet Canin of Ecology Action, the organization which implements the Bike to Work event, is nominating himself as the voting member and Saskia Lucas as the alternate. Mr. Canin has served on the Bicycle Committee since 2002 and Ms. Lucas has served since 2005. The request for reappointments is included as Attachment 3 - f.
Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission approve the nominations submitted by Commissioner Leopold, Coonerty, Campos, Stone, and Rivas, and Bike to Work.

SUMMARY

Seats on the Regional Transportation Commission’s Bicycle Committee for District 1, District 3, District 5, City of Watsonville, and Bike to Work expired at the end of March, 2010. Vacancies currently exist for District 4. Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission appoint the individuals nominated to fill those seats.

Attachments:
1) SCCRTC Rules and Regulations: Exhibit 4 - Bicycle Committee
2) Draft Bicycle Committee Roster
3) Appointment letters
4) Applications for District 1 and District 4
Committee: BICYCLE COMMITTEE

Committee Objectives: Serves in an advisory capacity to the Regional Transportation Commission and its member agencies on bicycle-related issues, policies, plans, programs and projects.

1. Reviews claims submitted to the Commission that deal with bicycle facilities;

2. Reviews recommendations for the bicycle section of the Regional Transportation Plan, including policies, programs and capital improvement projects;

3. Reviews the bicycle sections of other studies, programs and plans prepared by the Commission;

4. Reviews and advises implementing agencies in a timely manner on transportation capital improvement projects with bicycle elements for projects which are either funded by the SCCRTC or are otherwise major, regional level transportation projects. Project review by the Bicycle Committee involves review of the proposed concept and proposed design for the bicycle features of the transportation project. Local implementing agencies may seek the advice of the Bicycle Committee for more localized, locally funded bicycle projects at their discretion.

5. Advises the local jurisdictions' Public Works and Planning departments and Santa Cruz Metro, at their request, in their other functions as they related to bicycling, including bicycle plans, policies and ordinances and bikeway maintenance activities.

6. Advises local agencies and the Commission on the implementation of bicycle promotion programs funded by Commission funds;

7. Reviews and approves applications for Bikes Secure bike parking grant applications;

8. Assists in the pursuit of local, state and federal funds for bicycle projects and advises the Commission on project priorities for funding and grant applications for bicycle projects;

9. Serves as advocates on behalf of the bicycling population regarding bicycle related issues before the Commission.

Committee Membership:

One person representing each of the five supervisorial districts

Rules and Regulations

December 2004

Page 37
One person representing each of the four cities 4
One at-large member (until March, 2005 expiration of this position) 1
A representative of Bike to Work 1
A representative of the Community Traffic Safety Coalition 1

Total (prior to April, 2005) 12
Total (after March, 2005) 11

**Appointments:** Members representing agencies specified above are appointed by that agency and accepted by the Commission; all other members are appointed by the Commission based on recommendations of the Bicycle Committee and via open application process. The cities and the County Supervisors may nominate individuals for Commission consideration.

**Quorum:** A quorum is six members, assuming that there are no vacant positions. If there are vacant positions, a quorum will be half of the number of filled positions.

**Meeting Frequency and Time:** Set meeting time as 2nd Monday of the month from 7:00-9:00pm.

**Meeting Location:** At least one meeting annually will be scheduled for an appropriate location outside of the City of Santa Cruz and in proximity to a major transit route.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representing</th>
<th>Member Name/Contact Info</th>
<th>Appointment Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>District 1</strong> - Voting</td>
<td><em>Soquel, Live Oak, part of Capitola</em></td>
<td>First Appointed: 1993 Term Expires: 3/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Kem Akol <a href="mailto:kemakol@msn.com">kemakol@msn.com</a></td>
<td>247-2944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>District 2</strong> - Voting</td>
<td><em>Aptos, Corralitos, part of Capitola, Nisene Marks, Freedom, PajDunes</em></td>
<td>First Appointed: 2005 Term Expires: 3/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Holly M. Tyler</td>
<td>First Appointed: 2010 Term Expires: 3/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>District 3</strong> - Voting</td>
<td><em>Big Basin, Davenport, Bonny Doon, City of Santa Cruz</em></td>
<td>First Appointed: 2007 Term Expires: 3/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>David Casterson <a href="mailto:dcasterson@comcast.net">dcasterson@comcast.net</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>District 4</strong> - Voting</td>
<td><em>Watsonville, part of Corralitos</em></td>
<td>Term Expires: 3/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Term Expires: 3/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>District 5</strong> - Voting</td>
<td><em>SL Valley, Summit, Scotts Valley, part of Santa Cruz</em></td>
<td>First Appointed: 1989 Term Expires: 3/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Rick Hyman <a href="mailto:bikerick@att.net">bikerick@att.net</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Capitola</strong> - Voting</td>
<td><em>Chair</em> dkoست<a href="mailto:elec@sbcglobal.net">elec@sbcglobal.net</a> 325-9623</td>
<td>First Appointed 4/02 Term Expires: 3/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Andy Ward <a href="mailto:Andrew.ward@plantronics.com">Andrew.ward@plantronics.com</a> 462-6653</td>
<td>First Appointed: 2005 Term Expires: 3/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Santa Cruz</strong> - Voting</td>
<td><em>Wilson Fieberling <a href="mailto:anbfieb@yahoo.com">anbfieb@yahoo.com</a></em></td>
<td>First Appointed: 2/97 Term Expires: 3/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Carlos Garza <a href="mailto:carlos@cruzio.com">carlos@cruzio.com</a></td>
<td>First Appointed: 4/02 Term Expires: 3/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Scotts Valley</strong> - Voting</td>
<td><em>Gary Milburn <a href="mailto:g.milburn@sbcglobal.net">g.milburn@sbcglobal.net</a>/438-2888 ext 210 wk</em></td>
<td>First Appointed: 1997 Term Expires: 3/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Lex Rau <a href="mailto:lexrau@sbcglobal.net">lexrau@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>First Appointed: 2007 Term Expires: 3/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Watsonville</strong> - Voting</td>
<td><em>Bob Montague <a href="mailto:bob.montague@sbcglobal.net">bob.montague@sbcglobal.net</a></em></td>
<td>First Appointed: 8/08 Term Expires: 3/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Term Expires: 3/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bike To Work</strong> - Voting</td>
<td><em>Piet Canin <a href="mailto:pcanin@ecoact.org">pcanin@ecoact.org</a></em></td>
<td>First Appointed: 4/02 Term Expires: 3/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Saskia Lucas <a href="mailto:saskia@ecoact.org">saskia@ecoact.org</a></td>
<td>First Appointed: 1/05 Term Expires: 3/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Traffic Safety Coalition</strong> - Voting</td>
<td><em>Jim Langley <a href="mailto:jim@jimlangley.net">jim@jimlangley.net</a></em></td>
<td>First Appointed: 4/02 Term Expires: 3/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate</td>
<td>Leo Jed <a href="mailto:leojed@gmail.com">leojed@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>First Appointed: 3/09 Term Expires: 3/12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All phone numbers have the (831) area code unless otherwise noted.
March 2, 2010

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

Dear Members of the Commission:

I would like to nominate Kem Akol as the First District voting representative and Holly M. Tyler to serve as his alternate to the Commission's Bicycle Committee. Mr. Akol has served on the Committee since 1993, and Ms. Tyler is a new, highly qualified and motivated applicant.

Please don't hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or need additional information.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

JOHN LEOPOLD, Supervisor
First District

JL:pmp

cc: Kem Akol
    Holly M. Tyler

2347M1
March 16, 2010

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

Dear Members of the Commission:

I recommend the re-appointment of Peter Scott as the Third District representative on the Commission's Bicycle Committee and William Menchine as the Third District Alternate on the Committee.

Sincerely,

NEAL COONERTY, Supervisor
Third District

cc: Peter Scott
    William Menchine

1036T3
January 25, 2010

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

Dear Ms. Caletti:

I am forwarding you Brandon Kett's application for the Santa Cruz Regional Transportation Commission's Bicycle Committee. Mr. Kett has expressed interest in representing the Fourth District on the Bicycle Committee. There is currently a vacancy for a voting member for the Fourth District and I would like to nominate Mr. Kett for that seat.

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any questions.

Sincerely yours,

TONY CAMPOS, Supervisor  
Fourth District

TC:pmp  
Enclosure  
cc: Brandon Kett

3047P4
March 1, 2010

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

Dear Members of the Commission:

I recommend the reappointment of Rick Hyman to the Transportation Commission's Bicycle Committee, as the representative for District 5.

Sincerely,

MARK W. STONE, Supervisor
Fifth District

MWS:pmp

cc: Rick Hyman

4971C5
March 17, 2010

Cory Caletti
Senior Transportation Planner
SCCRTC
1523 Pacific Avenue
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Dear Ms. Caletti:

I would like to nominate Bob Montague to the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission’s Bicycle Committee to represent the City of Watsonville. I know he would be an excellent addition to the committee.

Thank you for your consideration of my nomination.

Sincerely,

Antonio Rivas
City Council Member
District 3
Hi Cory,

I would like to be the Bike to Work voting member and Saskia Lucas the alternate member.

Thanks.

piet

On Dec 11, 2009, at 11:25 AM, Cory Caletti wrote:

Hi again all:

I should have also reminded you that the appointments are for three year terms. If you email me back, please remember to indicate whether you'd like to be appointed to an alternate or voting member seat and for which district/city/program.

Thanks very much, Cory

Cory Caletti
Senior Transportation Planner/Bicycle Coordinator
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
phone: (831) 460-3201 / fax: (831) 460-3215

---

Hello Bicycle Committee members and alternates:

I am writing to those of you whose terms expire in March, 2010. Members/alternates representing the following areas or program are impacted:

12/15/2009

9-14
District 1
District 3
District 5
City of Watsonville

Bike to Work

Please email me back if you are interested in being reappointed and indicate if you’d like to be reappointed for a voting or alternate position. If I don’t hear back from you by Friday, Jan 15th, 2010, I will assume you are not interested in reappointed and will pursue conducting a recruitment to fill your seat.

The reappointment procedure is as follows:

- applications/indications for appointment are solicited
- applications/indications are forwarded to the Commissioner whose district/city you’d be representing (if applicable)
- Commissioner nominates applicants
- RTC approves Commissioner nomination

You are welcome to fill out the attached application if you would like to provide updated information or simply email me back indicating your request to be reappointed. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you for your public service and your dedicated work on behalf of the committee. Sincerely,
Cory

Cory Caletti
Senior Transportation Planner/Bicycle Coordinator
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Ave; Santa Cruz, CA 95060
phone: (831) 460-3201 / fax: (831) 460-3215
www.sccrtc.org

9-15

12/15/2009
COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT APPLICATION

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC)
Bicycle Committee

Meetings are scheduled for the second Monday of each month at 7:00 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 February 15, unless other arrangements have been made.

Please type or print clearly

Name:  Holly M. Tyler
Home address:  2226 Harper St., SC, CA 95062
Mailing address (if different):  PO Box 66643, Scotts Valley, CA 95067

Phone:  (home) 831-464-1545  (business/message/mobile) 831-818-2117
E-mail:  holly.m.tyler@comcast.net

Length of residence in Santa Cruz County:  20+ yrs
Position(s) I am applying for:  alternate position, RTC Bicycle Committee, District 1

Previous experience on a government commission or committee (please specify)
Served on Santa Cruz County RTC Bicycle Committee, 1976-1979
### 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>Santa Cruz County RTC (then SCCTC)</td>
<td>701 Ocean St., SC, 95060</td>
<td>Associate Transportation Planner; Bikeways Planner</td>
<td>1981-1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Bicycle Coalition</td>
<td>1226 Sacramento St., San Francisco, 94108</td>
<td>board member, advocate for bike routes and services in city ofSF</td>
<td>1979-1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALTRANS</td>
<td>Transportation Planning Division, San Francisco</td>
<td>Interned in bikeways planning department while attending UC Berkeley</td>
<td>1979-1980</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.

Promoting transportation alternatives has been a long time interest of mine. I am proud to have worked both from the government side and the citizen side of things to promote cycling in our area. I wish to continue that service and believe I can contribute a lot to the Committee with my relevant experience and expertise. I know many of the people, issues, processes, and challenges of current bicycle planning and advocacy in our county. During my years of service as a Bicycle Committee member and then as a planner for the RTC, I assisted in the development of the RTC's RTP, worked with the cities and county to develop a base coordinated network of bikeways on arterials, and helped get the bikes-on-buses program established, among other things. While working for CALTRANS, I helped establish the still operating bike carrying van on the Bay Bridge (a favorite project!). I would be very happy to once again be a member of RTC Bicycle Committee, and thank you for your consideration of my application.

**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*: Holly M. Yfaly  
*Date*: 01-21-10
Return Application to: SCCRTC
Bicycle Committee
1523 Pacific Avenue
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
fax: 460-3215  email: ccaletti@sccrtc.org

Questions or Comments: Call Cory Caletti at (831) 460-3201 or by email at ccaletti@sccrtc.org
COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT APPLICATION

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission Bicycle Committee

Meetings are scheduled for the second Monday of each month in the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission conference room at 7:00 pm located at 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA.

If you are interested in serving on this committee, please complete the attached application, including any comments or additional information in the section provided at the end, and return it to the Transportation Commission office at 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA 95060. All appointments will be made by the Commission.

General Information

Name: Brandon Kett

Address: Waterville, CA 95076

Phone: (Home) (Business) 831

E-mail:

Position Applied for:

[ ] Voting Member
[ ] Alternate Member

Supervisorial District: 4th

Length of Residence/Employment in Area: 51 years

Previous Experience on a County Commission or Committee (Please Specify)

3 years of S.C. County Farm Bureau
5 years of ASCS Committee
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**Work/Volunteer Experience**

*(Attach additional sheets if necessary. A resume may also be substituted if it includes relevant volunteer experience)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Town or Address</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Presbyterian Church</td>
<td>Watsonville</td>
<td>Building Grounds Committee</td>
<td>1993-1996</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Comments**

*Tom comes highly recommended, I would like to serve the 4th District Bicycle Committee.*

**Statement of Qualifications:** Please attach a brief statement indicating why you are interested in serving on the advisory body in question and why you are qualified for the appointment.

**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: 11/11/10

**Return Application to:**  
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Bicycle Committee
1523 Pacific Avenue
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

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

9-21
TO: Regional Transportation Commission
FROM: Yesenia Parra, Administrative Services Officer
RE: Workers’ Compensation Self Insured renewal

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Commission approve the application and resolution to renew the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) Workers’ compensation Self Insured status.

1. Approve the Application for a Public Entity Certificate of Consent to Self Insure
2. Approve Resolution authorizing application to the Director of Industrial Relations State of California

BACKGROUND

At its June 29, 2006 Transportation Policy Workshop the Commission approved a resolution (Attachment 1) to participate in an insurance pool that is self insured for worker’s compensation liabilities through the Special Districts Risk Management Association (SDRMA) insurance programs. SDRMA is a Joint Powers Authority (JPA) pool of special districts and public agencies in California established to self insure losses, purchase excess insurance and provide administrative services for a joint workers’ compensation insurance program.

DISCUSSION

To participate in the SDRMA program, the RTC will need to renew its 2006 resolution authorizing the execution of an application and resolution (Attachment 2) to the California State Director of Industrial Relations to participate in an insurance pool that is self-insured for workers’ compensation liabilities as part of the Joint Powers Authority (JPA). A commitment to participate in the SDRMA workers compensation program for three years is required.

Neither the application nor the resolution will have any effect on the current premium or contract. Staff recommends that the Commission approve the attached application and resolution (Attachment 2) to continue the RTC’s participation in the SDRMA insurance pool that is self-insured for workers’ compensation liabilities as part of the JPA.

SUMMARY

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission has been part of a pool that participates in the SDRMA insurance pool that is self-insured for workers’ compensation liabilities as part of the JPA since October of 2006. To continue its participation, the RTC must
renew its application to the California State Director of Industrial Relations and its resolution for a certificate of consent to self insure workers’ compensation liabilities.

Attachments:
1. Copy of 2006 application and resolution
2. Application and resolution
APPLICATION FOR A PUBLIC ENTITY
CERTIFICATE OF CONSENT TO SELF INSURE

NOTE: All questions must be answered. If not applicable, enter "N/A". Workers' compensation insurance must be maintained until certificate is effective.

APPLICANT INFORMATION

Legal Name of Applicant (show exactly as on Charter or other official documents):
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission

Street Address of Main Headquarters:
1523 Pacific Avenue  Santa Cruz  CA  95060-3911

Mailing Address (if different from above):

City:  State:  Zip +4:

Federal Tax ID No.: 

TO WHOM DO YOU WANT CORRESPONDENCE REGARDING THIS APPLICATION ADDRESSED?

Name:  Tegan Speiser

Title:  Senior Transportation Planner

Company Name:  Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission

Mailing Address:

1523 Pacific Avenue

City:  Santa Cruz  State:  CA  Zip +4:  95060-3911

Type of Public Entity (check one):

☐ City and/or County  ☐ School District  ☐ Police and/or Fire District  ☐ Hospital District  ☐ Joint Powers Authority

☒ Other (describe):  Public Agency: Regional Transportation Planning Agency

Type of Application (check one):

☒ New Application  ☐ Reapplication due to Merger or Unification  ☐ Reapplication due to Name Change Only

☐ Other (specify):

Date Self Insurance Program will begin:  10/1/06
CURRENT PROGRAM FOR WORKERS’ COMPENSATION LIABILITIES

☐ Currently Insured with State Compensation Insurance Fund, Policy Number: _____________________________

Policy Expiration Date: _____________________________ Yearly Premium: $ _____________________________

Current Yearly Incurred (paid & unpaid) Losses: $ _____________________________ (FY or CY) (FY or CY)

☒ Currently Self Insured, Certificate Number: _________________________________________________

Name of Current Certificate Holder: County of Santa Cruz

☐ Other (describe): ________________________________________________________________

JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY

Will the applicant be a member of a workers’ compensation Joint Powers Authority for the purpose of pooling workers’

compensation liabilities?

☒ Yes ☐ No If yes, then complete the following:

Effective date of JPA Membership: 10/1/06 JPA Certificate No.: 5806

Name and Title of JPA Executive Officer:

James W. Towns, CEO

Name of Joint Powers Authority Agency:

Special District Risk Management Authority

Mailing Address of JPA:

1112 "I" Street, Suite 300

City: Sacramento State: CA Zip + 4: 95814-2865

Telephone Number: (800) 537-7790

PROPOSED CLAIMS ADMINISTRATOR

Who will be administering your agency’s workers’ compensation claims? (check one)

☐ JPA will administer, JPA Certificate No.: _____________________________

☒ Third party agency will administer, TPA Certificate No.: 132

☐ Public entity will self administer ☐ Insurance carrier will administer

Name of Individual Claims Administrator:

Gregory B. Bragg & Associates Jen Hamlim

Name of Administrative Agency:

Gregory B. Bragg & Associates

Mailing Address:

One Sierra Gate Plaza, Suite 345B

City: Roseville State: CA Zip + 4: 95678-6642

Telephone Number: (916) 960-0900 FAX Number: (916) 783-0334
Number of claims reporting locations to be used to handle the agency's claims: 1

Will all agency claims be handled by the administrator listed on previous page? Yes No

AGENCY EMPLOYMENT

Current Number of Agency Employees: 17

Number of Public Safety Officers (law enforcement, police or fire): 0

If a school district, number of certificated employees: 0

Will all agency employees be included in this self insurance program? Yes No

If no, explain who is not included and how workers' compensation coverage is to be provided to the excluded agency employees:

INJURY AND ILLNESS PREVENTION PROGRAM

Does the agency have a written Injury and Illness Prevention Program? Yes No

Individual responsible for agency Injury and Illness Prevention Program:
Name and Title: George Dondero, Executive Director

Company or Agency Name: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission

Mailing Address: 1523 Pacific Avenue

City: Santa Cruz State: CA Zip + 4: 95060-3911

Telephone Number: (831) 460 3200

SUPPLEMENTAL COVERAGE

Will your self insurance program be supplemented by any insurance or pooled coverage under a standard workers' compensation insurance policy? Yes No

If yes, then complete the following:

Name of Carrier or Excess Pool:

Policy Number:

Effective Date of Coverage:
Will your self insurance program be supplemented by any insurance or pooled coverage under a specific excess workers' compensation insurance policy?  

☐ Yes  ☐ No

If yes, then complete the following:

Name of Carrier or Excess Pool: California Public Entity Insurance Authority

Policy Number: CP-03-EWC-30

Effective Date of Coverage: July 1, 2006 through June 30, 2007

Retention Limits: $ 4,750,000

Will your self insurance program be supplemented by any insurance or pooled coverage under an aggregate excess (stop loss) workers' compensation insurance policy?  

☐ Yes  ☑ No

If yes, then complete the following:

Name of Carrier or Excess Pool:

Policy Number:

Effective Date of Coverage:

Retention Limits:

---

RESOLUTION OF GOVERNING BOARD

See Attached Resolution—Page 5

CERTIFICATION

The undersigned on behalf of the applicant hereby applies for a Certificate of Consent to Self Insure the payment of workers' compensation liabilities pursuant to Labor Code Section 3700. The above information is submitted for the purpose of procuring said Certificate from the Director of Industrial Relations, State of California. If the Certificate is issued, the applicant agrees to comply with applicable California statutes and regulations pertaining to the payment of compensation that may become due to the applicant's employees covered by the Certificate.

Signature of Authorized Official:

Typed Name: Ellen Pirie

Title: Chair

Agency Name: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission

Date: 8/4/06

(Emboss seal above or Notarize signature)
APPLICATION FOR A PUBLIC ENTITY
CERTIFICATE OF CONSENT TO SELF INSURE

NOTE: All questions must be answered. If not applicable, enter “N/A”.
Workers’ compensation insurance must be maintained until certificate is effective.

### APPLICANT INFORMATION

| Legal Name of Applicant (show exactly as on Charter or other official documents): | Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission |
| Street Address of Main Headquarters: | 1523 Pacific Avenue |
| Mailing Address (if different from above): | Santa Cruz |
| | CA |
| | 95060-3911 |
| Federal Tax ID No.: | 95060-3911 |

| City: | Santa Cruz |
| State: | CA |
| Zip + 4: | 95060-3911 |

### TO WHOM DO YOU WANT CORRESPONDENCE REGARDING THIS APPLICATION ADDRESSED?

| Name: | Yesenia Parra |
| Title: | Administrative Services Officer |

| Company Name: | Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission |

| Mailing Address: | 1523 Pacific Avenue |

| City: | Santa Cruz |
| State: | CA |
| Zip + 4: | 95060-3911 |

### Type of Public Entity (check one):

- [ ] City and/or County
- [ ] School District
- [ ] Police and/or Fire District
- [ ] Hospital District
- [ ] Joint Powers Authority
- [x] Other (describe): Public Agency; Regional Transportation Planning Agency

### Type of Application (check one):

- [ ] New Application
- [ ] Reapplication due to Merger or Unification
- [ ] Reapplication due to Name Change Only
- [x] Other (specify): Renewal

Date Self Insurance Program will begin: 10/1/09
CURRENT PROGRAM FOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION LIABILITIES

☐ Currently Insured with State Compensation Insurance Fund, Policy Number: 

Policy Expiration Date: __________________________ Yearly Premium: $ __________________________

☐ Currently Yearly Incurred (paid & unpaid) Losses: $ __________________________ (FY or CY)

☐ Currently Self Insured, Certificate Number: 

Name of Current Certificate Holder: County of Santa Cruz

☐ Other (describe): 

JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY

Will the applicant be a member of a workers' compensation Joint Powers Authority for the purpose of pooling workers' compensation liabilities?

☐ Yes  ☐ No  If yes, then complete the following:

Effective date of JPA Membership: __________________________ JPA Certificate No.: 5806

Name and Title of JPA Executive Officer:

James W. Towns, CEO

Name of Joint Powers Authority Agency:

Special District Risk Management Authority

Mailing Address of JPA:

1112 "I" Street, Suite 300

City: Sacramento  State: CA  Zip + 4: 95814-2865

Telephone Number: (800) 537-7790

PROPOSED CLAIMS ADMINISTRATOR

Who will be administering your agency's workers' compensation claims? (check one)

☐ JPA will administer, JPA Certificate No.: 

☐ Third party agency will administer, TPA Certificate No.: 132

☐ Public entity will self administer  ☐ Insurance carrier will administer

Name of Individual Claims Administrator:

Gregory B. Bragg & Associates  Jen Hamlim

Name of Administrative Agency:

Gregory B. Bragg & Associates

Mailing Address:

One Sierra Gate Plaza, Suite 345B

City: Roseville  State: CA  Zip + 4: 95678-6642

Telephone Number: (916) 960-0900  FAX Number: (916) 783-0334
Number of claims reporting locations to be used to handle the agency’s claims: 1

Will all agency claims be handled by the administrator listed on previous page?  ☑ Yes  ☐ No

AGENCY EMPLOYMENT

Current Number of Agency Employees: 17

Number of Public Safety Officers (law enforcement, police or fire): 0

If a school district, number of certificated employees: 0

Will all agency employees be included in this self insurance program?  ☑ Yes  ☐ No
If no, explain who is not included and how workers’ compensation coverage is to be provided to the excluded agency employees:

INJURY AND ILLNESS PREVENTION PROGRAM

Does the agency have a written Injury and Illness Prevention Program?  ☑ Yes  ☐ No

Individual responsible for agency Injury and Illness Prevention Program:

Name and Title: George Dondero, Executive Director

Company or Agency Name: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission

Mailing Address:
1523 Pacific Avenue

City: Santa Cruz  State: CA  Zip + 4: 95060-3911

Telephone Number: (831) 460-3200

SUPPLEMENTAL COVERAGE

Will your self insurance program be supplemented by any insurance or pooled coverage under a standard workers’ compensation insurance policy?  ☐ Yes  ☑ No
If yes, then complete the following:

Name of Carrier or Excess Pool:

Policy Number:

Effective Date of Coverage:
Will your self insurance program be supplemented by any insurance or pooled coverage under a specific excess workers' compensation insurance policy?  
☑ Yes  ☐ No

If yes, then complete the following:

Name of Carrier or Excess Pool: California Public Entity Insurance Authority

Policy Number: CP-03-EWC-30

Effective Date of Coverage: July 1, 2006 through June 30, 2007

Retention Limits: $4,750,000

Will your self insurance program be supplemented by any insurance or pooled coverage under an aggregate excess (stop loss) workers' compensation insurance policy?  
☐ Yes  ☑ No

If yes, then complete the following:

Name of Carrier or Excess Pool: ____________________________

Policy Number: ____________________________

Effective Date of Coverage: ____________________________

Retention Limits: ____________________________

RESOLUTION OF GOVERNING BOARD

See Attached Resolution—Page 5

CERTIFICATION

The undersigned on behalf of the applicant hereby applies for a Certificate of Consent to Self Insure the payment of workers' compensation liabilities pursuant to Labor Code Section 3700. The above information is submitted for the purpose of procuring said Certificate from the Director of Industrial Relations, State of California. If the Certificate is issued, the applicant agrees to comply with applicable California statutes and regulations pertaining to the payment of compensation that may become due to the applicant's employees covered by the Certificate.

Signature of Authorized Official: ____________________________

Date: ____________________________

Typed Name: Randy Johnson

Title: Chair

Agency Name: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission

(Emboss seal above or Notarize signature)
RESOLUTION NO.: __________ DATED: ________________

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING APPLICATION
TO THE DIRECTOR OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS, STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR A CERTIFICATE OF CONSENT TO SELF INSURE
WORKERS' COMPENSATION LIABILITIES

At a meeting of the Board of

(enter title)

of the

(enter name of public agency, district)

a

(enter type of agency)

organized and existing under the laws of the State of California,

held on the ______ day of ______________________, 20____, the following resolution

was adopted:

RESOLVED, that the

(enter position titles)

be and they are hereby severally authorized and empowered to make application to the Director of Industrial Relations, State of California, for a Certificate of Consent to Self Insure workers' compensation liabilities on behalf of the

(enter name of district)

and to execute any and all documents required for such application.

I, ____________________________________________, the undersigned

(enter name) (enter title)

of the Board of the said

(enter name of agency)

a

(enter type of agency)

hereby certify that I am the

(enter title)

(enter type of agency)

of said

, that the foregoing is a full, true and correct copy of the

resolution duly passed by the Board at the meeting of said Board held on the day and at the place therein specified

and that said resolution has never been revoked, rescinded, or set aside and is now in full force and effect.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF: I HAVE SIGNED MY NAME AND AFFIXED THE SEAL OF THIS

(enter type of agency)

Seal

THIS __________ DAY OF ________________, 20____.

______________________________________

(Signature)
AGENDA: April 1, 2010

TO: Regional Transportation Commission

FROM: George Dondero, Executive Director

RE: Reappointment of Representatives to the California Association of Councils of Governments (CalCOG) and the Coast Rail Coordinating Council (CRCC)

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC):

1. Reappoint Commissioner Mark Stone as its delegate to the California Association of Councils of Governments (CalCOG); and
2. Reappoint Commissioner Tony Campos as its representative to the Coast Rail Coordinating Council (CRCC)

BACKGROUND

The Regional Transportation Commission holds a membership in CalCOG. CalCOG provides public policy advocacy and intergovernmental coordination with the state legislature, state agencies, the League of California Cities, the California State Association of Counties, California’s Congressional Delegation and federal officials. The RTC also has appointed a representative to the Coast Rail Coordinating Council (CRCC). The CRCC advocates for increased passenger rail service between Los Angeles and the San Francisco Bay Area and has been successful in securing regular intercity passenger rail service between Los Angeles and San Luis Obispo (Attachment 3).

DISCUSSION

California Association of Councils of Governments (CalCOG)

CalCOG delegates are typically appointed annually. CalCOG member agencies elect delegates to serve at CalCOG’s annual Regional Issues Forum and occasional delegate meetings, where CalCOG policies and priorities are discussed and adopted. At these forum, there are presentations and discussions on transportation, legislation, local and regional planning and financing issues. Attachment 1 is the agenda for the April 29 &30, 2010, Regional Issues Forum. Delegates may also attend “Capitol Day” in February, which affords opportunities to meet with key state legislators in Sacramento.

Commissioner Mark Stone has been serving as the RTC’s delegate to CalCOG since May 2006. Commissioner Stone has attended several Regional Issues Forums and has provided oral reports to the RTC. Commissioner Stone is interested in continuing to serve as the RTC delegate to CalCOG and staff recommends his reappointment.
**Coast Rail Coordinating Council (CRCC)**

The CRCC only meets every 3 months (Attachment 2). The CRCC is composed of the Caltrans Rail Program, Amtrak and counties along the coast rail corridor between Los Angeles and San Francisco. The CRCC advocates for increased passenger rail service along this route, including the initiation of a new Coast Daylight train which would connect northern and southern California.

The RTC has been a member of the CRCC since it began and Commissioner Tony Campos has served as the RTC representative since June 2007. Commissioner Campos has attended several meetings and has provided oral reports on the meetings to the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC). Commissioner Campos is interested in continuing to serve as the RTC representative to CRCC and staff recommends his reappointment.

**SUMMARY**

The RTC is a member of the California Association of Councils of Government (CalCOG) and the Coast Rail Coordinating Council. The RTC appointed Commissioner Stone and Commissioner Campos to serve as its representatives to these groups. Commissioner Stone and Commissioner Campos are interested in continuing to serve as representatives and staff recommends that they be reappointed.

<p>| Attachment 1: CalCOG 2010 Meeting Schedule |
| Attachment 2: 17th Annual CalCOG Regional Issues Forum Agenda |
| Attachment 3: CRCC 2010 Meeting Schedule |
| Attachment 4: What is CRCC |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 28, 2010</td>
<td>CALCOG Executive Director’s Dinner (at the Regional Issues Forum), Monterey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 29 &amp; 30, 2010</td>
<td>CALCOG Regional Issues Forum, Monterey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 17, 2010</td>
<td>CDAC &amp; Regional CalTrans Coordination Group Meeting, Sacramento *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 19, 2010</td>
<td>CDAC &amp; Regional CalTrans Coordination Group Meeting, Sacramento *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 20, 2010</td>
<td>CDAC &amp; Regional CalTrans Coordination Group Meeting, Sacramento *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 29, 2010</td>
<td>CALCOG Delegates Business Meeting and CDAC &amp; Regional CalTrans Coordination Group Meeting, Burlingame</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Executive Directors only
17th ANNUAL CALCOCG
REGIONAL ISSUES FORUM
APRIL 29 & 30, 2010

PRELIMINARY PROGRAM

MONTEREY PLAZA HOTEL & SPA
400 CANNERY ROW
MONTEREY, CA 93940
PHONE: 831-646-1700
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 28, 2010

7:00 PM  DINNER AT MASSARO AND SANTOS AT THE COAST GUARD PIER
Optional dinner honoring recently retired Executive Directors including: Robert McCleary, Contra Costa Transportation Authority

This dinner is not included in the conference registration, but is included on the registration form as a separate item. An additional fee of $50 is required to attend this event.

THURSDAY, APRIL 29, 2010

7:30 AM - 10:00 AM  REGISTRATION AND CONTINENTAL BREAKFAST
DOLPHINS BALLROOM

8:00 AM - 9:50 AM  FIRST ANNUAL CALCOG LEADERSHIP INSTITUTE:
This session is directed toward delegates and staff who are new to CALCOG. It will describe what is CALCOG, including what programs and services it offers to its member agencies and the role it plays in legislative advocacy with the legislative and executive branches of State government. We will also explain how MPOs, COGs, and Regional Transportation Agencies function, describe their regional variances and differences from one another, and how the SB 375 requirements and related regional housing and transportation laws are intended to work under both State and Federal law.

Speakers:
CALCOG Officers, Executive Directors, and Staff

9:50 AM - 10:00 AM  BREAK

10:00 AM - 10:15 AM  WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS:

Speakers:
Jon Edney, President, CALCOG
Monterey County or City Elected Official Local Dignitary

10:15 AM - 11:00 AM  ROLE OF UNIVERSITIES IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF SB 375:
Some major California universities are working closely with a number of regional agencies on issues such as modeling, travel surveys, and implementation of SB 375, among others. The speakers will share regional projects they are now working on and also discuss different ways CALCOG member agencies and the universities can collaborate their efforts on issues such as SB 375.

Speakers:
UC Davis Urban Land Use and Transportation Center
University of California Berkeley Center for a Sustainable California

11:00 AM - 12:30 PM  RAIL AND TRANSIT OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES:
Rail and transit are vital elements of the State’s existing transportation system. However, transit is facing declining State dollars and fare increases. In addition, the California Transportation Commission states that more than $1 billion is needed to cover total annual operating deficits of revenue to support transit operating deficits associated with the maintenance of existing physical condition and service performance. However, voters have approved bond money for high-speed rail and the Federal government has awarded California stimulus money for such a system. Rail and transit are also important for helping to reduce greenhouse gases and improve air quality. The panelists will address how to meet these opportunities and challenges.

Speakers:
Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Authority
L.A. Metro
California High-Speed Rail Authority
Federal Railroad Administration
California Transportation Commission
THURSDAY, APRIL 29, 2010

12:30 PM - 1:30 PM  LUNCH  UPPER PLAZA
1:30 PM - 3:00 PM  VIEWS FROM WASHINGTON, D.C.:  DOLPHINS BALLROOM

The regions, cities, counties, and the State are receiving a transfusion of billions of dollars from the Federal economic stimulus legislation to improve infrastructure in the State. Simultaneously, they are engaged in providing input to the U.S. Congress and executive branch on the reauthorization of legislation concerning federal surface transportation programs and Stimulus 2. The panelists will discuss the specific legislative proposals that will have a major impact on the transportation sector in California.

Speakers:
Federal Transit Administration
Federal Highway Administration
Office of the U.S. Department of Transportation Secretary

3:00 PM - 3:15 PM  BREAK

3:15 PM - 4:45 PM  STRENGTHENING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CALCOG AND ITS CONSTITUTIONAL MEMBERS: THE CALIFORNIA STATE ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES AND LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES:

The three organizations represent local government elected officials who usually agree on most issues. However, sometimes, one or more of the organizations stake out a position that is different than their other partners. In addition, local government elected officials wear different hats: some days it could be as a regional official and another day as a county supervisor or city council member. The panelists will discuss how the three organizations can work more closely together and how elected officials can resolve any policy conflicts they may have when their city or county takes a different position than their regional agency.

Speakers:
CALCOG
California State Association of Counties
League of California Cities

4:45 PM - 5:30 PM  BREAK

5:30 PM - 7:00 PM  RECEPTION OVERLOOKING MONTEREY BAY  LOWER TERRACE
FRIDAY, APRIL 30, 2010

7:30 AM - 9:00 AM  BREAKFAST  DOLPHINS BALLROOM
9:00 AM - 9:15 AM  VIEW FROM NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REGIONAL COUNCILS:
                   NARC represents the interests of most regional councils in Washington, D.C. We will hear from NARC on key issues facing regional councils.
                   Speaker:
                   National Association of Regional Councils

9:15 AM - 10:30 AM  VIEWS FROM SACRAMENTO:
                   Not only must regional officials monitor developments in Washington, D.C., they must also confront numerous fiscal and political challenges in their own backyard and Sacramento. What are these challenges? What solutions are being proposed? How are regional agencies directly impacted? What role should regional agencies be playing? The panelists will answer these questions.
                   Speakers:
                   Caltrans Director
                   Air Resources Board
                   Assembly Member
                   State Senator

10:30 AM – 10:45 AM  BREAK

10:45 AM – 12:00 Noon  CALCOG BUSINESS MEETING:

12:00 Noon - 1:00 PM  LUNCH  UPPER PLAZA

1:00 PM  ADJOURNMENT

ALL SPEAKERS AND TIMES LISTED IN THIS PROGRAM ARE SUBJECT TO CHANGE
**Proposed CRCC**  
**2010 Meeting Schedule**

**January 2010 – Sept 2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>POLICY MEETING</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, April 23rd</td>
<td>north Soledad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TECHNICAL MEETING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friday, July 30th 2010</td>
<td>central San Luis Obispo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>POLICY MEETING</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, Oct 22nd 2010</td>
<td>south Santa Barbara or Los Angeles (?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TECHNICAL MEETING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friday, January 28th 2011</td>
<td>south Ventura or Santa Barbara</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1) Most meetings are scheduled for the 3rd or 4th Friday of the month, if significant conflicts occur, it is rescheduled.
2) Meetings occur every 3 months alternating between the Policy Committee and Technical Committee.
3) Meetings will be canceled one month in advance as necessary.
What is the Coast Rail Coordinating Council?

BACKGROUND

Purpose
The Coast Rail Coordinating Council (CRCC) is a coalition of coastal county transportation and planning agencies organized to improve passenger rail services. The primary focus of the CRCC is to improve the frequency and speed of passenger trains on the coast route between San Francisco and Los Angeles.

Background
In 1992, through the passage of Assembly Resolution 39, State legislators requested that coastal transportation planning agencies prepare an upgrade study for the Pacific Coast Railroad Route between downtown Los Angeles and downtown San Francisco. Six transportation agencies from coastal counties (Los Angeles, Ventura, Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo, Monterey, and Santa Cruz) committed local funds to produce the Coast Rail Improvement Study in 1994 (Schiermeyer). An ACTION PLAN for 1999 to 2003 adopted in July, 1999 is attached for your information. In 1996, the Southern Pacific Coast Route Infrastructure Report (HDR) was completed which concluded that fairly significant time savings could be achieved by upgrading the corridor and using "tilt-train" technology. In June 2000, six CRCC agencies working with Caltrans and Amtrak completed the Coast Daylight Implementation Plan (Wilbur Smith & Associates) which provided an operating plan for new train services on the Coast Route.

Organizational Structure
The CRCC includes a Technical Committee which is made up of staff members from the various agencies, and a Policy Committee which is made up of elected officials from each of the agencies. The Technical Committee typically meets three or four times per year, and the Policy Committee meets two or three times per year. During Amtrak's development of the Master Plan for California, Policy Committee representation was expanded to include additional representation from the San Francisco Bay Area, the railroads, and commuter rail agencies. Meeting alternate between the Technical and Policy Committees. The San Luis Obispo Council of Governments (SLOCOG), since it is located in the middle of the corridor, usually hosts the meetings. Since 1992, SLOCOG has taken on the responsibility for staffing the CRCC, including the preparation and distribution of the agendas.

Current Work Efforts
The CRCC acts as an interregional forum to discuss all intercity rail issues of mutual concern, including, but not limited to; the High Speed Rail Authority's plans, local and state rail plans, freight railroad issues, and capital improvement projects.

Primarily, the CRCC is working with the Caltrans Rail Program, Amtrak West and Union Pacific to initiate a new train from downtown San Francisco to downtown Los Angeles. The CRCC also acts as the Coastal Corridor Task Force to assist in the development of Amtrak's 20 Year Rail Improvement Plan Summary Report for California. Railroad capacity modeling work is now underway to estimate capital requirements for starting new LA-SF services.

Participating regional agencies: Los Angeles MTA, Ventura CTC, Santa Barbara CAG, San Luis Obispo COG, Transportation Agency for Monterey County, Santa Cruz CRTC, San Benito, San Mateo County, and others
<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>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>Bicycle Committee - Note Special Time</td>
<td>6:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/13/2010</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Elderly &amp; Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee - Note Location</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>United Way Conference Room - 1220 41st Ave Capitola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/14/10</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Transportation Policy Workshop</td>
<td>6:00 pm</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/15/10</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Interagency Technical Advisory Committee - Note Special Time</td>
<td>1:00 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>Bicycle Committee - Cancelled</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 - CANCELLED</td>
<td>1:00 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/03/10</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Commission</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Watsonville City Council Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/08/10</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Elderly &amp; Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/10/10</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Budget and Administration/Personnel Committee</td>
<td>3:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/14/10</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Bicycle Committee - Note Special Time</td>
<td>6:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/17/10</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Transportation Policy Workshop</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/17/10</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Interagency Technical Advisory Committee - Note Special Time</td>
<td>1:00 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>02/23/10</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/23/10</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jennifer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/24/10</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/25/10</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/27/10</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>KP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/01/10</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bennie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/01/10</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>TO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/01/10</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Interested Parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/03/10</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Bennie</td>
<td>Stanton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/04/10</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Murray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/04/10</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>KP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/05/10</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>KP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/08/10</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>Union Pacific Railroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/10/10</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCMTD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec’d/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td></td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/10/10</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>GP 03/10/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/10/10</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>George Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/12/10</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>GP 03/12/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/15/10</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Kirk E Trost</td>
<td>Miller, Owen &amp; Trost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/15/10</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Thomas J Egan</td>
<td>Egan Consulting Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/16/10</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Lois Connell</td>
<td>Volunteer Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/18/10</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>To Whom It May Concern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Jan Beautz,

I am in the process of buying a condominium, now just entering escrow. My Realtor informs me that there may be a transportation issue affecting this property, and that I am to inquire with you for clarification.

The address is 6248 Cabot Street in Aptos, 95003, in the Willowbrook Village complex. I would appreciate any information you could afford me on this issue. I would also appreciate if at all possible, expediency.

Sincerely,
Sylvia Skefich

Sylvia Skefich, D.C.
(831) 475-1995
920 41st Ave., Ste. G
Santa Cruz, CA 95062

Sylvia Skefich - Thank you for contacting the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) regarding your potential property. The RTC is working on a number of projects to make our community’s transportation system more safe and accessible regardless of an individual’s mode of travel.

Based on the location of your property, the primary transportation project in your vicinity is the Highway 1 High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Lane project. The project would add a new lane in each direction for use by high occupancy vehicles (carpools, vanpools, and transit) between Santa Cruz and Aptos. Environmental analysis for this project is underway and the draft environmental document is expected to be available for public review late this year. Your email address has been added to the enews distribution list to receive information about the project at the earliest possible time. In addition, you can find information about the Highway 1 HOV Lane project, as well as other projects and programs, on the RTC website: www.sccrtc.org. You may also want to contact your supervisor, Ellen Pirie, to get more information about other projects planned in this part of the county.

Thank you.
- Karena Pushnik
Senior Transportation Planner/Public Information Coordinator
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Cc: Ellen Pirie
-----Original Message-----
From: Justin Saydell [mailto:jsaydell@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 04, 2010 6:02 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Inquiry as to what regional entities are doing to address climate adaptation issues

Hello,

I am a graduate student at Cal Poly in the City and Regional Planning program. I am doing some research on how agencies and organizations at various levels of government are working to address climate adaptation in terms of land use in California and how those strategies can/are being used to strengthen adaptation planning at the regional level. Below are a few questions that I was hoping you might be able to answer relevant to the aforementioned inquiry. Your help would be greatly appreciated. If it is easier for me to call you, I can follow this email up with a phone call to set up an appoint for an interview.

1.) What climate adaptation issue(s) has SCCRTC been working on and how has the Commission been addressing the issue(s)?
2.) What do think are the steps for moving forward on climate adaptation strategies on the regional level? What must state, county, regional, and local governments do in order to accomplish this?
3.) Has the SB 375 process affected how your organization addresses climate adaptation? If so, in what ways?
4.) What are the barriers to implementing adaptation planning strategies at the regional level?

Thank you once again for your help.

Best regards,

Justin Saydell
Graduate Studies, City and Regional Planning
Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo
(440) 552-9443
jsaydell@gmail.com
The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) received your inquiry and can respond from a transportation planning perspective. Our agency does not have any authority over land use decisions.

When you are referring to Climate Change Adaptation, we are assuming that you are referring to the potential impacts on transportation as a result of climate change. My specific responses to your questions are below. However, you should be aware that the RTC, as well as all transportation agencies, are in the early stages of Greenhouse Gas (GHG) analysis. The RTC is working within the new regulatory framework (Governor's Executive Order S-3-05, AB 32 and SB 375) to address transportation and greenhouse gases, however there is no standard adopted methodology for estimating and measuring GHG associated with transportation system investments at this time. Yet, we have included a climate change/GHG analysis in the draft of our most recent draft 25-year Regional Transportation Plan and Supplemental Impact Report. See pages 1-18 of this section of the Draft RTP:
http://www.sccrtc.org/pdf/rtp/2010%20Final/Ch5%20to%20glossary.pdf

You can find the full draft RTP and Envt Doc here:
http://www.sccrtc.org/rtp.html. Appendix F of the Supplemental EIR includes a GHG Analysis and discussion of the potential climate changes and impacts on transportation.

1.) What climate adaptation issue(s) has SCCRTC been working on and how has the Commission been addressing the issue(s)? The RTC has recently released its draft 25-year Regional Transportation Plan and associated Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR). The SEIR includes a discussion of the possible effects of Climate Change on Transportation Facilities in the Air Quality Analysis section and in Appendix F. The SEIR covers the entire Monterey Bay region, not just Santa Cruz County. It reviews the possible environmental impacts of the three separate Santa Cruz, the San Benito and Monterey County RTPs as they are combined into one document, the 2010 Metropolitan Transportation Plan prepared by our area’s Metropolitan Planning Organization, the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG). This is the first time that the RTC has taken a broad look at the effects of climate change on transportation facilities.

2.) What do think are the steps for moving forward on climate adaptation strategies on the regional level? What must state, county, regional, and local governments do in order to accomplish this? The RTC has taken the first step by including a discussion of the possible impacts in the environmental review for the RTP. As you know, this is a new issue being looked at by transportation planners. One of the challenges is the long term
time frame within which impacts may occur. Some say that a 50-
100 year planning horizon may be more appropriate when looking
at these potential impacts. Currently, our long-term planning
process extends a 25 year period.

3.) Has the SB 375 process affected how your organization
addresses climate adaptation? If so, in what ways? AMBAG is
taking the lead on developing a Blueprint Plan for the Santa
Cruz, San Benito and Monterey Counties. The outcome of this
planning process is expected to feed into the Sustainable
Community Strategies (SCS) required under SB 375. The RTC will
look at a SCS during the development of its next RTP, the 2012
RTP. SB 375 requires that RTP’s adopted after September 2010
include a SCS. In order to comply with federal requirements,
AMBAG will adopt a minor updated to the MTP in June 2010,
simultaneous with the RTC’s RTP adoption. Undoubtedly, work on
the 2012 update will begin shortly after the 2010 MTP is
adopted.

4.) What are the barriers to implementing adaptation planning
strategies at the regional level? At this early stage in
planning for adaption strategies, it is difficult to identify
the specific barriers. However, the two that seem likely are the
long planning horizon required (50-100 years) and a more
specific understanding of what level climate change will/could
occur globally and how it will effect us on the Central Coast.

Hope this helps. We would be interested to see the results of
your research. Please send a copy of your summary, if you
develop one.

- Karena Pushnik and Grace Blakeslee, Transportation Planners
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
www.sccrtc.org, 831.460-3200
Wilson, Kevin [WILSON_A@vta.org]
Tue 3/9/2010 8:05 AM

Hello,

I carpool from Santa Cruz to San Jose and park at the Pasatiempo, Park n’ Ride lot from 6:30 a.m. until 5 p.m. on Monday through Friday. Last Thursday, March 6, 2010, the front passenger window of my car was smashed in and my glove compartment and console were searched for valuables. I called the Santa Cruz County Sheriff’s dept. and reported the crime. I am now reporting it to you with some questions and comments.

1. Can you please tell me the dates and kinds of crimes that you have documented at this park n’ ride lot?
2. Are you aware that there is not adequate parking for the drivers using this lot? When I arrive at 6:30 a.m., for example, there are never any parking spaces available. When the crime occurred my car was parked along the southbound side of the frontage road just south of the actual lot. This may have played a factor in the crime. Do you offer any solutions to the parking problem at this site?
3. The sheriff’s dept. told me they would check the area out, but what crime prevention or security does the Santa Cruz RTP provide for these lots?

Thank you,

Kevin Wilson
VTA’s Office of Small & Disadvantaged Businesses
3331 N. First Street, Building A
San Jose, CA 95134
Office: 408.321.5831
Kevin.Wilson@vta.org
www.vta.org

From: Tegan Speiser [mailto:tspeiser@sccrtc.org]
Sent: Tuesday, March 09, 2010 6:17 PM
To: Wilson, Kevin
Subject: Pasatiempo Park and Ride Lot

Dear Mr. Wilson:

Thank you for your email regarding your experience at the Pasatiempo Park and Ride Lot. We take all incidents at park and ride lots very seriously.

In response to your questions:

1. Can you please tell me the dates and kinds of crimes that you have documented at this park n’ ride lot?

We are not aware of any other criminal incidents occurring at the Pasatiempo Park and Ride lot. The only complaints we have had were about litter. This was prior to Caltrans upgrade of the facility about a year ago when signage and striping were installed and regular maintenance was resumed.
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2. Are you aware that there is not adequate parking for the drivers using this lot? When I arrive at 6:30 a.m., for example, there are never any parking spaces available. When the crime occurred my car was parked along the southbound side of the frontage road just south of the actual lot. This may have played a factor in the crime. Do you offer any solutions to the parking problem at this site?

We are aware that there is room for between 50-60 vehicles to park at this site (depending on vehicle size) and that it is a very popular location. If parking is unavailable at Pasatiempo, we recommend proceeding to the Scotts Valley Transit Center where parking for more than 200 vehicles is available. Commute Solutions (a service of the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission) will begin a project this year to assess current needs for park and ride lot facilities and, based on the findings, to upgrade existing and add new P&R lots.

3. The sheriff’s dept. told me they would check the area out, but what crime prevention or security does the Santa Cruz RTP provide for these lots?

Like all park and ride lots or parking on public streets, the terms of using the lot are "park at your own risk." Commute Solutions has produced and distributed a Park and Ride Guide for people using P&R facilities. In light of the incident you reported, we will distribute the guide at the Pasatiempo Park and Ride Lot and request increased patrols of this area by the sheriff and CHP.

As a follow-up, please let us know if you noticed damage to any of the other vehicles in the area. Again, we appreciate your concerns and the time you took to bring them to our attention.

Regards,

Tegan Speiser
Commute Solutions Mgr./Sr. Transportation Planner
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
tspeiser@sccrtc.org - (831) 460-3209

From: Wilson, Kevin [mailto:WILSON_A@vta.org]
Sent: Thursday, March 11, 2010 11:13 AM
To: Tegan Speiser
Subject: RE: Pasatiempo Park and Ride Lot

Thank you for the response. I’m going to give that park and ride another try, based on your information.

Kevin Wilson
VTA's Office of Small & Disadvantaged Businesses
408.321.5831
From: Joseph DePage [mailto:jdepage@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, March 10, 2010 11:20 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Dinner Train

Hello,

Please count me as another resident against the proposed purchase of the UP track. Even though we would receive state funding to purchase this track, we can't afford to maintain this boondoggle.

Please use our transportation dollars where we really need it: our roads, highways and sidewalks.

Thanks!

Joe DePage
Santa Cruz

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
From: David Eselius [mailto:deselius@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, March 12, 2010 2:27 PM
To: DG Eselius (envelop)
Subject: E~Letter ~ The 1970s to date mystifying California social transformations

Friday, March 12, 2010

From: David G. Eselius
      Santa Cruz City, California

To: Santa Cruz County Supervisors, members

CC: Santa Cruz City Council, members
    Capitola City Council, members
    Watsonville City Council, members
    Scotts Valley City Council, members
    Santa Cruz County Regional Transition Commission (RTC), members
    Santa Cruz Sentinel

Subject: The 1970s to date mystifying California funded social transformations
    o Arana Gulch – Political Isolation and redirected funding?

Dear County Supervisors,

In the early 1970s, there was a plan to develop the Live Oak Expressway. This expressway was intended to provide another east-west connection from Live Oak to Santa Cruz. Property was purchased for a right-of-way from Broadway in the city of Santa Cruz across Arana Gulch to Brommer in the county.

Arana Gulch – Political Isolation and redirected funding?

When the early 1970s plan to develop the Live Oak Expressway was dropped, the state must have in lieu given Santa Cruz City (or the SRCCTC) the funded $1.5 million for the Live Oak Expressway. Most likely, the Santa Cruz City Council has spent the money on their social projects.

The state providing funds in lieu of building a project is/was a method of state politics transferring transportation funds to progressive social projects. I believe $8 million was transferred from transportation funds in lieu of rebuilding HWY 1 / HWY 9 intersection.

Which means the City Council can no longer afford to build the bicycle path and Arana Gulch bridge.

The California Coastal Commission provides another political delaying tactic to kill the Arana Gulch project that no longer has funds.

"California Coastal Commission delays Arana Gulch vote, asks city to study another option"

By J.M. BROWN
Posted: 03/12/2010
SANTA CRUZ -- After losing two court rulings in as many years, opponents of the city's plan to pave dual paths through Arana Gulch won a reprieve from the California Coastal Commission on Thursday.

The panel called for a deeper look at a substitute proposal that would avoid the endangered tar plant habitat while still providing access to cyclists and the disabled.

After hearing four hours of public testimony about the Arana Gulch Master Plan, Commissioner Mark Stone, a Santa Cruz County supervisor, made the motion to continue the matter, saying, "We would like to give this project another shot and look to see if there is a way to satisfy the commission."

Stone and a majority of other commissioners had indicated they would defy their own staff and vote against a proposal they saw as a transportation project dressed up as a conservation plan. They said the California Coastal Act would only permit paths to bisect the 68-acre greenbelt if they were "resource dependent," meaning critical to the education and appreciation of an environmentally sensitive habitat.

The turning point in Thursday's hearing, which was part of the commission's first meetings in Santa Cruz in 25 years, came when the agency's ecologist, John Dixon, said he would back the project if only because a lack of human intervention would spell doom for the tarplant. The city's proposal includes a habitat management plan that would fence in sensitive areas and monitor the tar plant's response to the paved paths, but it also would feature two bridges connecting Broadway with Brommer Street through the heart of the gulch.

Commissioners, who walked on the site's dirt paths Thursday morning, instructed Dixon and the agency's internal planners to work with the city to study alternative paths around Arana Gulch, as recommended by the California Native Plant Society. No deadline was set.

The various plans have split environmental camps and avid cyclists who disagree over how to promote an alternative east-west transportation route and safeguard the tarplant.

"This is good," Vince Cheap, a plant society leader, said of the delay. "It will be interesting to see how it will turn out."

The group, along with the Friends of Arana Gulch, sued in 2007 to stop the paving. A state appellate court upheld a Santa Cruz judge's ruling favoring the city, and the California Supreme Court declined to hear a challenge.

Proponents of the project, which dates back to 1994 when the city bought the former dairy site, had hoped the commission would finally put the long-stalled plans into motion. Juliana Rebagliati, the city's planning director, said the county Regional Transportation Commission -- the chief funder of the $4.2 million plan -- has already said an alternative path won't create a safe and accessible corridor connecting Santa Cruz to Live Oak.

Rebagliati said she was "obviously disappointed" and suspected the alternative plan would only raise new concerns, including proximity to other sensitive plant life.

Commissioner Mary Shallenberger of San Francisco said that was a risk worth taking because she was prepared to vote against the paving. She said the agency's staff who endorsed the plan "clearly had it wrong."
Some commissioners were swayed by Gray Hayes, a tarplant expert, who said, "The whole area must be considered to have the tarplant." He said the tarplant seed would not meander well around paved paths.

Commissioner Sara Wan of Malibu agreed, saying well-intentioned transportation initiatives can't come at the expense of a federally protected plant. "The only way to save a species on the verge of extinction is to save its habitat," she said.

For an issue that has sparked intense debate, Thursday's discourse was notably civil. There were only a couple of catcalls from the sign-toting audience, where supporters wore green T-shirts featuring a bicycle and the phrase "Coastal Access." Opponents, who have said creating more access for the disabled was a "ruse," wore bumper stickers on the back of their shirts that read "Save it. Don't Pave It."

Commissioner Richard Bloom of Santa Monica supported the project, saying bicycle access "is a really important issue we need to address."

Takashi Yogi, a member of the 500-member cycling advocacy group People Power, said the plan provides a safe route that protects habitat.

"We can preserve the tarplant not by leaving it alone but by aggressively protecting it," he said.

Several members of the Sierra Club's Santa Cruz chapter favored the paths, saying they would help visitors safely traverse the area. But other members disagreed, including Patricia Matejecck, a founder of Friends of Arana Gulch, who said environmentalists shouldn't support a transportation project "decorated" to look like an interpretive trail system.

"Putting lipstick on a pig doesn't make it a supermodel," she said.

Peter Heylin, who chairs the county's Commission on Disabilities, said the alternative path would not be as usable for people under the federal American Disabilities Act.

"I am a lunatic environmentalist, and I am sort of embarrassed that our brother and sister organizations would call using the ADA issue a Trojan horse," Heylin said.

QUOTES FROM THE CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION HEARING

(Note: According the official Arana Gulch environmental impact report (EIR), the Tarplant most likely never existed (or if it did it does not now exist). Most likely, the mythical plant was used as an environmental ruse to kill the 1970s Live Oak Expressway.)

PRO

Elizabeth Schilling, executive director of the Live Oak Family Resource Center, said the paved paths would address social and economic justice issues by helping low-income people who walk, bike or take public transportation from Mid-County to work downtown or at UC Santa Cruz. 'It's a well thought-out plan for the sake of the sustainability community. It's a chance for the Coastal Commission to act on global warming.'
County planner Susan Harris said paving would encourage more residents to use the trails, which in turn would reduce crime. 'More eyes on the trails make open safes safe for everyone.' She also said the plan protects 90 percent of the greenbelt from public access and ends the practice of eroding the ground through dirt paths. 'This removes all unauthorized trails,' she said.

Councilwoman Cynthia Mathews said the Arana Gulch Master Plan 'represents years and years of effort and cooperation with the community.' She said it includes a 'rigorous program to manage the tarplant, wetland and riparian areas. Fifteen years is a long time and now is the time to bring it to conclusion.'

CON

Former Mayor Sally DiGirolamo, who lives on a street next to Arana Gulch, urged the commission to block the plan. 'The more people, the more damage there is going to be. I can see nothing-good coming from putting in paths. Do what is right not what is popular.'

Jean Brocklebank, spokeswoman for Friends of Arana Gulch, said there is a good reason why the project has been delayed 15 years. 'If it was a good project, it would have been done a long time ago. Something must be wrong with it.'

Steve McCabe, an endangered plant specialist who worked at the UC Santa Cruz Arboretum, said the paved path is being promoted as 'the hybrid car of trails.' He said it's more like the 'Humvee of trails -- the passengers feel cool but they are not helping the environment. If we can't protect endangered plants in Santa Cruz, where do they have a chance?'

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.

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
Hello,

When I follow the recommendation to open the list of due diligence documents available or other information about the project, please consult the RTC website: http://www.sccrtc.org/transit.html#acquire, the SCCRTC general website comes up, and all the documents are 2006 or before. Is there something I can do to get recent documents, as suggested in the above quotation?

Thank you,

Rich Persoff
Watsonville

Hello Rich Persoff -

We received your email regarding due diligence documents available for the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line Acquisition. As noted in the enews, some due diligence documents are currently available and are posted on the RTC website. These are dated 2006 or older. The enews also noted that other due diligence documents may be released at the April 1, 2010, RTC meeting. At that meeting RTC will receive a recommendation regarding the acquisition of the Santa Cruz Branch rail corridor. If the recommendation is to proceed with the acquisition, due diligence documents will be released for public review.

If documents are released before April 1, an email notice will be sent.

Thank you for your correspondence.

- Karena Pushnik
  Senior Transportation Planner/Public Information Coordinator

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission

1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA 95060
United States Department of Transportation
Policy Statement on Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodation
Regulations and Recommendations

Signed on March 11, 2010 and announced March 15, 2010

Purpose

The United States Department of Transportation (DOT) is providing this Policy Statement to reflect the Department’s support for the development of fully integrated active transportation networks. The establishment of well-connected walking and bicycling networks is an important component for livable communities, and their design should be a part of Federal-aid project developments. Walking and bicycling foster safer, more livable, family-friendly communities; promote physical activity and health; and reduce vehicle emissions and fuel use. Legislation and regulations exist that require inclusion of bicycle and pedestrian policies and projects into transportation plans and project development. Accordingly, transportation agencies should plan, fund, and implement improvements to their walking and bicycling networks, including linkages to transit. In addition, DOT encourages transportation agencies to go beyond the minimum requirements, and proactively provide convenient, safe, and context-sensitive facilities that foster increased use by bicyclists and pedestrians of all ages and abilities, and utilize universal design characteristics when appropriate. Transportation programs and facilities should accommodate people of all ages and abilities, including people too young to drive, people who cannot drive, and people who choose not to drive.

Policy Statement

The DOT policy is to incorporate safe and convenient walking and bicycling facilities into transportation projects. Every transportation agency, including DOT, has the responsibility to improve conditions and opportunities for walking and bicycling and to integrate walking and bicycling into their transportation systems. Because of the numerous individual and community benefits that walking and bicycling provide — including health, safety, environmental, transportation, and quality of life — transportation agencies are encouraged to go beyond minimum standards to provide safe and convenient facilities for these modes.

Authority

This policy is based on various sections in the United States Code (U.S.C.) and the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) in Title 23—Highways, Title 49—Transportation, and Title 42—The Public Health and Welfare. These sections, provided in the Appendix, describe how bicyclists and pedestrians of all abilities should be involved throughout the planning process, should not be adversely affected by other transportation projects, and should be able to track annual obligations and expenditures on nonmotorized transportation facilities.

Recommended Actions

The DOT encourages States, local governments, professional associations, community organizations, public transportation agencies, and other government agencies, to adopt similar policy statements on bicycle and pedestrian accommodation as an indication of their commitment to accommodating bicyclists and pedestrians as an integral element of the transportation system. In support of this commitment, transportation agencies and local communities should go beyond minimum design standards and requirements to create safe, attractive, sustainable, accessible, and convenient bicycling and walking networks. Such actions should include:
• Considering walking and bicycling as equals with other transportation modes: The primary goal of a transportation system is to safely and efficiently move people and goods. Walking and bicycling are efficient transportation modes for most short trips and, where convenient intermodal systems exist, these nonmotorized trips can easily be linked with transit to significantly increase trip distance. Because of the benefits they provide, transportation agencies should give the same priority to walking and bicycling as is given to other transportation modes. Walking and bicycling should not be an afterthought in roadway design.

• Ensuring that there are transportation choices for people of all ages and abilities, especially children: Pedestrian and bicycle facilities should meet accessibility requirements and provide safe, convenient, and interconnected transportation networks. For example, children should have safe and convenient options for walking or bicycling to school and parks. People who cannot or prefer not to drive should have safe and efficient transportation choices.

• Going beyond minimum design standards: Transportation agencies are encouraged, when possible, to avoid designing walking and bicycling facilities to the minimum standards. For example, shared-use paths that have been designed to minimum width requirements will need retrofits as more people use them. It is more effective to plan for increased usage than to retrofit an older facility. Planning projects for the long-term should anticipate likely future demand for bicycling and walking facilities and not preclude the provision of future improvements.

• Integrating bicycle and pedestrian accommodation on new, rehabilitated, and limited-access bridges: DOT encourages bicycle and pedestrian accommodation on bridge projects including facilities on limited-access bridges with connections to streets or paths.

• Collecting data on walking and biking trips: The best way to improve transportation networks for any mode is to collect and analyze trip data to optimize investments. Walking and bicycling trip data for many communities are lacking. This data gap can be overcome by establishing routine collection of nonmotorized trip information. Communities that routinely collect walking and bicycling data are able to track trends and prioritize investments to ensure the success of new facilities. These data are also valuable in linking walking and bicycling with transit.

• Setting mode share targets for walking and bicycling and tracking them over time: A byproduct of improved data collection is that communities can establish targets for increasing the percentage of trips made by walking and bicycling.

• Removing snow from sidewalks and shared-use paths: Current maintenance provisions require pedestrian facilities built with Federal funds to be maintained in the same manner as other roadway assets. State Agencies have generally established levels of service on various routes especially as related to snow and ice events.

• Improving nonmotorized facilities during maintenance projects: Many transportation agencies spend most of their transportation funding on maintenance rather than on constructing new facilities. Transportation agencies should find ways to make facility improvements for pedestrians and bicyclists during resurfacing and other maintenance projects.

Conclusion

Increased commitment to and investment in bicycle facilities and walking networks can help meet goals for cleaner, healthier air; less congested roadways; and more livable, safe, cost-efficient communities. Walking and bicycling provide low-cost mobility options that place fewer demands on local roads and highways. DOT recognizes that safe and convenient walking and bicycling facilities may look different depending on the context — appropriate facilities in a rural community may be different from a dense, urban area. However, regardless of regional, climate, and population density differences, it is important that pedestrian and bicycle facilities be integrated into transportation systems. While DOT leads the effort to provide safe and convenient accommodations for pedestrians and bicyclists, success will ultimately depend on transportation agencies across the country embracing and implementing this policy.
APPENDIX

Key Statutes and Regulations Regarding Walking and Bicycling

Planning Requirements

The State and Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) planning regulations describe how walking and bicycling are to be accommodated throughout the planning process (e.g., see 23 CFR 450.200, 23 CFR 450.300, 23 U.S.C. 134(h), and 135(d)). Nonmotorists must be allowed to participate in the planning process and transportation agencies are required to integrate walking and bicycling facilities and programs in their transportation plans to ensure the operability of an intermodal transportation system. Key sections from the U.S.C. and CFR include, with italics added for emphasis:

- The scope of the metropolitan planning process "will address the following factors... (2) Increase the safety for motorized and non-motorized users; (3) Increase the security of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users; (4) Protect and enhance the environment, promote energy conservation, improve the quality of life..." 23 CFR 450.306(a). See 23 CFR 450.206 for similar State requirements.
- Metropolitan transportation plans "...shall, at a minimum, include...existing and proposed transportation facilities (including major roadways, transit, multimodal and intermodal facilities, pedestrian walkways and bicycle facilities, and intermodal connectors that should function as an integrated metropolitan transportation system..." 23 CFR 450.322(f). See 23 CFR 450.216(g) for similar State requirements.
- The plans and transportation improvement programs (TIPs) of all metropolitan areas "shall provide for the development and integrated management and operation of transportation systems and facilities (including accessible pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities)." 23 U.S.C. 134(c)(2) and 49 U.S.C. 5303(c)(2). 23 CFR 450.324(c) states that the TIP "shall include ...trails projects, pedestrian walkways; and bicycle facilities..."
- 23 CFR 450.316(a) states that "The MPOs shall develop and use a documented participation plan that defines a process for providing...representatives of users of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities, and representatives of the disabled, and other interested parties with reasonable opportunities to be involved in the metropolitan planning process." 23 CFR 450.210(a) contains similar language for States. See also 23 U.S.C. 134(i)(5), 135(f)(3), 49 U.S.C. 5303(i)(5), and 5304(f)(3) for additional information about participation by interested parties.

Prohibition of Route Severance

The Secretary has the authority to withhold approval for projects that would negatively impact pedestrians and bicyclists under certain circumstances. Key references in the CFR and U.S.C. include:

- "The Secretary shall not approve any project or take any regulatory action under this title that will result in the severance of an existing major route or have significant adverse impact on the safety for nonmotorized transportation traffic and light motorcycles, unless such project or regulatory action provides for a reasonable alternate route or such a route exists." 23 U.S.C. 109(m).
- "In any case where a highway bridge deck being replaced or rehabilitated with Federal financial participation is located on a highway on which bicycles are permitted to operate at each end of such bridge, and the Secretary determines that the safe accommodation of bicycles can be provided at reasonable cost as part of such replacement or rehabilitation, then such bridge shall be so replaced or rehabilitated as to provide such safe..."
accommodations." 23 U.S.C. 217(e). Although this statutory requirement only mentions bicycles, DOT encourages States and local governments to apply this same policy to pedestrian facilities as well.

- 23 CFR 652 provides "procedures relating to the provision of pedestrian and bicycle accommodations on Federal-aid projects, and Federal participation in the cost of these accommodations and projects."

Project Documentation

- "In metropolitan planning areas, on an annual basis, no later than 90 calendar days following the end of the program year, the State, public transportation operator(s), and the MPO shall cooperatively develop a listing of projects (including investments in pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities) for which funds under 23 U.S.C. or 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53 were obligated in the preceding program year." 23 CFR 332(a).

Accessibility for All Pedestrians

- Public rights-of-way and facilities are required to be accessible to persons with disabilities through the following statutes: Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (Section 504) (29 U.S.C. §794) and Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA) (42 U.S.C. §§ 12131-12164).
- The DOT Section 504 regulation requires the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to monitor the compliance of the self-evaluation and transition plans of Federal-aid recipients (49 CFR §27.11). The FHWA Division offices review pedestrian access compliance with the ADA and Section 504 as part of their routine oversight activities as defined in their stewardship plans.
- FHWA posted its Clarification of FHWA's Oversight Role in Accessibility to explain how to accommodate accessibility in policy, planning, and projects.
Summary of Gas Tax Swap from Santa Cruz Metro
Some text bolded by RTC staff

From: Les White
To: George Dondero
Sent: Monday, March 22, 2010 10:02 PM
Subject: State Update

Good Evening,

Today the California State Senate and Assembly met to consider and pass SB 70 which was developed over the weekend to address the concerns expressed by the Governor in his veto letter. The Bill revises the eligibility of the railroads and other diesel users to maintain their exemptions from the sales tax on diesel fuel sales. The lost revenue from reinstating the exemption is anticipated to be approximately $3 million statewide annually.

Based on the contents of SB 70 the Governor has reversed his position and signed AB 8X 6 and AB 8X 9 this evening. By signing these Bills the State Transit Assistance (STA) Account will receive $400 million for FY 10/11. This means that 90 days from now the State Controller will issue STA checks to Regional Transportation Planning Agencies in the state. The Santa Cruz Regional transportation Commission has always passed the STA funds through to METRO. If the SCCRTC continues this practice METRO anticipates receiving approximately $2.8 million that may be used to support the FY 10/11 Operating Budget.

The Governor's signature also means that the suspension of the STA funding until 2013 is repealed and the a “base level” STA program of approximately $350 million annually will commence in FY 12 and continue in subsequent years. This will mean a base level of STA funding of approximately $2.5 million to the SCCRTC that could be passed through to METRO annually. While the "gas tax swap" is a questionable trade the restoration of transit funding is a welcome relief to transit agencies like METRO who are struggling with the current anemic economy and lower sales tax receipts.

Special credit goes to Assembly Members who demanded that transit be funded in any proposal that would be sent back to the Senate. Bill Monning was a strong voice for restoration of transit funds during the discussions.

Thank you for advocating for transit funding during this process.

Les White
General Manager
Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District
Summary of Adopted Transportation Tax Swap Package
Signed by Governor Schwarzenegger
Modified from summary prepared by California State Association of Counties (CSAC)

The Governor reported on March 15, 2010 that he intended to veto the transportation tax swap package included in the Budget proposal approved by the Legislature (ABx8 6 and ABx8 9) due to concerns raised by private freight railroads and certain other users of diesel fuel. Specifically, under ABx8 6, these users who enjoy tax breaks under current law would see a net increase in taxes. Additionally, the Governor reinforced his desire that the transportation tax swap package include a per-gallon tax cut to consumers.

The Legislature spent the following week working to address the Governor’s concerns and achieve agreement between legislative leaders and the Administration. On March 22, 2010 the Legislature passed SB 70 (Committee on Budget) which included clean-up related to the railroad industry’s concerns and ensures that these users will not be adversely affected by a tax increase, AB 183 (Caballero) which extends a tax credit to first-time homebuyers, and SB 71 (Padilla) which provides a tax exemption on the purchase of clean-technology manufacturing equipment. While the clean-up measures did not specifically provide a per-gallon tax credit to consumers at the pump, the Governor indicated that the tax credits and exemptions passed were sufficient to garner his signature, and sign ABx8 6 and ABx8 9 he did.

The following is a quick recap of ABx8 6 and ABx8 9 and specific details on SB 70:

**ABx8 6:**
- Eliminates the sales tax on gasoline and increases the excise tax on gasoline by 17.3 cents.
- Beginning in 2011-12, increases the sales tax on diesel fuel by 1.75 percent (5% to 6.75%) and decreases the excise tax on diesel by 4.4 cents in 2011-12 (from 18 to 13.6 cents). The Board of Equalization will adjust this tax annually thereafter to maintain revenue neutrality. This change holds local streets and roads harmless under the new law as cities and counties will receive as much new gas tax as would have been otherwise received by Prop 42. The State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) is also to receive the same levels as received by Prop 42.

**ABx8 9:**
- Appropriates $400 million to transit operators to help fund operations for the remainder of 2009-10 and 2010-11.
- Provides that 75 percent of revenue from the diesel sales tax be directed to transit operators beginning in 2011-12 (roughly $350 million per year). The amount available for intercity rail and other state purposes will grow, via receipt of 25 percent of the state sales tax on gas and most of the non-Article XIX transportation funds (about $72 million per year).
- Protects the education funding guarantee (Prop 98).
- Appropriates approximately $700 million of revenue from the increased gas excise tax to go to bond debt service on an annual basis. The remaining funds will be split as follows: 12% SHOPP, 44% STIP, 44% Local Streets and Roads.

**Sales Tax on Diesel Exemption and Impacts of AB 186:**
Under current law, certain fuel consumers are exempt from excise taxes, others pay a reduced excise rate, and others are exempt from sales tax. Included are the following three groups: users of “dyed diesel fuel”, school buses and transit buses, and users of aviation gasoline. The bill revises the tax provisions, so that the special fuel users would not see any negative tax impact from the gas tax swap. For example, the users of dyed diesel fuel would be exempt from the increase in the sales tax on diesel fuel, since they would not receive the compensating benefit of a reduction in the excise tax (because they are already exempt from the excise tax). With the amendments in this bill, the tax changes are not only revenue-neutral overall, but are also revenue neutral for each of the special industry groups. Had dyed diesel users been subject to the sales tax increase, their net tax obligation would have increased about $30 million.

*For more information visit CSAC at: [http://www.csac.counties.org/]*
CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS REPORT

PRESENTED TO:
SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Information submitted on March 18, 2010
For the meeting of April 1, 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

IN VARIOUS LOCATIONS FROM SOUTH OF SAN LORENZO RIVER BRIDGE TO SOUTH OF ROUTE 9/35 INTERSECTION (PM 23.8 – 24.7, 7.7, 7.8)

- 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)
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: Bids opened on March 10, 2010
  - Resident Engineer: Bertha Roman
  - Contractor: Pave Tech Inc., Carlsbad
  - Construction Cost: $253,000
  - Estimated Start Date: Pending award and approval
  - 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 SEPERATION TO PASATIEMPO (PM 1, 17 15.4 – 17.1, 0.1 – 0.7)
  - Project: Highway planting and irrigation
  - Traffic Controls: Shoulder closures with minimal traffic impacts
  - Resident Engineer: Bertha Roman
  - Contractor: Watkin & Bortolussi Inc., San Rafael
  - Construction Cost: $695,000
  - Estimated Start Date: Mid-April 2010
  - Estimated Completion: End of October 2010
  - EA: 129114
HWY. 9 – RETAINING WALL

- NEAR SANTA CRUZ SOUTH OF RINCON CREEK BRIDGE (PM 1.8)
- Project: Construct Retaining Wall
- Project Status: Project advertised 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 advertised February 22, 2010
- Project Manager: Kelly McClain
- Est. Construction Cost: $370,000
- Bid Opening Date: March 23, 2010
- EA: 0S1604

HWY. 129 – REHABILITAE EXISTING PAVEMENT

- IN WATSONVILLE FROM WALKER STREET TO SAISIPUEDES CREEK BRIDGE (PM L1.2 – 0.6)
- Project: Cold plane existing pavement and repave with hot mix asphalt
- Project Status: Project to advertise on March 22, 2010
- Project Manager: Kelly McClain
- Est. Construction Cost: $400,000
- Bid Opening Date: April 21, 2010
- EA: 0S0904
HIGHWAY 1/17 LANDSCAPING PROJECT BEGINS NEXT MONTH

SANTA CRUZ—The second phase of the Hwy. 1/17 Interchange Merge Lanes project—constructed from 2006-2008—includes a project to landscape and re-vegetate the area and is scheduled to begin by the end of April, Caltrans and SCCRTC officials announced today. Landscaping is the final component of this roadway improvement project.

Vegetation, including non-native and invasive species, was removed to construct the Highway 1/17 Merge Lanes project. The re-vegetation effort will replace plants and trees at about a 3 to 1 ratio for those removed. More than 4,000 new plants are proposed for the roadsides, of which almost 700 are trees, including 450 coast redwoods. In addition, more than 1,700 vines will be planted to cover soundwalls and 7 acres will be seeded with native grasses and wildflowers. The city side of soundwalls will be planted with vines wherever possible and wall maintenance will be included through the life of the contract.

Traffic control will consist of periodic shoulder closures during daylight hours, primarily during the first 6 months of the contract. Although no lane closures are expected to occur, a single lane may be closed between 10 pm and 5 am if necessary for construction.

The contract begins by clearing weeds and debris from the roadsides and concludes with a 3-year plant establishment period, carrying it through to about October 2013.

The contractor for this $695,000 project is Watkin & Bortolussi Inc. of San Rafael, CA.

Caltrans reminds motorists that 'We're here to get you there.'

For traffic updates on other state highway projects in Santa Cruz County, the public can call Caltrans District 5 Public Affairs at 831-423-0396 or visit the District 5 website at: http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist05/maint/road/upsr.htm.

###

19-5
Public Hearing Scheduled for 9:30 a.m.

AGENDA: April 1, 2010

TO: Regional Transportation Commission

FROM: Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Team

RE: Public Hearing on the 2010 Regional Transportation Plan and Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (EIR)

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission:

1. Hold a public hearing to receive public testimony on the Draft 2010 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR);

2. Submit comments on the Draft RTP or SEIR to staff or the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) by April 19, 2010.

BACKGROUND

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission’s draft 2010 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and the draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) were released for public review on March 1, 2010. Periodic updates of the state-mandated Regional Transportation Plan provide both a short and long range transportation blueprint of goals, policies, funding projections and project lists to guide decisions regarding the region’s transportation infrastructure, services and operations/maintenance of the infrastructure. The Draft 2010 Regional Transportation Plan includes a description of the existing transportation system, forecasts the amount of funding anticipated for transportation projects over the next 25 years, and identifies transportation programs and projects to address the region’s needs. The plan is an essential first step in securing funding from federal and state sources. Projects identified in the draft RTP include improvements for roadways, highways, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, transit service, specialized transportation for seniors and people with disabilities, park and ride lot construction and transportation demand management programs.

The last update of the RTP was completed in 2005. The 2010 RTP is a minor update which includes updates to the project lists, revisions to the text in order to present the most up-to-date information available on the existing transportation system, and updated funding assumptions. In order to meet federal mandates, the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) must adopt the Metropolitan Transportation Plan, which incorporates the Regional Transportation Plans for Santa Cruz, Monterey, and San Benito Counties by July 2010. A more
extensive update is planned for 2012, which will incorporate forthcoming greenhouse gas emissions targets and land use coordination strategies from Senate Bill 375.

DISCUSSION

Both the Draft RTP and the Draft SEIR were released for public review on March 1, 2010. Notices about the availability of the document were sent to the media and community-based groups, including business, social service, environmental and neighborhood groups. In addition, the Draft 2010 RTP and SEIR are posted on the Commission’s website (www.sccrtc.org/rtp.html) and copies were mailed to libraries.

Copies of the Draft RTP and Draft SEIR were distributed to Commissioners and Alternates the week of March 1st. Please bring your copies to this meeting. Staff and the EIR consultant will give a brief presentation on the draft RTP and SEIR at this meeting.

The Draft 2010 Regional Transportation Plan

The 2010 RTP consists of five main elements: a description of the existing transportation system, the Policy Element, the Action Element, the Financial Element, and a preliminary discussion on Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHG).

The Policy Element identifies the goals, policies, and evaluation measures that guide transportation funding decisions and prioritization. At its June 2009 meeting the Commission re-approved the goals and policies from the Policy Element of the 2005 RTP, with minor amendments. The Action Element of the RTP identifies specific projects, programs and actions necessary to implement the policy element of the RTP. The Financial Element identifies funds available to the region, lists the additional funding needs over the next 25 years, distinguishes between dedicated and discretionary funds and explains uses of both. The 2010 RTP includes revenues from a potential future local half-cent sales tax. The Commission reviewed and approved the draft project list and financial projections in August 2009 to initiate the environmental review work for the RTP. The new GHG chapter recognizes some of the initiatives currently underway and plans for the future to address GHG emissions. This chapter is a work in process with significant advancements expected over the next few years. The RTC reviewed the GHG chapter at its February Policy Workshop. The Executive Summary of the Draft 2010 RTP is attached (Attachment 1).

The Draft RTP estimates $2.6 billion in funding (unescalated) will be available for transportation projects over the next 25 years, based on historic and current trends. The RTC has discretion over only $200 million of those funds. Given the large number of regionally significant projects identified in the document and limited funds available to the RTC each year, the RTC should begin to consider which projects it may want to prioritize for RTC-discretionary funds over the next ten years.
As approved by the Commission at its February 2009 meeting, environmental review of the RTP was done as a joint effort with the Commission’s partner agencies: the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG); the Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC); and San Benito Council of Governments (SBCOG). A Supplemental EIR has been prepared that updates information provided in the previous 2005 EIR. The Draft SEIR Executive Summary is attached (Attachment 2).

The SEIR provides program level environmental analysis on the transportation plans for the tri-county region. The document describes the potential environmental effects which may be associated with implementation of the plans on a regional, system-wide basis, rather than on a project-by-project basis. The SEIR also includes an analysis of Greenhouse Gas emissions. The intent of this analysis is to supplement the Air Quality section of the SEIR.

The Draft SEIR also provides an evaluation of the following four alternatives to implementation of only the Within Projected Funds (Constrained) list of projects.

1. The “No Build” alternative represents a scenario in which no new transportation projects would be constructed beyond maintenance of existing transportation infrastructure.

2. The “Financially Unconstrained” alternative represents a more extensive range of transportation system modifications, since it would encompass all of the transportation programs and projects identified as financially constrained, as well as all of the transportation programs and projects identified as Unconstrained.

3. The “Financially Constrained – No New Revenues” evaluates a scenario where some major projects may be postponed or jeopardized in the absence of funding, beyond those already programmed to projects.

4. Finally, the “GHG-Reduction” alternative assumes long-term changes in land use and circulation patterns, resulting in enhanced coordination between land use and transportation systems, with the ultimate goal of further reducing greenhouse gases and other environmental benefits. The environmental impacts associated with the GHG Reduction alternative are anticipated to more concentrated in a smaller geographic area, but ultimately result in fewer overall environmental impacts throughout the region. For these reasons, the “GHG Reduction” alternative would be considered the “environmentally superior” alternative. Such an alternative, however, will rely upon the long term coordination of regional land use and transportation planning efforts, and is not considered viable at this time.

Public Hearing

A public hearing has been scheduled and noticed for 9:30 a.m. on the Draft RTP & SEIR. Staff recommends that the Commission accept public comments on both the Draft 2010 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR).
immediately following the presentation. Staff will distribute any written comments received at the meeting. All comments received related to the Draft SEIR will be forwarded to AMBAG as the Lead Agency on that document.

Next Steps

Comments on the Draft RTP and SEIR are due April 19, 2010. The final 2010 RTP is scheduled for adoption by the RTC in May. AMBAG is schedule to certify the SEIR at its May 12, 2010 meeting.

SUMMARY

The RTC is responsible for preparing and updating the long-range Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) for Santa Cruz County. The draft Regional Transportation Plan and Supplemental Environmental Impact Report were released on March 1, starting the public review period which ends on April 19, 2010. A public hearing on these documents is scheduled for this meeting. The full documents are available on the RTC’s website: www.sccrtc.org/rtp.html.

Attachments:
1. Draft RTP Executive Summary
2. Draft SEIR Executive Summary

Staff Report Prepared by: Grace Blakeslee, Rachel Moriconi and Karena Pushnik
The RTP document was prepared with assistance from project sponsors and the entire RTC staff.
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March 2010
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission

Full document available online at: www.sccrtc.org/rtp.html
The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (herein referred to as the “RTC” or “Commission”) periodically completes a Regional Transportation Plan to guide short- and long-range transportation planning and project implementation for the county.

This 2010 Regional Transportation Plan (called the “2010 RTP”) is a minor update of the last version, completed in 2005, and provides guidance for transportation policy and projects through the year 2035. The 2010 RTP is the RTC’s comprehensive planning document, which identifies the goals, projects, and programs that will improve and maintain our transportation system over the next twenty-five years. Individual projects listed in the 2010 RTP must still undergo separate design and environmental processes, and can only be implemented as local, state and federal funds become available.

2010 PLAN ORGANIZATION

The 2010 RTP is organized into the following chapters:

- Chapter One  Introduction
- Chapter Two  Our Transportation System
- Chapter Three  Goals and Policies
- Chapter Four  The Investment Program
- Chapter Five  Environmental and Air Quality Review of the 2010 RTP
- Chapter Six  Greenhouse Gas Emissions- Meeting the Challenge

DEVELOPING THE 2010 RTP

The 2010 RTP is a minor update of the 2005 Plan which addresses the existing transportation system and transportation needs of the entire county. Such a comprehensive plan necessarily involves the cooperation of many local, regional and state agencies. Public input is also critical to the RTC’s planning and decision-making process. Comments from a wide range of individuals, public interest groups, and local agencies have been solicited over the past five years, most notably during extensive Transportation Funding Task Force workshops in 2006 and 2007. During development of the 2010 RTP, public input was sought through public meetings on key elements of the RTP. Additionally, in submitting projects for consideration, project sponsors took into consideration input they receive directly from the public.
INCREASED TRAFFIC CONGESTION AND COMPETING DEMANDS FOR LIMITED TRANSPORTATION DOLLARS

Public sentiment on policy and funding decisions can be strong in Santa Cruz County, and transportation issues are no exception. Traffic congestion in the county continues to be a source of frustration and the community has expressed many ideas about how the limited funds available for highway, transit, road, and alternative transportation projects should be spent. A number of factors are clear:

- Santa Cruz County has a rich multi-modal transportation network. The county’s existing transportation network comprises a broad range of transportation facilities and modes, including: state highways, local roads and streets, an extensive bus system and specialized transport system for seniors and people with disabilities, bikeways, sidewalks, a rail line, an airport, and traffic management systems such as carpool programs, Park and Ride lots, Intelligent Transportation System technology, and signal synchronization. This “multi-modal” transportation network is crucial to meeting the travel needs of all county residents, including drivers, non-drivers and commercial traffic. Notably, approximately one-third of county residents do not drive, and an aging population is likely to increase the demand for transit, safe pedestrian routes, and specialized transport services.

- Traffic congestion exists in Santa Cruz County and will not go away in the foreseeable future. Population growth and region-wide jobs to housing imbalances that encourage driving as the mode of choice result in more drivers making more automobile trips. The daily traffic jams on Highway 1 and local streets are only the most obvious example of increasing congestion on county roadways.

- Transit service is limited by available revenues. In response to reduced revenues from the half-cent local transit sales tax and state cuts to transit funding, bus service reductions will be considered.

- Maintenance needs for the existing transportation network are increasing. Roadway, bikeway, sidewalk, bridge and other repairs must be addressed in parallel with capacity and operational enhancements. If ongoing routine maintenance needs are not addressed, the cost of deferred maintenance will grow exponentially, leaving little funding for major improvements.

- The complexity of transportation solutions is increasing as communities find that new projects must be shoehorned into existing urban areas. Adding new highway lanes, widening city streets, building new roads, adding passenger rail service, or building new bus facilities are neither simple nor inexpensive propositions. Project delays, environmental concerns, neighborhood opposition, and right-of-way needs can increase cost, and, in some cases, may cause a funded project to be withdrawn.

- All transportation modes and facilities are subsidized with public funding generated from tax revenues—including freeways, local roads, bus and rail transit, and transportation for people with special needs. Many of the subsidies are indirect and
are not covered in the 2010 RTP or administered by the RTC. Examples of indirect transportation subsidies include pollution clean-up costs, law enforcement, emergency response costs and parking subsidies.

- The RTC has discretion over less than 10% of the transportation funds typically available to the region. The vast majority of transportation funding is dedicated to specific uses—such as airport improvements, highway safety and transit operations.

- The ebb and flow of federal, state, regional, and local funding affects project timing. Many needed projects with already identified funding have been delayed several years as the result of downturns in the economy that affect the availability of those funds.

- Existing funds are insufficient to finance major transportation improvements and ongoing maintenance. Additionally, the competition for limited state and federal funds favors large urban areas with local sources of revenues, such as local transportation sales taxes. New revenue sources will be needed to make major modifications to our transportation system and to eliminate the backlog of maintenance needs.

- Reaching consensus on transportation improvements is difficult, especially in light of limited funds, competing interests, and the inevitable impacts of major projects. In an attempt to generate sufficient funds for local transportation projects, the RTC proposed a new half-cent sales tax on the November 2004 ballot. Though voters rejected this first attempt, efforts continue to generate consensus and the 2010 RTP assumes that voters will approve a new tax in the next few years.

GOALS AND POLICIES

The 2010 RTP carries forward goals from the 2001 and 2005 RTP, which are to:

- Preserve and maintain the existing transportation system, emphasizing safety and efficiency.
- Increase mobility by providing an improved and integrated multi-modal transportation system.
- Coordinate land use and transportation decisions to ensure that the region’s social, cultural, and economic vitality are sustained for current and future generations.
- Ensure that the transportation system complements and enhances the natural environment of the Monterey Bay region and minimizes greenhouse gas emissions.
- Make the most efficient use of limited transportation financial resources.
- Solicit broad public input on all aspects of regional and local transportation plans, projects, and funding.
THE INVESTMENT PROGRAM

The Goals and Policies — along with local priorities, potential environmental impacts, safety, economic and transportation equity considerations, funding constraints, and identified gaps in the existing transportation network — provided the basis for the identification of over 450 transportation improvement projects and programs that are needed to address the region’s mobility, accessibility, and economic and environmental sustainability needs over the next 25 years. Together with a discussion of how they will be funded, these projects and programs constitute the 2010 RTP’s “Investment Program,” described in Chapter 4.

FUNDING PROJECTION

During the next 25 years, approximately $2.6 billion from federal, state, and local funding sources is projected to be available to finance transportation projects in Santa Cruz County.

Of the $2.6 billion projected to be available, over 75 percent is dedicated to specific types of projects. Approximately $1 billion of that dedicated funding is slated for transit service and capital improvements. A large proportion of transit revenues come from our county’s dedicated half-cent local sales tax for transit.

As noted earlier, the RTP also assumes that the region’s voters will approve a new half-cent transportation sales tax measure in the next few years. Approximately 14 percent of the $2.6 billion is anticipated from that new sales tax, and it would be up to the discretion of the voters which projects receive those funds, though this RTP assumes that those funds will be dedicated to the projects and programs listed in the 2010 RTP.

Less than 10% of the $2.6 billion, $200 million over the coming 25 years, are discretionary funds under the direct control of the RTC.

It is important to note that transportation funding can be incredibly unpredictable. State and federal actions can result in elimination of certain funding programs or diversion of transportation funds to the State General Fund, as has happened regularly to transit funds over the past several years. Inevitably, some of the funding sources assumed within the financial projections for this plan will not actually be realized, depending on decisions made by voters and the state and federal governments. In addition, the RTC is constantly working with other transportation planning agencies to develop new transportation revenue sources, but it is always very challenging to do so.

Even if all of the revenues assumed in this document are realized these projected funds are insufficient to keep up with maintenance, operational, safety, and major improvement needs of the region. As such, this document identifies additional sources for new funds that could be made available for “unconstrained” projects. These could include new local or state gas taxes, vehicle registration fees, statewide transportation bonds, special federal funding programs (such as American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA), Jobs for Main Street Act, special state legislative budget requests, and new grant or transportation impact fee programs.
FUNDING PROJECTS

The costs of individual projects and programs listed in the Investment Program are divided in two categories based on priority, funding availability, and potential environmental effects. Transportation improvements that can be funded with foreseeable transportation revenues between 2010 and 2035 are shown as “Constrained”. This group includes already funded projects to be constructed in the short term, and planned projects that could be constructed anytime within the 2010 RTP’s 25-year time-line as projected funds become available. Transportation improvements to be implemented if new revenues are generated or become available show their funding as “Unconstrained”. Some projects are identified with both constrained and unconstrained funds, indicating a need for additional funds to complete the entire project, though portions of those projects may be completed using anticipated funding.

The 2010 RTP assigns future transportation funds to a range of projects and programs designed to maintain the current transportation system, provide traffic congestion relief and broaden transportation options. Key proposals include:

- Maintenance of the existing transportation network including roads, highways, bike lanes, sidewalks, and transit
- Safety and operational improvements to Highways 1, 9, 17, 129 and 152
- Adding High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes on Highway 1 between Aptos and Santa Cruz to facilitate increased carpool, vanpool and transit use
- Improvements to major arterial roads -- including bus, pedestrian and bicycle facilities -- to better accommodate local and commute traffic
- Expanded bus service, with additional Highway 17 Express buses and more Park and Ride lots to serve Silicon Valley, UCSC, and south county commuters
- Construction of the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network along the coast
- Local bicycle and pedestrian projects designed to improve the feasibility of bicycle commuting, and provide safe bicycle and pedestrian routes to schools
- Expansion of specialized transport services to meet the projected increases in senior and disabled populations
- Increased availability of accurate and timely information about road conditions, transit operations, and other transportation options
- Landscaping and lighting improvements to make transportation corridors part of livable communities
IMPLEMENTING THE INVESTMENT PROGRAM

Development of the RTP project list is only the first step towards actual implementation of the projects identified in the 2010 RTP. Prior to the beginning of construction for each project, a number of steps must be taken to secure funds and satisfy environmental and funding requirements, requiring from 6 months to 20 years, depending on the particular project’s complexity, impacts, level of public interest, and availability of funds. These steps include: developing a detailed project cost estimate; obtaining local, state and/or federal grants; designing the project; determining the project’s environmental impacts according to state and federal laws; securing right-of-way, if necessary; and throughout the process, incorporating public input.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS STRATEGIES

New for the 2010 RTP, the RTC has included a discussion on greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) in relation to transportation planning. In the absence of tools to measure the effectiveness of specific RTC policies towards reducing GHGs and without having the specific GHG reduction targets from the state, the new chapter introduces some of the best practices which could be included in a portfolio of strategies to meet future emission reduction goals in Santa Cruz County. The discussion suggests that a combination of strategies is essential to bending the curve of future emissions downward. While technological developments in vehicle design and clean fuels are outside the purview of the RTC, the RTP can focus on strategies that transform mobility as a way to affect GHG trends. The RTP includes many projects that pro-actively implement GHG reduction strategies such as: operating a Commute Solutions program to encourage ridesharing; funding freeway service patrols to remove incidents and improve traffic flow; adding high occupancy vehicle lanes in the Highway 1 corridor to encourage carpools, vanpools and transit use; acquiring the rail corridor for goods movement, bicycle and pedestrian access and possible passenger service; and supporting bicycle, pedestrian and transit projects.

ENVIRONMENTAL AND AIR QUALITY REVIEW OF THE 2010 RTP

The California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 (CEQA) requires that the environmental effects of the 2010 RTP be fully analyzed. This analysis was prepared as a separate program level Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) to the 2005 RTP EIR, released along with the 2010 RTP. The SEIR was prepared in coordination with the Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC), the San Benito Council of Governments (SBCOG), and the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG). The SEIR supplements the certified 2005 RTP EIR by adding to the information provided in the 2005 EIR based on minor changes to the project lists and policies and addressing new information not previously available. The SEIR analyzes the potential environmental impacts of the 2010 RTP, including alternative investment scenarios, and identifies potential mitigation measures for impacts of the transportation program for the whole region. The SEIR does not analyze impacts of, or mitigations for, individual projects, as each project will undergo a separate environmental review process. The respective agency sponsors will conduct this project-specific review once funding is received and the project development process is initiated.
Together Santa Cruz, Monterey, and San Benito Counties comprise the North Central Coast Air basin (NCCAB). The three county region (or NCCAB) is an attainment area for ozone precursors and therefore exempt from conformity analysis. However, several projects in the plan implement the Air District’s approved Transportation Control Measures for the region, which are developed to reduce transportation-related emissions by reducing vehicle use or improving traffic flow.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (REPLACED IN ENTIRETY)

This Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) represents the environmental review for the 2010 Monterey Bay Area Metropolitan Transportation Plan (“2010 MTP”), which is the “project” under review. This document supplements the certified 2005 Monterey Bay Area MTP EIR, which is incorporated by reference. The information contained in this SEIR is intended to provide AMBAG with the environmental information necessary to consider approval and adoption of the project. The 2010 MTP, collectively, consists of the 2010 Monterey County Regional Transportation Plan (2010 MC-RTP), the 2010 Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Plan (2010 SCC-RTP) and the 2010 San Benito County Regional Transportation Plan (2010 SBC-RTP).

2010 MTP Project Overview

A series of transportation projects and programs as proposed, evaluated and selected at the county-wide level, serve as the basis for the 2010 MTP. In receipt of each county’s project list, AMBAG has been assured by the Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs) of each county that their RTP was developed taking into account transportation need, an evaluation of alternatives to meet that need, and the resultant plan and/or program selection to satisfy transportation needs. Most importantly, the RTPs reflect an extensive public involvement and participation process, as outlined in AMBAG’s Monterey Bay Region Public Participation Plan (June 11, 2008). The end product is a vision for a transportation system to serve the three-county region, based on public input, which embraces various modes of transportation to efficiently maximize the movement of people and goods, and to reduce energy consumption and air pollution through the year 2035.

The 2010 MTP does not provide project designs or construction schedules, and adoption of this comprehensive planning document does not represent an approval action for any of the individual transportation programs or projects. Details relating to the site-specific alignment, location, design and scheduling of the transportation improvement projects identified in the 2010 MTP are not fixed in, or defined by, this document. The adoption of the 2010 MTP represents an essential first step in qualifying for the receipt of the funding necessary to permit the implementation of programs and projects in the financially constrained Action Element of the 2010 MTP.

AMBAG as Lead Agency under CEQA

The Lead Agency in the development of the 2010 MTP and in the preparation of this Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) is the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG). The 2010 MTP expresses the priorities of AMBAG, TAMC, SCCRTC, SBCOG and
their partner planning/programming agencies, for transportation system improvements and programs within the Monterey Bay region. This Program SEIR describes, in general terms, the probable environmental effects which may be associated with those expressed priorities on a regional, system-wide basis, rather than on a project-by-project basis.

The SEIR updates information provided in the previous EIRs prepared on earlier MTPs and RTPs. These changes include slight revisions to policy statements; the deletion of some projects which appeared on previous financially constrained Action Element lists (but which have since been completed or have been dropped from consideration); the addition of new projects to the financially constrained Action Element and the Financially Unconstrained Project Lists; revisions of the Financial Element to reflect changes in anticipated revenues; a standalone Consistency Analysis to evaluate 2010 MTP consistency with other plans and programs currently in force within the region; a programmatic Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions Analysis; the addition of another alternative - the “GHG-Reduction” Alternative - and new population and housing forecasts released by AMBAG in 2008.

This SEIR identifies measures which appear to be available for, and effective in, mitigating the significant environmental effects associated with the implementation of the programs and projects identified in the financially constrained Action Element of the 2010 MTP. These mitigation measures, as identified, are recommendations to the appropriate agency responsible for the actual implementation of the projects. The identified mitigation measures may be subject to change based on comments received on the SEIR during the review period, and on the determination made by the respective governing boards in reviewing the SEIR.

What the 2010 MTP SEIR Is

This SEIR identifies the long-term environmental impacts of the components of the 2010 MTP and provides the basis for further project-level CEQA (and National Environmental Policy Act [NEPA]) compliance for implementation of future transportation projects. There are only a few chapters from the certified 2005 MTP EIR that have been updated in their entirety to contain “new information of substantial importance” based on updates from the 2010 MTP.

What this SEIR is Not

This SEIR is not a ‘comprehensive’ update to every chapter of the certified 2005 MTP EIR. As discussed above, several chapters have been updated in their entirety. Several other chapters, however, have been updated with minor additions or clarifying information. In those cases, chapters are identified with the label “Errata Changes Only”, and only the pages with text changes are reproduced.

The remaining chapters of the 2005 MTP EIR, requiring only temporal edits that do not include new information of substantial importance, remain valid, and are not reproduced within this SEIR. Those chapters are labeled with the heading “No Changes”.
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 Alternatives Evaluated

The SEIR evaluates four alternatives to the adoption of the 2010 MTP. In this document, the “No Build” alternative represents a scenario in which no new construction on transportation system improvement projects would take place in the absence of the 2010 MTP, although maintenance of the existing transportation infrastructure would continue. The “Financially Unconstrained” alternative represents a more extensive range of transportation system improvements than anticipated under the 2010 MTP, since it would encompass all of the transportation system improvement programs and projects identified in the financially constrained Action Element of the 2010 MTP, as well as all of the transportation system improvement programs and projects identified in the Financially Unconstrained Project Lists of the 2010 MTP. The “Financially Constrained – No New Revenues” evaluates a scenario where some major projects may be postponed or jeopardized in the absence of new funding sources. Finally, the “GHG-Reduction” alternative assumes long-term changes in land use and circulation patterns (consistent with Senate Bill (SB) 375 and the AMBAG Draft Blueprint Plan), resulting in enhanced coordination between land use and transportation systems, with the ultimate goal of further reducing greenhouse gases and other environmental benefits.

For the purposes of CEQA analysis, the “GHG Reduction” alternative is identified as the environmentally superior alternative. Such an alternative, however, will rely upon the long term coordination of regional land use and transportation planning efforts, and is not considered a viable “option” to the 2010 MTP at this time.

 Impact and Mitigation Summary Table

A “program-level” summary of the potentially significant adverse environmental impacts of the project is identified in the table on the following pages, along with corresponding mitigation measures and strategies. Although the impact analysis and resulting mitigation changed very little from 2005, the entire table has been produced here so that the public and reviewing agencies will have a complete summary of all impact and mitigation statements in one place.

In reviewing this analysis summary, it is important to remember that these potential impacts are not directly related to the adoption of the 2010 MTP. By itself, the adoption of the 2010 MTP would not be sufficient to enable any of the projects identified in the financially constrained Action Element of the 2010 MTP to proceed, and would not directly result in any adverse environmental impacts. Under CEQA, each of the appropriate agencies responsible for the actual implementation of projects identified in the financially constrained Action Element of the 2010 MTP will be required to provide some level of project-specific environmental review for each of the projects listed once such projects have been designed and formally proposed for approval.

As a result, several impacts are identified as “significant and unavoidable” until such time that they are reviewed, analyzed and mitigated at the project specific level.
RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) accept the Progress Report for the period November 2009 through March 2010 (Attachment 1) for the Highway 1 HOV Lane project and the Soquel/Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes project.

BACKGROUND

The 1986 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) identified improvements to Highway 1 as a high priority. In 2003, the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC), in cooperation with Caltrans and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), initiated preliminary design and environmental studies (referred to as the Project Approval/Environmental Documentation (PA/ED) phase) to add high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes to Highway 1 from Morrissey Boulevard in Santa Cruz to Larkin Valley Road in Aptos. For additional background and current information, visit the project website at: www.sccrtc.org/hov.

In 2002, Caltrans identified auxiliary lanes between Soquel Avenue and Morrissey Boulevard as a relatively low cost operational improvement that would provide congestion relief to the busiest segment of Highway 1. The RTC has been managing the project development process, in coordination with Caltrans and FHWA, since receiving federal funds in 2005 and subsequently securing $16.2 million in Proposition 1B - Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA) funds to construct the project. The Draft Environmental Document (DED) was released for public comment in October 2008 and the Project Development Team responded to community and agency comments to preparation of the Final Environmental Document which was approved by Caltrans and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) in September 2009. In January 2010, the consultant team began preparation of the final design plans for the project. For additional background and current information, visit the project website: www.sccrtc.org/SoquelMorrissey

DISCUSSION

RTC Project Manager, Kim Shultz will provide an oral presentation of the Progress Report (Attachment 1) for both the Highway 1 HOV Lane project and the Soquel/Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes project.

Highway 1 Soquel/ Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes Project

Work has progressed on the final engineering phase and the consultant team anticipates reaching the 65% design level milestone in April 2010. The 65% design plans provide
construction details, outline construction costs and specifications, and will be reviewed by Caltrans before advancing further in the design process. The consultant construction management firm will also review these plans as part of the preconstruction duties authorized by the RTC in February 2010.

The 65% design plans will also be used to work with resource agencies to coordinate mitigation actions in response to the project’s impact on sensitive environmental resources. Approximately 1.75 acres is required to mitigate permanent (.5 acre) and temporary (.25 acre) impacts caused by the project. The project team is currently negotiating with the City of Watsonville to participate in the Phase 2 Manabe Wetlands Restoration project to meet the riparian woodland, wetlands, and wet grassland mitigation requirements for this project.

As part of this process a Habitat Mitigation and Monitoring Plan is being prepared to address jurisdictional concerns of the Army Corp of Engineers, National Marine Fisheries Service, Regional Water Quality Control Board, and the California Department of Fish and Game.

Public Outreach

Two public meetings are planned over the next few months to gather community input and report back on opportunities to express preferences on specific project architectural and landscaping elements of the project. This is a requirement of the environmental document in response to community sensitivity to the aesthetic impacts of the project. Project elements for which community preference will be sought include the appearance of the La Fonda Bridge, retaining walls, concrete barriers, and roadside landscaping.

Construction Schedule

The Project Development Team (PDT) is currently reviewing the construction schedule in response to environmental and funding constraints. Without extensive mitigation action, environmental restrictions affect the timing of construction activity in wetland areas and the removal of existing trees that impact bird nesting areas. In response to these constraints, project sponsors will sometimes break a project into separate biddable phases, however, existing funding constraints and reliance on Proposition 1B funds to construct this project present potential costs and risks to breaking this project into different phases. Staff will present this item in greater detail in the next couple of months with the recommendation of the PDT on how best to proceed.

**Highway 1 HOV Lane Project**

Preliminary environmental technical studies completed in 2007 are being revised as required in response to agreement on geometric design details with Caltrans and current regulations. The updated draft environmental document along with technical reports will be submitted to Caltrans for review in May/June 2010.

Phased Implementation Plan

As part of the environmental documentation, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) requires submittal of a realistic project financing/implementation plan prior to approval of the
Final Environmental Document (FED). The PDT has begun discussions on the content and methodology of a phased implementation plan, which would prioritize the construction phases to provide the best congestion relief in the most cost effective manner while minimizing construction impacts to the surrounding community and allowing continued use of the corridor.

The implementation plan will assume the passage of a local transportation sales tax to provide the majority of the project funding as stipulated in the Regional Transportation Plan. In the event a sales tax measure is not in place by the anticipated approval date of the FED (Spring 2013) then one or more stand alone project pieces could be pursued from existing revenue sources until a measure does pass in a future year.

Sustainable Project Elements

The PDT will be working closely in the ensuing months to analyze and include recommendations of the sustainable transportation access rating system (STARS) as appropriate in the project environmental document. The HOV Lane project already incorporates many elements and features that support sustainable transportation. STARS can provide a framework to evaluate and strengthen those aspects to provide greatest benefit at the least cost.

SUMMARY

Staff will present the Progress Report for the period November 2009 through March 2010 (Attachment 1) for the Highway 1 HOV Lane project and the Soquel/Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes project. Through this period work has progressed on final engineering phase of the Soquel/Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes project and the consultant team anticipates reaching the 65% design level milestone in April 2010. The 65% design plans will be used to secure approval of mitigation plans for impacted environmental resources through respective state and federal resource agencies. The Project Development Team is currently reviewing the construction schedule for the Auxiliary Lanes project in response to environmental and funding constraints. Staff will provide details and recommendations at a meeting in the near future. The technical environmental documents are being updated on the HOV Lane project as necessary in response to agreement on geometric design details with Caltrans and current regulations.

Attachments:
MEMORANDUM

TO: SCCRTC
FROM: Nolte Associates, Inc.
PROJ #: Route 1 HOV Lane (SJ0086001) and Soquel/Morrissey PS&E (SJ0086003)
DATE: March 15, 2010
SUBJECT: Commission Status Report for Period: November 2009 through March 2010

I. PROJECT STATUS UPDATE (Soquel/Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes PS&E)

In December 2009, the RTC approved a contract with Nolte Associates for the final engineering phase (referred to as Plans, Specifications, and Estimates (PS&E)) of the Auxiliary Lanes project. This action was consistent with the original project schedule adopted by RTC, Caltrans, and the California Transportation Commission (CTC) in April 2007. However, state transportation funding constraints prevented staff from issuing a Notice to Proceed (NTP) to Nolte Associates until the CTC authorized release of funds together with accepting the final environmental document (FED) in October 2009.

1. Environmental

The Final Environmental Document for the project was approved by the FHWA and Caltrans in September 2009. The Notice of Determination (CEQA) was stamped and Notice of Availability of FONSI was posted with the State Clearinghouse on September 21, 2009.

The proposed project will result in permanent and temporary impacts to Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) and California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) jurisdictional areas. In consultations with Caltrans, a Habitat Mitigation and Monitoring Plan (HMMP) is under preparation to describe the proposed methods for mitigating project impacts within ACOE, National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), Regional Water Quality Control Board, and CDFG jurisdiction resulting from implementation of the Highway 1 Soquel to Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes Project (project).

The City of Watsonville is developing construction plans for the Phase 2 of the Manabe Wetlands Restoration Project in the City of Watsonville. The Auxiliary Lanes mitigation requirements for riparian woodland, wetlands, and wet grassland areas are similar to those proposed as part of the Phase 2 of Manabe Wetlands Restoration project offering off-site mitigation opportunities for the proposed Auxiliary Lanes project.

The project team is discussing equitable terms of participation with the City of Watsonville in funding those portions of the Phase 2 improvements that meet the environmental mitigation requirements of the Auxiliary Lane project. This restoration project is scheduled to go in construction in the summer of 2011.
2. **Engineering**

The Project Report (PR) was approved by Caltrans in September 2009. The Project Report was refined to be consistent with the Final Environmental Document.

   a. **Preliminary Engineering**

   Topographic Survey – Base map prepared under the previous (PAED) phase of the project was updated with supplemental field surveys. The field surveys also located existing utilities in areas where new design may necessitate re-location or avoidance.

   Boundary Survey – The field boundary surveys established and confirmed the existing Caltrans right of way lines. Right-of-way mapping and temporary construction easements were submitted to Caltrans Right-of-Way Division for review. Caltrans approved the Right-of-Way mapping along with four Plats and legal description for temporary construction easements required for the new La Fonda bridge construction.

   The field boundary surveys for work within city of Santa Cruz limits were established and confirmed the existing City right of way lines and determined the need for a temporary construction easement for the proposed improvements along Morrissey Boulevard and Rooney Street. The City of Santa Cruz has committed to securing easements outside of Caltrans right-of-way prior to bidding the construction contract.

   b. **PS&E Engineering**

   The preliminary design developed under the previous (PAED) phase is being advanced to develop roadway geometric plans and Bridge Plans based on the updated base map. The project geometrics were evaluated to identify opportunities to reduce retaining wall heights. One wall was eliminated. Preliminary plans, at 35% design level, along with soil and drainage reports were submitted to Caltrans for review in mid-October 2009. Comments on the 35% plans were received in January 2010. Caltrans comments were addressed and resolved and now the consultant team is preparing the 65% design plans. The 65% design plans will further enhance design elements, provide construction details and outline construction costs and specifications.

   A meeting was held in September 2009 with Caltrans Right-of-Way and Utilities staff to proceed with coordination of resolving utility conflicts for the project. Preliminary utility conflict plans were submitted to Caltrans in September 2009. Caltrans has begun coordinating with utility companies regarding potential conflicts with proposed improvements.

   La Fonda Avenue Bridge Type Selection report was prepared and identified proposed structural and architectural elements for the La Fonda bridge structure. Caltrans has approved the type selection report and is working with the consultant team to provide input on the architectural treatments for La Fonda Avenue Bridge. The 65% design plans will include La Fonda Bridge structural design plans.

   The 65% design plans along with the mitigation plan will be used to coordinate with resource agencies to secure construction permits.

3. **Public Outreach**

The PS&E phase plans to conduct two Highway Aesthetics Community Advisory meetings after completion of 65% design plans. The purpose of the community meetings is to gather public input on preferences for improving the visual qualities of the highway corridor. The appearance
of La Fonda Bridge, retaining walls, concrete barriers and roadside landscaping scheme are some of the elements of visual quality that will be discussed at the public meetings.

4. **Schedule**

A detailed schedule through final design has been developed and is being used by the Project Development Team (PDT) to coordinate and monitor progress on the project. The following are major milestones in the current schedule. ‘CMIA schedule’ refers to the schedule committed to the California Transportation Commission as a condition of funding from Proposition 1B for construction of the project. The scheduled completion of the PS&E is February 2011.

- ✔ Final ED submittal to FHWA  
  - February/March 2009
- ✔ Approval of Final Environmental Document and Project Report  
  - September 2009 (CMIA schedule = June ’09)
- ✔ Begin Final Design  
  - September 2008 (35% Design Authorized)
- ✔ Preliminary Design 35% plans  
  - October 2009 (Submitted)
- ✔ Begin PS&E  
  - December 2009
- ➢ Submit 65% Plans  
  - April 2010
- ➢ Submit 95% Plans  
  - August 2010
- ➢ Final Bid Package  
  - February 2011
- ➢ RTC Advertise/Award  
  - April 2011
- ➢ Begin Construction  
  - July 2011*

*Subject to CMIA funding availability and issuance of construction permits
II. PROJECT STATUS UPDATE (HOV Lane Project)

1. Environmental
   a. Technical Studies

   All draft technical reports in support of the Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Assessment were completed and submitted to Caltrans for review in August, 2007. Caltrans comments have been received on all the reports. Revisions are being performed to match updated geometrics and current regulations. The studies/reports include:

   ✓ air quality
   ✓ biology
   ✓ community impact/land use
   ✓ cultural resources
   ✓ energy
   ✓ geology/seismic
   ✓ growth inducement
   ✓ hazardous wastes
   ✓ hydrology/water quality
   ✓ noise
   ✓ paleontology
   ✓ transit market analysis
   ✓ visual

   b. Other Environmental Issues

   i. Global Warming [unchanged]

   The California Air Resources Board (CARB) has not yet issued methodology for evaluating greenhouse gases at a project level. In conformance to the Caltrans’ guidance, the project addresses this issue through a qualitative analytical approach. The project is designed to reduce congestion and provide increased incentive for people to carpool or use transit.

   ii. Growth Inducement: [unchanged]

   A quantitative growth inducement study incorporating reviews by a panel of local land use, economic development, and real estate professionals was performed and incorporated into the administrative draft EIR/EA.

   iii. Transit Market Analysis [unchanged]

   A quantitative analysis based on the AMBAG travel model results and extensive consultation with METRO was performed to identify current demand for Highway 1 transit services, quantify the latent demand that could be served, and estimate the
increased transit usage with the HOV Lane project alternatives. Results were incorporated into the administrative draft EIR/EA.

iv. California Coastal Commission [unchanged]

The southern reach of this project falls within the jurisdiction of the California Coastal Commission (CCC). A coastal development permit will be required. An initial meeting was held in January 2007 to introduce the project and identify CCC concerns and perspectives pending resolution of geometric design for both build alternatives 2006. A second coordination meeting was held in March 2008.

c. Environmental Document (EIR/EA)

The Administrative Draft Environmental Document (ED) was submitted for review by RTC/Caltrans in August 2007. Comments from Caltrans were received through the fall of 2007. Discussions to resolve and clarify approaches were conducted, and the document is being updated to reflect comments and incorporate agreed-upon modifications.

The administrative Draft EIR/EA includes two build alternatives: a Transportation System Management (TSM) proposal with Auxiliary lanes, interchange reconfiguring, ramp metering, and a High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Lane alternative that proposes primarily what the prior build alternative proposes but also HOV lanes.

FHWA will expect to see a realistic project financing/implementation plan included in the ED for them to approve/release a Final ED. A phased implementation plan and a financing plan are being developed and will be coordinated with FHWA to address their concerns. The implementation plan will assume the Santa Cruz County sales tax measure for transportation improvements will pass, with the project being built in phases. If the Local Tax Measure does not pass, then one or more of the stand-alone projects pieces would be pursued till the measure passes in the future years.

Discussions with Caltrans management staff were conducted to clarify the environmental document type and approach to address the ongoing STARS efforts to incorporate sustainable design elements into the current project scope. The updated draft environmental document with technical reports is scheduled for submittal to Caltrans for review in May/June, 2010.

2. Engineering

a. Geometric Development

i. The Nolte team continues to coordinate the development of the Alternatives with RTC, Caltrans and the local agencies. The Alternatives under development are:
   - No-Build Alternative
   - Ramp Metering and Auxiliary Lane or Transportation Systems Management (TSM)
   - HOV Lane Alternative

ii. HOV Lane Alternative geometric issues are being resolved with Caltrans. Design review meetings with Caltrans District and Headquarter staff were held on December 16th 2008, April 29th 2009 and September 22nd 2009 to discuss design issues for all nine interchanges in the project and the mainline corridor. At these meetings agreement was reached on the geometric design and Caltrans provided guidance for preparing the Fact Sheets for the design exceptions, where appropriate.
Caltrans concurrence on the geometric layouts of the mainline and interchanges has allowed the environmental analysis to proceed. The updated geometric plans with design exception Fact Sheets are scheduled for submittal to Caltrans in May/June 2010.

iii. Morrissey Boulevard, Soquel Avenue and Bay Porter/41st Ave Interchanges:

Multiple geometric configurations for Morrissey Boulevard, Soquel Avenue and Bay Porter/41st Avenue Interchanges were developed and reviewed with local agencies (City of Santa Cruz, County of Santa Cruz and City of Capitola). At the most recent Design Review meeting Caltrans concurred with geometrics that were developed based on the input from local agencies. It was challenging to balance Caltrans preference for an option that provides for better interchange operations while meeting the local circulations demand and limiting the interchange footprint to minimize right-of-way impacts.

b. Traffic Modeling Analysis

i. The Traffic Operation Report (TOR) was approved in August 2007. A supplemental report is prepared to make the TOR consistent with design changes. An amendment to the approved TOR reflecting recent design changes was submitted to Caltrans in March 2010.

A supplemental traffic analysis work is being done to identify the phased implementation of the proposed improvements along Highway 1 within the study corridor under a limited funding scenario. The prioritization of improvements will be performed separately for freeway and interchange improvements based on their potential to relieve congestion and minimize/avoid hot spots in the corridor.

ii. Supplemental Reports: The following Supplemental Reports have been or are being prepared, as noted.

- Transit Market Analysis (Draft Complete)
- Park & Ride Lot Study (Draft Complete)
- Parking Impacts Study (Draft Complete)
- Multimodal Study (Draft Complete)
- Bus Pad Memorandum (Draft complete)
- Mobility Study (Draft being refined)


c. Project Report and Attachments

i. Project Report (PR) - The PR summarizes the engineering design development and process issues for the project. This report acts as the formal transmittal document for the Environmental Document. The draft PR was submitted to Caltrans on August 24, 2007. Comments were received October 29, 2007 and are being resolved along with the project geometry. The updated Draft PR is scheduled for submittal to Caltrans in June 2010.

ii. Structural – Conceptual Bridge Plans or Advance Planning Studies (APS) have been prepared for the 15 structures (some new and some existing that require replacement or modification). Work continues using the HOV geometry as the most conservative approach for assessing more detailed issues, and establishing costs. APS comments were received in October 2008 and are being reviewed and resolved. Updated APS will be submitted along with the PR and geometric plans in June 2010.
d. New Study Reports

i. Sustainable Design Elements

This study will assess and document sustainable design and planning elements for consideration in the project development process and inclusion as appropriate in the project or a parallel project or program sponsored by the RTC. This effort includes identifying, evaluating, and documenting potential sustainable elements that would be desirable for inclusion in the project.

RTC staff proposed to integrate the work initiated by Nolte Associates on sustainable design and project elements in the proposed work program currently under development with the North American Sustainable Transportation Council (NASTC) in applying the Sustainable Transportation Access Rating System (STARS) to the Highway 1 HOV Lane project. RTC authorized NASTC to develop 12 STARS credits to assess Highway 1 HOV Lane Project in February 2010.

STARS would be used to analyze elements of the Highway 1 HOV Lanes Project to provide options for increased accessibility and sustainability. As one of the first participants in the program, RTC could gain national recognition as a leader in sustainable transportation. STARS can help position the HOV Lanes project to meet future GHG emissions standards, and prospective funding initiatives to encourage GHG conformity goals.

A Technical Advisory Committee is formed to assist in development work of the Sustainable Transportation and Access Rating System (STARS) and its potential applications to the Highway 1 HOV Lanes project. The goal of the STARS evaluation process applied to transportation projects is to:

- Improve access for the movement of people and goods
- Cut transportation climate and energy pollution
- Maximize benefit-cost

Credits developed through the STARS process will be evaluated by the Project Development Team of the Highway 1 HOV Lanes Project Development Team for input and subsequent consideration by the RTC for inclusion in the project.

The HOV Lane project already incorporates many elements and features that support sustainable transportation. STARS can provide a framework to evaluate and strengthen those aspects which can provide the greatest benefit at the least cost.

ii. Bike Path [unchanged]

The purpose of this study is to outline feasibility of constructing a bike path along the Route 1 corridor. This study will identify opportunities, constraints and cost of constructing a bike path parallel to Route 1, within the HOV Project limits and Caltrans right-of-way for non-motorized travel. The administrative draft was submitted to the RTC in October 2008. The current design activity and environmental analysis does not consider implementation of the bike paths.

iii. Aesthetic Treatment [unchanged]

The intent of this document is to provide RTC with guidelines on the formation and responsibilities of an Aesthetic Review Board for developing and approving visual guidelines for the aesthetic elements of the project. It is expected that the guidelines will
address the appearance of design elements such as; Architectural elements of bridges such as columns, cross section shapes, barriers, slope paving, and facades, sound walls and retaining walls, roadway barriers fences and landscaping. A draft is scheduled for submittal in July 2009.

3. Public Outreach Activities (HOV Project) [unchanged]

Public Hearing – A public hearing process similar to that used for the Auxiliary Lanes Project is proposed for the Highway 1 HOV Lanes project. However, three meetings are proposed at geographically spaced locations given the length, complexity and broad community interest in the HOV Lanes project. The Open House format would include comprehensive exhibits/displays for participants to view and discuss the items with members of the project team. Participants could provide comments during the Open House portion of the meeting either in written form or verbally to a court reporter at a separate information station available to record public comments.

The Public Hearing would include both a formal and open house style presentation. A brief presentation would precede the formal portion of Public Hearing providing a description of the project and orientation on how to provide testimony on the environmental documents. A court reporter would create a verbatim record of the proceedings to ensure all comments and questions are addressed in preparation of the final environmental document.

The exact date of public release of the draft environmental documents is not known at this time, but expected to be in the spring/summer 2011 with a 45-day public review period, as determined by Caltrans (the lead agency for the environmental process).

4. Schedule (HOV)

A detailed schedule for the project is being developed in consultation with Caltrans.

The following are major milestones in the current schedule. The anticipated completion is scheduled for 2013.

- Initial Admin Draft EA/EIR June/July 2007
- Updated Admin Draft EIR/EA May/June 2010
- STAR Credit development August 2010
- Updated DED to FHWA January 2011
- Public Circulation Spring/Summer 2011
- Select Preferred Alternative Fall 2011
- Archaeological Subsurface Work Winter/Spring 2012
- SHPO concurrence Summer/Fall 2012
- Final EA/EIR submittal to FHWA Fall 2012
- Approval of Final Environmental Document and Project Report Winter/Spring 2013

III. NEXT UPDATE – August 2010
AGENDA: April 1, 2010

TO: Regional Transportation Commission (RTC)

FROM: George Dondero, Executive Director and Luis Pavel Mendez, Deputy Director

RE: Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line Acquisition

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC):

1. Receive the Executive Director’s recommendation on the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line (Branch Line) Acquisition project to be presented at the meeting; and

2. Hold an evening public hearing on April 14, 2010 on the Branch Line Acquisition project.

BACKGROUND

The Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) has been working to acquire the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line (Branch Line) since 2001. In December 2004, the RTC entered into a non-binding letter of intent with Union Pacific (UP) to purchase the Branch Line for $19 million. Subsequently, the parties renegotiated the purchase price to account for findings made during the initial due diligence work. In August 2008, the RTC reached a new agreement in principle with UP to purchase the Branch Line for $14.2 million with the commitment that $5 million would be set aside for improvements to the rail line with the available funding. In February 2010, the RTC added recreational rail service between Santa Cruz and Davenport to the project and submitted a revised funding application and allocation request to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) to secure the funding for the project. The RTC has nearly completed all of the due diligence work necessary in connection with the acquisition of the Branch Line and is in the final stages of negotiations with UP and the short line operator (Sierra Northern Railroad).

DISCUSSION

The vast majority of the population and centers of activity in Santa Cruz County are located along or near the coast from Watsonville to Santa Cruz. This is a relatively narrow area of land with Highway 1 as the principal transportation corridor and extremely limited options for additional potential transportation corridors. This creates significant travel demand, congestion and safety concerns along this area nestled between the ocean and the mountains. Therefore, in the 1990’s the RTC produced a Major Transportation Investment Study (MTIS) to analyze existing and future travel needs and develop measures to better accommodate those needs along this area. The report culminated with a program of projects approved by the RTC (Attachment 1). Due to the limited number of transportation corridors
and the extreme difficulty to develop new corridors, the RTC decided to make better use of existing transportation corridors. Therefore, the MTIS program of projects includes acquisition of the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line (Branch Line) for future transportation purposes including a possible bicycle and pedestrian path, and passenger rail or other transit uses. More than a decade since that program of projects was approved, the RTC has nearly completed all of the work necessary to decide whether to purchase the Branch Line.

Attachment 2 is a list of the due diligence work items that have been produced to inform the RTC’s decision for purchase of the Branch Line. Some work items have already been made public and are available on the RTC’s website. Other items may be made public after this RTC meeting, depending on the status of negotiations and the Executive Director's recommendation. It is expected that the lease analysis report will remain confidential because it includes analyses which would affect future real property negotiations between the RTC and existing and potential future lease holders.

The list of due diligence work items includes funding applications, appraisals, environmental documents, inspections, economic analyses and agreements. Staff believes that the body of information necessary for the Executive Director's recommendation concerning the acquisition of the Branch Line will be complete by the date of this meeting. Two of the agreements and one report are not yet completed as this staff report is being written. Therefore, the Executive Director will present his recommendation on acquisition of the Branch Line at the meeting. **Staff recommends that the RTC receive the Executive Director’s recommendation and hold a public hearing on the project on April 14, 2010 at 7:00 pm.**

**Next Steps**

If the Executive Director recommends purchase of the Branch Line, the timeline of next steps would be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 1, 2010</td>
<td>Executive Director presents recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1, 2010</td>
<td>Due diligence work documents released</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 14, 2010</td>
<td>Public Hearing on purchase of rail line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 6, 2010</td>
<td>RTC to consider Executive Director’s recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 19 &amp; 20, 2010</td>
<td>California Transportation Commission (CTC) considers funding application</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What will follow after the CTC considers the funding application depends on the CTC’s decision and whether the State has money to provide to projects. If the CTC approves the funding application and the State has funds for the project, a funding agreement would be produced and the necessary filings for transfer of ownership would be submitted to the Surface Transportation Board (STB) right away. An escrow account would also be established to receive the funds and complete the transaction.

If the State does not have funds available for projects, as long as the application is approved, the RTC will receive the funding when it is available. When the funds become
available, the funding agreement and STB filings would be produced, and the escrow account established.

State Funding

The RTC has submitted a funding application and allocation request to the CTC for acquisition of the Branch Line, rail line improvements and implementation of recreational rail service between Santa Cruz and Davenport. RTC has been working with CTC staff and commissioners to ensure that all of the required information is provided. Senator Joe Simitian has also been very helpful in ensuring that CTC staff and Commissioners have what they need to give due consideration to the project. In addition, RTC staff has been working with members of the community to send letters of support for approval of the project to the CTC.

At its February 2010 meeting, the CTC passed a resolution that will allow the CTC to approve project applications for Proposition 116 funds even if the State does not have funds to provide to the projects. This allows the lead agencies for the projects to fulfill the June 30, 2010 deadline for Proposition 116 projects. Therefore, as long as the RTC’s application is approved, the deadline will have been met.

SUMMARY

The RTC has been working to acquire the Santa Cruz Branch Rail (Branch Line) since 2001. The RTC and UP agreed on a purchase price of $14.2 million, plus post-acquisition improvements in the amount of $5 million. The RTC has nearly completed negotiations and the due diligence work to ensure that the RTC has all of the information it needs to decide on acquisition of the Branch Line. The Executive Director anticipates making a recommendation on this project at the meeting. Staff recommends that the RTC receive the recommendation and hold a public hearing on the project on April 14, 2010 at 7:00 pm.

Attachments:
1. Major Transportation Investment Study Program of Projects
2. Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line Acquisition Project Due Diligence Items
ADOPTED PROGRAM OF PROJECTS FOR THE

WATSONVILLE/SANTA CRUZ/UCSC

BACKGROUND

Following earlier studies which evaluated the feasibility of establishing rail transit service on the existing branch rail line in Santa Cruz County, in 1994 the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission initiated a Major Transportation Investment Study or MTIS to evaluate rail and other transportation options in our most heavily traveled corridor within the county: between Watsonville and Santa Cruz, including the University of California, Santa Cruz (UCSC) campus. Eight options were analyzed in detail, including bus and rail transit, additional carpool lanes on Highway 1 and low cost strategies such as the promotion of telecommuting and flextime. The final report was available in late 1998 and a series of open houses were held to solicit input and share the information with the public.

Following Commissioner workshops, televised meetings and a public hearing in August of 1999, the Regional Transportation Commission approved a set of transportation options to pursue over the next 15 years for the Watsonville/Santa Cruz/UCSC corridor. These projects will be programmed and constructed as funds become available for allocation by the Commission.

APPROVED TRANSPORTATION OPTIONS FOR THIS CORRIDOR

BUS SERVICE IMPROVEMENTS $124 Million
Will fund a 15-year growth plan at an increase of approximately 4% per year for new bus service, new equipment and upgraded maintenance/operation facilities.

LOCAL ROAD IMPROVEMENTS $50 Million
Will fund improvements to local streets and roads, including rehabilitation, maintenance, and selected widening improvements.

ADDING HIGH OCCUPANCY TOLL (HOT) LANES TO HIGHWAY 1 $46 Million
Will partially fund an additional lane in each direction of Highway 1 between Morrissey Blvd. and State Park Drive. (See HOT lanes section for more information about the concept.)

RAIL RIGHT-OF-WAY ACQUISITION $15 Million
Will fund the purchase of the Union Pacific branch rail line between Watsonville and Santa Cruz/Davenport as a future transportation resource for the community.

BIKE/PEDESTRIAN PATH ON THE RAIL RIGHT-OF-WAY $12 Million
Will partially fund a bike/pedestrian path adjacent to, not in place of, the rail line. Existing freight train operations would continue and the pathway would be designed to not preclude future bus or rail transit options within the right-of-way.

LOCAL BICYCLE PROJECTS $12 Million
Will fund high priority bicycle projects in the cities and the county, including around local schools.

ELECTRIC BICYCLES $1 Million
Will allow for the discounted distribution and/or sale of electric bicycles to people who commit to driving less.

TOTAL FUNDING $260 Million
Based on the projected available funding over 15 years from existing or known sources
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Name</th>
<th>Completed</th>
<th>When Public</th>
<th>Remains Confidential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding Applications</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental Documents</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Study and Negative Declaration (Denise Duffy &amp; Associates)</td>
<td>Apr 2002</td>
<td>Apr 2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Geomatrix)</td>
<td>Mar 1997</td>
<td>Mar 1997</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase II Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) (AMEC Geomatrix)</td>
<td>Dec 2009</td>
<td>Apr 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Analysis Documents</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz Branch Line Economic Analysis (Alta Planning)</td>
<td>Nov 2002</td>
<td>Dec 2004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Business Plan (Systra Consulting)</td>
<td>Sep 2004</td>
<td>Sep 2004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Business Plan (Renaissance Rail)</td>
<td>Mar 2010</td>
<td>Apr 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease Analysis Summary (Colliers Pinkard)</td>
<td>Sep 2009</td>
<td>Apr 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease Analysis Report (Colliers Pinkard)</td>
<td>Sep 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inspection Documents</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Name</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>When Public</td>
<td>Remains Confidential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updated cost of structure assessment recommendations (Biggs Cardosa Associates)</td>
<td>Apr 2008</td>
<td>Apr 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track Inspection (HDR)</td>
<td>Dec 2009</td>
<td>Apr 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appraisal Documents</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Title Report (First American)</td>
<td>May 2005</td>
<td>May 2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Title Report (First American)</td>
<td>Sep 2009</td>
<td>Mar 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal Review Report (Sierra West Valuation)</td>
<td>Mar 2010</td>
<td>Apr 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal Report (Colliers Pinkard)</td>
<td>Sep 2009</td>
<td>Apr 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal Report (Arthur Gimmy Int.)</td>
<td>Apr 2006</td>
<td>Apr 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuation Study of Railroad Improvements (Woodside Consulting)</td>
<td>Sep 2004</td>
<td>Apr 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going concern Valuation (Wilbur Smith Associates)</td>
<td>Mar 2004</td>
<td>Apr 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agreements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter of Intent with Union Pacific to Purchase Rail Line</td>
<td>Dec 2004</td>
<td>Dec 2004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase and Sale Agreement with Union Pacific</td>
<td>Apr 2010</td>
<td>Apr 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration and Coordination Agreement with Sierra Northern Railway</td>
<td>Apr 2010</td>
<td>Apr 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Conservancy Reimbursable Grant Agreement</td>
<td>Jun 2006</td>
<td>Jun 2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line Informational Right of Way Maps</td>
<td>Nov 2005</td>
<td>Nov 2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortline Freight Service RFP</td>
<td>Jun 2005</td>
<td>Jun 2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Items remaining confidential due to impact to future real estate negotiations or Homeland Security requirements