



**Santa Cruz County Regional
Transportation Commission
Transportation Policy Workshop**

AGENDA

**Thursday, August 18, 2011
9:00 a.m.**

**NOTE LOCATION THIS MONTH
SCCRTC Conference Room
1523 Pacific Ave
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 TPW meeting agenda packet is posted on our website, please call (831) 460-3200 or email info@sccrtc.org to subscribe.

COMMISSION MEMBERSHIP

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

The majority of the Commission constitutes a quorum for the transaction of business.

Article 8 Transportation Development Act Claims – only City and County representatives vote

Article 4 Transportation Development Act Claims, Policy Issues, and SAFE – all 12 members vote

1. Introductions
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.

CONSENT AGENDA

No Consent Items

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.

CLOSED SESSION

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

Agency Negotiator: Paul Chrisman, Miller & Owen

Negotiation Parties: SCCRTC, Sierra Northern Railway, Union Pacific

Under Negotiation: Price and Terms

OPEN SESSION

4. Report on closed session

REGULAR AGENDA

5. Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Responsibilities
(*George Dondero, Executive Director*)
 - a. Staff report
 - b. Oral presentation by Andrew Chesley from San Joaquin Council of Governments

- c. August 3, 2011 staff report to TAMC's Executive Committee
 - d. Federal regulations for MPO designation and redesignation
 - e. Draft budget-SCCRTC as Single County MPO
 - f. Letter from the Monterey Bay Area Managers Group to AMBAG
6. Highway 1 HOV Lane project- Tiered Environmental document
(*Kim Shultz, Senior Transportation Planner*)
 - a. Staff report
 - b. Memorandum from RTC's Washington Office, dated July 12, 2011
 - c. Memorandum from Nolte Associates, dated, August 3, 2011
 - d. Full project budget to complete the HOV Lane Tiered Environment Document
 - e. Resolution amending the FY11-12 budget for the HOV Lane project
 7. 2012 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) development
(*Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner*)
 - a. Staff report
 - b. Input from ITAC
 - c. Priority Projects
 - d. 2010 RTIP projects, not yet completed
 - e. Letter from BOS on road repairs
 8. Federal legislation oral report
(*Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner*)
 9. Rail Line Acquisition project oral report
(*Luis Pavel Mendez, Deputy Director*)
 10. Next meetings

The next SCCRTC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, September 1, 2011 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 Thursday, September 15, 2011 at 9:00 am at the SCCRTC Offices, 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA.

HOW TO REACH US

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA 95060
phone: (831) 460-3200 / fax (831) 460-3215
email: info@sccrtc.org / website: www.sccrtc.org

HOW TO STAY INFORMED ABOUT RTC MEETINGS, AGENDAS & NEWS

Broadcasts: Many of the meetings are broadcast live. Meetings are cablecast by Community Television of Santa Cruz. Community TV's channels and schedule can be found online (www.communitytv.org) or by calling (831) 425-8848.

Agenda packets: Complete agenda packets are available at the RTC office, on the RTC website (www.sccrtc.org), and at the following public libraries:

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

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

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

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

HOW TO REQUEST

❖ ACCOMMODATIONS FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES

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

SERVICIOS DE TRADUCCIÓN/ TRANSLATION SERVICES

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

AGENDA: August 18, 2011

TO: Regional Transportation Commission Transportation Policy Workshop
FROM: George Dondero, Executive Director
RE: Single County Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Scenario

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC):

1. Accept this report on a possible single-county MPO scenario and a presentation from Andrew Chesley, Executive Director of the San Joaquin Council of Governments on single- county MPO operations and regional collaboration efforts in the San Joaquin Valley.
 2. Determine whether the RTC would accept the responsibilities of becoming a single county MPO for Santa Cruz County, should that be the desire of the region's cities and counties; and
 3. Provide any further direction to staff, as appropriate.
-

BACKGROUND

At the June 16 Transportation Policy Workshop (TPW), the RTC received a report on the possible re-designation of MPO responsibilities from the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) to two single-county MPO agencies. RTC Commissioners directed staff to do more research on the issue, and return for further discussion and consideration. The Transportation Agency of Monterey County (TAMC) has been engaged in parallel discussions over the same time period. Attachment 1 is a staff report on this issue to TAMC's Executive Committee.

The executive directors of TAMC and the RTC met on June 24 with staff from Caltrans, Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration to collect information regarding legal and administrative requirements associated with restructuring an MPO. The executive directors will attend a similar series of meetings on August 12 in Sacramento with representatives from Caltrans, the state Department of Housing and Community Development and the Air Resources Board. For a restructuring to occur, the member agencies of the MPO would each vote at their respective city council or board of supervisors whether to retain membership in AMBAG or to withdraw. If 75% of the region (by population) including the largest city (Salinas) were to vote to withdraw from AMBAG, then a restructuring could occur (see Attachment 2). The change would also need agreement from the Governor, most likely delegated through the Caltrans Director.

The RTC and the Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC) would each become an MPO and each would take on the mandated functions which AMBAG currently provides. San Benito County would no longer be a member of an MPO.

DISCUSSION

Experience in Other Regions

In order to provide some perspective from outside our own region, staff invited Andrew Chesley from the San Joaquin Council of Governments to present his perspective as Executive Director of a single-county MPO. Mr. Chesley will describe how his agency fulfills the role of MPO as well as accomplishing many regional collaborative efforts among eight counties in the San Joaquin Valley. He will discuss the trade-offs between the single-county versus a "one big MPO" model, and how his region evolved to the current structure.

Regional Housing Needs Assessment

One of the MPO responsibilities that generates concern among some RTC members is the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) through which there is a geographic allocation of projected low-income housing units to be constructed within the region. The process is mandated by the state Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), and HCD determines the number of housing units by MPO region based on a formula. The RHNA process was traditionally accomplished once every four years, and was recently changed to once every eight years. The next allocation of low-income housing units will occur in 2013.

The RHNA process is known to be contentious and challenging because larger or more politically dominant jurisdictions within a region sometimes work to allocate more low-income housing units to other jurisdictions. Under a single county MPO scenario, the Santa Cruz County region would not need to be concerned with the possibility that other jurisdictions would make it bear a disproportionate burden of the housing allocations. The RTC would administer the allocation process for Santa Cruz County and as suggested at the June RTC meeting, some kind of rules and process could be designed to protect the smaller jurisdictions from being dominated during the process. Staff is investigating how the process is handled in other jurisdictions, and will meet with an HCD representative on August 12 to learn more about the legal and administrative requirements of the process. Staff will report any new information at the August 18 meeting.

Managing the Regional Travel Demand Model

In the June meeting, staff proposed that the most effective way to manage the regional model would be through a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) or a Joint Powers Agreement (JPA). This joint effort could also be used to address other regional concerns or shared issues. This is the "big ticket" item under the list of MPO duties which needs to be planned and funded adequately in order to serve the

region successfully. It will be important for the partners in the MOU to provide attentive coordinated management for this to happen.

Staff has been researching what is needed to have an effective regional model and proposes that a full time modeler be hired, and that a ¼ time planner be dedicated to support modeling efforts for duties such as gathering land use and transportation data, setting up meetings, and responding to information requests from the public and other agencies. The planner could come from existing staff of the RTC or TAMC, and the source agency would be compensated through the MOU as part of the modeling effort. This would enable the modeler to devote most of his/her effort to developing and improving the model, which is not the case under current AMBAG staffing and organization. One of the concerns raised during a peer review of AMBAG's model is the need for adequate staffing and effort to maintain and improve the model.

Staff believes this approach would minimize any duplication of effort and give the partner agencies opportunity to manage the program for improved quality performance. One new development is the interest of the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District (Air District) in participating in model development and quality control. Informal discussions with Air district staff indicate that a financial contribution by the Air District toward the model would be justified, and this is proposed in the draft budget ([Attachment 3](#)). The Air District has also offered the possibility of housing the model and corresponding staff at the Air District offices, if they cannot be accommodated within RTC or TAMC facilities.

Fiscal Impacts

In [Attachment 3](#) a draft budget is provided, showing how MPO duties would be funded should the RTC become an MPO. For the non-modeling duties, it is estimated that one full time planner will be needed. In addition, one quarter of an existing planner's time would be provided to support the work of the modeler. Transit planning would be funded with federal funds provided for that purpose, either by existing staff or use of consultants as appropriate.

It is important to remember that AMBAG has suffered cash flow challenges repeatedly. In January 2011 the former Executive Director proposed that the distribution of federal planning dollars should change, and that AMBAG would need a larger portion of those funds than is currently the case. The RTC and TAMC both sent letters of protest to this proposal. However, if AMBAG is to continue as an MPO, it is very likely this issue will be revisited, and AMBAG would attempt to take at least some portion of the federal funds now passed through to the RTC and TAMC. Another option to increase revenues would be for AMBAG to raise the dues paid by each member agency, although this concept has not been well received when brought to the board in the recent past.

Potential Future Actions

As stated at the June TPW meeting, it is not for the RTC to decide whether AMBAG continues as the region's MPO or whether new single-county MPOs are established. This will be done by the region's cities and counties. As expressed in the staff report to TAMC's Executive Committee ([Attachment 1](#)), the Monterey Bay Area Managers Group is also interested in reevaluating the sharing of responsibilities across transportation agencies ([see Attachment 4](#)). As the region's cities and counties consider these questions, it may be useful for them to know whether the RTC is willing to serve as a single-county MPO for Santa Cruz County. Therefore, **staff recommends that the RTC determine whether it would accept the responsibilities of becoming a single-county MPO for Santa Cruz County should that be the desire of the region's cities and counties.**

A potential change in funding for MPOs could occur when a new transportation act is passed in Congress. Staff is told that this is now being discussed in Washington and a bill could be introduced as soon as September. Also being discussed is a proposal to raise the population threshold to qualify as an MPO. Depending on the proposal passed into law, it could create thresholds under which Santa Cruz County would not qualify as an MPO.

Acting AMBAG Executive Director Les White has been gathering information and analyzing AMBAG's position. Mr. White is expected to present a report to AMBAG's board in September, making recommendations regarding the future of the agency. Potential recommendations could include disbanding AMBAG and establishing new MPOs; merging AMBAG with another agency, merging other agencies with AMBAG or significantly restructuring AMBAG and keeping funds currently distributed to RTC and TAMC.

SUMMARY

The RTC is considering the potential impacts if it were to become a single county MPO. A budget is presented showing how the various responsibilities would be funded with the estimated revenues that would become available. A presentation on how the San Joaquin Council of Governments manages its responsibilities as a single county MPO and addresses regional issues will be provided. The interim Executive Director at AMBAG will present recommendations about the future of the agency at the September 14 AMBAG meeting.

Attachments:

1. August 3, 2011 staff report to TAMC's Executive Committee
2. Federal regulations for MPO designation and redesignation
3. Draft Budget – SCCRTC as Single County MPO
4. Letter from the Monterey Bay Area Managers Group to AMBAG



TRANSPORTATION AGENCY FOR MONTEREY COUNTY

Memorandum

To: Executive Committee
From: Debra L. Hale, Executive Director
Date: August 3, 2011
Subject: **Single-County Metropolitan Planning Organization Scenario**

RECOMMENDATION

RECEIVE staff report on budgetary impacts of a proposed shift to a single county metropolitan planning organization and presentation from Andrew Chesley, Executive Director of the San Joaquin Council of Governments on single-county metropolitan planning organization operations and regional collaboration efforts in the San Joaquin Valley.

SUMMARY

At its strategic planning session and subsequent follow up at its June, 2011 meeting, the Transportation Agency Board of Directors directed staff to research the notion of taking on the federal metropolitan transportation organization (MPO) responsibilities that are currently handled by the multi-county Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments. The purpose of such a shift to a “single-county MPO” would be to improve cost effectiveness by removing duplication of efforts across the agencies and increasing investment in the regional transportation model. This report summarizes staff analysis of the budgetary impacts of such a change, the options for continuing regional transportation discussions, and the timing of any possible change.

FINANCIAL IMPACTS

Under a single county metropolitan planning organization designation, the Transportation Agency is estimated to receive an additional \$648,500 in federal highway and transit planning funds, offset by a loss of \$395,000 in more flexible state planning funds. The result would be a net estimated annual amount available to cover increased responsibilities and to increase investment in the travel forecast model of just under \$250,000, but less flexibility in how to use these funds. The net estimated increase to the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission to cover these costs would be \$292,700, and the net increase in state funding for the San Benito COG is estimated at \$29,000. These amounts are subject to change depending on state and federal allocations.

If the current organizational structure is maintained, there is a possibility that AMBAG will seek to reduce the amount of federal planning funds that are allocated to the Transportation Agency and the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission to help meet its financial obligations.

S:\TPW\TPW 2011\0811\Single County MPO Attachment1.docx

DISCUSSION

The Transportation Agency Board of Directors has asked staff to evaluate the potential for designating our agency as the federal metropolitan planning organization (MPO) effectively to handle all the transportation planning activities in the county. The Santa Cruz County and San Benito County transportation planning agencies are also performing such a review.

Budgetary Issues

Given the financial issues that have been experienced recently at AMBAG, it is likely that the current relationship between the four agencies (AMBAG, TAMC, Santa Cruz County RTC and San Benito COG) will change even if all organizations continue to retain transportation planning responsibilities. Last year, AMBAG staff sent a letter indicating that it would like to reevaluate the memorandum of understanding that sets the distribution of federal planning funds among the four agencies, but the Board deferred action on this until next fiscal year.

The Santa Cruz County and Monterey County transportation agencies have also in the past helped AMBAG utilize its federal planning funds by agreeing to match “in kind” activities funded with non-federal monies. Both agencies have indicated that they would like to revisit this policy to assure that they have enough non-federal match for their own federal grants. In addition, the City Managers have indicated that they feel it is an appropriate time to reevaluate the sharing of responsibilities across transportation agencies, given the shortage of local funding (see letter, **Attachment 1**). For these reasons, now is an appropriate time to review all options for restructuring and improving cost effectiveness.

Below is a list of the transportation and related responsibilities that are currently performed by the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments that are typically performed by other single-county metropolitan planning organizations in San Luis Obispo County, Santa Barbara County and throughout the San Joaquin Valley.

- Overall Work Program (summary of agency activities for federal funding partners)
- Metropolitan Transportation Plan (25 year planning document)
- Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Plan (5 year programming document)
- Multi-County Travel Forecast Model
(utilized for general plans, transportation projects, capital improvement plans)
- Regional Environmental Document Clearinghouse
- Regional Housing Needs Assessment (occurs every 8 years)
- Census Data Center (disseminates population information)
- Monterey County Ridesharing Activities
- Sustainable Communities Strategy (part of the Regional Transportation Plan)

Under the proposed scenario, the first three roles would be absorbed into existing Transportation Agency activities with a small amount of additional staff time, primarily relating to the auditing functions for the work program. The latter roles would represent additional work effort by the agency. Staff recommends that under such a scenario the Sustainable Communities Strategy be completed by AMBAG since grants are already allocated and the work is well underway. After its adoption, updates could be handled on a single county basis by the Transportation Agency in coordination with its partners in the neighboring counties.

Staff is in the process of developing a budget for taking on this additional workload. Initial estimates are that it would take 1.0 full-time equivalent (FTE) staff persons to take on the above activities (not including ridesharing), and the level of effort would vary depending on what activities are due to take place. This need could be filled with one additional staff person, some contracted out activities, and a reshuffling of current agency assignments. It is anticipated that the travel forecast model would remain a regional effort towards which the Transportation Agency would make an annual contribution to a coordinating agency. At present, AMBAG's budget includes in federal planning funds \$292,000 for modeling activities, not including the upgrades for land use and bicycle modeling. Monterey County ridesharing activities would take an additional 0.5 to 1.0 FTE of staff time and would likely need to be funded out of new monies; however, the current rideshare grant expires in April 2012 and would require a new funding source regardless of which agency performs the activities.

Another option would be for the three countywide transportation agencies to merge with AMBAG and the single agency would handle all the transportation planning activities and allocation of transportation funding for the region. Staff has not been directed to evaluate this option, although it is likely to be reviewed by others. It is worth noting that while this structure does exist elsewhere in the state (most notably in the 9-county San Francisco Bay Area), there are still single-county agencies that provide input to the multi-county Metropolitan Transportation Commission. A key issue under this type of structure is concerns about local control over transportation funding.

Opportunities for Regional Interactions

Some individuals have expressed a concern that by taking the transportation responsibilities away from AMBAG that there will no longer be an opportunity for regional interactions regarding transportation or other matters. In fact, Santa Cruz and Monterey County agencies are already collaborating on the 511 traveler information system program and are collaborating in support of the Monterey Bay Electric Vehicle Alliance.

Another way to collaborate is through a multi-county regional forum. Staff has invited the Executive Director of the San Joaquin Council of Governments, Andrew Chesley, to come to the Executive Committee to talk about how his agency handles the metropolitan planning organization responsibilities as a single-county agency, as well as discuss the San Joaquin Valley Regional Transportation Planning Agencies. They are an association of the eight MPOs in the San Joaquin Valley. They have a policy forum which represents elected officials from each county. Among other collaborations, they have worked together to secure transportation funding along the Highway 99 corridor in recent state bond measures and also developed a regional plan setting freight project priorities. **Attachment 2** is a copy of their memorandum of understanding. The group meets periodically throughout the year, but is staffed by existing agencies.

This type of a regional forum could be created among the three Monterey Bay Area counties with minimal additional cost. Follow up activities would be conducted by existing agencies. One idea would be for each of the three counties to host a meeting annually, for a total of three meetings a year. Another idea would be to expand to include the Central Coast Coalition region (adding in Santa Barbara and San Luis Obispo counties) and create a policy forum for the five counties that corresponds to the Caltrans District 5 region.

Attachment 3 is a June 22, 2011 letter signed by three county presidents of the League of Women Voters in the region in support of AMBAG and "regional planning". Staff has not been contacted by

any of these presidents nor is aware of any research conducted by these entities regarding this issue. It is important to note that there are ways to conduct regional planning without having a separate organization, as is done by the San Joaquin Valley Regional Transportation Planning Agencies.

Timing and Coordination Issues

To learn more about all the activities that would need to be conducted as a single-county metropolitan planning organization, staff from all four agencies are meeting with Caltrans Planning, Programming and Audits departments, as well as the Federal Highway and Transit Administrations, the State Housing and Community Development Department, the California Air Resources Board. Any new information from these meeting will be provided at the Executive Committee meeting. The Federal Highway Administration indicated that it would be checking with its legal counsel regarding the precise procedure for withdrawing from an existing MPO and forming a new organization. According to the regulations, local governing boards representing 75% of the population within the three-county region (cities and counties), including the largest city (Salinas) and the Governor or his designee must approve withdrawal from the existing MPO and redesignation of the new MPO. **Attachment 4** is an excerpt of the regulations on this process.

One of the issues that arose at our last meeting with Caltrans and Federal Highways planning staff was the timing of any transition to a new federal metropolitan planning organization (MPO). They wanted to make sure that the adoption of the Sustainable Communities Strategy was not affected by a transition; the Strategy is slated for adoption no later than 2013. The federal agencies also noted that they hoped that the federal transportation programming document would not need to be re-adopted before its December 2012 expiration due to any redesignation of MPO status. All projects that receive federal funding must be included in this document. Typically it is amended after adoption of the State Transportation Improvement Program, which will occur in Spring 2012. Based on this information, staff's conclusion is that a formal transition of MPO responsibilities should take place no sooner than the start of the state or federal 2012/13 fiscal year; however, steps toward such a transition, particularly voting by the local governing boards, would need to proceed well before that July/October 2012 date.

Next Steps

Staff plans to present a more detailed analysis at the August 24, 2011 Transportation Agency Board of Directors meeting, and will continue to attend meetings of other regional agencies on this issue. Staff seeks direction on further information to gather and present at the August Board meeting.

Debra L. Hale, Executive Director

Date

Regular Agenda

Counsel Review: N/A

Attachments:

1. Letter from Monterey Bay Managers Association
2. San Joaquin Valley Regional Transportation Planning Agencies MOU
3. Letter from League of Women Voters
4. MPO designation and redesignation regulations

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
Federal Highway Administration
23 CFR Parts 450 and 500**

**Statewide Transportation Planning;
Metropolitan Transportation Planning**

Excerpt:

§ 450.310 Metropolitan planning organization designation and redesignation.

- (a) To carry out the metropolitan transportation planning process under this subpart, a metropolitan planning organization (MPO) shall be designated for each urbanized area with a population of more than 50,000 individuals (as determined by the Bureau of the Census).
- (b) MPO designation shall be made by agreement between the Governor and units of general purpose local government that together represent at least 75 percent of the affected population (including the largest incorporated city, based on population, as named by the Bureau of the Census) or in accordance with procedures established by applicable State or local law.
- (c) Each Governor with responsibility for a portion of a multistate metropolitan area and the appropriate MPOs shall, to the extent practicable, provide coordinated transportation planning for the entire MPA. The consent of Congress is granted to any two or more States to: (1) Enter into agreements or compacts, not in conflict with any law of the United States, for cooperative efforts and mutual assistance in support of activities authorized under 23 U.S.C. 134 and 49 U.S.C. 5303 as the activities pertain to interstate areas and localities within the States; and (2) Establish such agencies, joint or otherwise, as the States may determine desirable for making the agreements and compacts effective.
- (d) Each MPO that serves a TMA, when designated or redesignated under this section, shall consist of local elected officials, officials of public agencies that administer or operate major modes of transportation in the metropolitan planning area, and appropriate State transportation officials. Where appropriate, MPOs may increase the representation of local elected officials, public transportation agencies, or appropriate State officials on their policy boards and other committees as a means for encouraging greater involvement in the metropolitan transportation planning process, subject to the requirements of paragraph (k) of this section.
- (e) To the extent possible, only one MPO shall be designated for each urbanized area or group of contiguous urbanized areas. More than one MPO may be designated to serve an urbanized area only if the Governor(s) and the existing MPO, if applicable, determine that the size and complexity of the urbanized area make designation of more than one MPO appropriate. In those cases where two or more MPOs serve the same urbanized area, the MPOs shall establish official, written agreements that clearly identify areas of coordination and the division of transportation planning responsibilities among the MPOs.
- (f) Nothing in this subpart shall be deemed to prohibit an MPO from using the staff resources of other agencies, non-profit organizations, or contractors to carry out selected elements of the metropolitan transportation planning process.
- (g) An MPO designation shall remain in effect until an official redesignation has been made in accordance with this section.

(h) An existing MPO may be redesignated only by agreement between the Governor and units of general purpose local government that together represent at least 75 percent of the existing metropolitan planning area population (including the largest incorporated city, based on population, as named by the Bureau of the Census).

(i) Redesignation of an MPO serving a multistate metropolitan planning area requires agreement between the Governors of each State served by the existing MPO and units of general purpose local government that together represent at least 75 percent of the existing metropolitan planning area population (including the largest incorporated city, based on population, as named by the Bureau of the Census).

(j) For the purposes of redesignation, units of general purpose local government may be defined as elected officials from each unit of general purpose local government located within the metropolitan planning area served by the existing MPO.

(k) Redesignation of an MPO (in accordance with the provisions of this section) is required whenever the existing MPO proposes to make:

(1) A substantial change in the proportion of voting members on the existing MPO representing the largest incorporated city, other units of general purpose local government served by the MPO, and the State(s); or (2) A substantial change in the decisionmaking authority or responsibility of the MPO, or in decisionmaking procedures established under MPO by-laws.

(l) The following changes to an MPO do not require a redesignation (as long as they do not trigger a substantial change as described in paragraph (k) of the section):

(1) The identification of a new urbanized area (as determined by the Bureau of the Census) within an existing metropolitan planning area;

(2) Adding members to the MPO that represent new units of general purpose local government resulting from expansion of the metropolitan planning area;

(3) Adding members to satisfy the specific membership requirements for an MPO that serves a TMA; or

(4) Periodic rotation of members representing units of general-purpose local government, as established under MPO by-laws.

.....

Draft Budget - SCCRTC as Single County MPO

REVENUES - Using current FY 2011-12 funding formulas

865,335	Revenues, without AMBAG
<u>572,000</u>	Revenues, under AMBAG
293,335	Net increase to RTC

COSTS - to RTC

125,000	1 ft Sr. Planner w/benefits (FTIP, RHNA, Census, Clearinghouse)
80,541	Model, annual cost
<u>87,794</u>	Transit planning
293,335	

-

Travel Demand Model Estimated Budget

120,000	Modeler, salary
42,200	Modeler, benefits
25,000	Support staff, 1/4 time mid level planner w/benefits
15,000	Software & licenses
5,000	Hardware, backup
5,000	Overhead
<u>5,000</u>	Contingencies
217,200	total

Cost/year/partner agency	share
28,295 San Benito COG	13.0%
80,541 RTC	37.1%
88,365 TAMC	40.7%
<u>20,000 Air District</u>	9.2%
217,200 Total	100.0%

Assumptions -

1. The Regional Travel Demand Model would be funded and managed by the three counties and the Air District through a Memorandum of Understanding.
2. Regional projections for population, employment and housing would also be created under this MOU.
3. Proposed shares are based upon county population share of the region minus a fixed contribution from the Air District, which has not approved this draft budget.
4. This draft budget has not been approved by the partner agencies.
5. Modeler's office to be located in the RTC Watsonville satellite office.



City of Gonzales

P.O. BOX 647
PHONE: (831) 675-5000

147 FOURTH ST.
FAX: (831) 675-2644

GONZALES, CALIFORNIA 93926
www.ci.gonzales.ca.us

June 27, 2011

Maria Orozco
Mayor

Stephanie Aguilar, President
Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments
445 Reservation Road, Suite G
P.O. Box 809
Marina, California 93933-0809

Scott Funk
Mayor Pro Tem

Dear Ms. Aguilar:

Liz Silva
Councilmember

I am sending you this short letter as representative of the Monterey Bay Area Managers Group, (which encompasses Monterey, San Benito, and Santa Cruz Counties) for your consideration.

Jose G. Lopez
Councilmember

As you know, many of our cities are and have experienced significant budget challenges, which have required us to take a hard, long and critical look at all our functions and operations. Nothing has been left off the table. Therefore, with the transition currently underway with your Executive Director position, now would be an appropriate time to take a comprehensive look at AMBAG.

Jack L. Reed
Councilmember

René L. Mendez
City Manager

To these ends, a subcommittee of the Managers Group comprised of Carlos Palacios, Watsonville City Manager; Daniel Dawson, Del Rey Oaks City Manager; René L. Mendez, Gonzales City Manager; Nick Chiulos, Director of Intergovernmental and Legislative Affairs for the County of Monterey; Debbie Hale, Executive Director of the Transportation Agency for Monterey County; and George Dondero, Executive Director of the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission would like to work with your Interim Executive Director Les White, to take a comprehensive look at AMBAG and its role in the future. Many of us have already discussed this idea with our representatives to AMBAG.


Please do not hesitate to give me a call or email me at rmendez@ci.gonzales.ca.us if you have any questions and/or would like to discuss this further.

Sincerely,

René L. Mendez
City Manager

cc: City Managers and County Administrator, Members of MBAMG
Transportation Agency of Monterey County
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Les White, AMBAG Interim Executive Director

Gonzales will continue to be a safe, clean, family-friendly community, diverse in heritage, and committed to working collaboratively to preserve and retain its small town charm

TO: Transportation Policy Workshop
FROM: Kim Shultz, Senior Transportation Planner 
RE: Highway 1 HOV Lane Project – Tiered Environmental Document

RECOMMENDATION

The Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC) and staff recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) recommend that Caltrans develop a combined tiered environmental document for the Highway 1 HOV Lanes Project consisting of:

- a. Tier 1 - program level environmental documentation for the Highway 1 HOV Lanes Project; and
- b. Tier 2 – project level environmental documentation for auxiliary lanes between 41st Avenue and Soquel Drive and a bike/pedestrian crossing at Chanticleer Avenue.

Staff further recommends that the RTC approve the attached resolution (Attachment 4) amending the FY 2011/2012 Budget for the Highway 1 HOV Lanes Project as shown on Exhibit A to Attachment 4 to carryover unspent funds from FY 2010/2011 and move funds within the project budget to allow the environmental work to proceed.

BACKGROUND

In September 2003, the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) and Caltrans initiated preliminary design and environmental studies to add high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes to Highway 1 from Morrissey Boulevard in Santa Cruz to Larkin Valley/San Andreas Road in Aptos. This is referred to as the project approval/environmental documentation (PA/ED) phase. Since that time, as reported at the RTC's June Transportation Policy Workshop (TPW), there have been changes in the emphasis and scrutiny of federal environmental regulations. This led Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) officials to report in May 2011 that they could not approve a final environmental document for either of the alternatives under study in the HOV Lanes project until a committed source of funding is identified.

In this same timeframe, enforcement provisions of the federal government's "10 year rule" have been heightened requiring on-site construction or acquisition of right-of-way to begin within 10 years of starting the PA/ED phase or risk having to pay back federal funds used for those activities. Over \$5.5 million in federal funds have been used for the preliminary design/environmental analysis of the Highway 1 project. In response to this situation, the project team and FHWA recommend a tiered environmental document that will allow full disclosure of the HOV Lane project as currently defined, including the project's impacts, costs, and benefits (Tier 1). The document will also provide environmental documentation of a project deemed financially feasible from existing funding sources (Tier 2).

The project team evaluated potential Tier 2 projects consistent with the purpose of the HOV Lane project to reduce congestion on the highway and promote the use of alternative travel

modes. Through this process the project team recommended designating the 41st Avenue/Soquel Drive Auxiliary Lanes and the Chanticleer Bike/Ped Overcrossing as the Tier 2 project for environmental analysis and development. Once the environmental document is approved the RTC could proceed to design, acquire right-of-way, and construct the Tier 2 project. The Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC), at their August 4th meeting, voted unanimously to recommend that the RTC approve development of the proposed tiered environmental document.

DISCUSSION

As reported by RTC's Washington assistants (see Attachment 1), the changes in FHWA policy are consistent with other initiatives taken to more rigorously account for all federal spending as a result of several factors. The efforts to ensure that federal funds are being spent timely and efficiently are seen at agencies beyond the FHWA. While there are efforts to provide some assistance to local governments with transportation projects, those programs are based on the availability of local revenue, as opposed to revenues that are expected to be available from the federal government.

In consideration of the current regulatory environment and the suggestion from FHWA representatives for a tiered environmental document, **the ITAC and staff recommend that the RTC recommend that Caltrans develop a combined tiered environmental document for the Highway 1 HOV Lanes project consisting of:**

- a. Tier 1 - program level environmental documentation for the Highway 1 HOV Lanes Project; and,**
- b. Tier 2 - project level environmental documentation for auxiliary lanes between 41st Avenue and Soquel Drive and a bike/pedestrian overcrossing at Chanticleer Avenue.**

The document would meet federal guidelines and give the RTC the possibility of initiating work on a lower cost Tier 2 project within the "10-year rule" to avoid having to pay back over \$5.5 million in federal funds already spent. The RTC is the sponsoring and funding agency for the Highway 1 HOV Lanes project environmental document but Caltrans is the legal lead agency for the environmental document. Therefore, the RTC would recommend that a combined tiered environmental document be produced and Caltrans would make that decision. Accordingly, the project team, including FHWA representatives and Caltrans, has been engaged over the past two months in development of a scope of work and project schedule that meets the goal of approving a final tiered environmental document in time to advance development of a fundable project by September 2013. As discussed at the June TPW meeting, there are additional costs in transitioning existing studies and reports into a tiered document, including the work performed over the past few months to effectively define the final work product required by Caltrans and FHWA to achieve timely approval of the document.

Budget to Complete a Tiered Environmental Document

As a result of discussions with RTC staff and the project team, Nolte Associates Inc., lead to the consultant team, has prepared the attached memo (Attachment 2) describing the additional work elements and costs needed to complete a final tiered environmental document. While some of the additional costs are necessary to produce a final tiered environmental document, a

portion of the additional costs result from other work elements. These include changes in the state's storm water requirements; efforts over the past 18 months to develop a phased implementation plan in the absence of full project funding; resolution of design details for the reconstruction of freeway interchanges; and extended meetings with local agency staff and policy members, to minimize right-of-way impacts and optimize traffic operations and safety given projected future travel demand in the area.

Attachment 2 describes the cost increases for the consultant work based on the amount of funds currently included in the consultant contract. The RTC budget includes some funds previously approved for the Highway 1 HOV Lanes project that have not yet been included in the consultant contract. Parag Mehta, Nolte Project Manager, and Jeff Bingham, Parsons Environmental Manager, will provide a description of the proposed work effort to prepare a tiered environment document and respond to questions regarding this work. A detailed project schedule is being prepared with Caltrans and will be used to monitor progress and expenditures toward completion of the environmental process.

Major milestones in the PA/ED process are shown at the bottom of page 4 of Attachment 2, with release of the draft tiered environmental document anticipated in May 2012, selection of the preferred alternative in January 2013, with state and federal approval of the final environmental document in August 2013. The proposed schedule is very aggressive and assumes no delay in beginning work to transform existing documentation and develop all necessary new material needed for the combined Tier 1/Tier 2 environmental document.

Current and Future Year Expenses

The full cost of completing the PA/ED process through Fiscal Year 2013/2014 is shown on Attachment 3. Projected costs include RTC staff time, public outreach, FHWA required value analysis of the Tier 2 project, the current estimated cost of completing the STARS analysis of the HOV Lane project, and setting aside a reserve for legal defense of the final environmental document. These costs total approximately \$1.0 million more than has been previously approved by the RTC for the project. As shown on the table the need for additional funds occurs in next fiscal year, FY 2012/2013, when anticipated expenses would exceed currently budgeted revenues by \$425,000. In FY 2013/2014 an additional \$575,000 would be needed to complete the PA/ED process.

Beyond the work necessary to complete the environmental document, the cost estimate includes an additional \$250,000 as a reserve for legal defense and an additional \$380,000 for the proposed application of the Sustainable Transportation Analysis and Rating System (STARS) to the Highway 1 HOV Lane project. The RTC authorized staff to initiate this STARS evaluation in January 2011 with approval of a contract with the North American Sustainable Transportation Council (NATSC) in the amount of \$100,000. The preliminary cost estimates for the STARS evaluation include traffic and green house gas (GHG) analysis, optimal utilization of data already developed, and integration of recommendations into the environmental document at the completion of the STARS evaluation.

While recognizing the constrained funding environment RTC and all member agencies are currently experiencing, staff recommends continuing with the STARS work because it offers an opportunity to fully evaluate the role the project serves in meeting the access needs of the region, improving the health, safety and economic vitality of the community, reducing climate

pollution and energy consumption, and maximizing cost effectiveness. Given the experience with the Soquel/Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes project, staff also believes it prudent to provide a reserve for legal defense of the final tiered environmental document. The total of all proposed and currently anticipated expenses to complete the PA/ED process leads to a deficit of approximately \$1.0 million over funds previously approved by the RTC for the Highway 1 HOV Lane project.

A recommendation of how to fund the additional expenses to complete the environmental document (\$1.0 million) and the subsequent development and construction of the proposed Tier 2 Project (Auxiliary Lanes between 41st Avenue and Soquel Avenue and a Bicycle/Pedestrian Overcrossing of Highway 1 at Chanticleer Avenue, estimated at \$29.0 million) is discussed in a separate agenda item related to the 2012 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP).

FY 2011/2012 Budget Amendment

The current FY 2011/2012 RTC Budget includes funds previously approved by the RTC for the Highway 1 HOV Lanes project under the budget line "Reserve for future year expenses (see Exhibit A of Attachment 4). These available reserve funds of \$1.6 million along with the reconciled carryover funds from the FY 2010/2011 budget provide approximately \$2.2 million in funding to meet proposed expenses in proceeding with work on the tiered environmental document. However, an amendment to the current FY 2011/2012 Budget is necessary to provide budget authority to amend the consultant contract with Nolte Associates whose existing contract budget is nearly expended.

The timely amendment of the HOV lane project budget is critical to allow work to continue unabated on the environmental document so as to meet the project schedule within the time limits of the "10-year rule". **Accordingly, staff recommends that the RTC approve the attached resolution (Attachment 4) amending the FY 2011/2012 Budget for the Highway 1 HOV Lanes project as shown on Exhibit A to Attachment 4 to carryover unspent funds from FY 2010-2011 and move funds within the project budget to allow work to proceed on the tiered environmental document.**

SUMMARY

In full consideration of alternatives, the ITAC and staff recommend proceeding with a tiered environmental document for the HOV Lane project including completion of the project level document for auxiliary lanes between 41st Avenue and Soquel Drive and a bicycle/pedestrian overcrossing at Chanticleer. The full costs of completing the tiered environmental document, including STARS evaluation of the HOV Lane project and providing a reserve for legal defense of the completed environmental document is shown on Attachment 3. A recommendation of how to fund the additional expenses to complete the environmental document and the subsequent construction of the proposed Tier 2 Project (Auxiliary Lanes between 41st Avenue and Soquel Avenue and a Bicycle/Pedestrian Overcrossing of Highway 1 at Chanticleer Avenue), estimated at \$30 million, is discussed in a separate agenda item related to the 2012 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP). Staff recommends that the RTC approve resolution (Attachment 4) amending the FY 2011/2012 Budget to carryover unspent funds from FY 2010-2011 and move funds within the project budget to allow work to proceed on the tiered environmental document.

Attachments:

1. Memorandum from RTC's Washington Office, dated July 12, 2011
2. Memorandum from Nolte Associates, dated August 3, 2011
3. Full Project Budget to Complete the HOV Lane Tiered Environment Document
4. Resolution Amending the FY 2011/2012 Budget for the HOV Lane Project

\\Rtcserv2\shared\TPW\TPW 2011\0811\Hwy1\StaffReport-110818.docx

ATTACHMENT - 1

SANTA CRUZ COUNTY RTC WASHINGTON OFFICE MEMORANDUM

TO: George Dondero
FROM: Carolyn Chaney/Chris Giglio
DATE: July 12, 2011
SUBJECT: Federal Funding Trends

We wanted to follow-up on our recent conversation regarding the changes in Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) policy as it relates to the agency's consideration of non-federal future sources of revenue.

Based on our experiences with Congress and several federal agencies in recent years, the change does not surprise us and in fact reflects increasing efforts by the federal government to carefully account for all federal spending. There have been several factors that have resulted in this increased scrutiny, among them:

- *The 2009 American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA)*: As part of ARRA, the Obama Administration created and provided significant resources to a Recovery and Transparency Accountability Board made up of federal agency Inspectors General that was designed to root out any possible fraud in the distribution of the \$787 billion in stimulus funds. In addition, the media has kept a sharp eye on the distribution of ARRA funds, leading to stepped-up efforts to ensure that the funds resulted in concrete projects within a short timeframe.
- *Congressional Earmark Moratorium*: As a result of high-profile criticism of the practice by the Obama Administration, congressional Republicans and some congressional Democrats, Congress instituted a moratorium on congressional earmarks for both the FY 2011 and FY 2012 budget process. Even before the moratorium, earmarks had come under increased scrutiny by the media and general public, highlighted by the Alaska "Bridge to Nowhere" in the 2005 transportation reauthorization bill. Congress has also moved in recent months to rescind funding for earmarks in pre-1998 transportation reauthorization bills that have yet to be obligated.
- *The Deficit*: Sensing public discomfort over the deficit, Congress has recently placed significant caps on federal discretionary spending. As a result, there are fewer federal dollars to go around, and federal programs must show immediate results for fear of being cut. The most recent example of this in the transportation arena is a new House rule that prevents authorized surface transportation funding levels from being higher than the receipts in the Highway Trust Fund. The result was the recently introduced outline of transportation reauthorization bill in the House with funding levels that are 30 percent below those of the 2005 SAFETEA-LU bill.

These efforts to ensure that federal funds are being spent in an efficient and timely manner can also be seen at agencies other than the Department of Transportation. Congressional appropriators have recommended significant cuts to federal job training and homeland security programs, citing backlogs in spending from previous years funding, even if in many cases the delays are the result of demanding federal regulations. And securing federal funding for flood control projects that have not been previously funded is nearly impossible, as the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has been instructed to work on clearing the large backlog of unfinished projects across the country.

Finally, while there are efforts to provide some assistance to states and local governments with transportation projects through “creative” financing, they are based on available local revenues, as opposed to revenues that are expected to be available from the federal government. The recent proposal by the House Transportation & Infrastructure Committee to expand loan authority for the Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (TIFIA) program could potentially assist areas such as Los Angeles in accelerating projects included in ballot measures that have already been approved by voters.

We hope that this is somewhat helpful in understanding the political and economic climate in Washington. While the FHWA change in policy is not necessarily helpful to the Highway 1 project, we do not think that Santa Cruz or California are being treated differently than any other areas. It is more likely that the change you are experiencing is a result of a widespread effort on the part of the federal government to impose more oversight on spending in order to ensure that projects are completed in a timely manner despite declining resources.

Proposed Revisions to Project Scope and Budget

The Administrative Draft Environmental Document (ADED) along with technical reports including geometric support plans and design documentation will be revised/updated to support the tiered environmental document approach. Anticipated efforts required to update the environmental documents are based on consultation with Caltrans engineering and environmental staff.

Following is a brief description of the work tasks and proposed funding levels required to complete a draft PR, circulate the DED, responding to public comments and seeking project approvals from FHWA. The scope is based on the tiered document approach of the project as currently defined:

- 1) Task 1: Task 1 Project Management. Additional funding is required due to an increased coordination with Caltrans, FHWA and resource agencies, additional PDT meetings as well as increased public presentations over the project scope as defined in December 2009. Additional funding will also be required for agency coordination to resolve engineering and environmental issues (fact sheet processing for Tier 2 project, APS approval for Chanticleer Pedestrian bridge; DED and tech report coordination). The following assumes a street ready draft ED by early summer of 2012, 3 public hearings, organizing and responding to DED comments, preparing a final environmental document and Project Report.

Estimated additional Budget: \$169,000.

- 2) Task 2: Environmental Review and technical studies:

The draft technical reports will need to be updated per the current tiered approach. The Tier 2 project geometry will require specific exhibits and charts, updates to the wetland impacts, right-of-way data sheet, mitigation tables, storm water data report and noise technical report. It is expected that noise report will not be updated per the new protocol. Additional visual simulations are anticipated to be included in the DED to depict the Tier 2 project.

Estimated Budget: \$248,300

- 3) Task 5: Preliminary Engineering. It is necessary to meet Caltrans request to prepare Tier 2 Project exhibits per the current design standards. This will require converting the existing Metric Units mapping into English Unit mapping and creating base map to achieve a 35% design level of development with fact sheets for design exceptions for the draft Project Report (PR). This requires additional design development and cost estimation work. In addition to geometric development requirements, additional items that have an impact on budget include storm water treatment, soundwall and retaining wall design, and creating preliminary structural plan (APS) for the proposed pedestrian bridge structure consistent with the current geometry.

Estimated additional Budget: \$159,900.

4) Task 6 – Traffic Modeling and Operational Analysis:

It is anticipated that additional traffic analysis will be needed to support the tiered environmental document approach. Traffic analysis will provide a measure of effectiveness for the Tier 2 project and support an implementation strategy including prioritization of improvements, identification of downstream bottlenecks, and proposing mitigation measures based on possible funding plan for the project. Additional documentation and support will be required for the DED.

A third party review of traffic forecasts relative to latest AMBAG population and employment forecasts will be conducted to validate methodology and approach used in producing travel forecasts, induced travel, and greenhouse gas impacts.

Estimated additional budget: \$36,400

5) Task 7 - Preparation and Circulation of Environmental Document: The current scope as defined in December 2009 needs to be updated to meet the tiered EIR/EA template and review requirements. At minimum five Caltrans review cycles are anticipated. In addition, as a result of the public interaction that has taken place to date, as well as recent experience with the Soquel/Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes Project, significant effort is anticipated both in the preparation and review cycles to get a DED ready for circulation.

The DED will need to discuss the Tier 2 project in detail and provide sufficient details for Tier I alternatives (HOV and TSM) for public to understand the HOV Lane project. Based on our experience from the Auxiliary Lane DED, a large number of public comments are anticipated on the environmental document which will require a more significant effort to organize the comments than originally anticipated for this project.

Estimated additional Budget: \$247,000.

Task 8 – Draft Project Report. The draft Project Report (DPR) will need to be updated to discuss Tier 2 project in detail and provide engineering layouts for the Tier 2 project including the pedestrian overcrossing. The DPR will provide information on the Tier I alternatives but will not seek geometric approval from Caltrans. A Noise Abatement Decision Report (NADR) will be required for the Tier 2 project only. Besides updating the DPR for the revised geometry, all attachments including cost estimate, cross sections, and fact sheets will need to be updated for the Tier 2 project. The DPR will need to address phased implementation and address community impact during construction.

Estimated additional Budget: \$50,000

Task 9 – EIR/EIS Approval and Final Project Report. Based on our experience from the Soquel/Morrissey Auxiliary Lane DED, a large number of public comments are anticipated

for this project. Based on the current tiered environmental document approach we don't anticipate any subsurface archaeological work will be necessary for the Tier 2 project. Effort required under this task will include addressing public comments, updating the environmental document and Project Report and obtain FHWA approval. We had estimated \$985,000 budget in December 2009.

Estimated Budget: \$725,600

The direct expenses to circulate the DED and prepare Final ED are estimated to be \$67,900.

The total estimated budget needed to complete the PAED phase is \$1,704,100. As of this request we have \$119,200 in our current contract and hence the total proposed budget augmentation is \$1,585,000. This corresponds to \$741,000 for DED circulation and \$844,000 from DED circulation to FONSI.

Of the \$741,000 additional budget necessary for DED circulation, it our estimate that \$515,000 is for additional efforts due to the tiered environmental document approach. The table at the end of this memo provides an overview of the original project budget approved in 2003, subsequent budget amendments, and the current budget request. The table describes the reallocation of project budget by major task areas, in response to changes in project scope and processing requirements as well as specific new tasks added to the project from the original project scope.

Project Schedule

A detailed schedule for the project is being developed in consultation with Caltrans. RTC and Caltrans staff and the consultant team are currently discussing scope of work details in completing the current work program leading to distribution of the draft environmental document that maximizes the project delivery options for the project.

The following are major milestones in the current schedule. Circulation of the draft environmental document is anticipated in the summer 2012 and the approval of the final environmental document in August 2013.

- Admin Draft ED to Caltrans - October 2011
- Draft ED to FHWA - March 2012
- Draft ED/ Project Report - May 2012
- DED circulation - July 2012
- Select Preferred Alternative - January 2013
- Final EA/EIR submittal to FHWA - Spring 2013
- Approval of Final Environmental Document and Project Report - August 2013

S:\TPW\TPW 2011\0811\Hwy1\Nolte-FundingNeeds-HOV-20110803.docx

Route 1 HOV Lane Project					
SCCRTC					
Summary of Costs and Proposed budget to complete PAED FONSI - September 2013					
Budget request in August 2011					
Major Tasks	2003 Original Budget	Budget post Jan 2008 approved amendment	Budget post Dec 2009 approved amendment	August 2011 budget reallocation request	Proposed August 2011 budget
Project Management	\$918,711	\$1,395,985	\$1,525,985	\$151,300	\$1,677,285
Data Collection	\$566,517	\$445,379	\$445,379		\$445,379
Project Study Report	\$226,072	\$140,696	\$140,696		\$140,696
Env Technical Studies / PAED	\$1,347,492	\$1,288,607	\$1,468,607	\$208,300	\$1,676,907
Preliminary Engineering	\$1,565,038	\$2,382,383	\$2,542,383	\$159,900	\$2,702,283
Traffic Modeling & Operation Analysis	\$471,481	\$599,746	\$674,746	\$25,000	\$699,746
Prepare & Circulate DED	\$348,680	\$525,354	\$845,354	\$197,000	\$1,042,354
Draft Project Report	\$104,993	\$205,659	\$275,659	\$50,000	\$325,659
EIR/EIS Approval & Final	\$206,707	\$68,308	\$68,308	725,600	\$793,908
Public Outreach/Community Involvement	\$305,233	\$346,125	\$346,125		\$346,125
Interim Proj Assessment	\$155,108	\$109,309	\$109,309		\$109,309
M/S Auxiliary Lanes Project	\$0	\$155,813	\$155,813		\$155,813
Fundable Projects	\$0	\$52,097	\$52,097		\$52,097
Bike Pass Study	\$0	\$23,088	\$23,088		\$23,088
Sustainability Assessment	\$0	\$77,415	\$77,415		\$77,415
Reimbursable	\$294,707	\$184,036	\$234,036	\$67,900	\$301,936
Contingency	\$14,262	\$0	\$0		\$0
Sub Total	\$6,525,000	\$8,000,000	\$8,985,000	\$1,585,000	\$10,570,000

**Highway 1 HOV Lane Project - Tiered Environmental Project
Full Project Budget w/ STARS and Reserve for Legal Defense - 8/5/2011**

	Approved		Proposed		Total			
	FY 11/12	FY 11/12	FY 12/13	FY 13/14				
Revenues								
Est. Carryover		2,228,988	617,595	-425,905				
Expenditures								
Nolte - Existing Contract	250,000	357,893	0	0	357,893			
Nolte - Supplemental: Tiered DED & FED								
		750,000	620,000	215,000	1,585,000		Based on Est. 8/3/2011	
RTC Staff & Overhead	110,000	160,000	160,000	100,000	420,000		Staff oversite of environmental doc & STARS evaluation, Tier 2 project dev'l/p	
Public Info, materials, postage, meetings	60,000	40,000	25,000	10,000	75,000		3 Public workshops -Tier 1 project, 1 Public Hearing - Tier 2 project & Public Outreach ...	
...								
On-Call Cosultants	3,500	3,500	3,500	0	7,000			
ROW Consultant	10,000	10,000	10,000	0	20,000			
FHWA Value Analysis	12,000	0	35,000	0	35,000		Value Analysis needed for Tier 2 project	
STARS - NASC	75,000	75,000	25,000	0	100,000		Existing contract amount \$100,000,	
STARS - Traffic/GHG Analysis		150,000	100,000	0	250,000		Preliminary Est \$200K - \$300K	
STARS - Nolte		65,000	65,000	0	130,000		Initial Est \$150K	
Reserve for Legal Defense	0	0	0	250,000	250,000			
Reserve for Future Year Expenses	1,613,326	617,595	0	0				
Total Expenditures		2,228,988	1,043,500	575,000				
Balance: Revenue - Expenditures		0	-425,905	-1,000,905				

ATTACHMENT 4

RESOLUTION NO.

Adopted by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
on the date of August 18, 2011
on the motion of Commissioner
duly seconded by Commissioner

A RESOLUTION AMENDING THE FY 2011-12 BUDGET AND WORK PROGRAM FOR THE SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

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

1. The FY 2011-12 Budget and Work Program for the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission are hereby amended as shown in Exhibit A.

AYES: COMMISSIONERS

NOES: COMMISSIONERS

ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS

ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS

Mark Stone, Chair

ATTEST:

George Dondero, Secretary

Attachments: Exhibit A - SCCRTC FY 11-12 Budget as amended

Distribution: RTC Fiscal
AMBAG

**SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
OPERATING BUDGET BY PROGRAM - HIGHWAY 1
FY 2011-2012 BUDGET**

1 HWY 1 ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT & Design: 722200

2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37		
		WORK ELEMENT #683	FY11-12 APPROVED 06/16/11	FY11-12 PROPOSED 08/18/11	DIFFERENCE	NOTE																															
		REVENUES:																																			
		6 RSTP Exchange - HOV Lanes	1,850,000	2,225,007	375,007	- Reconciled carryover from FY 10/11																															
		7 CMAQ - HOV Lanes	65,000	0	-65,000	- Reconciled carryover from FY 10/12																															
		8 STIP - HOV Lanes	193,826	3,981	-189,845	- Reconciled carryover from FY 10/13																															
		9 Federal Earmark Aux Lanes: Design	28,500	28,500	0																																
		10 STIP - Aux Lanes: Design (carryover)	0	0	0																																
		11 RSTP Exchange - Aux Lanes: Design	75,000	75,000	0																																
		12 RSTP Exchange - Aux Lanes: PA/ED	185,000	185,000	0																																
		TOTAL REVENUES	2,397,326	2,517,488	120,162																																
		EXPENDITURES:																																			
		14 Salaries and Benefits	110,000	185,000	75,000	- Staff work to advance tiered environmental document																															
		17 Services and Supplies:																																			
		18 Hwy 1 HOV Lanes PA/ED:																																			
		19 PA/ED Consultant - Nolle Contract	250,000	1,107,893	857,893	- Carryover and additional funds to proceed with tiered environmental document																															
		20 PA/ED on Call Consultants	3,500	3,500	0																																
		21 PA/ED Public Information, materials, postage & meetings	60,000	40,000	-20,000	- Reduced based on past costs																															
		22 ROW Consultant	10,000	10,000	0																																
		23 FHWA Project Value Analysis	12,000	0	-12,000	- Not needed in this fiscal year																															
		24 Sustainability Analysis (STARS)	75,000	75,000	0																																
		25 Reserve for future year expenses	1,613,326	832,595	-780,731	- Moved to PA/ED consultant to proceed with tiered environmental document																															
		26 Highway 1 Morrissey-Soquel Aux Lane PA/ED																																			
		27 PA/ED Legal Costs	185,000	185,000	0																																
		28 Hwy 1 Morrissey-Soquel Aux Lane Design:																																			
		29 Final Design and Engineering Consultants	75,000	75,000	0																																
		30 Design on Call Consultants	2,000	2,000	0																																
		31 Design Public Information, materials, Postage & meeting space	1,500	1,500	0																																
		32 PS&E Construction Admin Activities	0	0	0																																
		33 Pre-construction activities	0	0	0																																
		<i>Subtotal Services & Supplies</i>	2,287,326	2,332,488	45,162																																
		Unappropriated Revenues - HOV:	0	0	0																																
		TOTAL EXPENDITURES	2,397,326	2,517,488	120,162																																

SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
 OPERATING BUDGET BY PROGRAM - HWY 1 CONSTRUCTION
 FY 2011-12 BUDGET

1 HWY 1 CONSTRUCTION: 722200

	FY11-12 APPROVED 06/16/11	FY11-12 PROPOSED 08/18/11	DIFFERENCE	NOTE - All funds and expenditures estimated to be carried over from FY 10-11
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				

WORK ELEMENT #683

REVENUES:

STIP Construction

CMIA Construction

TOTAL REVENUES

EXPENDITURES:

Salaries and Benefits

Services and Supplies:

Hwy 1 Morrissey-Soquel Aux Lane Construction:

Contractor - Capital Expenses

Construction - Management Team

Construction - Public Information

Construction - Oversight

Construction - On Call Consultants

Contingency & Future Year Costs

Subtotal Services & Supplies

Unappropriated Revenues

TOTAL EXPENDITURES

-75,000 - Construction estimated to begin in later half of the fiscal year

TO: Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) – Transportation Policy Workshop

FROM: Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner

RE: *2012 Regional Transportation Improvement Program* Development

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC):

1. Provide input on preliminary proposals for the *2012 Regional Transportation Improvement Program* (RTIP) and indicate its intent to:
 - a. Program the region's targeted share of 2012 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds (\$9.25 million), program the region's anticipated share of new FY11/12 Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds (\$2.5 million), seek an advance of STIP funds through FY19/20 (\$12 million), and reprogram \$7.5 million in STIP and Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds from the Mar Vista bicycle/pedestrian overcrossing to RTC projects and programs;
 - b. Program \$1 million of the RSTP funds for the tiered Highway 1 environmental document including legal defense and completion of STARS analysis;
 - c. Program \$29 million in STIP to the design, right-of-way, and construction phases of the Highway 1 41st Avenue-Soquel Auxiliary Lanes and Chanticleer Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge project (proposed Tier 2 project for the Highway 1 HOV Lanes project environmental document); and
 - d. Program the balance of RSTP and STIP funds to other RTC projects and programs, including rail line rehabilitation design and construction, the Freeway Service Patrol (FSP), and state and federal mandated planning, programming, and monitoring activities;
 2. Approve the proposed schedule for *2012 RTIP* adoption;
 3. Consider input received from the Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC) on proposals for the 41st Avenue/Soquel Drive Auxiliary Lanes and Chanticleer Bike/Pedestrian Crossing Project (proposed Tier 2 project for the Highway 1 HOV Lanes project environmental document) and 2012 RTIP process ([Attachment 1](#));
 4. Review, and amend as appropriate, the list of projects that have been identified as priority transportation needs for the next five to ten years ([Attachment 2](#)); direct staff to work with project sponsors to seek funds from other sources to advance these critical projects; direct staff to continue to advocate with legislative assistants for increased state and federal revenues for transportation; and direct staff to return at a future meeting with options to develop localized revenue sources to supplement existing transportation revenues; and
 5. Confirm that previously programmed projects remain priorities for RTC-discretionary funds ([Attachment 3](#)).
-

BACKGROUND

A key funding source for regional transportation projects in Santa Cruz County is the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). In addition to STIP funds, the RTC also programs the region's share of federal Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds in the RTIP. Under state transportation statutes established by Senate Bill 45 in 1998, the Regional Transportation Commission nominates projects to receive its formula share of STIP funds through the *Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP)*. After considering the RTIPs submitted statewide, the California Transportation Commission (CTC) makes the final determination on which projects are programmed to receive STIP funds, as well as for what year they are programmed. The California Transportation Commission (CTC) is scheduled to adopt the Fund Estimate and Guidelines for the *2012 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)* on August 10, 2011. The region's proposal for the 2012 STIP is due to the CTC by December 15, 2011.

DISCUSSION

2012 RTIP - Available Funds

The STIP is made up of a combination of state and federal funding sources, including funds from the excise tax on gasoline, Proposition 1B transportation bonds, federal Transportation Enhancement program (TE), and the Public Transportation Account (PTA). Based on the Draft 2012 STIP Fund Estimate, the CTC has indicated that **\$9.25 million in STIP funds may be available for programming in Santa Cruz County through FY16/17**. This amount includes \$2.9 million carried over from the 2010 STIP and an \$890,000 TE target. At a very minimum, in accordance with SB45 county shares rules, the CTC must make \$5.1 million in STIP available to the region for programming through FY15/16. The RTC may also request an advance of an additional \$12 million of the region's projected shares of STIP funds through FY 2019/20 for a larger project, for a **potential STIP total of \$21.25 million**.

In addition to these STIP funds, the RTC is responsible for selecting projects to receive the region's share of Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds. Given uncertainty surrounding the next federal transportation act, for which proposals include dramatic reductions in overall funding and elimination or consolidation of 70-90 funding programs, staff recommends that the RTC only program the regions' anticipated apportionments of RSTP funds through FFY2011/12 as part of the 2012 RTIP adoption, **\$2.5 million in new RSTP funds**. Other options for the 2012 RTIP would be to only program STIP funds at this time and to wait to program additional RSTP funds until the next federal transportation act is adopted; program additional RSTP funds beyond FY11/12, contingent upon the funds being made available in the next transportation act; or to keep RSTP funds in reserve to address potential funding needs for RTC rail and highway projects.

Funding Needs

As repeatedly discussed in the past, existing revenues are insufficient to fund all of the needs in the region and the RTC has discretion over less than 10% of the funds available for transportation projects. Given limited resources, it is critical for agencies to ensure that limited funds are going to the highest priority projects that are most beneficial. A list of some of the

highest priority projects for the next 5-10 years, as previously identified by RTC commissioners, staff, project sponsors, or RTC committee members, is attached ([Attachment 2](#)). How well a project addresses one or more of the following criteria is oftentimes considered when identifying priorities:

- Safety (reduce collisions)
- Mobility (reduce congestion, delay, travel times)
- Accessibility (increase travel options, reduce number or distance of trips)
- Reliability (reduce travel time variability, non-recurrent delay)
- Productivity (increase throughput, vehicle occupancy/passengers per vehicle mile)
- System Preservation (fix distressed facilities)
- Environment (air quality)
- Deliverability (if there are barriers to the schedule)
- Funding (if all other funding is secured)
- Number of people served

RTC advisory committees discussed priorities at their August meetings and those projects are reflected in the list ([Attachment 2](#)). **Staff recommends that the RTC review and amend, as appropriate, the list of priority projects and confirm that previously programmed projects ([Attachment 3](#)) remain among the highest priorities.**

Given that there are insufficient funds to meet most of the region's needs with STIP and RSTP funds, **staff recommends that the RTC work with project sponsors to seek funds from other sources in order to advance many of these critical projects and to continue to work with our state and federal legislative assistants to advocate for additional state and federal revenues for transportation. Staff further recommends that the RTC direct staff to return at a future meeting with options to develop localized revenue sources to supplement existing transportation revenues.**

Funding Highway 1

As discussed in a separate agenda item, approximately \$30 million in funding is needed to develop a tiered environmental document and implement the proposed Tier 2 project (Highway 1 41st Avenue/Soquel Drive Auxiliary Lanes and Chanticleer Bike/Ped Crossing project). Highway 1 is the most heavily traveled roadway in Santa Cruz County, carrying over 100,000 vehicles per day. Extended hours of daily congestion on Highway 1 result in: by-pass traffic on local arterials, compromising the safety and operational efficiency of the local roadway network serving motorized and non-motorized travel; increased travel times and delay; and increased environmental impacts to air quality and noise along Highway 1 and local roadways. **If the RTC decides to move forward with the proposed Tier 2 project, the RTC would need to:**

1. **Program \$1 million in Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds** to the Highway 1 HOV Lanes environmental document phase to transform the existing work into a combined Tier 1/Tier 2 environmental document for FHWA approval; complete the STARS analysis of the HOV lane project; and provide a reserve for legal defense.
2. **Redirect \$7.5 million in STIP and RSTP funds previously programmed to Mar Vista Bike/Pedestrian overcrossing** to this project. While shifting funds between projects is never ideal, construction of the Chanticleer crossing as part of the 41st/Soquel auxiliary lanes project is more efficient for environmental study, design and construction,

and provides improved bike and pedestrian access to growing commercial areas, medical facilities, and established residential areas as a safer alternative to the Soquel and 41st Avenue Interchanges. The Mar Vista overcrossing could be reconsidered in the future.

3. **Program all of the region's target of STIP funds through FY16/17**, as identified in the 2012 STIP Fund Estimate, to this project: **\$9.25 million** (this includes the region's unprogrammed balance from the prior STIP)
4. **Request that the CTC approve an advance** of the regions FY17/18-19/20 STIP funds for this project: **\$12 million**

Total: \$29.75 million

Staff considered concurrently seeking a federal TIGER 3 grant for the bike/pedestrian bridge portion of the project; however, construction funds for the TIGER 3 program must be obligated by September 2013, which is not feasible for this project. Staff will pursue other funding opportunities, as they arise, which could reduce the amount of funds coming from the STIP.

If the STIP advance is not approved by the CTC, in order to avoid repaying federal funds previously spent on the HOV lanes environmental document, the RTC could:

- Program funds for at least the tiered environmental document and right-of-way, and reserve the balance of STIP funds to program to design and construction in the future;
- Phase construction of the Tier 2 project to build the auxiliary lanes and the bike/pedestrian bridge one at a time, as funds become available in the future. This option may require updating the environmental document if an extended period passes between environmental approval and start of construction (typically 3 years) and may incur additional costs; and/or
- Redirect previously programmed funds from other projects to the Tier 2 project.

Funding Other RTC Project Needs

As demonstrated in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Attachment 2, there is no shortage of important projects in the region that need funding and RTC-discretionary funding is insufficient to fund most of these. Programming nearly \$30 million of RTC-discretionary funds for the proposed Tier 2 Highway 1 project, leaves \$1.5 million available for programming to other needs in the region in the 2012 RTIP.

Additional funds needed for regional RTC projects and programs which staff recommends the RTC consider as part of the 2012 RTIP include:

- Rail Structures Design: Cost unknown. It is possible that additional funds will be needed for design of rail structures and other improvements. Consultants interested in bidding on the project indicated that the \$300,000 previously programmed and budgeted may be insufficient. Actual funds needed (if any) should be known by September, following contract negotiations.
- Rail Structures Rehabilitation: \$615,000 may be needed to match STIP funds programmed for construction due to changes in state law, which resulted in the loss of state transit funds to the STIP—forcing federalization of the project. The STIP allocation request could be reduced by a similar amount with funds to return to the region in a future STIP cycle.

- \$120,000-\$235,000 to maintain Freeway Service Patrol (FSP) at current levels through FY12/13.
- Planning, Programming and Monitoring (PPM): \$300,000 to meet state and federal mandated planning and programming requirements through the 2012 STIP period (FY16/17).

Where do we go from here? Process for the 2012 RTIP

Due to funding needs for a few specific RTC-projects and programs, as shown above, staff does not recommend issuing a call for projects for programming funds in the 2012 RTIP. **Instead staff recommends that the RTC indicate its intent to program \$2.5 million in RSTP, program \$21.25 million in STIP, and redirect \$7.5 million from the Mar Vista Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge to regional projects, primarily the Highway 1 41stAve-Soquel Auxiliary Lanes project.**

The proposed schedule for 2012 RTIP development is as follows:

1. June-August 2011: Identify priorities and additional funding needs; Project sponsors update information on existing projects
2. August 2011: Committees discuss the highest priority needs in the region through FY2019/20 and confirm that previously programmed projects remain a priority
3. August 10, 2011: CTC adopts STIP Fund Estimate and Guidelines
4. August 18, 2011: RTC approves plan for 2012 RTIP
5. October/November 2011: Committees review Draft RTIP
6. December 2011: RTC adopts the 2012 RTIP at public hearing and submits to CTC
(due to CTC by December 15, 2011)
7. February 8, 2012: CTC STIP Hearing on RTIP proposals
8. March 8, 2012: CTC publishes CTC Staff Recommendations
9. March 28, 2012: CTC adopts 2012 STIP
10. May 2012: RTC amends RTIP as needed to reflect CTC actions

ITAC Recommendations

At its August 4, 2011 meeting, the Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC) discussed proposals for the 2012 RTIP and tiered Highway 1 environmental document. While the ITAC unanimously recommends the RTC develop a tiered environmental document that includes the 41st Avenue/Soquel Drive Auxiliary Lanes as Tier 2, there was no consensus on the process for the 2012 RTIP and the ITAC did not approve the staff recommendations for the 2012 RTIP process. Input received from the ITAC is attached ([Attachment 1](#)). Emphasizing needs of local jurisdictions, on a vote of 7 (with 4 abstentions), the ITAC recommended the RTC issue a call for projects for the \$2.5 million in RSTP funds. If approved by the RTC, this would result in the tiered environmental document/STARS analysis and other RTC projects competing with local projects for RSTP funds.

The ITAC did recommend that the RTC indicate its intent to program STIP to the 41st Avenue/Soquel Drive Auxiliary Lanes project, but recommended tabling discussion about whether to redirect funds from the Mar Vista Bridge to other projects.

Notably, the Board of Supervisors, following receipt of a presentation on the Statewide Local Streets and Roads Needs Assessment earlier this year, sent a letter urging the RTC to give priority for RSTP funds to local street and road repairs and maintenance ([Attachment 4](#)). While staff agrees that maintaining local streets and roads, as well as numerous projects identified by other agencies, are very important, given limited RSTP funds and RTC project needs, staff does not recommend making them a priority for RSTP in this cycle.

SUMMARY

Every other year the RTC prepares a Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) which proposes projects to receive various state and federal funds. For the 2012 RTIP, the California Transportation Commission (CTC) has indicated that \$9.25 million in STIP funds are available for programming in Santa Cruz County through FY16/17. The RTC can also request, but is not guaranteed, an advance of FY17/18-19/20 funds for large projects, for a total of \$21 million. Staff also recommends programming \$2.5 million in Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds anticipated through FY11/12 as part of the 2012 RTIP. Rather than issue a call for projects to program these funds, staff recommends that the RTC indicate its intent to program the funds to the RTC's previously stated priorities, which include Highway 1 and the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line.

Attachment 1: Input from ITAC

Attachment 2: Priority Projects

Attachment 3: 2010 RTIP projects, not yet completed

Attachment 4: Letter from BOS on Road Repairs

**Input from the
Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC)
on the
Highway 1 Tiered Environmental Document and
2012 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP)
August 4, 2011**

Highway 1 Tiered Environmental Document

Action taken: The Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC) unanimously approved (Yamin/Rodriguez) the staff recommendation to recommend that the RTC approve development of a combined tiered environmental document that will provide program level documentation for the Highway 1 HOV Lane Project (Tier 1) and project level documentation for the 41st Avenue/Soquel Drive Auxiliary Lanes and Chanticleer Bike/Pedestrian Crossing Project (Tier 2).

Summary of discussion:

In response to questions from Chris Schneider, Kim Shultz stated that in order to meet the schedule for delivering a two-tiered environmental document work needs to start immediately, the RTC needs to show it is making a good faith effort to complete the environmental document and initiate right-of-way acquisition by fall 2013. He noted that FHWA is now participating in project development team meetings. He also confirmed that the cost estimates for the Highway 1 41st Avenue/Soquel Drive Auxiliary Lanes and Chanticleer Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge (Tier 2) include design, right-of-way, construction, construction management, and contingencies.

Mr. Schneider asked if there was a risk of opponents of the Tier 2 project arguing segmentation and filing a lawsuit against the project. Kim Shultz responded that a legal challenge is indeed possible, but the principle argument against the project related to segmentation would be better addressed through the tiered environmental document and providing information on the entire HOV lanes project (Tier 1) would address cumulative impacts.

Mr. Schneider also questioned how critical the bicycle/pedestrian bridge and STARS analysis are, in light of the large number of other needs in the region and lack of funding that would be left for those other projects if the Tier 2 project and STARS is fully funded. Executive Director George Dondero and Mr. Shultz responded that while the project could proceed without the STARS analysis, it would be a loss given the RTC's commitment to sustainability and direction to staff to implement STARS. Staff will be bringing a breakout of the cost of STARS to the RTC. Mr. Schneider stated that APWA is also developing a sustainability analysis for transportation projects which may be less costly than STARS.

Mr. Shultz noted that the bicycle/pedestrian bridge at Chanticleer could be broken out of the Tier 2 project, but that bicycle and pedestrian facilities, including this bridge, have always been part of the Highway 1 HOV lanes project; inclusion of this facility could help reduce non-motorized travel through the interchanges and provide safer bicycle/pedestrian access in the area. Mr. Schneider suggested that less costly bicycle and pedestrian improvements could be made in the area to improve access for bikes and pedestrians and stated that he did not know if the Chanticleer bridge is the highest priority bicycle/pedestrian improvement for the region.

Majid Yamin, City of Scotts Valley Public Works, requested clarification regarding changes at the federal level that resulted in the need for a two tiered environmental document. Kim Shultz responded that FHWA has made new determinations that future sales tax revenues cannot be assumed in California given the 2/3 vote requirement.

Mr. Schneider noted that in concept he supports the RTC developing a two-tiered environmental document in order to address FHWA concerns and that 41st-Soquel Auxiliary Lanes are the logical next project for Highway 1.

2012 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) Preliminary Proposals

Actions Taken:

- 1. The ITAC approved a motion (Wiesner/Schneider) to recommend that the RTC issue a call for projects for \$2.5 million in anticipated FY11/12 Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds, rather than designate funds for RTC projects, with a vote of 7 (Chen, Rodriguez (2), Patel, Schneider (2), Wiesner, Yamin), with 4 abstentions (Aitken, Bateman, Beatty, Herron). This action was taken in contrast to the staff recommendation that the RTC indicate its intent to program RSTP funds to the tiered highway environmental review documents and STARS analysis and other RTC projects.**
- 2. The ITAC approved a motion (Wiesner/Schneider) to continue the discussion on whether to redirect funds from the Mar Vista Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge to other projects, on a vote of 7 (Chen, Rodriguez (2), Patel, Schneider (2), Wiesner, Yamin), with 1 opposed (Herron) and 3 abstentions (Aitken, Bateman, Beatty). This action was taken in place of the staff recommendation that the RTC indicate its intent to redirect \$7.5 million from the Mar Vista Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge to the 41st Ave-Soquel Auxiliary Lanes/Chanticleer Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge project.**
- 3. The ITAC approved a motion (Yamin/Schneider) to recommend that the RTC indicate its intent to program State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds to the 41st Avenue-Soquel Drive Auxiliary Lanes project, with a vote of 6 (Herron, Rodriguez (2), Schneider (2), Yamin), with 2 opposed (Chen, Wiesner) and 4 abstentions (Aitken, Bateman, Beatty, Patel).**

Summary of discussion:

After receiving information on available funds, priority projects, and preliminary recommendations for development of the 2012 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), ITAC members provided the following input:

Chris Schneider questioned if other non-RSTP funds might be available to fund design and construction of rail projects and he expressed concern that funding the 41st Avenue/Soquel Drive Auxiliary Lanes and Chanticleer Bike/Pedestrian Crossing Project would leave almost no additional funds for other projects. He suggested that more of an emphasis should be placed on local jurisdictions' very important projects. He also requested clarification that Planning, Programming and Monitoring was for RTC staff; which staff confirmed is true.

Steve Wiesner reported that the County of Santa Cruz has extensive storm damage and that the county's average pavement condition index is under 50 (poor), which makes it difficult to vote

for RSTP funds to be used for the state highway, especially when compounded by the loss of Redevelopment Agency (RDA) funding for road repairs. He stated that local streets and roads carry more vehicles than highways.

Rachel Moriconi and Director Dondero responded that the RTC and staff recognize the importance of local projects and that if the region wants to maintain the existing system, as well as make other improvements, there needs to be additional funding. Director Dondero stated that staff is looking at options for generating revenues, including a ballot measure for 2014, opting back into becoming a Congestion Management Agency and seeking 2/3 voter support for a vehicle registration fee of up to \$10, in order to backfill reduced funding for local streets and roads with a more stable revenue source. He noted that if the Tier 2 project moves forward, but there are no new revenues generated, it might be the last major improvement done on the highway for many years.

Santa Cruz Metro staff reported that they would be abstaining from voting on any recommendations for the 2012 RTIP or raising revenues through a ballot measure.

Majid Yamin stated that there is a need for funding for local road projects and expressed concern that large projects continually need additional funds, but that City of Scotts Valley residents use Highway 1, it needs to be widened, and the Highway 1 41st Avenue/Soquel Drive Auxiliary Lanes is a good project. Director Dondero recognized that a 5% cost overrun on a large project is more significant than on smaller projects.

In response to a question on what would happen if the RTC does not approve funds for the 41st Avenue/Soquel Drive Auxiliary Lanes project, George Dondero stated that the RTC could decide to fund just one portion of the project or would have to pay back to FHWA the \$5.5 million in federal funds that have been used on environmental review of the HOV Lanes, which would likely come out of future RSTP shares.

Mr. Schneiter stated that he does not recommend funding the Chanticleer Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge, but suggested making funds from the Mar Vista Bridge available to other projects. Mr. Wiesner responded that he could not take a position on funding the Chanticleer bridge over the Mar Vista bridge at this meeting and suggested taking more time to evaluate options, which might include redirecting funds from Mar Vista to other regional and local needs.

Angela Aitken noted that the list of priority projects is not in priority order. Committee members suggested additional projects be added to the list, suggested the list note which projects are already fully funded, and delete projects that are almost done. Committee members agreed to submit any other changes to the priority project list to Rachel Moriconi by noon on Monday August 8.

Meeting Attendees:

Angela Aitken, Santa Cruz METRO

Taylor Bateman, City of Scotts Valley Planning

Tove Beatty, Santa Cruz METRO

Russell Chen, County Planning Proxy

Dan Herron, Caltrans District 5

Maria Esther Rodriguez, City of Watsonville Public Works and Community Development Proxy

Bhupendra Patel, AMBAG

Chris Schneiter, City of Santa Cruz Public Works and Community Development Proxy

Steve Wiesner, County Public Works

Majid Yamin, City of Scotts Valley Public Works

S:\ITAC\2011\Aug2011\NotesHwy1rtip2012.docx

Priority Needs List (not in priority order)

List identifies a few key projects that local agencies and/or RTC are focused on implementing in the next 5-10 years. This list includes ongoing programs and priorities identified by project sponsors. Some are fully funded, while others may seek RTC-Discretionary funds or other funds in the near term.

Project	Cost
Highway	
Hwy 1 HOV Lane project: Environmental Review - including Tier 2 (Soquel-41st) and STARS analysis, RTC	\$13.4M
Hwy 1 Aux Lanes: 41st Ave and Soquel, RTC	\$29M
Hwy 1 HOV Lane project - Construction, RTC	\$500M
Hwy 1 Aux Lanes: Park Ave and Bay/Porter	\$30M
Hwy 1/Hwy 9 Intersection, City of SC	\$4M
Hwy 1 San Lorenzo River Bridge, City of SC	\$20M
Hwy 1/Mission St/Chestnut/King/Union Intersection Improvements, City of SC	\$2.4M
Hwy 1/Mission St/Bay St Intersection Improvements, City of SC	\$2M
Hwy 1/ Harkins Slough Road Interchange, Watsonville	\$9.8M
Hwy 152 (Main St)/Freedom Roundabout, Watsonville	\$1.25M
Hwy 152/Holohan/College Intersection - bike lanes on Holohan, sidewalks, additional turn lanes, County of SC	\$1.6M
Hwy 17/Mt. Hermon Rd. Ramps: Intersection Operations Project, SV	\$1M

Misc. Multi-Jurisdictional Projects

Freeway Service Patrol (FSP)	\$300k/year
Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line Improvements: Design	\$350k-\$1M
Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line Improvements: Construction	\$5.35M
Planning, Programming, and Monitoring (PPM)	\$150-\$300k/year
Commute Solutions Rideshare Program	\$150-200/year
Ecology Action Transp Program (already defunded PVTMA \$60/yr)	\$60/yr past
511 Implementation	\$10M

Local Streets/Roads

Countywide Local Street and Road Pavement Maintenance (cost reflects funding needs beyond city/co revenues)	\$12M/year
Storm Damage Repair - Countywide (unincorporated)	\$3.5M
Soquel Drive - Soquel Avenue to Freedom Boulevard - traffic signals, turn lanes, sidewalks, County	\$3.5M
Murray Street Bridge, City of Santa Cruz	\$11M (funded)
Wharf Roundabout, City of Santa Cruz	\$1M (funded)
Riverside Avenue Improvements, City of Santa Cruz	\$3M
West Cliff Path - Phase 2, City of Santa Cruz	\$400k
Soquel/Park Way Intersection Safety Project, City of Santa Cruz	\$800k (1/2 funded)
Mt. Hermon Rd./Scotts Valley Dr. Intersection Operations Improvement Project, City of Scotts Valley	\$1M
Airport Blvd Improvements, City of Watsonville	\$1.5M
Freedom Boulevard Reconstruction (Lincoln to Alta Vista), Watsonville	\$1.5M
Freedom Boulevard Reconstruction Ph 3 (Alta Vista to Davis), Watsonville	\$1.5M
Neighborhood Traffic Plan Implementation, City of Watsonville	\$500k
Ohlone Parkway Improvements (UPRR to W Beach), City of Watsonville	\$500k

Transit/Paratransit

Maintain Existing Fixed Route and Specialized Transportation Service	\$37M/year
Ongoing bus and paratransit vehicle replacements	\$3-4M/year
Increase Transit Service: (at minimum restore to 2009 service levels, provide access to La Posada/Gault area)	\$8M/year

<u>Project</u>	<u>Cost</u>
Increased transit/paratransit subsidies for very low income passengers	TBD
MetroBase Final Project: Photovoltaics, parking and water harvesting	\$11.5 million
ParaCruz Operations Building (10-year goal) with a price tag of \$12 million	\$12 million
Pacific Station Renovation (10-year goal)	\$12 million

Bicycle/Pedestrian

Countywide Bicycle Lane Maintenance, restriping, sweeping, vegetation removal	TBD
Countywide Sidewalk Maintenance, vegetation removal, sidewalk repairs	TBD
Sidewalk/pedestrian improvements that provide access between transit stops and senior/disabled activity centers	TBD
Fill gaps in bicycle network, low cost striping and/or signage projects	TBD
Countywide railroad crossing grade improvements	TBD
Countywide signal modifications to sense bicycles	TBD
Community Traffic Safety Coalition	\$150K/yr
Bike to Work/School Program, countywide	\$140K/yr
Bike Secure bike parking program, countywide	\$15k/yr
Bike Route Signage, countywide	\$500k
Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network (MBSST) - <i>sections to be prioritized through Master Plan</i>	\$30M
Hwy 1 Bike/Ped Xing @ Chanticleer (also included in 41st-Soquel Aux)	\$9M
Hwy 1 Bike/Ped Xing @ Mar Vista	\$7.5M
Capitola Avenue Bike Lanes, City of Capitola	\$150k
Monterey Avenue Bicycle Lanes and Sidewalks, City of Capitola	\$350k
Wharf Road Bike Lanes, City of Capitola to Soquel	TBD
Arana Gulch-Broadway Brommer Bike/Ped Path, City of Santa Cruz	\$4.8M (fully funded)
Branciforte Creek Bike/Ped Crossing, City of Santa Cruz	\$2.5M
King Street Bicycle Facilities	\$500k
Widen San Lorenzo River Bike/Ped Bridge adjacent to RR bridge	\$3M
Bean Creek Road Sidewalks (SVMS to Blue Bonnet), City of Scotts Valley	\$400k
Casa Way Bike Lanes, City of Scotts Valley	TBD
Green Hills Road Bike Lanes, City of Scotts Valley	\$700k
Sidewalks Vine Hill School Road and Tabor Drive, City of Scotts Valley	\$500k
Citywide Pedestrian Facilities, City of Watsonville	\$1.9M
Beach St Bicycle Lanes (San Andreas Rd through Watsonville)	TBD
Freedom Boulevard Bike Lanes, City of Watsonville	\$1M
Lincoln St Bicycle Lanes, City of Watsonville	TBD
Main Street Bicycle Lanes (fill gaps), City of Watsonville	TBD
38th Avenue - Portola to UPRR Xing, sidewalks, County	\$250k
41st Avenue - Hwy 1 to Soquel Drive, sidewalks, County	\$500k
East Cliff Drive - 5th to 12th Avenue, sidewalks, County	\$1M
Hwy 9 - Graham Hill to SLV Schools - sidewalks, County	\$1M
Graham Hill Road Bicycle Lanes, County to City of Santa Cruz	TBD
Lomond St., Laurel St., & Harmon St. - pedestrian safety improvements for BC Elementary	\$800k
Main Street - Soquel Drive to Sevilla - sidewalks, bike lanes	\$1.2M
Soquel Avenue - City of SC to Gross Road - sidewalks	\$1.5M
Trout Gulch/Valencia Road Improvements - to Valencia School Road - bike lanes, sidewalks	\$1M
Wilder Ranch Bike Path - Phase 2	\$4M

2010 Regional Transportation Improvement Program

City of Capitola

Proj No: CAP 11

Clares Street Traffic Calming

Location

Const Sched: on hold

PPNO: NA

Implementation of traffic calming measures: chicanes, center island median, dedicated right turn lane, new bus stop, and road edge landscape treatments to slow traffic. Pedestrian crossings at 42nd and 46th Avenue. Construct safe, accessible ped x-ing at 42nd and 46th Av.

Clares Street from Wharf Road to 41st Ave.

<i>Fund Source</i>	<i>Total/source</i>	<i>Obl Ttl</i>	<i>Envl</i>	<i>Design</i>	<i>ROW</i>	<i>Const</i>	<i>Other</i>	<i>ROWSup</i>	<i>Const Sup</i>	<i>Prior</i>	<i>08/09</i>	<i>09/10</i>	<i>10/11</i>	<i>11/12</i>	<i>12/13</i>	<i>13/14</i>	<i>14/15</i>
Add'l Need	160					160						160					
Local	165		5	70		90				75	90						
RSTPX	100	100				100					100						
Totals	425	100	5	70		350				75	190	160					

Proj No: CAP 12

38th Avenue Reconstruction

Location

Const Sched: 2011

PPNO: 2202

Reconstruct roadway and construct 470 feet of curb, gutter and sidewalk immediately south of Capitola Road. May also include Class 2 Bike Lanes in each direction.

38th Avenue: approx 100 feet south of Brommer St to Capitola Rd.

<i>Fund Source</i>	<i>Total/source</i>	<i>Obl Ttl</i>	<i>Envl</i>	<i>Design</i>	<i>ROW</i>	<i>Const</i>	<i>Other</i>	<i>ROWSup</i>	<i>Const Sup</i>	<i>Prior</i>	<i>08/09</i>	<i>09/10</i>	<i>10/11</i>	<i>11/12</i>	<i>12/13</i>	<i>13/14</i>	<i>14/15</i>
Local GF	158		36	97	25							158					
RSTPX	438	438				438						438					
Totals	596	438	36	97	25	438						596					

City of Santa Cruz

Proj No: SC 07 **Broadway-Brommer Bike/Ped Path (Arana Gulch Multiuse Path)***Location***Const Sched:** Fall 2012*PPNO:* 1822

Install multipurpose trail through Arana Gulch to connect to existing class 2 facilities.

Broadway to Brommer Street/7th Ave. through Arana Gulch

<i>Fund Source</i>	<i>Total/source</i>	<i>Obl Ttl</i>	<i>Envl</i>	<i>Design</i>	<i>ROW</i>	<i>Const</i>	<i>Other</i>	<i>ROWSup</i>	<i>Const Sup</i>	<i>Prior</i>	<i>08/09</i>	<i>09/10</i>	<i>10/11</i>	<i>11/12</i>	<i>12/13</i>	<i>13/14</i>	<i>14/15</i>
CMAQ	262	262	262							262							
County	1,380			564		816								564	816		
Local	525			525						225		300					
RSTPX	202	202		140		62				140					62		
Rule 431	25		25							25							
STIP (TE)	2,430					2,430									2,430		
TDA	21	21	21							21							
TSM	12	12	12							12							
Totals	4,856	496	320	1,229		3,308				684		300		564	3,308		

Proj No: SC 43 **Beach Area Roundabout***Location***Const Sched:** Oct 2010*PPNO:* NA

Installation of roundabout at Pacific Ave/Center intersection to reduce congestion. Includes bike lanes, sidewalks, landscaping, and road repairs in the vicinity.

Center/Pacific Avenue and vicinity

<i>Fund Source</i>	<i>Total/source</i>	<i>Obl Ttl</i>	<i>Envl</i>	<i>Design</i>	<i>ROW</i>	<i>Const</i>	<i>Other</i>	<i>ROWSup</i>	<i>Const Sup</i>	<i>Prior</i>	<i>08/09</i>	<i>09/10</i>	<i>10/11</i>	<i>11/12</i>	<i>12/13</i>	<i>13/14</i>	<i>14/15</i>
ARRA STR	550	800				550						550					
ARRA TE	200	200				200						200					
Local	583					583						583					
RDA	100		50	50							100						
Totals	1,433	1,000	50	50		1,333				100	1,333						

Proj No: SC 44a **West Cliff Drive Roadway Preservation***Location***Const Sched:** Spring 2011*PPNO:* NA

Roadway preservation.

Swanton to Almar

<i>Fund Source</i>	<i>Total/source</i>	<i>Obl Ttl</i>	<i>Envl</i>	<i>Design</i>	<i>ROW</i>	<i>Const</i>	<i>Other</i>	<i>ROWSup</i>	<i>Const Sup</i>	<i>Prior</i>	<i>08/09</i>	<i>09/10</i>	<i>10/11</i>	<i>11/12</i>	<i>12/13</i>	<i>13/14</i>	<i>14/15</i>
ARRA	300					300							300				
Local	222			20		202							222				
RSTPX	98	98				98							98				
Totals	620	98		20		600							620				

City of Watsonville

Proj No: WAT 01

Hwy 1/ Harkins Slough Road Interchange

Location

Const Sched: 2014

PPNO: 413

Reconstruct current half interchange to add on and off ramps to the northern side of the interchange in order to relieve congestion at Main Street (Hwy 152)/Green Valley Road intersection. Widen bridge, add bike lanes and sidewalks.

Hwy 1 at Harkins Slough Rd. PM 2.3/2.5

<i>Fund Source</i>	<i>Total/source</i>	<i>Obl Ttl</i>	<i>Envl</i>	<i>Design</i>	<i>ROW</i>	<i>Const</i>	<i>Other</i>	<i>ROWSup</i>	<i>Const Sup</i>	<i>Prior</i>	<i>08/09</i>	<i>09/10</i>	<i>10/11</i>	<i>11/12</i>	<i>12/13</i>	<i>13/14</i>	<i>14/15</i>
STIP	7,340					462	6,878								462		6,878
Watsonville	2,523		285	1,140	243	855							285	1,140	243		855
Totals	9,863		285	1,140	705	7,733							285	1,140	705		7,733

Proj No: WAT 31

Freedom Blvd Rehab (High-Broadis/Lincoln)

Location

Const Sched: Spring 2011

PPNO: 2204 (1175)

Rehab roadway and add 0.7 miles of bike lanes. Remove and replace curb, gutter and sidewalk, construct ADA upgrades, plus install conduit, boxes, and vaults for future utility undergrounding project.

Freedom Blvd: High Street to Broadis Street/Lincoln I/S.

<i>Fund Source</i>	<i>Total/source</i>	<i>Obl Ttl</i>	<i>Envl</i>	<i>Design</i>	<i>ROW</i>	<i>Const</i>	<i>Other</i>	<i>ROWSup</i>	<i>Const Sup</i>	<i>Prior</i>	<i>08/09</i>	<i>09/10</i>	<i>10/11</i>	<i>11/12</i>	<i>12/13</i>	<i>13/14</i>	<i>14/15</i>
Local	949		2	158		789				622	327						
RSTPX	751	751				751				751							
Totals	1,700	751	2	158		1,540				1,373	327						

County Health Service Agency

Proj No: CO 50b

South County CTSC Program

Location

Const Sched: January 2010

PPNO: NA

Safety education programs in south county. May include distribution of safety education materials, bike helmet use promotions, pedestrian safety campaign, and bike and walk to school events.

South county

<i>Fund Source</i>	<i>Total/source</i>	<i>Obl Ttl</i>	<i>Envl</i>	<i>Design</i>	<i>ROW</i>	<i>Const</i>	<i>Other</i>	<i>ROWSup</i>	<i>Const Sup</i>	<i>Prior</i>	<i>08/09</i>	<i>09/10</i>	<i>10/11</i>	<i>11/12</i>	<i>12/13</i>	<i>13/14</i>	<i>14/15</i>
RSTPX	100	100					100					50	50				
Totals	100	100					100					50	50				

County of Santa Cruz

Proj No: CO 02

Graham Hill Road Improvements near Roaring Camp

Location

Const Sched: Jan 2011

PPNO: 0930

Widen shoulders, improve drainage, and add left turn pocket at Roaring Camp.

Graham Hill Road, Roaring Camp to .61 miles south

<i>Fund Source</i>	<i>Total/source</i>	<i>Obl Ttl</i>	<i>Envl</i>	<i>Design</i>	<i>ROW</i>	<i>Const</i>	<i>Other</i>	<i>ROWSup</i>	<i>Const Sup</i>	<i>Prior</i>	<i>08/09</i>	<i>09/10</i>	<i>10/11</i>	<i>11/12</i>	<i>12/13</i>	<i>13/14</i>	<i>14/15</i>
Local	855		50	175		630				225			630				
RSTPX	310	310	149		161					310							
STIP	2,976	2,976	100	125	80	2,671				305			2,671				
Totals	4,141	3,286	299	300	241	3,301				840			3,301				

Proj No: CO 17B

Calabasas Rd widening, bike lanes and sidewalks

Location

Const Sched: Spring 2012

PPNO: 2304

Install bike lanes, curb, gutter, sidewalks, and rehab on Calabasas Road.

Buena Vista Dr to Bradford Rd.

<i>Fund Source</i>	<i>Total/source</i>	<i>Obl Ttl</i>	<i>Envl</i>	<i>Design</i>	<i>ROW</i>	<i>Const</i>	<i>Other</i>	<i>ROWSup</i>	<i>Const Sup</i>	<i>Prior</i>	<i>08/09</i>	<i>09/10</i>	<i>10/11</i>	<i>11/12</i>	<i>12/13</i>	<i>13/14</i>	<i>14/15</i>
Local	751		5	141	10	595				156					595		
RSTPX	250	250				250									250		
STIP (TE)	1,050					1,050									1,050		
TDA	390					390									390		
Totals	2,441	250	5	141	10	2,285				156					2,285		

Proj No: CO 36

State Park Drive/Seacliff Village Improvements

Location

Const Sched: Fall 2012

PPNO: 1870

Bike lanes, sidewalks, and bus turnouts on St. Park Dr, sidewalks and roadway rehab in Seacliff core area- consistent with the Seacliff Village Plan adopted by the BOS in 2003.

State Park Drive (Sea Ridge Rd to Santa Cruz Ave) and Santa Cruz Ave- Broadway- Center Ave loop.

<i>Fund Source</i>	<i>Total/source</i>	<i>Obl Ttl</i>	<i>Envl</i>	<i>Design</i>	<i>ROW</i>	<i>Const</i>	<i>Other</i>	<i>ROWSup</i>	<i>Const Sup</i>	<i>Prior</i>	<i>08/09</i>	<i>09/10</i>	<i>10/11</i>	<i>11/12</i>	<i>12/13</i>	<i>13/14</i>	<i>14/15</i>
Add'l Need	100					100									100		
County	1,045		5	100	45	895				105	45				895		
RSTPX	587	587				587									587		
TDA	263					263									262.912		
Totals	1,995	587	5	100	45	1,845				105	45				1,845		

Proj No: CO 42b

Green Valley Rd Pedestrian Safety Project

Location

Const Sched: 5/10

PPNO: NA

Build 6-foot wide sidewalk with some curb and gutter on NW side of Green Valley Rd from Airport Blvd to Amesti Rd (1800 ft).

Green Valley Rd from Airport Blvd to Amesti Rd.

<i>Fund Source</i>	<i>Total/source</i>	<i>Obl Ttl</i>	<i>Envl</i>	<i>Design</i>	<i>ROW</i>	<i>Const</i>	<i>Other</i>	<i>ROWSup</i>	<i>Const Sup</i>	<i>Prior</i>	<i>08/09</i>	<i>09/10</i>	<i>10/11</i>	<i>11/12</i>	<i>12/13</i>	<i>13/14</i>	<i>14/15</i>
Local	281		3		10	269									281.317		
TDA	11					11									10.683		
Totals	292		3		10	280									292		

Proj No: CO 51

Corralitos Rd Left Turn Lane (Bradley Elementary School)

Location

Const Sched: Spring 2012

PPNO: 2205

1260 foot left turn lane at Bradley Elementary School to improve traffic flow, especially during school drop off/pick up periods and associated roadside improvements

Corralitos Road, 0.85 miles north of Freedom Boulevard.

<i>Fund Source</i>	<i>Total/source</i>	<i>Obl Ttl</i>	<i>Envl</i>	<i>Design</i>	<i>ROW</i>	<i>Const</i>	<i>Other</i>	<i>ROWSup</i>	<i>Const Sup</i>	<i>Prior</i>	<i>08/09</i>	<i>09/10</i>	<i>10/11</i>	<i>11/12</i>	<i>12/13</i>	<i>13/14</i>	<i>14/15</i>
AB2766	130					130						130					
Add'l Need	192					192								192			
Local	100		5	35	10	80							10	90			
RSTPX	278	278				278							278				
Totals	700	278	5	35	10	680						130	288	282			

Proj No: CO 57

Soquel-San Jose Rd Overlay

Location

Const Sched: Fall 2011

PPNO: NA

Road repairs: Asphalt concrete overlay (est. 3 miles)

Soquel-San Jose Rd from Olson Rd to PM 8.51 (16,000 ft)

<i>Fund Source</i>	<i>Total/source</i>	<i>Obl Ttl</i>	<i>Envl</i>	<i>Design</i>	<i>ROW</i>	<i>Const</i>	<i>Other</i>	<i>ROWSup</i>	<i>Const Sup</i>	<i>Prior</i>	<i>08/09</i>	<i>09/10</i>	<i>10/11</i>	<i>11/12</i>	<i>12/13</i>	<i>13/14</i>	<i>14/15</i>
RSTP	760		13	51		697								760			
Totals	760		13	51		697								760			

Proj No: CO 58

Soquel Drive Overlay

Location

Const Sched: Fall 2011

PPNO: NA

Road repairs: Asphalt concrete overlay.

Soquel Dr: Borregas Dr. to St. Park Dr. (0.86mi)

<i>Fund Source</i>	<i>Total/source</i>	<i>Obl Ttl</i>	<i>Envl</i>	<i>Design</i>	<i>ROW</i>	<i>Const</i>	<i>Other</i>	<i>ROWSup</i>	<i>Const Sup</i>	<i>Prior</i>	<i>08/09</i>	<i>09/10</i>	<i>10/11</i>	<i>11/12</i>	<i>12/13</i>	<i>13/14</i>	<i>14/15</i>
Local	105		13	54		38								105			
RSTP	700					700								700			
Totals	805		13	54		738								805			

Proj No: CO 61

Davenport Resurfacing

Location

Const Sched: Fall 2011

PPNO:

Roadway repairs/cape seal to roadways in Davenport area.

1st St & 3rd St (east end to Cement Plant Rd); Center St (Marine View Ave to w. end); Church St; Davenport Ave & Ocean St (Hwy 1 to Marine Ave); Fair Ave (Coast Rd to w end); Marine View Ave; San Vicente Ave

<i>Fund Source</i>	<i>Total/source</i>	<i>Obl Ttl</i>	<i>Envl</i>	<i>Design</i>	<i>ROW</i>	<i>Const</i>	<i>Other</i>	<i>ROWSup</i>	<i>Const Sup</i>	<i>Prior</i>	<i>08/09</i>	<i>09/10</i>	<i>10/11</i>	<i>11/12</i>	<i>12/13</i>	<i>13/14</i>	<i>14/15</i>
Local	50					50								50			
RSTPX	45	45				45								45			
Totals	95	45				95								95			

Ecology Action

Proj No: RTC 17

Ecology Action Transportation Program

Location

Const Sched: Ongoing

PPNO: NA

Community organization that promotes alternative commute choices. Work with employers, Cabrillo College Go Green Program, incentives for travelers to get out of SOVs including: emergency ride home, interest-free bike loans, discounted bus passes. Avg cost: \$90K/yr. Coordinates with Bike to Work program.

Santa Cruz County, north of Freedom Blvd.

<i>Fund Source</i>	<i>Total/source</i>	<i>Obl Ttl</i>	<i>Envl</i>	<i>Design</i>	<i>ROW</i>	<i>Const</i>	<i>Other</i>	<i>ROWSup</i>	<i>Const Sup</i>	<i>Prior</i>	<i>08/09</i>	<i>09/10</i>	<i>10/11</i>	<i>11/12</i>	<i>12/13</i>	<i>13/14</i>	<i>14/15</i>
AB2766	43						43			40	3						
CMAQ	532	532					532			472	60						
Local	216	0					216			165	14	18	18				
RSTP	82	82					82			82							
RSTPX	120	120					120					60	60				
Totals	993	734					993			759	77	78	78				

SCCRTC

Proj No: RTC 01

Freeway Service Patrol (FSP) on Hwy 1 and Hwy 17

Location

Const Sched: Ongoing

PPNO: 0923

Maintain and expand tow truck patrols on Highways 1 and 17. Work with the CHP to quickly clear collisions, remove debris from travel lanes, and provide assistance to motorists during commute hours to keep incident related congestion to a minimum and keep traffic moving.

Highway 17 from the Santa Clara/Santa Cruz county line to Mt. Hermon Rd in Scotts Valley. Highway 1 from Highway 9 in Santa Cruz to State Park Drive in Aptos.

<i>Fund Source</i>	<i>Total/source</i>	<i>Obl Ttl</i>	<i>Envl</i>	<i>Design</i>	<i>ROW</i>	<i>Const</i>	<i>Other</i>	<i>ROWSup</i>	<i>Const Sup</i>	<i>Prior</i>	<i>08/09</i>	<i>09/10</i>	<i>10/11</i>	<i>11/12</i>	<i>12/13</i>	<i>13/14</i>	<i>14/15</i>
ARRA Bkup	320						320					320					
ARRA STR	180	180					180					180					
FSP Program	2,200						2,162			1,625	186	186	203				
RSTPX	180	180					180							180			
SAFE Reserves	221	152					221			152	69						
STIP (SOF)	615	615					615			615							
Totals	3,716	1,127					3,678			2,392	255	686	203	180			

Proj No: RTC 02

Commute Solutions Rideshare Program

Location

Const Sched: Ongoing

PPNO: 0922

Transportation demand management outreach and education. Includes matching service for carpools, vanpools, and bicyclists. Provides services and information about all alternative transportation modes, including transit, walking, bicycling, telecommuting, and park-n-ride lots. Avg annual cost: \$250k.

Countywide

<i>Fund Source</i>	<i>Total/source</i>	<i>Obl Ttl</i>	<i>Envl</i>	<i>Design</i>	<i>ROW</i>	<i>Const</i>	<i>Other</i>	<i>ROWSup</i>	<i>Const Sup</i>	<i>Prior</i>	<i>08/09</i>	<i>09/10</i>	<i>10/11</i>	<i>11/12</i>	<i>12/13</i>	<i>13/14</i>	<i>14/15</i>
CMAQ	1,496	1,495					1,496			909	587						
RSTP	382	132					382			132				250			
STIP (SOF)	536	536					536			536							
Totals	2,414	2,163					2,414			1,577	587			250			

Proj No: RTC 03

SC Branch Rail Line Acquisition, Corridor Preservation and Improvements

Location

Const Sched: 7/10

PPNO: 0932

Public purchase and improvement of the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line right-of-way for preservation of current uses and future transportation purposes. Includes: environmental studies, pre-acquisition, acquisition and some rail line infrastructure improvements.

Davenport to Watsonville Junction

Fund Source	Total/source	Obl Til	Envl	Design	ROW	Const	Other	ROWSup	Const Sup	Prior	08/09	09/10	10/11	11/12	12/13	13/14	14/15
Earmark	1,490	1,490	240		1,250					1,490							
Prop 116	11,000	800	160		10,840					800	10,200						
RSTPX	250	250		250									250				
STIP	9,350	4,000			4,000	5,350							9,350				
STIP (SOF)	78	225	78							78							
TDA	317	95	50	5	262					317							
UP	400			100	300								400				
Totals	22,885	6,860	528	355	16,652	5,350				2,685	10,200	10,000					

Proj No: RTC 04

Planning, Programming & Monitoring (PPM) - SB45

Location

Const Sched: Ongoing

PPNO: 0921

Development and amendments to state and federally mandated planning and programming documents, monitoring of programmed projects.

Countywide

Fund Source	Total/source	Obl Til	Envl	Design	ROW	Const	Other	ROWSup	Const Sup	Prior	08/09	09/10	10/11	11/12	12/13	13/14	14/15
STIP	2,434	1,659				2,434				909	150	300	300	300	175	150	150
Totals	2,434	1,659				2,434				909	150	300	300	300	175	150	150

Proj No: RTC 24

Hwy 1 HOV Lanes (Morrissey to Larkin Vly Rd)

Location

Const Sched: 2015

PPNO: 0073

Add High Occupancy Vehicle (Carpool) lanes from Aptos to Santa Cruz, add new bike/ped overcrossings, and operational improvements (ramp meters, modified intersections, TOS, soundwalls, & auxiliary lanes). (Aux lanes b/t Morrissey/Soquel listed under RTC 28).

In Santa Cruz County on Rte 1 between Morrissey Blvd. and Larkin Valley Rd. (PM 7.6/15.9)

Fund Source	Total/source	Obl Til	Envl	Design	ROW	Const	Other	ROWSup	Const Sup	Prior	08/09	09/10	10/11	11/12	12/13	13/14	14/15
CMAQ	5,560	5,560	5,560							5,560							
RSTPX	5,474	5,474	5,474							4,024			1,450				
STIP	1,375	1,375	1,375							1,375							
Totals	12,409	12,409	12,409							9,584	1,375		1,450				

Proj No: RTC 27

Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network

Location

Const Sched: 2012

PPNO: 1872

A network of bicycle and pedestrian facilities on or near the coast/Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary. Includes master planning study and environmental review.

Exact location TBD through Master Plan. May include trail segments adjacent to the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line. Will link to trail network in Monterey County and the California Coastal Trail.

<i>Fund Source</i>	<i>Total/source</i>	<i>Obl Ttl</i>	<i>Envl</i>	<i>Design</i>	<i>ROW</i>	<i>Const</i>	<i>Other</i>	<i>ROWSup</i>	<i>Const Sup</i>	<i>Prior</i>	<i>08/09</i>	<i>09/10</i>	<i>10/11</i>	<i>11/12</i>	<i>12/13</i>	<i>13/14</i>	<i>14/15</i>
CoastConsv	250						250						250				
Earmark	4,535	543	165			3,827	543			51	181		361		3942.40		
Local	100						100			26	29	25	20				
RSTP	332					332									332		
STIP (TE)	1,845			40		1,805									1845		
Totals	7,062	543	165	40		5,964	892			77	210	25	631		6,119		

Proj No: RTC 28

Hwy 1 Auxiliary Lanes: Soquel Ave. to Morrissey Blvd.

Location

Const Sched: RTL May 2011

PPNO: 6500

Construct auxiliary lanes, northbound and southbound, between Soquel Avenue and Morrissey Boulevard Interchanges.

Hwy 1 b/t Soquel and Morrissey (PM 14.9/15.9)

<i>Fund Source</i>	<i>Total/source</i>	<i>Obl Ttl</i>	<i>Envl</i>	<i>Design</i>	<i>ROW</i>	<i>Const</i>	<i>Other</i>	<i>ROWSup</i>	<i>Const Sup</i>	<i>Prior</i>	<i>08/09</i>	<i>09/10</i>	<i>10/11</i>	<i>11/12</i>	<i>12/13</i>	<i>13/14</i>	<i>14/15</i>
Add'l Need	174		174										174				
CMIA	16,190					15,640			550				16,190				
Earmark	2,642	2,642	1,520	677	281			164		1,520	1,122						
Local	34	34	34							34							
RSTPX	954	954	667	287						200	368		386				
STIP	2,734	472	146	326	71			41	2,150	100	484		2,150				
Totals	22,728	4,102	2,541	1,290	352	15,640		205	2,700	1,854	1,974		18,900				

Proj No: RTC 30

Hwy 1 Bicycle/Ped Overcrossing at Mar Vista

Location

Const Sched: 2014

PPNO: 1968

Pedestrian overcrossing of Highway 1 at Mar Vista. Serves Mar Vista Elementary School.

At Mar Vista Drive connecting Seacliff and Aptos.

<i>Fund Source</i>	<i>Total/source</i>	<i>Obl Ttl</i>	<i>Envl</i>	<i>Design</i>	<i>ROW</i>	<i>Const</i>	<i>Other</i>	<i>ROWSup</i>	<i>Const Sup</i>	<i>Prior</i>	<i>08/09</i>	<i>09/10</i>	<i>10/11</i>	<i>11/12</i>	<i>12/13</i>	<i>13/14</i>	<i>14/15</i>
RSTP	967			85		882									85	882	
STIP (TE)	6,564			664	526	5,374									1190	5,374	
Totals	7,531			749	526	6,256									1,275	6,256	

Proj No: RTC 31

Park and Ride Lot Development

Location

Const Sched: 6/10

PPNO: NA

Upgrade and maintain existing park and ride lots for commuters countywide. Secure additional park and ride lot spaces. Long range plan: identify, purchase land, construct Park & Ride lots.

Countywide, with emphasis on southern sections of county.

Fund Source	Total/source	Obl Ttl	Envl	Design	ROW	Const	Other	ROWSup	Const Sup	Prior	08/09	09/10	10/11	11/12	12/13	13/14	14/15
RSTPX	160	160				115	45					30	130				
Totals	160	160				115	45					30	130				

Proj No: RTC 32

Bicycle Route Signage

Location

Const Sched: Fall 11

PPNO: NA

Define routes, develop and install signs aimed at encouraging bicycling/directing cyclists to preferred routes to various destinations countywide.

Countywide

Fund Source	Total/source	Obl Ttl	Envl	Design	ROW	Const	Other	ROWSup	Const Sup	Prior	08/09	09/10	10/11	11/12	12/13	13/14	14/15
Add'l Need	400			125		275							400				
RSTPX	100	100		75		25						25	75				
Totals	500	100		200		300						25	475				

SCMTD

Proj No: MTD 01

MetroBase Consolidated Bus Operations Facility

Location

Const Sched: 2005-2010

PPNO: 0924

Construct a new facility at a centralized location to consolidate 7 operations, maintenance and administration facilities.

Harvey West - Encinal St/Hwy 9. Initially planned for westside of Santa Cruz.

Fund Source	Total/source	Obl Ttl	Envl	Design	ROW	Const	Other	ROWSup	Const Sup	Prior	08/09	09/10	10/11	11/12	12/13	13/14	14/15
FTA 5307	1,005					1,005				1,005							
FTA 5309	8,854		1,272	1,384	2,979	3,219				8,854							
HITT	3,374			1,870		1,504				3,374							
Local	14,080		318	1,184	879	11,699				12,383	1,697						
Prop1B-PTMISEA	26,429					26,429				4,404	2,491			2,481	17053		
STA	7,941			409		7,532				7,538	403						
STIP	1,137	1,137				1,137				1,137							
STIP (AB3090 Reim)	6,363	6,363				6,363				6,363							
Totals	69,183	7,500	1,590	4,847	4,863	57,883				38,695	10,954			2,481	17,053		

Proj No: MTD 19

Bus Stop Improvements

Location

Const Sched: 4/11

PPNO: 2284

Install, replace, repairs, and otherwise improve bus shelters and stops.

Santa Cruz County

<i>Fund Source</i>	<i>Total/source</i>	<i>Obl Ttl</i>	<i>Envl</i>	<i>Design</i>	<i>ROW</i>	<i>Const</i>	<i>Other</i>	<i>ROWSup</i>	<i>Const Sup</i>	<i>Prior</i>	<i>08/09</i>	<i>09/10</i>	<i>10/11</i>	<i>11/12</i>	<i>12/13</i>	<i>13/14</i>	<i>14/15</i>
Local	90		10	25	20	35						10	80				
STIP	500	500				500							500				
Totals	590	500	10	25	20	535						10	580				



County of Santa Cruz

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

701 OCEAN STREET, SUITE 500, SANTA CRUZ, CA 95060-4069
(831) 454-2200 • FAX: (831) 454-3262 TDD: (831) 454-2123

JOHN LEOPOLD
FIRST DISTRICT

ELLEN PIRIE
SECOND DISTRICT

NEAL COONERTY
THIRD DISTRICT

GREG CAPUT
FOURTH DISTRICT

MARK W. STONE
FIFTH DISTRICT

March 30, 2011

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

APR 7 2011

Dear Members of the Commission:

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

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

The LSRA report also documents an overall decline in funding for road maintenance and repair and points to other sources that have been used to backfill the decline in State funds. Unfortunately, one of those pools of funds in our county has been funds from local Redevelopment Agencies which are currently slated for elimination by the Governor. As an example, for the past few years, \$1 million to \$3 million has been spent on roads within the Santa Cruz County Redevelopment Agency area, which has resulted in a PCI of around 70 in the Live Oak and Soquel areas. With the potential loss of these funds, as well as the loss of one-time ARRA stimulus funds, we could easily see a reduction of more than \$10 million in essential road maintenance funds. Clearly, the County General Fund is not healthy enough to support a massive repair of our local roads. Therefore, we have to look for all available resources to repair our local roads.

March 30, 2011

Page 2

Another resource to repair and maintain the County's 600 miles of roads comes from funds from the Regional Surface Transportation Program. Over the past five years, RSTP and RSTPX funds have provided nearly \$2 million in funds to repair roads in the unincorporated areas. In light of the low level of pavement condition index scores on the County's road system, our Board believes that the first priority for the use of RSTP funds should be to maintain and repair our local road system. This, in turn, would mean that other funds could be used to pay for maintenance on local residential streets and rural roads.

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

Sincerely,



MARK W. STONE, Chairperson
Board of Supervisors

MWS:ted

cc: Clerk of the Board
Public Works Department

1252A6