AGENDA
Thursday, September 15, 2011
9:00 a.m.

NOTE LOCATION THIS MONTH
Board of Supervisors Chambers
701 Ocean St
Santa Cruz CA 95060

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

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

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

COMMISSION MEMBERSHIP

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

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

2. Oral communications

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

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

3. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agendas

CONSENT AGENDA

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

MINUTES

4. Approve draft minutes of the regular August 4, 2011 SCCRTC meeting

5. Approve draft minutes of the August 4, 2011 SCCRTC Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (SAFE) meeting

6. Approve draft minutes of the August 18, 2011 Transportation Policy Workshop meeting

7. Approve draft minutes of the special August 29, 2011 SCCRTC meeting

8. Accept draft minutes of the August 4, 2011 Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC) meeting

9. Accept draft minutes of the August 8, 2011 Bicycle Committee meeting

10. Accept draft minutes of the August 9, 2011 Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee meeting

POLICY ITEMS

11. Accept legislative update
PROJECTS and PLANNING ITEMS

12. Accept revised adoption date for the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)

BUDGET AND EXPENDITURES ITEMS

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

ADMINISTRATION ITEMS

No consent items

INFORMATION/OTHER ITEMS

14. Accept monthly meeting schedule
15. Accept correspondence log
16. Accept letters from SCCRTC committees and staff to other agencies
   a. Letter from RTC to State Senator Kehoe and Assemblymember Alejo regarding support for SB 436
   b. Letter from RTC Bicycle Committee to Highway 1 Auxiliary Lanes Management Plan Implementation Team regarding accommodations for cyclists as part of the project
17. Accept miscellaneous written comments from the public on SCCRTC projects and transportation issues
18. Accept information items
   a. Letter from League of Women Voters to AMBAG regarding support for regional planning

REGULAR AGENDA

19. Commissioner reports-oral reports
20. Director’s report – oral report (George Dondero, Executive Director)
21. Caltrans report and consider action items
   a. Construction projects report
22. Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 8 allocation claim from the City of Watsonville for curb cuts (Karena Pushnik, Senior Transportation Planer)
a. Staff report
b. Resolution approving City of Watsonville Article 8 TDA claim

23. 2012 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) development
(Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner)

a. Staff report
b. Summary of options for the 2012 RTIP process
c. Input from ITAC
d. Summary - Highway 1 Funding Proposal for the 2012 RTIP
e. Priority projects
f. 2010 RTIP projects, not yet completed
g. FHWA 10-Year Rule
h. Letter from Board of Supervisors on road repairs

24. Highway 1 Soquel/Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes Project – construction support
(Kim Shultz, Senior Transportation Planner)

a. Staff report
b. Resolution authorizing contracts with Parsons Brinkerhoff Americus Inc. and Nolte Associates Inc. for construction management and support services
c. Parsons Brinkerhoff (PB) Americas Inc. scope and fees, August 2011
d. Nolte Associates scope and fees, September 2011
e. Resolution amending the Highway 1 construction page of the FY 2011/12 budget

25. 2010-2011 Santa Cruz County Grand Jury Report
(Luis Mendez, Deputy Director)

a. Staff report
b. Back to the Future: Regional Gridlock and Local Planning Paralysis
c. Draft responses to the 2010-2011 Grand Jury Report

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

a. No agenda items this month

27. Next Meetings

The next SCCRTC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, October 6, 2011 at 9:00 a.m. at the County Board of Supervisors Chambers, 701 Ocean St., Santa Cruz, CA.

The next Transportation Policy Workshop meeting is scheduled for Thursday, October 20, 2011 at 9:00 a.m. 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

v 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.
v 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.
MINUTES

Thursday
August 4, 2011
9:00 a.m.

Watsonville City Council Chambers
275 Main St, Fourth Floor
Watsonville CA 95076

1. Roll call

The meeting was called to order at 9:02 am.

Members present:
Ron Graves (Alt)       John Leopold
Martin Garcia (Alt)    Don Lane
Neal Coonerty          Kirby Nicol
Eduardo Montesino      Ellen Pirie
Donald Hagen           Michelle Hinkle (Alt)
Aileen Loe (ex officio) Mark Stone

Member absent:
Randy Johnson

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

2. Oral communications – None

3. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agendas

There was a handout for Item 17. Item 22 was removed from the agenda.

CONSENT AGENDA (Nicol/Leopold – unanimous)
MINUTES

4. Approved draft minutes of the June 2, 2011 regular SCCRTC meeting

5. Approved draft minutes of the June 16, 2011 Transportation Policy Workshop meeting

POLICY ITEMS

No consent items

PROJECTS and PLANNING ITEMS

6. Accepted State Route 1 Corridor System Management Plan (CSMP)

7. Accepted fourth quarter FY 10-11 Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) work program progress report

8. Accepted Regional Transportation Plan – Smart Growth Implementation Plan Regional Advisory Committee appointments

BUDGET AND EXPENDITURES ITEMS

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

ADMINISTRATION ITEMS

10. Approved Bicycle Committee membership appointment

INFORMATION/OTHER ITEMS

11. Accepted monthly meeting schedule

12. Accepted correspondence log

13. Accepted letters from SCCRTC committees and staff to other agencies
   a. Letter from the Regional Transportation Commission to the City of Scotts Valley regarding the Vine Hill Elementary School sidewalk construction project

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

15. Accepted information items - None

REGULAR AGENDA
16. Commissioner reports - oral reports – Taken out of order after Item 19

Commissioner Montesino invited everyone to the Strawberry Festival to be held Saturday, August 6th in Watsonville. He asked if a guardrail could be installed on Highway 1 between Rio del Mar and State Park Drive and was told that Caltrans was already planning to install one there.

17. Director’s report – oral report

Executive Director George Dondero showed a clip of the current episode of the RTC’s “Transportation Café” program which can be seen on the Community TV website. The episode was about highway safety in Santa Cruz County.

Mr. Dondero announced that an independent RTC fiscal audit will take place on August 11-12. He said that the RTC received four proposals from rail design consultants who will be interviewed by a team comprised of staff from Caltrain, the public works departments of the cities of Watsonville and Santa Cruz and RTC staff. In addition, Mr. Dondero reported that the RTC was awarded two planning grants from Caltrans. One will be used to fund a half-time transit planning intern and the other will fund an on-board transit ridership survey.

18. Caltrans report and consider action items

Aileen Loe, Caltrans District 5, said that its Project Initiation Document program to scope new projects was vetoed in the recent budget but that the agency is trying to find a way to maintain hands-on support for local projects. She reminded everyone to slow for the cones in construction zones adding that currently there is a law to move to an adjacent lane when lights are flashing in a construction area. She added that the Salinas road project is on schedule.

19. State and federal legislative updates - Taken out of order after approval of the consent agenda

Assemblymember Bill Monning provided updates on state legislative activities, including highlights of the state budget. Mr. Monning said that the state’s bond rating has improved, and that longer term bonds are planned to be released in September. Assemblymember Monning mentioned a bill (AB 441) that he introduced that asks that a voluntary agency be formed to identify adverse public health impacts in transportation projects or to identify mitigations to these negative impacts. The bill is supported by public health agencies. Mr. Monning also emphasized the need for support for public transportation.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Leopold about the state’s plan to help local jurisdictions perform the functions previously tasked to the redevelopment agencies, Mr. Monning said that there are bills being proposed to reestablish redevelopment agencies with specific funding criteria and principles.
Commissioners discussed how AB 441 would apply to local transportation projects noting that these agencies would be voluntary and that in some areas these goals are folded into local jurisdictions’ general plans.

The RTC also received updates on proposed provisions of the next federal transportation act and a list of state bills that could impact transportation projects and programs.

20. Social media use policy

Senior Planner Karena Pushnik described a proposal to establish policies, guidelines, and standards on RTC use of social media technology. Social media is intended to disseminate information and receive public input and could be useful for a variety of the RTC’s programs and projects including the Commute Solutions program, specific information campaigns, and special events. The RTC currently posts segments from its Transportation Café television show on social media outlets and will consider expansion to Facebook and other interactive sites to reach broader segments of the community.

Commissioners discussed policies used in other agencies, staff time required to maintain the sites, defining what is appropriate for postings, free speech issues, and tying the sites to future 511 links. Commissioner Coonerty said it was important that the policy language be clear that that ultimate decision concerning what is posted rest with the Executive Director.

Commissioner Pirie moved and Commissioner Nicol seconded to approve the staff recommendations that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) approve the proposed Social Media Use Policy that establishes policies, guidelines, and standards on RTC use of social media technology with the change to the policy language clarifying that the Executive Director is responsible for all content decisions and that staff return in a month with a report from county counsel about handling inappropriate material and an assessment from staff about the amount of time required to maintain the sites.

21. Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line acquisition project

Deputy Director Luis Mendez presented a status update on the branch line acquisition. The RTC is still waiting for approval from the Federal Surface Transportation Board (STB) for the Branch Line purchase transaction. Congressman Farr has sent a letter to the STB Chair regarding the RTC’s petition for declaratory order and has communicated with the STB Chair. RTC staff and consultants have been working on completing all of the other tasks necessary to close escrow on the purchase; however there will still be 2-4 weeks of work to complete following STB approval. The community celebration planned for September 10 will be postponed until after the rail line purchase is fully complete.
Commissioners recommended that Senator Boxer, Assemblymember Eshoo and possibly the California Transportation Commission contact the STB.

22. New Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) websites- Removed from agenda

23. Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSST) Network Project Update

Senior Planner Cory Caletti introduced Mike Sherrod, RRM Design Group, the firm contracted to develop the Master Plan and Environmental Review document for the MBSST Network project. Mr. Sherrod gave a presentation on the planned bicycle/pedestrian trail describing a detailed Scope of Services that includes identifying and analyzing potential alignments, preliminary design, environmental compliance, and community outreach for the development of the Trail Network Master Plan. The consultant team will be responsible for coordinating all planning tasks, including but not limited to data collection, trail mapping, opportunities and constraints analysis, public workshops, presentations to all relevant bodies, draft and final document production, and California Environmental Quality Act compliance. The first set of public meetings could take place early this fall.

Commissioners discussed additional workshops in North County especially in the north coast region, linking existing trails, connecting to local attractions, easement, right-of-way issues, signage issues and retrofitting of trestles.

Commissioner Leopold asked to be part of the bike signage program.

Bob Culbertson said that there are several networks that could be connected to the scenic trail network including the Watsonville wetlands trails, and trail networks in the Mt Madonna, Castle Rock and north coastal areas. He supported a vertical trail network such as along Highway 9 to connect to the scenic trail. He suggested coordinating with other jurisdictions that have their own trail master plans.

Piet Canin commended the Commission for moving forward with this project adding that he would like more public workshops saying that there are many stakeholders.

Lowell Hurst said that he hopes things move forward smoothly and quickly.

Staff will work with the consultant on the feasibility of adding public workshops.

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

The RTC adjourned to the SAFE meeting at noon.

25. Next Meetings
George Dondero announced that a ribbon cutting ceremony for the RTC’s Watsonville satellite office will be held Tuesday, August 16 at 11am.

The meeting adjourned at 12:11 pm.

The next Transportation Policy Workshop meeting is scheduled for Thursday, August 18, 2011 at 9:00 a.m. at the SCCRTC Offices, 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA.

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 95060.

Respectfully submitted,

Gini Pineda, Staff

**ATTENDEES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dan Herron</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Culbertson</td>
<td>Watsonville Wetlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowel Hurst</td>
<td>Watsonville City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piet Canin</td>
<td>Ecology Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Sherrod</td>
<td>RRM Designs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MINUTES

Thursday
August 4, 2011

Watsonville City Council Chambers
275 Main St
Watsonville CA 95076

1. Oral communications - None

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

CONSENT AGENDA

No consent items

REGULAR AGENDA


Transportation Planner Ginger Dykaar presented the 2010 Safe on 17 Annual Report which reviews the work done by the California Highway Patrol, Caltrans, RTC and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission’s Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies and other stakeholders to continue improving safety on Highway 17. Efforts resulted in extra enforcement, collision and citation rate monitoring, Safe on 17 Task Force Meetings, public information and outreach, and highway safety improvements. Due to the State’s budget crisis, overtime enforcement was eliminated for 2010, preventing the CHP from providing overtime enforcement through the Safe on 17 program even though it is funded with local funds. Caltrans made a number of safety improvements during 2010.

Commissioner Leopold moved and Commissioner Pirie seconded to approve the staff recommendations that the Regional Transportation Commission/Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (SAFE) accept the 2010 Annual Report for the Safe on 17 Safety Corridor Project.

The motion passed unanimously.

4. Adjourn

The Commission adjourned to the regular RTC meeting at 12:10 pm.
Respectfully submitted,

Gini Pineda, Staff
1. Introductions

Commissioner Nicol called the meeting to order at 9:01 am. Self-introductions were made.

Members present:
Dene Bustichi
Greg Caput
Norm Hagen
Randy Johnson
John Leopold
Eduardo Montesino
Aileen Loe (ex-officio)

Kirby Nicol
Lynn Robinson
Neal Coonerty
Mark Stone
Don Lane
Ellen Pirie

Staff present:
George Dondero
Luis Mendez
Gini Pineda
Rachel Moriconi
Grace Blakeslee

Karena Pushnik
Yesenia Parra
Cory Caletti
Tegan Speiser
Kim Shultz

2. Oral communications

Jack Nelson said that people may be searching for the wilderness experience that is missing from most of life in modern society and cited the names of several cars and SUVs that refer to nature or the rugged outdoors.

Mark Greenfield recommended that METRO sell Caltrain tickets at the downtown transit center.
CONSENT AGENDA

No consent items

The Commission adjourned into closed session at 9:09 am.

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

   The Commission reconvened into open session at 9:33 am. There was nothing to report.

REGULAR AGENDA

5. Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Responsibilities

   Executive Director George Dondero said that staff from the RTC, Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC), Caltrans, the Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration met in June to collect information regarding legal and administrative requirements associated with RTPA’s also becoming MPO’s. Mr. Dondero explained how a decision to become a single county MPO would be made and clarified that the decision to do so was not before the Commission and would not be made by the Commission. He introduced Andrew Chesley from San Joaquin Council of Governments who gave a presentation on that agency’s experience as a single county MPO.

   Mr. Chesley described the advantages of local decision making and the areas in which a coalition of MPOs in the San Joaquin Valley made policy decisions as a group. He also said that the voluntary coalition often presented a unified agenda to Sacramento. Mr. Chesley said that within the Central Valley, each MPO has tailored its structure to best serve each agency’s individual needs.

   Commissioners discussed challenges with the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA), achieving air quality targets and cost factors. It was noted that working regionally with TAMC on some issues would be beneficial.
TAMC Executive Director **Debbie Hale** said that her research indicated that tax dollars could be saved by becoming a single county MPO. She noted that a Central Coast Coalition consisting of all the Regional Transportation Agencies within District 5 has been formed to discuss regional coordination issues.

**Chris Schneiter**, City of Santa Cruz Public Works, said that AMBAG’s modeling has not been useful in the past and supported the idea of developing and managing the model by the RTPA’s. He added that there seems to be a duplication of services regarding transportation planning.

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

1. Accept the 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 that 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. Direct staff to work with TAMC and San Benito Council of Governments to determine how to work regionally and return with possibilities describing what a regional coalition would look like.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Lane, AMBAG Executive Director Les White said that concerns for AMBAG board members included financing without transportation planning funds and performance issues. Mr. White said that there may have been a lack of coordination between AMBAG and local jurisdictions which he is working to improve.

Commissioners discussed preserving AMBAG for non MPO issues, the membership of the RTC if it were to determine housing issues, and ensuring that housing allocations were equitable towards smaller cities.

The motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Stone departed the meeting.

6. **Highway 1 HOV Lane project- Tiered Environmental document**

Senior Planner Kim Shultz reviewed the reasons for developing a tiered environmental document for the HOV lane project saying that the compelling argument to adopt a tiered approach is to be able to begin construction on the Tier 2 phase – auxiliary lanes between Soquel Drive and 41st Avenue – and avoid being penalized by the “10 year rule”, which could require paying back the $5.5 million in federal funds already spent. Since the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) has notified the RTC that revenue from a possible sales
tax can no longer be factored into a funding scenario, the HOV Lanes project is considered to be not completely fundable which would trigger the “ten year rule”. He said that attachments to the staff report include a revised scope of work, costs and a schedule.

Mr. Shultz introduced Parag Mehta, Nolte, and Jeff Bingham, Parsons, who gave a presentation outlining the pros and cons of tiering, as well as CEQA and NEPA statutes and guidelines regarding tiering. It was noted that Tier 1 of the project would be a program level environmental document for the entire HOV Lane project while Tier 2 would be a project level environmental document specifically for the proposed auxiliary lanes.

Commissioners discussed costs, the process used to determine the location of the Tier 2 project, public outreach, and the difference between tiering and segmentation. It was noted that the umbrella program level EIR for the entire HOV Lanes project prevented the Tier 2 project from being considered a segmented part of the overall project.

Commissioner Pirie asked that agency counsel investigate whether the Federal Highway Administration can impose the ten year rule on the basis of not having secured sales tax funding since it was accepted as a possible source of revenue for so many years. Commissioner Coonerty echoed the concern and added that there had not been a public process regarding this alternative yet.

Mr. Dondero said that the RTC has an email from the FHWA stating the basis for triggering the ten year rule and said that if federal money is used in developing an environmental document and the FHWA cannot approve the project, the spent money must be paid back.

**Chris Schneiter**, City of Santa Cruz, said that tiered documents are very common in city project.

**John Herr** said that the environmental document will be worthless in 5 years.

**Zoe Altermich** said that car use is decreasing and if the RTC is building for the future it should build for what people want the future to look like.

**Stacy Falls** said that she doesn’t want to widen the highway at all and that the plan doesn’t seem to include alternative transportation modes.

**Micah Posner** said that travel on Highway 1 has decreased because of the price of gas and asked if this trend has been factored into the long range plan. He added that he would also like a lawyer to look at the FHWA rule.

**Jack Nelson** said that he is concerned that if this item is approved, the next item will have to be approved which will remove funding that could be used for local roads. He added that his understanding was that STARS was supposed to help determine widening scenarios and that the RTC should get their report.
before deciding whether to proceed with tiering the project.

**Peter Scott** asked if any origin and destination studies had been performed. He said that during the Transportation Funding Task Force meetings, widening the highway wasn’t as important to the public as maintaining local roads and thinks a new survey should be undertaken.

**Zach Wolensky** said he is concerned that widening is not the best use of funds and doesn’t think it will make it safer or ease congestion on Highway 1. He thinks improving roads and ways to encourage people to drive less would address the root of congestion.

Commissioners clarified that there was no new money being requested for STARS, noted that growth has taken place without infrastructure growing to take care of it and said that there may be fewer cars on the freeways because there are fewer jobs.

Commissioner Montesino moved and Commissioner Pirie seconded to approve the Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC) and staff recommendations 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 a resolution amending the FY 2011/2012 Budget for the Highway 1 HOV Lanes Project to carryover unspent funds from FY 2010/2011 and move funds within the project budget to allow the environmental work to proceed.

Commissioners commented that Highway 1 has been improved in a staged way for years starting with Mission Street, that moving forward is necessary to make the transit work, that the question is what is the strategy to complete the EIR and there may be a need for more public input.

Commissioner Nicol called the question. The motion (Resolution 01-12) passed with Commissioners Nicol, Montesino, Bustichi, Hagen, Pirie, Robinson and Johnson voting “aye” and Commissioners Coonerty, Caput, Leopold and Lane voting “no”. Commissioner Stone was absent for the vote.

Commissioner Nicol tabled the remaining items to the 9/1/11 meeting.

7. **2012 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) development (Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner)** – Tabled to 9/1/11 meeting
8. Federal legislation oral report - Tabled to 9/1/11 meeting  
(Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner)

9. Rail Line Acquisition project oral report - Tabled to 9/1/11 meeting  
(Luis Pavel Mendez, Deputy Director)

10. Next meetings

The meeting adjourned at 12:23 pm.

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.

Respectfully submitted,

Gini Pineda, Staff

ATTENDEES

Chris Schneiter  City of Santa Cruz
Mark Greenfield
Jack Nelson
John Herr
Larry Lopp
Les White  SCMTD
Peter Scott  CFST
Debbie Hale  TAMC
Jeff Bingham  Parsons
Andy Chesley  San Joaquin COG
Les White  AMBAG
Zoe Altermich
Stacy Falls
Micah Posner
Zach Wolensky
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1. Roll call

The meeting was called to order at 2:02 pm.

Members present:
Dene Bustichi Randy Johnson
Greg Caput Don Lane
Neal Coonerty Kirby Nicol
Daniel Dodge (Alt) Ellen Pirie
Donald Hagen Lynn Robinson
Mark Stone John Leopold

Staff present:
George Dondero
Luis Mendez
Yesenia Parra

2. Oral communications

Micah Posner urged the commission to continue moving forward with the purchase of the rail line.

3. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agendas

CONSENT AGENDA

No consent items
REGULAR AGENDA

4. Review of items to be discussed in closed session

The Commission adjourned to closed session at 2:05 pm.

CLOSED SESSION

5. 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

The Commission reconvened and adjourned the meeting at 3:30 pm.

6. Report on closed session- no items to report

8. Next Meetings

   The next SCCRTC meeting is a special meeting scheduled for Thursday, September 15, 2011 at 9:00 a.m. at the Board of Supervisors Chambers, 701 Ocean St., Santa Cruz, CA.

Respectfully submitted,

Yesenia Parra, Staff

ATTENDEES

Micah Posner
DRAFT MINUTES

Thursday, August 4, 2011
2:00 p.m.
(Special Date/Start Time)

SCCRTC Conference Room
1523 Pacific Ave, Santa Cruz, CA

ITAC MEMBERS PRESENT
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

STAFF PRESENT
George Dondero
Luis Mendez
Rachel Moriconi
Kim Shultz

1. Call to Order – Chair Chris Schneiter called the meeting to order at 2:03 p.m.

2. Introductions – Self introductions were made

3. Oral communications – Rachel Moriconi thanked the committee for adjusting their schedules to move the August ITAC meeting date so that their input could be provided at RTC’s Transportation Policy Workshop.

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

CONSENT AGENDA (Rodriguez/ Wiesner) approved unanimously

5. Approved minutes of the March 17, 2011 ITAC meeting.

REGULAR AGENDA

6. 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
Kim Shultz provided an overview of the proposal to transform the Highway 1 HOV Lane environmental document to a tiered environmental document. In response to questions from Chris Schneiter, Mr. Shultz stated that in order to meet the schedule for delivering a two-tiered environmental document, work needs to start immediately. Based on Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) rules, 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 confirmed that 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. Schneiter 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 possible, but the principle argument against the project related to segmentation would be better addressed through the tiered environmental document, providing information on cumulative impacts of the entire HOV lanes project (Tier 1).

Mr. Schneiter also questioned how critical the bicycle/pedestrian bridge and Sustainable Transportation Analysis Rating System (STARS) application are in light of the large number of other needs in the region and limited funding that would be left for those other projects if the Tier 2 project and STARS are 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. Schneiter 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. Schneiter 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 area.

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 and that FHWA’s 10-year rule, requires initiation of right-of-way or construction phases within 10-years of federal authorization of preliminary engineering work.

Mr. Schneiter 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.

7. 2012 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) Preliminary Proposals

**Actions Taken:**
1. The ITAC approved a motion (Yamin/ Schneiter) 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, on a vote of 6 (Herron, Rodriguez (2), Schneiter (2), Yamin), with 2 opposed (Chen, Wiesner) and 4 abstentions (Aitken, Bateman, Beatty, Patel).

2. The ITAC approved a motion (Wiesner/ Schneiter) to recommend that the RTC issue a call for projects for $2.5 million in FY11/12 Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds, rather than designate funds for RTC projects, with a vote of 7 (Chen, Rodriguez (2), Patel, Schneiter (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, STARS analysis of the HOV Lanes project, and other RTC projects.

3. The ITAC approved a motion (Wiesner/ Schneiter) to continue the discussion on whether to redirect funds from the Mar Vista Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge to the 41st Avenue-Soquel Drive Auxiliary Lanes/ Chanticleer Bike/ Ped Bridge or other projects, on a vote of 7 (Chen, Rodriguez (2), Patel, Schneiter (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.

After receiving information from Rachel Moriconi 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 Schneiter 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 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, in part to backfill reduced funding for local streets and roads with a more stable revenue source. These include a ballot measure for 2014 and opting back into becoming a Congestion Management Agency and then seek 2/3 voter support for a vehicle registration fee of up to $10. 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 noted 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.

8. Status of ongoing transportation projects, programs, studies and planning documents - Verbal updates from project sponsors

County of Santa Cruz – Russell Chen and Steve Wiesner reported that the East Cliff Parkway, Graham Hill Road safety project, and Highland Way storm damage projects are under construction. Several pavement management and storm damage repair projects are scheduled to begin over the next month, including on Bear Creek Road at PM 5.05 and East Zayante Road.

City of Watsonville – Maria Rodriguez reported that the Freedom Blvd. rehabilitation project, including bicycle lanes, is scheduled for construction this month.

City of Santa Cruz – Chris Schneiter reported that the roundabout at Depot Park and the West Cliff Drive rehabilitation projects are nearly complete. He reported that the City may seek a grant for the Mission Street extension project.

SC Metro – Tove Beatty reported that Metro will be receiving new buses soon, funded by a federal State of Good Repair grant, and they have applied for a second round of funding to replace additional diesel buses with CNG vehicles. She noted that the AB2766 and STIC/5307-funded second CNG tank project is going out to bid. Planning studies on Watsonville area transit service and countywide ridership are underway. The Bus Stop Improvement project is under construction and will modify 107 bus stops and Metro Center. She noted that Metro anticipates that Congress will first extend SAFETEA-LU, the federal surface transportation act, followed by a short term act, rather than a long term bill. She asked other entities to contact her if they might be interested in partnering on future federal grant opportunities, which might include a fourth TIGER grant cycle.
9. **Update on the AMBAG Regional Travel Demand Model (RTDM) Peer Review and Model Improvement Plan**

Bhupendra Patel, AMBAG reported that the peer review of the Model Improvement Plan includes recommendations for short, mid and long term improvements to the model. Work done by Caltrans maybe used to build the activity based model. Data is being collected for the State Household Travel Survey (HTS) and AMBAG will also be kicking off the Origin and Destination study soon. AMBAG will be seeking input from local agencies on an ongoing basis as improvements are made to the model.

_Tove Beatty left the meeting._

10. **Central Coast Intelligent Transportation System (CCITS) Architecture Update**

Bhupendra Patel reminded members that a Central Coast Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) regional architecture plan exists and that federally-funded ITS projects must be included in architecture updates. He noted that training is being held on maintaining a regional ITS architecture plan and after September AMBAG will provide information to local agencies on how to input their ITS project information in the web-based program.

11. **Project Initiation Documents for Highway Projects Update**

Rachel Moriconi reported that due to reduced state funding for Project Initiation Document (PID) development and oversight at Caltrans, local agencies will be required to reimburse Caltrans for Caltrans’ oversight of locally-produced PIDs. She recommended that ITAC members identify projects on the state highway system that they intend to pursue for inclusion in the Caltrans 3-Year PID Strategic Plan. ITAC members identified the following projects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Year for PID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCR-1-San Lorenzo Bridge Widening</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>In process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCR-152/Main St/Freedom Blvd (Roundabout)</td>
<td>Watsonville</td>
<td>FY11/12-12/13; Fact Sheet underway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCR-09 Bicycle lanes and sidewalks near Felton</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>FY14/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCR-01/Mission St/ Bay St Intersection - modify signal, bus stop and turn-lanes.</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>FY14/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCR-01 Mission/Chestnut/King St Intersection improvements</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>FY14/15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. **Legislative Update**

ITAC members received a written report on state and federal legislative activities.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m. The next ITAC meeting is scheduled for September 22, 2011 at 1:30 PM in the SCCRTC Conference Room, 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA.

_Minutes prepared by: Rachel Moriconi_
1. Call to Order at 6:33 pm

2. Introductions

**Members Present:**
Piet Canin, Bike to Work (Alt.)
David Casterson, District 2, Chair
Eric Horton, District 2 (Alt.)
Andy Ward, City of Capitola, Vice Chair
Rick Hyman, District 5
Leo Jed, CTSC (Alt.)
Jim Langley, CTSC
Lex Rau, City of Scotts Valley
Brandon Kett, District 4

**Vacancies:**
City of Watsonville – Voting Member
City of Watsonville – Alternate
District 5 – Alternate

**Guests:**
Steve All, Resident of Santa Cruz
Alex Bell, Resident of Rio Del Mar
Marty Demare, North Coast Resident
Steph Nelson, AMBAG

**Unexcused Absences:**
Kem Akol, District 1
Peter Scott, District 3
Carolos Garza, City of Santa Cruz (Alt.)

**Excused Absences:**
Bill Fieberling, City of Santa Cruz
Nick Mucha, Bike to Work
Holly Tyler, District 1 (Alt.)
Will Menchine, District 3 (Alt.)
Shahe Moutafian, District 4 (Alt.)
Gary Milburn, City of Scotts Valley (Alt.)

**Staff:**
Cory Caletti, Senior Transportation Planner
Ginger Dykaar, Transportation Planner
Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner

3. Announcements – Cory Caletti made the following announcements: 1) Shahe Moutafian was appointed by Commissioner Caput to serve as the District 4 alternate, 2) Bob Montague, City of Watsonville voting member, resigned and City of Watsonville representatives are currently being recruited, 3) the RTC postponed the rail acquisition commemoration and will set a new date once escrow closes, 4) a Community Television episode regarding the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network will be filmed in late August and will air in mid September, 5) the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation will hold a fundraising bicycle ride for which brochures were provided, and 6) UCSC received a Bicycle Transportation Act grant for $173,000 to install 36 smart bike lockers.
Oral Communications – Piet Canin announced that a YouTube video made by Ecology Action is now available online and was featured by Ramona Turner in the latest Santa Cruz Sentinel Street Smarts blog. The instructional video discusses Shared Lane Pavement Markings and the proper way to make left hand turns. Mr. Hyman also mentioned that the California Bicycle Coalition will be holding a legislative agenda meeting in November and that Legislative Subcommittee members might want to attend or receive briefings on issues discussed.

Additions or deletions to consent and regular agenda – Cory Caletti asked to pull Item 11.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

A motion (Hyman/Langley) to approve the consent agenda with the exception of Item 11 passed unanimously. Item #11 was re-designated as Item #17a.

Approved draft minutes of the April 4, 2011 Bicycle Committee meeting

Accepted Bicycle Hazard Reports – Rick Hyman indicated that no action has been taken on a hazard report he submitted for Soquel Avenue near Staff of Life.

Accepted Bicycle Committee Roster

Accepted letter from the RTC Executive Director regarding support for the Vine Hill Elementary School sidewalk construction project and from the County of Santa Cruz Redevelopment Agency regarding the East Cliff Drive Parkway Project from 32nd Avenue to 41st Avenue

Accepted 2010 Santa Cruz County Bikeway Miles Count

Approve Bike Secure/Bicycle Parking Subsidy Program applications from the Palo Alto Medical Foundation, El Dorado Terrace Home Owner’s Association, and the Dominican Medical Foundation – *pulled and moved to 17 a.*

Accepted State and Federal Legislative Updates

**REGULAR AGENDA**

Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments Region Wide Bike Data Collection - Steph Nelson, AMBAG Transportation Planner, gave a detailed overview of the Bicycle Travel Demand Modeling tool which will be developed over the next two years using a $125,000 grant received from the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District (Air District). Ms. Nelson said that the goal of the bike modeling tool is to provide the Air District and other agencies with a means by which to conduct benefit-cost analyses of existing and proposed bicycle facilities and to sensitize the current model to non-motorized travel.

Ms. Nelson encouraged members to download the *CycleTracks* app to their smart phones, record distinct trips and encourage other cyclists to do so as well. She emphasized the need to engage the under-represented bicycle user population. Ms. Nelson indicated that data collection is the focus of her efforts through the next few months and that a consultant is expected to be brought on-board by September.
14. Identification of Priority Bicycle Projects – Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner, gave a brief summary of the extensive transportation project needs identified for Santa Cruz County over the next twenty-five years and the constrained funding situation faced by all jurisdictions. Ms. Moriconi said that the Bicycle Committee might wish to identify a few projects per area/jurisdiction that the Committee considers most important to pursue in the next few years should funding opportunities arise. Members discussed tracking bicycle needs, what might be a priority, and identified the following (not in priority order):

City of Capitola:
- Wharf Road - Completion of bike lanes from Capitola Road to Soquel Drive
- Monterey Avenue Bicycle Lanes
- Capitola Avenue Bicycle Lanes

City of Santa Cruz:
- Broadway-Brommer Bike/Ped Path (aka Arana Gulch Path)
- King Street Bicycle facilities
- Branciforte Creek Bike/Ped Crossing
- San Lorenzo River Bike/Ped Bridge adjacent to Railroad Bridge (near Boardwalk)

City of Scotts Valley:
- Green Hills Road Bike Lanes or Sharrows
- Casa Way Bike Lanes
- Bean Creek Road Bike Lanes

City of Watsonville:
- Freedom Boulevard Bike Lanes
- Main Street Bicycle Lanes
- Lincoln Street Bicycle Lanes

County of Santa Cruz:
- Soquel Drive Rehabilitation
- Hwy 1 Ped/Bike Bridge at Chanticleer
- Graham Hill Road Bicycle Lanes
- McGregor Drive Rehabilitation

Regional/multi-jurisdictional projects:
- Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network (MBSST), with priority sections to be identified as part of the Master Plan process
- San Lorenzo Valley Bicycle Facilities, with an emphasis in Felton area: may be on Highway 9, along rail line, and/or along river
- Beach Street Bicycle Lanes from San Andreas Road through the City of Watsonville
- Connection between Park Avenue, New Brighton, and Capitola Village
- Community Traffic Safety Coalition
- Bike to Work/School Program
- Bike Secure bike parking program
- Bicycle Route Signage
- County-wide traffic signal actuation
- Maintenance of existing bikeway network through vegetation abatement, regular bike lane restriping, hazard repairs, etc.
- Railroad-crossing grade improvements
- Close gaps in the bicycle transportation networks with low-cost, small projects (such as bike lane striping)

Members noted that additional priorities may be identified in the future. Ms. Moriconi indicated that staff would forward the Bicycle Committee’s recommendations to the local jurisdictions.

15. Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network project update – Cory Caletti, Senior Transportation Planner/Bicycle Coordinator, provided a detailed overview of the scope of work and timeline for the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network project saying the consultant, RRM Design Group, would conduct the Master Plan and Environmental Review Document for the proposed bicycle/pedestrian trail project. She mentioned that the scope of service is provided in the packet for Committee members’ perusal and that the project is a consolidation of the previously defined rail trail, coastal trail and other coastal access projects. The rail right of way will be utilized as feasible and will be examined through a bicycle network connectivity approach. Ms. Caletti outlined current data collection efforts, funding secured to date, public outreach plans, technical review opportunities as well as the draft timeline for completion of the Master Plan and environmental review. She said that meetings are being planned with partnering agencies, interest groups, and advisory committees, in addition to public workshops which will be open to all members of the community. She informed members that the first set of public meetings to identify route alignment possibilities is planned for the Fall and that a draft Master Plan is scheduled for release in 2012. Ms. Caletti asked for representatives to represent the Bicycle Committee throughout the technical review process. Piet Canin and David Casterson volunteered to serve in that capacity, joining Bill Fieberling who had been previously appointed by the Committee as a representative.

16. New RTC website and online bicycle hazard reporting system – Cory Caletti announced that the RTC unveiled two new websites, one for the agency’s general functions and for the Commute Solutions program. She indicated that the web sites are being fine tuned and that members are invited to provide feedback so that modifications can be made before a public rollout. Ms. Caletti discussed the new online hazard reporting, the ability to upload photos or sketches of specific hazards and her proposal to provide members with an itemized hazard report spreadsheet in upcoming packets rather than copies of each hazard report submitted. Ms. Caletti indicated that there might be a possibility for RTC staff to follow-up on actions taken by local jurisdictions, should time allow. Bicycle Committee members expressed satisfaction with both those efforts.

17. FY 11/12 Meeting Schedule – Cory Caletti proposed continuing the bi-monthly Bicycle Committee meeting schedule for FY2011/2012. Members expressed concerns regarding being able to consider and discuss agenda item thoroughly given time constraints. Members strategized various ways to be more concise, conduct more business through sub-committees, schedule special meetings or workgroups, move project tracking reports earlier in the agenda, or hold longer meetings. A motion (Hyman/Ward) to approve the RTC staff recommendation for the proposed bi-monthly meeting schedule for FY2011/2012, with the addition of amending the end of meeting time to 9:00 pm, passed unanimously.

17a. **Consent Agenda Item 11** - Cory Caletti reported the Palo Alto Medical Foundation withdrew the request for two bicycle racks for the Scotts Valley location and said that RTC staff recommends approving all applications with that one change. A motion (Ward/Kett) to approve the Bike Secure application with the withdrawal of the Palo
Alto Medical Foundation’s request for 2 racks for the Scotts Valley clinic passed unanimously.

18. Project Tracking/Subcommittee Tasks: Oral Reports
   a. City of Santa Cruz Project Tracking: Rick Hyman reported that the roundabout and signage project near Depot Park has been completed but noted that the bike lane markings are confusing and that bike lanes merge right into sidewalks. He mentioned the water line installation from High Street down Highway 9 to Harvey West Park is in progress and will continue over a 2-week period.
   b. City of Capitola Project Tracking: Andy Ward said that bike facilities in City of Capitola have degraded in the vicinity of a new hotel at 41st Avenue and Brommer Street. The City’s solution, the removal of a gutter and installation of traffic furniture, is hazardous to cyclists.
   c. City of Scotts Valley Project Tracking: Lex Rau said that Majid Yamin, City Engineer, has been active responding to reported problems. Cory Caletti mentioned that she submitted a hazard report for Green Hills Road in Scotts Valley and requested that Shared Lane Pavement Markings be added where no bike lanes exist, lines of sight are severely limited, and roadway width is constrained. She will meet with Mr. Yamin and Mr. Rau to discuss placement locations.
   d. City of Watsonville Project Tracking: The bike lane along Pajaro River levee within the unincorporated County was discussed and members inquired why it was no longer identified on the Santa Cruz Bikeways Map. Cory Caletti replied that it was taken off at the request of Santa Cruz County Public Works department but that it may eventually tie into the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network.
   e. County of Santa Cruz Project Tracking: No report provided
   f. Bike-to-Work Update: Piet Canin mentioned that last May’s Bike-to-Work/School had the greatest attendance thus far. He mentioned that Ecology Action is utilizing a grant from the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District to produce “e” newsletter mailings for the next two years targeting beginning cyclists. The next Bike-to-Work/School event will be held on October 6, 2011.
   g. CTSC and the South County Bike/Pedestrian Work Group Update: Cory Caletti reported that efforts to get bike counts are continuing while Leo Jed asked for volunteers for an upcoming pedestrian count survey. Piet Canin mentioned that there have been three bicycle fatalities from February through June 2011 and the ongoing safety education efforts need to be pursued. David Casterson said that bicycle related Public Safety Announcements (PSA) should be placed in cinemas which was followed by a motion (Hyman/Ward) to appoint David Casterson, Bicycle Committee Chair, as the Bicycle Committee’s representative in that effort.
   h. UCSC: No report provided
   i. Legislative Tracking: Leo Jed mentioned that SB910, the 3-foot passing law passed all legislative committees but received strong opposition from the CHP and the Teamsters union. He said that SB28 allows for stiffer penalties for cell phone use while driving and cycling. Mr. Jed said that the Draft Highway Design Manual is available for public review. He also mentioned, as an informational item, that the Los Angeles City Council passed an ordinance that allows cyclists to seek damages from drivers who harass them and be awarded triple damages or $1,000, whichever is greater, plus attorney fees and punitive damages.
   j. Sanctuary Scenic Trail: Discussed earlier during the meeting
   k. Technical Subcommittee: Rick Hyman reported that the Highway 1 Soquel/Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes project, scheduled for ground breaking in Spring 2012, has a proposed bicycle detour recommendation as well as other accommodations. He and other Technical Subcommittee members reviewed the plans and drafted additional
recommendations. The handout was distributed to members. He summarized recommendations regarding detour routes, traffic signal actuation, curb cut additions, pavement repairs, opening the one-way Brookwood Road during the construction to two-way traffic, improving a informal path in the vicinity of Harbor High, among others. Subcommittee members scheduled a meeting with Commissioner Leopold to discuss options. A motion (Canin/Jed) to endorse the Subcommittee’s recommendations and forward them, as appropriate, passed unanimously.

l. Bicyclist/Motorist Safety Education: No report provided
m. RTC Packet Monitoring Subcommittee: No report provided
n. Safe Routes to School: No report provided

21. Meeting adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

**NEXT MEETING:** The next Bicycle Committee meeting is scheduled for the **Special Date and Time** of Monday, October 17th 2011 at 6:30 pm at the City of Capitola Community Room, 420 Capitola Ave, Capitola, CA.

Minutes respectfully prepared and submitted by:

Cathy Judd, Administrative Assistant II and Cory Caletti, Senior Transportation Planner
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Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission’s Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee
Social Service Transportation Advisory Council Paratransit Advisory Council Meeting

MINUTES-DRAFT
Tuesday, August 9, 2011

1. Call to Order

John Daugherty called the meeting to order at 1:34 pm

2. Introductions

Members Present:
Hal Anjo, Social Service Provider-Seniors (County)
Sharon Barbour, 5th District
Lisa Berkowitz, CTSA-Community Bridges
Donella Bloebaum, 2nd District
Debbi Brooks, Persons of Limited Means (Volunteer Center)
John Daugherty, Metro
Veronica Elsea, 3rd District
Sally French, Soc. Serv. Prov.-Disabled (Hope Services)
Patti Shevlin, 1st District

Alternates Present:
Kirk Ance, CTSA Lift Line
April Warnock, SCMTD

Staff Present:
Cathy Judd
Karena Pushnik
Rachel Moriconi

Others Present:
Tove Beatty, SCMTD
Robert Cotter, SCMTD
Lynn Gallagher, Resident of La Posada
Catherine Patterson Valdez, Former Community Bridges Representative

3. Oral Communications

Veronica Elsea requested to receive the E&D TAC agenda packet materials in PDF format and requested that a separate file (not link) be sent to her email.

Lynn Gallagher made known that she would like METRO to reinstate direct bus route service for La Posada residential facility. Ms. Gallagher said that 75 people including Dominican Rehabilitation Center, and Gault St Apartment residents, attended a METRO meeting at the City of Santa Cruz Council Chambers, voiced their disappointment that METRO has not taken action, and understands that METRO has roadblocks that prohibit expansion of services. Patti Shevlin said that she feels it would be easy to install bus facilities on Gault Street. Karena Pushnik said that given the current METRO financial situation resulting in a decrease in service, METRO would probably only be responsive to a proposal to shift other services to this area. She said that the E&D TAC could develop a proposal and feels that there is a better chance for changes to service if the E&D TAC approached it in this fashion.

John Daugherty reminded members that at the April 2011, E&D TAC meeting the committee approved a letter to METRO of its proposed 12% cut in service and since then the cut reduced to 7% and takes effect in September.

Lisa Berkowitz informed members that Meals-on-Wheels is participating in a focus group analyzing bus ridership in Watsonville and will share results with the E&D TAC. She feels that a combination of service between Paratransit and dial-a-ride has potential and that the E&D TAC should discuss this at a future meeting. Tove Beatty told members that this was part of the METRO Watsonville Transit Study report to be available in March 2012.
Karena Pushnik announced that the RTC is opening a shared satellite office with the Air District. The office is located on the fourth floor in the new Watsonville City Government Building at 250 Main Street. She told members that the office would be open on a limited hourly basis and invited all E&D TAC members to the ribbon cutting ceremony for August 16, 2011 at 11:00am.

Sharon Barbour asked if it would be possible for METRO to create a smartphone app that includes bus schedules only. Tove Beatty said she would look into it.

4. Additions and Deletions
Karena Pushnik supplied a handout from Kirk Ance for Item 13b.
John Daugherty asked to pull items 11, 13b, and 13d from the Consent Agenda.

CONSENT AGENDA

Action: The motion (French/Berkowitz) -- to approve and accept the consent agenda with Items 11, 13b, and 13d pulled for discussion during the Regular Agenda -- carried with Veronica Elsea abstaining.

5. Approved Minutes from April 12, 2011 meeting
6. Received Transportation Development Act Revenues Report as of June 2011
7. Received RTC Highlights through June 2011
8. Accepted 7/14/11 letter from the RTC to City of Scotts Valley in support of Vine Hill Elementary sidewalk construction project
9. Received 4/20/11 letter from the E&D TAC to Santa Cruz Metro regarding the 12% Service Cut proposal
10. Accepted Robert White Resignation
11. Accepted Catherine Patterson Valdez Resignation
12. Received Information Items
   a. Article: Planning for Accessible Communities, 7/10/11 Santa Cruz Sentinel
   b. Spotlight on Veronica Elsea, 7/7/11 Good Times
   c. Accepted article on Mobility Training for Senior in Indiana, 7/14/11 Indy-Go
   d. Note from Community Bridges with their annual Report, expressing gratitude to the RTC for being a key partner
13. Received Agency Updates
   a. Volunteer Center
   - Receive 3rd Quarter Report
   b. Community Bridges/CTSA
   - Receive E&D TAC requested documentation regarding un-served riders
   c. Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (METRO)
   - Article about new ParaCruz vehicles by GM Les White in 3/1/11 Bus Ride
   - ParaCruz Operations Status Report: April, May & June 2011
   - Final Bus Route Cuts – 8%
   d. Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
   - Back on Track: Rail Acquisition Celebration?
   - New Website
   e. Private Operators
REGULAR AGENDA

11. Accepted Catherine Patterson Valdez Resignation

John Daugherty gave a detailed report of Catherine Patterson Valdez’ many accomplishments during her employment with Community Bridges and thanked her for her five years of service to the E&D TAC. Catherine Patterson Valdez thanked the committee for all their help and support.

Karena Pushnik mentioned that the RTC recently received notification that the Section 5310 Grant Application submitted by Ms. Valdez secured two new large and six new medium buses, 21 two-way radios, 6 new computers and a new network and Trapeze Mapping System.

13b. Community Bridges/ CTSA - Receive documentation regarding un-served riders

Kirk Ance provided committee members with requested information regarding un-served Transportation Development Act (TDA) - funded rides. Mr. Ance said that the information, taken from the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd Quarter FY10-11 TDA claim, was requested during the April 2011 E&D TAC meeting.

Mr. Ance mentioned that the number of un-served rides has increased but could not explain why. He mentioned that Elderday is expected to close on December 1, 2011 and that, based on Community Bridges providing approximately 80 rides per day to that site, un-served ride numbers would decrease. Elderday is trying to figure out how to continue service.

Karena Pushnik said that the E&D TAC request to furnish information about un-served rides for the next fiscal year was a condition for approving the last TDA claim. Ms. Pushnik requested more information about the high number of no shows for Elderday and whether it was due to a specific incident. Mr. Ance responded that Elderday books more rides than Community Bridges could accommodate because there are a certain number of clients that will cancel. Kirk Ance also discussed the information provided for Lift Line Medical applications mailed and Taxi Scrip sold. Veronica Elsea asked if the information included the number of applications approved. Mr. Ance replied that Community Bridges denies less than 5% applications.

Action: The motion (Elsea/Shevlin) to receive the information as presented per the TDA Claim presented in April 2011 regarding un-served riders -- carried with Kirk Ance abstaining.

13d. Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
- Back on Track: Rail Acquisition Celebration

Karena Pushnik informed members that the acquisition of the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Corridor is delayed due to a snag with federal Surface Transportation Board. Because of this delay, escrow has not yet closed and the planned celebration on September 10, 2011 is on hold. Ms. Pushnik said the RTC would announce a new date for the celebration once the application approval from the STB and close of escrow takes place.

- New Website

Karena Pushnik announced that the RTC launched its new website and requested feedback from E&D TAC members. She mentioned that the RTC has not done any public outreach yet. John Daugherty suggested addition of content on the page for Seniors and Accessible Transportation Services saying that he would like to see a link to METRO’s website after the link to the RTC’s Guide to Specialized Transportation Services for Seniors and People with Disabilities.

Action: The motion (Elsea/Shevlin) to receive the information as presented -- carried.
14. **Approve Recommendation to Regional Transportation Commission of Watsonville Transportation Development Act Claim for Curb Cuts**

Karena Pushnik provided an overview of the TDA claim submitted by the City of Watsonville for $182,000 to install 52 curb ramps on various streets within the City. Ms. Pushnik mentioned that Maria Esther Rodriguez, engineer at the City of Watsonville Public Works Department, said that installing curb ramps are necessary due to new development or user need. Hal Anjo asked if developer have any responsibility to finance or help finance installing curb ramps.

Veronica mentioned that the City generally installs curb ramps, but once installed it becomes the responsibility of the property owner to maintain. She mentioned that she learned this in her work with the Pedestrian Safety Work Group.

*Action: The motion (Elsea/French) to recommend to the RTC approval of the City of Watsonville TDA claim for $182,000 for 52 curb ramps -- carried.*

15. **Receive Update on Bus Stop Improvements**

Robert Cotter, METRO staff gave a detailed update on bus stop improvements to date. He mentioned that METRO has been able to deliver bus improvement projects under budget, and plans to incorporate additional bus stop improvements. Tove Beatty reiterated that the project is on schedule and under budget. Robert Cotter said he would come back to the committee in 2 months with the next update about bus stop improvements.

Karena Pushnik requested more information about the new bus stop on Emeline Avenue. Tove Beatty said that the new bus stop moved 84 feet to the right of the original stop.

Veronica Elsea asked if there is any information on METRO’s website that could inform sight-impaired riders how to activate lights installed at bus stops and if the lights are meant to make bus drivers aware there is a rider at the stop when it is dark. Robert Cotter said that the lights are mainly for the convenience of riders, but also will let bus driver know that riders are at the stop. He said that METRO would look into putting information on the website for sight-impaired riders.

Mr. Cotter also described the improvement project for lane 4 at the METRO Station on at Pacific Avenue saying that METRO might have to close lane 4 for about a week while construction takes place and that members can find information on the METRO website about the project and possible impact on riders and buses.

16. **Identification of Priority Projects**

Rachel Moriconi gave an overview of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Unmet Needs list. Ms. Moriconi said that E&D TAC members might wish to identify priority projects to balance need with funding. Ms. Moriconi said that the goal should be to develop 5-10 key projects to focus on and said that based on previous discussion with E&D TAC this list could include the following:

- Maintaining core fixed-route transit and paratransit service areas as a way to serve the greatest number of people for the lowest cost and environmental impact
- Prioritizing sidewalks/pedestrian improvements that provide universal access between transit stops and activity centers
- Filling missing bicycle and pedestrian links to high traffic residential and activity areas (e.g. Pedestrian/bicycle bridge over Highway 1 near Soquel Drive and Soquel Avenue, connecting Chanticleer and Dominican Hospital areas)

Veronica Elsea said that she considers ongoing sidewalk maintenance and pedestrian safety her highest priorities including access to and from activity centers.
Kirk Ance asked if anyone was looking into one call/one click centers and mentioned the Veterans Transportation and Community Living Act Grant. Ms. Moriconi said that could possibly tie into the 211 program.

Lynn Gallagher mentioned that restoration of service to Gault Street and La Posada in Santa Cruz and other high density concentrations of mobility-challenged individuals, as detailed in Item #22 of the Unmet Specialized Transportation/Transit Needs List included in the packet, is her highest priority.

Patti Shevlin said that restoration of transit service to 2009 levels is her highest priority because low-income residents cannot afford the fee for ParaCruz service. John Daugherty wanted to make clear that it would be a challenge for low cost or expanded service because of cuts to METRO service. Veronica Elsea said that the E&D TAC could make a general statement that all transit systems will become important as the population grows.

In response to a question about reduction of greenhouse gases (GHG), Ms. Moriconi said that the Highway Trust Fund does not keep pace with the need and Ms. Beatty said that there is no funding for projects because goals for reduction of GHG targets were not reached.

17. Receive Pedestrian Safety Work Group Outreach Campaign Update

Veronica Elsea told members that the Pedestrian Safety Work Group is working on its outreach campaign about sidewalk maintenance and gave detailed information of the four components of campaign:

- Community Value of Good Sidewalks
- Attributes of Good sidewalks
- Maintenance responsibilities
- Report poor conditions

Ms. Elsea said that outreach to community for the campaign includes the following:

- 2 guest editorials in the Santa Cruz Sentinel
- recorded television public service announcements
- Public Service Announcements for radio stations
- pursuing slots on interview shows throughout the County
- meetings with Santa Cruz neighbors
- presentations during oral communications at all local jurisdiction meetings

Ms. Elsea asked members for ideas for additional outreach. She also mentioned that since Doug Patrick resigned, that the group is looking for new members and asked the E&D TAC what they would consider appropriate in terms of recruiting new members for the group. Sally French, a member of the Pedestrian Safety Group wanted to acknowledge all the hard work that Ms. Elsea has done. Hal Anjo voiced interest in joining the group.

Lisa Berkowitz said that presentations at the senior centers would be good idea to get the word out to secure volunteers. Hal Anjo said that the Seniors Commission started a project to track the calls received for special needs and services and that the Seniors Commission might be receptive to receiving a presentation.

Veronica Elsea also mentioned that the group is currently working on expending a grant already received for pedestrian improvements between bus stops and activity centers.

18. Meeting Adjourned at 3:20 pm

Prepared by: Cathy Judd, SCCRTC Staff
RECOMMENDATIONS
This item is for information only.

BACKGROUND
As part of the Regional Transportation Commission’s (RTC) legislative program, the RTC, working with its legislative assistants in Sacramento and Washington, D.C. and other transportation entities, monitors legislative activities that could impact transportation in Santa Cruz County.

DISCUSSION
Federal Transportation Act

The current federal transportation act, SAFETEA-LU, which establishes funding levels and rules for road, transit, bicycle, and other transportation programs, expired on September 30, 2009. Several short term extensions have been approved by Congress since 2009, with the latest set to expire on September 30, 2011. In July, House and Senate transportation leaders released outlines of their proposals for the next multi-modal surface transportation authorization bill. Details of these proposals will not be known until bill language is released, possibly in September. A summary of the proposals is provided from the RTC’s federal legislative assistants in Attachment 1. Given the level of negotiations anticipated for the next transportation act, Senator Boxer is proposing a 4-month extension of the current act.

Tied to the September 30, 2011 expiration date is the federal gas tax. All but 4.3 cents of the 18.4 cent per gallon federal gas tax could expire that date. Even if the gas tax is renewed, if the transportation act is not extended or reauthorized, there would be no way for the funds to be distributed. In either case, projects slated to receive federal funds, including highway, transit, and safety projects, would be impacted. California has legislation in place that allows a minor 4.7 cent increase in the state excise tax to backfill some of the federal tax, but new state legislation would be needed to fully fill the gap. Transportation groups in the state are working on drafting such legislation, but it might require a two-thirds vote, due to Proposition 26.

SUMMARY
This report provides an update on federal legislative activities.
Congress was in recess for the month of August and both the House and Senate returned to Washington during the week of September 5. Work continues behind the scenes on the crafting of surface transportation reauthorization bills. The current extension of the SAFETEA-LU law is set to expire on September 30.

As you know, House Transportation & Infrastructure (T&I) Committee Chairman John Mica (R-FL) unveiled an outline of a six-year, $230 billion measure in July that so far has been planned with no Democratic input. While Mica spoke of issues such as eliminating dozens of DOT programs and streamlining project delivery in his rollout, few details of the plan have actually been released. The reaction to Mica’s proposal in Washington was somewhat muted, with most transportation interests expressing disappointment with the low funding level. If enacted, the bill would represent a 30 percent reduction in funding from SAFETEA-LU levels. Mica, however, is bound by newly-enacted House rules that prohibit highway and transportation spending in excess of projected revenues to the Highway Trust Fund.

Meanwhile, Chairman Barbara Boxer (D-CA) and her Republican counterpart on the Senate Environment and Public Works (EPW) Committee, Senator James Inhofe (R-OK) announced in July that they had come to an agreement on the framework of a six-year, $339 billion surface transportation reauthorization. Its progress would rely on the ability of the Senate Finance Committee to find the necessary revenues (about $12 billion annually) to close the gap between highway trust fund receipts and the proposed funding level. In late July, Senate leadership announced that the Finance Committee had found funds to fill the gap, but the statement was quickly retracted.

Once again, details of the Boxer plan are few, but one highlight is the expansion of the Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (TIFIA) program, which provides loans for regionally significant projects with a revenue stream, a priority of the Mayor of Los Angeles.

Subsequent discussion about the Boxer plan has revolved around a proposal to consider a two-year bill. Supporters of this idea maintain that an expensive multi-year bill is a difficult climb in the current climate in Washington, and that a two-year bill could provide some economic stimulus at a smaller price tag. Thus far, however, Mica and
House leadership have rejected such a scenario. Boxer’s committee is expected to take up a four-month transportation bill extension on September 8, and there are reports that she will unveil her two-year reauthorization proposal in the next few weeks, possibly as early as September 15.

Even if Mica and Boxer reveal drafts of their respective bills in September, it is a certainty that they will not be completed prior to September 30. Tradition holds that Congress would pass another short-term extension next month while negotiations continue. However, there is speculation that the federal gas tax may be the next target of anti-tax interests here and that there may be some opposition to a SAFETEA-LU extension in the name of tax relief and “devolution” of such responsibilities to the states.

Republican leadership in recent days has indicated that they would allow a “clean” short-term extension to proceed, as failure to extend the law would result in nothing short of chaos for federal highway and transit programs. However, the recent debate over an extension of Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) programs demonstrated how far some in Congress would go to prove a point. Last month, instead of providing a short-term extension of FAA programs while negotiators worked out a long-term bill, House Republican leaders added controversial language to their extension regarding rural air service.

The result was that FAA programs were allowed to expire, 4,000 DOT employees were furloughed, and airport construction projects across the country were halted for about two weeks. An agreement was eventually reached in which the Senate would accept the House language in order to gain approval of the extension, but Secretary of Transportation then waived implementation of the rural air service provision using his regulatory powers.
TO: Regional Transportation Commission

FROM: Grace Blakeslee, Transportation Planner

RE: Revised Adoption Date for the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) receive the proposed revised timeline for the next Regional Transportation Plan.

BACKGROUND

As the state-designated regional transportation planning agency for Santa Cruz County, the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) is responsible for developing, implementing and regularly updating the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) for Santa Cruz County. The RTP is a state-mandated long range transportation plan for the region. The current RTP was adopted by the RTC board in June 2010.

The RTPs adopted by Santa Cruz, Monterey, and San Benito Counties are incorporated into the federally-mandated Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP), which is prepared by Metropolitan Transportation Planning Agency (MPO), currently the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG). A Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) will be included as a fourth element of the MTP developed by the MPO, as required by SB375, and included in the RTP by reference.

DISCUSSION

Development of the next Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) has been historically coordinated with the development of the three-county Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). The Santa Cruz County RTP policies, programs and projects must be consistent with the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS), which will be included as a new element in the next MTP. Under SB375, planning for the MTP must also be coordinated with the Monterey Bay Area’s two Regional Housing Needs Allocation Plans (RHNA) and local jurisdictions’ Housing Elements.

The AMBAG Board will be considering a revised MTP adoption date of June 2014 at their October meeting. AMBAG staff has indicated that a revised adoption date is needed to complete some modeling improvements identified through the modeling peer review process, to update the region’s employment and housing forecast, and
to complete all work included in the recently awarded Strategy Growth Council (SGC) grant, which funds much of the SCS planning work.

While the RTC had initially anticipated adopting an updated RTP in 2012, given the coordination required between the development of the Santa Cruz County RTP and the MTP, including the SCS, the RTP adoption date would also be revised to coordinate with the new MTP adoption.

A 2014 adoption date would have the following impacts on the RTP development:

- Allow more complete evaluation of land-use and transportation interactions in priority growth areas (identified through the Blueprint and SCS);
- Better inform transportation policy decisions by improving the Regional Travel Demand Model’s ability to project impacts of transportation investments; and,
- Provide more time for development of key deliverables, such as draft goals and policies, project lists, financial projections and performance measures.

A 2014 adoption date would result in the following timeline for RTP deliverables:

- **Spring 2012** Preliminary Goals & Policies/Performance Measures/Financial Projections
- **Fall 2012** Solicit New Projects and Project Updates
- **Summer 2013** Draft Project Lists/SCS
- **Early 2014** Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR)/RTP/SCS
- **May 2014** Final EIR/RTP/SCS

As development of the RTP, MTP, and SCS progress, staff will periodically return to the RTC with schedule updates.

**RTP Work Plan Progress**

**Sustainability Framework**

Establishing a sustainability framework that will support development of the RTP goals and policies is currently underway. The Sustainable Transportation Council, responsible for the development of the Sustainable Transportation Analysis Rating System (STARS), is coordinating with their Expert Advisory Panel and RTC staff to identify appropriate topics for evaluating the sustainability of transportation plans. This Fall, RTC staff will provide a report to Commissioners on the STARS for Plan Manual and the proposed sustainability framework for the RTP.

**Complete Streets Initiative**

The RTPA/MPO Working Group, composed of staff from RTC, AMBAG, Transportation Agency for Monterey County, and San Benito Council of Governments, is currently developing a tool for analyzing how well the transportation infrastructure in priority growth areas (identified through the Blueprint and SCS) implement “complete streets”. Complete streets provide safe access for all users: motorists, pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit riders of all ages and abilities. The complete streets component of the RTP development, funded in part through the SGC grant received by AMBAG, is not a specific requirement of SB375. However, this complete streets initiative is an important part of the region’s
strategy to ensure that the regional transportation plans are consistent with the SCS, reduce vehicle miles traveled, and are reflective of the adopted California RTP Guidelines. The RTP/MTP Working Group has reviewed a draft outline for creating a complete streets analysis tool. RTC staff will be seeking input on the complete streets tool from local jurisdictions and RTC Committees in early 2012 and the RTC board in Spring 2012.

On-Board Transit Survey
The RTC and Santa Cruz METRO were recently awarded a Caltrans grant which will fund a transit rider origin and destination survey. This project is intended to collect transit data that will substantiate local conditions in the Regional Travel Demand Model (RTDM) and support future transit route planning efforts. RTC staff, as the project lead, is working with Santa Cruz METRO and Caltrans District 5 to determine if this project can be completed by August 2012, rather than the scheduled 2013 date. An earlier completion date would allow the new transit ridership data to be included with the other RTDM improvements proposed by AMBAG to be completed in time for consideration in the 2014 MTP. RTC staff will return to the RTC to request authorization to release a Request for Proposals for these services this fall, if the project can be expedited.

SCS Committee Activities
RTC staff is also coordinating with AMBAG on additional SCS related efforts, including participation in AMBAG’s Planning Director’s Forum (one of five SCS related committees), and supporting establishment of the Smart Growth Implementation Plan Regional Advisory Committee. A list of regional coordination efforts organized by AMBAG is included as Attachment 1. RTC staff will continue to bring relevant RTP and MTP items to the RTC, as needed.

SUMMARY
Development of the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) has been historically coordinated with the development of the three-county Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). The Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) Board will be considering a revised MTP adoption date of June 2014 at their October meeting. Given the coordination required between the development of the Santa Cruz County RTP and the MTP, including the SCS, the RTP adoption date would also be revised to coordinate with the new MTP adoption date.

Attachment 1: SB375 Regional Coordination Efforts
To ensure comprehensive, region-wide participation in SB 375 planning efforts, AMBAG’s planning framework includes a set of regional coordination efforts as well as a set of planning processes. Each of these is described in more detail below.

**Regional Coordination Efforts**

Regional Coordination Efforts are comprehensive and diversified and consist of the following:

1. **Ongoing RTPA/MPO Working Group**

   This group meets (bi)monthly and consists of AMBAG and RTPA Staff. It addresses all issues related to MTP/RTP planning, including SB 375.

2. **Planning Directors’ Forum**

   AMBAG convened this quarterly Forum for the first time in April of 2011. They will continue to meet quarterly to address all issues related to SB 375 planning.

3. **AMBAG Board Ad-Hoc Policy Committee**

   This Committee will convene for the first time on June 8, 2011, prior to the AMBAG Board of Directors meeting. Staff from regional transportation planning agencies, transit agencies and local jurisdictions will be welcome to attend as appropriate at upcoming monthly or quarterly meetings. The Committee will guide all issues related to SB 375 planning.

4. **Land Use and Transportation Initiative Sub-Contracts**

   This item is not a committee or working group; rather, it references two initiatives wherein AMBAG will be providing funding to member and partner agencies for the “Joint Work Plan for the Sustainable Communities Strategy” including, but not limited to, the transportation and land use initiatives.

5. **Regional Advisory Committee**

   These Committee members may be comprised of local planning and redevelopment staff, community leaders and business leaders, among other stakeholders. This Committee will meet quarterly to provide AMBAG Staff with useful insight on “Smart Growth Development Strategies” to assist with the implementation of the SCS.

In addition to these efforts, AMBAG Staff will engage elected officials and the general public through a series of SB 375 required workshops. Collectively, these efforts provide multiple opportunities for elected officials, professionals and the general public to actively participate in all aspects of SB 375 planning efforts.

*Excerpted from AMBAG Memorandum regarding SB375 & Sustainable Communities Strategy*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>FY10-11 Actual Revenue</th>
<th>FY11-12 Estimate Revenue</th>
<th>FY11-12 Actual Revenue</th>
<th>Difference As % of Projection</th>
<th>Cumulative % of Actual to Projection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>410,500</td>
<td>450,500</td>
<td>499,800</td>
<td>49,300</td>
<td>10.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>547,300</td>
<td>547,300</td>
<td>666,400</td>
<td>119,100</td>
<td>21.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>819,955</td>
<td>779,955</td>
<td>776,432</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>458,300</td>
<td>498,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>611,000</td>
<td>611,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>776,432</td>
<td>736,432</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>502,700</td>
<td>479,259</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>670,300</td>
<td>639,012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>510,760</td>
<td>625,623</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>412,600</td>
<td>396,653</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>605,300</td>
<td>579,581</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>631,612</td>
<td>624,035</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6,956,759</td>
<td>6,967,650</td>
<td>1,166,200</td>
<td>168,400</td>
<td>2.42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
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### Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission

**THREE MONTH MEETING SCHEDULE**

**SEPTEMBER 2011 through NOVEMBER 2011**

(Revised 9/2/11)

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Meeting Day</th>
<th>Meeting Type</th>
<th>Meeting Time</th>
<th>Meeting Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/8/2011</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Budget and Administration/Personnel Committee</td>
<td>3:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/12/11</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td><strong>Bicycle Committee - Cancelled</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/15/11</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>SPECIAL MEETING Regional Transportation Commission</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/22/11</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Interagency Technical Advisory Committee - <em>Note Special Date</em></td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/06/11</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Commission</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11/11</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Elderly &amp; Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/17/11</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td><strong>Bicycle Committee - Note Special Date and Time</strong></td>
<td>6:30 pm</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/20/11</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Transportation Policy Workshop</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/20/11</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Interagency Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/03/11</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Commission</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>City of Scotts Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/10/11</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Budget and Administration/Personnel Committee</td>
<td>3:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/14/11</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td><strong>Bicycle Committee - Cancelled</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/17/11</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Transportation Policy Workshop</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/17/11</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Interagency Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commission Offices - 1523 Pacific Ave - Santa Cruz CA 95060
Board of Supervisors Chambers/CAO Conference Room/RDA Conf Room - 701 Ocean St - Santa Cruz CA 95060
City of Scotts Valley - 1 Civic Center Drive - Scotts Vault CA 95066

S:\RTC\TC201109\***\3month meeting schedule.xlsx]\Sheet1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Letter Rec'd/Sent</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Incoming/Outgoing</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>TO First</th>
<th>TO Last</th>
<th>TO Organization</th>
<th>FROM First</th>
<th>FROM Last</th>
<th>FROM Organization</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07/15/11</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Susan Bransen</td>
<td>Department of Transportation</td>
<td>SCCRTC Audit of Indirect Cost Allocation Plan for FY2010/2011 File Number: P1591-0078</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/26/11</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Les</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>AMBAG</td>
<td>Luis Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td>FY2010-2011 Second Partial 1st Quarter FHWA PL Invoice for Indirect Costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/26/11</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Les</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>AMBAG</td>
<td>Luis Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td>FY2010-2011 Second Partial 2nd Quarter FHWA PL Invoice for Indirect Costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/26/11</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Les</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>AMBAG</td>
<td>Luis Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td>FY2010-2011 Second Partial 3rd Quarter FHWA PL Invoice for Indirect Costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/27/11</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Les</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>AMBAG</td>
<td>Luis Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td>FY2010-2011 Partial First Quarter CMAQ Invoice for Indirect Costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/27/11</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Les</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>AMBAG</td>
<td>Luis Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td>FY2010-2011 Partial Second Quarter CMAQ Invoice for Indirect Costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/27/11</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Les</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>AMBAG</td>
<td>Luis Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td>FY10-11 Fourth Quarter FHWA PL Invoice and Narrative Progress Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Letter Rec’d/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/27/11</td>
<td>Letter O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Les</td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td>AMBAG</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/27/11</td>
<td>Letter I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Garth</td>
<td>Hopkins</td>
<td>Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/28/11</td>
<td>Letter O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Celine</td>
<td>Foord</td>
<td></td>
<td>Iron Mountain</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/29/11</td>
<td>Letter O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kimberly</td>
<td>Sledge</td>
<td></td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/02/11</td>
<td>Letter O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Herron</td>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/03/11</td>
<td>Letter O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Herron</td>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/03/11</td>
<td>Letter O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Herron</td>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec’d/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>TO First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>FROM First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/03/11</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Herron</td>
<td>Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>FY2010-2011 Invoice #7 for the Rural Planning Assistance Funds (State Highway Account)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/08/11</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>QJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Neil</td>
<td>Signo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comments, Job Application Question &quot;Do You Have a Car?&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/10/11</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>S Cruz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Skeff</td>
<td></td>
<td>Use of Parking Lot on Highway 9 in Ben Lomond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/15/11</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Leslie R</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>SCMTD</td>
<td>Increased FY12 STA Funding for Santa Cruz METRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/16/11</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>Luis A</td>
<td>California State Senate California State Assembly</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Support for Senate Bill 436 (Kehoe) - Land Use: Mitigation Lands: Nonprofit Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/22/11</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Denix</td>
<td>Anbiah</td>
<td>Department of Transportation</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>LSR Statewide Needs Assessment Funding Concurrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Letter Rec’d/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>TO First</td>
<td>TO Last</td>
<td>TO Organization</td>
<td>FROM First</td>
<td>FROM Last</td>
<td>FROM Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/22/11</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Connie</td>
<td>Gabriel Wilson</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>08/30/11</td>
<td>Question on Peg/Bike Improvements to Rooney/Morrissey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/23/11</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Stacey</td>
<td>Falls</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>08/26/11</td>
<td>Thursday’s Meeting on Highway Widening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/25/11</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>KP</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>08/25/11</td>
<td>Highway 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/26/11</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Cedar</td>
<td>Geiger</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>08/30/11</td>
<td>Highway 1 Widening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/26/11</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Chris and Gina</td>
<td>Weeks</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>08/30/11</td>
<td>Adding Lanes to Highway 1 Needed Now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/30/11</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Donn</td>
<td>Miyahara</td>
<td>Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Federal Report of Expenditures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/30/11</td>
<td>Memo</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Shultz</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Highway 1 Soquel/Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes Project Transportation Management Implementation Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Rec'd/Sent</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/01/11</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Herron</td>
<td>Department of Transportation</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Proposition 116 Bond Program Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/02/11</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Garin</td>
<td>Schneider</td>
<td>Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Invoice #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/02/11</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Herron</td>
<td>Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Contract No. A Monterey Bay Area Travel Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/06/11</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Monty</td>
<td>Reeder</td>
<td>Iron Mountain</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>SB324</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
September 9, 2011

The Honorable Christine Kehoe  
California State Senator  
c/o Gil Topete  
State Capitol, Room 5050  
Sacramento, CA 95814

The Honorable Luis A. Alejo  
Assemblymember 28th District  
California State Capitol  
P.O. Box 942849  
Sacramento, CA 94249-0028

SUBJECT:  Support for Senate Bill 436 (Kehoe) –  
Land use: mitigation lands: nonprofit organizations

Dear Senator Kehoe and Assemblymember Alejo:

On behalf of the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC), I am writing express our support for your co-sponsored bill allowing State agencies to transfer funds for habitat mitigation to non-profit organizations, as outlined in Senate Bill 436 (Kehoe), which merged with Assembly Bill 484 (Alejo). This provides a cost-effective means to protect sensitive habitat while streamlining the environmental review process for transportation projects.

In the course of constructing transportation infrastructure projects, permanent environmental impacts may be created from the displaced habitat needed to build the project. The current process involves the state agency purchasing, and managing in perpetuity, land that offsets the project’s environmental impacts. This can become a lengthy, bureaucratic process that jeopardizes funding sources with specific time requirements. The purpose of Senate Bill 436 (Kehoe) is to speed up the environmental review and permitting process by allowing state agencies to transfer both the land and management funds to non-profit organizations for environmental mitigation projects. This relieves the state agency of the responsibility to manage habitat and ensures that all environmental and fiscal safeguards are met. Under the existing law, permits and clearances from the Department of Fish and Game have been significantly delayed for projects. This legislation will reduce delays and help vital transportation projects proceed to construction more quickly.

We appreciate you co-authoring Senate Bill 436 (Kehoe) and thank you for your support of transportation in California.

Sincerely,

George Dondero  
Executive Director
Memo

To: Kim Shultz, RTC Senior Transportation Planner
Highway 1 Soquel/Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes Project Transportation Management Plan Implementation Team

From: Cory Caletti, RTC Senior Transportation Planner/Bicycle Coordinator

Date: 8/30/2011

Re: Bicycle Committee recommendations for accommodations for bicyclists as part of the Highway 1 Auxiliary Lane Project

Enclosed please find the RTC Bicycle Committee's recommendations for bicycle and pedestrian accommodations during construction of the Highway 1 Soquel/Morrissey Auxiliary Lane Project as well as associated long term improvements as mandated by state law for all new or improvement projects.

As background, the RTC's Bicycle Committee serves to advise the RTC and its member agencies on proposed bicycle policies, programs, projects, plans, funding applications, and legislation. The Bicycle Committee, at their August 8th, 2011 meeting, reviewed and endorsed recommendations from their Technical Subcommittee regarding improvements and accommodation for bicyclists as part of the Highway 1 Soquel/Morrissey Auxiliary Lane Project. The enclosed recommendations include detours and other safety measures during construction as well as long term improvements to serve non-motorized travelers. The full Bicycle Committee requested that the recommendations be forwarded to the project team and be considered for implementation.

Should you have any questions regarding the enclosed recommendations, please contact Cory Caletti, staff to the RTC's Bicycle Committee. The Committee appreciates your efforts to promote bicycling by providing safe and convenient facilities for all user types and abilities.

Sincerely,

Cory Caletti, on behalf of the RTC Bicycle Committee

cc: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission's Bicycle Committee
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ROUTE 1 SOQUEL/MORRISSEY AUXILLIARY LANE PROJECT:

1. In order to install the new bridge, the existing bridge has to be removed and that portion of La Fonda Avenue has to be closed for a period of time. This will present a hardship for cyclists wishing to travel in the area. We understand that there is only one set of detour plans. Directing westbound cyclists to follow the same detour plans as for motor vehicles will present a tremendous inconvenience. Furthermore, cyclists can not use the same detour as motor vehicles as it involves traveling on the freeway on-ramp where cyclists are prohibited. Some local cyclists may be familiar with short-cuts but other cyclists will not. Therefore, we recommend that separate detour routes be prepared for cyclists and publicized to groups out of the area that may be touring in town:

a. Proposed cyclist detour route from the southeast: La Fonda Avenue to pathway between La Fonda and Park Way at Santa Cruz Adult School to Park Way to Roxas Street to Pacheco Avenue to Fairmont Avenue to Morrissey Boulevard.

b. Proposed cyclist detour route from the east: Soquel Drive to Paul Sweet Road to Brookwood Drive to Prospect Heights. Brookwood Drive is currently one-way eastbound. There have been various unsuccessful proposals to open this road to westbound cyclists. If it can not be opened to westbound cyclists permanently, then for the duration of the detour Brookwood should be signalized at each end of its one-way section. This would allow approaching westbound cyclists to push a button to activate the signal – giving the westbound cyclist a green light and eastbound vehicles a stop. Signalizing one-way segments during construction is commonly employed.

2. In order to make these detours functional and in the spirit of complying with complete streets and greenhouse gas reduction legislation, we recommend that the following improvements be made:

- improve the pathway between La Fonda and Park Way at the Santa Cruz Adult School
- curb cut at Park Way and pathway;
- curb cut widened at northwest corner of Fairmont Avenue to Morrissey Boulevard;
- bike lanes on Goss Avenue (Branciforte to Gilbert), Gilbert Lane, Rooney Street and Morrissey Boulevard (Park Way to Prospect Heights) – these are all in Santa Cruz City’s 2008 Bicycle Transportation Plan;
- southbound bike lane on La Fonda Avenue south of the new Highway One bridge (which we welcome will have bike lanes) – this is in Santa Cruz City’s 2008 Bicycle Transportation Plan;
- traffic signals in the area sensitized and timed to detect and accommodate cyclists (e.g., Fairmount and Morrissey; La Fonda and Soquel; Paul Sweet and La Fonda) – the law requires that all new or improvement projects include upgrades to traffic signals to actuate for bicycles.

In order to provide for bike lanes on Rooney Street the proposed sidewalk addition needs to be setback.

3. We understand that a shuttle will be provided to transport students to school if construction work extends into the school season. We recommend that the shuttle be able to carry bicycles. Some students’ schedules may not be accommodated by the shuttle in both directions, but they could take it one way and then ride the other way.

4. The construction activities and detours may create congestion in the area, especially around Harbor High School, resulting in motor vehicles possibly being in bike lanes. While parking in bike lanes is prohibited, “No Stopping” signs should be installed like the ones by Westlake School. Dropping off and picking up students likely will coincide with the greatest cycling traffic.

5. Finally, we request that the enclosed “Recommended Guidelines to Protect the Safety of Bicyclists, Pedestrians and Disabled Travelers during Road Construction” be followed to ensure safe and convenient non-motorized travel during the project’s construction.

Attachment 1: Recommended Guidelines to Protect Bicyclists during Road Construction
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COMMUNITY TRAFFIC SAFETY COALITION
Recommended Guidelines to Protect the Safety of Bicyclists, Pedestrians, and Disabled Travelers during Road Construction

As stated in the California MUTCD (2003 Edition with Revisions Number 1 and 2 Incorporated, December 2007), “The needs and control of all road users (motorists, bicyclists, and pedestrians within the highway, including persons with disabilities in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA) Title II, Paragraph 35.130) through a TTC zone shall be an essential part of highway construction, utility work, maintenance operations, and the management of traffic incidents.”

THE PROBLEM

There are three general situations which impact bicyclists, pedestrians, and disabled travelers:

1. Work in the bikeway* or walkway which forces bicyclists or pedestrians to compete with motor vehicles in a narrow car lane.
2. Work which is not in the bikeway or walkway but which puts equipment, debris, or warning signs in the bikeway or walkway.
3. Work which blocks the direction of travel without a clear, safe, and convenient detour for cyclists, pedestrians, or wheelchair travelers.

In addition, please be aware of these specific hazards for bicyclists, pedestrians, and disabled travelers.

Hazards to Bicyclists
- Signs, equipment, or debris in the bikeway.
- Bikeway blocked without advance warning.
- Rough pavement or gravel without advance warning.
- Poor pavement transitions, especially when parallel to the line of travel (eg: metal plate edges or pavement removal/resurface areas which are not tapered).
- Inadequate time to pass through a signalized one-lane, two-way traffic control.

Hazards to Pedestrians
- Blocked or hazardous walkway which is not marked in a way that is visible in advance, especially at night.
- Alternate route or detour which is not negotiable by wheelchairs, strollers, carts, etc.

Special Hazards to Visually Impaired Pedestrians
- Blocked or hazardous walkway without a barrier which is solid enough to be discernible by guide dog or cane.

Special Hazards to Wheelchair Travelers
- Signs, equipment, or debris partially blocking the walkway.
- Sidewalk blocked with no curb cut or ramp to exit sidewalk, or advance warning to exit at a prior curb cut.
- Rough pavement, grooves, or gravel without advance warning. Rocks of 3” diameter or greater are especially hazardous because they may cause the wheelchair to stop abruptly and eject the occupant.

* For the purposes of these guidelines, “bikeway” will be used to refer to where bicyclists usually travel on a given road, including painted bike lanes, paved shoulders, the right side of a wide travel lane, or the center of a narrow travel lane if there is no bike lane or shoulder. “Walkway” will be used to refer to sidewalks, shoulders, and paths where pedestrians and wheelchairs travel.
THE SOLUTION

The California MUTCD (Section 5-01-2) includes these “fundamental principles” for bicyclists and pedestrians in construction and maintenance work zones:

1. Bicycle and pedestrian “movement should be disrupted as little as practicable”.
2. “Pedestrians and bicyclists should be provided with access and passage through, or around, the temporary traffic control zone at all times.”
3. Bicyclists and pedestrians “should be guided in a clear and positive manner while approaching and space traversing the temporary traffic control zone.”

In addition, please consider the following specific safety and access measures.

Detours

- When construction blocks the bikeway, accommodations should be made for bicyclists if they are made for motor vehicles, including safe and well marked detours for cyclists when needed. In some situations when motor vehicles are detoured, a safe corridor can be left open for bicyclists. If not possible, post “End Bike Lane” and “Share the Road” (or “Merge Left”) caution signs to encourage cyclists to merge into the through lane. Rather than directing bicyclists to walk their bikes in pedestrian zones, try to provide a rideable alternative.

- If construction or signs must block the walkway, establish safe, well-signed detours for pedestrians which are accessible for wheelchairs, strollers, carts, etc.

- When one-lane, two-way traffic control is done by temporary traffic signals, timing should accommodate bicyclists, who will be slower than motor vehicles especially in the uphill direction. Consider push button signals for bicyclists or special bicycle loops, if practical.

- Barriers should include a portion low enough and solid enough to be easily discernible by a cane, guide dog, or child. If necessary, use flaggers to guide pedestrians.

Signs

- Whenever possible, construction warning signs should be placed out of the bikeway and walkway, so that the sign itself is not a barrier for bicyclists for wheelchair travelers. Remove construction signs promptly when construction pauses or ends.

- Any construction or sign which blocks the bikeway should have sufficient sight distance, including night-time visibility, to allow cyclists time to merge safely into the car lane. Use “End Bike Lane” and “Share the Road” signs.

- Any construction or sign which blocks the walkway should have prior warning to allow wheelchairs time to exit the walkway at a prior curb cut.

- For all construction where the bikeway or walkway is blocked or the lane narrows, post “Share the Road” caution signs to warn motorists to slow down and watch for bicyclists and pedestrians.

Pavement Surface

- Temporary pavement or metals plates installed during construction should have cold mix asphalt tapered at the edges for bicyclist, pedestrian and wheelchair safety. When locating metal plates, avoid placing edges in the middle of the bikeway. Debris in the bikeway or walkway should be cleared at the end of each workday.

- If no smooth surface is available for bicyclists, pedestrians, or wheelchairs, post signs warning “Rough Surface” or “Uneven Pavement” at the beginning of the work area. Keep signs posted at the end of the workday. Use reflective signage on barricades with flashers for night safety.

- Prior to “sign off” on projects, verify that the pavement in the bikeway and walkway is even. Overlay should be smoothed at drainage grates, manholes, and gutter pan, and after narrow trenching in the bikeway.
Good morning Linda--

Thank you for your inquiry. I spoke with the corresponding maintenance supervisor for the area. He informed me that it is a partially paved parking lot, primarily used as a bus stop. For you to be able to park there, you would need a permit. I am referring you to Steve Senet, our District Permit Engineer. You may reach him at (805) 549-3206. I also left this information on your telephone.

Have a great day.

Susana Z. Cruz
Public Information Officer /
Portavoz de Relaciones Públicas
(805) 549-3138
(805) 549-3326--Fax

--- Original Message ---
From: LINDA SKEFF [mailto:redwoodduff@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 10, 2011 8:56 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Use of Parking Lot on Highway 9 in Ben Lomond

From: LINDA SKEFF <redwoodduff@gmail.com>
Subject: Use of Parking Lot on Highway 9 in Ben Lomond

Dear Sir,

I am actively organizing an environmental restoration project with Santa Cruz Parks and the Valley Women's Club in the San Lorenzo Valley. We will be restoring the riparian corridor along the San Lorenzo River at Highlands Park in Ben Lomond. Classes and restoration will take place on Saturday mornings 8-12. The restoration will be ongoing.

Saturdays see the highest use by the community at Highlands so we would like the restoration volunteers to be able to use the large parking lot directly across from Highlands Park on Highway 9. At this point I would estimate 5-10 cars would use the lot 8-12pm.

Is this in your jurisdiction to ok? If not could you direct me to the right department?

Thank you for your time.

Linda Skeff
831-338-9500
To: 'LINDA SKEFF'
Subject: RE: Use of Parking Lot on Highway 9 in Ben Lomond

Dear Linda,

Thank you for this information. This sounds like a wonderful and much needed project. However, the parking area that you mention is not something that our agency has control over. I can suggest that you contact the Public Works Department for the County of Santa Cruz @ 831 454 2160 or Caltrans @ 831 423 0396.

Good luck with your project.

Regards,

Cathy Judd
Administrative Assistant II
SCCRTC
1523 Pacific Ave
Santa Cruz CA 95060
831 460 3206
Fax 831 460 3215
cjudd@scrctc.org
www.sccrtc.org
-----Original Message-----
From: Connie Gabriel Wilson [mailto:camt@cruzio.com]
Sent: Monday, August 22, 2011 8:57 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: question on ped/bike improvements to rooney/morrissey

Reading the article by Ramona Turner this morning I have a question regarding the
bike/ped improvements for Morrissey and Rooney streets. I would appreciate more
information on what will be implemented. I am aware of the La Fonda bridge
improvements but do not know specifics on Morrissey and Rooney. As a cyclist
biking in this area I know there is much needed especially on the Morrissey
overpass. Thank you Connie Wilson

*****

08/30/11

Hi Connie -

The improvements on Morrissey Boulevard and Rooney Street associated with the
Soquel/Morrissey Auxiliary Lane project are being coordinated with the City of
Santa Cruz and involve sidewalk gap closures on the inland side of the Morrissey
Boulevard Interchange. On Morrissey Boulevard, the proposed sidewalk section will
fill gaps to extend continuously between Pacheco Avenue and San Juan Avenue.
On Rooney Street, a new section of sidewalk would be constructed to connect the
current sidewalk area near Pacheco Avenue moving toward Elk Street to meet the
existing sidewalk area in front of the Habitat for Humanity homes constructed some
3-4+ years ago.

No work is proposed to Morrissey Boulevard Interchange as part of the
Soquel/Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes project. The outdated design of this facility is
recognized and the RTC has worked with Caltrans and the City of Santa Cruz to
secure conceptual agreement on a reconstruction design for this interchange as
part of the Highway 1 HOV Lane Project. The draft environmental document for the
full HOV Lane project – between Morrissey Boulevard and San Andreas Road in
Aptos -- will be circulated for public comment in May/June 2012. However, no
funding source has been identified to construct the full HOV Lane project.

If you have further questions, please call Kim Shultz, Highway 1 Project Manager,
at 831-460-3200.
June 22, 2011

Stephany Aguilar  
President  
AMBAG  
P.O. Box 809  
Marina, CA 93933

SUBJECT: SUPPORT FOR REGIONAL PLANNING

Dear President Aguilar and Members of the Board of Directors:

The Leagues of Women Voters of Santa Cruz County, Monterey Peninsula and Salinas Valley would like to take this opportunity to support regional planning in the three county area. We are aware of efforts to change or eliminate the regional planning functions of AMBAG. Because of our long-standing support for regional planning for land use, transportation and air quality, we urge the Board to make every effort to assure that those functions continue within the region while addressing short-comings of the existing organization that may exist.

AMBAG was formed in 1968 as a forum for collaboration and communication. It played an invaluable role in coordinating such efforts as opposing exported wastewater from the Santa Clara Valley and the Kesterson drain to the Monterey Bay and supporting formation of the Monterey Bay Sanctuary. The functions identified below are currently performed by AMBAG. They are regional in scope and cannot be effectively performed by single county organizations:

1. As the federally designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), AMBAG is responsible for preparing the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP).
2. If transportation conformity determinations are required again because the North Central Coast Air Basin fails to meet the federal ozone standard, the MPO plays a critical role in transportation and general conformity determinations.
3. As the MPO, AMBAG is required to approve federal plans to meet federal ambient air quality standards for ozone.
4. AMBAG prepares population, employment and housing forecasts that are used in regional plans including those for water, transportation and air quality. Using a common set of forecasts assures consistency from one regional plan to another.
5. AMBAG's transportation model is used by the Air Resources Board (ARB) to prepare mobile source emission inventories for air quality plans. The population, employment and housing forecasts are used to forecast population-related emissions.
6 AMBAG negotiates with the California Department of Housing and Community Development regarding regionwide fair share allocations for housing and works with cities and the counties to disaggregate allocations.

7. AMBAG is preparing the SB375 plan having already laid the ground work with the Blueprint. AMBAG has also prepared baseline emission inventories for local GHG action plans, a unique accomplishment in California.

The Board may wish to review regional structures currently used throughout California to determine their applicability to our three county region. For example, the Bay Area has a transportation planning agency (Metropolitan Transportation Commission) which combines the functions of all county transportation agencies into a single organization leaving other regional planning efforts to the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). In Southern California, the Southern California Association of Governments performs functions very similar to those currently performed by AMBAG.

The Leagues appreciate your dedication to effective regional governance, and we look forward to your efforts to assure that regional cooperation continues.

Sincerely,

Beverly Bean
LWV of the Monterey Peninsula

Jan Karwin
LWVoF Santa Cruz County

Mary Ellen Dick
LWV of Salinas Valley

cc: Rich Stedman, MBUAPCD
TAMC
SCCRTC
San Benito County COG
AMBAG Cities and Counties
**CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Construction Timeline</th>
<th>Construction Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>Project Manager (Resident Engineer)</th>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>HWY. 1 Salinas Road Interchange (315924)</td>
<td>North of Moss Landing at Salinas Road (PM 99.9-101.5)</td>
<td>Construct new interchange</td>
<td>4/15/2010- Fall 2012</td>
<td>$12 Million</td>
<td>STIP/CMIA</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Richard Rosales (JW)</td>
<td>Desilva Gates Construction LP, Dublin</td>
<td>Phase I of Salinas Rd. Detour beings August 15, moving southbound traffic in a detour and northbound traffic remaining on Hwy. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>HWY. 1 Micro-surfacing (0T3704)</td>
<td>In Santa Cruz from San Lorenzo River Bridge to just north of Western Street (PM 17.5-20.2)</td>
<td>Place micro-surfacing on existing pavement</td>
<td>7/17/2011— mid- September 2011</td>
<td>$706,000</td>
<td>Highway Maintenance</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Kelly McClain (PD)</td>
<td>Intermountain Slurry Seal, Watsonville</td>
<td>Alternating lane closures Sun-Thur 9pm-6am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>HWY. 9 Grind and Replace (0S0804)</td>
<td>In Santa Cruz from so. of the Rte 01/09 junction to just no. of Vernon St. (PM 0.0-PM 0.6)</td>
<td>Cold plane and hot mix asphalt and repaving</td>
<td>Mid- September 2011—mid- October 2011</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>Highway Maintenance</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Kelly McClain (PD)</td>
<td>Pavex Construction Div., San Jose</td>
<td>Pending SCr City Water line. Nighttime One-way traffic control with flagging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>HWY. 17 Guardrail Upgrades (0L70U4)</td>
<td>Near Scotts Valley at various locations from Santa’s Village Rd. to the Santa Clara County Line (PM 6.0-12.6)</td>
<td>Upgrade guardrail, crash cushions, end treatments and retaining walls for guardrail</td>
<td>1/13/2010- Spring 2012</td>
<td>$5.5 Million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Doug Hessing (PD)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Future contract re-bidding due to contractor default</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>HWY. 17 Santa’s Village Road Guardrail (0G4004)</td>
<td>Near Scott’s Valley from just north of Santa’s Village to Crescent Drive (PM 6.1-6.6)</td>
<td>Construct concrete guardrail</td>
<td>1/31/2011- Winter 2011</td>
<td>$3 Million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Doug Hessing (PD)</td>
<td>Gordon N. Ball Inc., Alamo</td>
<td>Alternating lane closures both northbound and southbound at various hours primarily overnight weeknights</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Construction Timeline</th>
<th>Construction Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>Project Manager (Resident Engineer)</th>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. HWY. 17 Vinehill Wet Weather Improvements (0P8104)</td>
<td>Near Scotts Valley from south of West Vinehill Rd. to south of Vinehill Rd. (PM 7.0-7.3)</td>
<td>Construct soldier pile wall</td>
<td>6/20/2009- TBD</td>
<td>$1.5 Million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Doug Hessing (PD)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>90% complete, contractor default, re-bid remaining work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## PROJECTS IN DEVELOPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Construction Timeline</th>
<th>Construction Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Hwy 1 Guardrail Upgrades 05-0P250</td>
<td>Highway 1, Mon and Santa Cruz Co., Trafton Rd to .4Mi N. of 41st Ave (Various locations: Mon. 101.50 – SCr 13.62)</td>
<td>Metal Beam Guard Rail and Concrete Barrier Improvements</td>
<td>Late 2011 to Early 2012</td>
<td>$.7 M</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Luis Duazo</td>
<td>PS&amp;E/RW</td>
<td>Scheduled to be advertised Fall 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. HWY 1 Harkins Slough Interchange</td>
<td>Highway 1 in Watsonville at Harkins Slough Road (PM 2.3-2.5)</td>
<td>Construct Interchange</td>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>$9 M</td>
<td>RIP</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Steve DiGrazia</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>Cooperative Agreement being drafted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Hwy 1 Guardrail Upgrade, Concrete Barrier, Retaining Wall 05-0R910</td>
<td>Highway 1 from S of South Aptos Underpass to .1 Mi N. of Rt 9 (PM 9.0-17.6)</td>
<td>Upgrade Metal Beam Guard Rail, other improvements</td>
<td>Early 2013 to Summer 2013</td>
<td>$ 2.3 M</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Doug Hessing</td>
<td>PS&amp;E/RW</td>
<td>Scheduled to be advertised early 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PROJECTS IN DEVELOPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Construction Timeline</th>
<th>Construction Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Santa Cruz Highway 1 Median Barrier</td>
<td>Highway 1 in Santa Cruz (17.5-18.2)</td>
<td>Construct colored and textured Median Barrier</td>
<td>Winter/Spring 2012</td>
<td>$1.6 M</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Doug Hessing</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>Pending Award and Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Hwy 1 Guardrail/Crash Cushions</td>
<td>Highway 1, various locations from San Lorenzo R. Bridge to Waddell Creek (PM 17.4-36.3)</td>
<td>Upgrade guard rail, end treatments</td>
<td>Spring/Summer 2012</td>
<td>Two Projects Total $5.2 M</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Doug Hessing</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>Pending Award and Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Hwy 9 Holiday Lane Improvements</td>
<td>Highway 9 between Ben Lomond and the Highland Co. Park; S. of Holiday Lane (PM 8.0-8.8)</td>
<td>Upgrade guard rail and widen shoulders</td>
<td>Spring 2012</td>
<td>$2.1 M</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Doug Hessing</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>Pending Award and Approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Regional Transportation Commission  
FROM: Karena Pushnik, Senior Transportation Planner  
RE: Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 8 Allocation Claim from the City of Watsonville for Curb Cuts

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee and staff recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission approve the attached resolution (Attachment 1) approving the City of Watsonville's Transportation Development Act Article 8 allocation claim for $174,800 (Exhibit 1 of Attachment 1) for curb cuts at 52 locations in the city.

BACKGROUND

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

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

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

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

Exhibit 1 of Attachment 1 is a TDA Article 8 allocation request from the City of Watsonville Public Works Department for the construction of 52 curb cuts at various locations in the city. The city requested $182,000, however their TDA balance ($113,874) plus the adjusted TDA allocation based on the budget also included in this packet ($60,926) totals $174,800. Also included in the attachment are suggested locations and numbers of ramps at each site.

At the August 9, 2011 meeting, the E&D TAC Committee reviewed the City of Watsonville's allocation request and recommended that the Commission approve the TDA claim. Staff supports this recommendation.

**SUMMARY**

The City of Watsonville submitted a TDA Article 8 allocation request (Exhibit 1) for the construction of curb cuts at various locations in the city. The allocation request from the city was for $182,000, however the TDA funds available to them is $174,800.

**Attachment:**

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

Adopted by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
on the date of September 15, 2011
on the motion of Commissioner
duly seconded by Commissioner

A RESOLUTION ALLOCATING $174,800 IN ARTICLE 8 TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT (TDA) FUNDS TO THE CITY OF WATSONVILLE FOR CITYWIDE CURB RAMP CONSTRUCTION

WHEREAS, the City of Watsonville has sufficient unallocated Article 8 TDA revenues and has submitted a TDA allocation request (Exhibit 1) for a total of $174,800 for pedestrian improvement projects; and

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

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

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

1. $174,800 in TDA Article funds is hereby allocated to the City of Watsonville for the construction of curb ramps at various locations throughout the city.

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

__________________________________________
Mark Stone, Chair

ATTEST:

____________________________
George Dondero, Secretary

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

Distribution: City of Watsonville Public Works
RTC Fiscal
RTC Planner
June 1, 2011

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

SUBJECT: TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT FUNDS

Dear Mr. Dondero,

The following is an initial claim for Transportation Development Act Funds for the construction of curb ramps at various locations in the City:

1. **Description**
   The project consists of the installation of curb ramps on various streets within the City. A list of streets with the number of proposed ramps is attached.

2. **Justification**
   In accordance with ADA law, the City has adopted a policy that curb ramps be installed on streets scheduled for repaving. The City also prioritizes citizen requests for ramp installations, particularly when they are along highly utilized pedestrian corridors.

3. **Estimated Cost**
   The estimated cost for installation of 52 curb ramps is $182,000. It is requested that this project be funded with TDA funds. The City has no other sources available to fund this project.

4. **Maintenance**
   It is the policy of the City that sidewalk maintenance be paid for by the adjacent property owner. City staff monitors sidewalks throughout the City and administers the sidewalk repair program.

5. **Disbursements**
   A final claim will be made upon completion of the project.

Sincerely,

Maria Esther Rodriguez
Principal Engineer

Enclosure

P.O. BOX 50000 WATSONVILLE, CA 95077-5000
## 2011 Curb Ramp Project
### City of Watsonville

*Locations include, but not limited to:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Cross Street</th>
<th># Ramps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allston Way</td>
<td>Crescent Dr.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brewington Ave</td>
<td>Bonita Terr.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brewington Ave.</td>
<td>CerritoTerr.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware St</td>
<td>Wagner Ave.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware St.</td>
<td>Bronson St.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Fifth St.</td>
<td>Jefferson St.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Fifth St.</td>
<td>Sudden St.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Front St.</td>
<td>Main St.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonzales St.</td>
<td>W. High St.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonzales St.</td>
<td>Brennan St.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manor Ave.</td>
<td>McKenzie Ave.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlefield Ln.</td>
<td>Western Dr.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlefield Ln.</td>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Ave</td>
<td>Tharp Ave.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Ave</td>
<td>Wilkie Ave.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivienne Dr.</td>
<td>Lake Village Dr.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Beach St.</td>
<td>Locust St.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkie Ave.</td>
<td>California St.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Ramps: 52**
AGENDA: September 15, 2011

TO: Regional Transportation Commission (RTC)
FROM: Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner
RE: 2012 Regional Transportation Improvement Program Development

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC):

1. Consider options for the **2012 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP)**, summarized in Attachment 1;

2. Indicate its intent to program the region’s targeted share of 2012 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds ($9.25 million), seek an advance of STIP funds through FY19/20 (up to $12 million), program the region’s FY11/12 Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds ($2.5 million), and redirect funds previously programmed to the Mar Vista bicycle/pedestrian overcrossing ($6.56 million STIP and $967,000 RSTP), as part of the 2012 RTIP process;

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 2);

4. Indicate its intent to program STIP funds as follows:
   a. $27 million to the proposed 41st Avenue/Soquel Drive Auxiliary Lanes and Chanticleer Bike/Pedestrian Crossing Project for design, right-of-way, and construction phases, as described in Attachment 3; and
   b. $300,000 for state and federally-mandated RTC planning, programming and monitoring activities;

5. Indicate its intent to program some of the region’s FY 11/12 RSTP funds, plus $967,000 in RSTP redirected from the Highway 1 Mar Vista Bicycle Pedestrian Bridge, as follows:
   a. $370,000 for the tiered Highway 1 HOV Lanes environmental document, not including legal defense and completion of STARS analysis;
   b. $615,000 for rail structures rehabilitation to match federal STIP funds already programmed to the project;
   c. Up to $215,000 to the Freeway Service Patrol (FSP) program;
   d. Funds for design and engineering for rail structures rehabilitation, if needed;
   e. Issue a call for projects for the balance of RSTP funds (approximately $2 million);

6. Approve the proposed schedule for **2012 RTIP** adoption, which includes issuing a call for projects to solicit applications for RSTP funds at this meeting and holding a public hearing on project funding proposals, including those listed above, at the December RTC meeting;

7. Review, and amend as appropriate, the list of priority transportation needs for the next five to ten years (Attachment 4); direct staff to work with project sponsors to seek funds from other sources to advance these important 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

8. Confirm that previously programmed projects remain priorities for RTC-discretionary funds (Attachment 5).

BACKGROUND

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) is responsible for selecting projects to receive a variety of state and federal funding sources. Those include State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds. Projects selected to receive those funds are programmed in the RTC's Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP). 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 CTC adopted the Fund Estimate and Guidelines for the 2012 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) on August 10, 2011. For the 2012 STIP the CTC has stated its intent to focus on proposals that meet State highway improvement needs. The RTC’s proposal for STIP funds is due to the CTC by December 15, 2011.

DISCUSSION

As part of development of the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), the RTC considers how much funding to program, determines a process for programming those funds, and selects projects to receive those funds following a public hearing. Options for the 2012 RTIP process are described below and summarized in Attachment 1. At this meeting the RTC is being asked to indicate its intent to designate some funds to certain projects and issue a call for projects for the balance of funds. RTC formal action to adopt the 2012 RTIP to program funds will occur following a noticed public hearing, scheduled for the December 2011.

2012 RTIP - Available Funds

The STIP is made up of a combination of state and federal funding sources including funds from the per gallon excise tax on gasoline, Proposition 1B transportation bonds, federal Transportation Enhancement program (TE), and a small amount from the Public Transportation Account (PTA). Based on the 2012 STIP Fund Estimate, the Santa Cruz County region’s 2012 STIP programming target is **$9.25 million through FY16/17**. This amount includes the region’s unprogrammed balance carried over from the 2010 STIP, $650,000 not released for the rail line acquisition in January 2011, and an $890,000 TE target. At a very minimum, in accordance with SB45 (1998) 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, but is not guaranteed, an advance of the region’s projected STIP funds for FY17/18-19/20 ($12 million) for large projects, for a potential STIP total of **$21.25 million**.

While most categories of transportation projects are eligible for STIP funds, the California Transportation Commission (CTC) has repeatedly rejected programming and allocation requests to use STIP funds on local street and road projects, making it difficult to get CTC approval to use STIP on anything other than highway or TE-eligible (bicycle, pedestrian, landscaping, and other enhancements) projects. As a result of the gas tax swap, approved earlier this year,
transit funds previously programmed through the STIP are instead now directed to transit via the State Transit Assistance formula program.

In addition to STIP funds, the RTC is responsible for selecting transportation projects to receive the region’s share of Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds. However, unlike STIP funds, programming decisions for RSTP funds are not subject to CTC approval. 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.**

**Transportation Funding Needs**

As regularly discussed, 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. How well a project addresses one or more of the following criteria are 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 and climate change)
- Deliverability (if there are barriers to the schedule)
- Funding (if all other funding is secured)
- Number of people served

As demonstrated in the RTC’s long range plan, the *Regional Transportation Plan* (RTP), there is no shortage of important projects in the region that need funding. A list of some of the highest priority projects for the next 5-10 years is attached (Attachment 4). RTC advisory committees discussed priorities at their August meetings and those projects, as well as projects previously identified by RTC commissioners, staff, or project sponsors, are reflected in the list. **Staff recommends that the RTC review and amend, as appropriate, the list of priority projects. Staff also recommends that the RTC confirm that previously programmed projects (Attachment 5) remain among the highest priorities.**

Unfortunately RTC-discretionary funding is insufficient to fund all of these projects. 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

One facility the RTC has identified as a priority is Highway 1. As discussed at the June and August 2011 RTC Transportation Policy Workshops, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) officials reported in May 2011 that they would not be able to approve the environmental document for alternatives under review for Highway 1 High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Lanes project until a committed source of funding is identified. Additionally an FHWA “10-Year Rule” (Attachment 6) requires right-of-way acquisition for, or construction of, federally-funded projects to begin within ten years of the year in which a project was authorized to start preliminary engineering work. In order to utilize information gathered and analysis done as part of the Highway 1 HOV Lane environmental document and avoid repaying $5.56 million in federal funds, the right-of-way (ROW) or construction phase must be initiated by September 2013 on a component of the Highway 1 project that is reasonably fundable from existing revenue sources. As such, the RTC has approved evaluation of a Tier 2 project as part of the environmental document which could be funded with existing revenue sources and initiate right-of-way acquisition within that timeframe: Highway 1 41st Avenue/Soquel Drive Auxiliary Lanes and Chanticleer Bike/Pedestrian Crossing project. Nearly $28 million in funding is needed to implement the Highway 1 41st Avenue/Soquel Drive Auxiliary Lanes and Chanticleer Bike/Ped Crossing project. Additional information on the Tier 2 project is included in Attachment 3.

Estimated additional funds needed for the Highway 1 HOV Lanes environmental phase and Tier 2 project are:

1. $370,000 million in RSTP funds for the Highway 1 HOV Lanes environmental phase to transform the existing work into a combined Tier 1/Tier 2 environmental document for FHWA approval;
2. $250,000 additional RSTP to complete the STARS analysis of the HOV lane project;
3. $250,000 RSTP for potential legal defense of the tiered environmental document;
4. $4 million STIP for design and right-of-way for the full Tier 2 project (auxiliary lanes and bike/ped bridge)
5. $18 million STIP for construction of auxiliary lanes;
6. $5 million for construction of the Chanticleer bike/ped bridge.

**Estimated Total: $28 million**

Notably, these are estimates and may be refined prior to an RTC public hearing on and adoption of the 2012 RTIP later this year. **Staff recommends that the RTC indicate its intent to program $370,000 RSTP for the tiered environmental document (#1), approximately $27 million in STIP for design, right-of-way and construction of the project (#4-6 above).** Given projected STIP funds are insufficient to fully fund this project, **staff further recommends that the RTC indicate its intent to redirect funds previously programmed to the Mar Vista Bike/ Pedestrian overcrossing to this and other projects.** 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.

Additional funding options considered for this project as part of the 2012 RTIP are summarized in Attachment 1. If the STIP advance of up to $12 million is not approved by the CTC or the RTC does not approve the staff recommendation, in order to avoid repaying federal funds
previously spent on the HOV lanes environmental document, the RTC may need to consider some of these other options. However, based on state and federal rules, project phases cannot be partially funded.

Notably, of these RTC-discretionary funds, only RSTP can be used to fund work in the environmental review phase because the CTC will not approve supplemental STIP funds for this phase of work. If other state or federal funding opportunities arise prior to construction of this project, such as future federal grant programs that may be developed as part of the next federal act, staff will pursue those grants which could free up STIP funds for other projects in the future.

### Funding Other RTC Project Needs

In addition to the Tier 2 Highway 1 Soquel-41st Avenue Auxiliary Lanes project, additional funds needed for regional RTC projects and programs include:

- **Rail Structures Rehabilitation Design/Engineering**: Cost unknown. It is possible that additional RSTP 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 following contract negotiations.

- **Rail Structures Rehabilitation**: $615,000 RSTP is needed to match STIP funds previously 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. If at least $215,000 RSTP is not programmed, service would need to be cut or SAFE reserves would need to be used to continue current service.**

- **Planning, Programming and Monitoring (PPM)**: $300,000 STIP to meet state and federal mandated planning and programming requirements through the 2012 STIP period (FY16/17).

**Staff recommends that the RTC indicate its intent to program RSTP and STIP funds for these projects as part of the 2012 RTIP.**

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

Due to funding needs for a few specific RTC-projects and programs, **staff recommends that the RTC indicate its intent to program some of the region’s RSTP and STIP funds to regional RTC-projects**, as described above, and **recommends issuing a call for projects for the balance of RSTP funds** (approximately $2 million).

The proposed schedule for 2012 RTIP development is as follows:

1. **June-September 2011**: Identify priorities and additional funding needs; Project sponsors update information on previously programmed projects
2. **August 2011**: Committees discuss the highest priority needs in the region through 2020 and confirm that previously programmed projects remain a priority
3. **August 10, 2011**: CTC adopts STIP Fund Estimate and Guidelines
4. **September 15, 2011**: RTC approves plan for 2012 RTIP and issues call for projects for RSTP funds
5. October 27, 2011: Proposals for RSTP funds due from project sponsors
6. November 2011: Committees review Draft RTIP (staff recommendations)
7. December 2011: Public hearing, RTC adoption and submittal of the 2012 RTIP proposal for STIP funds to CTC (due to CTC by December 15, 2011)
8. February 8, 2012: CTC STIP Hearing on RTIP proposals
9. March 8, 2012: CTC publishes CTC Staff Recommendations for STIP funds
11. May 2012: RTC amends RTIP as needed to reflect CTC actions

Other options that were considered for the 2012 RTIP process, summarized in Attachment 1, included: only program STIP funds by the CTC’s December 15, 2011 deadline and wait to program RSTP funds until later this year or 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.

Input from ITAC and Others

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 recommended the RTC develop a tiered environmental document that includes the 41st Avenue/Soquel Drive Auxiliary Lanes as Tier 2, there was no unanimous recommendation on the process for the 2012 RTIP. Input received from the ITAC is attached (Attachment 2).

The ITAC did recommend that the RTC indicate its intent to program STIP to the 41st Avenue/Soquel Drive Auxiliary Lanes project. The ITAC recommended tabling discussion about whether to redirect funds from the Mar Vista Bike/Pedestrian Bridge and construct the Chanticleer Bridge. Some members expressed interest in seeing the bridge funds redirected to lower cost bicycle, pedestrian, and other projects. 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 FY11/12 RSTP funds.

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 7).

Staff agrees that maintaining local streets and roads, as well as numerous other projects that have been identified by local agencies, are very important. As such, staff has modified its original recommendations to reduce funding proposals for RTC projects and recommends that the RTC issue a call for projects for the balance of RSTP (approximately $2 million). If the RTC decides to issue a call for projects for all of the RSTP funds, the tiered environmental document and other RTC projects would compete with local projects for RSTP funds. Depending on the results of federal actions on the next transportation act, the RTC may select projects for future year shares of projected RSTP funds (estimated $2.5 million per year) as early as Spring 2012.

Comments received on this item in advance of printing the agenda packet are included as Attachment 8. Any additional comments received by Wednesday September 14 will be
distributed at this meeting. As noted above, at this meeting the RTC is being asked to indicate
its intent to designate some RSTP and STIP funds to certain projects. RTC formal action to
amend the 2012 RTIP to program the funds will occur following a noticed public hearing,
scheduled in December.

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 ($12 million) 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, and reprogramming $7.5
million in STIP and RSTP previously programmed to the Highway 1 Mar Vista Bicycle/Pedestrian
Bridge as part of the 2012 RTIP. Staff recommends that the RTC issue a call for projects for
approximately $2 million of the RSTP funds and indicate its intent to program the remainder of
the STIP and RSTP funds to the RTC projects, which include Highway 1 and the Santa Cruz
Branch Rail Line. A public hearing is scheduled for December to take final actions to program
the funds.

Attachment 1: Summary of 2012 RTIP Options
Attachment 2: Input from ITAC
Attachment 3: Summary - Highway 1 Funding Proposal for the 2012 RTIP
Attachment 4: Priority Projects
Attachment 5: 2010 RTIP projects, not yet completed
Attachment 6: FHWA 10-Year Rule
Attachment 7: Letter from BOS on Road Repairs
Attachment 8: Comments received from the public
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Summary of 2012 RTIP Options

Amount of Funding to Program:

State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP):

1. **Staff recommendation:** Plan to program, as part of the 2012 RTIP, the region’s $9.25 million STIP target through FY16/17, seek an advance of up to $12 million of the region’s STIP shares through FY19/20 for major projects, and reprogram $6.56 million in STIP previously programmed to the Highway 1 Mar Vista Bicycle/Pedestrian Overcrossing = Up to $27.8 million total

2. Other options:
   a. Only program RTC’s guaranteed share of $5.1 million in STIP through FY15/16;
   b. Only program the region’s 2012 STIP Target: $9.25 million through FY16/17. Do not seek advance of $12 million in STIP shares through FY19/20, wait to program those funds as part of the 2014 RTIP;
   c. If project priorities or schedules have significantly changed, redirect funds previously approved for some projects to new/other projects.

   **Note:** All RTC programming actions for STIP funds are subject to California Transportation Commission (CTC) concurrence.

Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP)

1. **Staff recommendation:** Given uncertainties with the next federal transportation act, only program the region’s balance of RSTP through FFY11/12, $2.5 million; plus redirect $967,000 in RSTP from the Mar Vista Overcrossing to other projects.

2. Other options:
   a. Hold RSTP funds in reserve to program to projects as needed;
   b. Only program the amount of RSTP funds needed to develop the Tier 2 environmental document for the Soquel-41st Auxiliary Lanes project ($370,000) and wait to program the balance until later this fiscal year or until the next federal transportation act is adopted;
   c. Program RSTP funds as a separate process from STIP funds. There is no strict deadline for programming RSTP funds, whereas proposals for STIP funds are due to the CTC by December 15, 2011. The RTC could wait to program additional RSTP funds until later this fiscal year or until the next federal transportation act is adopted;
   d. Program additional RSTP funds beyond FFY11/12 shares, contingent upon the funds being made available in the next transportation act (assume $2.5 million per year).

Projects to fund/Overall process

1. **Staff recommendation** *(Formal action to program funds would be taken following a public hearing this fall):*
   a. Indicate intent to program approximately $27 million STIP for design, right-of-way, and construction for the full Tier 2 project (Soquel-41st Ave auxiliary lanes and Chanticleer Bike/Pedestrian Crossing);
   b. Indicate intent to program $300,000 STIP for state and federally-mandated RTC planning, programming and monitoring activities; and
   c. Indicate intent to program RSTP funds as follows:
      i. $370,000 for the tiered Highway 1 HOV Lanes environmental document, not including legal defense and completion of STARS analysis;
      ii. $615,000 for rail structures rehabilitation to match federal funds already programmed to the project;
      iii. Funds for design and engineering for the rail structures rehabilitation, if needed;
iv. $215,000 to the Freeway Service Patrol (FSP) program; and
d. Issue a call for projects for the balance of RSTP funds (approximately $2 million).

2. Other Options:
   a. Issue a call for projects (solicit applications) for all or a portion of the region's shares of STIP and/or RSTP funds. The ITAC recommends the RTC issue a call for projects for the $2.5 million in FY11/12 RSTP funds. If approved by the RTC, this would result in local projects and RTC projects competing for funds.
   b. Only indicate intent to program RSTP funds for the Tier 2 environmental document ($370,000) and $4 million STIP for right-of-way and final design; retain balance of STIP and RSTP funds in reserve for future programming.

Options for Funding the Hwy 1 Soquel-41st Ave. Auxiliary Lanes/Chanticleer Bike-Ped Bridge
The preliminary cost estimate for the Highway 1 Soquel-41st Avenue Auxiliary Lanes and Chanticleer Bicycle/Pedestrian Crossing Project is approximately $27 million.

1. **Staff recommendation:** Indicate intent to program $370,000 RSTP for tiered environmental document (STIP is not available for this phase of work) and approximately $27 million in STIP for design, right-of-way, and construction of the full Tier 2 project.

2. Other Options:
   a. Program funds for just the tiered environmental document ($370,000 in RSTP) and right-of-way ($1.3 million in STIP), and reserve the balance of STIP funds to program to design and construction in the 2014 RTIP/STIP;
   b. Phase construction of the Tier 2 project to build the auxiliary lanes and the bike/pedestrian bridge one at a time (Southbound Auxiliary Lane - $10 million; Northbound Auxiliary Lane - $11 million; Chanticleer Avenue Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge - $5 million). 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;
   c. Redirect previously programmed funds from other projects to fully fund the Tier 2 project.
   d. Program $250,000 RSTP to complete the STARS analysis of the HOV lane project;
   e. Program $250,000 RSTP to the environmental phase as a reserve for possible legal defense.
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:
Kim Shultz provided an overview of the proposal to transform the Highway 1 HOV Lane environmental document to a tiered environmental document. In response to questions from Chris Schneiter, Mr. Shultz stated that in order to meet the schedule for delivering a two-tiered environmental document, work needs to start immediately. Based on Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) rules, 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 confirmed that 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. Schneiter 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 possible, but the principle argument against the project related to segmentation would be better addressed through the tiered environmental document, providing information on cumulative impacts of the entire HOV lanes project (Tier 1).

Mr. Schneiter also questioned how critical the bicycle/pedestrian bridge and Sustainable Transportation Analysis Rating System (STARS) application are in light of the large number of other needs in the region and limited funding that would be left for those other projects if the Tier 2 project and STARS are 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. Schneiter 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. Schneiter 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 area.

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 and that FHWA’s 10-year rule, requires initiation of right-of-way or construction phases within 10-years of federal authorization of preliminary engineering work.

Mr. Schneiter 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 (Yamin/Schneiter) 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, on a vote of 6 (Herron, Rodriguez (2), Schneiter (2), Yamin), with 2 opposed (Chen, Wiesner) and 4 abstentions (Aitken, Bateman, Beatty, Patel).

2. The ITAC approved a motion (Wiesner/Schneiter) to recommend that the RTC issue a call for projects for $2.5 million in FY11/12 Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds, rather than designate funds for RTC projects, with a vote of 7 (Chen, Rodriguez (2), Patel, Schneiter (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, STARS analysis of the HOV Lanes project, and other RTC projects.

3. The ITAC approved a motion (Wiesner/Schneiter) to continue the discussion on whether to redirect funds from the Mar Vista Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge to the 41st Avenue-Soquel Drive Auxiliary Lanes/Chanticleer Bike/Ped Bridge or other projects, on a vote of 7 (Chen, Rodriguez (2), Patel, Schneiter (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.

Summary of discussion:
After receiving information from Rachel Moriconi 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 Schneiter 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 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 is 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, in part to backfill reduced funding for local streets and roads with a more stable revenue source. These include a ballot measure for 2014 and opting back into becoming a Congestion Management Agency and then seek 2/3 voter support for a vehicle registration fee of up to $10. 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 noted 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
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Summary

Highway 1 Funding Proposal for the 2012 RTIP
41st Ave/Soquel Dr Auxiliary Lanes and Chanticleer Bike/Ped Crossing Project
(Tier 2 of the Highway 1 HOV Lanes project environmental document)

At the August 18, 2011 Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) meeting, the RTC voted to support development of a tiered environmental document for Highway 1, to include project level environmental documentation for auxiliary lanes between 41st Avenue and Soquel Drive and a bike/pedestrian bridge at Chanticleer Avenue (Tier 2) and program-level analysis of the larger HOV Lanes project (Tier 1). Funding proposals for completion of the tiered environmental document and implementation of the Tier 2 auxiliary lanes project are provided herein.

Need for Project that Can be Delivered Soon

In 2003 the RTC and Caltrans initiated preliminary design and environmental studies to add high occupancy vehicle lanes on Highway 1 from Morrissey Boulevard in Santa Cruz to Larkin Valley/San Andreas Road in Aptos. Since that time, changes in the emphasis and scrutiny of federal regulations, combined with the absence of a countywide sales tax measure or sufficient other revenues committed to construct the Highway 1 HOV Lane project requires a change in the format of the environmental document and approach to the Highway 1 project. Additionally, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) has a “10-Year Rule”, which requires the FHWA to approve the NEPA document and project sponsors to advance to the right-of-way phase of a reasonably fundable project by September 2013 in order to avoid having to repay $5.56 million in federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds used for preliminary engineering and environmental technical studies in development of the environmental document.

Accordingly, a tiered environmental document will be developed that allows full disclosure of the HOV Lane project (Tier 1) and provide environmental documentation of a Tier 2 project deemed financially feasible from existing funding sources. Once the combined tiered environmental document is approved by both FHWA and Caltrans, right-of-way acquisition and design could proceed on the Tier 2 project.

Completion of the Environmental Document

Through January 2010, the RTC has programmed $12.4 million in CMAQ, STIP, and RSTP funds for completion of the HOV Lane environmental document, including $200,000 for the STARS analysis of the project.

An estimated additional $1 million is needed for the following elements of the environmental phase:

- **Preparation of a Tiered Environmental Document - $370,000**
  Includes: converting existing draft HOV environmental report into a tiered environmental document for public circulation, response to comments received and preparation of the final environmental document for state and federal approval.

- **Application of STARS Pilot Project, with a refined scope of work - $250,000**
  The project team has developed a refined scope of work that has reduced the additional funding need from $380,000 to $250,000 to conduct the traffic & green house gas
analysis and compile existing data, document and integrate recommendations into the tiered environmental document. STARS analysis will provide a comprehensive evaluation of the Highway 1 HOV project’s ability to meet the region’s access needs, and design/operational modifications to reduce climate and energy impacts, and increase cost effectiveness.

- **Reserve for Legal Defense - $250,000**

  In the event that the tiered environmental document for Highway 1 is challenged, RTC is responsible for funding Caltrans legal defense of the environmental document. While it is prudent to set aside some funds for this potential expense, RTC could program RSTP funds as part of the 2012 RTIP, or wait until a future year.

**Tier 2 Project development and construction costs: Approximately $27 million**

Beyond the additional funds needed to develop the tiered environmental document, the preliminary cost estimates for final design, right-of-way (ROW) and construction phases of the 41st Avenue - Soquel Auxiliary Lanes and bike/ped crossing project are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project component</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>ROW (including support)</th>
<th>Construction (includes support)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southbound Auxiliary Lane between 41st Avenue and Soquel Avenue</td>
<td>$1,250,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
<td>$11,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbound Auxiliary Lane between 41st Avenue and Soquel Avenue</td>
<td>$1,025,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$8,500,000</td>
<td>$9,675,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Bridge overcrossing of Highway 1 at Chanticleer Avenue</td>
<td>$425,000</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
<td>$4,500,000</td>
<td>$6,025,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,700,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,300,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$23,000,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$27,000,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The previous cost estimate of $29 million had included a nearly 35% contingency. That has since been reduced to be more consistent with industry standard of 25%.

**Project Benefits: 41st Ave/Soquel Drive Auxiliary Lanes and Chanticleer Bike/Ped Bridge 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.

The RTC and Caltrans evaluated a series of auxiliary lane segments as potential Tier 2 projects within the HOV lane project footprint and identified auxiliary lanes from 41st Avenue to Soquel Drive, including a bike/pedestrian crossing at Chanticleer, as the most beneficial change that can be made to Highway 1, in the absence of HOV lanes. This project was prioritized over other improvements along the corridor for the following reasons:

- Level of congestion relief performance levels (northbound and southbound - during both AM and PM peak periods), including:
  - Average Travel Time & Travel Delay (vehicle hours of delay)
  - Number of Vehicle Trips (vehicle throughput)
  - Freeway Travel Time (vehicle hours of travel)
  - Travel Distance (vehicle miles of travel)
- Estimated cost of the project
- Minimal environmental impacts to allow completion of the environmental document in a timely manner
- Relationship to the approved Purpose and Need to reduce congestion and encourage alternative transportation modes
- Operational Independence and logical sequence building on existing and proposed improvements on the multi-use corridor
**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highway</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 1 HOV Lane project: Environmental Review - including Tier 2 (Soquel-41st) and STARS analysis, RTC</td>
<td>$13.4M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 1 Aux Lanes: 41st Ave and Soquel, RTC</td>
<td>$29M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 1 HOV Lane project - Construction, RTC</td>
<td>$500M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 1 Aux Lanes: Park Ave and Bay/Porter</td>
<td>$30M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 1/Hwy 9 Intersection, City of SC</td>
<td>$4M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 1 San Lorenzo River Bridge, City of SC</td>
<td>$20M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 1/Mission St/Chestnut/King/Union Intersection Improvements, City of SC</td>
<td>$2.4M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 1/Mission St/Bay St Intersection Improvements, City of SC</td>
<td>$2M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 17/ Harkins Slough Road Interchange, Watsonville</td>
<td>$9.8M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 152 (Main St)/Freedom Roundabout, Watsonville</td>
<td>$1.25M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 152/Holohan/College Intersection - bike lanes on Holohan, sidewalks, additional turn lanes, County of SC</td>
<td>$1.6M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 17/Mt. Hermon Rd. Ramps: Intersection Operations Project, SV</td>
<td>$1M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Misc. Multi-Jurisdictional Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway Service Patrol (FSP)</td>
<td>$300k/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line Improvements: Design</td>
<td>$350k-$1M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line Improvements: Construction</td>
<td>$5.35M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning, Programming, and Monitoring (PPM)</td>
<td>$150-$300k/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commute Solutions Rideshare Program</td>
<td>$150-200/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecology Action Transp Program (already defunded PVTMA $60/yr)</td>
<td>$60/yr past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11 Implementation</td>
<td>$10M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Streets/Roads</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countywide Local Street and Road Pavement Maintenance (cost reflects funding needs beyond city/co revenues)</td>
<td>$12M/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Damage Repair - Countywide (unincorporated)</td>
<td>$3.5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soquel Drive - Soquel Avenue to Freedom Boulevard - traffic signals, turn lanes, sidewalks, County</td>
<td>$3.5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray Street Bridge, City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>$11M (funded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wharf Roundabout, City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>$1M (funded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside Avenue Improvements, City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>$3M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Cliff Path - Phase 2, City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>$400k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soquel/Park Way Intersection Safety Project, City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>$800k (1/2 funded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Hermon Rd./Scotts Valley Dr. Intersection Operations Improvement Project, City of Scotts Valley</td>
<td>$1M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Blvd Improvements, City of Watsonville</td>
<td>$1.5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom Boulevard Reconstruction (Lincoln to Alta Vista), Watsonville</td>
<td>$1.5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom Boulevard Reconstruction Ph 3 ( Alta Vista to Davis), Watsonville</td>
<td>$1.5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Traffic Plan Implementation, City of Watsonville</td>
<td>$500k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohlone Parkway Improvements (UPRR to W Beach), City of Watsonville</td>
<td>$500k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit/Paratransit</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain Existing Fixed Route and Specialized Transportation Service</td>
<td>$37M/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing bus and paratransit vehicle replacements</td>
<td>$3-4M/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Transit Service: (at minimum restore to 2009 service levels, provide access to La Posada/Gault area)</td>
<td>$8M/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased transit/paratransit subsidies for very low income passengers</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MetroBase Final Project: Photovoltaics, parking and water harvesting</td>
<td>$11.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ParaCruz Operations Building (10-year goal) with a price tag of $12 million</td>
<td>$12 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Station Renovation (10-year goal)</td>
<td>$12 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bicycle/Pedestrian**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bicycle/Pedestrian</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Countywide Bicycle Lane Maintenance, restriping, sweeping, vegetation removal</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countywide Sidewalk Maintenance, vegetation removal, sidewalk repairs</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk/pedestrian improvements that provide access between transit stops and</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>senior/disabled activity centers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill gaps in bicycle network, low cost striping and/or signage projects</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countywide railroad crossing grade improvements</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countywide signal modifications to sense bicycles</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Traffic Safety Coalition</td>
<td>$150K/yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike to Work/School Program, countywide</td>
<td>$140K/yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Secure bike parking program, countywide</td>
<td>$15K/yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Route Signage, countywide</td>
<td>$500k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network (MBSSST) - sections to be prioritized</td>
<td>$30M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>through Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 1 Bike/Ped Xing @ Chanticleer (also included in 41st-Soquel Aux)</td>
<td>$9M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 1 Bike/Ped Xing @ Mar Vista</td>
<td>$7.5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitola Avenue Bike Lanes, City of Capitola</td>
<td>$150k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Avenue Bicycle Lanes and Sidewalks, City of Capitola</td>
<td>$350k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wharf Road Bike Lanes, City of Capitola to Soquel</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arana Gulch-Broadway Brommer Bike/Ped Path, City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>$4.8M (fully funded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branciforte Creek Bike/Ped Crossing, City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>$2.5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Street Bicycle Facilities</td>
<td>$500k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widen San Lorenzo River Bike/Ped Bridge adjacent to RR bridge</td>
<td>$3M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bean Creek Road Sidewalks (SVMS to Blue Bonnet), City of Scotts Valley</td>
<td>$400k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casa Way Bike Lanes, City of Scotts Valley</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Hills Road Bike Lanes, City of Scotts Valley</td>
<td>$700k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks Vine Hill School Road and Tabor Drive, City of Scotts Valley</td>
<td>$500k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citywide Pedestrian Facilities, City of Watsonville</td>
<td>$1.9M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach St Bicycle Lanes (San Andreas Rd through Watsonville)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom Boulevard Bike Lanes, City of Watsonville</td>
<td>$1M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln St Bicycle Lanes, City of Watsonville</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street Bicycle Lanes (fill gaps), City of Watsonville</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38th Avenue - Portola to UPRR Xing, sidewalks, County</td>
<td>$250k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41st Avenue - Hwy 1 to Soquel Drive, sidewalks, County</td>
<td>$500k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Cliff Drive - 5th to 12th Avenue, sidewalks, County</td>
<td>$1M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 9 - Graham Hill to SLV Schools - sidewalks, County</td>
<td>$1M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham Hill Road Bicycle Lanes, County to City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lomond St., Laurel St., &amp; Harmon St. - pedestrian safety improvements for BC</td>
<td>$800k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street - Soquel Drive to Sevilla - sidewalks, bike lanes</td>
<td>$1.2M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soquel Avenue - City of SC to Gross Road - sidewalks</td>
<td>$1.5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trout Gulch/Valencia Road Improvements - to Valencia School Road - bike lanes,</td>
<td>$1M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sidewalks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilder Ranch Bike Path - Phase 2</td>
<td>$4M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2010 Regional Transportation Improvement Program

### City of Capitola

#### Proj No: CAP 11  
**Clares Street Traffic Calming**
- 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Total/source</th>
<th>Obl/Ttl</th>
<th>Envl</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>Const</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>ROWSup</th>
<th>Const Sup</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>13/14</th>
<th>14/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Add'l Need</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTPX</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>425</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>70</strong></td>
<td><strong>90</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>350</strong></td>
<td><strong>438</strong></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Proj No: CAP 12  
**38th Avenue Reconstruction**
- 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Total/source</th>
<th>Obl/Ttl</th>
<th>Envl</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>Const</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>ROWSup</th>
<th>Const Sup</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>13/14</th>
<th>14/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local GF</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTPX</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>438</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>438</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>596</strong></td>
<td><strong>438</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>97</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>438</strong></td>
<td><strong>438</strong></td>
<td><strong>438</strong></td>
<td><strong>438</strong></td>
<td>596</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## City of Santa Cruz

### Project No: SC 07

**Broadway-Brommer Bike/Ped Path (Arana Gulch Multiuse Path)**

- **Install multipurpose trail through Arana Gulch to connect to existing class 2 facilities.**
- **Location:** Broadway to Brommer Street/7th Ave. through Arana Gulch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Total/source</th>
<th>Ob'l Ttl</th>
<th>Envl</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>Const</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>ROW Sup</th>
<th>Const Sup</th>
<th>Prior 08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>13/14</th>
<th>14/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>262</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>262</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>1,380</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>816</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>564</td>
<td>816</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>816</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>225</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTPX</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule 431</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP (TE)</td>
<td>2,430</td>
<td>2,430</td>
<td>2,430</td>
<td>2,430</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,430</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSM</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,856</strong></td>
<td><strong>496</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,229</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,308</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>684</strong></td>
<td><strong>300</strong></td>
<td><strong>564</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,308</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project No: SC 43

**Beach Area Roundabout**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Total/source</th>
<th>Ob'l Ttl</th>
<th>Envl</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>Const</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>ROW Sup</th>
<th>Const Sup</th>
<th>Prior 08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>13/14</th>
<th>14/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARRA STR</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>550</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>550</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARRA TE</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>583</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>583</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,433</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,333</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,333</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project No: SC 44a

**West Cliff Drive Roadway Preservation**

- **Roadway preservation.**
- **Location:** Swanton to Almar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Total/source</th>
<th>Ob'l Ttl</th>
<th>Envl</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>Const</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>ROW Sup</th>
<th>Const Sup</th>
<th>Prior 08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>13/14</th>
<th>14/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARRA</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>202</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>222</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTPX</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>620</strong></td>
<td><strong>98</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>600</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>620</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2010 Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) - as amended through March 3, 2011
City of Watsonville

**Proj No: WAT 01**  
**Hwy 1/ Harkins Slough Road Interchange**  
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.

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

**Proj No: WAT 31**  
**Freedom Blvd Rehab (High-Broadis/Lincoln)**  
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.

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

County Health Service Agency

**Proj No: CO 50b**  
**South County CTSC Program**  
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Total/source</th>
<th>Obl Ttl</th>
<th>Envl</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>Const</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>ROWSup</th>
<th>Const Sup</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>13/14</th>
<th>14/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RSTPX</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2010 Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) - as amended through March 3, 2011
### Graham Hill Road Improvements near Roaring Camp

**Proj No:** CO 02  
**Location:** Graham Hill Road, Roaring Camp to .61 miles south  
**Const Sched:** Jan 2011  
**Widen shoulders, improve drainage, and add left turn pocket at Roaring Camp.**

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

### Calabasas Rd widening, bike lanes and sidewalks

**Proj No:** CO 17B  
**Location:** Buena Vista Dr to Bradford Rd.  
**Const Sched:** Spring 2012  
**Install bike lanes, curb, gutter, sidewalks, and rehab on Calabasas Road.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Total/source</th>
<th>Obl Ttl</th>
<th>Envl</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>Const</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>ROWSup</th>
<th>Const Sup</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>13/14</th>
<th>14/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>595</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>156</td>
<td>595</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTPX</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP (TE)</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1050</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA</td>
<td>390</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>390</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>390</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,441</strong></td>
<td><strong>250</strong></td>
<td><strong>141</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,285</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>156</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,285</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### State Park Drive/Seacliff Village Improvements

**Proj No:** CO 36  
**Location:** State Park Drive (Sea Ridge Rd to Santa Cruz Ave) and Santa Cruz Ave- Broadway- Center Ave loop.  
**Const Sched:** Fall 2012  
**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.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Total/source</th>
<th>Obl Ttl</th>
<th>Envl</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>Const</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>ROWSup</th>
<th>Const Sup</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>13/14</th>
<th>14/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Add'l Need</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>895</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>895</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTPX</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>587</td>
<td></td>
<td>587</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>587</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA</td>
<td>263</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>263</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>263</td>
<td>262.912</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,995</strong></td>
<td><strong>587</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,845</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>105</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,845</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj No: CO 42b</td>
<td>Green Valley Rd Pedestrian Safety Project</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Const Sched:</td>
<td>5/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPNO: NA</td>
<td>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).</td>
<td>Green Valley Rd from Airport Blvd to Amesti Rd.</td>
<td>281.317</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Total/source</th>
<th>Obl Ttl</th>
<th>Envl</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>Const</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>ROWSup</th>
<th>Const Sup</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>13/14</th>
<th>14/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>269</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>292</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td><strong>280</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proj No: CO 51</th>
<th>Corralitos Rd Left Turn Lane (Bradley Elementary School)</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Const Sched:</th>
<th>Spring 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPNO: 2205</td>
<td>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</td>
<td>Corralitos Road, 0.85 miles north of Freedom Boulevard.</td>
<td>292</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proj No: CO 57</th>
<th>Soquel-San Jose Rd Overlay</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Const Sched:</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPNO: NA</td>
<td>Road repairs: Asphalt concrete overlay (est. 3 miles)</td>
<td>Soquel-San Jose Rd from Olson Rd to PM 8.51 (16,000 ft)</td>
<td>760</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Total/source</th>
<th>Obl Ttl</th>
<th>Envl</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>Const</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>ROWSup</th>
<th>Const Sup</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>13/14</th>
<th>14/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RSTP</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>697</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>760</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>760</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>51</td>
<td><strong>697</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>760</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proj No: CO 58</th>
<th>Soquel Drive Overlay</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Const Sched:</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPNO: NA</td>
<td>Road repairs: Asphalt concrete overlay.</td>
<td>Soquel Dr: Borregas Dr. to St. Park Dr. (0.86mi)</td>
<td>805</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

2010 Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) - as amended through March 3, 2011
**Proj No:** CO 61  
**PPNO:**

**Davenport Resurfacing**
Roadway repairs/cape seal to roadways in Davenport area.

**Location**
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Total/source</th>
<th>Obl Ttl</th>
<th>Envl</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>Const</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>ROWSup</th>
<th>Const Sup</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTPX</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>95</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td><strong>95</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>95</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ecology Action**

**Proj No:** RTC 17  
**PPNO:** NA

**Ecology Action Transportation Program**
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.

**Location**
Santa Cruz County, north of Freedom Blvd.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Total/source</th>
<th>Obl Ttl</th>
<th>Envl</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>Const</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>ROWSup</th>
<th>Const Sup</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB2766</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>532</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>216</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTPX</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>993</strong></td>
<td><strong>734</strong></td>
<td><strong>993</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>759</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2010 Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) - as amended through March 3, 2011
**SCCRTC**

**Proj No:** RTC 01  
**PPNO:** 0923  
**Freeway Service Patrol (FSP) on Hwy 1 and Hwy 17**  
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.  

**Location**  
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Total/source</th>
<th>Ob/Td</th>
<th>Envl</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>Const</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>ROWSup</th>
<th>Const Sup</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>13/14</th>
<th>14/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARRA Bkup</td>
<td>320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARRA STR</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSP Program</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,162</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTPX</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFE Reserves</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>152</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>221</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP (SOF)</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>615</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>615</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>3,716</td>
<td>1,127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,678</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proj No: RTC 02**  
**Commute Solutions Rideshare Program**  
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.  

**Location**  
Countywide  
**Cost Sched:** Ongoing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Total/source</th>
<th>Ob/Td</th>
<th>Envl</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>Const</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>ROWSup</th>
<th>Const Sup</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>13/14</th>
<th>14/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>1,496</td>
<td>1,495</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,496</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>382</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP (SOF)</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>536</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>536</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>2,414</td>
<td>2,163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,414</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Proj No: RTC 03

**SC Branch Rail Line Acquisition, Corridor Preservation and Improvements**

- **PPNO:** 0932
- **Location:** Davenport to Watsonville Junction
- **Const Sched:** 7/10

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.

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

### Proj No: RTC 04

**Planning, Programming & Monitoring (PPM) - SB45**

- **PPNO:** 0921
- **Location:** Countywide
- **Const Sched:** Ongoing

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Total/source</th>
<th>Obl Ttl</th>
<th>Envl</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>Const</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>ROWSup</th>
<th>Const Sup</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>13/14</th>
<th>14/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STIP</td>
<td>2,434</td>
<td>1,659</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,434</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>909</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,434</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,659</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2,434</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>909</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Proj No: RTC 24

**Hwy 1 HOV Lanes (Morrissey to Larkin Vly Rd)**

- **PPNO:** 0073
- **Location:** In Santa Cruz County on Rte 1 between Morrissey Blvd. and Larkin Valley Rd. (PM 7.6/15.9)
- **Const Sched:** 2015

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).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Total/source</th>
<th>Obl Ttl</th>
<th>Envl</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>Const</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>ROWSup</th>
<th>Const Sup</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>08/09</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>10/11</th>
<th>11/12</th>
<th>12/13</th>
<th>13/14</th>
<th>14/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ</td>
<td>5,560</td>
<td>5,560</td>
<td>5,560</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,560</td>
<td>5,560</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,560</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTPX</td>
<td>5,474</td>
<td>5,474</td>
<td>5,474</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,474</td>
<td>4,024</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>1,375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP</td>
<td>1,375</td>
<td>1,375</td>
<td>1,375</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,409</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,409</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,409</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>9,584</strong></td>
<td>1,375</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### RTC 27: Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network

**Location:** Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary. Includes master planning study and environmental review.

**Proj No:** RTC 27  
**PPNO:** 1872

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

### RTC 28: Hwy 1 Auxiliary Lanes: Soquel Ave. to Morrissey Blvd.

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

**Proj No:** RTC 28  
**PPNO:** 6500

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

### RTC 30: Hwy 1 Bicycle/Ped Overcrossing at Mar Vista

**Location:** At Mar Vista Drive connecting Seacliff and Aptos.

**Proj No:** RTC 30  
**PPNO:** 1968

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

---

2010 Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) - as amended through March 3, 2011
**Proj No:** RTC 31  
**Park and Ride Lot Development**  
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Total Source</th>
<th>Obl Ttl</th>
<th>Envl Design</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>Const</th>
<th>Other ROW</th>
<th>Sup Const Sup</th>
<th>Prior 08/09 09/10 10/11 11/12 12/13 13/14 14/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RSTPX</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30 130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>160</strong></td>
<td><strong>160</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>30 130</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proj No:** RTC 32  
**Bicycle Route Signage**  
Define routes, develop and install signs aimed at encouraging bicycling/directing cyclists to preferred routes to various destinations countywide.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Total Source</th>
<th>Obl Ttl</th>
<th>Envl Design</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>Const</th>
<th>Other ROW</th>
<th>Sup Const Sup</th>
<th>Prior 08/09 09/10 10/11 11/12 12/13 13/14 14/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Add'l Need</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTPX</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>500</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>200</strong></td>
<td><strong>300</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>25 475</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCMTD**

**Proj No:** MTD 01  
**MetroBase Consolidated Bus Operations Facility**  
Construct a new facility at a centralized location to consolidate 7 operations, maintenance and administration facilities.

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

2010 Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) - as amended through March 3, 2011
**Proj No:** MTD 19  
**PPNO:** 2284  
**Bus Stop Improvements**  
Install, replace, repairs, and otherwise improve bus shelters and stops.

**Location**  
Santa Cruz County

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

2010 Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) - as amended through March 3, 2011
PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING PHASE OVER 10 YEARS

I. BACKGROUND

Title 23 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 630.112(c)(2)), as well as United States Code (USC) Title 23, Section 102 (b), requires the following for any Federal-aid project: In the event that Right-of-Way (ROW) acquisition for, or actual construction (CON) of, the road for which this preliminary engineering (PE) is undertaken, is not started by the close of the tenth fiscal year following the fiscal year in which the project is authorized, the State Transportation Department (STD) will repay to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) the sum or sums of Federal funds paid to the transportation department under the terms of the agreement.

II. POLICY

1. Any project that reaches the status of “PE over 10 years” is out of compliance with 23 CFR 630.112(c)(2), as well as Section 102 (b) of USC Title 23, unless the project has an approved time extension. All invoice requests for a project out of compliance will cease to be paid. The project will be reviewed for closure and repayment of Federal funds.

2. Any project in the PE phase that has not moved to either ROW or CON in 8 years, any project that has exceeded the 10-year deadline, and any project that has an approved time extension, will be posted on the Division of Local Assistance (DLA) website shown below:

   http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/pe_over_10yrs.html

3. For any project in the PE phase that is within two years of reaching the 10-year deadline, the local agency may either submit a Request for Authorization (E-76) for ROW or CON, request a time extension or withdraw the project. If the time extension is denied, the project will be closed and Federal funds repaid.

4. An approved time extension for projects that are within two years of reaching the 10-year deadline will be in force for three years, beginning on October 1st of the FFY that the project will be out of compliance. All projects with an approved time extension are expected to:
   a. proceed to the ROW or CON phase prior to expiration of the extension
   b. submit a status update at the beginning of each FFY the time extension is in place
   c. invoice against the Federal funds in the timeframes outlined in 23 CFR 630.106 (5) and the Local Assistance Procedures Manual to avoid inactivity.

5. When any project advances to ROW or CON phase without the aid of Federal funds, the local agency will inform the District Local Assistance Engineer (DLAE) and this information will be forwarded on to FHWA, so that the project can be closed and removed from the “PE over 10 years” list.
6. Any local agency having a project with the PE phase already past the 10-year deadline without a current time extension will be given until July 1, 2011 to either:
   a. submit an E-76 for ROW or CON.
   b. submit a time extension request.
   c. submit a letter to withdraw the project.

An E-76 or a request for time extension must be received by the DLAE by the July 1, 2011 deadline. An approved time extension for a project already past the 10-year deadline will be in force for three years from the date of the FHWA approval letter.

7. Any project that surpasses the 10-year deadline as of October 1, 2011, without an approved time extension, will be closed and Federal funds repaid.
March 30, 2011

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

Dear Members of the Commission:

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

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

The LSRA report also documents an overall decline in funding for road maintenance and repair and points to other sources that have been used to backfill the decline in State funds. Unfortunately, one of those pools of funds in our county has been funds from local Redevelopment Agencies which are currently slated for elimination by the Governor. As an example, for the past few years, $1 million to $3 million has been spent on roads within the Santa Cruz County Redevelopment Agency area, which has resulted in a PCI of around 70 in the Live Oak and Soquel areas. With the potential loss of these funds, as well as the loss of one-time ARRA stimulus funds, we could easily see a reduction of more than $10 million in essential road maintenance funds. Clearly, the County General Fund is not healthy enough to support a massive repair of our local roads. Therefore, we have to look for all available resources to repair our local roads.
March 30, 2011
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
From: Eric Smith [mailto:Eric.Smith@elekta.com]  
Sent: Thursday, August 25, 2011 8:18 AM  
To: info@sccrtc.org  
Subject: Highway 1  

I don't know if you've noticed, but highway 1 needs widening. The train tracks are a waste of money.

Thanks,

Eric Smith  
Sequel, CA

Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail.

The contents of this e-mail message (including any attachments) are confidential to and are intended to be conveyed for the use of the recipient to whom it is addressed only. If you receive this transmission in error, please notify the sender of this immediately and delete the message from your system. Any distribution, reproduction or use of this message by someone other than recipient is not authorized and may be unlawful.

*****  
08/25/11  

Dear Eric,

The RTC has secured funding for three projects: Mission Street, Highway 1/17 Interchange and the Morrissey/Sequel Auxiliary Lanes project, the latter of which is scheduled to begin construction as early as February 2012. For more information on the RTC's work to improve Highway 1 please see the newly updated website: http://sccrtc.org/projects/streets-highways/highway-1-aux-lanes/.

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review.

Please visit the SCCRTC website at www.sccrtc.org for information on the Commission and its activities.

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

23-37
-----Original Message-----
From: Cedar Geiger [mailto:cedarspirit@gmail.com]  
Sent: Friday, August 26, 2011 5:03 PM  
To: info@sccrtc.org  
Subject: highway 1 widening

How many times do the people have to express their feelings verbally or through the ballot box. We do not want highway 1 widened. Period!

******

06/30/11

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review.

Please visit the SCCRTC website at www.sccrtc.org for information on the Commission and its activities.

Thank you again.

Cathy Judd  
Administrative Assistant II  
SCCRTC  
1523 Pacific Ave  
Santa Cruz CA 95060  
831 460 3206  
Fax 831 460 3215  
cjudd@sccrtc.org  
www.sccrtc.org

23-38
From: cgcbaweeks@comcast.net [mailto:cgcbaweeks@comcast.net]
Sent: Sunday, August 28, 2011 4:55 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: adding lanes to hwy 1 needed now!

We are writing in remembrance of Andrew Mekie founder of Andy’s Auto. We would like to add our names to the list to say that we want the addition of the lanes on Hwy 1. Please start construction soon!!! This is a much needed project.

Chris and Gina Weeks
1491 Branciforte Dr
Santa Cruz, CA 95065

The Weeks Family

******
08/30/11
011
Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review.

Please visit the SCCRTC website at www.sccrtc.org for information on the Commission and its activities.

Thank you again.

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

Cathy Judd
Administrative Assistant II
SCCRTC
1523 Pacific Ave
Santa Cruz CA 95060
831 460 3206
Fax 831 460 3215
cjudd@sccrtc.org
www.sccrtc.org

3-3-39
Longtime community member and former business owner Andrew Mekis dies

By Chelsea Hawkins

Posted: 08/25/2011 01:30:12 AM PDT

SANTA CRUZ — Characterized as a loving father, a bright and caring businessman, and a devoted husband, Andrew Mekis was known for owning one of the few businesses in the 1950s and '60s that allowed patrons to open a charge account, allowing young people a chance to accrue credit.

Mekis, who owned Andy's Auto Supply on Pacific Avenue, died Saturday. He was 91.

His son Michael Mekis, who now manages the store, worked alongside his father for years.

"I worked shoulder to shoulder with my father and I had a wonderful experience," Michael Mekis said. "He was a hard worker, very sharp, but once he walked out the door at six every night, he was focused on my mom and us."

He developed loyalty and trust within the community, his children said.

"Any man from this area knew Andy's Auto Supply," said his daughter Lisa Mekis. "[My father] was just a really disciplined, hard worker, but he loved to have fun."

Lisa Mekis said her father would often work more than eight hours a day, six days a week and then spend Saturdays with his family and parents in Watsonville. In the evenings he would take their mother, Audrey, dancing. Lisa Mekis said her parents "saw the world and danced," spending much of their time together exploring different countries and continents while maintaining a love for dance and for each other.

The son of immigrants from Croatia, Mekis spent his childhood in Watsonville, thriving in the booming Croatian community.

Kathryn Miller said her father's story was the "quintessential" story of first-generation immigrants.

"He set high expectations for himself," Miller said. "He expected to change the world for himself and for his family."

Mekis moved to Santa Cruz as an adult to open up his business after marrying his wife, but he remained tied to Watsonville. His family said that throughout his life, Mekis loved both cities and was disappointed that there was not a better connection between them.

"When you don't have good links between cities, one of them will wither," said his son Jim Mekis, adding his father's desire to see both Santa Cruz and Watsonville thrive drove his father to support the widening of Highway 1. Mekis had lived in the area before the highway existed, when all that connected Santa Cruz and Watsonville was Freedom Boulevard and Soquel Drive.
Before his death, Mekis requested that rather than mourners sending the family flowers, they show their support by writing the Regional Transportation Commission at 1523 Pacific Ave., Santa Cruz, or www.sccrtc.org in support of "immediately" widening Highway 1.

"There are very few people in this county who understood both Santa Cruz and Watsonville," Lisa Mekis said.

Biography
Andrew Mekis
BORN: March 4, 1920
DIED: Aug. 20, 2011
HOME: Santa Cruz
OCCUPATION: Businessman, owner of Andy's Auto Supply
EDUCATION: Graduate of Watsonville High School, class of 1938
COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT: Elks, Knights of Columbus, Forty Thieves, Native Sons and Slavic American Cultural Organization; Santa Cruz Parking Commission; named the 'Old Timer of the Year' in 2010 by the Santa Cruz Old Timers organization.
SURVIVORS: Wife of 63 years, Audrey Mekis; sister Helen Ostojic of Hollister; children Jim Mekis, Kathryn Miller, Michael Mekis, Donna Mekis, Paul Mekis and Lisa Mekis; nine grandchildren; and three great-grandchildren.
SERVICES: A Mass of Christian burial 11 a.m. Aug. 29 at Holy Cross Church, 126 High St., Santa Cruz. A reception will follow. Visitation will be 6 to 8 p.m. Aug. 28 at Benito and Azzaro Pacific Gardens Chapel, 1050 Cayuga St.
From: Ken [mailto:kgreywolf@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 06, 2011 5:24 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Road widening vs, local road repair

Even if you support widening the highway, do you support it at the expense of repairing our local roads for a decade? If your road is in need of repair or you want to be sure there are funds available over the next ten years to repair and maintain roads you travel on, I urge you to come to this RTC meeting and let the commission know how you feel about this plan.

I wish to have our local roads repaired rather than widen a small section of our Highway 1 - - please fix our roads! I’m sure that you all would agree Adams road is much more important to fix - - come up and review it with me.

Kenneth Woelfel

408-353-1687

*****

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review.

Please visit the SCCRTC website at www.sccrtc.org for information on the Commission and its activities.

Thank you again.

Cathy Judd
Administrative Assistant II
SCCRTC
1523 Pacific Ave
Santa Cruz CA 95060
831 460 3206
Fax 831 460 3215
cjudd@sccrtc.org
www.sccrtc.org

23-42
From: Steven Zigman [mailto:zig4@sbcglobal.net]  
Sent: Tuesday, September 06, 2011 5:30 PM  
To: info@sccrtc.org  
Subject: auxiliary lanes  

I do not believe we should even think of pushing forward with the auxiliary lanes from Soquel Drive to 41st Ave. It is a waste of funds and time. The funds should be used for the repair of county roads. They are in a state of TERRIBLE disrepair and should be considered as the first use of the funding that we have left. The widening is a RTC ponzi scheme and having gone to the meeting(s) through the years and listening to numerous stats, etc. I find the whole bureaucracy full of tales of fear and doom as to the priority of highway 1 widening. 
I am against the Auxiliary Lanes!!!

Respectfully,

Steven Zigman  
Soquel, Ca

*****

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review.

Please visit the SCCRTC website at www.sccrtc.org for information on the Commission and its activities.

Thank you again.

Cathy Judd  
Administrative Assistant I  
SCCRTC  
1523 Pacific Ave  
Santa Cruz CA 95060  
831 460 3206  
Fax 831 460 3215  
cjudd@sccrtc.org  
www.sccrtc.org

23.43
Widening highway 1 will guarantee only one thing: more people will use highway 1. I’ve watched this happen over and over again. Reducing congestion is NEVER the long-term result.

Stop wasting money on building an even bigger highway through our narrow strip of land along the coast. Instead, focus on improving the existing transportation infrastructure:

- Repair local roads
- Provide better bike lanes and even dedicated bike paths
- Improve pedestrian pathways

Today, I walked from a local business at the end of 41st avenue to a street off Capitola road. It was a pain as I had to walk through parking lots, dirt paths, and jumbled sidewalks. I often felt unsafe as I crossed uncontrolled highway entrances and multi-lane roads with just seconds to spare.

It is remarkable how we have not provided safe, easy pathways for pedestrians. It is self-evident that if you do not provide easy and safe ways for people to bike and walk, they will not bike and walk.

And I can’t help but mention how noisy highway 1 is. I live as far away as you can get in Santa Cruz from highway 1 and I no longer hear the dull roar. But every other place I’ve lived you can hear the trucks and the tire noise. The faster the traffic, the louder the noise. Don’t we live in Santa Cruz because of its natural beauty?

NO MORE MONEY FOR MULTI-LANE HIGHWAYS.

Thanks,

Will Mayall
224 Palisades Ave.
Santa Cruz, CA 95062
831-476-2198

*****

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review.

Please visit the SCCRTC website at www.sccrtc.org for information on the Commission and its activities.

Thank you again.

Cathy Judd
Administrative Assistant II
SCCRTC
1523 Pacific Ave
Santa Cruz CA 95060
831 460 3206
Fax 831 460 3215
cjudd@sccrtc.org
www.sccrtc.org

23.44
From: Patricia Mc Veigh [mailto:pmcveigh@baymoon.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 06, 2011 5:57 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: widening versus roads

I want to object strenuously to a plan being put forth to divert road repair funds to the "Widening Highway 1" project. This project has been put to the voters and has been soundly rejected. Keeping the existing roads workable must be a priority over widening roads. It is time to get down to business with the rail line and work toward making this a viable means of transportation for Santa Cruz County. Promoting better bus service, especially commuter and recreational busses from "over the Hill" will be an essential part of any planning. We simply cannot continue to use automobiles as our personal one-person transportation alternative. So, listen to the wishes of the people and make this a better place to live now and into the future.

Thank you

Patricia Mc Veigh
pmcveigh@baymoon.com

"No one makes a greater mistake than he who did nothing because he could do only a little." -- Edmund Burke

*****

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review.

Please visit the SCCRTC website at www.sccrtc.org for information on the Commission and its activities.

Thank you again.

<<<<<<<<<

Cathy Judd
Administrative Assistant II
SCCRTC
1523 Pacific Ave
Santa Cruz CA 95060
831 460 3206
Fax 831 460 3215
cjudd@sccrtc.org
www.sccrtc.org

23-45
-----Original Message-----
From: Patterson Willard (Bill) [mailto:wilderwill@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, September 06, 2011 7:23 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Highway Funding

Do not use road repair monies, present or future, to widen highway 1.
This is a misuse/abuse of road repair funds. The roads I travel on in Santa Cruz are
rutted and holed. They need repairing.
Bill Patterson
444 Baker Street Santa Cruz, Ca 95062

*****

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for
their review.

Please visit the SCCRTC website at www.sccrtc.org for information on the
Commission and its activities.

Thank you again.

<<<<<<<<<<<

Cathy Judd
Administrative Assistant II
SCCRTC
1523 Pacific Ave
Santa Cruz CA 95060
831 460 3206
Fax 831 460 3215
cjudd@sccrtc.org
www.sccrtc.org

23-46
To whom it may concern,

Please note that I am against the proposal to divert any funding from county road maintenance to the widening of HWY 1 between Soquel and 41st. Our county roads need to be the priority for safety in all the communities and for efficient use of county services. Please, please keep our county road maintenance a priority.

Sincerely,
Deleese Taylor

We cannot live only for ourselves. A thousand fibers connect us with our fellow men. ~Herman Melville

*****

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review.

Please visit the SCCRTC website at www.sccrtc.org for information on the Commission and its activities.

Thank you again.

 Cathy Judd  
 Administrative Assistant II  
 SCCRTC  
 1523 Pacific Ave  
 Santa Cruz CA 95060  
 831 460 3206  
 Fax 831 460 3215  
 cjudd@sccrtc.org  
 www.sccrtc.org

23-47
-----Original Message-----
From: Evelyn Bernstein [mailto:eyeyirene@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 06, 2011 8:00 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: money for local roads

I wish to state my support for fixing our local roads now and for the next 10 years, and not spending the money for 1 mile of extended freeway! We have been hit hard by nature, and need the roads fixed for our daily use now! Evelyn Bernstein  Morris Dr. Soquel

******

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review.

Please visit the SCCRTC website at www.sccrtc.org for information on the Commission and its activities.

Thank you again.

Cathy Judd
Administrative Assistant II
SCCRTC
1523 Pacific Ave
Santa Cruz CA 95060
831 460 3206
Fax 831 460 3215
cjudd@sccrtc.org
www.sccrtc.org

23-48
From: Kathy Dethlefsen [mailto:kathyd2607@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 06, 2011 8:32 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: hwy 1 widening

Hello,
While I support the widening of Hwy1 - I do not support it if the cost is using all other road repair money for this single project. I happen to live in the Santa Cruz mountains and many - many - of our roads need work. I'm sure many more will need work this coming winter. Please consider where our road dollars can make the most difference to the most people. I believe this will be in spreading the money over many roads - not concentrating it on this single short road upgrade.

Thanks for your time.

Kathy Dethlefsen
Brookdale

*****

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review.

Please visit the SCCRTC website at www.sccrtc.org for information on the Commission and its activities.

Thank you again.

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

Cathy Judd
Administrative Assistant II
SCCRTC
1523 Pacific Ave
Santa Cruz CA 95060
831 460 3206
Fax 831 460 3215
cjudd@sccrtc.org
www.sccrtc.org

23-49
-----Original Message-----
From: Frank Mara [mailto:frank_mara@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 06, 2011 9:37 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: pot holes

Please do not take money away from local road repair to fund highway widening.
thank you,
Frank Mara

****

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review.

Please visit the SCCRTC website at www.sccrtc.org for information on the Commission and its activities.

Thank you again.

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

Cathy Judd
Administrative Assistant II
SCCRTC
1523 Pacific Ave
Santa Cruz CA 95060
831 460 3206
Fax 831 460 3215
cjudd@sccrtc.org
www.sccrtc.org

23-50
From: David Giannini [mailto:davidgiannini@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 07, 2011 7:41 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Opposed to use funds to widen Hwy 1

Please state and federal road dollars funds to repair existing roads.

Thank you,

David Giannini
412 Stanford Ave.
Santa Cruz
CA 95062

*****

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review.

Please visit the SCCRTC website at www.sccrtc.org for information on the Commission and its activities.

Thank you again.

<<<<<<<<<

Cathy Judd
Administrative Assistant II
SCCRTC
1523 Pacific Ave
Santa Cruz CA 95060
831 460 3206
Fax 831 460 3215
cjudd@sccrtc.org
www.sccrtc.org

<<<<<<<<<

23-S1
From: Sue Reynolds [mailto:utopia@cruzio.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 07, 2011 1:06 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: DON'T WIDEN HYW 1, REPAIR LOCAL ROADS

Dear SCCRTC Commissioners,

Please do not widen Highway 1 against the express will of the voters. What a waste of money when our local roads are crumbling. Please turn this money toward repairing local roads.

Sincerely,

Sue Reynolds

*****

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review.

Please visit the SCCRTC website at www.sccrtc.org for information on the Commission and its activities.

Thank you again.

<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>><<<<>>>:<352

Cathy Judd
Administrative Assistant II
SCCRTC
1523 Pacific Ave
Santa Cruz CA 95060
831 460 3206
Fax 831 460 3215
cjudd@sccrtc.org
www.sccrtc.org

23-52
From: Saskia Lucas [mailto:saskia_lucas@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 07, 2011 2:59 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Oppose Use of All Federal and State Funds for Highway 1 Widening

Dear RTC Commissioners,

I write to express my opposition to the proposed use of all Federal and State transportation funds for the next 10 years for the Highway 1 widening project (auxiliary lane between Morrissey Blvd. and Soquel Ave.)

So many of our local roads are in need of repair. Well-maintained roads are not only a matter of comfort but more importantly safety for road users, especially bicyclists. Regular maintenance also saves money in the long run as road repair costs go up when problems go unaddressed.

Please vote against this fiscally unwise and unsafe proposal.

I appreciate your consideration.

Kind regards,

Saskia Lucas
537 Buena Vista Ave., Santa Cruz
saskia_lucas@yahoo.com

*****

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review.

Please visit the SCCRTC website at www.sccrtc.org for information on the Commission and its activities.

Thank you again.

Cathy Judd
Administrative Assistant II
SCCRTC
1523 Pacific Ave
Santa Cruz CA 95060
831 460 3206
Fax 831 460 3215
cjudd@sccrtc.org
www.sccrtc.org
-----Original Message-----
From: Jules Resnick [mailto:24jules@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, September 07, 2011 3:30 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Funding for Local Roads

Please don't divert millions of dollars from our local roads to expand a freeway, but not solve the freeway problems!

I can't believe that this idea of diverting funds is even being seriously considered and that this would continue for 10 YEARS. ARE YOU CRAZY???? This would seem to be a no brainer......

Mary Ann Leer
Live Oak Resident

*****

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review.

Please visit the SCCRTC website at www.sccrtc.org for information on the Commission and its activities.

Thank you again.

Cathy Judd
Administrative Assistant II
SCCRTC
1523 Pacific Ave
Santa Cruz CA 95060
831 460 3206
Fax 831 460 3215
cjudd@sccrtc.org
www.sccrtc.org

23-54
-----Original Message-----
From: Jules Resnick [mailto:24jules@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, September 07, 2011 3:52 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Highway 1 Widening Project

Continuing with this project is wasting more money on top of the money already wasted on it. The project takes money from local road work to widen a road very few people want widened and will provide little benefit. A true benefit would have been if the Highway 1/17 money plus this money was used for public transit, which is badly needed. A mistake was made starting this project; please end this mistake now.

Thank You, Jules Resnick

*****

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review.

Please visit the SCCRTC website at www.sccrtc.org for information on the Commission and its activities.

Thank you again.

Cathy Judd
Administrative Assistant II
SCCRTC
1523 Pacific Ave
Santa Cruz CA 95060
831 460 3206
Fax 831 460 3215
cjudd@sccrtc.org
www.sccrtc.org

23-55
From: Michela Barcus [mailto:michelabarcs@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 07, 2011 6:43 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Funding for roads

I want to urge you to focus on fixing the many miles of injured roads in SC Courty before you fund another mile of widening for Highway 1. I know it's hard to make these choices, but as someone who lives in the San Lorenzo Valley and drives to SC every day, I can assure you the roads we travel that are not the freeways are in dire need. I vote to focus there instead of giving more to the freeways. Thanks for listening.

Michela Barcus
Public Health Manager, SC County
170 Figone Lane
Ben Lomond, CA

*****

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review.

Please visit the SCCRTC website at www.sccrtc.org for information on the Commission and its activities.

Thank you again.

Cathy Judd
Administrative Assistant II
SCCRTC
1523 Pacific Ave
Santa Cruz CA 95060
831 460 3206
Fax 831 460 3215
cjudd@sccrtc.org
www.sccrtc.org

23-56
AGENDA: September 15, 2011

TO: Regional Transportation Commission

FROM: Kim Shultz, Senior Transportation Planner

RE: Highway 1 Soquel/Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes Project – Construction Support

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) approve:

1. The attached resolution (Attachment 1) authorizing contracts with Parsons Brinckerhoff Americas, Inc. in the amount of $1,896,360 for construction management services, and with Nolte Associates Inc. in the amount of $268,300 for design support services in association with the construction of the Highway 1 Soquel/Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes project; and

2. The attached resolution (Attachment 4) amending the Highway 1 Construction page of the fiscal year (FY) 2011-12 RTC budget to move funds from the contingency line to the construction management team line.

BACKGROUND

Beginning in 2008, the RTC considered assuming construction management responsibility for the Highway 1 Soquel/Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes project. Beyond the expedited project schedule, the benefits of the RTC assuming construction management authority include:

- Direct involvement in critical decisions regarding the project
- Proactive construction management approach
- Community accountability and community relations

In June 2009, following a consultant selection process, the RTC acted to take construction management responsibility and approved an initial contract in the amount of $22,000 with Parsons Brinckerhoff (PB) Americas Inc. for preconstruction activities in conjunction with finalizing the design plans for the project. The project design plans were subsequently completed and accepted by the California Transportation Commission (CTC) in June 2011. On August 10, 2011, the CTC authorized release of Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA) and State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds in a total amount of $18,340,000 for construction to begin at the earliest possible time.

DISCUSSION

Based on state requirements, the RTC has six months from the CTC release of funds to award a construction contract. In addition, RTC staff and the construction management consultant recommend advancing the construction process at the earliest possible date to realize the greatest cost efficiencies on the project. An aggressive project schedule has been developed
that would enable bid advertisement, award, and administration of construction to begin as early as mid-December 2011. An aggressive timeline is required as environmental regulations restrict trimming of trees suitable for migratory bird nesting (found adjacent to the highway in this area) between October 1st and February 15th to avoid disturbing seasonal habitat. If trees in this area are not trimmed by February 15th, then construction of the Highway 1 Soquel/Morrissey Auxiliary Lane project would be delayed for one year.

Accordingly, RTC staff and the construction management team have begun work in preparation of advertising construction bid documents in early October. To facilitate this early work effort the Executive Director, through his administrative authority, has issued a limited Notice to Proceed in the amount of $15,000 to PB.

Construction Management Services

The total cost of the construction management effort is estimated at $1,896,360 (see Attachment 2). This amount includes sub-consultant work for material testing, construction staking, and environmental monitoring, and providing office space and equipment for the construction management team in proximity to the construction site. The estimated cost cited above is approximately $270,000 over the cost estimated in June 2009 of $1,625,000 and approved in the current FY 2011-12 RTC Budget. Therefore, a budget amendment will be necessary to enter into a contract for construction management services. The reasons for the cost increases are due to increased labor rates, the addition of a paleontologist to the team to minimize potential construction delays, a one month increase in the duration of the construction period required to coordinate the La Fonda Avenue bridge demolition with the school year, and provision of office space and equipment which are included in the construction cost estimate.

The FY 2011-12 Budget includes $500,000 in contingency and unappropriated revenues to cover the construction management cost estimate. Moreover, the project team is confident that by bidding the construction work as soon as possible the construction capital costs will be well under the estimate of $15.64 million. The majority of any savings between the estimated construction cost and the contractor’s bid price remains available as contingency for both capital and construction management/support activities through the construction process.

Project Design Support

The services of the project designer (Nolte Associates Inc.) are needed through the construction phase to provide support during the bid advertisement and construction process including preparation of the “As-Built” drawings at the conclusion of the project to document the work performed. Nolte’s estimate for this work effort is $268,300 (see Attachment 3), which is within the approved FY 2011-12 Budget of $270,000.

Note the duration of the construction project is estimated to be 24 months by Nolte in contrast to the 12 month estimate assumed by the construction management consultant, PB Americas Inc. This is consistent with the different approaches taken by the respective consultants wherein the design consultant takes a more conservative approach that leads to a higher cost estimate, for programming and budgeting purposes, while the construction manager’s approach is to deliver the project ahead of schedule and under budget.
The project team recommends bidding the project at the earliest possible time to meet state requirements, fully realize cost savings built into the design plans and avoid a delay to the start of construction due to environmental regulations. Accordingly, staff recommends that the RTC approve the attached resolution (Attachment 1) authorizing contracts with Parsons Brinckerhoff Americas, Inc. in the amount of $1,896,360 for construction management services, and with Nolte Associates Inc. in the amount of $268,300 for design support services in association with the construction of the Highway 1 Soquel/Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes project. Staff also recommends approval of the attached resolution (Attachment 4) amending the Highway 1 Construction page of the fiscal year (FY) 2011-12 RTC budget to move funds from the contingency line to the construction management team line.

SUMMARY

Construction funds for the Highway 1 Soquel/Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes project were released by the Californian Transportation Commission in August and staff recommends initiating the construction phase at the earliest possible time to meet state requirements, fully realize cost savings built into the design plans, and avoid a delay to the start of construction due to environmental regulations. To meet this goal the Executive Director has, through his administrative authority, issued a limited Notice to Proceed in the amount of $15,000 to Parsons Brinckerhoff Americas (the construction management consultant selected in 2009) to assist the RTC in preparing to administer its first construction project. To meet the aggressive project schedule to begin construction at the earliest possible time staff recommends that the RTC approve the attached resolution (Attachment 1) authorizing contracts with Parsons Brinckerhoff Americas, Inc. in the amount of $1,896,360 for construction management services, and with Nolte Associates Inc. in the amount of $268,300 for design support services for the construction of the Highway 1 Soquel/Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes project. Staff also recommends approval of a FY 2011-12 budget amendment (Attachment 4) to shift funds within the Highway 1 Soquel/Morrissey Auxiliary Lane construction budget.

Attachments:
1. Resolution authorizing contracts with Parsons Brinckerhoff Americus Inc. and Nolte Associates Inc. for Construction Management and Support Services
2. Parsons Brinckerhoff (PB) Americas Inc., Scope and Fees, August 2011
3. Nolte Associates, Scope and Fees, September 2011
4. Resolution amending the Highway 1 Construction page of the FY 2011/12 Budget
RESOLUTION NO.

Adopted by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
on the date of September 15, 2011
on the motion of Commissioner
duly seconded by Commissioner

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO EXECUTE A CONTRACT WITH PARSONS BRINCKERHOFF AMERICAS INC. IN THE AMOUNT OF $1,896,360 FOR CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT SERVICES, AND WITH NOLTE ASSOCIATES INC. IN THE AMOUNT OF $268,300 FOR DESIGN SUPPORT SERVICES IN ASSOCIATION WITH THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE HIGHWAY 1 SOQUEL/MORRISSEY AUXILIARY LANES PROJECT

WHEREAS, Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) approved assuming responsibility for administrating the construction phase of the Highway 1 Soquel/Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes project in June 2009; and,

WHEREAS, the California Transportation Commission on August 10, 2011, released funds for construction capital and support services and the RTC has included these funds and activities in the FY 2010/2011 Work Program and Budget;

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

1. The Executive Director is authorized to execute a contract with Parsons Brinckerhoff Americas Inc. in the amount of $1,896,360 for construction management services associated with the Highway 1 Soquel/Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes Project.

2. The Executive Director is authorized to execute a contract with Nolte Associates Inc. in the amount of $268,300 for design support services associated with the construction of the Highway 1 Soquel/Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes Project.

3. The Executive Director is authorized to negotiate and execute amendments to the agreements identified above provided that the amendments are within the intended scope of duties to complete the construction of the Highway 1 Soquel/Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes Project and are consistent with the adopted RTC budget.

AYES: COMMISSIONERS

NOES: COMMISSIONERS

ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS

ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS

Mark Stone, Chair

George Dondero, Secretary

Distribution: RTC Fiscal
RTC Planner

S:\RESOLUTION\2011\RES00911\ConstructionMgmt&DesignSupport-AuxLaneProject.doc
ATTACHMENT - 2
CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT SERVICES -ROUTE 1 SOQUEL/MORRISSEY AUXILLARY LANES PROJECT
PB AMERICAS, INC.
COST PROPOSAL SUMMARY

1) BURDENED LABOR COSTS (Includes Profit)

REGULAR TIME $1,183,788

OVERTIME

PREMIUM TIME

SUBTOTAL $1,183,788

2) SUBCONSULTANTS:

Materials Testing (Pacific Crest/Kleinfelder) Rough Est $134,000
Construction Staking (GTS, Inc.) Rough Est $249,120
Public Outreach (Desiree Douville) $20,000
Biological Monitoring (Gary Kittleson) $50,000
Paleontologist (Place holder) $100,000

SUBTOTAL $553,120

3) EXPENSES: $159,452

SUBTOTAL $159,452

TOTAL AMOUNT $1,896,360
## PB STAFFING SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSITIONS</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>TOTAL HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Manager</td>
<td>Bart Littell, PE</td>
<td>PB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Engineer/Str Rep</td>
<td>Bruce Shewchuk, PE</td>
<td>PB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structures/Civil Insp</td>
<td>Tom Fitzgerald</td>
<td>PB</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil/Electrical Insp</td>
<td>Mike Lyons</td>
<td>PB</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Engineer</td>
<td>Robert Gana</td>
<td>PB</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule/Claims Spec.</td>
<td>Scott Frenette</td>
<td>PB</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Administrator</td>
<td>Marianne Beltram</td>
<td>PB</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 9,027
CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT SERVICES - ROUTE 1 SOQUEL/MORRISSEY AUXILLARY LANES PROJECT

PB ESTIMATED EXPENSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>COST ($)</th>
<th>SUBTOTAL ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RE Office</td>
<td>Months 16</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>$35,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janitorial Service</td>
<td>Months 16</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>$6,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>Months 16</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax Machine</td>
<td>Allowance 1</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copier</td>
<td>Months 16</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>$9,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Furniture</td>
<td>LS 1</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Services</td>
<td>Months 16</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>$4,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computers/Printer</td>
<td>LS Allowance 6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEHICLES, VEHICLE O&amp;M, CELL PHONES, FIELD EQUIPMENT HOURS</td>
<td>6271</td>
<td>$12</td>
<td>$75,252</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SAFETY EQUIPMENT, SURVEY EQUIPMENT

B) OFFICE SUPPLIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>COST ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Supply</td>
<td>LS 1</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>Months 14</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipping for Bid Mgt</td>
<td>LS 1</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising for Bid Mgt</td>
<td>LS 1</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage/Express Mail</td>
<td>Months 14</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ESTIMATED EXPENSES $159,452
Parsons Brinckerhoff Americus Inc.
Scope of Services
Construction Management
Route 1 Soquel/Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes Project

1. Complete the biddability review with the project designer (Nolte Associates Inc.) and finalize bid documents.

2. Participate with the Project Development Team in completing the utility coordination process and developing the construction delivery schedule.

3. Assist RTC in setting up procedures for processing contract change orders (CCO), contractor’s progress payments and contractor’s contract

4. Participate in early partnering activities with Caltrans, the City and County of Santa Cruz, California Highway Patrol, and other interested and involved agencies.

5. Manage/Administer the bidding process consisting of:
   a) Advertise the project
   b) Store and distribute Contract Documents (provided by others) as required.
   Transfer all plan purchase fees to the RTC at the end of the bidding Process
   c) Maintain a Plan Holder’s List
   d) Schedule/Conduct a Pre-Bid Conference
   e) Receive/coordinate responses to bidder inquiries
   f) Issue/track/log addenda
   g) Conduct the Bid Opening
   h) Review bids, bid bonds, insurance certificates and related submittals and recommend award to the lowest responsible bidder

6. Act as construction project coordinator and the point of contact for communications and interaction with the contractor, Caltrans, affected local agencies and designer.

7. Perform all applicable Resident Engineer functions as required by Caltrans Standard Specifications, the project Special Provisions, and applicable sections of the Caltrans Construction Manual.

8. Participate in a partnering relationship to be developed between the RTC, Caltrans, affected local agencies and the contractor.

9. Conduct a pre-construction conference.
10. Review and monitor the construction schedule. Prepare monthly reports documenting the progress of construction. Take photographic recordings of the construction progress on a regular basis.

11. Schedule, manage and perform construction staking in accordance with the methods, procedures and requirements of Caltrans Surveys Manual and Caltrans Staking Information Booklet.

12. Schedule, manage, perform and document all field and laboratory testing services. Materials testing shall conform to the requirements and frequencies as defined in the Caltrans Construction Manual and the Caltrans Materials Testing Manuals.

13. Process submittals and monitor design consultant review activities.

14. Prepare and recommend progress payments.

15. Coordinate and meet construction oversight requirements of Caltrans and affected local agencies for work being performed within the respective jurisdictions.

16. Identify potential claims and make recommendations to resolve said claims.

17. Perform construction administrative activities, including correspondence and document control.

18. Perform field inspection activities, monitor contractor’s performance verses requirements of applicable codes, specifications, and contract drawings.

19. Oversee the design clarification process.

20. Oversee quality acceptance and materials testing.

21. Evaluate, negotiate, recommend, and prepare change orders.


23. Provide final inspections services and project closeout activities, including preparation of the final construction project report.

24. Turn construction documents over to the RTC.
I  PROJECT OVERVIEW

This Scope of Work identifies professional services necessary to support Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) in the bidding process and construction of the State Route 1 Auxiliary Lanes Project, between Soquel Avenue and Morrissey Blvd, including replacement of the La Fonda Avenue overcrossing, in Santa Cruz County. The final design was completed by Nolte Associates, Inc. (NV5) and funding was approved for construction.

The work will include NV5’s support during the bid process, including any work needed before advertisement of the project. We anticipate the bid process to be approximately 3 months, with advertisement, bid and contract award each being one month in duration. After award, we anticipate the construction duration to be approximately 2 years (24 months).

NV5 will team with Verde Design, Fehr & Peers, Parikh Consultants and Geocon Consultants as done for the final design of the project in order to expedite any questions or clarifications requested by the contractor. The following major tasks have been identified as necessary to complete the construction of this auxiliary lane project:

- Task 1  Bid Support
- Task 2  Design Support during Construction

II  DETAILED SCOPE OF SERVICES

The following detailed scope of services, assumptions and requirement of deliverables have been developed in consultation with the RTC.

Task 1 - Bid Support

Parag Mehta, Project Manager, will be responsible to lead this effort. Additional individual responsibilities are listed in the subtasks as appropriate.

1.1  Prepare Bid Package

The final design plans were prepared in consultation with RTC and Caltrans District 5. The package was Ready to List (RTL) in June 2011; however, the utility coordination with PG&E is ongoing as PG&E’s design to relocate their utility poles has not been completed. As part of the bid package, NV5 will finalize any revisions to the plans and specifications so the contractor will be able to coordinate the utility relocations as required for the construction of the La Fonda Ave Overcrossing.

NV5 will also work with RTC’s construction management team (CM) to review and change the bid package, as necessary, for biddability and/or constructability issues so the bid and construction processes are project efficient. If plan changes are required (design changes), an iteration process of reviews with Caltrans will be necessary. Currently, the fee does not assume any design changes will be required.

The Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) requirements have also changed since the RTL of the project, and NV5 will review and change the special provisions so the project adheres to the current requirements.

NV5 assumes a total of 100 man-hours will be necessary to complete this task.
1.2 **Support During Bid Period**

Once advertisement of the project begins, NV5 will be available to provide the following assistance during the bidding process on a time and materials basis:

- Attend a pre-bid meeting.
- Assist RTC and CM staff in responding to questions from bidders, vendors and other interested parties.
- Prepare addenda as requested by RTC and CM staff.
- Assist RTC and CM staff with review of bid results as requested.

The NV5 team assumes approximately 60 man-hours will be required to complete this task. If more work is required, NV5 will inform RTC before moving forward with further work.

**Task 2 - Design Support during Construction**

The NV5 team will assist RTC during construction and will be available to provide the following services on a time and materials basis.

2.1 **Design Support Project Management**

As part of the design support, continual project management will be required, including attendance at construction meetings (as requested by RTC and/or CM staff) and subconsultant coordination of RFIs and change orders. We anticipate the duration of construction will be approximately 24 months, and the following work will be based on this duration period.

For construction meetings, we assume 1 meeting per month may be required (24 total). Attendance at the pre-construction meeting with the successful bidder is included in this task.

For agency and subconsultant coordination, we will assume 2 hours per month (48 hours total). If more work is necessary, NV5 will inform RTC before moving forward with further coordination efforts.

2.2 **Construction Support Activities**

2.2A – **General Activities**

During construction, the following general activities are anticipated to be part of construction support:

- Respond to RFIs and questions as construction work progresses.
- Conduct field reviews to observe the general contractor’s adherence to the design presented in the contract documents (a total of six field visits are assumed).
- Review technical submittals (shop drawings).
- Review laboratory, shop, and mill test reports.
- Assist in preparation of design change orders, if necessary (a total of two change orders are assumed).

The NV5 team anticipates approximately 400 man-hours will be required for all tasks above and will be done on a time and materials basis. If more work is required, NV5 will inform RTC before moving forward with further work.

2.2B – **Structural Support Services**

During the construction of the structural elements, including the La Fonda Avenue Overcrossing, the sound walls and the retaining walls, the following activities are anticipated.

- Respond to RFIs
• Review Shop Drawings (for Retaining Wall No. 5)
• Prepare 4-Scale Drawing for La Fonda OC
• Review Bridge Demolition Plan
• Review Falsework, Reinforcement, Post Tensioning & Type 7 Rail Shop Drawings
• Review Materials Submittals
• Attend meetings and conduct field reviews during bridge and wall construction

It is assumed approximately 570 man-hours will be required for structural support services and will be done on a time and materials basis. If more work is required, NV5 will inform RTC before moving forward with further work.

2.3 As-Built Drawings & Microstation Conversion

At the conclusion of construction, NV5 will prepare record drawings in hard copy and electronic format in accordance with Caltrans and RTC requirements. The as-built drawings will be based on the construction management team’s redlined plans and contractor’s approved changes. NV5 assumes initial work to be approximately 1 hour per sheet with 145 sheets total.

As part of Caltrans requirements, the electronic files of the plans will need to be converted from AutoCAD format drawings into Microstation format. It is assumed that each drawing will take about 3 man-hours to convert from AutoCAD to Microstation. The converted files will be backchecked for consistency before being submitted to Caltrans for approval.

Task 3 - Direct Expenses

Hand materials, such as the geotechnical report, are required to be given to the contractor as part of the contract. Information used in the Resident Engineer’s file is also an expense to the project.
NV5 proposes to provide the above services on a Time and Materials basis. The total fee for this scope of services will be $268,300. The fee estimate will not be exceeded without the prior written authorization of RTC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TASK 1 - BID SUPPORT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Prepare Bid Package</td>
<td>$ 15,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Support During Bid Period</td>
<td>$ 9,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK 2 – DESIGN SUPPORT DURING CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Design Support Project Management</td>
<td>$ 15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2A</td>
<td>Construction Support Activities – General</td>
<td>$ 72,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2B</td>
<td>Construction Support Activities – Structural Services</td>
<td>$ 85,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>As-Built Drawings &amp; Microstation Conversion</td>
<td>$ 68,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK 3 – DIRECT EXPENSES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td>$ 1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL FEE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$ 268,300</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESOLUTION NO.

Adopted by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
on the date of September 15, 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
              RTC Planner
### HWY 1 CONSTRUCTION: 722200

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK ELEMENT #883</th>
<th>FY11-12 APPROVED 08/18/11</th>
<th>FY11-12 PROPOSED 09/15/11</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE - All funds and expenditures estimated to be carried over from FY 10-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 STIP Construction</td>
<td>2,150,000</td>
<td>2,150,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 CMIA Construction</td>
<td>16,190,000</td>
<td>16,190,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
<td>18,340,000</td>
<td>18,340,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENDITURES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Salaries and Benefits</td>
<td>66,000</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL SERVICES &amp; SUPPLIES</strong></td>
<td>18,200,000</td>
<td>18,275,000</td>
<td>-75,000</td>
<td>Moved to construction management team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNAPPROPRIATED REVENUES</strong></td>
<td>76,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-75,000</td>
<td>Moved to construction management team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>18,340,000</td>
<td>18,340,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGENDA: September 15, 2011

TO: Regional Transportation Commission (RTC)
FROM: Luis Pavel Mendez, Deputy Director
RE: 2010-2011 Santa Cruz County Grand Jury Report

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) approve the proposed responses (Attachment 2) to the 2010-2011 Santa Cruz County Grand Jury Final Report.

BACKGROUND

As required by State law 19 randomly selected citizens of Santa Cruz County are empanelled every year as a grand jury in Santa Cruz County. The charge of the Santa Cruz County Grand Jury is to:

- To examine all aspects of city and county governments and special districts by initiating its own investigations;
- To serve as ombudsmen for the citizens of the cities and county; and
- To conduct criminal investigations and, if the evidence is sufficient, issue criminal indictments in lieu of a preliminary Superior Court hearing.

The 2010-2011 Grand Jury Final Report includes a section on transportation titled Back to Future: Regional Gridlock and Local Planning Paralysis (Attachment 1).

DISCUSSION

The findings and recommendations in the transportation section of the 2010-2011 Grand Jury Final Report require a response from the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) by October 1, 2011. According to the Back to the Future chapter of the 2010-2011 Grand Jury Final Report:

“The Grand Jury initially investigated the fiscal impacts of the proposed acquisition of the rail line through Santa Cruz County by the RTC. During the course of the investigation, we found evidence that very little coordination existed between the local jurisdictions and the RTC in the development of the transportation and housing elements of general plans. Development of the general plans by local jurisdictions has ostensibly ignored the detailed Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) developed by the RTC.

The Grand Jury observed that there was a broader issue regarding coordination of transportation planning between the local jurisdictions and the RTC. Our focus was subsequently redirected to an investigation of this lack of coordination.”
The Grand Jury commends the transportation planning work of the RTC and recommends that the RTC write the transportation sections of the local jurisdictions’ general plans. RTC staff appreciates the Grand Jury’s commendation of RTC’s work, specifically the recently completed 2010 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

The RTC staff believes that there is coordination between the local jurisdictions and the RTC in transportation planning and that there are many overarching transportation planning and policy measures included in the Regional Transportation Plan that could also be included in the local general plans. However, RTC staff believes that each local jurisdiction is uniquely suited to integrate the inclusive regional initiatives into their own locally specific General Plans and to combine the transportation element with the housing, land use, conservation, open space, noise and safety elements required in the plan.

In addition, both the RTP and circulation elements of General Plans have specific requirements and guidelines per state law. For example, the RTP acknowledges that there is insufficient funding to implement every project, program and strategy listed in the RTP, so the projects are separated into two lists: constrained or within projected funding estimates, and unconstrained or beyond projected funding estimates. Also, RTP’s must be updated every 4 or 5 years while general plans may not be updated for 20 years or more.

Staff has prepared draft responses to the 2010-2011 Grand Jury Final Report and they are included as Attachment 2. **Staff recommends that the RTC approve these proposed responses to the 2010-2011 Santa Cruz County Grand Jury Final Report.**

**SUMMARY**

The 2010-2011 Grand Jury Final Report includes a section on transportation which requires response from the RTC by October 1, 2011. Staff recommends that the RTC approved the proposed responses (Attachment 2) to the 2010-2011 Santa Cruz County Grand Jury Final Report.

**Attachments:**
1. Back to the Future: Regional Gridlock and Local Planning Paralysis
2. Draft responses to the 2010-2011 Grand Jury Report

\Rtcserv2\shared\RTC\TC2011\0911\GrandJury\GrandJuryResp0911.docx
Summary

The lack of integrative planning between the Regional Transportation Commission and the planning departments of the county and cities has resulted in deplorable traffic congestion along the Highway 1 corridor on a daily basis. The Regional Transportation Commission has noted that one of the fundamental reasons for the congestion is a lack of consensus among the political stakeholders. The County, which is responsible for the unincorporated areas, and the cities have chosen not to integrate their transportation plans with those provided by the Regional Transportation Commission. Therefore, the Grand Jury recommends the transportation sections of all general plans for the county and cities should be written by the Regional Transportation Commission.

Definitions

- **AB 32**: Assembly Bill 32, the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006.
- **AMBAG**: The Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments. A 24-member board of directors comprised of elected officials from each city and county within the region from Monterey, San Benito and Santa Cruz counties. AMBAG serves as a federally designated Metropolitan Planning Organization and Council of Governments, and is responsible for regional collaboration and problem solving. Membership and participation is voluntary.
- **Caltrans**: California Department of Transportation.
- **RTP**: Regional Transportation Plan.
- **SCCRTC (RTC)**: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission. The commission is made up of the five county supervisors, one member from each of the four incorporated cities in the County and three members appointed by the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District Board of Directors. Caltrans serves as a non-voting member of the commission. The RTC responsibilities include ensuring improved mobility, access and air quality; allocating funding for the transportation system; setting priorities for transportation infrastructure; and conducting programs to encourage the use of alternative transportation. The RTC develops comprehensive transportation plans for Santa Cruz County.
- **SB 375**: Senate Bill 375, passed in 2008, enhancing the ability to reach the goals promoted by AB 32.

Background

The Grand Jury initially investigated the fiscal impacts of the proposed acquisition of the rail line through Santa Cruz County by the RTC. During the course of the investigation, we found evidence that very little coordination existed between the local jurisdictions and the RTC in the development of the transportation and housing elements of general plans. Development of the general plans by local jurisdictions has ostensibly ignored the detailed Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) developed by the RTC.1
The population of Santa Cruz County has grown significantly in the past four decades, from 123,790 in 1970\(^2\) to 262,382\(^3\) in 2010. Improvements to the primary transportation corridor of Highway 1 have not kept up with the population growth, resulting in congested traffic conditions between the cities of Santa Cruz and Watsonville. Although alternative means of addressing this quagmire have been discussed, no coordinated plan has been implemented by any of the local jurisdictions.

The local jurisdictions are not accepting the transporting planning leadership provided by the RTC. The RTC has produced the most robust and comprehensive regional transportation plan to date,\(^1\) but the other jurisdictions, such as the County of Santa Cruz,\(^4\) cities of Santa Cruz,\(^5\) Capitola,\(^6\) Watsonville,\(^7\) and Scotts Valley\(^8\) appear to be operating in a vacuum, without regard to how well their plans integrate with the RTP.\(^1\) This lack of integration across transportation plans has obstructed the implementation of the improvements to the transportation corridors that will alleviate current conditions.

**Scope**

The Grand Jury interviewed personnel of various planning departments, agencies, and local organizations. Although the interviews were unscripted, we did ask three key questions listed below at each interview:

- What, in your opinion, should be done with the railroad acquisition in the long-term?
- How will this affect our long-term population distribution, business location and traffic patterns?
- Which agency, in your opinion, should be developing and EXECUTING long-term development plans in order to take advantage of the railroad acquisition?

The Grand Jury observed that there was a broader issue regarding coordination of transportation planning between the local jurisdictions and the RTC. Our focus was subsequently redirected to an investigation of this lack of coordination.

**Investigation**

There is little disagreement that the current major transportation arteries of Santa Cruz County are congested during specific windows of time during the day. This condition will worsen in the future as the aggregate population of the county continues to grow. From the 2010 RTP,\(^1\)

> Many drivers complain about regularly being stuck in traffic. In a September 2007 RTC poll of likely Santa Cruz County voters “traffic and transportation” tied with “affordable housing/low income housing/cost of living” as the most important problem in the region. Area residents pay for traffic congestion in a number of ways including wasted time, increased air pollution, higher stress levels, fewer visitor dollars, and the apparent trend toward more aggressive driving habits. As we plan our transportation system for the next 25 years, addressing the seemingly intractable problem of traffic congestion is one of our key challenges.

The overarching causes of this problem are straightforward - an increasing number of drivers, a relative decrease in the rate at which transportation projects are being funded and constructed,
and an ongoing lack of consensus for how to deal with congestion issues. Again, from the 2010 RTP:

There are three fundamental reasons why traffic congestion is a major issue in the county, as well as elsewhere in the state and nation. First, more people are driving more miles than ever before and per person vehicle registrations are at an all time high. Second, decreases in the amount of transportation funding available for local projects has meant that our investment in transportation facilities and services has not kept pace with growing demands for road space and transportation alternatives. Third, there has been a lack of consensus on how to invest in our transportation system. To effectively improve mobility for all Santa Cruz County residents, it is useful to understand each of these factors.

We gathered background information in an attempt to understand the possible long-term implications of the railroad purchase in the initial stages of the investigation. While looking into the environmental and fiscal impacts of different modes of transportation in the county, we also reviewed the procedural differences of transportation planning among the different jurisdictional agencies, including the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission,[1] County of Santa Cruz Planning Department,[4] City of Santa Cruz Planning Department,[2] City of Capitola Community Development Department,[6] City of Watsonville Community Development Department,[8] and the City of Scotts Valley Planning Department.[8]

Many of our initial interviews highlighted the importance of Assembly Bill 32[9] and Senate Bill 375,[10] both of which make a distinct link between the integrated planning for housing and transportation. Many of those interviewed felt that the first passed bill, AB 32 (Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006),[9] was too weak with respect to punitive consequences for jurisdictions that did not comply with the objectives of the bill.

SB 375[10] was passed in 2008, enhancing the ability to reach the goals promoted by AB 32,[9] which included long range development planning that endeavored to create more sustainable communities. The bill sets timeline targets for both 2020 and 2035 for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions from passenger vehicles. AMBAG is currently working on producing a regional planning blueprint that incorporates the goals of SB 375 and AB 32 (Envisioning the Monterey Bay Area: A Blueprint for Sustainable Growth and Smart Infrastructure).[11] Some interviewees stated local county and city agencies have delayed updating their transportation plans in anticipation of the production of a guiding regional planning blueprint by AMBAG. The RTC is the only county agency that has completed a comprehensive regional transportation plan[1] that already incorporates most of the goals of both bills, ahead of final production of the AMBAG “Blueprint.”

In reviewing general plans for both the county[4] and the four incorporated cities[5][6][7][8] within the county, as well as the 2010 RTP,[1] we observed no evidence of integrated planning between appropriate entities. For example, none of the existing general plans have substantively incorporated transportation elements outlined in the RTP.[1] It appears conflicting, narrowly defined policy objectives are the reason for this lack of integrated planning. As stated in the 2010 RTP:[1]
Given the reality of limited funds & the delicate balance between benefits and impacts of major and minor projects, strong disagreements about priorities have continued to divide the community. At times, public opinion is stronger in opposition of transportation options than for them, causing a community paralysis that can inhibit compromise. This lack of agreement can make it difficult for decision makers to move forward with projects acceptable to their diverse constituencies.

A critical component for the creation and implementation of transportation plans is a reliable source of funding. When the 2010 RTP\[1\] was created, the RTC assumed that a half-cent sales tax would be approved by 2012.\[1\] Their reasoning was that 84% of the population in California live in areas which have approved local funding measures to address their transportation needs. Sales taxes require voter approval, which makes this source of funding unreliable. In addition, fluctuating economic cycles can adversely affect future revenues. The RTC has little long-term funding for future planning without this assumed funding source.

To summarize, the citizens of Santa Cruz County are burdened with bad traffic congestion along the Highway 1 corridor on a daily basis, primarily due to the fact that the number of drivers is growing, while transportation infrastructure improvements have not kept pace. This problem is driven by a lack of integrative planning and policy consensus between the RTC and the county and city legislative bodies. The RTC is clearly providing detailed and substantive long-range transportation planning guidance to the local jurisdictions. However, absent a mandate to incorporate RTC plans, local jurisdictions do not include comprehensive, up-to-date regional transportation planning within their general plans.

**Findings**

**F1.** Traffic congestion on Highway 1 corridor is problematic.

**F2.** Local jurisdictions do not implement the regional transportation plan created by the RTC.

**F3.** Lack of consensus between the local jurisdictions and the RTC staff obstructs the coordination of the local transportation plans with the Regional Transportation Plan.

**F4.** Each agency’s General Plan is an integrated document that includes housing and transportation as elements. There is no mandated link between the local agency’s General Plans and the Regional Transportation Plan.

**F5.** No consistent long-term funding source is currently available for RTC planning.

**Recommendations**

**R1.** Transportation sections of all county and city general plans should be written by Regional Transportation Commission staff.

**R2.** The local jurisdictions should review the transportation sections developed by RTC staff for adequacy every two years and RTC staff should be required to revise when necessary.
R3. The RTC should develop cost estimates and pursue stable funding sources to implement recommendations one and two.

Commendations

The Grand Jury would like to acknowledge the exceptional work the RTC has accomplished in creating, and periodically updating, comprehensive regional transportation plans. Their plans provide a framework for jurisdictions to integrate their local transportation plans with others in the county.

Responses Required

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Respond Within/Respond By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>F1-F4</td>
<td>R1-R3</td>
<td>90 days October 1, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission</td>
<td>F1–F5</td>
<td>R1-R3</td>
<td>90 Days October 1, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Santa Cruz Planning Department</td>
<td>F2-F4</td>
<td>R1-R2</td>
<td>60 days September 1, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Cruz City Council</td>
<td>F1-F4</td>
<td>R1-R2</td>
<td>90 days October 1, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Cruz Planning Department</td>
<td>F2-F4</td>
<td>R1-R2</td>
<td>60 days September 1, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Watsonville City Council</td>
<td>F1-F4</td>
<td>R1-R2</td>
<td>90 days October 1, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watsonville Community Development Department</td>
<td>F2-F4</td>
<td>R1-R2</td>
<td>60 days September 1, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Capitola City Council</td>
<td>F1-F4</td>
<td>R1-R2</td>
<td>90 days October 1, 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Sources


ATTACHMENT 2

Draft Responses to the Back to the Future Chapter of the 2010-2011 Grand Jury Final Report

Finding F1: Traffic congestion on Highway 1 corridor is problematic.

Draft response: Agree

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC), Caltrans and the local jurisdictions and other agencies have been working to address traffic congestion along the Highway 1 corridor and parallel roads that are used as alternate routes to the highway by implementing congestion reducing projects and programs. These include:

1. Highway 1/Mission Street project – completed in 2002
2. Highway 1/17 Merge Lanes project – completed in 2007
3. Highway 1 Freeway Service Patrol (FSP) program – ongoing
4. Traffic Operations System (changeable message signs, highway advisory radio) - ongoing
5. Capitola Road Widening
6. Commute Solutions program - ongoing

Congestion on the Highway 1 corridor continues to be problematic and impacts not only the highway but also local streets. Therefore, work continues on future projects which include:

1. Highway 1 - Soquel to Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes: Construction anticipated to begin in early 2012
2. Highway 1 HOV Lanes from Morrissey Boulevard to Larkin Valley Road: includes auxiliary lanes, bicycle and pedestrian overcrossings, and transit improvements to facilitate express bus service; completion of environmental document anticipated in 2013; an approved local sales tax measure will likely be required to fund the construction of this $500 million project.
3. Highway 1 Million Gallon Challenge: Funding is being sought for targeted strategies to reduce fuel consumption and congestion by increasing vehicle occupancy on the most congested sections of Highway 1.
4. Highway 1 San Lorenzo River Bridge Widening: Project development documents are being produced; funding is yet to be identified for this $20 million project and an approved local sales tax measure would help to provide funding for this and other projects.

Finding F2: Local jurisdictions do not implement the regional transportation plan created by the RTC.

Draft response: Partially Agree
Regional Transportation Plans (RTP) are developed by the RTC with the active participation of the cities, the county, Santa Cruz Metro, Caltrans and other partners. The RTP provides a listing of transportation projects, programs and strategies that the Santa Cruz County community desires to implement to ensure a sound transportation system. Many of the projects and strategies included in the RTP were recommended for approval based on a selection and vetting process through each jurisdiction. Because the document also is focused on regional transportation issues, much of the detailed local project information is more appropriately contained in local jurisdiction General Plans and other documents. As shown in the RTP, there are sufficient funds to implement only a fraction of the transportation projects, programs and strategies listed in the RTP. Therefore, the RTC, the local jurisdictions and others cannot implement a significant portion of the RTP due to insufficient transportation funding. Some of the reasons for insufficient transportation funding include:

1. Funding from state and federal sources for transportation projects, programs and planning has been decreasing, while the needs and requirements are increasing;
2. One of the main sources of funding is based on the quantity of motor vehicle fuel sold, which decreases as vehicles become more efficient and inflation decreases the value of revenues relative to costs; and
3. Efforts to secure local funds have not been successful due to the economy, the super majority requirement, and diverse community opinions

If more transportation funding became available possibly through a local sales tax or other funding mechanism approved through a ballot measure with a 2/3 vote, a much more significant portion of the RTP could be implemented by the local jurisdictions and others. In addition, the RTP uses a 25-30 year planning horizon. Projects included in the RTP could be constructed in the short, medium or long term.

Finding F3: Lack of consensus between the local jurisdictions and the RTC staff obstructs the coordination of the local transportation plans with the Regional Transportation Plan.

Draft Response: Disagree

The local jurisdictions actively participate with the RTC and other agencies in the production of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). In addition, there are many opportunities for public input into the development of the RTP insuring that community members are able to weigh in on the direction of the plan and ensure that it meets local needs. Therefore, the RTP is not just a work product of the RTC but of the community as a whole including the local jurisdictions. The RTP must be updated every four or five years. The local transportation plans are included in the local jurisdictions' general plans and those general plans do not require updates as often as the RTP. Therefore, there can be discrepancies between the local jurisdictions' general plans and the RTP because the general plans may not be updated for 20 years or more.
Finding F4: Each agency's General Plan is an integrated document that includes housing and transportation as elements. There is no mandated link between the local agency's General Plans and the Regional Transportation Plan.

Draft Response: Partially Agree

General plans are indeed integrated documents that include housing and transportation or circulation elements. Traditionally there has not been a mandated link between general plans and the RTC other than consistency between the two. However, statewide efforts that resulted in AB32 and SB375, recognized this weak link between transportation planning and other planning and resulted in requirements for more interagency coordination and cooperation to address our transportation, land use, air quality and global warming concerns. As a result transportation planning and land use planning agencies are required to increase cooperation levels to produce regional transportation plans that will include a sustainable community strategy. Unfortunately, AB32 and SB375 did not include the funding necessary to implement the more coordinated regional transportation plans and the sustainable community strategy.

Finding F5: No consistent long-term funding source is currently available for RTC planning.

Draft Response: Partially Agree

The RTC uses a variety of federal, state and local funding sources for the transportation planning work that it performs. Some of the regular on-going funding sources are more consistent than others but they are always insufficient for all the work already required and the additional work that becomes required periodically. The RTC augments the on-going funding sources with one-time grants that it has successfully secured through competition with other applicants.

Projects and programs identified through the planning work face an even more significant funding challenge. The amount of federal, state and local funds available to the Santa Cruz County region for transportation projects and programs is a small fraction of the amount needed. As a result it can take a very long time to fund and complete projects, especially the larger ones and by the time they are completed, they no longer suffice.

Recommendation R1: Transportation sections of all county and city general plans should be written by Regional Transportation Commission staff.

Draft Response: Will not be implemented

Local jurisdictions are well suited to write their general plans based on the local needs, as expressed by constituents, local input processes and local decision
makers. RTC is well suited to analyze and plan for regional needs, in coordination with local jurisdictions and neighboring counties. A number of regional and local efforts demonstrate the increased coordination that is already taking place in our area without the need for the RTC to write the transportation sections of the local jurisdictions’ general plans. These efforts include:

1. The Blueprint Plan developed through a collaborative process by local agencies to determine a regional growth and conservation strategy called Envisioning the Monterey Bay Area. This effort, otherwise known as the “Blueprint,” focuses on improved mobility, accessibility and coordinated transportation and local land use for the region’s future population while preserving the most important agricultural lands and conservation areas;
2. Development of a Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS) as part of the 2014 Regional Transportation Plan to reduce per capita vehicle miles traveled and related GHG through coordinated land use and transportation planning;
3. Application of the Sustainable Transportation Analysis and Rating System (STARS) to the development of the 2014 Regional Transportation Plan;
4. The Santa Cruz County Sustainable Community and Transit Corridor Plan (Santa Cruz County Planning Department secured a state grant for this plan which includes the participation of the RTC, Santa Cruz Metro and other agencies to help ensure coordination); and
5. Development of the City of Santa Cruz General Plan (RTC staff was invited by City of Santa Cruz Planning Department staff and participated in discussing items in the circulation element of the general plan and the EIR).

Since the early work on the Blueprint Plan began in 2008 there has been a much greater degree of communication and coordination between city and county planning staff and the staff at the RTC. Awareness of planning, growth and transportation issues has grown across traditional boundaries between agencies.

**Recommendation R2:** The local jurisdictions should review the transportation sections developed by RTC staff for adequacy every two years and RTC staff should be required to revise when necessary.

**Draft Response:** Will not be implemented

Since R1 above will not be implemented, there is no need to implement this recommendation. See response to R1 above.

**Recommendation R3:** The RTC should develop cost estimates and pursue stable funding sources to implement recommendations one and two.

**Draft Response:** Will not be implemented

Since R1 and R2 above will not be implemented, there is no need to implement this recommendation. See responses to R1 and R2 above.