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 November 17, 2011 Special SCCRTC meeting

5. Approve draft minutes of the November 8, 2011 Elderly and Disabled Technical Advisory Committee (E&DTAC) meeting

6. Approve draft minutes of the November 14, 2011 Bicycle Committee meeting

7. Approve draft minutes of the November 17, 2011 Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC) meeting

POLICY ITEMS

No consent items

PROJECTS and PLANNING ITEMS

No consent items

BUDGET AND EXPENDITURES ITEMS

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

ADMINISTRATION ITEMS
No consent items

INFORMATION/OTHER ITEMS

9. Accept monthly meeting schedule

10. Accept correspondence log

11. Accept letters from SCCRTC committees and staff to other agencies
   a. Letter from RTC Bicycle Committee Chair, David Casterson to Ken Anderson City of Scotts Valley Public Works regarding appreciation for shared roadway bicycle markings.
   b. Letter from RTC Bicycle Committee Chair, David Casterson to various elected officials regarding reauthorization of the federal transportation act.

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

13. Accept information items
   a. Santa Cruz County “State of the Pavements” 2011 Update Presentation
   b. Executive Summary of California Statewide Local Streets and Roads Needs Assessment – 2011 Final Report

REGULAR AGENDA

14. Commissioner reports - oral reports

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

16. Elect RTC Chair and Vice-chair for 2012-oral report
   (Mark Stone, Commission Chair)

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

18. FY 11/12 Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 8 allocation claim from the City of Santa Cruz for bikeway striping and minor improvements
   (Cory Caletti, Senior Transportation Planner)
   a. Staff report
   b. Resolution approving the City of Santa Cruz Article 8 TDA claim
19. Single County Metropolitan Transportation Organization (MPO)  
   (George Dondero, Executive Director)
   a. Staff report
   b. Summary report
   c. Appendices to report (available on the RTC website)

20. 10:00 A.M. PUBLIC HEARING: 2012 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP)  
    (Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner)
   a. Staff report
   b. Resolution Adopting the 2012 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP)
   c. Proposed STIP projects
   d. Map of STIP Proposed Projects
   e. Benefit Summary - STIP Project Nominations
   f. Proposed RSTP projects
   g. Proposed Amendments to Existing Projects
   h. Project Fact Sheets
   i. RTIP Project Listings
   a. Public comments – Comments received as of November 22, 2011 are included in the packet

21. Draft State and Federal Legislative Agenda and State Legislative Update  
    (Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner)
   a. Staff report
   b. Presentation from John Arriaga and Steve Schnaidt, JEA and Associates

22. Review of items to be discussed in closed session

   CLOSED SESSION

23. Conference with legal counsel pursuant to Government Code 54956.9(c) to consider initiation of litigation for one potential case

   OPEN SESSION

24. Report on closed session

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

26. Next Meetings

   The next Transportation Policy Workshop meeting is scheduled for Thursday, December 15, 2011 at 9:00 a.m. at the SCCRTC Offices, 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA.
The next SCCRTC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, December 1, 2011 at 9:00 a.m. at the Board of Supervisors Chambers, 701 Ocean St., Santa Cruz, CA.

HOW TO REACH US

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

HOW TO STAY INFORMED ABOUT RTC MEETINGS, AGENDAS & NEWS

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

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

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

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

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

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

HOW TO REQUEST

❖ ACCOMMODATIONS FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES

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

✧ **SERVICIOS DE TRADUCCIÓN/ TRANSLATION SERVICES**

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

Thursday, November 17, 2011
9:00 a.m.

Scotts Valley City Council Chambers
One Civic Center Dr
Scotts Valley, CA

1. Roll call

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

Members present:
Dene Bustichi        John Leopold
Greg Caput           Don Lane
Andy Schiffrin (Alt.) Kirby Nicol
Daniel Dodge (Alt.)  Ellen Pirie
Donald Hagen         Lynn Robinson
Brandy Rider (ex officio) Mark Stone
Randy Johnson

Staff present:
George Dondero       Yesenia Parra
Luis Mendez          Kim Shultz
Rachel Moriconi      Ginger Dykaar

2. Oral communications

Jack Nelson noted that the automobile is an object that takes up a lot of space but can only move very few people at any one time. He also noted the proposal from the City of Santa Cruz regarding the change to Pacific Ave and said they faced a similar issue as the RTC on Hwy 1. The RTC is proposing a project that promotes more vehicle use but does not have the infrastructure to support all the additional needs that come with vehicle congestion.

3. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agendas

Executive Director George Dondero noted that there were handouts for items 15, 18 and 2 pages of flyers for upcoming public workshops.
Chair Mark Stone moved item 23 of the regular agenda to right before item 20.

CONSENT AGENDA
(Nicole/Leopold, unanimous)

MINUTES
4. Approved draft minutes of the October 6, 2011 regular SCCRTC meeting
5. Approved draft minutes of the October 20, 2011 Transportation Policy Workshop (TPW) meeting

POLICY ITEMS
No consent items

PROJECTS and PLANNING ITEMS
6. Accepted first quarter quarterly Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) work program progress report

BUDGET AND EXPENDITURES ITEMS
7. Accepted status report on Transportation Development Act (TDA) revenues

ADMINISTRATION ITEMS
8. Approved 2012 RTC health insurance contribution amounts for active and retired RTC employees (Resolution)

INFORMATION/OTHER ITEMS
9. Accepted monthly meeting schedule
10. Accepted correspondence log
11. Accepted letters from SCCRTC committees and staff to other agencies
   a. Letter from Executive Director George Dondero to Governor, Jerry Brown regarding Senate Bill (SB) 293 requesting a veto.
12. Accepted miscellaneous written comments from the public on SCCRTC projects and transportation issues
13. Accepted information items
a. Article- “California Turns to China for New Bay Bridge” by Richard Gonzales
b. Article- “Alarming State Report Predicts $294 Billion Shortfall for Transportation Over Next Decade” by Gary Richards, San Jose Mercury News
c. Letter from Assembly Member Luis Alejo regarding information on Senate Bill (SB) 436
d. Letter to Bimla Rhinehart, California Transportation Commission regarding 2011 Statewide Transportation System Needs Assessment

REGULAR AGENDA

14. Commissioner reports

Chair Mark Stone said that at the last Transportation Policy Work Shop (TPW) meeting the Commission approved the creation of 2 ad hoc committees, one for the polling survey proposal and the second to determine the feasibility of the RTC becoming a congestion management agency. Staff will send an email to Commissioners and Commissioners interested in serving on either of these committees should respond to staff.

15. Director’s report

Executive Director Dondero reported that the RTC Transportation Café will be taping a session on Friday in Spanish. Commissioner Eduardo Montesino, Luis Mendez and Yesenia Parra will be the participants. These shows are posted on the RTC website, RTC facebook and Community TV’s website. He also noted that the RTC facebook page has 60 “likes” so far and that a more detailed report will be provided to the Commissioners at a future RTC meeting.

Mr. Dondero reported that the Surface Transportation Board indicated that the RTC application for the rail line purchase is still under review.

He also noted that he attended the Focus on the Future Conference in San Francisco where counties who are not yet self-help counties held a meeting. The group agreed to meet on a regular basis. The meetings will probably be held at the same time as CTC meetings. He also reported that Napa will be taking a ballot measure for transportation to its voters in 2012.

Mr. Dondero noted several upcoming workshops and invited Commissioners and the public to participate. The workshop schedule is as follows:

- November 17, 2011 from 6:00-9:00 pm- Sustainability workshop at the Live Oak Senior Center. Information obtained will provide guidance for the 2014 RTP project and policies. A survey will also be available on the RTC website that will ask how the RTC should evaluate sustainability.
- Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail public informational workshops
  - December 13, 2011 at the Davenport Pacific Elementary School
  - December 14, 2011 at the Live Oak Simpkins Swim Center
December 15, 2011 at the City of Watsonville Civic Plaza Community room.
- December 6, 2011 from 8:00 am to 6:00 pm-Designing for Bicycles and pedestrians planning workshop at the Ecology Action conference room.

He also reported that on November 29, 2011 RTC staff will meet with staff from TAMC, AMBAG and SaCOG to discuss ways to improve efficiencies, collaboration and resources sharing. This will be the first of several meeting.

Commissioner Nicol asked staff to provide the RTC with more information on self help counties to include how long they have been self help counties, and if the status has helped them obtain funding. Commissioner Nicol noted that he conducted an informal poll of the public works departments in the county to determine the backlog of road maintenance, which he discovered to be at about $100 million.

Commissioner Leopold said that the County Supervisors received a presentation regarding the state of local roads in the unincorporated areas. He also noted the report prepared by The California Association of Counties (CSAC) and the League of California cities that documented the state of local roads throughout the state. He noted that the County would need $12 million just to maintain its current infrastructure.

Commissioner Dodge arrived.

16. Caltrans report and consider action items

Brandy Rider, Caltrans District 5 said that the guardrail and concrete median barrier of a 14 mile stretch of highway 1 (Trafton Rd to N. of 41st Ave) had begun and will go through February 2012. She also noted that Caltrans awarded 66 million for Safe Routes to School funding which included $1.1 million to Santa Cruz for projects that include sidewalks, curb ramps and traffic enforcement among a few. Grant deadlines for Federal discretionary and planning grants are coming up.

17. Appoint nominating committee for RTC Chair and Vice-chair

Chair Mark Stone appointed, Commissioners, Pirie, Leopold, Lane and Commissioner Alternate Dodge. The committee will make a recommendation for Chair and vice-chair at the December 1, 2011 meeting.

18. 2012 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP): Preliminary Staff Recommendations

Rachel Moriconi reviewed the criteria used to determine which projects to recommend for funding and reminded the commissioners that the amount of funding needed for proposed projects far exceeds the $9 million in State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and $1.4 million in Regional
Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds currently available for programming.

She noted the public hearing at the December 1, 2011 RTC meeting which will be held at the County Government Center, where the RTC will select projects to receive the STIP and RSTIP funds.

Commissioners discussed several projects on the proposed list and reiterated their direction to staff to work with the CTC to allow STIP funds for local road projects.

Commissioner Robinson arrived.

Martha Kaufeldt, Nelson Rd. resident thanked the Commission for listening to the Nelson Rd. residents’ concerns and said that the current road condition does not allow for emergency vehicle access. She shared that just recently a vehicle went over the embankment and that the tow truck was unable to drive to the scene due to its size and that the residents pulled the vehicle out.

Jack Nelson said that it is the Commissioners responsibility to determine priorities and make the tough decisions.

Commissioner Alternate, Schiffrin motioned to direct staff to provide a list of project options that could be funded if the 4 million dollars currently recommended for the Hwy1 Auxiliary Lanes project was not approved. Commissioner Caput seconded the motion. After significant discussion and clarification the motion failed on a 5 to 7 vote.

19. Highway 1 Corridor future funding scenarios

Executive Director George Dondero said that this information item was requested by Commissioners at the October 6, 2011 RTC meeting. Commissioners discussed the various project costs and funding options listed on the staff report. Some Commissioners suggested that the project title be changed.

Jack Nelson asked if the auxiliary lanes would be designed to more easily accommodate HOV lanes in the future.

23. Adjourn to special meeting of the Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (Moved up by Chair Stone) – Taken out of order prior to item 20.

The Commission adjourned the regular RTC meeting at 10:35 to convene the special meeting of the Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies and reconvened to the regular RTC meeting at 10:50 am.

20. Review of items to be discussed in closed session
CLOSED SESSION

21. Conference with legal counsel pursuant to Government Code 54956.9(c) to consider initiation of litigation for one potential case

Commission convened into closed session at 10:52 am

OPEN SESSION

22. Report on closed session

Commission reconvened to open session at 11:45 am. There were no reports on the closed session item.

Meeting adjourned at 11:46 am.

24. Next Meetings

The next SCCRTC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, December 1, 2011 at 9:00 a.m. at the Board of Supervisors Chambers, 701 Ocean St., Santa Cruz, CA.

The next Transportation Policy Workshop meeting is scheduled for Thursday, December 15, 2011 at 9:00 a.m. at the SCCRTC Offices, 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA.

Respectfully submitted,

Yesenia Parra, Staff

ATTENDEES

Scott Wood          California Highway Patrol
Les White           SCMT
Steve Wiesener      Santa Cruz County Public Works
Jack Nelson         
Bob Orser           
Jeri Davis          Nelson Rd resident
Dan Herron          Caltrans
Mark Dettle         City of Santa Cruz
Chris Schneiter     City of Santa Cruz
Martha Kaufeldt     Nelson Rd resident
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission's
Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee
Social Service Transportation Advisory Council
Paratransit Advisory Council Meeting

MINUTES-DRAFT
Tuesday, November 8, 2011

1. Call to Order

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

2. Introductions

Members Present:
Kirk Ance, CTSA Lift Line
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)
Mike Molesky, Social Service Provider-Disabled (County)
Patti Shevlin, 1st District

Alternates Present:
April Warnock, SCMTD

Staff Present:
Cathy Judd
Karena Pushnik
Rachel Moriconi

Others Present:
Ciro Aguirre, SCMTD
Frank Bauer, SCMTD
Tove Beatty, SCMTD

3. Oral Communications

Staff distributed a memo provided by Charlie Dixon about the ADA trails for the Arana Gulch including a request for people to attend the December 8th Coastal Commission meeting in San Francisco.

Karena Pushnik invited E&D TAC members to upcoming SCCRTC workshops: 1) Sustainability Workshop on November 17th from 6-9 pm at the Elena Baskin Senior Center; 2) December 6th workshop for the design of bicycle and pedestrian facilities; and 3) Community workshops for the Sanctuary Scenic Trail network that will be held from 6-8pm on December 13 in North County at the Davenport Resource Center, December 14 in Mid-County at the Simpkins Swim Center and December 15 in South County at the Watsonville Civic Plaza.

Ms. Pushnik also announced that the RTC is the construction manager for the 1-mile segment of the Highway 1 Auxiliary lanes project from Soquel to Morrissey and will kick off the project in mid-January with an open house/informational meeting.

4. Additions and Deletions

There were none.

CONSENT AGENDA
**Action:** The motion (Kempf/Elsea) -- to approve and accept the consent agenda -- carried unanimously.

5. Approved Minutes from August 9, 2011 meeting

6. Received Transportation Development Act Revenues Report as of September 2011

7. Received RTC Highlights through October 2011

8. Accepted Monterey County Taxi Authority Update

9. Accepted Information Items
   a. Sentinel article 10/7/11 titled *Ticket to Ride* about the Volunteer Center’s transportation program
   b. Pogonip Master Plan – Master Plan Amendment and New East Multi-Use Trail Mitigated Negative Declaration and Initial Study by the City of Santa Cruz. The deadline for comments is November 28, 2011.
   c. Project Action article on Transportation and Health/Wellness Connection

10. Received Agency Updates
    a. Volunteer Center
       - Receive 3rd Quarter Report
    b. Community Bridges/CTSA
       - Receive 4th and Year End FY2010-2011 TDA Reports
    c. Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (METRO)
       - ParaCruz Operations Status Report: April – September 2011
       - Accessible Services Report: August – October 2011
    d. Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
       - Sustainability Elements to include in next RTC Update, November 17, 6-8pm
       - Sanctuary Scenic Trail Workshops, December 13-15, 6-8pm
    e. Private Operators

**REGULAR AGENDA**

11. Consideration of Mobility Restraining Device for Fixed Route Buses – Metro Staff

    Ciro Aguirre, Metro staff, provided an overview of proposed new Q-Pod Mobility Restraining Devices for fixed route buses. Mr. Aguirre said that Metro would be getting 11 new buses with a federal grant called the State of Good Repair. A power point presentation by Frank Bauer, Metro staff, featured the Mobility Restraining Devices Metro is considering along with the adaptability and number of riders served on each bus. Members then went on a field trip to view and test first-hand the Mobility Restraining Devices currently in use on a Valley Transit Authority (VTA) bus.

    Upon return, members asked questions about standing and seating capacity, if there could be a dedicated seat at the front of the bus for those with ambulatory issues, if the cost of implementation is known, how many different configurations could be adopted and if Metro would pursue implementing the restraining devices soon.

    A motion (Barbour/Elsea) -- to send a letter to VTA thanking them for providing the demonstration bus with the proposed Mobility Restraining Devices -- carried unanimously.

    A motion (Elsea/Molesky) -- to send a letter to Metro thanking them for securing the VTA
demonstration bus with the Mobility Restraining Devices, encouraging further study and exploration of the Q-pod restraint system with input from wheelchair manufacturers, requesting cost information, and requesting information about other transit agency experiences both from operators and passenger perspective -- carried unanimously with John Daugherty abstaining.

12. Recommendations on the 2012 Regional Transportation Improvement Program Funding – RTC Staff

Rachel Moriconi, RTC Staff, provided an overview of the 2012 Regional Transportation Improvement Program Funding including detailed information about $8.9 million dollars projected to be available in STIP funding and $1.4 million dollars in RSTP funding. Ms. Moriconi provided a handout at the meeting with staff recommendations and updated available funding. Ms Moriconi noted that there will be a public hearing on December 1st where the RTC will take final action to program the funds.

Clay Kempf voiced concern about funding for Planning, Programming, and Monitoring (PPM) which enables all projects to secure funding and move forward, and suggested that all projects be reduced by $10,000 for a total of $80,000 to increase PPM to $230,000.

Hal Anjo asked Ms. Moriconi what would be taken away from projects if the proposed $10,000 diverted to Planning, Programming, and Monitoring. Ms Moriconi said that the RTC could implement PPM duties with the proposed funding of $150,000 because these funds are not needed until FY2015-2016 and FY 2016-2017. She said that the RTC is optimistic that additional funding would be available in the upcoming 4 - 5 years.

A motion (Kempf/Anjo) -- to reduce the eight recommended projects by $10,000 each and allocate that $80,000 to increase the total to $230,000.00 for Planning, Programming and Monitoring - - carried with Veronica Elsea and Lisa Berkowitz opposed.

Ms. Moriconi said that the other staff recommendation is that the E&D TAC recommends to the Regional Transportation Commission that they program the Regional Surface Transportation Program Funds to projects listed on Attachment 2, for the Rail Line and Auxiliary Lane projects.

A motion (Elsea/Barbour) -- to approve the RSTP funds as recommended by staff and listed in Attachment 2 - - carried with Hal Anjo abstaining.

The E&D TAC also added their general concurrence that there be an emphasis on the importance of the Chanticleer Bridge in the Highway 1 41st Avenue/Soquel Auxiliary Lanes Project.

13. Input on Draft RTC Legislative Agenda – RTC Staff

Rachel Moriconi, RTC Staff, provided an overview of the Draft RTC Federal and State Legislative program for 2012 and asked the committee for recommended changes from last year’s legislative agenda. Ms. Moriconi asked members to forward issues at the State or Federal level to be included in the agenda by December 15th in time for the approved documents to be presented in January 2012.

Clay Kempf mentioned the elimination of medical transportation that was included as an allowable Medi-Cal cost as part of the Delta Health Care Centers. As an example, if Elderday turned into a social day care model it would not include ride funding to get people there. Mr. Kempf would like this added to the existing list for the Draft Legislative program.

Veronica Elsea asked if there is a way to get the State to drop the 85th percentile rule that determines the speed of traffic at which radar may be used for enforcement. Ms. Elsea feels that this is a transportation safety issue.
Mike Molesky asked about call box usage and has the usage gone down due to cell phone usage. Ms. Moriconi mentioned that call boxes, although not used as much as in the past, are still a lifeline for people who might not have a cell phone or for places where cell service is unavailable.

Ms. Moriconi said that she would send an email to the E&D TAC members for their input.

14. **Receive Pedestrian Safety Work Group Outreach Campaign Update – Chair**

a. Hazard Report Update and Demo

Veronica Elsea, Pedestrian Safety Work Group Chair, said that they are excited about the new Bicycle and Pedestrian Hazard Report available online and the Pedestrian Safety Work Group is using their outreach campaign to spread the word about the availability of the online reporting feature.

Karena Pushnik provided a demonstration of the online hazard report form features including the ability to upload pictures of the affected areas. Ms. Pushnik mentioned that since the online reporting feature became available, the number of reports has increased 7 times from the prior fax-in method. She attributes this increase to the ease of the online report and outreach from the Pedestrian Safety Work Group.

b. Outreach Campaign

Veronica Elsea mentioned that the Work Group’s Outreach Campaign is reaching its goals, forging excellent partnerships with groups sharing similar goals, PSA’s being played on local radio and television stations, several Sentinel articles, and presentations to local groups such as the Kiwanis by Sally French. She welcomed and thanked Hal Anjo to the group and encouraged others to get involved.

Lisa Berkowitz asked if any of the concrete contractors would be willing to come on board for repair projects for sidewalks. Veronica Elsea said that each jurisdiction handles it differently. Some have preferred contractor lists, some hire one contractor for all repairs and others avoid making recommendations.

Clay Kempf thanked the Pedestrian Safety Work Group for all their hard work and what they have accomplished with their attention to pedestrian safety.

15. **Review Future meeting topics and need for December meeting**

Charge for Disabled parking behind Logo’s Elderday
Next meeting will be February 14, 2012

16. **Meeting Adjourned at 4:20 pm**

*Prepared by: Cathy Judd, SCCRTC Staff*
1. Call to Order

2. Introductions

**Members Present:**
Kem Akol, District 1
Piet Canin, Bike to Work
David Casterson, District 2 and Chair
Jim Langley, CTSC
Bill Fieberling, City of Santa Cruz
Eric Horton, District 2 (Alt.)
Rick Hyman, District 5
Leo Jed, CTSC (Alt.)
Will Menchine, District 3 (Alt.)
Shane Moutafian, District 4 (Alt.)
Peter Scott, District 3
Holly Tyler, District 1 (Alt.)
Andy Ward, City of Capitola and Vice-Chair

**Excused Absences:**
Gary Milburn, City of Scotts Valley (Alt.)
Carlos Garza, City of Santa Cruz (Alt.)
Lex Rau, Scotts Valley
Brandon Kett, District 4

**Unexcused Absences:**

**Vacancies:**
City of Watsonville – Voting and Alternate

**Guests:**
Steve All, Resident
Cathy Crowe, UCSC

3. Announcements - Cory Caletti, RTC Transportation Planner, provided the following announcements: 1) Bicycle Hazard reports, pages 11 and 12 in the packet, are now being submitted to the Bike Committee in a summarized format with follow-up activities indicated rather than individually; 2) The RTC is organizing a free all-day workshop on “Designing for Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety” on December 6th geared towards planners, public works engineers, policy makers and advocates; 3) The RTC is hosting a “Sustainability Workshop” on November 17th to evaluate sustainability in the next Regional Transportation Plan; 4) Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network public workshops are scheduled for December 13th, 14th and 15th and 5) The application to purchase the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Right-of-Way is being reviewed by the Surface Transportation Board.
4. Oral Communications - Steve All, Santa Cruz County resident, inquired regarding Committee members' familiarity with a bicycle route numbering system called CycleNet that he is proposing and has developed. Two members raised their hands. Mr. All requested that the item be agendized for a future Committee meeting.

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

CONSENT AGENDA

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

6. Approved draft minutes of the August 8, 2011 Bicycle Committee meeting
7. Accepted Summary of Bicycle Hazard Reports
8. Accepted Bicycle Committee Roster
9. Accepted Memo from RTC Staff to Local Jurisdictions regarding Bicycle Committee’s Priority Bicycle Projects
10. Accepted letter of resignation from Bob Montague, City of Watsonville representative to the Bicycle Committee
11. Accepted Memo to Highway 1 Soquel/Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes Project Team regarding the Bicycle Committee’s recommendations for accommodating bicyclists as part of the upcoming highway project
12. Accepted Draft 2012 Meeting Schedule and Tentative Agenda
13. Approved Bikes Secure/Bicycle Parking Subside Program applications from Brommer Plaza LLC, the Garden Company Nursery and Gift Shop, Burger and Pacific Collegiate Charter School

REGULAR AGENDA

14. City of Santa Cruz Article 8 Transportation Development Act (TDA) Claim – Cory Caletti summarized the City of Santa Cruz’s annual TDA claim since Cheryl Schmitt, City Transportation Coordinator, fell ill and was unable to attend. A motion (Fieberling/Langley) to recommend that the RTC approve the claim for $20,000 for annual maintenance, minor improvements and bikeway striping was approved unanimously. A suggestion was made to add West Cliff Drive to the re-striping list.

15. Monterey Bay Area Bicycle Travel Demand Modeling Project Data Collection Efforts Update – Ginger Dykaar, RTC Transportation Planner, updated the Committee on the Association of Monterey Bay Area Government’s (AMBAG) Bicycle Travel Demand Modeling project and encouraged members to track their bicycle trip and route choices through the CycleTracks smart phone app. Members deliberated about different ways to collect data from non-smart phone users including school children. Ideas such as MapMyRide or paper documentation were suggested. Ginger will contact AMBAG to see if there are other methods that could be utilized to contribute to the bike route choice data collection efforts.

16. Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network project update – Cory Caletti summarized bicycle/pedestrian trail planning activities to date including a kick-off meeting early in the summer, a three day field corridor tour and base mapping exercise and a series of stakeholder meetings with representatives from key partnering agencies and interest groups. She also provided information regarding community workshops, planned for December 13th, 14th and 15th, and briefly outlined public participation solicitation efforts. She encouraged members to attend and to spread the word about the opportunity to provide input. Members discussed convening a subcommittee meeting after the public workshops to evaluate preliminary alignments and provide feedback to, and on behalf of, the Committee.
17. 2012 Regional Transportation Improvement Program Preliminary Recommendations – Rachel Moriconi, RTC Senior Transportation Planner, summarized the staff report, the amount of State Transportation Improvement Program funding available to the region, the list of projects for which funding is being requested and the staff recommendation. After some discussion on each of the projects, a motion was made (Hyman/Scott) to recommend the following projects for approval by the RTC: 1) funds for design and right of way for the Chanticleer bicycle/pedestrian bridge; 2) design and construction of the Branciforte bicycle/pedestrian bridge, including a request that the City of Santa Cruz commit the full funding needed to make the project eligible for the STIP funding; 3) Vine Hill School sidewalks and bicycle lanes; 4) funds needed to complete bicycle lanes and sidewalks on Airport Blvd; and 5) Park Ave sidewalks. The motion passed unanimously. Members did not take a position on other projects.

18. Draft 2012 State and Federal Legislative Program – Rachel Moriconi summarized the RTC's annual federal and state legislative program as described in the staff report. Since no specific questions were raised, she requested that members provide her with feedback prior to December 15th. Members requested that an item on bills introduced for the 2012 legislative session be brought to their next meeting for review. Additionally, a motion was made (Akol/Hyman) to write a letter in support of preservation of the Transportation Enhancement and Safe Routes to School funding programs. The motion passed unanimously.

19. Project Tracking/Subcommittee Tasks: Oral Reports
   a. City of Santa Cruz Project Tracking: An update was provided on the Coastal Commission's consideration of the Arana Gulch Master Plan proposal at the December 8th public meeting.
   b. City of Capitola Project Tracking: No report provided.
   c. City of Scotts Valley Project Tracking: In the absence of the City of Scotts Valley's representatives to the Committee, Cory Caletti reported on the Shared Lane Roadway Markings stenciled by the City staff after Bicycle Committee coordination and review of bicycle safety opportunities in the area's narrow roads. A motion was made (Ward/Langley) to write a letter of appreciation to the City of Scotts Valley Public Works Director. The motion passed unanimously.
   d. City of Watsonville Project Tracking: No report was provided.
   e. County of Santa Cruz Project Tracking: Kem Akol provided a progress report of the East Cliff Drive Parkway improvement project. An update was requested on the Bicycle Committee's proposal for bicycle route detours and minor improvements associated with the Highway 1 Soquel to Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes project that spans the City of Santa Cruz and unincorporated County boundary. Cory Caletti indicated that the proposal to modify Brookwood Drive from a one-way to two-way traffic flow was not being considered at this time; that a formal response would be provided early next year; and that the La Fonda to Park Way dirt path will be formalized into a standard bikeway.
   f. Bike to Work Update: Ecology Action is part of a Safe Route to School grant received by the County Health Services Department. Ecology Action staff will be expanding its Bike to School program by targeting eight additional schools across the county, as well as promoting walking school buses and other programs.
   g. CTSC Update: Staff to the CTSC, Theresia Rogerson, has returned from maternity leave. Public Service Announcements regarding the dangers of distracted driving are airing in South County and will air at Cinema 9 in Santa Cruz during the holiday season.
   h. UCSC: No update was provided.
   i. Legislative Tracking: Covered in earlier agenda item. This subcommittee may re-convene prior to the next Bicycle Committee meeting to review next year's new bills.
   j. Sanctuary Scenic Trail: Covered in earlier agenda item.
   k. Technical Subcommittee: Subcommittee members are interested in receiving the formal
response regarding the Highway 1 Soquel to Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes detour and bike improvement proposal.

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

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

n. Safe Routes to School: Will Menchine reported that he started a Safe Routes to School Coalition at Mission Hill Middle School which is supported by the school’s administration.

20. Meeting adjourned at 9:25 p.m.

NEXT MEETING: The Bicycle Committee meeting scheduled for Monday, December 12, 2011, was cancelled. The next meeting will be held on Monday, February 13th, 2012 at the special meeting time of 6:30pm at the RTC office.

Minutes respectfully prepared and submitted by:

\Cory Caletti, Senior Transportation Planner
Call to Order – Chair Chris Schneiter called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m.

Introductions – Self introductions were made.

Oral communications – None.

Additions or deletions to consent and regular agendas – A flyer on the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSST) Public Workshops and Page 2-20 of the 2010 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) regarding jurisdictions’ transportation budgets was distributed for Item 11.

CONSENT AGENDA (Rodriguez/ Dettle) approved unanimously

Approved minutes of the September 22, 2011 ITAC meeting.

Received December 6, 2011 Designing for Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Workshop Notice

REGULAR AGENDA

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

County of Santa Cruz: Steve Wiesner reported that construction of the STIP-funded Graham Hill Road safety project is wrapping up for the winter, though utility relocations will be taking place over the next few months. There will be some one lane and two-day closures. Storm damage repairs are nearly complete on Schulties and Bear Creek Roads. The East Cliff Parkway project is scheduled for completion in early summer 2012.

Watsonville: Maria Rodriguez reported that RSTP-funded construction of the Freedom Boulevard Reconstruction project continues. The City is also finishing up its annual street maintenance projects for the winter. The City's Proposition 1B TLSP-funded Signal Synchronization project along Freedom Boulevard, Airport Boulevard, and Green Valley Road will be going live soon. Safe Routes to Schools-funded pedestrian improvements near several schools throughout Watsonville are currently in design, with construction scheduled for early next year.

Caltrans: Dan Herron announced that Caltrans has awarded Safe Route to Schools funds totally over $1 million to three projects in Santa Cruz County. He also reported that Caltrans is starting construction of 14 miles of guardrails on Highway 1 between 41st Avenue and Monterey County. There will be some lane closures between 9:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m. through March. He also distributed information on grant opportunities: the federal highway Discretionary Grants, including $29 million for the Transportation, Community, and System Preservation Program (TCSP) program which can be used to fund bicycle/pedestrian and other projects, and the Proposition 84 Sustainable Communities Grant. He noted that Caltrans will be soliciting applications for Caltrans' Planning Grant programs soon. He also noted that he will be retiring in December and introduced Adam Fukushima who will be taking over as the Caltrans Planner for Santa Cruz County.

Scotts Valley – Ken Anderson reported that the City is putting the final overlay on the Lockhart Gulch storm damage repair.

SCCRTC - Rachel Moriconi reported that that the RTC will be hosting workshops on the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSST) project December 13-15; integrating Sustainable Transportation Access Rating System (STARS) into the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) on November 17; and Designing for Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety on December 6. She reported that the Highway 1 Soquel-Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes project is out to bid, with the RTC scheduled to award a construction contract in mid/late December and tree removal to be completed by the end of February. She noted that the RTC is still awaiting final approval from the Surface Transportation Board for the Rail Line purchase. Steve Jesberg requested an electronic copy of the MBSST workshop flyer.

AMBAG – Anais Schenk reported that AMBAG is in the process of implementing its Regional Model Improvement Plan, including hiring a consultant to assist with the model update. A webportal is being set up where local agencies will update information on the existing road network. A webinar on the webportal and model update will be held in December. Local jurisdictions will need to review and update files by February.

Ecology Action – Piet Canin reported that despite the rain over 5500 people participated in the Fall Bike to Work event. He noted they are working with County Health Services on a $400,000 Safe Routes to Schools non-infrastructure grant targeting eight schools. The agency will also be working with the City of Santa Cruz on education and walking school bus elements of a project at Westlake Elementary School. Ecology Action is also working with others entities on planning, development, and implementation of electric vehicle stations throughout the Monterey Bay area.
UCSC - Teresa Buika reported that the University recently installed Electric Vehicle charging stations.

City of Capitola - Steve Jesberg reported that the City is working with businesses regarding design of the RSTPX-funded 38th Avenue bicycle lane and sidewalk project. Design of the RSTPX-funded Clare Street Traffic Calming is nearly complete, with workshops scheduled for January.

SC Metro - Tove Beatty reported that the Bus Stop Improvement project construction continues, below budget, thus more than the original 107 stops will receive upgrades. Installation of a second CNG fuel tank is underway, which will allow more vehicles to use CNG. Metro is getting new vehicles through a State of Good Repair grant that will also provide real time information to drivers. Metro is also evaluating a new restraint system for vehicles to meet ADA requirements for large mobility devices. Construction of the operations facility on River Street will be starting and includes significant pile driving. The Watsonville Transit Study is underway, with onboard survey information scheduled for release in March 2012. She also stated that Metro is tracking proposals for the next federal transportation act and expressed concerns regarding MAP-21 proposals.

City of Santa Cruz - Chris Schneiter reported that construction of Laurel St. safety improvements near the High School will start soon and that the City is rebidding the West Cliff Path project.

8. Augmentation of Local Funds

Rachel Moriconi reported that the RTC board recently discussed the need for new local funding sources and directed staff to initiate the process to hire a consultant to poll voters about possibly increasing vehicle registration fees by up to $10 for transportation projects. If there is strong support, the RTC could become a Congestion Management Agency (CMA) again and seek voter approval as early as November 2012. ITAC members indicated support for increasing revenues for transportation projects.

9. Draft 2012 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) Recommendations

Rachel Moriconi reviewed preliminary staff recommendations for approximately $9 million in State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds and $1.4 million in Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds.

The ITAC unanimously approved a motion (Yamin/Dettle) that the RTC approve the staff recommendations for programming STIP and RSTP funds (with Beatty, Canin, and Schenk abstaining). After discussing California Transportation Commission (CTC) priorities for STIP funds and local streets and roads, the Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC) unanimously approved a motion (Wiesner/Jesberg) to have the ITAC send a letter to the CTC Executive Director advocating that the CTC program STIP funds consistent with the RTC’s balanced proposal of both highway and local street and road projects.

10. Draft 2012 Legislative Programs

Rachel Moriconi reported that the RTC is in the process of developing the 2012 State and Federal Legislative Programs. She requested that members inform her of any recommended additions or changes by December 15, 2011.

11. Local Street and Road Maintenance Report

Rachel Moriconi reported that the RTC has requested a report on local street and road (LSR) needs
and revenues. She requested input from the ITAC on possible information to include in the report. The committee discussed the importance of clearly communicating needs and shortfalls to the community. This includes information on gas taxes, the limited amount of property and parcel taxes that go to roads, and what could be done at different funding levels. Public works staff indicated that the backlog of needs may be over $300 million and that the summary of annual needs versus budgets included in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) needs to be updated. Steve Wiesner agreed to work with staff to develop a survey of public works departments.

The meeting adjourned at 2:40 p.m. The next ITAC meeting is scheduled for **January 19, 2012 at 1:30 PM** in the SCCRTC Conference Room, 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA.

*Minutes prepared by: Rachel Moriconi*
<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</th>
<th>% OF ACTUAL TO PROJECTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JULY</td>
<td>410,500</td>
<td>499,800</td>
<td>499,800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</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>699,895</td>
<td>-80,060</td>
<td>-10.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTOBER</td>
<td>458,300</td>
<td>498,300</td>
<td>486,400</td>
<td>-11,900</td>
<td>-2.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOVEMBER</td>
<td>611,000</td>
<td>611,000</td>
<td>648,500</td>
<td>37,500</td>
<td>6.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECEMBER</td>
<td>776,432</td>
<td>736,433</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>624,034</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>6,956,759</td>
<td>7,016,950</td>
<td>3,000,995</td>
<td>64,640</td>
<td>0.92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**

S:\RTC\TC2011\1211\[TDA Report.xlsx]FY2012
### Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission

**THREE MONTH MEETING SCHEDULE**

**DECEMBER 2011** through **JANUARY 2012**

(Revised 11/22/11)

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Meeting Day</th>
<th>Meeting Type</th>
<th>Meeting Time</th>
<th>Meeting Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/12/11</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Bicycle Committee - <strong>Cancelled</strong></td>
<td>6:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/13/11</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Elderly &amp; Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee - <strong>Cancelled</strong></td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/15/11</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Transportation Policy Workshop</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/15/11</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Interagency Technical Advisory Committee - <strong>Cancelled</strong></td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/12/12</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Commission - <strong>NOTE SPECIAL DATE</strong></td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Santa Cruz City Council Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/16/12</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Bicycle Committee - <strong>Cancelled</strong></td>
<td>6:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/17/12</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Elderly &amp; Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee - <strong>Cancelled</strong></td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/19/12</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Transportation Policy Workshop - <strong>NONE THIS MONTH</strong></td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/19/12</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Interagency Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/02/12</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Commission</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Watsonville City Council Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/09/12</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Budget and Administration/Personnel Committee</td>
<td>3:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/13/12</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Bicycle Committee</td>
<td>6:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/14/12</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Elderly &amp; Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/16/12</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Transportation Policy Workshop</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/16/12</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Interagency Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Letter Rec'd/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/08/11</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ 11/08/11</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/09/11</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maryann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/09/11</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ 11/09/11</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/11</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ 11/12/11</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/16/11</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Luis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/16/11</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Luis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/17/11</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Donn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Correspondence Log December 1, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Letter Rec'd/Sent</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Incoming/Outgoing</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Last</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Last</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/17/11 Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Darin</td>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Luis Don Fred</td>
<td>Jessup</td>
<td>Kusanovich Griffin Chavez Jr Jacob Wilkinson</td>
<td>United Rail Labor</td>
<td>Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line Acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/17/11 Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Kaplan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nelson Road Rock Slide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/18/11 Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>Roesner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation Issues Disclosures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
November 17, 2011

Ken Anderson, Public Works Director
City of Scotts Valley
701 Lundy Lane
Scotts Valley, CA 95066

E: Appreciation for Shared Roadway Bicycle Markings

Dear Mr. Anderson:

I am writing on behalf of the Bicycle Committee of the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) to express our appreciation for the Shared Roadway Bicycle Markings (aka Sharrows) recently stenciled by City of Scotts Valley to enhance bicycle travel within the City.

As you know, Sharrows are placed to better identify the footprint bicyclists should travel where roadway width is too narrow for bicyclists to ride along side motor vehicles. The pavement markings are placed where no bicycle lanes exist and are to remind motorists to expect bicyclists in the travel path. The RTC’s Bicycle Committee worked with the City of Scotts Valley Public Works staff to identify locations where the markings could benefit all road users by better informing them of proper lane sharing behaviors.

On Monday, August 15th, City Traffic Engineer Majid Yamin, Scotts Valley representative on the Bicycle Committee Lex Rau, and RTC Bicycle Coordinator Cory Caletti identified approximately 40 locations within the City’s boundaries where safety and operational enhancements could be made. Green Hills road, Glen Canyon Road, Granite Creek Road, Bean Creek Road, and Glenwood Drive were among the roads identified. Two days later, the City’s maintenance crew was already out on the roadways stenciling Sharrows and making the bicycle travel safer for commuters, kids riding to school, utilitarian riders and fitness enthusiasts.

This was an exemplary collaborative effort between City of Scotts Valley staff and the RTC’s Bicycle Advisory Committee. Many thanks and much gratitude go to you and your staff for speedy implementation, most notably Majid Yamin, maintenance supervisor Frank Alvarez, as well as other maintenance crew members.

Bicycle Committee members appreciate the City of Scotts Valley’s ongoing efforts to improve bicycle facilities and encourage non-motorized travel. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact the RTC’s Bicycle Coordinator and staff to the Bicycle Committee, Cory Caletti at (831) 460-3201 or by email at ccaletti@sccrtc.org.

Sincerely,

David Casterson
RTC Bicycle Committee Chair

cc: City of Scotts Valley City Council
    Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
    Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission Bicycle Committee
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November 22, 2011

The Honorable Barbara Boxer
United States Senate
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Senator Boxer:

On behalf of the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) Bicycle Committee, I urge you to ensure that reauthorization of federal transportation act includes dedicated funding for the Transportation Enhancement (TE) and Safe Routes to School (SRTS) programs. These programs are critical for addressing safety and mobility needs of travelers in Santa Cruz County. While we are pleased that these programs are included in the mark-up of MAP-21 bill released earlier this month, we are disappointed that the draft reduces funding and adds expensive new eligibilities that do not conform to the purposes that these were designed to achieve as part of a consolidated program.

SRTS and TE funds have been used to address critical transportation needs in Santa Cruz County. Some of the projects funded with TE and SRTS funds in Santa Cruz County include:

- Bicycle lanes, sidewalks, and multi-use paths providing access to numerous schools, including Calabasas Elementary School, Amesti Elementary School, Bay View Elementary School, Holy Cross School, Mar Vista Elementary School
- San Lorenzo River Bike/Pedestrian Bridge, near Highway 1 – previously people were unsafely and illegally crossing the river by using the highway bridge
- Beach Street Bikeway near the Santa Cruz Boardwalk

However, gaps in the bicycle and pedestrian network continue to exist. In order to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, reduce fatalities, and generate jobs, it is important to provide balanced transportation choices—including safe and convenient walking and bicycling routes. Please include dedicated funding for walking and bicycling investment programs in the reauthorization bill with increases on par with other parts of the bill will help to meet the growing demand for safe, affordable, healthy transportation, and the high quality of life that travelers want and deserve. We are aware of the debate and controversy that currently surrounds these programs in the U.S. Senate and House, and urge you to work with your fellow Congress members to ensure these programs are not eliminated.

We urge you to work with committee leadership, other senators and Congress members to address our concerns and approve a reauthorization bill that dedicates funding pedestrian and bicycle projects.

Sincerely,

David Casterson
Chair, RTC Bicycle Committee

cc: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
    Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission’s Bicycle Committee
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From: jerry danzig [mailto:jdanzig1@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, November 09, 2011 10:27 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: 7th Ave. Rail Crossing

From: jerry danzig <jdanzig1@comcast.net>
Subject: 7th Ave. Rail Crossing

Message Body:
The metal protective barrier around the rail crossing gate mechanism on the west side of 7th Ave. is badly damaged and a danger to anyone walking on that sidewalk. It has been that way for about five years. It would seem that it should be repaired or replaced by Union Pacific prior to the RTC accepting ownership of the line.

J. Danzig

******

This mail is sent via contact form on SCCRTC http://sccrtc.org

-----Original Message-----
From: Karena Pushnik
Sent: Wednesday, November 09, 2011 3:11 PM
To: 'jdanzig1@comcast.net'
Subject: FW: 7th Ave. Rail Crossing

Hello J. Danzig -

Your email regarding the rail crossing metal barrier at 7th Avenue was received. We will inform the rail operator, Sierra Northern, about the situation. As you noted, the Regional Transportation Commission does not yet own the rail right of way.

Thank you.

Karena Pushnik, Senior Transportation Planner/Public Information Coordinator
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Ave | Santa Cruz, CA 95060
ph 831.460.3210 kpushnik@sccrtc.org
“State of the Pavements”
2011 Update

Presented by:
Nichols Consulting Engineers, Chtd.
November 8, 2011
What Is A Pavement Management Program?

• Tool to make cost-effective decisions on roads
• Answers 4 main questions:
  – What does Santa Cruz County have in the road network?
  – What condition is it in?
  – What repairs are needed and when?
  – How much money is required to maintain or improve roads cost-effectively?
• We use MTC’s StreetSaver® software
Santa Cruz County’s Road Network

- 596 centerline miles
- Estimated $763 million investment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Total Miles</th>
<th>Lane Miles</th>
<th>% Network Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential/Local</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/ Rural</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>596</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,212</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How big is the pavement network?

It’s approx. the same distance from Watsonville to Vancouver, Canada.
How is Condition Measured?

- **Good - Excellent**
- **At Risk**
- **Poor**
- **Failed**

County is at 49
How is Condition Measured?

- **Good - Excellent**: Arterials/Major collector = 71
- **At Risk**: County Overall = 49
- **Poor**: Minor Collectors/Local = 48
- **Failed**: Other/Rural = 23

- **Goal**: 70
How Does Santa Cruz County Compare to Other Counties?

Most data from 2010
Eaton
PCI = 97
East Cliff Dr
PCI = 70
Soquel Dr
PCI = 56
Park Dr
PCI = 39
San Andreas Rd
PCI = 27
Upper Thompson
PCI = 14
Average PCI

2007 PCI = 52

2011 PCI = 49

25.8% 29.3%
23.8% 21.1%

* % of pavement area

Good (70-100)
At Risk (50-69)
Poor (25-49)
Failed (0-24)
Average PCI: 2007 vs. 2011

Arterials PCI = 69
- 58.0%
- 25.0%
- 11.0%
- 6.0%

Collectors PCI = 56
- 40.0%
- 24.0%
- 25.0%
- 11.0%

Arterials PCI = 73
- 65.9%
- 26.4%
- 5.1%
- 2.6%

Collectors PCI = 47
- 27.8%
- 24.3%
- 20.6%
- 27.4%
Average PCI: 2007 vs. 2011

Local PCI = 52
- 14.0%
- 26.0%
- 35.0%
- 26.0%

Rural PCI = 39
- 38.0%
- 12.0%
- 32.0%

Local PCI = 48
- 20.4%
- 24.8%
- 27.5%
- 27.2%

Rural PCI = 24
- 60.5%
- 12.8%
- 10.5%
- 16.2%
Historical PCI

![Historical PCI Chart]

- **Year**: 2000 to 2030
- **Pavement Condition Index (PCI)**:
  - Entire Network
  - Arterials
  - Collectors
  - Residential
  - Other

The chart shows the trend of pavement condition index from 2000 to 2030 for different types of road networks.
"Pay Now or Pay More Later"

- $2.70/sy, Surface Seals
- $29.00/sy, Thin Overlays
- $35.00/sy, Thick Overlays
- $81/sy, Reconstruction

PCI

Time (years)
2011 Current Funding (~$2.5 M/yr)
Maintain Current PCI ($13 M/year)

Deferred Maintenance ($ Millions) vs. Pavement Condition Index (PCI)

- Year 2011 Before Work
- Deferred Maintenance: $118, $105, $119, $146, $169, $177, $180, $183, $191, $198, $204, $216, $224, $238, $269, $311, $326, $342, $355

Note: The chart shows the deferred maintenance costs and PCI values for the years 2011 to 2030.
Improve PCI by 5 ($15.5 M/year)
How Did We Get Here?

- Pavements are deteriorating rapidly
- Asphalt prices have increased five-fold since 1999
- Funding has not kept up
Funding Sources

2010-11 Funding Sources ($6.8m)
- Gas Tax, $0.5M
- RSTP, $1.3M
- ARRA, $2.5M
- Prop 1B, $1.2M
- Redevel, $1.3M

2011-12 Current Sources ($5.1m)
- Lost Revenue
- Prop 1B, $3.6M
- RSTP, $1.5M
- Gas Tax, $0.5M
- ARRA, $2.5M
- RSTP, $1.3M
Historical Pavement Budget vs Pavement Needs

- Historical Pavement Budget
- Needs (approx $15 - $28 m)
- RDA/Prop 1B/ARRA

Budget amounts:
- 2000: $2.1
- 2001: $4.0
- 2002: $1.1
- 2003: $1.0
- 2004: $0.8
- 2005: $1.1
- 2006: $4.2
- 2007: $4.3
- 2008: $8.1
- 2009: $6.0
- 2010: $6.7
Pavement Maintenance & Rehabilitation Practices

• Preventive Maintenance Practices over the last 10 years include:
  – Chip Seals
  – Slurry Seals
  – Digouts
  – Scrub Seals
  – Cape Seals (Slurry Seal over Chip Seal)

• Rehabilitation Practices over the last 10 years include:
  – HMA Overlays (1.5 - 2”)
  – RHMA Overlays
  – Full Depth Recycling (e.g. Carlton Rd, Green Valley Rd, and San Andreas Rd)
  – Pavement Reinforcing Fabric
  – Reinforcement Grid (e.g. Glass Grid)
Policy Considerations

• Ensure County is competitive for federal funding i.e.
  – Local match needed to leverage
• Comply with policies for:
  – Sustainable communities
  – Environment
  – Local economy
• Ensure acceptable quality of life for residents & visitors
  – Smoother rides
  – Lower maintenance costs for vehicles
• Ensure taxpayer’s investment in transportation infrastructure is protected
• Ensure Economic Viability by efficient movement of commuters, commodities, and goods
• Consider tiered pavement standards
Summary

• The County has improved the PCI of Arterials & Major Collectors
• Without Prop 1B & ARRA funds (available temporarily) County roads would be in worse condition
• Become a “Self Help” County in order to provide consistent revenue for pavement management
• PW requires reliable revenue to improve and maintain the County’s road network
Questions?

Margot Yapp, P.E.
Nichols Consulting Engineers, Chtd.
myapp@ncenet.com
(510) 215-3620
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Executive Summary

California’s local street and road system continues to be in crisis.

Every trip begins on a city street or county road. Whether traveling by bicycle, bus, rail, truck or family automobile, Californians need a reliable and well-maintained local street and road system. However, these are challenging times on many levels. Funding is at risk, and there is a significant focus on climate change and building sustainable communities, and the need for multi-modal opportunities on the local system has never been more essential. Every component of California’s transportation system is critical to provide a seamless, interconnected system that supports the traveling public and economic vitality throughout the state. Sustainable communities cannot function without a well-maintained local street and road system.

The first comprehensive statewide study of California’s local street and road system in 2008 provided critical analysis and information on the local transportation network’s condition and funding needs. This comprehensive 2010 update provides another look at this vital component of the state’s transportation system and finds further deterioration and a growing funding shortfall.

As before, the objectives were to report the condition of the local system and provide the overall funding picture for California’s local street and road transportation network. We needed answers to some important questions. What are the pavement conditions of local streets and roads? What will it cost to bring pavements to a Best Management Practices (BMP) or most cost-effective condition? How much will it cost to maintain them once we achieve the BMP or optimal pavement condition? What are the needs for the essential components to a functioning system? How much is the funding shortfall? What are the solutions? As part of this report, we also wanted to see how different funding scenarios would affect the local street and road system condition.

As owners and operators of 82 percent of the state’s roads (Figure 1), cities and counties found that the 2008 study was of critical importance for several reasons. While federal and state governments’ regularly assess their system needs, no such data existed for the local component of the state’s transportation network. Historically, statewide transportation funding investment decisions have been made without recognition of the particular requirements of the local system, and without local pavement condition data. Thus, this assessment provides a critical piece in providing policy makers with a more complete picture of our transportation system funding needs.

The goal is to use the findings of this report to continue to educate policymakers at all levels of government about the infrastructure investments needed to provide California with a seamless, multi-modal transportation system. The findings of this study provide a credible and defensible analysis to support a dedicated, stable funding source for maintaining the local system at an optimum level. It also provides the rationale for the most effective and efficient investment of public funds, potentially saving taxpayers from paying significantly more to fix local streets and roads into the future.

The study surveyed all of California’s 58 counties and 480 cities in 2010. The information collected captured data from more than 97 percent of the state’s local streets and roads! This level of
participation exemplifies the interest at the local level to provide comprehensive and defensible data in hopes of tackling this growing problem.

The results show that California’s local streets and roads are moving ever closer to the edge of a cliff. On a scale of zero (failed) to 100 (excellent), the statewide average pavement condition index (PCI) has deteriorated from 68 in 2008 to 66 (“at risk” category) in 2010. If current funding remains the same, the statewide condition is projected to deteriorate to a PCI of 54 by 2020. Even more critical, the unfunded backlog will almost double from $39.1 billion to $63.6 billion. The maps on the next page illustrate the pavement deterioration that has resulted since the 2008 study. Approximately 67 percent of the state’s local streets and roads are now “at risk” or in “poor” condition. Later in this report, we will define the consequences of this degradation and paint a clearer picture of what this will mean for the mobility and safety of the traveling public and ultimately the economic vitality of California.

To spend the taxpayer’s money cost-effectively, it makes more sense to preserve and maintain our roads in good condition than to let them deteriorate, since deteriorated roads are more expensive to repair in the future. Consistent with that approach, the costs developed in this study are based on achieving a roadway pavement condition of what the industry calls Best Management Practices (BMPs). This condition represents improving the pavement condition to a level where roads need preventative maintenance treatments (i.e., slurry seals, chip seals, thin overlays). These treatments have the least impact on the public’s mobility and commerce. Further, these treatment types are more environmentally friendly than the next level of construction that would be required (i.e., rehabilitation and reconstruction).
The importance of this approach is significant. As roadway pavement conditions deteriorate, the cost to repair them increases exponentially. For example, it costs twelve times less to maintain a BMP pavement compared to a pavement that is at the end of its service life. Even a modest resurfacing is four times costlier than a pavement in the BMP condition. At a time when counties and cities are on fixed budgets, employing maintenance practices consistent with BMP results in treating four to twelve times more road area. By bringing the roads to BMP conditions, cities and counties will be able to maintain streets and roads at the most cost-effective level. It is a goal that is not only optimal, but also necessary.

Local bridges are also an integral part of the local streets and roads infrastructure. There are approximately 12,562 local bridges, and approximately $3.3 billion is needed to replace or rehabilitate them. There is an estimated shortfall of $0.3 billion.

This study helps answer the following key questions:

**What are the pavement conditions of local streets and roads?**

The current average PCI is 66, and is expected to further decline to 54 by 2020 given existing funding levels. In addition, the percentage of “failed” streets will grow from 6.1 percent to almost 25 percent of the network by 2020.

**Based on the results of this study, approximately $70.5 billion of funding is needed over the next ten years to bring the pavement condition of the state’s local streets and roads to a level where the taxpayer’s money is most cost-effective.**

Once the BMP condition is reached, it will cost approximately $2.3 billion a year to maintain them at that condition.

**What will cost to bring pavements to a BMP or most cost-effective condition?**

It will cost $70.5 billion to reach BMP in 10 years.

**How much will it cost to maintain them once we achieve the BMP or optimal pavement condition?**

In order to maintain the pavement network at its existing condition, $3.1 billion a year is required. This is more than twice the current funding level of $1.42 billion/year.

**How will different funding scenarios affect the pavement conditions?**

The State of California is facing severe budget challenges that are affecting a wide range of services throughout the state. Over the past two years, the results of the 2008 study have helped educate policy makers and prevented severe cuts to road funding. To further assist policy makers on how potential cuts will affect pavement conditions, this report includes the results of four different funding scenarios:

1. Existing funding ($1.42 billion per year).
2. Loss of old and new Highway User Tax Account (HUTA) funds for three years (i.e., resulting in a funding level of $0.763 billion/year for three years then returning to $1.42 billion/year for the next seven years).
3. Permanent loss of new HUTA (i.e., resulting in a funding level of $1.25 billion per year).
4. Funding to maintain current pavement condition at PCI = 66 (i.e., $3.1 billion/year).
The results are summarized in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Pavement Condition (PCI)</th>
<th>Unfunded Backlog ($ billion)</th>
<th>Pavements Failed Condition %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>$63.6</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>$65.8</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>$67.6</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>$37.9</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What are the impacts of deferring maintenance?

Every dollar of maintenance deferred today will cost $1.53 in 2020. This assumes that labor and construction costs do not increase.

What are the needs for the essential components to a functioning system?

The transportation network includes essential safety and traffic components such as curb ramps, sidewalks, storm drains, streetlights and signals. These components require $29.1 billion over the next 10 years. However, this does not include the costs due to National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) regulations, which may be as much as an additional 10 percent of the transportation costs.

What is the total funding shortfall?

The table below shows the total funding shortfall of $78.9 billion over the next 10 years. For comparison, the 2008 results are also included.

Summary of 10 Year Needs and Shortfall for 2010 and 2008 ($Billion)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation Asset</th>
<th>2010 Results</th>
<th>2008 Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Needs</td>
<td>Funding Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavements</td>
<td>$70.5</td>
<td>$14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential Components*</td>
<td>$29.1</td>
<td>$6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges</td>
<td>$3.3</td>
<td>$3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$102.9</td>
<td>$24.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Does not include National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)

What are the Solutions?

To bring the state’s local street and road system to a best management practice level where the taxpayer’s money can be spent cost effectively, we will need approximately $56.3 billion of additional funding for pavements alone and a total of $78.6 billion for a functioning system over the next 10 years. The sooner this is accomplished, the less funding will be required in the future.

If cities and counties lose any additional funding from the state, the results will be disastrous for local streets and roads—and ultimately the entire transportation network—as all modes are interrelated.
The fact that more than twice the current funding level is needed just to maintain the current conditions is alarming.

To bring the local system back into a cost-effective condition, thereby preserving the public’s $271 billion pavement investment and stopping further costly deterioration, almost $7.9 billion annually in new money is needed to stop the further decline and deterioration of local street and road system.

This is equivalent to about a 53-cent per gallon gas tax increase. It is imperative that cities and counties receive a stable and dedicated revenue stream for cost effective maintenance of the local system to avoid this crisis.

The conclusions from this study are inescapable. Given existing funding levels available to cities and counties for maintaining the local system, California’s local streets and roads will continue to deteriorate rapidly within the next 10 years. Unless this condition is addressed, costs to maintain the local system will only continue to grow, while the quality of California’s local transportation network deteriorates.
## RECENTLY COMPLETED PROJECTS

| #  | Project                  | Location Description                                                                 | Construction Timeline       | Construction Cost | Funding Source | Lead Agency     | Project Manager | Contractor                  | Comments                                   |
|----|--------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------------------|
| 1  | HWY. 1 Micro-surfacing   | In Santa Cruz from San Lorenzo River Bridge to just north of Western Street (PM 17.5-20.2) | 7/17/2011—October 28, 2011  | $706,000          | Highway Maintenance | Caltrans     | Kelly McClain (PD) | Intermountain Slurry Seal, Watsonville | Completed October 28                       |
| 2  | HWY. 1 Salinas Road      | Highway 1, Mon. County, North of Moss Landing at Salinas Road (PM 99.9-101.5)           | 4/15/2010-Fall 2012         | $12 Million       | STIP/CMIA     | Caltrans          | Richard Rosales (JW) | Desilva Gates Construction LP, Dublin | Phase II of Salinas Rd. Detour in place—no traffic control |
| 3  | HWY. 1 Guardrail Upgrades| Highway 1, Mon and Santa Cruz Co., Trafton Rd to .4Mi N. of 41st Ave (Various locations: Mon. 101.50 – SCR 13.62) | Nov. 15, 2011 to mid-March 2012, weather permitting | $ 578,000        | SHOPP         | Caltrans          | Luis Duazo (BR)    | Frank Medina, Oroville      | Alternating nighttime lane closures M-F 9 pm to 6 am |
| 4  | HWY. 9 Grind and Replace | In Santa Cruz from so. of the Rte 01/09 junction to just no. of Vernon St. (PM 0.0-PM 0.6) | Early-Spring 2012–Mid-Spring of 2012 | $350,000         | Highway Maintenance | Caltrans          | Kelly McClain (PD)     | Pavex Construction Div., San Jose | SCr City working on water line. Nighttime One-way traffic control with flagging. |

## CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location Description</th>
<th>Construction Timeline</th>
<th>Construction Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>HWY. 1 Salinas Road</td>
<td>Highway 1, Mon. County, North of Moss Landing at Salinas Road (PM 99.9-101.5)</td>
<td>4/15/2010-Fall 2012</td>
<td>$12 Million</td>
<td>STIP/CMIA</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Richard Rosales (JW)</td>
<td>Desilva Gates Construction LP, Dublin</td>
<td>Phase II of Salinas Rd. Detour in place—no traffic control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>HWY. 1 Guardrail Upgrades</td>
<td>Highway 1, Mon and Santa Cruz Co., Trafton Rd to .4Mi N. of 41st Ave (Various locations: Mon. 101.50 – SCR 13.62)</td>
<td>Nov. 15, 2011 to mid-March 2012, weather permitting</td>
<td>$ 578,000</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Luis Duazo (BR)</td>
<td>Frank Medina, Oroville</td>
<td>Alternating nighttime lane closures M-F 9 pm to 6 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>HWY. 9 Grind and Replace</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>Early-Spring 2012–Mid-Spring of 2012</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>SCr City working on water line. Nighttime One-way traffic control with flagging.</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>HWY. 17</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>
<tr>
<td>HWY. 17</td>
<td>Near Scott's 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>Luis Duazo (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>Hwy 1 Guardrail Upgrade, Concrete Barrier, Retaining Wall 05-0R910</td>
<td>Highway 1 from S of South Apts 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>Luis Duazo</td>
<td>PS&amp;E/RW</td>
<td>Scheduled to be advertised early 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>Luis Duazo</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>Pending Award and Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>Luis Duazo</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>Pending Award and Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Construction Timeline</td>
<td>Construction Cost</td>
<td>Funding Source</td>
<td>Lead Agency</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Hwy 9 Holiday Lane Improvements</td>
<td>Highway 9 between Ben Lomond and the Highland Co. Park; S. of Holiday Lane (PM 8.4-8.6)</td>
<td>Construct Viaduct, Upgrade guard rail</td>
<td>Summer 2012</td>
<td>$1.3 M</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Steve DiGrazia</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>Pending Advertise, Award and Approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGENDA: December 1, 2011

TO: Regional Transportation Commission
FROM: Cory Caletti, Senior Transportation Planner
RE: FY 11/12 Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 8 Allocation
Claim from the City of Santa Cruz for Bicycle Improvement Projects

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Bicycle Committee and staff recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission approve the attached resolution (Attachment 1) for allocation of FY 11/12 Article 8 Transportation Development Act funds to the City of Santa Cruz in the amount of $20,000 (Exhibit 1 of Attachment 1) for bikeway striping and minor improvements.

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 transportation in California. TDA funds are also used by local jurisdictions for bicycle and pedestrian projects. Each year the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) allocates Article 8 Transportation Development Account (TDA) funds to local jurisdictions for bikeway and pedestrian projects according to the RTC’s Rules and Regulations.

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 Santa Cruz County is done by the RTC according to population using an approved formula in the RTC Rules & Regulations. Allocation is the discretionary action by the RTC that designates funds for a specific claimant to a specific purpose. TDA funds are apportioned annually by the RTC and allocated on an on-going, non-competitive basis. Payment is authorized by instructions issued by the RTC in its Rules and Regulations. Unused TDA funds allocated to any project may be rolled over from one fiscal year to the next.

As stated in the Rules and Regulations, a TDA Article 8 claim shall include a description of the project adequate for review by the RTC and its advisory committees; justification for the project including a statement regarding its consistency and relationship with the Regional Transportation Plan; estimated cost of the project including other funding sources; and a statement agreeing to maintain the funded project in the condition outlined in the submitted plans for a period of 20 years.
Allocation requests for bicycle facilities must be reviewed by the Bicycle Committee and requests with pedestrian components must be reviewed by the Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee prior to consideration by the RTC. According to the RTC Rules and Regulations, only Commissioners representing the County and the Cities are eligible to vote on Article 8 allocation requests.

**DISCUSSION**

Exhibit 1 of Attachment 1 is a TDA Article 8 allocation request from City of Santa Cruz Public Works in the amount of $20,000 for bikeway striping and minor improvements. The request provides for the annual re-striping of the City’s 30 miles of bikeways, maintenance of bikeways and minor bikeway improvements. The City of Santa Cruz has adequate funds in its unallocated TDA balance for this claim and agrees to maintain facilities on an on-going basis, as required for TDA funded projects.

**Bicycle Committee Review**

At the November 14, 2011 meeting, the Bicycle Committee reviewed the City of Santa Cruz allocation request and recommended that the Commission approve the TDA claim for $20,000.

**SUMMARY**

The City of Santa Cruz submitted a TDA Article 8 allocation request (Exhibit 1) for $20,000 for bicycle striping and minor improvements. The Bicycle Committee and staff recommend that the RTC approve the City of Santa Cruz’s TDA allocation claim.

**Attachment 1**: Resolution approving the City of Santa Cruz Article 8 TDA claim
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RESOLUTION NO.

Adopted by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
on the date of December 1, 2011
on the motion of Commissioner
duly seconded by Commissioner

A RESOLUTION ALLOCATING $20,000 IN ARTICLE 8 TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT (TDA) FUNDS TO THE CITY OF SANTA CRUZ FOR BICYCLE IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

WHEREAS, the City of Santa Cruz has sufficient unallocated Article 8 TDA revenues and has submitted a TDA allocation request (Exhibit 1) for $20,000 for bicycle improvement projects; and

WHEREAS, the Bicycle Committee reviewed the request and recommends approval; and

WHEREAS, the proposed project is 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. $20,000 in TDA Article 8 funds is hereby allocated to the City of Santa Cruz for Bikeway Striping and Minor Improvements.

AYES: COMMISSIONERS

NOES: COMMISSIONERS

ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS

ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS

________________________________________
Mark Stone, Chair

ATTEST:

________________________________________
George Dondero, Secretary

Exhibit 1: FY 11/12 TDA Article 8 Allocation Request from the City of Santa Cruz

Distribution: City of Santa Cruz Public Works, RTC Fiscal, RTC Planner
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August 29, 2011

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

RE: City of Santa Cruz – FY 2011-12 TDA Article 8 Allocation Request

Dear Mr. Dondero:

Please accept this letter as a FY 2011-12 TDA Article 8 allocation request for the following projects:

1. Bikeway Striping and Minor Improvements ($20,000): This project provides for the annual re-striping of the City’s 30 miles of bikeways, maintenance of bikeways and minor bikeway improvements. This project is entirely supported with TDA funds.

The City’s remaining unallocated balance will be used to match existing grant applications, under funded projects, and future bikeway striping and parking projects.

As with all City claims, the City will commit to maintain any facilities provided with these funds for 20 years and will prepare all necessary environmental review for these projects. All of the projects above are consistent with the City Bicycle Transportation and Pedestrian Plans and the RTP.

Please call me (831-420-5422) if you have any questions or need additional information.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Christophe J. Schneider
Assistant Public Works Director/City Engineer

Attachments:
Claim Forms (1)
cc: Transportation Coordinator (CS)
    Finance Department (RG)
Transportation Development Act (TDA) – Local Transportation Funds
CLAIM FORM
for Bike/Ped Projects
Submit a separate form for each project.

If you have any questions about this claim form or would like an electronic copy of the form,
please contact the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission at 460-3200.

Project Information

1. Project Title: Bikeway Striping and Minor Improvements

2. Implementing Agency: City of Santa Cruz

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

4. TDA funding requested this claim: $ 20,000

5. Fiscal Year (FY) for which funds are claimed: FY 11 / 12

6. General purpose for which the claim is made, identified by the article and section of the Act which
authorizes such claims (ex. Article 8 Bicycle project): Article 8 Bicycle and/or Pedestrian Facilit

7. Contact Person/Project Manager: James Burr
   Telephone Number: (831) 420-5426
   E-mail: jbur@cityofsantacruz.com

   Secondary Contact (in event primary not available): Rich Smith
   Telephone Number: (831) 420-5522
   E-mail: rsmith@cityofsantacruz.com

8. Project/Program Description/Scope (use additional pages, if needed, to provide details such as work
   elements/tasks): Annual re-striping of the City's 30 miles of bikeways and minor
   bikeway improvements.

9. Number of people to be served/anticipated number of users of project/program:
   Daily bicycle commuters = 2,549
   Commuters = 30% of all traffic
   Therefore 8,497 x 365 = 3,101,405 bicyclists/year, 8,497 bicyclists/day

10. Project Location/Limits (attach a map and/or photos if available/applicable, include street names):
    Those streets most in need will be striped.

11. Justification for the project. (Why is this project needed? Primary goal/purpose of the project;
    problem to be addressed; project benefits; importance to the community)

    Traffic safety.

12. Consistency and relationship with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) – please reference Project
    or Policy number: Policy 1.1: ensure that adequate support is provided to maintain
    and operate existing transportation system.

13. Measures of performance, success or completion to be used to evaluate project/program:

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

15. Project Cost/Budget, including other funding sources, and Schedule: (complete "10a" OR "10b")

### 10a. Capital Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHEDULE (Month/Yr)</th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Environmental Engineering</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Contingency</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>4/12</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>Striping as needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Cost/Phase

STD requested

Source 2:

Source 3:

Source 4:

*Please describe what is included in "Other":

### 10b. Non-Capital Projects – Cost/Schedule: List any tasks and amount per task for which TDA will be used. Can be substituted with alternate budget format.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Element/Activity/Task</th>
<th>SCHEDULE (Month/Yr)</th>
<th>Total Cost per Element</th>
<th>$TDA requested</th>
<th>$ Source 2:</th>
<th>Source 3:</th>
<th>Source 4:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration/Overhead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 3:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 4:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex. Consultants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex. Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

17. Proposed schedule of regular progress reports:

18. TDA Eligibility:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES/NO?</th>
<th>A. Has the project/program been approved by the claimant’s governing body? Attach resolution to claim. (If &quot;NO,&quot; provide the approximate date approval is anticipated.)</th>
<th>YES/NO?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Has this project previously received TDA funding?</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. For capital projects, have provisions been made by the claimant to maintain the project or facility,</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
or has the claimant arranged for such maintenance by another agency for the next 20 years? (If an agency other than the Claimant is to maintain the facility provide its name:  

| D. Has the project already been reviewed by the RTC Bicycle Committee and/or Elderly/Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee? (If "NO," project will be reviewed prior to RTC approval.) | yes |
| E. For "bikeways," does the project meet Caltrans minimum safety design criteria pursuant to Chapter 1000 of the California Highway Design Manual? (Available on the internet via: http://www.dot.ca.gov.) | yes |

Documentation to Include with Your Claim:

All Claims
- A letter of transmittal to SCCRTC addressed to the Executive Director that attests to the accuracy of the claim and all its accompanying documentation.
- Resolution indicating TDA eligible claimants’ roles and responsibilities and commitment to maintain facilities as indicated in the submitted plans for a period of 20 years.

Article 3 & 8 Bicycle/Pedestrian Claims
- Evidence of environmental review for capital projects
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TO: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
FROM: George Dondero, Executive Director
RE: Improving Transportation Planning in the Monterey Bay Region

RECOMMENDATION

RECEIVE final compiled report on single-county Metropolitan Planning Organization proposal and DIRECT staff to work with the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) to reduce duplication of efforts, improve the regional travel forecast model and increase coordination and collaboration among agencies.

BACKGROUND

Per Board direction, Agency staff has been researching since June, 2011 the scenario of taking on the federal metropolitan transportation organization (MPO) responsibilities that are currently handled by the tri-county Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG). The purpose of such a shift to a “single-county MPO” would be to improve cost effectiveness and increase operational efficiencies by removing duplication of efforts across the agencies and freeing up resources to increase investment in the regional transportation model. While there was interest in making improvements, there appeared to be a reluctance to make a structural change that would likely affect the ability of AMBAG to survive as a tri-county regional forum.

DISCUSSION

In October, 2011, the Salinas City Council voted to support retaining the current transportation planning structure and asked that AMBAG return with a progress report in addressing identified issues within one year. The AMBAG Board of Directors voted to:

1) Retain AMBAG in its current form as a regional COG and MPO; 2) Direct staff to identify and address any and all performance related issues going forward and report out to the Board of Directors at their January 2012 meeting along with a timeline for addressing the issues; 4) Improve coordination and collaboration throughout the region by conducting regional technical committee meetings, allowing other agencies ex-officio status on the AMBAG Board of Directors, hold periodic joint executive committee meetings, and identify specific areas of duplication and strategies for addressing
those. [.....and] direct staff to discuss the MOU between AMBAG and the RTPA’s in order to appropriately fund the Regional Transportation Demand Model and avoid any duplication of transportation planning efforts.

Staff has indicated its willingness to work collaboratively with AMBAG and seeks Board approval of this effort. In addition, TAMC staff has consolidated all of the information gathered in this evaluation effort into a single final report (Attachment 1) with a set of relevant appendices (Attachment 2 – on the website). Per the request of the City of Salinas, a report back on the status of these activities will take place by the end of 2012. During that year, certain developments may occur, including a proposed federal change in the allowable size of metropolitan planning organizations that may affect the region’s ability to devolve into even smaller agencies much less retain AMBAG without losing federal planning funds.

**Staff recommends that the RTC direct staff to work with the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) to reduce duplication of efforts, improve the regional travel forecast model and increase coordination and collaboration among agencies.**

**FINANCIAL IMPACTS**

Staff’s analysis of the restructuring effort was that it would utilize less funding to have a three-agency transportation planning structure than a four-agency transportation planning structure as currently exists, with AMBAG conducting federal planning and TAMC, Santa Cruz RTC and San Benito COG conducting state-level transportation planning. Under the restructuring, some state planning money would be lost to the region. However, by removing one agency, the restructuring would also free up some federal planning funds allocate to the single-county agencies to take on the federal planning activities, with money left over to reinvest in improving the regional travel forecast model on an ongoing basis.

Working with AMBAG to make improvements within the existing four-agency structure will require a certain amount of staff time on the part of all four agencies, but this staff time would be substantially less than taking on the federal metropolitan planning organization responsibilities. That said, there are no additional resources provided for this regional improvement effort, and long-term improvements to the regional model will require all agencies to identify funding (new or existing) to pay for that effort after the current grants have expired.
SUMMARY

The City of Salinas and the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments have voted to retain the current four-agency transportation planning structure within the Monterey Bay Area, and have instead directed AMBAG to work on performance and other related improvements. RTC staff sent a letter indicating its willingness to work collaboratively with AMBAG and seeks Board approval of this effort. In addition, staff has consolidated all of the information gathered in this multi-month evaluation into a single final report with a set of relevant attachments.

Attachments:

1. Summary report
2. Appendices to report (available on RTC website)
Improving Transportation Planning in the Monterey Bay Region:
Evaluating the Scenario of Consolidating Transportation Planning and Programming into
Single-County Metropolitan Planning Organizations

INTRODUCTION
In the current funding environment, it is increasingly critical that agencies maximize performance and minimize expenditures. For this reason, the Transportation Agency Board of Directors at its May, 2011 strategic planning session asked staff to evaluate the potential for reducing time and resources utilized by four agencies that oversee transportation planning and implementation in Monterey County. The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Planning Agency and the San Benito Council of Governments provided similar policy direction to engage in this examination of the structure of transportation planning in the region. This report compiles several staff reports into a more complete analysis of the potential for the more cost-effective conduct of transportation planning, modeling and project delivery in the region through the creation of a new single-county Metropolitan Planning Organization or MPO.

The information in this report was collected during the months of June through October 2011 in collaboration with the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission and the San Benito County Council of Governments. The agencies held meetings with representatives from a variety of agencies, including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans Divisions of Planning, Audits, Programming and District 5), the Monterey Bay Unified Regional Air Pollution Control District, the Federal Highway Administration, the Federal Transit Administration and the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
The question posed by staff of the regional transportation planning agencies was whether they would be able to take on the federal transportation planning responsibilities currently handled by the Association of Monterey Bay Area governments, within the currently available funding, and also free up additional monies to fund long-term improvements to the regional travel demand forecast model. The conclusion is that it would be financially feasible to transition from four transportation planning agencies in the Monterey Bay region to two single-county Metropolitan Planning Organizations and one regional transportation planning agency. The two new MPOs for Monterey and Santa Cruz counties would handle both the state and federal transportation planning responsibilities for their respective jurisdictions. San Benito COG would remain the state planning agency, and its federal transportation planning responsibilities would devolve to Caltrans. Regional collaboration on transportation and related issues could occur on a three or five-county basis according to the model used by the San Joaquin Valley Regional Transportation Planning Agencies,
which holds interagency staff level and policy level meetings on regional issues, but has no separate staff. This new structure would free up additional funding to be utilized to improve the regional travel forecast model and increase funding for its ongoing upkeep. The model could be administered through collaboration among the transportation agencies and perhaps the regional Air District.

However, under this scenario, the impact of shifting to single-county MPOs would be to remove a substantial portion of the budget from the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG). Without shifting to a different financial model, this loss of federal transportation planning funds would likely put AMBAG out of existence, thereby removing a formal forum for intercounty collaboration on transportation and non-transportation issues. The dissolution of AMBAG would also necessitate shifting of certain mandated but unfunded/underfunded land-use related responsibilities to other agencies, many of which would likely fall to the single-county agencies: e.g., regional housing needs assessment, sustainable communities’ strategy, census data center. Finally, the transition to two single-county MPOs would take time and resources to implement. Several months could be needed to allow the cities to vote on the change, the Governor to approve the change, and the re-formed agencies to adopt required federal plans and policies.

AMBAG conducted a survey of its member and partner agencies in order to evaluate its performance in several areas. The results of this survey are attached to this report and identified several areas for improvement. It also indicated support for the regional forum provided by the Association.

The largest city in the region, Salinas, which must support a transition to single-county agencies, voted on October 11, 2011 to continue AMBAG in its current form. However, the City also asked that AMBAG evaluate ways to improve its services to member agencies, develop a peer review process to provide recommendations for improvements and report back the progress within a year, after conducting a follow up survey. This action effectively put on hold a restructuring to single-county MPOs for at least a year. AMBAG followed up with direction to its staff to address performance issues by January 2012, improve coordination and collaboration, and work with the regional transportation planning agencies to identify areas of duplication and strategies for addressing those. In addition, AMBAG directed its staff to “discuss the MOU between AMBAG and the RTPAs in order to appropriately fund the Regional Transportation Demand Model and avoid any duplication of transportation planning efforts.”

Staffs of all four agencies have agreed to set up teams to work collaboratively to develop recommended actions for improving work products, reducing duplication of effort and increasing collaboration across all four agencies. Long-term success of this strategy will depend on the creation of a work plan that is supported and implemented by all agencies, a viable long-term financial strategy for AMBAG that recognizes the upcoming phase-out of certain grant funds, and the ability of the new AMBAG Executive Director to provide the dynamic leadership needed to accomplish the performance improvements recommended in the survey.
STRUCTURE OF TRANSPORTATION PLANNING IN THE REGION

The Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments was created in 1968. In 1975 it was designated as the Metropolitan Planning Organization for the three-county Monterey Bay region. This designation requires the Association to conduct certain transportation planning activities and in turn it receives certain federal planning funds. The Transportation Agency for Monterey County, the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC) and the San Benito Council of Governments (San Benito COG) are the state-designated Regional Transportation Planning Agencies that receive state rural planning assistance funds and prepare state mandated short and long-range planning documents, as well as allocate funds to projects. AMBAG passes through 50% of its federal planning funds in recognition that the Regional Transportation Planning Agencies play a key part in transportation planning and setting priorities for transportation funding. In many small/medium-sized regions, such as San Luis Obispo, Shasta or San Joaquin Counties, the state and federal planning functions are combined within a single county transportation planning agency. In fact, AMBAG is the smallest multi-county MPO by population in the state.

PROPOSED REALIGNMENT: CREATION OF TWO SINGLE-COUNTY MPOS

The proposed realignment of responsibilities would designate the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission and the Transportation Agency for Monterey County as single-county Metropolitan Planning Organizations. Due to its size, the San Benito COG would become one of 26 other counties that rely on the state to meet these federal requirements.

Staff’s analysis is that the most cost-effective structure would have the single-county transportation agencies taking on the all the transportation, travel forecast model and data gathering functions. AMBAG or another agency(ies) could take on the non-transportation-related activities and serve as a forum for regional collaboration. Administration and update of the regional travel forecast model would preferably take place through a joint powers agreement among the single-county agencies or with the assistance of another related regional agency. The Sustainable Communities Strategy could be managed and prepared either by the single-county agencies in collaboration with one another, by AMBAG during a transition period, or by a consultant.

FINANCIAL IMPACTS

The primary result of a realignment of transportation responsibilities would be improved coordination of activities that would likely save staff time and administrative costs and result in improved work products. Approximately $681,000 in state rural planning funds would be lost to the region, but this loss would be offset by a net gain of approximately $383,000 in federal planning funds and a reduction in administrative costs. In addition, unless other non-transportation related activities continued at the organization, $173,699 paid annually in dues to Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments by member agencies would no longer be collected, representing a portion of the savings in administrative costs. The result would be improved coordination and probably a cost neutral budget for TAMC. The region would lose (or not spend) approximately $297,500 in state funds, and member agencies would not have to pay approximately $173,700, for a total savings of approximately $471,200 per year. (AMBAG dues, Appendix 1)
Under the proposed single-county scenario, estimates are that the Transportation Agency would receive a net annual increase of $250,000 in federal funds. This net considers the fact that there would be a loss of $395,000 in more flexible state rural planning funds. According to the budget developed by Transportation Agency staff (Budget Scenario, Appendix 2) the additional $250,000 would be sufficient to cover increased staffing needs and allow a contribution towards the maintenance of the regional travel model. The net estimated annual increase to the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission would be $292,700, and the net increase in state funding for the San Benito COG is estimated at $29,000. These amounts could change depending on state and federal allocations.

The shift in responsibilities would likely require the Transportation Agency to add two additional planners and potentially temporary staff to complete the Sustainable Communities Strategy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 10-11 Funding With AMBAG as MPO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMBAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA PL*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* AMBAG budgets ~$42,381 of PL to San Benito COG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 10-11 Funding with SCCRTC, TAMC as MPOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMBAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Difference | $ 297,559 |

FHWA PL = Federal Highway Administration planning funds
FTA 5303 = Federal Transit Administration planning funds
CURRENT AMBAG DUTIES

AMBAG currently conducts activities that can be grouped into roughly three categories: transportation planning, travel forecast modeling and related data gathering, and other non-transportation activities. It is the first two categories of activities that could be consolidated into the single-county transportation planning agencies, resulting in important cost savings due to reduced overhead costs and funding that could be released to improve the regional travel forecast model.

Transportation Planning Activities

AMBAG largely compiles and consolidates the information prepared by the countywide transportation planning agencies (TAMC/SCCRTC/San Benito COG) into three-county documents:

Metropolitan Transportation Plan: AMBAG prepares this 25-year long-range planning document which is largely based on the three county Regional Transportation Plans. The Sustainable Communities Strategy is a newly-required part of these plans, for which AMBAG is leading the outreach and development, with significant involvement of the other transportation agencies.

Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program: AMBAG prepares this three county document largely based on each county’s Regional Transportation Improvement Program, to assure that projects qualify for federal funds.

Public Participation Plan: AMBAG prepares this document which compiles the activities that each of the agencies engage in to provide information and gather input from the public.

Overall Work Program: AMBAG compiles the information which is prepared by each of the three planning agencies, plus its own information, into a three-county document that is the basis for approval of federal funding.

Regional Vanpool Authority: AMBAG recently obtained a Monterey Bay Air Pollution Control District grant for the regional vanpool authority and just joined that authority.

Monterey County Transportation Activities: AMBAG has taken on certain transportation activities that are single-county, within Monterey County. These include the ridesharing program and the intermodal transportation facility study.

Travel Forecast Model and Related Data Gathering

Travel Forecast Model Administration and Updates: AMBAG administers the regional travel forecast model, which is a critical tool for environmental review of major roadway and rail projects, air quality forecasting, greenhouse gas emissions estimating and local land use plans. The model is also an important part of the Sustainable Communities Strategy project.

Information Gathering and Distribution: AMBAG serves as a clearinghouse for information, including environmental reviews, population/housing/employment forecasts and census data, much of which is important information for the regional travel model. AMBAG also implements the Regional Housing Needs Assessment, an unfunded state mandate required for the development of countywide housing elements. The state recently changed the frequency of making the assessment from once every four years to once every eight
years. AMBAG provides this service to Monterey and Santa Cruz counties; San Benito County COG performs its own assessment.

**Air Quality Planning and Modeling:** When the region did not meet federal air quality standards, AMBAG was responsible for preparing a *State Implementation Plan* for meeting air quality improvements, and certifying a list of transportation control measures to reach the standards, AMBAG also had to conduct an air quality “conformity” analysis on its planning documents to assure that the proposed projects resulted in meeting the standards in the future. The way of measuring federal air quality changed and the region went into “attainment” status (it now meets or attains federal standards) so these activities are not required. Should the air quality standards change again, these requirements would likely be reactivated for the region and generate an important amount of work.

**Non-Transportation Activities**

- **Energy Watch:** AMBAG has received a PG&E grant to administer an energy savings assistance program to governments, non-profits and business.

- **Pajaro River Watershed Flood Prevention Authority:** AMBAG provides contract work for the Pajaro River Watershed Flood Prevention Authority.

- **Monterey Bay Sanctuary:** AMBAG has been involved in Monterey Bay Sanctuary Activities, on an unreimbursed basis.

**REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCY ACTIVITIES**

The regional transportation planning agencies (TAMC, Santa Cruz County RTC, San Benito COG) engage in the following related transportation planning and programming activities.

- **Work Program:** The regional agencies prepare a document summarizing their activities according to various work elements for review by Caltrans. AMBAG takes these three documents, adds federally required information and its own agency activities and submits the document to the federal funding partners. It is submitted annually and is amended throughout the year as needed.

- **Regional Transportation Plan:** The regional agencies prepare this 25 year planning document according to state requirements. The document includes information on projects gathered from throughout the respective counties that utilize federal and state funding. These documents become the basis for the information compiled in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan by AMBAG. In recent years, the counties and AMBAG have collaborated in the development of financial assumptions and have commissioned a single environmental impact report. The Plan is generally updated every four years.

- **Regional Transportation Improvement Program:** The countywide regional agencies prepare this five-year programming document according to state requirements to request money from the California Transportation Commission in its adoption of the State Transportation Improvement program. The document is generally prepared every two years, and sets priorities for funding regionally significant projects in each county.

- **Environmental Document Review and Comment and Regional Impact Fee Programs:** The regional transportation planning agencies to some degree review environmental documents
prepared for new development projects. They analyze the impacts of the proposed project upon the regional transportation system, facilitate the mitigation of impacts between the city/county and Caltrans, and recommend addition of features that support the use of transit, bicycles and walking. In Monterey County, TAMC administers a countywide regional traffic impact fee program that is utilized to mitigate the impact of new development on a defined regional transportation network.

**Public Participation Planning:** The regional agencies assist AMBAG in preparing and implementing the federally-required public participation plan. Many of the outreach activities are conducted by the regional transportation planning agencies, as a single-county approach is often more successful in bringing out public participation.

**Sustainable Communities Strategy – Complete Streets:** The regional transportation agencies have been designated to receive a portion of the grant obtained by AMBAG to prepare the Sustainable Communities Strategy: the Complete Streets policies. TAMC and SCCRTC will be preparing these policies for inclusion in the final Sustainable Communities Strategy, which will be included in the Regional and Metropolitan Transportation Plans (long-range transportation planning documents).

**Travel Forecast Model Committee:** The regional agencies make extensive use of the tri-county travel forecast model administered by AMBAG. The model was used, for example, to create estimated traffic volumes needed to calculate the regional traffic impact fee in Monterey County. The model is also used to evaluate the regional traffic impacts of major highway and rail projects. The regional agencies are keenly interested in keeping the model up-to-date to assure that it is able to continue these critical transportation-related functions. A recent peer review of the model indicated that substantial improvement to the regional model is needed. The regional agencies have supported AMBAG in its requests for grant funding and data gathering to improve and keep the travel forecast model current.

**COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS**

This section of the report reviews the above-described responsibilities currently performed by all four agencies and evaluates the costs and benefits of having the single-county agencies or another agency take on those responsibilities. Appendix 3 is a summary matrix of this analysis.

**Transit District and Highway Fund Benefits**

Transportation Agency staff has met with the General Manager/CEO of Monterey-Salinas Transit (MST) and made a presentation to the district’s Board of Directors. The General Manager has indicated that it would find value in being designated the recipient of applicable Federal Transit Administration (FTA) funds, and currently has the necessary approvals to serve in this role. Currently AMBAG holds this designation for some FTA funds, which creates an additional layer of approval for receipt of these grants. The issue of having two organizations instead of one required to approve federal funding is similar to that for highway funding and the TAMC-AMBAG relationship. TAMC staff agrees that it would be more efficient for a single agency to be designated the Federal Transit fund recipient (MST) and one agency designated the Federal Highway Administration fund recipient (TAMC) for our county. Similar benefits would accrue in Santa Cruz County.

*Evaluation: cost savings and efficiencies.*
Opportunities for Regional Coordination

Some individuals have expressed a concern that by taking the transportation responsibilities away from AMBAG that there will no longer be an opportunity for regional interactions regarding transportation or other matters (Appendix 4, Letter from League of Women Voters). In fact, Santa Cruz and Monterey County agencies are already collaborating on the 511 traveler information system program and are collaborating in support of the Monterey Bay Electric Vehicle Alliance.

Another way to collaborate is through a multi-county regional forum. The Executive Director of the San Joaquin Council of Governments, Andrew Chesley, discussed at the TAMC Executive Committee and the SCCRTC Transportation Policy Workshop how the eight San Joaquin Valley Regional Transportation Planning Agencies work together on issues of regional importance. They have a policy forum which represents elected officials from each county and an Executive Director’s forum. Although their eight county region has discussed the formation of a multi-county MPO (similar to AMBAG) to address regional issues, they have retained the independent agencies with this lower-cost policy forum despite shared air quality issues. (see Appendix 5 for their memorandum of understanding).

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

Evaluation: lower cost regional coordination; same individuals involved.

Sustainable Communities’ Strategy Development

Under a single-county MPO model, the single county agencies would be responsible for preparing and updating the Sustainable Communities Strategies, unless other arrangements were made. Since AMBAG is well underway in the development of a three-county sustainable communities’ strategy and has substantial grants in place to do so, the single-counties are contemplating a scenario in which this document would be finalized by AMBAG and be adopted by the single county agencies as a shared strategy for the region. According to the Air Resources Board, which is overseeing the development of these plans, there are other regions in the state who are preparing multi-county documents to satisfy the requirements of SB 375. In future single-county updates, one option is to have a shared air quality emissions target for the three-county air basin and the agencies must coordinate their updated strategy in order to reach the target on a multi-county basis.

Evaluation: allowing AMBAG to complete the current SCS effort would be most cost effective; could require future multi-county coordination on updates.

Multi-County Travel Demand Model

A budget has been developed by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission for the shared administration of the regional travel demand model among the Santa Cruz, Monterey, and San Benito regional transportation planning agencies and the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District. This budget involves contributions by each agency and would raise the level of
staffing devoted to this document above current levels to allow for improved ongoing maintenance of the model. The assumption is that prior to transition of the model to the joint administration that AMBAG would complete its model upgrades that are already funded and underway. Otherwise, the agencies would be required to make additional contributions to make the improvements recommended by the Federal Highway Administration’s peer review panel. Caltrans Audits indicated that a clear agreement outlining cost contributions and responsibilities would be required. The Federal Highway Administration raised questions as to whether the multi-county travel forecast model could be funded out of federal monies given to single counties, but both TAMC and Santa Cruz RTC staff felt that other areas had multi-county models and that our current multi-county model best reflects travel patterns (and in fact includes Santa Clara County, which is outside the Monterey Bay –AMBAG region). 

**Evaluation:** the savings from the single-counties scenario will free up funding that can result in better travel forecast model; requires ongoing interagency-coordination; requires upfront staff time to prepare the multi-agency agreement and work with the Federal Highway Administration to address the multi-county model issues.

### Air Quality Regulations

The California Air Resources Board has indicated that if the United States Environmental Protection Agency changes its air quality standard for ozone emissions back to the prior one-hour rule that the Monterey Bay Air Basin would fall out of conformity with federal standards due to emissions measured at the Pinnacles air station and possibly in Hollister. This change would place the region back into “non-conformity” status and require a certain amount of extra work that none of the four transportation planning agencies are currently conducting. This extra work would primarily be: 1) evaluation of the combined three-county Metropolitan Transportation Plan to determine if the projects in that plan will allow the region to meet the standards (required); and, 2) require adoption of a so-called State Implementation Plan for meeting those standards and adopting transportation control measures to further improve air quality. The analysis would need to be done on the entire air basin and therefore the three-county region. As is done in the San Joaquin Valley, if the agencies became single-county MPOs, they would need to coordinate air quality modeling throughout the air basin. This calculation would be facilitated by retaining the three-county travel forecast model.

**Evaluation:** falling back into “nonconformity” with federal standards will be an additional cost under a multi-county or single-county scenario without additional revenues; single-county operations will require greater coordination to meet requirements.

### Legal Issues and Federal Highway Administration

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) is having their legal staff confirm the methodology for withdrawing from an existing MPO and forming a new single-county federally-designated agency. These are issues that need to be resolved by FHWA before a final course of action is decided. In addition, FHWA has indicated prior to updating the single-county Regional Transportation Plan, the agency would need to update its federal Public Participation Plan. This plan was recently adopted by AMBAG with significant involvement of all three transportation agencies. While preparation of a single-county plan would be relatively straight-forward, there is an involved consultation and public outreach/review process that would make the adoption of such a plan somewhat time-consuming. It is important to synchronize the development of this public participation plan with the timely adoption of the Regional Transportation Plan and the federal transportation programming document by the end of 2013.
Evaluation: If a restructuring takes place, all agencies will need to work closely with the Federal Highway Administration to assure that their requirements are met and that logistically they can be met according to required timelines.

Regional Housing Needs Assessment and Housing, Population, Employment Forecasts

Staff received a briefing from Housing and Community Development staff on the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) process. This process involves state calculation of the housing needs by region that are to be included in the individual city and county housing elements. At present, AMBAG divides up the forecast for the Monterey and Santa Cruz County regions into city and county housing targets. San Benito County COG already conducts its own RHNA analysis. Under a single-county scenario, each of the regional transportation agencies would calculate the housing targets and would negotiate with the State Housing and Community Development department on its countywide numbers based on a number of demographic characteristics. These RHNA calculations fit into the development of the housing and employment forecasts that are developed every four years, as well as the Regional Transportation Plan, which the single-county transportation agencies already prepare for state purposes.

There are two implications for this shift under a single-county system. First, there would be greater control at a county by county level over the projections and outreach would be to all TAMC and SCCRTC member agencies. Second, there would be a significant need for resources every 8 years, when these RHNA calculations are required. The draft scenario budget presumes that $30,000 in additional consultant resources would be spent on this periodic process, in addition to agency staff time. It is worth noting that this exercise is required, but does not come with additional funding. Normally, agencies fund this housing allocation process with federal transportation funds, given the link to the regional plan.

Evaluation: under the proposed scenario there would be increased local control over housing allocations with an additional cost every eight years.

Audit Compliance

Staff met with the Caltrans audit staff to assure that we understood the new requirements for auditing in a change of relationship. Other federally-funded agencies, including but not limited to AMBAG, have had difficulties in complying with the very rigorous Caltrans audit requests. We learned that auditing requirements are the same as we currently have, but they would apply to a larger set of activities under a single-county MPO arrangement, given the larger amount of federal funds. As a result, we have included in the single-county budget additional financial staff time and resources for audit compliance. The discussion reinforced our understanding of the complexities of receiving federal funds, but also provided clear direction on how to best comply with those requirements and coordinate with Caltrans. It was clarified that existing AMBAG audit issues would remain with that agency and not be transferred to the single-county agencies.

Evaluation: additional audit compliance activities will require increased education and time/cost for the single-county agencies, but realistically it will be a transfer of efforts from AMBAG to the single-county agencies.

Transition Timing

Moving to two single-county MPOs would require a two part process. According to state law (see Appendix 6), there would need to be a vote of the city councils and county boards of
supervisors representing 75% of the tri-county region by population, including the largest city (Salinas) in order to withdraw from AMBAG as the federally-designated MPO. Also, the cities and county within Monterey and Santa Cruz Counties would need to designate their respective agencies as single county MPOs. Then, the Governor, most likely through the Caltrans Director, would need to approve the withdrawal and redesignation. Should those approvals occur, the Santa Cruz County RTC and TAMC would then become the MPOs and would take on the mandated transportation functions. While approval by the AMBAG board of directors does not appear to be required, concurrence from the AMBAG board would make the realignment easier to implement.

Based on discussions with Caltrans and the Federal Highway Administration, it would seem to make sense to transition to a single-county MPO status at the start of a federal fiscal year, which is October 1, 2012. There would be many activities taking place leading up to such a transition, including voting by local governing boards and potentially the update of a public participation plan related to adoption of the Federal Transportation Improvement Program. The timing would be coordinated with the planned adoption of Regional Transportation Plans in 2014 and the corresponding requirement for adoption of regional housing needs assessments prior to this adoption.

*Evaluation:* coordination of timing of any transition will be important; a transition will take place over time rather than all at once.

**THE FUTURE OF AMBAG REPORT AND AGENCY SURVEY**

In response to the issues raised above by the regional transportation planning agencies in Santa Cruz, Monterey and San Benito Counties, the AMBAG Interim Executive Director conducted a performance survey of member and partner agencies. The survey identified several areas for improvement that were grouped into categories, including: collaboration, communications, lack of leadership, financing/operating expenses, staff performance/training, duplication of services, mission/vision, and organization structure (see Appendix 7 for the survey results).

In coordination with staff, the Interim Director also prepared a report entitled *The Future of AMBAG*, presented to the AMBAG Board of Directors on September 14, 2011. This report, also distributed to the RTPA boards and member agencies, outlined three options for moving forward: 1) Combining all four transportation planning agencies into one; 2) forming two single-county MPOs, plus San Benito COG, and dissolving AMBAG; and 3) retaining the current four agencies and shifting half of the federal planning dollars allocated to the Santa Cruz and Monterey County regional transportation planning agencies back to AMBAG ($250,000) to improve investment in the regional travel forecast model. The report recommended the third option, in addition to a list of performance-related improvements. Appendix 8 is the executive summary of that report.

The Transportation Agency Director expressed concerns with the report’s recommendation, including the fact that it would not increase cost-effectiveness and would simply shift money from the two more locally-controlled agencies. Appendix 9 is a letter indicating the details of those concerns.
JOINT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES MEETING

At the request of the Transportation Agency for Monterey County, the Executive Committees of the four transportation planning agencies in the Monterey Bay region met jointly to discuss regional transportation planning coordination and consolidation issues raised in the AMBAG report and regional agency staff reports. They held a roundtable discussion among the elected officials regarding perspectives on AMBAG, areas for improved communication and collaboration and other issues to address (see Appendix 10 for meeting summary). They made several suggestions and agreed to hold a future meeting or perhaps meet regularly to work on the identified improvements.

ACTIONS TAKEN BY CITY OF SALINAS, AMBAG

Given its ability as the largest city in the region to veto or spearhead a movement to shift federal planning responsibilities to the single-county agencies, the City of Salinas was viewed as critical to the discussion. On October 11, 2011, the City heard a presentation by the AMBAG Interim Executive Director and the Transportation Agency Executive Director on the proposals for streamlining operations and addressing performance issues at AMBAG. The City Council action was essentially to support AMBAG in its current status with a request for various performance improvements and a report back in one year:

Upon motion by Councilmember Sanchez and second by Councilmember Lutes, the City Council voted unanimously following presentations from the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) and the Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC), requesting that the City Council provide input and direction to its representatives on AMBAG (Councilmember McShane) and TAMC (Councilmember Craig) respectively, regarding the function, structure and future of AMBAG by drafting a letter to AMBAG supporting AMBAG 1) in its current status, and 2) to provide better service to its member agencies, and 3) develop a “peer” review committee/process as part of the team to provide an objective opinion and recommendations to AMBAG and come back a year from today to report back. The peer review committee/process should include a pre and post survey outlining goals, objectives and implementation recommendations.

At its Board meeting on September 14, 2011, the AMBAG Board agreed to retain its current status and work on performance improvements, reduction of duplication of efforts, and increased collaboration with the single-county agencies. After some discussion, they agreed not to vote to shift federal planning funds from TAMC and SCCRTC back to AMBAG. The motion as approved was:

... to approve recommendations 1, 2 and 4 of the staff report. 1) Retain AMBAG in its current form as a regional COG and MPO; 2) Direct staff to identify and address any and all performance related issues going forward and report out to the Board of Directors at their January 2012 meeting along with a timeline for addressing the issues; 4) Improve coordination and collaboration throughout the region by conducting regional technical committee meetings, allowing other agencies ex-officio
status on the AMBAG Board of Directors, hold periodic joint executive committee meetings, and identify specific areas of duplication and strategies for addressing those. Motion passed unanimously.

Motion made by Director Talmage, seconded by Director Pendergrass to direct staff to discuss the MOU between AMBAG and the RTPA’s in order to appropriately fund the Regional Transportation Demand Model and avoid any duplication of transportation planning efforts. Motion passed unanimously.

In response to these actions, TAMC staff sent a letter (Appendix 11) to the AMBAG Interim Executive Director indicating a willingness to work on these objectives including reducing duplication of efforts, enhancing the regional travel forecast model and improving collaboration and communications among the four agencies. It is truly of benefit to all four agencies to work together towards continuous improvement in cost-effectiveness, collaboration and sharing of resources. It is anticipated that all agencies will report on the success of this effort by the close of 2012 in accordance with the request of the Salinas City Council.
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TO: Regional Transportation Commission (RTC)  
FROM: Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner  
RE: Adoption of the 2012 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP)  

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC):

1. Hold a public hearing to receive comments on the proposed 2012 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) and consider written comments received;

2. Consider staff and Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC) recommendations, Bicycle Committee recommendations, and Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&DTAC) recommendations for State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds (Attachment 2);

3. Adopt a resolution (Attachment 1) to program $8,939,000 in projected State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds in the 2012 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), as recommended by staff and the Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC) (Attachment 2);

4. Program $1,435,000 in Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds, as shown in Attachment 3 and recommended by staff, the Interagency Technical Advisory Committee and Elderly/Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee;

5. Make changes to previously programmed projects to reflect current project costs and schedules (Attachment 4); and

6. Request that the California Transportation Commission (CTC) and Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) incorporate these funding actions into the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP), respectively.

BACKGROUND

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC), as the state-designated Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for Santa Cruz County, is responsible for selecting projects to receive a variety of state and federal funds. These include State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds which are available for a wide range of transportation projects, with the exception of ongoing maintenance. The RTC programs funds and monitors approved projects through its Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP). The RTIP is typically adopted every two years. Interim amendments are made as needed.
The RTIP serves two primary purposes: 1) a tool to assist in monitoring the delivery of state and federally-funded projects; and 2) the RTC's proposal to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) for the region's share of funds from the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). After considering proposals submitted by RTPAs statewide, the CTC makes the final determination on which projects are programmed to receive STIP funds, in which year they are programmed, and when to release (allocate) funds to individual projects.

**DISCUSSION**

Staff recommends, upon completion of the scheduled public hearing, that the RTC adopt a resolution (Attachment 1) programming State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds (Attachments 2 & 3), and amending previously programmed projects (Attachment 4).

The Bicycle Committee, Elderly/Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E/DTAC), and Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC) reviewed projects proposed for STIP and RSTP funds at their November 2011 meetings. Committee recommendations are reflected in Attachments 2 and 3.

**Available STIP Funds**

The STIP program is made up primarily of revenues from the excise tax on gasoline and some federal Transportation Enhancement (TE) funds. For the 2012 STIP, up to $8,939,000 in new STIP is available for projects in Santa Cruz County through Fiscal Year 2016/17, though the California Transportation Commission (CTC) is only required to program $4.8 million of the region’s share in the 2012 STIP.

On September 15, 2011 the RTC issued a call for projects for the region’s targeted share of State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds. The RTC also indicated its intent to program $4 million of these STIP funds to the design and right-of-way phases of the Highway 1 41st Avenue to Soquel Drive Auxiliary Lanes project, which is a Tier 2 project of the HOV Lanes project environmental document. Applications for STIP funds were due October 27, 2011.

Attachment 2 reflects the list of projects submitted by project sponsors, as well as staff and RTC committee recommendations. A map of the projects is included as Attachment 2A. Staff recommendations are based on evaluation of the benefits identified by project sponsors, summarized in Attachment 2B. The staff recommendation is consistent with the RTC’s Regional Transportation Plan, which calls for a balanced multimodal transportation system. Summary fact sheets for each of the proposed STIP projects is also attached (Attachment 5).

**RSTP Funds**

In addition to selecting projects to receive the region's projected STIP funds through FY16/17, the RTC is also considering regional projects to receive approximately $1.4 million in Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds. Attachment 3 reflects existing RTC projects recommended for RSTP funds. These reflect costs of existing projects that cannot be funded with STIP funds. At its October 6, 2011 meeting, the RTC indicated its intent to program RSTP funds to these regional projects and reserve the remainder of FY11/12 RSTP funds (approximately $1.2 million) for future programming to local projects, following CTC action on the 2012 STIP in March 2012.
Highway 1 41st Avenue to Soquel Drive Auxiliary Lanes

The largest project proposed for State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds this cycle is the Highway 1 41st Avenue-Soquel Drive Auxiliary Lanes 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 roads, 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 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 will reduce congestion during peak travel periods, reduce delay, and improve bicycle and pedestrian access.

Environmental analysis of this project is being done as part of the combined Tier 1/Tier 2 Highway 1 HOV Lanes/41st–Soquel Auxiliary Lanes environmental document. $370,000 in proposed Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds will be used to transform the HOV lanes document into a tiered document. The $4 million in State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds proposed this cycle would be used for design and right-of-way. The RTC may pursue funds for construction through new local, state and/or federal opportunities that may arise or as part of the 2014 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) cycle. Estimated costs per component are as follows, however the cost to implement each separately could be higher:

<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>Northbound Auxiliary Lane between 41st Avenue and Soquel Avenue</td>
<td>$1,285,000</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>$11,000,000</td>
<td>$12,340,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbound Auxiliary Lane between 41st Avenue and Soquel Avenue</td>
<td>$775,000</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>$7,000,000</td>
<td>$7,830,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Bridge overcrossing of Highway 1 at Chanticleer Avenue</td>
<td>$510,000</td>
<td>$1,320,000</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>$6,830,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,570,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,430,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$23,000,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$27,000,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At their November 2011 meetings, the E&DTAC and Bicycle Committee emphasized their support for the bicycle and pedestrian bridge at Chanticleer.

Other Project Amendments

In addition to programming STIP funds to various projects, staff and project sponsors recommend that the RTC amend the RTIP to reflect updated schedule, cost and other administrative changes to several previously programmed projects (Attachment 4). These amendments include changes to project schedules or matching funds. The RTIP must be amended to reflect these changes in order to ensure federal and state funds are retained and accessible to project sponsors.
Public Hearing

Consistent with RTC Rules and Regulations, a public hearing has been scheduled for 10:00 a.m. to receive public input on the proposed program of projects and other amendments. A news release on the hearing was sent to local media and the hearing was advertised in the Santa Cruz Sentinel and Register-Pajaronian. Comments received as of November 22, 2011 are included as Attachment 6. Any additional written comments received by 2:00 p.m. on November 30, 2011 will be distributed at the meeting.

Next Steps

The RTC’s 2012 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), proposing projects for State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds, is due to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) by December 15, 2011. Based on proposals submitted statewide, CTC staff will inform RTC staff whether the CTC is likely to approve the RTCs proposal in January or February 2012. The CTC will hold hearings on STIP proposals in February 2012. CTC staff recommendations will be released by March 8, 2012 and the CTC is scheduled to adopt the 2012 STIP on March 28, 2012. If the CTC does not support the RTC’s proposals for STIP funds, staff will return at a future meeting with alternate recommendations.

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, approximately $9 million in new STIP funds are available for programming to projects in Santa Cruz County through FY16/17. The RTC is also considering regional projects to receive approximately $1.4 million in new Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds through FY11/12. Staff recommends that, following a public hearing, the RTC adopt a resolution selecting projects to receive STIP and RSTP funds and amending existing projects for the 2012 RTIP.

Attachments:
1. Resolution Adopting the 2012 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP)
2. Proposed STIP projects
2A. Map of STIP Proposed Projects
2B. Benefit Summary - STIP Project Nominations
3. Proposed RSTP projects
4. Proposed Amendments to Existing Projects
5. Project Fact Sheets
6. Public comments - Comments received as of November 21, 2011 are included in the packet.
RESOLUTION NO.

Adopted by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
on the date of December 1, 2011
on the motion of Commissioner
duly seconded by Commissioner

A RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE
2012 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
FOR SANTA CRUZ COUNTY TO
PROGRAM STATE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (STIP) AND
REGIONAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM (RSTP) FUNDS AND
AMEND PROJECT LISTINGS FOR PREVIOUSLY PROGRAMMED PROJECTS

WHEREAS, the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) prepared the 2012 Regional Transportation Improvement Program consistent with the 2010 Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), state law (including SB 45) and the California Transportation Commission’s (CTC) State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Guidelines, and in consultation and cooperation with local project sponsors and Caltrans District 5;

WHEREAS, the Commission must prepare and adopt a Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) for submittal to the California Transportation Commission in order for projects to be considered for the 2012 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP);

WHEREAS, the 2012 STIP Fund Estimate identifies $8,939,000 in State Transportation Improvement Program available for programming in Santa Cruz County through FY2016/17;

WHEREAS, Santa Cruz County has an additional unprogrammed balance of $2.6 million in federal Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds; and

WHEREAS, the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission is the agency responsible for assuring that the regional share of STIP and RSTP funds are programmed and expended according to CTC and Caltrans guidelines;

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

1. The 2012 Regional Transportation Improvement Program for Santa Cruz County is hereby adopted to:
a. Program $8.939 million in Santa Cruz County’s regional target of 2012 State Transportation Improvement Program funds to projects shown in Attachment 2; 

b. Program $1.435 million in Santa Cruz County’s share of Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds to regional projects shown in Attachment 3; and 

c. Amend project listings for previously programmed projects to reflect the most current project funding and schedule information, as shown in Attachment 4.

2. The California Transportation Commission is hereby requested to incorporate these amendments into the 2012 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments is hereby requested to incorporate these amendments into the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP).

3. STIP funding availability is contingent on approval by the California Transportation Commission (CTC).

4. Project sponsors are required to obtain SCCRTC concurrence in allocation, extension, amendment or other requests for proposed STIP projects prior to submittal of such requests to Caltrans or the CTC.

5. Concurrence will be handled administratively by SCCRTC staff unless substantive project issues require that concurrence be authorized by SCCRTC action.

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

Mark Stone, Chair

ATTEST:

George Dondero, Secretary

Distribution: AMBAG, CTC, Caltrans, Project Sponsors, RTIP files
**2012 RTIP: Staff Recommendations STIP**

Guaranteed minimum STIP: $4.775M, though CTC could agree to program to 2012 STIP Target: $8.939M (includes $890k TE target)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map #</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>STIP Funds Requested</th>
<th>Staff &amp; ITAC Recommendations</th>
<th>E&amp;D TAC Rec (increase PPM $80k, reduce others by $10K)</th>
<th>Bike Committee Rec</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RTC 24f</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Hwy 1 Soquel-41st Auxiliary Lanes and Chanicleer Bike/Ped Bridge: ROW/Design</td>
<td>Add aux lanes and bike/ped bridge - Design/ROW only</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>$3,990,000</td>
<td>Design &amp; ROW for Bike/Ped Bridge only $1,830,000</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Planning, Programming &amp; Monitoring (PPM)</td>
<td>RTC tasks required to meet state and federally mandated planning and programming requirements, monitoring of programmed projects.</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$230,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAP-P08</td>
<td>City of Capitola</td>
<td>Bay Ave/Capitola Ave Roundabout</td>
<td>Construct roundabout.</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$510,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAP-P04</td>
<td>City of Capitola</td>
<td>Park Ave Sidewalks</td>
<td>Add sidewalks from Cliffwood Heights neighborhood to Capitola Village, add crosswalks at Cabrillo and Washburn.</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$430,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC-P34</td>
<td>City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Branciforte Creek Bike/Ped Bridge</td>
<td>Build bridge to connect San Lorenzo Park Multi-use trail and levee trail near Soquel Dr.</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$2,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01SC</td>
<td>City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Soquel/Park Way Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>Install protected left turn lanes and signal</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>$440,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC 3B</td>
<td>City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>State Route 1 San Lorenzo River Bridge Widening: Design only</td>
<td>Widen bridge to add travel lanes.</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC 25</td>
<td>City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>State Routes 1/9 Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>Intersection modifications including new turn lanes, bike lanes/shoulders.</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
<td>$840,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01 SV</td>
<td>City of Scotts Valley</td>
<td>Vine Hill School Road and Tabor Drive Transportation Improvement Project</td>
<td>Add sidewalk, curb/gutter, bike lanes, 6’ pavement widening, ADA-Accessible Ramps</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$390,000</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAT-P28</td>
<td>City of Watsonville</td>
<td>Airport Boulevard Improvements</td>
<td>Includes road widening to accommodate extension of bicycle lane and portion of travel lane, installation of bus pull out, and installation of new sidewalk and curb ramps. East of Freedom Boulevard to County line.</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
<td>$840,000</td>
<td>Bike Lane and Sidewalks only $300,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO 1sd</td>
<td>County of SC</td>
<td>Alba Rd PM 3.48 Storm Damage Repair Project</td>
<td>Repair 50 ft. slipout to reopen roadway to 2-way traffic.</td>
<td>$485,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$485,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO 2sd</td>
<td>County of SC</td>
<td>Glenwood Drive PM 2.02 Storm Damage Repair</td>
<td>Repair 100 ft. slipout to reopen roadway to 2-way traffic.</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO 3sd</td>
<td>County of SC</td>
<td>Green Valley Rd PM 0.69 Storm Damage Repair</td>
<td>Repair 20 ft. section where roadway and shoulder distressed or destroyed around culvert.</td>
<td>$329,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$329,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO 4sd</td>
<td>County of SC</td>
<td>Nelson Rd PM 2.0 Storm Damage Repair</td>
<td>Build permanent bypass road around 350 ft. debris that has closed road.</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$1,189,000</td>
<td>$1,179,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map #</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>STIP Funds Requested</td>
<td>Staff &amp; ITAC Recommendations</td>
<td>E&amp;D TAC Rec (increase PPM $80k, reduce others by $10K)</td>
<td>Bike Committee Rec</td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO 5sd</td>
<td>County of SC</td>
<td>North Rodeo Gulch Rd PM 4.75 Storm Damage Repair</td>
<td>Repair 75 ft. slipout to reopen roadway to 2-way traffic.</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$650,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO 6sd</td>
<td>County of SC</td>
<td>Redwood Lodge Rd PM 1.65 Storm Damage Repair</td>
<td>Repair 80 ft. slipout/slump to reopen roadway to traffic.</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
<td>$840,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO 7sd</td>
<td>County of SC</td>
<td>Vienna Dr at Mesa Dr Storm Damage Repair</td>
<td>Repair 60 ft. slipout and sidewalk.</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$15,264,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,939,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,780,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$22,954,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No longer under consideration for 2012 STIP due to insufficient STIP - to be reconsidered in 2014 STIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>STIP Funds Requested</th>
<th>Staff &amp; ITAC Recommendations</th>
<th>E&amp;D TAC Rec (increase PPM $80k, reduce others by $10K)</th>
<th>Bike Committee Rec</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Hwy 1 Soquel-41st Auxiliary Lanes and Chanicleer Bike/Ped Bridge: Construction*</td>
<td>Add aux lanes and bike/ped bridge - CONSTRUCTION ROW/design only in 2012</td>
<td>$23,000,000</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$23,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Funding construction phase of Soquel-41st Auxiliary Lane in 2012 RTIP would require advance from CTC and redirecting funds from other projects; could also be phased/the RTC could decide to only fund portions of the project (e.g. Southbound lane, northbound lane, and bridge separate, though would increase total cost).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map #</th>
<th>Project Sponsor</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>STIP Funds requested</th>
<th>Staff Recommendation</th>
<th>Regional Significance</th>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>Mobility (congestion relief, support for all modes)</th>
<th>Accessibility (opportunity and ease of reaching destinations)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RTC 24f</td>
<td>RTC</td>
<td>Hwy 1 Soquel-41st Auxiliary Lanes and Chanileer Bike/Ped Bridge: ROW/Design</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>High - Serves over 100,000 travelers/day - commuter, goods movement, visitor, emergency vehicle, bicycle and ped travelers</td>
<td>Med - Merging, bike/ped</td>
<td>High- project to reduce peak period congestion, travel time, increase bike/ped access</td>
<td>Med - Increase access to medical facilities, schools, neighborhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>RTC</td>
<td>Planning, Programming &amp; Monitoring (PPM)</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>High - Mandated activities required for all projects to access state and federal funds</td>
<td>Low - assess needs, monitor safety projects</td>
<td>Low - assess needs, monitor projects</td>
<td>Low - assess needs, monitor projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAP-P08</td>
<td>Capitola</td>
<td>Bay Ave/Capitola Ave Roundabout</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Med - Medium use, ADT 10,000</td>
<td>Med - reduce # and severity of collisions, improve ped safety</td>
<td>Med - reduce peak hour queuing</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAP-P04</td>
<td>Capitola</td>
<td>Park Ave Sidewalks (Cliffwood Heights neighborhood to Capitola Village)</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>Low - Fill gaps in pedestrian network</td>
<td>Med - ped</td>
<td>Med - increase ped facilities</td>
<td>Med - increase travel options, access to schools, access to transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC-P34</td>
<td>City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Branciforte Creek Bike/Ped Bridge near Soquel Dr.</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Med - Est. 2000 users/day; fills gap in bike/ped network</td>
<td>Med -bike/ped</td>
<td>Med - increase bike/ped facilities; reduce travel time</td>
<td>Med - increase travel options, access to major job and activity centers, access to schools, access to transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01SC</td>
<td>City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Soquel/Park Way Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>High - Serves over 40,000 travelers/day (all modes) - ADT approx 30,000; serves travel between SC and Live Oak</td>
<td>High - Primary purpose of project. Currently avg 10-13 collisions/yr</td>
<td>High - Reduce delay, travel times, improve access to transit/transit ops, widen s/w</td>
<td>Med - improve access to schools, transit, medical facilities, activity centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC 38</td>
<td>City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>State Route 1 San Lorenzo River Bridge Widening: Design only</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>High - Serves majority of county population multiple times/year; over 74,000 vehicles/day</td>
<td>High - history of collisions</td>
<td>High - Reduce delay, travel times, peak PM congestion by 39%, improve access to transit op facility</td>
<td>Med - serves major job and activity centers, access to schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Project Benefits Summary -- STIP Project Nominations

*Summary of benefits identified in applications submitted by project sponsors*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map #</th>
<th>Project Sponsor</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>STIP Funds requested</th>
<th>Staff Recommendation</th>
<th>Regional Significance</th>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>Mobility (congestion relief, support for alt modes)</th>
<th>Accessibility (opportunity and ease of reaching destinations)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SC 25</td>
<td>City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>State Routes 1/9 Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
<td>High - Serves majority of county population multiple times/year; over 85,000 vehicles/day</td>
<td>High - history of collisions, all modes</td>
<td>High - Reduce delay, travel times, peak PM congestion, improve access to transit ops facility, bike/ped access</td>
<td>Med - serves major job and activity centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O1 SV</td>
<td>Scotts Valley</td>
<td>Vine Hill School Road and Tabor Drive Sidewalks and Bike Lanes</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>Low - Fill gaps in bike/pedestrian network</td>
<td>High - children walking in road now</td>
<td>Med - increase bike and pedestrian facilities, improve traffic flow</td>
<td>Med - increase travel options, access to schools, access to transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAT-P28</td>
<td>Watsonville</td>
<td>Airport Boulevard Improvements (extend travel and bike lanes, add sidewalks)</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
<td>High - serves approx 15k users/day; ADT 14,000. Alt route to Hwy 152.</td>
<td>Med-ped, other modes</td>
<td>High - Reduce congestion with bus pull out, lane widening, improve access to transit, add s/w, improve bike lane</td>
<td>Med - increase travel options, access to transit, serves major job and activity centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO 1sd</td>
<td>County of SC</td>
<td>Alba Rd PM 3.48 Storm Damage Repair</td>
<td>$485,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Low - low usage, low traffic volumes</td>
<td>Med - widen lanes, shoulder</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Med - fully reopen road to 2-way traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO 2sd</td>
<td>County of SC</td>
<td>Glenwood Drive PM 2.02 Storm Damage Repair</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Low - low usage, low traffic volumes</td>
<td>Med - widen lanes, shoulder</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Med - fully reopen road to 2-way traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO 3sd</td>
<td>County of SC</td>
<td>Green Valley Rd PM 0.69 Storm Damage Repair</td>
<td>$329,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Med - mid traffic volumes</td>
<td>Low - temp plate now</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Low - road currently open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO 4sd</td>
<td>County of SC</td>
<td>Nelson Rd PM 2.0 Storm Damage Repair</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$1,189,000</td>
<td>Low - low usage, low traffic volumes</td>
<td>Med - replace temp bypass</td>
<td>Low - reduce travel times</td>
<td>Med - reopen road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO 5sd</td>
<td>County of SC</td>
<td>North Rodeo Gulch Rd PM 4.75 Storm Damage Repair</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Low - low usage, low traffic volumes</td>
<td>Med - reduce potential conflicts</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Med - fully reopen road to 2-way traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO 6sd</td>
<td>County of SC</td>
<td>Redwood Lodge Rd PM 1.65 Storm Damage Repair</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
<td>Low - low usage, low traffic volumes</td>
<td>Med - reduce potential conflicts</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Med - reopen road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO 7sd</td>
<td>County of SC</td>
<td>Vienna Dr at Mesa Dr Storm Damage Repair</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Low - low usage, low traffic volumes</td>
<td>Med - ped</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Med - reopen sidewalk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** $15,264,000 $8,939,000
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Sponsor</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
<th>Productivity (increase efficiency of system, increase use of existing facilities)</th>
<th>System Preservation</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Cost Effectiveness/ Lifecycle Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RTC</td>
<td>Hwy 1 Soquel-41st Auxiliary Lanes and Chanicleer Bike/Ped Bridge: ROW/Design</td>
<td>Med - reduce incidents, increase reliability of travel times</td>
<td>Med - Reduce SOV, increase bike and pedestrian mode share; improve access to P&amp;K for carpool and transit use</td>
<td>Med - Will extend life of pavement on highway</td>
<td>Med - Improve air quality by reducing congestion and idling; shift travelers to bike and ped modes</td>
<td>Med - Materials used aimed at extending useful life of facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC</td>
<td>Planning, Programming &amp; Monitoring (PPM)</td>
<td>Low - assess needs, monitor projects</td>
<td>Low - assess needs, monitor projects, implement projects aimed at reducing SOV use</td>
<td>Low - assess needs, monitor projects</td>
<td>Med - used to prepare RTP, including SB 375 implementation</td>
<td>Low - benefit analysis, using performance measures of plans and funding proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitola</td>
<td>Bay Ave/Capitola Ave Roundabout</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Med - increase vehicle throughput</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Med - Reduce pollutants, GHG, fuel use, and storm water runoff</td>
<td>None identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitola</td>
<td>Park Ave Sidewalks (Cliffwood Heights neighborhood to Capitola Village)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Med - could increase transit use, increase ped mode share</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Med - Reduce pollutants, GHG, fuel use by shifting drive to ped</td>
<td>None identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Branciforte Creek Bike/Ped Bridge near Soquel Dr.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Med - Reduce SOV, increase bike and pedestrian mode share</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Med - Reduce pollutants, GHG, fuel use by shifting drive to bike/ped</td>
<td>N/A new facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Soquel/Park Way Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>Med - reduce travel time variability, non-recurring congestion, and transit times</td>
<td>Med - increase vehicle throughput, reduce stops 30%, reduce queues 74%, serve left turns</td>
<td>Med - Traffic signal and street lights</td>
<td>Med - Reduce pollutants, GHG, fuel use; storm water quality improvements</td>
<td>25+ years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>State Route 1 San Lorenzo River Bridge Widening: Design only</td>
<td>Med - reduce travel time variability, non-recurring congestion, and transit times</td>
<td>Med - increase vehicle throughput, address projected growth</td>
<td>High - Bridge seismic improvements</td>
<td>Med - Reduce pollutants, GHG, fuel use; storm water quality improvements; improve river flow/fish habitat</td>
<td>50+ year lifecycle; address future volumes, seismic for bridge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Project Benefits Summary – STIP Project Nominations

Summary of benefits identified in applications submitted by project sponsors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Sponsor</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
<th>Productivity (increase efficiency of system, increase use of existing facilities)</th>
<th>System Preservation</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Cost Effectiveness/ Lifecycle Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>State Routes 1/9 Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>Med - reduce non-recurring congestion, and transit times</td>
<td>Med - increase vehicle throughput, address projected growth</td>
<td>Low - pavement overlay part of project</td>
<td>Med - Reduce pollutants, GHG, fuel use; storm water quality improvements</td>
<td>25+ years to 2030 volumes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotts Valley</td>
<td>Vine Hill School Road and Tabor Drive Sidewalks and Bike Lanes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Med - increase bike and ped mode share, transit use</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Med - Reduce pollutants, GHG, fuel use by shifting drive to ped and bike</td>
<td>Reduce road wear and tear, idling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watsonville</td>
<td>Airport Boulevard Improvements (extend travel and bike lanes, add sidewalks)</td>
<td>Med - increase accessibility and safety to/from transit</td>
<td>Med - increase accessibility and safety to/from transit</td>
<td>Med-reduces backlog of road maintenance</td>
<td>Med - Reduce pollutants, GHG, fuel use by shifting drive to walk and transit</td>
<td>New construction and pavement lifecycle: 20 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of SC</td>
<td>Alba Rd PM 3.48 Storm Damage Repair</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>High - Primary purpose of project.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Reairs roadway</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of SC</td>
<td>Glenwood Drive PM 2.02 Storm Damage Repair</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>High - Primary purpose of project.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Reairs roadway</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of SC</td>
<td>Green Valley Rd PM 0.69 Storm Damage Repair</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>High - Primary purpose of project.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Reairs roadway</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of SC</td>
<td>Nelson Rd PM 2.0 Storm Damage Repair</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>High - Primary purpose of project.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Reairs roadway</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of SC</td>
<td>North Rodeo Gulch Rd PM 4.75 Storm Damage Repair</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>High - Primary purpose of project.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Reairs roadway</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of SC</td>
<td>Redwood Lodge Rd PM 1.65 Storm Damage Repair</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>High - Primary purpose of project.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Reairs roadway</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of SC</td>
<td>Vienna Dr at Mesa Dr Storm Damage Repair</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>High - Primary purpose of project.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Reairs roadway</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Project Benefits Summary – STIP Project Nominations

Summary of benefits identified in applications submitted by project sponsors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Sponsor</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Deliverability - Risks to project cost, schedule, funding</th>
<th>Economic Benefit</th>
<th>TE projects - Agree to use Conservation Corps?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RTC</td>
<td>Hwy 1 Soquel-41st Auxiliary Lanes and Chanicleer Bike/Ped Bridge: ROW/Design</td>
<td>CEQA/NEPA clearance, right-of-way, and permitting could impact schedule.</td>
<td>Med - job creation, facility used by visitors and goods movement</td>
<td>Yes - If TE used for portions of project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC</td>
<td>Planning, Programming &amp; Monitoring (PPM)</td>
<td>Ongoing project</td>
<td>Low - 1 FTE/yr, Work program includes economic analysis of transportation system</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitola</td>
<td>Bay Ave/Capitola Ave Roundabout</td>
<td>Public education and support will be needed; funding being sought from others</td>
<td>None identified</td>
<td>Yes - commit to see if they could construct portion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitola</td>
<td>Park Ave Sidewalks (Cliffwood Heights neighborhood to Capitola Village)</td>
<td>No risks anticipated</td>
<td>None identified</td>
<td>Yes - commit to see if they could construct portion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Branciforte Creek Bike/Ped Bridge near Soquel Dr.</td>
<td>Environmental permits needed; not fully funded</td>
<td>48 construction jobs, used by visitors, access to downtown, ecotourism</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Soquel/Park Way Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>No risks- project ready to construct</td>
<td>27 construction jobs, used by visitors, access to businesses</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>State Route 1 San Lorenzo River Bridge Widening: Design only</td>
<td>State permits and approval needed; project not fully funded</td>
<td>Med - 450 construction jobs, visitor use, access to econ centers, reduce flooding</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Project Benefits Summary – STIP Project Nominations

Summary of benefits identified in applications submitted by project sponsors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Sponsor</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Deliverability - Risks to project cost, schedule, funding</th>
<th>Economic Benefit</th>
<th>TE projects - Agree to use Conservation Corps?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>State Routes 1/9 Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>State permits and approval needed</td>
<td>Med - 123 construction jobs, visitor use, access to econ centers, reduce flooding</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotts Valley</td>
<td>Vine Hill School Road and Tabor Drive Sidewalks and Bike Lanes</td>
<td>No risks anticipated, but if not fully funded, will need to see other grants</td>
<td>Low - 20 jobs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watsonville</td>
<td>Airport Boulevard Improvements (extend travel and bike lanes, add sidewalks)</td>
<td>No risks anticipated</td>
<td>Med - 15 jobs, serves visitors, improves access to shopping/commercial</td>
<td>Maybe - open to seeing if corps could construct portion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of SC</td>
<td>Alba Rd PM 3.48 Storm Damage Repair</td>
<td>Environmental permits needed; no local funds</td>
<td>None identified</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of SC</td>
<td>Glenwood Drive PM 2.02 Storm Damage Repair</td>
<td>Environmental permits needed; no local funds</td>
<td>None identified</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of SC</td>
<td>Green Valley Rd PM 0.69 Storm Damage Repair</td>
<td>Environmental permits needed; no local funds</td>
<td>None identified</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of SC</td>
<td>Nelson Rd PM 2.0 Storm Damage Repair</td>
<td>Environmental permits and right-of-way mitigation; no local funds</td>
<td>None identified</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of SC</td>
<td>North Rodeo Gulch Rd PM 4.75 Storm Damage Repair</td>
<td>Environmental permits needed; no local funds</td>
<td>None identified</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of SC</td>
<td>Redwood Lodge Rd PM 1.65 Storm Damage Repair</td>
<td>Environmental permits needed; no local funds</td>
<td>None identified</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of SC</td>
<td>Vienna Dr at Mesa Dr Storm Damage Repair</td>
<td>Environmental permits needed; no local funds</td>
<td>None identified</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## RSTP Staff, ITAC, and E&DTAC Recommendations for Regional Projects

RTC has indicated its intent to reserve $1.2M RSTP for future programming to local projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Project Name Description</th>
<th>RSTP Recommended</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prelim Staff Recommendations: Funds needed immediately</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Combined Tier 1/Tier 2 Hwy 1 Corridor/Hwy 1 Soquel-41st Auxiliary Lanes and Chanicleer Bike/Ped Bridge: Environmental Review</td>
<td>$370,000</td>
<td>$12,779,000</td>
<td>FY11/12-12/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line Structures: Design</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>Oct 2011 to August 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Rail Structures Rehabilitation: Construction - Match to federal STIP funds Reserve as match, if federal STIP funds allocated by CTC (STIP would be reduced by same amount &amp; available for reprogramming in 2014).</td>
<td>$615,000</td>
<td>$5,350,000</td>
<td>FY12/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,435,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other RTC-Project RSTP Needs (NOT recommended with 2012 RTIP adoption in December -- may be considered in the future)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Project Name Description</th>
<th>RSTP Recommended</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Freeway Service Patrol (FSP) Maintain current levels of tow truck service for two years, to remove incidents during peak travel periods.</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td>$260,000</td>
<td>FY12/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>STARS analysis of Hwy 1 HOV project To conduct traffic and GHG analysis, compile data, document and integrate into tiered environmental doc.</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>FY11/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Hwy 1 Tiered Environmental Document - Reserve for Legal Defense Reserve for possible legal defense. Alt: could wait, program funds when/if document challenged.</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>FY12/13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## 2012 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP)

### Proposed Amendments to Existing Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Proposed Amendment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RTC 03</td>
<td>SC Branch Rail Line Acquisition, Corridor Preservation and Improvements</td>
<td>Add RSTP funds for design ($450k) and construction ($615K match to federal STIP, STIP to be reduced same amount at allocation and available in 2014 STIP).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC 27</td>
<td>Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network</td>
<td>Shift funds to later years based on current schedule, with construction anticipated in FY13/14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC 30</td>
<td>Hwy 1 Bicycle/Ped Overcrossing at Mar Vista</td>
<td>Update schedule and costs per phase: $500k PA/ED in FY13/14; $650k PS&amp;E in FY14/15; $5.18M Construction in FY15/16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAT 01</td>
<td>Hwy 1/ Harkins Slough Road Interchange</td>
<td>Shift funds to later years based on current schedule, with right-of-way anticipated in FY13/14.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROJECT FACT SHEET
Highway 1 41st-Soquel Auxiliary Lanes and Chanticleer Bike/Pedestrian Bridge
Design & Right-of-Way Phases

1. Implementing Agency: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC)

2. Amount of STIP Funding Requested: **$4,000,000**

3. Project Description/Scope: Add auxiliary lanes northbound (NB) and southbound (SB) on Highway 1 connecting 41st Avenue and Soquel Drive on/off ramps. Add bicycle/pedestrian bridge over Highway 1 at Chanticleer Avenue.

4. Project Cost by Mode:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Rehab</th>
<th>Road – Auto Serving</th>
<th>Bicycle</th>
<th>Pedestrian</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>TDM*</th>
<th>TSM*</th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*TDM=Transportation Demand Management (ex. rideshare programs); TSM=Transportation System Management (ex. ITS, signal sync)

5. Project Location/Limits: Highway 1 – 41st Avenue interchange to Soquel Drive interchange

6. Project Length in miles (if applicable): 1.5 miles

7. Implementation Schedule: Design and Right-of-Way start FY13/14

8. Cost Estimate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental (PA/ED)</th>
<th>Design (PS&amp;E)</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>Construction*</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>$2,700,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,300,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$23,000,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$27 million</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note- RTC not considering construction funds at this time

Project Benefits

9. 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Significance</th>
<th>Section of roadway serves over 100,000 vehicles per day; Serves commute, visitor, truck, emergency vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian travel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety (Hazard elimination)</td>
<td>Reduce incidents by providing more distance for merging and weaving; provide safe bike/pedestrian access across freeway</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Mobility (Provides congestion relief; support for alternative modes) | Project will reduce congestion 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) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Accessibility</strong> (Opportunity and ease of reaching desired destinations.)</th>
<th>Increases access to medical facilities, schools, neighborhoods by all travelers.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reliability</strong></td>
<td>Project aimed to reduce incidents and increase reliability of system for all modes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Productivity</strong> (throughput, increase vehicle occupancy, reduce SOV)</td>
<td>Project aimed at increasing bicycle and pedestrian mode share, improving access to park and ride lot and productivity of bus system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>System Preservation</strong></td>
<td>Project will resurface existing lanes extending the useful life of approximately 4 miles of freeway mainlines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air Quality/ Global Warming/Environment</strong></td>
<td>Project expected to reduce congestion and idling; plus shift travelers to bicycle and pedestrian.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Return on Investment/ Lifecycle Cost</strong></td>
<td>Materials used aimed at extending life of facilities, and roadway to be resurfaced to extend useful life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deliverability/ Risks to Project Cost, Funding or Schedule</strong></td>
<td>CEQA/NEPA environmental clearance, Right-of-way acquisition, and permitting could impact schedule; release of STIP funds by CTC (though potential issue for all STIP projects).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project funding</strong></td>
<td>ROW and Design phases proposed to be 100% STIP-funded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Benefits</strong> (jobs created, etc)</td>
<td>Project anticipated to generate medium level of jobs, be used by visitors and facilitate goods movement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enhancement Projects—agree to use Conservation Corps</strong></td>
<td>Yes — Bike/Ped Bridge.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*SCCRC is mandated by SB286 to give priority for TE funds to project sponsors that are working with/agree to work with local or state Conservation Corps.*
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PROJECT FACT SHEET
Highway 1 41st-Soquel Auxiliary Lanes and Chanticleer Bike/Pedestrian Bridge
Design & Right-of-Way Phases

1. Implementing Agency: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC)

2. Amount of STIP Funding Requested: $4,000,000

3. Project Description/Scope: Add auxiliary lanes northbound (NB) and southbound (SB) on Highway 1 connecting 41st Avenue and Soquel Drive on/off ramps. Add bicycle/pedestrian bridge over Highway 1 at Chanticleer Avenue.

4. Project Cost by Mode:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Rehab</th>
<th>Road –Auto Serving</th>
<th>Bicycle</th>
<th>Pedestrian</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>TDM*</th>
<th>TSM*</th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*TDM=Transportation Demand Management (ex. rideshare programs); TSM=Transportation System Management (ex. ITS, signal sync)

5. Project Location/Limits: Highway 1 – 41st Avenue interchange to Soquel Drive interchange

6. Project Length in miles (if applicable): 1.5 miles

7. Implementation Schedule: Design and Right-of-Way start FY13/14

8. Cost Estimate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental (PA/ED)</th>
<th>Design (PS&amp;E)</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>Construction*</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part of HOV EIR</td>
<td>$2,700,000</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
<td>$23,000,000</td>
<td>$27 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note- RTC not considering construction funds at this time

Project Benefits

9. 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Significance</th>
<th>Section of roadway serves over 100,000 vehicles per day; Serves commute, visitor, truck, emergency vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian travel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety (Hazard elimination)</td>
<td>Reduce incidents by providing more distance for merging and weaving; provide safe bike/pedestrian access across freeway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility (Provides congestion relief; support for alternative modes)</td>
<td>Project will reduce congestion northbound and southbound - during both AM and PM peak periods including:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Average Travel Time &amp;Travel Delay (vehicle hours of delay)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Number of Vehicle Trips (vehicle throughput)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Freeway Travel Time (vehicle hours of travel)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Travel Distance (vehicle miles of travel)
- Increase bicycle and pedestrian access

| Accessibility (Opportunity and ease of reaching desired destinations.) | Increases access to medical facilities, schools, neighborhoods by all |
| Reliability | Project aimed to reduce incidents and increase reliability of system for all modes |
| Productivity (throughput, increase vehicle occupancy, reduce SOV) | Project aimed at increasing bicycle and pedestrian mode share, improving access to park and ride lot and productivity of bus system. |
| System Preservation | Project will resurface existing lanes extending the useful life of approximately 4 miles of freeway mainlines. |
| Air Quality/ Global Warming/Environment | Project expected to reduce congestion and idling; plus shift travelers to bicycle and pedestrian. |
| Return on Investment/ Lifecycle Cost | Materials used aimed at extending life of facilities, and roadway to be resurfaced to extend useful life |
| Deliverability/ Risks to Project Cost, Funding or Schedule | CEQA/NEPA environmental clearance, Right-of-way acquisition, and permitting could impact schedule; release of STIP funds by CTC (though potential issue for all STIP projects) |
| Project funding | ROW and Design phases proposed to be 100% STIP-funded |
| Economic Benefits (jobs created, etc) | Project anticipated to generate medium level of jobs, be used by visitors and facilitate goods movement |
| Enhancement Projects- agree to use Conservation Corps* | Yes – Bike/Ped Bridge |

*SCCRTC is mandated by SB286 to give priority for TE funds to project sponsors that are working with/agree to work with local or state Conservation Corps

---

![Map of Tier II Project Limits](image)

Tier II Project Limits

Auxiliary Lanes (Northbound and Southbound)

Chanticleer Avenue Bicycle/Pedestrian Overcrossing
PROJECT FACT SHEET
State & Federally Mandated
Planning, Programming, and Monitoring

1. Implementing Agency: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC)

2. Amount of STIP Funding Requested: $300,000

3. Project Description/Scope: As the state-designated Regional Transportation Planning Agency for Santa Cruz County, the RTC is required to administer certain funds, monitor projects, and conduct a variety of planning and programming duties. This includes coordination with Caltrans on state highway projects and development of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP). Collectively the CTC identifies these duties as Planning, Programming, and Monitoring (PPM). The RTC is eligible to use up to 5% of its STIP county share for these tasks and historically has used between $150,000-300,000 per year. Since the 2012 STIP adds two additional fiscal years, it isWith the addition of FYadditional years to the 2012 STIP, Currently funds $150,000 is programmed in FY10/11 and no funds in future years. If the RTC does not secure STIP funds to perform these duties, additional local funds, such as Transportation Development Act (TDA), would need to be used. An additional $925,000 is needed to complete state and federally-mandated PPM activities for five years: FY10/11-14/15.

4. Project Cost by Mode:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Rehab</th>
<th>Road – Auto Serving</th>
<th>Bicycle</th>
<th>Pedestrian</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>TDM*</th>
<th>TSM*</th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Project Location/Limits: Santa Cruz County – all areas

6. Project Length in miles (if applicable): N/A

7. Implementation Schedule: Funds for FY15/16 and FY16/17

8. Cost Estimate: $150,000 per year

**Project Benefits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Significance</th>
<th>Mandated activities required for all projects (not just RTC projects) to access state and federal funds.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety (Hazard elimination)</td>
<td>Funds used to assess needs, plan and monitor safety projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility (Provides congestion relief, support for alternative modes)</td>
<td>Funds used to plan and monitor mobility projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility (Opportunity and ease of reaching desired destinations.)</td>
<td>Funds used to plan and monitor accessibility projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>Funds used to plan projects aimed at improving system reliability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity (throughput, increase vehicle occupancy, reduce SOV)</td>
<td>Funds used to plan projects aimed at reducing SOV use, increasing vehicle occupancy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Preservation</td>
<td>Funds used to access system preservation needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air Quality/ Global Warming/Environment</strong></td>
<td>Funds used to prepare RTP aimed at reducing GHG via SB375 implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Return on Investment/ Lifecycle Cost</strong></td>
<td>Tasks include benefit analysis and performance measures to address.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deliverability/ Risks to Project Cost, Funding or Schedule</strong></td>
<td>No – ongoing annual tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project funding</strong></td>
<td>Tasks partially funded by Transportation Development Act Planning funds and state Rural Planning Assistance funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Benefits (jobs created, etc)</strong></td>
<td>Work program includes analysis of economic benefits of transportation system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enhancement Projects- agree to use Conservation Corps</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*SCCRTC is mandated by SB286 to give priority for TE funds to project sponsors that are working with/agree to work with local or state Conservation Corps*
1. Implementing Agency: **City of Capitola**

2. Amount of STIP Funding Requested: **$200,000**

3. This is County priority number __2__ of __2__ projects.

4. Project Description/Scope: **Roundabout construction at the intersection of Bay Avenue and Capitola Avenue. A highly skewed geometry at this intersection results in lengthy cueing and increase vehicle/pedestrian conflicts. The project would address peak period demands while improving turning movements, pedestrian access and bicycle access**

5. Project Cost by Mode:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Rehab %</th>
<th>Road - Auto Serving 75%</th>
<th>Bicycle 10%</th>
<th>Pedestrian 10%</th>
<th>Transit %</th>
<th>Planning 5%</th>
<th>TOTAL 100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6. Project Location/Limits: **Bay Ave/Capitola Ave Intersection**

7. Project Length in miles (if applicable): **Intersection**

8. Construction Schedule: **Fall 2013-Spring 2014**

9. Total Cost Estimate:

| Environmental (PA/ED) $22,000 | Design (PS&E) $110,000 | ROW $88,000 | Construction $440,000 | Contingency $90,000 | Total Cost $750,000 |

**Project Benefits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Significance</th>
<th>ADT: 10,000</th>
<th>Improved pedestrian crossing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety (Hazard elimination)</td>
<td>Reduces collisions/improve safety for pedestrians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility (Provides congestion relief, support for alternative modes)</td>
<td>Reduce peak hour queuing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility (Opportunity and ease of reaching desired destinations.)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity (throughput, increase vehicle occupancy, reduce SOV)</td>
<td>Increase vehicle throughput</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Preservation</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality/ Global Warming/Environment</td>
<td>Reduce pollutants, fuel use, green house gases.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return on Investment</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deliverability/ Risks to Project Cost, Funding or Schedule</strong></td>
<td>Are there barriers to delivering this project? <strong>project would be first roundabout in Capitola so public support may be an issue. Funding will come from a multiple sources including air quality grants, and local funding.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project funding</strong></td>
<td>STIP funds will not provide 100% of the funding. Air Board grants and local funding will be sought as part of the final funding package. No local funds secured yet.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Benefits (jobs created, etc)</strong></td>
<td>None identified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enhancement Projects- agree to use Conservation Corps</strong></td>
<td>Yes - The City would commit to discussing with the either the state or community corps if they could construct portions of project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*SCCRTC is mandated by SB286 to give priority for TE funds to project sponsors that are working with/agree to work with local or state Conservation Corps*
PROJECT FACT SHEET
Park Avenue Sidewalks

1. Implementing Agency: City of Capitola

2. Amount of STIP Funding Requested: $200,000

3. This is County priority number 1 of 2 projects.

4. Project Description/Scope: New sidewalk construction that will provide primary pedestrian access from the Cliffwood Heights neighborhood to Capitola Village. Currently only 4 short segments of sidewalk exist. This project would complete the connection. The project will also include crosswalks at Cabrillo and Washburn improving access to transit stops on the south side of Park Avenue s. This project can be built in phases if less than full funding is awarded.

5. Project Cost by Mode:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Rehab %</th>
<th>Road Auto Serving %</th>
<th>Bicycle %</th>
<th>Pedestrian 90%</th>
<th>Transit 5%</th>
<th>Planning 5%</th>
<th>TOTAL 100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6. Project Location/Limits: Park Avenue from the Cliffwood Heights neighborhood to Capitola Village

7. Project Length in miles (if applicable): 1800 feet = 1/3 mile

8. Construction Schedule: Summer-Fall 2013

9. Total Cost Estimate:

| Environ-mental (PA/ED) 26,824 | Design (PS&E) 67,060 | ROW 10,000 | Construction 268,242 | Other* | Contingency 53,648 | Total Cost 425,774 |

Project Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Significance</th>
<th>Fills gap in local pedestrian network</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety (Hazard elimination)</td>
<td>Reduces collisions/improve safety for pedestrians. Project will provide improved pedestrian access along arterial roadway between residential area and Capitola Village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility (Provides congestion relief, support for alternative modes)</td>
<td>Increases number of pedestrian facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility (Opportunity and ease of reaching desired destinations.)</td>
<td>Increases travel options and opportunities; provides bike or pedestrian access to schools; provides improved pedestrian access to transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity (throughput, increase vehicle occupancy, reduce SOV)</td>
<td>Provides safer access to existing transit stop, could increase transit ridership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Preservation</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air Quality/ Global Warming/Environment</strong></td>
<td>Reduce pollutants, fuel use, green house gases; reduce number of vehicle miles traveled by shifting trips from auto to walk and transit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Return on Investment</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deliverability/ Risks to Project Cost, Funding or Schedule</strong></td>
<td>None identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project funding</strong></td>
<td>STIP funds will not provide 100% of the funding. No local funds secured yet, but general fund and gas tax will be used to supplement STIP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Benefits (jobs created, etc)</strong></td>
<td>None identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enhancement Projects- agree to use Conservation Corps</strong></td>
<td>Yes - The City would commit to discussing with the either the state or community corps if they could construct portions of project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*SCCRTC is mandated by SB286 to give priority for TE funds to project sponsors that are working with/agree to work with local or state Conservation Corps

**Other:** Petition with 94 signatures requesting these sidewalks submitted with application.
## PROJECT FACT SHEET
### Branciforte Creek Bike and Pedestrian Bridge

1. **Implementing Agency:** City of Santa Cruz

2. **Amount of STIP Funding Requested:** $1,000,000

3. **This is County priority number ___4___ of ____4____ projects.**

4. **Project Description/Scope:**
   
   The project is to construct a bike and pedestrian bridge across the Branciforte Creek channel (near Soquel Avenue and Dakota Street) and path connections to the existing San Lorenzo River levee multi-use trail. This project will close the gap in the 3-mile long San Lorenzo River levee pathway system.

   The levee pathway is a direct north-south alternative transportation commute route, conveniently located in the core of the City and connecting employment areas with neighborhoods. The connection serves the Beach/Boardwalk area, through Downtown, County Government Center and to the Harvey West Area for commuting and recreation. Interconnections exist with cross-town bike lanes, sidewalks and other paths.

   The project also has environmental and educational purposes, bringing the public closer to and within the natural environment. No work is planned in the river or riparian areas.

5. **Project Cost by Mode:** **Bike 50%; Pedestrian 50%**

6. **Project Location/Limits:** Branciforte Creek near Soquel Drive/San Lorenzo River Path.

7. **Project Length in miles (if applicable):** Approx. 500 feet with trail connections

8. **Construction Schedule:** Summer-Fall 2013

9. **Total Cost Estimate:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental (PA/ED)</th>
<th>Design (PS&amp;E)</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Other*</th>
<th>Contingency</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$1,600,000 (with 2 year escalation)</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>$2,400,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*What is included in other? Construction Management and Administration

### Project Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Significance</th>
<th>Avg number of users- 2000 per/day Population served/benefiting from project: Santa Cruz residents, employees and visitors.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety (Hazard elimination)</td>
<td>Removes bikes and pedestrians from street system onto a through path, reducing potential conflict with vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility (congestion relief, support alternative modes)</td>
<td>Increase bike/ped facilities; Reduce commute times for bicyclists and pedestrians. Improve accessibility to natural area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility (Opportunity and ease of reaching desired destinations.)</td>
<td>Increase travel options and opportunities, serves major activity or job centers, provide bike/ped access to schools, provide new pedestrian access to transit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reliability  
N/A

**Productivity (throughput, reduce SOV)**  
Potentially reduce single occupancy vehicles

System Preservation  
N/A

Air Quality/ Global Warming/Environment  
Reduce pollutants, fuel use, green house gases, number of vehicle miles traveled by shifting trips from cars to bikes and walking.

Return on Investment/ Lifecycle Cost  
N/A – new facility

**Deliverability/ Risks to Project Cost, Funding or Schedule**  
Are there barriers to delivering this project?  
Environmental permits could delay project, though project is being designed to reduce permitting requirements.

**Project funding**  
Project not fully funded. City seeking other state and federal funds dedicated for trail or bike/pedestrian projects. Some local funds committed to project.

**Economic Benefits (jobs created, etc)**  
Estimated # of Jobs Created or Saved by project 48 construction jobs  
Use by visitors Yes  
Other economic benefits: Access to Downtown, compliments Ecotourism

**Enhancement Projects- agree to use Conservation Corps**  
Yes

---

*SCCRTC is mandated by SB286 to give priority for TE funds to project sponsors that are working with/agree to work with local or state Conservation Corps*
PROJECT FACT SHEET
Soquel/Park Way Traffic Signal Improvements

1. Implementing Agency: City of Santa Cruz
2. Amount of STIP Funding Requested: $500,000
3. This is County priority number __3__ of __4___ projects.
4. Project Description/Scope: This safety project includes the installation of protected left-turn phasing (green/red arrow indicators) at the Soquel/Park Way signalized intersection on the east side of Santa Cruz. This arterial is the primary east-west corridor for the City and County of Santa Cruz, with approximately 30,000 vpd and a growing number of cyclists and pedestrians. Bike lanes were installed a few years ago and they are well used. The intersection is an important transfer point for Metro users. It is adjacent to the main Palo Alto Medical Foundation facility.

The removal and replacement of 2 retaining walls is required to provide enough width for the turn lanes. The design incorporates improved transit stops, bike lanes, and pedestrian push buttons and access ramps. There are many autos, trucks, buses, bike and pedestrian uses in this constrained area, especially during peak hours.

The project design and easement acquisition is complete. The project is ready to construct. The funding request is for construction of the project, with 50% of the project costs paid with local funds.

5. Project Cost by Mode:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Rehab</th>
<th>Road-Auto Serving</th>
<th>Bicycle</th>
<th>Pedestrian</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>TDM*</th>
<th>TSM*</th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*TDM=Transportation Demand Management (ex. rideshare programs); TSM=Transportation System Management (ex. ITS, signal sync)

6. Project Location/Limits: Soquel Drive at Park Way
7. Project Length in miles (if applicable): At intersection
8. Construction Schedule: Summer 2012-Spring 2013
9. Total Cost Estimate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental (PA/ED)</th>
<th>Design (PS&amp;E)</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Other*</th>
<th>Contingency</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>$940,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*What is included in other? Construction Management and Administration

**Project Benefits**
Improved multimodal access, significant improvements to safety for all users,, reduction in delays, reduction in GHG.

**Regional Significance**
Used by/serves 40,000 travelers/day (all modes)
ADT: ~30,000 VPD in 2010 & ~36,000 in 2030.
Serves City of Santa Cruz and County residents
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Safety</strong> (Hazard elimination)</th>
<th>Will reduce fatal or injury collision, all modes. On average 10 of 13 annual collisions are susceptible to correction. Transit stop relocated to safer location.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mobility</strong> (congestion relief, support alternative modes)</td>
<td>Project to reduce delay by 5.2 vehicle hours, reduce commute times, peak and non-peak period travel times, improve access to transit operation and to transit facilities, widen sidewalks, preserve existing bicycle facilities and improve transit stops and access to transit stops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessibility</strong> (Opportunity and ease of reaching desired destinations.)</td>
<td>Improves all travel options: access to transit, serve major activity and job center, provide bike/ped access to school (Harbor High+), improved access to transit, access to local businesses and medical clinic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reliability</strong></td>
<td>Address travel time variability, non-recurring congestion and improve transit times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Productivity</strong> (throughput, reduce SOV, etc)</td>
<td>Increase throughput - reduces vehicle stops by 30% during peak hour, reduces queues by 74% with projected traffic. Total daily vehicle trips: ~30,000 ADT existing &amp; ~36,000 projected Total peak period trips: ~ 3,300 PM existing &amp; ~ 4,000 projected Other: Safely serves left-turning vehicles to local businesses, Palo Alto Medical Clinic and neighborhoods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>System Preservation</strong></td>
<td>Traffic signal and street light maintenance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air Quality/ Global Warming/Environment</strong></td>
<td>Project will reduce smog forming pollutants, reduce Greenhouse Gas (GHG), fossil fuel and energy use. Reduce Storm Water Runoff: Storm water quality improvement to be installed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Return on Investment/ Lifecycle Cost</strong></td>
<td>Extending the lifecycle of existing transportation facilities: <strong>Minimum 25 years</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deliverability/ Risks to Cost, Funds or Schedule</strong></td>
<td>Are there barriers to delivering this project? <strong>No, project is ready to construct</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project funding</strong></td>
<td>Project fully funded – City has committed matching funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Benefits (jobs created, etc)</strong></td>
<td>Estimated # of Jobs Created or Saved by project: <strong>27 construction jobs</strong> Use by visitors: <strong>Yes</strong> Other economic benefits: <strong>Improved access to local businesses.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enhancement Projects-agree to use Conservation Corps</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROJECT FACT SHEET
State Route 1 San Lorenzo Bridge Widening/Replacement

1. Implementing Agency: City of Santa Cruz

2. Amount of STIP Funding Requested: $1,000,000

3. This is County priority number 2 of 4 projects.

4. Project Description/Scope: The proposed project includes the widening or replacement of the State Route 1 bridge over the San Lorenzo River. The structure would be 3 lanes southbound and 4 lanes northbound. It is currently 2 lanes in each direction. The bridge constructed in 1955/56 does not have the capacity to serve traffic conditions and prevents the full utilization of the lanes at the State Route 1/9 intersection. The 2005 AADT is 62,000 and projected to be over 100,000 in 2030.

The draft Project Study Report (PSR-PDS) has been submitted to Caltrans for approval and the cooperative Agreement for the Project Approval and Environmental Document (PA/ED) development is being negotiated.

The funding request is for design of the project.

5. Project Cost by Mode:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Road Service</th>
<th>Bicycle</th>
<th>Pedestrian</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>TDM*</th>
<th>TSM*</th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Project Location/Limits: The project is located on State Route 1, between State Route 9 and the State Route 1/17 interchange. Projects limits are at PM 17.31 to PM 17.51 on State Route 1.

7. Project Length in miles (if applicable): The total project length is approximately 1,200 feet

    Construction Schedule: Spring 2015-December 2016

9. Total Cost Estimate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental (PA/ED)</th>
<th>Design (PS&amp;E)</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Other*</th>
<th>Contingency</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$1.5 million</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$15 million</td>
<td>$1.0 million</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>$17.8 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*What is included in other? Construction Management and Administration

Project Benefits
The bridge has been a significant concern to the community, City and County, within the context of the State Route 1/9 intersection as they are closely linked and due to the potential for flooding. It is a significant bottle neck to accessing many areas of Santa Cruz, including the University, Harvey West, Westside and Downtown. The draft Project Study Report (PSR-PDS) was developed by the City and submitted to Caltrans early this year. It has been determined that the addition of lanes is needed to fully serve the Route 1/9 intersection and reduce backups at the Route 1/17.
The project reduces congestion issues at the intersection and at the interchange therefore improving access for all auto, transit and trucks by the addition of lanes by reducing delays, improving safety and reduce GHC. The improvements also include current seismic design standards, and if replaced will reduce flooding potential in the area and improve fish passage conditions. Widened shoulders improve highway worker safety.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Significance</th>
<th>Used by/serves more than 75% of county multiple times/year Average number of travelers/day (all modes): 124,000 projected. ADT: ~74,000 VPD in 2010 &amp; ~103,000 VPD projects in 2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety (Hazard elimination)</td>
<td>There have been several fatal or injury collisions. Other safety hazard: Improved highway worker safety. Average of 4.79 collisions vs. actual of 7.63 collisions per million miles traveled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility (congestion relief, support alternative modes)</td>
<td>Project to reduce PM peak congestion by 39%, reduce commute times, peak and non-peak period travel times, and improve access to transit operation and to transit facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility (Opportunity and ease of reaching desired destinations.)</td>
<td>Increase travel options, access to transit, serve major activity and job center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>Address travel time variability, non-recurring congestion and improve transit times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity (throughput, reduce SOV, etc)</td>
<td>Increase throughput; Total daily vehicle trips: Projected Rte 1 ~103,000 ADT Total peak period trips: Projected ~ 6,500 AM &amp; ~ 7,600 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Preservation</td>
<td>Reduces back log of bridge maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality/ Global Warming/Environment</td>
<td>Project will reduce smog forming pollutants; reduce Greenhouse Gas (GHG), fossil fuel and energy use. Storm water quality improvement to be installed. Other: Potential to reduce obstructions to fish passage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return on Investment/ Lifecycle Cost</td>
<td>Extending the lifecycle of existing transportation facilities: Minimum 50 years. Projected volumes are to 2030. Includes improved seismic resistance, reduced flooding and improved fish habitat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverability/ Risks to Project Cost, Funding or Schedule</td>
<td>Are there barriers to delivering this project? State Permits and Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project funding</td>
<td>Project not fully funded – City will be working to secure construction funds from various sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Benefits (jobs created, etc)</td>
<td>Estimated # of Jobs Created or Saved by project: 450 construction jobs Use by visitors: Yes Other economic benefits: Improved access to industrial Westside and Harvey West areas, UCSC and Downtown. Reduces flooding potential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement Projects-use Cons Corps</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROJECT FACT SHEET
State Route 1/9 Intersection Improvements

1. Implementing Agency: City of Santa Cruz

2. Amount of STIP Funding Requested: $1,000,000

3. This is County priority number __1__ of __4__ projects.

4. Project Description/Scope: The proposed project includes the following improvements at the State Route 1/9 intersection. The intersection improvements require a small amount of road widening on Highway 1 (west of Highway 9) and on both sides of Highway 9 (River Street). The project design plan is attached to the application. The scope includes the following components:
   - Add a second left-turn lane on Highway 1 southbound to Highway 9 northbound.
   - Add a second northbound through lane and shoulder on northbound Highway 9, from Highway 1 to Fern Street, to receive vehicular and bicycle traffic from both the new left turn lane on Highway 1 and the 2 lanes and bike lane from northbound River Street.
   - Add a right-turn lane and shoulder on northbound Highway 9, between Fern Street and Encinal Street, to accommodate traffic turning into the Tannery Arts Center.
   - Add a through-left turn lane on northbound River Street.
   - Replace channelizers on Highway 9 at the intersection of Coral Street.
   - Provide sufficient lane width along the northbound through/left turn lane on Highway 9 from Fern Street to Encinal Street.
   - Add a new sidewalk along the east side of Highway 9 from Fern Street north to Encinal Street.
   - Add a new through/left turn lane on southbound Highway 9.
   - Include Traffic Signal interconnect to adjacent signals.

5. Project Cost by Mode:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road –Auto Serving</th>
<th>Bicycle</th>
<th>Pedestrian</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>TDM*</th>
<th>TSM*</th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Project Location/Limits: The project is located at the State Route 1/9 intersection, with limits at PM 17.5/17.7 on Highway 1 and PM 0.0/0.2 on Highway 9.

7. Project Length in miles (if applicable): Approximately 0.5 miles


9. Total Cost Estimate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental (PA/ED)</th>
<th>Design (PS&amp;E)</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Other*</th>
<th>Contingency</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>$4.1 Million</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>$5,800,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*What is included in other? Construction Management and Administration

Project Benefits
The intersection has been a significant concern to the community, City and County, for many years. It is a significant bottle neck to accessing many areas of Santa Cruz, including the University, Harvey West and Downtown. The Project Study Report was originally completed by
Caltrans in 2001, but then no additional work was done on developing the project until the City of Santa Cruz funded the PA/ED process. It has been determined on a local, regional and state level that intersection improvements are the only cost effective and reasonable solution available.

The project will not resolve all congestion issues at the intersection, but it has been determined through the current development process that the project will improve access for all users by the addition of lanes, reduce delays, improve safety and reduce GHC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Significance</th>
<th>Intersection used by/serve more than 75% of county multiple times per year; ADT: Current-85,000 projected 110,000 in 2030; serves regional commerce, tourism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety (Hazard elimination)</td>
<td>There have been several fatal and injury incidents, all modes. Current accident rate is 0.68 vehicles per million. Expected accident rate after project construction is 0.43 per million vehicles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility (congestion relief, support alternative modes)</td>
<td>Project to reduce PM peak congestion by 39%, reduce commute times, peak and non-peak period travel times, increase pedestrian and bicycle use/safety, and improve access to transit operation facilities and provide for superior emergency access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility (Opportunity and ease of reaching desired destinations.)</td>
<td>Increase travel options, access to transit, serve major activity and job centers, provide bike and ped access to schools, and provide minor new pedestrian access to transit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>Address non-recurring congestion and improve transit times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity (throughput, reduce SOV, etc)</td>
<td>Total daily vehicle trips: Projected in 2030: Rte 1 ~89,000 &amp; Rte 9 ~26,000 ADT Total peak period trips: Projected in 2030; ~ 6,500 AM &amp; ~ 7,600 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Preservation</td>
<td>Overlay part of project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality/ Global Warming/Environment</td>
<td>Project will reduce smog forming pollutants, reduce Greenhouse Gas (GHG), fossil fuel and energy use. Reduce Storm Water Runoff: Storm water quality improvement to be installed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return on Investment/ Lifecycle Cost</td>
<td>Extending the lifecycle of existing transportation facilities: Projected volumes are 2030 with anticipated life of project est. to be 25 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverability/ Risks to Cost, Funding, Schedule</td>
<td>Are there barriers to delivering this project? State Permits and Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project funding</td>
<td>Significant local funds are budgeted/reserved/available for project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Benefits (jobs created, etc)</td>
<td>Estimated # of Jobs Created or Saved by project: 123 construction jobs Use by visitors: Yes Other economic benefits: Improved access to industrial Westside and Harvey West areas, UCSC and Downtown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement Projects - agree to use Conservation Corps*</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*SCCRTC is mandated by SB286 to give priority for TE funds to project sponsors that are working with/agree to work with local or state Conservation Corps
PROJECT FACT SHEET

Vine Hill Elementary School Sidewalk and Bike Lanes Project

1. Implementing Agency: City of Scotts Valley

2. Amount of STIP Funding Requested: $450,000

3. This is priority number 1 of 1 projects. *(If requesting funds for more than one project)*

4. Project Description/Scope: The improvements consist of construction of new sidewalk (Portland Cement Concrete (PCC)) for pedestrians, pavement widening for bike lanes (about 6’), ADA-Accessible Ramps and other incidental items including PCC Curb/Gutter, four foot-high gravity retaining wall in some areas.

5. Project Cost by Mode:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bicycle</th>
<th>Pedestrian</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Project Location/Limits: North side of Vine Hill School Road and both sides of Tabor Drive, along the Vine Hill Elementary School’s frontage property. Vine Hill Elementary School is located on the northwest corner of the Vine Hill School Road and Tabor Drive intersection in the City of Scotts Valley. Vine Hill School Road also provides accesses to the City’s primary recreational facility, Siltanen Park. Siltanen Park is a high sports participation facility containing three baseball fields, soccer fields, swimming pool, children’s playground, and a group picnic area. During sporting seasons and sporting events, traffic congestion increases significantly. The picnic area also attracts a significant amount of traffic with 225 participants per day. There is sidewalk on the south side and bike lanes on both sides of Vine Hill School Road. There is sidewalk in some areas of Tabor Drive outside of the proposed project limits. Completion of this project would result in widening Tabor Drive from about 26’ to 32’ for bike lanes and provides sidewalk on both sides of Tabor Drive linking with the existing sidewalk.

7. Project Length: Adds approximately 1,800 linear feet of pedestrian and 1,000 linear feet of bike lane facilities.

8. Construction Schedule: Spring 2013

9. Cost Estimate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Environmental (PA/ED)</th>
<th>Design (PS&amp;E)</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Other*</th>
<th>Contingency</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>380,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*What is included in other? Construction Support

**Project Benefits**

The residents of Vine Hill School Road, Tabor Drive as well as surrounding neighborhoods use the project’s roadways to access schools, parks, commercial and employment centers, corporate buildings, urgent care medical clinics, shopping centers, small businesses. All motorists, pedestrians and bicyclists would benefit from the implementation of the proposed project, including transit riders embarking or disembarking buses at the Bus Stop located at the main entrance to Siltanen Park on Vine Hill School Road.

- School children at Scotts Valley Middle School and Vine Hill Elementary School and Bethany College students and staff/teachers who travel to and from school
- Visitors to Siltanen Park (city’s primary recreation facility used by an average of 225 people per day, many of whom walk or bike to this 7-acre site (expected to be expanded to 17-acres), with
three baseball fields, soccer field, swimming pool, children’s playground and group picnic area)
- Students and staff attending Scotts Valley High School
- Pedestrians who push baby strollers along the roadway
- Senior citizens who push personal shopping carts along this road and wait for transit service
- Physically challenged individuals who travel the road via motorized wheelchairs and scooters
- Employees who work in the commercial and business areas located at the southern boundary of this project and walk during their lunch hour
- Scotts Valley Police Department bicycle patrol officers who bicycle on Hacienda Drive to patrol schools and parks and parking lots

The proposed sidewalk and bike lanes construction project would provide an incentive to change people’s thinking by encouraging the use of more environmentally sensitive modes of transportation (e.g. walking or bicycling to commercial areas, schools and parks, and thus resulting in reduction in energy consumption, vehicle emissions (air pollution) and improved air quality. Also, walking and bicycling improves quality of life since it increases self-reliance and sense of responsibility.

| General Information/Regional Significance | The roadways encompassing the project carry about 5,400 vehicles per day.  
| Avg number of people directly served/day; number of users of facility/day: | 570  
| Students and 225 peoples | Population served/benefiting from project: Students and Siltanen Park users |

| Safety (Hazard elimination) | Constructing sidewalks along the school’s frontage property on Vine Hill Rd and adding bicycle lanes on Tabor and sidewalks on west side along school property will improve safety. Currently, the bicyclists and pedestrians are forced to share the roadway with vehicular traffic resulting in a potentially dangerous situation of possible collisions between pedestrians, bicyclists and motorists. Reducing this potential danger is of utmost importance. Implementation of this project and the elimination of the conflict between cars, pedestrians, and bicyclists. One of the primary safety hazards around the school is parents or caretakers dropping off and picking up their children. Since motorists and pedestrians use the same roadway, the danger becomes escalated. Scotts Valley School District officials have informed the City that the residents have frequently expressed their concern for children’s safety when dropping off along the school property on Vine Hill School Road and Tabor Way, due to the lack of designation between bicycles, pedestrians, and vehicles. The absence of a sidewalk and adequate bicycle lanes on these roads in Scotts Valley exposes pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit service patrons to potential danger from the following sources:  
- hazard from potholes, bumps, cracks, rocks, mud, debris, protruding shrubbery, and visual traffic impairments  
- can cause conflicts and collisions among pedestrians, bicyclists and vehicles.  
- deters people from walking, bicycling, and using the bus service, consequently encouraging them to use vehicles, thus increasing traffic congestion, delays and pollution.  

While no documented fatal or injury accidents to date, reducing fatal and injury collision is of utmost importance to the City of Scotts Valley; this project will reduce potential conflicts.

Implementation of the proposed improvements will result in a significant increase in safety of those utilizing the roadway by:
- providing pedestrians (particularly school children) with a safe place to walk  
- providing bicyclists with a safe place to ride  
- providing transit riders with a safe place to walk to bus stops to board and disembark from the bus
- providing pedestrians, bicyclists, and motorists with clearly designated travel areas to reduce conflict.

The proposed project would solve the existing problems by providing:
- an incentive, as opposed to fear, for using alternative transportation.
- a reduction of motorized transportation.
- a viable alternative to using vehicles.
- an incentive, as opposed to fear, for using alternative transportation.
- a reduction of motorized transportation.
- a reduction of vehicular/pedestrian/bicyclist conflicts
- better control of pedestrians, bicyclists and vehicles.
- link for pedestrians between neighborhoods
- enhanced traffic flow by increasing capacity and decreasing delay
- improved speed control of vehicles turning through an intersection
- a safe location for traffic control devices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mobility</th>
<th>Accessibility (Opportunity and ease of reaching desired destinations.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project expected to reduce vehicle delay, reduce congestion, reduce commute times, and reduce peak and non-peak period traffic by increasing pedestrian (1,800 Linear feet) and bicycle facilities (0.38 miles). Will provide the maximum feasible separation of the following basic modes of transportation: cars, buses, motorcycles, pedestrians, and bicycles. The project is expected to reduce existing pedestrian and vehicular conflict and thus provide a more efficient transportation system and access, i.e. improving roadway capacity, traffic flow and progression. Also, the proposed improvements in overall safety would result in a significant decrease in motorized transportation delay times (including vehicle hours of delay, peak period delay times as well as non-peak period travel times), as well as decrease in commute times, traffic congestion and energy consumption. The proposed project is expected to increase pedestrian and bicycle traffic significantly by providing the missing link to surrounding sidewalk and bike lane facilities on Vine Hill School Road and Tabor Drive, Glenwood Drive, and Scotts Valley Drive, thus increasing its usage significantly based on the following criteria:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. increased capacity and safety as well as decreased delay</td>
<td>Will project increase travel options and opportunities? Yes. The main purpose of this project is to provide bike and pedestrian access to schools, thereby eliminating gaps in the existing bike and pedestrian transportation system. Specific groups who would benefit from the safety features of sidewalks and bike lanes include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. enhanced traffic flow</td>
<td>- all users of Vine Hill School Road would benefit from indication of proper use of travel lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. decreased conflicts resulting from physical separation of vehicular as well as non-motorized traffic and pedestrians</td>
<td>- all users of Tabor Drive would benefit from indication of proper use of travel lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. a more positive indication to drivers of proper use of travel lanes</td>
<td>- all bicyclists on Vine Hill School Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. a protected area for the location of traffic control devices</td>
<td>- school children at Scotts Valley Middle School and Scotts Valley High School students who travel to and from school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. better speed control of vehicles turning through intersections</td>
<td>- employees who work in the commercial and business areas located at the southern boundary of this project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. better control of pedestrians and vehicles in the vicinity of the school</td>
<td>- Scotts Valley Police Department bicycle patrol officers who bicycle on Vine Hill School Road and Tabor Drive to patrol schools, parks and parking lots.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Transit riders: provides safe place to walk to bus stops to board and disembark from the bus stop located 1) near the entrance to Vine Hill Elementary School at the corner of Vine Hill School Road/Tabor Drive & Scotts Valley Drive intersection (See Figure 10), and 2) near the main entrance to Siltanen Park and just east of Vine Hill Elementary School on Vine Hill School Road
- Serve major activity or job centers: roadways used to access Scotts Valley High School, as well as commercial and employment centers, corporate buildings, urgent care medical clinics, shopping centers, small businesses, schools, and Siltanen Park (City’s primary recreation facility).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability</th>
<th>Does the project ensure on time trips and service?</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Address travel time variability (non-recurring congestion):</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve Transit times:</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Productivity (throughput)</th>
<th>Does the project increase throughput?</th>
<th>Yes, more people will be able to travel by foot.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce daily vehicle trips:</td>
<td>Yes, will reduce vehicle trips.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce peak period vehicle trips:</td>
<td>Yes, by shifting to walk and bike.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce single occupancy vehicles:</td>
<td>Yes, by shifting to walk and bike.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase Transit ridership:</td>
<td>Provides accessible sidewalk to transit stop</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System Preservation</th>
<th>Not a system preservation project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Air Quality/ Global Warming/Environment</th>
<th>Medium: Will reduce emissions by increasing bike/ped trips and reducing motor vehicle trips/vehicle miles traveled; will improve efficiency of access, traffic safety, flow and progression to commercial employment centers, recreational facilities, and schools from surrounding residential areas.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Return on Investment/ Lifecycle Cost</th>
<th>Adding sidewalk reduces roadway’s wear and tear.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverability/ Risks to Project Cost, Funding or Schedule</th>
<th>Dependent on CTC funding approval. If less than $450K is approved, the City would need to secure additional funds from other sources and/or scale back the project’s scope of work.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project funding</th>
<th>Is the project fully funded?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are local funds available?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Benefits</th>
<th>Estimated # of Jobs Created or Saved by project:</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Enhancement Projects-agree to use Cons Corps* | Yes |

*SCCRTC is mandated by SB286 to give priority for TE funds to project sponsors that are working with/agree to work with local or state Conservation Corps

Other: Letters of support provided from the Scotts Valley Unified School District, the Scotts Valley Police Department and the Santa Cruz Regional Transportation Commission Bicycle Committee.
PROJECT FACT SHEET
Airport Boulevard Improvements

1. Implementing Agency: City of Watsonville

2. Amount of STIP Funding Requested: $1,500,000

3. This is County priority number 1 of 1 projects.

4. Project Description/Scope: Project includes installation of road improvements on Airport Boulevard from east of Freedom Boulevard to the County line. Specific improvements would include road widening to accommodate extension of bicycle lanes and portion of travel lane, installation of bus pull out, installation of new sidewalk, improved pedestrian crossing, and ADA compliant curb ramps. (See Exhibit E for project location aerial and existing condition photos.)

Project would address safety concern regarding position of existing bus stop and pedestrian crossing into shopping center. Accident history at this location over the past few years has included some incidents at this crossing. There are also reports of “near misses” regarding this location.

5. Project Cost by Mode:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Rehab</th>
<th>Road – Auto Serving</th>
<th>Bicycle</th>
<th>Pedestrian</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>TDM*</th>
<th>TSM*</th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Project Location/Limits: Airport Boulevard from east of Freedom Boulevard to City Limits

7. Project Length in miles (if applicable): 0.2 miles


9. Total Cost Estimate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Design (PS&amp;E)</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Construction Support</th>
<th>Contingency</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$10 K</td>
<td>$50 K</td>
<td>$25 K</td>
<td>$1,130 K</td>
<td>$60 K</td>
<td>$225 K</td>
<td>$1,500 K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Benefits

Regional Significance
Avg number of users- approx 15,000 (bus ridership & vehicles, pedestrian and bike counts not available, est. 1000/day)
ADT: 14,000
Population served/benefiting from project: City, county residents and commuters using Airport Blvd to Holohan to access SR 152

Safety (Hazard elimination)
Reduces fatal/injury collision for all modes

Mobility (Provides congestion relief, support for alternative modes)
Reduce congestion with bus pull out and lane widening/bike lane; increase pedestrian facility (700’ of sidewalk); improve existing bike lane

Accessibility (Opportunity and ease of reaching desired destinations.)
Increase travel options and opportunities, accessible bus stop, serves major activity or job centers (adjacent to shopping, commercial, and library), provide new pedestrian access to transit, add sidewalks/ADA ramps

Reliability
Increase accessibility and safety to/for transit
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Productivity</strong> (vehicle occupancy, reduce SOV)</th>
<th>Increase accessibility and safety to/for transit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>System Preservation</strong></td>
<td>Reduces the back log of road maintenance or bus facilities overdue for maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air Quality/ Global Warming/Environment</strong></td>
<td>Reduce pollutants, fuel use, green house gases, number of vehicle miles traveled by shifting trips from cars to transit, walking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Return on Investment/ Lifecycle Cost</strong></td>
<td>New construction/paving lifecycle: 20 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deliverability/ Risks to Project Cost, Funding or Schedule</strong></td>
<td>Are there barriers to delivering this project? <strong>None anticipated at this time</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project funding</strong></td>
<td>Project funding proposed: STIP, Traffic Fees and Gas Tax. Other grant funding opportunities also to be explored. Local funds available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Benefits (jobs created, etc)</strong></td>
<td>Estimated # of Jobs Created or Saved by project: <strong>15 construction jobs</strong> Use by visitors <strong>Yes</strong> Other: <strong>Improve access to shopping/commercial business</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enhancement Projects-agree to use Conservation Corps</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>Maybe</strong> - The City would be open to discussing the construction of the appropriate project items with corps. Proposed project includes concrete and some landscaping items that could potentially be done by corps workers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*SCCRTC is mandated by SB286 to give priority for TE funds to project sponsors that are working with/agree to work with local or state Conservation Corps

---

**Aerial view of Airport Boulevard Improvements project limits:** East of Freedom Boulevard to City limits

\Rtcserv2\internal\RTIP\2012 STIP\Proposals\FactSheets\AirportImpWatFactSheet.doc
PROJECT FACT SHEET
Alba Rd PM 3.48 Storm Damage Repair Project

1. Implementing Agency: County of Santa Cruz
2. Amount of STIP Funding Requested: $485,000
3. This is County priority number 6 of 7 projects.
4. Project Description/Scope:
The Alba Road site at Post Mile 3.48 consists of an area approximately 50 feet in length where the outboard roadway has been distressed or destroyed by a slipout. The slipout has required the County to restrict traffic through the site to a single lane and therefore the safety of the motoring public is at a greater risk because of the narrow traffic lanes at this location. An earth retaining system is now needed to restore the roadway and shoulder width to its predisaster condition. The scope of work shall consist of the following: geotechnical investigation, prepare engineered plans, construct soldier pile retaining wall with tiebacks, structure excavation and backfill, new asphalt concrete pavement and dike, metal beam guard rail, erosion control and revegetation.
5. Project Cost by Mode: Road- Auto Serving 100%
6. Project Location/Limits: Alba Road at post mile 3.48
7. Project Length in miles (if applicable): .01 miles
8. Construction Schedule: Summer-Fall 2014
9. Total Cost Estimate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environ-mental (PA/ED)</th>
<th>Design (PS&amp;E)</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Other*</th>
<th>Contingency</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$44,000</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$305,000</td>
<td>$88,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$485,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*What is included in other? Construction Inspection and Overhead

Project Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Significance</th>
<th>Low usage, low traffic volumes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety (Hazard elimination)</td>
<td>Project will reduce potential collisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility (Provides congestion relief, support for alternative modes)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility (Opportunity and ease of reaching desired destinations.)</td>
<td>Fully reopen roadway with storm damage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity (throughput, increase vehicle occupancy, reduce SOV)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Preservation</td>
<td>Repair roadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality/ Global Warming/Environment</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Return on Investment/ Lifecycle Cost</strong></td>
<td>Repair roadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deliverability/ Risks to Project Cost, Funding or Schedule</strong></td>
<td>Are there barriers to delivering this project? Environmental permits could delay project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project funding</strong></td>
<td>Seeking STIP to fund 100% of project. No local funds budgeted/available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Benefits (jobs created, etc)</strong></td>
<td>None identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enhancement Projects- agree to use Conservation Corps</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*SCCRTC is mandated by SB286 to give priority for TE funds to project sponsors that are working with/agree to work with local or state Conservation Corps
1. Implementing Agency: County of Santa Cruz

2. Amount of STIP Funding Requested: $600,000

3. This is County priority number 4 of 7 projects.

4. Project Description/Scope: The Glenwood Drive site at Post Mile 2.02 consists of an area approximately 100 feet in length where the outboard roadway has been distressed or destroyed by a slipout. The slipout has required the County to restrict traffic through the site to a single lane and therefore the safety of the motoring public is at a greater risk because of the narrow traffic lanes at this location. An earth retaining system is now needed to restore the roadway and shoulder width to its predisaster condition. The scope of work shall consist of the following: geotechnical investigation, prepare engineered plans, construct soldier pile retaining wall with tiebacks, structure excavation and backfill, new asphalt concrete pavement and dike, metal beam guard rail, erosion control and revegetation.

5. Project Cost by Mode: Road- Auto Serving 100%

6. Project Location/Limits: Glenwood Drive at post mile 2.02

7. Project Length in miles (if applicable): .02 miles

8. Construction Schedule: Summer-Fall 2014

9. Cost Estimate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Environmental (PA/ED)</th>
<th>Design (PS&amp;E)</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Other*</th>
<th>Contingency</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost Estimate</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$57,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$377,000</td>
<td>$108,000</td>
<td>$38,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*What is included in other? Construction Inspection and Overhead

**Project Benefits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Significance</th>
<th>Low usage, low traffic volumes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety (Hazard elimination)</td>
<td>Project will reduce potential fatal and injury collisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility (Provides congestion relief, support for alternative modes)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility (Opportunity and ease of reaching desired destinations.)</td>
<td>Fully reopen roadway with storm damage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity (throughput, increase vehicle occupancy, reduce SOV)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Preservation</td>
<td>Repair roadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality/ Global Warming/Environment</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return on Investment/ Lifecycle Cost</td>
<td>Yes- repairs roadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverability/ Risks to Project Cost, Funding or Schedule</td>
<td>Are there barriers to delivering this project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project funding</td>
<td>Seeking STIP to fund 100% of project. No local funds budgeted/available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Benefits (jobs created, etc)</td>
<td>None identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement Projects- agree to use Conservation Corps*</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*SCCRTC is mandated by SB286 to give priority for TE funds to project sponsors that are working with/agree to work with local or state Conservation Corps
PROJECT FACT SHEET
Green Valley Rd PM 0.69 Storm Damage Repair Project

1. Implementing Agency: County of Santa Cruz

2. Amount of STIP Funding Requested: $329,000

3. This is County priority number __7__ of ___7__ projects.

4. Project Description/Scope: The Green Valley Rd site at post mile 0.69 consists of an area approximately 20 feet in length where the roadway and shoulder has been distressed or destroyed by undermining of the road and around the 8 foot culvert. The erosion required the County to place temporary steel plates over the slumped roadway to allow vehicle access. A new culvert and headwalls is now needed to restore the roadway and shoulder to its predisaster condition. The scope of work shall consist of the following: geotechnical investigation, prepare engineered plans, remove and reinstall 8 foot culvert, reinforced concrete headwall, new asphalt concrete pavement and dike, metal beam guard rail, erosion control and revegetation.

5. Project Cost by Mode: Road- Auto Serving 100%

6. Project Location/Limits: Green Valley Rd at Post Mile 0.69

7. Project Length in miles (if applicable): .01 miles

8. Construction Schedule: Summer-Fall 2014

9. Total Cost Estimate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environ-mental (PA/ED)</th>
<th>Design (PS&amp;E)</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Other*</th>
<th>Contingency</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$59,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$329,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*What is included in other? Construction Inspection and Overhead

Project Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Significance</th>
<th>Low usage, low traffic volumes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety (Hazard elimination)</td>
<td>Project will reduce potential collisions. Temporary steel plates have been installed over the damaged road section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility (Provides congestion relief, support for alternative modes)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility (Opportunity and ease of reaching desired destinations.)</td>
<td>Repair roadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity (throughput, increase vehicle occupancy, reduce SOV)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Preservation</td>
<td>Repair roadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality/ Global Warming/Environment</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Return on Investment/Lifecycle Cost</strong></td>
<td>Yes - repairs roadway, extend life of roadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deliverability/ Risks to Project Cost, Funding or Schedule</strong></td>
<td>Are there barriers to delivering this project? Environmental permits could delay project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project funding</strong></td>
<td>Seeking STIP to fund 100% of project. No local funds committed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Benefits (jobs created, etc)</strong></td>
<td>None identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*<em>Enhancement Projects-agree to use Conservation Corps</em></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*SCCRTC is mandated by SB286 to give priority for TE funds to project sponsors that are working with/agree to work with local or state Conservation Corps.
PROJECT FACT SHEET
Nelson Rd PM 2.0 Storm Damage Repair Project

1. Implementing Agency: County of Santa Cruz

2. Amount of STIP Funding Requested: $1,500,000

3. This is County priority number __1__ of ___7__ projects.

4. Project Description/Scope: The Nelson Rd site at PM 2.0 consists of an area approximately 350 feet in length where the roadway has been blocked by a massive debris flow. The debris flow has closed the road to through traffic and has blocked access to over 30 residents. A permanent bypass road is now needed to restore access to over 30 residents and fire, life and safety responders. The scope of work shall consist of the following: geotechnical investigation, prepare engineered plans, bridge/culvert, excavation and backfill, new asphalt concrete pavement, and erosion control and revegetation.

5. Project Cost by Mode: Road- Auto Serving 100%

6. Project Location/Limits: Nelson Road at post mile 2.0

7. Project Length in miles (if applicable): 0.1 miles

8. Construction Schedule: Spring-Fall 2015

9. Cost Estimate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment (PA/ED)</th>
<th>Design (PS&amp;E)</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Other*</th>
<th>Contingency</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$101,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$690,000</td>
<td>$230,000</td>
<td>$69,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*What is included in other? Construction Inspection and Overhead

Project Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Significance</th>
<th>Low usage, low traffic volumes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety (Hazard elimination)</td>
<td>Project will reduce collisions, including for bikes and pedestrians. Narrow temporary bypass road is being utilized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility (Provides congestion relief, support for alternative modes)</td>
<td>Will reduce commute times and peak travel times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility (Opportunity and ease of reaching desired destinations.)</td>
<td>Reopen roadway with storm damage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity (throughput, increase vehicle occupancy, reduce SOV)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Preservation</td>
<td>Repair roadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality/ Global Warming/Environment</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return on Investment/ Lifecycle Cost</td>
<td>Yes- repairs roadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverability/ Risks to Project Cost, Funding or Schedule</td>
<td>Are there barriers to delivering this project? Environmental permits and right of way mitigation may delay project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project funding</td>
<td>Seeking STIP to fund 100% of project. No local funds budgeted/available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Benefits (jobs created, etc)</td>
<td>None identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement Projects-agree to use Conservation Corps*</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*SCCRTC is mandated by SB286 to give priority for TE funds to project sponsors that are working with/agree to work with local or state Conservation Corps
PROJECT FACT SHEET
North Rodeo Gulch Rd PM 4.75 Storm Damage Repair Project

1. Implementing Agency: County of Santa Cruz

2. Amount of STIP Funding Requested: $650,000

3. This is County priority number __3__ of ___7__ projects.

4. Project Description/Scope:
The North Rodeo Gulch Road site at Post Mile 4.75 consists of an area approximately 75 feet in length where the outboard roadway has been distressed or destroyed by a slipout. The slipout has required the County to restrict traffic through the site to a single lane of alternating traffic and therefore the response times have increased for fire, life and safety responders. An earth retaining system is now needed to restore the roadway and shoulder width to its predisaster condition. The scope of work shall consist of the following: geotechnical investigation, prepare engineered plans, construct soldier pile retaining wall with tiebacks, structure excavation and backfill, new asphalt concrete pavement and dike, metal beam guard rail, erosion control and revegetation.

5. Project Cost by Mode: Road- Auto Serving 100%

6. Project Location/Limits: North Rodeo Gulch Rd at post mile 4.75, Soquel

7. Project Length in miles (if applicable): .01 miles

8. Construction Schedule: Summer-Fall 2014

9. Total Cost Estimate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental (PA/ED)</th>
<th>Design (PS&amp;E)</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Other*</th>
<th>Contingency</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$408,000</td>
<td>$118,000</td>
<td>$41,000</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*What is included in other? Construction Inspection and Overhead

**Project Benefits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Significance</th>
<th>Low: low usage, low traffic volumes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety (Hazard elimination)</td>
<td>Medium: Project will reduce potential collisions – bikes and autos. Two lane road is down to one lane with stop signs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility (Provides congestion relief, support for alternative modes)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility (Opportunity and ease of reaching desired destinations.)</td>
<td>Fully reopen roadway with storm damage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity (throughput, increase vehicle occupancy, reduce SOV)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Preservation</td>
<td>Repair roadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air Quality/ Global Warming/Environment</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Return on Investment/ Lifecycle Cost</strong></td>
<td>Yes - repairs roadway, extend life of roadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deliverability/ Risks to Project Cost, Funding or Schedule</strong></td>
<td>Are there barriers to delivering this project? <strong>Environmental permits could delay project</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project funding</strong></td>
<td>Seeking STIP to fund 100% of project. No local funds committed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Benefits (jobs created, etc)</strong></td>
<td>None identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enhancement Projects-agree to use Conservation Corps</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*SCCRTC is mandated by SB286 to give priority for TE funds to project sponsors that are working with/agree to work with local or state Conservation Corps*
Redwood Lodge Rd PM 1.65 Storm Damage Repair Project

1. Implementing Agency: County of Santa Cruz

2. Amount of STIP Funding Requested: $1,000,000

3. This is County priority number 2 of 7 projects.

4. Project Description/Scope:
The Redwood Lodge Road site at Post Mile 1.65 consists of an area approximately 80 feet in length where the entire road width has dropped down about 4 feet and the outboard embankment has slipped out. The road slump and slipout has required the County to close the road to through traffic and therefore the response times have increased for fire, life and safety responders because they will have to use alternate routes. An earth retaining system is now needed to restore the roadway and shoulder width to its predisaster condition. The scope of work shall consist of the following: geotechnical investigation, prepare engineered plans, construct soldier pile retaining wall with tiebacks, structure excavation and backfill, drainage facilities, new asphalt concrete pavement and dike, metal beam guard rail, erosion control and revegetation.

5. Project Cost by Mode: Road- Auto Serving 100%

6. Project Location/Limits: Redwood Lodge Rd PM 1.65

7. Project Length in miles (if applicable): .01 miles

8. Construction Schedule: Spring-Fall 2015

9. Total Cost Estimate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental (PA/ED)</th>
<th>Design (PS&amp;E)</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Other*</th>
<th>Contingency</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$644,000</td>
<td>184,000</td>
<td>$64,000</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*What is included in other? Construction Inspection and Overhead

Project Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Significance</th>
<th>Low usage, low traffic volumes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety (Hazard elimination)</td>
<td>Project will reduce fatal and injury auto and bicycle collisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility (congestion relief, support alternative modes)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility (Opportunity and ease of reaching desired destinations.)</td>
<td>Fully reopen roadway with storm damage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity (throughput, reduce SOV, etc)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Preservation</td>
<td>Repair roadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality/ Global Warming/Environment</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Return on Investment/ Lifecycle Cost</strong></td>
<td>Yes - repairs roadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deliverability/ Risks to Project Cost, Funding or Schedule</strong></td>
<td>Are there barriers to delivering this project? Environmental permits could delay project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project funding</strong></td>
<td>Seeking STIP to fund 100% of project. No local funds committed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Benefits (jobs created, etc)</strong></td>
<td>None identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enhancement Projects - agree to use Conservation Corps</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*SCCRTC is mandated by SB286 to give priority for TE funds to project sponsors that are working with/agree to work with local or state Conservation Corps*
Vienna Dr at Mesa Dr Storm Damage Repair Project

1. Implementing Agency: County of Santa Cruz

2. Amount of STIP Funding Requested: $550,000

3. This is County priority number 5 of 7 projects.

4. Project Description/Scope:
The Vienna Drive site at Mesa Drive consists of an area approximately 60 feet in length where the outboard roadway has been distressed or destroyed by a slipout and the existing sidewalk has been undermined. The slipout has required the County to close the sidewalk and therefore the pedestrians are forced to walk along the shoulder of the road. An earth retaining system is now needed to restore the roadway and shoulder width to its predisaster condition. The scope of work shall consist of the following: geotechnical investigation, prepare engineered plans, construct soldier pile retaining wall with tiebacks, structure excavation and backfill, new asphalt concrete pavement and dike, metal beam guard rail, erosion control and revegetation.

5. Project Cost by Mode: (Approximate % of total project costs related to different transportation modes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road – Auto Serving</th>
<th>Pedestrian</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Project Location/Limits: Vienna Drive at Mesa Drive (Aptos area)

7. Project Length in miles (if applicable): .01 miles

8. Construction Schedule: Summer-Fall 2014

9. Total Cost Estimate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental (PA/ED)</th>
<th>Design (PS&amp;E)</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Other*</th>
<th>Contingency</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$47,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$348,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*What is included in other? Construction Inspection and Overhead

Project Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Significance</th>
<th>Low usage, low traffic volumes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety (Hazard elimination)</td>
<td>Project will increase pedestrian safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The sidewalk at this location is closed because it has been undermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility (Provides congestion relief, support for alternative modes)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility (Opportunity and ease of reaching desired destinations.)</td>
<td>Provide access on roadway with storm damage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity (throughput, increase vehicle occupancy,</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>System Preservation</strong></td>
<td>Repair roadway and sidewalk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air Quality/ Global Warming/Environment</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Return on Investment/ Lifecycle Cost</strong></td>
<td>Yes - repairs roadway and sidewalk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deliverability/ Risks to Project Cost, Funding or Schedule</strong></td>
<td>Are there barriers to delivering this project? Environmental permits could delay project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project funding</strong></td>
<td>Seeking STIP to fund 100% of project. No local funds budgeted/available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Benefits (jobs created, etc)</strong></td>
<td>None identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enhancement Projects-agree to use Conservation Corps</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*SCCRTC is mandated by SB286 to give priority for TE funds to project sponsors that are working with/agree to work with local or state Conservation Corps*
-----Original Message-----
From: Karen Kaplan [mailto:kaplanks@hotmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, November 17, 2011 4:51 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: November 18, 2011 Meeting

From: Karen Kaplan <kaplanks@hotmail.com>
Subject: November 18, 2011 Meeting

Message Body:
Please authorize funding to clear the Nelson Road rock slide, ASAP! Thank you for your immediate consideration.

*****

11/21/11

This mail is sent via contact form on SCCRTC http://sccrtc.org

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 3200
Fax 831 460 3215
cjudd@sccrtc.org
www.sccrtc.org
From: Jeff Powell [mailto:jrpstonecarver@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, November 12, 2011 2:49 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Cc: John Leopold
Subject: Strong concern about local road repairs

To whom it may concern on the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission,

I keep hearing that the county is planning to spend millions of dollars widening highway 1, potentially years worth of road repair funds.

I must say that I strongly oppose such a move. I live in a rural part of the county, and our roads are in disastrous shape. The rainy season is starting again and they will only get worse.

In a good year on my road we might see a pickup truck with one guy who will put a few shovels of asphalt patch into a pothole or two and then drive off. That is nowhere near real road maintenance, as I am sure you know.

Please give priority to getting our county roads maintained and repaired. If the economy improves in a few years, traffic gets worse again, and the monetary situation changes, only then might it be reasonable to reconsider widening highway 1. For now such a project is clearly misguided and could only be completed - if it can be completed at all - at the expense of nearly all maintenance and repair of the rest of the county's road infrastructure. Please do not make that mistake.

The road I live on - Miller Hill Road - has numerous potholes and issues, and I would really like to see it significantly repaired, but frankly it's pretty good compared to other nearby roads that have suffered far more. Miller Cut-Off is an astounding maze of potholes and patches, for example. And there are plenty of other rural roads in similar or worse condition. I suspect that if any of the RTC members lived on roads as poorly maintained as these, the commission's view of what is important might be significantly different.

Please, stop the highway 1 widening project in its tracks and help the county to get its rural roads back into shape.

Thank you.

Jeffry R. Powell
24620 Miller Hill Road
Los Gatos, CA 95033
408-353-6010
jrpstonecarver@gmail.com

CC: Supervisor John Leopold

******
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 3200
Fax 831 460 3215
cjudd@sccrtc.org
www.sccrtc.org
-----Original Message-----
From: Mary Ann Leer [mailto:maleer@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, November 09, 2011 1:16 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Road Work Priorities

Hello, again I would just like to add my support for putting our very limited road maintenance money to work where it is MOST needed. It should be a 'no-brainer' in these days of tight budgets that road maintenance money should do just that MAINTAIN ROADS rather than spend enormous amounts of money on ONE roadway.

Everyone, the Transportation Commission, County Supervisors and city officials, should be doing long term planning keeping in mind what will make the most impact on the quality of life in Santa Cruz County.

Mary Ann Leer, Live Oak

******

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.

<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<
-----Original Message-----
From: Scott Dillingham [mailto:scottndebbie1545@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 08, 2011 7:11 PM
To: info@scrcrc.org
Subject: Hwy 1

Both my wife and I support efforts to widen Hwy 1 and to reduce cross county traffic on our local streets. We also want our local streets to be maintained. We would vote for funding both.

Regards,
Scott and Debbie Dillingham

Sent from my iPhone

*****

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

Please visit the SCCRTC website at www.scrcrc.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 3200
Fax 831 460 3215
cjudd@scrcrc.org
www.scrcrc.org
October 19, 2011

To: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission

1523 Pacific Avenue

Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Re: Prioritization of Transportation Projects in Santa Cruz County

Dear Commissioners:

I reside in Aptos, California with my family. Our sons are 6th generation County residents. We travel via automobile, bike and pedestrian modes. Over the years, I have watched transportation in the County become more and more impacted as the economy and populace grew. The consequence of more people on the roads is of course less efficiency. Our family has stopped all commute activity basically past 41st Avenue unless it is done between the hours of say 10 and 1. We do not shop in Santa Cruz. We have our car serviced at Soquel Drive near Dominican, but only because it is right off the freeway. The only shopping we do in Santa Cruz is at Costco and then only at 10 AM. We spend our money shopping in Capitola, Aptos and Watsonville. Even Sand City and Monterey offer an easy commute (not to mention major retailers) for items we may need. My wife and I are registered voters. We both work in the County and drive as part of our jobs. My wife works in Scotts Valley and schedules her work appointments so that she is south of Soquel Drive no later than 3 PM. I fortunately work in Watsonville and enjoy a commute of 7 minutes at 65 mph.

It has been decades since any substantive improvements have been made to Highway One. The most recent project at the Fishhook provides evidence to any lay person that if one provides greater capacity, higher throughput at reasonable speeds is the result. It is evident to most persons that when the choke point is encountered (now just past Morrissey), vehicles slow and travel becomes inefficient.

I have no expectations of any further improvements to Highway One. If they come to fruition, I will be pleasantly surprised. I may even change my commute patterns and shop in Santa Cruz. I know that it has a lot to offer. I just don’t have the time to waste to get there.

As the Commission considers yet again the priority of transportation projects, it might ask itself the following questions.

1. Should a major thoroughfare through the County provide for safe and expedient travel for life safety vehicles?
2. Do automobiles run more efficiently and produce less pollution when idling or when moving at reasonable speed?
3. If the major thoroughfare through the County is inefficient, do people just stop driving or do they find an alternative route on surface streets?
4. If they do take surface streets, does that make neighborhoods more or less safe for bicyclists and pedestrians?
5. If there are more cars on surface streets, does that result in more or less degradation of those roads?
6. Is it important that people not be limited in their economic or other commute choices because a thoroughfare is inefficient?
7. Should a thoroughfare provide lanes dedicated to high occupancy vehicles and mass transit to further increase throughput?
8. Can you name another County that has not improved a major thoroughfare in the last 20 years?
9. What was the effect of that inaction?
10. If the main thoroughfare were improved, would that provide more or less jobs?
11. If the main thoroughfare were efficient, would people spend more or less money in the County, or better yet, in different parts of the County?

I am under no illusions that the prioritization of projects is a daunting exercise. Does one spend limited funds on existing infrastructure or plan for the future? I would suggest that doing nothing or maintaining antiquated infrastructure is akin to repairing an original Macintosh computer when investing in an i-Pad makes so much more sense. Structural improvement breeds efficiency and economic success.

As I said, my sons are 6th generation residents of the County. In the 1930's my grandfather, who was an apple farmer in Watsonville, hauled sand and gravel from the Corralitos Creek up on to what was then the Santa Cruz Highway (now Freedom Blvd, perhaps named because it allowed for free travel), to provide an improved thoroughfare for the movement of people and products. Imagine the improvement in getting apples to market on a smooth road as opposed to dragging a loaded wagon through the mud.

I would posit that the same magnitude of improvements my grandfather helped initiate on the Santa Cruz Highway faces the Commission at this time. It is approaching a generation in duration that our main thoroughfare has not been improved. It is beyond me (and many I speak with) as to why this has been allowed to occur. I sincerely hope that I will not have to wait for the 7th generation of my family to enjoy an improved transportation thoroughfare through the County and that the Commission will prioritize its efforts to make that happen.

Sincerely,

Christopher S. Mann
October 19, 2011

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

Reference: Prioritization of Transportation Projects for Santa Cruz County

Dear Commissioners:

Graniterock is a 111 year-old provider of high-quality construction materials and services headquartered in Watsonville. Our customer base stretches from Monterey to San Francisco and beyond. About 125 of our Team Members live in Santa Cruz County and commute to work at our Corporate Offices or our other twenty-six Branch operation locations.

Our industry is inextricably linked to the provision of safe and efficient infrastructure systems for the movement of goods and people. As the Commission considers such projects, Graniterock would encourage the Commission to continue to give priority to the improvement of Highway 1. As you know, Highway 1 is the main (really the only) artery allowing for the transportation of both goods and people through the County. Roadway capacity has not been increased for decades and today's traffic conditions have made the road nearly impassable during extended periods of time each day.

Roadway planning that the community needs is of maximum import for safety, economic efficiency, and energy efficiency factors. We further understand that not all projects in this day and age, while worthy of funding, can generate or ultimately procure the funds necessary for their implementation. We believe that all modes of transportation are important and that when each is properly prioritized, transportation on all types (highway, local roads, mass transit, alternative transit, bicycle, pedestrian and others) make for an efficient, sustainable and fully-integrated transportation system. However, we believe that Highway 1 improvement should continue to receive the Commission's highest level of support and effort in order to address the single most important, highly used component of our County's transportation system - Highway 1.

I believe the vast majority of Santa Cruz County residents support your efforts to expand the capacity of Highway 1. Highway 1 conditions, as they have been allowed to exist today, do not support job creation and economic opportunity for Santa Cruz County residents who have suffered from high unemployment rates prior to the current recession.

Sincerely,

Graniterock

Bruce W. Woolpert
President & CEO

Material Supplier/Engineering Contractor
License #22

P.O. Box 50001 Watsonville, CA 95077-5001 (831) 768-2000 Fax (831) 768-2201
www.graniterock.com
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Avenue
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Re: Prioritization of Transportation Projects for Santa Cruz County – Regular Agenda Item 5

Dear Commissioners:

The Santa Cruz County Business Council is a non-profit organization dedicated to the enhancement of public – private partnerships. Our member companies employ nearly 20,000 individuals and rely on the efficient movement of products, services and people across our County and beyond.

As the Commission considers the prioritization of upcoming projects, the SCCBC would encourage it to continue to prioritize the improvement of Highway One.

Highway One is the main artery allowing for transportation of goods and people through the county. Its efficiency is of maximum import for safety, economic efficiency, energy efficiency and maximum use of commute time.

We are well aware of the overall economic situation our area faces and are not immune to its challenges. We further understand that not all projects in this day and age, while worthy of funding, can generate or ultimately procure the funds necessary for their implementation. We believe that all modes of transportation are important and that properly assembled, transportation on all types of throughways (highway, local roads, mass transit, alternative transit, bicycle, pedestrian and others) makes for an efficient, sustainable and fully integrated transportation model. We believe that Highway One improvement, however, should continue to receive the Commissions highest level of support and effort in order to provide the highest quality, most efficient and safest major arterial to the residents and visitors and commuters within and through our County that can be achieved.

The business community relies on the safe, efficient and timely flow of its products and people. We look forward to supporting your efforts to achieve those goals.

Sincerely,

Ted Burke
Co-Chair

Chris Mann
Co-Chair

Gary Merrill
Executive Director

P.O. Box 21, Santa Cruz, California 95063
Telephone: 831-429-1129
Mail: gary@sccbusinesscouncil.com
Cell Telephone: 831-818-6366
-----Original Message-----
From: Jeanne Simari [mailto:jeannes@cruzio.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 13, 2011 1:43 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: future projects

I support transportation money to be spent on supporting increased pedestrian and bicycle access in the community. I do not support widening Hwy. 1.

I ride my bike and walk more than ever before since those activities have become safe and convenient. When I first moved here 36 years ago, biking downtown from 41st Ave. meant taking your life into your hands. Now I do it often since bike lanes are part of the street design. When there is no bike lane, I ride on the sidewalk which I know isn't okay but I've never been ticketed so I think the powers that be recognize it's unavoidable at times. I would definitely support continued efforts to encourage healthier and life sustaining transport instead of devoting our resources to continued support and more and faster automobile traffic.

Jeanne Simari
Santa Cruz

******

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
From: Ana Schaffer [mailto:Ana@TeamSchaffer.com]
Sent: Monday, October 10, 2011 3:05 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: The Mar Vista Bridge

To whom it may concern @ the Santa Cruz Regional Transportation Commission,

I just learned about the Mar Vista bridge plans- a bridge that would connect the two segments of Mar Vista Drive together over highway 1. I am so excited about this! We live on the ocean side of the freeway and this would mean that our children could safely walk or ride their bikes to school (with supervision)!

I understand that 7.5 million dollars was allocated to this bridge as part of a highway expansion project a few years ago. And that this bridge could be built on its own with a small extra expense, or as part of the first phase of the highway project. Either way, I urge you to please make this a priority! I believe this to be an important thing for our community and I would love to see it happen in the next few years.

I have been an Aptos resident for 18 years years and I can see how this bridge would bring more unity and provide another safe way across the highway for our residents and visitors. I am told that Seacliff Beach is one of the most visited beaches in our area. The bridge could improve access to the beach, too!

Warmly,
Ana Schaffer
156 Seacliff Drive
Aptos, California

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

At one point there was a staff recommendation to divert funding from the Mar Vista Overcrossing project to other projects from the 2012 State Transportation Improvement Program funds. This is no longer included in recommendation that will be considered at the December 1 RTC public hearing.

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

Thank you again.

Gini Pineda
Administrative Assistant III
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Ave. Santa Cruz CA 95060
831 460 3200
831 460 3215(fax)
gpineda@sccrtc.org
www.sccrtc.org
-----Original Message-----
From: Hertz, Christopher [mailto:christopher_hertz@pvusd.net]
Sent: Sunday, October 09, 2011 1:45 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Mar Vista Pedestrian Bridge Project

Dear Santa Cruz County Transportation Commissioners,

The pedestrian bridge at Mar Vista is important for the safety of the children. I strongly disapprove of reallocating the bridge funds for any purpose other than bridge development. Our students need a safe and direct way to get to school. Thank you for not changing the plan.

With concern,

Chris Hertz

Chris Hertz, Elementary Principal
761-6177 ext 4975

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.

<<<<<<<<<><<<<<<<><<<<<<<><<<<<<<><<<<<<<><<<<<<<><<<<<<<><<<<<<<><<<<<<<>
Gini Pineda
Administrative Assistant III
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Ave. Santa Cruz CA 95060
831 460 3200
831 460 3215(fax)
gpineda@sccrtc.org
www.sccrtc.org
From: PAUL SAMPSON [mailto:paulsampson@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Saturday, October 08, 2011 11:57 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Mar Vista Bridge

Hello SCCRTC,

I am a parent of two fourth grade children at Mar Vista school and I live in the West Seacliff neighborhood. Several years ago I noticed that Mar Vista Drive must have run from Soquel Drive all the way to the beach before the freeway was built. I thought it would be great to have a tunnel or overpass to re-connect Mar Vista Drive, but dismissed the idea as too large to bring to bear.

Recently, the Mar Vista Parent Club met and discussed the issue and it was mentioned that there is funding that was set aside for a pedestrian overpass.

I am writing to let you know that I support the building of the overpass and will campaign in my neighborhood to spread the word.

Sincerely,

Paul Sampson

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.

Gini Pineda
Administrative Assistant III
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Ave. Santa Cruz CA 95060
831 460 3200
831 460 3215(fax)
gpineda@sccrtc.org
www.sccrtc.org
Hello Transportation Commissioners and Supervisor Pirie,

I am writing to express my support for the Mar Vista Bridge that is proposed to be built over Highway 1. My two daughters attend Mar Vista Elementary School, and while we live on the same side of the highway as the school, I think a bridge connecting Mar Vista Drive over Hwy 1 would be a wonderful thing.

My family is fortunate in that we are able to walk to and from school each day due to our proximity to the school. I see tons of vehicular traffic with other parents dropping off and picking up their children at Mar Vista every day. I know that a lot of those families live on what would be the other side of that bridge. It would be great to see a bridge in place so that walking to school would become an option for so many more families.

Not to mention it would be a lot safer and closer than walking over State Park Drive.

I understand that the funds of $7.5 million are in place to proceed with this project. I would love to see it become a priority and get that bridge built!!

Thank you for your time,

Christine San Miguel

*****

10/06/11

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
From: Stacey Falls [mailto:staceyffalls@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2011 9:27 AM
To: nj12@comcast.net
Cc: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Thursday's meeting on highway widening

Dear Commissioner Johnson,

Nowadays, it is easy to feel disenchanted with governmental bureaucracies and politics in general. Sometimes it feels like the electoral process simply boils down to mudslinging between candidates, and important decision making descends into partisan bickering. However, when an elected official starts denigrating the character of constituents, members of the general public with whom they disagree, well, that is really disillusioning.

I spoke at Thursday's meeting of the SCCRTC about why I don't support highway widening. I didn't attack any members of the commission or turn my beliefs into a personal attack, but your rebuttal was to accuse me of lacking empathy. You don't know me. You don't know anything about my personality, and so to question my character is quite offensive. In fact, I am quite compassionate; I feel, deeply, the pain of others, and much of my life is devoted to making the world a better place for everyone who lives here. I believe that you, too, want what is best for your community. We just disagree on what that looks like.

I have countless friends and loved ones who commute long distances every day. I have loved ones and family members who are quite aged, and I certainly don't believe that the solution is for everyone to stop driving and ride their bike. I understand that people hate traffic, and that regularly being stuck in traffic jams diminishes quality of life. I feel immensely for people who have long commutes that keep them from their families or hobbies. I care about them so much that I want REAL solutions, and not a costly, time-consuming, boondoggle with dubious efficacy.

I seriously believe that highway widening is not the solution. Besides costing millions (billions?), the project will take years to complete. In the meantime, Highway 1 will be gridlocked with construction traffic, and when it is finally done, our county will have grown so much that we will still face the same traffic congestion that we do today.

Most people want real, long-term, sustainable, environmentally-sound alternatives. In your comments, you pointed to Eduardo as someone who would suffer if I had my way, but when I talked to Eduardo after the meeting I said, "If you could take a train, if there was one that was reliable and cheap, wouldn't you prefer it?" and he said, "Of course!" He went on to express concerns about the viability of a train, and I agree, a train is a big dream, but, let's be honest, so is this huge highway widening project. (Again, billions of dollars and a decade are needed.) If we are going to dream big, let's dream sustainably.

In the meantime, there are easy and inexpensive things we can do to decrease congestion on Highway 1. For a fraction of the cost of widening the highway, the RTC could work with local businesses to incentivize the staggering of work hours. Commuters with young kids might even appreciate having options to go to work at 7 am, 8 am, 9 am or 10 am. It would reduce the burden of child-care costs on working families and would put less traffic on Highway 1 at key commute hours. The RTC could work with the Santa Cruz Metro to install Wi-Fi on all buses, not just the Highway 17 bus, and local business could encourage workers to take the bus or telecommute.

A solution that would benefit the entire county would be to put funds into economic development of South County. Eduardo expressed concern that Watsonville lacks jobs, forcing people to commute north on Highway 1. This is sad for a few reasons, and to diminish the need for commuters and improve the economy of Watsonville, it seems that our local officials should be working on job creation in South County.

We all have to live in this county together. It would obviously be ideal if we could all agree on a positive and productive course of action for transportation policy in the county, but even if we can't it would be great if we could all be civil and polite. Even if we disagree, we have the same aspirations: to make our county the best it can be.

Sincerely,
Stacey Falls
120 Walk Circle
Santa Cruz, CA
95060
631-421-9367
RTC members,

I am opposed to continued use of funds to widen Hwy 1, since it is fiscally irresponsible, and the first priority for these funds should be to maintain existing local roads and alternate/public transportation. Widening Hwy 1 does none of this!

On another note, why is this not a CA state or Fed project? Isn't that where it belongs? And not sucking funds from local needs?

I recommend that the regional RTC office be dismissed (or reduced in authority) and replaced by the County DPW for road funding, and that locals address state highway needs with state elected officials, so that State highways are maintained by the State!

Maybe I am old school, but believe that existing travel infrastructure must be kept up before spending money on expansions, otherwise how can anything be maintained, since funding is finite. If you want to abandon something, say so....., but do not let others swing in agony....

Maintaining the current road infrastructure will benefit the county by maintaining/improving property values and local businesses. Note that local county roads such as Soquel-San Jose Road, Bear Creek, among others, are everyday commute corridors that are in need of repairs and must be addressed to avoid neglect and possible liability.

Fiscal highlights - it is my understanding that close to $12M has been spent for the EIR for 1 mile of extension or 10% of the overall project, to extend this to San Andreas Road, with little or no assurance that this will allow construction at projected costs. Spending this much for "paper generation" and not real construction is way out of line. Although not your problem, will ask my elected officials to correct situations like this. Understand that I am environmentally concerned, but am skeptical of ludicrous amounts spent on generating "paper" as opposed to results.

If I do a back of the envelope calculation to extend Hwy 1 expansion to San Andreas Road (overall project goal), EIR cost will be about $144M, construction cost another $600M, cost of disruption might be about $300M for biz/working people - this is approaching $1 billion dollars, how do you justify this, and why focused on this versus other alternatives.

What are the alternatives for spending $1B??

- Alternate traffic access to the Central Coast
- Widening of Hwy 17 to 3 lanes in each direction (doesn't seem practical), what do experts say?
• A new route to the Central Coast (maybe via Watsonville or Corralitos) separate from 17, maybe a spur off of Hwy 85 or Almaden Expwy through one of the old train tunnels in the mountains and/or through SJ water district/public property, thus minimizing problems with eminent domain.

• The Livermore/Tracy area is an example to review - that grew like bonfires in the past 20 years with the 580 connections. It will take something like that to allow economic growth in our county with increased biz expansion and real estate values, which is important to the county govt's for revenue, and a local benefit to residents.

Why pursue a path that will lead to Agency bankruptcy, get rid of the agency and work amongst yourselves?

If you have a rebuttal, I am willing to read or listen.

Best Regards,

Reed

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.

Gini Pineda
Administrative Assistant III
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Ave. Santa Cruz CA 95060
831 460 3200
831 460 3215(fax)
gpineda@sccrtc.org
www.sccrtc.org
-----Original Message-----
From: Jeanne Simari [mailto:jeannes@cruziocom]
Sent: Sunday, September 18, 2011 4:54 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: future projects

I would support future projects funded by RTC to include pedestrian and bicycle access and would not support widening of Hwy. 1 any further.

I ride my bike and walk more than ever since there has been so much support of these activities. When I moved here 36 years ago, biking from 41st Ave. to downtown meant taking your life in your hands and now I do it often and feel supported to do so. I would hope that you further support healthy forms of transport as a priority and not support more and faster auto traffic through our community. Of course I drive too and see that the freeway is congested but congestion is often what promotes people to take their bike out more or walk more or take other modes of transportation. There seem to be more people than ever who choose to bike or bus to work these days and that's a wonderful thing.

Jeanne Simari
157 Cabrillo St.
Capitola, Cal. 95010

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.

<html>

Gini Pineda
Administrative Assistant III
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Ave. Santa Cruz CA 95060
831 460 3200
831 460 3215(fax)
gpineda@sccrtc.org
www.sccrtc.org
</html>
Hello,
I have been following the news stories and meeting minutes for the RTC regarding the project that includes a bridge over Chanticleer. Can you let me know to whom I should direct a letter or comment regarding this project, and other transportation issues in this area?

We have recently moved to the area adjacent to Dominican hospital in Santa Cruz Gardens. We moved from the Seabright area. Clearly, our previous neighborhood was naturally better situated for bicycle transportation to commercial areas than is our new neighborhood. What is striking to me, now, though as I study the layout of our neighborhoods, and look at how it has developed is how Live Oak and the area along Soquel has packed in medical facilities and dense housing, while not providing obvious transportation solutions. In fact, it appears that there has been a deliberate fracturing of these communities.

In order to access groceries, libraries, and the coast, residents near Dominican need to drive, (or pedal dangerously along terrible lanes with high traffic) laterally along the freeway. We are literally driving circles, and driving twice as much as needed in order to get groceries, or take our children to parks and activities.

I watch hospital employees drive, or wait at bus stops, but I know many of them live on the Live Oak side. There are retirement communities on the Live Oak side, where elderly need to get to the medical building on our side of the Hwy. How on earth can this be considered ok? There should always have been a bridge across this part of Hwy 1! The very fabric of this area is cut in half, and needs to be connected in order to assure community identity, and to insure viability as alternative transportation is encouraged.

Thank you,
~Eliza James
4801 Thurber Lane

Dear Elizabeth James:

You can direct correspondence regarding transportation issues to the RTC at the info@sccrtc.org address and your comments will be made available to the Commission for their review. We also maintain project updates of (all kinds) on our website www.sccrtc.org.

In addition, I am going to enter your contact information into our database to receive email updates regarding the HOV lane project as this is the project that includes the bridge over Chanticleer. There is a place of our website that allows people to sign up for email announcements regarding other transportation projects or programs sponsored by the RTC. We do not have a one size fits all newsletter so it is necessary to indicate what your areas of interest are and you can be put into the corresponding database. The website makes this process pretty user friendly (we hope!)

Thank you for your interest in the RTC and its activities.

Gini Pineda
Administrative Assistant III
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Ave. Santa Cruz CA 95060
831 460 3200
831 460 3215(fax) gpineda@sccrtc.org www.sccrtc.org
Commissioners,

I strongly oppose devoting any more precious county funds towards study or planning related to widening State Route 1 in Santa Cruz County. The reason for my opposition is not simply about one mile of additional concrete and asphalt.

It is that expanding the highway, even for a relatively short stretch, alters a much wider geographic area, permanently.

Here is a very up-to-date review of the past 15 years of academic studies about whether additional traffic is the inevitable result of roadway expansion. The answer is a resounding “yes”, and the academics have produced an overwhelming amount of evidence, mostly in terms of economics (elasticity of demand, selfish behavior, etc.) to explain it. What is most unsettling is that the downstream effects of roadway expansion are exponentially negative, including even worse congestion, increased parking demand, accident risk, suburban sprawl, and pollution. At the same time, they show how investments in alternative transportation (including transit and commute trip reduction programs) can, over the long term, result in greater social benefits (e.g., better health, safety, lower transportation costs). I encourage you to take the time to read this compelling report:
http://www.vtpi.org/gentraf.pdf

The cost of highway expansion with regard to greenhouse gas emissions has been described by the Sightline Institute as follows: Over the first few (5-10) years following construction, traffic congestion decreases, and so do emissions. However, over the longer term (beyond 10 years), the total carbon footprint far outweighs any short-term GhG savings, and is estimated to be over 100,000 tons of CO2 per mile of new highway lanes.
http://smartgrowthamerica.org/RP_docs/Sightline_widening_emissions.pdf

Both of these reports illustrate that there are only very short-term benefits to widening highways and that the long-term effects are devastatingly bad. Los Angeles is the perfect example of this negative feedback system gone amuck. So it’s not just “the road” we’re concerned about, it’s about how changing it affects our entire region and quality of life.

Elizabeth Levy
Principal Consultant
Optimal Edge
Soquel, CA 95073

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.

Gini Pineda
Administrative Assistant III
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Ave. Santa Cruz CA 95060
831 460 3200 831 460 3215(fax) gpineda@sccrtc.org www.sccrtc.org
Hello,

My name is Susan Page. I live on Laurel Road, Los Gatos, 95033 off Highway 17. I can’t express how important it is to repair Redwood Lodge Road! It is a fire escape for many of us who live up here and a very important road to use by those of us who commute.

I would appreciate it if you would come up to see the problems we have here, so you can experience our situation.

I strongly urge you to repair Redwood Lodge Road! If you need any other information, please contact me at 408-353-1636.

Sincerely,
Susan Page

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.

Giní Pineda
Administrative Assistant III
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Ave. Santa Cruz CA 95060
831 460 3200
831 460 3215(fax)
gpineda@sccrtc.org
www.sccrtc.org
From: Shirley Welch [mailto:curlsky@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 13, 2011 9:38 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: RTC Funding

Dear RTC Members,

I am writing to please ask you to reconsider the plan for using federal funds traditionally earmarked for road repair to fund the completion of the EIR report for the project to widen Highway 1 between Soquel Avenue and 41st Avenue. I'm not sure if any of you typically drive on any of the roads in Santa Cruz County, but I can tell you from first hand experience, they are in horrible condition. Potholes, rats, culvert collapse, we have it all.

In the event that something serious does happen, the county solves this problem by placing a sign that reads "one lane road". It is not uncommon for these signs to be in place for years. I have seen firetrucks and school buses with children on board navigating around these "road repairs". This is how the hundreds of miles of county roads are maintained with current funding in place. I don't even want to consider what the roads would be like after ten years of no repair, which could happen if the monies used to uphold our current level of maintenance are diverted to be used in a report to widen just ONE MILE of highway 1.

Sincerely,

Shirley Welch
26800 Adams Rd,
Los Gatos, CA 95033

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.

Gini Pineda
Administrative Assistant III
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Ave. Santa Cruz CA 95060
831 460 3200
831 460 3215(fax)
gpineda@sccrtc.org
www.sccrtc.org
RTC. PLEASE, PLEASE, PLEASE!!! consider the condition of our local roads, the highway can wait, our infrastructure is crumbling daily and not only unsafe for drivers, but cyclist and pedestrians, we are living among the most beautiful place on the planet yet our access is deplorable. PLEASE, PLEASE, PLEASE consider our local roads first.

Thanks
Mike Andalora.

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.

Gini Pineda
Administrative Assistant III
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Ave. Santa Cruz CA 95060
831 460 3200
831 460 3215(fax)
gpineda@sccrtc.org
www.sccrtc.org
-----Original Message-----
From: Steve Piercy - Web Site Builder [mailto:Web@StevePiery.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 13, 2011 5:13 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Cc: john.leopold@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; Micah Posner
Subject: Use Transportation Funds Wisely for People, Not Highways

Dear RTC,

Please use what little transportation funding the County receives from federal and state sources to:

* provide safe transportation routes for pedestrians and bicyclists
* fund deferred maintenance on local roads
* repair damaged roads from the spring storms
* move people and goods, not automobiles and their drivers who are inconvenienced during the weekday rush hour

Widening Highway One is a waste of money. It would do nothing to improve traffic because it would be obsolete before it would be completed. It would encourage more driving, pollution, petroleum consumption, wars for oil and so on.

We should spend what little money we have for practical transportation projects that benefit all of its people and its environment.

Thank you for your consideration.

Steve Piercy
3003 Fairway Drive
Soquel, CA 95073
email: web@StevePiery.com
voice: 831-480-0765

-- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- -- --

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

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

Thank you again.

<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<
Gini Pineda
Administrative Assistant III
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Ave. Santa Cruz CA 95060
831 460 3200
831 460 3215 (fax)
gpineda@sccrtc.org
www.sccrtc.org
From: Lauretta Anderson [mailto:lauretta.anderson@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2011 4:21 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Widening Hwy 1 for with ten years of local taxes!

Hwy 1 is not a county road. Although it needs widening, it is not worth giving up all our local road tax funds. How about stopping work on the double lane divided road between Watsonville and Castroville once the overpass at Salinas road is completed? How about widening Hwy 1 between Morissey and Soquel next. Do it in sequence, we got a good start at Hwy 17 intersection. Doing a bit here and a bit there will only create more traffic congestion in more places where the roads narrow back down to two lanes.

Signed, Gary Anderson on my wife's site.

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.

<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<

Gini Pineda
Administrative Assistant III
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Ave. Santa Cruz CA 95060
831 460 3200
831 460 3215(fax)
gpineda@sccrtc.org
Dear Members of the Transportation Commission,

"Adding another lane to a freeway to solve traffic congestion is like wearing a larger belt to solve obesity."

Since widening that one-mile piece of Hwy 1 will take so much money from the critical repair and maintenance of our local roads, for so many years, and will only "solve" the congestion problem for a few years at best, I am urging you not to continue diverting funds to this project.

Sincerely,

Nancy Macy, Chair
Environmental Committee for the SLV
The Valley Women's Club www.vwcweb.org
831/338-1728; fax: 831/338-7107; cell: 831/345-1555

Check out EcoCruz ~ The Environmental Guide for Santa Cruz County Visit http://www.EcoCruz.org to find environmental information, organizations and events in Santa Cruz County.

Civilization has been slow to give up on our myth of the Earth's infinite generosity. Rather grandly, we have overdrawn our accounts. 2  Barbama Kingsolver

It's just one big garden we should all be tending. 3
Andrew Macy

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.

Gini Pineda
Administrative Assistant III
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Ave. Santa Cruz CA 95060
831 460 3200
831 460 3215 (fax)
gpineda@sccrtc.org
www.sccrtc.org
From: John Mertz [mailto:jmertz@4rbs.com]
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2011 7:21 AM
To: info@scrrtc.org
Cc: 'John Leopold'; ellen.pirie@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; dpwweb@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; mark.stone@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; greg.caput@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; bds031@co.santa-cruz.ca.us
Subject: 10 Years of County Road Maintenance for 1 Mile of Expanded Lanes on Highway 1 is NOT a Reasonable Proposal

Sirs,

We must STRONGLY object to your proposal to 'steal' money that has historically been used for local road repair to fund yet another Environmental Impact Review of a project that will be of little or no benefit to the citizens of Santa Cruz County – specifically the Highway 1 Widening Project. According to our county supervisor, John Leopold, "In order to complete the EIR and avoid paying back $5.5 million to the federal government, the RTC is proposing to use virtually all of the state and federal road dollars over the next ten years to construct one mile of auxiliary lanes between the Soquel Avenue and 41st Avenue exits" In summary, we object for the following reasons:

. This project is simply not economically viable and continuing it is fiscally irresponsible. The EIR for this project is so far over budget, and still not finished, that it cannot be saved. And then to spend another $30 million for yet more paperwork and to add additional lanes to a 1 mile stretch of road that will have little or no positive impact on traffic is an irresponsible waste of our limited resources.

. This project will probably cause more traffic congestion than it solves.

Abandoning maintenance on the county roads will probably open the RTC and the County to charges of negligence and other court actions. Loosing in court would cost much more than what you owe the federal government.

. The roads in Santa Cruz County are in the worst condition they have ever been in for over 40 years.

. The roads are beginning to cause serious damage to our cars’ suspensions and tires.

. Some roads are so bad that emergency vehicles may not be able to use them creating the probability that someone will lose their life because of your actions.

. Should serious injury or loss of life occur because of the lack of road maintenance, the courts would probably hold you at least partially financially responsible.

. Trading 10 years of road maintenance for 1 mile of expanded lanes is fiscally irresponsible.

. Growth of viable businesses, adding significantly to the county’s tax revenue, in the mountain areas (e.g. wineries) demand better roads to support the influx of tourists.

In 2003 the Highway EIR was originally budgeted at $6.5 million, but it is still not finished and costs are now closer to $12 million. Spending more money on this project will simply be throwing good money after bad. And the idea of spending $30,000,000 to widen Highway 1 for 1 mile is, quite frankly, obscene. It would have almost no impact on congestion, traffic is backed up well past 41st street headed south and the ‘fish hook’ – well is there anything good anyone can say about the ‘fish hook’.

The problem is that the proposed widening will probably make matters worse. If you have ever commuted through Los Gatos on Highway 17, you are familiar with the massive congestion Cal Trans
-----Original Message-----
From: Kathy Handforth [mailto:kahandforth@cruzio.com]
Sent: Sunday, September 11, 2011 1:59 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Santa Cruz bus

I am wondering if you can help us figure out who to contact regarding the upcoming 9/15/11 bus service changes that deal a 3 strike blow to local working people trying to get home from work. We have tried the metro itself and the board - unresponsive and uninterested.

The route 71 to Santa Cruz is a major use route for working people - there are more jobs in Watsonville and Aptos/Soquel than in Santa Cruz. The metro has removed 2 key return routes IN A ROW between 4 and 5:00 pm. So, an hour is added. Then, the route 35, the 6:30 pm, that connects to the route 71 after the 2 removed routes, is GONE as well. People trying to get home to Scotts Valley and San Lorenzo Valley are supposed to wait the the 7:00 PM bus !!! A three hour commute that will destroy family life, after school events and jobs. NOTE: that route 35 has NOT been removed for the weekend - these changes are only directed at working people. We cannot get anyone to listen and are hoping you can get the word out and suggest others to talk to about this issue.

Thank you

-----Original Message-----
From: Karena Pushnik [mailto:kpushnik@sccrtc.org]
Sent: Tuesday, September 13, 2011 11:23 PM
To: kahandforth@cruzio.com
Cc: Erich Friedrich; Angela Aitken; ellen.pirie@co.santa-cruz.ca.us
Subject: FW: Santa Cruz bus

Dear Kathy -
Your email regarding bus service changes was received. As you noted, the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (Metro) is the entity responsible for overseeing and providing the local bus service. Your comments to the Transit District staff and board are the primary way to request service changes. Your email will be forwarded to Metro staff and the board chair for their consideration.

Unfortunately, funding for Metro's ongoing operations are based on sales tax revenues which have decreased dramatically in the last year. As such, Metro has had to make some tough decisions about how to address this huge hit to their budget. They have had over a dozen public hearings about proposed changes to their bus service and fare structure. Changes to be implemented on 9/15/11 reflect their best effort to minimize the effect of these difficult decisions.

- Karena Pushnik
Senior Transportation Planner/Public Information Coordinator
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA 95060
--- Original Message ---
From: Johanna Bowen [mailto:jobowen@cabrillo.edu]
Sent: Friday, September 09, 2011 12:45 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Opinion on HOV lane completion

> I would like to register an unsolicited opinion for the meeting on the 15th on
the topic of completion of Hwy 1 HOV lane through 41st.
> 1. I am in favor of completion by whatever means necessary, even if it
means less/ no money for pothole repairs. This county needed to widen that
highway 25 - 20 -- 15 -- 10 years ago. The money spent studying bike lanes and
alternatives could have been better spent. The rhetoric of the highway being
like a gateway drug to destroy paradise is so much nonsense.
> Please get the job done.

> 2. Are you aware of concerns being voiced that an HOV restriction for the
new, additional lane might not be the best option? Please see this LAO report:
> http://www.lao.ca.gov/2000/010700_hov/010700_hov_lanes.html
> Thank you for listening, and recording my unsolicited "vote"
> I cannot attend the meeting, much as I would like to.
> Johanna Bowen
> 4235 Gladys Ave
> Santa Cruz 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.

Gini Pineda
Administrative Assistant III
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Ave. Santa Cruz CA 95060
831-460-3200
831-460-3215 (fax)
gpineda@sccrtc.org
www.sccrtc.org
-----Original Message-----
From: Carole DePalma [mailto:caroledepalma@att.net]
Sent: Thursday, September 08, 2011 6:39 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Using Fed and State road repair Money for Highway One

I am opposed to using this money for any part of the one mile Highway 1 widening. We need every cent of this money to repair and fix our county roads which are in a sorry state of disrepair.

Carole DePalma
2001 Brommer St
Santa cruz, 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.

<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>><<<<<<<<<<>>>>}<
From: Michela Barcus [mailto:michelabarcus@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 County 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
-----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.

<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<
---- 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
-----Original Message-----
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
From: Sue Reynoldson [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 Reynoldson

*****

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
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](http://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](http://www.sccrtc.org)
-----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
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
-----Original Message-----
From: Evelyn Bernstein [mailto:eveyirene@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
From: D. Taylor [mailto:b40top.taylor@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 06, 2011 7:33 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: RTC funding of HWY 1 widening

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
-----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
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.
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
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 II
SCCRTC
1523 Pacific Ave
Santa Cruz CA 95060
831 460 3206
Fax 831 460 3215
cjudd@sccrtc.org
www.sccrtc.org
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
From: 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 Mekis 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

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: 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!

*****

08/30/11

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

Thanks,

Eric Smith
Soquel, CA

The RTC has secured funding for three projects: Mission Street, Highway 1/17 Interchange and the Morrissey/Soquel 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
TO: Regional Transportation Commission (RTC)
FROM: Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner
REGARDING: Draft 2012 State and Federal Legislative Programs and Legislative Updates

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC):

1. Receive a presentation from RTC’s Sacramento Legislative Assistants; and

2. Provide input on the RTC’s Draft State and Federal Legislative Programs for 2012 (Attachments 1 & 2, respectively), including identification of any new legislative issues the RTC should pursue or monitor in 2012.

BACKGROUND

Each year the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) adopts legislative programs to guide its support and opposition of state and federal legislative or administrative actions. Working with its Sacramento and Washington, D.C. legislative assistants and transportation entities statewide, the RTC develops and implements the RTC legislative program, notifying state representatives of the RTC’s positions on key issues, and monitoring bills and other federal and state actions that could impact transportation in Santa Cruz County.

DISCUSSION

Presentation on State Legislative Issues

At this meeting, the RTC’s Sacramento Legislative Assistants John Ariaga of JEA and Associates and Steve Schmaldt will provide a summary of state legislative activities in 2011 and discuss what may be forthcoming in 2012. A summary of bills tracked by JEA and staff in 2011 is attached (Attachment 3).

Draft 2012 Legislative Programs

Staff is in the process of developing the RTC’s 2012 State and Federal Legislative Programs. The Draft 2012 State and Federal Legislative Programs for the RTC are attached (Attachments 1 & 2, respectively). Staff recommends that RTC provide input on the legislative programs at this meeting and identify any additional issues the RTC should monitor or pursue in 2012. Proposed additions and deletions from the 2011 Legislative Program are shown in underline and strikeout. Staff is meeting with the Commission’s advisory committees, local
entities, and transportation agencies statewide over the next few weeks and will incorporate any additional changes into Legislative Programs for approval at the January RTC meeting.

Focus areas for 2012 are noted in the Legislative Programs. As transportation revenues continue to fall far below the needs of the multi-modal transportation system, the RTC will continue to focus on preserving funds dedicated to transportation and generating new, more stable revenue sources.

Federal Legislation

Development of the new federal transportation act and implementation of the act in California will be a priority for both the State and Federal Legislative Programs. As reported at past meetings, the Federal Transportation Act, SAFETEA-LU expired in September 2009 and has been extended through continuing resolutions. In early November, the Senate Environment and Public Works (EPW) Committee, Chaired by Senator Boxer, released details on its proposed two-year highway reauthorization bill, Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21). A summary of MAP-21 is included as Attachment 4.

Staff is working with the RTC's Federal Legislative Assistants and other entities to evaluate the proposal. Based on very preliminary review of the 600 page bill, staff is concerned about potential impacts to Santa Cruz County, especially changes that could result in redirection of funds from smaller counties, including Santa Cruz, to very large Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO). For instance, MAP-21 proposes to phase out smaller MPOs. Additionally, since Santa Cruz County is currently not eligible for Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Improvement Program funds due to changes in how air quality standards are measured, staff is concerned that the proposal to combine the Transportation Enhancement, Safe Routes to Schools, and Recreational Trails programs into the CMAQ program could further reduce funds available for Santa Cruz County transportation projects. Staff will be communicating concerns with Senator Boxer.

While MAP-21 includes no earmarks, in the event that new special federal funding opportunities arise in 2012, the RTC's Federal Legislative Program includes a list of projects to prioritize for special funding opportunities (Item 3.a. of the Federal Legislative Program).

SUMMARY

This report provides the initial Draft 2012 State and Federal Legislative Programs for review and comment. The RTC is scheduled to approve the documents in January 2012.

Attachment 1 - Draft State Legislative Program
Attachment 2 - Draft Federal Legislative Program
Attachment 3 - 2011 State Legislative Tracking
Attachment 4 - MAP-21 Summary
FOCUS AREAS FOR 2012:

1. **Funding Priority Projects:** Seek and preserve funding for priority transportation projects and programs in Santa Cruz County, including:
   - Projects on Highway 1
   - Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line
   - Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District projects
   - Local Street and Roadway Preservation
   - Bicycle and Pedestrian facilities

2. **Expand revenue-raising opportunities** and innovative financing options beyond the traditional gas tax.
   - Sponsor legislation to expand the authority of the RTC and local jurisdictions to increase taxes and fees for transportation projects, including increased gas taxes, new vehicle registration fees, and increases Service Authorities for Freeway Emergencies (SAFE) vehicle registration fees by $1 in order to support motorist aid programs.
   - Support legislation that lowers the voter threshold for local transportation funding measures, such as local transportation sales tax ballot measures, from the 2/3 supermajority to a simple majority, 55% or 60% majority vote.

3. **Address Air Quality/Climate Change:**
   - Support legislation to provide funding to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, including funds needed to implement SB375 and AB32.

4. **Protect and Augment Transportation Funding:** Pursue policy and/or legislative changes to restore, preserve and augment funding for all modes of transportation:
   - Support legislation and other efforts to provide stable funding for transit, local streets and roads, and State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) projects
   - Advocate for prompt release of Proposition 1B bonds to projects in Santa Cruz County, including transit projects.
   - Ensure STIP funds are programmed and allocated to regions based on SB 45 formulas and the region’s priorities, which may include projects on local streets and road. Ensure the State Budget allows flexibility to fund transit projects in the STIP.
   - Increase funding for state Safe Routes to Schools, Bicycle Transportation Account and other bicycle and pedestrian programs.
   - Support increased funding for local streets and roads, as highlighted in the statewide Local Streets and Roads Needs Assessment.
   - Oppose proposals which would restrict or redirect state and federal transportation funds to “megaregions”

5. **Support efforts to streamline Project Initiation Documents (PIDs).** Oppose efforts to transfer the State costs of PID development and oversight to local entities.
General Legislative Platform

1. Preserve Existing Transportation Funding and Formulas.
   Preserve and protect against deferral, borrowing or taking of state funding designated for the transportation system. Retain and enhance California’s funding formulas based on the increased costs to maintain and address deficiencies to the existing transportation system. Specifically:
   a) Support legislation and other efforts to ensure stable funding for transit, local streets and roads, and State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) projects. Could include increased per gallon excise tax or state sales tax on gasoline dedicated to transportation. (Focus area for 2012)
   b) Support early and timely sale of bonds for transportation, including allocation of Proposition 1B for projects in Santa Cruz County. Support extension of legislative deadlines previously established for bond programs to coincide with the state’s bonding ability. (Focus area for 2012)
   c) Oppose proposals to shift transportation funds to non-transportation purposes and the State General Fund.
      • Protect existing highway and transit funds, including Highway Users Tax Revenue (gas tax), sales taxes for transportation, Public Transportation Account (PTA) and “spillover” revenues, against suspension, transfer or expenditure for non-transportation uses.
      • Support legislation that expedites repayment of transportation funds previously diverted to the State General Fund.
   d) Support State Budget Reform that will bring fiscal discipline and predictability to the state budget.
   e) Ensure that transportation planning funds are available to agencies throughout the year and are not withheld due to delays in enacting the state budget.
   f) Support the continuation of state transportation funding programs dedicated to projects such as transit, Safe Routes to Schools, Bicycle Transportation Account, paratransit and Freeway Service Patrol.
   g) STIP Modernization
      • Ensure State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds are equitably programmed and allocated to regions, based on SB 45 (1998) formulas and regions’ priorities, which may include local road rehabilitation and transit projects.
      • Ensure the State Budget and STIP Fund Estimate allow flexibility to fund all modes of projects in the STIP; increase flexibility for funding STIP projects.
      • Ensure that transit projects remain eligible for regional STIP funds, even if the STIP does not include Public Transit Account funds.
   h) Oppose proposals which would restrict or redirect state and federal transportation funds to “megaregions”
   i) Support legislation that would trigger an increase in the state excise tax on gasoline, to replace the federal gas tax, in the event that the federal tax expires or is reduced.

2. Support New Transportation Funding. Support countywide and statewide efforts to raise needed funds to maintain and enhance the transportation system, including:
   a) Increase and index state gas and fuel taxes and other sources of transportation revenues so that transportation revenues keep pace with inflation/increased cost. Dedicate revenues to transportation projects and programs.
   b) Support efforts to address and expand revenue-raising opportunities and innovative financing options beyond the traditional gas tax, especially in recognition of the fact that
growth in vehicle miles traveled often exceeds growth in fuel consumption. **(Focus area for 2012)**

c) Support the development of a steady stream of new transportation funds dedicated to local road rehabilitation and maintenance, especially for roadways utilized by bicyclists.

d) Support legislative efforts to expand the authority of the RTC and local jurisdictions to increase taxes and fees for transportation projects, including gas taxes and fees, vehicle registration fees, congestion pricing, and fees relating to the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. **(Focus area for 2012)**

- Seek amendment to SB 83 (2009) to ensure all regional transportation agencies, not just Congestion Management Agencies (CMA), are authorized to seek voter approval to increase vehicle registration fees by up to $10 to fund transportation programs and projects. **(Focus area for 2012)**
- Support legislation that would allow the County of Santa Cruz to pursue a sales tax measure for transportation improvements in the unincorporated areas.

e) Work with local elected officials, local agencies and interest groups to address continuing gaps in funding for local transportation projects and pursue new local funding sources.

f) Support legislation that lowers the voter threshold for local transportation funding measures, including local transportation sales tax ballot measures from the 2/3 supermajority to a simple majority, 55% or 60% majority vote.

g) Work to ensure that state transportation programs provide the maximum amount of revenues for the Santa Cruz County region. If special state funding programs are developed, support funding of projects in Santa Cruz County.

h) Advocate that any new state revenues created for transportation be locally controlled and include safeguards to prevent diversion to the State General Fund.

3. **Support Efforts that Improve Government Efficiency and Expedite Project Delivery.**

a) Support organizational reform efforts that streamline and otherwise improve transportation funding, programming or project delivery processes and eliminate unnecessarily and/or duplicative requirements.

b) Support greater flexibility in contracting methods.

c) Support initiatives that increase opportunities to trade federal funds for state funds, as currently exists for Santa Cruz County’s share of Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds.

d) Grant preaward spending authority for transit projects, especially those funded by STIP.

e) Support efforts to streamline Project Initiation Documents (PIDs) for projects on the State Route System in order to lower the overall cost of PID development. Oppose efforts to transfer the State costs of PID development and oversight to local entities that take the lead on highway projects. **(Focus area for 2012)**

f) Oppose unfunded mandates on local and regional government.

4. **Air Quality/ Climate Change (Focus area for 2012)**

a) Support efforts to reduce the number of vehicle miles traveled and encourage smart-growth practices, which also preserve the authority and flexibility of local agencies. Ensure
that the region’s needs are incorporated in emerging climate change and sustainability programs, legislation, and regulations, including meeting the goals of AB 32 – the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, and SB 375.

**b) Ensure adequate funding is made available to fulfill the requirements of AB 32 and SB 375, including funds for transit, bicycle, pedestrian, and other projects that reduce greenhouse gas emissions and resources to prepare plans in compliance with SB 375.**

### 5. **Specifics**

**a) Transit:**
- Support efforts to restore, protect, and enhance funding for public transit, especially in light of AB32 and SB375 goals to reduce greenhouse gases (GHG).
- Support introduction and passage of legislation designed to preserve and enact additional sources of transit operating and capital assistance, including legislation aimed at reducing greenhouse gas emissions.
- Support funding programs that promote transit-oriented development and transit villages. Ensure that state-supported housing projects near transit facilities provide safe and convenient access for disabled persons to transit and are available to all regions.
- Support measures to allow the use of gas taxes for transit capital purposes, including purchase of rolling stock.
- Support development of the Coast Daylight Train and Transportation Agency for Monterey County’s commuter train extension projects.
- Increase flexibility to use state transit funds on both operations and capital expenses.

**b) Transportation for Seniors and People with Disabilities**
- Support transportation programs that are beneficial to communities with limited means.
- Increase funding levels for elderly and disabled transportation, including operating and capital funds for ADA paratransit service and vehicles.
- Support continuation of a competitive process, rather than formula distribution, of FTA5310 funds.
- Support funding transportation to dialysis and other medically necessary appointments; support Medicaid funding for transit and paratransit and oppose reductions in Medi-Cal funding for transportation.
- Support funding to ensure universal access, including access for paratransit vehicles within new developments, fully accessible transit stops and safe travel paths (accessible pedestrian facilities, including audible pedestrian signals), especially between senior and/or disabled living areas, medical facilities, educational facilities, employment locations, and bus stops.
- Support measures that require Medi-Cal to provide adequate transportation assistance and funding to ensure the Adult Day Health Care (ADHC) population has access to Medi-Cal funded ADHC centers and services.

**c) Bicycling & Walking**
- Support legislative initiatives and modifications to the California Vehicle Code that would improve conditions for bicyclists and pedestrians, including safety and access.
  - Support legislation and local ordinances prohibiting parking in designated bicycle lanes, to allow law enforcement to ticket vehicles parked in bicycle lanes even if specific “no parking” signage is absent.
o Support measures that would require bicycle and pedestrian facilities as a part of newly constructed roads and streets.

- Support increased funding for bicycle and pedestrian projects and programs, including education and awareness programs, the Bicycle Transportation Account, Safe Routes to Schools, Complete Streets programs, audible pedestrian signals, and programs that educate enforcement personnel regarding best practices.
- Support the inclusion and expansion of bicycle education programs (e.g. helmet laws, how to ride safely, etc.) in public and private schools, including high schools.
- Support Incentive Programs for bicycle and pedestrian commuters. Support efforts to extend the transportation fringe benefits in the state tax code to bicycle and pedestrian commuters.

**d) Transportation Demand Management/ Carpooling:**

- Oppose measures to remove existing or restrict future High Occupancy Vehicle lanes.
- Support legislation to provide incentives for both employers and employees, to encourage use of alternatives to driving alone, such as state tax incentives.
- Support efforts to secure new funding for regional rideshare programs.
- Support programs that would provide incentives for students to use transit and support revision of state laws that restrict Community Colleges’ ability to implement transportation fees for transit.

**e) SAFE Callbox and Freeway Service Patrol**

- Support proposals to increase state funding of Freeway Service Patrol programs.
- Support increased flexibility for compatible expenditures of SAFE funds.
- Support continuation of the $1 SAFE vehicle registration fee and seek authorization to increase the fees by $1.00 to fund Freeway Service Patrol and other motorist aid programs. *(Focus area for 2012)*

**f) Safety**

- Support legislative initiatives to improve safety for motorists, bicyclists and pedestrians.
  - Authorize local jurisdictions to reduce speed limits, based on what that jurisdiction determines is most appropriate for their facility.

6. Coordinate with Local, Regional and State Agencies and Organizations on legislative principles of mutual interest.

*Please contact us at 831-460-3200 with any questions about the RTC Legislative Program.*
1. Next Federal Transportation Act: *(Focus Area for 2012)*

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) will work with our congressional representatives, local entities, regional agencies, the State of California and federal agencies to advance RTC’s policy priorities in development of the next Federal Transportation Act. Priorities include:

a) Increase funding levels for all modes, as needed to bring transportation infrastructure up to a good state of repair and meet growing transportation needs in Santa Cruz County. Provide sufficient funds to allow agencies in Santa Cruz County to replace crumbling infrastructure, minimize traffic congestion, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, improve safety, and expand travel options available to citizens and visitors. Give top priority to preservation and maintenance of the existing system of roads, highways, bridges, sidewalks, and transit.

b) Support development of a formula funding program targeting greenhouse gas emissions and air quality. Could include changes to the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Improvement Program that expand eligibility to access funds allowing Santa Cruz County to receive funds to reduce vehicle emissions in Santa Cruz County.

c) Ensure equitable distribution of funds to California and Santa Cruz County, which may include direct subventions to counties and Metropolitan Planning Organizations. Oppose proposals which restrict, redirect or otherwise disproportionately direct funds to large metropolitan areas or “megaregions” or National and Interstate Highways. Ensure that proposals for innovative financing, including infrastructure banks, do not result in diversion of funds from or negatively impact small regions.

d) Support extension of the Small Transit Intensive Cities Program (STIC).

e) Make the existing federal gas tax permanent and support development of new funding mechanisms for transportation to ensure the financial integrity of the Highway Trust Fund and Mass Transportation Account. Given that current per-gallon gasoline fees are insufficient to address transportation infrastructure needs, this may include increasing and indexing gas taxes and fees and collecting fees based on vehicle miles traveled.

f) Streamline project delivery. Support regulations to streamline federal project delivery requirements and integrate planning, project development, review, permitting, and environmental processes to reduce project costs and delays.

g) Provide procurement preference for building and paving materials that have a lower emissions footprint than conventional materials but demonstrate comparable performance.

h) Preserve federal funding programs most commonly utilized in Santa Cruz County, such as the Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP), the
Transportation Enhancement Program (TE) for bicycle and pedestrian projects, FTA Section 5307, 5311, 5310, STIC, JARC, and New Freedom (NF) transit programs, Highway Safety program (HSIP), local bridge program (HBP), Safe Routes to Schools (SRTS), and federal Planning (PL); or provide replacement programs that will continue to provide essential funding to Santa Cruz County projects at current levels. Oppose proposals that would reduce funding to these programs.

i) Include funding programs for rail line maintenance and rail goods movement that could be used to address needs on the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line.

2. **Job Creation.** Spending on improving our nation’s infrastructure is particularly important at this time, given its decaying state and its ability to support an economic recovery through the movement of goods and people and the creation of jobs.

a) Oppose any reductions to key Department of Transportation programs in deficit reduction packages or annual appropriations.

b) Support efforts to boost the economy and create jobs through targeted, short term infrastructure spending proposals that supplement current spending levels.

3. **Maximize Funding for Local Area Projects.** Support increased revenues for transportation projects in the Santa Cruz County region. Oppose any efforts to reduce transportation funding to California or the region. Work with congressional representatives to obtain additional funding for Santa Cruz County highways, rail corridor, transit operations and capital projects, paratransit service, local streets and roads, transportation demand management, and pedestrian and bicycle facilities and programs.

a) Seek federal funds for high priority projects in Santa Cruz County through the next federal transportation authorization, annual appropriations, stimulus, or other special funding bills or programs. Priority projects include (not shown in priority order):
   - Projects on Highway 1
   - Local road repair and sidewalk projects
   - Infrastructure improvements to the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line
   - Intelligent Transportation System (ITS)/511 program
   - Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District’s priority transit projects
   - Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSST)
   - Watsonville/Pajaro Rail Station
   - Projects otherwise delayed due to state funding shortfalls

b) Promote inclusion of funding for transportation infrastructure and transit operations in any new national funding programs, including climate change, cap and trade, economic stimulus/jobs bills, or infrastructure investment legislation. Ensure that those funds are available to deliver state, regional, and local projects. Ensure flexibility to use the funds to accelerate delivery of existing projects.

c) Support timely annual allocations at the maximum levels allowed for programs authorized by the federal transportation act in order to meet growing transportation needs for local streets and roads, improving transit, relieving traffic congestion, encouraging alternative modes of transportation, and meeting increased paratransit demands. Allow for flexibility to use Federal Transit Administration urban and non-urban funds for both capital and operations.
d) Oppose unfunded mandates on local and regional governments, in order to reduce project costs and maximize funding for infrastructure projects.

e) Oppose proposals that would combine Santa Cruz, Watsonville, and Salinas into one urbanized area, given that they are not one continuous urban area, but rather separated by large rural areas. Furthermore, this reclassification could otherwise significantly reduce funding available for transit in the region.

4. Air Quality and Climate Change:
   a) Support federal action on climate change and energy policy and ensure that any legislation to reduce greenhouse gas emissions be structured in such a way as to assist the region and the state in achieving greenhouse gas reduction and mobility goals, not dilute state efforts. Ensure that any new environmental requirements are accompanied by additional funding necessary to implement those requirements.
   b) Support research and development of renewable energy sources that reduce the amount of emissions from the combustion of fossil fuels and support the development of more fuel efficient vehicles.
   c) Support a multi-pronged approach to addressing global warming, including carbon taxes or cap-and-trade systems and direct revenues to transportation and land use projects that reduce reliance on automobiles, including but not limited to public transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

5. Support Improved Elderly and Disabled Transportation.
   a) Support increased funding for transportation services for seniors and people with disabilities, including those required by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and services beyond those required by ADA.
   b) Support federal rule changes to reimburse non-emergency medical transportation through Medicare as a less costly alternative to ambulances and provide funding for medical dialysis transportation.
   c) Require that all interstate transportation providers comply with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) provisions, including wheelchair accessibility requirements.

6. Support Simplification and Expansion of Incentive Programs for Bicycle, Pedestrian, Carpool, and Transit Commuters. In an effort to reduce congestion, pollution, wear and tear on roads, and vehicle miles traveled:
   a) Expand grant programs to decrease single-occupancy vehicle trips.
   b) Expand and simplify transportation fringe benefits in the tax code (Commuter Choice Tax Benefit): permanently increase pre-tax transit benefits to at least the level allowed for parking expenses and make it easier for commuters to access the benefits.
7. **Freight and Passenger Rail**

   a) Support funding and incentives that could be used for freight and passenger railroad maintenance, capacity expansion and safety improvement projects on the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line.

   b) Support full funding for the combined Federal and State funding program for rail capital projects in which federal funds are used for 80% of the project’s cost and state funds for the remaining 20%, as provided for highway capital projects.

   c) Support the ongoing extension of Section 45G Railroad Track Maintenance Credit that provides 50 percent tax credit to short line railroads conducting qualified railroad track maintenance.

   d) Support measures that will facilitate the shared use of tracks by passenger and freight rail.

8. **Support Legislative and Administrative Proposals to Streamline the Process for Federally Funded Projects.** Support regulations to streamline federal project delivery requirements (including cooperative agreements, pre-award audits, disadvantaged business enterprise regulations and duplicative federal environmental review laws) while maintaining the substance of environmental laws, either through regulatory or statutory changes. Support provisions that better integrate state and federal environmental laws.

---

*Please contact us at 831-460-3200 with any questions about the RTC Legislative Program.*
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BILLS APPROVED IN 2011

**AB 105** (Committee on Budget) Transportation – “The Gas Tax Swap”
*Introduced: 1/10/2011; Last Amended: 3/16/2011*
*Status: 3/24/2011-Chaptered by the Secretary of State, Chapter Number 6, Statutes of 2011*
*Summary: Authorizes vehicle weight fees to be deposited in the State Highway Account for reimbursement of the General Fund for payment of current general obligation bond debt service for voter-approved transportation bonds.*

**AB 147** (Dickinson D) Subdivisions.
*Introduced: 1/14/2011
Last Amended: 5/31/2011*
*Status: 9/6/2011-Chaptered by the Secretary of State, Chapter Number 228, Statutes of 2011*
*Summary: This bill authorizes a local ordinance to require payment of a fee as a condition of approval of a final map or as a condition of issuing a building permit for purposes of defraying the actual or estimated cost of constructing transportation facilities.*

**AB 427** (John A. Pérez D) Transportation bond funds: transit system safety.
*Introduced: 2/14/2011; Last Amended: 8/15/2011*
*Status: 10/7/2011-Chaptered by the Secretary of State, Chapter Number 527, Statutes of 2011*
*Summary: Clarifies shares of Proposition 1B Transit System Safety, Security, and Disaster Response Account funds that commuter rail operators are eligible to receive.*

**AB 516** (V. Manuel Pérez D) Safe routes to school.
*Introduced: 2/15/2011; Last Amended: 7/14/2011*
*Status: 9/7/2011-Chaptered by the Secretary of State, Chapter Number 277, Statutes of 2011*
*Summary: Existing law requires the Department of Transportation, in consultation with the California Highway Patrol, to establish and administer a "Safe Routes to School" program for construction of bicycle and pedestrian safety and traffic calming projects, and to award grants to local agencies in that regard from available federal and state funds, based on the results of a statewide competition. This bill modifies required public participation process, with involvement by the public, schools, parents, teachers, local agencies, the business community, key professionals, and others, which process identifies community priorities, ensures those priorities are reflected in the proposal, and secures support for the proposal by relevant community stakeholders. The bill also adds another factor relating to benefit of a proposal to a low-income school.*

**AB 892** (Carter D) Department of Transportation: environmental review process: federal pilot program.
*Introduced: 2/17/2011; Last Amended: 7/13/2011*
*Status: 10/6/2011-Chaptered by the Secretary of State, Chapter Number 482, Statutes of 2011*
*Summary: Extends time period whereby Caltrans can assume certain responsibilities for environmental review and clearance of transportation projects that would otherwise be the responsibility of the federal government through January 1, 2016.*
AB 1097 (Skinner D) Transit projects: domestic content.
Introduced: 2/18/2011; Last Amended: 8/29/2011
Status: 10/2/2011-Chaptered by the Secretary of State, Chapter Number 405, Statutes of 2011
Summary: Existing law provides various sources of funding for transit projects. This bill would specifically
authorize the state or a local agency, relative to the use of federal funds for transit purposes, to provide a bidding
preference to a bidder if the bidder exceeds Buy America requirements applicable to federally funded transit
projects.

AJR 5 (Lowenthal, Bonnie D) Transportation revenues.
Introduced: 2/10/2011; Last Amended: 3/29/2011
Status: 6/8/2011-Chaptered by the Secretary of State, Chapter Number 29, Statutes of 2011
Summary: Requests the President and the Congress of the United States to consider and enact legislation to
conduct a study regarding the feasibility of the collection process for a transportation revenue source based on
vehicle miles traveled, in order to facilitate the creation of a reliable and steady transportation funding mechanism
for the maintenance and improvement of surface transportation infrastructure.
RTC Position: Support

SB 310 (Hancock D) Local development.
Introduced: 2/14/2011; Last Amended: 8/29/2011
Status: 10/3/2011-Chaptered by the Secretary of State, Chapter Number 446, Statutes of 2011
Summary: Existing law authorizes the legislative body of a city or county to adopt an infrastructure financing
plan, which is required to contain specified information, for the purpose of financing certain infrastructure
facilities, if specified procedural requirements are met, and requires the legislative body, if it adopts the plan, to
submit the proposal to the voters. Existing law authorizes the legislative body to create an infrastructure financing
district, by ordinance, if 2/3 of the qualified electors of the proposed district vote in favor of adoption of the plan,
and also authorizes the legislative body to initiate proceedings to issue bonds to finance the infrastructure
facilities if 2/3 of those electors vote in favor of the issuance. Existing law authorizes infrastructure finance
districts to finance specified projects, including financing certain infrastructure facilities. This bill would
authorize a district to reimburse a developer that meets specified requirements for permit expenses or expenses
related to the construction of affordable housing units pursuant to the Transit Priority Project Program described
below. This bill would also require that an infrastructure financing plan also include a plan to finance any
potential costs for reimbursing a developer that meets specified requirements for permit and affordable housing
expenses related to a project of the Transit Priority Project Program.
RTC Position: Support

SB 325 (Rubio D) Central California Railroad Authority.
Introduced: 2/14/2011
Last Amended: 6/9/2011
Status: 9/6/2011-Chaptered by the Secretary of State, Chapter Number 234, Statutes of 2011
Location: 9/6/2011-S. CHAPTERED
Summary: Existing law authorizes the creation of railroad authorities in various parts of the state. This bill would enact the
Central California Railroad Authority Act to create the Central California Railroad Authority as an alternative for
ensuring short-line railroad service in the Counties of Kern, Kings, Tulare, Fresno, and Merced. The bill would
require the authority to be governed by a board of directors who would be appointed by the council of
governments or county association of governments within the Counties of Kern, Kings, Tulare, Fresno, and
Merced, thereby imposing a state-mandated local program. The bill would authorize the Counties of Madera,
Stanislaus, and San Joaquin to elect to join the authority. The bill would set forth the powers and duties of the
authority. The bill would require the authority to conduct its first meeting not later than 120 days after
abandonment or discontinuance of service on, or the bankruptcy or sale of, the short-line railroads in the member
counties if the members have formed a joint exercise of powers agreement to implement and manage the
authority. The bill would authorize the authority to acquire and operate railroads or select a franchisee to operate a
rail transportation system, to prepare a plan for acquisition and operation of specified railroad lines, and establish
criteria for the award of a franchise for the acquisition, financing, and operation of the railroad system. The bill
would further authorize the authority to issue revenue bonds pursuant to the Revenue Bond Law of 1941. The bill
would provide that the state is not liable for any contract, debt, or obligation of the authority. The bill would
prohibit the authority from being a claimant for Transportation Development Act funds or from receiving funds
from the Public Transportation Account. The bill would also state the intent of the Legislature in enacting the
authority.

RTC Position: Support

SB 468 (Kehoe D) Department of Transportation: north coast corridor project: high-occupancy toll lanes.
Introduced: 2/17/2011; Last Amended: 8/31/2011
Status: 10/7/2011-Chaptered by the Secretary of State, Chapter Number 535, Statutes of 2011
Summary: Bill imposes additional requirements on Caltrans with respect to specified highway projects on State
Highway Route 5 in southern California, known collectively as the north coast corridor project, that are located
entirely or partially in the coastal zone, including requiring the department to collaborate with local agencies, the
California Coastal Commission, and other affected local, state, and federal agencies to ensure that multimodal
transportation options are evaluated and included in the public works plan and, where appropriate, in the project
design for the projects. The bill would make these requirements applicable to the San Diego Association of
Governments (SANDAG) and would also require SANDAG, for these projects, to establish a safe routes to transit
program that integrates the adopted regional bike plan with transit services and, pursuant to SANDAG's
agreement, to commit to dedicate for regional habitat acquisition, management, and monitoring activities a
portion of specified taxes approved by the voters in San Diego County. The bill would, for these projects, require
the department to suspend a notice of determination relating to environmental impact, issued between January 1,
2011, and January 1, 2012, until it is determined that environmental documents for the projects satisfy the
requirements of the bill. The bill would also make legislative findings and declarations.

RTC Position: Originally would have imposed severe restrictions on highway projects anywhere in the coastal
zone; letters sent expressing concerns 4/7/11 and 4/29/11. Kehoe significantly amended May 31 and now only
applies to San Diego County.

BILLS VETOED BY THE GOVERNOR

AB 650 (Blumenfield D) Blue Ribbon Task Force on Public Transportation for the 21st Century.
Introduced: 2/16/2011; Last Amended: 8/15/2011
Status: 9/26/2011-Vetoed by the Governor
Summary: Existing law establishes various boards and commissions within state government. Existing law
establishes various transit districts and other local entities for development of public transit on a regional basis
and makes various state revenues available to those entities for those purposes. Existing law declares that the
fostering, continuance, and development of public transportation systems are a matter of statewide concern. The
Public Transportation Account is designated as a trust fund and funds in the account shall be available only for
specified transportation planning and mass transportation purposes. This bill would establish, until March 30,
2013, the Blue Ribbon Task Force on Public Transportation for the 21st Century. The bill would require the task
force to be comprised of 12 members and would require the Senate Committee on Rules and the Speaker of the
Assembly to each appoint 6 specified members, by January 31, 2012. The bill would require the task force to elect
one of its nonlegislative members as chair. The bill would require the task force to issue a written report that
contains specified findings and recommendations relating to, among other things, the current state of California's
transit system, the estimated cost of creating the needed system over various terms, and potential sources of
funding to sustain the transit system's needs, and to submit the report by September 30, 2012, to the Governor, the
Legislature, the Joint Legislative Budget Committee, the Senate Committee on Rules, the Speaker of the
Assembly, and the transportation committees of the Legislature. The bill would require the task force, for
purposes of collecting information for the written report, to consult with appropriate state agencies and
departments and would require the task force to contract with consultants for preparation of the report. The bill
would require the Department of Transportation to provide administrative staffing to the task force. The bill
would appropriate $750,000 from the Public Transportation Account to the department, to accomplish the
purposes of these provisions.

Status: 10/6/2011-Vetoed by the Governor
Summary: The Bergeson-Peace Infrastructure and Economic Development Bank Act sets forth the duties of the
California Infrastructure and Economic Development Bank in financing economic development facilities, and
promoting infrastructure and economic development opportunities in the state generally. This bill would require
the bank to consult, and authorize it to coordinate implementation of its revolving loan program, with local and
regional revolving loan funds and networks of revolving loan funds, for specified purposes.

AB 700 (Blumenfield D) Infrastructure and Economic Development Bank.
Introduced: 2/17/2011
Last Amended: 6/28/2011
Status: 10/6/2011-Vetoed by the Governor
Summary: The Bergeson-Peace Infrastructure and Economic Development Bank Act establishes the
Infrastructure and Economic Development Bank within the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency. The
act provides that bank is governed and its corporate powers are exercised by a board of directors of which the
Secretary of Business, Transportation and Housing or his or her designee shall serve as chair. This bill would
delete the provisions establishing the bank within the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency and
providing that the Secretary of Business, Transportation and Housing or his or her designee shall serve as chair of
the board of directors. It instead would provide that the bank is within state government and that the Director of
Finance or his or her designee shall serve as chair of the board of directors.

SB 28 (Simitian D) Vehicles: electronic wireless communications devices: prohibitions.
Introduced: 12/6/2010; Last Amended: 7/7/2011
Status: 9/7/2011-Vetoed by the Governor
Summary: This bill would require the Department of Motor Vehicles to include a test of the driver’s license
applicant's understanding of the distractions and dangers of handheld cell phone use and text messaging while
operating a motor vehicle.

SB 29 (Simitian D) Vehicles: automated traffic enforcement systems.
Introduced: 12/6/2010; Last Amended: 8/26/2011
Status: 10/7/2011-Vetoed by the Governor
Summary: Existing law authorizes the limit line, intersection, or other places where a driver is required to stop to
be equipped with an automated enforcement system, as defined, if the system meets certain requirements.
Existing law authorizes a governmental agency to contract out the operation of the system under certain
circumstances, except for specified activities, that include, among other things, establishing guidelines for
selection of location. A violation of the Vehicle Code is a crime. This bill would require that those requirements
include identifying the system by signs posted within 200 feet of an intersection where a system is operating. The
bill would require that automated traffic enforcement systems installed as of January 1, 2012, be identified no
later than January 1, 2013. The bill would require the governmental agency that operates an automated traffic
enforcement system to develop uniform guidelines for specified purposes and to establish procedures to ensure
compliance with those guidelines. The bill would require, for systems installed as of January 1, 2012, that a
governmental agency that operates an automated traffic enforcement system establish those guidelines by January
1, 2013. The bill would require the governmental agency to adopt a finding of fact establishing the need for the
system at a specific location for reasons related to safety for those systems installed after January 1, 2012.
**SB 223 (Leno D) Voter-approved local assessment: vehicles.**
*Introduced: 2/9/2011; Last Amended: 8/31/2011*

**Status:** 10/4/2011-Vetoed by the Governor

**Summary:** Existing law authorizes certain counties to impose a local vehicle license fee not exceeding $10 per vehicle, as provided, for the privilege of operating specified vehicles on public roads in the county. Existing law requires a county imposing this fee to contract with the Department of Motor Vehicles to collect and administer the fee. This bill would authorize the City and County of San Francisco to impose a voter-approved local assessment for specified vehicles if certain conditions, including approval by local voters, are met. The bill would require the city and county to contract with the department to collect and administer the assessment, as provided.

**RTC Info:** Originally applied to all counties, amended 7/11/11 to only cover SF.

---

**SB 582 (Yee D) Commute benefit policies.**
*Introduced: 2/17/2011; Last Amended: 7/7/2011*

**Status:** 8/1/2011-Vetoed by the Governor

**Summary:** Existing law requires transportation planning agencies to undertake various transportation planning activities, including preparation of a regional transportation plan. Existing law requires transportation planning agencies that are designated under federal law as metropolitan planning organizations to include a sustainable communities strategy as part of the regional transportation plan for their region. Existing law creates air quality management districts and air pollution control districts with various responsibilities relative to reduction of air pollution. This bill, beginning on January 1, 2013, subject to certain exceptions, would authorize a metropolitan planning organization jointly with the local air quality management district or air pollution control district to adopt a commute benefit ordinance that requires covered employers operating within the common area of the organization and district with a specified number of covered employees to offer those employees certain commute benefits. The bill would require that the ordinance specify certain matters, including any consequences for noncompliance, and would impose a specified reporting requirement. The bill would provide for the 8 metropolitan planning organizations within the region served by a specified air district to adopt the ordinance only after the district first acts to adopt the ordinance. The bill would exclude from its provisions an air district with a trip reduction regulation initially adopted prior to the federal Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 as long as it continues to have a regulation that allows trip reduction as a method of compliance. The bill would make its provisions inoperative on January 1, 2017.

---

**SB 910 (Lowenthal D) Vehicles: bicycles: passing distance.**
*Introduced: 2/18/2011; Last Amended: 8/30/2011*

**Status:** 10/7/2011-Vetoed by the Governor

**Summary:** Under existing law, a driver of a vehicle overtaking another vehicle or a bicycle proceeding in the same direction is required to pass to the left at a safe distance without interfering with the safe operation of the overtaken vehicle or bicycle, subject to certain limitations and exceptions. A violation of this provision is an infraction punishable by a fine not exceeding $100 for a first conviction, and up to a $250 fine for a 3rd and subsequent conviction occurring within one year of 2 or more prior infractions. This bill would recast this provision as to overtaking and passing a bicycle by requiring the driver of a motor vehicle overtaking and passing a bicycle that is proceeding in the same direction on a highway to pass in compliance with specified requirements applicable to overtaking and passing a vehicle, and to do so at a safe distance that does not interfere with the safe operation of the overtaken bicycle, having due regard for the size and speed of the motor vehicle and the bicycle, traffic conditions, weather, and the surface and width of the highway. The bill would prohibit the driver of the motor vehicle that is overtaking or passing a bicycle proceeding in the same direction on a highway from passing at a distance of less than 3 feet between any part of the motor vehicle and any part of the bicycle or its operator, except as provided. The bill would make a violation of this provision an infraction punishable by a $35 fine. The bill would also require the imposition of a $220 fine on a driver if a collision occurs between a motor vehicle and a bicyclist causing bodily harm to the bicyclist, and the driver is found to be in violation of the above provisions.
BILLS THAT DID NOT MAKE IT OUT OF 2011 SESSION –

Some bills may be carried forward in 2012

AB 49 (Gatto D) Development: expedited permit review.
Introduced: 12/6/2010; Last Amended: 3/24/2011
Summary: Aimed at streamlining the permit approval process for developments.

AB 286 (Berryhill, Bill R) State highways: Routes 108 and 120.
Introduced: 2/8/2011; Last Amended: 8/30/2011
Summary: Related to sale of property acquired by the state for highway purposes if the property is no longer needed for those purposes upon terms, standards, and conditions established by the California Transportation Commission.

AB 296 (Skinner D) Building standards: cool pavement.
Summary: Existing law requires the Department of Transportation to adopt a balanced, multimodal research and development program, including the research and development of new technologies. This bill would establish the Cool Pavements Research and Implementation Act and would encourage the department to consult and coordinate with specified state agencies, to implement the act. The bill would require the department to publish or make available on the department's Internet Web site, by January 1, 2014, a Cool Pavements Handbook to detail specifications, testing protocols, and best practices for cool pavements.

AB 343 (Atkins D) Redevelopment plans: environmental goals.
Introduced: 2/10/2011; Last Amended: 6/14/2011
Location: 7/8/2011-Failed Deadline; S. 2 YEAR
Summary: This bill would require each redevelopment plan to be consistent with the regional sustainable communities strategy or alternative planning strategy adopted by the metropolitan planning organization or council of government.

AB 345 (Atkins D) Vehicles: traffic control device uniform standards: advisory committee.
Status: 9/1/2011-Ordered to inactive file at the request of Senator Kehoe.
Summary: Existing law requires the Department of Transportation to consult with local agencies before adopting rules and regulations prescribing uniform standards and specifications for official traffic control devices. This bill would additionally require the department to establish, after consulting with groups representing users of streets, roads, and highways, a specified committee to advise the department, and to hold public hearings regarding all of the above. The bill would require the committee to include various representatives, including representatives from organizations representing the interests of nonmotorized users of the highway.

AB 356 (Hill D) Public works projects: local hiring policies.
Introduced: 2/10/2011; Last Amended: 4/25/2011
Summary: This bill would prohibit any local agency from mandating that any portion or percentage of work on a public works project be performed by local residents or persons residing within particular geographic areas if any portion of that public works project will take place outside the geographical boundaries of the local agency. The bill would also require a local agency to fund any increase in cost of a public works project that is located entirely within the geographical boundaries of the local agency where the public works project is funded with state funds and the local agency implements a local resident hiring policy.

AB 381 (Alejo D) Department of Transportation.
Introduced: 2/14/2011; Status: 5/13/2011-Failed Deadline
Summary: Existing law creates the Department of Transportation, within the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency, under the administration of the Director of Transportation, who is required to organize the department, as specified, with the approval of the Governor and the Secretary of the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency. This bill would make a nonsubstantive, grammatical change to that provision.

AB 441 (Monning D) State planning.
Introduced: 2/14/2011; Last Amended: 3/24/2011
Summary: This bill would require the California Transportation Commission (CTC) to include health issues in the guidelines for the preparation of regional transportation plans.

AB 484 (Alejo D) Land use: natural resources: transfer of long-term management funds.
Introduced: 2/15/2011; Last Amended: 5/27/2011
Status: 7/8/2011-Failed Deadline; 2 YEAR
Summary: Public agencies are authorized to designate a nonprofit organization to hold title to, and manage an interest in, real property that the state or local public agency requires a property owner to transfer to the agency to mitigate any adverse impact upon natural resources caused by permitting the development of a project or facility, provided the nonprofit organization meets specified conditions. This bill would authorize funds set aside for the long-term management of any lands or easements conveyed to a nonprofit organization pursuant to the above provisions to also be conveyed to the nonprofit organization as specified. The bill would also require the nonprofit organization to hold, manage, invest, and disburse the funds in furtherance of managing and stewarding the land or easement for which the funds were set aside.
RTC Position: Supported. Merged with Kehoe bill SB 436, which was signed into law.

AB 485 (Ma D) Infrastructure financing.
Status: 9/7/2011-Ordered to inactive file at the request of Senator Wolk.
Summary: This bill would eliminate the requirement of voter approval for the adoption of an infrastructure financing plan, the creation of an infrastructure financing district, and the issuance of bonds with respect to a transit village development district. Sets requirements for affordable housing.

AB 567 (Valadao R) Transportation funds: capital improvement projects.
Introduced: 2/16/2011
Summary: Spot bill - Existing law requires specified funds made available for transportation capital improvement projects to be programmed and expended for interregional and regional improvements, as specified. This bill would make nonsubstantive changes to these provisions.

AB 605 (Dickinson D) Environmental quality: California Environmental Quality Act: transportation impacts.
Introduced: 2/16/2011
Status: 5/10/2011-Failed Deadline; 2 YEAR
Summary: This bill would require the Office of Planning and Research to prepare and adopt guidelines that would establish the percentage reduction in the projected trip generation and vehicle miles traveled for a project as compared to the average for trip generation and vehicle miles traveled for that project type that would assist a region in meeting the greenhouse gas emission reduction targets established by the State Air Resources Board for the automobile and light truck sector for that region, and develop a list of mitigation measures that a project may incorporate to reduce the project's projected trip generation and vehicle miles traveled. The bill would provide that a project meeting or exceeding the percentage reduction in trip generation and vehicle miles traveled or a project that incorporates the listed mitigation measures sufficient to allow the project to meet the percentage reduction would not need to consider the transportation-related impact of the project in environmental documents prepared pursuant to CEQA. Because a lead agency would be required to determine whether a project would meet the percentage reduction established by the guidelines, this bill would impose a state-mandated local program.

AB 638 (Skinner D) Fuel resources: State Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission and State Air Resources Board.
Introduced: 2/16/2011; Last Amended: 4/13/2011
Status: 5/28/2011-Failed Deadline; 2 YEAR
Summary: This bill would require the State Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission (commission) and the State Air Resources Board (board) to adopt policies and regulations to attain the fuel consumption targets set forth in state plan to increase the use of alternative transportation fuels, coordinate the attainment of the targets with provisions regulating alternative fuels, and assess how future guidelines, regulations, and investments affect the attainment of the fuel consumption targets. The bill would require those entities to update a specified economic analysis, develop a strategy for petroleum fuel use reduction and alternative fuel use in specified vehicles, and identify regulatory and statutory barriers to attaining the petroleum fuel consumption targets.

AB 710 (Skinner D) Local planning: infill and transit-oriented development.
Introduced: 2/17/2011; Last Amended: 8/18/2011
Summary: This bill would state the findings and declarations of the Legislature with respect to parking requirements and infill and transit-oriented development, and would state the intent of the Legislature to reduce unnecessary government regulation and to reduce the cost of development by eliminating excessive minimum parking requirements for infill and transit-oriented development.

AB 819 (Wieckowski D) Bikeways.
Introduced: 2/17/2011; Last Amended: 3/31/2011
Status: 5/10/2011-Failed Deadline; 2 YEAR
Summary: Existing law requires the Department of Transportation, in cooperation with county and city governments, to establish minimum safety design criteria for the planning and construction of bikeways, and authorizes cities, counties, and local agencies to establish bikeways. Existing law defines 3 classes of bikeways for its purposes. This bill would include a class IV bikeway among the bikeways subject to the above provisions and would define a class IV bikeway to include a segregated bike lane which provides exclusive use of bicycles on streets.

AB 890 (Olsen R) Environment: CEQA exemption: roadway improvement.
Status: 5/10/2011-Failed Deadline; 2 YEAR
Summary: This bill would additionally exempt a roadway improvement project or activity that is undertaken by a city, county, or city and county from CEQA.

AB 893 (V. Manuel Pérez D) State government: California infrastructure and economic development bank.
Introduced: 2/17/2011; Last Amended: 5/31/2011
Status: 8/26/2011-Failed Deadline - 2 YEAR
Summary: This bill would require the California Infrastructure and Economic Development Bank Fund in the State Treasury to provide technical support to small and rural communities in the state in obtaining financing for local infrastructure projects.

AB 910 (Torres D) Infrastructure financing districts: facilities and projects.
Summary: Existing law authorizes counties and cities to form infrastructure financing districts, in accordance with a prescribed procedure, and requires that a district finance only public capital facilities of communitywide significance, as specified. This bill would, in addition to public capital facilities, require a district to finance affordable housing facilities and economic development projects. The bill would provide that with respect to a district proposing to implement a specified plan, an election would not be required to form a district, adopt an infrastructure financing plan, or issue bonds.

AB 987 (Grove R) Public works: prevailing wages.
Introduced: 2/18/2011
Summary: Modifies prevailing wage requirements for public projects.

AB 988 (Grove R) Prevailing wages.
Introduced: 2/18/2011
Summary: Modifies methodology for determining prevailing wage.

Introduced: 2/18/2011
Summary: This bill would require the Office of Planning and Research to prepare recommendations for expedited environmental review for transit-oriented development.

**AB 1134 (Bonilla D) Department of Transportation: project study reports.**
*Introduced: 2/18/2011; Last Amended: 3/21/2011*
*Summary:* This bill attempts to streamline development of project study reports for any project on the state highway system and clarify when an entity performing a project study report must reimburse the department for the cost of reviewing and approving a report for projects that are not in an adopted regional transportation plan, a voter-approved county sales tax measure expenditure plan, or another voter-approved transportation program.

**AB 1229 (Feuer D) Transportation: financing: federal highway grant anticipation notes.**
*Introduced: 2/18/2011; Last Amended: 6/21/2011*
*Status: 8/26/2011-Failed Deadline -S. 2 YEAR*
*Summary:* Modifies rules for federal highway grant anticipation notes, commonly known as GARVEE bonds, to fund transportation projects.

**AB 1250 (Alejo D) Redevelopment.**
*Introduced: 2/18/2011; Last Amended: 6/3/2011*
*Status: 6/6/2011-Re-referred to Com. on RLS.*
*Summary:* Spot bill -This bill would impose new requirements on redevelopment agencies with respect to implementation plans and evidentiary standards and expand existing prohibitions on agency direct assistance to certain projects.

**AB 1287 (Buchanan D) Local government: audits.**
*Introduced: 2/18/2011*
*Status: 5/13/2011-Failed Deadline - 2 YEAR*
*Summary:* This bill would require local agencies, defined to include cities, counties, a city and county, special districts, authorities, or public agencies, to comply with General Accounting Office standards for financial and compliance audits and would prohibit an independent auditor from engaging in financial compliance audits unless, the auditor completes a quality control review in accordance with General Accounting Office standards.

**AB 1308 (Miller R) Highway Users Tax Account: appropriation of funds.**
*Introduced: 2/18/2011*
*Summary:* This bill, in any year in which the Budget Act has not been enacted by July 1, would provide that all moneys in the Highway Users Tax Account in the Transportation Tax Fund designated for specific purposes are continuously appropriated and may be encumbered until the Budget Act is enacted.

**AB 1354 (Huber D) Public works: progress payments: notice: retention proceeds.**
*Introduced: 2/18/2011; Last Amended: 4/26/2011*
*Status: 5/10/2011-Failed Deadline -A. 2 YEAR*
Summary: For private and public works projects, and in a public works contract, this bill requires a prime contractor or subcontractor pay to any subcontractor not later than 7 days after receipt of each progress payment.

**ABX1 9 (Chesbro D) Taxation: vehicle license fees.**
**Introduced:** 12/13/2010  
**Status:** 9/12/2011-Died at Desk.  
**Summary:** The Vehicle License Fee Law, in lieu of any ad valorem property tax upon vehicles, imposes an annual license fee for any vehicle subject to registration in this state in the amount of 1% of the market value of that vehicle, as provided, for a specified amount of time. Existing law also, until June 30, 2011, imposes an additional tax equal to 0.15% of the market value of specified vehicles, as determined by the Department of Motor Vehicles, to the vehicle license fee, to be deposited in the General Fund and transferred to the Local Safety and Protection Account, a continuously appropriated fund. This bill would repeal the provision relating to the sunset date and repeal of the additional 0.15% tax, thereby depositing additional moneys into a continuously appropriated fund.

**ACA 4 (Blumenfield D) Local government financing: voter approval.**
**Introduced:** 12/6/2010  
**Status:** 8/29/2011-Ordered to inactive file at the request of Assembly Member Blumenfield.  
**Summary:** The California Constitution prohibits the ad valorem tax rate on real property from exceeding 1% of the full cash value of the property, subject to certain exceptions. This measure would create an additional exception to the 1% limit for a rate imposed by a city, county, city and county, or special district, as defined, to service bonded indebtedness incurred to fund specified public improvements and facilities, or buildings used primarily to provide sheriff, police, or fire protection services, that is approved by 55% of the voters of the city, county, city and county, or special district.  
**RTC Position:** Support

**SB 81 (Committee on Budget and Fiscal Review) Transportation.**
**Introduced:** 1/10/2011; Last Amended: 3/14/2011  
**Status:** 3/14/2011- Read second time and amended. Re-referred to Com. on BUDGET.  
**Summary:** Gas tax swap rules regarding debt service payments, incorporated into overall budget bill.

**SB 145 (Wyland R) Public works: prevailing wage rates.**
**Introduced:** 2/1/2011  
**Status:** 5/13/2011-Failed Deadline- 2 YEAR  
**Summary:** This bill would make technical, nonsubstantive changes to the provisions relating to the prevailing rate of per diem wages.

**SB 186 (Kehoe D) The Controller.**
**Introduced:** 2/7/2011; Last Amended: 5/31/2011  
**Status:** 7/8/2011-Failed Deadline - 2 YEAR  
**Summary:** This bill would expand provisions for which the Controller investigates annual reports to include a special district, joint powers authority, or redevelopment agency. This bill would also, until January 1, 2017, authorize the Controller to exercise discretionary authority to perform an audit or investigation of any county, city, special district, joint powers authority, or redevelopment agency, if the
Controller has reason to believe, supported by documentation, that the local agency is not complying with the financial requirements in state law, grant agreements, local charters, or local ordinances.

**SB 214** *(Wolk D)* Infrastructure financing districts: voter approval: repeal.
**Introduced:** 2/8/2011; **Last Amended:** 6/21/2011
**Status:** 9/9/2011-Ordered to inactive file on request of Assembly Member Ma.
**Summary:** This bill would revise the provisions governing the public facilities that may be financed. The bill would eliminate the requirement of voter approval and authorize the legislative body to create the district, adopt the plan, and issue the bonds by resolutions. The bill would authorize a district to finance specified actions and projects and prohibit the district from providing financial assistance to a vehicle dealer or big box retailer, as defined.

**SB 392** *(Gaines R)* Transportation: California Transportation Commission.
**Introduced:** 2/15/2011
**Status:** 5/13/2011-Failed Deadline - S. 2 YEAR
**Summary:** Spot Bill - Existing law establishes the California Transportation Commission and authorizes the commission to alter or change the location of any state highway if, in the opinion of the commission, the alteration is for the best interest of the state.

**SB 475** *(Wright D)* Infrastructure financing.
**Introduced:** 2/17/2011; **Last Amended:** 6/20/2011
**Status:** 7/8/2011-Failed Deadline- 2 YEAR
**Summary:** This bill would authorize a local governmental agency to enter into an agreement with a private entity for financing for specified types of revenue-generating infrastructure projects. The bill would require an agreement entered into under these provisions to include adequate financial resources to perform the agreement, and would additionally permit the agreements to lease or license to, or provide other permitted uses by, the private entity.

**SB 545** *(Anderson R)* Transportation.
**Introduced:** 2/17/2011
**Status:** 5/13/2011-Failed Deadline - S. 2 YEAR
**Summary:** Spot bill - Existing law creates various transportation programs to develop and implement improvements to transportation systems. This bill would state the intent of the Legislature to enact legislation enabling the state to examine efficiency in administering solutions to California's transportation needs.

**SB 693** *(Dutton R)* Public contracts: local agencies.
**Introduced:** 2/18/2011; **Last Amended:** 4/13/2011
**Status:** 6/3/2011-Failed Deadline - S. 2 YEAR
**Summary:** Existing law authorizes Caltrans to delegate to any city or county any part of its powers and jurisdiction, except the power of approval, with respect to any portion of any state highway within the city or county, and to withdraw the delegation. This bill would specify that the delegation authority includes the authority to utilize private-public partnership agreements for transportation projects.

**SB 822** *(Evans D)* Infrastructure plan.
**Introduced:** 2/18/2011; **Last Amended:** 3/24/2011
Status: 6/9/2011-Referred to Com. on BUDGET.
Summary: Existing law requires the Governor, in conjunction with the Governor's Budget, to submit annually to the Legislature a proposed 5-year infrastructure plan containing specified information concerning infrastructure needed by state agencies, public schools, and public postsecondary educational institutions and a proposal for funding the needed infrastructure. This bill would require the Governor to also submit the infrastructure plan to the Treasurer.

**SB 851 (Anderson R) Transportation.**
Introduced: 2/18/2011
Status: 5/13/2011-Failed Deadline -S. 2 YEAR
Summary: Spot bill -Existing law provides the Department of Transportation with full possession and control of all state highways and authorizes the department to lay out and construct all state highways, as specified. This bill would state intent of the Legislature to enact legislation that would address the need for highway construction.

**SB 907 (Evans D) Master Plan for Infrastructure Financing and Development Commission.**
Introduced: 2/18/2011; Last Amended: 5/3/2011
Summary: The California Constitution regulates the issuance of debt by the state and requires that debt in excess of $300,000 for which the state will be generally obligated be submitted to, and approved by, the voters. This bill would create the Master Plan for Infrastructure Financing and Development Commission, consisting of specified members, and would require the commission to prepare and submit a strategy and plan for infrastructure development in California. The commission would dissolve 30 days after submission of its final report.
SUMMARY OF MOVING AHEAD FOR PROGRESS IN THE 21ST CENTURY (MAP-21)

Bill Highlights

• Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) reauthorizes the Federal-aid highway program at the Congressional Budget Office’s baseline level—equal to current funding levels plus inflation—for two fiscal years.
• MAP-21 consolidates the number of Federal programs by two-thirds, from about 90 programs down to less than 30, to focus resources on key national goals and reduce duplicative programs.
• Eliminates earmarks.
• Expedites project delivery while protecting the environment.
• Creates a new title called “America Fast Forward,” which strengthens the Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Program (TIFIA) program to leverage federal dollars further than they have been stretched before.
• Consolidates certain programs into a focused freight program to improve the movement of goods.

Authorizations and Programs

MAP-21 continues to provide the majority of Federal-aid highway funds to the states through core programs. However, the core highway programs have been reduced from seven to five, as follows:

• **National Highway Performance Program** [New core program] ~$20.6 billion
  This section consolidates existing programs (the Interstate Maintenance, National Highway System, and Highway Bridge programs) to create a single new program, which will provide increased flexibility, while guiding state and local investments to maintain and improve the conditions and performance of the National Highway System (NHS). This program will eliminate the barriers between existing programs that limit states’ flexibility to address the most vital needs for highways and bridges and holds states accountable for improving outcomes and using tax dollars efficiently.

• **Transportation Mobility Program** [New core program] ~$10.4 billion
  This program replaces the current Surface Transportation Program, but retains the same structure, goals and flexibility to allow states and metropolitan areas to invest in the projects that fit their unique needs and priorities. It also gives a broad eligibility of surface transportation projects that can be constructed. Activities that previously received dedicated funding in SAFETEA-LU, but are being consolidated under MAP-21, will be retained as eligible activities under the Transportation Mobility Program.

• **National Freight Network Program** [New core program] ~$2 billion
  Our nation’s economic health depends on a transportation system that provides for reliable and timely goods movements. Unfortunately, the condition and capacity of the highway system has failed to keep up with the growth in freight movement and is hampering the ability of businesses to efficiently transport goods due to congestion.
MAP-21 addresses the need to improve goods movement by consolidating existing programs into a new focused freight program that provides funds to the states by formula for projects to improve regional and national freight movements on highways, including freight intermodal connectors.

- **Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program** ~$3.3 billion [Modify/consolidate Existing core program] - The Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) Program provides funds to states for transportation projects designed to reduce traffic congestion and improve air quality.

  MAP-21 improves the existing CMAQ program by including particulate matter as one of the pollutants addressed, and by requiring a performance plan in large metropolitan areas to ensure that CMAQ funds are being used to improve air quality and congestion in those regions.

  Reforms the Transportation Enhancements program with more flexibility granted to the states on the use of the funds within the program.

- **Highway Safety Improvement Program** [Existing core program] ~$2.5 billion – MAP-21 builds on the successful Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP). MAP-21 substantially increases the amount of funding for this program because of the strong results it has achieved in reducing fatalities. Under HSIP, states must develop and implement a safety plan that identifies highway safety programs and a strategy to address them.

- **Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Program (TIFIA)** – The TIFIA program provides direct loans, loan guarantees, and lines of credit to surface transportation projects at favorable terms. TIFIA will leverage private and other non-federal investment in transportation improvements.

  Included in the “America Fast Forward” title of MAP-21 will be provisions that build upon the success of the TIFIA program. MAP-21 modifies the TIFIA program by increasing funding for the program to $1 billion per year, by increasing the maximum share of project costs from 33 percent to 49 percent, by allowing TIFIA to be used to support a related set of projects, and by setting aside funding for projects in rural areas at more favorable terms.

- **Projects of National and Regional Significance Program** – This bill authorizes a program to fund major projects of national and regional significance which meet rigorous criteria and eligibility requirements. This program authorizes for appropriation $1 billion in Fiscal Year 2013.

- **Federal Lands and Tribal Transportation Highways Programs** – MAP-21 consolidates the existing program structure by creating a new Federal lands and tribal transportation program. The bill maintains funding for maintenance and construction of roads and bridges that are vital to the federal lands of this country.

- **Territorial and Puerto Rico Highways Program** – This program provides funds to the U.S. territories and Puerto Rico to construct and maintain highway, bridge, and tunnel projects.

- **Administrative Expenses** – Funds the general administrative operations of the Federal Highway Administration.
• **Emergency Relief** – Provides funds to states to repair highways and bridges damaged by natural disasters.

• **Highway Bridge and Tunnel Inventory and Inspection Standards** – Improves the existing highway bridge inspection program and authorizes a national tunnel inspection program to ensure the safety of our nation’s bridges and tunnels.

**Performance Management**

• Performance Measures and Targets in MAP-21
  - The bill establishes an outcome-driven approach that tracks performance and will hold states and metropolitan planning organizations accountable for improving the conditions and performance of their transportation assets.

• State and Metropolitan Transportation Planning
  - MAP-21 improves statewide and metropolitan planning processes to incorporate a more comprehensive performance-based approach to decision making. Utilizing performance targets will assist states and metropolitan areas in targeting limited resources on projects that will improve the condition and performance of their transportation assets.

**Acceleration of Project Delivery**

MAP-21 includes program reforms designed to reduce project delivery time and costs while protecting the environment. Examples of improvements include: expanding the use of innovative contracting methods; creating dispute resolution procedures; allowing for early right-of-way acquisitions; reducing bureaucratic hurdles for projects with no significant environmental impact; encouraging early coordination between relevant agencies to avoid delays later in the review process; and accelerating project delivery decisions within specified deadlines.

**Research and Education**

• **Transportation Research Programs** – MAP-21 funds research and development, technology deployment, training and education, intelligent transportation system (ITS), and university transportation center activities to further innovation in transportation research. The primary research areas include: improving highway safety and infrastructure integrity; strengthening transportation planning and environmental decision-making; reducing congestion, improving highway operations; and enhancing freight productivity.
Restructuring of Core Highway Programs Under the Senate’s MAP-21 Transportation Reauthorization Proposal

Current Formula Programs
- Interstate Maintenance
- National Highway System
- Highway Bridge Program

15% For Off-System Bridges

MAP-21 Core Program Structure
- NATIONAL HIGHWAY PERFORMANCE PROGRAM (NHPPP - New)
  ~$20.6 billion
- TRANSPORTATION MOBILITY PROGRAM (TMP - New)
  ~$10.4 billion
- NATIONAL FREIGHT NETWORK PROGRAM (New)
  ~$2 billion
- CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY (CMAQ)
  ~$3.3 billion
- HIGHWAY SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (HSIP)
  ~$2.5 billion

All above programs are eliminated except Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ). Transportation Enhancements, Safe Routes to School and Rec. Trails are eliminated but become eligible uses in a new reserve fund within CMAQ.