Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission

AGENDA

Thursday, January 12, 2012
9:00 a.m.

NOTE LOCATION THIS MONTH
City of Santa Cruz Council Chambers
809 Center Street
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 December 1, 2011 SCCRTC meeting

POLICY ITEMS

No consent items

PROJECTS and PLANNING ITEMS

5. Approve recommendation on Proposition 1B Transit Security Funds for Santa Cruz METRO (Resolution)

BUDGET AND EXPENDITURES ITEMS

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

7. Approve funding agreement for Monterey Bay origin and destination study (Resolution)

ADMINISTRATION ITEMS

No consent items

INFORMATION/OTHER ITEMS
8. Accept monthly meeting schedule

9. Accept correspondence log

10. Accept letters from SCCRTC committees and staff to other agencies - *none*

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

12. Accept information items

**REGULAR AGENDA**

13. Commissioner reports - oral reports

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

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

16. Regional Transportation Plan Sustainability Framework and Goal and Policy Development *(Grace Blakeslee, Transportation Planner)*
   a. Staff report
   b. 2014 Regional Transportation Plan fact sheet and timeline
   c. Sustainability framework for transportation plans
   d. Overview of comments received at Sustainability workshops
   e. Resolution

17. Adoption of the 2012 State and Federal Legislative Programs *(Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner)*
   a. Staff report
   b. Draft State Legislative Program
   c. Draft Federal Legislative Program
   d. MAP-21 Draft Comment Letter

18. On-Board Transit Ridership Study – Release Request for Proposals
   a. Staff Report
   b. Draft scope of work, project schedule and data needs
19. Review of items to be discussed in closed session

CLOSED SESSION

20. Conference with Real Property Negotiator Pursuant to Government Code 54956.8 for acquisition of the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line Property: Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line from Watsonville Junction to Davenport

Agency Negotiator: Paul Chrisman, Miller & Owen
Negotiation Parties: SCCRTC, Union Pacific
Under Negotiation: Price and Terms

OPEN SESSION

21. Report on closed session

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

23. Next Meetings

The next SCCRTC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, February 2, 2012 at 9:00 a.m. at the Watsonville City Council Chambers, 275 Main St., Watsonville, CA.

The next Transportation Policy Workshop meeting is scheduled for Thursday, February 16, 2012 at 9:00 a.m. at the SCCRTC Offices, 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA.

HOW TO REACH US

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

HOW TO STAY INFORMED ABOUT RTC MEETINGS, AGENDAS & NEWS

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

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

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

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

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

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

HOW TO REQUEST

❖ 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.
1. Roll call

The meeting was called to order at 9:05 am.

Members present:
Rich Krumholz      Don Lane
Kirby Nicol        Randy Johnson
Eduardo Montesino  Ellen Pirie
John Leopold       Mark Stone
Neal Coonerty      Greg Caput
Dene Bustichi      Lynn Robinson
Norm Hagen

Staff present:
George Dondro      Rachel Moriconi
Karena Pushnik     Yesenia Parra
Kim Shultz         Cory Caletti

2. Oral communications

Jack Nelson: Talked about the importance of sustainable transportation and thanked the RTC for sponsoring the Sustainability Workshop that was well attended. He said that he admired the Commission for having sustainable transportation goals.

3. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agendas

Executive Director George Dondro said that there was a replacement page for item 4, add-on pages for items 20 and 21.

Executive Director George Dondro requested that the Commission consider adding an urgency item to the agenda pursuant to Government Code
54954.2(b)(2). The information necessary to consider the item became available after the agenda packet had been distributed. The administrative step to execute a funding agreement with AMBAG for travel survey must be completed by December 31, 2011.

Commissioner Leopold moved and Commissioner Pirie seconded to add the special item as item 8a of the consent agenda. The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Stone said that the closed session will take place immediately following the consent agenda.

CONSENT AGENDA
(Pirie/Lane, unanimous)

MINUTES

4. Approved draft minutes of the November 17, 2011 Special SCCRTC meeting

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

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

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

ADMINISTRATION ITEMS

No consent items

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

13. Accepted 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

22. Review of items to be discussed in closed session (moved up by Chair Stone and taken out of order ahead of the Regular Agenda)

The Regional Transportation Commission adjourned to closed session at 9:10 AM.

CLOSED SESSION

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

PUBLIC SESSION

The Regional Transportation Commission reconvened to public session at 9:26 AM.

24. Report on closed session

   Executive Director George Dondero said that the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) has determined that the Highway 1 Soquel/Morrissey Auxiliary Lane project does meet the FHWA 10-year funding rule. The FHWA will not seek reimbursement from the RTC. The caveat to this decision is that the RTC must complete the tiered environmental document for the Highway 1 HOV Lanes project.

14. Commissioner reports (taken out of order after Item 24)- oral reports

   Commissioner Leopold said that he attended the RTC Sustainability workshop. He said that the discussion of how we think about sustainability was important and necessary. He thanked staff for putting the workshop together and said
that this type of public discussion puts the RTC on a good road for the next Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

15. Director’s report – oral report

Executive Director George Dondero said that he and other RTC staff including Senior Transportation Planner Rachel Moriconi met with the Santa Cruz County Public Works Director to discuss ways to collaborate on a possible tax measure. He said that polling will be done for the 2012 election. He said that the County expressed interest in working with the RTC on polling questions. He also noted that the County is looking at a utility tax measure.

Mr. Dondero said that the Soquel/Morrissey Auxiliary Lane project is out for bid and the closing date is December 13, 2011. He said that the window for cutting the necessary trees is very tight. He noted that a special RTC meeting may be needed to sign a contract with the chosen consultant. He proposed that the meeting take place on January 5, 2012 at 9:00a.m. He said that the regular Commission meeting scheduled for January 12, 2012 will still take place.

He also announced the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSST) Network workshops are scheduled for December 13, 14, and 15th. He said that flyers have been distributed to Commissioners and staff has done extensive promotions for these workshops. Short videos have also been completed by an RTC volunteer intern, Ariana Green, who is a student at CalPoly. He said that any Commissioner that would be interested in making welcome remarks at any of the workshops please contact Executive Director Dondero directly. The consultants will use the information gathered at these workshops to consider possible trail locations.

16. Elect RTC Chair and Vice-chair for 2012-oral report

Commissioner Pirie said that the nominating committee consisted of Commissioners Leopold, Lane, Dodge and herself. She said the committee unanimously agreed on the nomination of Commissioner Nicol as the 2012 Commission Chair and Commissioner Coonerty as the Vice-chair. Commissioner Leopold noted that the committee agreed that it would be important to have a County Supervisor and City Councilmember representative in these seats.

Commissioner Pirie moved and Commissioner Leopold seconded to accept the committee’s recommendation to elect Commissioner Nicol as the 2012 Commission Chair and Commissioner Coonerty as Vice-chair. The motion passed with Commissioner Nicol abstaining due to conflict of interest.
17. Caltrans report and consider action items

Commissioner Krumholz reported that Highways 152 and 236 had night closures due to the heavy winds last night. He said that Caltrans employees are working as quickly as possible to clear all fallen trees. He reminded everyone that it is that time of year where travelers must allow extra time for travel and safety should come first.

He noted the release of the CA511 system that will offer many features and allow Caltrans to inform travelers about lane closures, weather events, and road conditions, to name a few.

He reported that the Salinas road interchange false work is going up and work is moving forward. He said that unfortunately traffic is queuing thru this particular construction area. Mr. Krumholz also said that a project for the Pajaro River median barrier upgrade will be awarded on December 7.

He also noted that the speed limit on Hwy 101 thru Prunedale has been reduced to 55 MPH until the Prunedale corridor projects have been completed. He reminded all that speeding through constructions zones is unsafe and ticket fines are doubled.

He reminded the Commission that Dan Herron, Caltrans Planner, is retiring at the end of the year and that Mr. Adam Fukushima will be replacing Mr. Herron.

Commissioners congratulated Mr. Herron and wished him well.

Commissioner Caput thanked Mr. Krumholz for the College and Holohan Rd sidewalk work that has been completed. Responding to a comment from Commissioner Caput, Mr. Krumholz said that Caltrans employees working on Santa Cruz County roads are local residents.

18. FY 11/12 Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 8 allocation claim from the City of Santa Cruz for bikeway striping and minor improvements

Senior Transportation Planner Cory Caletti said that the City of Santa Cruz presented a TDA claim in the amount of $20,000 for bikeway striping and minor improvements as prescribed by the RTC Rules and Regulations.

Commissioner Coonerty moved and Commission Pirie seconded to approve the Bicycle Committee and staff recommendations that the Regional Transportation Commission approve a resolution for FY11-12 Article 8 Transportation Development Act funds for the City of Santa Cruz in the amount of $20,000 for bikeway striping and minor improvements.

A roll call vote was taken and the motion (Resolution36-11) passed with Commissioners Coonerty, Nicol, Lane, Johnson, Montesino, Pirie, Leopold, Caput and Stone voting “aye”. 
19. Single County Metropolitan Transportation Organization (MPO)

Executive Director Dondero said that the summary included in the packet had been prepared by the Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC) and it encapsulates the discussions thus far. Mr. Dondero said that this is an informational item. Staff will continue to work with AMBAG, TAMC and San Benito COG to look for ways to reduce redundancy and improve collaboration.

Commissioner Leopold thanked staff from all the agencies for all the work that has been done. He noted that one city has veto power, the City of Salinas. He hopes that AMBAG is more responsive to the agencies’ needs.

Commissioner Pirie said that she and Commissioners Coonerty and Robinson sit on the AMBAG board and that this process has been a changing experience for AMBAG. She said she has already seen some change. She noted that the AMBAG board directed staff to work more collaboratively and find ways to eliminate duplicative work.

George said that the City of Salinas Council asked for a report one year from now on how the collaborations are doing. Commissioner Pirie said that the Commission needs to keep in mind that the permanent director left in June and Mr. White is the interim only through December. A second interim director will be on board for about 4 months during the continued recruitment for a permanent director.

Commissioner Pirie motioned and Commissioner Robinson seconded to direct staff to continue to work with sister agencies to look for ways to improve collaboration and reduce duplication. The motion passed unanimously.

The Regional Transportation Commission adjourned for a short break at 9:55 AM and reconvened at 10:03 AM.

20. 10:00 A.M. PUBLIC HEARING: 2012 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP)

Senior planner Rachel Moriconi said that the Bicycle, Interagency Technical Advisory and the Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committees reviewed the proposed projects for State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds. The Committees’ recommendations are included in the written staff report.

Commissioner Stone said that he spoke to staff of some Public Works Departments in the Bay Area and they were concerned with the process of allocating funding, specifically STIP funds, to large projects without a long term plan to actually fund the entire project. He said that the concern is that STIP funds will go away if projects are not completed within the allotted timeframe.
Executive Director Dondero and Commissioners thanked staff and the local jurisdictions for their diligent work on the proposed project lists.

Commissioner Pirie asked members of the public to review the recommendation from her and Commissioner Stone. She noted that the Highway 1 HOV Lane project had not been at the top of the project funding list until the concern from the FHWA to return funds was brought to light. She summarized that the proposal was to not fund the Soquel to 41st Auxiliary Lane project during this STIP cycle and instead allocate the funds to local streets and road projects; however, it also includes a commitment from the Commission to allocate funds to the Soquel to 41st Auxiliary Lane project during the next available funding cycle.

Commissioner Stone said that this is an attempt to change the way the RTC is talking about transportation and address the pressure to fix local streets and roads.

Commissioners clarified that the next funding cycle could be as late as FY15/16 and that Highway 1 is considered to be a local road by many. Commissioners also discussed the concern that the CTC does not normally fund local roads and that they want local jurisdictions to help themselves.

The RTC opened the floor for comments from the public.

**Lucy McCullough**, Long Ridge Rd resident, said that the local roads have not been maintained since the Loma Prieta earthquake. She said that the emergency state of the roads is due to the lack of maintenance not just the damage caused by the storms. She asked that speed limit signs be posted when traffic is being detoured off of Hwy 17 through local roads and also asked why there is no advisory committee for rural roads.

**Frank Cirocco**, Skyline Road resident, said that roads in the unincorporated area need attention. He said that he is concerned that only partial filling of potholes is done and that the filling is not consistent even on the same road. He distributed photos of road conditions for Miller and Skyline roads.

**Rick Longinotti**, resident, thanked Commissioners Stone and Pirie for asking the Commission to take a different direction. He asked the Commission to consider the future, specifically the cost of fuel which will affect how people travel. He noted that vehicle miles traveled has been dropping every year. He said people drive less when fuel costs more and will rely on foot, transit and cycling for alternative transportation. He asked the Commission to consider a study session of the impact of peak oil.

**Paul Elerich**, Aptos resident thanked Commissioners Pirie and Stone. He said there is an overwhelming awareness that the roads need to be fixed. He added
that 175 residents live at the end of Vieira Drive which desperately needs to be fixed. If that road goes due to rain, the 175 residents are stuck.

Micah Posner, People Power, said that transportation is changing and that incrementally bike usage is going up while vehicle usage is going down. He said that what is being proposed by Commissioners Pirie and Stone is a compromise but does not move toward less vehicle usage. He added that People Power supports the idea of fixing local roads but will not support improvements to Hwy 1 in the future.

Wilson Fieberling, City of Santa Cruz resident and RTC Bike Committee member, asked the Commission to include the Branciforte Bridge for funding as it will be used by many cyclists. He said that this is a small project that can actually be accomplished.

Manu Koenig, Corralitos resident, said that the local community has established a committee to get funding for Corralitos area roads. He said that regional funds should be used for regional projects and that Hwy 1 projects should be funded through tolls. He also said that disincentives to driving would be the ultimate solution but may not be accomplished as soon as people want it.

Jim Danaher, Live Oak resident, said the public has spoken loud and clear that they want local roads and sidewalks fixed to make it safe for residents to get around. He said that he supports the proposal from Commissioners Stone and Pirie.

Steve Piercy, County resident and member of People Power, said that he is aware of the finite resources available and reminded the Commission that in 2004 Measure J was soundly defeated. He said that despite the Measure J defeat, the Commission began to build “sneak lanes.” He said he wants safe travel options for people who cannot afford to purchase cars and rely on public transportation and sidewalks. He thanked Commissioners Pirie and Stone for the compromise and said that if you build sidewalks or fix pot holes they will come.

Robert Kundus, Redwood Lodge road resident said that Redwood Lodge road is 2 miles long and is in dire straits. He said it is used to connect to Hwy 17. He said that FEMA has already invested in Redwood Lodge road so if the CTC does not approve funding for local roads that the Commission should go to FEMA again.

Cara Lamb, Santa Cruz resident, said that she does not drive and that people like her are the future. She said that the baby boomers will lose the ability to drive and need other transportation options. She said that it was clear that the Commission’s plans for the future are not the same as hers. She said that bus service has gone down in the past 20 years and service has not changed. Transportation options should be based on the user needs.
**Peter Scott**, Campaign for Sensible Transportation, said he opposes the widening of Hwy 1 and that although the proposal from Commissioners Stone and Pirie is not what the Campaign for Sensible Transportation usually supports, he is supporting the proposal. He also said that he reviewed some photos of storm damaged roads and that repairing them now will probably be cheaper than repairing them later.

**Tawn Kennedy**, Greenways to School Project Director, said that he supports Commissioners Stone and Pirie’s proposal and asked that decision be made to protect the most vulnerable road users, such as young people who cannot drive. He asked that transportation alternatives for young people that also address issues like obesity such be prioritized.

**Larry Lapp**, 40 year resident, said that the latest pavement report states that we have 100 miles of failing roads, a condition likely to get worse with winter coming. He is concerned about how he and other residents will be able to get to town. He said that differed road maintenance cost are 5 to 10 times higher than storm damage repair costs. He also said that 52% of these damaged roads are in the unincorporated areas. He noted that members of the Commission are from incorporated areas. He feels underrepresented.

**Chris Mann**, Business Council, said that the Business Council represents 60 companies and more than 20,000 people. He said the Council surveyed membership and they support continued prioritization of Hwy 1 but also support alternative modes of transportation. He said that he was traveling 10 miles per hour this morning starting at Park Ave, to Morrissey, after Morrissey traffic began to move at a normal speed. He also said he was empathetic with the charge of the Commission.

**George Smith**, summit resident, said he would like to see the projects on Hwy 1 completed. He said that it is unfortunate that funds need to be diverted to fix storm damaged roads but they do need to get fixed. He said he supported the proposal made by Commissioners Stone and Pirie.

**Luke Rizzuto**, said that his heart went out to the Commission. He noted that Commissioner Leopold was instrumental in getting Redwood Lodge road fixed. He said that the problem he has with taking so long to complete Hwy 1 projects is that by the time the projects are done they are obsolete. He asked the Commission to be visionary. He said that a study was done and it concluded that in the next 15 to 20 years 60% of traffic will be traveling to San Jose and Monterey. Residents of “mountain roads” don’t want roads widened because it will require speed increases and take property. However, they would appreciate the trimming of bushes and patch work of their roads.

**Rebecca Evans**, Long Ridge Road resident, said that the state of the roads is awful. She said the priority should always be safety. Some of these roads don’t
even have access for emergency vehicles. She noted that it was the 25 year anniversary of the Mountain fire.

**John Herr** thanked staff for their work on the proposed project list. He said that if roads are not maintained at a certain level, the cost becomes disproportional. He recommended that the Commission maintain all its current projects and not bring in any new projects.

**Jack Nelson** said that the state of pavement report states that you either pay now or pay more later. He said that when you add lanes you get renewed congestion as early as 5 years down the road. He said that people who use Hwy 1 for short trips can be converted.

**Daniel Dodge**, City of Watsonville representative, said that the proposal from Commissioners Stone and Pirie would allow for some South County projects to be funded which would free up funds for other City projects. He said that South County residents that drive from Watsonville to San Jose, UCSC and the County offices depend on Hwy 1. He said that not completing the Hwy 1 projects affects South County residents everyday life.

The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Leopold said that Santa Cruz County has pressing local road needs and the projects to address safety and those should be a priority. He noted that all counties are facing new issues that were not there just a few years ago like the lack of assistance from FEMA. He also said that local road projects should be awarded to local construction companies whenever possible.

Commissioner Leopold moved to accept the staff recommendations substituting the STIP funding recommendations made by staff with those proposed by Commissioners Stone and Pirie in a chart attached to a letter dated November 28, 2011 and distributed to the Commissioners. Commissioner Pirie seconded the motion.

Commissioners and staff clarified that the funding available to the Commission for transportation projects cannot be used for road maintenance, that the $4 million proposed for Hwy 1 by staff is not for a study but for the design and right-of-way phases of the Hwy 1 41st Ave to Soquel Dr Auxiliary Lanes project and that the failure of Measure J did not mean that funds should not be allocated to Hwy 1 projects or any other project included in the measure.

Commissioners discussed the need to repair damaged local roads, the need to continue to improve Hwy 1, funding challenges for all transportation needs especially very large projects such as the Hwy 1 HOV Lanes project, the need to be prepared to take advantage of unforeseen funding opportunities, and the fact that Hwy 1 is used as a local road by residents especially those South County to get to work and school.
Commissioner Lane asked to move $150,000 from the Hwy 1/9 intersection project to the Branciforte Creek Bridge project. This request was accepted by the maker and second of the motion on the floor as a friendly amendment. Commissioner Pirie asked for a friendly amendment to the motion on the floor to add that the Commission indicates intent to support future Hwy 1 improvements the next time that the Commission has an opportunity to vote on STIP funding. Commissioner Leopold did not accept this as a friendly amendment.

Commissioner Coonerty asked whether the friendly amendment could be limited to supporting $4 million for the Hwy 1 41st Ave to Soquel Dr Auxiliary Lanes and Chanticleer Overcrossing project rather than all potential Hwy 1 improvements. Commissioner Pirie accepted that as the redefined friendly amendment. It was still not acceptable to Commissioner Leopold as a friendly amendment.

A motion was made by Commissioner Pirie and seconded by Commissioner Coonerty to amend the motion on the floor by adding that the Commission indicate an intent to support $4 Million in funding for the Hwy 1 41st Ave to Soquel Dr Auxiliary Lanes and Chanticleer Overcrossing project next time that the Commission has an opportunity to program available STIP funding.

Commissioner Nicol suggested a friendly amendment to replace the word “intent” in the amendment to the motion to the word “commitment”. This was not accepted as a friendly amendment by the second to the motion to amend the main motion on the floor.

A motion was made by Commissioner Nicol and seconded by Commissioner Montesino to replace the word “intent” with the word “commitment” in the motion by Commissioners Pirie and Coonerty to amend the main motion on the floor. The motion failed with 5 votes in favor and 7 votes in opposition.

The motion made by Commissioner Pirie and seconded by Commissioner Coonerty to amend the main motion on the floor failed with 6 votes in favor and 6 votes in opposition.

Commissioner Pirie withdrew her second to the main motion by Commissioner Leopold. Commissioner Coonerty then seconded the main motion by Commissioner Leopold.

Commissioner Nicol motioned to substitute Commissioner Leopold’s main motion with a motion to accept the staff recommendations as presented in the staff report. Commissioner Bustichi seconded the motioned. The motion to substitute Commissioner Leopold’s main motion with the staff recommendations passed with 7 votes in favor and 5 votes in opposition.

Commissioner Stone called the question on the substitute motion on the floor made by Commissioner Nicol and seconded by Commissioner Bustichi to
approve the staff recommendations as presented in the staff report. The motion passed on a 9 to 3 vote with Commissioners Lane, Coonerty and Leopold voting no.

21. Draft State and Federal Legislative Agenda and State Legislative Update

Senior Planner Rachel Moriconi said that the information received today will help in the development of the 2012 legislative program. She also noted that if the RTC is interested in giving preferential treatment to local businesses for transportation projects, as mentioned during an earlier item, legislative changes would be needed to allow it. She reported that a proposal for a new federal transportation act is on the table and that it could result in reduced funding for the Santa Cruz County region.

John Arriaga, JEA and Associates and Steve Schnaidt provided a brief summary of state legislative activities.

22. Meeting adjourn at 12:57

Executive Director Dondero announced that the December 15 Transportation Policy Workshop meeting will likely be canceled.

23. 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. This meeting will likely be cancelled.

The next SCCRTC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, January 12, 2012 at the City of Santa Cruz Council chambers, 809 Center St.

Respectfully submitted,

Yesenia Parra
Administrative Services Officer
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AGENDA: January 12, 2012

TO: Regional Transportation Commission (RTC)

FROM: Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner

RE: Proposition 1B Transit Security Funds for Santa Cruz METRO

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) adopt a resolution (Attachment 1) designating the RTC’s share of FY11/12 Proposition 1B California Transit Security Grant Program (CTSGP) funds to the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (Santa Cruz METRO), approving Santa Cruz METRO’s proposed projects, authorizing staff to submit applications for the funds on behalf of Santa Cruz METRO, and authorizing staff to execute any agreements necessary to receive and pass-through funds to Santa Cruz METRO.

BACKGROUND

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

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

As part of the annual State Budget, the legislature determines how much funding to appropriate to Proposition 1B programs. In FY12, the State Controller’s Office allocated $212,337 to the RTC and $228,168 to Santa Cruz METRO, for a Santa
Cruz County total of $440,505 in Proposition 1B California Transit Security Grant Program (CTSGP) funds.

Since inception of this Proposition 1B program, the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) has designated its share of Proposition 1B Transit Security funds to Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (Santa Cruz METRO) for comprehensive transit security improvements and video surveillance systems.

DISCUSSION

Santa Cruz METRO requests (Attachment 2) that the RTC designate its FY12 funds ($212,337) for Santa Cruz METRO transit security projects as it has done since 2008. Santa Cruz METRO proposes to use this year’s funds to complete installation of lighting and video surveillance equipment at all METRO facilities, including Park and Ride lots. Project proposals are due to the California Emergency Management Agency by February 1, 2012.

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) approve a resolution (Attachment 1) designating the RTC’s share of Proposition 1B Transit Security Funds to the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (Santa Cruz METRO); authorizing staff to submit applications for the funds on behalf of Santa Cruz METRO to the California Emergency Management Agency; and authorizing staff to execute any agreements necessary to receive and pass funds through to Santa Cruz METRO.

SUMMARY

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

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

Adopted by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
on the date of January 12, 2012
on the motion of Commissioner
duly seconded by Commissioner

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

WHEREAS, the Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air quality, and Port Security Bond Act of 2006 (Proposition 1B) and its enabling legislation in California Government Code Section 8879.23 designated $600 million in Proposition 1B bond funds for the California Transit Security Grant Program (CTSGP); and

WHEREAS, the CTSGP funds are available to Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs) and transit operators eligible to receive State Transit Assistance funds pursuant to Sections 99313 and 99314 of the Public Utility Code (PUC); and

WHEREAS, the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission and the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (Santa Cruz METRO) are the eligible recipients of CTSGP funds in Santa Cruz County; and

WHEREAS, Santa Cruz METRO requests that the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission designate its allocation of FY12 CTSGP funds to Santa Cruz METRO; and

WHEREAS, Santa Cruz METRO proposes to use the region’s entire allocation of FY12 CTSGP funds for security enhancement projects that are consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan and in conformance with the CTSGP Guidelines; and

WHEREAS, applications to the California Emergency Management Agency (Cal EMA) for FY12 CTSGP funds must be approved by and submitted through the RTPA; therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE Santa Cruz COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION THAT:

1. The FY12 allocation of Proposition 1B California Transit Security Grant Program funds for Santa Cruz County in FY12 Proposition 1B, Grant #6461-0002 are hereby programmed to Santa Cruz METRO for projects that increase protection from security or safety threats against public transit riders, stations, facilities and equipment;

2. The Executive Director is authorized to submit an application for FY12 CTSGP
funds to the Cal EMA on behalf of Santa Cruz METRO;

3. The Executive Director is hereby authorized to execute on behalf of the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission any actions and agreements necessary for the purpose of obtaining financial assistance for Santa Cruz METRO as provided by the Cal EMA from the FY12 CTSGP funds.

AYES: COMMISSIONERS

NOES: COMMISSIONERS

ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS

ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS

______________________________
Kirby Nicol, Chair

ATTEST:

______________________________
George Dondero, Secretary

Distribution: OHS; Thomas Hiltner, SCMTD; RTC Programming
December 22, 2011

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

RE: Authorize an Application for FY12 California Transit Security Grant Program Funds

Dear George:

This purpose of this letter is to request that the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) adopt a resolution to authorize an application from Santa Cruz METRO to the California Emergency Management Agency for FY12 California Transit Security Grant Program (CTSGP) funds. The Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality and Port Security Bond Act of 2006 (Proposition 1B) established $600 million for the CTSGP within the California Transit Assistance Fund. Each year, the State Controller’s Office allocates CTSGP funds to eligible agencies for transit security projects. The RTC must adopt a new resolution each year for the ongoing program and submit the application on behalf of Santa Cruz METRO for the CTSGP funding allocation to Santa Cruz County.

In accordance with Government Code Section 8879.58, the State Controller’s Office allocated FY12 CTSGP funds to the RTC and to Santa Cruz METRO in the same proportion that STA funds are allocated under Public Utilities Code 99313 and 99314. Accordingly, the RTC will receive $212,337 and Santa Cruz METRO will receive $228,168 for a total of $440,505 in FY12 CTSGP funds, the same amount as last year. Santa Cruz METRO requests that the RTC designate its FY12 funds for Santa Cruz METRO transit security projects as it had done in each of the previous four years, FY08 – FY11.

The Santa Cruz METRO Board of Directors will consider a resolution on 1/13/12 to authorize the General Manager to submit an application from Santa Cruz METRO for the FY12 CTSGP funds. Santa Cruz METRO requests that the RTC designate its allocation of FY12 CTSGP funds to Santa Cruz METRO and authorize an application on behalf of Santa Cruz METRO to the California Emergency Management Agency (Cal-EMA) contingent upon Santa Cruz METRO’s Board adopting its resolution on 1/13/12.
Santa Cruz METRO will apply the FY12 CTSGP funds to complete installation of video surveillance and security lighting at all METRO facilities including its Park & Ride lots. The following table shows the single project proposed by Santa Cruz METRO for FY12 CTSGP funds:

**FY12 California Transit Security Grant Program**  
**Santa Cruz METRO Proposed Transit Security Projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>GC 8879.58(a)(2)</th>
<th>GC 8879.58(a)(3)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project FY12 Allocation</td>
<td>$212,337</td>
<td>$228,168</td>
<td>$440,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Lighting and Video Surveillance</td>
<td>$212,337</td>
<td>$228,168</td>
<td>$440,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Projects</td>
<td>$212,337</td>
<td>$228,168</td>
<td>$440,505</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the RTC concurs with the proposed transit security projects using FY12 CTSGP funds, please provide a resolution authorizing the allocation of RTC’s funds to Santa Cruz METRO and an application through the RTC to the Cal EMA. In order to meet the submission deadline of 2/1/12, I would appreciate the RTC’s consideration of Santa Cruz METRO’s request at its January 12, 2012 meeting. If approved, Santa Cruz METRO will then prepare an application for the RTC to submit to Cal-EMA in accordance with the FY 2011-12 Program Guidelines.

Please call me if you have any questions about this request.

Thank you

Sincerely,

LESLIE R. WHITE  
General Manager
<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>DIFFERENCE AS % OF PROJECTION</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE % 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>
<td>100.00%</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>
<td>111.37%</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>
<td>102.14%</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>
<td>101.17%</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>
<td>102.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECEMBER</td>
<td>776,432</td>
<td>736,433</td>
<td>804,307</td>
<td>67,874</td>
<td>9.22%</td>
<td>103.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANUARY</td>
<td>502,700</td>
<td>479,259</td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCH</td>
<td>510,760</td>
<td>625,623</td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>605,300</td>
<td>579,581</td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>6,956,759</td>
<td>7,016,950</td>
<td>3,805,302</td>
<td>132,514</td>
<td>1.89%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
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RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) approve the attached resolution (Attachment 1) authorizing the Executive Director to enter into a funding agreement with the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) to provide $22,500 in RTC funds for the Monterey Bay origin and destination study.

BACKGROUND

The Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) secured a grant to conduct the Monterey Bay origin and destination study. This data gathering effort will provide information for AMBAG and the regional transportation planning agencies (RTPAs) in the region to help fulfill transportation modeling, planning and project needs. The secured grant requires matching funds and the RTPAs in the region agreed to support the funding application and provide matching funds.

DISCUSSION

AMBAG secured a $200,000 federal grant to conduct an origin and destination study. The data gathered will be used to update and improve the regional travel demand model and will help to support transportation project development and planning efforts in the Monterey Bay region. The funding requires matching funds and the RTC included $22,500 in its fiscal year (FY) 2011-12 budget for this purpose in anticipation that the grant would be secured. A funding agreement (Attachment 2) is required to be able to provide the funds to AMBAG. Therefore, staff recommends that the RTC approve the attached resolution (Attachment 1) authorizing the Executive Director to enter into a funding agreement with AMBAG to provide $22,500 in RTC funds for the Monterey Bay origin and destination study.

SUMMARY

AMBAG secured funds for an origin and destination study and the RTPAs in the region agreed to provide funding for the required match. The RTC approved $22,500 in its FY 2011-12 budget for this purpose. Staff recommends that the RTC approve a resolution to enter into a funding agreement with AMBAG to provide the $22,500 in matching funds for the origin and destination study.
Attachments:
1. Resolution authorizing Executive Director to enter into funding agreement with AMBAG
2. Draft funding agreement with AMBAG for the Monterey Bay origin and destination study
RESOLUTION NO.  

Adopted by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) on the date of January 12, 2012 on the motion of Commissioner duly seconded by Commissioner

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO ENTER INTO A FUNDING AGREEMENT WITH THE ASSOCIATION OF MONTEREY BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS (AMBAG) FOR THE MONTEREY BAY ORIGIN AND DESTINATION STUDY

WHEREAS, AMBAG secured funding for the Monterey Bay origin and destination study and the funding requires matching funds; and

WHEREAS, the data collected would help improve the regional travel demand model and support transportation projects and planning in the region; and

WHEREAS, the regional transportation planning agencies in the region agreed to provide matching funds for the origin and destination study; and

WHEREAS, RTC budgeted $22,500 in its FY 2011-12 budget for this purpose;

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

1. The Executive Director is authorized to enter into a funding agreement with AMBAG to provide $22,500 in RTC funds for the Monterey Bay origin and destination study.

AYES: COMMISSIONERS

NOES: COMMISSIONERS

ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS

ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS

____________________________
Kirby Nicol, Chair

ATTEST:

____________________________
George Dondero, Secretary

Distribution: AMBAG, RTC Fiscal
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AGREEMENT FOR CASH MATCHES AND IN-KIND SERVICES
FOR THE MONTEREY BAY ORIGIN DESTINATION STUDY

THIS AGREEMENT, is made and entered into this 22nd day of
December, 2011, by and between the ASSOCIATION OF MONTEREY BAY
AREA GOVERNMENTS (AMBAG), and the SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION (SCCRTC).

RECITALS

WHEREAS, AMBAG is the federally designated Metropolitan
Planning Organization (MPO) for Monterey, Santa Cruz and San
Benito Counties;

WHEREAS, AMBAG as the MPO is responsible for maintaining
and updating the regional travel demand model, and conducting
long-range transportation planning;

WHEREAS, the requirements of maintaining and updating the
regional travel demand model, conducting long-range
transportation planning, and overseeing particular land use
planning activities are partially funded through federal
planning dollars, and federal and state grants;

WHEREAS, in order to maintain and update the regional
travel demand model AMBAG and SCCRTC must collect information on
the travel patterns of people within the region as well as those
entering and exiting the region;

WHEREAS, one project that will allow AMBAG to collect data
on travel behavior and patterns is the Monterey Bay Area Origin-
Destination Study (PROJECT);

WHEREAS, SCCRTC has agreed to support the MONTEREY BAY AREA
ORIGIN DESTINATION STUDY with a cash match and in-kind services
to help meet grant funding requirements;

NOW, THEREFORE, THE PARTIES AGREE AS FOLLOWS:

1. SCCRTC shall provide a cash match and in-kind services
   for the PROJECT as set forth in EXHIBIT A attached hereto and
   incorporated herein by this reference.

2. The deliverables for the PROJECT are as set forth in
EXHIBIT B attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference.

3. SCCRTC agrees to provide their cash match at the beginning of the PROJECT.

4. SCCRTC agrees that in-kind services will be provided throughout the period of the PROJECT concluding June 30, 2014.

5. SCCRTC agrees that in-kind services will also include participation in a Technical Advisory Committee for the PROJECT.

6. Adjustments to the cash match amounts can be made at any time by means of a written amendment to this Agreement duly executed by all parties.

7. All PARTIES agree to meet all conditions as required by the Overall Work Program adopted by the AMBAG Board of Directors to allow grant application and funding by the Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration.

A. TERM OF AGREEMENT

1. The term of this agreement shall begin upon execution of all parties hereto and shall remain in force until the final deliverables are completed pursuant to EXHIBIT B or June 30, 2014, unless extended by mutual consent of the PARTIES.

B. GENERAL ADMINISTRATION AND MANAGEMENT

1. AMBAG shall have the primary administrative responsibility under this Agreement for the administration of the PROJECT.

C. COMPLETION OF TASKS

1. The parties shall make every reasonable effort to complete the tasks according to this Agreement.

2. The parties will diligently proceed with the in-kind services agreed to, but it is expressly agreed and understood that the parties shall not be held responsible for delays occasioned by factors beyond their control, nor by factors which could not reasonably have been foreseen at the time of execution of this Agreement.
D. SUSPENSION/TERMINATION OF AGREEMENT

1. The right is reserved by any or all of the PARTIES to this Agreement to terminate or suspend this Agreement with or without cause at any time by giving ninety (90) days written notice to the other PARTIES. If this agreement is terminated or suspended, AMBAG will only refund cash provided by SCCRTC that has not already been expended for the purpose of this PROJECT.

E. AUDIT AND RECORDS

1. Each of the PARTIES to this Agreement shall maintain books, accounts, records and data related to this Agreement in accordance with federal and/or state requirements and shall maintain those books, accounts, records and data for a period of three (3) years after termination of this Agreement. For the duration of the Agreement, and for a period of three (3) years thereafter, all PARTIES representatives and representatives of the California Department of Transportation, the Auditor General of the State of California, shall have the right to examine these books, accounts, records, data and other information relevant to this Agreement for the purpose of auditing and verifying statements, invoices, bills, and revenues pursuant to this Agreement.

F. ASSIGNMENT

1. This Agreement may not be assigned or otherwise transferred by any party hereto without the prior written consent of the other PARTIES.

G. HOLD HARMLESS

1. AMBAG shall defend, indemnify and hold SCCRTS, its officers, agents and employees harmless from and against any and all liability, loss, expense (including reasonable attorneys' fees) or claims for injury or damages arising out of the performance of this Agreement but only in proportion to and to the extent such liability, loss expense, attorneys' fees, or claims for injury or damages are caused by or result from the negligent or intentional acts or omissions of AMBAG, its officers, agents or employees.

SCCRTC shall defend, indemnify and hold AMBAG, its officers, agents and employees harmless from and against any and all
liability, loss, expense (including reasonable attorneys' fees) or claims for injury or damages arising out of the performance of this Agreement but only in proportion to and to the extent such liability, loss, expense, attorneys' fees, or claims for injury or damages are caused by or result from the negligent or intentional acts or omissions of SCCRTC, its officers, agents or employees.

H. NOTICES

1. Any notice to be given to the PARTIES hereunder shall be addressed as follows (until notice of a different address is given to the parties):

Executive Director  
ASSOCIATION OF MONTEREY BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS  
P.O. Box 809  
Marina, CA 93933

Executive Director  
SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
1523 Pacific Avenue  
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Any and all notices or other communications required or permitted relative to this Agreement shall be in writing and shall be deemed duly served and given when personally delivered to any of the PARTIES to whom it is directed; or in lieu of such personal service, when deposited in the United States mail, first class, postage prepaid, addressed to PARTIES at the addresses set forth above.

Any party may change their address for the purpose of this paragraph by giving written notice of such change to the other party in the manner provided for in the preceding paragraph.

I. AGREEMENT CONTAINS ALL UNDERSTANDINGS: AMENDMENT

1. This document represents the entire and integrated Agreement between AMBAG and SCCRTC, and supersedes all prior negotiations, representations and agreements, either written or oral pertaining to these PROJECT.
J. **GOVERNING LAW**

1. This Agreement shall be governed by the laws of the State of California.

K. **SEVERABILITY**

1. If any term of this Agreement is held invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction the remainder of this Agreement shall remain in effect.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have executed this Agreement on the date first hereinabove written.

_____________________________________
Interim Executive Director
ASSOCIATION OF MONTEREY BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS

_____________________________________
George Dondero, Executive Director
SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

_____________________________________
Approved as to Form
Agency Counsel
SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
EXHIBIT A
CASH MATCH AND IN-KIND SERVICES

Below is the agreed upon cash match and in-kind services to be provided by PARTIES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Origin Destination Revenues</th>
<th>Origin Destination Expenditures</th>
<th>Origin Destination In-Kind</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMBAG*</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC**</td>
<td>$22,500</td>
<td>$22,500</td>
<td>$10,000 to be provided by Regional Transportation Planning Agencies collectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$222,500</td>
<td>$222,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Partnership Planning Grant
**Non-federal funding source
EXHIBIT B

DELIVERABLES

Below are the deliverables and tasks as outlined in the Partnership Planning Grant scope of work awarded by the Federal Highway Administration and managed by the California Department of Transportation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Number</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Establish Stakeholder Group</td>
<td>Stakeholder list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Develop Scope of Work with Technical Committee</td>
<td>Scope of Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Issue RFP and Select Consultant</td>
<td>RFP &amp; Contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Deploy license recognition system</td>
<td>Deploy system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Household survey of owners</td>
<td>Conduct &amp; Analyze Mail/Web Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Prepare project documentation</td>
<td>Final documentation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission

### THREE MONTH MEETING SCHEDULE

**SEPTEMBER 2011 through NOVEMBER 2011**

(Revised 9/2/11)

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Meeting Day</th>
<th>Meeting Type</th>
<th>Meeting Time</th>
<th>Meeting Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01/19/12</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Transportation Policy Workshop - <em>Cancelled</em></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>03/01/12</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Commission</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>County Board of Supervisor Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/12/12</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Bicycle Committee - <em>Cancelled</em></td>
<td>6:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/15/12</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Transportation Policy Workshop</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/15/12</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Interagency Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec'd/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>TO First</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/15/11</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/28/12</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/09/11</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>KP 11/09/11</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/14/11</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/18/11</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>George</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/22/11</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/22/11</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rahn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Letter Type</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>11/22/11</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/28/11</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/29/11</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/29/11</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/29/11</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CC 11/29/11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/30/11</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Letter Format</td>
<td>Rec’d/Sent</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>TO First</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/30/11</td>
<td>Email I</td>
<td>11/30/11</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/01/11</td>
<td>Letter O</td>
<td>12/01/11</td>
<td>Luis Duazo</td>
<td>Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/01/11</td>
<td>Email I</td>
<td>12/01/11</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/01/11</td>
<td>Email I</td>
<td>12/01/11</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/02/11</td>
<td>Letter O</td>
<td>12/02/11</td>
<td>Dan Herron</td>
<td>Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/02/11</td>
<td>Letter O</td>
<td>12/02/11</td>
<td>Ellen Pirie</td>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/02/11</td>
<td>Letter O</td>
<td>12/02/11</td>
<td>Donald A Smith Jr.</td>
<td>Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec'd/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>TO First</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/02/11</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Stan</td>
<td>Trammell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/02/11</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Yates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/02/11</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/02/11</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/05/11</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/07/11</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/10/11</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>RM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec'd/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>TO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/13/12</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dan Herron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Transportation</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY2011-2012 Invoice #1 for the Rural Planning Assistance Funds (State Highway Account) in Accordance the OWP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/14/12</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bimia Rhinehart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>California Transportation Commission</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2012 Santa Cruz County RTIP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/20/12</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Luis Duazo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Transportation</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STIP/CMIA Construction Award Time Extension Request - SR 1 Auxiliary Lanes, Soquel to Morrissey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/20/12</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel Nikuna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Moss, Levy &amp; Hartzheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Copy of Audit with the Management's Discussion and Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/29/12</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>George Dondero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Ecology Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bike to Work/School Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
-----Original Message-----
From: Ann Roesner [mailto:anna.roesner@state.vt.us]
Sent: Friday, November 18, 2011 8:51 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Transportation Issues Disclosures

From: Ann Roesner <anna.roesner@state.vt.us>
Subject: Transportation Issues Disclosures

Message Body:
Good Morning - We are in the process of purchasing a house and received the "Santa Cruz County Transportation Issues Disclosure" sheet in our packet and would like to confirm if there will be any 'transportation issues that could have an impact on the interest of home ownership within the county." The address of the property is 331 Pestana Avenue, Santa Cruz
Thank you

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

Hello Ann Roesner -
Congratulations on purchasing a home in Santa Cruz County.

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) has a number of transportation projects planned or underway. Based on your address, the projects that may be of interest or impact you would be the following projects in the Highway 1 corridor:

- Highway 1 Soquel/Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes Project - Will add auxiliary lanes (connecting the off ramp with the next on ramp) in each direction between Soquel Drive and Morrissey Boulevard. Will replace the La Fonda Bridge. Will begin construction in early 2012 and last about 18 months. Vegetation including trees will be removed, sound walls constructed, and the area re-landscaped.
- Highway 1 41st Avenue/Soquel Drive Auxiliary Lanes Project - Funding for right of way and the environmental document will be decided by the Regional Transportation Commission at a public hearing on December 1, 2011. Project, if approved, would not begin for a few years. Would add auxiliary lanes in each direction between Soquel Drive and 41st Avenue and add a new bicycle/pedestrian bridge over the highway in the vicinity of Chanticleer Drive.

Please see our website for more information about these and other RTC programs and projects, and let me know if you have additional questions.
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

/ / /
From: Jane Parks-McKay [mailto:janeparksmckay@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 29, 2011 10:52 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: question

Hi: I received your email about some trail public workshops, can you tell me where the trails would go?

I can't attend the workshops right now. I'm a caregiver but it sounds lovely!

Jane Parks-McKay and family, Capitola area

Jane Parks-McKay
janeparksmckay@sbcglobal.net

******

Hello Jane: Thank you for your interest in the trail project. Where the trail will go has not been determined. Coastal and rail alignments are currently being analyzed and will be determined after public input and further review. Spur trails are also being considered to maximize access and connectivity of the bicycle and pedestrian trail network. We hope you'll share your ideas as the planning process moves forward. Best, Cory Caletti

Cory Caletti, Senior Transportation Planner/Bicycle Coordinator
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Santa Cruz 831.460.3201 | Watsonville 831.768.8012
1523 Pacific Avenue | Santa Cruz CA 95060

Follow our social networks for the latest RTC news
From: Hal & Jody Stanger [mailto:hjstange@pacbell.net]
Sent: Wednesday, November 30, 2011 12:51 AM
To: Regional Transportation Commission
Subject: Re: Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network - Public Workshops Coming Soon

How unexciting and useless when.. Why don't you figure out how to fund and fix our darn roads and infrastructure instead of this next la la land boondoggle? First the choo choo train and now this? Yikes! What a waste of time at this critical time when we need pot holes filled.

******

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
Members of the Regional Transportation Board,

The roads of unincorporated Santa Cruz County are in deplorable condition. The surfaces are so neglected that many roads don’t look like they even have any asphalt at all. When the winter rains start the roads continue to wash out; many roads are not even wide enough to let two vehicles pass each other without one backing up or finding a safe place to pull over. These conditions are worsened by the significant overgrowth of trees and roadside brush making driving to the right side impossible without scratching one’s vehicle. Even our more significant roads, San Joe Soquel, have signs posted warning road conditions are subject to change.

As a US Census worker in both mapping in 2009 and enumeration in 2010, my co-workers and I encountered roads that only could be accessed by 4 wheel drive. Though all workers were local residents, not all of us surveyed the roads with which we were most familiar. I was fortunate to own a 4-wheel drive vehicle which allowed me to see some of the worse roads in our county.

I worry that these roads won’t be here in 2020 for the next census, some may not even make it through another winter of rains and wind!

The County has allowed the building of residences on these roads and people who live on our bad county roads must travel to and from school, work and activities on a daily basis. They deserve safe ingress and egress to their homes. When roads are not even maintained, the quality of life is severely impacted. If people can’t even get off their local roads, how will they have any need to use one lousy lane added to highway 1??? If you allow roads to continue to deteriorate at current rates, emergency vehicles will not be able to get to residents in need, which I believe would easily constitute negligence on the part of the county and the RTC.

I urge you to reconsider your priorities and remove Highway 1 HOV lane from your funding list.

Thank you.

Valerie Emery
26760 Adams Road
Los Gatos CA 95033

*****

Hello Valerie - Thank you for your comments. The RTC approved $2 million to repair storm damage on Nelson Road and Redwood Lodge during its meeting yesterday. The complete list of projects approved for funds is available online at: http://sccrtc.org/funding-planning/project-funding/. Notably, funding for the HOV Lanes project was not under consideration by the RTC yesterday. They did approve $4 million for design and right-of-way work for the Soquel-41st Auxiliary Lanes/Chanticleer Bike-Ped Bridge project (auxiliary lanes connect exit ramps to the next on ramp). One of the benefits of the project is that it will improve access to the hospital for emergency vehicles and residents.

The County of Santa Cruz’s Public Works Department is investigating options to ask residents to increase taxes/fees to cover the ongoing cost to maintain and repair roads in the county. An extra $12 million per year would be needed just to keep roads in the unincorporated areas at the current conditions (which as you noted are not good). We encourage you to work with the County as that effort moves forward.

The RTC did approve $760,000 for roadway repairs to San Jose-Soquel Road in 2009. The County is scheduled to start construction on that project next year.

Rachel Moriconi, SCCRTC
-----Original Message-----
From: Jeanne Simari [mailto:jeannes@cruzio.com]
Sent: Thursday, December 01, 2011 6:55 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: hiway widening

Please vote against widening our freeway.

Thank you.

Jeanne Simari
4230 Gladys Ave.
Santa Cruz

*****

Thank you for your comments. They will be forwarded to the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) for future consideration.

The RTC approved a multimodal list of projects during its meeting on December 1, 2011. The complete list of projects approved for funds is available online at: http://sccrtc.org/funding-planning/project-funding/.

Rachel Moriconi, SCCRTC
831-460-3203
From: Jessica Evans [mailto:jesseevansfiddler@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, December 02, 2011 8:14 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Transportation in Santa Cruz

I live on the West Side of Santa Cruz with my family. We are homeowners and long time residents. The roads in Santa Cruz have been in steady decline over the last ten years. I would believe local roads, rather than highway widening, should be the focus of our transportation planning and funding. Highway widening is insanely expensive and doesn't give good 'bang for the buck'. The community would recieve a much higher benefit if those funds were devoted to local street and alternative (bike and pedestrian) resources.

Sincerely, Jessica Evans
921 Seaside St.
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

*****

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: Carta, Amy [mailto:Amy.Carta@hhs.sccgov.org]  
Sent: Monday, December 05, 2011 10:23 AM  
To: 'info@sccrtc.org'; 'mark.stone@co.santa-cruz.ca.us'; 'john.leopold@co.santa-cruz.ca.us'; 'ellen.pirie@co.santa-cruz.ca.us'; 'neal.coonerty@co.santa-cruz.ca.us'; 'greg.caput@co.santa-cruz.ca.us'  
Subject: request for prioritization of maintaining local roads

Dear Regional Transportation Commission and Supervisors,

My email may be too late for the December 1st meeting regarding the regional transportation plan, but, I feel it still important to submit my request for prioritization of maintaining local roads.

As a resident of the unincorporated county (living off Upper Zayante Road), I drive county roads every day. Upper Zayante Road has many areas where there is two-way traffic on a one-lane road. My little Honda Civic needs to swerve repeatedly so as not to hit the growing pot holes. Some areas have large pot holes in the one-lane areas. This is becoming problematic and truly requires attention.

In this era of severely limited financial resources, I know that counties must prioritize work. It is unacceptable to me that our limited funding would be used to expand Highway 1 rather than maintain existing roads – especially those that allow access to homes.

Please focus on maintaining existing roads so that your unincorporated county residents can maintain access to our homes.

Many thanks  
Amy Carta  
Santa Cruz County resident and Santa Clara County employee

*****

Thank you for your comments. They will be forwarded to the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) for future consideration.

The RTC approved $2 million to repair storm damage on Nelson Road and Redwood Lodge during its meeting on December 1, 2011. The complete list of projects approved for funds is available online at: http://sccrtc.org/funding-planning/project-funding/. Notably, funds for general road maintenance (filling potholes) are not eligible for the funds overseen by the RTC.

The County of Santa Cruz’s Public Works Department is investigating options to ask residents to increase taxes/fees to cover the ongoing cost to maintain and repair roads in the county. An extra $12 million per year would be needed just to keep roads in the unincorporated areas at the current conditions (which as you noted are not good). We encourage you to work with the County as that effort moves forward. Links for the public works departments are available on our website at: http://sccrtc.org/projects/streets-highways/.

Sincerely,

Cathy Judd  
Administrative Assistant II  
SCCR TC  
1523 Pacific Ave  
Santa Cruz CA 95060  
831 460 3200  
Fax 831 460 3215  
cjudd@sccrtc.org  
www.sccrtc.org
Hello,

I was unable to attend the meeting of the Regional Transportation Commission but would like to express my opinion regarding local country roads as I own two homes in the Los Gatos mountains. Maintaining these county roads greatly adds to our quality of life, the tax dollars we pay to the county, the quality of our schools, etc. This is not a light matter. Many of us commute to the Silicon Valley and beyond and we need the roads to be very workable and conducive to our daily commute and lives. We need these roads to be maintained to the highest of standards.

Sincerely,

Ann and Dave Peck

*****

Hello Ann and Dave Peck:

Thank you for your comments. They will be forwarded to the RTC for future consideration.

For the list of approved projects and complete staff report for the December 1 meeting, including benefits analysis of all the multimodal projects under consideration, please visit: http://sccrtc.org/funding-planning/project-funding/. The approved list includes $2 million for storm damage repairs. Some of the project benefits that were evaluated included the number of people served, safety, travel time savings, accessibility, facilities served (e.g. schools, hospitals, job centers, etc), and potential of a project to increase bicycling, walking, and/or transit use.

Notably, funds for general road maintenance (filling potholes) are not eligible for the funds overseen by the RTC. The County of Santa Cruz's Public Works Department is investigating options to address ongoing road maintenance needs in unincorporated areas and may ask residents to increase taxes/fees to cover the ongoing cost to maintain and repair roads in the county. An extra $12 million per year would be needed just to keep roads in the unincorporated areas at the current conditions (which as you noted are not good). We encourage you to work with the County Public Works Department as that effort moves forward. Links for the public works departments are available on our website at: http://sccrtc.org/projects/streets-highways/.

Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Ave, Santa Cruz, CA 95060
831-460-3203; fax 460-3215
www.sccrtc.org
It became clear to me that you are not trying to use the railroad tracks for trains but rather for trails. Through the Seadrift area, at least, when the train is running there isn’t enough room left to walk. So, I believe I would rather have the train. Take the trail along the beach or some place else. Call me if you wish.

James (JP) Peterson 831- 464-3391

E-NEWS UPDATE

Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network – Next Steps

Thank you for attending one of three Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network public workshops last week and signing up for our e-newsletter. You were one of over 200 people that attended workshops in Davenport, Live Oak or Watsonville locations. Many topics were raised that will be explored further and considered in the development of the draft Trail Network Master Plan.

Your feedback and input into planning for the largest coastal and rail multi-use bicycle/pedestrian trail network project in Santa Cruz County is invaluable.

Key next steps in the planning process include the following:

- Release of the draft Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Master Plan and the draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) this upcoming summer.

- A second series of public workshops to receive input into the draft documents and confirm the route alignments.

- Final adoption of the Master Plan and EIR is expected in early 2013.

A number of people inquired about the availability of the trail alignment maps presented at the workshops for later review. Staff is working to make those maps available for in-office viewing later in the month of January, after modifications to errors have been made.

We appreciate your interest and hope you participate throughout the entire planning process. Please direct comments, feedback, and questions to Cory Caletti, Senior Transportation Planner and Project Manager, at ccaletti@sccrtc.org.

Feel free to encourage others interested in the project to sign up for our e-news distribution list.

*****

RTC | Commute Solutions
1523 Pacific Ave | Santa Cruz CA 95060
831.460.3200

The Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) is pursuing acquisition of the 32-mile rail corridor to maximize transportation uses within the corridor. The RTC website has information about these and other projects on our website:


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.
Federal judge blocks Calif. low-carbon fuels rule

Associated Press

Published Thursday, Dec. 29, 2011

FRESNO, Calif. -- California officials say they will ask a federal judge to stay his ruling that blocks the state from enforcing the first-in-the-nation mandate for cleaner, low-carbon fuels.

In a decision issued Thursday, Fresno-based U.S. District Court Judge Lawrence O'Neill said the low-carbon fuel rules favor biofuels produced in the state. He said that violates the U.S. Constitution's commerce clause by discriminating against crude oil and biofuels producers located outside California.

California Air Resources Board spokesman Dave Clegern disagreed, saying the fuel rule is "an evenhanded standard that encourages the use of cleaner low carbon fuels by regulating fuel-providers in California."

He said the board plans to ask the judge to stay the ruling, and appeal if necessary to the 9th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals.

Out-of-state fuel's producers hailed the decision as a win for California drivers.

"Today's decision ... struck down a misguided policy that would have resulted in even higher fuel costs for Californian consumers while increasing the cost of business throughout the state," Consumer Energy Alliance Executive Vice President Michael Whatley said.

Beginning this year, the standard has required petroleum refiners, companies that blend fuel and distributors to gradually increase the cleanliness of the fuel they sell in California.

The board previously had said the low-carbon mandate will reduce California's dependence on petroleum by 20 percent and account for one-tenth of the state's goal to cut greenhouse gas emissions by 2020.

The regulation does not mandate specific alternative fuels. Rather, it assigns a so-called carbon-intensity score to various fuels. By 2020 all vehicles fuels, on average, must be 10 percent less carbon-intensive than gasoline is now.

The Rocky Mountain Farmers Union, the California Dairy Campaign, the Renewable Fuels Associations and other groups filed a similar lawsuit in the same court in 2009. Their complaint said the regulation conflicted with the federal Renewable Fuel Standard and would close California's borders to corn ethanol made in other states.

The fuel standard "discriminates against out-of-state and foreign crude oil while giving an economic advantage to in-state crude oil," O'Neill wrote Thursday.

1/2 -
The nonprofit legal organization Earthjustice, which was not party to the suit but works on climate-related issues, said the state's clean energy programs are consistent with federal law.

"California is leading the way on cleaner fuels and a cleaner power grid," Earthjustice President Trip Van Noppen said. "It is not surprising that the oil industry is attacking these programs, but like previous attacks in the courts and at the ballot box, we expect this one ultimately to fail."
California Supreme Court hands Gov. Brown a win on redevelopment

kyamamura@sacbee.com

Published Friday, Dec. 30, 2011

California redevelopment agencies lost their battle for survival Thursday after the state Supreme Court ruled lawmakers legally eliminated the local offices that subsidize construction in blighted areas, such as Sacramento's downtown rallyard and K Street corridor.

 Officials in Sacramento and other cities called on the Legislature to fast-track legislation that reinstates redevelopment in some form. But such prospects are hazy because Gov. Jerry Brown remains a redevelopment skeptic.

The decision marks a significant budget win for the Democratic governor, who began the year by asking lawmakers to eliminate redevelopment agencies without offering to rebuild them.

He has criticized the agencies for using property tax dollars to subsidize private development.

"Today's ruling by the California Supreme Court validates a key component of the state budget and guarantees more than a billion dollars of ongoing funding for schools and public safety," Brown said Thursday in a statement.

Brown and lawmakers counted on their redevelopment plan to produce $1.7 billion in state budget savings this fiscal year.

The court's decision will likely result in lesser savings of about $1 billion this year but more money for the state budget in future years, according to the Department of Finance.

That's because the court struck down the original plan in which redevelopment agencies would have made significant upfront payments to help the state budget this year. Instead, the state will see savings by stopping the flow of property tax dollars to redevelopment agencies.

Sacramento City Manager John Shirey, who previously led the California Redevelopment Association, said the decision threatens efforts to energize the city's core.

"It means the same for us as it means for every city and county in the state, which is the redevelopment agency's out of business," Shirey said. "Along with it are various affordable housing projects and projects to continue the revitalization of downtown that are now gone."

Shirey does not believe the decision affects the city's efforts to build a new downtown arena.
for the Sacramento Kings. But city officials said it could affect construction in the surrounding railyard area, where redevelopment dollars could have gone toward housing and retail projects.

The court's decision may have been the worst possible outcome for the roughly 400 redevelopment agencies across California.

Cities and redevelopment agencies sued the state in July to block the state's plan. In doing so, they argued that the two-bill proposal was unconstitutional because the state had forced redevelopment agencies to make payments in violation of Proposition 22, a local funding protection that voters approved in 2010 at the urging of local leaders.

The first bill, Assembly Bill 1X 26, eliminated redevelopment agencies. The second bill, AB 1X 27, allowed them to continue only if they made the state-mandated transfers.

Cities hoped the high court would reject the two bills together, said League of California Cities executive director Chris McKenzie. But the court instead upheld the elimination bill while blocking the law that would have allowed re-establishment of the agencies.

"Legislators repeatedly said on the floor of the Legislature that these bills would not end redevelopment agencies," McKenzie said. "It was not their intention, nor was it their desire."

Senate President Pro Tem Darrell Steinberg, D-Sacramento, said Thursday that lawmakers will revisit the redevelopment issue in the coming months, though he observed that "the governor doesn't seem at all that enamored with doing that."

Steinberg has been a vocal critic of the manner in which local officials have fought the state in recent years. He said the main reason lawmakers set up their plan with an elimination component was because local governments asked voters to tie the Legislature's hands with Proposition 22.

"I think it's important to recognize but for Proposition 22, the League (of California Cities)-inspired initiative, we would have a lot of flexibility to amend redevelopment in a way to keep it alive and help fund schools," Steinberg said. "I hate to say it, but it's an example of all-or-nothing politics that leads to nothing."

The proposal was backed mostly by Democrats, but it was not entirely a partisan issue. Assemblyman Chris Norby, R-Fullerton, was a frequent critic of redevelopment agencies and voted to eliminate them.

Meanwhile, Sen. Rod Wright, D-Inglewood, bucked his party and defended redevelopment. He said Thursday he doubted that the Legislature and Brown would do much this year to help rebuild the agencies.

© Copyright The Sacramento Bee. All rights reserved.
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## 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. 1 Salinas Road Interchange (315924)</td>
<td>Highway 1, Mon. County, North of Moss Landing at Salinas Road (PM 99.9-101.5)</td>
<td>Construct new interchange</td>
<td>4/15/2010-Fall 2012</td>
<td>$12 Million</td>
<td>STIP/CMIA</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Richard Rosales (JW)</td>
<td>Desilva Gates Construction LP, Dublin</td>
<td>Phase II of Salinas Rd. Detour in place—no traffic control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWY. 1 Guardrail Upgrades (0P2504)</td>
<td>Highway 1, Mon and Santa Cruz Co., Trafton Rd to .4Mi N. of 41st Ave (Various locations: Mon. 101.50 – SCr 13.62)</td>
<td>Metal Beam Guard Rail and Concrete Barrier Improvements</td>
<td>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>Hwy. 1 Watsonville (CAPM) Rehab. (0M7504)</td>
<td>Hwy 1 (PM 0.0-10.2) In Santa Cruz County in Watsonville and Aptos from Pajaro River Bridge to North Aptos Underpass</td>
<td>Pavement Rehabilitation (hot mix asphalt on existing pavement)</td>
<td>January 2012-Summer 2012</td>
<td>$12M</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Luis Duazo (BR)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Bids Opened Dec. 7, 2011. Pending Award and Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz Highway 1 Median Barrier (0S3104)</td>
<td>Highway 1 in Santa Cruz (17.5-18.2)</td>
<td>Construct colored and textured Median Barrier</td>
<td>Spring-Summer 2012</td>
<td>$1.6 M</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Luis Duazo (PD)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Bids Opened Dec. 7, 2011. Pending Award and Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWY. 9 Grind and Replace (0S0804)</td>
<td>In Santa Cruz from so. of the Rte 01/09 junction to just no. of Vernon St. (PM 0.0-PM 0.6)</td>
<td>Cold plane and hot mix asphalt and repaving</td>
<td>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 Santa’s Village Road Guardrail (0G4004)</td>
<td>Near Scott’s Valley from just north of Santa’s Village to Crescent Drive (PM 6.1-6.6)</td>
<td>Construct concrete guardrail</td>
<td>1/31/2011-Spring 2012</td>
<td>$3 Million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Doug Hessing (PD)</td>
<td>Gordon N. Ball Inc., Alamo</td>
<td>southbound lane closures at various hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWY. 17 Vinehill Wet Weather Improvements (0P8104)</td>
<td>Near Scotts Valley from south of West Vinehill Rd. to south of Vinehill Rd. (PM 7.0-7.3)</td>
<td>Construct soldier pile wall</td>
<td>6/20/2009-Spring 2012</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, Bonding company sub-contracted Pavex to complete 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 (05-0R9101)</td>
<td>Highway 1 from S of South Aptos Underpass to .1 Mi N. of Rt 9 (PM 9.0-17.6)</td>
<td>Upgrade Metal Beam Guard Rail, other improvements</td>
<td>Early 2013 to Summer 2013</td>
<td>$ 2.3 M</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Luis Duazo</td>
<td>PS&amp;E/RW</td>
<td>Scheduled to be advertised early 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 1 Guardrail/Crash Cushions (0M9701)</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>Fall 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>Schedule to begin construction Fall 2012</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>10. Hwy 9 Holiday Lane Improvements (0K2301)</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>End of PS&amp;E</td>
<td>HQ Advertising May 2012 and Award July 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission

FROM: Grace Blakeslee, Transportation Planner

RE: Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Sustainability Framework and Goal and Policy Development

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC):

1. Approve the sustainability framework outlined in Attachment 2 as the basis for developing the next Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) goals and policies.

2. Amend the FY11/12 budget to shift the remaining Highway 1 High Occupancy Vehicle Lanes STARS funds to the Regional Transportation Plan STARS analysis (Attachment 4).

3. Approve the attached resolution authorizing the Executive Director to amend the RTC agreement with the North American Sustainable Transportation Council (STC) for work related to the RTP to increase the maximum amount by $36,500 and include the tasks required to identify those strategies most likely to achieve sustainable transportation plan goals (Attachment 4).

4. Direct staff to incorporate the strategies identified by the North American Sustainable Transportation Council (STC) for achieving sustainable outcomes into the development of draft RTP policies.

BACKGROUND

An update of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), a state-mandated long range transportation plan for the region, is underway (Attachment 1). In March 2011, the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) authorized staff to work with the North American Sustainable Transportation Council (STC) to use the Sustainable Transportation Analysis and Rating System (STARS) to develop standards for basing the next RTP on three sustainable outcomes. The standards are intended to provide the RTC with tools to assess future transportation challenges and provide more direction for addressing reduction of greenhouse gases, while at the same time assessing the impact of other transportation related issues and meeting the requirements of SB375.
DISCUSSION

RTP and STARS Sustainability Framework

RTC staff has been working with STC staff and a team of sustainability and transportation experts from California, Oregon, and Washington to identify sustainability standards and define categories and goals that should be evaluated when developing a sustainable transportation plan and could be integrated into the Santa Cruz County RTP. The subject categories and goals identified (Attachment 2) make up the sustainability standards and are the foundation of the Sustainable Transportation Analysis and Rating System (STARS) to be applied to transportation plans. The sustainability framework outlined in Attachment 2 supports the Triple Bottom Line definition of sustainability, which identifies a sustainable transportation system as one that balances the needs of people, the planet, and prosperity. The sustainability goals identified take into consideration the authority and influence of transportation agencies, measurable indicators, and reasonably available data.

How is this different from the 2010 RTP?

Although many of the existing RTP goals are consistent with planning for a sustainable transportation system, prior RTPs have not directly incorporated sustainable transportation measures. A key component of the current effort to incorporate sustainable principles into the RTP is defining a sustainable transportation system as one that balances the needs of people, the planet, and prosperity, and understanding the trade-offs and the factors that result in the maximum benefit in all three for a given amount of effort. Utilizing the STARS standards to plan for and evaluate sustainable transportation outcomes in the RTP will allow the RTC to obtain a comprehensive view of what is involved in constructing and evaluating a sustainable transportation plan, and will provide tools for interpreting and communicating this information to the public and decision makers.

Integrating sustainable outcomes into the RTP utilizing the STARS tool also encourages identifying specific desirable targets and developing a plan that achieves these results. This differs from traditional planning efforts, which rely on demand based forecasts to direct the planning and investments. STARS can help the RTC identify where identifying specific targets may benefit the RTC’s sustainability effort and are feasible to incorporate.

Input on Sustainable Principles

RTC and STC staff presented and solicited input on the categories and associated goals to be considered in a sustainable transportation plan at two workshops. The primary purpose of the workshops was to inform participants how RTC staff is proposing to incorporate sustainability principles into the next RTP, describe the role of STARS in developing the framework, and solicit input on which of the transportation related goals best advanced all three Triple Bottom Line outcomes.
(the needs of people, the planet, and prosperity). Fourteen public agencies participated in the November 2nd workshop designed for agency partners and twenty-six members of the public, including one commissioner, participated in the November 17th evening workshop. The workshop focused on agency partners also included a discussion about which measures best indicate progress towards the sustainability goals. An overview of comments received at both workshops is included as Attachment 3. The comments received are supportive of the sustainability framework proposed by STC and supported by RTC staff. A survey soliciting additional input from the public will be posted on the RTC website in late January.

The work done to establish a framework for incorporating sustainable principles into the RTP was the first step in applying STARS to the RTP. RTC staff recommends that the RTC approve the sustainable transportation subject categories and associated goals shown in Attachment 2 as the basis for developing the next draft RTP goals and policies, with the understanding that RTP goals and policies will not be limited to those encompassing sustainable principles.

RTC staff is scheduled to present the draft RTP goals and policies to the RTC in April 2012. An updated RTP timeline is included as Attachment 1.

**Next Steps**

As part of developing the next RTP, RTC staff will also be developing draft policies which identify actions and methods that support RTP goals. Staff recommends working with the STC to develop part of Step 2 of STARS, which involves developing strategies and methodologies to support the sustainability outcomes of Step 1. This work would be very helpful in identifying draft RTP policies which most significantly advance the RTP goals that encompass sustainable principles. The methodologies utilized to evaluate and identify strategies for achieving sustainability goals will support both qualitative and quantitative analysis. Employing the STC to work with RTC staff to identify these strategies would cost $36,500. RTC staff pursued, but was not successful in securing grant funds to apply the second phase of STARS to the RTP. Originally, $100,000 in funding was identified to complete a STARS analysis for the Highway 1 High Occupancy Vehicle Lanes Project. To date, approximately $70,000 remains for this analysis, however, these funds are insufficient to complete the Highway 1 HOV Lanes STARS analysis. Additional funds to complete this analysis were considered, but not recommended or approved as part of the 2012 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) adoption. **Staff recommends that the RTC approve the attached resolution (Attachment 4) amending the FY11/12 budget to shift the remaining Highway 1 High Occupancy Vehicle Lanes STARS funds to the Regional Transportation Plan STARS analysis to integrate sustainable principles into the RTP and complete additional STARS analysis of the RTP, if desired by the RTC; and amend the agreement with the STC to increase the maximum contract amount by $36,500, include tasks required to**
identify those strategies most likely to achieve sustainable transportation plan goals, and identify specific sustainable targets where appropriate.

Staff also recommends that the RTC direct staff to incorporate strategies to achieve sustainable outcomes as identified by STARS into the development of draft RTP policies, with emphasis paid to developing a more concise set of policies that most advance the RTC’s goals and serve to make the RTP a functional resource document for the public and decision makers.

SUMMARY

An update of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), which is a state-mandated long range transportation plan for the region, is underway (Attachment 1). Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) staff has been working with the North American Sustainable Transportation Council (STC) to use the Sustainable Transportation Analysis and Rating System (STARS) to develop standards for basing the next RTP on three sustainable outcomes. RTC solicited input from partner agencies and the public on evaluating a sustainable transportation plan at two workshops. RTC staff recommends that the RTC approve the sustainability framework identified in Attachment 2 as the basis for incorporating sustainable principles into the draft RTP goals. RTC staff also recommends the RTC amend the FY11-12 budget and STC contact to allow staff to begin work with the STC to identify strategies that best achieve goals encompassing sustainable principles and incorporate the findings into the draft RTP policies.

Attachments:
1. 2014 Regional Transportation Plan Fact Sheet and Timeline
2. Sustainability framework for transportation plans
3. Overview of comments received at November 2nd and November 17th workshops
4. Resolution amending the FY11-12 budget and authorizing the Executive Director to amend the agreement with the North American Sustainable Transportation Council

S:\RTC\TC2012\0112\RTP_SustainabilityFramework.docx
What is the RTP?
The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) is a long range (typically twenty-five year) transportation plan for the Santa Cruz County area. Long range planning assesses the transportation challenges we face now and those we will face in the future. The long range transportation plan prioritizes limited transportation funding and develops a strategy to fund the long list of unmet multimodal transportation needs (highway, road, transit, bicycle, pedestrian, etc). The RTP is updated every four or five years to address new trends, issues, and priorities; and to incorporate new state and federal regulations. The current Regional Transportation Plan for the Santa Cruz County area was adopted in June 2010. The next plan is currently scheduled for adoption in 2014.

How is the long range transportation plan developed?
The first step is to identify the objectives for the plan and craft overarching goals and policies that guide decisions to achieve the goals. These set the direction for the development of system-wide evaluation measures to track progress. Next, an estimate of all the potential funding available for transportation projects in our county from local, state and federal sources is developed. Projects that achieve the goals are then solicited from transportation agencies and local jurisdictions. The RTC identifies which projects could be funded over the next 25 years based on priorities and anticipated funding. A second-tiered list of additional needs that could be funded should more funding become available is also identified. The program of projects is then reviewed to identify potential environmental impacts. As shown in the adjacent graphic, there are opportunities at every stage of the development of the RTP for public, agency and committee input. The goals/policies, funding estimates and project lists build on each other and input at the early stages will shape the draft and final plan.
The next Regional Transportation Plan will address the following:

- Transportation needs in the region through 2035 as a result of population growth, environmental, economic and other social trends.
- The amount of state, federal, and local funding available for transportation projects and new sources of funding needed to deliver high priority projects.
- Sustainability of the transportation system and sustainable outcomes utilizing the Sustainable Transportation Analysis and Rating System (STARS).
- New legislative requirements, including SB375, which stipulate that regions must meet greenhouse gas reduction targets by reducing vehicles miles traveled through a coordinated land use and transportation plan called the Sustainable Communities Strategy.
- “Complete Streets” as a tool for planning for a multi-modal transportation system, particularly for those transportation improvements needed to accommodate growth.

Why a focus on sustainability?
The RTC represents diverse transportation interests which frequently reflect the impacts of transportation investments on environmental, economic and social concerns. A focus on sustainability can assist the RTC and the community in recognizing that these areas are intertwined, not exclusionary. Also, an approach that evaluates how transportation investments impact people’s health and safety, the economic vitality of the region, and the universal need for a healthy planet, is consistent with current wisdom. Some investments are win/win, but many require trade-offs in the three areas of economy, environment and people. A focus on sustainability will support the RTC in identifying these trade-offs and achieving multiple long-term goals.

How can you get involved?

- Tell us what you think should be addressed in the RTP or what additional projects and funding options you think should be considered in the future plans. Provide input as elements of the plan are developed.
- Ask to be added to the RTP E-news List by emailing info@sccrtc.org, calling 831-460-3200 or signing up on the RTC website www.sccrtc.org
- Send comments to SCCRTC: info@sccrtc.com or 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA 95060
- Participate in the development of the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments’ Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS), www.ambag.org.
**2014 Regional Transportation Plan**

**Key Milestones (as of Jan 2012)**

- **Review Work Plan & Process for Goal Development**
  - Mar 2011

- **Conduct Sustainability Workshop**
  - Nov 2011

- **Sustainability Web Based Public Outreach**
  - Jan-Feb 2012

- **Review Sustainability Framework & Regional Complete Streets Concept**
  - Feb 2012

- **Solicit New Projects & Updates**
  - Jun 2012

- **Approve Sustainability Framework**
  - Jan 2012

- **Review & Accept Complete Streets ‘Tool Box’**
  - April 2012

- **Approve Preliminary Goals/ Policies/ Evaluation Criteria**
  - Apr-May 2012

- **Project Ideas Due**
  - Sep 2012

- **Review & Accept Complete Streets**
  - Feb 2012

- **Approve Sustainability Framework**
  - Jan 2012

- **Review & Accept Complete Streets ‘Tool Box’**
  - April 2012

- **Solicit New Projects & Updates**
  - Jun 2012

- **Approve Preliminary Goals/ Policies/ Evaluation Criteria**
  - Apr-May 2012

- **Project Ideas Due**
  - Sep 2012

  - Apr-May 2013

- **Adopt Final EIR/RTP/SCS**
  - May 2014

- **Release Draft EIR/RTP/SCS**
  - Feb 2014

**KEY:**

- **Public**
- **RTC Advisory Committees**
- **Agencies & Staff**
- **Governing Boards/ Decision Makers**

*Public participation is always encouraged. Symbol indicates when public input is formally solicited and encouraged.*
Sustainable Transportation Analysis Rating System (STARS) for Plans-Sustainability Framework & Recommended Outline for Integrating Sustainable Principles into next Regional Transportation Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Triple Bottom Line</th>
<th>STARS Credit Category</th>
<th>STARS Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>People</strong></td>
<td>Access &amp; Mobility</td>
<td>Improve people’s ability to meet most of their daily needs without having to drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improve the convenience and quality of trips, especially for walk, bicycle, transit, car/vanpool trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safety &amp; Health</td>
<td>Improve multimodal safety, especially for the most vulnerable users*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improve health by increasing physical activity by people using the transportation system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improve air quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>Reduce disparities in healthy, safe access to key destinations for transportation-disadvantaged populations**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstrate that planned investments do not disproportionately impact transportation-disadvantaged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prosperity</strong></td>
<td>Economic Benefit</td>
<td>Re-invest in the local economy by reducing expenses from fuel consumption and related vehicle use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improve access and proximity to employment centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improve travel time reliability and consistency for high-value trips (i.e freight trips)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Optimize benefits and costs over the life-cycle of the project, program, and/or plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maintain the existing system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planet</strong></td>
<td>Climate and Energy</td>
<td>Reduce smog forming pollutants, greenhouse gas emissions and fossil fuel consumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ecological Function</td>
<td>Improve or avoid habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improve water quality and stream flows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Context</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Vulnerable users are those that are injured or killed in greater proportion than the rest of the population either because of the mode they are using or their demographic

**Transportation-disadvantaged include the elderly, youth, people without cars, people experiencing poverty, people who experience language barriers, and people with disability who may have constrained travel options
Overview of Comments Received at Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Sustainability and STARS Workshops

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) hosted two workshops on development of the next RTP in November 2011. During both the RTP Sustainability and STARS for Transportation Plans Partner Agency Workshop on November 2nd and the Public Workshop on November 17th, participants discussed what a sustainable transportation system would look like and provided feedback on the specific subject areas and goals to evaluate a sustainable transportation plan, as proposed by the Sustainable Transportation Analysis Rating System (STARS) and supported by RTC staff. An overview of the comments received is provided below.

General Comments: Participants of both workshops commented that the information provided was very helpful in understanding how a sustainable transportation plan would be evaluated and understanding the Triple Bottom Line framework. Participants at the public workshop commented that some of the terminology needed to be more understandable and use less jargon. In a few cases, the comments received mentioned specific strategies for achieving the stated goals, rather than which goals themselves were most significant.

What is Sustainable Transportation?: When asked “what is a sustainable transportation system?”, workshop participants responded: a transportation system that is coordinated with mixed-use development, safe and comfortable bicycle facilities, neighborhood access to goods and services, less need for new infrastructure, less need to travel (e.g. virtual travel), a strong transit system, bicycle facilities linking schools and neighborhoods, greater prevalence of cleaner fuels, safe and convenient pedestrian access to transit stops, separation of bicycle and pedestrian facilities from vehicle facilities, affordable transportation options, more jobs closer to housing, reliable transportation choices, and a range of transportation options.

Sustainability goals: When asked if the sustainability subject areas and goals proposed in STARS were the best measures for evaluating a sustainable transportation system and which goals best supported a sustainable transportation system, workshop participants responded:

Yes- right focus on the number of vehicle trips, fossil fuels, impervious surface, equity analysis, affordability of transportation, access to employment, tree canopy, physical activity, bicycle and pedestrian safety, and air pollution

No- greenhouse gas reduction goals should be prioritized over other sustainability goals, goals should be more aggressive goals such as “achieve” and “change”, and goals should have greater emphasis on goods movement

Maybe- access goal must acknowledge differences between rural and urban transportation needs, more emphasis on land use: mixed land use and density, plan should look longer term, and more emphasis should be placed on encouraging innovative approaches
RESOLUTION NO.

Adopted by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
on the date of January 12, 2012
on the motion of Commissioner
duly seconded by Commissioner

A RESOLUTION AMENDING THE FY11-12 BUDGET AND WORK PROGRAM; AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO AMEND THE CONTRACT WITH THE NORTH AMERICAN SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL TO APPLY THE SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORTATION ANALYSIS AND RATING SYSTEM TO THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN AND AMENDING THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

WHEREAS, the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC), as the state-designated Regional Transportation Planning Agency, is required to prepare and periodically update a long-range Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) for Santa Cruz County pursuant to State law;

WHEREAS, the Commission will focus the next Regional Transportation Plan on sustainability principles;

WHEREAS, the North American Sustainable Transportation Council is developing a system for evaluating transportation plans with respect to sustainability entitled the Sustainable Transportation Analysis and Rating System (STARS);

WHEREAS, the RTC approved $25,000 in its fiscal year (FY) 2010-11 budget to apply the first phase of STARS to the next RTP and approved pursuing grant funds for phases two and three;

WHEREAS, the first phase of STARS has been completed and grant funds were not secured for phase two; and,

WHEREAS, working with the North American Sustainable Transportation Council will be very helpful in development draft RTP policies that support RTP goals focused on sustainable principles.

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

1. The FY 11-12 Budget and Work Program for the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) is hereby amended as shown in Exhibit A, and authorize the Executive Director to increase by $36,500 the North American Sustainable Transportation Council contract to apply STARS to the RTP to support development of the next Regional Transportation Plan policies.

2. The unused Regional Surface Transportation Program Exchange (RSTPX) funds programmed to the Highway 1 High Occupancy Vehicle Lanes project for STARS analysis are hereby reprogrammed to the Regional Transportation Plan STARS analysis and the Regional Transportation Improvement Program is hereby amended to reflect these changes.
## HWY 1 ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT & Design: 722200

### OPERATING BUDGET BY PROGRAM - HIGHWAY 1

**FY 2011-2012 BUDGET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK ELEMENT #683</th>
<th>FY11-12</th>
<th>FY11-12</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
<td>PROPOSED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/06/11</td>
<td>01/12/12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### REVENUES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY11-12</th>
<th>FY11-12</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RSTP Exchange - HOV Lanes</td>
<td>2,227,500</td>
<td>2,157,200</td>
<td>-70,300</td>
<td>Unused funds for HOV STARS analysis programmed to STARS for RTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ - HOV Lanes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP - HOV Lanes</td>
<td>3,981</td>
<td>3,981</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Earmark Aux Lanes: Design</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP - Aux Lanes: Design (carryover)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP Exchange - Aux Lanes: Design</td>
<td>90,841</td>
<td>90,841</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP Exchange - Aux Lanes: PA/ED</td>
<td>185,000</td>
<td>185,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL REVENUES**: 2,507,322 2,437,022 -70,300

### EXPENDITURES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY11-12</th>
<th>FY11-12</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and Benefits</td>
<td>185,000</td>
<td>185,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/ED Consultant - Nolte Contract</td>
<td>1,107,893</td>
<td>1,107,893</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/ED on Call Consultants</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/ED Public Information, materials, postage &amp; meetings</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW Consultant</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA Project Value Analysis</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Analysis (STARS)</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>29,700</td>
<td>-45,300</td>
<td>Unused funds for HOV STARS analysis programmed to STARS for RTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve for future year expenses</td>
<td>835,088</td>
<td>810,088</td>
<td>-25,000</td>
<td>Unused funds for HOV STARS analysis programmed to STARS for RTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA/ED Legal Costs</td>
<td>185,000</td>
<td>185,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Design and Engineering Consultants</td>
<td>55,282</td>
<td>55,282</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design on Call Consultants</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Public Information, materials, Postage &amp; meeting space</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E Construction Admin Activities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-construction activities</td>
<td>10,559</td>
<td>10,559</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal Services & Supplies**: 2,322,322 2,252,022 -70,300

### TOTAL EXPENDITURES**: 2,507,322 2,437,022 -70,300

-9-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCES</th>
<th>APPROVED 10/06/11</th>
<th>PROPOSED 01/12/12</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TDA Planning</td>
<td>416,840</td>
<td>416,840</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Planning Assistance (RPA)</td>
<td>315,000</td>
<td>315,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP for Planning (PPM)</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP Exchange - Eco Act, CTSC, Bike Signage &amp; STARS</td>
<td>130,814</td>
<td>201,114</td>
<td>70,300</td>
<td>- Unused funds for HOV STARS analysis programmed to STARS for RTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA - Earmark</td>
<td>430,000</td>
<td>430,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA - Planning (PL) - from AMBAG</td>
<td>233,351</td>
<td>233,351</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Env. Justice Context-Sensitive Planning Grant</td>
<td>39,500</td>
<td>39,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Freedom Grant</td>
<td>165,000</td>
<td>165,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Professional Development Grant</td>
<td>13,413</td>
<td>13,413</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal transit planning grant</td>
<td>41,405</td>
<td>41,405</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Conservancy</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGC Grants (AMBAG &amp; SC County)</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB2766/Air District Funds:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Secure - RTC</td>
<td>16,146</td>
<td>16,146</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Ride Home - Ecology Action</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC Funds Budgeted</td>
<td>96,189</td>
<td>96,189</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,487,658</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,557,958</strong></td>
<td><strong>70,300</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff &amp; Overhead by Program</th>
<th>FY 11-12</th>
<th>FY 11-12</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan Coordination</td>
<td>97,244</td>
<td>97,244</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use/Transportation Coordination</td>
<td>35,020</td>
<td>35,020</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable community strategy</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC County sustainable comm and transit corridor plan</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Program</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Information</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian Planning</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Secure</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Signage Plan</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSST) Network</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Transportation</td>
<td>39,222</td>
<td>39,222</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Improvement to Transit Plan</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Paths to Transit</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan</td>
<td>92,736</td>
<td>92,736</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Monitoring</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-board transit survey</td>
<td>14,801</td>
<td>14,801</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Planning Intern grant</td>
<td>15,151</td>
<td>15,151</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)</td>
<td>209,500</td>
<td>209,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway &amp; Roadway Planning</td>
<td>105,045</td>
<td>105,045</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal Staff and Overhead: 1,023,719

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services &amp; Supplies</th>
<th>FY 11-12</th>
<th>FY 11-12</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bike To Work Program (Ecology Action)</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike &amp; Ped Safety (Community Traffic Safety Coalition)</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South County Bike/Ped Safety (Comm Traffic Safety Coal)</td>
<td>53,861</td>
<td>53,861</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go Green Campaign (Ecology Action)</td>
<td>10,869</td>
<td>10,869</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Paths to Transit</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Signage Program</td>
<td>36,084</td>
<td>36,084</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal Services & Supplies: 1,463,939

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</th>
<th>FY 11-12</th>
<th>FY 11-12</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,463,939</td>
<td>1,534,239</td>
<td>70,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Unused funds for HOV STARS analysis programmed to STARS for RTP
## SALARIES, Benefits & Overhead

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>FY11-12 Proposed</th>
<th>RTC</th>
<th>RPA</th>
<th>FHWA PL - AMBAC</th>
<th>St. C. Grant AMBAC</th>
<th>St. C. Grant County</th>
<th>AB2766</th>
<th>STIP</th>
<th>FHWA Earmark</th>
<th>Env Just Plng Grant</th>
<th>Fed 5304 Intern Grant</th>
<th>Fed 5304 Transit Grant</th>
<th>New Freedom Grant</th>
<th>Coastal Conserv</th>
<th>RSTPX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan Coordination</td>
<td>97,244</td>
<td>2,047</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>95,197</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Land Use/Transportation Coordination</td>
<td>36,020</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,004</td>
<td>28,016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Sustainable community strategy</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 SC County sustainable comm and transit corridor plan</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Work Program</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9,200</td>
<td>36,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Public Information</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>92,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Bicycle/Pedestrian Planning</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>2,375</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32,625</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Bike Secure</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Bike Signage Plan</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSST) Network</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Specialized Transportation</td>
<td>39,222</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>36,724</td>
<td>2,498</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Pedestrian Improvement to Transit Plan</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Safe Paths to Transit</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Regional Transportation Plan</td>
<td>92,736</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>64,037</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13,699</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Traffic Monitoring</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 On-board transit survey</td>
<td>14,801</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,775</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Transit Planning Intern grant</td>
<td>15,151</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,738</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)</td>
<td>200,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Highway &amp; Roadway Planning</td>
<td>105,045</td>
<td>20,295</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>84,750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Salaries, Benefits &amp; Overhead</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,023,719</strong></td>
<td><strong>32,717</strong></td>
<td><strong>19,513</strong></td>
<td><strong>315,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>233,351</strong></td>
<td><strong>30,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>223,199</strong></td>
<td><strong>60,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>39,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,413</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,026</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
<td><strong>30,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Services & Supplies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>FY11-12 Proposed</th>
<th>RTC</th>
<th>RPA</th>
<th>FHWA PL - AMBAC</th>
<th>St. C. Grant AMBAC</th>
<th>St. C. Grant County</th>
<th>AB2766</th>
<th>STIP</th>
<th>FHWA Earmark</th>
<th>Env Just Plng Grant</th>
<th>Fed 5304 Intern Grant</th>
<th>Fed 5304 Transit Grant</th>
<th>New Freedom Grant</th>
<th>Coastal Conserv</th>
<th>RSTPX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bike To Work Program (Ecology Action)</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike &amp; Ped Safety (Community Traffic Safety Coalition)</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South County Bike/Ped Safety (Comm Traffic Safety Coal)</td>
<td>53,861</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go Green Campaign (Ecology Action)</td>
<td>10,869</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Paths to Transit</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>160,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Signage Program</td>
<td>36,084</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36,084</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Professional Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>FY11-12 Proposed</th>
<th>RTC</th>
<th>RPA</th>
<th>FHWA PL - AMBAC</th>
<th>St. C. Grant AMBAC</th>
<th>St. C. Grant County</th>
<th>AB2766</th>
<th>STIP</th>
<th>FHWA Earmark</th>
<th>Env Just Plng Grant</th>
<th>Fed 5304 Intern Grant</th>
<th>Fed 5304 Transit Grant</th>
<th>New Freedom Grant</th>
<th>Coastal Conserv</th>
<th>RSTPX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento Assistant</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Assistant</td>
<td>44,600</td>
<td>44,600</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Other Technical Consultants</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>39,894</td>
<td>35,106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Planning Intern grant</td>
<td>590,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBSST Network Master Plan Consultant</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>98,629</td>
<td>11,371</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal Services & Supplies**                                      | **1,534,239**    | **384,123** | **76,676** | **-** | **-** | **-** | **16,146** | **76,801** | **370,000** | **-** | **-** | **29,379** | **160,000** | **250,000** | **171,114** |

## TOTAL EXPENDITURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>FY11-12 Proposed</th>
<th>RTC</th>
<th>RPA</th>
<th>FHWA PL - AMBAC</th>
<th>St. C. Grant AMBAC</th>
<th>St. C. Grant County</th>
<th>AB2766</th>
<th>STIP</th>
<th>FHWA Earmark</th>
<th>Env Just Plng Grant</th>
<th>Fed 5304 Intern Grant</th>
<th>Fed 5304 Transit Grant</th>
<th>New Freedom Grant</th>
<th>Coastal Conserv</th>
<th>RSTPX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,557,958</strong></td>
<td><strong>416,840</strong></td>
<td><strong>96,169</strong></td>
<td><strong>315,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>233,351</strong></td>
<td><strong>30,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,146</strong></td>
<td><strong>300,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>430,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>39,500</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,413</strong></td>
<td><strong>41,405</strong></td>
<td><strong>165,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>250,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## REVENUES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Element #101</th>
<th>Approved 03/10/11</th>
<th>Proposed 01/12/12</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 State RSTP Exchange Funds</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Interest</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 RSTP Exchange Funds Budgeted - Carryover</td>
<td>5,664,390</td>
<td>5,734,690</td>
<td>70,300</td>
<td>Unused funds for Hwy 1 HOV Lanes project STARS analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>5,694,390</td>
<td>5,764,690</td>
<td>70,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## EXPENDITURES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Element #101</th>
<th>Approved 03/10/11</th>
<th>Proposed 01/12/12</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Capitola</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Clares Street Traffic Calming</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 38th Avenue Rehabilitation</td>
<td>438,000</td>
<td>438,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Capitola Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>538,000</td>
<td>538,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Broadway-Brommer Bike/Ped Path</td>
<td>62,000</td>
<td>62,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Santa Cruz Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>62,000</td>
<td>62,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Watsonville</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Freedom Blvd Rehab (High - Broadis)</td>
<td>751,000</td>
<td>751,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Watsonville Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>751,000</td>
<td>751,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Corralitos Road Left Turn</td>
<td>278,000</td>
<td>278,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 State Park Drive Improvement</td>
<td>587,000</td>
<td>587,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Calabasas Road Bike/Pedestrian</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Graham Hill Road Safety Project</td>
<td>16,714</td>
<td>16,714</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Lump Sum Road Repairs (ARRA2)</td>
<td>148,000</td>
<td>148,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Davenport Road Repairs</td>
<td>44,889</td>
<td>44,889</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>County of Santa Cruz Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>1,324,603</td>
<td>1,324,603</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Health Services</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 South County Based Community Traffic Safety Coalition</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CTSC Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Park and Ride Lot Program</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Bike Route Signage</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 STARS for RTP</td>
<td>70,300</td>
<td>70,300</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Unused funds for Hwy 1 HOV Lanes STARS analysis programmed to STARS for RTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Highway 1 Soquel-Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes</td>
<td>386,000</td>
<td>386,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line Acquisition and Improvement</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCCRTC Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>896,000</td>
<td>966,300</td>
<td>70,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unappropriated Revenues:</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unprogrammed Funds</strong></td>
<td>2,072,787</td>
<td>2,072,787</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>5,694,390</td>
<td>5,764,690</td>
<td>70,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Regional Transportation Commission (RTC)
FROM: Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner
REGARDING: 2012 State and Federal Legislative Programs

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC):

1. Adopt the 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; and

2. Ratify positions on Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21), outlined in a draft letter to Senator Boxer (Attachment 3).

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

2012 Legislative Programs

The recommended 2012 State and Federal Legislative Programs for the RTC are attached (Attachments 1 & 2, respectively). The draft programs include items identified by RTC advisory committee members and other transportation entities. Proposed additions and deletions from the 2011 Legislative Program are shown in underline and strikeout.

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. The RTC’s Legislative Programs also include a list of projects to prioritize for special funding opportunities that may arise in 2012 (Item 3.a. of the Federal Legislative Program).
Staff recommends that the RTC review the draft 2012 Legislative Programs, identify any additional issues that the RTC should monitor or pursue in 2012, and adopt the 2012 Legislative Programs (Attachments 1 & 2).

Federal Transportation Act

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 several times 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).

MAP-21 includes several positive proposals; however, staff is concerned about potential negative impacts some of the proposals would have for transportation projects in Santa Cruz County, especially changes that could result in redirection of funds from smaller counties 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 recommends that the RTC ratify positions on MAP-21, outlined in a draft letter to Senator Boxer (Attachment 3).

Notably, the EPW bill contains only the highway, research, safety and planning portions of the surface transportation law and would require an additional $12 billion. The Senate Finance Committee is currently working on a solution to filling that gap with not much success. The transit section of the bill is being drafted by the Senate Banking Committee. On the House side, Congressman Mica, Chair of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee (T&I) announced that a bill will be marked up sometime in January, but that date is expected to slip until February.

SUMMARY

Staff recommends that the RTC adopt the 2012 State and Federal Legislative Programs, which guide its support and opposition of state and federal legislative or administrative actions. The 2012 Legislative Programs continue to focus on preserving and increasing funding for transportation projects in Santa Cruz County.

Attachments:
1. Draft State Legislative Program
2. Draft Federal Legislative Program
3. MAP-21 Draft Comment Letter
FOCUS AREAS FOR 2012:

1. **Fund 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
   - Transit projects
   - Local Street and Roadway Preservation
   - Bicycle and Pedestrian facilities

2. **Expand revenue-raising opportunities** and innovative financing options beyond the traditional gas tax.
   - **Support 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 increased Service Authorities for Freeway Emergencies (SAFE) vehicle registration fees by $1 for motorist aid programs. Ensure that authority to increase taxes and fees is not limited to federally-designated Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs).
   - **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 green house gas emissions, including funds to implement SB375 and AB32.

4. **Stabilize and Augment Transportation Funding**: Pursue policy and/or legislative changes to preserve, restore, and augment funding for all modes of transportation:
   - **Ensure state implementation of the Federal Transportation Act does not reduce funds available for Santa Cruz County projects**.
   - **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 sale and 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 roads. 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**.
   - **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. **Stabilize and 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.
- Ensure that any new regional tax or fee authorization is not restricted to federally-designated Metropolitan Planning Organizations or Congestion Management Agencies, but rather available to regional transportation planning agencies representing counties statewide.

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.
  - 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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January 12, 2012

The Honorable Barbara Boxer  
United States Senate  
Washington, DC 20510  
VIA FAX: (202) 228-2382

RE: MAP-21/Surface Transportation Reauthorization – Request for Modifications

Dear Senator Boxer:

On behalf of the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC), I am writing to express our appreciation for your leadership in developing “Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century” (MAP-21) to authorize federal surface transportation programs. MAP-21 is surely a step in the right direction to ensure we have a viable plan for our nation’s transportation future. However, we are very concerned with a few of the proposals and request that you work with your colleagues to modify elements of the bill that would otherwise negatively impact smaller urban and rural areas, including Santa Cruz County.

1. **Retain Transportation Enhancement (TE) and Safe Routes to School (SRTS) programs as separate programs from the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Program.** It is critical to ensure dedicated funding for projects that improve safety and mobility for bicycling and walking. MAP-21 both decreases current funding for bicycling and walking and adds new eligibilities that will compete for this reduced funding pot. In addition, the central coast region of California has worked very hard on local projects that have resulted in an attainment area designation under CMAQ. As a result, we are concerned that we would be denied access to funding for emissions reduction programs such as Transportation Enhancement and Safe Routes to School simply because we have had success in that area and do not qualify for CMAQ funds. Shifting the TE program into the CMAQ program would jeopardize millions in funds designated for key projects in Santa Cruz County, including the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network, a bicycle/pedestrian bridge over Highway 1 in Aptos, and new sidewalk and bicycle lane projects near schools countywide.

2. **Off System Bridge Funding/Highway Bridge Program (HBP).** Unlike current law, MAP-21 would not provide dedicated funding for bridges (the legislation would eliminate the Highway Bridge Program (HBP), as well as the 15 percent off-system set-aside for local bridges). We urge continuation of the set-aside for bridges located on public roads other than those on a Federal-aid highway. This funding has allowed the County of Santa Cruz and counties throughout California to improve or replace county-owned bridges. Without eligibility for funding or a dedicated federal funding source, local bridges will continue to deteriorate, threatening public safety and the efficient movement of goods.

3. **Maintain the current MPO threshold of 50,000.** Please strike provisions of MAP-21 that would phase out up to a third of the Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) nationwide and approximately half of the MPOs in California. Regional planning
and associated federal planning (PL) funding play an important part in creating accountable and transparent transportation infrastructure investments.

4. **All regions need funds, not just major metropolitan areas.** We are very concerned by the trend to focus more funds to major metropolitan areas. While not a major metropolitan area, Santa Cruz County is highly urbanized and suffers severe mobility challenges and needs federal assistance to reduce congestion that affects all modes. We ask that the bill ensure equitable suballocation of funds to all regions, not just those covered by Metropolitan Planning Organizations. We oppose proposals which restrict or otherwise disproportionately direct funds to large metropolitan areas at the expense of small and rural areas.

5. **Increase funding levels for all modes and stabilize the Highway Trust Fund and Mass Transportation Account.** While we appreciate the modest increase in funding proposed in MAP-21, especially in comparison to the draconian 30% cuts that were threatened by the House earlier this year, it represents only a fraction of what is needed to preserve and improve our transportation system. We are mindful of the fact that given the current economy, it may be difficult to approve the revenues necessary to meet the staggering infrastructure needs of the nation. However, we stand ready to assist in advocating for increased revenues and new funding mechanisms necessary to ensure the financial sufficiency of the Highway Trust Fund and Mass Transportation Account to meet our transportation needs.

We know that you are well aware of the importance of a strong transportation act to California’s economy. Like much of the state, the infrastructure needs of Santa Cruz County are great, and we are hopeful that the federal government will continue to be a partner in promoting projects that reduce congestion, repair aging infrastructure, improve commerce, and create jobs. We would be pleased to provide you with additional information on how a robust, long-term surface transportation reauthorization would benefit the Santa Cruz County region.

Sincerely,

Kirby Nichol
Chair, SCCRTC

Cc:  Senator Feinstein, Congressman Farr, Congresswoman Eshoo
     Senator Inhofe, Committee on Environment and Public Works
     Congressman Mica, Chair, House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure
     Congressman Johnson, Chair, Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Development
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RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission:

1. Authorize staff to release a request for proposals to conduct an on-board transit ridership survey.

2. Provide input regarding on-board transit ridership survey purpose and draft scope (Attachment 1).

BACKGROUND

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) and the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (Santa Cruz METRO) received a Rural or Small Urban Transit Planning Studies grant from the California Department of Transportation to conduct an on-board transit ridership study. RTC and Santa Cruz METRO are also coordinating with the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG), the Metropolitan Transportation Planning agency for Santa Cruz, Monterey, and San Benito Counties, on this project.

DISCUSSION

An on-board transit ridership survey is needed to collect recent and accurate Santa Cruz County transit ridership data. The primary purpose of the project is to collect the data needed to support the transit function of the regional travel demand model (RTDM) managed by the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) and support future transit planning efforts. Santa Cruz METRO has also requested that questions to identify the limited English proficiency of transit riders also be included in the survey. As envisioned, the data would be collected through person to person surveys and counts.

Up-to-date transit ridership data is essential to support planning efforts that achieve statewide and regional goals to reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and achieve greenhouse gas (GhG) targets. Santa Cruz County, like many regions, will refer to the RTDM and associated transportation modeling efforts for evaluating the impacts of new transportation investments on GhG and meeting other regional
goals. Transit ridership can be an important strategy for reducing VMT and GhG. As a result, there is a desire to update the transit data included in the RTDM to reflect recent transit usage in Santa Cruz County and to enable the most accurate transit ridership forecast possible.

At the same time, transit agencies are functioning in an extremely constrained financial environment. In this environment, there is an opportunity to look again at transit efficiencies and future service planning. Updated transit ridership data can support these transit service planning efforts.

This request for proposals (RFP) is intended to solicit proposals from interested consultants to plan, design, implement, and document the transit ridership survey including, but not limited to developing a sampling plan, preparing a survey questionnaire, conducting the survey, collecting and documenting the results, reporting and analyzing the findings, and demonstrating how data collected supports RTDM. The grant funds identify $21,540 to conduct the transit survey. The project timeline is shown below.

**Timeline:**
- January 13, 2012: Release RFP
- January 25, 2012: Conduct Proposers’ Conference, Santa Cruz, CA
- February 10, 2012: Proposals due, 5:00 pm, Pacific Standard Time
- February 21, 2012: Consultant interviews
- February 2012: Select consultant
- March 2012: Finalize contract
- April 2012: Conduct survey
- June 2012: Administrative Draft Report due
- July 2012: Draft Report due
- August 2012: Final Plan due

**Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission authorize staff to release a request for proposals to conduct an on-board transit ridership survey and provide input regarding on-board transit ridership survey purpose and draft scope (Attachment 1).** Please note that the draft scope of work as shown in Attachment 1 does not reflect comments from Santa Cruz METRO or AMBAG. Both Santa Cruz METRO and AMBAG staff’s comments on the draft scope will be included before it is finalized and released.

**SUMMARY**

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) and the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (Santa Cruz METRO) received a Rural or Small Urban Transit Planning Studies grant from the California Department of Transportation to conduct an on-board transit ridership study. A consultant is sought to design, plan, implement, and document the on-board transit ridership survey. RTC staff is requesting approval to release a request for proposals for these consultant services.

**Attachment 1:** Draft On-Board Ridership Transit Study Scope of Work
Please note that the draft scope of work as shown in Attachment 1 does not reflect comments from Santa Cruz METRO or AMBAG. Both Santa Cruz METRO and AMBAG staff’s comments on the draft scope will be included before it is finalized and released.

DESCRIPTION

Background

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) and the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (Santa Cruz METRO) received a Rural or Small Urban Transit Planning Studies grant from the California Department of Transportation to conduct an On-Board Transit Ridership Study. The RTC is the state-designated public agency with regional transportation planning responsibilities that cross city-county boundaries. The Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District operates, and manages the countywide bus system. RTC and Santa Cruz METRO are also coordinating with the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG). AMBAG is the Metropolitan Transportation Planning agency for Santa Cruz, Monterey, and San Benito Counties and is the agency that maintains the travel demand model for the region.

Up-to-date transit ridership data is essential to support planning efforts that achieve statewide and regional goals to reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and achieve greenhouse gas (GHG) targets. Santa Cruz County, like many regions, will rely on the Regional Travel Demand Model (RTDM) and associated transportation modeling efforts for evaluating the impacts of new transportation investments on GHG and meeting other regional goals. In addition, Santa Cruz METRO needs survey results which characterize the population with a primary language other than English. Increasing transit ridership can be an important strategy for reducing VMT and GHG. As a result, current transit ridership data will be collected to enable the RTDM to forecast future transit ridership more accurately.

At the same time, transit agencies are functioning in an extremely constrained financial environment and are faced with service cuts. The Santa Cruz METRO currently operates thirty-six routes and averages 21,800 rides on weekdays in the month of April, when the survey is scheduled to be completed.

Project Description

An on-board transit ridership survey is needed to collect recent and accurate Santa Cruz County transit ridership data. As envisioned, the survey will collect the data needed to support the transit function of the RTDM and support future transit planning efforts. The data is expected to be collected through person to person
surveys and counts. However, the consultant is encouraged to propose alternate data collection strategies that best fit within the project scope and budget.

This RFP is intended to solicit proposals from interested consultants to design and conduct an on-board transit ridership survey in Santa Cruz County. The data collected will be shared amongst the RTC, Santa Cruz METRO, and AMBAG to plan for and support future transportation funding decisions. Specifically, AMBAG will use the data collected as an input into the RTDM as part of the current modeling programs. The RTC will utilize the data to support regional transportation planning efforts and the Santa Cruz METRO will utilize the data to support future transit planning.

**Project Objectives**

The RTC’s undertaking in this project is based on consideration of the following objectives:

1. An on-board transit ridership survey is needed to collect recent and statistically accurate Santa Cruz County transit ridership data
2. The on-board transit ridership survey will collect the data needed to support the transit portion of the Association of Monterey Bay Area Government’s Regional Travel Demand Model (RTDM) and support future transit planning efforts
3. The on-board transit ridership survey data collected will be used to inform decision makers’ about transit ridership including, but not limited to, transit riders origins and the destinations and mode used to access transit
4. The on-board transit ridership survey should serve as a tool to characterize transit riders with Limited English Proficiency

**SCOPE OF CONSULTANT SERVICES**

The consultant shall plan and conduct an on-board scientific sample survey of transit riders in Santa Cruz County, which applies accepted survey practices and sampling techniques; deliver the data collected in a format usable by the RTDM, Santa Cruz METRO, and RTC; and analyze and report the survey results to RTC, and Santa Cruz METRO. The data collected should, at a minimum, include the data required to support the transit function of the RTDM. Additional data collected should support future transit service planning. A list of data identified by RTC, Santa Cruz METRO, and AMBAG as priority transit needs to support the project objectives is included as *Attachment 1: Exhibit B*. Highest priority should be given to the data required to support the RTDM. The consultant is encouraged to inform the RTC, Santa Cruz METRO, and AMBAG in their proposal if additional data is required and/or recommended to achieve the project objectives.

The intent of this scope is to clearly communicate the tasks expected to complete the project, meet project objectives, and establish an outline for receiving progress reports by task as work on the on-board transit ridership survey proceeds. A set of
deliverables is outlined under each task. Interim reporting is required for effective communication between consultant and the project team. The project schedule can be found in Attachment 1: Exhibit A. Key milestones include establishing a sampling plan, developing the survey questionnaire, scheduling data collection, implementing the survey, and producing the draft and final reports.

Throughout the consultant’s Proposed Approach, the consultant should identify the constraints and opportunities presented by the selected approach. Factors for identifying constraints and opportunities should include, but are not limited to:

- Existing available Santa Cruz County transit data
- Evaluating the existing RTDM and proposed model improvements
- Reviewing recent transit planning efforts

The consultant is also encouraged to propose alternate approaches to meeting project goals, including associated cost, and should thoroughly explain their reasoning. This information should be included in the Exceptions and Deviations section of the consultant’s proposal.

PART I: On-Board Transit Ridership Survey Plan and Design

Consultant shall explain the proposed approach to transit ridership data collection, how it relates to current best practices, and why this approach best achieves project goals. RTC, Santa Cruz METRO, and the consultant shall meet to review and discuss the proposed sampling approach prior to implementation.

**TASK 1: Review Survey Objectives**

Consultant shall work with RTC and Santa Cruz METRO to clearly define the problems and opportunities that will be address by this project and meet with RTC and Santa Cruz METRO at the beginning of the project to refine survey objectives, if needed.

**Deliverable 1:** Discussion summary with documentation of survey objectives

**TASK 2: Develop a Sampling Plan**

Consultant shall develop a transit ridership sampling plan, which should specify how the survey is to be administered, the basis for this sampling approach, the survey sample size, the sample distribution within the transit network and times of day, and explain the procedures to be used to prevent bias and adjust to short trips. The sampling plan should consider the variation of transit boardings and alightings by transit stop to ensure that completed surveys mirrored the actual distribution of riders. The sampling plan shall also address how it will ensure data accuracy and prevent data gaps. The consultant will ensure that the methodology proposed will render a representative sample of transit riders in Santa Cruz County.
**Deliverable 2:** Detailed description of how samples will be collected, an explanation of the basis for the recommended approach, and estimated response rate

**Deliverable 3:** Documentation of sample size, sample distribution by route and time, statistical significance, and explanation of basis for recommended approach. Explanation of why a 95% confidence level was not used to calculate the appropriate sample size, if applicable

**Deliverable 4:** Explanation of how sampling approach ensures data accuracy, prevents data gaps, is consistent with best practices for on-board transit surveys, and how this approach ensures a representatives sample of Santa Cruz County transit riders

**Deliverable 5:** Detailed explanation of how sampling approach will achieve survey objectives

---

**TASK 3: Preparation of the Survey Questionnaire**

Consultant shall design the survey questionnaire that ensures the best response rate possible and a high level of valid trip responses. The survey will be conducted in English and Spanish. Each survey should include a place for the surveyor to enter the transit route, date, day of week the survey is conducted and the surveyor’s name, if applicable. The survey should also address the data needs identified in Attachment 1: Exhibit B and address Limited English Proficiency (LEP) data collection needs. The survey questionnaire must be designed to obtain responses that positively identify the origin and destination and sequence of transit vehicle used to complete the one way trip made by the respondent. If possible, the survey instrument itself will include a Geographic Positioning System to collect the latitude and longitudinal information and time.

**Deliverable 6:** Detailed description of the survey instrument

**Deliverable 7:** Survey questionnaire and design

**Deliverable 8:** Explanation of how the proposed design is consistent with best practices

---

**TASK 4: Describe Data to be Collected & RTDM Transit Function/Transit Planning Connection**

Consultant shall list all of the data to be collected using the survey instrument and provide an explanation of how data is directly linked to improving RTDM functionality and/or transit service planning needs. (See Attachment 1: Exhibit B for priority transit data needs identified by RTC, Santa Cruz METRO, and AMBAG.) Identify any additional gaps in transit data which could be addressed as part of this project.

**Deliverable 9:** Matrix of data to be collected and relationship to RTDM transit function, Limited English Proficiency, or transit planning
PART II: Conduct On-Board Transit Ridership Survey

Consultant shall describe the recommended survey implementation strategies including field procedures and scheduling. RTC, Santa Cruz METRO, and consultant shall meet to review and discuss how the survey will be conducted before data collection is initiated.

TASK 5: Field procedures plan

Consultant shall describe how the survey will be distributed and recovered in the most cost effective manner, how survey staff will be hired and trained, and how field work will be conducted, if applicable. The consultant shall also describe how to prevent non-response errors, and what procedures will be in place to ensure that quality data is collected. The consultant shall work with Santa Cruz METRO to schedule the survey and receive permission from Santa Cruz METRO prior to conducting the survey. The consultant shall conduct the transit survey in accordance with the field procedures plan.

Deliverable 10: List of staff required to conduct surveys including, but not limited to, surveyors, trainers and supervisors
Deliverable 11: A description of how survey staff will be hired and trained, if applicable.
Deliverable 12: A description of the proposed process for distributing and receiving surveys and how survey will be carried out
Deliverable 13: Explanation of how the proposed approach is consistent with best practices and ensures that quality data is collected
Deliverable 14: Completed surveys

PART III: On-Board Transit Ridership Survey Data Reporting

Consultant shall compile and analyze data collected and compile a final report for the project. The documentation and analysis should clearly convey the project purpose, methods, analysis, and results.

TASK 6: Compiling and Analyzing Data

Consultants shall ensure that questionnaires are checked for completeness and the result documented electronically. Consultant shall run tabulations to analyze the transit data. The consultant shall provide the data to RTC and Santa Cruz METRO in a format to be used by the transportation model and by local decision makers.

Deliverable 15: Electronic documentation of survey results in excel format with origin and destination addresses and boarding and alighting locations geocoded to provide latitude and longitude of these locations for all trips and Santa Cruz METRO data formatting needs
Deliverable 16: Analytical description, trip tables, and data presentation in tabular form and graphic format, supplemented by a narrative discussion in order to
facilitate the reader’s understanding of the significance of the data and prevailing characteristics of transit riders including, but not limited to, demographics, vehicle availability, trip purpose, mode to access transit, distance to and from, distance to transit, travel times, trip distance, travel times by trip purpose and trip distance, trip origin and trip end density maps.

**TASK 7: Reporting**

Consultant shall prepare a final report that documents how the survey was conducted, what data was collected, identifies any problems that were encountered, and how they were dealt with. The report should include a standard analysis, key findings, and other significant topics including anecdotal information and data summaries of the survey results. The report shall also include a summary of the report findings and a detailed description of the analysis conducted. The report will also provide an executive summary suitable for distribution to board members, stakeholders, citizens and interested parties. The report will also include a discussion of the quality assurance procedures in place at each stage of the survey ensure quality samples, representation, and reporting and how every stage of survey development and implementation related to best sampling practices.

**Deliverable 17:** Administrative Draft Report  
**Deliverable 18:** Draft Report  
**Deliverable 19:** Final Report
RTC is seeking a consultant to perform the services described in this Scope of Work for a period of nine months ending on August 30, 2012. The RTC is looking forward to working with a qualified contractor who will be able to meet this deadline.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 13, 2012</td>
<td>Release RFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 25, 2012</td>
<td>Conduct Proposers’ Conference, Santa Cruz, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:00 pm PST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 10, 2012</td>
<td>Proposals due, 5:00 pm, Pacific Standard Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 16, 2012</td>
<td>Notify consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 21, 2012</td>
<td>Consultant interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February, 2012</td>
<td>Select consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1, 2012</td>
<td>Request contract approval from RTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2012</td>
<td>Finalize contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April, 2012</td>
<td>Conduct On-Board Transit Ridership Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 21, 2012</td>
<td>Administrative Report due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 25, 2012</td>
<td>Draft Report due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 18, 2012</td>
<td>Final Report due</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Exhibit B

### On-Board Transit Study Data Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Need</th>
<th>Potential Survey Responses, Description, and/or Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Travel Demand Model Data Needs (RTDM) Data Needs (Data may also support other transit planning efforts)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Bus Route</td>
<td>Santa Cruz METRO identified Route # for tracking purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Time data collected</td>
<td>Time of day to identify am, mid-day, peak, or night</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Date data collected</td>
<td>Date to identify weekend, &amp; weekday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Number of boardings</td>
<td>Counts at each stop to disaggregate model data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Number of alightings</td>
<td>Counts at each stop to disaggregate model data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Trip Origin: Address, or closest intersection</td>
<td>Geographic coordinates to calculate trip distance to calibrate trip assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Trip Destination: Address, or closest intersection</td>
<td>Geographic coordinates to calculate trip distance to calibrate trip assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Transit Embark Stop: Location or number</td>
<td>Geographic coordinates and direction (outbound or inbound) to calibrate trip assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Transit Alighting Stop: Location or number</td>
<td>Geographic coordinates and direction (outbound or inbound) to calibrate trip assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Mode used to access transit</td>
<td><em>walk, drive, bicycle, dropped-off, shared ride, other</em> to calibrate mode share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Mode used to access destination</td>
<td><em>walk, drive, bicycle, dropped-off, shared ride, other</em> to calibrate mode share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Age</td>
<td>Exact age per California Household Transportation Survey to calibrate trip distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Household size</td>
<td>1,2,3,4+ to calibrate trip distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Household income</td>
<td>$15,000 or less; $15,000-$24,999; $25,000-$34,999; $35,000-$59,999; $60,000-$95,999; $95,000 or more to calibrate trip distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Auto availability</td>
<td>Yes, No to calibrate mode share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Education</td>
<td>12 grade or less, high school graduate, some college credit, associate or technical school degree, bachelor's or undergraduate degree, graduate degree, other to calibrate distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Transfer</td>
<td>Yes, No to calibrate mode share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Trip Purpose</td>
<td><em>Home Based Work, Home Based Shopping, Home Based School/University, Home Based Other, Non-Home Based</em> to calibrate trip distribution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Limited English Proficiency (LEP) Data Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>19 Preferred Language</th>
<th>English or Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 What prevents you from using service, if language other than english</td>
<td>Infrequent service, financial resources, language assistance, call stops are only in English, Schedule/Route information is unavailable, Insufficient bus stops, no translation service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 How METRO could improve transit services to work better for you?</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Transit Planning (TP) Data Needs

| 22 Observed time of departure | To calculate actual travel time for scheduling and performance |
| 23 Observed time of arrival | To calculate actual travel time for scheduling and performance |
| 24 Detailed Trip Purpose Information | Shopping, Visiting friends/family, Medical Appointment, Personal Business, Leisure/Entertainment * |

*Trip purpose data solicited in 2007 Transit Ridership Survey. Work with consultant and AMBAG to determine if these trips can be categorized under line 18 responses.*