RIDESHARE MONTH
REGISTRATION

October 2011

Welcome to the 28th annual celebration of Rideshare Month! Rideshare Month is the Monterey Bay Area’s annual campaign to raise awareness of the benefits of using sustainable transportation. Commuting sustainably helps to relieve our congested streets, improve air quality, and save energy and commute costs. In October, each time you commute sustainably you are entered to win prizes for yourself or group by challenging other employers, community groups, and colleges! Who can complete the most sustainable trips during the month of October 2011?

Personal Information
First Name* ______________________
Last Name* ______________________
Address ______________________
City __________________________ Zip ______
Email Address* ______________________
Phone Number ______________________

What County do you live in?*
- Monterey County
- San Benito County
- Santa Cruz County
- Other

Employer Information
Employer Name* ______________________
Address ______________________
City __________________________ Zip ______

How many days per week do you work or attend college?*

What County do you work or attend college in?*
- Monterey County
- San Benito County
- Santa Cruz County
- Other

Commute Information
How do you normally commute to work?* (Check One)
- Drive Alone
- Bus
- Carpool
- Vanpool
- Bicycle
- Walk
- Telecommute

If you drive to work how many miles per gallon does your vehicle get?*

How many miles is your commute to work? (One-way)*

Pledge & Easy Trips Ideas (besides work)

☐ I pledge that, during the month of October, I will increase my efforts to be more sustainable, by biking, walking, taking the bus, carpooling, vanpooling or telecommuting more than I am currently doing.

Easy Trips Ideas (besides work):
- Ride to the Park
- Carpool to the Store, to Church, to the Gym!
- Walk to your favorite Restaurant
- Take the Bus downtown to go shopping
- Drive all the neighborhood kids to school, or take the team to practice or the big game!

Do you tweet? Tell us your Twitter ID and follow @RideshareMonth to earn an extra entry!

WHICH CHALLENGE ARE YOU A PART OF?*

- Individual
- Workplace
- Non-Profit/ Community Organization
- College Organization

See website for more information on challenges and prizes.

Name of Group: ______________________

***Must be 18 to enter***

Rideshare Week Brought to You By:

MONTEREY BAY
Unified Air Pollution Control District

*Required Information
AGENDA: September 15, 2011

TO: Regional Transportation Commission

FROM: George Dondero, Executive Director

RE: Director’s Report

For Information Only

*Future of AMBAG*

On September 14, AMBAG’s Interim executive Director Les White presented the *Future of AMBAG Report* and recommendations to the AMBAG Board of Directors. I attended this meeting and will provide some brief commentary at today’s RTC meeting. The report is authored by Mr. White and the AMBAG staff and recommends that AMBAG continue in its current role as a Council of Governments and a Metropolitan Planning Organization. Among the recommendations in the report of specific interest to the RTC:

“Direct staff to modify the MOU between AMBAG and the RTPAs in order to better fund the Regional Transportation Demand Model and avoid any duplication of transportation planning efforts with a target of retaining half of the current pass through PL funds for specified functions. While the total dollar amount withheld is important, the Board may look at passing through more of the PL in exchange, for other RTPA funds. As non-federal dollars, those RTPA funds could b used to support match requirements for AMABAG grants.”

These recommendations, if implemented, would have significant negative impacts to the RTC budget, both in decreased funding for RTC projects and programs and loss of flexibility. Staff will bring this item to the RTC for consideration at a future meeting. See the cover memorandum (*Attachment 1*) and the Executive Summary (*Attachment 2*). The full report and appendices are available on the AMBAG website.

*Surface Transportation Board filing*

On September 7, RTC’s petition to the federal Surface Transportation Board to approve change in ownership of the Santa Cruz Branch Line was submitted with revisions consistent with those requested by STB staff. We are waiting to hear from STB regarding their decision.
Federal Transportation Act Update
On September 13, 2011 the U.S. House approved a bill that would provide a short-term extension of the surface transportation bill (SAFETEA-LU) and maintain current funding levels for transit, highway and aviation programs until March 31, 2012; the most recent extension was set to expire Sept. 30. The legislation also includes an extension of the excise tax on fuel (gas tax) as well as a 4-month extension of aviation (FAA) authorization. The Senate considered the extension on September 14, but Senator Tom Coburn (R-OK) has placed a "hold" on the transportation extension, because he is seeking an amendment that would eliminate the 1.5% of federal transportation funds that go to Transportation Enhancements (TE). In California TE makes up approximately 10% of the STIP. Santa Cruz County receives over $17 million in SAFETEA-LU funds annually for a variety of transportation projects.

President's "American Jobs Act" Proposals for Transportation
In his September 8 speech before a joint session of Congress, President Obama cited the nation's crumbling infrastructure—including public transportation—as a major priority in his proposal to lower U.S. unemployment levels and return people to work. The president's plan calls for $50 billion in immediate federal investments for transportation, including $9 billion for public transportation; $4 billion for high-speed rail corridors; $2 billion for other intercity passenger rail; and $5 billion for the multimodal Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) and Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (TIFIA) programs. It also calls for a National Infrastructure Bank and includes enhancements to infrastructure-related job training opportunities for individuals from underrepresented groups to ensure that small businesses can compete for infrastructure contracts. Republican lawmakers who control the House have promised quick review of the legislation and seem open to the tax-cutting elements, but some have already rejected new spending. If approved, Caltrans officials anticipate strict deadlines will be set to use the funds.

CalCOG Report
COG Directors met in Sacramento on August 31. Discussion focused on federal and state legislation as informational items. There was plenty of interest over SB791 which would authorize MPOs to ask voters to pass a regional fuel tax to help pay for transportation improvements that would relieve congestion. The bill has since been pulled, and may return next legislative session.

Great concern was expressed by a representative of CSAC over AB 1220 (Alejo) which has passed out of both houses of the legislature and is now
awaiting action by the Governor. This bill would expand the statute of limitations to sue a city or county from one year to three years, challenging the adoption of a housing element or a number of related ordinances. CSAC opposes a broad statute that allows any interested party to sue struggling cities and counties three years after a decision is made.

A CalCOG delegates meeting will occur November 30 in San Diego.

**Bicycle – Pedestrian Design Workshop**
RTC will host a free workshop titled "Designing for Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety" on Wed, November 30th. The workshop will tie in with the planning work now started for the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network with an emphasis on multi-use trail development. The workshop, presented by the Rails-to-Trails Conservancy and the Health Transportation Network, will provide bicycle and pedestrian design tools to practicing transportation, planning, engineering and design professionals as well as elected officials and advocates.

Workshop organizers are providing highly qualified trainers, materials and management through a grant and have asked local sponsors to provide workshop space, light breakfasts, lunches and other refreshments for 40-50 people. RTC staff secured donations to cover the estimated cost of those expenses.

We’ll notify you of the workshop location on our website and at future meetings, and send out invitations once details have been worked out. We hope you’ll join us and encourage your planning and public works staff to attend.

**RTC’s Transportation Café #5 – Trail Planning**
The fifth episode of the Transportation Cafe show highlights the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network (Trail Network) project. The purpose of the program is to focus on transportation issues of interest to Santa Cruz County and the surrounding region and is now airing every other month.

In this episode I interviewed Cory Caletti, RTC program manager for the coastal Trail Network project and other bicycle programs, and Mike Sherrod, with the RTC’s selected consultant firm RRM Design Group. The show provides an overview of the planning effort underway for a proposed bicycle and pedestrian multi-use transportation trail network that will eventually ring the Monterey Bay to provide increased coastal access. Topics included in this episode of the Transportation Cafe are: who will benefit and be served by the trail, how it will be coordinated with the rail corridor, and how it will be planned, built and funded.
Also, the show encourages the public to sign up to be included in the first public workshop on the coastal Trail Network scheduled to be held in the fall. The final work product will be a Master Plan, similar to one developed in Monterey County, which will identify priority segments that can be constructed as funding is secured. The show is airing on Community TV at selected times and can be viewed on Community Television’s website.

**Cash for Carpoolls**

This edition of the Transportation Café also includes a short segment on the ‘Cash for Carpoolls’ promotion currently underway by the RTC’s Commute Solutions program. Cash for Carpoolls offers rewards for people logging 12 or more round-trips in a new carpool. The campaign is sponsored by the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District with the goals of increasing the number of passengers per vehicle, improving air quality and reducing greenhouse gas emissions. For more information on Cash for Carpoolls, please log on to [www.commutesolutions.org](http://www.commutesolutions.org). The short will also be on the Commute Solutions website.

**October is Rideshare Month**

This October marks our region’s 28th annual Rideshare Month highlighting the benefits of using sustainable transportation. Commuting sustainably by walking, biking, carpooling, vanpooling, taking the bus, or telecommuting helps cut individual commute costs, improves air quality, saves energy and uses our transportation system more efficiently. Funded by the Air District, Rideshare Month is a joint effort of all the rideshare agencies in the region including our own Commute Solutions program.

This year’s campaign has a new twist—teams will challenge each other to commute sustainably and compete for prizes. Competition categories include Individual, Workplace, Non-Profit/Community Organization, and College Challenges.

Our Commute Solutions expert staff is now visiting workplaces and schools promoting Rideshare Month and providing personalized help to people in planning their commutes. We encourage community leaders to invite Commute Solutions to your worksite, sponsor a Rideshare Month Challenge Prize and challenge neighboring businesses to a friendly competition! Sign up online at Rideshare Month dot com or using the paper sign-up sheets provided today.
Rotating Art Exhibit
The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission is hosting a new exhibit of landscape art by Merlyn Moreno. Her paintings can be viewed during regular office hours until December 15, 2011. Ms. Moreno’s landscape paintings are colorful celebrations of the natural world as it relates to human activities - agriculture and recreation. If you would like more information about Merlyn Moreno or would like to view her gallery, see her website at http://members.cruzio.com/~scva/mmoreno.html

Attachments:
1. 09/14/2011 Cover memorandum to Future of AMBAG Report
2. Executive Summary to Future of AMBAG Report
3. 09/14/2011 Comments from TAMC to Future of AMBAG Report
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MEMORANDUM

TO: AMBAG Board of Directors
FROM: Les White, Interim Executive Director
SUBJECT: Future of AMBAG Report
MEETING DATE: September 14, 2011

Attached is the report regarding the Future of AMBAG. It is submitted as two separate documents: The first document includes a Table of Contents, Executive Summary, Methodology and the body of the report with recommendations. The second document of appendices includes all the memorandum, articles and studies staff referred to in preparing the report. This second document is lengthy but is a fairly comprehensive and provides a good snapshot of key reference material.

It is proposed that the Board of Directors review this material, receive a PowerPoint presentation at the September 14, 2011 Board of Directors meeting, hear public comments and ask questions of staff. In view of all the material, I would then suggest that additional questions be given to the AMBAG staff in writing a week later (by September 23), so we can prepare a Q and A report and give it to the Board prior to the October 12 Board meeting. I would recommend that the Board take action on the recommendations (or direct alternative courses of action) at the October Board meeting.

We have provided specific recommendations to give a clear focus to what AMBAG staff and I believe are important points to consider in effectively addressing the key issues in the report of duplication of efforts, financial considerations, the Regional Travel Demand Model and AMBAG performance issues.

I believe it is extremely important that a decision be made, in October, with some finality so that disruption to work efforts will be minimized and achieving the best work products can occur. Having an effective, focused AMBAG will ensure employee effectiveness, minimize staff turnover and positively effect staff performance.

I further believe that most of the issues can be resolved by continuing to focus on the issues and concerns mentioned in the surveys of Board members, managers and administrators. The structure doesn’t need to change to resolve most of the substantive issues by Board members, city managers and administrators.

In that regard the Future of AMBAG report sets forth three scenarios. After analyzing those three scenarios, I do not see a compelling argument for significantly changing the
structure of the agency. In many respects it can be concluded that those types of changes proposed by other agencies would be disruptive to current programs, effective relations with state and federal officials and not yield the time and cost savings alluded to in various agency reports.

Certainly, though, there is plenty of room for improving performance as suggested by a number of local government representatives. Thus, there needs to be a number of areas of improvement in communications, collaboration, front-end coordination with RTPAs, as well as other local and regional agencies. AMBAG staff is currently working on all of those and making very good progress.

As it relates to recommendations, those proposed in the report are repeated below:

1. Retain AMBAG in its current form as a regional COG and MPO.

2. Direct staff to identify and address any and all performance related issues going forward

3. Direct staff to modify the MOU between AMBAG and the RTPAs in order to better fund the Regional Transportation Demand Model and avoid any duplication of transportation planning efforts with a target of retaining half of the current pass through PL funds for specified functions. While the total dollar amount withheld is important, the Board may look at passing through more of the PL in exchange, for other RTPA funds. As non-federal dollars, those RTPA funds could be used to support match requirements for AMBAG grants.

4. Improve coordination and collaboration throughout the region by:
   • conducting regular regional technical committee meetings
   • allowing other agencies ex-officio status on the AMBAG Board of Directors
   • holding periodic joint executive committee meetings
   • identifying specific areas of duplication and strategies for addressing those issues

We look forward to a positive and forthright discussion of this report and the many other reports that have been provided to various boards.

APPROVED BY:

[Signature]
Les White, Interim Executive Director
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Executive Summary

Recently there has been a great deal of discussion around the structure of transportation planning agencies in the tri-county metropolitan planning region. Most of this discussion has centered on the dissolution of AMBAG as the federally-designated regional Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), serving 18 cities and 3 counties, in favor of re-designating TAMC and SCCRTC as single-county MPOs. With the associated loss of federal funding, this would necessarily result in the dissolution of AMBAG as it is structured and operates today. The goals of such a restructuring, as written in TAMC memos, “would be to improve cost effectiveness by removing duplication of efforts across agencies and increasing investment in the regional transportation model.” In subsequent Board and Executive Committee memos at TAMC, SCCRTC, and SBtCOG, many statements have been made regarding AMBAG staff performance and lack of regional coordination, financial concerns regarding cash flow at AMBAG, and the effectiveness of and lack of funding for the Regional Travel Demand Model (RTDM).

This discussion must be understood in context of the unique structure of transportation planning in this region.

AMBAG is the only region in California in which the MPO is not also an RTPA. Combined with the MOUs between AMBAG and the region’s RTPAs, under which AMBAG passes through approximately $500,000 of federal funding annually allocated to support AMBAG’s transportation programs and related activities, this arrangement exacerbates revenue issues for AMBAG. Similarly, this large sum of federal dollars passed through by AMBAG siphons away funding that could otherwise be used to make the much needed investment in model improvements recommended by peer review experts which the RTPAs state has resulted in a less than satisfactory model. Furthermore, if the RTPAs are concerned about funding for the model, then providing additional funds would meet their often stated concern about achieving an improved model. In fact, as can be seen in the main report following this summary, the RTPAs have programmed the vast majority of federal funds passed through AMBAG for work elements that AMBAG is federally mandated to carry out in areas that then are cast as “duplication of efforts” and cited as a rationale for AMBAG’s dissolution. In other words, the RTPAs are not investing in the model, as they indicate is important; rather, the RTPAs put federal dollars in elements that there are state funds to use which, in part, may duplicate AMBAG’s existing and mandatory efforts.

The scenario proposed by the RTPAs would eliminate AMBAG as the tri-county regional MPO in favor of smaller, single-county MPOs. Financially, the region would experience a net loss of $215,557 (this amount fluctuates based on annual apportionments) in transportation planning funding, based on the differential between federal funding gained and state funding lost. By shifting transportation planning away from a regional model, the tri-county region would also be taking a step in the opposite direction of both federal and state trends. Draft Surface Transportation Reauthorization bills at the federal level have contained provisions to increase the threshold for populations served by an MPO, and on a state level, SB 375, RHNA, and the Regional Travel Demand Model requirements all strongly imply the need for transportation planning to be done at a regional scale. Local commute patterns in our region very clearly form a tri-county commute shed, and transportation projects implemented in each county directly impact transportation system of each adjacent county. When applying for competitive funds, a collective regional body which aggregates multiple counties is in a better position to obtain these funds than single-county agencies, which would be competing against each other for funding. Significant, the memoranda advocating single-county MPOs (see Appendix items E and F) spend considerable time explaining all the various approaches that may be necessary to achieve regional coordination under single-county MPOs.

Removing AMBAG as the regional MPO will also not yield the promised savings to taxpayers. Rather, it would result in a net loss in transportation funding for the region while redistributing $681,000 of flexible state RPA dollars to other regions in California according to Caltrans. In discussions at both TAMC and SCCRTC, this
has been framed as “taxpayer savings”, however it must be understood that if these dollars are not spent in this region, then according to Caltrans officials, they will be spent in other regions, as the total funding allocated at the state level does not change based on the number of recipients. Thus, taxpayers in this region would actually see their tax dollars spent in every California region except their own. In fact, if the goals are to improve cost effectiveness by removing duplication of efforts across agencies and increasing investment in the regional transportation model, the most efficient way to do this would be to consolidate the region’s transportation planning into one single agency that is both the regional MPO and RTPA (as is the case in nearly every other region in California). This would consolidate not one, but three executive directors and administrative staff, thereby removing the potential for duplication of efforts, and increasing funding for the RTDM while maximizing cost savings to taxpayers.

While there has been some discussion around the savings to individual jurisdictions from no longer paying AMBAG dues, it should be noted that the annual cost savings to member jurisdictions, their residents, school districts, and hospitality industries resulting from energy efficiency projects funded by AMBAG’s Energy Watch program alone are greater than five years of member dues. When added to the $20 million in energy efficiency funding which AMBAG has brought to the region since 2006, one could conclude that just this single program offsets member dues many times over. In addition, other projects, such as, aerial photography, regional housing needs allocations, population and employment forecasting and GIS information have provided measurable benefits to member agencies.

AMBAG is clearly not without room for performance improvement. There have been a number of issues in recent years regarding coordination with regional partners and communication with affected agencies as well as with the AMBAG Board of Directors. While the dissolution of AMBAG as the regional MPO does not actually achieve the goals set out by other regional agencies, it is clear that moving forward in a “business as usual” manner is not acceptable. Through both staff and the Board of Directors, AMBAG will need to redefine and improve its relationships with other transportation agencies and regional stakeholders in order to improve coordination, cooperation, and performance. Through a survey of AMBAG board members as well as managers/administrators (see Appendix B) the agency is identifying areas of improvement and exploring and implementing solutions. It should be the new AMBAG Executive Director’s first and highest priority to reform and reestablish positive working relationships with the RTPAs, other regional agencies and local government jurisdictions in the region to alleviate any duplication of efforts and ensure increased sustainable funding for a robust and greatly improved regional traffic model.

AMBAG has existed for 43 years as a forum for regional collaboration and cooperation. Locally elected representatives have identified AMBAG as the best agency to address regional concerns through programs such as transportation planning, Blueprint Planning, Sustainable Communities Strategy, Regional Housing Needs Allocation, population and economic forecasting, providing support to the Pajaro River Watershed Flood Prevention Authority, facilitating discussion of Monterey Bay Sanctuary programs and issues, the Central Coast Joint Data Committee, Energy Watch, Commute Alternatives, Environmental Clearinghouse, and others. There were and are very good reasons for these programs to be carried out by AMBAG as a regional body. To disband the organization and lose some, if not all, of these programs when there are more effective ways of achieving the goals set out by TAMC and SCCRTC would be contrary to trends towards more, not less, regional coordination and collaboration.
September 14, 2011

Stephany Aguilar, Chair
Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments
445 Reservation Road, Suite G
P.O. Box 809
Marina, CA 93933

Re: Future of AMBAG Report

Dear Chair Aguilar:

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the *Future of AMBAG Report* by your Interim Executive Director Les White. It is a most difficult issue for an agency to reevaluate its future and its ultimate existence, and I appreciate the effort that Mr. White and the AMBAG staff have made in this report. I would like to make four primary observations on its conclusions:

- **The report underestimates the benefits of the single-county MPO structure.** Such a structure would both be more cost-effective and increase local control as compared to the recommended “strengthen AMBAG” option. The single-county scenario would reduce spending of taxpayer funds (regardless of who enjoys the savings, it requires less money), increase the investment in the travel forecast model, remove a middleman in the federal approval process, and reduce duplication of efforts on planning and programming documents—these changes are the very definition of improved cost-effectiveness.

- **The report’s recommended option would create a funding structure that is less cost-effective and reduces local control.** The proposed option would take $250,000 away from the single county transportation planning agencies to invest in the travel forecast model. However, the report does not indicate who would perform the federally-funded activities that the Transportation Agency for Monterey County, the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission and the San Benito Council of Governments currently perform: project selection and programming, long-term planning, outreach to the public, elderly and disabled transportation oversight. If AMBAG is to perform these functions, it would mean decision-making would move from the countywide to the tri-county governing body—essentially a loss of local control. If not, then other local or state monies would be required to perform these functions; essentially this proposal would cost more. Furthermore, it is unclear how AMBAG would match these new federal funds in the long-term, since over the past several years the countywide transportation agencies have provided that non-federal match. The proposal that agencies could “buy back” the federal money that they currently receive with existing state or local funds would result in paying more money for the same services that could be provided on a less costly basis under the single-county MPO option.
• The survey results point to issues of both performance and agency structure. The results of the survey are valuable and revealing. It is clear that some of the observations relate to performance issues (coordination, clarity, focus) while other issues are more structural (financial stability, grants vs. mission and duplication of efforts). While performance issues can be addressed within the organization, structural issues require more dramatic changes. The ongoing funding and grant issues likely relate to the fact that this is the smallest multi-county MPO region in California and federal funding is simply inadequate to support the current structure.

• There appears to be strong support for some kind of regional deliberative body. As the San Joaquin Valley regional transportation planning agencies’ agreement shows, this regional body can involve policymakers but does not require a separate agency executive director, staff and offices. It will require more cooperation for such a multi-agency body to operate, but if such a body includes appointees from the countywide regional transportation planning agencies, its activities may result in even better coordinated activities than do separate appointees to a separate agency.

Improving transportation planning in our region is a complex issue that will take a while to evaluate and could involve an extensive transition process. The TMC Board of Directors requests that the Executive Committees of AMBAG, Santa Cruz County RTC and San Benito COG join with TMC’s representatives to discuss how to proceed with this issue before making a decision. I would ask that you accept this invitation and direct your Interim Executive Director work with our agencies to arrange such a meeting. In addition, given its pivotal role in the MPO structure, the City of Salinas has requested a presentation on this issue prior to your next Board meeting. I hope that Mr. White can join me in making that presentation, as well as be available to present his report to the TMC Board on September 28.

I appreciate the time that AMBAG has taken to study the options, and would hope that you would continue to delay recruitment of a permanent Executive Director until a resolution can be reached. Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Debra L. Hale
Executive Director

cc: TMC Board of Directors
    George Dondero, SCCRTC
    Lisa Rheinheimer, San Benito COG
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-----Original Message-----
From: Carole DePalma [mailto:caroledepalma@att.net]
Sent: Thursday, September 08, 2011 6:39 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Using Fed and State road repair Money for Highway One

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

Carole DePalma
2001 Brommer St
Santa Cruz, 95062

******

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

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

Thank you again.

<CJUDD>
Original Message

From: Johanna Bowen [mailto:jobowen@cabrillo.edu]
Sent: Friday, September 09, 2011 12:45 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Opinion on HOV lane completion

> I would like to register an unsolicited opinion for the meeting on the 15th on
the topic of completion of Hwy 1 HOV lane through 41st.
  1. I am in favor of completion by whatever means necessary, even if it
means less/ no money for pothole repairs. This county needed to widen that
highway 25 - 30 -- 15 -- 10 years ago. The money spent studying bike lanes and
alternatives could have been better spent. The rhetoric of the highway being
like a gateway drug to destroy paradise is so much nonsense.
> Please get the job done.

> 2. Are you aware of concerns being voiced that an HOV restriction for the
new, additional lane might not be the best option? Please see this LAO report:
> http://www.lac.ca.gov/2000/010700_hov/010700_hov_lanes.html
> Thank you for listening, and recording my unsolicited "vote"
> I cannot attend the meeting, much as I would like to.
> Johanna Bowen
> 4235 Gladys Ave
> Santa Cruz 95062

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

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

Thank you again.

Gini Pineda
Administrative Assistant III
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Ave. Santa Cruz CA 95060
831 460 3200
831 460 3215(fax)
gpineda@sccrtc.org
www.sccrtc.org
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Hwy 1 is not a county road. Although it needs widening, it is not worth giving up all our local road tax funds. How about stopping work on the double lane divided road between Watsonville and Castroville once the overpass at Salinas road is completed? How about widening Hwy 1 between Morissey and Soquel next. Do it in sequence, we got a good start at Hwy 17 intersection. Doing a bit here and a bit there will only create more traffic congestion in more places where the roads narrow back down to two lanes.

Signed, Gary Anderson on my wife's site.

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

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

Thank you again.

Gini Pineda
Administrative Assistant III
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Ave. Santa Cruz CA 95060
831 460 3200
831 460 3215(fax)
gpineda@sccrtc.org
-----Original Message-----
From: Nancy Macy [mailto:nbbm@cruzio.com]
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2011 12:29 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Repairs vs widening
Importance: High

Dear Members of the Transportation Commission,

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

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

Sincerely,

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

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

³Civilization has been slow to give up on our myth of the Earth’s infinite generosity. Rather grandly, we have overdrawn our accounts.² Barbara Kingsolver

³It’s just one big garden we should all be tending.²
Andrew Macy

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

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

Thank you again.
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From: John Mertz [mailto:jmertz@4rhs.com]
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2011 7:21 AM
To: info@scctc.org
Cc: 'John Leopold'; ellen.pirie@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; dpwweb@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; mark.stone@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; greg.caput@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; bds031@co.santa-cruz.ca.us
Subject: 10 Years of County Road Maintenance for 1 Mile of Expanded Lanes on Highway 1 is NOT a Reasonable Proposal

Sirs,

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

In summary, we object for the following reasons:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The problem is that the proposed widening will probably make matters worse. If you have ever commuted through Los Gatos on Highway 17, you are familiar with the massive congestion Cal Trans
created when they took the highway down from 3 lanes (each way) to 2, then back up to 3 lanes and then back to 2 lanes. It is a nightmare – and that is what Highway 1 will be like if you proceed with this project.

The rural roads of unincorporated Santa Cruz County, in particular, are poorly maintained, dangerous and lay in wait for the rains to begin and become the next natural disaster. When the mud slides and uprooted trees do happen because you took all of the road maintenance money, and someone is injured or killed, a smart lawyer will easily make the case that your actions were a significant contributor to the tragedy.

San Jose Soquel Road is known to be a preferred commute route for folk who want to avoid the infamous 'Fishhook' and get past 41st Street and the bulk of much congestion. If San Jose-Soquel Road should wash out again (and it will without any maintenance), the loss of this major artery will cause serious traffic issues on Highway 1 and Highway 17.

Residents who have lived in the mountains for over 40 years say that they have never seen the roads in such poor condition. Yet the rural areas are filled with art studios, and an ever growing number of wineries which bring in visitors, and tax revenue, from around the Bay Area and the country to enjoy the bounty and beauty of the region. This growth, in and of itself, demands that you not abscond with the road maintenance funds.

As a 2010 Census worker, Val Emery personally witnessed roads all over the county in such poor condition, with no roadbed (some asphalt thrown on top of gravel), serious potholes, washouts and other erosion issues, that she had to stop and get out of the car to see if the road was passable. Many parts of roads have washed away due to the rains each year because of lack of maintenance. During late fall when fire danger is the highest, we have roads which are barely passable except by 4 wheel drive vehicles. If an emergency should occur, many emergency vehicles might not be able to respond which could result in loss of life.

And, on top of everything else, the roads have become so bad that they are beginning to damage our vehicles causing serious alignment problems and punctured tires.

And, to add insult to injury, the condition of the roads is having an extremely unfavorable impact on the value of our homes.

Yes, we choose to live in this beautiful area and do not expect super highways running through the less populated rural areas, BUT we do expect adequate roads and reasonable maintenance. Your proposal to postpone local maintenance for at least 10 years must be viewed as short sighted at best and probably negligent.

Finally, one mile of Auxiliary Lanes on Highway 1 cannot, in any way, be considered a good trade for 10 lost years of local road repair. Highway 1 is not going to be improved with the widening of a mere mile. Another 10 years of neglect to our rural roads will result in a disaster, hopefully one that will not include the loss of life.

In particular, our road (Adams Road) has not had any meaningful maintenance since 1985. It is a disaster. We finally got the county to earmark $750,000 to repair Adams Road next year. You are now proposing that the residents on Adams Road wait at least another 10 years for it to be fixed. This is not a reasonable proposal.

It is time for you to face the music. This is a project that is ill-conceived, inappropriate and fiscally irresponsible. Either pay back the $5.5 million or declare bankruptcy. Do not touch our road maintenance money.

Sincerely,

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

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

Thank you again.

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

Thanks
Mike Andalora.

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

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

Thank you again.

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

Dear RTC,

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration.

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

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

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

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

Thank you again.

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

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

Dear RTC Members,

I am writing to please ask you to reconsider the plan for using federal funds traditionally earmarked for road repair to fund the completion of the EIR report for the project to widen Highway 1 between Soquel Avenue and 41st Avenue. I'm not sure if any of you typically drive on any of the roads in Santa Cruz County, but I can tell you from first hand experience, they are in horrible condition. Potholes, ruts, culvert collapse, we have it all. In the event that something serious does happen, the county solves this problem by placing a sign that reads "one lane road". It is not uncommon for these signs to be in place for years. I have seen firetrucks and school buses with children on board navigating around these "road repairs". This is how the hundreds of miles of county roads are maintained with current funding in place. I don't even want to consider what the roads would be like after ten years of no repair, which could happen if the monies used to uphold our current level of maintenance are diverted to be used in a report to widen just ONE MILE of highway 1.

Sincerely,

Shirley Welch
26800 Adams Rd,
Los Gatos, CA 95033

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

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

Thank you again.

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

- Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP)
- Improvement Program (STIP)
- State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)

Funding Sources

What is the RTIP?

- Implement Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)
- Improve State transportation Commission (STIP) funds
- Propose to California Transportation Commission by the PTC
- List of Projects selected to receive funds

Process

- Issue a call for Projects for balance of Funds
- Regional projects
- Indicate interest to program some Funds
- Decide process for selecting Projects:
  - Consider available funding
  - Establish process for the 2012 Regional:
  - Today:

2012 RTP Development
SCCICF Funds Insufficient

Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTP)

- SIII: 24% of Caltrans operations
- 23%: Surface transportation funds in region
- RTC has discretion over > 10% of for needs
- Discretionary funds insufficient

Past Distribution of RTP

($38.5 M over 15 years)

Projects Funded by RTC since 1992

Eligible Uses (continued)
**Other Options: Attachment 1**

- RSTP - APPROX. $2 billion
- Issue Call for Projects for balance of
  - Other RTT Projects/Programs - $1.2 million
  - Tier 1 Highway 41/Seguol Aux Lane - $27 million
  - Tier 2 Environmental Document - $370,000 RSTP
- Indicate Intent to Program Funds:

---

**RSTP Today's Actions**

---

**Other Regional Needs**

- Freeway Service Patrol - up to $2.5 billion
- Design for Rail Structures - RSTP $7.5 billion
  (to match STIP)
- Rail Structures Rehab - $6.5 billion
- $300,000 STIP (PM)
- State/Federally Mandated Planning

---

**Benefits of Project**

- Local Streets
- Reduce "Cut-Through" Traffic on
- Improve Safety
- Reduce Congestion

Environmental Review

- $370,000 RSTP needed to

---

**Auxiliary Lanes**

- 41st Ave/Sanguel Drive
What is the RTIP?
- List of Projects selected to receive funds by the RTC

2012 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP)

Funding Sources
- Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP)
- State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)

2012 RTIP Development
- Establish process for the 2012 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP)
- Consider available funding
  - Indicate intent to program some funds to regional projects
  - Issue a call for projects for balance of funds

Implement long-range Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)
- Proposal to California Transportation Commission for State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds
How much RSTP is available?

- $2.5 million for FY11/12
  - Redistribute $1M from Mar Vista
  - $3.5M total

State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)

What is the STIP?

- Combination of State and Federal Funds
- Largest RTC discretionary fund program
- Projects programmed over 5 year period

How much STIP is available?

- Up to $21.25 million new STIP
  - $25.25M "target" through FY16/17
  - Only $5.1M guaranteed through FY15/16
  - Only $12M advance of shares through FY20

Eligible Uses of Funds

- RSTP not dedicated for local roads
- Road reconstruction and rehabilitation
- Pedestrian
- Bicycle
- Transit
- Transportation demand management programs

- Plus: $6.6M - if redirect from Mar Vista Bike/Ped Bridge
SHOP - Approx 14 counties: Caltrans operations
- 7 counties: STIP directly
- 43 counties: to other counties directly
- E.G. State gas tax funds split
  - Transportation Funds in Region
  - RTC has discretion over >10% of
  - Discretionary Funds Insufficient
  - Funds Insufficient

Past Distribution of STIP

Projects Funded by RTC since 1992

Eligible Uses (continued)
Meeting
- Consider options at future needs new local revenue sources
  from other sources
- Help project sponsors seek funds
- Focus RTC funds on Regional

Staff Recommendation

Context
Highway 1 - Env. Doc. Costs

HUTA

Agency
Santa Cruz County ($7.5 M)
Capitola ($280,000)
Santa Cruz City ($1.6 M)
Scotts Valley ($52,000)
Watsonville ($1.4 M)

HUTA

Annual Gas Tax Distribution

State Gas Tax (HUTA)
Other Regional Needs

- STP
- Design for Rail Structures - RSTP $TPD
  (to match STIP)
- Rail Structures Rebuild - $675K RSTP
- $300,000 STIP (PPM)
  - State/Federally Mandated Planning

Other Options: Attachment 1
- RSTP - Approx. $2 Million
- Issue Call for Projects for balance of STIP
  Other RTC Projects/Programs - $72M +/−
- Preferred Environmental Document - $370K RSTP
- Indicate Intent to Programs Funds

Today's Actions

- Local Streets
- Reduce "Cut-Through" Traffic on
- Improve Safety
- Reduce Congestion
- Benefits of Project

Environmental Review
  Complete Tiered Hwy 1
$370,000 RSTP needed to

Auxiliary Lanes
41st Ave/Soguel Drive
CTC considers projects for STIP - March 2012
Public Hearing & RTR Adoption - December 1
Committee Review - Fall 2011
Performance Evaluation of Projects - Fall 2011
Project Proposals due - October 27
Set Process for 2012 RTRP - Today
Identify Priority Needs - July-September 2011

SCTC RTRP Development Schedule