AGENDA

Thursday, June 6, 2019
9:00 a.m.

NOTE LOCATION THIS MONTH
City of Watsonville Council Chambers
275 Main Street, #400
Watsonville, CA

NOTE
See the last page for details about access for people with disabilities, translation services 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 visit sccrtc.org/about/esubscriptions/

COMMISSION MEMBERSHIP

Caltrans (ex-officio)                      Tim Gubbins
City of Capitola                           Jacques Bertrand
City of Santa Cruz                         Sandy Brown
City of Scotts Valley                     Randy Johnson
City of Watsonville                       Trina Coffman-Gomez
County of Santa Cruz                      Greg Caput
County of Santa Cruz                      Ryan Coonerty
County of Santa Cruz                      Zach Friend
County of Santa Cruz                      John Leopold
County of Santa Cruz                      Bruce McPherson
Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District  Aurelio Gonzalez
Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District  Ed Bottorff
Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District  Mike Rotkin

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

2. Oral communications

Any member of the public may address the Commission 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, and may not take action on items that are not on the agenda.

Speakers are requested to sign the sign-in sheet and state their name clearly 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 minutes of the March 25, 2019 Measure D Taxpayer Oversight Committee meeting

5. Approve draft minutes of the April 8, 2019 Bicycle Advisory Committee meeting

6. Approve draft minutes of the May 2, 2019 Regional Transportation Commission meeting

7. Accept draft minutes of the May 13, 2019 Measure D Taxpayer Oversight Committee meeting

POLICY ITEMS

8. Approve RTC Procurement Policies (Resolutions)

PROJECTS and PLANNING ITEMS

9. Approve California Highway Patrol (CHP) Statewide SAFE Call Box Coordination Contract (Resolution)

10. Approve On-Call Real Property Service for Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line Right-of-Way (Resolution)

11. Approve Highway 1 Bus on Shoulder Implementation (Resolution)

BUDGET AND EXPENDITURES ITEMS

12. Approve Fiscal Year 2019-20 Work Program (Resolution)
13. Accept status report on Transportation Development Act (TDA) revenues
14. Accept status report on Measure D revenues and distribution

ADMINISTRATION ITEMS

15. Approve the Bicycle Advisory Committee membership appointments
16. Approve Lease Agreement with Humble Sea Brewing Company (Resolution)
17. Approve Agreement for Financial Advisory Services (Resolution)

INFORMATION/OTHER ITEMS

18. Accept monthly meeting schedule
19. Accept correspondence log
20. Accept letters from RTC committees and staff to other agencies
   a. Letter to the California Public Utilities Commission regarding Senate Bill 1376 Implementation from Grace Blakeslee, Senior Transportation Planner
21. Accept information items - none

REGULAR AGENDA

22. Commissioner reports on RTC related items – oral reports
23. Director’s Report – oral report (Guy Preston, Executive Director)
24. Caltrans report
   a. Santa Cruz County project updates
25. 9:30 A.M. PUBLIC HEARING: Measure D: Five-Year Programs of Projects for Regional Projects and Community Bridges Lift Line (Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner)
   a. Staff report
   b. Resolution adopting Measure D 5-year program of projects
   c. Regional Project Fact Sheets
26. Transportation Funding Updates and Priority Projects  
   (Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner)
   a. Staff report  
   b. Preliminary Priority Projects List
   c. RTC Discretionary Fund Descriptions
   d. Leveraging Discretionary Funds on Competitive Grants for Regional Priorities
   e. Letter from Matt Machado, County Public Works

27. Highway 1 Bay-Porter/State Park Auxiliary Lanes Cooperative Agreement with Caltrans and Consultant Contract with Mark Thomas and Company, Inc.  
   (Sarah Christensen, Senior Transportation Engineer)
   a. Staff report  
   b. Resolution - Cooperative Agreement with Caltrans
   c. Resolution - Consultant Contract Award
   d. Draft Scope of Services, Fee Estimate, and Critical Path Method Schedule

28. Fiscal Years (FY) 2016/17 and 2017/18 Measure D Annual Report  
   (Shannon Munz, Communications Specialist)
   a. Staff report  
   b. FY 2016/17 and 2017-18 Measure D Annual Report

29. Next meetings

   A special RTC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, June 27, 2019 at 9:00 a.m. at the City of Santa Cruz Council Chambers, 809 Center Street, Santa Cruz, CA.

   **There will be no meetings in July.**

   The next RTC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, August 1, 2019 at 9:00 a.m. at the City of Scotts Valley Council Chambers, 1 Civic Drive, Scotts Valley, CA.

   The next Transportation Policy Workshop meeting is scheduled for Thursday, June 20, 2019 at 9:00 a.m. at the RTC Offices, 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

Watsonville Office

275 Main Street, Suite 450, Watsonville, CA 95076  
phone: (831) 460-3205

e-mail: info@sccrtc.org / website: www.sccrtc.org
COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC
Written comments for items on this agenda that are received at the RTC office in Santa Cruz by noon on the day before this meeting will be distributed to Commissioners at the meeting.

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 all Santa Cruz County public libraries.

For information regarding library locations and hours, please check online at www.santacruzpl.org or www.cityofwatsonville.org/public-library

On-line viewing: The SCCRTC encourages the reduction of paper waste and therefore makes meeting materials available online. Agendas are typically posted 5 days prior to each meeting. To receive email notification when complete agenda packet materials are posted to our website please visit sccrtc.org/about/esubscriptions/

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

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 anticipó 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.

TITLE VI NOTICE TO BENEFICIARIES
The RTC operates its programs and services without regard to race, color and national origin in accordance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act. Any person believing to have been aggrieved by the RTC under Title VI may file a complaint with RTC by contacting the RTC at (831) 460-3212 or 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA 95060 or online at www.sccrtc.org. A complaint may also be filed directly with the Federal Transit
Administration to the Office of Civil Rights, Attention: Title VI Program Coordinator, East Building, 5th Floor-TCR, 1200 New Jersey Ave., SE, Washington, DC 20590.

AVISO A BENEFICIARIOS SOBRE EL TITULO VI

La RTC conduce sus programas y otorga sus servicios sin considerar raza, color u origen nacional de acuerdo al Titulo VI del Acta Sobre los Derechos Civiles. Cualquier persona que cree haber sido ofendida por la RTC bajo el Titulo VI puede entregar queja con la RTC comunicándose al (831) 460-3212 o 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA 95060 o en línea al www.sccrtc.org. También se puede quejar directamente con la Administración Federal de Transporte en la Oficina de Derechos Civiles, Atención: Coordinador del Programa Titulo VI, East Building, 5th Floor-TCR, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE, Washington, DC 20590.
Minutes
Monday, March 25, 2019
6:00 p.m.
Location: RTC Conference Room
1523 Pacific Ave, Santa Cruz, CA

Taxpayer Oversight Committee Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representing</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisorial District 1</td>
<td>Janet Edwards, Vice Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisorial District 2</td>
<td>Michael Machado, Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisorial District 3</td>
<td>Abel Rodriguez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisorial District 4</td>
<td>Carmen Herrera Mansir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisorial District 5</td>
<td>Todd Guin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Call to Order: Chair Michael Machado called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

2. Introductions

**Members Present:**
Janet Edwards, District 1
Michael Machado, District 2
Carmen Herrera Mansir, District 4
Todd Guin, District 5

**Members Absent:**
Abel Rodriguez, District 3

**Staff:**
Luis Mendez, Deputy Director
Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner
Shannon Munz, Communications Specialist
Tracy New, Director of Finance and Budget

**Guests:**
Marissa Duran, Finance Analyst, City of Watsonville
Murray Fontes, Principal Engineer, City of Watsonville
Bill Hays, Assistant Director of Finance, City of Watsonville
Daryl Jordan, Public Works Director, City of Scotts Valley
Kim Moore, DPW Chief of Fiscal, County of Santa Cruz
Tom Nord, member of the public
Chris Schneiter, Assistant Director of Public Works, City of Santa Cruz

3. Additions, deletions, or other changes to consent and regular agendas: None

**CONSENT AGENDA**

*A motion (Guin/Mansir) was made to approve the consent agenda. The motion passed unanimously with members Edwards, Machado, Mansir and Guin voting in favor.*

4. Received Travel Reimbursement Policy and Form for committee members

5. Received Simple Parliamentary Procedures Cheat Sheet

6. Approved Minutes of the October 29, 2018 Oversight Committee meeting

7. Received Summary of Measure D Revenue Allocations by Month FY2019-Feb.

8. Received HDL Q3 Sales Tax Update (*Q3 of calendar year=July-September 2018*)

9. Received Draft FY19/20 Measure D Apportionments

10. Received Measure D - Spring 2019 Update

**REGULAR AGENDA**

11. FY17/18 Fiscal Audits

Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner, gave a summary of the FY17/18 fiscal audits and expenditure reports from the Measure D recipient agencies, including the RTC, cities of Capitola, Santa Cruz, Scotts Valley and Watsonville, the County of Santa Cruz, Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District, and Community Bridges/Lift Line. Funding agreements with recipient agencies require each agency receiving Measure D revenues to annually provide an expenditure report and audited financial statements showing how Measure D funds were spent in the prior fiscal year. Rachel also discussed the process, content and timeline for the Taxpayer Oversight Committee to draft a report to the public and SCCRTC board commenting on whether provisions and requirements have been complied with, as required by the Measure D Expenditure Plan and Ordinance. The committee was given sample oversight committee reports from other measures to use as reference for their report. The committee agreed to write a committee statement for the report.

Committee Chair Michael Machado stated that the financial audits look good and complete, had no negative findings, and demonstrate funds allocated were consistent with the ordinance. He suggested the committee draft a straightforward report that summarizes financial activities including: Measure
D revenues collected, disbursed to recipient agencies, and a description of expenditures in FY17/18, including how much remains for future use. Janet Edwards suggested the report also highlight some Measure D projects from each agency. Chair Machado said he would write a first draft of a committee statement for the report.

Committee members requested that staff look at the auditing process, including how much it costs each agency to do separate Measure D audits each year, if it would be possible and how much it would cost to centralize the audits rather than having each agency do them separately, and/or if it would be possible for each agency to combine their Measure D audit with their overall agency audits. Todd Guin suggested expenditure testing every year.

Staff responded to questions from committee members clarifying that RTC pays funds out to local jurisdictions, METRO and Lift Line on an ongoing basis. Committee members noted that funds are being spent on pre-construction activities and suggested future reports provide information on construction of those projects, as well as any leveraged funds.

12. Verbal Updates from Recipient Agencies

a. County of Santa Cruz
Kim Moore, DPW Chief of Fiscal, reported that the county spent about $200,000 of their FY17/18 Measure D funds and had $2.9 million remaining at the end of the fiscal year because one of the county’s largest Measure D-funded projects did not break ground until fiscal year 18/19. The county is currently working on its 2019 projects which are all resurfacing projects.

b. Watsonville Public Works
Murray Fontes, Principal Engineer, discussed the city’s Measure D projects and said that they chose to set aside some small amounts of their funds to spend on items that usually get overlooked. These include $50,000 for bike and safety improvements, $50,000 to revitalize the downtown corridor, $50,000 to maintain the Watsonville Slough trail network, and $50,000 for pedestrian and traffic safety items. They are also using $500,000 for a large road maintenance project, $100,000 for the design of the Green Valley Road project, and $30,000 for the design of a trail on Lee Road.

c. Scotts Valley Public Works
Daryl Jordan, Public Works Director, discussed the projects that the city is working on that use Measure D funds, including sidewalks on Kings Village Road that were recently completed, a large Glenwood open space preserve trail project, a pavement rehabilitation project on Bean Creek Road, and a Glenwood Drive rehabilitation project to widen the street and add bike lanes.

d. City of Santa Cruz
Chris Schneiter, Assistant Public Works Director, discussed the city’s 5-year plan and stated that they are trying to balance its Measure D program with
50 percent paving projects and 50 percent bike and pedestrian projects. The city is also using Measure D money to actively work on three rail trail projects: Segment 7 Phase I will go out to bid this summer with construction in the fall; Segment 7 Phase II was just approved by the planning commission; and Segment 8 Phase III (San Lorenzo River Parkway bridge) is currently under construction. The city is also using Measure D money to leverage matching grants.

e. SCCRTC Regional Projects
Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner, discussed the RTC’s Measure D projects and programs, including the Coastal Rail Trail, Highway 1 auxiliary lanes, Highway 1 bus-on-shoulder, Highway 1 Mar Vista Bicycle and pedestrian overcrossing, Cruz511, Freeway Service Patrol and Safe on 17.

13. Committee Member Oral Communications: None

14. Public Comment on Matters Not on the Agenda

Tom Nord, member of the public, spoke and said he was on a fact-finding mission for the Boulder Creek community regarding Highway 236 safety improvements. Nord said that there are three school and METRO bus stops along the highway with very narrow shoulders that pedestrians walk on. In addition to a pedestrian fatality last year, he said there have been many other incidents and close calls and the community is now coming together to try and get safety improvements along the corridor. He said the first thing they are trying to do is figure out how to secure funding.

15. Next meetings: The next meeting is on May 13, 6-7:30 p.m. at the RTC, 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz.

16. Adjourn: Meeting adjourned at 7:40 p.m.

Minutes prepared by: Shannon Munz
1. Call to Order: Chair, Amelia Conlen called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm.

2. Introductions

**Members Present:**
Amelia Conlen, Bike-to-Work, Chair
Grace Voss, District 1
Janneke Strause, District 1 (Alt.)
Peter Scott, District 3
Will Menchine, District 3 (Alt.)
Anna Kammer, District 4
Rick Hyman, District 5
Theresia Rogerson, District 5 (Alt.)
Michael Moore, City of Capitola
Matt Farrell, City of Santa Cruz
Richard Masoner, City of Scotts Valley
Murray Fontes, City of Watsonville
Leo Jed, CTSC

**Unexcused Absences:**
Shea Johnson, District 2
Casey Beyer, District 2 (Alt.)
Bruce Sawhill, City of Santa Cruz (Alt.)
Drew Rogers, City of Watsonville (Alt.)
Jim Langley, CTSC (Alt.)
Kira Ticus, Bike-to-Work (Alt.)

**Excused Absences:**
Shea Johnson, District 2
Casey Beyer, District 2 (Alt.)
Bruce Sawhill, City of Santa Cruz (Alt.)
Drew Rogers, City of Watsonville (Alt.)
Jim Langley, CTSC (Alt.)
Kira Ticus, Bike-to-Work (Alt.)

**Vacancies:**
District 4 – Alternate
City of Capitola – Alternate
City of Scotts Valley - Alternate

**Staff:**
Guy Preston, Executive Director
Sarah Christensen, Senior Transportation Engineer
Cory Caletti, Senior Transportation Planner
Anais Schenk, Transportation Planner
Tommy Travers, Transportation Planning Technician

**Guests:**
Matt Machado, County of Santa Cruz
Lauren Freeman, County of Santa Cruz
Kailash Mozumder, City of Capitola
Chris Schneiter, City of Santa Cruz
Daryl Jordan, City of Scotts Valley
Kelly McClendon, Caltrans (by phone)
Terri Persons, Caltrans (by phone)
Ingrid McRoberts, Caltrans (by phone)
Piet Canin, Ecology Action/Bike-to-Work
Sally Arnold, Friends of the Rail and Trail
3. Announcements – Staff announced that 1) Anais Schenk, staff representative for the Committee, will be ending employment with the RTC, 2) the June Committee meeting will be in Aptos as noted below, and 3) the RTC is seeking public input for the Unmet Transit and Specialized Transportation List via the RTC website or a public hearing during the May 2 RTC meeting in Capitola.

4. Oral communications – Piet Canin announced that May is Bike Month featuring an online challenge called Love to Ride, and May 7 is Bike to Work/School Day. Janneke Strause announced that Open Streets Watsonville is June 2, Bike Santa Cruz County is undertaking a membership campaign, and shared the organization’s quarterly newsletter.

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

**CONSENT AGENDA**

A motion (Hyman/Masoner) was made to approve the consent agenda. The motion passed unanimously with members Conlen, Voss, Menchine, Kammer, Hyman, Moore, Farrell, Masoner, Fontes, and Jed voting in favor.

6. Approve draft minutes of the February 11, 2019 Bicycle Advisory Committee meeting

7. Accept summary of hazard reports

8. Approve recommendation to the RTC to approve Ecology Action’s Transportation Development Act (TDA) allocation request for $60,000 for the Bike to Work/School Program

9. Approve recommendation to the RTC to approve the county Health Services Agency’s TDA allocation request for $130,000 for the Community Traffic Safety Coalition and the Ride n Stride Bicycle and Pedestrian Education Programs

**REGULAR AGENDA**

Committee member Scott arrived during item 10.

10. Update on Caltrans District 5 pedestrian and bicycle plans – Kelly McClendon, Terri Persons, and Ingrid McRoberts, Caltrans planners, presented an update on the Caltrans District 5 Active Transportation Plan. They stated that the plan is in its outreach/public engagement phase and is scheduled to finish by the end of 2019. They asked for ideas of additional events in Santa Cruz County at which their team can collect public input, particularly from disadvantaged communities. They shared the public website (bikewalkcentralcoast.mindmixer.com) available to collect public input and requested local agencies and organizations share the web address. They introduced the plan as looking primarily at the state highway system and the pedestrian and bicycle connections that are located on, along, and across the system. They announced that the next partner team meeting, which includes representatives
from the RTC, city of Santa Cruz, city of Watsonville, and Bike Santa Cruz County, will be April 26 in San Luis Obispo. Committee members asked about consideration of bicycle and pedestrian facilities on Mission Street in Santa Cruz. Staff announced that the RTC has been sharing with Caltrans District 5 information about stakeholders and public events for outreach as well as projects, programs, and plans relevant to the development of the Active Transportation Plan.

11. Design review for Glenwood Drive bike lane widening – Daryl Jordan, City of Scotts Valley Public Works Director, presented designs for widening to add bike lanes on Glenwood Drive north of Scotts Valley High School. Members requested that for the northern reach where there is space for only one bike lane, the preference should be a lane for the uphill direction and to install “Bikes May Use Full Lane” signs and sharrows centered in the travel way in the other direction. Members requested consideration of protected bike lanes near the high school in the future.

12. Design review for Brommer Street pedestrian and bike improvements – Kailash Mozumder, City of Capitola Public Works Project Manager, presented designs for adding a bike lane and sidewalk to the north side of Brommer Street and a bike box at 41st Avenue. Members requested delineation of both sides of the bike lane where there is adjacent parking and concern about adequate width considering the “door zone” of parked cars. Members requested coordination of this project with possible overhead wire undergrounding. There was also discussion about ways to gain more width for lanes through right of way modifications on the north side of the street. Staff commented on addressing the grading on the west side of the intersection as well as consideration of including bike detectors on the east side of the intersection. Members formed an ad-hoc committee consisting of Michael Moore, Janneke Strause, and Leo Jed to review the final plans.

13. Design review for Green Valley Road bike lane reconstruction, and installation of green lanes at various locations – Murray Fontes, City of Watsonville Principal Engineer, first presented designs for adding sidewalks, widening bike lanes to 5 feet, and narrowing automobile lanes between Freedom Blvd and Home Depot. Members expressed concerns about the high speeds of vehicles and the possibility of a speed limit reduction after project construction, and identified this road as a good candidate for future protected bike lanes. Murray Fontes next presented designs for adding green bike lanes near intersections along Green Valley Road, Harkins Slough Road, Walker Street, West Beach Street, Rodriguez Street, and Bridge Street in Watsonville. Members requested consideration of bike boxes on Green Valley Road.

14. Review and provide input on the draft “5-year Program of Projects” for the Measure D regional investment categories – Sarah Christensen, RTC Sr. Transportation Engineer, and Cory Caletti, RTC Sr. Transportation Planner, presented the program of projects and reviewed funding changes from the previous 5-year plan for the regional projects.

Matt Machado, County of Santa Cruz Public Works Director, Murray Fontes, City of Watsonville Principal Engineer, and Chris Schneiter, City of Santa Cruz Assistant Public Works Director, discussed rail trail projects within their respective jurisdictions. Committee members and staff discussed the decision to allocate $2.8 million of the requested $3.8 million to segment 18 in Watsonville rather than the full amount. Members and staff also discussed the prospects of additional grant funding for active transportation projects as well as bonding. Piet Canin asked about the increased
funding for Cruz511 and staff responded that there would be a call for proposals for an agency/non-profit to assist RTC in administering the new Commute Manager platform.

15. Update on Mar Vista Dr and Chanticleer Ave overcrossings – Sarah Christensen, RTC Sr. Transportation Engineer, provided a brief update that the Chanticleer overcrossing is on schedule, and that the County of Santa Cruz will now be the lead agency for the Mar Vista overcrossing, for which project preliminary engineering should start in Fall 2019.

16. Discuss Route Designation Endorsement for United States Bicycle Route System – Anais Schenk, RTC Transportation Planner, discussed the staff proposal to endorse the Pacific Coast Bicycle Route as part of the nationwide route system. The Committee had no concerns with the proposal.

17. Update on Committee Visioning Workshop – Anais Schenk, RTC Transportation Planner, announced that the workshop will be rescheduled from May 1 to take the place of one of the future 2019 Committee meetings.

18. Updates related to Committee functions – None

19. Adjourn – 8:27 pm

NEXT MEETING: The next Bicycle Committee meeting is scheduled for June 10, 2019 from 6:00pm to 8:30pm at the Community Foundation Santa Cruz County, 7807 Soquel Dr, Aptos, CA.

Minutes respectfully prepared and submitted by:
Tommy Travers, Transportation Planner
1. Roll call

The meeting was called to order at 9:01 a.m.

Members present:

Sandy Brown
Ed Bottorff
Greg Caput
Zach Friend
Aurelio Gonzalez
Randy Johnson
John Leopold
Mike Rotkin
Tony Gregorio (alt.)
Lowell Hurst (alt.)
Virginia Johnson (alt.)
Andy Schiffrin (alt.)
Sam Storey (alt.)
Aileen Loe (ex-officio)

Staff present:

Guy Preston
Luis Mendez
Yesenia Parra
Tracy New
Sarah Christensen
Grace Blakeslee
Cory Caletti
Fernanda Dias Pini
Joanna Edmonds
Rachel Moriconi
Shannon Munz
Tracy New
Amy Naranjo

2. Oral communications

Brian Peoples, Trail Now, stated that the Capitola coastal corridor is crucial for mobility in Capitola and that it is currently closed due to erroneous assumptions made by the RTC.
Peter Stanger, South County resident, stated that Beach Road conditions need to be improved for bicycle riders and he asked that RTC staff reconsider the planned route for Segment 17 of the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail.

3. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agendas

Handout for Item 27.

CONSENT AGENDA

Chair Bottorff moved Item 16 to the regular agenda after Item 24.

Commissioner Friend recused himself from voting on Items 10 and 29, citing conflict of interest.

Commissioner Rotkin moved and Commissioner Alternate Schiffrin seconded the amended consent agenda. The motion carried unanimously with Commissioners Brown, Bottorff, Caput, Friend (except for Item 10), Gonzalez, Johnson, Leopold, Rotkin, and Commissioner Alternates Hurst, V. Johnson, Schiffrin, and Storey voting “aye.”

MINUTES

4. Accepted minutes of the February 11, 2019 Bicycle Advisory Committee meeting

5. Accepted minutes of the March 21, 2019 Interagency Technical Advisory Committee meeting

6. Approved draft minutes of the April 4, 2019 Regional Transportation Commission meeting

7. Accepted draft minutes of the April 9, 2019 Elderly & Disabled Transportation Committee meeting

8. Accepted draft minutes of the April 18, 2019 Interagency Technical Advisory Committee meeting

POLICY ITEMS

No consent items

PROJECTS and PLANNING ITEMS

9. Approved the Santa Cruz County Regional Conservation Investment Strategy Grant Award (Resolution 23-19)
10. Approved Construction Management for Five Storm Damage Repair Projects (Phase 1) on the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Corridor *(Resolution 24-19)*

**BUDGET AND EXPENDITURES ITEMS**

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

12. Accepted Measure D revenues and distribution

13. Accepted Fiscal Year 2017-18 Fiscal Audit for the SCCRTC Measure D Fund

14. Accepted Fiscal Year 2017-18 Fiscal Audit for the SCCRTC

15. Accepted Fiscal Year (FY) 2018-19 SCCRTC and Measure D Semi-Annual Internal Financial Statements

16. Approve Fiscal Year (FY) 2019-20 Transportation Development Act (TDA) claims for Volunteer Center, Community Bridges and Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District *(Resolutions 25-19, 26-19, 27-19)*

*Chair Bottorff moved the item to follow Item 24.*

17. Approved Fiscal Year (FY) 2019-20 Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 8 claims for the Community Traffic Safety Coalition, the Ride ‘n Stride Program, and the Bike to Work Program *(Resolutions 28-19, 29-19)*

**ADMINISTRATION ITEMS**

18. Accepted appointments to the Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee

**INFORMATION/OTHER ITEMS**

19. Accepted monthly meeting schedule

20. Accepted correspondence log

21. Accepted letters from RTC committees and staff to other agencies

   a. Letter to Senator Jim Beall regarding RTC’s position of opposition, unless amended, to Senate Bill 152 from Guy Preston, Executive Director

22. Accept information items - *none*
REGULAR AGENDA

23. Commissioner reports on RTC related items – oral reports

None

24. Director’s Report – oral report

Guy Preston, Executive Director, presented his report (available on the RTC’s website: https://sccrtc.org/meetings/commission/agendas/).

Commissioners comments: lauded the San Lorenzo River trestle bridge bicycle and pedestrian improvements.

**Brian Peoples**, Trail Now, congratulated the RTC for the completion of the San Lorenzo River trestle bridge improvements and stated that the Lift Line electric buses are an excellent example of investing in different uses of existing transportation infrastructure. Mr. Peoples also stated that the rail corridor needs to be open to the public as soon as possible.

**Peter Stanger**, South County resident, discussed the need for safety improvements in Mid and South County. He said that the majority of funding had been allocated to transportation improvements around the City of Santa Cruz.

**Sally Arnold**, Friends of the Rail and Trail, congratulated the RTC on the completion of the San Lorenzo River trestle bridge bike and pedestrian improvements and stated that she looks forward to seeing the completion of more active transportation projects throughout the county.

16. Approve Fiscal Year (FY) 2019-20 Transportation Development Act (TDA) claims for Volunteer Center, Community Bridges, and Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (METRO)

Commissioners discussed: update on the status of the Pacific Station/Metro Center-Station Rehabilitation project; requested a Pacific Station project progress report in the fall; City of Santa Cruz is looking forward to bringing this project to fruition; potential opportunities for state funding; that the METRO board is working with the Association on Monterey Bay Area Governments and state legislators to find funding sources for the Pacific Station project.

**Alex Clifford**, METRO CEO/General Manager, stated that years of planning and discussion with stakeholders has led to the decision on the future of the Pacific Station and bus operation system in Santa Cruz County, and that the METRO Board approved a project to start the rehabilitation of the Pacific...
Station which is contingent on funding availability.

Commissioner Leopold moved and Commissioner Alternate Schiffrin seconded a motion to approve the Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee and staff recommendation to:

1. Adopt Resolution (25-19) approving the Fiscal Year (FY) 2019-20 Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 8 funds claim in the amount of $739,977 from Community Bridges to provide transportation for seniors and people with disabilities, contingent on approval from the City of Santa Cruz to act as the claimant;

2. Adopt the Resolution (26-19) approving the FY2019-20 TDA Article 8 funds claim in the amount of $88,093 for the Volunteer Center to administer the volunteer driver transportation program primarily serving seniors, contingent on approval from the City of Santa Cruz to act as the claimant; and

3. Adopt Resolution (27-19) approving the TDA Article 4 funds claim in the amount of $7,531,910 from the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (METRO) to provide operating assistance for fixed route public transit and Americans with Disabilities Act complementary paratransit operations.

And staff recommendation to:

4. Adopt Resolution (27-19) approving the State Transit Assistance (STA) claims from METRO in the amounts of $5,162,192.

With direction from Commissioners for staff to:

5. Provide a progress status report on the Pacific Station/Metro Center-Station Rehabilitation project in the Fall of 2019.

The motion carried unanimously with Commissioners Brown, Bottorff, Caput, Friend, Gonzalez, Johnson, Leopold, Roktin and Commissioner Alternates Hurst, V. Johnson, Schiffrin, and Storey voting “aye.”

25. Caltrans report

Aileen Loe, District 5 Deputy Director, stated that District 5 observed the Caltrans Workers Memorial and Worker Safety day on May 2, 2019 and asked that all be mindful and careful when driving, especially around construction zones. Ms. Loe also reported that there may be opportunities for collaboration to implement Highway 9/ San Lorenzo Valley Complete Streets Corridor Plan projects and that Caltrans has a commitment to the safety of all users.
Commissioners discussed: appreciation for Caltrans work in South County; the importance of caution while driving around construction zones; and the risk faced by Caltrans workers while making infrastructure improvements.

At the request of Chair Bottorff, the RTC held a moment of silence in honor of the 189 Caltrans workers who have been killed in the line of duty.

26. City of Capitola Public Works Update – oral report

(Kailash Mozumder, Capitola Public Works Project Manager)

Chair Bottorff moved the item to follow Item 27.

27. 9:30 A.M. PUBLIC HEARING: 2019 Unmet Paratransit and Transit Needs

Grace Blakeslee, Senior Transportation Planner, reported that the RTC regularly solicits input on transportation needs in Santa Cruz County to assess and prioritize the needs of transit-dependent or disadvantaged persons, and highlighted a few high-priority needs.

Commissioner comments: the positive impact of Measure D funding in addressing high-priority unmet needs.

Chair Bottorff opened the Public Hearing at 9:48 a.m.

Peter Stanger, South County resident, stated that the absence of a bus route in La Selva Beach has limited transportation options and that bus service for that area is needed.

Brian Peoples, Trail Now, stated that the unmet needs list shows that there are many areas that need transportation funding and that no money should go towards rail or rail-related projects. Mr. Peoples asked that the RTC be transparent in its funding allocations.

Carol Childers, Meals on Wheels and San Lorenzo Valley Seniors Commission, stated that there is a great need to provide transportation options for isolated seniors and low-income seniors living in the San Lorenzo Valley, and throughout the county.

Kirk Ance, Community Bridges/Lift Line, stated that the unmet needs list has greatly assisted Lift Line in obtaining grants to provide transportation services for the community.

Johanna Lighthill, Seacliff resident, stated that it is imperative for senior citizens to have safe mobility and transportation options to remain independent and have access to basic amenities.
Sally Arnold, Friends of the Rail and Trail, stated that system-wide solutions to different mobility needs are available through high-capacity service on the rail corridor.

Public Hearing was closed at 10:00 a.m.

Commissioners discussed: the importance of outreach; maintaining the unmet needs list; and lauded the increased collaboration between the local transportation agencies or organizations.

Commissioner Alternate Schiffrin moved and Commissioner Leopold seconded the staff recommendation to:

1. Adopt the 2019 Unmet Paratransit and Transit Needs with revisions as appropriate; and

2. Consider unmet paratransit and transit needs as funding becomes available

The motion carried unanimously with Commissioners Brown, Bottorff, Caput, Friend, Gonzalez, Johnson, Leopold, Rotkin, and Commissioner Alternates Hurst, V. Johnson, Schiffrin, and Storey voting "aye."

Commissioner Friend left the meeting.

26. City of Capitola Public Works Update – oral report

Kailash Mozumder, Capitola Public Works Project Manager, presented on various transportation projects funded by the RTC or Measure D in the City of Capitola.

Commissioners discussed: appreciation for the presentation and work that is being carried out, especially for the 38th and Brommer Streets improvement projects.


Amy Naranjo, Transportation Planner, presented the staff report on the Safe on 17 Safety Corridor Program.

CHP Lieutenant Ian Troxell responded to Commissioner questions about safety, collision numbers and cost and officer availability for additional enforcement on Highway 17.

Commissioners discussed: contributors to increased collision rates; importance of safe driving education and enforcement; funding for a greater California Highway Patrol (CHP) presence on Highway 17; Measure D funds for safety
improvements on Highway 17; if there is capacity and what would be the cost to increase CHP patrol on Highway 17; inclusion of Safe on 17 reports in the RTC Agenda packets; and collaboration with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission-Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies to increase CHP presence on Highway 17; CHP officer overtime.

Commissioner Alternate Schiffrin moved and Commissioner Brown seconded the staff recommendation to:

1. Accept the 2018 Annual Report for the Safe on 17 Safety Corridor Program; and

2. Approve Resolution (30-19) authorizing the Executive Director to amend the current agreement with the California Highway Patrol to increase annual funding for extra enforcement on Highway 17.

With additional direction from the Commission for staff to:

3. Coordinate with the California Highway Patrol (CHP) to do an analysis of additional CHP officer patrol hours on Highway 17 and what would it take for the RTC to support it; and

4. Provide an analysis of the financial and bureaucratic implications to the RTC to fund an additional CHP officer to be regularly assigned to patrol Highway 17.

The motion carried unanimously with Commissioners Brown, Bottorff, Caput, Gonzalez, Johnson, Leopold, Rotkin, and Commissioner Alternates Hurst, V. Johnson, Schiffrin, and Storey voting “aye.”

Commissioner Johnson left the meeting.

29. Measure D: Five-Year Program of Projects for Regional Projects

Commissioner Alternate Storey recused himself from this item citing a conflict of interest and stepped off of the dais.

Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the staff report and asked for input on the draft Fiscal Year (FY) 2019-20 to 2023-24 “5-Year Program of Projects” for Measure D regional project categories: Active Transportation, Highway Corridors, San Lorenzo Valley Highway 9 Corridor Improvements, Highway 17 Wildlife Crossing, and Rail Corridor.

Commissioners discussed: process to amend the Measure D 5-year program of projects plan; the broad and extensive impact of Measure D funding; Measure D program fact sheets; trail from North Coast to Aptos could be completed by 2025; need improved pedestrian and bicyclist crossing facilities on Highway 1
and Harkings Slough Road; Measure D presentation to the City of Watsonville City Council; funding for the San Lorenzo Valley Safe Routes to Schools; and critical need to lobby Congress to increase federal transportation funding.

**Brian Peoples**, Trail Now, stated that the RTC should not spend limited funds on an unaffordable rail system and that segments 7 and 18 of the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail are examples of inefficient fund allocation.

**Chris Schneiter**, City of Santa Cruz Assistant Director of Public Works/ City Engineer, expressed the need for Measure D funding for Segment 7 to match City of Santa Cruz funds and to leverage other grant funds. Mr. Schneiter also provided an update on the status of the other MBSST segments within the City of Santa Cruz.

**Sally Arnold**, Friends of the Rail and Trail, expressed excitement about the progress that has been made on different segments of the MBSST and the benefits this project will bring to the county.

Commissioner Alternate Schiffrin moved and Commissioner Alternate V. Johnson seconded the staff recommendation to:

1. Review the preliminary draft FY19/20-23/24 “5-Year Program of Projects” for Measure D regional investment categories and projects: Active Transportation, Highway Corridors, San Lorenzo Valley/Highway 9 Corridor Improvements, Highway 17 Wildlife Crossing, and Rail Corridor;

2. Identify any additional items Commissioners would like staff to evaluate;

3. Schedule a public hearing for the June RTC board meeting to consider public input and approve update.

4. Adopt a resolution (Attachment 2) amending the RTC budget to add FY 2018/19 Measure D funds to match rail alternatives analysis grant ($13,000) and add funds ($150,000) to cover actual final costs of the Unified Corridor Investment Study

With additional direction from the Commission for staff to:

5. Provide a presentation on Measure D funding to the City of Watsonville City Council.

Motion carried unanimously with Commissioners Brown, Bottorff, Caput, Gonzalez, Leopold, Rotkin, and Commissioner Alternates Hurst, V. Johnson, and Schiffrin voting “aye.”
Commissioner Leopold left the meeting.

Commissioner Caput left the meeting and was replaced by Commissioner Alternate Gregorio.

30. Measure D: Community Bridges/ Lift Line Five-Year Plan

Commissioner Alternate Storey rejoined the meeting.

Grace Blakeslee, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the staff report and asked the RTC to provide input on the draft “5-Year Program of Projects” for Community Bridges/Lift Line for Measure D funds available under the Transit for Seniors and People with Disabilities category.

Kirk Ance, Community Bridges/Lift Line, stated that Measure D funding has allowed Lift Line to provide extended services, transportation to and from activities that are part of the Downtown Senior’s Center, acquire electric buses and installation of electric vehicle charging stations, and secure a new operations facility.

Commissioners discussed: eligibility to use Lift Line buses; Lift Line’s out-of-county transportation to medical facilities services; and appreciation of Lift Line’s services to low-income, disabled, and senior residents in the Santa Cruz County community.

Commissioner Rotkin moved and Commissioner Alternate Schiffrin seconded the staff recommendation to:

1. Review and provide input on the draft “5-Year Program of Projects” for Community Bridges, serving as the Consolidated Transportation Services Agency, for the direct allocation of Measure D funds under the Transit for Seniors and People with Disabilities category; and

2. Schedule a public hearing for June 6, 2019 to consider public input on the Measure D Five-Year Plan under the Transit and Seniors and People with Disabilities category.

The motion carried unanimously with Commissioners Brown, Bottorff, Gonzalez, Rotkin, and Commissioner Alternates Gregorio, Hurst, V. Johnson, Schiffrin, and Storey voting “aye.”

31. 2045 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Environmental Impact Report
Grace Blakeslee, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the staff report and asked for the RTC to provide input on the development of the 2045 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

Commissioner Rotkin moved and Commissioner Alternate Schiffrin seconded the staff recommendation to:

1. Receive information and provide input on the development of the 2045 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP);

2. Authorize staff to coordinate with the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG), Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC), and the San Benito Council of Governments (SBCOG) on the 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP)/Sustainable Communities Strategy and RTPs;

3. Authorize the Executive Director to enter into an agreement with AMBAG to contribute $60,000 for environmental review of the 2045 MTP/RTPs.

The motion carried unanimously with Commissioners Brown, Bottorff, Gonzalez, Rotkin, and Commissioner Alternates Gregorio, Hurst, V. Johnson, Schiffrin, and Storey voting “aye.”

32. Review of items to be discussed in closed session

Luis Mendez, Deputy Director, reviewed items to be discussed in closed session.

The Commission adjourned to closed session at 11:49 a.m.

CLOSED SESSION

33. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – ANTICIPATED LITIGATION.

Significant exposure to litigation pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.9(d)(2): Once Case

34. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – ANTICIPATED LITIGATION.

Significant exposure to litigation pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.9(d)(4): One Case

OPEN SESSION
The meeting reconvened to open session at 12:29 p.m.

35. Report on closed session

None.

36. Meeting adjourned Next meetings

The next RTC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, June 6, 2019 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, June 20, 2019 at 9:00 a.m. at the RTC Offices, 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA.

The meeting adjourned at 12:29 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Fernanda Dias Pini

Attendees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Abrams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather</td>
<td>Adamson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk</td>
<td>Ance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally</td>
<td>Arnold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Childers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>Clifford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Crowley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johanna</td>
<td>Lighthill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>Machado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kailash</td>
<td>Mozumder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Peoples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Sandoval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Schneiter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Stanger</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Draft Minutes
Monday, May 13, 2019
6:00 p.m.
Location: RTC Conference Room
1523 Pacific Ave, Santa Cruz, CA

Taxpayer Oversight Committee Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representing</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisorial District 1</td>
<td>Janet Edwards, Vice Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisorial District 2</td>
<td>Michael Machado, Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisorial District 3</td>
<td>Abel Rodriguez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisorial District 4</td>
<td>Carmen Herrera Mansir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisorial District 5</td>
<td>Todd Guin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Call to Order: Chair Michael Machado called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

2. Introductions

**Members Present:**
Janet Edwards, District 1
Michael Machado, District 2
Todd Guin, District 5

**Members with Excused Absence:**
Abel Rodriguez, District 3

**Members with Unexcused Absence:**
Carmen Herrera Mansir, District 4

**Staff:**
Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner
Shannon Munz, Communications Specialist
Tracy New, Director of Finance and Budget
Guy Preston, Executive Director

**Guests:**
Kirk Ance, Lift Line Program Director, Community Bridges
Jessica Cassidy, Transportation Program Manager, Monterey Bay Economic Partnership
Barrow Emerson, Planning and Development Director, METRO  
Kailash Mozumder, PW Project Manager, City of Capitola  
Doug Underhill, Chief Finance Officer, Community Bridges

3. Additions, deletions, or other changes to consent and regular agendas: None

**CONSENT AGENDA**

A motion (Edwards/Guin) was made to approve the consent agenda. The motion passed unanimously with members Edwards, Machado, and Guin voting in favor.

4. Approved Minutes of the March 25, 2019 Oversight Committee meeting

**REGULAR AGENDA**

5. Verbal Updates from Recipient Agencies
   a. Community Bridges Lift Line  
      Kirk Ance, Lift Line Program Director, reported that the organization has used Measure D funds to expand service by adding two additional drivers resulting in 420,056 rides for seniors and people with disabilities. They used Measure D funds for a new driver training program and to hire a new executive assistant to help with dispatching and outreach. Their Measure D funds were also used to leverage grant funds that allowed them to purchase two new electric 16-passenger vehicles, and to install two EV charging stations in Watsonville that will be available for other transit agencies and the public to use. Additionally, they are in escrow on a property to house a new operations facility and are using some of their Measure D funds for this.

   b. City of Capitola  
      Kailash Mozumder, Public Works Project Manager, reported that the city has completed two projects using Measure D funds – green bike lanes and citywide pavement slurry seal on several streets. They have two projects queued up for this year using their Measure D funds – the Park Avenue sidewalk project and the Brommer Street improvement project.

   c. Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District  
      Barrow Emerson, Planning and Development Director, reported that METRO used approximately $1.3 million of their Measure D funds for operations to fund nine fixed-route operators and one Paracruz operator. Approximately $2 million of their Measure D funds is spent on buying, repairing and refurbishing busses and Paracruz vehicles. Additionally, with over 60% of their vehicles over 12 years old, they created a $3 million a year bus replacement fund using Measure D and SB1 funds, and they spent approximately $100,000 to get a matching grant to purchase a Paracruz van.

6. FY17/18 Fiscal Audits – Continued from March 25, 2019 meeting
Rachel Moriconi, RTC Senior Transportation Planner, gave committee members an opportunity to ask questions on the audits and expenditure reports they received at the last meeting. No committee members had questions.

7. Annual Report/Findings for Fiscal Year 2017/18
Shannon Munz, RTC Communications Specialist, presented the committee with a draft annual report prepared by staff based on direction from committee members at the March meeting. The draft report included a letter from the committee, prepared by Chair Machado, on their findings regarding the FY17/18 Measure D expenditure and audits. It also included a Measure D overview and highlights of projects funded by the measure in FY17/18. Shannon asked committee members to provide feedback on the draft report and approve its content.

Chair Machado asked that the two tables showing fund distribution and expenditures be merged together and that staff double check all of the numbers in the table. Rachel Moriconi, RTC Senior Transportation Planner, suggested that a column for interest earned be added to the table and committee members agreed.

With these changes made to the draft report, all committee members approved the report and its content. Chair Machado asked that committee members provide their signatures to be included in the report. He also asked that staff make all the suggested changes to the report and resend to all committee members for a final review.

8. Audit Guidance
At the March 2019 meeting, committee members requested that staff look at the auditing process, including how much it costs each agency to do separate Measure D audits each year, if it would be possible and how much it would cost to centralize the audits rather than having each agency do them separately, and/or if it would be possible for each agency to combine their Measure D audit with their overall agency audits.

Tracy New, RTC Director of Finance and Budget, reported to committee members that the ordinance states that no less than annually an independent audit shall be conducted by each agency receiving Measure D funds, so the audits cannot be centralized. Tracy reported that the agencies receiving Measure D funds may combine their Measure D audit with their overall agency audit to cut down on costs.

9. Committee Member Oral Communications: None

10. Public Comment on Matters Not on the Agenda: None

11. Next meetings: The committee will meet again in February/March of 2020, once FY18/19 audits and expenditure reports are available for review.

12. Adjourn: The meeting adjourned at 7:45 p.m.
AGENDA: June 6, 2019

TO: Regional Transportation Commission (RTC)

FROM: Ginger Dykaar, Sr Transportation Planner; Tracy New, Director of Finance and Budget; and Sarah Christensen, Sr Transportation Engineer

RE: Regional Transportation Commission Procurement Policies

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC):

1. Approve the attached resolution (Attachment 1) to amend Section 5 (Attachment 2) of the RTC Administrative and Fiscal Policies by replacing with Exhibit A of Attachment 1 – RTC Procurement Policies;
2. Approve the attached resolution (Attachment 4) to become subject to the Uniform Public Construction Cost Accounting Act that establishes a uniform construction cost accounting standard;
3. Approve the attached ordinance (Attachment 5) to provide informal bidding procedures for construction projects under the Uniform Public Construction Cost Accounting Act.

BACKGROUND

The draft RTC’s Procurement Policies (Exhibit 1 of Attachment 1) sets forth the proposed Agency’s policies for procuring goods and services. These proposed policies will replace Section 5 (Attachment 2) of the RTC’s Administrative and Fiscal Policies. The procurement policies are designed to assure that the RTC meets federal, state and local funding requirements. RTC staff proposes to update the existing RTC Procurement Policies due to changes in RTC business and to meet Caltrans audit requirements. The proposed 2019 RTC Procurement Procedures Manual (Attachment 3) sets forth procurement procedures in a manner that clarifies the requirements and can be followed by RTC staff.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of the policies is to assure that an agency engages in full and fair competition, and obtains the best value, price, and quality for taxpayer-funded goods and services. Staff propose that the procurement procedures manual (Attachment 3), which provides the step by step procedures for staff to meet the policy requirements, be separated from the policies, so they can be updated by the Executive Director to meet day-to-day operational needs without needing approval by the Board. This change is consistent with existing policy in that policies require Board approval, but procedures can be developed and implemented by the Executive Director.
The draft RTC Procurement Policies (Exhibit A of Attachment 1) follow federal and state requirements as specified below:

- Caltrans Local Assistance Procedures Manual (LAPM);
- California Government Code 4525 - 4529
- California Public Contracting Code, Contracting by State Agencies [10100-19150]
- California Public Contracting Code, Contracting by Local Agencies [20100 – 22178]
- Caltrans Master Fund Agreements
- California Uniform Public Construction Cost Accounting Program (CUPCCA)

The master fund agreements between RTC and Caltrans specify that the RTC must follow the Caltrans Local Assistance Procedures Manual (LAPM) for projects funded by federal agencies and state (non-federal) funds. The LAPM is updated on an annual basis. In January 2019, additional requirements were added to the LAPM for state-only funded architectural & engineering projects and for non-architectural & engineering projects.

A Caltrans indirect cost allocation plan (ICAP) audit of FY 2014/15 requires RTC to:
1. Develop procurement policies and procedures specific to RTC and ensure staff comply with RTC’s procurement policies and procedures; and
2. Ensure compliance with Caltrans’ agreements and state and federal regulations regarding proper procurement actions and documentation.

The deadline to meet this requirement is June 2019. As communicated during the audit, the RTC uses a public and fair procurement process to secure consultant services and has followed the requirements of the LAPM. Since the RTC used to be part of the Santa Cruz County government infrastructure, the RTC has been using the Santa Cruz County procurement procedures. The development of the draft 2019 RTC Procurement Procedures Manual (Attachment 3), sets forth procurement procedures in a manner that clarifies the requirements and can be followed by RTC staff.

Further changes to the RTC’s Administrative and Fiscal Policies may be necessary relatively soon but given the June 2019 deadline to address the ICAP audit requirements, it is proposed to only replace “Section 5 Procurement” with Exhibit A of Attachment 1. Any additional changes to the RTC’s Administrative and Fiscal Policies beyond Section 5 will be brought to the RTC at a later date.

**California Uniform Public Construction Cost Accounting (CUPCCA)**

The Uniform Public Construction Cost Accounting Act (Act), enacted under Public Contract Code (PCC) section 22000 et seq., allows local agencies to utilize informal bidding procedures for construction projects up to a higher threshold if the agencies elect to follow the cost accounting procedures set forth by the California Uniform Construction Cost Accounting Commission. Any local agency can voluntarily elect to become a participating agency of the Act.
ELECTING INTO THE CALIFORNIA UNIFORM PUBLIC CONSTRUCTION COST ACCOUNTING PROCEDURES

Electing into the California Uniform Public Construction Cost Accounting procedures allows local agencies to:

1. Contract for construction by negotiated contract or purchase order for projects with costs up to $60,000;
2. Contract by informal bidding procedures for projects with estimated costs of $60,000 to $200,000 using a contractor list that is established by annual notifications (mail, fax, or email notices) to all contractors on any current list and construction trade journals specified. Lists for construction contractors will be established by staff for all categories of work that the RTC has a need for, including earthwork, signage, railroad signals, etc.

The maximum cost threshold for informal bidding of construction projects is otherwise $10,000 for public agencies who have not opted into the Act. Each public agency that elects to become subject to the uniform construction cost accounting procedures (Attachment 4) shall enact an informal bidding ordinance (Attachment 5) that specifies the notice to contractors to perform public projects.

The cost accounting procedures that are required as part of CUPCCA are used for tracking costs for work done within the agency on a “project” as defined by the Act (PCC Section 22002(c)). These procedures follow industry-standard accounting methods, and are intended to capture and record all direct and indirect labor, materials, and supervision costs as well as the appropriate overhead costs for the public agency associated with each “project” they perform with their own forces, which is not applicable to the RTC because we do not employ a labor force.

Once opting into the CUPCCA Act, participating agencies must always adhere to the terms of the Act until such time the agency formally opts out by resolution of its governing board. Having opted in, selective adherence to the terms of the Act is a violation.

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) approve the attached resolution (Attachment 1) to amend Section 5 (Attachment 2) of the RTC Administrative and Fiscal Policies by replacing with RTC Procurement Policies (Exhibit A of Attachment 1). Staff recommends that the RTC approve the attached resolution (Attachment 4) to become subject to the Uniform Public Construction Cost Accounting Act that establishes a uniform cost accounting standard and to approve the attached ordinance (Attachment 5) to provide informal bidding procedures for construction projects under the Uniform Public Construction Cost Accounting Act.

FISCAL IMPACT

The RTC Procurement Policies will have no direct financial impact to the RTC. Indirectly, it is expected that the RTC may save staff time and associated funding by the efficiencies of informal bidding within the CUPCCA requirements.

SUMMARY
RTC Procurement Policies (Exhibit A of Attachment 1) assure that the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission meets federal and state requirements, engages in full and fair competition, and obtains the best value, price, and quality for taxpayer-funded goods and services. RTC staff has updated the draft RTC Procurement Policies to replace Section 5 of the RTC Administrative and Fiscal Policies due to recent changes in the LAPM, changes in RTC business and to meet Caltrans audit requirements. RTC staff recommend that the RTC approve the resolution regarding RTC Procurement Policies (Attachment 1), approve the resolution to elect CUPCCA (Attachment 4) and approve the CUPCCA Informal Bidding Procedures Ordinance (Attachment 5).

Attachments:
1. Resolution - RTC Procurement Policies
2. Section 5 – Existing Administrative and Fiscal Policies
4. CUPCCA Accounting Procedures Resolution
5. CUPCCA Informal Bidding Procedures Ordinance
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RESOLUTION NO.

Adopted by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
on the date of June 6, 2019
on the motion of Commissioner
dually seconded by Commissioner

A RESOLUTION AMENDING SECTION 5 “PROCUREMENT” OF THE RTC ADMINISTRATION
AND FISCAL POLICIES TO BE REPLACED WITH EXHIBIT A - RTC PROCUREMENT POLICIES
WHICH INCLUDES ADOPTION OF CHAPTER 10 OF CALTRANS LOCAL ASSISTANCE
PROCEDURES MANUAL (LAPM)

WHEREAS, the RTC is responsible for the execution of Federal and State funded
projects including Architectural & Engineering services, non-Architectural & Engineering
services, and construction projects; and

WHEREAS, the purpose of procurement policies is to assure that the RTC engages
in full and fair competition, and obtains the best value, price, and quality for taxpayer-
funded goods and services; and

WHEREAS, 23 CFR 172.5(b)(1) requires subrecipients to adopt written policies and
procedures prescribed by the awarding State Transportation Agency for the procurement,
management, and administration of engineering and design related consultant services in
accordance with applicable Federal and State laws and regulations; and

WHEREAS, the State of California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) has
developed the Local Assistance Procedures Manual (LAPM), Chapter 10, Consultant
Selection which sets forth policies and procedures for procurements and managements of
contracts for engineering and design related consultant services contracts on federal and
state funded transportation projects to ensure compliance with applicable Federal and
State laws and regulations; and

WHEREAS, LAPM Chapter 10, Consultant Selection, describes the consultant
selection and procurement process for Architectural & Engineering services local agencies
must follow to maintain eligibility for federal and state reimbursement; and

WHEREAS, a Caltrans indirect cost allocation plan (ICAP) audit of FY 2014/15
requires RTC to develop procurement policies and procedures specific to RTC, ensure staff
comply with RTC’s procurement policies and procedures, and to ensure compliance with
Caltrans’ agreements and state and federal regulations regarding proper procurement
actions and documentation.

WHEREAS, Section 5 Procurement of the RTC Administration and Fiscal Policies has
not been updated to include Federal and State procurement requirements.

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

1. For the procurement of Architectural & Engineering Services using Federal and
State funding, the RTC adopts Caltrans LAPM Chapter 10 Consultant Selection, and
any updates thereto.
2. Amend Section 5 of the RTC Administration and Fiscal Policies to be replaced with
Exhibit A – RTC Procurement Polices.
AYES: COMMISSIONERS

NOES: COMMISSIONERS

ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS

ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS

____________________________
Ed Bottorf, Chair

ATTEST:

______________________________
Guy Preston, Secretary

Exhibit A: RTC Procurement Policies
Distribution: Caltrans, RTC Fiscal

s:\resolut\2019\06\procurementpolicies-res.docx
SECTION 5. PROCUREMENT

The purpose of the procurement policies is to assure that the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (Commission) engages in full and fair competition, and obtains the best value, price, and quality for taxpayer-funded goods and services. The policies are based on the following regulations/requirements:

- Caltrans Local Assistance Procedures Manual (LAPM);
- California Government Code 4525 – 4529
- California Public Contracting Code, Contracting by State Agencies [10100-19150]
- California Public Contracting Code, Contracting by Local Agencies [20100 – 22178]
- Caltrans Master Fund Agreement

The requirements provided in this document shall automatically adjust based on updates of any regulations of which they have been based without the necessity of amending this policy to reflect any such adjustment. **Purchasing requirements shall not be artificially divided so as to avoid the provisions of these policies.**

5.1 Authority and Approvals

The Executive Director or his/her designee is authorized to enter into and sign on behalf of RTC, without the prior approval of the Commission, a contract for goods, services, or public projects:

A. Which contains a maximum amount for a single transaction not to exceed $25,000.00, this amount is increased to $60,000.00 with Commission Chair approval, more than $60,000.00 requires approval from the Commission.

B. In the event of an emergency or urgent need, the Executive Director is authorized to take all necessary actions to prevent significant unnecessary loss to RTC, a shutdown of public services, or to address a situation threatening the health or safety of persons or property, including authorization to contract with a contractor or consultant on a sole source basis, consistent with applicable state or federal law without prior approval from the Board of Directors. In the event such an emergency or urgent need occurs, the Executive Director will consult with the Chair of the Board and submit a report to the Commission at its next regular meeting to obtain ratification for those actions.

The Executive Director is authorized to approve disbursements of funds consistent with the annual budget and shall have other duties, powers, and responsibilities as may be assigned by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission.
The Executive Director or his/her designee can approve monthly progress payments when required or to release contract retention.

The Executive Director or his/her designee is authorized to approve award of a sole source contract as long as it meets state and/or federal requirements.

For construction contracts following the California Uniform Public Construction Cost Accounting Act, the Executive Director may authorize contract change orders or amendments up to $25,000 or $60,000 with Commission Chair approval.

5.2 Conflict of Interest

RTC staff and Commissioners are required to take all steps to prevent fraud, waste, abuse and conflict of interest when carrying out procurement or contracting procedures. RTC’s Conflict of Interest Code (RTC’s Rules & Regulations, Exhibit 9) conforms to the Political Reform Act of 1974.

The Political Reform Act (Act) prohibits a public official, including employees and elected officials, from using his or her official position to influence a governmental decision in which he or she has a financial interest. The individuals must disclose their financial interests as specified in the agency’s conflict of interest code.

Staff are prohibited from accepting gifts from vendors or from representatives of any non-governmental organization that provides or is desirous of contracting with RTC if the aggregate annual value of the gift or gifts will equal or exceed $50. This prohibition applies to any gift, gratuity, favor, entertainment, or loan, and includes such items as liquor, lodging, travel, food, and tickets to public functions (sports events, theater, etc.).

5.3 Procurement

The Administrative Service Officer (ASO) or the Executive Director's designee in the absence of the ASO is the purchasing agent of the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) who is responsible for overseeing purchases and ensuring high quality goods and services are acquired at a reasonable price.

5.3.1 Procurement of Goods and Professional Services

Professional Services in this section include all Architectural & Engineering (A&E) Services, non-A&E Services, and Construction services that are not defined or required, by statute or regulation, to follow sections 5.3.2 contained herein.

A. RTC staff while away from the office during a business trip, must follow the procurement policies and procedures.

B. Claims by any RTC Board member against the RTC for purchases or travel expenses must be preapproved by the full RTC Board.
C. For all purchases and contracts, regardless of the cost range, a competitive process will be encouraged as provided in the RTC Procurement Procedures Manual (PPM).

D. Purchases of Goods

i. Purchases of $5,000 or less in any one transaction, shall be made using simplified and cost-effective procedures.

ii. Purchases of goods estimated to cost over $5,000, and up to $25,000 shall follow a fair and competitive process. Typically quotes from three vendors shall be evaluated unless a justification for sole source is approved.

iii. Purchases of goods estimated to cost over $25,000 shall follow a fair, open, and competitive process with a minimum of three quotes selecting lowest responsible bidder meeting specifications or a justification for Sole Source is approved.

E. Contracts for Services

i. Contracts of $5,000 or less in any one transaction, shall be made using simplified and cost-effective procedures.

ii. Contracts estimated to cost over $5,000, and up to $60,000 shall follow a fair and competitive process. Typically, proposals from three firms shall be evaluated unless justification for Sole Source is approved.

iii. Contracts estimated to cost over $60,000 will follow a fair, open and competitive process, advertised publicly and select the most responsive and responsible bidder. Professional services and consultants shall be selected on the basis of demonstrated competence and on the professional qualifications necessary for the satisfactory performance of the required services.

5.3.2 Procurement of Architectural & Engineering (A&E) Services, non-A&E Services, and Construction using Federal and State Funds.

The RTC adopts as its procurement policies and procedures the following:

- Caltrans Local Assistance Procedures Manual (LAPM);
- California Government Code 4525 - 4529
- California Public Contracting Code, Contracting by State Agencies [10100-19150]
- California Public Contracting Code, Contracting by Local Agencies [20100 – 22178]
5.3.3 Sole Source Purchases or Contracts: Generally, purchases may not be made without soliciting proposals from more than one company or individual unless there is clear justification for the sole source such as the proposed vendor is:

(a) The sole qualified supplier of required purchase; or
(b) Has unique qualifications or experience; or
(c) Is a Federal, State, or other public agency or not-for-profit corporation which will perform the services at actual cost; or
(d) Is a vendor selected by another public jurisdiction (such as the State of California) through a competitive bidding process.

5.4 Contract Development

1. All contracts are to be developed and executed consistent with the RTC’s Procurement Procedures Manual.

2. Review and approval by RTC Counsel for legal form is required for all contracts over $5,000.

5.6 Petty Cash

A Petty Cash "Fund" may be authorized by the Executive Director with a total amount to be determined and reevaluated as needed. The Petty Cash "Fund" may be used for small purchases including office supplies, small equipment, materials, publications, subscription, meals and other expenses as may be authorized by the Executive Director or his/her designee in accordance with purchasing policies.

A. Fund Authorized Amount: The Fund is currently set at $500 until modified by the RTC Board. Claims against the fund are limited to $200 per claim.

B. Fund Audit: Strict accounting of the fund shall be maintained. In addition to the annual independent audit, the fund shall be audited internally at least quarterly.

C. Fund Replenishment: The fund will be replenished when it is 50% depleted (expended) and at the fiscal year end. For each expenditure and any cash received, receipts shall be obtained and itemized.
5.7 Credit Card Use

RTC credit cards used for official RTC business are subject to the existing RTC purchasing and travel policies and procedures and must be supported by receipts and/or documentation for the purpose of the purchase.

A. Credit Card Company: The Executive Director or his/her designee may use the CalCard system or may contract the services of any other credit card company.

B. Card Holders and Credit Limits: Credit cards are issued to the Executive Director, the Deputy Director, and the designated RTC Purchasing Agent. The Executive Director may issue additional credits cards to other designated RTC staff members as needed. The Executive Director will set the credit line and single transaction limits of each card in accordance with company card restrictions.

5.8 On a quarterly basis, the Executive Director shall provide the Budget, Administration, and Personnel Committee with a listing of all warrants paid and credit card statements for the reporting period.
SECTION 5. PROCUREMENT

5.1 Purchasing Policy

The Administrative Service Officer (ASO) or the Executive Director’s designee in the absence of the ASO is the purchasing agent of the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) who is responsible for overseeing purchases and ensuring high quality goods and services are acquired at a reasonable price.

A. All purchases and normal travel expenses incurred by RTC staff while away from the office during a business trip, must be authorized by the Executive Director or his/her designee in accordance with established procedures. Claims by any RTC Board member against the RTC for purchases or travel expenses must be pre-approved by the full RTC Board.

B. The Executive Director or his/her designee may approve expenditures for a single transaction up to $25,000 without further RTC Board action, and up to $50,000 with concurrence of the RTC Chair. This authorized spending limit may be raised by the RTC Board in the future.

C. For all purchases and contracts, regardless of the cost range, a competitive process will be encouraged.

D. Purchases or Contracts of $1,000 to $2,500 per transaction require at least three verbal quotes unless fewer than three qualified vendors are identified after reasonable attempts or a justification for Sole Source is approved.

E. Purchases or Contracts estimated to cost over $2,500, but less than $15,000 may be made after an informal bidding process, which shall be documented. Typically bids from three vendors or firms shall be evaluated unless the item is proprietary and there are no substitutes or a justification for Sole Source is approved.

F. Purchases or Contracts estimated to cost $50,000 or more for any one order must be approved by the RTC Board. Professional services and consultants shall be selected on the basis of demonstrated competence and on the professional qualifications necessary for the satisfactory performance of the required services. Parceling out orders to avoid aforementioned requirement is forbidden.

G. Sole Source Purchases or Contracts: Generally, purchases may not be made without soliciting proposals from more than one company or individual unless there is clear evidence to demonstrate that the proposed vendor is:

(a) The sole qualified supplier of required purchase; or
(b) Has unique qualifications or experience; or
(c) Is a Federal, State, or other public agency or not-for-profit corporation which will perform the services at actual cost; or
(d) Is a vendor selected by another public jurisdiction (such as the State of California) through a competitive bidding process.
H. Contract Development

1. All contracts are to be developed and executed consistent with the Administrative Procedures Manual.
2. Review and approval by RTC Counsel for legal form is required for all contracts over $5,000.

I. On a quarterly basis, the Executive Director shall provide the RTC Board with a listing of all warrants paid and credit card statements for the reporting period.

J. No RTC employee or agent shall either solicit or accept gratuities, favors, or anything of monetary value from suppliers or potential suppliers.

5.2 Petty Cash

A Petty Cash “Fund” may be authorized by the Executive Director with a total amount to be determined and reevaluated as needed. The Petty Cash “Fund” may be used for small purchases including office supplies, small equipment, materials, publications, subscription, meals and other expenses as may be authorized by the Executive Director or his/her designee in accordance with purchasing policies.

A. Fund Authorized Amount: The Fund is currently set at $500 until modified by the RTC Board. Claims against the fund are limited to $200 per claim.

B. Fund Audit: Strict accounting of the fund shall be maintained. In addition to the annual independent audit, the fund shall be audited internally at least quarterly.

C. Fund Replenishment: The fund will be replenished when it is 50% depleted (expended) and at the fiscal year end. For each expenditure and any cash received, receipts shall be obtained and itemized.

5.3 Credit Card Use

RTC credit cards used for official RTC business are subject to the existing RTC purchasing and travel policies and procedures and must be supported by receipts and/or documentation for the purpose of the purchase.

A. Credit Card Company: The Executive Director or his/her designee may use the CalCard system or may contract the services of any other credit card company.

B. Card Holders and Credit Limits: Credit cards are issued to the Executive Director, the Deputy Director, and the designated RTC Purchasing Agent. The Executive Director may issue additional credits cards to other designated RTC staff members as needed. The Executive Director will set the line and single transaction limits of each card in accordance with company card restrictions and RTC procedures.
1 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the procurement process is to assure that the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) engages in full and fair competition, and obtains the best value, price, and quality for taxpayer-funded goods and services. The procurement policies and procedures in this manual follow the federal and state requirements listed below:

- Caltrans Local Assistance Procedures Manual (LAPM) that sets the requirements for Federal and State funded Architectural & Engineering Services and Federal and State funded non-Architectural & Engineering Services (http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/لام/لاو.htm);
- California Government Code 4525 - 4529
- California Public Contracting Code, Contracting by State Agencies [10100-19150]
- California Public Contracting Code, Contracting by Local Agencies [20100 – 22178]
- Caltrans Master Fund Agreements
- California Uniform Public Construction Cost Accounting Program (CUPCCA)

The procurement guidelines for the various types of procurement (goods, services and construction) and dollar thresholds are presented in Table 1 and designate the section(s) to refer to for the required procurement process. The requirements provided in this manual shall automatically adjust based on updates of any regulations of which they have been based, without the necessity of amending this manual to reflect any such adjustment. Purchasing requirements shall not be artificially divided so as to avoid the provisions of this manual.

The procurement procedures laid out below for each contract type and threshold state the minimum requirements. Additional steps or levels of formality can be increased if warranted. Caltrans District Local Assistance offers a variety of training to assist local agencies on procurement requirements. RTC managers of Architectural & Engineering contracts are required to attend these trainings (http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/training.html#1).

1.1 Authority and Approvals

The Administrative Services Officer (ASO) or the Executive Director's designee in the absence of the ASO is the Purchasing Agent of the RTC who is responsible for overseeing purchases and ensuring high quality goods and services are acquired at a reasonable price.
All procurements MUST have budget authority by the RTC and MUST be approved by the Executive Director or the Deputy Director. In the absence of the Executive Director and the Deputy Director, the Administrative Services Officer may, on an emergency basis, approve purchases less than $10,000 provided that the Executive Director or Deputy Director are subsequently made aware of the transactions by initialing the Purchase Request Form.

**Procurements up to $25,000 do not require specific approval from the Commission as long as there is budget authority for such procurement.** All procurements exceeding $25,000 and up to $60,000.00 must be approved by the Executive Director and the Chair of the Commission. All procurements exceeding $60,000 must be approved by the Executive Director AND by the Commission. Transactions approved by persons without authority are void.

In the event of an emergency or urgent need, the Executive Director is authorized to take all necessary actions to prevent significant unnecessary loss to RTC, a shutdown of public services, or to address a situation threatening the health or safety of persons or property, including authorization to contract with a contractor or consultant on a sole source basis, consistent with applicable state or federal law without prior approval from the Board of Directors. In the event such an emergency or urgent need occurs, the Executive Director will consult with the Chair of the Commission and submit a report to the Commission at its next regular meeting to obtain ratification for those actions.

Nothing herein is intended to limit the Executive Director’s authority to determine not to make a contract award if he/she determines that the bids/proposals received or contract terms negotiated by RTC staff are not in RTC’s best interests.

The Executive Director has authority to update the procurement procedures as long as they follow the procurement policies in Section 5 of the RTC Administrative and Fiscal Policies and follow federal and state requirements.

1.2 **Standard Code of Conduct/Conflict of Interest**

RTC staff and commission is required to take all steps to prevent fraud, waste, abuse and conflict of interest when carrying out procurement or contracting procedures. RTC’s Standard Code of Conduct (RTC’s Rules & Regulations) follow federal and state requirements to make decisions ethically and prevent conflict of interest. RTC staff in following the standard code of conduct for employment with the Commission are required to not participate in a procurement if there is a conflict of interest. If non-RTC staff is requested to evaluate proposals or bids, those persons also may not have a conflict of interest. The declaration concerning a
conflict of interest can be found in Exhibit 10-T of the LAPM (Appendix A). All evaluators are required to fill out this form and sign documenting that they have no conflict of interest prior to participating in the evaluation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purchase Type</th>
<th>Cost of Good/Service</th>
<th>Procurement Manual</th>
<th>Guidelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOODS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>up to $200</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Petty cash may be used per approval of ASO. Purchase request form required for purchases over $100.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$201 to $1,000</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Purchase request form required stating efforts to obtain best value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,001 to $5000</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Purchase Request Form and Competitive Quote Form with three quotes or provide sole source justification. Cooperative purchasing through other government agencies can also be used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$5,001 to $25,000</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Independent cost estimate, email solicitation to adequate number of vendors, purchase request form, competitive quote form, minimum of three written quotes, document process. Cooperative purchasing through other government agencies can also be used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$25,001 and up</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Independent cost estimate, advertise publicly, purchase request form, competitive quote form, minimum of three written quotes unless limited competition justification, document process including RTC chair approval if over $25,000 and RTC resolution showing approval if over $50,000. Cooperative purchasing through other government agencies can also be used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural &amp; Engineering (A&amp;E - includes architectural, engineering, environmental, land surveying, construction engineering, or program management)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$0 to &lt;$250,000</td>
<td>3.1.1</td>
<td>Follow requirements in Caltrans Local Assistance Procedures Manual, Chapter 10, Section 10.2 for State-Only A&amp;E as less than $250,000 is considered to be a small contract. For detailed procedures, see the RTC PPPM. Contracts &gt; $150,000 are subject to Caltrans Financial Document Review prior to contract execution. Federal Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) requirements must still be met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$250,000 and up</td>
<td>3.1.2</td>
<td>Follow requirements in Caltrans Local Assistance Procedures Manual, Chapter 10, Section 10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Funds (no Federal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$0 and up</td>
<td>3.2.1</td>
<td>Follow requirements in Caltrans Local Assistance Procedures Manual, Chapter 10, Section 10.2 for State-Only A&amp;E. For detailed requirements, see the RTC PPPM. Requirements include an independent cost estimate, advertise widely, qualifications-based RFP/RFQ, minimum of 3 vendors unless limited competition justification, rank in order of preference, negotiate cost with top ranked vendor, document process. Submit Exhibit 10-C.2 State-Only A&amp;E Consultant Contract Reviewers Checklist to Caltrans for acceptance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local (no State or Federal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$0 to $60,000</td>
<td>3.3.1</td>
<td>See RTC PPPM. Requirements include interview a minimum of 3 vendors from RTC database of A&amp;E firms, consultant submit sealed cost proposals, rank firms based on qualifications, negotiate cost with top ranked consultant, document process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$60,001 and up</td>
<td>3.3.2</td>
<td>Follow requirements in Caltrans Local Assistance Procedures Manual, Chapter 10, Section 10.2 for State-Only A&amp;E. For detailed requirements, see the RTC PPPM. Requirements include an independent cost estimate, advertise, qualifications-based RFP/RFQ, minimum of 3 vendors, rank in order of preference, negotiate cost with top ranked vendor, document process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Type</td>
<td>Cost of Good/Service</td>
<td>Procurement Manual</td>
<td>Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-Architectural &amp; Engineering (includes planning, skilled non-professional trades, outreach activities, non-infrastructure)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Funds</td>
<td>$0 and up</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Caltrans Local Assistance Procedures Manual, Chapter 10, Section 10.3 requires Federal non-A&amp;E to follow procurement procedures for State-Only funds with exception that DBE requirements must be met for federally funded contracts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Funds (no Federal)</td>
<td>$0 to &lt;$5,000</td>
<td>4.2.1</td>
<td>See RTC PPM. Requirements include quotes from a minimum of 2 vendors, award vendors based on cost and qualifications, document process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000 and up</td>
<td>4.2.2</td>
<td>Follow requirements in Caltrans Local Assistance Procedures Manual, Chapter 10, Section 10.3 for non A&amp;E. For detailed requirements, see the RTC PPM. Requirements include an independent cost estimate, advertise widely, RFP using cost only or cost and qualifications that publishes evaluation criteria with cost weighted 30% or higher, minimum of 3 vendors, award goes to lowest responsible bidder for cost only and to vendor with highest score for cost and qualifications, document process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local (no State or Federal)</td>
<td>$0 to $5,000</td>
<td>4.3.1</td>
<td>See RTC PPM. Requirements include quotes from a minimum of 2 vendors, award vendors based on cost and qualifications, document process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$5,001 to $60,000</td>
<td>4.3.2</td>
<td>Follow requirements in the RTC PPM for non A&amp;E contracts using local funds. Requirements include seeking quotes from a minimum of 3 vendors from RTC database of non A&amp;E firms, award vendors based on cost and qualifications, document process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$60,001 and up</td>
<td>4.3.3</td>
<td>Follow requirements in Caltrans Local Assistance Procedures Manual, Chapter 10, Section 10.3 for non A&amp;E. For detailed requirements, see the RTC PPM. Requirements include an independent cost estimate, advertise widely, RFP using cost only or cost and qualifications that publishes evaluation criteria with cost weighted 30% or higher, strive for a minimum of 3 consultants, award goes to lowest responsible bidder for cost only and to consultant with highest score for cost and qualifications, document process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Funds</td>
<td>$0 and up</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Follow requirements in Caltrans Local Assistance Procedures Manual, Chapter 15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State &amp; Local (no Federal)</td>
<td>$0 to $60,000</td>
<td>5.2.1</td>
<td>Use simplified and cost effective procedures that reduce staff costs as allowed by Public Contract Code 22030-22045 and election of the California Uniform Construction Cost Accounting Procedures for costs up to $60,000. For detailed procedures, see RTC PPM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$60,001 to $200,000</td>
<td>5.2.2</td>
<td>Follow informal public contract bidding procedure requirements as allowed through Public Contract Code 22030-22045 and election of the California Uniform Construction Cost Accounting Procedures for costs up to $200,000. For detailed procedures, see RTC PPM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$200,001 and up</td>
<td>5.2.3</td>
<td>Follow formal public contract bidding procedures as required by Public Contract Code 20150. For detailed procedures, see RTC PPM.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2  **Procurement of Goods**

The Administrative Services Officer (ASO) or the Executive Director’s designee in the absence of the ASO is the Purchasing Agent of the RTC who is responsible for overseeing purchases and ensuring high quality goods and services are acquired at a reasonable price. The procedures to follow for procurement of goods is based on the dollar value of the purchase. Goods may also be procured through other government agency procurement procedures as discussed in Section 6.6. Sales receipts/invoices should be included as backup for the purchase of all goods.

2.1  **Purchases up to $200**

Petty Cash may be used by filling out a Petty Cash Request Form ([Appendix A](#)) per approval of Administrative Services Officer. See instructions for obtaining approval for Petty Cash purchases below. Fill out a Purchase Request Form ([Appendix A](#)) for any purchases over $100.

2.2  **Purchases greater than $200 and up to $1,000**

Fill out a Purchase Request Form ([Appendix A](#)) and indicate need of purchase and the efforts made to ensure the best pricing. Attach a printout of the item with vendor and cost or provide the quote as backup.

2.3  **Purchases greater than $1,000 and up to $5,000**

Fill out a Purchase Request Form ([Appendix A](#)) indicating the need for the purchase and justification for chosen vendor. Attach the Competitive Quote Form ([Appendix A](#)) with three verbal or written quotes unless there is a justification for sole source (See Sections 6.3 - 6.4).

2.4  **Purchases greater than $5,000 up to $25,000**

Prepare an Independent Cost Estimate ([Appendix A](#)) prior to soliciting quotes. Obtain written bids from a minimum of three vendors by sending an email request to an adequate number of vendors. Choose the vendor that provides the best value taking into account the possible range of competing product and materials available, fitness of purpose, manufacturer’s warranty, and other similar factors in addition to price. Fill out a Purchase Request Form ([Appendix A](#)) indicating the need for the purchase and justification for chosen vendor and attach the Competitive Quote Form ([Appendix A](#)) and the written quotes. Document on the Procurement Checklist ([Appendix A](#)) the process followed including which vendors were sent quote requests, the responses received, and the vendor selected.
2.5 Purchases over $25,000

Prepare an Independent Cost Estimate (Appendix A) prior to soliciting bids. Advertise bids publicly (RTC website and other online locations as feasible) and obtain written bids from a minimum of three suppliers. Choose the responsive and responsible bidder whose bid conforms to the terms and conditions of the invitation for bids and is the lowest responsible bidder meeting specifications. Fill out a Purchase Request Form (Appendix A) indicating the need for the purchase and justification for chosen vendor and attach the Competitive Quote Form (Appendix A) and the written quotes. Document on the Procurement Checklist (Appendix A) where the invitation for quotes was published, the vendors that were sent quote requests, the responses received, and the vendor selected. Purchases greater than $25,000 require approval for purchase from Executive Director and Chair of the Commission. Purchases greater than $60,000 require a resolution showing approval for purchase from the Commission. Purchases can also be procured through cooperative purchasing with other government agencies (See Section 6.6).

2.6 Steps for Approval of Petty Cash

A petty cash fund currently set at $500 is maintained by the Administrative Services Officer. Petty cash expenditures can be approved by the ASO with a maximum allowable cost per single transaction of $200. In the absence of the ASO, a staff member designated by the Executive Director, can approve these funds. The Petty Cash Fund is not to be used to circumvent the regular purchasing process and not to be used for frequently purchased items. Petty Cash can be provided as a reimbursement or requested in advance of purchase.

1. If the purchase amount is over $100, a signed Purchase Request Form (Appendix A) by the Executive Director or his designee must be attached to the completed Petty Cash Request Voucher (Appendix A).

2. Submit the Petty Cash Request Voucher (Appendix A) to the ASO, specifying whether the cash is an advance or a reimbursement.

   a. If a reimbursement, include the original receipt indicating the exact amount spent out of pocket and the ASO will provide the cash to the individual.

   b. If an advance, the ASO will approve the request and provide the cash to the individual. The individual makes the purchase and provides the original receipts and any unused funds.
3. The ASO will keep all receipts until it becomes necessary to replenish the fund. Receipts are then provided to the Director of Finance and Budgets.

2.7 Steps for Approval of a Purchase Request Form.

1. Complete the Purchase Request Form (Appendix A) and suggest a vendor. Attach all necessary backup materials where applicable (i.e. resolution, quotes, Independent Cost Estimate (Appendix A), and the Justification for Sole Source Form (Appendix A) if applicable).

2. Submit the Purchase Request Form and related information to the ASO.

3. The ASO reviews the Purchase Request Form, the backup information and the budget availability, and determines the best purchasing method (Purchase Order, credit card, petty cash, direct invoicing, or contract). The ASO may choose a different vendor if it is in the best interest of the RTC regarding such factors as pricing, quality and timeline, etc.

4. The ASO submits the Purchase Request Form (Appendix A) with all the related information to the Executive Director or Deputy Director for approval.

5. Upon approval of the Purchase Request Form (Appendix A) by the Executive Director or Deputy Director, the ASO or designee makes the purchase. No commitment on behalf of the RTC should be made until the Purchase Request Form (Appendix A) is approved. The ASO will decide the payment method. If a purchase order (PO) is used as the method of payment to purchase the good, the PO is the proper authorization to purchase. If a PO is not required, the approved Purchase Request Form is the proper authorization to purchase.

6. Staff who requested the purchase certifies receipt of the goods in good condition and/or services as required by approving the original invoice.

7. Forward the approved invoice to ASO.

8. The ASO will attach the Purchase Request Form and all appropriate backup, to the invoice, and

9. The ASO forwards the invoice to Fiscal for payment.

2.8 Credit Card (Cal-card)

The ASO is the credit card program coordinator with the Director of Finance and Budgets acting as a backup. The CalCard system or services of any other credit card company can be used. There are currently four Cal-cards at the RTC. The Executive Director, ASO, and Senior Administrative Assistant each has a Cal-card
which can be used for general purchases, travel, and conference registration fees. The Executive Director may issue additional credits cards to other designated RTC staff members as needed. The ASO or a designee may choose to make purchases on a Cal-card instead of a using a purchase order following the approval of a purchase request form as specified above.

In addition, a Cal-card is available to be checked out from the ASO for gasoline purchases for the RTC vehicle. Gasoline purchases do not require a purchase request form but the original receipt must be provided to ASO or designee with the vehicle mileage. **The use of a personal credit card for RTC purchases is prohibited except for travel expenses or if pre-authorized.**

The original receipts from credit card purchases are kept and provided to the ASO or designee after any purchase. The ASO reviews the credit card statements and approves for payment, then forwards the bank statements to Fiscal on a monthly basis. Fiscal will review and process the claim for payment.
3 **Procurement of Architectural & Engineering Services**

See definition of Architectural & Engineering services in Chapter 10 of the LAPM. The 23 Code of Federal Regulations §172 and CA State Law defines Architectural and Engineering (A&E) services and includes those private consulting firms providing architectural, landscape architectural, engineering, environmental, land surveying, construction engineering, or program management. Document the procurement process using the Procurement Checklist (Appendix A).

### 3.1 Procurement of A&E services using Federal Funds

Federal Funds that are distributed through the State may be required to follow the “state only” procurement process. Verify the procurement procedures to follow with the funding agency.

#### 3.1.1 $0 to less than $250,000

Federal contracts less than $250,000 (2019 threshold as stated in LAPM 10.1.9) are considered small contracts in accordance with federal regulations and the agency shall follow the requirements as specified in the LAPM, Section 10.2, State-Only Funded A&E contracts and detailed below in Section 3.2.1.

Contracts greater than $150,000 (2019 LAPM threshold) are subject to the Caltrans Financial Document Review prior to contract execution. See Section 10.1.3 of the LAPM.

Contracts less than $150,000 (2019 LAPM threshold) are not subject to the Caltrans Financial Document Review.

#### 3.1.2 $250,000 and up

Follow the procurement procedures described in Chapter 10, Section 10.1 of the Local Assistance Procedures Manual – Consultant Selection, Federally Funded A&E Contracts.

### 3.2 Procurement of A&E services using State (non-Federal) Funds

#### 3.2.1 $0 and up

The procurement of Architectural & Engineering services up to $250,000 with state funds shall be made following the procedures prescribed below which meet the requirements as outlined in the LAPM, Chapter 10, Section 10.2 and are based on the CA Government Code 4525-4529. There is no other threshold for small purchase agreements for A&E contracts with state (non-federal) funds.

1. Review LAPM Exhibit 10-C.2 *State-Only Consultant Contract Reviewers Checklist* to assure procurement process is accepted by Caltrans.
2. Define project and determine project schedule
3. Identify need for consultant
4. Appoint contract manager and contract administrator
5. Document that there is no conflict of interest of anyone participating in the procurement process
6. Define scope of work specifying deliverables
7. Produce an independent cost estimate (Appendix A) for the consultant work
8. Determine type of contract - project specific or on-call
9. Determine Method of Payment - Actual Cost-Plus- Fixed-Fee; Cost Per Unit of Work; Specific Rate of Compensation; or Lump Sum; (see LAPM 10.1.2 for description of these methods of payment. Discuss with RTC management to determine method of payment.)
10. Determine the Qualifications-Based Solicitation Document – RFP, RFQ or Two Step RFQ/RFP and whether it will be an On-Call contract (see LAPM 10.1.4-10.1.7 for descriptions of these methods). Include in the RFP/RFQ the evaluation process/criteria with weights and procurement schedule. More detail about On-Call contracts can be found in Section 6.2.
11. The contract manager advertises the solicitation on the RTC website and/or other locations that are known and readily accessible to A&E firms and invites firms to submit an RFP/RFQ. Strive for 4 weeks (minimum of 14 calendar days) between advertising the project and the deadline for proposals or Statement of Qualifications. Proposals or Statement of Qualifications should include the cost in a sealed envelope.
12. Clarification on the RFP/RFQ can be addressed by inviting submittal of written questions or holding a proposer’s conference. Questions and responses will be posted on the RTC website.
13. Form a consultant selection committee where no one has a conflict of interest. Document this by having the committee members sign and date a form (Appendix A) specifying that there is no conflict of interest.
14. Evaluate the submitted proposals or statements of qualifications and rank the firms in order of preference based on qualifications to complete the project. Use a Proposal Responsiveness Checklist (Appendix A) to assure compliance with requirements. If fewer than three are submitted, justification must be documented to proceed with the procurement (See Sole Source Justification Form in Appendix A). The justification should state that the solicitation did not arbitrarily limit competition, competition is limited and that it is not feasible to re-advertise under a new solicitation.
15. Contract Manager opens the cost proposal from the top ranked proposer.
16. Contract manager negotiates an agreement with the firm based on scope, scheduling, completion data and compensation. If no agreement is reached, negotiations with the first ranked firm are terminated and negotiations with the second ranked firm are opened.
17. Prior to contract award, send the *State-Only Funded A&E Consultant Contract Reviewers Checklist* to aeoversight@dot.ca.gov for review.

18. Once the negotiations have been completed, the contract manager prepares the agreement, which is submitted to the ASO for insurance and contract number, legal counsel and the Executive Director for approval and signatures.

19. After contract award, all unopened cost proposals should be disposed of unopened or returned to the offeror.

20. Document the procurement process using the procurement checklist in Appendix A.

**3.3 Procurement of A&E services using Local Only Funds**

**3.3.1 $0 to $60,000**

The procurement of Architectural & Engineering services with local funds of $60,000 or less shall be contracted using the simplified and cost-effective procedures described below:

1. Define scope of work
2. The contract manager reviews the database of A&E firms at the RTC and selects contractors with potential qualifications to perform the work.
3. Firms are requested to submit proposals and/or are interviewed to assess their ability to perform the work in a timely manner. A minimum of three firms should be evaluated to perform the work unless there is justification for sole source (See Section 6.4).
4. Cost proposals are submitted sealed by the interested firms.
5. Contract manager ranks firms in order of preference based on qualifications documenting basis for selection.
6. Contract Manager opens the cost proposal from the top ranked proposer.
7. Contract manager negotiates an agreement with the top ranked firm based on scope, scheduling, completion data and compensation. If no agreement is reached, negotiations with the first ranked firm are terminated and negotiations with the second ranked firm are opened.
8. Once the negotiations have been completed, the contract manager prepares the agreement, which is submitted to the ASO for insurance and contract number, legal counsel and the Executive Director for approval and signatures.
9. After contract award, all unopened cost proposals should be disposed of unopened or returned to the offeror.
10. Document the procurement process using the Procurement Checklist (Appendix A).
3.3.2 $60,001 and up

The procurement of Architectural & Engineering services with local funds between $50,001 to $250,000 shall be made following the same procedure as the A&E State-Only and described below:

1. Define project and determine project schedule
2. Identify need for consultant
3. Appoint contract manager
4. Document that there is no conflict of interest of anyone participating in the procurement process
5. Define Scope of Work specifying deliverables
6. Estimate Cost of Consultant Work
7. Determine type of contract - project specific or on-call
8. Determine Method of Payment - Actual Cost-Plus- Fixed-Fee; Cost Per Unit of Work; Specific Rate of Compensation; or Lump Sum; (see LAPM 10.1.2 for description of these methods of payment. Discuss with RTC management to determine method of payment.)
9. Determine the Qualifications-Based Solicitation Document – RFP, RFQ or Two Step RFQ/RFP and whether it will be an On-Call contract (see LAPM 10.1.4 to 10.1.7 for descriptions of these methods). Include in the RFP/RFQ the evaluation process/criteria with weights and procurement schedule. More detail about On-Call contracts can be found in Section 6.2.
10. The contract manager advertises the solicitation on the RTC website and other online locations that are known and readily accessible to A&E firms and invites firms to submit an RFP/RFQ. Strive for 4 weeks (minimum of 14 calendar days) between advertising the project and the deadline for proposals or Statement of Qualifications.
11. Proposals or Statement of Qualifications should include the cost in a sealed envelope.
12. Clarification on the RFP/RFQ can be addressed by inviting submittal of written questions or holding a proposer’s conference. Questions and responses will be posted on the RTC website.
13. Form a consultant selection committee where no one has a conflict of interest. Document this by having the committee members sign and date a form specifying that there is no conflict of interest.
14. Evaluate the submitted proposals or statements of qualifications and rank the firms in order of preference based on qualifications to complete the project. Use a proposal responsiveness checklist to assure compliance with requirements. If fewer than three are submitted, justification must be documented to proceed with the procurement. The justification should state that the solicitation did not arbitrarily limit competition, competition is limited and that it is not feasible to re-advertise under a new solicitation.
15. Contract Manager opens the cost proposal from the top ranked proposer.
16. Contract manager negotiates an agreement with the firm based on scope, scheduling, completion data and compensation. If no agreement is reached, negotiations with the first ranked firm are terminated and negotiations with the second ranked firm are opened.
17. Once the negotiations have been completed, the contract manager prepares the agreement, which is submitted to the ASO for insurance and contract number, legal counsel and the Executive Director for approval and signatures.
18. After contract award, all unopened cost proposals should be disposed of unopened or returned to the offeror.
19. Document the procurement process using the procurement checklist (Appendix A).
4 Non-Architectural & Engineering Services

See definition of non-Architectural & Engineering services in Chapter 10 of the LAPM. The services included here must not be included in the definition of A&E. They are typically more of a technical nature and that requiring a cost proposal would be in the public’s best interest. Non-A&E services are not directly related to a construction project and do not require the work of a registered engineer or architect. Examples include planning, material testing, right-of-way appraisal or acquisition, public outreach, education and outreach activities, Intelligent Transportation Systems and non-infrastructure. Document the procurement process using the Procurement Checklist in (Appendix A). Procurement of legal services are not included under either A&E or non-A&E and are discussed in a separate section.

4.1 Procurement of non-A&E Services using Federal Funds

Refer to state requirements below as directed by LAPM 10.3 with exception of DBE requirements that are needed for all federal-aid funded contracts.

4.2 Procurement of non-A&E Services using State (non-Federal) Funds

4.2.1 $0 to <$5,000

The procurement of non-Architectural & Engineering services with state funds less than $5,000 shall be contracted using simplified and cost-effective procedures that reduce staff time costs. California Public Contracting Code, Contracting by State Agencies [10100-19150] does not apply to services less than $5,000.

1. Define scope of work
2. Solicit quotes from a minimum of 3 providers
3. Fill out a purchase request form and competitive quote form (See Section 2.7 - Steps for Approval of a Purchase Request Form)
4. Award vendor based on cost and qualifications
5. Payment type (credit card, purchase order, invoice, contract etc) is made based on services provided

4.2.2 $5,000 and up

The procurement of non-Architectural & Engineering services $5,000 and up with state funds shall be made following the procedures prescribed below. These procedures meet the requirements as outlined in the LAPM, Chapter 10, Section 10.3 and are based on the California Public Contracting Code, Contracting by State
Agencies [10100-19150]. Local agencies must follow the same policies and procedures that the State uses for procurement with state (non-Federal) funds.

1. Define project and determine project schedule
2. Identify need for consultant
3. Appoint contract manager
4. Document that there is no conflict of interest of anyone participating in the procurement process
5. Define Scope of Work specifying deliverables
6. Estimate Cost of Consultant Work
7. Determine type of contract - project specific or on-call
8. Determine Method of Payment - Actual Cost-Plus- Fixed-Fee; Cost Per Unit of Work; Specific Rate of Compensation; or Lump Sum; (see LAPM 10.1.2 for description of these methods of payment. Discuss with RTC management to determine method of payment)
9. Determine Solicitation Document – RFP, RFQ or Two Step RFQ/RFP and whether it will be an On-Call contract (see LAPM 10.1.4 to 10.1.7 for descriptions of these methods). Include in the RFP/RFQ the evaluation process/criteria with weight and procurement schedule. More detail about On-Call contracts can be found in Section 6.2. The contract manager advertises the solicitation on the RTC website and other locations that are known and readily accessible to non-A&E firms and invites firms to submit an RFP/RFQ. Strive for 4 weeks (minimum of 14 calendar days) between advertising the project and the deadline for proposals or Statement of Qualifications.
10. An RFP can be based on cost only and thus must follow the below requirements
   a. Proposal is submitted with cost in a separate sealed envelope with proposal
   b. Local agency shall determine proposals that meet requirements
   c. Sealed cost envelopes for proposers that meet requirements shall then be publicly opened and read
   d. Contract must be awarded to lowest responsible consultant
11. An RFP can also be based on cost and qualifications.
   a. Local agency must include the evaluation criteria and scoring method.
      Cost must be given substantial weight in the scoring with a minimum of 30%.
   b. Evaluation committee scores proposals consistent with what was specified in the RFP
   c. Award is given to consultant with highest score by evaluation committee
12. A minimum of three proposals must be received. If less than three proposals are received, the firms that were solicited and a justification must be documented to proceed.
13. Contract manager negotiates an agreement with the firm based on scope, scheduling, completion date and compensation. If no agreement is reached, negotiations with the first ranked firm are terminated and negotiations with the second ranked firm are opened.

14. Once the negotiations have been completed, the contract manager prepares the agreement, which is submitted to the ASO for insurance and contract number, legal counsel and the Executive Director for approval and signatures.

15. Document the procurement process using the Procurement Checklist (Appendix A).

4.3 For procurement of non-A&E Services using Local Only Funds

4.3.1 $0 to < $5,000
The procurement of non-Architectural & Engineering services with local funds less than $5,000 shall be contracted using simplified and cost-effective procedures that reduce staff time costs. [Note: This process is the same as the procurement of non-A&E using State Funds $0 to < $5,000.]

1. Define scope of work
2. Solicit quotes from a minimum of 3 providers
3. Fill out a purchase request form and competitive quote form (See Section 2.7 - Steps for Approval of a Purchase Request Form)
4. Award vendor based on cost and qualifications
5. Payment type (credit card, purchase order, invoice, contract etc) is made based on services provided
6. Document the procurement process using the procurement checklist in Appendix A.

4.3.2 $5,000 to $60,000
The procurement of non-Architectural & Engineering services with local funds from $5,000 and up to $60,000 shall be contracted using the simplified and cost-effective procedures described below:

1. Define Scope of Work
2. Estimate Cost of Consultant Work
3. The contract manager reviews the database of consultants at the RTC and solicits quotes from a minimum of 3 firms based on qualifications
4. Contract manager negotiates an agreement with the top ranked firm based on cost and qualifications. If no agreement is reached, negotiations with the first ranked firm are terminated and negotiations with the second ranked firm are opened.
5. Once the negotiations have been completed, the contract manager prepares the agreement, which is submitted to the ASO for insurance and contract number, legal counsel and the Executive Director for approval and signatures.


4.3.3 $60,001 and up

The procurement procedures for non-A&E using greater than $60,000 in local funds are defined below [Note: These procedures are the same as the non-A & E services using State-Only funds greater than $5,000.]

1. Define project and determine project schedule
2. Identify need for consultant
3. Appoint contract manager
4. Document that there is no conflict of interest of anyone participating in the procurement process
5. Define Scope of Work specifying deliverables
6. Estimate Cost of Consultant Work
7. Determine type of contract - project specific or on-call

8. Determine Method of Payment - Actual Cost-Plus- Fixed-Fee; Cost Per Unit of Work; Specific Rate of Compensation; or Lump Sum; (see LAPM 10.1.2 for description of these methods of payment. Discuss with RTC management to determine method of payment)

9. Determine Solicitation Document – RFP, RFQ or Two Step RFQ/RFP and whether it will be an On-Call contract (see LAPM 10.1.4 to 10.1.7 for descriptions of these methods). Include in the RFP/RFQ the evaluation process/criteria and procurement schedule. More detail about On-Call contracts can be found in Section 6.2. The contract manager advertises the solicitation on the RTC website and other online locations that are known and readily accessible to non-A&E firms and invites firms to submit an RFP/RFQ. Strive for 4 weeks (minimum of 14 calendar days) between advertising the project and the deadline for proposals or Statement of Qualifications.

10. An RFP can be based on cost only and thus must follow the below requirements
   a. Proposal is submitted with cost in a separate sealed envelope
   b. Local agency shall determine proposals that meet requirements
   c. Sealed cost envelopes for proposers that meet requirements shall then be publicly opened and read
   d. Contract must be awarded to lowest responsible respondent
11. An RFP can also be based on cost and qualifications.
a. Local agency must include the evaluation criteria and scoring method. Cost must be given substantial weight in the scoring with a minimum of 30%.
b. Evaluation committee scores proposals consistent with what was specified in the RFP
c. Award is given to consultant with highest score by evaluation committee

12. A minimum of three proposals must be received. If less than three proposals are received, the firms that were solicited and a justification must be documented to proceed.

13. Contract manager negotiates an agreement with the firm based on scope, scheduling, completion date and compensation. If no agreement is reached, negotiations with the first ranked firm are terminated and negotiations with the second ranked firm are opened.

14. Once the negotiations have been completed, the contract manager prepares the agreement, which is submitted first to the ASO for insurance, contract number and signature, second to legal counsel and third to the Executive Director for approval and signatures.

15. Document the procurement process using the procurement checklist in Appendix A.
5 Procurement for CONSTRUCTION

5.1 Procurement for Construction using Federal Funds

Refer to Chapter 15: Advertise and Award Project of the Caltrans Local Assistance Procedures Manual for information on procuring and administering construction contracts using Federal Funds.

5.2 Procurement for Construction using State and/or Local Funds

Procurement of construction contracts using State and/or local funds are based on California Public Contracting Code, Contracting by Local Agencies [20100-22178]. Document the procurement process using the procurement checklist in Appendix A.

5.2.1 $0 to $60,000

RTC who has by resolution elected to become subject to the California Uniform Construction Cost Accounting Procedures (CUPCCA), can perform public projects by negotiated contract, or by purchase order. Construction Projects valued at $60,000 or less, shall be contracted using simplified and cost-effective procedures without the requirement of soliciting requests for bids from multiple providers.

1. Notify a minimum of three providers of the procurement for construction services unless justification for sole source.
2. Request contractors to submit quotations for service.
3. Award of contract goes to the bidder that provides the lowest responsible bid that meets specifications.

5.2.2 $60,001 to $200,000

Informal Bidding Procedures (Public Contract Code § 22034)

RTC who has by resolution elected to become subject to the California uniform construction cost accounting procedures (CUPCCA), can apply the following informal bid procedures for construction projects greater than $60,000 and up to $200,000 as described below:

1. The notice to contractors shall be provided in accordance with either paragraph (1) or (2), or both.
   (1) The public agency shall maintain a list of qualified contractors, identified according to categories of work. Minimum criteria for development and maintenance of the contractors list shall be determined by the CUPCAA commission. All contractors on the list for the category of work being bid shall be mailed, faxed, or emailed a notice inviting informal bids unless the product or service is proprietary. All mailing of notices to contractors pursuant to this subdivision shall be completed not less than 10 calendar days before bids are due. The list of contractors shall be a public record.
(2) The public agency may elect to mail, fax, or email a notice inviting informal bids to all construction trade journals specified in PCC Section 22036. The CUPCCA commission shall determine, on a county-by-county basis, the appropriate construction trade journals which shall receive mailed, faxed, or emailed notice of all informal and formal construction contracts being bid for work within the specified county.

2. The notice inviting informal bids shall describe the project in general terms and how to obtain more detailed information about the project, and state the time and place for the submission of bids.

3. The governing body of the public agency may delegate the authority to award informal contracts to the public works director, general manager, purchasing agent, or other appropriate person.

4. If all bids received are in excess of two hundred thousand dollars ($200,000), the governing body of the public agency may, by adoption of a resolution by a four-fifths vote, award the contract, at two hundred twelve thousand five hundred dollars ($212,500) or less, to the lowest responsible bidder, if it determines the cost estimate of the public agency was reasonable.

5. Whenever possible, construction project contracts shall be based on at least three (3) quotations;

6. Quotations shall be submitted in writing;

7. Evaluate the proposals for responsiveness;

8. Award the contract to the responsive and responsible bidder who has submitted the lowest bid that meets the requirements and criteria set forth in the invitation for bids;

9. Notice of Award to the selected bidder;

10. Document the procurement process using the procurement checklist in Appendix A.

5.2.3 $200,001 and up
Formal bidding is required for all construction projects with estimated costs of more than $200,000. The specific details of procurement for construction with state/local funds as defined in the California Public Contracts Code [20100-22178] are listed in subsections 5.2.3.1 to 5.2.3.12 below.

5.2.3.1 Adoption of Plans, Specifications and Details (PCC 20150.12)
The RTC must adopt plans, specifications, and working details for all public projects where the expenditure exceeds two hundred thousand dollars ($200,000).

5.2.3.2 Advertising (Public Contract Code §20150.8 and §1601)
a) The notices inviting formal bids shall state the time and place for receiving and opening of sealed bids and distinctly state the project to be done and the place where plans and specifications are on file. The first publication of the notice shall be at least 10 days prior to the opening of bids. Notice shall be published at
least twice, not less than 5 days apart, in a newspaper of general circulation, printed and published in the jurisdiction of the County.

b) In addition, a notice may be published in a trade publication and/or through other means designed to encourage competition.

5.2.3.3 Bid Documents

a) Copies of Bid Documents
   (1) Bid documents are available to download via BidExpress. All bidders shall have the opportunity to examine the plans, specifications and working details.
   (2) Bidders shall use complete sets of bidding documents in preparing bids; the RTC will not assume any responsibility for errors or misinterpretations resulting from the use of incomplete sets of bidding documents.
   (3) The RTC makes copies of the bidding documents available on the above terms only for the purpose of obtaining bids for the specified commodities or services and does not confer a license or grant for any other use.

(b) Interpretation or Correction of Bidding Documents
   (1) Bidders shall promptly notify RTC of any inconsistency or error discovered upon examination of the bidding documents, or of the site and local conditions.
   (2) Bidders requiring clarification or interpretation of the bidding documents shall contact the RTC at least five (5) working days prior to the date for receipt of bids, or as specified in the Invitation for Bids.
   (3) Any interpretation, correction or change of the bidding documents will be made by written addendum. Interpretations, corrections or changes of the bidding documents made in any other manner will not be binding, and bidders shall not rely upon such interpretations, corrections and changes.

(c) Alternate Bids
   (1) The materials, products and equipment described in the bid documents establish a standard of required function, dimension, appearance and quality to be met. An equal product must meet minimum specifications and the burden of proof of merit of proposed alternate or substitute is on the bidder.
   (2) Non-solicited alternates may be considered for award if submitted by the bidder who would otherwise be the low bid.
   (3) Solicited alternates may be awarded based on the sole judgment of the RTC.

(d) Addenda
   (1) Addenda will be sent to all plan holders via BidExpress.
   (2) No addenda will be issued later than five calendar days prior to the date for receipt of bids except an addendum withdrawing the request for bids or one that includes postponement of the date for receipt of bids. For bids opened on Tuesdays, this means addenda will not be issued after the preceding Thursday except as described above.
   (4) Each bidder shall be responsible for ascertaining prior to submitting a bid that it has received all addenda issued.
(5) Bidders shall acknowledge receipt of addenda to receive award consideration unless otherwise indicated in the bid documents.

5.2.3.4  **Form of Bid**
To receive consideration, bids shall be made on the forms and in the manner set forth in the Invitation for Bids.
(a) Late bids shall not be accepted.
(b) Each bid must be signed by an authorized representative of the bidder, include the legal name of the bidder and a statement of non-collusion signed by the bidder.
(c) Bidders shall not change the bid form nor make additional stipulations on the bid form that are not consistent with the provisions of the specifications.

5.2.3.5  **Bid Security**
A bid bond may be required to protect the agency in the event the bidder awarded the contract does not execute the contract. A performance bond may be required to protect the agency in the event the contractor cannot perform the work. A required bid bond and performance bond must be submitted with the bid electronically via BidExpress with a pre-approved surety agent and be in the amount as specified in the Invitation for Bids. In the event a low bidder is allowed to withdraw its bid due to claim of error, the RTC may retain the bid guarantee to offset its administrative costs of handling the bid. The guarantees of the lowest bidder should be retained until the contract has been executed and approved and any performance bond and certificate of insurance provided, at which time they will be released except where forfeited. The bid bonds/deposits of the second and third lowest responsible bidders may be retained until the contract has been fully executed and insurance certificates are obtained.

5.2.3.6  **Receipt of Bids**
All bids must be received in BidExpress by the time specified in the IFB. Late bids shall not be accepted and shall not be considered under any circumstances.

5.2.3.7  **Opening of Bids**
The contract manager or designee shall administer all bid openings and all bids shall be opened publicly in the presence of one or more witnesses at the time and place designated in the IFB. The RTC assumes no responsibility over the confidentiality of bid information unless specifically stated otherwise in the IFB.

5.2.3.8  **Correction or Withdrawal of Bids (Public Contract Code § 5100 - 5107)**
RTC shall consult with RTC Counsel regarding any request or decision involving a bid mistake, correction or withdrawal. Except as otherwise specified in Public Contract Code Section 5100, correction or withdrawal of inadvertently erroneous bids before or after bid opening may be permitted only if such correction or withdrawal is not prejudicial to the interest of the agency or fair competition.
Mistakes in bids detected during or after bid opening may not be corrected by the bidder except:

1. A bidder may be permitted to correct a material mistake that would cause such bidder to have the low bid if the mistake is clearly evident from examining the bid document. However, a bidder shall not be permitted to correct a bid for errors of judgment. A low bidder shall not be permitted to increase its bid price and still be considered as the low bidder.

2. An otherwise low bidder may be permitted the opportunity to furnish other information called for by the Invitation for Bids and not supplied due to oversight, so long as it does not affect responsiveness. The contract manager shall maintain complete and sufficient records of evidence used to establish an error and intended price. Records of bid withdrawals shall also be maintained to ensure there is no abuse of the competitive bidding process. All decisions to permit the correction of bid mistakes and the withdrawal of bids shall be made in writing by the contract manager and retained in the bid file. In the event that the correction of a bid subsequent to bid opening results in a new low bidder, the Purchasing Agent, at his/her discretion, may recommend, or make, given proper approval requirements, an award to the new low bidder, or may request new bids.

5.2.3.9 Bid Evaluation
The Contract Manager shall maintain complete and sufficient records of bid evaluations to ensure there is no abuse of the competitive bidding process. All reasons for making the award recommendation shall be made in writing by the Contract Manager and retained in the bid file.

5.2.3.10 Rejection of Bids
The RTC may, in its discretion, reject any bids presented. The RTC may also:
(a) Reject a bid not accompanied by any required bid security or by other data required by the bidding documents.
(b) Reject a bid that is in any way incomplete, irregular, amplified, unqualified or otherwise not in compliance with the bid documents in all material respects.
(c) Waive any informality, irregularity, immaterial defects or technicalities, in any bids received.
(d) Cancel an Invitation for Bids or reject all bids because of any of the following reasons:
   (1) Specifications are inadequate or ambiguous.
   (2) Specifications have been revised.
   (3) Supplies or services are no longer needed.
   (4) RTC requirements have changed.
   (5) All bids have been deemed unreasonable.
   (6) Bids were not independently arrived at and/or were submitted in bad faith.
(7) Necessary requirements of the bid process have not been met.
(8) Competition is insufficient.
(9) Cancellation or rejection of all bids is in the RTC’s best interest.
(10) The company’s name appears on either the Federal Excluded Parties list per 28 CFR, Part 66, Subpart C, Section 66.35 for any Federal Grant funded contracts or sub contracts and/or the appearance of the company’s name on the California State’s Department of Industrial Relations, Division of Apprenticeship Standards (DAS) debarment list for all Public Works contracts issued by the RTC, and therefore the contractor must be denied.

The Purchasing Agent shall maintain complete and sufficient written records of bid rejections and cancellations to ensure that there is no abuse of the bidding process. All reasons for rejecting a bid shall be retained in the bid file.

5.2.3.11 Cost Estimate Re-evaluation (Public Contract Code § 20150.9 & § 20150.10)
If, after a first invitation for bids, all bids are rejected after re-evaluating its cost estimates of the project, the RTC shall abandon the project or shall re-advertise for bids. If, after re-advertising, the RTC again rejects all bids presented, the RTC may proceed with the project by use of RTC personnel or may re-advertise again. If two or more bids are the same and the lowest, the RTC may accept the one it chooses. If no bids are received, the RTC may have the project done without further complying with Public Contract Code § 20150.9.

5.2.3.12 Bid Award (Public Contract Code § 20103.8)
If the RTC decides to award a contract, the RTC generally must award the contract to the lowest responsible and responsive bidder whose bid best meets the requirements and criteria set forth in the Invitation for Bids. In the event the successful bidder fails to perform or such bidder’s bid is authorized to be withdrawn, the RTC may award a contract to the next lowest responsible and responsive bidder.

5.2.3.13 Cancellation of Bid Award
Failure on the part of the successful bidder within the time allowed to execute the contract, furnish an acceptable performance bond, or comply with any other requirement precedent to execution of the contract shall be considered just cause for cancellation of the award and forfeiture of the bid security, not as a penalty, but in liquidation of certain damages sustained. Contract award may then be made to the next lowest responsible and responsive bidder, the call for bids re-advertised, or such other action taken as deemed appropriate by the RTC.

5.2.3.14 Public Notice of Award
RTC shall maintain a summary of all contract awards and make it available for public inspection. The summary shall, at a minimum, include the date of the award, the contract numbers, the suppliers, the contract amounts, and a brief description of the commodity or service.
6 Other Procurement Considerations

6.1 Local or Geographical Preference

The Code of Federal Regulations, section 200.319 where federal funding is used in part, or in whole, the Purchasing Officer must conduct procurements in a manner that prohibits the use of statutorily or administratively imposed state, local, or tribal geographical preferences in the evaluation of bids or proposals, except

1. In those cases where applicable Federal statutes expressly mandate or encourage geographic preference.

2. When state licensing laws require otherwise.

3. When contracting for architectural and engineering (A/E) services, geographic location may be a selection criterion provided its application leaves an appropriate number of qualified firms, given the nature and size of the project, to compete for the contract.

6.2 On-Call Procurements

An on-call contract is a contract that may be utilized for a number of projects, under which task or work orders are issued on an as-needed basis, for an established contract period. On-call contracts are typically used when a specialized service of indefinite delivery or indefinite quantity is needed for a number of different projects, such as construction engineering, design, environmental analysis, traffic studies, geotechnical studies, and field surveying, etc. Many agencies use these contracts to address peaks in workload of in-house engineering staff and/or to perform a specialized service which the agency does not have. On-call contracts shall specify the following in both the solicitation and the contract:

1. A general scope of work, complexity, and professional nature of services that covers all aspects of the final need;
2. Evaluation criteria that will be used for awarding the on-call contract to determine how the award will be decided;
3. If there are more than one contractor that have been awarded an on-call contract for the same work, the process must be specified for how the award of the task orders will be decided;
4. A reasonable maximum length of contract, not to exceed 5 years;
5. A maximum total contract dollar amount (23 CFR 172) and maximum amount for each work order; and
6. The number of contracts that are anticipated to be awarded.
There are two solicitation methods that can be used for on-call contracts; The One Step RFQ and the Two Step (RFQ followed by RFP). The One-Step RFQ method can be used when only the top ranked consultant will be awarded the on-call contract. On-Call with Two-Step (RFQ followed by an RFP) method is used if more than one consultant is awarded an on-call contract. **Follow the requirements for the project type and dollar threshold amount outlined in Sections 3 through 5 above with the following additions for an on-call procurement.**

1. Solicitation of work as required based on project type and dollar threshold in above sections.
2. A cost estimate/analysis (Appendix A) as required by the project type and dollar threshold amount that includes a historical analysis of annual needs for consultant work, professional labor cost, and reasonable profit analysis.
3. Issuance of a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) that includes the length of contract, maximum contract amount, anticipated number of contracts to be awarded;
4. Established evaluation criteria publicized in the RFQ. Criteria can include availability of personnel, staff capabilities, completion time, experience of consultant, specialized expertise, and past performance;
5. Scope of work defined for a specific discipline or focus that covers all aspects of potential work;
6. For A&E services, SOQs submitted with hourly rates in a sealed envelope;
7. For non- A&E services, SOQs submitted with hourly rates included;
8. Ranking of the most qualified firms;
9. If only top ranked consultant is awarded on-call contract,
   a. Negotiation of fully loaded hourly rates and markups with top-ranked consultant;
   b. Execution of an On-Call contract(s);
   c. For specific assignments or task orders, negotiation of scope and hours needed to complete the work;
   d. Execution of work orders for specific assignments.
8. If more than one consultant is identified to be awarded an on-call contract
   a. Negotiation of fully loaded hourly rates and markups with top ranked consultants;
   b. Execution of the On-Call contracts with top ranked consultants;
   c. For specific assignments (task orders), competition amongst the list of on-call consultants is either
      i. Through a mini-RFP issued to all the on-call consultants; or
      ii. On a regional basis whereby the region is divided into areas identified in the solicitation, and consultants are selected to provide on-call services for assigned areas only.
      iii. For Local Only funds less than $20,000, a consultant can be chosen from the on-call contract list without going through a
mini-RFP with justification made using the On-Call Consultant Selection form (Appendix A).

iv. The process for which task orders are assigned must be included in the RFQ and the on-call contract.

d. If A&E services, cost for the task order is submitted in a sealed envelope. Based on the mini-RFP, consultants are ranked.

e. For each task order, negotiation with the highest ranked consultant on scope and amount based on wage rates agreed on from on-call contract;

f. Execution of work orders for specific assignments

9. If negotiations fail with the top ranked firm, notify and document official ending of negotiations with top ranked and begin negotiations with second ranked firm.

For on-call contracts, a fully executed copy of the contract with original signatures will be sent to the consultant. Each subsequent task order (for individual project) will be accompanied with a copy of the signed task order and a Notice to Proceed, once it is negotiated and approved. For on-call consultant contracts, any amendments are restricted to the work (task order) that has already been started by the consultant and can not include any new work. Task orders are not considered an amendment and therefore not appropriate for extending the terms of the contract. Task order expiration dates may not exceed the Master On-call agreement end date.

An example of acceptable contract wording in multiple on-call contracts for the same type of service:

- “Agency has or will enter into three (3) task order contracts for performance of the Scope of Services identified in Exhibit “A”, including this Agreement ("CM Services Task Order Contracts"). The other CM Services Task Order Contracts are [identify other two contracts by agreement numbers and consultant firms]. The total amount payable by Agency for the CM Services Task Order Contracts shall not exceed a cumulative maximum total value of One Hundred Thousand Dollars ($100,000) ("NTE Sum"). It is understood and agreed that there is no guarantee, either expressed or implied that this dollar amount will be authorized under the CM Services Task Order Contracts through Task Orders. Each time a Task Order is awarded under any of the CM Services Task Order Contracts, the Agency shall send written notification to Consultant and each of the other consultants entering into the CM Services Task Order Contracts. The notice shall identify the total funds allocated under issued Task Orders, and the remaining unencumbered amount of the NTE Sum. Consultant acknowledges and agrees that Agency shall not pay any amount under this Agreement that would exceed the NTE Sum, and Consultant shall not enter into a Task Order that exceeds the NTE Sum.”
6.3 Non-Competitive (Sole-Source) Procurements – Federal Funds

Procurement by noncompetitive proposals may be used only when the award of a contract is infeasible under sealed bids or competitive proposals (23 CFR 172.7(a)(3)). A limited competition procurement cannot be justified when the need for foregoing the full and open competition requirement is due to either a failure to plan or a lack of advance planning or due to concerns about the amount of assistance available to support the procurement.

These types of contracts are considered “Sole Source” contracts and should be used only in very limited circumstances. Conditions under which noncompetitive negotiated contracts may be acceptable include:

- Staff solicited competitive bids and was unable to obtain a responsive bidder.
- The grantor agency providing the federal funds has approved sole source procurement.
- The service is only available from a single source because contractor will be required to use confidential information, intellectual property, or trade secrets owned by contractor.
- The federal grantor agency made the award of funds being used based on RTPA’s use of a particular team of contractors, and the contractor is one of the team members identified in the funding application.
- The work is necessary to continue development or production of highly specialized equipment or components thereof, and it is likely that award to another contractor would result in substantial duplication of costs that are not expected to be recovered through competition or when it is likely that award to another contractor would result in unacceptable delays in fulfilling RTC’s needs.
- Sole source is authorized by statute, or only one contractor can comply with specific statutory requirements.
- A national emergency exists, and a particular facility or contractor is needed to achieve mobilization.
- The disclosure of RTC’s needs in a public procurement process would compromise national security.
- A particular expert or neutral person’s services are needed for a current protest, dispute, claim, or litigation.
- A competitive procurement is precluded by the terms of an international agreement or treaty or the written directions of a foreign government providing reimbursement for the cost of the supplies or services.
• To establish or maintain an educational or other nonprofit institution or a federally funded research and development center that has or will have an essential engineering, research, or development capability.

For noncompetitive negotiation, RTC staff will:
• Develop an adequate scope of work, evaluation factors, and an independent cost estimate (Appendix A) before solicitation;
• Conduct negotiations to ensure a fair and reasonable cost.

The local agency must carefully document details of the special conditions using the Sole Source Justification Form (Appendix A). If federal or state funds, obtain Caltrans approval on a Public Interest Finding and retain all documents in the project files for future Caltrans’ or FHWA’s review.

6.4 Non-Competitive (Sole-Source) Procurements – State or Local Funds

For non-Federally funded contracts, at least one of the following must apply to justify sole source:
• Only one contractor/consultant/vendor can provide unique/highly specialized item/service.
• Economy or efficiency supports award to existing contractor/consultant as a logical follow-on to work already in progress under a competitively awarded contract.
• Cost to prepare for a competitive procurement exceeds the cost of the work or item.
• The item is an integral repair part or accessory compatible with existing equipment.
• The item or service is essential in maintaining research or operational continuity.
• The item/service is one with which staff members who will use the item/service have specialized training and/or expertise and retraining would incur substantial cost in time and/or money.

Sole source requests should be documented on the Sole Source Justification Form provided in Appendix A and signed by the Executive Director.

6.5 Competitive Procurement Exemptions

The following are exemptions to the competitive bidding requirements:
A. Emergency purchases made under a declaration of an emergency by the Commission, executive committee, or designee per PUC § 180154;

B. Situations where solicitations of bids or proposals would for any reason be impractical, unavailing, or impossible;

C. Cooperative purchasing through other government agencies that have been competitively bid within the past five (5) years whose purchasing process is consistent with RTC procurement procedures;

D. Sole source goods or services provided there is adequate justification or minimal cost. See dollar thresholds that dictate the procurement requirements that are needed above;

E. Insurance and bonds;

F. Purchasing funded by grants, donations, or gifts when the special conditions attached to the grants, donations, or gifts require the purchase of particular goods and/or services to be purchased in a more specific manner than described herein;

G. Goods and/or services obtained from or through agreement with any governmental, public, or quasi-public entity;

H. Works of art, entertainment, or performance;

I. Surplus personal property owned by another governmental, public, or quasi-public entity;

J. Membership dues, conventions, training, and travel arrangements;

K. Advertisements in magazines, newspapers, or other media;

L. Where competitive bids or proposals have been solicited and no bid or proposal has been received. In such a situation the Purchasing Officer may proceed to have the services performed or the goods purchased without further competitive bidding.

M. Legal services

6.6 Procurement through Other Government Agencies

Public Utilities Code Section 132352.4(b)(2) states that RTC is permitted to enter into an intergovernmental agreement for services from other government agencies without utilizing competitive procurement procedures. This exception to competitive procurement is not permitted when FTA or FHWA funds will be utilized to carry out the project unless the procuring agency followed federal procurement requirements. In all cases a market, price or cost analysis must be performed and documented to establish the amount that will be paid at the time of purchase will be fair and reasonable per Master Fund Transfer agreement provision, CFR 49 18.36 (f)(1).

Cooperative purchasing through other government agencies, non-profits etc. (e.g. California Special District Association, County of Santa Cruz) can reduce the cost of goods and services by aggregating the purchasing power of public agencies.
Cooperative purchasing may be used if it has been competitively bid within the past five (5) years and whose purchasing process is consistent with RTC procurement procedures.

6.7 Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE)

DBE contract goals are required for Federal funded contracts. See LAPM Chapter 9 for detailed discussion on DBE requirements for contract procurements using Federal Funds. DBE requirements for federal funds only apply if there is a CONTRACT. If there is no contract, such as with a Purchase Order (PO), DBE is not required. DBE contract goals are not allowed for State–Only funded contracts based on Proposition 209 but DBE participation is encouraged.

Notices for any contract work by RTC staff (RFPs, RFQs etc) should be sent to DBE firms interested in providing the required services. A list of certified DBE’s organized by type of services offered is provided by Caltrans at the following link (http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/bep/find_certified.htm).

6.8 Protest Procedures

Respondents not selected for interview or contract award will be informed by phone, mail and/or email. Upon request, the RTC will offer a debriefing to respondents who were not selected, at a mutually agreeable time after award of the contract.

Protest procedures are provided to allow proposers an opportunity to formally protest a procurement. The RTC will review only protests submitted by an actual or prospective Proposer. Protests by prospective subcontractors will be rejected. A protest which does not strictly comply with the RTC protest procedures will be rejected.

A proposer may object to a provision of the RFP/RFQ/IFB on the grounds that it is arbitrary, biased, or unduly restrictive, or may object to the selection of a particular consultant on the grounds that RTC procedures, the provisions of the RFP/RFQ/IFB or applicable provisions of federal, state or local law have been violated or inaccurately or inappropriately applied. Any objection must be submitted in writing and either mailed or hand delivered to the RTC Contract Manager and must include an explanation of the basis for the objection. The date of filing will be the date that the RTC receives the protest.

1. Protests relating to the content of the solicitation (i.e. RFP, RFQ, IFB) must be filed no later than 4:00 PM on the fifth business day after the date of the solicitation or addendum with the revised content is released to the public; or
2. Protests relating to a notice of non-responsiveness or not meeting the minimum qualifications must be filed no later than 4:00 pm on the fifth business day after the date of such notice; or 
3. Protests relating to failure to make the shortlist must be filed no later than 4:00 pm on the fifth business day following protester’s receipt of a notice regarding the shortlisting; or 
4. Protests relating to the notification that proposer was not recommended for selection or that another proposer was recommended for selection must be filed no later than 4:00 pm on the fifth business day following protester’s receipt of such notice.

Except with regard to initial determinations of non-responsiveness, the evaluation record shall remain confidential until the RTC authorizes the award.

A letter of protest must set forth detailed grounds for the protest and be fully supported with technical data, documentary evidence, names of witnesses, and other pertinent information related to the subject being protested. The protest also must state the law, rule, regulation, or policy upon which the protest is based. The RTC Contract Manager will respond to the objection in writing within thirty business days. No contract to a consultant shall be executed until the expiration of the objection period or, if an objection is filed, the issuance of a written response to the protest by the RTC Contract Manager.

The proposer may appeal the decision of the RTC Contract Manager by filing a written appeal with the RTC Executive Director, no less than three (3) working days after receipt of the written response from the RTC Contract Manager. The Executive Director will respond to the appeal within ten business days and the decision will be final.

If the protest relating to a contract award is sustained, the original Notice of Intent to Award may be withdrawn after the deadline for protest reconsideration has passed. RTPA then may issue a new Notice of Intent to Award to a different bidder/Proposer and a new protest period will commence using the same timelines discussed above. If the protest is rejected, the original Notice of Intent to Award will stand and RTPA will continue with contract negotiations with the awardee.

6.9 Amendments

All contract amendments shall be executed prior to the contract term end date, and require all parties to sign and date the amendments. Amendments to a contract, including time extensions must be within the original scope of work and are not so excessive as to be considered a “cardinal contract change”. Cardinal contract changes are considered sole source procurements and require a sole source justification (Appendix A).
A cardinal contract change is a significant change in contract work (goods or services) that causes a major deviation from the original purpose of the work or the intended method of achievement or causes a revision of contract work so extensive, significant, or cumulative that, in effect, the contractor is required to perform very different work from that described in the original contract.

A change within the scope of the contract (sometimes referred to as an “in-scope” change) is not a cardinal change. Legal Counsel should be consulted to make a final determination regarding whether a particular contract change or amendment will constitute a cardinal change.

A cost or price analysis should be performed in connection with every procurement action that will result in expenditure of funds, including contract modifications and amendments.
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PETTY CASH REQUEST VOUCHER

SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA 95060-3911 PHONE 831 460 3200 FAX 831 460 3215

☐ Requesting Advance
☐ Requesting Reimbursement

NAME ___________________________ DATE __________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
<th>Describe the Purpose for the Purchase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPROVED BY ____________________________
Petty Cash Custodian Signature

I CERTIFY THAT I HAVE BEEN REIMBURSED BY SCCRTC
FOR THE AMOUNT SHOWN ABOVE.

Requestor Signature
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Total Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal Taxable: 0.00

Tax:

Shipping & Handling:

Recycling Fee:

Total: 0.00

Justification/Program:

Resolution (for purchases over $50,000): □ Attached □ On File □ N/A

Submitted by _______________________________ Date ____________________

Approved by _______________________________ Date ____________________

Approved by _______________________________ Date ____________________

Executive Director _______________________________ Date ____________________

Note: 1) **This form is required for any purchase more than $100.00**
2) An original invoice from the vendor is required in order to pay
3) All vendors should have a tax ID on file with the County or vendor must fill out a W-9 form
   (Attach the W-9 to the invoice if new vendor and is not in the County system)
4) This form is not required for normal travel expenses.
# Competitive Quote Form
To be used as supporting documentation for requisitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VENDOR NAME AND ADDRESS</th>
<th>VENDOR NO. 1</th>
<th>VENDOR NO. 2</th>
<th>VENDOR NO. 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PHONE NUMBER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSON CONTACTED</td>
<td></td>
<td>(verbal quote)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>QTY</td>
<td>UNIT OF</td>
<td>UNIT PRICE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MEASURE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shipping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VENDOR NO. 1</th>
<th>VENDOR NO. 2</th>
<th>VENDOR NO. 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Total: $0.00 $0.00 $0.00

1. Can the Vendor Deliver within your time requirements
   - VENDOR NO. 1: Y/N Yes
   - VENDOR NO. 2: Y/N Yes
   - VENDOR NO. 3: Y/N Yes

2. Are shipping charges included? If not, how much, where from and method of shipping

Comments:

---
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INDEPENDENT COST ESTIMATE
For Goods or Small Procurements
(Small Procurements = Services estimated at less than $5,000)

Project Manager: ___________________________ Date: _______________________

Purchase Description: _________________________________________________________

Independent Cost Estimate: $___________

An Independent Cost Estimate must be completed prior to requesting quotes from prospective vendors, contractors, and consultants.

Please indicate which of the statements apply with a check mark.

☐ I performed market research for the pricing of products and/or services being procured using one or more of the following sources:
  ☐ Internet
  ☐ Catalog
  ☐ Other Agency’s Contracts
  ☐ Dealer Comparison
  ☐ Other: ___________________________

☐ I contacted other agencies that may have procurement knowledge/experience for the product or service being procured to determine the prices they paid.

☐ I reviewed/compared TAMC historical or established labor rates or product pricing in order to determine my estimate for this procurement.

☐ The service and cost already has been negotiated and approved in a TAMC contract.

☐ The service is being procured based on rates regulated by the government (i.e., utilities).

☐ Other (explain): _____________________________________________________________

Provide a brief explanation of your analysis that is the basis of your estimate:

Estimator’s Name (Print): ___________________________

Estimator’s Signature: ___________________________
INDEPENDENT COST ESTIMATE

For Services > $5,000

Project Manager: ________________________________  Date: __________________

Purchase Description: __________________________________________________________

Independent Cost Estimate: $________________________

An Independent Cost Estimate must be completed prior to requesting quotes from prospective vendors, contractors, and consultants.

Specify contract payment type and provide the information listed below:

☐ Actual Cost plus Fixed Fee (or Profit) – develop a spreadsheet with:
  o Specific contract tasks
  o Estimated hours per task, by personnel position
    (e.g. Principal, Project Manager, Analyst, Support Staff, Designer, Auditor)
  o Estimated cost per hour, by position
  o Estimated direct costs (e.g. travel, printing)
  o Estimated profit (if not built into hourly costs)

☐ Lump Sum:
  o For retainers – provide comparable costs per month
    ▪ Source of estimate: ____________________________________________
      (e.g. other RTPA, past contracts)
  o For other single payment contracts – provide justification for cost estimate

☐ Rates of Compensation:
  o Provide comparative historical or other RTPA information on typical hourly rates
  o Provide comparative historical or other RTPA information on direct costs

☐ On-Call Contract
  o Set an overall budget based on typical annual or bi-annual costs
  o Utilize one of the above methods to estimate costs by task order

Provide a brief explanation of the assumptions in your estimate (attach other pages as necessary):

Estimator’s Name (Print): ________________________________
Estimator’s Signature: ________________________________

S:\RTC\TC2019\TC0619\Consent\Procurement Item\Appendix A\4.2 - Independent Cost Estimate - Standard Procurements.docx  8-56
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
GOODS/SERVICES/CONSTRUCTION PROCUREMENT CHECKLIST
for Documentation of Procurement Process

Note: This checklist is designed to document the steps taken to procure goods, services or construction contracts by checking the appropriate lines depending on the project type and cost. See the Procurement Policies and Procedures Manual to determine the steps needed for the procurement type of interest.

Date:
Project Manager:
Contract Administrator:
Project Title:
Describe Need for Consultant:

Contract Period Timeframe – Begin: End:

A. PROCUREMENT

1. PROCUREMENT TYPE
   _ Determine if funds are available in the budget for the procurement and specify the funds to be utilized.
   _ Procurement is for purchase of goods over $5,000
   _ Procurement is for Architectural & Engineering Services
   _ Procurement is for non – Architectural & Engineering Services
   _ Procurement is for Construction
   _ Procurement is for Legal Services

2. IF PROCUREMENT OF GOODS FOR $5000+
   _ Fill out a Purchase Request form
   _ Fill out a Competitive Quote form with minimum of 3 vendors that submitted quotes and vendor selected
   _ Specify number of quotes received, if less than 3:
     i. If 1 - Fill out the sole source justification form
     ii. If 2 - Provide justification
   _ Fill out an Independent Cost Estimate Form
   _ Keep list of vendors that were solicited in file

3. IF PROCUREMENT OF SERVICES/CONSTRUCTION
   Specify Source of Funds:
   _ Federal
   _ State (non-Federal)
   _ Local Only

Choose solicitation method(s):
   _ Solicit quotes using simplified procedures for services <$5000
   _ RFQ – general skills needed, or use to screen submittals prior to RFP
   _ RFP – specific project proposal desired
   _ IFB – Invitation for Bids for construction projects
   _ On-Call – services needed for future tasks
   _ Sole Source – fill out sole source justification form in order to allow for
RFQ/RFP/IFB Content:

- Use latest approved RFP/RFQ/IFB format in S:\CONTRACTS\INVITE
- Develop Scope of Work
- Architectural, Environmental/Engineering (A&E) Contracts:
  - Cost proposal shall be submitted in separate, sealed envelope
  - Do not review cost proposal until after selection
- For non-A&E contracts, cost can be a ranking factor – 30% minimum
- Prepare independent cost estimate and draft project schedule
- Federal contracts:
  - set DBE Goal
  - check contract language w/Caltrans Local Assistance
  - use federal boilerplate language for contract
- State (no Federal funds) contracts:
  - DBE goals are not allowed
  - DBE is encouraged
- Specify ranking criteria and points per criterion in RFP/RFQ/IFB (If non-A&E, cost needs to be 30% of points minimum per the LAPM)
- Specify consultant selection schedule in RFQ/P
- Decide if you want an option to interview, specify date(s) in RFQ/RFP/IFB
- Decide if you want a pre-proposal conference, specify date(s) in RFQ/RFP/IFB
- Set response due date in RFQ/RFP/IFB: not Friday and not 5:00 pm*
- Attach standard contract format
- Have supervisor and attorney review
- Consider whether need to bring to RTC Board for approval
- If solicitation is for on-call contract, include in the invite
  - The number of contracts anticipated to be awarded,
  - how the award of the task orders will be decided,
  - length of the on-call contract (5 years max), and
  - a maximum total contract amount.
- If A&E and using Federal funds, Fill out LAPM, Form 10-C, Consultant Contract Reviewer’s Checklist, and submit to Caltrans Division of Local Assistance for signature, save in files
- If A&E and using State (non-Federal) funds, fill out the LAPM, Form 10C-2a: State-Only funded Consultant Reviewer’s Checklist and submit to Caltrans Division of Local Assistance for signature, save in files

Solicitation:

- Download the DBE list from Caltrans website appropriate for the services of interest
- Send to consultant database list
- Send to DBE list
- Post notice on RTC website, employment opportunities page
- Post notice on RFP database website http://www.rfpdb.com/
- Advertise in newspaper and/or industry trade magazine
- All firms must get same information – avoid phone discussions
- If pre-proposal conference, hold a few weeks before due date
- Send sign-in sheet, questions & answers to full list; retain in file
- Post answers to questions regarding RFP/RFQ/IFB on RTC website, employment opportunities page
- Save RFP/RFQ/IFB, ads and distribution list in contract file

Selection Panel:

- Choose selection panel representing diverse perspectives
- Have selection panel sign the conflict of interest forms and PM review
- Prepare scoring sheets to reflect criteria and points from RFP/RFQ/IFB
Distribute proposals for panel review
- Check references
- Calculate scoring for each proposer based on panels review

Interviews:
- If no interviews are needed; make recommendation based on written proposals
- If interviews are needed; panel selects firms to interview
  - Send email to confirm those to interview, document to file
  - Ask all proposers the same questions, except follow ups
  - Document panel ranking of consultants
  - Collect all scoring sheets inclusive of both proposal and interview scores

Selection of Top Ranked Firm(s):
- Write a memo to the file summarizing panel rankings and reasons for rankings
- Top Ranked Firm based on Qualifications
- Top Ranked Firm based on Highest Score from Evaluation Committee

B. CONTRACT NEGOTIATION AND APPROVAL

1. CONTRACT NEGOTIATION
- For A&E, Open cost proposal, compare with independent cost estimate
- Notify preferred firm
- Negotiate scope of work and final budget
- Prepare Contract – include:
  - Contract expiration date:
  - Method of payment: (See Local Assistance Manual Exhibit 10-H and consult with Fiscal Officer)
    - Actual Cost-Plus-Fixed Fee; or
    - Cost Per Unit of Work; or
    - Specific Rates of Compensation; or
    - Lump Sum
- Invoices – specify that they must include:
  - Monthly invoices, progress reports, and % work/tasks completed
  - Amount billed vs. contract amount remaining and total amount
  - Include 5% Retention -- if contract is over $1,000,000
    (structure as balloon payment at end of contract)
- Review draft contract with legal counsel
- Federally funded contracts:
  - Review contract with Caltrans Local Assistance or Mass Transportation, document

2. CONTRACT APPROVAL
- Prepare staff report requesting approval to contract with consultant/firm/vendor
- Explain selection rationale
- Notify firms that are not recommended
- RTC approval date: ________________

C. CONTRACT MANAGEMENT

1. PRIOR TO INITIATING A&E WORK
- Pre-Award Audit: Initiate with Caltrans Audits
Less than $150,000 – no audit needed
$150,000 and over -- consultants and subcontractors must submit LAPM Form 10-A

Federally-Funded Contracts:
- Obtain E-76 federal authorization prior to doing any reimbursable work
- Submit Exhibit 10-O2 - Consultant DBE Info, to Caltrans Local Assistance

Execution:
- Attach completed checklist (this form) to contract file
- Obtain contract signatures: first RTC legal counsel,(wet signature not needed), then make 2 copies and have the Executive Director and Consultant sign and date both copies.
- Provide wet signature hard copies to consultant/vendor/contractor
- Provide wet signature hard copies of all contract documents to Director of Finance and Budget
- Store all electronic documents in the project file
- Issue written notice to proceed

2. INVOICING and PROJECT MANAGEMENT

Project Manager:
- Assure that monthly invoices and progress reports are being submitted
- Confirm work performed and eligibility of costs
- Verify % of work complete vs. contract or task amount remaining
- Assure that correct grant is billed (in coordination with Finance Officer)
- Alert your supervisor to any inconsistencies or questions

Finance Officer:
- Reconcile billing with contract specifications
- Double-check remaining contract amount

3. CONTRACT CLOSE OUT
- Review contract deliverables to assure that all work has been completed
- Catalog list of completed work products in contract file
- Clearly identify file and folder with final versions
- Remove working or interim drafts from files as soon as final is approved
- Send notice of completion/expiration to consultant, copy to contract file
- Pay final retention, if applicable
- Review retention policy for when proposals can be deleted and add date for deletion to folder name
- Review retention policy for when invoices can be deleted and add date for deletion to folder name
SOLE SOURCE JUSTIFICATION

Project Manager: ___________________________  Date: ___________________________

Executive Director: ___________________________

Consultant/Vendor: ___________________________

Contract Amount: $ ___________________________

Project Description: ___________________________

Notice: Contracting without providing for full and open competition is prohibited unless justified on one or more of the boxes below.

BY MARKING THE BOXES BELOW, YOU ARE AFFIRMING THAT THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS ARE TRUE

☐ The need for a sole source is not due to a failure to plan or a lack of advanced planning.

☐ The need for a sole source is not due to concerns about the amount of State or Federal assistance available to support the procurement (for example, expiration of state or Federal assistance available for award).

JUSTIFICATIONS FOR AWARD OF SOLE SOURCE CONTRACT (without FEDERAL FUNDING)

For non-federally funded contracts, at least one of these justifications must apply:

☐ Only one contractor/consultant/vendor can provide unique/highly specialized item/service.

☐ Economy or efficiency supports award to existing contractor/consultant as a logical follow-on to work already in progress under a competitively awarded contract.

☐ Cost to prepare for a competitive procurement exceeds the cost of the work or item.

☐ The item is an integral repair part or accessory compatible with existing equipment.

☐ The item or service is essential in maintaining research or operational continuity.

☐ The item/service is one with which staff members who will use the item/service have specialized training and/or expertise and retraining would incur substantial cost in time and/or money.

EXPLANATION: (please include a written explanation)
For federally funded contracts, at least one of these justifications must apply:

- Staff solicited competitive bids and was unable to obtain a responsive bidder.
- The grantor agency providing the federal funds has approved sole source procurement.
- The service is only available from a single source because contractor will be required to use confidential information, intellectual property, or trade secrets owned by contractor.
- The federal grantor agency made the award of funds being used based on RTPA's use of a particular team of contractors, and the contractor listed above is one of the team members identified in the funding application.
- The work is necessary to continue development or production of highly specialized equipment or components thereof, and it is likely that award to another contractor would result in substantial duplication of costs that are not expected to be recovered through competition or when it is likely that award to another contractor would result in unacceptable delays in fulfilling RTPA's needs.
- Sole source is authorized by statute, or only one contractor can comply with specific statutory requirements.
- A national emergency exists, and a particular facility or contractor is needed to achieve mobilization.
- The disclosure of RTPA's needs in a public procurement process would compromise national security.
- A particular expert or neutral person's services are needed for a current protest, dispute, claim, or litigation.
- A competitive procurement is precluded by the terms of an international agreement or treaty or the written directions of a foreign government providing reimbursement for the cost of the supplies or services.
- To establish or maintain an educational or other nonprofit institution or a federally funded research and development center that has or will have an essential engineering, research, or development capability.

EXPLANATION: (please include a written explanation)
ON-CALL TASK ORDER FIRM SELECTION FORM FOR MULTIPLE PREQUALIFIED FIRMS using Local Funds

Project Manager: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________
Task Order No.: ___________________________ Contract No.: ___________________________
Task Order Amount: ________________________
Project Description/Title: _________________________________________________________

You must compare all eligible on-call firms to each other. You may not select one firm and then simply state why it is qualified because, in almost all cases, more than one on-call firm is eligible and qualified for the work. Therefore, a comparison of the firms is required. You must document a comparison of the eligible firms and explain why the firm selected is the best choice among the eligible firms based on the selection factors discussed in the procurement document.

Draft Scope of Work was discussed with or compared with the SOQs or proposal(s) of the on-call firms shown below:

☐ Name of Firm  ☐ Name of Firm  ☐ Name of Firm  ☐ Name of Firm
☐ Name of Firm  ☐ Name of Firm  ☐ Name of Firm  ☐ Name of Firm

Describe any additional specialty qualifications and experience needed for Task Order or Project:

(Provide Brief Description of Qualifications and Experience)

If one or more eligible on-call firms were not considered for the work in this Task Order/Project, identify the firm(s) and provide an explanation for why the firms were not considered based on factors such as experience, approach, or past performance:

(Explanation)

Check all that apply for your comparison analysis. The selected firm:

☐ Offers the most relevant experience based on the complexity level of this Task Order/Project compared to the other prequalified firms.
☐ Can meet the schedule needed for completion of the scope of work for this Task Order/Project.
☐ Has prior work experience with this Project that will prevent work from being redone.
☐ Demonstrated best understanding of the Project and approach during interviews/discussions as compared to the other firms.
☐ Offered the best overall proposal for this Task Order/Project taking level of effort into account.
☐ Was selected in previous documentation for the overall Project and has performed to RTPA’s satisfaction on prior work for the Project.
☐ Performance ratings of firm on previous work establish it has performed satisfactorily for RTPA.

Document any discussions with on-call firms confirming information marked in boxes above and/or identifying information in proposals or other documents establishing that the qualifications and approach of selected firm for this Task Order/Project meet RTPA’s needs.
I am not aware of any conflicts of interest or organization conflicts that would arise as a result of choosing [name of firm] and believe it is best qualified for this Task Order/Project.

_____________________________    _______________________
Project (or Task Order) Manager    Date

_____________________________
Accepted by Contracts Officer

_____________________________
Date

S:\RTC\TC2019\TC0619\Consent\Procurement Item\Appendix A\7-On-Call Consultant Firm Selection Form.docx
EXHIBIT 10-C.2: STATE-ONLY FUNDED
A&E CONSULTANT CONTRACT REVIEWERS CHECKLIST
(Not applicable for Non A&E Contracts)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Amendment:</th>
<th>District:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency Name:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Project Number:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Agency Contract Number/Solicitation Number:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Name:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Contract Period:</td>
<td>Begin:</td>
<td>End:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Contract Dollar Amount:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Funding:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. PROCUREMENT PLANNING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Description of need for consultant:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Local agency contract administrator information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a Name:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b Phone:</td>
<td>Email:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Do you have a scope of work?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the schedule specified in the scope of work?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cost estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. SOLICITATION DOCUMENTS AND ADVERTISEMENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Consultant selection committee and conflict of interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Was Conflict of Interest form (EXHIBIT 10-T) signed by all?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Was Conflict of Interest form (EXHIBIT 10-T) dated by all?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Does the solicitation contain a procurement schedule?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Evaluation criteria and weights (EXHIBIT 10-B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Were weight values assigned to criteria?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Records of publication for RFP or RFQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Was widespread publication used to advertise the RFP/RFQ (eg newspaper, web posting, Planetbids, etc.)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Records of response to solicitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>How many consultants responded to this solicitation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Does your agency have a proposal responsiveness checklist?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Were records of response documented (eg. log sheet, copies of time-stamped envelopes, other)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. EVALUATION AND SELECTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Documentation of consultant selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>How many consultants were evaluated?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Was evaluation criteria the same as in solicitation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Original score sheets and final rankings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Was final score sheet(s) signed by each evaluator?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Develop top ranked consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cost proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Did you rank all candidates?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Is cost proposal in Exhibit 10-H format or equivalent complete and in the correct form based on the method of payment?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Payment Method:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Is direct labor cost proposal broken down by job classifications and types of costs and/or rates?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. Is the ICR for current fiscal year?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. Are key personnel identified?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g. Are &quot;other direct cost&quot; itemized by items of work quantity, unit price and total for each item (EXHIBIT 10-H)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Audit and review documents before contract execution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Was proposed ICR submittal sent to A&amp;I for approval (EXHIBIT 10-A)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. What is A&amp;I's ICR decision?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Does the final cost proposal reflect the adjusted or accepted ICR?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Record of cost negotiations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Did you perform cost analysis (wage rates, fixed fee, other direct costs, indirect costs and indirect rates)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Was price used as an evaluation factor?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. FOR CONSULTANT CONTRACT AMENDMENT ONLY

| 1   | Amendment number: |
| 2   | Start date: End date: |
| 3   | What is A&I's ICR decision? |
| 4   | Amendment amount: Total amended contract amount: |
| 5   | Description of need for amendment: |
| 6   | Has the scope of work changed? |

**Note:** Please submit EXHIBIT 10-C.2 using fillable PDF along with a signed copy via email.

I certify the information I provided on and in connection with this form is true, accurate and complete and supporting documents are filed in our office filing system. I also understand that any false statements or omissions on this document may be grounds for disqualification from State funding.

Local Agency Contract Administrator  Date

I have reviewed the Exhibit 10-C.2 Consultant Contract Reviewers Checklist but I have not reviewed the supporting documentation in detail. The Exhibit 10-C.2 checklist appears to have been prepared in accordance with Chapter 10 “Consultant Selection” of the Local Assistance Procedures Manual. I have not conducted a comprehensive review of the supporting documentation and cannot, therefore, attest that there are no errors, ambiguities, or omissions in the Exhibit 10-C.2 checklist. Caltrans assumes no liability for any defect in the Exhibit 10-C.2 by virtue of its review of this.

Caltrans DLA  Acceptance Date
Proposal Responsiveness Checklist

☐ Proposal was submitted by deadline

☐ Proposal included the number of required copies

☐ Proposal meets the minimum qualifications

☐ Proposal format includes all requested information

☐ Other______________________________________________________________________________

☐ Other______________________________________________________________________________
RESOLUTION NO.

Adopted by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
on the date of June 6, 2019
on the motion of Commissioner
duly seconded by Commissioner

A RESOLUTION IN THE MATTER OF UNIFORM PUBLIC CONSTRUCTION COST ACCOUNTING PROCEDURES

WHEREAS prior to the passage of Assembly Bill No. 1666, Chapter 1054, Statutes of 1983, which added Chapter 2, commencing with Section 22000, to Part 3 of Division 2 of the Public Contract Code, existing law did not provide a uniform cost accounting standard for construction work performed or contracted by local public agencies; and

WHEREAS Public Contract Code section 22000 et seq., the Uniform Public Construction Cost Accounting Act, establishes such a uniform cost accounting standard; and

WHEREAS, the California Uniform Construction Cost Accounting Commission established under the Act has developed uniform public construction cost accounting procedures for implementation by local public agencies in the performance of or in the contracting for construction of public projects;

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

1. Hereby elects under Public Contract Code section 22030 to become subject to the uniform public construction cost accounting procedures set forth in the Act and to the California Uniform Construction Cost Accounting Commission's policies and procedures manual and cost accounting review procedures, as they may each from time to time be amended, and directs that the Executive Director notify the State Controller forthwith of this election.

AYES: COMMISSIONERS

NOES: COMMISSIONERS

ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS

ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS

8-69
ORDINANCE 2019-1
AN ORDINANCE OF THE SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION TO PROVIDE INFORMAL BIDDING PROCEDURES UNDER THE UNIFORM PUBLIC CONSTRUCTION COST ACCOUNTING ACT (“Act”) FOR CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS
(Section 22000, et seq. of the Public Contract Code)

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) do ordain as follows:

Section 1. Informal Bid Procedures
Public projects, as defined by the Act and in accordance with the limits listed in section 22032(b) of the Public Contract Code, may be let to contract by informal procedures as set forth in Section 22032, et seq., of the Public Contract Code.

Section 2. Contractors List.
The RTC shall comply with the requirements of Public Contract Code Section 22034.

Section 3. Notice Inviting Informal Bids
Where a public project is to be performed which is subject to provisions of this Ordinance, a notice inviting informal bids shall be circulated using one or both of the following alternatives:
1. Notices inviting informal bids may be mailed, faxed, or emailed to all contractors for the category of work to be bid, as shown on the list developed in accordance with section 2.
2. Notices inviting informal bids may be mailed to all construction trade journals as specified by the California Uniform Construction Cost Accounting Commission in accordance with Section 22036 of the Public Contract Code.
Additional contractors and/or construction trade journals may be notified at the discretion of the Executive Director or their designee. If the product or service is proprietary in nature such that it can be obtained only from a certain contractor or contractors, the notice inviting informal bids may be sent exclusively to such contractor or contractors.
Section 4. Award of Contracts
The Executive Director and Chair of the Board of Directors, as authorized by the Board, are hereby authorized to award informal contracts pursuant to this Ordinance.

Section 5. Adoption and Notification
This Ordinance shall take effect and be in force thirty (30) days from the date of its passage, and before the expiration of fifteen (15) days after its passage, it or a summary of it shall be published once, with the names of the members of the Board of Directors of the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission, voting for and against the same in the Santa Cruz Sentinel, a newspaper of general circulation published in the County of Santa Cruz.

PASSED, APPROVED, and ADOPTED by the Board of Directors of the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission, this _____day of __________,_______ by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:
AGENDA: June 6, 2019

TO: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission/Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies

FROM: Amy Naranjo, Transportation Planner

RE: California Highway Patrol (CHP) Statewide SAFE Call Box Coordination Contract

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC), serving as the regional Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (SAFE), approve the attached resolution (Attachment 1) authorizing the Executive Director to execute a new contract with the California Highway Patrol (CHP) for the Santa Cruz County share of the Statewide CHP Callbox Coordinator Position.

BACKGROUND

Through a partnership with the CHP and Caltrans, the SCCRTC, serving as the Santa Cruz County SAFE, operates a highway call box motorist aid system. The system consists of 50 call boxes available to be used by motorists to obtain assistance for vehicle breakdowns, report collisions or other incidents, and obtain assistance in case of emergency situations.

DISCUSSION

All SAFEs throughout the state, including Santa Cruz County SAFE, are required to pay their proportionate share of the statewide CHP SAFE Coordinator Position. The CHP SAFE coordinator is responsible for the review and approval of plans for the implementation and modification of call box systems on state highways. The CHP SAFE coordinator is also responsible for facilitating collaboration between CHP and regional SAFEs, providing regional SAFEs with annual vehicle registration fee estimates from the State Controllers office and calculating the appropriate level of CHP staff resources throughout the state to ensure appropriate implementation of regional call box systems.

A new contract with the CHP for the CHP SAFE Coordinator Position is needed to cover FY 2019/20 – FY 2021/22. Santa Cruz County SAFE’s proportion of the CHP SAFE coordinator position in FY 2019/20 will be approximately $680. SCCRTC SAFE’s proportional share of the billing “factor” is determined at the beginning of each fiscal year by comparing the number of motor vehicles registered within each SAFE’s boundaries to the total number of motor vehicles registered in all counties.
which have entered into SAFE Agreements with CHP. The billing factor is then multiplied by the annual SAFE Coordinator Position annual personnel costs.

**Staff recommends that the SCCRTC SAFE approve the attached resolution authorizing the Executive Director to enter into agreements with the CHP for the statewide CHP SAFE coordinator position for three-year terms or other term lengths as may be required by the CHP and not to exceed $1,000 annually.**

**SUMMARY**

California Streets and Highways Code section 2557 requires regional SAFEs to pay their proportionate share of the statewide CHP SAFE coordination position for the review and approval of plans for the implementation of call boxes on state highways. Staff recommends approving the attached resolution authorizing the Executive Director to enter into an agreement with the CHP for the statewide CHP SAFE coordinator position for a three-year term not to exceed $1,000 annually.

**Attachments**

1. Resolution Authorizing the Executive Director to execute a new contract with CHP for the Statewide SAFE Coordinator
RESOLUTION NO.

Adopted by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
on the date of June 6, 2019
on the motion of Commissioner
duly seconded by Commissioner

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
TO EXECUTE A CONTRACT WITH THE CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL,
FOR THE CHP STATEWIDE SAFE COORDINATOR POSITION

WHEREAS, the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission serves as the Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (SAFE) for Santa Cruz County and as such collects a $1 vehicle registration fee for all vehicles registered in Santa Cruz County to provide a system of roadside call boxes along state highways and other motorist aid projects;

WHEREAS, as the SAFE the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission contracts with various entities to implement and maintain the call box system including with the California Highway Patrol (CHP) to oversee the statewide call box system; and

WHEREAS, State law requires SAFEs to pay their proportionate share of the statewide CHP SAFE coordinator position,

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

1. The Executive Director is hereby authorized to enter into agreements with the CHP for the statewide CHP SAFE coordinator position for three-year terms or other term lengths as may be required by the CHP and not to exceed $1,000 annually.

2. The Executive Director is authorized to approve any necessary amendments to said agreement within the approved budget.
AYES: COMMISSIONERS

NOES: COMMISSIONERS

ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS

ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS

_____________________________
Ed Bottorff, Chair

ATTEST:

____________________________
Guy Preston, Secretary

Distribution: Auditor-Controller
RTC Fiscal
California Highway Patrol
TO: Regional Transportation Commission (RTC)
FROM: Luis Pavel Mendez, Deputy Director
RE: On-Call Real Property Service for Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line Right-of-Way

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) approve the attached resolution (Attachment 1) to:

1. Include RailPros and Associated Right of Way Services (AR/WS), Inc. in the on-call list for real property services associated with the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line (Branch Line) right-of-way (ROW); and

2. Authorize the executive director to negotiate and enter into contracts for real property services with RailPros and AR/WS up to a combined maximum amount of $400,000.

BACKGROUND

In October of 2012, the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) acquired the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line (Branch Line) right-of-way (ROW). With this acquisition, the RTC inherited corresponding real estate rights, property improvements, encumbrances, responsibilities, leases, licenses, crossings, encroachments, etc. It also became necessary for the RTC to manage all such responsibilities inherent with being an owner of such real property. Initially, the RTC contracted with the Santa Cruz County Real Property Division to help it manage its ownership of the rail line right-of-way to issue encroachment permits, rights of entry, temporary leases, etc. consistent with policies approved by the RTC in 2014 and amended in 2018. The Santa Cruz County Real Property Division notified the RTC that due to workload, it could no longer provide real property services to the RTC. In addition, as the RTC proceeds with the construction of projects on the Branch Line right-of-way, it becomes necessary to address complicated title issues and encroachments. Therefore, the RTC released a request for proposals for on-call real property services for the Branch Line ROW.

DISCUSSION

The request for proposals for on-call real property services outlined a variety of service needs for the RTC including:

1. Process and issue right of entry agreements and encroachment permits;
2. Review, catalogue and update utility agreements;
3. Update of existing leases and pursuit of potential leases;
4. Identify and address encroachments;
5. Support capital projects by clarifying real property rights and acquire additional rights, if needed; and
6. Appraisals to support capital project needs and lease management.

These are described on Attachment 2. The RTC received three proposals to provide the outlined services and interviewed two consultant teams – RailPros and Associated Right of Way Services (AR/WS).

RailPros specializes in providing services to railroads and entities that own and operate railroads. Their services include railroad engineering, planning, inspections and property management. They currently provide real property management services to large railroads as well as to public agencies and have established systems and tools, including online tools, to provide those services.

Associated Right of Way Services (AR/WS) specializes in providing ROW services in support of capital projects for public agencies. These include appraisals, clearing encroachments, securing and acquiring right-of-way rights, and negotiating acquisition of rights and leases.

Based on the expertise of the interviewed firms and the needs of the RTC, staff recommends including both RailPros and AR/WS on its on-call list for real property services and entering into contracts with both firms. RailPros is better suited to address the first two tasks listed above and AR/WS is better suited to address the remaining four tasks. Therefore, staff also recommends that the RTC authorize the Executive Director to negotiate and enter into agreements with both RailPros and AR/WS for real property services suited to their expertise up to a combined maximum amount of $400,000.

**FISCAL IMPACT**

It is estimated that the cost of the real property services needed by the RTC as outlined in the scope of work will be about $400,000 over the course of two to three years. After the initial tasks are completed, it is anticipated that the on-going annual cost will be significantly less at about $25,000 to $50,000 per year depending on the level of activity. The RTC has sufficient Measure D funds in the rail and active transportation programs to pay for the services. In addition, revenue will be generated as a result of some of these services and the revenue generated will pay for some of the cost. Currently, about $60,000 per year is generated in on-going leases. As those leases are updated and new leases generated more lease revenue will be received. It is anticipated that the generated lease revenue will more than cover the annual on-going costs associated with leases, licenses, rights of entry, encroachment permits and processing any other requests for access. Any excess funds will be used for maintenance needs. For capital project support, the ultimate cost will depend on the needs of the specific project and the right-of-way...
needs associated with the project should be considered part of the project cost and included as part of the costs covered by the funding of the project.

**SUMMARY**

As owner of the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line, the RTC inherited a variety of responsibilities with such ownership. The RTC contracted with the Santa Cruz County Real Property Division to manage those responsibilities. Due to work load the County Real Property Division can no longer provide those services. Therefore, RTC staff issued a request for proposals. Three proposals were received and two teams were interviewed – RailPros and AR/WS. Due to their different strengths of expertise, staff recommends that both RailPros and AR/WS be included in the RTC’s on-call list for real property services and that the Executive Director negotiate and enter into contracts with both firms for different tasks up to a combined maximum amount of $400,000.

**Attachments:**

1. Resolution authorizing the Executive Director to negotiate and enter into contracts with RailPros and AR/WS
2. Scope of services for real property needs on the Branch Line
3. Excerpts from the proposals provided by RailPros and AR/WS
RESOLUTION NO.

Adopted by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission

on the date of June 6, 2019
on the motion of Commissioner
duly seconded by Commissioner

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO ENTER INTO AGREEMENTS WITH RAILPROS AND ASSOCIATED RIGHT OF WAY SERVICES, INC. FOR REAL PROPERTY SERVICES ASSOCIATED WITH THE BRANCH LINE ROW

WHEREAS, the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) acquired the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line right-of-way in October 2012 and inherited responsibilities as owner of such a property; and

WHEREAS, the RTC released a request for proposals for on-call real property services associated with the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line (Branch Line); and

WHEREAS, RailPros and Associated Right of Way Services (AR/WS), Inc. demonstrated the experience and expertise for Branch Line ROW real property services required by the RTC;

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

1. RailPros and AR/WS are both included in the RTC’s on call consultant list for real property services associated with the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line ROW; and

2. The Executive Director is authorized to negotiate and enter into agreements with RailPros and AR/WS to a combined maximum amount of $400,000 for real property services associated with the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line ROW, subject to the review of legal counsel; and

3. The Executive Director is authorized to make amendments to agreements consistent with the RTC approved budget.

AYES: COMMISSIONERS:

NOES: COMMISSIONERS:

ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS

ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS
ATTEST:

Guy Preston, Secretary

Ed Bottorff, Chair
Scope of Services

Initial Services:

Task 1 – Update Existing Lease Agreements
Review the existing lease agreements and update terms and conditions to fair market value. There are approximately seventeen existing lease agreements on the Santa Cruz Rail Corridor right of way for parking, storage, landscaping, private crossings and related uses. Consultant shall conduct appraisals of leased property, prepare updates and amendments to lease agreements for RTC to review and approve, coordinate and negotiate with lessees.

Task 2 – Pursue Potential Leases
The 2009 lease analysis identified six potential leases, which have not been explored. Since 2012, six potential new lease opportunities have come up and the RTC is currently pursuing two potential new leases. Known potential new lease uses include industrial, commercial, residential, cellular phone site and agricultural. Consultant shall conduct appraisals for potential leases and prepare and negotiate appropriate agreements for such leases.

Task 3 – Review Existing Utility Agreements
Review the existing utility agreements and update the terms based on current needs of the RTC as needed. According to information provided by Union Pacific there are about 185 pipeline and wire related agreements that affect the Branch Line ROW. A few of those appear to be easements. Provide basic information of each utility (type, size, etc.) and approximate location information of each utility agreement for mapping in GIS by RTC staff.

Task 4 – Encroachments
Encroachments from adjacent private property owners have been discovered through right of way boundary surveys. Some of those surveys have recently been filed with the County of Santa Cruz as part of capital projects. Four of the known encroachments on the ROW through the west side of Santa Cruz will be addressed through upcoming construction of a project. There are an additional 14 encroachments in the west side of Santa Cruz that must be addressed. Other encroachments are being identified as projects are being developed and the total number of encroachments on the entire Branch Line ROW is unknown. Consultant shall coordinate the removal of encroachments or negotiate fair market leases with adjacent property owners in accordance with the RTC policy for leases, licenses, and rights of entry.

Task 5 – Railway Property Risk Management Plan
Ownership of railway property creates certain risks for the RTC. Consultant shall identify the risks associated with ownership of the railway property and develop a plan to avoid, mitigate, or manage the associated risks.

Ongoing Services:
Right of Entry (ROE) Agreements
Process right of entry (ROE) agreements on an as-needed basis. The RTC considers simple ROE agreements to include temporary access within the right of way for sampling, field surveys, or short term access to the right of way by local jurisdictions, private property owners, community groups, or other parties. The RTC considers complex ROE agreements to involve construction of repairs, utilities, grade crossings, or other capital improvements, or long-term access or storage within the right of way. The consultant shall develop a fee schedule for simple and complex right of entry agreements in accordance with the RTC policy for leases, licenses, and rights of entry for review and approval by the RTC. The consultant shall also develop forms which can be used by interested parties to apply for the right of entry agreements. Forms shall provide for inclusion of all of the information necessary to fully assess and consider the right of entry being sought. Forms shall also be developed such that they can be made available through the internet and completed electronically. Simple rights of entry may be submitted electronically but complex rights of entry may require traditional submittal. Because the Branch Line ROW includes an operating short line railroad who owns an easement for freight operations and is the common carrier designated by the Surface Transportation Board (STB), rights of entry will require coordination with the short line operator and a right of entry from the short line operator may also be required for rights of entry sought from the RTC.

Support for RTC Capital Projects
The RTC implements capital projects in along the Branch Line ROW that may have the need to acquire right of way or relocate utilities. Consultant shall support the RTC with right of way appraisal and acquisition services, as well as utility relocation coordination for all capital projects implemented by the RTC along the Branch Line ROW. Ongoing services may include negotiating new utility crossing agreements or modifying existing agreements as part of the utility relocation efforts for a capital project.

Appraisals
Prepare summary appraisal reports to determine the fair market value of the rights to be acquired from each subject property and prepared in accordance to professional standards, Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice (USPAP), and the Caltrans Right-of-Way Manual and all applicable laws and regulations. Each subject property appraisal will be separately bound and prepared in a “stand-alone” format suitable for furnishing to the associated property owners per Caltrans’ requirements. The comparable sales analysis shall be in chart format with accompanying analysis in narrative form. Comparable data shall be verified with parties to the transaction.

Acquisitions
Conduct “good faith negotiations” with property owners for the purchase of right-of-way based on values established in the reviewed and approved appraisals; adherence to all professional standards and the Caltrans Right-of-Way Manual and all applicable laws and regulations; preparation of all written correspondence, applicable forms and RTC’s standard purchase agreement; coordination with RTC staff; performance of notary services related to the signing of acquisition documents; escrow coordination
with RTC’s selected title company; completion of final close-out work per Caltrans requirements; and maintenance of all acquisition files including acquisition diaries.

**Lease Agreements**
Ongoing updates to lease agreements to fair market value, and updates to the terms and conditions of the agreements as needs arise. Negotiate new lease agreements with interested parties on behalf of the RTC as needs arise.

**Other Support Services As Needed**
Filing of right of way boundary maps with the County, conducting simple title searches, entering into new utility agreements, conducting appraisals and acquisitions for other needs as directed by the Project Manager.
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**RENA ROBISON • RAILPROS • PROJECT MANAGER**

Ms. Renay Robison is a real estate and right of way management professional with more than 25 years’ experience. For 10 years Renay served as Director/Assistant Director of Real Estate providing leadership for negotiation and preparation of contract with utilities, public and private entities, and individuals who wish to cross or use UP’s property. Her extensive knowledge of real estate, appraisal, and unique railroad statutes lead to her serving as an industry expert in legislative and litigation issues involving utility occupancies on railroad right of way. In addition, she has also held leadership positions in economic development and railroad organizations in Iowa and Nebraska, the National Association of Development Organizations (NADO) and the American Railway Development Association (ARDA).

Education: The University of Nebraska, BS in Political Science; John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University-Leadership for the 21st Century

Time Available to Work on Project: 60%

**DAN DAVIS • RAILPROS • PRINCIPAL IN CHARGE**

Mr. Dan Davis is a successful railroad senior manager with more than 38 years of experience in managing, planning, design, and construction of freight and commuter railroad projects, tunnels, bridges, underground excavations, rail yards, and support systems. He is a Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) qualified railroad bridge supervisor. He has also provided special bridge inspection reports and letter of acceptance for the repair and construction of numerous bridges for various rail lines as the qualified railroad bridge supervisor per the FRA Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Chapter 237, Subpart F. He has also served as the project manager on projects involving the design of new railroad bridges.

Dan is currently serving as Project Manager for the SCCRTC Branch Rail Line Engineering and Other Improvements, project currently underway. In his leadership role, Dan provided inspection and repair recommendations for all bridge structures with track, drainage and at-grade crossing improvement recommendations on the 31 mile branch line. He assisted the client in the development of construction bid documents for the rehabilitation work on the bridges as well as the design for the replacement of a 340 foot long deck plate girder structure.

Education: Studies in Mathematics and Sociology, College of the Redwoods

Time Available to Work on Project: 40%

**DAVID FITZWATER, PE, • RAILPROS • STRUCTURAL ENGINEER**

Mr. David Fitzwater is a registered Professional Engineer with 34 years of experience and 22 years specifically in the heavy freight railway industry. He is experienced in both civil and structural aspects of railway design and construction. During his career, he has managed large multi-discipline teams and been responsible for the completion of project scheduling, cost estimates, studies, ratings, inspections, design, utility installations and field engineering. Dave is currently reviewing utility applications and installation...
A. PROJECT TEAM

work plans for 176 utility conflicts on behalf of Union Pacific Railroad as a part of the California High Speed Rail, Construction Package 1 in Fresno, CA.

Education: MS, Structural Engineering, University of Nebraska at Lincoln; BS, Civil Engineering, Iowa State University
Time Available to Work on Project: 50%

JUSTIN MAHR • RAILPROS • REAL ESTATE MANAGER

Mr. Justin Mahr is a real estate and right of way professional with a full suite of experience in railroad real estate, right of way management, property valuation, property rights, utility management, real estate contract management, utility relocation, and public projects in the transportation and utility industries. Justin was an in-house real estate manager for a Class 1 Railroad for over 6 years managing third party utility projects, public agency projects, and environmental and non-environmental rights of entries. He has successful track record of project management. He has an extensive understanding of railroad and utility engineering standards and requirements.

Education: BS, University of Nebraska at Omaha
Time Available to Work on Project: 60%

CONNIE ALVIS • RAILPROS • PERMITTING SPECIALIST

Ms. Connie Alvis has extensive knowledge of railroad operating policies and real estate practices with emphasis on negotiation, problem solving, and management. Her skills include appraisal valuation, preliminary environmental assessments, and understanding the difficulties that surround railroad permitting regarding easements; assignments and abandonments; leases; property ownership and fee title issues. She understands regulatory issues; signal and fiber optic communications; utility service agreements; license agreements for utility license owners; property appraisals regarding permitting; negotiation of contracts; contractor right of entry agreement; construction agreements; temporary use permits; wireline crossings; mitigation studies; pipeline crossings; private and public road crossings. In addition, Connie is a specialist in local, state, and federal regulatory permitting requirements.

Time Available to Work on Project: 60%

JASON MURRAY • RAILPROS • REAL ESTATE SPECIALIST

Mr. Jason Murray is a real estate and right of way professional with 13 years of experience in real estate sales, and right of way management for the transportation and utility industries. Served as in-house Real Estate Manager for a Class 1 Railroad, managing third party utility use (crossings, encroachments, and temporary uses) of the Railroad’s property in a four to eight state area, leveraging previous rail logistics experience to minimize impact to rail operations and ensure the safety of all involved parties. Jason is an experienced project manager with deep understanding of railroad and utility engineering standards and requirements. He has developed thorough understanding of rail operations as logistics professional, managing full-service transportation solutions for national fresh and frozen food and beverage customers.

Education: BA, Human Resource Management, Michigan State University; BA Communications, Michigan State University
Time Available to Work on Project: 60%
Founded in 2000, RailPros, a California Corporation, has developed wide-ranging expertise in railroad engineering, planning, construction management, program management, safety, and operations. The firm currently provides services to public agencies and private companies throughout California and across the nation. RailPros employs more than 500 professionals nationwide whose specialties include design engineering, planning, construction management, inspection, program and project management, safety, and staff augmentation support. RailPros has unmatched experience in passenger rail projects and the capability and availability to provide the services required for this on-call contract.

RailPros understands the nature of this on-call real estate services contract and the requirement for experience in managing railroad real estate leases, sales, utility licenses and rights of entry. We have put together a team of railroad real estate and engineering experts that can manage all aspects of Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC) Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line right of way requested services. The team has years of experience in property inspection and identification of encroachments, negotiating new leases and licenses, and updating railroad leases and licenses to reduce the railroad’s liabilities and risks. RailPros has partnered with Flairssoft, a software solutions company and developed an online permit and management system to handle railroad property applications and right of entry (ROE) requests. It is an industry-leading, cloud-based, application management system designed in partnership by our railroad experts and supported by a fully engaged internet technology team. The web-enabled right-of-way management software provides a workflow and document preparation and management mechanism that increases efficiency and accuracy for RailPros and the railroad lease, licenses and permit applicants.

Renay Robison will lead the program with over 25 years of real estate and development experience, including ten (10) years as a director in Union Pacific Railroad’s real estate department. Renay’s experience includes railroad sales, leases, and contract management. She has expertise in property examination for the railroad to determine encroachments, identify adjacent property owners and marketing surplus property to the adjacent owners and ultimately negotiating the terms of the sale and closing the sale. She also oversaw all complex utility crossing and encroachment contracts. Renay was responsible for negotiating all terms and conditions within the contracts and was required to know the railroad’s legal positions and acceptable terms regarding safety. Renay aided in the preservation of the real estate corridor and was able to conduct the risk analysis necessary to recommend whether or not to proceed with litigation to protect the railroad’s property rights and franchise preservation. Her railroad right-of-way experience also includes the valuation of the railroad’s corridor. Understanding the historical and complex valuation policies and methodologies of the railroad corridor is critical to establish and justify fair market values for the SCCRTC.

SUBCONSULTANT

Psomas Founded in 1946, Psomas has grown into an Engineering National Review Top 150 design firm offering professional surveying, right-of-way engineering, geographic information systems (GIS), civil engineering, transportation engineering, water/wastewater engineering, utility engineering, and construction management services throughout California, Arizona, and Utah. Psomas’ survey team has performed similar surveying services for joint transportation projects, local municipal projects, light rail projects, and Caltrans on-call contracts for Districts 3 and 4. Additionally, Psomas surveyors often team with large A/E transportation firms to provide similar services, and are therefore accustomed to coordinating the needs of multiple consultants while working on similar large projects. Implementing new technologies in performing surveying and mapping services to improve safety, productivity, and quality of surveying and mapping services is part of the culture at Psomas. The Psomas team has the technology, capacity, and demonstrated experience to perform all of the required surveying and mapping services for this project.
B. DEMONSTRATED KNOWLEDGE

PROJECT EXPERIENCE

1-25 SOUTH GAS RAILROAD PROJECT, COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (CDOT)

RailPros completed 29 ROE permits and specific exhibits involving railroad culverts impacted by the highway project. The RailPros team also provides permit services for bridge utilities that are being installed at the same time the bridge is built. These permits will be obtained when all construction is complete. These utilities involve lighting utilities for the BNSF, fiber optic for surrounding city and underground drainage pipe permits. This complicated process requires working with the engineer that designed the plans as well as the onsite engineer and the real estate division of the railroad. The RailPros team also conferred with JLL and Bartlett and West who approve and draft the permits for BNSF. Many of CDOT’s permit requests require RailPros to research the history of the C&M agreement of the bridge to determine who owns what utility line, if the utility line was prepaid, and who the lines serve.

CONTACT
Tracy Vance - 303-757-9927
Patricia-McKinney Clark (303) 757-9882

ITC HOLDINGS

RailPros is providing railroad permitting assistance for 300+ applications including engineering design review, construction observation and real estate coordination services. RailPros staff provides review of the design, plans and specifications for electric distribution on or across railroad right of way to ensure that the design does not hinder safe operation of the railroad.

CONTACT
Matthew Rice
(248) 946-3593

FIVE MILE TRAIL, CITY OF HENDERSON, NV

This project involved permitting utilities existing within a proposed 75-foot trail on UPRR right of way. Our focus was on permitting those utilities impacted due to construction of the trail while also repurposing of an existing pedestrian underpass. RailPros worked with engineering to obtain permits for utilities. This project included the permitting of 44 utilities.

CONTACT
Matt Roybal
City of Henderson Public Works Engineer
(702) 267-3066
RailPros is providing BNSF Railway with plan and specification review for California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) construction packages 1 thru 4 between Madera and Bakersfield, CA. Reviews of applications for new and relocated utilities are performed for three separate CHSRA contracts and multiple subcontractors in accordance with BNSF Utility Accommodation Policy and AREMA Manual for Railway Engineering. Scope of reviews includes application, design plans, specifications, calculations and construction work plans for fiber optic, telecommunications, sewer, water, gas, irrigation, overhead and underground power lines. Construction work plans include overhead lines, underground horizontal directional drilling (HDD), underground jack and bore and underground trenching for track crossing and longitudinal encroachments. RailPros reviews shoring plans and boomed equipment lift plans in accordance with AREMA and BNSF requirements. Once the utility design and construction work plans are accepted, RailPros advises the BNSF Project Engineer who approves the utility applications. RailPros has developed review checklists and trained a team of engineers to facilitate these reviews so that dozens of applications can be reviewed simultaneously. We have also developed a seamless document control process using Microsoft SharePoint to receive new applications and post review comments. BNSF has full visibility to all documents and the control log maintained by RailPros to track application status. Disputed comments are resolved in a comment resolution meeting with the contractor as needed. When site constraints require deviation from Railroad Company requirements, the contractor submits an RFI which is coordinated by RailPros Project Manager with BNSF personnel to review and approve the deviation. RailPros also provides construction inspectors to ensure that the utility installation proceeds in accordance with the approved permit documents.

**CONTACT**

Walter Smith  
General Director, Commuter Construction BNSF Railway  
(909) 386-4910  
walter.smith@bnsf.com

RailPros is providing UPRR with complete project management for all plan and specification review and construction for CHSRA construction packages between Madera and Bakersfield, CA. Utilities is one of our core functions along with structures, track, flagging coordination, utility observation, document control, construction management and budget. Our Utility group reviews applications, work plans, and monitoring plans for new and relocated utilities. Applications are reviewed for accuracy and required information and final as-built's are prepared in accordance with UPRR and AREMA Manual for Railway Engineering standards. Scope of reviews includes application, design plans, specifications, calculations and construction work plans for fiber optic, telecommunications, sewer, water, gas, irrigation, overhead and underground power lines. Construction work plans include overhead lines, underground horizontal...
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directional drilling (HDD), underground jack and bore and underground trenching for track crossing and longitudinal encroachments. RailPros reviews shoring plans and boomed equipment lift plans in accordance with AREMA and UPRR requirements. RailPros has developed review checklists and trained a team of engineers to facilitate these reviews so that dozens of applications can be reviewed simultaneously. We also provide construction inspectors to ensure that the utility installation proceeds in accordance with the approved permit documents.

CONTACT

Mary Schroll
UPRR Senior Manager of Industry & Public Projects
(916) 789-6111
mrschrol@up.com
LARRY CASTELLANOS, SR/WA, R/W-AC
Vice President | Project Manager

Larry Castellanos joined Associated Right of Way Services, Inc., in 1997. Mr. Castellanos is responsible for project management of multi-faceted projects involving property appraisal, acquisition and relocation throughout the San Francisco Bay Area, Central Valley and Sacramento region. He has negotiated full and partial acquisitions numbering in the hundreds on improved, unimproved, agricultural, commercial, industrial, residential, multi-tenant and public agency properties. Experienced in redevelopment, transportation, flood control, and pipeline projects, Mr. Castellanos often conducts informational presentations about the right of way and acquisition process to public agency boards, staff and legal counsel.

Mr. Castellanos began his career at AR/WS as an Acquisition Consultant and Appraiser before being promoted to Appraisal Manager. While managing the company’s appraisal division, he worked closely with public agency legal counsel on appraisal report preparation and reviewed appraisals for federally funded projects. He coordinated the hiring of specialists in hazardous waste, vineyards, wetlands, and fixtures and equipment; and prepared full and complex partial acquisition eminent domain appraisal reports for commercial, industrial, residential and agricultural properties.

Project Experience

**California High Speed Rail Authority – California High-Speed Rail Project**
Mr. Castellanos is the Project Manager for CP4 in Kern County. AR/WS team members are currently providing project management, appraisal and property acquisition services in Kern County as part of the Fresno to Bakersfield section of the project. Mr. Castellanos is the overall project manager for the AR/WS team, managing all aspects of the right of way process.

**Napa County Flood Control and Water Conservation District – Napa River/Napa Creek Flood Protection Project**
Mr. Castellanos provided project management on the replacement of the Third Street, First Street and Maxwell Bridges. Tasks included coordination with Caltrans for the Maxwell Street Bridge, which was an on-system project with federal funding.

**County of Sonoma – Highway 12 Corridor Improvement Project**
The State Route 12 project included road widening and sidewalk improvements along Highway 12, just north of the City of Sonoma. This project required a full spectrum of right of way services for 88 parcels. Mr. Castellanos managed the appraisal process, which included coordination with AR/WS appraisers, appraisal subconsultants and appraisal review subconsultants.

EDUCATION
MBA, Finance, University of San Francisco

BS, Finance, California State University, Sacramento

CERTIFICATION / LICENSES
State of California Real Estate Broker License
No. 01223935

State of California Certified General Real Estate Appraiser
No. AG026501

MEMBERSHIPS
International Right of Way Association, Senior Member and Right of Way Negotiation and Acquisition Certified

EXPERIENCE HIGHLIGHTS
✓ 28 years of industry experience
✓ Project management and coordination experience
✓ In depth knowledge of federal and state guidelines
✓ Former Caltrans Right of Way Agent
✓
GARY DOWD
Right of Way Consultant

Gary Dowd joined Associated Right of Way Services, Inc., in early 2013 as a Right of Way Consultant. In his role he is responsible for providing acquisition services; program management support; project management; budget oversight; project coordination; and final delivery of projects for both private companies and public agencies. His work is performed in conformance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act, Housing and Community Development Department applying Caltrans standards while following state and federal guidelines.

Prior to joining the AR/WS team, Mr. Dowd worked for the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) as both Assistant Director and Director of the SFPUC Real Estate Services Division (February 1996 – September 2012). Prior to his work with the SFPUC, Mr. Dowd was a Right of Way Agent with Caltrans, District 4, in Oakland, CA, from August 1988–November 1994. In that capacity, Mr. Dowd was responsible for acquisition, appraisal, property management, local agency oversight, planning and management, and he served as the railroad liaison between Caltrans and all railroads operating in the San Francisco Bay Area.

Project Experience

**County of Tuolumne - State Route 108/5th Avenue Signal Project**
This project will consist of signalizing the intersection of State Route 108/49 and 5th Avenue, adding turn lanes on 5th Avenue in the northbound and southbound directions at the intersection. AR/WS prepared appraisal reports for the four impacted parcels. Mr. Dowd is providing right of way project management and acquisition services for the four parcels.

**California High-Speed Rail Authority – California High-Speed Rail Project**
The California High-Speed Rail Project will provide transportation for passengers traveling between San Francisco and Sacramento in the north to Los Angeles and San Diego in the south. AR/WS property acquisition agents, including Mr. Dowd have made over 80 First Written Offers and settled the majority of these parcels.

**City of Pleasant Hill - Golf Club Road/Old Quarry Road Improvements Project**
Mr. Dowd provided right of way project management and acquisition services for this project. This federally funded project had an expedited time frame to complete acquisitions, which required significant acquisition preparation and coordination during the early planning and appraisal steps of the project. All three acquisitions were completed within the ambitious project schedule.

EDUCATION
BA, Mass Communications, University of California, Berkeley

CERTIFICATION / LICENSES
State of California, Department Real Estate Broker’s License No. 01753694
State of California Notary Public Commission No. 2206324

MEMBERSHIPS
International Right of Way Association (IRWA), Member

EXPERIENCE HIGHLIGHTS
✓ 31 years of industry experience
✓ In depth knowledge of federal and state guidelines
✓ Former Caltrans District 4 Right of Way Agent
ERIK WOODHOUSE, MAI, R/W-AC
Appraiser

Erik A.T. Woodhouse joined Associated Right of Way Services, Inc., in 2012, and currently serves as a Real Estate Appraiser, performing appraisals for full and partial acquisitions assignments on improved and unimproved properties for public improvement projects. The scope of his work includes commercial, industrial, and multi-family residential properties for transportation and utility improvement projects. All work is performed in conformance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act, Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice, Caltrans standards, and state and federal guidelines.

Mr. Woodhouse is experienced in appraising an extensive assortment of real estate types, often involving complex damage analyses. He earned the distinguished MAI designation conferred by the Appraisal Institute by completing a rigorous program of course work, written exams, appraisal projects, and narrative report presentations. Mr. Woodhouse has had numerous public speaking engagements on a variety of topics for the Appraisal Institute, the International Right of Way Association, and the CLE Eminent Domain Conference.

Project Experience

California High-Speed Rail Project - California High-Speed Rail Authority
Mr. Woodhouse has been providing appraisal services on the Merced to Fresno and Fresno to Bakersfield sections of the project. Appraisal assignments have involved a variety of property types with full and partial acquisitions. Property appraisals have included agricultural, public use, commercial and industrial properties.

Southgate Road Realignment Project - Bay Area Toll Authority
Mr. Woodhouse prepared 5 appraisals reports of US Coast Guard (USCG) owned property on Yerba Buena Island for this project. The assignments included full acquisition appraisals of two single family residences and three partial acquisitions of open space land within the USCG ownership. Mr. Woodhouse coordinated with the head appraisal reviewer with the General Services Administration office in San Francisco.

Various Projects - Pacific Gas & Electric Company (PG&E)
Since 2012, Mr. Woodhouse has prepared over 60 appraisal reports on a variety of projects and property types for PG&E. Appraisals have included valuations for permanent and temporary easements for electric and gas facilities. Mr. Woodhouse’s projects have included expedited appraisal services on several assignments, including the Cressy-Gallo 115kV Power Line Project and the Line 118 Relocation Project. He has routinely exceeded schedule expectations while adhering to budget requirements.

EDUCATION
BA, Economics and German, Connecticut College (New London, CT)

CERTIFICATION / LICENCES
Appraisal Institute MAI Designation, No. 446913
State of California Certified General Real Estate Appraiser, No. AG034630
R/W-AC, Appraisal Certified, International Right of Way Association (IRWA)

MEMBERSHIPS
International Right of Way Association, Member
Appraisal Institute, Northern California Chapter, Board of Directors: 2011; 2013 – 2015; 2017 – 2019

EXPERIENCE HIGHLIGHTS
✓ 15 years of industry experience
✓ MAI Designation
✓ In depth knowledge of federal and state guidelines
✓
MARK RICARDS, SR/WA
Utility Relocation Coordinator

Mark Ricards joined Associated Right of Way Services, Inc., in 2011, with 25 years of professional real estate and right of way experience. Highly experienced in appraisal, acquisition, relocation assistance, and utility coordination, Mr. Ricards provides project management for complex multi-disciplinary projects. Mr. Ricards negotiates to acquire property for full and partial acquisitions and provides assistance and coordination for the right of way closeout and transfer of property rights to Caltrans on State highway projects. He has extensive experience working closely with Caltrans Right of Way Utility relocation staff and providing utility relocation coordination on Caltrans related and federally funded projects.

Mr. Ricards is also responsible for preparing ad coordinating right of way data sheets and right of way certifications in Caltrans Right of Way procedure and format. Work is performed in conformance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act, Housing and Community Development Department, Caltrans standards, and state and federal guidelines.

Project Experience

**Alameda County Transportation Commission - I-880 Southbound HOV Lane**
The project included partial acquisitions from 61 residential, commercial and industrial properties along Interstate 880. AR/WS also provided utility relocation coordination services in compliance with the Caltrans Right of Way Manual. Mr. Ricards worked to relocate all utilities on each interchange along with one high-risk underground utility under the freeway’s San Leandro Creek Bridge. He also coordinated the execution of all utility relocation documents by the Alameda County Transportation Commission and each utility owner.

**Alameda County Transportation Commission - SR-24 Expressway Widening**
Mr. Ricards has provided utility coordination services for the relocation of 13 utilities, which included preparation of 13 sets of utility relocation documents that were reviewed and approved by Caltrans District 4 Right of Way Local Programs. Utilities included water, sewer, gas distribution, gas transmission, electric distribution, electric transmission and telecommunication. Subsequent to Caltrans review and approval, Mr. Ricards coordinated the execution of all utility relocation documents by the Alameda County Transportation Commission and each utility owner.

**San Francisco County Transportation Authority - Various Projects**
Mr. Ricards was responsible for coordinating with the utility companies, project design team and Caltrans Right of Way, Local Programs Sections for the relocation of all utilities necessary to accommodate project construction. Projects have included the 19th Avenue (SR 1) Bulb Outs, Lombard Street (SR 101) Bulb Outs, Yerba Buena Island Southgate Road Realignment and the I-80 Yerba Buena Island East-Side Ramps.

EDUCATION
BA, Liberal Arts and Business Administration, University of the Pacific

CERTIFICATION / LICENSES
State of California Real Estate Broker License
No. 00452250

State of California Notary Public Commission No. 2119555

MEMBERSHIPS
International Right of Way Association, Senior Member

EXPERIENCE HIGHLIGHTS
✓ 32 years of industry experience
✓ Project management and coordination experience
✓ In depth knowledge of federal and state guidelines
✓ Former Caltrans Senior Right of Way Agent

EDUCATION
BA, Liberal Arts and Business Administration, University of the Pacific

CERTIFICATION / LICENSES
State of California Real Estate Broker License
No. 00452250

State of California Notary Public Commission No. 2119555

MEMBERSHIPS
International Right of Way Association, Senior Member

EXPERIENCE HIGHLIGHTS
✓ 32 years of industry experience
✓ Project management and coordination experience
✓ In depth knowledge of federal and state guidelines
✓ Former Caltrans Senior Right of Way Agent
STEVE WEBSTER | LS

Steve has 35 years of surveying experience, both in the office and in the field. As a project manager, his primary responsibility is the management of construction projects. While at RRM Design Group he has performed surveying services such as construction staking, boundary and topographic surveying, both in the public and private sectors. Along with field surveying duties, Steve prepares construction stake calculations, conducts research and analysis of boundaries, and creates boundary, topographic and ALTA maps. He has experience with surveying equipment such as total and robotic stations and GPS.

**RELEVANT PROJECTS**

- Arana Gulch Master Plan Implementation, Santa Cruz, CA
- Hearst Ranch Conservation Easement and Coastal Trail Plan, San Simeon, CA
- Knickerbocker Drainage Channel Trail, Big Bear Lake, CA
- La Mirada Creek Park Master Plan, La Mirada, CA
- Las Positas Multi-Use Pathway, Santa Barbara, CA
- Linderon Linear Park, Westlake Village, CA
- Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network Master Plan, Santa Cruz, CA
- Morro Bay Harborwalk, Morro Bay, CA
- San Luis Obispo Railroad Trail Phase I & III, San Luis Obispo, CA
- Santa Cruz Rail Trail Segment 5 Surveying Services, Santa Cruz, CA
- Santa Cruz County RTC Segment 5 Mapping, Santa Cruz, CA
- Santa Cruz Rail Trail Segment 7 Surveying Services, Santa Cruz, CA
- Sapwi Trails Community Park, Thousand Oaks, CA
- Twin Lakes Beachfront Improvements, Santa Cruz, CA
- Venice Beach Oceanfront Walk and Bike Path, Venice, CA
- Whittier Greenway Trail East, Whittier, CA

**EDUCATION**

- Bachelor of Science, Agricultural Engineering, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, CA

**ACCREDITATIONS • LICENSES • AFFILIATIONS**

- Professional Land Surveyor, CA, LS7561
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EXPERIENCE WITH REAL PROPERTY MANAGEMENT, RIGHTS OF ENTRY

Larry Castellanos as a Caltrans Right of Way Agent in the Property Management Section provided short term property management services for acquired properties prior to demolition. This included arranging for board ups, fencing, security and eventually demolition of structures.

Gary Dowd of AR/WS as a Right of Way Agent for Caltrans provided on-going property management services on State owned properties. These services including lease monitoring and rental collection. Mr. Dowd as the Director of Real Estate for the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, prior to joining AR/WS, was responsible for Asset, Facilities and Property Management which included an extensive portfolio of approximately 400 properties owned by the SFPUC. Mr. Dowd and his team’s primary role was lease negotiations, monitoring and rental collection.

Mr. Dowd is currently managing a project in the City of Ukiah which includes the solicitation of 87 Rights of Entry. The purpose of the Rights of Entry is to acquire the necessary right to enter the privately-owned properties to perform construction for the benefit of the property owners. The construing on the private properties is conformance of the entry ways, of primarily businesses, with the new sidewalk. The sidewalks are being reconstructed as part of a roadway improvement project.

AR/WS also has experience with the California High-Speed Rail Authority and the California Department of Water Resources, and additional clients obtaining Permits to Enter for Testing. Most of the Permits have been for entering private property for soil testing during a Phase II property investigation, biological studies, or the sampling of building materials in preparation of demolition.
EXPERIENCE WITH RAILROAD CORRIDORS

Most of our team’s expertise has been in the acquisition of property rights from rail corridors and former rail corridors. This has given us a strong background in the issues involved which may impact title, ownership, and use on the Branch Line. We have acquired property from Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) and other railroad owners. Some of these services include appraisal and acquisitions from UPRR for the City of Alameda’s Jean Sweeney Park, the East West Connector, and projects in Milpitas, Tracy, Dixon and Elk Grove. We have also acquired property rights from the Napa Valley Wine Train, Sonoma-Marin Area Rail Transit and Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad. AR/WS has a strong relationship with the Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) real estate group and we were selected by response to a competitive request for proposal to provide appraisal services for BART.

RRM has over 40 years’ experience analyzing historic and other survey documents along rail lines (active & non-active) to identify property boundaries and encroachments. RRM is the surveyor or record for boundary work for the RTC’s current rail trail projects stretching from the Santa Cruz Boardwalk up the coast to Davenport.

Towill has recently completed a large cadastral, boundary, and right of way project for the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) related to the Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) Silicon Valley Extension. An extensive boundary survey of the former Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) corridor and adjacent properties and street crossings was performed to establish the boundaries of the future VTA right of way.

Chase Kaljian owner of Piedrazul Consulting has worked with Redtree Partners in Santa Cruz creating a master plan to demise and sublease a 33-acre industrial site with rail spur in Felton. Mr. Kaljian was involved with environmental site remediation at the state and county level. He oversaw design and construction to bring utilities underneath railroad to site via horizontal jack-bore drilling technique.

EXPERIENCE WITH ENCROACHMENTS

AR/WS has extensive expertise in addressing encroachments on a linear corridor for the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission. AR/WS provided significant consultation in both policy and procedure drafting related to the SFPUC’s encroachment policy. AR/WS was involved with the successful implementation of the encroachment policy, involving approximately 300 encroachments affecting the SFPUC right of way corridor. Bruz Meade of our staff and AR/WS team members provided field contacts and negotiations with owners, written correspondence with the owners and SFPUC, individual file updates and maintenance, regular meetings, preparation of spreadsheet reports and meeting notes and memoranda, coordination with other SFPUC staff, participation in public meetings and presentations, coordination with surveyors and other SFPUC consultants and assistance with dispute resolutions. Implementation of the encroachment policy included extensive contacts and coordination with SFPUC legal counsel.

EXPERIENCE IN SANTA CRUZ COUNTY

AR/WS has extensive experience providing right of way services in and to the County of Santa Cruz. AR/WS has recently performed appraisal review services for the County of Santa Cruz for the Porter Street; and San Lorenzo Way Bridge Replacement Projects. AR/WS has also recently provided appraisal services in the County of Santa Cruz for Pacific Gas & Electric Company; and right of way services as a subconsultant to T.Y. Lin International for the Civil Engineering Design and Environmental Services for Storm Damage Related Road Repair Projects. AR/WS has been awarded an upcoming project with Wood Rodgers, Inc. for the County of Santa Cruz - Alta Via Road Storm Damage Project.
RRM has been working in Santa Cruz non-stop since 2003. Agencies served to date include the RTC, Cities of Santa Cruz, Scotts Valley, Capitola, and Watsonville, Santa Cruz County, and Santa Cruz Land Trust. Specific to this RFO, RRM has worked with the RTC since 2009 developing the Rail Trail Network Master Plan, researching and mapping RTC boundaries, and preparing engineering packages for Rail Trail build-out.

Towill, Inc. has provided surveying services to the following clients/projects in Santa Cruz County: UC Santa Cruz for base mapping for Student Housing West; Cemex for photogrammetric mapping and volume calculations for Bonny Doon quarries; USACE San Francisco District providing GIS services for Pajaro River Basin; and USACE San Francisco District providing flood-related emergency surveying and mapping of the Pajaro River.

Chase Kaljian owner of Piedrazul Consulting, is based in Santa Cruz and a vast majority of his projects have been in the immediate Santa Cruz area. Mr. Kaljian has worked for Driscoll Strawberry Associates drafting leases for a $15 million-dollar campus addition; 7-8 leases for a 100,000 SF office on Westridge and $5 million-dollar tissue culture lab construction and greenhouse renovation. Mr. Kaljian provided consulting services for Redtree Partners overseeing design, bidding, and team selection for $3 million-dollar infrastructure project within Delaware Addition master plan development on the Westside of Santa Cruz. He was project manager for $2 million dollar building renovation, earthquake retrofit, and ingress/egress for newly acquired concrete tilt building on Swift Street. He also created a master plan to demise and sublease 33-acre industrial site with rail spur in Felton. He was involved with environmental site remediation at the state and county level. Oversaw design and construction to bring utilities underneath railroad to site via horizontal jack-bore drilling technique. Mr. Kaljian clients also include UC Santa Cruz.

**Experience with analyzing historic or other surveying documents to identify property boundaries**

RRM has over 40 years’ experience analyzing historic and other survey documents along rail lines (active & non-active) to identify property boundaries and encroachments. RRM is the surveyor or record for boundary work for the RTC’s current rail trail projects stretching from the Santa Cruz Boardwalk up the coast to Davenport.

Towill has extensive experience and expertise in boundary/property surveys for land/parcel determination, performing tens of thousands of surveys over the firm’s 64-year history. Towill’s project managers and project surveyors each have many years of experience resolving complex boundaries. They are experts at interpreting title reports, deeds, right of way and easement documents, USPLSS cadastral records, Record of Survey maps, and all of the other types of real property records. They have the knowledge and experience to recognize when this may occur, and they know how to investigate non-public sources in an attempt to locate such documents. They have worked with a wide variety of property owners, both public and private, to obtain correct boundary information and to resolve boundary lines.

**Experience in working with adjacent property owners concerning correct property boundaries**

RRM has over 40 years’ experience working with adjacent property owners to identify actual boundaries in the field, remove encroachments, and create legal descriptions and plats for easements over adjacent properties. Moreover, RRM recently recorded a Record of Survey for seven encroachments along the RTC’s rail corridor through the City of Santa Cruz, and has identified another 14 encroachments needing further attention.

Towill’s project managers and project surveyors each have many years of experience resolving complex boundaries. They are experts at interpreting title reports, deeds, right of way and easement documents, USPLSS cadastral records, Record of Survey maps, and all of the other types of real property records. They have the knowledge and experience to recognize when this may occur, and they know how to investigate non-public sources in an attempt...
to locate such documents. They have worked with a wide variety of property owners, both public and private, to obtain correct boundary information and to resolve boundary lines.

For example, Towill completed a large cadastral, boundary, and right of way project for the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) related to the Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) Silicon Valley Extension. An extensive boundary survey of the former Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) corridor and adjacent properties and street crossings was performed to establish the boundaries of the future VTA right of way.

In-depth research of existing property records was completed, the boundaries of the rail corridor and hundreds of adjacent parcels were surveyed to resolve discrepancies, and a 51-page Record of Survey map was filed with Alameda and Santa Clara Counties.

In addition to establishing the locations of exterior parcel boundaries, all existing easements and other encumbrances affecting those parcels were plotted and added to the project’s master base map. This process involved reviewing and interpreting numerous Preliminary Title Reports and thousands of recorded deeds and maps to ensure that recorded easements and other encumbrances were accurately shown for each parcel.

Other recent projects include the Warm Springs Extension for BART, the California High-Speed Rail Authority Pacheco Pass Segment, and the Southern Skyline Boulevard Bay Area Ridge Trail Extension for the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC).

**Experience with Railroad Property Appraisal, Documentation and Knowledge of Best Practices**

Our history with UPRR and other railroads includes appraisal and acquisition services on a variety of projects. For example, UPRR related projects include the City of Alameda’s Jean Sweeney Park, City of Tracy’s proposed Multimodal Station, City of Dixon’s Train Station, City of Elk Grove’s Grant Line Road Widening, and the Fremont Union City East-West Connector. Appraisal and acquisition services on other rail facilities include services related to the Napa Valley Wine Train, Sonoma-Marin Area Rail Transit, California High-Speed Rail, appraisal and acquisition services for the Delta Diablo Sanitation District on the Burlington Northern Santa Fe.

**Experience with General Property Appraisal in Coastal Areas of Central and Northern California**

AR/WS appraisers are experienced with appraising properties throughout Central and Northern California, including in coastal areas. Our appraisers have backgrounds in appraising various types of properties including residential, commercial, industrial, agricultural and special uses, and are experienced in appraising property for public acquisitions through the eminent domain process. They also provide appraisal services for the disposal, rental and leasing of property owned by our public agency clients, as well as appraisal reviews. Our appraisal staff is also experienced in providing valuation studies for other purposes, including right of way planning, budgeting and park land fee projects. The diverse backgrounds of our appraisal staff and their ability to think independently and communicate well gives us the ability to complete a wide variety of real estate appraisal assignments.

**Experience with Research and Analysis of Title Documents Particularly for Properties with Long, Complex and Incomplete Title Histories.**

As a team we are keenly aware of the issues which arise with railroad properties and the title issues due to the method in which they were acquired, by federal grant, the date of the grant, or direct acquisition by fee or easement. Complexities arise if the language is for rail purposes only and if the land is being planned for other uses. Our team
which includes right of way professionals, surveyors and a title company with extensive and varying backgrounds has the knowledge and expertise to identify and provide consulting services related to title issues.

**EXPERIENCE WITH REAL PROPERTY ACQUISITIONS, INCLUDING EMINENT DOMAIN**

AR/WS is a California Corporate Real Estate Broker. All AR/WS acquisition agents are currently licensed brokers or salespersons by the State of California Bureau of Real Estate. AR/WS acquisition agents also hold notary public commissions. AR/WS acquisition agents have successfully completed a course in the Uniform Relocation and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act. Our acquisition agents have training related to acquisition of property for public projects. Many of our acquisition agents have earned a professional designation or certification from the IRWA.

The majority of AR/WS services are provided to public agencies on capital improvement projects which include property acquisitions under the threat of eminent domain. The AR/WS team members included on our team have extensive experience providing services beginning with the approval of an environmental document through the real estate appraisal, property acquisition and relocation assistance process, and through eminent domain when necessary. Mr. Castellanos, Mr. Dowd and Mr. Ricards are former Caltrans Right of Way Agents and are well versed in federally funded and Caltrans related projects. Mr. Woodhouse has prepared appraisal reports for eminent domain related projects virtually his entire career. While at AR/WS Mr. Meade has worked on several projects, providing project management and property acquisition services where eminent domain proceedings have been initiated.
**CALIFORNIA HIGH-SPEED RAIL AUTHORITY**

**CALIFORNIA HIGH-SPEED RAIL PROJECT**

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The California High-Speed Rail Project will provide transportation for passengers traveling between San Francisco and Sacramento in the north to Los Angeles and San Diego in the south. The Merced to Fresno section consists of an 80-mile portion of the overall High-Speed Rail Project. The Fresno to Bakersfield section of the Project is comprised of an approximately 114-mile section of the High-Speed Rail system.

**AR/WS Services**

AR/WS has acquired parcels in Construction Packages 1, 2, 3, and 4. AR/WS assignments have included parcels in the Downtown Fresno area to the north and the City of Wasco to the south. AR/WS staff appraisers prepared more than 60 appraisal reports, prepared updates as needed and provided information and consulting to the property acquisition agents. Appraisals have involved a variety full and partial acquisitions from agricultural, public use, commercial and industrial properties in Madera, Fresno, Kern and Kings Counties. Several partial acquisition appraisals have required the evaluation of damages to remainder properties and complex valuation issues.

AR/WS property acquisition agents have made over 80 First Written Offers and settled the vast majority of these parcels. AR/WS also provided relocation assistance services for households, business occupants and a large non-profit transitional housing facility.

Under Construction Package 4, in Kern County, AR/WS has been assigned 32 parcels. Appraisals have been completed. First Written Offers have been made on all approved appraisals and settlements have been reached on 30 parcels. Relocation efforts on 21 business occupants have primarily been completed or are underway.

Cost savings measures have been achieved by using a project coordinator to track all aspects of the progress of each parcel and their deliverables. Additionally, we are using a single agent to prepare all Resolution of Necessity Packages for all of our acquisition agents.

**LOCATION**

Merced to Fresno
Fresno to Bakersfield

**SERVICES**

Project Management
Permits to Enter
Right of Way Appraisal
Right of Way Acquisition
Relocation Services

**DURATION**

2012 - Ongoing

**KEY TEAM MEMBERS**

Larry Castellanos, SR/WA, R/W-AC
Erik Woodhouse, MAI, R/W-AC
Mark Ricards, SR/WA

**REFERENCE**

Shirley Parker, SR/WA
Assistant Director of Real Property
California High-Speed Rail Authority
770 L Street, Suite 620-MS-2
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 403-6937
Shirley.parker@hsr.ca.gov
B. Demonstrated Knowledge

County of Santa Cruz
Various Appraisal Review Services

Project Description
AR/WS staff has provided real estate appraisal review services to the County of Santa Cruz on multiple appraisal reports. Properties impacted have included commercial, industrial, residential and agricultural uses involving full and partial acquisitions with severance damages and permanent and temporary easements.

San Lorenzo Way Bridge Replacement Project
The San Lorenzo Way Bridge Replacement Project included four (4) appraisal review reports for temporary construction rights to conform the new bridge and approach with Rose Acres Lane in Felton.

Heart of Soquel Project
AR/WS provided appraisal reviews for two appraisals that were for a permanent easement and temporary construction easement from the Soquel Elementary School and an improved parcel with an office building and parking spaces. The subject area runs along the Soquel Creek and the subject easements were required as part of the Heart of Soquel Project. Upon acquisition of the easements the County would have the right to repair and maintain the easement area for use as a public trail and riparian area.

Location
County of Santa Cruz

Services
Right of Way Appraisal Review

Duration
2019

Key Team Member
Erik Woodhouse, MAI, R/W-AC

Reference
John Kriegsman
Real Property Agent
County of Santa Cruz
701 Ocean Street, Room 440
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
(831) 454-2337
John.kriegsman@santacruzcounty.us
**Pacific Gas & Electric Company**

**Various Appraisals**

**Project Descriptions**
AR/WS has provided a full spectrum of Right of Way services to PG&E, including project management, QA/QC, pre-acquisition work, real estate appraisal, property acquisition and general consulting services. AR/WS has and continues to work on specialized projects such as encroachment removal support, line review and planning and policy information.

**Appraisal**
Since 2012, AR/WS staff appraisers have prepared over 100 appraisal reports on a variety of projects and property types for PG&E. Appraisals have included valuations for permanent and temporary easements for electric and gas facilities. Assignment locations have included Contra Costa, San Mateo, Santa Clara, San Francisco, Alameda, Sonoma, Monterey, San Joaquin, Santa Cruz, Stanislaus, Placer, Merced and Madera Counties. Appraisal assignment in Santa Cruz County include:

- UC Santa Cruz Valuation Estimate – 2017

AR/WS has provided expedited appraisal services on several PG&E appraisal assignments. Our appraisal staff has routinely exceeded schedule expectations while adhering to budget requirements.

In early 2015, AR/WS provided expedited appraisal services to PG&E for the Cressey-Gallo 115kV Power Line Project. This assignment included partial acquisitions from nine agricultural properties located in unincorporated Merced County, near the community of Cressey and the City of Livingston. All nine appraisal reports were completed by AR/WS within 30 days of authorization to proceed on the assignment. Three appraisal reports were subsequently requested and also completed on an expedited basis.

**Location**
Various, California

**Services**
- Project Management
- Consulting
- Right of Way Estimating
- Right of Way Appraisals
- Right of Way Acquisition

**Duration**
2012 – Ongoing

**Key Team Member**
Erik Woodhouse, MAI, R/W-AC

**Reference**
Nathan Mott
Supervisor, Land Acquisition
Pacific Gas and Electric Company
1850 Gateway Blvd., 7th Floor
Concord, CA 94520
(925) 270-2765
AGENDA: June 6, 2019

TO: Regional Transportation Commission

FROM: Sarah Christensen, P.E., Senior Transportation Engineer

RE: Highway 1 Bus on Shoulder Implementation

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends:

1. Approval of the resolution (Attachment 1) authorizing the Executive Director to amend the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (METRO) in the amount up to $125,000 to continue development of the Highway 1 Bus on Shoulder project.

BACKGROUND

A Feasibility Study to evaluate the possibility of operating buses on highway shoulders in Monterey and Santa Cruz counties was completed in 2018 by Monterey-Salinas Transit (MST) in cooperation with California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), California Highway Patrol (CHP), Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC), Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC), Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (METRO) and local jurisdictions. The conclusions of the Feasibility Study are that implementing a bus on shoulder facility on Highway 1 is feasible and cost effective if implemented in coordination with the auxiliary lanes projects planned on Highway 1 in Santa Cruz County. METRO contributed $50,000 in 2018 for the consultant under contract with the RTC to prepare the Concept of Operations (ConOps) for the facility through an MOU with the RTC.

DISCUSSION

The Draft ConOps was reviewed by Caltrans in November of 2018. Although Caltrans comments were minor, they require approval from the California Traffic Control Device Committee (CTCDC) for all signage and pavement markings that deviate from the California Manual for Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD). The proposal for non-standard signing and pavement markings will be reviewed by the CTCDC at the August 2019 meeting.

The Draft ConOps was also provided to the California Highway Patrol (CHP) Headquarters and local divisions for review and comments have been received and incorporated into the document. The CHP is generally in support of the project, and
continued coordination with the CHP through the development of the project through implementation will be essential to the success of the project. Support from CHP will greatly help in gaining approval from the CTCDC for the project’s signing and pavement marking concept.

Next Steps
Upon Caltrans and CHP concurrence on the ConOps and approval of non-standard signing and pavement markings by CTCDC, RTC plans to implement each segment of the BOS project with the future auxiliary lane projects, as part of its Highway 1 Capital Investment Program. Additional coordination and approvals are required in order to implement the Bus on Shoulder facility.

On May 17, 2019, METRO authorized an additional $125,000 in operating funds for further project development activities for review and approval by Caltrans, CHP, and CTCDC by amending the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) in place between METRO and the RTC. The work will be performed by the consultant under contract with the RTC for the final design phase of the auxiliary lanes project between 41st Avenue and Soquel Avenue/Drive. The funds contributed to this project by METRO will fund this effort; therefore, RTC staff recommends approval of the resolution (Attachment 1) authorizing the Executive Director to amend the MOU with the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (METRO) to continue funding the project development activities for the Bus on Shoulder facility on Highway 1.

FISCAL IMPACT

The FY 2018-19 budget and work program require an amendment to include the $175,000 in funding from Santa Cruz METRO and the corresponding work.

SUMMARY

A feasibility study for operating buses on the shoulders of Highway 1 was completed in 2018 which concluded that implementing a bus on shoulder facility on Highway 1 is feasible and cost effective if implemented in coordination with the auxiliary lanes projects planned on Highway 1 in Santa Cruz County. Metro provided $50,000 through an MOU with RTC in 2018 for the preparation of the Concept of Operations by the RTC consultant. METRO’s board has approved an additional $125,000 to continue funding project development activities. Staff recommends the RTC authorize an amendment to the MOU to continue with project development activities.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Resolution authorizing the Executive Director to amend the Memorandum of Understanding with the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District
RESOLUTION NO.

Adopted by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
on the date of June 6, 2019
on the motion of Commissioner
duly seconded by Commissioner

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO AMEND THE
MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING WITH THE SANTA CRUZ METROPOLITAN TRANSIT
DISTRICT IN THE AMOUNT OF $125,000 TO CONTINUE DEVELOPMENT OF THE HIGHWAY
1 BUS ON SHOULDER PROJECT

WHEREAS a Feasibility Study to evaluate the possibility of operating buses on
highway shoulders in Monterey and Santa Cruz counties was completed in 2018 by
Monterey-Salinas Transit (MST) in cooperation with the California Department of
Transportation (Caltrans), California Highway Patrol (CHP), Transportation Agency for
Monterey County (TAMC), Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC),
Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (METRO) and local jurisdictions;

WHEREAS the Feasibility Study concluded that implementing a bus on shoulder
facility on Highway 1 is feasible and cost effective if implemented in coordination with the
auxiliary lanes projects planned on Highway 1 in Santa Cruz County;

WHEREAS on August 16, 2018 the RTC authorized the Executive Director to enter
into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with METRO to fund the preparation of the
operating concept of the Bus on Shoulder facility on Highway 1 between Soquel
Avenue/Drive and 41st Avenue Interchanges;

WHEREAS, in 2018, METRO contributed $50,000 in funds for the consultant under
contract with the RTC to prepare the Concept of Operations (ConOps) for the facility; and

WHEREAS, on May 17, 2019, METRO authorized an additional $125,000 in
operating funds for further project development activities for review and approval by
Caltrans, CHP, and the California Traffic Control Device Committee (CTCDC) by amending
the MOU in place between the RTC and METRO

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

1. The Executive Director is hereby authorized to amend the Memorandum of
   Understanding with the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (METRO) to
   continue funding the project development activities for the Bus on Shoulder facility
   on Highway 1;

2. The FY 2018-19 budget and work program are hereby amended accordingly to
   include the $175,000 in funding from Santa Cruz METRO and the corresponding work.

AYES: COMMISSIONERS

NOES: COMMISSIONERS

ATTACHMENT 1

11-3
ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS

ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS

____________________________
Ed Bottorff, Chair

ATTEST:

______________________________
Guy Preston, Secretary

Attachments: Exhibit A – Memorandum of Understanding Highway 1 Bus-on-Shoulder Project Amendment #1

Distribution: RTC Fiscal, RTC Engineer
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MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
HIGHWAY 1 BUS-ON-SHOULDER PROJECT
AMENDMENT #1

This Amendment #1 to the existing Memorandum of Understanding (“MOU”) is entered into between the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (“METRO”) and the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (“SCCRTC”) (collectively the “Parties”) this _____ day of _____, 2019. The Parties agree as follows:

RECITALS

WHEREAS, bus operations along the congested portions of Highway 1 within Santa Cruz County pose a significant challenge for METRO as the agency works to keep public transit competitive with single-occupant vehicles in the same traffic conditions.

WHEREAS, in June of 2018, a Feasibility Study was completed to evaluate the possibility of operating buses on highway shoulders in Monterey and Santa Cruz counties (“Bus-on-Shoulder”). This study was prepared in cooperation with Caltrans, California Highway Patrol (CHP), SCCRTC, METRO and other local jurisdictions.

WHEREAS, the Feasibility Study resulted in several findings, including a determination that Highway 1 shoulders lack the width and pavement structural section to support Bus-on-Shoulder operations without significant construction, and that existing and planned auxiliary lanes provide an opportunity for Bus-on-Shoulder operations and should be implemented in coordination with each of the auxiliary lane projects.

WHEREAS, METRO and the RTC are interested in the potential implementation of the Bus-on-Shoulder project to address existing and future traffic issues, the two parities entered into an MOU on October 1, 2018 to support development of an operating concept.

WHEREAS, additional project development activities are needed to obtain approvals by Caltrans, California Highway Patrol, and the California Traffic Control Device Committee.

WHEREAS, this Amendment to the MOU outlines the general cooperation and funding framework relating to the preparation of further project development activities for the Bus-on-Shoulder project with the SCCRTC as the implementing agency for the capital project and METRO responsible for the Operations of the facility as outlined in the Concept of Operations (ConOps).

WHEREAS, this MOU does not constitute a “Project” subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”).

EXHIBIT A
NOW, THEREFORE:

1. METRO and SCCRTC agree to work in good faith with Caltrans staff and a contract consultant to complete further project development activities for the Bus-on-Shoulder project as rapidly as possible.

2. SCCRTC agrees to contract, consistent with its contracting procedures, with a consultant it determines, in its sole reasonable discretion, to be qualified to prepare the further project development activities for the Bus-on-Shoulder project.

3. METRO agrees to contribute $125,000 of METRO funds towards the cost of the preparation of the further project development activities by the contract consultant. SCCRTC shall be responsible for the remaining cost of the contract, unless this MOU is amended in writing to require METRO to contribute additional funds. Except for METRO’s contribution of funds hereunder, each party shall be responsible for its own costs incurred pursuant to this MOU.

4. It is agreed that time is of the essence.

5. SCCRTC and METRO shall defend, indemnify and hold one another and their respective officers, employees, and agents harmless from and against any and all liability, loss, expense, 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, attorney’s fees, or claims for injury or damages are caused by or result from the negligent acts or omissions or willful misconduct of their respective officers, agents, or employees.

6. This Amendment to the MOU will be effective when signed by the officials listed below and will continue to be effective until completion of the project development activities for the Bus-on-Shoulder project, unless amended. Amendments may be made upon mutual agreement, in writing, of the Parties.

Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District

By: ____________________________  ____________________________
    Title: ____________________________  Date
    Name: ____________________________

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission

By: ____________________________  ____________________________
    Title: ____________________________  Date
    Name: ____________________________
TO: Regional Transportation Commission (RTC)

FROM: Luis Pavel Mendez, Deputy Director

RE: Fiscal Year (FY) 2019-20 Work Program

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) adopt the attached resolution (Attachment 1) approving the draft final fiscal year (FY) 2019-20 RTC work program (Exhibit A to Attachment 1).

BACKGROUND

Each year the RTC works with Caltrans to prepare a work program for the following fiscal year based on the budget approved by the RTC as well as state and federal requirements. The work program is required for RTC to receive federal and state transportation planning funds and must include the work necessary to meet federal and state transportation planning requirements. The RTC’s work program also includes all of the other work that the RTC performs. The work program provides summary information on the work that the RTC will perform with the state and federal planning funds as well as a summary schedule and work products.

DISCUSSION

RTC staff prepared a draft FY 2019-20 work program for the RTC and submitted it to Caltrans for review. The draft final included as Exhibit A to Attachment 1 has incorporated Caltrans comments and suggestions. As in past years, the FY 2019-20 RTC work program (Exhibit A to Attachment 1) addresses state-mandated responsibilities and RTC priorities including:

- Implementation of the 2040 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) in cooperation and coordination with AMBAG, neighboring regional transportation planning agencies, Caltrans and local jurisdictions;
- Production of the 2045 RTP and 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP)/SCS in coordination with AMBAG, Caltrans, neighboring regional transportation planning agencies and other partners;
- Production and implementation of the various required state and federal funding documents including the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP);
- Completion and design and environmental documents for Highway 1 auxiliary lane, bicycle and pedestrian overcrossing, and bus on shoulder projects;
- Implementation of the federal transportation law, Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST) Act;
• Management, operation and planning for the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line;
• Implementation of the Measure D ½-cent transactions and use tax for transportation;
• Continued maintenance and enhancement of various public information outlets, including information and outreach in Spanish;
• Continued work with project sponsors and funding agencies on securing funds for high priority projects for all modes of transportation;
• Implementation of the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSST) Network master plan;
• Monitor and participate in local, state and federal efforts to address global warming and sustainability;
• Continued services to Santa Cruz area travelers through the Cruz511, SAFE callbox, Safe on 17 and Freeway Service Patrol programs, including coordination with partner agencies to ensure the best possible service.

Staff recommends that the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) adopt the attached resolution (Attachment 1) approving the draft final FY2019-20 RTC work program (Exhibit A to Attachment 1).

FISCAL IMPACT

The work program is consistent with the approved RTC budget and summarizes the work to be done by the RTC using the budget already approved by the RTC. The budget includes a variety of federal, state and local funding sources that will be used to fund the work described in the work program. Some work may be completed within the 2019-20 fiscal year and some may not. The work not completed within the fiscal year will roll over to the next fiscal year along with its corresponding funding.

SUMMARY

The RTC must prepare a work program to receive state and federal transportation planning funds. The attached draft final FY 2019-20 RTC work program includes state-mandated responsibilities and RTC priorities. The draft FY 2019-20 work program has been reviewed by Caltrans and their comments and suggestions have been incorporated. Staff recommends that the RTC adopt the attached resolution (Attachment 1) approving the draft final FY 2019-20 RTC work program (Exhibit A to Attachment 1).

Attachments:
1. Resolution approving the Draft Final FY 2019-20 Work Program
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RESOLUTION NO.

Adopted by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission

on the date of June 6, 2019
on the motion of Commissioner
duly seconded by Commissioner

A RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE FY 2019-20 WORK PROGRAM FOR
THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

WHEREAS, the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
adopts and periodically amends a budget and work program for each fiscal year to
guide its expenses and work;

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

1. The FY 2019-20 Work Program for the Santa Cruz County Regional
   Transportation Commission (RTC) is hereby adopted as shown in Exhibit A; and

2. The RTC executive Director is authorized to make amendments to the FY 2019-
   20 Work Program for the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation
   Commission as needed to ensure state approval and receipt of planning funds
   secured by the RTC by formula or grant award.

AYES: COMMISSIONERS:

NOES: COMMISSIONERS:

ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS

ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS

_________________________________________________________
Ed Bottorff, Chair

ATTEST:

_________________________________________________________
Guy Preston, Secretary

Attachment: Exhibit A - SCCRTC FY 2019-20 RTC Work Program
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission

FISCAL YEAR 2019 - 2020
FINAL DRAFT WORK PROGRAM

Final Draft May 23, 2019
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Work Element 101 – Overall Work Program</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Work Element 102 – Transportation Development Act Administration</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Work Element 112 – Transportation Plans Coordination and Interagency Liaison</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Work Element 113 – Public Participation Program</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Work Element 177 – Freeway Service Patrol</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Work Element 178 – Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies</td>
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INTRODUCTION

Santa Cruz County is the second smallest of California’s 58 counties with 445 square miles of land area. Santa Cruz County is on the coast 65 miles south of San Francisco, 35 miles north of Monterey, and 35 miles southwest of Silicon Valley. The California Department of Finance estimates the population of Santa Cruz County for 2018 at 276,684 and is estimated to increase to nearly 310,000 (12%) by 2040. The largest population (134,218) is in the unincorporated area of the county and the remainder in the four incorporated cities of Capitola (10,563), Scotts Valley (12,195), Watsonville (53,434) and Santa Cruz (66,454). About 80% of the population lives in approximately 20% of the area of the county. The population is clustered primarily along the coast between the city of Santa Cruz and Aptos and in the San Lorenzo Valley. The vast majority of low income individuals and families who cannot afford a car – do not drive a personal vehicle. The city of Watsonville, and much of the rest of the county, is located in the south eastern part of the county and around the city of Santa Cruz.

The demographics, geography, available jobs, and desirability of Santa Cruz County as a place to call home and visit significantly impact travel in Santa Cruz County and creates a variety of challenges. Within Santa Cruz County, most work trips (77%) are within county boundaries. However, 17% of Santa Cruz County commuters travel to San Francisco Bay Area counties and about 5% to Monterey County. The Santa Cruz Conference and Visitors Council estimates that approximately 3 million people visit Santa Cruz County per year and the great majority during the summer months. Nearly one third of those visits are overnight stays. The vast majority of those stays are for leisure travel and the great majority during the summer months.

The Santa Cruz Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) utilized an independent third party rating system called the Sustainable Transportation Analysis and Rating System (STARS) to develop a sustainable transportation framework for the 2040 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Challenges of the 2040 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP):
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available data and are expected to evolve as new data becomes available. The goals for the 2040 RTP are as follows:

Goal 1: Establish livable communities that improve people’s access to jobs, schools, recreation, healthy lifestyles and other regular needs in ways that improve health, reduce pollution and retain money in the local economy.

Goal 2: Reduce transportation related fatalities and injuries for all transportation modes.

Goal 3: Deliver access and safety improvements cost effectively, within available revenues, equitable and responsive to the needs of all users of the transportation system and beneficially for the natural environment.

The Santa Cruz County RTP identifies measurable outcomes, called targets that are each linked to a sustainability goal. Incorporating targets into the goals and policies enables the Regional Transportation Commission to assess how well the long range plan will perform over time in advancing the targets and address the following transportation challenges:

- System Preservation – Maintenance needs for the existing transportation network are increasing. Roadway, bikeway, sidewalk, bridge and other repairs must be addressed in parallel with capacity and operational enhancements. If ongoing routine maintenance needs are not addressed, the cost of deferred maintenance will grow exponentially, leaving little funding for new projects.

- Safety – The federal transportation act, Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act (FAST) identifies safety as a national goal area and requires each state to set Safety Performance Management Targets in order to achieve a significant reduction in motorized and non-motorized traffic fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads. The Metropolitan Planning Organizations must also establish targets in coordination with the state.

- Congestion – Traffic congestion exists in Santa Cruz County and will not go away in the foreseeable future. Population growth and region-wide jobs to housing imbalances that encourage driving as the mode of choice result in more drivers making more automobile trips. The frequent traffic jams on Highway 1 are the most obvious example of congestion on county roadways.

- Environmental and Public Health - A sustainable transportation system can play a vital role in the environmental health of Santa Cruz County and the health of its residents. Greenhouse gas emissions (GHG)
have global environmental and public health effects, and air pollutants can affect both the environment and public health on a regional scale. The link between limited use of active transportation, such as biking and walking, and adult and childhood obesity is increasingly strengthened through research. Strategies for addressing this concern are being discussed at federal, state and local levels.

- Energy – Global energy demands are predicted to grow by 30% by 2040 as emerging economies increase their energy use comparable to other major energy consuming nations. Transportation relies heavily on fossil fuel which is a finite commodity. It cannot be assumed that fossil fuel will be abundant and inexpensive into the foreseeable future.

- Economy – The economic vitality of a region can be affected by transportation in a number of ways. Improved access is likely to positively affect businesses through faster goods movement and increased tourist activity. Implementation of transportation projects can provide jobs, and the smaller the percentage of household income that goes to transportation, the greater the amount of money that is available to go back into the local economy.

- Funding – Funding for transportation in Santa Cruz County has notably improved in the last couple of years. Measure D, approved by Santa Cruz County voters in 2016, provides approximately $20 million in revenues per year from sales taxes that are dedicated for use on the transportation categories approved by voters. In 2017, the California legislature provided more stable funding for transportation for the first time in nearly 25 years with passage of Senate Bill 1 (SB1).

The 2040 RTP endeavors to work toward a sustainable transportation system that addresses these challenges and results in safer, healthier and more efficient travel choices that provide improved multimodal access to opportunities such as jobs, education, and healthcare for our residents.

**Funding Transportation Needs**

Thanks to the passage of SB1, which was upheld by California voters through rejection of Proposition 6 in 2018, and the approval of Measure D by a supermajority of Santa Cruz County voters, funding for transportation is better than it has been in many years. However, the amount of funding available is still quite insufficient to meet all of the communities transportation needs. The various sources of funding available to the Regional Transportation Commission include State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds, Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) funds, Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) Exchange funds, Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds, Measure D funds and funds established through SB1 for various funding programs. The RTC uses
these funds to meet the transportation goals and address the transportation challenges of the community, and establishes its funding decisions through the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP).

The RTIP is developed biennially by the RTC and is due to the CTC by December 15 of every odd numbered year. The program of projects in the RTIP is a subset of projects in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), which is developed through an extensive public participation process in the region and reflects the unique mobility, sustainability, and air quality needs of the community. As set forth in the California Transportation Commission (CTC) STIP Guidelines, the RTIP is based on the Regional Transportation Plan that has been developed and updated pursuant to Government Code Section 65080, and a region-wide assessment of transportation needs and deficiencies.

The RTIP is developed in consultation with stakeholders and partner agencies, including Caltrans, the County of Santa Cruz, the cities of Capitola, Santa Cruz, Scotts Valley and Watsonville, the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (SCMTD), the University of California at Santa Cruz (UCSC), and local non-profits that provide community transportation services or implement local transportation programs. As stated above, the RTIP is reflective of the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), which calls for a balanced multimodal transportation system.

The Work Program

The fiscal year (FY) 2019-20 work program for the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRCRTC) describes the activities, to help meet the goals and address the challenges described in the Regional Transportation Plan using the available transportation funds. During the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2019 and ending June 30, 2020 those activities include the following mandated responsibilities and SCCRTC priorities:

- implementation of the 2040 Regional Transportation Plan and 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy in coordination and cooperation with the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG), the Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC) the San Benito Council of Governments (SBtCOG), local jurisdictions, Caltrans and other local and regional agencies;
- production of the 2045 Regional Transportation Plan and 2045 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy in coordination with AMBAG, Caltrans, TAMC, SBtCOG and other local and regional agencies;
- production and implementation of the various required state and federal funding documents including he Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP);
- completion of design for the Highway 1 auxiliary lane and bicycle and pedestrian overcrossing project included in the completed Highway 1 Investment Program tiered environmental document;
• completion of environmental documents and design for other Highway 1 auxiliary lane projects and the bus on shoulder project;
• management, operation, planning and improvement of the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line;
• continuation of additional bridge rehabilitation work on the Sana Cruz Branch Rail Line;
• implementation of the master plan for the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSST) Network;
• continued work to carry out the RTC’s responsibilities to monitor and coordinate with Caltrans and local agencies on timely implementation of state highway and local projects with state or federal funding participation;
• continued work with project sponsors and funding agencies on securing funds for high priority projects for all modes of transportation;
• continued services to Santa Cruz area travelers through the SAFE callbox, Safe on 17 and Freeway Service Patrol programs, including coordination with partner agencies to ensure the best possible service;
• continued implementation of the Cruz511 program for Santa Cruz County travelers with the added Commute Manager program;
• continuation of the Bike to Work and the Community Traffic Safety Coalition’s bicycle and pedestrian education programs;
• continued maintenance and enhancement of a variety of public information outlets, which include information and outreach in Spanish;
• continued development and implementation of systems necessary to ensure that the RTC continues to function efficiently and effectively as an independent government agency;
• monitor and participate in local, state, and federal efforts to address global warming and sustainability;
• implement the federal transportation law, Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST) Act;
• maximize the transportation benefits of the Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017 (SB1);
• implement the new Measure D ½-cent transactions and use tax for transportation to maximize the benefits to the community; and
• pursuit of any and all funding sources for transportation projects in the region including the development of local funding sources as well as seeking other new sources.

Through the activities listed in this work program, the SCCRTC works to deliver a full range of safe, convenient, reliable and efficient transportation choices for the community taking into account sustainability, equity and economic vitality.
WORK ELEMENT NUMBER 101

Overall Work Program

Agency: SCCRTC                      Project Manager: Luis Pavel Mendez, Deputy Director  Total Budget: $34,535

ESTIMATED EXPENDITURE AND ANTICIPATED REVENUE: FY 2019-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENDITURES</th>
<th>REVENUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Amount ($)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>34,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>34,535</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Description

Develop, maintain, and oversee the annual work program and budget to carryout the transportation planning activities of the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC) in accordance with federal, state and local requirements and available funding. This includes OWP development, coordination, and meetings with local, regional, state and federal agencies (including AMBAG, Caltrans, FHWA, TAMC and San Benito CDG) to ensure that the entire three-county region is meeting federal requirements. Additionally, this work element provides monitoring and review of policy and legislative activities that impact the production, coordination, implementation and requirements of the OWP. Further duties include quarterly reporting to verify progress in implementing the work program.

Project Product(s)

FY 2020-21 Overall Work Program and Budget and amendments; amendments to the FY 2019-20 OWP and Budget; quarterly and annual progress reports.

Federally Eligible Task

Develop and implement annual Overall Work Program and Budget

Proposed Expenditure of Federal Funding (PL/FTA 5303)

Develop, implement and oversee the annual overall work program activities and budget in accordance with federal and state requirements in coordination with Caltrans, AMBAG and other partner agencies; and produce quarterly and annual progress reports.

Previous Accomplishments

Developed and adopted FY 2018-19 OWP and Budget; Processed amendments to the FY 2018-19 OWP and Budget; provided required quarterly and annual progress reports for transportation planning and project activities to SCCRTC, AMBAG, and Caltrans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Finalize FY 2018-19 revenues and expenditures</td>
<td>Revenues and expenditures files</td>
<td>8/16/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Produce final FY 2018-19 work program quarterly report and provide to Caltrans</td>
<td>Final FY 2018-19 quarterly report</td>
<td>8/16/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Prepare and adopt the annual fall FY 2019-20 budget and overall work program amendment</td>
<td>FY 2019-20 amendments and staff reports</td>
<td>11/7/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Produce FY 2019-20 quarterly work program reports and provide to Caltrans</td>
<td>FY 2019-20 quarterly work program reports</td>
<td>10/28/2019 01/30/2020 04/30/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task Description</td>
<td>Scheduling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Prepare for and participate in annual OWP kick-off meeting with TAMC, AMBAG, Caltrans, FHWA, FTA, SBTCOG, SCMTD and MST.</td>
<td>12/20/2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Develop FY 2020-21 draft work program and budget and provide document to Caltrans</td>
<td>02/28/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Prepare and adopt the annual spring FY 2019-20 budget and overall work program amendment and provide to AMBAG and Caltrans</td>
<td>03/27/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Participate in 2020-21 OWP development and coordination meetings with AMBAG, Caltrans and other agencies in the region</td>
<td>04/30/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Incorporate comments/suggestions into final draft FY 2020-21 OWP and provide document to AMBAG and Caltrans</td>
<td>04/30/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Prepare and present final FY 2020-21 OWP to SCCRTC board for approval</td>
<td>05/21/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Update the Continuing Cooperative Agreement (CCA) with AMBAG consistent with the OWP and submit to AMBAG and Caltrans</td>
<td>06/12/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Prepare other amendments to the FY 2019-20 budget and work program as necessary and submit to AMBAG and Caltrans</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WORK ELEMENT NUMBER 102
Transportation Development Act Administration

Agency: SCCRTC
Project Manager: Luis Pavel Mendez, Deputy Director
Tracy New, Director of Finance and Budgets
Total Budget: $769,200

ESTIMATED EXPENDITURE AND ANTICIPATED REVENUE: FY 2019-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>769,200</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>519,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>769,200</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>769,200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>769,200</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Description
SCCRTC as Regional Transportation Planning Agency for Santa Cruz county distributes Transportation Development Act (TDA) Local Transportation Fund (LTF) and State Transit Assistance (STA) funds for planning, transit, bicycle facilities and programs, pedestrian facilities and programs and specialized transportation in accordance with state law and the unmet transit needs process.

Project Product(s)
- Transportation Development Act and State Transit Assistance Funds apportionments, allocations and claims
- Triennial performance audit and corresponding modifications
- FY 2018-19 Fiscal Audit
- Adopted Unmet Transit Needs List

Other Task (Nonfederal)
Manage, coordinate and distribute TDA and STA funds in accordance with state law and RTC rules and regulations

Previous Accomplishments
Every three years, SCCRTC contracts for triennial performance audits of the transit operators and itself to ensure that the agencies are meeting the requirements of state TDA law. In FY 2018-19 a triennial performance audit for FYs 2015-16, 2016-17 and 2017-18 was initiated and will be completed in FY 2019-20. All of the recommendations in the prior triennial performance audit of the RTC were implemented. Annually, SCCRTC oversees the fiscal TDA audits for the transit operators in Santa Cruz County and itself. In FY 2018-19 TDA fiscal audits were completed for FY 2017-2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Coordinate review of appropriate TDA claims with advisory committees</td>
<td>Staff reports and resolutions</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Provide staff support to Budget and Administration/ Personnel Committee</td>
<td>Agendas and staff reports</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Coordinate annual unmet transit needs process, including outreach to traditionally underrepresented communities, and adopt resolution of unmet transit needs finding</td>
<td>Staff reports, presentation, information materials (Spanish), public outreach, meetings and resolution</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Maintain records and pay claims for TDA, STA and other trust fund accounts.</td>
<td>Files, invoice processing and payments</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Assist transit operators with annual financial audits</td>
<td>Phone calls, emails</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Due Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Implement recommendations in most recent performance audit</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Obtain TDA funds estimates from County Auditor Controller</td>
<td>01/10/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Monitor TDA revenue receipts, compare to estimates and adjust estimates as necessary</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Conduct the FY 2018-19 annual fiscal audit and implement suggested changes</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Produce staff assignment lists, performance evaluations and personnel actions</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Prepare and submit to Caltrans the FY 2019-20 indirect cost allocation plan</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Produce and distribute annual financial report</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Coordinate, meet, confer and negotiate with labor representatives; such activities are included in the indirect cost allocation plan</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Conduct the FY's 2015-16, 2016-17 and 2017-18 triennial performance audit</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|            | Staff reports and modifications to processes and forms               | 06/30/20  |
|            | Emails and estimate materials                                      | 01/10/20  |
|            | Reports to B&A/P Committee and RTC                                 | 06/30/20  |
|            | Audit report and staff reports                                     | 06/30/20  |
|            | Assignment list, individual staff meetings, evaluation forms       | 06/30/20  |
|            | ICAP report and staff report                                       | 06/30/20  |
|            | Financial report and staff reports                                 | 06/30/20  |
|            | Meetings, agenda and information materials                         | 06/30/20  |
|            | Audit reports and staff reports                                    | 06/30/20  |
**WORK ELEMENT NUMBER 112**  
Transportation Plans Coordination and Interagency Liaison

**Agency:** SCCRTC  
**Project Manager:** Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner  
**Total Budget:** $217,518

### ESTIMATED EXPENDITURE AND ANTICIPATED REVENUE: FY 2019-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>97,918</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>State RPA</td>
<td>86,417</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual</td>
<td>119,600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>131,101</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>217,518</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>217,518</td>
<td>0 % Federal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: No RPA funds will be used for the contractual work listed in this work element, which will be paid with local funds only and is for hiring legislation and regulation consultants who assist the RTC in obtaining information and producing reports to fully understand the implications of regulatory and statutory changes to transportation planning and funding and adequately communicate such changes and implications and implement them accordingly. Lobbying is not part of any work task under this work element.

### Project Description

This is an ongoing element concerned with the coordination of regional transportation planning activities consistent with federal and state law to maintain a coordinated approach to transportation planning on a local, regional, state and federal level that addresses all aspects of the transportation system, including safety. This includes coordinated implementation of the federal FAST Act and the State's Senate Bill 1, the Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017.

### Project Product(s)

- Agendas, minutes, reports and presentation materials for Interagency Technical Advisory Committee meetings
- Reports and presentation materials for RTC meetings
- Agendas, notes and materials for meetings with representatives from local, regional and state entities

### Federally Eligible Task

**Proposed Expenditure of Federal Funding**

Coordinate the implementation of the FAST Act requirements as it relates to regional transportation planning and monitoring  

- 0%

### Previous Accomplishments

The SCCRTC worked with AMBAG and TMC to ensure a coordinated effort for the production of the 2040 RTP/MTP and is currently working with those and other agencies on the production of the next RTP/MTP. The SCCRTC held regular meetings of the Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC) and SCCRTC staff held meetings with Santa Cruz Metro, AMBAG, TMC, San Benito COG, VTA, educational institutions, non-profits, local jurisdictions, the Air District, other regional agencies and Caltrans to discuss and implement coordination efforts.

### Task Description Deliverable Completion Date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Collect, process and transmit information on funding, plans and related activities to facilitate interagency communication</td>
<td>Phone calls, emails, and information materials</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Participate in, prepare and distribute agendas and staff reports for RTC and committee meetings</td>
<td>Agendas and staff reports</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Meet quarterly with Caltrans to coordinate planning and programming activities and prepare materials for meetings</td>
<td>Teleconference, Agenda and meeting materials and action items</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Coordinate on planning and programming with other agencies throughout the state through participation in the Regional Transportation Planning Agencies group, the Central Coast Coalition and the California Transportation Commission.

Participate in the MTP/SCS Steering Committee with AMBAG, TMC, SBCOG, and transit agencies to coordinate Santa Cruz County efforts with those of other transportation planning agencies in the region.

Participate in Santa Cruz METRO board meetings and Santa Cruz METRO/RTC management meetings and communicate with other agencies in the region to help ensure regional transit planning coordination.

Continue to coordinate with Caltrans, AMBAG and other partner agencies on improved planning for the movement of goods into, out of and through the region, including designation of Critical Urban/Rural Freight Corridors.

Work with the City of Watsonville, Caltrans Aeronautics and other partner agencies to update and implement the master plan for the Watsonville airport to help ensure efficient access to and from the airport.

Exchange information concerning transportation planning, and funding with local jurisdictions, Caltrans, AMBAG, Santa Cruz Metro, the Air District, UCSC, and other federal, state and local agencies.

Prepare reports and materials for the Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC) to facilitate planning and programming coordination among all of the various transportation partners represented on the Committee - (public works departments, planning departments, transit district, UCSC, Caltrans, AMBAG, Air District).

Monitor and participate in efforts at the federal, state and local level related to reduction of VMT and other transportation planning and programming measures to reduce green house gases (GHG) and address global warming.

Monitor and participate in efforts at the federal, state and local level and with law enforcement agencies to address and improve the safety of the transportation system.

Prepare for and participate in meetings of the AMBAG Board as an ex-officio representative.

Coordinate with business and community organizations, and task forces, including those who engage traditionally underrepresented communities, on transportation planning, and funding issues.

With the assistance of consultant services, stay informed on state and federal legislative, regulatory and budgetary changes and proposed changes affecting transportation to more effectively and efficiently coordinate current transportation activities with changing requirements - (consultant and RTC).

With the assistance of consultant services, communicate with legislative officials and others on the effective and efficient coordination of proposed legislative and budgetary changes with current transportation planning activities - (Consultants and RTC).

Continue to work with Interagency Technical Advisory Committee members and other transportation partners to cooperatively develop and pursue grant opportunities for transportation studies and development of transportation plan components and funding.

Develop partnerships with local agencies responsible for land use decisions to facilitate coordination of transportation planning with land use, open space, job-housing balance, environmental constraints, and growth management.

Monitor and participate in efforts at the state and regional level to effectively implement the requirements of the FAST Act and SB1-The Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017, including federal rulemaking, guidelines and performance measure requirements.
Participate in coordination of traveler information including quarterly meetings.
WORK ELEMENT NUMBER 113  
Public Participation Program

Agency: SCCRTC  
Project Manager: Shannon Munz, Communications Specialist  
Total Budget: $109,544

ESTIMATED EXPENDITURE AND ANTICIPATED REVENUE: FY 2019-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>59,544</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>109,544</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>109,544</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>109,544</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% Federal 0%

Project Description
This work element includes public participation activities that support the overall public participation program of the SCCRTC but are not attributable to a specific project, program or activity. This includes general maintenance of the RTC website and social media outlets and responding to general inquiries regarding the SCCRTC.

Project Product(s)
Well functioning website and social media outlets and updated general postings, press releases, e-news, SCCRTC meeting highlights, year in review communicating notable accomplishments for the previous year; broadcasts of RTC meetings

Previous Accomplishments
The SCCRTC migrated its overhauled website to more current technology that offers more efficient maintenance and integration with social media outlets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provide information to and solicit information from the community at large regarding the general functions and duties of the RTC using the media, internet, advertisements, in-office and partner organization contact distribution mechanisms and presentations to local groups as a means to involve the public in the transportation planning process</td>
<td>Updated and functioning website</td>
<td>6/30/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Use print and electronic media to disseminate and solicit information to and from traditionally underrepresented populations</td>
<td>Bilingual print and electronic media</td>
<td>6/30/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fully implement and updated as necessary the RTC's Title VI Civil Rights Program and fully investigate and monitor all Title VI complaints</td>
<td>Webpage, postings, agendas, forms and list of complaints and investigations</td>
<td>6/30/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Broadcast regular RTC meetings and public hearings countywide on Community TV</td>
<td>Televised RTC meetings</td>
<td>6/30/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Utilize Spanish translation services during SCCRTC meetings, public workshops and public hearings</td>
<td>Translators at meetings</td>
<td>6/30/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Continue to provide outreach to the community regarding ways to improve safety as users of the transportation system.</td>
<td>Bilingual print and electronic media and public presentations</td>
<td>6/30/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Publicize regional and state news items at the request of Caltrans</td>
<td>Webpage and social media postings, enews</td>
<td>6/30/2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ESTIMATED EXPENDITURE AND ANTICIPATED REVENUE: FY 2019-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENDITURES</th>
<th>REVENUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Amount ($)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>86,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>345,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserves</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>431,936</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Description
SCCRTC Freeway Service Patrol (FSP) operates on Highways 1 and 17 in Santa Cruz County to assist stranded or stalled motorists, and to remove collisions and freeway debris that cause episodic traffic congestion. SCCRTC works closely with Caltrans and California Highway Patrol to implement the program.

Project Product(s)
Freeway Service Patrol towing services, invoices, service contracts, funding agreements, service statistics and reports

Other Task (Nonfederal)
Implement county level Freeway Service Patrol

Previous Accomplishments
In FY 2017-18 and FY 2018-19, SCCRTC participated with other FSP agencies in the state and Caltrans on the development and implementation of funding guidelines for additional state FSP funding made available through the passage of SB1-the Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017. In FY 2016-17, SCCRTC completed a procurement process and established new tow service contracts and worked with other FSP programs throughout the state to increase state funding for FSP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provide supplies as needed, monitor use, evaluate future program needs, and process invoices for payment of service from contractors.</td>
<td>Tow truck service to motorists, invoices, purchase orders, statistics, and reports</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Conduct quarterly training and informational meetings with Caltrans, CHP and tow operators and partner with TAMC for the quarterly trainings</td>
<td>Training sessions, agendas and materials</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Continue to provide tow truck service to motorists through contracts with tow service providers and under supervision of the CHP (RTC, contractor, CHP)</td>
<td>Tow truck service to motorists, contracts for service, logs and invoices</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Represent the RTC at statewide oversight committee meetings to demonstrate effectiveness and to maintain and increase state funding for FSP program</td>
<td>Meeting participation, reports, presentations</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Improve data collection techniques and enhance data gathering equipment to improve truck tracking and vehicle dispatching capabilities.</td>
<td>Data reports and analysis</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Work with other freeway service programs within region to enhance the program's cost-effectiveness</td>
<td>Cost effectiveness analysis</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task Description</td>
<td>Final Product or Methodology</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Prepare Annual Report</td>
<td>Annual report and presentation</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Continue to promote the program and increase awareness</td>
<td>Outreach materials in English and Spanish</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Continue to implement and monitor the usage and effectiveness of FSP tow truck service in cooperation with CHP and Caltrans</td>
<td>Data reports and analysis</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Coordinate FSP with neighboring counties</td>
<td>Phone calls, emails, letters and meetings</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Consider revisions to FSP services based on analysis of usage and availability of funding</td>
<td>Analysis and reports</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Maintain FSP data collection system and feed the data into the statewide FSP benefit/cost model to better reflect conditions of smaller FSP programs</td>
<td>Data reports and analysis</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Investigate and pursue potential new funding sources for FSP programs</td>
<td>Phone calls, emails, letters and meetings</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WORK ELEMENT NUMBER 178
Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (SAFE)

Agency: SCCRTC
Project Manager: Amy Naranjo, Transportation Planner
Total Budget: $393,550

ESTIMATED EXPENDITURE AND ANTICIPATED REVENUE: FY 2019-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENDITURES</th>
<th>REVENUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Amount ($)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>134,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>259,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>393,550</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% Federal | 0%

Project Description
The Santa Cruz County Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (SAFE) operates the County's highway callbox system and works with the California Highway Patrol and Caltrans on motorist aid and highway safety projects and programs.

Project Product(s)
Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies call box system and extra CHP enforcement to reduce collisions

Other Task (Nonfederal)
Maintain and implement SAFE program and provide extra CHP enforcement

Previous Accomplishments
During FY 1991/92, the first full year of this program, SCCRTC implemented the SAFE Motorist Aid Callbox System in Santa Cruz County. In 1999, SCCRTC SAFE as a partner with the CHP and Caltrans initiated the SAFE on 17 program to reduce collisions on Highway 17 with enforcement, engineered improvements and education. The program has successfully helped to reduce collisions by almost 50% over its life time. In FY 2014-15, SCCRTC SAFE completed an analysis of call box usage and as a result reduced the number of call boxes in the system and upgrade the remaining call box system. In FY 2018-19, the RTC incorporated Measure D funds into the Safe on 17 Program to provide increased CHP enforcement on Highway 17.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Continue to work with contractors to provide reliable and efficient call box facilities and services</td>
<td>Roadside call box service</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Complete mobility and site improvements as needed</td>
<td>ADA accessible call box sites</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Track DMV collection of SAFE funds to ensure accurate revenue collection</td>
<td>Revenue history</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Continue to work with the CalSAFE Committee to coordinate on statewide issues related to Call Box and motorist aid systems</td>
<td>Coordinated and consistent services</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Work with other SAFE agencies in the region to solicit new contracts for call box implementation and maintenance services</td>
<td>Maintenance contract</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Continue to administer enhanced CHP enforcement as part of the SAFE on 17 Program to reduce collisions and improve the safety of the transportation system</td>
<td>Enforcement data and reports</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tasks</td>
<td>Due Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Continue the funding partnership with Metropolitan Transportation Commission to ensure continuation of the enhanced CHP enforcement on Hwy 17</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Continue to monitor and track collision and safety issues on Highways 1 and 17</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Coordinate with Caltrans, the County of Santa Cruz, and emergency services on disaster preparedness and evacuation planning</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Produce annual report for the Safe on 17 program and invoice MTC for funds</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Communications with partner agencies and disaster and evacuation plans</th>
<th>06/30/20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual report</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funding agreement and invoices</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collision information</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**WORK ELEMENT NUMBER 179**  
Transportation Demand Management: Cruz511/Rideshare & Motorist Information

**Agency:** SCCRTC  
**Project Manager:** Anais Schenk, Cruz511 Manager  
**Total Budget:** $613,663  
**ESTIMATED EXPENDITURE AND ANTICIPATED REVENUE: FY 2019-2020**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENDITURES</th>
<th>REVENUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agency</strong></td>
<td><strong>Amount ($)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>213,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>141,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserves</td>
<td>258,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>613,663</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Description**  
Through Cruz511/Rideshare SCCRTC provides traveler information and direct services to Santa Cruz County area residents, visitors and employers to encourage the use of sustainable transportation modes; increase vehicle occupancy through carpooling, vanpooling and riding the bus; eliminate vehicle trips through telecommuting and compressed work weeks; and implements other Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies. The TDM program establishes the strategies that result in more efficient use of available transportation resources. The program promotes sustainable transportation choices and implements programs that result in emission reduction, regional traffic congestion and delay mitigation, and reduction in vehicle trips and vehicle miles travelled. The work is done in coordination with the Transportation Agency for Monterey County, the Council of San Benito County Governments, the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments, the Metropolitan Transportation commission for the San Francisco Bay Area, the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District and the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority.

**Project Product(s)**  
Cruz511 Rideshare and Traveler Information Program

**Federally Eligible Task**  
Promote sustainable transportation modes and choices region-wide through the coordination of incentives, promotional events, campaigns and information dissemination

**Previous Accomplishments**  
Ride matching assistance; program/event promotion; regional coordination of TDM efforts; radio and TV interviews; newspaper articles and press releases; employer and college outreach; website development. In FY 2016-17 the RTC incorporated 511 traveler information services as part of its overall list of services under Cruz511.org that also includes rideshare services and TDM strategies. In FY 2016-17, SCCRTC completed the Cruz511 In Your Neighborhood pilot program to plan, develop and test an individualized marketing and research program for Santa Cruz County that empowers solo-drivers to switch modes. Successful strategies developed through the pilot program will be in incorporated into other efforts. In FY 2018-19 the RTC partnered with the City of Santa Cruz to provide a Commute Manager program focusing travelers to the Downtown Santa Cruz area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Update and maintain content and design of websites including the Cruz511 traveler information component</td>
<td>Updated Rideshare/Cruz511 Website &amp; traveler information component</td>
<td>6/30/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Operate 429-POOL hotline and coordinate regional participation and access to the 511.org online ride matching system. Maintain online database of people interested in a ride match.</td>
<td>Match lists, robust database</td>
<td>6/30/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agenda Item</td>
<td>Expected Deliverables</td>
<td>Due Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Direct, monitor, and document media communications related to program's objectives and goals</td>
<td>Media releases, interviews, articles, etc.</td>
<td>6/30/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Assist employers in promoting multi-modal travel options and services through transportation fairs and on-site presentations</td>
<td>Scatter maps, presentation materials, list of employers</td>
<td>6/30/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Develop and apply a consistent set of evaluation measures for TDM projects and programs</td>
<td>Improved evaluation tools</td>
<td>6/30/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Participate in transportation-related air quality and climate change activities including those related to implementing State and Federal Clean Air Acts and other legislation such as AB 32 and SB 375; this includes promoting the advancement of clean fuel vehicles</td>
<td>Promotional materials and handouts</td>
<td>6/30/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Promote and facilitate access to existing park and Ride Lots and plan for future P&amp;R facility needs</td>
<td>Improved PNR facilities, signs, and agreements; usage counts</td>
<td>6/30/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Develop and maintain information on TDM initiatives in the community</td>
<td>Data on TDM programs</td>
<td>6/30/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Research most effective methods and strategies to meet program objectives</td>
<td>Information on other programs</td>
<td>6/30/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Coordinate with regional rideshare and transit service providers, promote transit services</td>
<td>Promotional materials and handouts</td>
<td>6/30/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Participate in periodic meetings of the Transportation and Air Quality Joint Marketing Committee</td>
<td>Agendas, notes and action items</td>
<td>6/30/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Participate in tri-county coordination of outreach campaigns - i.e. Rideshare Week</td>
<td>Agendas, notes and action items</td>
<td>6/30/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Prepare and conduct community outreach, education, and promotional materials and provide personalized ridematching services</td>
<td>Promotional materials and handouts</td>
<td>6/30/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Update Cruz 511 In Your Neighborhood promotional and information materials and continue to provide to the public to encourage use of alternative transportation modes</td>
<td>Updated Cruz 511 in Your Neighborhood materials</td>
<td>6/30/2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ESTIMATED EXPENDITURE AND ANTICIPATED REVENUE: FY 2018-2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENDITURES</th>
<th>REVENUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Amount ($)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>165,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual</td>
<td>450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>615,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Description
The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) and Caltrans Division of Rail & Mass Transportation will work in conjunction with stakeholders to develop a Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line Network Integration Study as part of the High Capacity Transit Alternatives Analysis. The study will build on previous work to determine the optimal options high capacity transit on the rail line and for an integrated transit network within and beyond Santa Cruz County. This study will include considerations for operations, governance, ridership and community benefits for service in Santa Cruz County and regional connectivity to Monterey, the San Francisco Bay Area and the Coast Rail Corridor. The Alternatives Analysis will evaluate both rail, and bus rapid transit, and other potential high-capacity public transit options on the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line within an integrated transit network. The Caltrans SHA grant portion of this study will focus on evaluating the rail alternatives of the analysis with connectivity to bus transit for an integrated transit network. The overall study is anticipated to include other alternatives for high-capacity public transit, as well as changes in service to existing bus service, including an alternative of BRT on the railway.

Project Product(s)
Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line Network Integration Study
Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line High Capacity Transit Alternatives Analysis

Previous Accomplishments
After an effort that spanned several years, produced modeling tools, included ample public and stakeholder participation, developed performance measures and analyzed multiple projects and project scenarios, the RTC completed a Unified Corridor Investment Study (UCS). The UCS analyzed potential projects and project scenarios on the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line, Highway 1 and the roadway network to meet the community’s transportation needs along a corridor where most of Santa Cruz County’s population and activities are located. At the completion of the UCS the RTC resolved to produce an alternatives analysis to evaluate the best option for high-capacity public transit on the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Develop scope, potential schedule and cost estimate for high capacity transit alternatives analysis with the network integration study</td>
<td>Scope of work, schedule and cost estimate</td>
<td>9/30/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Initiate project and secure consultant services</td>
<td>Kickoff meetings, RFP and consultant contract</td>
<td>10/30/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Oversee consultant work and manage consultant contract to produce the Network Integration Study</td>
<td>Reports, invoices</td>
<td>01/29/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Stakeholder and Public Participation - Outreach to public, stakeholders, RTC Committees and RTC for input at key project junctures.</td>
<td>public involvement plan, meeting agendas, news releases, eNews, and staff reports</td>
<td>01/29/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Review prior studies, identify comparable transit systems, develop goals and performance measures and identify data needs</td>
<td>goals, objectives, performance measures, list of data needs, staff reports</td>
<td>12/30/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Compile data, define rail service scenarios integrated with bus transit, building on previous studies analyze service scenarios including ridership, integration with bus service and governance</td>
<td>summary and tables of data collected, staff reports</td>
<td>07/31/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Prepare reports of the integration study including administrative draft, draft and final report</td>
<td>Administrative draft of study, Draft document, Final Report, staff reports</td>
<td>01/29/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task Description</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Grant Administration - This task includes invoicing, reporting and closeout of</td>
<td>Invoice packages, Quarterly Reports, Grant Closeout Letter/Invoice</td>
<td>02/26/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>grant contract.</td>
<td>Administrative draft analysis, Draft document, Final Report</td>
<td>01/29/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Summary Report of alternatives analysis - Develop administrative draft, draft and</td>
<td>Funding applications</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>final reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seek grant funding sources to help with production of the alternatives analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Description

The objective of this program is to ensure the development of a regional pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure as an integral part of the overall transportation system for the Santa Cruz County and the AMBAG region. This helps to ensure a better integrated and connected transportation system across modes and helps to ensure a safer transportation system for non-motorists. This work element includes working with cities and the county to develop, update and implement bicycle and pedestrian plans and active transportation plans and integrate active transportation planning in all transportation planning efforts, including project plans, corridor plans and studies, specific area plans, general plans, the regional transportation plan and the metropolitan transportation plan. Work with the Transportation Agency for Monterey County and AMBAG to ensure that the local active transportation planning efforts are the components that lead to a more robust and integrated active transportation infrastructure for the entire AMBAG region.

Previous Accomplishments

In FY 2017-18 and 2018-19, the SCCRTC and the Bicycle Advisory Committee reviewed and provided input into the 2040 Regional Transportation Plan, AMBAG's 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy, green lane treatments, bicycle and mode split counts, Transportation Development Act claims, the RTC's Unified Corridor Investment Study, state and federal legislative programs, the Chanticleer Bike/Ped overcrossing, as well as design plans for the City of Santa Cruz and City of Watsonville rail trail projects. Through ad-hoc committees, the Committee examined and made recommendations on improvements for gap closures or other safety measures throughout the county, as well as assisting with bicycle safety observations conducted by the Health Services Agency.
| 1 | Coordinate and provide staff support for SCCRTC’s Bicycle Committee including the production of agendas, staff reports and minutes for six meetings per year. | Agendas, agenda packets, meetings and minutes |
| 2 | Work with the City of Santa Cruz, the University of California at Santa Cruz (UCSC) and other local jurisdictions to modify and update their Active Transportation Plans ensuring that federal and state requirements are met and that bicycle and pedestrian facilities are coordinated with other modes and facilities throughout the region. | Active Transportation Plans for Santa Cruz and UCSC and other local jurisdictions |
| 3 | Engage the public in bicycle and pedestrian transportation planning efforts including the Watsonville community through coordination with Jovenes Sanos, County of Santa Cruz Health Services Agency and other community groups. | Meetings, presentations, and information materials in English and Spanish |
| 4 | Work with the local jurisdictions on implementation of their plans and policies to ensure that bicycle and pedestrian travel is adequately integrated and coordinated with other modes and across the region and with overall development to ensure a better integrated and safer multimodal transportation system and employment of a complete streets approach as required by AB 1358. | Bicycle and pedestrian transportation network consistent with approved general plans and bicycle plans |
| 5 | Pursue continued collection of bicycle count and mode split data | Bicycle counts and mode split data |
| 6 | Continue working with AMBAG in its efforts to improve the regional travel demand model to include a bicycle and active transportation component | Phone calls, emails, meetings, analysis of bicycle use data |
| 7 | Coordinate and participate with Caltrans on the implementation of the California Active Transportation Plan, Toward an Active California including the production of a statewide bicycle map and development of the District 5 Active Transportation Plan | Agendas, materials, communications and active, bike and ped transportation plans |
| 8 | Coordinate with local, regional, state and federal agencies on bicycle and pedestrian planning and funding efforts | Phone calls, emails, meetings, and information materials |
| 9 | Work with the County of Santa Cruz, Caltrans, local community groups, businesses and the public on planning for improved bicycle and pedestrian access and facilities in the San Lorenzo Valley that is coordinated with the regional bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure and other transportation modes | Phone calls, emails and meetings |
| 10 | Work with the County of Santa Cruz, Caltrans and community groups on bicycle safety improvements including green bike lane treatments at select freeway interchanges throughout the county | Phone calls, emails and meetings |
### ESTIMATED EXPENDITURE AND ANTICIPATED REVENUE: FY 2019-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>510,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>RSTP Exchange</td>
<td>165,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual</td>
<td>3,489,250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Measure D</td>
<td>2,929,250</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>HSIP</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>525,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Active Transp Program</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,999,250</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,999,250</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**% Federal** 0%

### Project Description

The objective of this program is to encourage a safer bicycle and pedestrian transportation network through the funding, support and implementation of bicycle and pedestrian safety and education programs and projects working in partnership with the Community Traffic Safety Coalitions, Bike to Work, partner agencies, the local jurisdictions, the business community and the community at large. This work element also implements the master plan for the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail network and the countywide bike signage plan.

### Project Product(s)

Improved awareness and expanded bicycle and pedestrian transportation facilities.

### Federally Eligible Tasks

- Coordinate and advance bicycle and pedestrian projects and programs in Santa Cruz County

### Proposed Expenditure of Federal Funding (PL/FTA 5303)

0%

### Previous Accomplishments

In 2016 and 2017, the RTC continued implementation of the award-winning Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network (and Coastal Rail Trail spine) as defined in the adopted Master Plan and secured federal, state and private grant funds for about 10 miles of trail segments. In 2016, Santa Cruz County voters passed measure D, which provides close to $100 million over 30 years for implementation of the MBSST Network Master Plan. In FY 2018-19, the RTC completed the environmental document for MBSST trail construction in the North Coast. In 2015, the RTC completed a bike route signage plan, sought and received Active Transportation Program funding to implement the plan. In FY 2017-18 the RTC completed the design phase of the bike route signage plan and FY 2018-19, the RTC began construction of the project. In FY 2018-19 the RTC secured an HSIP grant for pedestrian improvements on Highway 9 at different locations.

### Task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Continue financial support of the Bike to Work/School program, and the Community Traffic Safety Coalition (CTSC) - (Consultants and RTC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Continue funding and promoting the bilingual bicycle and pedestrian safety education program (Ride N' Stride) at schools - (Consultant and RTC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Investigate and implement methods to reduce vehicle travel by expanding and enhancing bicycle and pedestrian travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Continue to compile and update digitized bikeway information to be provided to the public as a roadway layer through the County’s GIS webpage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bike week 2019; Work Plan implementation</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved allocations; trainings</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded bike and ped facilities</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digitized map information</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continue outreach and administration of Bicycle Hazard and Pedestrian Access Reports to identify network deficiencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Continue working with the Pedestrian Safety Task Force to implement the findings of the report &quot;Improving Safety and Accessibility of Sidewalks in Santa Cruz County&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Implement a Bicycle Route Signage system through coordination with local jurisdictions, bicycle advocates and community members. Review planned routes and coordinate with stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Implement the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network (and Coastal Rail Trail spine) project as defined in the adopted Master Plan; continue to apply for funding for additional rail trail segment implementation, coordinate with local jurisdictions and execute contracts, and develop overall guidelines and policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Implement bicycle and pedestrian improvements in the San Lorenzo Valley working with partner agencies, especially the County for Santa Cruz and Caltrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Continue updating and distributing the Santa Cruz County Bikeways Map</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WORK ELEMENT NUMBER 621  Elderly & Disabled & Americans with Disabilities Act

Agency: SCCRTC  Project Manager: Grace Blakeslee, Sr. Transportation Planner  Total Budget: $68,433

ESTIMATED EXPENDITURE AND ANTICIPATED REVENUE: FY 2019-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>68,433</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>68,433</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>68,433</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>68,433</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Description
To plan and coordinate the delivery of transportation services to the elderly and persons with disabilities, and to achieve economies of scale among human service and transportation agencies. Additionally, this work element identifies the transportation needs of traditionally underserved groups (elderly, persons with disabilities, persons of color, and low-income) and assesses the adequacy of the transportation system to meet those needs.

Project Product(s)
Agenda packets and minutes of the Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee
Inclusion of transportation needs of elderly and disabled into transportation planning and programming efforts and documents

Federally Eligible Task
Administer and conduct Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee meetings

Proposed Expenditure of Federal Funding (PL/FTA 5303)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federally Eligible Task</th>
<th>Proposed Expenditure of Federal Funding (PL/FTA 5303)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide staff support to the E&amp;D Transportation Advisory Committee</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Previous Accomplishments
SCCRTC works with AMBAG and other regional and local partner agencies to update the Coordinated Public Transit Human Services Transportation Plan. The Committee established the Pedestrian Safety Work Group to better address accessible pedestrian planning, especially for the elderly and disabled. SCCRTC holds E&D Transportation Advisory Committee meetings regularly to coordinate with public transit operators and social service providers. The RTC continues to work to implement the planning efforts of the report titled "Safe Paths of Travel: Projects, Results and Continuing Efforts" funded by an Environmental Justice Planning grant through Caltrans. In FY 2015-16, the Committee, RTC and staff successfully conducted an extensive effort to maintain Committee positions filled. In FY 2016-17, the Committee completed a safety brochure on what pedestrians and bicyclist want each other to know. In FY 2018-19, the RTC and the E&D TAC participated with AMBAG in the production of the Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportatin Plan for the Monterey Bay region and updated the guide to specialized transportation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provide staff support to the E&amp;D Transportation Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Agenda, agenda packet and minutes</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Implement the accessible pedestrian planning program through the Pedestrian Safety Work Group (subcommittee)</td>
<td>Annual report summarizing activities</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Continue to coordinate with local public, private, and non-profit entities involved in providing specialized transportation, including Community Bridges, the Volunteer Center, SCMTD and its Metro Advisory Committee (MAC) to ensure that all planning documents incorporate the needs of the elderly, disabled and low income communities.</td>
<td>Phone calls, meetings, reports and presentations</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with the E&amp;D Transportation Advisory Committee to conduct outreach to the elderly, disabled and low income communities in the region on transportation needs to be included in RTP, MTP, RTIP, FTIP and other transportation planning and programming documents.</td>
<td>Public meetings, outreach materials, reports and presentations</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update the Guide for Specialized Transportation and provide other public information materials on transportation planning and programming for specialized transportation</td>
<td>Updated public information materials</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review project plans to ensure consistency with Regional Transportation Plan policies for improved access to elderly and disabled individuals.</td>
<td>Project summaries and comments</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with AMBAG and other agencies to update the Coordinated Public Transit Human Service Transportation Plan</td>
<td>Updated plan</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work to ensure that transportation planning and programming at all levels in the region consider and incorporate the needs of the elderly, disabled and low income communities</td>
<td>Improved planning and programming documents</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Description
The focus of this work element is implementation of the existing transportation plans for the region - the 2040 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) for Santa Cruz County and the 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP)/Sustainable Communities Strategy. This work element also includes modifications, updates and amendments that may be necessary to the existing plans and coordination with local and regional agencies for the production of the next set of transportation plans with possibly a 2045 horizon year. Additionally, rules regarding regional transportation planning established by the federal transportation acts, will continue to be implemented. This work element also includes working with local jurisdictions to ensure that regional transportation policies and projects are included in local jurisdiction planning activities. Staff will also continue work on incorporating sustainability into all transportation planning documents and activities for the region.

Project Product(s)
Implementation of the 2040 RTP and 2040 MTP/SCS
Updates to the 2040 RTP and 2040 MTP/SCS to produce the 2045 RTP and 2045 MTP/SCS

Federally Eligible Task
Update the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) to produce a 2045 MTP

Proposed Expenditure of Federal Funding (PL/FTA 5303)
0%

Previous Accomplishments
SCCRTC worked with AMBAG and regional partners to complete the 2035 MTP/SCS and the 2014 RTP, which includes sustainability considerations and significant outreach to the community. In FY’s 2015-16, 2016-17 and 2017-18 RTC worked with AMBAG and other agencies to develop the 2040 RTP and 2040 MTP/SCS including environmental review, project lists, funding projections, and sustainability analysis for the plans. In FY 2018-19, the RTC completed corridor planning documents such as the Unified Corridor Study and the Highway 9 San Lorenzo Valley Complete Streets Plan. The work done through these corridor studies and their results will feed into the production of the next Regional Transportation Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Work with other entities in the region on long-range transportation planning activities within the region, including timelines, public participation efforts, updated project costs and revenue estimates, environmental documentation, and other efforts that may produce economies of scale in the production of the 2045 RTP and 2045 MTP/SCS</td>
<td>Components of RTP and MTP/SCS</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Work with AMBAG, local jurisdictions, the public and other entities in the region to advance the goals, policies, and targets of the 2040 RTP and 2040 MTP/SCS including safety improvements and greenhouse gas emission reductions. Monitor performance of SCC to advance sustainability targets where feasible given limited data availability.</td>
<td>Performance monitoring where feasible.</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Implement a comprehensive public participation and outreach program for implementation of the 2040 MTP/SCS and 2040 RTP, and production of the 2045 MTP/SCS and RTP, that may include public events, public meetings, printed materials, website information, public surveying, bilingual outreach, Facebook posts, email distributions, media releases, radio, etc.</td>
<td>Outreach materials that may include email distributions, website updates, facebook posts, surveys, media releases, including outreach to Spanish speaking population.</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Continue to work with AMBAG, Caltrans and local agencies to implement the RTP’s and MTP’s projects, policies, sustainability and safety goals through the various planning and capital improvement programming actions.</td>
<td>Programming documents that reflect MTP and RTP policies, goals and priorities</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Working with local jurisdictions, AMBAG, and other partner agencies, identify and document transportation projects and programs required to meet regional and interregional goals, policies and targets including mobility, access, safety, maintenance, and greenhouse gas emission reductions.</td>
<td>Phone calls, emails, meetings, outreach materials</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Study potential new transportation revenue sources to decrease the funding shortfalls and help to implement the projects in the MTP and RTP, including vehicle registration fees and countywide development impact fee programs.</td>
<td>Analysis of revenue source options</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Work with Caltrans and AMBAG on implementing regional planning and transportation safety requirements enacted through the federal transportation acts</td>
<td>Planning documents consistent with federal requirements</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Apply the Sustainable Transportation Analysis and Rating System (STARS) process to the implementation and updates of the MTP and RTP to ensure a more sustainable transportation planning process.</td>
<td>STARS analysis of MTP and RTP</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ensure consistency between the MTP and RTP with other transportation planning documents in the region such as general plans, active transportation plans, climate action plans, etc. to ensure that all other planning documents that include transportation are consistent with the MTP.</td>
<td>Planning documents consistent with MTP and RTP</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ensure that projects proposed for federal, state or local funding are consistent with the MTP and RTP.</td>
<td>Programming documents consistent with MTP and RTP</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Continue to participate in Caltrans system planning activities including the California Transportation Plan, Strategic Highway Safety Plan, California Freight Mobility Plan, Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan, District 5 System Management Plan, Transportation Concept Reports, Comprehensive Multimodal Corridor Plans and Ramp Metering Development Plan, etc.</td>
<td>Regional and state planning documents coordinated with local plans</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WORK ELEMENT NUMBER 641  
Transportation Improvement Programs (TIP)

Agency: SCCRTC  
Project Manager: Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner  
Total Budget: $295,487

ESTIMATED EXPENDITURE AND ANTICIPATED REVENUE: FY 2019-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>220,487</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>State RPA</td>
<td>51,007</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>STIP</td>
<td>139,097</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>105,383</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>295,487</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>295,487</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Federal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Contractual work under this work element is paid for by local funds and is for assistance with the analysis of programming criteria or potential development of funding sources.

Project Description

Administer and monitor federal aid funding programs whose projects are included in the federal transportation improvement program, including programs identified in FAST Act such as the Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (formerly RSTP) and Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP), Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP), National Highway Performance Program (NHPP), and Federal Lands Access Program; as well as the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and other funding programs identified in Senate Bill 1 including the Local Partnership Program (LPP), Active Transportation Program (ATP) and Solutions for Congested Corridors Program (SCCP). This includes the production, maintenance and amendments of programming documents required for federally funded and regionally significant projects. The work also includes assisting project sponsors with compliance of requirements to receive the funds and deliver the federally funded and regionally significant projects. This work element also includes leveraging federal funds to secure any required match and funding from other sources to deliver as many regionally significant transportation projects as possible. Produce and implement the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) to secure State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds for federally funded and regionally significant projects to ensure delivery of as many regionally significant projects as possible that are included in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) and the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP). Work with regional and state partners on appropriate implementation of the federal transportation act, FAST Act, in California and the Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017 (SB 1.)

Project Product(s)

- FY 2018/19 to FY 2021/22 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) updates and amendments
- Funding applications and decisions for Surface Transportation Block Grant Program funds and other funding sources
- Amendments to the 2018 Regional Transportation Improvement Program and State Transportation Improvement Program
- Completion of the 2020 Regional Transportation Improvement Program and State Transportation Improvement Program

Federally Eligible Task

Production and maintenance of the MTIP and other programming documents to secure funding and delivery of federally funded and regionally significant projects.

Proposed Expenditure of Federal Funding (PL)

0%

Previous Accomplishments

In FY 2015-16, the RTC worked with the CTC and project sponsors to address the significant reduction in STIP funding and amend programming documents accordingly. In FY 2016-17, the RTC programmed Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) for a variety of regionally significant projects. In FY 2017-18, the RTC programmed over $22 million of federal and state funding to a variety of transportation projects, about 85% of which was available due to the passage of Senate Bill 1. SCCRTC also assisted project sponsors in delivering federally funded projects.

### Task Description | Deliverables | Completion Date
--- | --- | ---
1 Prepare, amend and maintain the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) to ensure full funding and delivery of projects in the MTP/SCS and MTIP | Initial materials and timeline | 06/30/20
Prepare application and programming documents for Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) Program and State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds

Solicit and receive project applications for the Surface Transportation Block Grant Program and State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)

Review and evaluate project proposals for the RTIP including their potential to improve safety of the transportation system; produce draft programming recommendations and program funds

Work with AMBAG to prepare amendments to the MTIP and any supporting programming documents such as the RTIP and STIP as needed

Coordinate with AMBAG, Caltrans and other entities as needed on all Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) amendments and amendments of other programming documents such as the Regional Transportation Improvement Program and the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) that impact the FTIP

Conduct planning and project activities (including corridor studies, project initiation documents and other transportation planning studies) to identify and develop candidate projects for the Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) and Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP)

Monitor the state and federal transportation budgets and work with Caltrans and the California Transportation Commission on obtaining funding for federally funded and regionally significant projects included in the FTIP, STIP, RTIP, and MTP/RTP

Monitor federal actions with regard to federal transportation act reauthorization, implementation, extensions and appropriations to ensure full funding and delivery of projects in the MTP and MTIP

Program funds for projects through federal and state funding programs that provide funding for regionally significant projects included in the MTIP such as the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and the Surface Transportation Block Grant Program

Monitor the implementation of STBG, STIP, HSIP, TAP, NHPP, HBP, Earmark, and other federally-funded projects, with an emphasis on project delivery, timely use of funds and compliance with all Federal and state laws and California Transportation Commission guidelines to ensure delivery of federally funded and regionally significant projects

Streamline delivery of qualifying and approved regionally significant projects, exchange federal RSTP/STBG funds for State funds through the State’s STP Exchange program

Assist local agencies in filing and monitoring funding allocation requests

Work with AMBAG and Caltrans to monitor both major and minor state highway projects and to fulfill project monitoring and project delivery responsibilities

Work with AMBAG, counterpart regional agencies, Caltrans and the California Transportation Commission (CTC) on the development of implementation policies and procedures for federal and state funding programs, including those under SB 1

Prepare and federally-mandated information and reports for AMBAG, Caltrans, FHWA, and the CTC

Monitor development of performance measures as part of FAST Act implementation to maximize efficiency of implementation of the MTP and MTIP

Implement a comprehensive public participation and outreach program for production of the various programming documents and funding decisions that includes public workshops, public meetings, printed materials, web site information, public surveying, segments of the Transportation Cafe television program, bilingual outreach, social media, media releases, radio, etc.

Application and timeline 06/30/20

Funding applications 06/30/20

Recommendations and staff reports and materials 06/30/20

Materials for MTIP amendments 06/30/20

FTIP amendments 06/30/20

Planning studies 06/30/20

State and federal transportation budget information materials and reports 06/30/20

Materials and reports, teleconferences phone calls 06/30/20

Transportation improvement program documents 06/30/20

Communications with project sponsors 06/30/20

Reports, resolutions, and agreements 06/30/20

Allocation requests 06/30/20

Communications with partner agencies 06/30/20

Improved funding procedures 06/30/20

Reports 06/30/20

Reports, communications with state and federal agencies 06/30/20

Outreach materials including materials in Spanish and to traditionally underrepresented communities 06/30/20
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Investigate and evaluate the feasibility of a county wide development impact fee for regional transportation projects</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Work with local agencies, regional agencies, Caltrans and the California Transportation Commission to ensure full compliance with requirements of SB 1 funding and maximize the Santa Cruz County benefits from SB 1 funding</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communications with partner agencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ESTIMATED EXPENDITURE AND ANTICIPATED REVENUE: FY 2019-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>278,694</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Measure D</td>
<td>2,683,394</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>6,173,660</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>RSTPX</td>
<td>560,064</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reserves</td>
<td>43,896</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>6,467,354</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>6,467,354</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Description
This work element involves management and development of the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line right-of-way and planning for improved future uses. The Regional Transportation Commission, through partnership with a rail service operator has instituted seasonal recreational passenger rail service and will consider other recreational service possibilities. The development of bicycle and pedestrian paths using the right-of-way adjacent to the rail line is shown within the bicycle pedestrian projects work element.

Project Product(s)
SCCRTC meeting materials; Implementation plans for recreational rail service; agreements with operators; leases

Other Task (nonfederal)
Ownership and management of Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line right-of-way and infrastructure and its operation

Previous Accomplishments
In FY 2012-13, the SCCRTC completed the purchase of the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line from Union Pacific and selected an operator for freight and recreational passenger service. Working with SCCRTC and the community, the rail operator provided tourist train service for the Christmas holiday until a major washout severed the rail line during the 2017 winter storms. In FY 2014-15, the RTC completed rehabilitation work on four bridges, including reconstruction of the La Selva Beach trestle. In FY 2016-17, a supermajority of Santa Cruz County voters approved Measure D, which provides funding for preservation of the rail infrastructure. In FY 2017-18, the RTC worked with the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to initiate repairs for storm damage. In FY 2017-18, the RTC also worked to secure a new rail service operator for the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line and implement a preventative maintenance program. In FY 2018-19, the new rail service operator took over and has increased freight service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Establish contracts and systems to effectively, efficiently and reliably operate the freight service, maintain the rail line and manage the ownership of the property</td>
<td>Service contracts, leases, property management policies</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Investigate lease possibilities, update old leases and secure new leases</td>
<td>Updated leases</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Coordinate operation of the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line, including current and future uses, with operators, shippers, partner agencies and local jurisdictions</td>
<td>Operation agreements</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Work with rail service operators on the development of additional recreational rail service throughout the entire rail line</td>
<td>Rail service plan and implementation</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Seek planning grants funds for the production of feasibility studies and implementation plans for various types of passenger and transit service on the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line; work done with grants from successful applications may be done under separate work elements.</td>
<td>Grant applications</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Guide consultant and contractor work on the rehabilitation of structures and repair and maintenance of railroad infrastructure of the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line in cooperation with the rail operator and local jurisdictions</td>
<td>Meetings, agendas, minutes, phone calls</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Seek funding for other necessary improvements to the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line in cooperation with the rail operators and other regional partners</td>
<td>Funding applications and requests</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Continue to work with the Caltrans Division of Rail and Mass Transportation on any updates and implementation of the State Rail Plan and regional rail service efforts that could benefit Santa Cruz County travelers</td>
<td>Plan production materials and State Rail Plan</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Continue to work with the Transportation Agency for Monterey County, the Coast Rail Coordinating Council, Caltrain, AMTRAK and Caltrans Division of Rail to support the establishment of a rail station at the Pajaro station for any new or expanded rail passenger service on the coast mainline</td>
<td>Meetings, phone calls, email, reports, presentations</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WORK ELEMENT NUMBER 683
Highway and Roadway Planning (SCCRTC)

Agency: SCCRTC  Project Manager: Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner  Total Budget: $85,297

ESTIMATED EXPENDITURE AND ANTICIPATED REVENUE: FY 2019-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>85,297</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>State RPA</td>
<td>59,981</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>25,316</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>85,297</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>85,297</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Federal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% Federal</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Description**

This work element is for the planning work necessary to maintain and improve the roadway and highway system for efficient movement of people and goods. The work includes participation and coordination with Caltrans on the State Highway Operations and Protection Program, Project Initiation Documents, and any other planning documents and efforts to improve the operation and safety of the state highway system. The work also includes participation with local jurisdictions and other partner agencies in their planning efforts to maintain and improve the operation and safety of the highway and roadway system and intersections of the system. This element also includes working with Caltrans, AMBAG and other regional agencies on the effective movement of goods into, out of and through Santa Cruz County.

**Project Product(s)**

- SR 1 Transportation Concept Report, Highway 17 Wildlife corridor planning, coordinated State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPP),
- Transportatin planning documents including PID's for Highway 1 in the North Coast
- Improved operation, safety and mobility on the region's highway and roadway system

**Federally Eligible Task**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Expenditure of Federal Funding (PL/FTA 5303)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work with Caltrans and local jurisdictions and other entities on planning for improved roadways and highways</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Previous Accomplishments**

Working with Caltrans and other local an regional partners, the Highway 17 Access Management Plan was completed and presented by Caltrans to the community and the RTC. A transportation concept report for State Route 1 was also completed. The RTC secured funding for Highway 17 Wildlife corridor through Measure D and the Land Trust of Santa Cruz County. Working with Caltrans and resource agencies a framework has been agreed to for necessary improvements on Highway 1 in the North Coast. The RTC has also entered into an advanced mitigation arrangement with resource agencies, which will help significantly with the planning, funding and development of local highway and roadway projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Completion Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Work with Caltrans and local agencies on the development of the State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) to ensure that well in advance of its drafting the regional and interregional safety and mobility needs of the Santa Cruz County highway system are considered for inclusion in the draft document. This includes coordination with Caltrans and the Interagency Technical Advisory Committee at meetings and other communications means.</td>
<td>Communications with partner agencies and information materials, coordinated SHOPP</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Work with partner agencies on preparation and update of a regional road assessments to establish roadway funding needs and priorities for inclusion in programming documents.</td>
<td>Regional roads assessment and updates</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prepare public information materials in English and Spanish regarding highway and roadway needs and priorities and to communicate to decision makers and the public the need for funding these priorities.</td>
<td>Public information materials, reports and presentations</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Work with Caltrans, the CHP and other transportation partners through the Traffic Operation Systems (TOS) Oversight Committee and Safe on 17 Task Force to identify safety, mobility and operations needs, priorities and improvements for inclusion in planning and programming documents.</td>
<td>Communications with partner agencies and meetings</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Work with Caltrans and other partners to implement the State Route 17 Access Management Plan and communicate to the public the efforts and progress of implementation.</td>
<td>Inclusion of State Route 17 Access Management Plan elements in funding efforts, public outreach materials</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Work with Caltrans, resource agencies and local partners to produce a plan, which identifies strategies that preserve and enhance the critical transportation link that is Highway 1 in the North Coast while preserving and enhancing the critical habitat in the region.</td>
<td>Meetings, communications, Feasibility Study, Modeling, and concept report</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>In cooperation with Caltrans and other regional partners, review and participate in the production of corridor studies to help ensure consistency with the Regional Transportation Plan</td>
<td>Meeting materials, communications and Concept Reports for state highways</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Work with Caltrans, the County of Santa Cruz, and the public to identify and implement priorities for the Highway 9 Corridor</td>
<td>Meeting materials, communications and documentation of multimodal needs on SR9</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Continue to work with Caltrans on collaboration and funding partnerships to implement complete streets improvements on Highway 9</td>
<td>Funding applications and agreements</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Work with Santa Cruz METRO and other local and regional agencies to implement the results of the Bus on Shoulders study and incorporate it into planning and programming efforts</td>
<td>Meeting materials, communications, and funding arrangements</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Work with the California Traffic Control Devices Committee (CTCDC) on any necessary signage approvals to implement &quot;Bus on Shoulder&quot; improvements</td>
<td>Submittals to the CTCDC and CTCDC approval</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Review and participate in planning efforts associated with the California Transportation Plan, California Freight Mobility Plan, the Caltrans District 5 System Management Plan, Transportation Concept Reports, Ramp Metering Development Plan and Central Coast Coalition products.</td>
<td>Meetings, communications, reports and coordinated state and regional plans</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Work with Caltrans and local agencies to develop and implement strategies of the Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) appropriate to Santa Cruz County and investigate the possibility of developing a dedicated transportation safety plan for Santa Cruz County</td>
<td>Safety strategies, communications and reports</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Work with Caltrans, the Land Trust of Santa Cruz County and other transportation partners to develop plans for improved motorist safety and wildlife protection along Highways 1 and 17.</td>
<td>Meeting materials and communications with partner agencies.</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Work with Caltrans, the CHP and other partner agencies to develop plans for necessary transportation improvements on Highways 129 and 152</td>
<td>Meeting materials and communications with partner agencies.</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Work with Caltrans, local and regional agencies to ensure that requirements of SB 1 for highway and roadway planning and improvement are fully met and well coordinated</td>
<td>Meeting materials and communications with partner agencies.</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WORK ELEMENT NUMBER 684

Highway 1 Corridor Investment Program (SCCRTC)

Agency: SCCRTC
Project Manager: Sarah Christensen, Senior Transportation Engineer
Total Budget: $10,435,128

ESTIMATED EXPENDITURE AND ANTICIPATED REVENUE: FY 2019-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENDITURES</th>
<th>REVENUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>RSTP Exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services and supplies</td>
<td>STIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingencies</td>
<td>Measure D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| EXPENDITURES                  | REVENUE                        |
|-------------------------------| Source                        |
|                               | % Federal                     | 0%         |

**Project Description**

SCCRTC is responsible for tasks including the implementation of the Project Approval/ Environmental Documents (PA/ED) phase for the Highway 1 Corridor Investment Program, which includes HOV Lanes and bicycle and pedestrian crossings. Through this investment program the SCCRTC will produce a tiered environmental document with project level environmental review for auxiliary lanes between 41st Avenue and Soquel Drive and a bicycle and pedestrian overcrossing at Chanticleer. The remainder of the corridor will be analyzed at a programmatic level to assist with future investments on sections of the corridor. The RTC will also produce environmental review and design for a bicycle and pedestrian over crossing at Mar Vista and axillary lanes in other segments of the freeway.

**Project Product(s)**

Tiered environmental documents for the Highway 1 Corridor Investment Program and a project level analysis for the Highway 1 41st-Soquel Auxiliary Lanes project, and preliminary design/environmental analysis for the Mar Vista Pedestrian/Bicycle Crossing of Highway 1 and other auxiliary lane segments.

**Other Task**

Project Approval/ Environmental Documents (PA/ED) for the Highway 1 Corridor Investment Program and the Highway 1 41st-Soquel Auxiliary Lanes project

**Previous Accomplishments**

In FY 2015-16, the RTC released the draft tiered environmental documents for the Highway 1 Corridor Investment Program and the 41st Avenue to Soquel Drive auxiliary lanes. In FY 2016-17 and FY 17-18, the project team worked to update technical studies and prepare responses to more than 900 comments. In FY 2018-19, the final environmental document for the Highway 1 Corridor Investment Program was completed and certified and the design phase for the Highway 1 41st to Soquel Auxiliary Lanes project was initiated. In FY 2016-17, the RTC secured consultant services to initiate the preliminary design and environmental documents for the Highway 1 Mar Vista bicycle and pedestrian overcrossing. In addition, in FY 2016-17, a supermajority of Santa Cruz County voters approved Measure D, which will provide funding for highway projects.

**Task** | Description                                                                 | Deliverables                                             | Completion Date |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Guide the consultant work, in cooperation with the Project Development Team, Caltrans, local, and regional agencies on the completion of the design phase for the Highway 1 41st to Soquel auxiliary lanes project</td>
<td>Meetings, agendas, minutes</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Guide the consultant work in cooperation with project partners to complete the preliminary design and environmental analysis on the Mar Vista Pedestrian/Bicycle Crossing of Highway 1</td>
<td>Technical studies, preliminary design &amp; environmental document</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Release requests for proposals and select consultants for various environmental review and design work activities</td>
<td>Technical studies, preliminary design &amp; environmental document</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with Santa Cruz METRO, Caltrans and other partners complete the environmental documents for the Highway 1 Bus on Shoulder project and incorporate the necessary Bus on Shoulder features into the design of the auxiliary lanes projects</td>
<td>Technical studies, preliminary design &amp; environmental document</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with the California Traffic Control Devices Committee (CTCDC) on any necessary signage approvals to implement “Bus on Shoulder” improvements</td>
<td>Submittals to the CTCDC and CTCDC approval</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in the Project Development Team (PDT) oversight</td>
<td>Communication with team members</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate with Caltrans and the consultant team to meet all funding and project reporting requirements and ensure designs and environmental documents meet state requirements.</td>
<td>Reports, invoices</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement public outreach plans for the environmental documents and design including outreach to traditionally underrepresented communities</td>
<td>Public meetings, outreach materials in English and Spanish</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate public outreach efforts with other RTC projects and other local and regional agencies, and respond to concerns from residents and businesses</td>
<td>Coordinated outreach, responses to public</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide the consultant work in cooperation with project partners to complete the preliminary design and environmental analysis for the Highway 1 State Park to Bay/Porter Auxiliary lanes project</td>
<td>RFP’s, consultant contracts</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**WORK ELEMENT NUMBER 801**

**Measure D Implementation**

**Agency:** SCCRTC

**Project Manager:** Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner

**Total Budget:** $21,618,974

**Luis Pavel Mendez, Deputy Director**

**ESTIMATED EXPENDITURE AND ANTICIPATED REVENUE: FY 2019-2020**

**EXPENDITURES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>571,732</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Measure D</td>
<td>21,618,974</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services and supplies</td>
<td>205,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apportionments</td>
<td>20,837,242</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unappropriated</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,618,974</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,618,974</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REVENUE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Federal</td>
<td>21,618,974</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Description**

SCCRTC is responsible for implementing the local voter approved Measure D. This includes receiving funds from the 1/2-cent transactions and use tax and distributing those funds to the cities, the county, SC Metro and Community Bridges. The RTC will also program some of the Measure D funds to projects and be responsible to ensure that those projects get delivered in accordance with Measure D. The RTC also established an oversight community and fully accounts for the funds in accordance with the voter approved measure.

**Project Product(s)**

Agreements with local agencies and project sponsors, annual reports, audit reports, 5 year implementation plans and updates, 30-year implementation plan and updates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Receive funds from State Department of Tax and Fee Administration, distribute the funds to local agencies and projects in accordance with Measure D and RTC policies and decisions</td>
<td>Payments received and issued</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Produce estimates of overall funding available and the formula distributions to each category of projects and implementing entity</td>
<td>Fund estimates</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Secure and manage consultant services to analyze funds receipts and produce reports and audit the use of the funds</td>
<td>Requests for proposals, contracts</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Produce and implement outreach plan to inform voters on the use Measure D funds</td>
<td>Public outreach plan, including Spanish outreach</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Produce, maintain and update agreements with local agencies for funding allocations</td>
<td>Funding agreements</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Produce and publish annual reports and audit reports per Measure D</td>
<td>Reports</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Prepare and update 5-year and 30-year implementation plans consistent with the approved Measure D and the approved Expenditure Plan included in the measure</td>
<td>Implementation plans</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Establish policies and guidelines and update them as necessary to ensure sound implementation of Measure D</td>
<td>Guidelines and policies</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Establish, staff and maintain citizens oversight committee in accordance with Measure D</td>
<td>Oversight committee, agendas, minutes</td>
<td>06/30/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Code</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>State RPA</td>
<td>STIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE101</td>
<td>Overall Work Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE102</td>
<td>TDA Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE112</td>
<td>Transp. Plan Coord. &amp; Interagency Liaison</td>
<td>86,417</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE113</td>
<td>Public Part. Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE177</td>
<td>Freeway Serv. Patrol</td>
<td>69,124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE178</td>
<td>Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE179</td>
<td>Cruz511/Rideshare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE 401a</td>
<td>Rail Line Network Integration Study</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE614</td>
<td>Bike/Ped Planning</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE615</td>
<td>Bike &amp; Ped Projects</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>525,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE621</td>
<td>Elderly &amp; Disabled &amp; ADA</td>
<td>68,433</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE622</td>
<td>Transp. Planning for the Region</td>
<td>139,595</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE641</td>
<td>Transp. Imprvnt. Prgm.</td>
<td>51,007</td>
<td>139,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE682</td>
<td>Rail/Trail Authority</td>
<td>223,896</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE683</td>
<td>Highway and Roadway Planning</td>
<td>59,981</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE684</td>
<td>Highway 1 Corridor Investment Program</td>
<td>5,059,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE801</td>
<td>Measure D Implement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>337,000</td>
<td>5,295,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP - 21)/Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act Planning Factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE 101</td>
<td>WE 102</td>
<td>WE 112</td>
<td>WE 113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Support the economic vitality of the metropolitan area, especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity, and efficiency.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Increase the safety of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Increase the security of the transportation system for motorized and non-motorized users.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Increase the accessibility and mobility of people and for freight.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Protect and enhance the environment, promote energy conservation, improve the quality of life, and promote consistency between transportation improvements and State and local planned growth and economic development patterns.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Enhance the integration and connectivity of the transportation system, across and between modes, for people and freight.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Promote efficient system management and operation.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Emphasize the preservation of the existing transportation system.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Improve the resiliency and reliability of the transportation system and reduce or mitigate stormwater and reduce or mitigate stormwater impacts of surface transportation.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Enhance travel and tourism.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This table indicates which work program elements contribute to the overall goal of the particular federal MAP-21/FAST Act planning factors.
### SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
#### TDA ReVENUE REPORT
##### FY 2018-2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>FY17 - 18 ACTUAL REVENUE</th>
<th>FY18 - 19 ESTIMATE REVENUE</th>
<th>FY18 - 19 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>583,500</td>
<td>589,335</td>
<td>908,365</td>
<td>319,030</td>
<td>54.13%</td>
<td>154.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUGUST</td>
<td>778,000</td>
<td>785,780</td>
<td>670,376</td>
<td>-115,404</td>
<td>-14.69%</td>
<td>114.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPTEMBER</td>
<td>1,146,538</td>
<td>1,158,003</td>
<td>886,090</td>
<td>-271,913</td>
<td>-23.48%</td>
<td>97.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTOBER</td>
<td>665,500</td>
<td>672,155</td>
<td>1,276,595</td>
<td>604,440</td>
<td>89.93%</td>
<td>116.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOVEMBER</td>
<td>887,300</td>
<td>896,173</td>
<td>577,500</td>
<td>-318,673</td>
<td>-35.56%</td>
<td>105.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECEMBER</td>
<td>959,017</td>
<td>968,607</td>
<td>905,920</td>
<td>-62,687</td>
<td>-6.47%</td>
<td>103.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANUARY</td>
<td>655,100</td>
<td>661,651</td>
<td>877,694</td>
<td>216,043</td>
<td>32.65%</td>
<td>106.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEBRUARY</td>
<td>873,500</td>
<td>882,235</td>
<td>816,270</td>
<td>-65,965</td>
<td>-7.48%</td>
<td>104.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCH</td>
<td>855,723</td>
<td>929,364</td>
<td>861,435</td>
<td>-67,929</td>
<td>-7.31%</td>
<td>103.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRIL</td>
<td>564,300</td>
<td>638,787</td>
<td>847,201</td>
<td>208,414</td>
<td>32.63%</td>
<td>105.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>854,103</td>
<td>851,681</td>
<td>607,386</td>
<td>-244,295</td>
<td>-28.68%</td>
<td>102.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE</td>
<td>777,152</td>
<td>574,948</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>9,599,733</td>
<td>9,608,719</td>
<td>9,234,830</td>
<td>201,059</td>
<td>2.09%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
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### SUMMARY OF REVENUE ALLOCATION BY MONTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY2019 ENDING JUNE 30, 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GROSS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,873,758.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADJUSTED</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,136,645.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ADMINISTRATION & IMPLEMENTATION - JULY/AUG/SEP/OCT/NOV/DEC

<p>| | <strong>O/H ADJUST</strong> | <strong>GROSS</strong> |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| ADMINISTRATION - SALARIES &amp; BENEFITS | - | 18,737.59 |
| - | 14,573.99 | 19,049.69 |
| - | 26,505.91 | 15,696.56 |
| - | 19,444.88 | 18,852.78 |
| - | 18,129.03 | 18,452.85 |
| - | 18,503.20 | 13,419.98 |
| - | - | 201,366.46 |
| - | 201,366.46 | 18,857.87 |
| - | 19,049.69 | 19,049.69 |
| - | 26,505.91 | 26,505.91 |
| - | 15,696.56 | 15,696.56 |
| - | 19,444.88 | 19,444.88 |
| - | 18,852.78 | 18,852.78 |
| - | 18,129.03 | 18,129.03 |
| - | 18,452.85 | 18,452.85 |
| - | 13,419.98 | 13,419.98 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&lt; 0.00</th>
<th>&lt; 0.00</th>
<th>&lt; 0.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### SERVICES & SUPPLIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JANUARY/MARCH/AUG/SEP/OCT</th>
<th><strong>GROSS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9,855.87</td>
<td>9,855.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,855.87</td>
<td>9,855.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,855.87</td>
<td>9,855.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,855.87</td>
<td>9,855.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,855.87</td>
<td>9,855.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### DISTRIBUTED TO INVESTMENT CATEGORIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JULY/AUG/SEP/OCT/NOV/DEC</th>
<th><strong>GROSS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>729000/4018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWY 17 Wildlife</td>
<td>729500/62856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLV SR9</td>
<td>729300/4018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>729500/4018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>729500/4018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SUMMARY OF REVENUE ALLOCATION BY MONTH
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<tr>
<td><strong>GROSS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,873,758.17</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,136,645.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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</tr>
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<td>20,136,645.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission make the following appointments to the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission’s Bicycle Advisory Committee:

1. Grace Voss (voting) and Janneke Strause (alternate) to represent District 1;
2. Peter Scott (voting) to represent District 3;
3. Rick Hyman (voting) and Thersea Rogerson (alternate) to represent District 5;
4. Murray Fontes (voting) and Drew Rogers (alternate) to represent the City of Watsonville; and
5. Amelia Conlen (voting) and Kira Ticuc (alternate) to represent Bike to Work

BACKGROUND

Seats on the Regional Transportation Commission’s Bicycle Advisory Committee correspond to City and Supervisor District seats on the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC). Commissioners may nominate individuals for RTC consideration. Two additional seats for Bike to Work and the Community Traffic Safety Coalition also exist, and nominations are made by the respective organization. Seats for three-year terms on the Bicycle Committee expire on a rotating basis. This year, positions expired for Districts 1, 3, and 5, the City of Watsonville, and Bike to Work.

The Bicycle Advisory Committee’s description, role, and membership are in the 2017 RTC Rules and Regulations available on the RTC website.

DISCUSSION

Reappointments for 5 expired seats are being requested. Additional vacancies exist for alternate seats representing District 3, District 4, the City of Capitola, and the City of Scotts Valley. Staff is working to recruit applicants to fill vacancies and welcomes recommendations from Commissioners. The application is available on the RTC website.

**District 1** – Grace Voss, voting member, has served since 2016 and is seeking reappointment. Janneke Strause, alternate member, has served since 2017 and is seeking reappointment. Commissioner Leopold nominated Ms. Voss and Ms. Strause for continued service via communication to RTC staff.
**District 3** - Peter Scott, voting member, has served since 2007 and is seeking reappointment. Commissioner Coonerty nominated Mr. Scott for continued service via communication to RTC staff.

**District 3** - Rick Hyman, voting member, has served since 1989 and is seeking reappointment. Theresia Rogerson, alternate member, has served since 2018 and is seeking reappointment. Commissioner McPherson nominated Mr. Hyman and Ms. Rogerson for continued service via communication to RTC staff.

**City of Watsonville** - Murray Fontes, voting member and current vice chair, has served since 2016 and is seeking reappointment. Drew Rogers, alternate member, has served since 2018 and is seeking reappointment. Commissioner Coffman-Gomez nominated Mr. Fontes and Mr. Rogers for continued service via communication to RTC staff.

**Bike to Work** - Amelia Conlen, voting member and current chair, has served since 2013 and is seeking reappointment. Kira Ticus, alternate member, has served since 2017 and is seeking reappointment. Bike to Work / Ecology Action staff nominated Ms. Conlen and Ms. Ticus for continued service via communication to RTC staff.

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission approve nominations submitted by Commissioners Leopold, Coonerty, McPherson, and Coffman-Gomez, as well as Bike to Work to serve on the RTC’s Bicycle Advisory Committee. A draft roster is included as Attachment 1.

**FISCAL IMPACT**

None.

**SUMMARY**

Seats on the Regional Transportation Commission’s Bicycle Advisory Committee have expired for Districts 1, 3, and 5, the City of Watsonville, and Bike to Work. Reappointment requests were communicated to respective commissioners. Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission appoint the individuals nominated by the Commissioners and Bike to Work to the seats as identified above.

**Attachment:**

1. 2019 Draft Bicycle Committee Roster
Draft 2019 Bicycle Advisory Committee Roster

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Representing</th>
<th>Alternate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grace Voss*</td>
<td>County of Santa Cruz-District 1</td>
<td>Janneke Strause*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shea Johnson</td>
<td>County of Santa Cruz-District 2</td>
<td>Casey Beyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Scott*</td>
<td>County of Santa Cruz-District 3</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Kammer</td>
<td>County of Santa Cruz-District 4</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Hyman*</td>
<td>County of Santa Cruz-District 5</td>
<td>Theresia Rogerson*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Moore</td>
<td>City of Capitola</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Farrell</td>
<td>City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Bruce Sawhill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Masoner</td>
<td>City of Scotts Valley</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray Fontes*</td>
<td>City of Watsonville</td>
<td>Drew Rogers*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelia Conlen*, Chair</td>
<td>Bike to Work</td>
<td>Kira Ticus*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo Jed</td>
<td>Community Traffic Safety Coalition</td>
<td>Jim Langley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Reappointed individuals as requested by Commissioners Leopold, Coonerty, McPherson, and Coffman-Gomez as well as Bike to Work.
AGENDA: June 6, 2019

TO: Regional Transportation Commission

FROM: Luis Pavel Mendez, Deputy Director

RE: Lease Agreement with Humble Sea Brewing Company

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC):

1. Approve the attached resolution (Attachment 1) authorizing a lease agreement with Humble Sea Brewing Company.

2. Waive the 21-day public review period of the terms and conditions of the lease.

BACKGROUND

The RTC currently manages several long-term leases of the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line (Branch Line) right-of-way for various uses including parking, storage, and related uses. The RTC periodically receives requests for updates to existing leases and additional long-term leases on the Branch Line. Leases must be consistent with the RTC’s purpose for purchasing the right-of-way, funding requirements, existing agreements, existing railroad operations, and safety requirements of the Surface Transportation Board (STB), Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), and California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC). To ensure that there is no gift of public funds, new leases shall be at market rate.

DISCUSSION

The RTC was approached by the owners of Humble Sea Brewing Company to lease a portion of the Branch Line right of way for the purpose of a patio extension. The location of their proposed patio extension is on the inland side of the railroad tracks on the opposite side of the tracks from Segment 7 of the future rail trail. Plans for the proposed patio extension were reviewed and approved by the RTC Engineer and the short line railroad operator.

Staff recommends waiving the 21-day review period required by RTC policy for leases, licenses, and rights of entry, which is not bound to any state law or statute. The purpose of the 21-day public review period is to provide the opportunity for other interested parties to express interest in the real property. In this circumstance, because of the geographic location of the real property between the brewery facility and the railroad, there would not be a benefit to having this review period, and having it would delay the RTC receiving the revenue from the lease.
Therefore, **Staff recommends the Commission waive the 21-day public review period for this lease.**

**Terms and Conditions**

Humble Sea Brewing Company is located at 820 Swift Street in Santa Cruz, and the lease request is for a 23’-2” wide by 151’-1” long area of land against their existing brewery and tap room building, as shown in their site plan (Attachment 2). The proposed lease area is approximately 3,500 square feet and is located a minimum of 15 feet from the nearest rail.

The initial lease term was developed to be approximately 20 months, to match with Humble Sea Brewing Company’s building lease term ending on January 31, 2021 with an option for the lease to be extended in increments of 5 years. The RTC will have an opportunity to make adjustments to the lease rate based on fair market valuation upon lease term extension.

**Valuation**

Staff worked with the County of Santa Cruz Real Property Division to calculate the valuation of the land, as $75 per square foot based on comparable recent sales of land with similar use. Assuming a 6% return on the valuation results in an annual lease rate of $4.50 per square foot, or a monthly rate of $0.38 per square foot. This lease would generate $1,330 monthly or $15,960 annually. The proposed patio extension will reduce the maintenance obligation by the RTC for this area, which is typically mowed annually. Therefore, **Staff recommends the Commission approve the attached resolution (Attachment 1) authorizing a lease agreement with Humble Sea Brewing Company.**

**FISCAL IMPACT**

This lease will generate $15,960 annually for the rail budget.

**SUMMARY**

The RTC has negotiated the terms and conditions of a lease agreement with Humble Sea Brewing Company for a 3,500 square foot area adjacent to their brewing facility and the railroad tracks in the west side of Santa Cruz. Staff recommends authorization to enter into a lease agreement with the Brewery that will generate $15,960 annually.

**Attachments:**

1. Resolution authorizing lease with Humble Sea Brewing Company
2. Proposed patio extension site plan
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RESOLUTION NO.

Adopted by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission

on the date of June 6, 2019
on the motion of Commissioner
duly seconded by Commissioner

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO ENTER INTO A LEASE WITH HUMBL SEA BREWING COMPANY

WHEREAS, the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission acquired the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line right-of-way in October 2012 using state funds; and

WHEREAS, the right-of-way includes property not currently used for railroad infrastructure or anticipated to be used for trail infrastructure; and

WHEREAS, the state allows for the lease of Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line right-of-way purchased with its funds as long as the lease revenue is to be used for the railroad purposes in the approved funding application; and

WHEREAS, the RTC established a policy for leases of Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line right-of-way requiring that all leases generating more than $10,000 per year be approved by the RTC Board; and

WHEREAS, the lease negotiated with the Humble Sea Brewing Company is at market rate, includes adjustment of the lease rate according to market conditions, and includes termination of the lease by the RTC should the property be needed for an RTC project;

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

1. The Executive Director is authorized to enter into a lease with the Humble Sea Brewing Company for excess Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line right-of-way at Swift Street in Santa Cruz; and

2. The Executive Director is authorized to make amendments to the lease as necessary to ensure market rental rates and to remain consistent with applicable laws and RTC policies, projects and decisions.

AYES: COMMISSIONERS:

NOES: COMMISSIONERS:
ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS

ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS

____________________________

Ed Botorff, Chair

ATTEST:

____________________________

Guy Preston, Secretary
Proposed lease area: 3,500 square feet
RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends authorizing the Executive Director to enter into a two-year agreement with KNN Public Finance, LLC for a term of three (3) years with three (3) additional one-year options to extend to provide financial advisory services to the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission.

BACKGROUND

In November 2016 the residents of Santa Cruz County approved Measure D, a ½-cent transaction and use tax with a term of thirty years. The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) is the designated administrator of Measure D. The RTC sets priorities and secures funding for capital improvement to transportation infrastructure including highways and local roads.

In accordance with Section 8 of Measure D Ordinance 2016-01, the RTC shall administer and oversee expenditure of Measure D revenue through an Implementation Plan. The purposes of the Implementation Plan are to define the scope, cost, and delivery schedule of each Expenditure Plan project or program, detail the revenue projections and possible financing tools needed to deliver the Expenditure Plan within the 30 years promised to voters, and describe the risks, critical issues and opportunities that the Authority should address to expeditiously deliver the Expenditure Plan.

The RTC is beginning the process of developing the Implementation Plan for Measure D revenues by identifying program objectives and goals supported by sound financial objectives. This process is expected to be completed during the fiscal year 2019-2020.

The RTC has a need for a financial advisory firm to work with staff to provide the following services to assist in the development of the Implementation Plan including a cash flow model and identify borrowing needs including:
• Provide as-needed financial advice regarding market conditions and trends, financial products, credit and credit analysis, third party alternative financing and special facility financing.
• Provide general assistance and advice to the Commission on plans and methods of financing its capital improvement plans.
• Present alternative strategies for managing the Commission’s current or future debt to achieve the best value for taxpayers.
• Assist with the preparation of presentations to the Commission; attend Commission meetings as needed.
• Attend meetings with Finance and Public Works departments and Commission Manager’s staff as needed.
• Provide other financial services as required.

The Firm may also be called upon to assist with the issuance of bonds or obtaining other debt financing by, but not limited to, the following:

• Assist Commission staff with new money issues, including but not limited to analyses and evaluations of underwriter proposals, financing structure, pricing, rating and insurance proposals, reserve fund (re)investment, assistance with preparation and review of related documents, and coordination of financing team, bond counsel and schedules.
• Assist with the preparation of a Request for Proposals and serve on an evaluation committee for selection of underwriting firms for the Commission’s potential new money issues.

DISCUSSION

In April 2019, the RTC issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) seeking the services of a qualified Financial Advisor to provide financial advisory services including but not limited to staff and board education, evaluation of bond markets, debt management, maintaining credit ratings, modeling funding for large construction projects, long-term strategic financial planning, and managing bond issuance for the RTC.

The RTC received four proposals from well qualified firms. Proposers were awarded points based on their qualifications, responses, recommended approach, and cost. The two highest scoring firms, KNN Public Finance and PFM Financial Advisors LLC, were interviewed. While both firms were qualified and presented well, staff recommends KNN Public Finance, LLC.

FISCAL IMPACT

The proposed agreement with PFM Financial Advisors/KNN Public Finance, LLC will not exceed $73,949,500 without prior approval from the RTC Board of Directors. There are sufficient resources in the Measure D implementation budget approved by the RTC— for professional services.
SUMMARY

Staff recommends the RTC Board authorize the Executive Director to enter into an agreement not to exceed $73,940,000 with KNN Public Finance, LLC to provide financial advisory services. The contract period is proposed for a two-three (3) year term with two-three (3) additional one-year options which may be exercised at the RTC’s discretion.

Attachments:
1. Draft KNN Public Finance, LLC Financial Advisory Services Financial Advisory Services Agreement. Final contract subject to legal review prior to execution.

2. Resolution authorizing the Executive Director to enter into a contract with KNN Public Finance, LLC.
Replacement pages for Item 17
THIS AGREEMENT made and entered into this _______ day of June 2019 by and between the SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION, hereinafter called COMMISSION, and KNN Public Finance, LLC, hereinafter called CONSULTANT for Financial Advisory Services. The parties agree as follows:

1. DUTIES.
   A. CONSULTANT agrees to exercise special skill to accomplish the following results: financial advisory services, as specified in Exhibit A: Scope of Services, which by this reference is incorporated herein.
   B. CONSULTANT shall provide the personnel listed below to perform the above-specified services, which persons are hereby designated as key personnel under this Agreement.

   Firm Name: KNN Public Finance, LLC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David Leifer, Senior Managing Director</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Shick, Director</td>
<td>Day-to-Day Execution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nedko Nedev, Vice President</td>
<td>Quantitative Analysis and Execution Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Lom, Assistant Vice President</td>
<td>Quantitative Analysis and Execution Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Cox, Vice President</td>
<td>Quantitative and Pricing Analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   C. No person named in paragraph B of this Article or in the Fee Schedule (Exhibit CB), or his or her successor, shall be removed or replaced by CONSULTANT, nor shall his or her agreed-upon function hereunder be changed, without the prior written consent of the COMMISSION Contract Manager. Such consent shall not be unreasonably withheld.

   D. CONSULTANT’S PROGRESS REPORTS AND/OR MEETINGS
   1. CONSULTANT shall perform the services in accordance with the Project Schedule attached hereto (Exhibit A) and incorporated by reference. The CONSULTANT shall submit written progress reports with each invoice. The report should be sufficiently detailed for the Contract Manager to determine if the CONSULTANT is performing to expectations or is on schedule; to provide communication of interim findings; and to sufficiently address any difficulties or special problems encountered, so remedies can be developed.
   2. The CONSULTANT’s Project Manager shall meet with the COMMISSION’s Contract Manager, as needed, to discuss progress on the contract.

2. COMPENSATION. In consideration for CONSULTANT accomplishing work to be performed under this contract (as described in Exhibit A: Scope of Services), COMMISSION shall compensate CONSULTANT in accordance with the approved Fee Schedule, dated April 29, 2019, attached hereto (Exhibit CB) and incorporated by reference. If there is any conflict between the approved Cost Proposal and this contract, this contract shall take precedence. COMMISSION agrees to pay CONSULTANT as follows:
   A. Total payment is not to exceed $7350,000.00 for time and materials at the rates and conditions set forth in Exhibit CB: Fee Schedule, which by this reference is incorporated herein.
   B. In no event, will the CONSULTANT be reimbursed for overhead costs at a rate that exceeds the overhead rate set forth in the Fee Schedule.
C. Transportation and subsistence expenses claimed for reimbursement shall not exceed the rates authorized to be paid rank and file STATE employees under current State Department of Personnel Administration (DPA) rules or to employees under current U.S. General Service Administration rules.

D. Reimbursable expenses will be billed and processed for payment upon approval of the Contract Manager.

E. Progress payments will be made no less than monthly in arrears based on satisfactory services provided and actual allowable incurred costs. If CONSULTANT fails to submit the required deliverable items according to the schedule set forth in the Scope of Services, the COMMISSION may delay payment and/or terminate this Agreement in accordance with the provisions of Section 4 of this Agreement.

F. No payment will be made prior to approval of any work, nor for any work performed prior to approval of this Agreement.

G. This contract is valid and enforceable only, if sufficient funds are made available to COMMISSION for the purpose of this contract. It is mutually agreed that if sufficient funds are not appropriated, this contract may be amended to reflect any reduction in funds.

H. The CONSULTANT will be reimbursed after receipt by the COMMISSION’s Contract Manager of itemized invoices. Invoices shall be submitted no later than 45 calendar days after the performance of work for which the CONSULTANT is billing. Invoices shall be mailed to the COMMISSION’s Contract Manager at the following address:

SCCRTC – Attn: Tracy New, Director of Finance and Budget
1523 Pacific Ave, Santa Cruz, CA, 95060

The invoices must include the following information:

1. Labor (staff name, hours charged, hourly billing rate, current charges and cumulative charges) performed during the billing period by task;
2. Itemized expenses incurred during the billing period;
3. Total invoice/payment requested, specifically noting the amount of retention, if any;
4. Total amount previously paid under this Agreement;
5. Report of expenditures by CONSULTANT and subconsultants for each task and subtask or milestone and estimated percentage completion by such divisions of work;
6. Written progress reports, in a format to be mutually agreed upon, that is sufficiently detailed for the Contract Manager to determine if the CONSULTANT is performing to expectations and is on schedule; provides communication of interim findings; addresses any difficulties or special problems encountered, so remedies can be developed; and other information as requested by COMMISSION.
7. CONSULTANT’s final invoice must be submitted within 60-calendar days after acceptance of the CONSULTANT’s work by the Contract Manager.

3. TERM.
A. This Agreement shall go into effect on June 15, 2019; contingent upon prior approval by the COMMISSION governing board, and the CONSULTANT shall commence work after notification to proceed by the COMMISSION’S Contract Manager. The term of the Agreement shall be two (2) years with three (3) additional one-year term options to extend following the effective date unless earlier terminated or extended by contract amendment.
B. The CONSULTANT is advised that this Agreement is not binding and enforceable until it is approved by the COMMISSION's board and fully executed.

C. The period of performance for each specific project shall be in accordance with the Task Order for that project. If work on a Task Order is in progress on the expiration date of this contract, the terms of the contract shall be extended by contract amendment.

4. **TERMINATION.**
   
   A. COMMISSION reserves the right to terminate this contract upon thirty (30) calendar days written notice to CONSULTANT with the reasons for termination stated in the notice.

   B. COMMISSION may terminate this contract with CONSULTANT should CONSULTANT fail to perform the covenants herein contained at the time and in the manner herein provided. In the event of such termination, COMMISSION may proceed with the work in any manner deemed proper by COMMISSION. If COMMISSION terminates this contract with CONSULTANT, COMMISSION shall pay CONSULTANT the sum due to CONSULTANT under this contract prior to termination, unless the cost of completion to COMMISSION exceeds the funds remaining in the contract. In which case the overage shall be deducted from any sum due CONSULTANT under this contract and the balance, if any, shall be paid to CONSULTANT upon demand.

5. **INDEMNIFICATION FOR DAMAGES, TAXES AND CONTRIBUTIONS.** CONSULTANT shall exonerate, indemnify, defend, and hold harmless the COMMISSION (which for the purpose of this Agreement shall include, without limitation, its officers, agents, employees and volunteers) from and against:

   A. Any and all claims, demands, costs, or liability arising from or connected with the services provided hereunder due to negligent acts, errors, or omissions of the CONSULTANT. The CONSULTANT will reimburse COMMISSION for any expenditure, including reasonable attorney fees, incurred by COMMISSION in defending against claims ultimately determined to be due to negligent acts, errors, or omissions of the CONSULTANT; and

   B. Any and all Federal, State and Local taxes, charges, fees, penalties, or contributions required to be paid with respect to CONSULTANT and CONSULTANT’S officers, employees and agents engaged in the performance of this Agreement (including, without limitation, unemployment insurance, social security and payroll tax withholding).

6. **INSURANCE.** CONSULTANT, at its sole cost and expense, for the full term of this Agreement, and any extensions thereof, shall obtain and maintain at minimum compliance with all of the following insurance coverage(s) and requirements. Such insurance coverage shall be primary coverage as respects COMMISSION and any insurance or self-insurance maintained by COMMISSION shall be in excess of CONSULTANT’S insurance coverage and shall not contribute to it. Insurance is to be placed with insurers reasonably acceptable to COMMISSION.

   A. Types of Insurance and Minimum Limits

      1. Workers’ Compensation in the minimum statutorily required coverage amounts.

      2. Automobile Liability Insurance for each of CONSULTANT’S vehicles used in the performance of this Agreement, including owned, non-owned (e.g. owned by CONSULTANT’S employees), leased or hired vehicles, in the minimum amount of $1,000,000 combined single limit per occurrence for bodily injury and property damage.

      3. Comprehensive or Commercial General Liability Insurance coverage at least as broad as ISO form CG 00 01, with a minimum limit of one million dollars ($1,000,000) per occurrence, and $2,000,000 in the aggregate, including coverage for: (a) products and completed
operations, (b) bodily and personal injury, (c) broad form property damage, (d) contractual liability, and (e) cross-liability.

4. Professional Liability Insurance in the minimum amount of one million dollars ($1,000,000) combined single limit, if, and only if, this Subparagraph is initialed by CONSULTANT and COMMISSION. If CONSULTANT normally carries insurance in an amount greater than the minimum amount required by the COMMISSION for this Agreement, that greater amount shall become the minimum required amount of insurance for purposes of this Agreement. Therefore, CONSULTANT hereby acknowledges and agrees that any and all insurances carried by it shall be deemed liability coverage for any and all actions it performs in connection with this Agreement.

B. Other Insurance Provisions

1. If any insurance coverage required in this Agreement is provided on a “Claims Made” rather than “Occurrence” form, CONSULTANT agrees that the retroactive date thereof shall be no later than the effective date of this Agreement, and that it shall maintain the required coverage for a period of three (3) years after the expiration of this Agreement (hereinafter “post agreement coverage”) and any extensions thereof. CONSULTANT may maintain the required post agreement coverage by renewal or purchase of prior acts or tail coverage. This provision is contingent upon post agreement coverage being both available and reasonably affordable in relation to the coverage provided during the term of this Agreement. For purposes of interpreting this requirement, a cost not exceeding 100% of the last annual policy premium during the term of this Agreement in order to purchase prior acts or tail coverage for post agreement coverage shall be deemed to be reasonable. The COMMISSION will not be responsible for any premiums or assessments on the policy.

2. All policies of Commercial General Liability Insurance shall be endorsed to cover the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission, its officials, employees, agents and volunteers, and its officials, employees, agents and volunteers. Endorsements shall be at least as broad as ISO Form CG 20 10 11 85 or both CG 20 10 10 01 and CG 20 37 10 01, covering ongoing operations and products and completed operations.

3. All required insurance policies shall be endorsed to contain the following clause:

“This insurance shall not be canceled until after thirty (30) days (10 days for nonpayment of premium) prior written notice has been given to:

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Attn: Yesenia Parra
1523 Pacific Avenue
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Should CONSULTANT fail to obtain such an endorsement to any policy required hereunder, CONSULTANT shall be responsible to provide at least thirty (30) days’ notice (10 days for non-payment of premium) of cancellation of such policy to the COMMISSION as a material term of this Agreement.

4. CONSULTANT agrees to provide its insurance broker(s) with a full copy of these insurance provisions and provide COMMISSION on or before the effective date of this Agreement with Certificates of Insurance and endorsements for all required coverages. However, failure to obtain the required documents prior to the work beginning shall not waive the CONSULTANT’s obligation to provide them. All Certificates of Insurance and endorsements shall be delivered or sent to:

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
5. The CONSULTANT agrees that the insurance herein provided for, shall be in effect at all times during the term of this contract. In the event said insurance coverage expires at any time or times during the term of this contract, the CONSULTANT agrees to provide at least thirty (30) days prior notice to said expiration date; and a new Certificate of Insurance evidencing insurance coverage as provided for herein, for not less than either the remainder of the term of the contract, or for a period of not less than one (1) year. New Certificates of Insurance are subject to the approval of the COMMISSION. In the event the CONSULTANT fails to keep in effect at all times insurance coverage as herein provided, the COMMISSION may, in addition to any other remedies it may have, terminate this Agreement upon occurrence of such event.

6. If any insurance policy of CONSULTANT required by this document includes language conditioning the insurer’s legal obligation to defend or indemnify COMMISSION on the performance of any act(s) by the named insured, then said insurance policy, by endorsement, shall also name the COMMISSION as a named insured. Notwithstanding the foregoing, both the CONSULTANT and its insurers agree that by naming the COMMISSION as a named insured, the COMMISSION may at its sole direction, but is not obligated to, perform any act required by the named insured under said insurance policies.

7. CONSULTANT shall do all things required to be performed by it pursuant to its insurance policies including but not limited to paying within five (5) work days, all deductibles and self-insured retentions (SIR) required to be paid under any insurance policy that may provide defense or indemnity coverage to COMMISSION or any additional insured.

8. CONSULTANT hereby grants to COMMISSION a waiver of any right of subrogation which any insurer of said CONSULTANT may acquire against the COMMISSION by virtue of the payment of any loss under such insurance. CONSULTANT agrees to obtain any endorsement that may be necessary to affect this waiver of subrogation, but this provision applies regardless of whether or not the COMMISSION has received a waiver of subrogation endorsement from the insurer.

9. CONSULTANT shall cause the foregoing provisions to be inserted in all subcontracts for any work covered under this Agreement, provided that the foregoing provisions shall not apply to contracts or subcontracts for standard commercial supplies or raw materials.

7. FEDERAL, STATE AND LOCAL LAWS.
   A. CONSULTANT warrants that in the performance of this Agreement, it shall exercise usual and customary professional care in its efforts to comply with all applicable federal, state and local laws, statutes and ordinances and all lawful orders, rules and regulations promulgated thereunder.
      In the event of a conflict between the laws and lawful regulations of any government entities having jurisdiction over the project, the CONSULTANT shall notify COMMISSION of the nature and impact of such conflict. The COMMISSION agrees to cooperate and work with the CONSULTANT in an effort to resolve any conflict.
   
   B. Those laws, statutes, ordinances, rules, regulations and procedural requirements that are imposed on COMMISSION as a recipient of federal or state funds are imposed on CONSULTANT.

8. NON-DISCRIMINATION AND COMPLIANCE PROVISIONS. During and in relation to the performance of this Agreement, CONSULTANT agrees to the following:
   A. The CONSULTANT and its subconsultants shall not unlawfully discriminate, harass, or allow discrimination or harassment against any employee, applicant for employment, or subconsultant
in any manner prohibited by Federal, State and local laws, including but not limited to race, color, sex, gender, religious creed, national origin, ancestry, physical disability (including HIV and AIDS), mental disability, medical condition (e.g., cancer), marital status, sexual orientation, age (over 40), veteran status, denial of family and medical care leave and denial of pregnancy disability leave, or any other non-merit factor unrelated to job duties.

B. Consultant and subconsultants shall ensure that the evaluation and treatment of their employees and applicants for employment are free from such discrimination and harassment. Consultant and subconsultants shall comply with the provisions of the Fair Employment and Housing Act (Gov. Code §12990 et seq.) and the applicable regulations promulgated thereunder (California Code of Regulations, Title 2, Section 8113 et seq.). The applicable regulations of the Fair Employment and Housing Commission implementing Government Code Section 12990 (a-f), set forth in Chapter 5 of Division 4 of Title 2 of the California Code of Regulations, are incorporated into this Contract by reference and made a part hereof as if set forth in full. Consultant and its subconsultants shall give written notice of their obligations under this clause to labor organizations with which they have a collective bargaining or other Agreement.

C. Such action shall include, but not be limited to, the following: recruitment; advertising, layoff or termination; rates of pay or other forms of compensation; and selection for training (including apprenticeship), employment, upgrading, demotion, or transfer. The CONSULTANT agrees to post in conspicuous places, available to employees and applicants for employment, notice setting forth the provisions of this non-discrimination clause.

D. CONSULTANT shall comply fully with all federal, State and local laws and regulations which prohibit discrimination. The CONSULTANT’s signature affixed herein, and dated, shall constitute a certification under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the CONSULTANT has, unless exempt, complied with, the nondiscrimination program requirements of Government Code Section 12990 and Title 2, California Administrative Code, Section 8103.

E. Consultant and its subconsultants shall permit access to all records of employment, employment advertisements, application forms, and other pertinent data and records by the State Fair Employment Practices and Housing Commission or any other agency of the State of California designated by STATE to investigate compliance with this Article.

F. In the event of CONSULTANT’S non-compliance with the non-discrimination clauses of this Agreement or with any of the said rules, regulations or orders the COMMISSION may cancel, terminate or suspend the Agreement in whole or in part. CONSULTANT may also be declared ineligible for further agreements with the COMMISSION.

9. HARASSMENT. The COMMISSION maintains a strict policy prohibiting unlawful harassment, including sexual harassment, in any form, including verbal, physical and visual harassment by any employee, supervisor, manager, officer or Board member, or agent of the employer. Vendors, contractors, and consultants shall not engage in conduct that has an effect of unreasonably interfering with a COMMISSION employee's work performance or creates an intimidating, hostile or offensive work environment.

10. CONFLICT OF INTEREST.

A. CONSULTANT shall disclose any financial, business, or other relationship with COMMISSION that may have an impact upon the outcome of this contract, or any ensuing COMMISSION construction project. CONSULTANT shall also list current clients who may have a financial interest in the outcome of this contract, or any ensuing COMMISSION construction project, which will follow.

B. CONSULTANT hereby certifies that it does not now have, nor shall it acquire any financial or business interest that would conflict with the performance of services under this contract.
C. Any subcontract in excess of $25,000 entered into as a result of this contract, shall contain all of the provisions of this Article.

11. **LICENSES.** If a license of any kind is required of CONSULTANT, its employees, agents, or subcontractors by Federal or State law, CONSULTANT warrants that such license has been obtained, is valid and in good standing, that CONSULTANT shall keep it in effect at all times during the terms of this Agreement, and that any applicable bond has been posted in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations.

12. **INDEPENDENT CONSULTANT STATUS.** CONSULTANT and COMMISSION have reviewed and considered the principal test and secondary factors herein and agree that CONSULTANT is an independent CONSULTANT and not an employee of COMMISSION. CONSULTANT is responsible for all insurance (workers compensation, unemployment, etc.) and all payroll related taxes. CONSULTANT is not entitled to any employee benefits. COMMISSION agrees that CONSULTANT shall have the right to control the manner and means of accomplishing the result contracted for herein.

   A. **PRINCIPAL TEST:** The CONSULTANT rather than COMMISSION has the right to control the manner and means of accomplishing the result contracted for.

   B. **SECONDARY FACTORS:** (a) The extent of control which, by agreement, COMMISSION may exercise over the details of the work is slight rather than substantial; (b) CONSULTANT is engaged in a distinct occupation or business; (c) In the locality, the work to be done by CONSULTANT is usually done by a specialist without supervision, rather than under the direction of an employer; (d) The skill required in the particular occupation is substantial rather than slight; (e) The CONSULTANT rather than the COMMISSION supplies the instrumentalities, tools and work place; (f) The length of time for which CONSULTANT is engaged is of limited duration rather than indefinite; (g) The method of payment of CONSULTANT is by the job rather than by the time; (h) The work is part of a special or permissive activity, program, or project, rather than part of the regular business of COMMISSION; (i) CONSULTANT and COMMISSION believe they are creating an independent CONSULTANT relationship rather than an employer-employee relationship; and (j) The COMMISSION conducts public business.

   C. It is recognized that it is not necessary that all secondary factors support creation of an independent CONSULTANT relationship, but rather that overall there are significant secondary factors which indicate that CONSULTANT is an independent CONSULTANT.

   D. By their signatures to this Agreement, each of the undersigned certifies that it is his or her considered judgment that the CONSULTANT engaged under this Agreement is in fact an independent CONSULTANT.

13. **RETENTION OF RECORDS/AUDIT.**

   A. For the purpose of determining compliance with Public Contract Code 10115, et seq. and Title 21, California Code of Regulations, Chapter 21, Section 2500 et seq., when applicable and other matters connected with the performance of the contract pursuant to Government Code 8546.7; CONSULTANT, subconsultants, and COMMISSION shall maintain and make available for inspection all books, documents, papers, accounting records, and other evidence pertaining to the performance of the contract, including but not limited to, the costs of administering the contract. All parties shall make such materials available at their respective offices at all reasonable times during the contract period and for four years from the date of final payment under the contract. The state, State Auditor, COMMISSION, FHWA, or any duly authorized representative of the Federal Government shall have access to any books, records, and documents of CONSULTANT and it’s certified public accountants (CPA) work papers that are pertinent to the contract and indirect cost rates (ICR) for audit, examinations, excerpts, and transactions, and copies thereof.
shall be furnished if requested. If any action has occurred relative to the records, the records must be retained until completion of the action and resolution of all issues that arise from it.

B. Subcontracts in excess of $25,000 shall contain this provision.

C. Contractor and subcontractors shall establish and maintain, an accounting system conforming to Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) to support Requests for Reimbursement which segregate and accumulate the costs of work elements by line item (i.e. direct labor, other direct costs, subrecipients/subcontractor, etc) and enable the determination of incurred costs at interim points of completion, and provide support for reimbursement payment vouchers or invoices.

14. **ACKNOWLEDGMENT.** CONSULTANT shall acknowledge in all reports and literature that the material is prepared for and on behalf of the COMMISSION.

15. **WORK PRODUCTS/OWNERSHIP OF DATA.** All material, data, information, and written, graphic or other work produced under this Agreement is subject to the unqualified and unconditional right of the COMMISSION to use, reproduce, publish, display, and make derivative use of all such work, or any part of it, free of charge and in any manner and for any purpose; and to authorize others to do so.

A. Upon completion of all work under this contract, ownership and title to all custom letters, reports, documents, plans, specifications, and estimates and other products produced as part of this Agreement (herein "deliverables") will automatically be vested in the COMMISSION; and no further agreement will be necessary to transfer ownership to the COMMISSION. The CONSULTANT shall furnish the COMMISSION all necessary copies of data needed to complete the review and approval process.

B. If any of the work is subject to copyright, trademark, service mark, or patent, CONSULTANT now grants to the COMMISSION a perpetual, royalty-free, nonexclusive and irrevocable license to use, reproduce, publish, use in the creation of derivative works, and display and perform the work, or any part of it, and to grant to any third party a comparable and coextensive sublicense.

C. Any subcontract in excess of $25,000 entered into as a result of this contract, shall contain all of the provisions of this Article.

16. **CONFIDENTIALITY OF DATA.**

A. All financial, statistical, personal, technical, or other data and information relative to COMMISSION’s operations, which are designated confidential by COMMISSION and made available to CONSULTANT in order to carry out this contract, shall be protected by CONSULTANT from unauthorized use and disclosure.

B. Permission to disclose information on one occasion, or public hearing held by COMMISSION relating to the contract, shall not authorize CONSULTANT to further disclose such information, or disseminate the same on any other occasion.

C. CONSULTANT shall not comment publicly to the press or any other media regarding the contract or COMMISSION’s actions on the same, except to COMMISSION’s staff, CONSULTANT’s own personnel involved in the performance of this contract, at public hearings or in response to questions from a Legislative committee.

D. CONSULTANT shall not issue any news release or public relations item of any nature, whatsoever, regarding work performed or to be performed under this contract without prior review of the contents thereof by COMMISSION, and receipt of COMMISSION’S written permission.

E. Any subcontract entered into as a result of this contract shall contain all of the provisions of this Article.
17. **AUDIT REVIEW PROCEDURES.**

A. Any dispute concerning a question of fact arising under an interim or post-completion audit of this Agreement that is not disposed of by agreement, shall be reviewed by the COMMISSION’S Contract Manager.

B. Not later than 30 days after issuance of the final audit report, the CONSULTANT may request a review by the COMMISSION’S Executive Director of unresolved audit issues. The request for review will be submitted in writing. The Executive Director’s determination regarding such dispute shall be final unless the Executive Director determines, in its sole discretion, that the dispute shall be determined by the Board of COMMISSION.

C. Neither the pendency of a dispute nor its consideration by the COMMISSION will excuse the CONSULTANT from full and timely performance, in accordance with the terms of this contract.

18. **SUBCONTRACTING.**

A. Nothing contained in this contract or otherwise, shall create any contractual relation between COMMISSION and any subconsultant(s), and no subcontract shall relieve CONSULTANT of its responsibilities and obligations hereunder. CONSULTANT agrees to be as fully responsible to COMMISSION for the acts and omissions of its subconsultant(s) and of persons either directly or indirectly employed by any of them as it is for the acts and omissions of persons directly employed by CONSULTANT. CONSULTANT’S obligation to pay its subconsultant(s) is an independent obligation from COMMISSION’S obligation to make payments to the CONSULTANT.

B. The CONSULTANT shall perform the work contemplated with resources available within its own organization; and no portion of the work pertinent to this Agreement shall be subcontracted without prior written authorization by the COMMISSION’S Contract Manager, except that, which is expressly identified in the approved Fee Schedule.

C. CONSULTANT shall pay its subconsultants within seven (7) calendar days from receipt of each payment made to CONSULTANT by COMMISSION.

D. All subcontracts entered into as a result of this contract shall contain all the provisions stipulated in this contract to be applicable to subconsultants.

E. Any substitution of subconsultants must be approved in writing by the COMMISSION’S Contract Manager prior to the start of work by the subconsultant.

F. Any subcontract in excess of $25,000 entered into as a result of this contract, shall contain all the provisions required by this Agreement to be applicable to those subconsultants.

19. **REBATES, KICKBACKS OR OTHER UNLAWFUL CONSIDERATION.** The CONSULTANT warrants that this Agreement was not obtained or secured through rebates, kickbacks, or other unlawful consideration, either promised or paid to any COMMISSION employee. For breach or violation of this warranty, COMMISSION shall have the right in its discretion; to terminate the Agreement without liability; to pay only for the value of the work actually performed; or to deduct from the contract price; or otherwise recover the full amount of such rebate, kickback or other unlawful consideration.

20. **BROKERAGE OR OTHER FEES.** CONSULTANT warrants that s/he has not employed or retained any company or person, other than a bona fide employee working for the consultant, to solicit or secure this agreement, and that s/he has not paid or agreed to pay any company or person, other than a bona fide employee, any fee, commission, percentage, brokerage fee, gift, or any other consideration, contingent upon or resulting from the award or formation of this agreement. For breach or violation of this warranty, the COMMISSION shall have the right to annul this agreement without
liability, or at its discretion to deduct from the agreement price or consideration, or otherwise recover, the full amount of such fee, commission, percentage, brokerage fee, gift or contingent fee.”

21. **NOTIFICATION.** All notices hereunder and communications regarding interpretation of the terms of this Agreement and changes thereto, shall be effected by the mailing thereof addressed as follows:

**CONSULTANT:** KNN Public Finance, LLC  
David Leifer, Project Manager  
1300 Clay Street, Suite 1000  
Oakland, CA 94612

**COMMISSION:** Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC)  
Guy Preston, Executive Director  
1523 Pacific Ave  
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

22. **COMPLETE AGREEMENT.**

A. **AGREEMENT:** The two parties to this Agreement, who are the before named CONSULTANT and the before named COMMISSION, hereby agree that this Agreement constitutes the entire Agreement which is made and concluded in duplicate between the two parties. Both of these parties for and in consideration of the payments to be made, conditions mentioned, and work to be performed; each agree to diligently perform in accordance with the terms and conditions of this Agreement as evidenced by the signatures below.

B. **COMMISSION DESIGNEE:** The Executive Director of COMMISSION, or his or her designee, shall have the authority to act for and exercise any of the rights of COMMISSION as set forth in this Agreement subsequent to, and in accordance with the authorization granted by the COMMISSION.

C. **COMPLETE AGREEMENT, INCLUDING ATTACHMENTS.** This Agreement includes all exhibits, attachments, and documents incorporated herein and made applicable by reference, constitutes the complete and exclusive statement of the terms and conditions of the Agreement between COMMISSION and CONSULTANT, and supersedes all prior representations, understandings and communications. The invalidity in whole or in part of any term or condition of this Agreement shall not affect the validity of other terms or conditions. The COMMISSION’s waiver of CONSULTANT’s performance of any term(s) or condition(s) of this Agreement shall not be construed as a waiver for any future performance of such term(s) or condition(s)

D. Attachments are:

- Exhibit A: Scope of Services
- Exhibit B: Fee and Project Schedule
- Exhibit C: Regulatory Disclosures
- Certificate of workers compensation insurance
- Certificate of liability insurance (should include min. $1M auto, $1M comprehensive or gen liability per occurrence and $2M in aggregate)
- Certificate of professional liability insurance (min $1M)
- W-9 Taxpayer Identification Number and Certification

Each of the undersigned represents and warrants that he or she is duly authorized to execute and deliver this Agreement and that such execution is binding upon the entity for which he or she is executing this document.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have caused this Agreement No. _______ to be executed on the date first written above.

1. KNN PUBLIC FINANCE, LLC
   By: _______________________________   By: _____________________________
   SIGNED                         SIGNED
   ______________________________        ______________________________
   PRINTED                        PRINTED
   DATE:  _________________________  DATE:  _______________________

KNN Public Finance, LLC
1300 Clay Street, Suite 1000
Oakland, CA 94612
Telephone: (510) 839-8200
Fax: (510) 208-8282
Email: dleifer@knninc.com

2. SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
   By: _______________________________   By: _____________________________
   SIGNED                         SIGNED
   ______________________________        ______________________________
   PRINTED                        PRINTED
   DATE:  _________________________  DATE:  _______________________

RTC Administrative Services Officer       COMMISSION Counsel
DATE:  _______________________      DATE:  ___________________________

3. APPROVED AS TO INSURANCE:
   RTC Administrative Services Officer
   DATE:  __________________________

DISTRIBUTION:
• RTC Director of Finance and Budget
• CONSULTANT

4. APPROVED AS TO FORM:
   COMMISSION Counsel
   DATE:  __________________________
EXHIBIT A: SCOPE OF SERVICES AND PROJECT SCHEDULE

Scope of Services

Task #1: Goal Setting

• Assist SCCRTC with the development of financial goals and policies for the implementation of Measure D.

Task #2: Strategic Planning

• Prepare a timetable setting forth the actions necessary to accomplish the delivery objectives for updates to the Measure D Strategic Plan.
• Assist in development of Measure D cash flow model and financing plan alternatives for ongoing updates to the Strategic Plan.
• Conduct and evaluate sales tax revenue forecasting and sensitivities.
• Establish optimal mix of pay-go and borrowing needs.
• Review financial alternatives and scenarios available to SCCRTC and make recommendations on specific strategies to meet financial and policy principles within the Strategic Plan.
• Establish goals and protocols including size and timing of recommended debt issuances and appropriate debt issuance instruments.
• Evaluate and assist in the ongoing refinement to the Strategic Plan’s financial and cash flow principles, goals and protocols; assist in the identification of financing alternatives and recommend adjustments where appropriate.
• Assist in drafting financial sections of Strategic Plan updates, as may be desired.
• Board and stakeholder outreach to build consensus.
• Development of Measure D implementation, financial, and debt policies.

Task #3: On-Going Advisory Services

• Assist in other tasks and services as may be deemed desirable by SCCRTC, including:
  • Assist in capital planning.
  • Advise on debt capacity.
  • Develop revenue estimates for SCCRTC personnel and Board Members.
  • Refine Measure D cash flow model and develop or refine plan of financing.
  • Analyze alternative financing structures and make recommendations.
  • Provide knowledge of markets and expertise on available resources.
  • Provide educational public finance workshops to SCCRTC staff and Board Members.
  • Provide written and oral reports for SCCRTC staff and Board Members, as directed.
  • Assist in developing debt or other policies.
  • Evaluate proposals and ideas provided to SCCRTC by underwriters or other market participants.
  • Provide other “On-Call” municipal advisory related services, as necessary.

Task #4: Bond Transaction Services

• Lead transaction management efforts.
• Prepare a financing schedule and coordinate activities of financing team members and representatives of SCCRTC.
• Evaluate method of sale approach—negotiated versus competitive.
• Assist with the procurement of the financing team—underwriters (if negotiated sale), bond counsel, disclosure counsel, etc.
• Review fees proposed by underwriter(s) to ensure consistency with market comparables and make recommendations about composition of underwriting syndicate (if utilized) as well as syndicate policies to ensure the proper incentives are structured to result in the lowest cost of funds for SCCRTC.
• Analyze bond structures that be most attractive to bond market participants and will result in the best bond pricing for SCCRTC.
• Prepare debt service analysis for the proposed Bonds including analyses under alternative market and structure scenarios.
• Consider impacts of the current bond offering on possible future bond offerings.
• Assist in review of all financing and legal documents.
• Assist in ensuring full and complete disclosure in SCCRTC’s Preliminary Official Statement.
• Develop rating agency strategy and approach. Prepare rating agency presentation and accompany SCCRTC staff to rating agency meetings.
• Evaluate potential cost effectiveness of credit enhancement and a surety reserve policy, if applicable.
• Monitor tax-exempt market conditions; make recommendations regarding timing of the pricing.
• Assist with investor outreach to aid pre-sale marketing of the Bonds.
• If competitive sale, manage sale process, including the development and drafting the notice of sale, outreach and communication with potential bidders, and administering pricing mechanics.
• If negotiated sale, analyze bond structures in a manner that is independent from the underwriter, if a negotiated sale.
• If negotiated sale, provide pricing oversight to ensure a transparent process and the best result for SCCRTC, including the following activities:
  o analysis of relevant/recent pricing comparables;
  o outreach to non-manager underwriter desks to ensure proposed pricing is consistent with market environment;
  o negotiation with the senior underwriter to ensure final pricing yields are consistent with demand for the Bonds.
• Assist SCCRTC and the financing team in arranging for the execution of financing documents and in the closing of the financing.
• Prepare a post-sale closing memorandum.
• Assist in the development of SCCRTC’s debt policy to ensure compliance with SB 1029 (Chapter 307, Statutes of 2016) prior to issuance and ongoing reporting duties.
• Provide advice about post issuance compliance requirements (i.e., arbitrage rebate, continuing disclosure, reporting under SB 1029, etc.).

Project Schedule:

Tasks 1 and 2 are to be completed by December 31, 2019.
Task 3 is ongoing and to be performed as requested.
Task 4 to be performed as requested.

EXHIBIT CB: FEE SCHEDULE per proposal dated April 29, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Hourly Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David Leifer, Senior Managing Director</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>$345.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Shick, Director</td>
<td>Day-to-Day Execution</td>
<td>$325.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nedko Nedev, Vice President</td>
<td>Quantitative Analysis and Execution Support</td>
<td>$295.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Cox, Vice President</td>
<td>Quantitative and Pricing Analysis</td>
<td>$295.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Lom, Assistant Vice President</td>
<td>Quantitative Analysis and Execution Support</td>
<td>$275.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXHIBIT C: REGULATORY DISCLOSURES

MSRB Rules G-42 – Disclosure of Conflicts of Interest and Legal or Disciplinary Events

Pursuant to Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board (“MSRB”) Rule G-42, on Duties on Non-Solicitor Municipal Advisors, Municipal Advisors are required to make certain written disclosures to clients which include, amongst other things, Conflicts of Interest and any Legal or Disciplinary Events of KNN Public Finance, LLC (“KNN Public Finance”) and its associated persons.

Conflicts of Interest

KNN Public Finance serves a wide variety of other clients that may from time to time have interests that could have a direct or indirect impact on the interests of COMMISSION. For example, KNN Public Finance serves as municipal advisor to other municipal advisory clients and, in such cases, depending on the client, owes either a fiduciary duty or a duty of care to such other clients just as it does to COMMISSION under this engagement. These other clients may, from time to time and depending on the specific circumstances, have competing interests. In acting in the interests of its various clients, KNN Public Finance could potentially face a conflict of interest arising from these competing client interests. KNN Public Finance fulfills its regulatory duty and mitigates such conflicts through dealing honestly and with the utmost good faith with COMMISSION.

Compensation. KNN Public Finance represents that in connection with the issuance of municipal securities, KNN Public Finance may receive compensation from an Issuer or Obligated Person for services rendered, which compensation is contingent upon the successful closing of a transaction and/or is based on the size of a transaction. Consistent with the requirements of MSRB Rule G-42, KNN Public Finance hereby discloses that such contingent and/or transactional compensation may present a potential conflict of interest regarding KNN Public Finance’s ability to provide unbiased advice to enter into such transaction. This conflict of interest will not impair KNN Public Finance’s ability to render unbiased and competent advice or to fulfill its fiduciary duty to the COMMISSION.

If KNN Public Finance becomes aware of any additional potential or actual conflict of interest after this disclosure, KNN Public Finance will disclose the detailed information in writing to the Issuer in a timely manner.

Legal or Disciplinary Events

KNN Public Finance has never been subject to any legal, disciplinary or regulatory actions nor was it ever subject to any legal, disciplinary or regulatory actions previously, when it was a division of Zions First National Bank or Zions Public Finance, Inc.

A regulatory action disclosure has been made on Form MA-I for one of KNN’s municipal advisory personnel relating to a 1998 U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (“SEC”) order that was filed while the municipal advisor was employed with a prior firm, (not KNN Public Finance). The details of which are available in Item 9; C(1), C(2), C(4), C(5) and the corresponding regulatory action DRP section on Form MA and Item 6C; (1), (2), (4), (5) and the corresponding regulatory action DRP section on Form MA-I. Issuers may electronically access KNN Public Finance’s most recent Form MA and each most
recent Form MA-I filed with the Commission at the following website: www.sec.gov/edgar/searchedgar/companysearch.html.

The SEC permits certain items of information required on Form MA and Form MA-I to be provided by reference to such required information already filed on a regulatory system (e.g., FINRA CRD). The above noted regulatory action has been referenced on both Form MA and MA-I due to the information already filed on FINRA’s CRD system and is publicly accessible through BrokerCheck at http://brokercheck.finra.org. For purposes of accessing such BrokerCheck information, the Municipal Advisor’s CRD number is 4457537.

There has been no change to any legal or disciplinary event that has been disclosed on KNN Public Finance’s original SEC registration Form MA filed on February 8, 2016 or Form MA-I’s filed on January 22, 2016.

**MSRB Rule G-10 – Additional Disclosures**

Pursuant to Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board Rule G-10, on Investor and Municipal Advisory Client Education and Protection, Municipal Advisors are required to provide certain written information to their municipal entity and obligated person clients which include the following:

a) KNN Public Finance, LLC is currently registered as a Municipal Advisor with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission and the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board.

b) Within the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board (“MSRB”) website at www.msrb.org. The COMMISSION may obtain the Municipal Advisory client brochure that is posted on the MSRB website. The brochure describes the protections that may be provided by the MSRB Rules along with how to file a complaint with financial regulatory authorities.
RESOLUTION NO.

Adopted by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
on the date of June 6, 2019
on the motion of Commissioner
duly seconded by Commissioner

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO ENTER INTO A CONTRACT WITH KNN PUBLIC FINANCE, LLC FOR FINANCIAL ADVISORY SERVICES TO ASSIST WITH THE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR THE SANTA CRUZ COUNTY TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PLAN MEASURE

WHEREAS, in November 2016 the residents of Santa Cruz County approved Measure D, a ½ cent transaction and use tax known as the “Santa Cruz County Transportation Improvement Plan Measure”; and

WHEREAS, the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) allocates, administers and oversees the Expenditure Plan of all Measure revenues which are not directly allocated by formula through an Implementation Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Implementation Plan’s purpose is to define the scope, cost, and delivery schedule including revenue projections and financing to determine cost effective methods to accelerate project delivery; and

WHEREAS, the RTC has a need for the services of a financial advisory firm to provide assistance and advice to identify the most cost-effective financing sources including capital financial planning, long-range financial planning, and debt policy; and

WHEREAS, the RTC’s approved FY18/19 budget for the administration and implementation of Measure D includes funds for consultant services;

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

1. The Executive Director is authorized to enter into an agreement with KNN Public Finance, LLC for an amount not to exceed $73,940 $50,000;

2. The Executive Director is authorized to negotiate and execute amendments to the agreement provided that the amendments are consistent with the RTC’s approved budget.

AYES: COMMISSIONERS

NOES: COMMISSIONERS

ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS

ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS

17-21
Replacement pages for Item 17

ATTEST:

__________________________________________
Ed Bottorff, Chair

__________________________________________
Guy Preston, Secretary

Distribution: RTC Fiscal, RTC and Consultant
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<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>6/6/2019</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Commission</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Watsonville City Council Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/10/2019</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Bicycle Advisory Committee</td>
<td>6:00 pm</td>
<td>Solari Room, Community Foundation in Aptos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/11/2019</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Elderly &amp; Disabled Transportation Advisor Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Old Watsonville City Council Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/13/2019</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Canceled Budget and Administration/Personnel Committee</td>
<td>3:00 pm</td>
<td>Redwood Room, SC County Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/20/2019</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Transportation Policy Workshop</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>RTC Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/20/2019</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Interagency Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>RTC Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/27/2019</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Commission Special Meeting</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Santa Cruz City Council Chambers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NO MEETINGS IN JULY**

<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>8/1/2019</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Commission</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Scotts Valley City Council Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/8/2019</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Budget and Administration/Personnel Committee</td>
<td>3:00 pm</td>
<td>Santa Cruz County Bldg – Redwood Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/12/19</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Bicycle Advisory Committee</td>
<td>6:00 pm</td>
<td>Rm A140, Cabrillo College’s Watsonville Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/13/19</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Elderly &amp; Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>RTC Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/15/19</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Transportation Policy Workshop</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>RTC Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/15/19</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Interagency Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>RTC Offices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RTC Commission Offices** – 1523 Pacific Ave. – Santa Cruz, CA

**Board of Supervisors Chambers/Redwood Conference room** – 701 Ocean St-5th floor – Santa Cruz, CA

**City of Watsonville Council Chambers** – 275 Main St Ste 400 – Watsonville, CA

**Old Watsonville City Council Chambers** – 250 Main Street – Watsonville, CA

**City of Capitola Council Chambers** – 420 Capitola Ave., Capitola, CA

**City of Scotts Valley Council Chambers** – 1 Civic Center Drive – Scotts Valley, CA

**Community Foundation in Aptos** – 7807 Soquel Drive, Aptos, CA

**Cabrillo College Watsonville Center** – 318 Union St, Watsonville, CA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Rec'd/Sent</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Rec'd/Sent</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Last</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Last</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02/11/19</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Outgoing</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC Santa Cruz Community Church</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Permission to use Parking Lot for Park and Ride Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/02/19</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Outgoing</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Kirk</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC Merlone Geier Partners Capitola Mall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Permission to use Parking Lot for Park and Ride Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/10/2019</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Outgoing</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>Crispell</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC Santa Cruz Sutter Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Permission to use Parking Lot for Park and Ride Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/22/2019</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Joanna</td>
<td>Edmonds</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unmet Transit and Specialized Transportation Needs Input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/22/2019</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Joanna</td>
<td>Edmonds</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Haid</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unmet Transit and Specialized Transportation Needs Input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/22/2019</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Joanna</td>
<td>Edmonds</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>Walker</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Best way to get a Micro put in at Redwood and 236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/23/19</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Joanna</td>
<td>Edmonds</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Father Karl</td>
<td>Claver</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unmet Transit and Specialized Transportation Needs Input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/23/19</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Joanna</td>
<td>Edmonds</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>Angus</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unmet Transit and Specialized Transportation Needs Input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/23/19</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Joanna</td>
<td>Edmonds</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Robin</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unmet Transit and Specialized Transportation Needs Input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/23/19</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Joanna</td>
<td>Edmonds</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Kerala</td>
<td>Fraser</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unmet Transit and Specialized Transportation Needs Input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/23/19</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Joanna</td>
<td>Edmonds</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Gloria</td>
<td>Wells</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unmet Transit and Specialized Transportation Needs Input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/23/19</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Joanna</td>
<td>Edmonds</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Panagos</td>
<td>Pateras</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unmet Transit and Specialized Transportation Needs Input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/23/19</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Joanna</td>
<td>Edmonds</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Matte</td>
<td>Sapone</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unmet Transit and Specialized Transportation Needs Input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/23/19</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Joanna</td>
<td>Edmonds</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>McCoy</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unmet Transit and Specialized Transportation Needs Input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/24/19</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Joanna</td>
<td>Edmonds</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Rebbie</td>
<td>Higgins</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unmet Transit and Specialized Transportation Needs Input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/24/19</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Joanna</td>
<td>Edmonds</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Roettger</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unmet Transit and Specialized Transportation Needs Input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/25/19</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Outgoing</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Kailash</td>
<td>Mozumder</td>
<td>City of Capitola</td>
<td>Anais</td>
<td>Schnek</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/25/19</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Joanna</td>
<td>Edmonds</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Christine</td>
<td>Huffard</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unmet Transit and Specialized Transportation Needs Input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/25/19</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Outgoing</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Suzi</td>
<td>Merriam</td>
<td>City of Watsonville Community Development</td>
<td>Guy</td>
<td>Preston</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/26/19</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Outgoing</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>Peary</td>
<td>Redtree Partners</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/26/19</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Shannon</td>
<td>Munz</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Nadene</td>
<td>Thorne</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concerned Citizen about Trail Now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/29/19</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Outgoing</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Derek</td>
<td>Wong</td>
<td>Michael Baker International</td>
<td>Guy</td>
<td>Tracy</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/28/19</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Ginger</td>
<td>Dykaar</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Sally</td>
<td>Arnold</td>
<td>Friends Of The Rail &amp; Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/28/19</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Joanna</td>
<td>Edmonds</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Joanna</td>
<td>Edmonds</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unmet Transit and Specialized Transportation Needs Input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Letter/Sent</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/28/19</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Joanna Edmonds</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>Conley</td>
<td>County of SC</td>
<td>Unmet Transit and Specialized Transportation Needs Input</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/30/19</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Joanna Edmonds</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>Conley</td>
<td>County of SC</td>
<td>Unmet Transit and Specialized Transportation Needs Input</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/30/19</td>
<td>email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Joanna Edmonds</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Gray</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Unmet Transit and Specialized Transportation Needs Input</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01/19</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Joanna Edmonds</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Bonnie</td>
<td>Gutierrez</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Unmet Transit and Specialized Transportation Needs Input</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01/19</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Joanna Edmonds</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Joanna</td>
<td>Edmonds</td>
<td>County of SC</td>
<td>Our County needs rail service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/05/19</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Luis Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Terri</td>
<td>Gessell</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Who has jurisdiction of Celia Ave. in Boulder Creek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/06/19</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>Machado</td>
<td>County DPW</td>
<td>Surface Transportation Block Grant Program funding allocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/06/19</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Thomas Travers</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Maguire</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Homeless activity taking place near rail line</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/09/19</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>California State Assembly</td>
<td>Outcomes and next steps resulting from the April 18, 2019 meeting between Caltrans District 5, Supervisor McPherson, SC County Public Works, CHF, and SLV Unified School District regarding Highway 9 Corridor safety improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/10/19</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Thomas Travers</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Carie</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td>Land Trust of Santa Cruz County</td>
<td>Encampment by Antonelli Pond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/10/19</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Outgoing</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Permission to use Parking Lot for Park and Ride Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/10/19</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Joanna Edmonds</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Debbie</td>
<td>Bulger</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Sidewalk by 655 High Street needs improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/10/19</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incoming</td>
<td>Luis Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Gregory</td>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Road grade crossing repair at Spring Valley Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/10/19</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incomings</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>Kaufmann</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>I support the improvements in Scenario B of the Unified Corridor Investment Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/13/19</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incomings</td>
<td>Cory Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Upset Citizen about the amount spent on the tressel new walking path.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/14/19</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Incomings</td>
<td>Jim Beall</td>
<td>Senator 15th District</td>
<td>Marjie Rodgers, Pete, Debra, Guy Kinn, Preston</td>
<td>Central Coast Coalition</td>
<td>SB 152 (Beall): Active Transportation Program - OPPOSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/16/19</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incomings</td>
<td>Cory Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jed</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Why can City of SC Employees use the new trestle to commute but closed to the public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/16/19</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Incomings</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>RTC Commission</td>
<td>Nadene</td>
<td>Thorne</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Emails back and forth with Commissioner Mike Rotkin about the Rail Possabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/16/19</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>M.Rotkin 05/16/19</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Erin</td>
<td>Thompson</td>
<td>Dept of Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/21/19</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Incomings</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Guy</td>
<td>Preston</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5/29/2019 - CORRESPONDENCE LOG
CPUC Public Advisor
California Public Utilities Commission
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, Ca 94102

May 10th, 2019

Re: Rulemaking 19-02-012 – Order Instituting Rulemaking to Implement Senate Bill 1376
Requiring Transportation Network Companies to Provide Access for Persons with Disabilities,
Including Wheelchair Users who need a Wheelchair Accessible Vehicle

To the California Public Utilities Commission:

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) is the Regional
Transportation Planning Agency for Santa Cruz County. The Elderly & Disabled Transportation
Advisory Committee (E&D TAC) advises the RTC, the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District
(METRO), the Consolidated Transportation Services Agency (CTSA), social service agencies,
and the local jurisdictions in Santa Cruz County on transportation issues, policies, plans,
programs, and projects for seniors, persons with disabilities (includes physical and mental
disabilities), and persons of limited means. The E&D TAC identifies unmet paratransit needs and
has discussed opportunities for expanding access for persons with disabilities to on-demand
transportation options, commonly referred to as Transportation Network Companies (TNCs).

The RTC has the following comments for the CPUC’s consideration to help successfully
implement this law to its intended effect.

1. Establishment of the Access Fund: Amount

   a. Care should be taken to understand the adequacy of the fees that are being collected in
      funding the service level objectives for WAVs. The fee revenues should be sufficient to
      cover the cost of incentives and training for drivers to provide WAV trips. The fee should
      be reviewed annually to determine if fee revenues are adequate for addressing WAV
      demand and service levels.

2. Establishment of Access Fund: Geographic Area

   a. Per-trip fees should be charged for all trips throughout the State. Data should be collected
      by county to determine supply, demand, and level of service for WAV trips. Wait times,
      trip origins, time of day, and availability of drivers should be reported for both non-WAV
      trips and WAV to allow for a comparison. Revenues should be distributed to jurisdictions
      in a way that considers the amount generated in each county and the demand for WAV
      rides within that jurisdiction.
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3. **TNC Investment Offsets and Exemptions**
   
a. Potential offsets should be carefully reviewed and deferred until a TNC demonstrates for a minimum of one year: the presence and availability of drivers with WAVs on its online-enabled application or platform; improved level of service including reasonable response times; efforts to publicize and promote available WAV services to disability communities; and an accounting of funds expended as required by SB 1376.

b. TNCs need to demonstrate they are providing equivalent service for WAV and non-WAV customers for a minimum of one-year before an exception is approved. The Commission should use data on total trip requests to fulfilled requests and wait times for both WAV and non-WAV customers.

c. TNCs should be required to report and make available to the public offset and exemption requests and WAV service data and non-WAV service data including details of investment costs, and how they meet the requirements.

4. **Additional considerations and requirements**
   
a. Ride fees, including cancellation fees, should be the same for WAV and non-WAV rides.

b. TNCs should provide technical assistance such as assistance reserving a ride over the phone for those with limited technical proficiency or access.

c. CPUC should leverage the expertise of Santa Cruz County RTC to evaluate applications and performance of TNC service providers in Santa Cruz County.

Thank you for reviewing and considering these comments regarding the implementation of this legislation to ensure that this legislation adequately addresses the on-demand transportation needs of paratransit users.

Sincerely,

Grace Blakeslee
Senior Transportation Planner
Resignation of Brooke Miller as RTC Legal Counsel

Brooke Miller, Assistant County Counsel, announced last month that she would be leaving the Office of County Counsel for a position in San Diego. Brooke has been RTC’s lead attorney for the past 5 years. Although I have only worked with Brooke for 6-months, I have a great appreciation for her knowledge and expertise in serving RTC. I have been working with Brooke to prioritize her limited time working with County Counsel on a plan to cover RTC’s legal needs. Brooke’s last day is June 11th.

Request for Proposals for Legal Services

RTC has been using the legal services from the County of Santa Cruz, since its inception. Earlier this year, County Counsel, Dana McRae, and I met to discuss RTC’s needs and the County’s resources.

Although County Counsel has provided excellent services, the workload associated with RTC’s legal needs has grown with the increases in responsibilities and complexities associated with both owning a rail line and becoming a self-help county. RTC’s use of County’s limited legal resources has become more challenging for the County. Additionally, there are potential legal issues between the County and RTC, which could result in conflicts of interest when sharing legal counsel. For those reasons, County Counsel has advised RTC to obtain outside legal services for future legal needs.

County Counsel has worked with RTC to prepare a Request for Proposals (RFP) for a full-service legal firm. The following is the proposed schedule for the procurement of a legal services firm:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 7, 2019</td>
<td>Issue RFP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 8, 2019</td>
<td>Proposals due from Consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 8 - 10, 2019</td>
<td>Panel review and ranks proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 15 &amp; 16, 2019</td>
<td>Interview Top Ranked Consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 1, 2019</td>
<td>Recommended consultant for approval to the RTC Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 9, 2019</td>
<td>Consultant Notice to Proceed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Due to the very tight schedule, I expect challenges in scheduling. I will be reaching out to Commissioners to seek interest and availability in being part of the evaluation committee.

**Status of Rail Line Storm Damage Contracts**

Staff has been working hard to deliver the 2017 storm damage contracts to construction this season. There had been considerable progress on the development of plans, specifications and permits, but the start of construction is subject to receipt of permits and following all permit conditions.

At our last board meeting, the Commission authorized, and I have subsequently started entering into contracts for a construction management firm to assist in the final packaging of the Phase 1 construction contracts, which included 5 of the 8 storm damage projects, including the washout near Harkin’s Slough. Services include procurement and management of a construction contract with a qualified low bid contractor.

Although the Phase 1 contracts are still expected to be advertised this summer, the receipt of final permits, the contract award date and the necessary lead time to start construction may not allow for construction at the washout near Harkin’s Slough this season. If this is the case, I will likely recommend that RTC award a contract this year, but any field work, subject to permit conditioned work window restrictions, may need to be suspended until next season. Work at sites not subject to work window restrictions is expected to proceed, as construction contracts are approved for award. I will continue to update the Commission on the delivery of all storm damage contracts on the rail line.

**Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSST)**

The Santa Cruz City Council will have a public hearing on an appeal of the Planning Commission’s approval of the Initial Study / Mitigated Negative Declaration for Phase II of Segment 7 of the MBSST at 11:00 am on June 11, 2019.

The grand opening ceremony for the Segment 8 San Lorenzo River trestle bridge project was held on Wednesday, May 22, 2019. The 10’ wide cantilevered bicycle and pedestrian path has been open now for over two weeks. This project was implemented by the City of Santa Cruz, utilizing multiple fund sources, including Measure D.

**Scott’s Creek Lagoon and Marsh Restoration Project**

Last month, the RTC received notice that it has been awarded a $237,690 grant from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) for the Scotts Creek Lagoon and Marsh Restoration Project, one of 38 statewide projects selected to receive funding for multi-benefit ecosystem restoration projects under CDFW’s Proposition 1 and Proposition 68 grant programs.

The Scott’s Creek project will develop a restoration design that includes a modern transportation corridor for Highway 1 which will allow for the ecological condition and dynamism of the Scotts Creek lagoon, marsh, and dune system while also planning for
climate change resiliency. RTC staff will be collaborating with Caltrans District 5 and the Resource Conservation District on this project. The grant will continue the critical work of this project team and federal and state resource agencies that has been developed to-date for the Scott Creek Lagoon and Marsh Restoration project.

Rail Line Alternatives Analysis and 2019 Rail-Volution Conference

Staff is working on finalizing a draft Request for Proposals (RFP) and Scope of Work (SOW) for a planned alternative’s analysis for high-capacity public transit on the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line. RTC and METRO staff is scheduled to bring the SOW for the alternative’s analysis to the RTC and METRO boards for input at their board meetings on June 27th and June 28th, respectively. Work is expected to commence in September 2019 and be completed in early 2021.

The 2019 Rail-Volution conference will be held on September 8-11th in Vancouver, British Columbia. The theme of this year’s conference is “Building Livable Communities with Transit”. There will be over 75 thought and discussion provoking workshops, ranging from cutting policy overviews to practical hands-on strategies. Last year, RTC sent two staff members to this conference in Pittsburg. This year, I plan to attend this conference with Ginger Dykaar, who is leading the RTC’s efforts on the alternative’s analysis. The conference topics and schedule coincide well with that of the alternative’s analysis, and I expect the conference to be beneficial for RTC’s staff working on the study.

Triennial Performance Audit

Every three years the RTC goes through a triennial performance audit as required by the Transportation Development Act. The RTC hired the firm Michael Bake International and Derek Wong is the lead auditor. As part of the audit, the hired auditor reaches out to Commissioners for input on the audit. The audit work will be starting soon so do not be surprised, if you hear from the auditor.

Internal Staffing Changes

Last month I announced that I appointed Tommy Travers, Transportation Planning Tech to a provisional planner position to temporarily fill the RTC’s vacant planner position. To temporarily fill Tommy’s Planning Tech position, RTC recruited and has hired a provisional planning technician, Jason Thompson effective June 17, 2019.

Jason graduated in 2016 from Cal Poly with a Bachelor of Science Degree in Forestry and Natural Resource Management. He has experience working with utility companies, many of which cross the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line. He has also served as a consulting arborist with Davey Resource Group.

Earlier this month, RTC brought an engineering intern, Brian Zamora, on board. Brian is studying for an Associate degree in Civil Engineering at Cabrillo College with plans to transfer to a 4-year University.
### PROJECTS UNDER CONSTRUCTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location Post Mile (PM)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Construction Timeline</th>
<th>Construction Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Project Manager (Resident Engineer)</th>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Santa Cruz 1 CAPM and Bridge Rails (1C85U4)</td>
<td>In and near Santa Cruz from North Aptos up to Jct. Route 9 PM (10.2 to 17.5)</td>
<td>Pavement Rehabilitation, ADA Curb Ramps, Guardrail/Barrier rail/Bridge</td>
<td>June 2, 2019 - June 2023</td>
<td>$19 million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Luis Duazo (GG)</td>
<td>Granite Construction Company Watsonville, CA</td>
<td>1C85U combines two projects 1C850 and 1F520 for construction. Ten Accessible Pedestrian Signal (APS) locations also added to 1C85U. Project is scheduled to begin June 2, 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Highway 9 Spring Creek Road Soldier Pile Wall (1K140)</td>
<td>Near Boulder Creek at Spring Creek Road (PM 15)</td>
<td>Construct Soldier pile wall restore roadway and facilities, place water pollution control BMPs, erosion control</td>
<td>Summer 2019</td>
<td>$2.8 million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Doug Hessing (BR)</td>
<td>Gordon N. Ball, Inc. Alamo, CA</td>
<td>Project was awarded on 4/25/19. Construction likely to begin Summer 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Highway 9 Shoulder Widening, Guardrail Upgrades, and Center Rumble Strips (1C650)</td>
<td>North of Boulder Creek to south of SR 35 (PM 22.1-23.8)</td>
<td>Shoulder widening, guardrail upgrades, and center rumble strips</td>
<td>March 18, 2019</td>
<td>$7.7 million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Doug Hessing (IN)</td>
<td>Granite Construction Company Watsonville, CA</td>
<td>Construction started March 18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Highway 17 Pasatiempo Shoulder Widening (1C670)</td>
<td>South of Pasatiempo overcrossing (PM 0.2/0.5)</td>
<td>Shoulder widening and soil nail wall</td>
<td>Spring 2019-Summer 2020</td>
<td>$5.7 million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Luis Duazo (BR)</td>
<td>Graniterock Company Watsonville, CA</td>
<td>Construction area clearing started.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Highway 17 Storm Water Mitigation (0Q600)</td>
<td>North of the Fishhook to Sims Road (PM 0.7-1.4)</td>
<td>Construct multiple storm water improvements</td>
<td>Winter 2017-May 10, 2019</td>
<td>$7.4 million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Doug Hessing (BR)</td>
<td>Graniterock, Watsonville, CA</td>
<td>Project is completed and accepted on May 10, 2019.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PROJECTS UNDER CONSTRUCTION (Cont’d.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location Post Mile (PM)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Construction Timeline</th>
<th>Construction Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Project Manager (Resident Engineer)</th>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. <strong>Highway 17 North Route 17 CAPM (1F760)</strong></td>
<td>Scotts Valley from just north of the Granite Creek Road over-crossing to SCL (PM 6.0/12.5)</td>
<td>Maintenance pavement overlay</td>
<td>Spring 2019</td>
<td>$19 million</td>
<td>SHOPP SB-1</td>
<td>Doug Hessing (BR)</td>
<td>Granite Construction Company, Watsonville, CA</td>
<td>Construction is underway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. <strong>Highway 152 Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) (1E020)</strong></td>
<td>Near Watsonville from Wagner Avenue to south of Holohan Road (PM 1.3-R2.0)</td>
<td>Install sidewalks for ADA compliance</td>
<td>Spring 2019</td>
<td>$1.9 million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Mike Lew (IN)</td>
<td>Granite Construction Company, Watsonville, CA</td>
<td>Construction started in the first week of April 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. <strong>Pedestrian Signal Upgrades (1G160)</strong></td>
<td>Various Locations: Highways 1, 9, 17, 129, and 152</td>
<td>Install Accessible Pedestrian Signal (APS)</td>
<td>January 2019</td>
<td>$1.8 million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Mike Lew (ML)</td>
<td>Out to Bid May 2019</td>
<td>The Project RTL’d in January and is scheduled to advertise next month.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROJECTS IN DEVELOPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location Post Mile (PM)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Construction Timeline</th>
<th>Estimated Construction Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. <strong>Highway 1 Soquel Creek Scour Protection (1H480)</strong></td>
<td>In Capitola at Soquel Creek Bridge (PM 13.3)</td>
<td>Bridge preventative maintenance – Place scour protection</td>
<td>Winter 2022</td>
<td>$2.2 million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>LuisDuazo</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PROJECTS IN DEVELOPMENT (Cont’d.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location Post Mile (PM)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Construction Timeline</th>
<th>Estimated Construction Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. TMS Detection Repair (1H990)</td>
<td>Various locations throughout District 5 along SRs 1, 17, 68, 156, 101 (PM Various)</td>
<td>Replace failed TMS Detection</td>
<td>Summer 2020</td>
<td>$451,000</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Doug Hessing</td>
<td>PS&amp;E/RW</td>
<td>Project is in Design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Highway 1/Highway 17 Ramp Safety Improvements (1H060)</td>
<td>From the fishhook to Pasatiempo overcrossing (PM 16.7)</td>
<td>Construct ramp safety improvements</td>
<td>Spring 2020</td>
<td>$5.8 million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Luis Duazo</td>
<td>PS&amp;E/RW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Highway 1 Davenport Culvert Replacement (0J200)</td>
<td>Near Davenport and south of Waddell Creek Bridge (PM 31.9/35.7)</td>
<td>Replace culverts</td>
<td>Fall 2021</td>
<td>$3.6 million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Doug Hessing</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>Project is in preliminary Design and environmental phase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. SCr 9 South Drainage and Erosion Control Improvements (1F920)</td>
<td>From SR 1 and 9 to slightly north of Glen Arbor Road (PM 0.0/8.5)</td>
<td>Upgrade drainage systems and stabilize slopes</td>
<td>Fall 2020</td>
<td>$2 million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Doug Hessing</td>
<td>PS&amp;E/RW</td>
<td>Project is in Design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Highway 9 PM 1.0 and 4.0 Viaduct (1K120)</td>
<td>Near SCr north of Vernon Street (PM 1/1)</td>
<td>Construct side-hill viaduct restore roadway and facilities, place Water Pollution Control BMPs, erosion control</td>
<td>Fall 2022</td>
<td>$9.9 million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Luis Duazo</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Location Post Mile (PM)</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Construction Timeline</td>
<td>Estimated Construction Cost</td>
<td>Funding Source</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCr 9 Upper Drainage and Erosion Control Improvements</td>
<td>In Boulder Creek from Holiday Lane to just south of Ben Lomond to the SR 236/9 Junction</td>
<td>Upgrade drainage and erosion control</td>
<td>Fall 2022</td>
<td>$5.4 million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Luis Duazo</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(1G950)</em></td>
<td>(PM 8.5/25.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 9 San Lorenzo River Bridge and Kings Creek Bridge Replacement</td>
<td>Near Boulder Creek, at San Lorenzo River Bridge and at Kings Creek Bridge</td>
<td>Replace bridges</td>
<td>Summer 2022</td>
<td>$12 million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Doug Hessing</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>Project is in preliminary Design and environmental phase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(1H470)</em></td>
<td>(PM 13.6/15.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 9 Hairpin Tieback</td>
<td>Near Boulder Creek about 1.1 miles south of the SR 236/9 Junction</td>
<td>Soldier Pile Tieback Retaining Wall</td>
<td>Spring 2021</td>
<td>$2.6 million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Luis Duazo</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(1K130)</em></td>
<td>(PM 19.97)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 17 Wildlife Habitat Crossing</td>
<td>From Laurel Road to just north of Laurel Road</td>
<td>Construct wildlife undercrossing</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$5.6 million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Aaron Henkel</td>
<td>PS&amp;E/RW</td>
<td>Project is in design and on schedule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(1G260)</em></td>
<td>(PM 9.442-9.692)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 129/ Lakeview Road Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>Near Watsonville, at Lakeview Road</td>
<td>Construct roundabout and improve street lighting</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$4.5 million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Luis Duazo</td>
<td>PS&amp;E/RW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(1G990)</em></td>
<td>(PM 1.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PROJECTS IN DEVELOPMENT (Cont’d.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location Post Mile (PM)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Construction Timeline</th>
<th>Estimated Construction Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Highway 152 Corralitos Creek ADA (05-1F620)</td>
<td>Near Watsonville, East of Beverly Drive to Holohan / College Road (PM1.9 to R2.0)</td>
<td>Construct Accessible Pathway</td>
<td>Spring 2022</td>
<td>$3.4 million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Mike Lew</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Crosswalks and Pedestrian Safety Enhancements (1G760)</td>
<td>Various Locations: Highways 1, 9, 129, and 152</td>
<td>Install Electrical / Signs / Markings / Pavement</td>
<td>Fall/Winter 2019</td>
<td>$1.2 million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Ken Dostalek</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>Project is at 95% PS&amp;E SCR 1 @ PM 18.8 (Laurent Street) SCR 9 @ PM 9.51 (Main Street) SCR 129 @ PM 0.23 (near SR1) SCR 152 @ PM T3.161 (Marchant Street)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Santa Cruz 1 CAPM and Bridge Rails (1C85U)</td>
<td>In and near Santa Cruz from North Aptos up to Jct. Route 9 PM (10.2 to 17.5)</td>
<td>Pavement Rehabilitation, ADA Curb Ramps, Guardrail/Barrier rail/Bridge</td>
<td>January 2019 - June 2023</td>
<td>$19 million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Luis Duazo</td>
<td>PS&amp;E/RW</td>
<td>1C85U combines two projects 1C850 and 1F520 for construction. Ten Accessible Pedestrian Signal (APS) locations also added to 1C85U. These APS locations are being removed from 1G160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ACRONYMS USED IN THIS REPORT:**

- **ADA**: Americans with Disabilities Act
- **CEQA**: California Environmental Quality Act
- **CMAQ**: Congestion Mitigation Air Quality
- **CMIA**: Corridor Mobility Improvement Account
- **CTC**: California Transportation Commission
- **ED**: Environmental Document
- **EIR**: Environmental Impact Report
- **PA&ED**: Project Approval and Environmental Document
- **PM**: Post Mile
- **PS&E**: Plans, Specifications, and Estimates
- **RW**: Right of Way
- **SB1**: Senate Bill 1, the Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017
- **SCL**: Santa Clara County Line
- **SHOPP**: State Highway Operation and Protection Program
- **SR**: State Route
- **STIP**: State Transportation Improvement Program
- **TMS**: Traffic Management System
RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) hold a public hearing and adopt a resolution (Attachment 1) to:

1. Approve the five-year programs of projects for Measure D regional investment categories and projects: Highway Corridors, Active Transportation, Rail Corridor, San Lorenzo Valley-Highway 9 Corridor Improvements and the Highway 17 Wildlife Crossing (Exhibits A through E), and for Community Bridges-Lift Line (Exhibit F).

2. Amend the Fiscal Year (FY) 2019/20 RTC budget to reflect the approved Measure D “5-year programs of projects”; and

3. Direct staff to use Measure D funds to leverage other grants and to enter into agreements with implementing agencies, as may be necessary to implement projects allocated funds in the Measure D 5-year programs of projects and ensure requirements of the Measure D Ordinance are met.

BACKGROUND

Measure D, the 30-year transportation ballot measure passed by more than two-thirds majority of Santa Cruz County voters on November 8, 2016, provides funding for five categories of projects - neighborhood projects (30% of net measure revenues), highway corridors (25%), transportation for seniors and people with disabilities (20%), active transportation (17%), and the rail corridor (8%).

Each agency receiving Measure D revenues is required to annually develop, update, hold a public hearing on, and adopt a five-year program of projects. The five-year program of projects identifies how each agency plans to use Measure D funds in the upcoming 5 years. Agencies receiving direct formula allocations (cities, the County of Santa Cruz, Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (METRO) and Community Bridges/Lift Line) typically develop and update their five-year programs of projects as part of their annual budget and/or capital improvement program. Community members may provide input on those plans directly to each recipient agency. The Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) is responsible for developing the five-year program of projects for regional investment categories and projects, as
described below. The RTC previously approved Five-Year plans for Measure D regional projects in June of 2017 and 2018. Last month, the RTC reviewed the preliminary draft 5-year plans for FY19/20-23/24 and scheduled a public hearing to solicit public input at this meeting.

DISCUSSION

The RTC prepares the five-year plans for each of the Measure D regional investment categories and projects -- Highway Corridors, Active Transportation, and the Rail Corridor, as well as San Lorenzo Valley Highway 9 Corridor Improvements and the Highway 17 Wildlife Crossing.

The “5-year programs of projects” are adjusted annually based on actual expenditures, updated revenue projections (adopted by the RTC as part of the budget in April 2019), proposed allocations to specific projects and work tasks, and updated project schedule and cost information for previously approved projects. The plans also include the carryover of unspent revenues from prior years and include some new projects. Since annual revenues are sometimes insufficient for larger projects, agencies sometimes carry over, reserve, or “bank” revenues to future years. For some projects, staff proposes to reserve funds to serve as match for competitive grant programs or to be used if those grants are not secured. The 5-year plans also propose to advance future Measure D funds to accelerate delivery of some projects. Proposed allocations exceed projected revenues in some years and short-term loans between Measure D categories or financing may be necessary.

Recommendations for the Measure D regional programs and projects is included as Attachment 1 (Exhibits A-E). Fact sheets on major regional projects are included in Attachment 2. Below is a summary of some of the changes proposed in the 2019 5-year updates.

Active Transportation/Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network (MBSST)
The proposed FY19/20-23/24 5-year plan for the MBSST program proposes the following major updates:

- Adds $1 million for the Phase 2 of Segment 7 of the rail trail from California Ave/Bay Street to the wharf roundabout in Santa Cruz, as requested by the City of Santa Cruz.
- Adds $2.8 million for Segment 18 of the rail trail in the City of Watsonville. While the City of Watsonville requested $3.8M, staff recommends that the City of Watsonville contribute Neighborhood Measure-D funds to meet the balance of the funding needs or seek grants to fill the short-fall.
- Adds $3.8 million for the County of Santa Cruz to initiate environmental review and preliminary engineering for sections of the rail trail between 17th Ave and Aptos Creek Road (Segment 10: 17th-47th/Jade St. Park, Segment 11: Monterey Ave. to State Park Dr., and Segment 12: State Park Dr. to Aptos Creek Rd.). While the County requested $4M, $200K was allocated last year; thus adding $3.8M satisfies the $4M request for this 5.3-mile project.
- In total, 18.3 miles of the rail trail will be in progress with this approval.
Highway Corridors and Highway 9
The proposed 5-year plans for highway categories and projects include the following updates:

- Seek competitive grants to accelerate delivery and cover greater share of Highway 1 auxiliary lanes and bicycle/pedestrian overcrossings project costs.
- Increase funds for traveler information/transportation demand management programs in FY19/20 and FY20/21, may issue “call for projects” for programs that reduce vehicle miles traveled.
- Increase funds for the Safe on 17 program aimed at reducing collisions on Highway 17 through increased California Highway Patrol (CHP) enforcement.
- Highway 9: Increase funds for transportation projects providing access to San Lorenzo Valley (SLV) High School, Elementary School, and Middle School campus.

Rail
The proposed 5-year plans for the Rail category includes one new project:

- Adds funds for an alternatives analysis of possible high-capacity transit uses on the rail corridor, identified by the RTC as a next step from the Unified Corridor Investment Study.

Lift Line-Community Bridges Paratransit
Four percent (4%) of net Measure D revenues are allocated to Community Bridges-Lift Line, as the Consolidated Transportation Services Agency (CTSA) for Santa Cruz County, for paratransit service. Since Community Bridges-Lift Line is the only agency receiving a direct allocation of Measure D fund that is not a public agency, review and approval of Community Bridges Lift Line Measure D five-year plan is overseen by the RTC and included in the RTC’s public review process. The Lift Line five-year plan includes funds for the following:

- Two driver positions to provide door-to-door service for elderly and/or physically or mentally limited and/or ill passengers;
- New van driver trainer who supervises and trains drivers and serves as a substitute driver;
- Administrative assistant and dispatcher to receive and screen telephone calls, maintain records, prepare statistics and reports, correspondence and coordination of tasks and scheduling rides;
- Outreach and publicity to provide materials and videos to promote paratransit ride availability;
- Operations and facility reserve for an operations facility that will house the entire Lift Line operations in one location or for increases in facility leases, including relocation, if needed; and
- Vehicle and equipment reserve to purchase two new fleet vehicles, replace aging and worn shop equipment, and upgrade maintenance and operations facility.

Advisory Committee Reviews
The RTC’s Bicycle Advisory Committee, the Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committees, and Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC) reviewed the draft 5-year plans at their April meetings.
Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission hold a public hearing and adopt by resolution (Attachment 1) the updated Measure D 5-year programs of projects for the regional and RTC oversight projects -- Highway Corridor, Active Transportation/Trail Program, Rail Corridor, San Lorenzo Valley/Highway 9 Corridor, and the Highway 17 Wildlife Crossing, as well as the 5-year program of projects for Community Bridges-Lift Line (Exhibits A-F); amend the FY 2019-20 RTC budget to reflect the approved Measure D programs of projects, direct staff to use Measure D funds to leverage grants for projects identified in the 5-year plans, and authorize the Executive Director to enter into agreements, as may be necessary, with implementing agencies that may receive Measure D funds from these regional categories.

Any public comments on the five year plans that are received by noon on June 5 will be distributed to the RTC at this meeting. A public hearing has been noticed in local newspapers to begin no earlier than 9:30am.

Next Steps

After the close of each fiscal year, agencies must submit reports to ensure funds were expended consistent with the requirements of the voter-approved Measure D ordinance. The reports describe actual expenditures, progress made to improve the transportation system, how maintenance of effort requirements have been met to ensure Measure D revenues are supplementing (not supplanting) other revenues, and the degree that Measure D funds were used to secure additional funding from other sources (leveraging). Fiscal audits of FY17/18 expenditures were reviewed by the Measure D Taxpayer Oversight Committee; the committee’s report/findings and FY17/18 annual report is included as a separate item on this agenda. Recipient agency audits and expenditure reports are posted on the RTC’s Measure D website (https://sccrtc.org/funding-planning/measured/taxpayer-oversight/).

Implementation Plan

Later this year, RTC staff will be preparing an implementation plan that looks at opportunities to accelerate delivery of some projects. While “pay-as-you-go” financing is the preferred method of financing Measure D projects, the RTC may determine bonding or other financing is cost-effective to accelerate regional project implementation. Use of bonding, loans between Measure D categories, or other financing options will depend on project delivery schedules, funding needs, matching fund opportunities, and cash flow estimates. Direct recipients (cities, the County of Santa Cruz, METRO and LiftLine) may not bond against Measure D revenues directly, but could access options such as cooperative fund agreements among agencies receiving Measure D funds, or other means to advance funding for projects as they near construction. As projects near construction, staff will return to the RTC with an analysis of financial options to accelerate specific projects. The five year plans reflect the RTC’s intent to investigate these options, but are not a commitment to bond or otherwise finance projects.
5-year Plans for Cities/County and Transit
Concurrent to the RTC preparing the 5-year program of projects for regional categories (Highways, Rail, Trail), agencies which receive direct allocations of funds have also been updating their 5-year plans. Staff encourages interested parties to track city, county and METRO meeting packets and provide any input on how they propose to use their funds directly to the cities, county and METRO. The Lift Line 5-year plan is reviewed by the RTC’s Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC) in April and is subject to approval by the RTC board.

FISCAL IMPACT

On average, Measure D generates approximately $20 million per year. While nearly 50% of the funds are allocated to cities, the County of Santa Cruz, METRO, and Lift Line, the RTC is responsible for programming and budgeting the remaining funds designated in the voter-approved expenditure plan for regional investment categories and projects. The 5-year plan updates show how RTC anticipates investing funds through FY23/24. As part of approval of the updated plans, the RTC budget will be amended to reflect anticipated FY19/20 expenditures and any carryover revenues.

SUMMARY

The 30-year Measure D ½-cent sales tax is providing critical funding to improve local highways, construct new bicycle and pedestrian facilities, repair local roads, maintain and expand transit and paratransit services for seniors and people with disabilities, and maintain other publicly owned transportation facilities. Measure D requires recipient agencies to annually prepare and update a program of projects, identifying how agencies plan to invest Measure D funds over the next 5 years, consistent with the voter-approved Expenditure Plan. Staff recommends that the RTC hold a public hearing and approve five-year plans for each of the regional transportation categories -- Highway Corridors, Active Transportation, and the Rail Corridor, as well as San Lorenzo Valley Highway 9 Corridor Improvements, the Highway 17 Wildlife Crossing, and Community Bridges Lift Line (Attachment 1: Exhibits A-F).

Attachments:

1. Resolution adopting Measure D 5-year programs of projects
   Exhibits:
   a. Highway Corridors
   b. Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network (MBSST)/Coastal Rail Trail 5-Year Program of Projects
   c. Rail Corridor 5-Year Program of Projects
   d. San Lorenzo Valley Highway 9 Corridor 5-Year Program of Projects
   e. Highway 17 Wildlife Crossing 5-Year Program of Projects
   f. Community Bridges Lift Line 5-Year Program of Projects
2. Regional Project Fact Sheets
RESOLUTION NO.

Adopted by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
on the date of June 6, 2019
on the motion of Commissioner
duly seconded by Commissioner

A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE FIVE-YEAR PROGRAMS OF PROJECTS FOR
REGIONAL MEASURE D PROJECTS AND COMMUNITY BRIDGES/LIFT LINE AND
AMENDING THE FY19/20 RTC BUDGET
TO REFLECT PLANNED USE OF MEASURE D REVENUES

WHEREAS, to address immense transportation needs and severe
transportation funding shortfalls, Santa Cruz County voters approved Measure D in
November 2016 by over a 2/3 majority; and

WHEREAS, Measure D is a ½ cent sales tax for 30 years to fund five
transportation improvement categories; and

WHEREAS, all Measure D funding recipients are required to annually develop
a five-year program of projects to identify planned expenditures and deliverables,
with these plans adjusted annually based on updated revenue and distribution
estimates, project schedule and cost information, as well as information on other
grants or funds secured for the projects; and

WHEREAS, the RTC is the agency responsible for delivering and distributing
funds for regional and other projects in the voter-approved Measure D Expenditure
Plan including Highway Corridors, Active Transportation (Coastal Rail Trail), Rail
Corridor, San Lorenzo Valley Highway 9 Corridor Improvements, and the Highway 17
Wildlife Crossing; and

WHEREAS, Community Bridges is the agency designated as the Consolidated
Transportation Services Agency in Santa Cruz County that is responsible for receiving
four percent (4%) net of revenue from Measure D to deliver paratransit services to
seniors and people with disabilities; and

WHEREAS, Community Bridges is not a public agency, the RTC holds a public
hearing for the Community Bridges/Lift Line’s Measure D 5-year program of projects; and

WHEREAS, the RTC has prepared plans for projected revenues from FY
2019/20 through FY 2023/24 which are consistent with the Measure D Ordinance and
Expenditure Plan;

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

1. The Five-Year Program of Projects (FY19/20-23/24) for the Measure D regional
categories and projects: Highway Corridors, Active Transportation (Coastal
Rail Trail), Rail Corridor, San Lorenzo Valley Highway 9 Corridor Improvements, and the Highway 17 Wildlife Crossing, as shown in Exhibits A
through E, are hereby adopted.

2. The Five-Year Program of Projects for the Consolidated Transportation Services Agency (Community Bridges/Lift Line) paratransit services to serve seniors and people with disabilities, as shown in Exhibit F is hereby adopted.

3. The FY19/20 RTC Budget is hereby amended, consistent with the Five-Year Program of Projects to reflect and implement the adopted Measure D 5-year programs of projects;

4. The Executive Director, or his or her designee, is hereby authorized to enter into agreements with agencies implementing components of the five-year program of projects;

5. Staff is directed to utilize Measure D funds to leverage other state and federal funds, expedite deliverables and provide public information to keep the community apprised about these investments.

AYES: COMMISSIONERS

NOES: COMMISSIONERS

ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS

ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS

_________________________
Ed Bottorff, Chair

ATTEST:

_________________________
Guy Preston, Secretary

Exhibits A-E: Five Year Program of Projects for Regional Categories and Projects
Exhibit F: Five Year Program of Projects for Community Bridges Lift Line

Distribution: RTC Fiscal, Community Bridges, Subrecipients
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## Measure D: 5-Year Program of Projects (FY19/20-FY23/24)

**DRAFT - 2019**

### Category: Highway Corridors (25% of Measure D Revenues)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name/Road/Limits</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Prior Years Spent</th>
<th>Total Measure D</th>
<th>2019 Updates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Highway 1: 41st Avenue/Soquel Drive Auxiliary Lanes and Chanticleer Bike/Pedestrian Overcrossing</td>
<td>Freeway operational improvement, rehab roadway and drainage, improve bike/pedestrian access over freeway.</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$1,650,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Highway 1: Auxiliary Lanes from State Park Drive to Bay-Porter, and Reconstruction of Capitola Avenue Overcrossing</td>
<td>Freeway operational improvement, rehab roadway and drainage, soundwalls and retaining walls, reconstruct Capitola Ave. overcrossing with sidewalks and bike lanes</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$9,113,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Highway 1 Bicycle/Pedestrian Overcrossing at Mar Vista Drive</td>
<td>RTC oversight and assistance to address restricted bike/pedestrian access by building new overcrossing with lighting, traffic calming, and moderate aesthetic treatments</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Santa Cruz County Regional Conservation Investment Strategy - Grant match</td>
<td>Match to Wildlife Conservation Board grant for early mitigation planning for transportation projects.</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$25,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cruz 511-Traveler Information and Commuter Manager</td>
<td>Ongoing system &amp; demand management (TDM), includes Cruz511.org traveler information, carpool and other TDM programs</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Safe on 17</td>
<td>Ongoing system management program, involves increased CHP enforcement on Highway 17</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Unified Corridor Investment Study</td>
<td>Analysis of Highway 1 corridor projects</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>No change. Project completed in FY18/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Freeway Service Patrol</td>
<td>Ongoing system management and congestion reducing program. Roving tow trucks removing incidents and obstructions during peak travel periods on Hwy 1 and Hwy 17</td>
<td>$118,813</td>
<td>$937,176</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Estimated Annual Measure D Allocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>FY19/20</th>
<th>FY20/21</th>
<th>FY21/22</th>
<th>FY22/23</th>
<th>FY23/24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior</td>
<td>$10,102,267</td>
<td>$5,209,311</td>
<td>$5,277,032</td>
<td>$5,345,633</td>
<td>$5,415,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Carryover from Previous Year</td>
<td>$8,890,706</td>
<td>$11,413,589</td>
<td>$11,547,689</td>
<td>$13,606,060</td>
<td>$18,257,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Available</td>
<td>$14,100,073</td>
<td>$16,693,021</td>
<td>$16,893,322</td>
<td>$19,021,186</td>
<td>$23,384,878</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Planned Use

1. **Hwy 41st/Soquel Aux Lane and Chanticleer B/P Overcrossing**: Previously programmed funds used for preliminary and final engineering design and right-of-way phases over the period FY 17/18-through-FY 19/20. Measure D funds for PS&E and Project Management activities. RTC will target SCCP and LPP Cycle 2 or could decide at future date whether to utilize bond or other financing.

2. **Hwy 1 Auxiliary Lanes from State Park Drive to Bay/Porter Project**: Measure D funding for preliminary design and environmental documentation (FY 18/19 - FY 19/20) assumes PS&E will be advanced in FY 20/21, and right-of-way acquisition occurring in FY 21/22. RTC will target SCCP and LPP Cycle 2 or could decide at future date whether to utilize bond or other financing.

3. **Mar Vista Bicycle/Pedestrian Overcrossing**: Previously programmed funds used for project development and construction activities. Measure D funds ($300K) to supplement project management and public outreach support activities as needed. RTC will target SCCP and LPP Cycle 2 or could decide at future date whether to utilize bond or other financing.

4. **Freeway Service Patrol**: Through state budget/SB1 more Caltrans funds became available reducing Measure D needed.

**Notes:**

1. **Hwy 41st/Soquel Aux Lane and Chanticleer B/P Overcrossing**: Previously programmed funds used for preliminary and final engineering design and right-of-way phases over the period FY 17/18-through-FY 19/20. Measure D funds for PS&E and Project Management activities. RTC will target SCCP and LPP Cycle 2 or could decide at future date whether to utilize bond or other financing.

2. **Hwy 1 Auxiliary Lanes from State Park Drive to Bay/Porter Project**: Measure D funding for preliminary design and environmental documentation (FY 18/19 - FY 19/20) assumes PS&E will be advanced in FY 20/21, and right-of-way acquisition occurring in FY 21/22. RTC will target SCCP and LPP Cycle 2 or could decide at future date whether to utilize bond or other financing.

3. **Mar Vista Bicycle/Pedestrian Overcrossing**: Previously programmed funds used for project development and construction activities. Measure D funds ($300K) to supplement project management and public outreach support activities as needed. RTC will target SCCP and LPP Cycle 2 or could decide at future date whether to utilize bond or other financing.

4. **Freeway Service Patrol**: Through state budget/SB1 more Caltrans funds became available reducing Measure D needed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rail Trail Project/Program</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Prior Years Spent</th>
<th>FY19/20</th>
<th>FY20/21</th>
<th>FY21/22</th>
<th>FY22/23</th>
<th>FY23/24</th>
<th>Total Measure D</th>
<th>2019 Updates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Segment 7: Natural Bridges to Bay/California (Phase I), Bay/Californiat to Wharf (Phase II), City of Santa Cruz (SC) lead</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$2,100,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,100,000</td>
<td>Shift $1.1M for ph. 1 to FY19/20 &amp; add $1 million per City of SC request for Phase 2 for construction, contingent on city securing other funds for balance of Ph. 2. Shift capital funds to FY19/20 based on updated schedule. Phase I: Summer-Fall 2019, Phase II: TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>Segment 7: Natural Bridges to Bay/California (Phase I), Bay/Californiat to Wharf (Phase II), City of Santa Cruz (SC) lead</td>
<td></td>
<td>$91,972</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$241,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Seg 8: San Lorenzo River trestle widening, City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>No change. FY18/19 (to be completed ~ June 2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A</td>
<td>Seg 8: San Lorenzo River trestle widening, City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$122,775</td>
<td>Updates RTC and technical assistance costs (previously $15k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Seg 8/9: SC Wharf to 17th Ave., City of SC lead (partnership with County)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>Shifted funds from FY 20/21 est. 2022/23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>Seg 8/9: SC Wharf to 17th Ave., City of SC lead (partnership with County)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>Add FY22/23 and FY23/24 estimates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>City of SC trail maintenance and operations</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>Add FY23/24 at same level; add $25K to FY19/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Segment 18: Lee Rd-Walker, Watsonville</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,800,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,950,000</td>
<td>Shift funds to match current schedule and add $2.8M of city’s $3.8M request, contingent on city securing other funds for balance of construction cost. FY19/20 and remaining portion in FY 21/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5A</td>
<td>Segment 18: Lee Rd-Walker, Watsonville</td>
<td>$62,775</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$122,775</td>
<td>Updates RTC and technical assistance costs, adding funds in FY20/21-22.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Trail Project/Program</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Prior Years Spent</td>
<td>FY19/20</td>
<td>FY20/21</td>
<td>FY21/22</td>
<td>FY22/23</td>
<td>FY23/24</td>
<td>Total Measure D</td>
<td>2019 Updates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 City of Watsonville trail maintenance and operations</td>
<td>Ongoing maintenance. Includes restriping, sweeping, vegetation management, mitigations, and periodic repaving.</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$43,000</td>
<td>Add funds for FY23/24 maintenance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 North Coast Segment 5</td>
<td>RTC project mgmt, oversight, outreach and technical assistance (EIR consultants, legal, Environmental Health Services &amp; ROW)</td>
<td>$1,216,939</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,766,939</td>
<td>Updated costs est 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 North Coast Segment 5: trail maintenance and operations</td>
<td>Ongoing maintenance of sections of trail once constructed. Includes restriping, sweeping, vegetation management, mitigations, and periodic repaving.</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>Deleted FY21/22 funds, adds funds for FY23/24. ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 North Coast Seg 5: Trail construction and reserve to match grants</td>
<td>Funds to serve as match to grant application(s)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,700,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,700,000</td>
<td>No change. est. 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Segment 10-12: Segment 10 (17th-47th/Jade St. park), Seg 11 (Monterey to St. Park Dr.), &amp; Seg 12 (St. Park to Aptos Creek Rill) PA/ED: Preliminary Analysis of 17th Ave/Jade St. Park.</td>
<td>Allocation to County DPW: Environmental Review and Preliminary design, right of way research/surveys, assessments, and grant writing services. County DPW-Capitola project.</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,333,333</td>
<td>$1,333,333</td>
<td>$1,333,333</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>Expand scope. Increase from $200K previously allocated to Seg 10 to $4M total for expanded project length and level of analysis. TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Capitola Trail: City Hall to Monterey Ave</td>
<td>RTC project mgmt, oversight, outreach and technical assistance (consultants, legal, Environmental Health Services &amp; ROW)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>Increased funds due to expanded scope; added FY23/24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Ongoing RTC oversight, coordination, and assistance, including on development of future trail sections.</td>
<td>RTC: Surveys, Environmental Health (EHS), legal, stakeholder coordination, response to public comments, and development of future projects/grant applications</td>
<td>$304,767</td>
<td>$235,000</td>
<td>$210,000</td>
<td>$285,000</td>
<td>$345,000</td>
<td>$345,000</td>
<td>$1,724,767</td>
<td>Updated estimated costs, adds FY23/24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Santa Cruz County Regional Conservation Investment Strategy - Grant match</td>
<td>Match to Wildlife Conservation Board grant for early mitigation planning for transportation projects.</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$17,340</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$17,340</td>
<td>New - approved by RTC May 2, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Corridor encroachments &amp; maintenance</td>
<td>Ongoing corridor maintenance, including vegetation, tree removal, trash, graffiti, drainage, encroachments, storm damage repairs outside of what is required for railroad operations</td>
<td>$502,724</td>
<td>$499,250</td>
<td>$519,250</td>
<td>$519,250</td>
<td>$519,250</td>
<td>$519,250</td>
<td>$3,078,974</td>
<td>Updated estimated costs FY17/18-19/20 (slightly lower), adds FY23/24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Estimated Annual Measure D Expenditures**

- $2,691,677
- $4,859,923
- $6,142,583
- $5,358,583
- $3,140,250
- $1,140,250
- $23,333,267

**Estimated Interest Earnings on Measure D Revenues**

- $35,297
- $21,066
- $14,583
- $1,885

**Balance/Reserves** - negatives reflect years that loans or other financing may be needed if there are no delays to projects or lower expenditures. Long term implementation plan being developed.

- $4,213,162
- $2,916,635
- $377,016
- ($1,344,652)
- ($802,616)
- $1,787,290
## Measure D: 5-Year Program of Projects (FY19/20-FY23/24)

**Category:** Rail Corridor (8% of Measure D Revenues)

### Measure D Revenues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prior FY19/20</th>
<th>FY20/21</th>
<th>FY21/22</th>
<th>FY22/23</th>
<th>FY23/24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Annual Measure D Allocations</td>
<td>$3,232,724</td>
<td>$1,666,979</td>
<td>$1,688,650</td>
<td>$1,710,603</td>
<td>$1,732,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Carryover from Previous Year</td>
<td>$1,309,943</td>
<td>$825,312</td>
<td>$1,247</td>
<td>$392,846</td>
<td>$504,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Available (includes interest and carryover)</td>
<td>$3,232,724</td>
<td>$2,976,922</td>
<td>$2,513,962</td>
<td>$1,711,850</td>
<td>$2,125,686</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Planned Use

#### Project Description

- **Unified Corridor Investment Study**: Analysis of rail corridor usage options
- **Alternatives Analysis**: Analysis of high-capacity transit uses on rail corridor
- **2017 Storm Damage Repair & Cleanup**: Repair and cleanup of damage resulting from the 2017 winter storms including one washout, minor slides and various downed or compromised trees
- **Railroad Bridge analysis**: Updated engineering analysis of railroad bridges to complete bridge rehabilitation work outlined in engineering analysis completed in 2012
- **Capitola Trestle Railroad Bridge analysis**: Analysis of feasibility for building a trail on the bridge through Capitola Village and over Soquel Creek.
- **Railroad Bridge Rehabilitation**: Rehabilitation of railroad bridges consistent with analysis completed in 2012 and updated analysis proposed for 2018
- **Track infrastructure and signage maintenance and repairs**: On-going maintenance, repair and rehabilitation of railroad track infrastructure and signage
- **Rail Transit or Other Projects Environmental Document**: Preparation of environmental documents for projects on rail corridor resulting from the Unified Corridor Study
- **Santa Cruz County Regional Conservation Investment Strategy - Grant match**: Match to Wildlife Conservation Board grant for early mitigation planning for transportation projects.
- **Rail Agreement Lawsuit**: Defense against CEQA lawsuit regarding the rail operator agreement

### Prior Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Prior Years</th>
<th>FY19/20</th>
<th>FY20/21</th>
<th>FY21/22</th>
<th>FY22/23</th>
<th>FY23/24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Unified Corridor Investment Study</td>
<td>$775,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a Alternatives Analysis</td>
<td>$13,000</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 2017 Storm Damage Repair &amp; Cleanup</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Railroad Bridge analysis</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a Capitola Trestle Railroad Bridge analysis</td>
<td>---&gt;</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Railroad Bridge Rehabilitation</td>
<td>---&gt;</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$1,700,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Track infrastructure and signage maintenance and repairs</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>$166,841</td>
<td>$169,010</td>
<td>$171,207</td>
<td>$173,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Rail Transit or Other Projects Environmental Document</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
<td>$1,150,000</td>
<td>$1,450,000</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Santa Cruz County Regional Conservation Investment Strategy - Grant match</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$8,160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Rail Agreement Lawsuit</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2019 Updates

- Adds $150k in FY18/19 based on actual costs.
- Identified from the UCS as the next step for the rail corridor. $13k in FY18/19 to match grant.
- Some work not covered by FEMA. Increased from $400k.
- No change. Bridge inspections completed in FY 18/19.
- Funds shifted to FY19/20.
- Funds respread to reflect current schedule.
- Carryover unspent FY18/19 funds, add anticipated FY19/20 repairs and FY23/24 ongoing est.
- Shifted to reflect current schedule, after alternatives analysis; serve as match for future grants.
- New - approved by RTC May 2, 2019.
- Carryover $100k from FY 18/19.
| Estimated Annual Measure D Expenditures | $1,938,000 | $2,158,160 | $2,516,841 | $1,319,010 | $1,621,207 | $923,433 | $10,476,651 |
| Annual Interest Earnings on Measure D Revenues | $15,218 | $6,550 | $4,127 | $6 | $6 | $1,964 |
| Carry over to next fiscal year | $1,309,943 | $825,312 | $1,247 | $392,846 | $504,485 | $1,338,384 |
| Annual | $ | $ | $ | $ | $ | $ |
| Interest | $ | $ | $ | $ | $ | $ |
| Earnings | $ | $ | $ | $ | $ | $ |
| on | $ | $ | $ | $ | $ | $ |
| Measure | $ | $ | $ | $ | $ | $ |
| D | $ | $ | $ | $ | $ | $ |
| Revenues | $ | $ | $ | $ | $ | $ |
| 15,218 | $6,550 | $4,127 | $6 | $6 | $1,964 |
| | | | | | | |
| $1,309,943 | $825,312 | $1,247 | $392,846 | $504,485 | $1,338,384 |
| | | | | | | |
# Measure D: 5-Year Program of Projects (FY19/20-23/24)

**DRAFT - 2019**

**Category:** Neighborhood Projects: San Lorenzo Valley (SLV)/Highway 9 Corridor ($10 million over 30 years)

## Measure D Revenues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Annual Measure D Allocations</th>
<th>Prior FY19/20</th>
<th>FY20/21</th>
<th>FY21/22</th>
<th>FY22/23</th>
<th>FY23/24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Carryover from Previous Year (including interest)</td>
<td>$648,248</td>
<td>$704,823</td>
<td>$41,680</td>
<td>$375,222</td>
<td>$710,431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Available (including interest)</td>
<td>$694,445</td>
<td>$981,581</td>
<td>$1,038,156</td>
<td>$375,014</td>
<td>$708,555</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Planned Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name/Road/Limits</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Prior Years</th>
<th>FY19/20</th>
<th>FY20/21</th>
<th>FY21/22</th>
<th>FY22/23</th>
<th>FY23/24</th>
<th>Total Measure D</th>
<th>2019 Updates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 San Lorenzo Valley (SLV) Safe Routes to Schools - Preconstruction &amp; grant match</td>
<td>Add pathways to SLV tri-school campus entrance south to at least Fall Creek Rd)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>Increase from $750k to $1 million and shift funds to FY20/21 to match anticipated grant application timing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Preliminary scope and engineering documents for near term projects</td>
<td>Develop engineers estimates, prelim. designs, and initial screening, implementation documents needed to secure funds for priority projects; may include engineering needed to integrate complete streets components into SHOPP projects.</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>NEW. Needed for programming documents and to prepare grant applications for priority projects identified in the SLV Complete Streets Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Hwy 9 Pedestrian Crosswalks and Enhancements</td>
<td>Stripe new crosswalks and add RRFBs, ladder striping, etc to several existing crosswalks</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>New project. $250,000 HSIP grant secured, with Measure D expected to cover balance of costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Hwy 9/SLV Corridor Plan - Completion of plan</td>
<td>Community-based comprehensive corridor plan, identifying priority transportation projects.</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Estimated Annual Measure D Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Interest Earnings on Measure D Revenues</th>
<th>$50,000</th>
<th>$280,000</th>
<th>$1,000,000</th>
<th>$0</th>
<th>$0</th>
<th>$0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Balance/Reserve for priorities in Highway 9- SLV Corridor Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Balance/Reserve for priorities in Highway 9-SLV Corridor Plan</th>
<th>Exact projects TBD. Use as match to leverage grants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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## Measure D: 5-Year Program of Projects (FY19/20-FY23/24)

*DRAFT - 2019*

**Category:** Highway 17 Wildlife Corridor ($5 million over 30 years)

### Measure D Revenues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Prior FY19/20</th>
<th>FY20/21</th>
<th>FY21/22</th>
<th>FY22/23</th>
<th>FY23/24</th>
<th>Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated</td>
<td>$347,222</td>
<td>$166,667</td>
<td>$166,667</td>
<td>$166,667</td>
<td>$166,667</td>
<td>$3,819,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated</td>
<td>$349,055</td>
<td>$502,467</td>
<td>$656,646</td>
<td>$(1,191,688)</td>
<td>$(3,040,021)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carryover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated</td>
<td>$347,222</td>
<td>$515,721</td>
<td>$669,133</td>
<td>$823,312</td>
<td>$(1,025,021)</td>
<td>$(2,873,354)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Planned Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name/Road/Limits</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Prior Years</th>
<th>FY19/20</th>
<th>FY20/21</th>
<th>FY21/22*</th>
<th>FY22/23*</th>
<th>FY23/24</th>
<th>Future Debt Service*</th>
<th>Total Measure D</th>
<th>2019 Updates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Highway 17 Wildlife Crossing near Laurel Curve</td>
<td>Construct wildlife undercrossing to connect habitat on either side of the highway. Creates a wildlife corridor enabling animals to safely cross the highway. Includes $15k/year RTC costs associated with oversight, agreements, financing, coordination, and public engagement.</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$2,015,000</td>
<td>$2,015,000</td>
<td>Debt service payments TBD</td>
<td>$946,090</td>
<td>$5,006,090</td>
<td>No expenditures pre-FY19/20. Includes placeholder for financing to advance project delivery. Updated interest estimates.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Estimated Annual Measure D Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Prior FY19/20</th>
<th>FY20/21</th>
<th>FY21/22*</th>
<th>FY22/23*</th>
<th>FY23/24</th>
<th>Future Debt Service*</th>
<th>Total Measure D</th>
<th>2019 Updates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated</td>
<td>$1,832</td>
<td>$1,745</td>
<td>$2,512</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Earnings</td>
<td>$349,055</td>
<td>$502,467</td>
<td>$656,646</td>
<td>$(1,191,688)</td>
<td>$(3,040,021)</td>
<td>$(2,873,354)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carryover Balance - RESERVE or Financing for construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**At a future date, RTC will evaluate financing options to advance delivery, since full $5M committed in Measure D will not be available until end of 30 year measure.**

**Total cost includes pre-construction and support costs funded through Caltrans SHOPP ($4.5M). Land Trust has committed to raise $3M for part of construction costs. Actual cost will depend on final design, bids, any claims, and financing costs.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost estimate 19/20</th>
<th>Cost estimate 20/21</th>
<th>Cost estimate 21/22</th>
<th>Cost estimate 23/24</th>
<th>Cost estimate 24/25</th>
<th>Cost estimate 5 year total</th>
<th>Total Measure D funds used since inception***</th>
<th>Other funds</th>
<th>Schedule (year)</th>
<th>Major project? * (yes/no)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Driver 1</td>
<td>Additional driver to provide expanded hours of paratransit service</td>
<td>$119,025</td>
<td>$123,191</td>
<td>$127,503</td>
<td>$131,965</td>
<td>$136,584</td>
<td>$638,268</td>
<td>$878,541</td>
<td>2019-2020</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver 2</td>
<td>Additional driver to provide expanded hours of paratransit service</td>
<td>$119,025</td>
<td>$123,191</td>
<td>$127,503</td>
<td>$131,965</td>
<td>$136,584</td>
<td>$638,268</td>
<td>$878,541</td>
<td>2019-2020</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver 3</td>
<td>Part-time Additional driver to provide expanded hours of paratransit service</td>
<td>$47,132</td>
<td>$53,931</td>
<td>$101,063</td>
<td>$101,063</td>
<td>$101,063</td>
<td>$101,063</td>
<td>$101,063</td>
<td>2019-2020</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver Trainer</td>
<td>To support safety and service training for paratransit drivers</td>
<td>$69,504</td>
<td>$73,080</td>
<td>$77,011</td>
<td>$79,706</td>
<td>$82,496</td>
<td>$381,798</td>
<td>$482,507</td>
<td>2019-2020</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Assistant/Dispatcher</td>
<td>To support additional paratransit rides</td>
<td>$60,373</td>
<td>$63,661</td>
<td>$67,274</td>
<td>$69,628</td>
<td>$72,065</td>
<td>$333,001</td>
<td>$433,380</td>
<td>2019-2020</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach/Publicity</td>
<td>Materials and videos to promote paratransit ride availability</td>
<td>$5,848</td>
<td>$5,848</td>
<td>$5,848</td>
<td>$6,023</td>
<td>$6,023</td>
<td>$29,591</td>
<td>$38,844</td>
<td>2019-2020</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants / Project Managers</td>
<td>Facility project management-architects, environ review, design</td>
<td>$41,725</td>
<td>$45,354</td>
<td>$45,163</td>
<td>$132,242</td>
<td>$132,242</td>
<td>$132,242</td>
<td>$132,242</td>
<td>2019-2020</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations Facility</td>
<td>Reserve for projected Acquisition, construction and/or renovation expenses</td>
<td>$382,990</td>
<td>$375,000</td>
<td>$370,000</td>
<td>$365,000</td>
<td>$355,000</td>
<td>$5,799,450</td>
<td>$2,619,335</td>
<td>2019 Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Equipment Reserve</td>
<td>Vehicle replacement, matching funds, project procurement and implementation</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>$235,000</td>
<td>2019 No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Operating costs include driver support (Mechanic, IT Support, Fleet manager, Program Supervisor) salaries and fringes, vehicle operations such as vehicle maintenance and repair, fuel, vehicle Insurance, communications expenses, as well as...
### Measure D: 5-Year Plan (FY19/20-FY24/25)

**Project name:** Community Bridges - Lift Line Vehicle and Equipment Acquisition  
**Location:** Lift Line Paratransit Vehicles & Equipment  
**Description:** Fund reserves that can be used vehicle procurement projects, including fleet vehicles that cannot be funded through 5310, replace ageing and or worn shop equipment, improvements and or upgrades to maintenance/operations facility. Provide project matchign funds to leverage state funding.  
1) CARB Project. Procurement of 2 Electric Busses and the installation of 2 lever II charging stations. Measure D to provide matching funding to a CARB grant.  
2) LCTOP Electric vehicle and 2 level III charging stations, CTSA to experiment going green, alternative fuels, environmentally friendly vehicle program.  
3) Vehicle Reserve Fund for additonal grant funded matching funds.  
4) Replace old and worn shop equipment such as vehicle hoist, rolling bridge jacks, tire mounting equipment. (Shop equipment is no longer funded through 5310).  
5) Maintenance of current leased facility, with improvements such as install better lighting, new hot water heater, fix leaking roof, and make upgrades to building, bathrooms and offices.

### Schedule (estimated)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CARB Project</th>
<th>LCTOP</th>
<th>Vehicle Reserve</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019-2020</td>
<td>$ 360,592</td>
<td>$ 448,721</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 809,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure D Funds</td>
<td>$ 62,000</td>
<td>$ 41,166</td>
<td>$ 71,834</td>
<td>$ 175,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matching Funds</td>
<td>2 16 pass E-buss, 2 lvl II chargers</td>
<td>10 pass E-bus, 2 lvl III chargers</td>
<td>future projects and matching funds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Info (e.g. map, photos, etc)
Measure D: 5-Year Plan (FY19/20-FY24/25)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project name: Community Bridges - Lift Line Operations Facility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lift Line Administrative offices, maintenance facility, fleet parking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description:**
Purchase of property and construction/renovation of an operations facility that will house the entire CTSA Lift Line operations in one location. Our current amended plan includes the purchase of a very suitable $3M property that we are currently under contract to purchase, with an estimated additional $2.8M of renovations and other expenses. We will utilize current Measure D facility reserve funds for the down payment, along with owner and bank financing. Measure D funds will be utilized in the renovation costs and other associated expenses.

**New Facility to include the following but not limited to:**
1) Operational offices
2) Dispatch & Intake station
3) Driver holding area (extra board) and lockers.
4) Breakroom
5) Maintenance shop
6) Proper Vehicle Hoists (Large Bus & Mini Vans)
7) Electric Charging / Fuel Station (time and money)
8) Wash Station
9) Shop Ventilation System
10) Hazardous Waste storage
11) Solar Bus Ports

**Other Info:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Acquisition</th>
<th>Renovation</th>
<th>Contingency/ Fees</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019-2021</td>
<td>$202,903</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>$2,200,000</td>
<td>$272,250</td>
<td>$5,799,450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Measure D Funds | $124,297 | $202,903 | $3,000,000 | $2,200,000 | $272,250 | $5,799,450 |

| Fund - Capital Campaign/ Donations | $124,297 | $202,903 | $750,000 | $1,550,000 | $272,240 | $2,627,200 |
| Fund - Commercial Loan/Owner Financing | $2,250,000 | $272,240 | $2,250,000 |

**Personnel/Consultants:**
Personnel 76,810
Legal 7,500
Bidding Expense 6,500

**Pre-Development:**
Architecture Design 202,903
Survey / Engineering 43,200
Permits, Inspections and Fees 16,524

**Acquisition:**
Purchase of Property 3,000,000

**Construction/Renovation:**
Construction / Renovation 2,200,000
Permits, Inspections and Fees 64,573
Equipment / Furnishings 75,000
Contingency / Utility Fees 106,440

**Total Preliminary Cost** 5,799,450
Project Description

The Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network (MBSST) is a Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) proposed 50-mile bicycle and pedestrian trail project. The spine of the trail network will be the 32-mile Coastal Rail Trail from Davenport to Watsonville, to be built within or adjacent to the RTC-owned rail right-of-way. The remaining miles will be connecting paths, sidewalks, bike lanes, other roadway improvements or unpaved coastal spur trails.

The Coastal Rail Trail promises to be a highly valuable asset to the Santa Cruz County community for transportation, recreation, education, health, eco-tourism, coastal access, economic vitality, and other visitor-serving purposes. It will connect to neighborhoods, schools, parks, transit hubs, commercial and other activity centers. Thirteen miles of projects are in various stages of development and have been funded in full or in part. Project delivery includes completing design, engineering and environmental permitting, as well as receiving public input.

Approximately $24M has been secured from state/federal grants and private donations. Additionally, Measure D, the voter-approved transportation sales tax, will allocate approximately $120M for the trail over 30 years.

Following extensive public outreach, the RTC prepared and adopted an award-winning Master Plan which provides initial cost estimates and concept designs. All local jurisdictions through which the trail will traverse have also adopted the Master Plan as a guide for implementation.

Project Highlights

- Half the county population, 92 parks and 44 schools are located within 1 mile of the rail line.
- Thirteen (13) miles of projects are under development.
- Approximately $24M has been secured from state/federal grants and private donations.
- Measure D will allocate approximately $125M for the trail over 30 years.
- Construction of the first project began in 2019.
Coastal Rail Trail
Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network

Status of Funded Rail Trail Projects

**North Coast: Davenport to Wilder Ranch**

- **Benefits:** Provides a car-free alternative to Highway 1; connects to Wilder Ranch trails, numerous beaches, soon to be opened Coast Dairies and San Vicente Redwoods trails and Davenport; includes parking lots and restrooms at Panther/Yellowbank beach and in Davenport; links to City of Santa Cruz providing approximately 11 miles of continuous bike/ped paths.
- **Distance:** 5.4 miles (fully funded); 2.1 miles + 3 parking lot improvements and a crossing in Davenport (partially funded)
- **Width:** 16-20 feet
- **Construction:** FY2021/22 for 5.4-mile segment; construction TBD for remaining 2.1 miles + amenities based on funding availability.

**City of Santa Cruz: Natural Bridges Drive to Pacific Avenue/Santa Cruz Wharf**

- **Benefits:** Connects over 30,000 residents who live within one mile of the trail, to schools, work, beaches, shopping and other activity centers; provides safer car-free alternative to Mission Street and connects to the Beach Street bike-way; 9 schools and 28 parks are located within a mile of this section of trail.
- **Distance:** 2.1 miles
- **Width:** 12 - 16 feet
- **Construction:** To be built in two phases: 1) Natural Bridges to Bay/California and 2) Bay/California to Pacific Avenue. Phase 1 construction will begin in fall of 2019. Phase II TBD based on funding availability.

**City of Santa Cruz/County of Santa Cruz: Boardwalk to 17th Avenue**

- **Benefits:** Close to 48,000 residents live within one mile of the corridor where 15 schools and 37 parks are also located.
- **Distance:** 2.2 miles
- **Width:** 12 feet
- **Construction:** Estimated 2022-23

**San Lorenzo River walkway:** Widening of the San Lorenzo River walkway at the Boardwalk was funded and advanced ahead of trail

**City of Watsonville: Lee Road to Walker Street**

- **Benefits:** Close to 20,000 residents live within one mile of the corridor where 12 schools and 12 parks are also located. The new trail will link 850 homes along Ohlone Parkway with the City’s 7-mile slough trail system and the downtown area.
- **Distance:** 1.2 miles
- **Width:** 12 feet
- **Construction:** First portion - FY2019/20; remainder FY2021/22

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission  |  (831) 460-3200  |  www.sccrtc.org
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Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network
Coastal Rail Trail (Segment 7)

Updated May 2019

Project Description
The Coastal Rail Trail segment 7 project (as defined in the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSST) Network Master Plan) proposes to construct 2.10 miles of the MBSST’s rail trail spine between Natural Bridges Drive and Pacific Avenue at the Santa Cruz Wharf. The existing facility is an unimproved railroad right-of-way in public ownership. Alternate routes have high bicycle and pedestrian crash histories, making this the highest priority project in mid-Santa Cruz County.

The goals of this project are to increase the numbers of people biking and walking, improve safety and mobility of non-motorized users, and to provide high-quality connections to schools, parks, and community facilities. When constructed, this project will be one portion of the planned 32-mile rail trail network that traverses the entire coastline of Santa Cruz County.

The segment 7 project is at the epicenter of several existing trail networks such as Younger Lagoon Reserve and Antonelli Pond Park, and will also provide connections to Natural Bridges State Beach, West Cliff Drive bike/pedestrian path and the Wilder Ranch path.

Segment 7 will be built in two phases in order to accelerate delivery of the construction-ready portion. Phase I from Natural Bridges to Bay/California will begin construction in winter 2019. Phase II from Bay/California to Pacific Avenue is in the design and environmental permitting phase and will be built once the project clears the permitting phase and construction funding is secured.

Project Highlights
- Provides a low stress, off-street dedicated bicycle and pedestrian trail, improving safety and connectivity to schools, employment centers, and transit facilities
- Over 30,000 residents live within one mile of the trail
- Provides a safer car-free alternative to Mission Street and connects to the Beach Street bikeway
- Enhances mobility and transportation for disadvantaged communities
- 9 schools and 28 parks are located within a mile of the trail

Project Costs and Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Phase I</th>
<th>Phase II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Project</td>
<td>$5,100,000</td>
<td>$9,950,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure D</td>
<td>$1,100,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Secured</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,950,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE I</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE/Environmental: Completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Design (PS&amp;E)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisement/Award</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE II</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE/Environmental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Design (PS&amp;E)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisement/Award*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Pending availability of funding
Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network
Coastal Rail Trail (Segments 8 & 9)

Project Description
The Coastal Rail Trail Segments 8 and 9 Project (as defined in the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail {MBSST} Network Master Plan) proposes to construct 2.18 miles of the MBSST’s rail trail spine between the new San Lorenzo River multi-use crossing widening recently completed in the City of Santa Cruz and 17th Avenue in the unincorporated area of Santa Cruz County. Segments 8 and 9 of the rail trail were identified as two of the highest priorities in the award-winning MBSST Master Plan. The existing facility is an unimproved railroad right-of-way in public ownership. Alternate routes have high bicycle and pedestrian crash history, making this project of utmost importance.

Goals of this project are to increase the numbers of people biking and walking, improve safety and mobility of non-motorized users, and provide high-quality connections to schools, parks, and community facilities. When constructed, this project will be part of a planned 32-mile rail trail network that traverses the entire coastline of Santa Cruz County. Segments 8 and 9 are particularly challenging due to four new bridges and nine at-grade crossings.

The project received $3M in Active Transportation Program (ATP) funds for pre-construction efforts. Voter-approved Measure D transportation funds are being used as the local match for this project as is $1.5M from the non-profit Land Trust for Santa Cruz County. For more information on the Measure D program, see the RTC’s website (www.sccrtc.org).

Project Highlights
- Provides a dedicated bicycle and pedestrian trail, improving safety and connectivity to schools, employment centers, and transit facilities
- Connects to Beach Street bikeway, downtown, San Lorenzo River levee trails, and Segment 7 rail trail
- Enhances mobility and transportation for disadvantaged communities
- 48,000 residents live within 1 mile of the corridor, where 15 schools and 37 parks are located
- Preliminary engineering and environmental review to begin in 2019

Project Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE/Environmental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Design (PS&amp;E)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisement/Award*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Pending availability of funds
# Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network

## Coastal Rail Trail (Segments 8 & 9)

**Updated May 2019**

## Project Costs and Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Project Cost</th>
<th>$ 31,269,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding Sources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure D</td>
<td>$ 3,7000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Secured</td>
<td>$ 4,669,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need</td>
<td>$ 22,900,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Diagram of coastal rail trail segments](image-url)
Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network
Coastal Rail Trail (Segment 10)

Project Description
The Coastal Rail Trail Segment 10 Project proposes to construct 1.5 miles of the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network (Rail Trail) between 17th Avenue in the unincorporated area of Santa Cruz County known as Live Oak and Jade Street Park in the City of Capitola. Segment 10 of the rail trail was identified as one of the highest priorities in the award-winning Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network Master Plan. The existing facility is an unimproved railroad right-of-way in public ownership. Alternate routes have high bicycle and pedestrian crash history.

Goals of this project are to increase the proportion of trips accomplished by biking and walking, improve safety and mobility of non-motorized users, and to provide high-quality connections to schools, parks, and community facilities. When constructed, this project will connect to a proposed 32-mile rail trail network that traverses the entire coastline of Santa Cruz County. Segment 10 is particularly challenging due to right-of-way constraints requiring realignment of 1 mile of the railroad track bed. The project includes a 200-foot span pre-engineered bicycle and pedestrian bridge over Rodeo Gulch Creek on the inland side of the rail trestle bridge.

Project Highlights
- Provides a dedicated bicycle and pedestrian trail, improving safety and connectivity to schools, employment centers, and transit facilities
- Includes a new bicycle and pedestrian bridge over Rodeo Gulch Creek
- Enhances mobility and transportation for disadvantaged communities
- Within a quarter mile of four public schools
- Can be phased into shorter segments

Project Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE/Environmental*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Design (PS&amp;E)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisement/Award*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Pending availability of funding
Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network
Coastal Rail Trail (Segment 10)

Project Costs and Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Project Cost</th>
<th>$15,570</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding Sources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure D</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Secured</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need</td>
<td>$15,570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Description
The Coastal Rail Trail Segment 11 Project proposes to construct 3.2 miles of the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network (Rail Trail) between Jade Street Park in the City of Capitola and State Park Drive in the unincorporated area of Santa Cruz County known as Aptos. Segment 11 of the rail trail was identified as one of the highest priorities in the award-winning Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network Master Plan. The existing facility is an unimproved railroad right-of-way in public ownership. Alternate routes have high bicycle and pedestrian crash history.

Goals of this project are to increase the proportion of trips accomplished by biking and walking, improve safety and mobility of non-motorized users, and to provide high-quality connections to schools, parks, and community facilities. When constructed, this project will connect to a proposed 32-mile rail trail network that traverses the entire coastline of Santa Cruz County. Segment 11 is within a quarter mile of three public schools, Cabrillo College, four parks, and New Brighton and Seacliff State beaches.

Segment 11 is particularly challenging due to the need to replace the iconic 500-foot-long railroad trestle over Soquel Creek located in Capitola Village with a new bridge that accommodates both rail and trail users. Results from a recent bridge inspection and subsequent feasibility study will provide scope and cost estimates for the new trestle bridge over Soquel Creek (anticipated late 2019).

Project Highlights
- Connects Aptos to Capitola
- 3 new bridges, including replacement of the historic railroad trestle over Soquel Creek in Capitola Village with a new multimodal bicycle and pedestrian railroad bridge
- Provides a dedicated bicycle and pedestrian trail, improving safety and connectivity to schools, commercial centers, and transit facilities

Project Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE/Environmental*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▲▲</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Design (PS&amp;E)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▲▲</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisement/Award*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▲▲</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▲▲</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Pending availability of funds
Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network
Coastal Rail Trail (Segment 11)

Project Costs and Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Project Cost</th>
<th>$  TBD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Funding Sources**

| Measure D               | $  0    |
| Other Secured          | $  0    |
| Need                   | $  TBD  |

*Updated March 2019*
Highway 1 Auxiliary Lanes (41st Avenue to Soquel Drive), and Chanticleer Bike/Ped Overcrossing

Project Description

The project will construct northbound and southbound auxiliary lanes between the 41st Avenue and Soquel Avenue/Drive interchanges and construct a new bicycle and pedestrian overcrossing at Chanticleer Avenue. Historically, this section of Highway 1 has been the busiest in the county serving over 100,000 vehicles a day, providing access to the primary regional commercial/retail activity centers on 41st Avenue and regional medical facilities located on Soquel Drive. The auxiliary lanes will connect the on-ramps with the next off-ramp, thereby extending the weaving and merging distance between the ramps, improving traffic operations, and reducing cut-through traffic diverting to local streets and neighborhoods.

The pedestrian/bicycle overcrossing at Chanticleer Avenue provides an alternative route for bicyclists and pedestrians currently using the Soquel or 41st interchanges to cross over Highway 1. The overcrossing will be lighted, 12 to 14 feet wide, and will incorporate aesthetic treatments consistent with the visual character of the corridor and the adjacent community.

Voter-approved Measure D transportation funds are being used for this project to allow the project development process to be accelerated. For more information on the Measure D program, see the RTC’s website (www.sccrtc.org).

Project Highlights

- Improves traffic operations on Highway 1
- Improves bicycle and pedestrian connectivity to regional destinations and transit by providing a dedicated crossing for active transportation users at Chanticleer Avenue
- Measure D funds are being used to accelerate the project development process
- Construction ready in 2020, pending availability of funds
Highway 1 Auxiliary Lanes (41st Avenue to Soquel Drive), and Chanticleer Bike/Ped Overcrossing

Project Costs and Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Project Cost</th>
<th>$ 34,212M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Sources</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure D</td>
<td>$ 1,650M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Secured</td>
<td>$ 6,000M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needed</td>
<td>$ 26,562M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE/Environmental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Design (PS&amp;E)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisement/Award*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Pending Availability of Funds
## Project Description

The project will construct northbound and southbound auxiliary lanes between the Bay Avenue/Porter Street and State Park Drive interchanges and replace the existing Capitola Avenue local roadway overcrossing. This section of Highway 1 is one of the busiest in the county, providing access to the City of Capitola, Soquel and Aptos villages, and Cabrillo College. The auxiliary lanes will connect the on-ramps with the next off-ramp, thereby extending the weaving and merging distance between the ramps, improving traffic operations, and reducing cut-through traffic diverting to local streets and neighborhoods.

The new Capitola Avenue overcrossing will include enhanced bicycle and pedestrian facilities to improve connectivity for bicyclists and pedestrians between Soquel Drive to the north and the future Coastal Rail Trail to the south. The overcrossing, soundwalls and retaining walls will incorporate aesthetic treatments consistent with the visual character of the corridor and the adjacent community.

Voter-approved Measure D transportation funds are being used for this project to allow the project development process to be accelerated. For more information on the Measure D program, see the RTC’s website (www.sccrtc.org).

## Project Highlights

- Improves traffic operations on Highway 1
- Improves bicycle and pedestrian connectivity to regional destinations and transit by providing enhanced bicycle and pedestrian facilities for active transportation users at Capitola Avenue
- Measure D funds are being used to accelerate the project development process
- Construction ready in 2022, pending availability of funds

## Project Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE/Environmental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Design (PS&amp;E)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisement/Award*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Pending availability of funds
Highway 1 Auxiliary Lanes
(Bay Avenue/Porter Street and State Park Drive)

Project Costs and Funding
(in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Project Cost</th>
<th>$ 83,255M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Sources</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure D</td>
<td>$ 9,113M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Secured</td>
<td>$ 1,830M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need</td>
<td>$ 72,312M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Description
The Highway 1 Mar Vista Bicycle and Pedestrian Overcrossing will provide a safe link between schools, the beach, residential neighborhoods and retail centers on each side of Highway 1. This bicycle and pedestrian overcrossing was one of three bicycle and pedestrian overcrossings identified in the Highway 1 Corridor Investment plan. The proposed crossing locations were chosen with public input to provide community cohesion and improved connectivity to schools and other activity centers.

The Mar Vista crossing will reduce travel distances for bicyclists and pedestrians traveling between Mar Vista Drive at McGregor Drive in Seacliff to Mar Vista Elementary School by up to 1.6 miles and minimize travel through the busy State Park Drive interchange. The bridge will also improve access to residential, educational, recreational, and commercial destinations, including Seacliff State Beach, Cabrillo College, and Aptos/Seacliff villages.

This project is eligible to receive voter-approved Measure D transportation funds. For more information on the Measure D program, visit www.sccrtc.org.

Project Highlights
- Provides new opportunities for safe and convenient travel
- Improves bicycle and pedestrian connectivity to regional destinations and transit by providing a dedicated crossing for active transportation users
- Connects neighborhoods, schools, parks/beaches, and commercial centers

Project Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE/Environmental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Design (PS&amp;E)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisement/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Pending availability of funds
Highway 1
Mar Vista Bicycle and Pedestrian Overcrossing

Project Costs and Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Project Cost</th>
<th>$ 13,215M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Funding Sources**

- Measure D $ 300M
- Other Secured $ 7,531M
- Need $ 5,384M

Project Area with proposed overcrossing shown
Cruz511
Traveler Information for Santa Cruz County

Project Description
For more than 35 years, the RTC has offered transportation demand management (TDM) services to Santa Cruz County with the goal of using the existing transportation system more effectively by assisting travelers to use various modes of transportation, especially sustainable transportation modes. TDM programs use a multi-pronged approach to incentivize and support mode share changes to non-drive alone methods of transportation.

Cruz511, the RTC’s TDM service, provides a comprehensive website of resources for travel options around the county including a trip planner, bicycle maps, accessible travel options, and an interactive traffic map with real-time information on construction, incidents and travel speeds. Knowledgeable travel counselors are also available to help people understand their options for getting around.

The Cruz511 program works with non-profits and community-based organizations to deliver messaging around transportation safety. Staff works closely with agencies implementing Vision Zero plans and campaigns around the county by providing resources and guidance. Cruz511 also provides a hazard reporting system where members of the public can report issues that impede access and mobility on our roadway networks.

In 2019, Cruz511 will develop and deliver an online "trip manager" system that will provide employers, residents and visitors access to rideshare matches, bike resources including bikeshare, transit information that will integrate with Metro’s real-time information as well as access to a host of other mobility services such as Scoop, Waze and Uber. This system will provide access to a suite of transportation choices. It will also allow employers to conduct workplace challenges and gamification of sustainable commuting.

Visit Cruz511.org for Santa Cruz County traveler information.

Project Highlights
- Provides sustainable commute choices to residents through coordination with major employers in the county
- Developing an online and mobile platform to make sustainable commute choices easier for all people to access
- Coordinating with Metro to promote and encourage transit usage
- Provides education and informational messaging regarding safety and mobility options to the public through online and print media

Project Costs and Funding (18/19)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Project Cost</th>
<th>$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>380,052</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Sources</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure D</td>
<td>$ 150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Secured</td>
<td>$ 230,052</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Description

The Highway 17 corridor was identified as a high collision corridor in 1998 as a result of collision data analysis and recommendations of local, regional, county and state agencies. The Safe on 17 Task Force was formed to develop and implement collision reducing strategies, such as additional CHP enforcement, traffic safety improvements, and public education. These strategies focus on preventing the occurrence of the top five Primary Collision Factors in fatal and injury collisions including driving at unsafe speeds, vehicle right-of-way violations, improper turning and improper lane change.

The Task Force is comprised of representatives from the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC) and the San Francisco Bay Area’s Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), the California Highway Patrol (CHP), California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), local police and fire departments, legislators’ offices and the media. SCCRTC and MTC provide $50,000 annually for enhanced CHP enforcement using Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (SAFE) funds. SAFE funds come from a $1 registration fee on all vehicles in the region and fund the highway call box system, Freeway Service Patrols on Hwy 1 and 17 in addition to extra CHP enforcement on Hwy 17 and other motorist-aid services.

Project Highlights

- Multi-agency, multi-jurisdictional effort to reduce injury and fatal collisions on Highway 17
- Encourages safer driving and deters traffic violations with extra CHP enforcement
- Implements road safety improvements to reduce wet weather and run-off-road collisions through guardrail upgrades, shoulder widening projects, and pavement surface treatments
- Increases safe driving practices, especially on mountainous highway roads, through education and public outreach

Meeting Schedule

The Safe on 17 Task Force meets twice a year to share information about transportation projects and collisions on Highway 17 and traffic operation systems in Santa Cruz County. Meetings are open to the public and all are welcome to attend.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAFE ON 17 MEETINGS</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3rd Wednesday in March</td>
<td>CHP San Jose</td>
<td>2020 Junction Ave, San Jose CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Wednesday in September</td>
<td>SCCRTC office</td>
<td>1523 Pacific Ave, Santa Cruz, CA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Current Highway 17 Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>TIMELINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pavement Restoration</td>
<td>Santa Cruz County – Caltrans D5</td>
<td>Granite Creek Road to Santa Clara/ Santa Cruz County line</td>
<td>March 2019 – October 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildfire Prevention/ Fuel Reduction</td>
<td>Santa Clara County – SCFD</td>
<td>Bear Creek Road to Santa Clara/ Santa Cruz County line</td>
<td>April/May 2019 – December 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramp Safety Improvements</td>
<td>Santa Cruz County – Caltrans D5</td>
<td>Fishhook (Hwy 1/Hwy 17) to Pasatiempo overcrossing</td>
<td>Spring 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement Restoration &amp; Safety Improvements</td>
<td>Santa Clara County – Caltrans D4</td>
<td>Alma College Road to Santa Clara/ Santa Cruz County line</td>
<td>January 2021 – October 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Description

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) operates the Freeway Service Patrol (FSP) program in Santa Cruz County in conjunction with the Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and the California Highway Patrol (CHP). This program consists of two tow trucks patrolling Highway 1 from Highway 9 to State Park Drive and Highway 17 from Mount Herman Road to the Santa Clara County Line.

FSP tow trucks remove disabled vehicles from the highway at no cost to the motorists. They reduce the congestion on the highway by quickly clearing accidents, debris and other incidents, and allowing traffic to return to normal conditions. They commonly perform tasks such as changing a flat tire, jump-starting a vehicle, or providing gas. Service is available during weekday commute hours and on a limited schedule on weekends.

The FSP program is designed to reduce congestion, improve safety, and reduce fuel consumption and auto emissions by minimizing the congestion associated with collisions and other incidents. The benefit/cost ratio for the Santa Cruz County FSP program is 4:1.

Project Highlights

- Reduces the number of traffic jams by quickly clearing accidents, debris and other incidents
- Lessens the chain of further accidents and bottlenecks caused by passing drivers
- Saves fuel and cuts air-pollution emissions by reducing stop-and-go traffic
- Helps stranded motorists

Service Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WEEKDAYS</th>
<th>WEEKENDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 1</td>
<td>6:00-9:00 a.m.</td>
<td>3:30-6:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 17</td>
<td>6:30-9:30 a.m.</td>
<td>3:30-6:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Special weekend service is provided during Spring Break (3/23/19 – 4/21/19) and Summer (5/25/19 – 9/1/19).
PROJECT FACT SHEET

Updated March 2019

Freeway Service Patrol

Project Costs and Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Project Cost FY18/19</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Towing</td>
<td>$ 325,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Funding Sources FY18/19       |       |
| Caltrans                      | $ 248,975 |
| Measure D                     | $ 175,008 |

FSP Partners

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission | (831) 460-3200 | www.sccrtc.org
Project Description
Highway 9 serves as the "Main Street" and economic center for the towns of Felton, Ben Lomond, Brookdale, and Boulder Creek and is an interregional arterial connecting Silicon Valley and Santa Cruz.

Corridor Plan
Measure D designates $10 million for transportation projects in the Highway 9 corridor that will improve travel for residents of the San Lorenzo Valley (SLV). Since Measure D, state, federal, and other local revenues are limited, a first step in identifying priority projects was development of a comprehensive Highway 9-SLV Complete Streets Corridor Plan. Building on past public input and planning activities, the plan identifies, evaluates, and prioritizes transportation projects on Highway 9 and connecting county roads through SLV that can be implemented in the short and mid-term to address challenges on the corridor. The plan focuses on safety for pedestrians, bicyclists, and motorists; access to schools, businesses, and bus stops; traffic operations, pavement conditions, drainage, and other needs in this travel corridor.

The plan includes conceptual complete street designs and provides a framework for partnering with Caltrans to implement investments that address community concerns, improve multi-modal safety, access, connectivity, economic vitality, and environmental quality, and improve the condition of existing infrastructure (e.g. fill potholes).

The plan is online at www.sccrtc.org/slvplan.

Priority Projects
The Highway 9 Corridor Plan identifies over 30 priority projects for the corridor, including the following:

- Pedestrian and bicycle paths to SLV schools and modifications to improve traffic flow along the schools' entrances
- Modifications to Felton, Brookdale, Ben Lomond, and Boulder Creek village cores to create safer pedestrian walking and crossing facilities, reduce speeding, and improve access to businesses
- Corridor-wide roadway maintenance, storm damage repairs, and emergency preparedness; pedestrian safety and visibility improvements; and shoulder widening for bicycles

The plan will be used to secure grants and facilitate subsequent design, environmental review, and construction of these and other priority projects.
San Lorenzo Valley Highway 9 Corridor

Project Costs and Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Project Cost</th>
<th>Varies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure D</td>
<td>$ 10M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$ TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need</td>
<td>$ TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Highway 9 Pedestrian Crosswalks and Enhancements

A $250,000 Highway Safety Improvement Program grant and Measure D funds will be used for pedestrian crossing safety enhancements on Highway 9 (State Route 9/SR9) in the San Lorenzo Valley. The project includes upgrades to five intersections and a range of treatments, such as installation of high-visibility striping and signage, advance warning flashing beacons, and Rectangular Rapid Flash Beacons. Five locations with high foot traffic and a history of collisions involving pedestrians were identified as priorities for these funds. Caltrans is reviewing these locations for constructability:

- SR9/Redwood Drive in Felton
- SR9 midblock crossing between Graham Hill Road and Kirby Street in Felton
- SR9/Clear Creek Road in Brookdale
- SR9/Forest Street in Boulder Creek
- SR9/Pool Drive in Boulder Creek
Highway 17 Wildlife Habitat Connectivity Project

Project Description
The Highway 17 Wildlife Habitat Connectivity Project is a joint project from Caltrans, the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission, the Land Trust of Santa Cruz County, and resource agencies to construct a wildlife undercrossing on Highway 17 near Laurel Road in Santa Cruz County.

The Santa Cruz Mountains are home to a variety of wildlife species including endangered and threatened species. The area of Highway 17 at Laurel Road has been identified as a critical linkage for two core wildlife habitat areas on either side of the highway.

Highway 17 is the major freeway connection between the San Francisco Bay Area and the Monterey Bay Region through the Santa Cruz Mountains. More than 65,000 vehicles travel the highway each day (24 million vehicles a year). The dense traffic, concrete median barriers, and lack of culvert undercrossings or bridges make Highway 17 a major barrier for wildlife moving through the Santa Cruz Mountains. Many wildlife (including mountain lions, bobcats and deer) have been hit trying to cross Highway 17 near Laurel Road.

Highway 17 at Laurel Road is built over a natural drainage, an ideal place to install a culvert to allow animals to travel beneath the highway. At the project location, 460 acres of mostly undeveloped land on both sides of the highway have been preserved in a conservation easement by the Land Trust of Santa Cruz County.

For information, contact Aaron Henkel, Caltrans District 5 Project Manager, 805-549-3084.

Project Highlights
- Provides safe passage for wildlife to cross under Highway 17 near Laurel Road
- Bridges two core wildlife habitat areas on each side of Highway 17
- Highway 17 at Laurel Curve is built over a large natural drainage, an ideal place to install a culvert to allow animals to travel beneath the highway
- Collaborative project between the Regional Transportation Commission, Land Trust of Santa Cruz County, and Caltrans

Project Costs and Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Project Cost</th>
<th>$12.4M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Sources</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure D</td>
<td>$5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP)</td>
<td>$4.54M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Trust of Santa Cruz County</td>
<td>$3M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Updated March 2019
Highway 17 Wildlife Habitat Connectivity Project

Project Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental (PA/ED)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Design (PS&amp;E)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisement/Award</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Pending availability of financing

Funding Partners

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission | (831) 460-3200 | www.sccrtc.org
Project Description
The 32-mile Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line is a continuous transportation corridor offering tremendous potential for new mobility options for residents and visitors alike. In October 2012, the RTC completed acquisition of this 135-year old transportation resource bringing it into public ownership with the objective of increasing transportation options and opportunities. The rail corridor spans the county from Davenport to Watsonville, runs parallel to the Highway 1 corridor, and connects to regional and state rail lines. This important transportation corridor is within one mile of more than 80 parks, 25 schools, approximately half of the county’s population, and provides access to the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary at several key locations.

Potential uses include the following:

- Increased freight rail service
- Seasonal or recreational passenger rail service
- High-capacity public transit
- Bicycle & pedestrian path in conjunction with rail services (see Coastal Rail Trail fact sheet)

Rail Improvement Efforts
As owner of the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line, the RTC entered into an Administration, Coordination and License Agreement with St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co. LLC, a subsidiary of Progressive Rail Incorporated, to operate freight service and maintain the rail infrastructure within the railroad easement.

- **Rail Structure Upgrades & Repairs** - With over $5 million in State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds, the RTC reconstructed the La Selva Beach trestle and completed improvements to three other bridges in 2015. A new structures assessment is underway to help determine the next phase of structure upgrades. In addition, the RTC is working to repair damages caused by the storms of 2017.

- **Freight Rail Service** - Freight rail service is currently provided by St. Paul & Pacific Railroad to a number of companies for commodities such as construction materials, agricultural products, beverages, and biofuels. Freight rail service helps to reduce traffic and greenhouse gases as one rail car load generally removes four truck trips from roadways and freeways.

- **Passenger Operations** - Big Trees Railroad currently operates seasonal and special event recreational rail service on the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line. St. Paul & Pacific Railroad also plans to operate some recreational rail service. In January 2019, the RTC unanimously approved keeping the track in place and conducting an alternatives analysis for high-capacity public transit that could be implemented in the future. St. Paul & Pacific Railroad is required to submit a plan for recreational rail service by March 15, 2020.
Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line

Infrastructure Preservation and Analysis of Options

Measure D provides 8 percent of its revenue for the rail corridor. The RTC is responsible for maintaining the rail right-of-way. The RTC has a Preventative Maintenance Program that outlines procedures for RTC staff to carry out maintenance operations on the rail line. Regular inspections and repairs to the infrastructure within the rail right-of-way will maintain the corridor for future use and limit impacts to adjacent jurisdictions and private property.

Alternatives Analysis

An outcome of the Final Unified Corridor Investment Study, which was adopted by the RTC in January 2019, was to work with Santa Cruz Metro to perform an alternatives analysis for high-capacity transit options on the rail ROW. RTC and Metro staff are working together to determine the scope of work, schedule, and budget for the project. The tentative project schedule is to release the request for proposals in summer 2019 for consultants to perform this analysis and complete the project by January 2021.

The RTC received a Caltrans State Highway Account Grant for $100,000 which will go toward the Alternatives Analysis.
AGENDA: June 6, 2019

TO: Regional Transportation Commission (RTC)

FROM: Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner

RE: Transportation Funding Updates and Priority Projects

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC):

1. Receive updates on various transportation funding programs;

2. Provide input on priority projects for transportation funding programs (Attachment 1) and provide direction to staff on which projects to prioritize for grant applications through 2020; and

3. Consider the range of programming options and competing priorities, and provide
direction to staff to issue a consolidated call for projects for on programming methodology for on RTC-discretionary 2020 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), Surface Transportation Block Grant Program/Regional Surface Transportation Program Exchange (STBG/RSTPX), Local Partnership Program-formula (LPP-f), and Highway Infrastructure Program (HIP) funds; and —

4. Direct staff to continue to meet with its stakeholders for input and return to the RTC in August or September with a proposed process and timeline for programming the RTC’s discretionary funds.

BACKGROUND

Transportation projects in Santa Cruz County are funded by a combination of state, federal, and local funds. As outlined in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), the majority of revenues available for transportation projects are restricted to certain uses (e.g. transit, the State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP), state gas tax revenues allocated directly to cities and counties, local sales taxes). The RTC has discretion over less than 5% of funds. These discretionary funds include regional shares of Surface Transportation Block Grant Program/Regional Surface Transportation Program Exchange (STBG/RSTPX), State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), new SB1 Local Partnership Program-formula (LPP-f), and one time Highway Infrastructure Program (HIP) funds. These funds and their available uses are described in more detail in Attachment 2. The RTC typically programs the region’s discretionary funds through a competitive process, based on the RTC’s Rules and Regulations, goals identified in the RTP, state and federal guidelines, and taking into consideration regional priorities, including those that may cross jurisdictional boundaries. On average $6-7 million in RTC discretionary funds are available for programming each year.

In addition to RTC-Discretionary funds, there are a few state and federal competitive grant opportunities that staff recommends submitting applications for over the next year.
Local and RTC-discretionary funds can be used to leverage those grants. Agencies in Santa Cruz County would be eligible to compete for over $450 million per year in statewide competitive grants that are available for congested corridors, active transportation projects, and state-local partnership program for regions/agencies with local transportation sales taxes and fees.

**DISCUSSION**

**Regional Priorities**

As regularly discussed at Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) meetings, there are many important transportation projects in our region. Unfortunately, even with a boost of funds from Measure D and Senate Bill 1 for local road, transit, highway, trail and rail projects, existing revenues remain insufficient to fully fund all of the priority projects and ongoing maintenance of the existing transportation network. Therefore, it is helpful to periodically revisit the list of priorities to ensure that limited funds are focused on the highest priority projects and to provide direction to RTC staff and other agencies on which projects to prioritize when seeking grants and prioritizing projects for RTC discretionary funds. Caltrans is also currently requesting that agencies identify any new state highway projects that they plan to fund or seek state grants for in the next 3 years that may require development of a Project Initiation Document (PID).

RTC, local jurisdictions, stakeholder groups, and the public have identified numerous priorities for the transportation system, through the long range Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), Measure D, the Unified Corridor Investment Study (UCIS) preferred scenario for the Watsonville-Santa Cruz corridor (approved January 2019), the Highway 9/San Lorenzo Valley (SLV) Complete Streets Corridor Plan, the Highway 17 Access Management Plan, the Unmet Transit Needs List (updated each May), local Bicycle Plans and Active Transportation Plans, and other planning efforts. A summary of some of the high priority regional projects that have been identified is included in Attachment 1: Priority Projects list. The list is focused on regional projects that facilitate travel between jurisdictions, provide access to major destinations, and are used by residents of multiple jurisdictions; it includes projects that are critical for goods movement, and fill gaps in the multimodal regional network.

Balancing ongoing maintenance of existing transportation infrastructure and services, while also addressing safety, travel between jurisdictions (whether by car, bike, foot, or transit), access and mobility, equity, economic and air quality goals can be challenging when funds are limited. **Staff recommends that the RTC review the PRELIMINARY list of priorities (Attachment 1) which might compete for state, federal, and/or RTC-discretionary funds through 2020.** This list, originally developed by the RTC several years ago, is in draft form and is not presented in any sort of priority order. At the April Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC) meeting, staff requested that local agencies identify priorities, as well as provide updates on previously programmed projects. **No agencies have yet submitted their priority lists and will need to provide additional input as to whether this list represents their priorities.** Staff will continue to work with project sponsors and advisory committees to update the list of priority projects that are possible
candidates for RTC discretionary funds (STIP, STBG/RSTPX, LPP-formula, and HIP), as well as other state and federal grants.

**RTC Discretionary Programs:**

As the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for Santa Cruz County, the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) is responsible for selecting projects to receive approximately $6-7 million in discretionary state and federal funds per year. This is less than 5% of the total local, state, and federal transportation funds that are typically available for transportation projects in Santa Cruz County. Most of these discretionary funds are available for a wide range of projects, including highway, local street and road, transit, paratransit, and community transportation services, public mass transit guideways, grade separations, bicycle, pedestrian, transportation system management, transportation demand management, soundwalls, intermodal facilities, safety, and bridge projects. (See Attachment 2 for more information on eligible uses of each fund.) Cities, the County of Santa Cruz, the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC), Caltrans, University of California Santa Cruz (UCSC), Santa Cruz Metro, and non-profit agencies (with public agency sponsorship) are among those eligible to apply for the funds.

This year, staff estimates that the following RTC-discretionary funds are available for programming:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RTC-Discretionary Programs</th>
<th>Funds</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)-regional shares</td>
<td>$5-7 million through FY24/25 (total TBD by 8/19 CTC Fund Estimate)</td>
<td>Available for most transportation projects, except ongoing transit and local road maintenance and operations. CTC draft fund estimate expected mid-June. Subject to concurrence from CTC; RTC must select projects by 12/15/19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Transportation Block Grant Program/Regional Surface Transportation Program Exchange (STBG/RSTPX)</td>
<td>Approximately $3 million per year, starting in FFY19</td>
<td>RTC typically programs 2-3 years of funds at a time. RTC process is usually combined with STIP when there is capacity in the STIP. Available for wide range of transportation projects. Match: 11.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Infrastructure Program (HIP)</td>
<td>$680,000 (one time)</td>
<td>One-time infusion of federal funds available for highway, bridge and local road projects. Must be obligated by 9/30/21. Not eligible: Rural minor collectors or local access, transportation alternatives (bike/ped), ferries, transit, or transportation planning and studies. Match: 13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Partnership Program-formula (LPP-f)</td>
<td>Approx. $300,000 per year</td>
<td>Funds available FY19/20-FY20/21, may be carried over to future years. Submittals due to CTC 12/10/19. Match: 1-to-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure D Highway Corridor funds available for Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs</td>
<td>$100,000 (one time)</td>
<td>Proposed in Measure D 5-year plan for FY19/20-20/21.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The RTC typically selects (programs) projects to receive its discretionary funds through a competitive application process, which includes evaluation of project benefits, review by the RTC’s advisory committees, a public hearing, and adoption by the RTC board.

Similar to years past, staff recommends selecting projects for several funding programs through a consolidated programming process in 2019. Staff has been recommending a consolidated application process for several reasons, including:

- The RTC has discretion over less than 5% of the transportation funds available for projects in Santa Cruz County.
- A consolidated process reduces the amount of time the RTC and project sponsors spend on the programming process. Most local agencies have repeatedly requested that the RTC combine the application process for several funding sources, rather than having multiple calls for project that would require submittal of different applications for each fund source. Having separate call for projects, especially for small funding amounts (e.g. $300,000 in LPP in FY19/20) would not be efficient.
- A consolidated process allows RTC to work with project sponsors and public to identify projects with the greatest benefits that also meet state and federal mandates to implement the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS).
- Programming discretionary funds (e.g. STIP, STBG/RSTPX, LPP-f, and local funds) to priority projects can help leverage competitive grants, since agencies that show they are programming discretionary funds to priority projects are generally more successful in receiving competitive grants.
  - Staff and project sponsors will also be looking at opportunities to use RTC-discretionary funds to leverage other statewide and federal competitive grants. This may include things like initiating pre-construction work with regional funds, so that projects that have been identified as regional priorities are “shovel ready” and able to compete (see Attachment 3).
- A consolidated process allows RTC to consider discretionary funds for regional priorities identified through public processes, including those identified through the Unified Corridor Investment Study (UCIS) and other strategic plans.
- A consolidated process allows RTC staff to work with projects sponsors to identify the most appropriate fund source for each project, and provides the flexibility to focus STIP, LPP-formula and other funds which have more “strings” attached (e.g. federal funds and funds that flow through the CTC) to projects or project sponsors that are better equipped to meet those requirements, while considering regional priorities for our diverse transportation system. It also allows RTC and project sponsors to strategize on how to maximize funding to the region (leveraging) by applying the most appropriate fund source to each project.
- The STIP has been very unpredictable over the past two decades. While SB1 will hopefully bring more stability to the STIP, actual revenues available in the STIP have often fallen short of programmed amounts, especially when gas tax revenues come in lower than projections.
  - Several times, $0 in new STIP capacity was available, making STBG/RSTPX the only source available for regional and local projects. In 2016 price-based gas taxes dropped so low that the CTC had to delete $750 million previously programmed to projects statewide, including $6.44 million in STIP funds from the Harkins Slough Road/Highway 1 intersection - bicycle/pedestrian crossing.
  - Even though the RTC is responsible for selecting projects to receive the region’s share of STIP funds, the CTC makes the final decision on whether projects are
included in the STIP and in what year. It is not uncommon for the CTC to program only some projects and to shift projects to later years than requested, even for previously programmed projects. When the CTC has not agreed to program or been unable to allocate funds to locally approved projects, the RTC has maintained its commitment to delivery of those projects and regularly backfilled those projects with STBG/RSTPX funds. For instance, the RTC has committed to reprogram $6.44 million in RTC-discretionary funds (RSTPX or STIP) to the City of Watsonville’s Highway 1/Harkins Slough Road Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge project, if it does not secure Active Transportation Program (ATP) or other grant funds. The project was one point short of receiving ATP funds this past cycle and is expected to reapply in Cycle 5. If the project does not receive Cycle 5 ATP funds, the RTC will have to program STIP or STBG/RSTPX to the project to fulfill its commitment.

- A consolidated process provides the flexibility to focus STIP and LPP funds to projects that also meet CTC priorities in a given cycle, and may include sometimes swapping previously programmed RSTPX for STIP funds on larger projects.

- For local-lead projects (rather than Caltrans-lead), once STIP funds have been allocated, no supplemental STIP funds are available to cover cost increases, sometimes leaving RSTPX and local funds as the only option. For instance, prior to Measure D, RSTPX was the only fund source available to complete the Highway 1 environmental review document.

- A competitive process provides a transparent forum for the public and RTC advisory committees to weigh in on how regional funds are spent.

- A wide range of agencies and projects regularly compete for RTC-discretionary funds. For instance, a local agency may submit an application for a regionally significant intersection (e.g. projects that cross jurisdictional boundaries or are heavily used by residents of other jurisdictions, such as Highway 1/9, Highway 152/Holohan, transit or trail projects); non-profit agencies such as Ecology Action and Bike Santa Cruz County, the Health Services Agency, University of California at Santa Cruz (UCSC), Santa Cruz METRO, Lift Line, among others may also submit applications. Providing formula funds to only certain agencies would be at the exclusion of other transportation system providers.

On average, RTC has programmed 50% of its discretionary funding to cities and the county, with the balance to a mix of METRO, Caltrans, RTC, UCSC, and transportation demand management/bike and pedestrian education and safety programs implemented by non-profits.

Alternative Programming Options

County Public Works staff have suggested that all of the STBG/RSTPX funds be programmed by formula to cities and the County, rather than a consolidated competitive application process (Attachment 4). At the March and April Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC) meetings, the RTC’s consolidated process and the County’s recommendation for formula distribution of STBG/RSTPX were discussed, but only County of Santa Cruz staff indicated a preference for a formula program over a consolidated process. Some members present instead indicated support for a consolidated process, opposed a formula process, and/or indicated support for a process that allows them to fund larger projects. Since that time, some of the directors from ITAC member agencies have indicated a preference for a range of alternative programming methods.

For the reasons stated above, staff does not recommend has not been recommending
programming and allocating any of the region’s discretionary funds by formula this year. However, there are a range of options for programming RTC-discretionary funds, which are used by some other regions in the state:

- Program 100% of RTC-discretionary funds through a consolidated competitive process, with projects selected based on project benefits. *(This has been the staff recommendation for STIP, STBG/RSTPX, LPP-f, HIP and Measure D-TDM funds this cycle.)*
- Program all or some portion of STBG/RSTPX to cities and the county by formula, with or without the balance available to regional priorities, with local highway, transit, rail, non-profit, UCSC, and other projects in competition;
- Program each discretionary fund through a separate process; may include a combination of competitive, formula, and non-competitive processes (setting aside some funds off the top for specific regional projects). METRO staff has expressed interest in this option, while Santa Cruz, Watsonville, Ecology Action, and others have expressed preference for a consolidated application over submitting applications several times for different programs.
- Program 100% of STIP funds to regionally-significant projects identified by the RTC, rather than a competitive process (most regional agencies program STIP funds in this way).
- Program 50% of STBG/RSTPX to cities, the county, and transit operators by formula and 50% to regional projects (similar to Measure D)
- Establish off the top targets of funds for major regional projects, providing more certainty about the balance available through a competitive pot.
- Program 100% of discretionary funds (STIP, STBG/RSTPX, LPP-f, and HIP) to only regionally-significant projects, not through a competitive process.

Staff recommends that the RTC consider the range of programming options (above) and competing priorities (Attachment 1), and provide direction to staff to issue a consolidated call for projects for programming methodology of RTC-discretionary 2020 STIP, STBG/RSTPX, LPP-formula, and HIP funds. Staff will continue to meet with its stakeholders for input and will return to the RTC in August or September with the proposed process and timeline for programming these funds.

Later this year, RTC staff will also present a Measure D Implementation Plan which will further evaluate options for funding of priority projects, including cash flow model of Measure D programs/projects and potential options for bonding.

**FISCAL IMPACT**

Securing funding is critical to implementation of priority projects. Strategic programming can help RTC leverage additional grant funds and help local agencies avoid losing funding if they do not meet guidelines for certain programs. Any funds programmed by the RTC will be included in the 2020 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) and/or future RTC budget amendments, as appropriate.

**SUMMARY**

In 2019, the RTC will be approving projects to receive regional shares of funds and prioritizing projects to compete for federal and state grants. Staff recommends that the
RTC provide input on the list of priority projects for future funding opportunities and option for programming RTC discretionary funds.

Attachments:

1. Preliminary Priority Projects list - Revised
2. RTC Discretionary Fund Descriptions
3. Leveraging Discretionary Funds on Competitive Grants for Regional Priorities
4. Letter from Matt Machado, County Public Works
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**Priority Regional Projects** - Candidates for state, federal, and regional grants

SB1 and Measure D provide new funding to address some of the backlog of transportation needs in Santa Cruz County. The majority of SB1 funds are dedicated to repairing and maintaining the existing multimodal transportation system. In addition to funds allocated by formula to Caltrans to maintain state highways, cities and counties for projects on local streets and roads, and transit and regional agencies for transit projects, there are several competitive grant programs focused on increasing biking and walking, reducing congestion, improving goods movement, and expanding transit and rail. Additionally, the RTC has discretion over about $6-7 million/year from state and federal funding programs. The following list includes priority projects in Santa Cruz County that have consistently been identified by the public, project sponsors, the RTC, and/or its citizen advisory committees that SB1 can fund. Some projects or portions of projects may also be funded from Measure D and other funds.

### Near Term Priority Projects (not in priority order) - Candidates for 2019 & 2020 Grants

This list includes SB1-Conges. Corridor, LPP, ATP; STIP, STBG/RSTPX, HIP projects. The following table provides details of the projects and their estimated total costs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Estimated Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highway 1</strong></td>
<td>Hwy 1 Aux Lanes: 41st to Soquel Ave and Chanticleer Bike/Ped Bridge</td>
<td>$34,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SC</strong></td>
<td>Hwy 1/Ahw 9 Intersection, City of SC</td>
<td>Approx. $8M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WAT</strong></td>
<td>Hwy 1 Bike/Ped Bridge @ Harkins Slough Rd</td>
<td>$8-12M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CO</strong></td>
<td>Hwy 1 Bike/Ped Xing @ Mar Vista</td>
<td>$13,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SC</strong></td>
<td>Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network (MBBST)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SC</strong></td>
<td>MBSST - Sections 8 &amp; 9 construction (SLR-Live Oak)</td>
<td>$28-35M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SC</strong></td>
<td>MBSST - Segment 7 - ph 2</td>
<td>$8-10M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WAT</strong></td>
<td>MBSST - Segment 18</td>
<td>$2-4M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SC</strong></td>
<td>Soquel/Freedom Blvd (UCIS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>varies</strong></td>
<td>Buffered/protected bike lanes - Robertson to State Park Dr</td>
<td>$2,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>varies</strong></td>
<td>Intersection improvements</td>
<td>$2,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>varies</strong></td>
<td>Hwy 9 Corridor Improvements: Various bike, pedestrian, transit, intersection, and safety projects.</td>
<td>$15-50M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>varies</strong></td>
<td>Hwy 9: Graham Hill Road to Glen Arbor Safe Routes to Schools</td>
<td>$3-5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CO</strong></td>
<td>SR152/Holohan Road Intersection - $1.5M shortfall</td>
<td>$1-3M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MTD</strong></td>
<td>Metro Center - Pacific Station Renovation (downtown SC)</td>
<td>$25,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MTD</strong></td>
<td>ParaCruz Operations Building</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>cities/Co</strong></td>
<td>Local Street and Road Pavement Preservation - over $100M backlog</td>
<td>$100-150M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>varies</strong></td>
<td>Countywide Bike and Ped projects</td>
<td>$100-150M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MTD</strong></td>
<td>Ongoing Santa Cruz METRO bus replacements</td>
<td>$6.5M/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>varies</strong></td>
<td>Streets Smarts Education/Safety - Vision Zero programs</td>
<td>$100k/year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The table includes projects that can be funded from various sources in addition to SB1 and Measure D.*

Attachment 1: REVISED

DRAFT - FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES
**Priorities Identified as Candidates for future grant cycles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>varies</td>
<td>Storm Damage Repairs - Countywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Hwy 1/Mission St/Chestnut/King/Union Intersection Improvements, City of SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Hwy 1/Mission St/Bay St Intersection Improvements, City of SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO/CT</td>
<td>Davenport - Hwy 1 crossing improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Hwy 1 Interchange Improvements: 41st Avenue, Soquel Avenue and Morrisey Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Hwy 1 NB Auxiliary Lane Larkin Valley Rd. to Freedom Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Hwy 1 San Lorenzo River (SLR) Bridge, City of SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Hwy 9 Corridor Improvements: mid-term priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT/SV</td>
<td>Hwy 17/Mt. Hermon Rd. Ramps/Interchange Operations; add lane to SB off-ramp, Scotts Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>Hwy 17 Access Management Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>SR 17 from Granite Creek Rd to Summit Rd: multimodal improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>SR 17 from Granite Creek Rd to Summit Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>SR 17 at Vine Hill Rd: Construct interchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>SR 17 from Sugarloaf Rd to Laurel Rd: Construct interchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>SR 17 at Old Santa Cruz Hwy: Construct interchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>varies</td>
<td>Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network (MBSST)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC/CFL</td>
<td>MBSST - Segment 5/North Coast- ph 1 cost increases, mit measures, and ph2; $10M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>MBSST Segment 10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>varies</td>
<td>Goods Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Highway 129 Safety, Freight and Complete Streets study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>Highway 129: Highway 101 to Hwy 1 Freight and Safety, includes improvements at Lakeview intersection, severe congestion at other intersections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>East Lake Ave-(Hwy 152) Widening (Martinelli St-Holohan Rd) - Goods Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>Watsonville Freight Rail, bridge; links to landfill; partnership with Progressive Rail;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>Highway 1 - Scott Creek bridge restoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB</td>
<td>Community Bridges Lift Line Operations Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC/MTD</td>
<td>Unified Corridor Investment Study Priorities - Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAMC</td>
<td>Pajaro Station- partnership with TAMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC</td>
<td>Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line Infrastructure Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC</td>
<td>Countywide railroad crossing grade improvements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. NOTE: This list is not in priority order and has been developed by the RTC over several years. Last reviewed by RTC board in 2017. Other agencies are concurrently being asked for updates lists of priority projects, as noted at the April 2019 ITAC meeting.
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC)
Discretionary Funds

**Surface Transportation Block Grant Program/Regional Surface Transportation Program Exchange (STBG/RSTPX)** – Federal funds, usually exchanged for state funds in Santa Cruz County

**Background**: The STBG program (sometimes referred to as RSTP and STP) is established through the federal transportation act, with criteria set by FHWA and Caltrans Local Assistance guidance, and RTC Rules and Regulations. As a smaller county in California, the state allows RTC to exchange the federal STBG funds for state RSTPX. The RTC has programmed these funds through a competitive process for at least the past 25 years to a wide range of projects and agencies.

**RTC-discretionary share**: Approximately $3 million per year. *The County of Santa Cruz receives an additional $224,813 of the region’s share directly.*

**Eligible applicants**: Governmental entities implementing eligible activities, including RTC, Caltrans, cities, counties, UCSC, METRO, Cabrillo, and non-profits with a master agreement with Caltrans or with a public agency sponsor – such as Ecology Action, Bike Santa Cruz County, Community Bridges, Community Traffic Safety Coalition, etc.

**Eligible Projects and Activities**: Funds must be used for projects as defined in Sections 133(b) and 133(c) of Title 23 of the United States Code (U.S.C)—Highways, and not otherwise excluded by Article XIX—Motor Vehicle Revenues of the CA State Constitution.

1. **Location of Projects (23 U.S.C. 133(c))**: STBG projects may not be undertaken on a road functionally classified as a local road or a rural minor collector unless the road was on a Federal-aid highway system on January 1, 1991, except:
   (1) For a bridge or tunnel project (other than the construction of a new bridge or tunnel at a new location);
   (2) For a project described in 23 U.S.C. 133(b)(4)-(11) and described below under "Eligible Activities" (b)(4) through (11);
   (3) For transportation alternatives projects described in 23 U.S.C. 101(a)(29) before enactment of the FAST Act (these are described in 23 U.S.C. 133(h) and in separate TA Set-Aside guidance.); and
   (4) As approved by the Secretary.

2. **Eligible Activities (23 U.S.C. 133(b))**: Subject to the location of projects requirements in paragraph (a), the following eligible activities are listed in 23 U.S.C. 133(b):
   (1) Construction, as defined in 23 U.S.C. 101(a)(4), of the following:
      i. Highways, bridges, and tunnels, including designated routes of the Appalachian development highway system and local access roads under 40 U.S.C. 14501;
      ii. Ferry boats and terminal facilities eligible under 23 U.S.C. 129(c);
      iii. Transit capital projects eligible under chapter 53 of title 49, United States Code;
      iv. Infrastructure-based intelligent transportation systems capital improvements, including the installation of vehicle-to-infrastructure communication equipment;
      v. Truck parking facilities eligible under Section 1401 of MAP-21 (23 U.S.C. 137 note); and
   (2) Operational improvements and capital and operating costs for traffic monitoring, management, and control facilities and programs. Operational improvement is defined in 23 U.S.C. 101(a)(18).
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(3) Environmental measures eligible under 23 U.S.C. 119(g), 328, and 329, and transportation control measures listed in Section 108(f)(1)(A) (other than clause (xvi) of that section) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7408(f)(1)(A)).
(4) Highway and transit safety infrastructure improvements and programs, including railway-highway grade crossings.
(7) Planning, design, or construction of boulevards and other roadways largely in the right-of-way of former Interstate System routes or other divided highways.
(8) Development and implementation of a State asset management plan for the National Highway System (NHS) and a performance-based management program for other public roads.
(9) Protection (including painting, scour countermeasures, seismic retrofits, impact protection measures, security countermeasures, and protection against extreme events) for bridges (including approaches to bridges and other elevated structures) and tunnels on public roads, and inspection and evaluation of bridges and tunnels and other highway assets.
(10) Surface transportation planning programs, highway and transit research and development and technology transfer programs, and workforce development, training, and education under chapter 5 of title 23, United States Code.
(11) Surface transportation infrastructure modifications to facilitate direct intermodal interchange, transfer, and access into and out of a port terminal.
(12) Projects and strategies designed to support congestion pricing, including electronic toll collection and travel demand management strategies and programs.
(13) Upon request of a State and subject to the approval of the Secretary, if Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (TIFIA) credit assistance is approved for an STBG-eligible project, then the State may use STBG funds to pay the subsidy and administrative costs associated with providing Federal credit assistance for the projects.
(14) The creation and operation by a State of an office to assist in the design, implementation, and oversight of public-private partnerships eligible to receive funding under title 23 and chapter 53 of title 49, United States Code, and the payment of a stipend to unsuccessful private bidders to offset their proposal development costs, if necessary to encourage robust competition in public-private partnership procurements.
(15) Any type of project eligible under 23 U.S.C. 133 as in effect on the day before the FAST Act was enacted. Among these are:
   i. Replacement of bridges with fill material;
   ii. Training of bridge and tunnel inspectors;
   iii. Application of calcium magnesium acetate, sodium acetate/formate, or other environmentally acceptable, minimally corrosive anti-icing and deicing compositions for bridges (and approaches to bridges and other elevated structures) and tunnels;
   iv. Projects to accommodate other transportation modes continue to be eligible pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 142(c) if such accommodation does not adversely affect traffic safety;
   v. Transit capital projects eligible for assistance under chapter 53 of title 49, United States Code, including vehicles and facilities (publicly or privately owned) that are used to provide intercity passenger bus service;
   vi. Approach roadways to ferry terminals to accommodate other transportation modes and to provide access into and out of the ports;
vii. Transportation alternatives previously described in 23 U.S.C. 101(a)(29) and described in 23 U.S.C. 213;
viii. Projects relating to intersections having disproportionately high accident rates, high levels of congestion (as evidenced by interrupted traffic flow at the intersection and a level of service rating of "F" during peak travel hours, calculated in accordance with the Highway Capacity Manual), and are located on a Federal-aid highway;
ix. Construction and operational improvements for any minor collector if the minor collector and the project to be carried out are in the same corridor and in proximity to an NHS route; the construction or improvements will enhance the level of service on the NHS route and improve regional traffic flow; and the construction or improvements are more cost-effective, as determined by a benefit-cost analysis, than an improvement to the NHS route;
x. Workforce development, training, and education activities discussed in 23 U.S.C. 504(e);
xi. Advanced truck stop electrification systems. Truck stop electrification system is defined in 23 U.S.C. 101(a)(32);
 xii. Installation of safety barriers and nets on bridges, hazard eliminations, projects to mitigate hazards caused by wildlife;
xiii. Electric vehicle and natural gas vehicle infrastructure in accordance with 23 U.S.C. 137;
xiv. Data collection, maintenance, and integration and the costs associated with obtaining, updating, and licensing software and equipment required for risk-based asset management and performance based management, and for similar activities related to the development and implementation of a performance based management program for other public roads;
xv. Construction of any bridge in accordance with 23 U.S.C. 144(f) that replaces any low water crossing (regardless of the length of the low water crossing); any bridge that was destroyed prior to January 1, 1965; any ferry that was in existence on January 1, 1984; or any road bridge that is rendered obsolete as a result of a Corps of Engineers flood control or channelization project and is not rebuilt with funds from the Corps of Engineers. Not subject to the Location of Project requirement in 23 U.S.C. 133(c); and
xvi. Actions in accordance with the definition and conditions in 23 U.S.C. 144(g) to preserve or reduce the impact of a project on the historic integrity of a historic bridge if the load capacity and safety features of the historic bridge are adequate to serve the intended use for the life of the historic bridge. Not subject to the Location of Project requirement in 23 U.S.C. 133(c).

2. Applicability of Planning Requirements (23 U.S.C. 133(d)(5)): Projects must be identified in the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)/Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and be consistent with the Long-Range Statewide Transportation Plan and the Metropolitan Transportation Plan(s). When obligating suballocated funding (discussed below), the State must coordinate with relevant metropolitan planning organizations (MPO) or rural planning organizations (23 U.S.C. 133(d)(3)). Programming and expenditure of funds for projects shall be consistent with 23 U.S.C. 134 and 135. STBG projects for eligible planning purposes must be reflected in the statewide SPR work program or Metropolitan Unified Planning Work Program. Further, these projects must be in the STIP/TIP unless the State DOT or MPO agree that they may be excluded. (23 CFR 420.119(e))

3. Applicability of 23 U.S.C. 217(i) for Bicycle Projects: 23 U.S.C. 217(i) requires that bicycle facilities "be principally for transportation, rather than recreation, purposes." However, 23 U.S.C. 133(b)(6) and 133(h) list "recreational trails projects" as eligible activities under STBG. Therefore, the requirement in 23 U.S.C. 217(i) does not apply to recreational trails projects (including for bicycle use) using STBG funds. Section 217(i) continues to apply to bicycle facilities other than trail-related projects, and Section 217(i) continues to apply to bicycle facilities using other Federal-aid highway program funds
(e.g., NHPP, Highway Safety Improvement Program, and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program). The transportation requirement under Section 217(i) is applicable only to bicycle projects; it does not apply to any other trail use or transportation mode.

**Not eligible:** Only direct project related costs are eligible. Local agency overhead and other non-direct charges are ineligible for STBG and RSTPX. Ongoing maintenance and operations are also ineligible.

**Match:** 11.47% non-federal

**Considerations:** The County Public Works Department has proposed that these funds be distributed by formula to cities and counties. This would restrict the RTC’s ability to fund the highest priority projects in the region that meet evaluation criteria set by the RTC; restrict the RTC’s ability to fund regional projects that cross jurisdictional borders, transit projects, and projects implemented by non-profit agencies; and reduce flexibility to leverage other grants; as well as address other needs (see 6/6/19 staff report).

**State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) – State & federal funds**

**Background:** Since approval of Senate Bill 45 in 1997, regions have received 75% of STIP funds by formula for projects approved by the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) – RTC in Santa Cruz County. The RTC has typically programmed these funds through a competitive process, though has occasionally set aside a portion of the region’s share of funds for major regional projects.

Criteria for use of the funds and final approval and allocation of funds is set by the California Transportation Commission (CTC). *2020 STIP Guidelines to be finalized in August 2019.*

Prior to 1998, the CTC focused most of the funds on highway and interregional rail projects, when the STIP was one of the only funding source for capacity increasing projects on the State Highway System.

**RTC-Discretionary Share:** Avg. $3 million per year. Available fund amounts have varied significantly over the years depending on the state Fund Estimate and allocation capacity which is impacted by state and federal legislation, CTC priorities, Caltrans SHOPP program costs, state bond debt service repayment methods, fuel consumption and gas tax revenues. Historically, the region’s share has averaged $3 million per year. Two years of new capacity will be added through FY24/25 in the 2020 STIP. Funds are currently fully programmed through FY22/23.

**Eligible applicants:** Governmental entities implementing eligible activities, including RTC, Caltrans, cities, counties, METRO.

**Eligible Projects:**
- Projects that meet eligibility requirements for funds from the State Highway Account, in accordance with Article XIX of the California Constitution can receive STIP funds.
- RTC project planning, programming, and monitoring: this includes preparation of the RTIP, RTP, coordination with Caltrans on highway projects, etc.
- Capital projects (including project development costs). These projects generally may include, but are not limited to, improving State highways, local roads, public transit (including buses), intercity rail, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, grade separations, transportation system management, transportation demand management, soundwalls, intermodal facilities, and safety.
  - Rail rolling stock and buses may be funded only from the Federal revenues in the STIP.
- Non-capital costs for transportation system management or transportation demand management may be included where the regional agency finds the project to be a cost-effective substitute for capital expenditures.
- **Not eligible**: Road and transit maintenance are not eligible.

**Match**: None currently required

**Timing**: RTC proposals are due to CTC by 12/15/19. Funds are available through June 30, 2025 and are subject to strict use-or-lose schedule deadlines.

**Local Partnership Program-formula (LPP-f)** – State funds

**Background**: The LPP program was established through Senate Bill 1 (2017). The funds are available for projects in areas with sales taxes or fees dedicated to transportation. Currently 50% of the funds are programmed by the CTC through a statewide competition and 50% are allocated by formula to agencies with eligible taxes and fees. The RTC has discretion over half of Santa Cruz County’s formula share; METRO receives an equal amount of the county’s share for its transit ½-cent sales tax. **Criteria are established by the CTC and are subject to change, with guidelines and FY20/21 fund estimates scheduled for adoption by the CTC 10/9/19.**

**RTC-Discretionary Share**: FY19/20: $302,000; FY20/21 – TBD, likely slightly lower than $300,000. Staff would not recommend allocating this relatively small amount of funds by formula or through a separate competitive program.

**Eligible applicants**: Governmental entities implementing eligible activities, including RTC, Caltrans, cities, counties, UCSC, METRO, Cabrillo, and non-profits with a master agreement with Caltrans or with a public agency sponsor – such as Ecology Action, Bike Santa Cruz County, Community Bridges, Community Traffic Safety Coalition, etc.

**Match**: Requires one-to-one match of funds that are not under CTC discretion (with the possible exception of STIP funds)

**Eligible Projects and Activities:**
- Transportation projects identified in Measure D sales tax
- Improvements to the state highway system including, but not limited to, all of the following:
  - Major rehabilitation of an existing segment that extends the useful life of the segment by at least 15 years;
  - New construction to increase capacity of a highway segment that improves mobility or reduces congestion on that segment; and
  - Safety or operational improvements on a highway segment that are intended to reduce accidents and fatalities or improve traffic flow on that segment.
- Improvements to transit facilities, subject to the restrictions of Article XIX of the California Constitution, including guideways, that expand transit services, increase transit ridership, improve transit safety, enhance access or convenience of the traveling public, or otherwise provide or facilitate a viable alternative to driving.
- Improvements to the local road system, including, but not limited to, both of the following:
  - Major roadway rehabilitation, resurfacing, or reconstruction that extends its useful life by at least 15 years; and
  - New construction and facilities to increase capacity, improve mobility, or enhance safety.
- Improvements to bicycle or pedestrian safety or mobility with a useful life of at least 15 years.
• Improvements to mitigate the environmental impact of new transportation infrastructure on a locality’s or region’s air quality or water quality, commonly known as “urban runoff,” including, management practices for capturing or treating urban runoff.
• For purposes of the Local Partnership Program, a separate phase or stage of construction for an eligible project may include mitigation of the project’s environmental impacts, including, but not limited to, sound walls, landscaping, wetlands or habitat restoration or creation, replacement plantings, and drainage facilities.
• Sound walls for a freeway that was built prior to 1987 without sound walls and with or without high occupancy vehicle lanes if the completion of the sound walls has been deferred due to lack of available funding for at least 20 years and a noise barrier scope summary report has been completed within the last 20 years.
• Road maintenance and rehabilitation.
• Other transportation improvement projects.
• Preconstruction work will be allowed for the formulaic programs.

**Highway Infrastructure Program (HIP) - Federal Funding**

**Background:** The 2018 Federal Omnibus bill provided CA additional funds apportioned for road and bridge projects. This was a one-time allocation of funds.

**RTC-Discretionary Share:** $680,000 in one time funding. This is not an ongoing program. Staff would not recommend allocating this relatively small amount of funds by formula or through a separate competitive program.

**Eligible activities:** Only construction, right-of-way, and design of highways, bridges and tunnels on the federal-aid system per 23 USC 133 (b)(1)(A). (See STBG above). **Not eligible:** Rural minor collectors or local access, transportation alternatives (bike/ped), ferries, transit, or transportation planning and studies.

**Match:** 13.5% non-federal match required

**Timing:** Funds must be obligated by September 30, 2021, or the funds lapse.
RTC and local transportation partner agencies anticipate using Measure D, new SB1-formula funds allocated to cities/counties and transit, and RTC-discretionary funds to leverage competitive grants. This includes applying for competitive grants over the next year for priority projects identified in the Unified Corridor Investment Study (UCIS) preferred scenario and Measure D, such as Highway 1 auxiliary lanes and bus on shoulders, bicycle and pedestrian bridges over Highway 1, segments of the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network (MBSST), upgrades to the Soquel-Freedom Boulevard from Santa Cruz to Aptos, and projects on Highway 9. Statewide competitive grant programs include the SCCP, LPP-C, and ATP:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Program</th>
<th>Available</th>
<th>Next cycle-timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solutions for Congested Corridors Program (SCCP)</td>
<td>$250 million/year statewide (SB1)</td>
<td>Applications due Jan. 2020; CTC project selection by May 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Partnership Program-Competitive (LPP-C)</td>
<td>$90-$100 million per year statewide* (SB1)</td>
<td>Applications due Jan. 2020; CTC project selection by May 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Transportation Program (ATP)</td>
<td>Approx. $130 million* total thru statewide and small urban/rural competitions (combo of SB1, federal Transportation Alternative Program (TAP), and state highway account funds)</td>
<td>TBD- next cycle likely to start in fall 2020, with applications due late 2020 or early 2021, CTC selecting projects in 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Several agencies in the state have been lobbying to reduce the amount of LPP and ATP funds available through statewide competition and these amounts could change. The RTC, in partnership with the Central Coast Coalition and other mid- and small-sized regionally agencies, has opposed efforts that would reduce the amount of funding projects in Santa Cruz County could compete for.

Strategic programming of discretionary funds (e.g. STIP, STBG/RSTPX, and local funds) to priority projects can help leverage competitive grants, since agencies that show they are programming discretionary funds are generally more successful in receiving competitive grants. Staff recommends the RTC consider the importance of flexibility in putting together a funding plan for major projects that best leverages various discretionary funds (including STIP, STBG/RSTPX, Measure D, and other local funds) for regional priorities. The Measure D Strategic Implementation Plan (coming later this year) will be developed in coordination with the RTC-discretionary fund programming process; staff recommends strategically targeting the discretionary funds to lead to greater awards of state and federal grants, in both the number of projects and the overall grant awards. Measure D is only part of the equation. Showing a commitment to regional projects with multiple discretionary funds sources creates a competitive advantage for securing grant funds.
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GUY PRESTON, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Avenue
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Dear Mr. Preston:

In 2016 the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act) converted the long-standing Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) into the Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG) acknowledging that this program has the most flexible eligibilities among all Federal-aid highway programs. The RSTP/STBG Program promotes flexibility and provides funding to best address State and local transportation system needs.

The State receives the funds from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) by formula and in turn distributes to the regions by the percentages specified under the FAST Act for local regions based on their relative shares of the State’s population using the RSTP distribution formula mandated under current State law.

While the Federal and State governments apportion the RSTP/STBG funds by formula to our region the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Committee (SCCRTC), the local agency responsible for the distribution of these funds, has chosen to require our County’s local agencies and non-profit companies to compete for the funds. The SCCRTC typically issues a call for projects that mixes the RSTP/STBG funds with other funding sources on an approximate two-year competitive cycle.

RSTP/STBG funds are primarily intended for projects on Federal-aid routes. Federal-aid routes in the unincorporated area of our County comprise over 50% of the County maintained road system. Over the past 10 years the County has been focusing most of its available resources on Federal-aid routes and has been using RSTP/STBG funds as the primary resource for the preservation and resurfacing of its arterial and major collector roadways. Nearly 50% of the County’s population resides in the unincorporated areas and the County is responsible to maintain nearly 68% (lane miles) of the entire local publicly maintained system (including all local cities). While the County has focused most of its resources on Federal-aid routes, the condition of our roadways continues to decline. Despite the concentrated focus of resources on Federal-aid routes a recent condition survey of County maintained roads revealed that the Pavement Condition Index (PCI) of County maintained Federal-aid routes has dropped from 72 to 56 in the past 6 years.
Having a declining PCI presents many problems for our County. Besides system vulnerability resulting in more storm damage during winter months, commute delays, increased wear and tear on vehicles and quality of life issues for our residents, the largest impact is to the County’s general liability which is nearly $2,000,000/year, just for roads. These large annual liability costs are due primarily to lack of resources resulting in poorly maintained roads. If all our roads were well maintained with proper surface, signage, striping and drainage infrastructure, we could avoid most of the claims and lawsuits.

The County has aggressively pursued RSTP/STBG funds in past grant application cycles administered by the SCCRTC, however, has only been partially successful in winning funds for its projects on Federal-aid routes. The County has strategically submitted grants that equal approximately 50% of the available funds, using the approximately 50% of our population in the unincorporated area as a guide, however, the SCCRTC has either partially funded our projects or not funded some projects at all, citing taking a balanced approach and/or not valuing Federal-aid routes that it considers not regionally significant. The disparity often lies on projects that are on critical county Federal-aid routes, such as Empire Grade and Glenwood Drive, that the SCCRTC does not find regionally significant. However, these Federal-aid routes are extremely important to our residents for emergency service delivery, emergency evacuation, system connectivity and quality of life.

Below are the County’s competitive success rates in the past 4 cycles for RSTP/STBG:

- 2013 – 42.3%
- 2014 – 47.5%
- 2016 – 28.9%
- 2018 – 16.9%

The County and other local agencies have long advocated for a formula-based distribution of the Federal RSTP/STBG funds that are apportioned to our County annually. This issue has been raised many times in the past at the Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC), however, SCCRTC staff has never supported this approach. We have been told by staff that they will never support this approach. When we recently inquired as to the future of the apportioned RSTP/STBG funds in our region and the possibility of simplifying the distribution of funds through a formula-base apportionment we received this reply:

“As far as what you might receive in the future, the Unified Corridor Study (UCS) assumes the SCCRTC will be a bit more strategic on investments in the future and in order to implement the preferred scenario, more discretionary funds (RSTP, STIP, etc.) would be focused on Soquel/Freedom. Hwy 1, and rail corridors. So, I would not recommend banking on past trends.”

Rachel Moriconi, 12/18/18.

While the UCS is a valuable study it only considers a few select commute routes. The locally maintained Federal-aid system in our County is much greater than the limited routes considered in the UCS.
Requiring local agencies to compete for RSTP/STBG funds is not in the best interest of the publicly maintained Federal-aid route system for the following reasons:

1) Funds are apportioned by formula to our region and should therefore be apportioned by formula to the local agencies.

2) Local agencies cannot estimate how much funds RSTP/STBG funds it will have available for projects. This makes it difficult to estimate budgets for projects that qualify for these funds. The County is now producing a two-year budget which compounds this problem.

3) Locals are required to submit time consuming grant applications and the County historically submits 5 because of our practice to provide geo-equity to our 5 Supervisorial Districts. Historical project awards do not provide geo-equity to our region.

4) The call for projects usually gets mixed with other funding sources such as STIP, etc. This is not advantageous to local agencies because RSTP/STBG funds are more flexible (though can only be spent on Federal-aid routes) and not all funding sources can be spent for the same purposes. Also, the STIP is programmed on a different cycle than the RSTP/STBG funds.

5) Having a formula-based distribution will help agencies better scope their projects. The County has been using its RSTP/STBG funds primarily for pavement management and when it gets shorted on requested funds it often necessitates truncating the limits of project. This makes it difficult to communicate to the public and elected officials actual project limits.

6) Regional significance of the SCCRTC do not always align with the importance of maintaining the locally maintained Federal-aid route system.

7) Maximum investment in the locally maintained Federal-aid route system will reduce liability costs.

8) Having a formula-based distribution is the fairest and most efficient way to allocate RSTP/STBG funds to our local agencies who are responsible to maintain the local Federal-aid route system.

9) A formula-based apportionment would allow local agencies to program future projects and be shelf ready to secure additional Obligation Authority (OA) statewide during the annual August redistribution, thereby delivering more than 100% of our regions OA.

We recommend the SCCRTC implement a formula based annual distribution of RSTP/STBG funds to the local agencies that are responsible for maintaining our local Federal-aid route system. We believe a population-based split would be the fairest, however, the SCCRTC may consider other factors such as lane miles of Federal-aid routes in each jurisdiction. Attached is a chart that shows how the County is split by population and lane miles per jurisdiction. Also attached are RSTP/STBG fact sheets from FHWA and the State Department of Transportation.

We look forward to a more predictable, sustainable and equitable distribution of RSTP/STBG funds that are apportioned annually to our region. If you have any questions please contact me or Steve Wiesner, Assistant Director of Public Works, at 831-454-2160.

Sincerely,

MATT MACHADO
Deputy CAO
Director of Public Works
### Population & Mileage by Jurisdiction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Lane Miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitola</td>
<td>10052</td>
<td>3.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>133790</td>
<td>49.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>63789</td>
<td>23.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotts Valley</td>
<td>11928</td>
<td>4.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watsonville</td>
<td>52087</td>
<td>19.17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals: 271646 100.00% 1792 100.00%

### Population by Jurisdiction

- Capitola: 19%
- County: 49%
- Santa Cruz: 4%
- Scotts Valley: 24%
- Watsonville: 4%

### Road Mileage by Jurisdiction

- Capitola: 10%
- County: 98%
- Santa Cruz: 3%
- Scotts Valley: 0%
- Watsonville: 0%
FAST Act FACT SHEET

PREPARED BY: Muhaned Aljabiry, Chief
Office of Federal Transportation Management Program
(916) 654-2983; Muhaned.Aljabiry@dot.ca.gov

DATE: June 7, 2016

SUBJECT: Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBGP) under Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST) Act

PROBLEM STATEMENT:
Identify changes implemented by the FAST Act to the STBGP, formerly the Surface Transportation Program (STP). The Division of Transportation Programming is responsible for calculating the distribution of apportionments for the STBGP and STBGP set-aside for the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP). The Department’s goal is to determine the most equitable distribution of STBGP and STBGP TAP set-aside apportionment provided to the regions. Therefore, the Department must decide if sub-allocation of the Regional Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (RSTP) and the Active Transportation Program (ATP) will continue as mandated under current State law.

RECOMMENDATION:
Based on the Department’s final programmatic funding distribution proposal on June 6, 2016, the final recommendation is to distribute STBGP to the regions by the percentages specified under the FAST Act for areas based on their relative shares of the State's population using the RSTP distribution formula mandated under current State law that considers a special rule for the federal-aid urban (FAU) and federal-aid secondary (FAS) systems.

Additionally, the Department’s proposal included a regional consensus to exchange $21 million of Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) funds for STBGP funds to be distributed to the regions by the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) county share formula after Department’s Local Assistance oversight deductions. The amount of regional HSIP exchange may be adjusted based on annual estimates and actual apportionment distribution provided by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). State law may also need to be amended to update reference to the STBGP sub-allocations in federal law.

The STBGP apportionment set-aside for TAP will continue to be distributed as part of the Statewide ATP in accordance with the California Streets and Highways Code Sections 2380-2385.

BACKGROUND:
MAP-21 implemented major program restructure and consolidations to several programs, including Surface Transportation Program (STP). Each State is required to set-aside from its STP apportionment a proportionate share of funds for the State’s Transportation Alternatives (TA) program; 2% for State Planning and Research (SPR); and, for off-system bridges, an amount not less than 15% of the State’s
FY 2009 Highway Bridge Program apportionment (which may not be taken from amounts sub-allocated based on population).

After set-asides, 50% of a State’s STP apportionment is sub-allocated to the following areas in proportion to their relative shares of the State’s population:
- Urbanized areas with population greater than 200,000;
- Areas with population greater than 5,000 but no more than 200,000;
- Areas with population of 5,000 or less.

The remaining 50% may be used in any area of the State.

Under the FAST Act, STP is renamed the Surface Transportation Block Grant Program. The set-asides for SPR and off-system bridges remain the same. Additionally, STBGP has two specified set-aside amounts:

1. “STBG Set-Aside” for TAP – the sub-allocation split is 50/50 each fiscal year subject to the same formula as STBG.
2. “STBG Set-Aside-Recreational Trails” – a State may opt out of the recreational trails program if the Governor of the State notifies the Secretary no later than 30 days prior to apportionments being made for any fiscal year.

The STBGP sub-allocation increases one percent per year from 51% in 2016 to 55% by 2020 to the following areas in proportion to their relative shares of the State’s population:
- Urbanized areas with population greater than 200,000 – this portion is to be distributed among areas based on their relative population, unless the Secretary approves a joint request from the State and relevant MPOs) to use other factors.
- Areas with population greater than 5,000 but no more than 200,000 – Projects in these areas are to be identified for funding by the State in consultation with regional planning organizations, if any.
- Areas with population of 5,000 or less.

The remaining may be used in any area of the State.

CA Streets and Highways Code (S&H) Code Section 182.6

California law refers to subsection (d) of Section 133 of Title 23 of the United States Code for RSTP apportionment methodology. It also includes additional provisions - S&H Code Section 182.6(d) (1) and S&H Code 182.6(d) (2), which guarantee minimum funding to counties under the FAU and FAS programs of an amount no less than 110 percent that the county was apportioned under these programs in Fiscal Year (FY) 1990-91. This provision was based on, and designed to ensure federal compliance that required each State to obligate for areas under 5,000 population not less than 110 percent of the amount apportioned to the State for the FAS system for FY 1991. This federal provision was removed in MAP-21.

Without a change in state law, the State has customarily supplemented “state flexible funds” to counties whose population does not yield the minimum apportionments mandated by California law. Historically, nine smaller counties (Alpine, Inyo, Lassen, Modoc, Mono, Plumas, Sierra, Siskiyou, and Trinity) have
received state flexible funds. Section 182.6 also includes various provisions concerning the administration of RSTP funding designed to ensure the full use of federal funds while maintaining the State formula distribution.

CA Streets and Highway Code (S&H) Code Sections 2380-2385

California law S&H Section 2380 established the Active Transportation Program (ATP). Section 2381(a) states that ATP shall be funded by state and federal funds which include 100 percent of the federal Transportation Alternative program funds and to be distributed:

- 40 percent to metropolitan planning organizations (MPO) in urban areas with populations greater than 200,000, in proportion to their relative share of population through a competitive process in consultation with the Department and the California Transportation Commission (CTC);
- 10 percent to small urban and rural regions with populations of 200,000 or less, with projects competitively awarded by the CTC to projects in those regions;
- 50 percent to projects competitively awarded by the CTC on a statewide basis.

State law also directs that the California Transportation Commission (CTC) in consultation with the ATP Program Workgroup to develop guidelines and project selection criteria for the ATP program and to adopt an annual or multi-year program of projects.

Additional Resources:


FHWA Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG) Implementation Guidance (Revised by the FAST Act), [http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/specialfunding/stp/160307.cfm](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/specialfunding/stp/160307.cfm)
The FAST Act converts the long-standing Surface Transportation Program into the Surface Transportation Block Grant Program acknowledging that this program has the most flexible eligibilities among all Federal-aid highway programs and aligning the program’s name with how FHWA has historically administered it. [FAST Act § 1109(a)]. The STBG promotes flexibility in State and local transportation decisions and provides flexible funding to best address State and local transportation needs.

Statutory citation

FAST Act § 1109; 23 U.S.C. 133

Funding features

Type of budget authority
Contract authority from the Highway Account of the Highway Trust Fund, subject to the overall Federal-aid obligation limitation.

Apportionment of funds
As under MAP-21, the FAST Act directs FHWA to apportion funding as a lump sum for each State then divide that total among apportioned programs. Each State’s STBG apportionment is calculated based on a percentage specified in law. (See “Apportionment” fact sheet for a description of this calculation)

Set-asides
The following are to be set aside from a State’s STBG apportionment:

- Funding for Transportation Alternatives (See the “Transportation Alternatives” fact sheet for additional information). [23 U.S.C. 133(h)]
- 2% for State Planning and Research (SPR). [23 U.S.C. 505]
- Funding for bridges not on Federal-aid highways (see “Off-system bridges” below). [23 U.S.C. 133(f)]
Additionally, from the portion of a State’s STBG apportionment available for use in any area of the State, the Governor of a border State may designate up to 5% for border infrastructure projects eligible under the SAFETEA-LU Coordinated Border Infrastructure Program. [FAST Act § 1437]

**Suballocation**

A percentage of a State’s STBG apportionment (after set-asides for Transportation Alternatives) is to be obligated in the following areas in proportion to their relative shares of the State’s population:

- **Urbanized areas with population greater than 200,000** — This portion is to be divided among those areas based on their relative share of population, unless the Secretary approves a joint request from the State and relevant MPO(s) to use other factors.
- **Areas with population greater than 5,000 but no more than 200,000** — The State is to identify projects in these areas for funding, in consultation with regional planning organizations, if any.
- **Areas with population of 5,000 or less.** [23 U.S.C. 133(d)]

The percentage to be suballocated grows over the period of the FAST Act (51% in FY 2016; 52% in FY 2017; 53% in FY 2018; 54% in FY 2019; 55% in FY 2020). The remainder net of suballocated amounts may be used in any area of the State. [23 U.S.C. 133(d)(6)]

The FAST Act also extends the requirement for States to make available obligation authority to urbanized areas over 200,000 population, but changes the period of time to which that requirement attaches (now over the period of FY 2016-2020). [23 U.S.C. 133(g)(1)]

**Transferability to other Federal-aid apportioned programs**

A State may transfer to the National Highway Performance Program, National Highway Freight Program, Highway Safety Improvement Program, and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program up to 50% of STBG funds made available each fiscal year. STBG funds suballocated under 23 U.S.C. 133(d)(1)(A) may not be transferred. [23 U.S.C. 126]

**Federal share**

As a general rule, in accordance with 23 U.S.C. 120. (See the “Federal Share” fact sheet for additional detail.)

**Eligible activities**

The FAST Act’s STBG Program continues all prior STP eligibilities (see in particular 23 U.S.C. 133(b)(15), as amended). It also adds the following new eligibilities:

- A State may use STBG funds to create and operate a State office to help design, implement, and oversee public-private partnerships (P3) eligible to receive Federal highway or transit funding, and to pay a stipend to unsuccessful P3 bidders in certain circumstances [23 U.S.C. 133(b)(14)]; and
- At a State’s request, the U.S. DOT may use the State’s STBG funding to pay the subsidy and administrative costs for TIFIA credit assistance for an eligible STBG project or group of projects. [23 U.S.C. 133(b)(13)].

The FAST Act also adds specific mention of the eligibility of installation of vehicle-to-infrastructure communication equipment. [FAST Act §1407, 23 U.S.C. 133(b)(1)(D)]

**Program features**

**Location of Projects**

26-27
In general, STBG projects may not be on local roads or rural minor collectors. There are a number of exceptions to this requirement, such as the ability to use up to 15% of a State’s rural suballocation on minor collectors. Other exceptions include: bridge and tunnel projects; safety projects; fringe and corridor parking facilities/programs; recreational trails, pedestrian and bicycle projects, and safe routes to school projects; boulevard/roadway projects largely in the right-of-way of divided highways; inspection/evaluation of bridges, tunnels, and other highway assets; port terminal modifications; and projects within the pre-FAST Act title 23 definition of “transportation alternatives.” [23 U.S.C. 133(c)]

Off-system bridges
The FAST Act continues (without change) the MAP-21 set-aside of a share of each State’s STBG apportionment for use on bridges not on Federal-aid highways (“off-system bridges”). The amount is to be not less than 15% of the State’s FY 2009 Highway Bridge Program apportionment. The Secretary, after consultation with State and local officials, may reduce a State’s set-aside requirement if the State has insufficient off-system bridge needs.

For wholly State/locally funded projects to replace or rehabilitate deficient off-system bridges, any amounts spent that are in excess of 20% of project costs may be credited to the non-Federal share of eligible bridge projects in the State. [23 U.S.C. 133(f)]

Bridge and tunnel inspection standards
If a State is not compliant with national bridge and tunnel inspection standards established by the Secretary, a portion of STBG funds must be used to correct the problem. [23 U.S.C. 144(h)(5)]

Treatment of projects
Each STBG project—including a project located outside of a Federal-aid highway right-of-way, but excluding a project funded by the recreational trails set-aside— is treated as a project on a Federal-aid highway. [23 U.S.C. 133(i)]

Bundling of Bridge Projects
The FAST Act encourages States to save costs and time by bundling multiple bridge projects using NHPP funds as one project under one project agreement and it places requirements on how that bundling is to be conducted. [23 U.S.C 144(j)]
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RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC):

1. Approve the attached resolution (Attachment 1) authorizing the Executive Director to negotiate and enter into a Cooperative Agreement with Caltrans contingent on RTC Legal Counsel review, for the environmental phase of the Highway 1 Auxiliary Lanes Project between Bay Avenue/Porter Street and State Park Drive, with the RTC as the implementing agency and Caltrans responsible for oversight.

2. Approve the attached resolution (Attachment 2) authorizing a professional engineering services contract with Mark Thomas & Company, Inc. for the environmental phase of the Highway 1 Auxiliary Lanes Project between Bay Avenue/Porter Street and State Park Drive.

BACKGROUND

The RTC, in cooperation with Caltrans and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), prepared a combined Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Assessment (EIR/EA) for the Tier I programmatic-level long range vision for the Highway 1 corridor and the Tier II (project level) 41st/Soquel Auxiliary Lanes and Bike/Ped Overcrossing Project. The Final EIR/EA was certified in January 2019.

The RTC advanced and implemented the final design for the Highway 1 41st/Soquel Auxiliary Lanes and Bike/Ped Overcrossing Project to achieve project readiness for funding opportunities. Measure D and STIP funds were used to advance design of the 41st/Soquel Auxiliary Lanes and Bike/Ped Overcrossing project. By advancing the design, this project is expected to be ready for construction in 2020, dependent on construction funding.

The completion of the Highway 1 programmatic level Final EIR/EA allows for various project-level (Tier II) environmental documents to move forward, including the two additional sets of auxiliary lanes between Bay Avenue/Porter Street and Park Avenue interchanges, and Park Avenue to State Park Drive interchanges as a single
project. Completion of the project level environmental document will help to demonstrate project readiness for future state and federal funding applications.

DISCUSSION

The proposed Highway 1 Auxiliary Lanes Project between the Bay Avenue/Porter Street and State Park Drive interchanges will construct northbound and southbound auxiliary lanes between the Bay Street/Porter Avenue and Park Avenue, and Park Avenue to State Park Drive interchanges on Highway 1, rehabilitate freeway pavement, construct drainage facilities, construct retaining walls and soundwalls. The project also includes the replacement of the Capitola Avenue Overcrossing.

The total cost for the project is estimated to be approximately $83M. Staff is planning to apply for Senate Bill 1 (SB1) Solutions for Congested Corridors Program (SCCP) and Local Partnership Program (LPP) funds for construction of this project in Cycle 2. Cycle 2 will have a call for projects later this year and will program $700M of funds to transportation projects that are construction-ready within FY 21/22 and 22/23.

Cooperative Agreement

At the March 2019 RTC meeting, the Executive Director, reported that staff has begun discussion with Caltrans for a Cooperative Agreement for the Highway 1 Auxiliary Lanes Project between the Bay Avenue/Porter Street and State Park Drive interchanges. The Cooperative Agreement will describe the roles and responsibilities for the environmental phase of the project.

RTC staff prepared the scope of work for the project and provided it to Caltrans, who then prepared their work plan including cost and project schedule if Caltrans were the implementing agency for the project. The cost that Caltrans proposed was $2.815M, with a schedule of 30 months for the environmental phase.

Staff determined that due to this project being a top priority for the region, maintaining control over the schedule and funding for the project is in the best interest of the RTC and will result in the most competitive project for state and local funds for construction. Staff believes an environmental document can be completed in less than 24-months. As the implementing agency, RTC will have the ability to advance the design phase in order to save an estimated 6 to 8 months on the overall project schedule. The RTC successfully used this approach for the Highway 1 Auxiliary Lanes Project between 41st Avenue and Soquel Drive, which will be construction-ready in 2020 pending availability of funds for construction.

Therefore, staff recommends the RTC approve the attached resolution (Attachment 1) authorizing the Executive Director to negotiate and enter into a Cooperative Agreement with Caltrans contingent on RTC Counsel review, for the environmental phase of the Highway 1 Auxiliary Lanes Project between Bay Avenue/Porter Street and State Park Drive, with the RTC as the implementing agency and Caltrans responsible for oversight.
Consultant Contract

In April, the RTC issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) to procure an engineering consultant to prepare the preliminary engineering and environmental documentation for the Highway 1 Auxiliary Lanes Project between Bay Avenue/Porter Street and State Park Drive which includes bus on shoulder improvements and the replacement of the local overcrossing at Capitola Avenue. The RFP included a provision to retain the successful firm for final design, at the option of the RTC.

Eight proposals were received by qualified consultants that have experience delivering similar types of projects on the state system. The selection panel for this procurement was made up of 6 individuals, including the Executive Director and Engineer of the RTC, as well as Matt Machado, Public Works Director and Deputy County Administrative Officer (CAO) for the County of Santa Cruz, Kailash Mozumder, Public Works Project Manager for the City of Capitola, Lara Bertaina, Environmental Senior for Caltrans, and Luis Duazo, Project Manager for Caltrans. The proposal review and ranking resulted in the short listing of four firms.

Interviews of shortlisted consultants took place at the RTC offices last month. The selection panel ranked Mark Thomas and Company, Inc. as the top ranked firm, due to their technical approach for traffic studies, environmental clearance, and innovative solutions to advance this project as effectively and expeditiously as possible. Mark Thomas included CDM Smith on their team which will maintain consistency and expertise from the previous Bus on Shoulder feasibility study and Concept of Operations.

The draft contract, scope of services, fee estimate, and detailed Critical Path Method (CPM) schedule are attached (Attachment 3). The contract value is $1.83M which is well below the Caltrans cost estimate, and within the RTC’s budgeted amount for this contract. Upon Commission approval of the contract award, staff will provide the consultant with a Notice to Proceed (NTP) to begin preparing the preliminary design and environmental technical studies for the project.

The CTC is scheduled to allocate $1.83M in State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds for the environmental phase of this project at its August meeting. Because the RTC intends to start work prior to the STIP allocation for the environmental work, the first 2 months of the contract will be funded with up to $200,000 of Measure D funds. Upon STIP allocation of $1.83M by the CTC at their August meeting, the remaining contract amount will be funded with STIP. Article XVIII of the contract includes language that it is only valid and enforceable if sufficient funds are made available to the RTC for the purpose of the contract.

In order to begin the preliminary engineering and environmental studies for this project, staff recommends that the RTC approve the attached resolution (Attachment 2) authorizing the Executive Director to sign a professional engineering services contract with Mark Thomas & Company, Inc. for the environmental phase of the Highway 1 Auxiliary Lanes Project between Bay Avenue/Porter Street and State Park Drive.
FISCAL IMPACT

This project’s environmental phase work is primarily funded by the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). The CTC is scheduled to allocate $1.83M to fund the environmental work at its August 2019 meeting. An estimated $200,000 in Measure D-Highway Program funds allocated for FY 18/19 through 22/23 will fund the first two months of environmental work, as well as other project development activities, such as project management and community outreach.

SUMMARY

The RTC staff recommends authorizing the Executive Director to negotiate a Cooperative Agreement with Caltrans, subject to final review by RTC Legal Counsel, for the environmental phase of the proposed Highway 1 Auxiliary Lanes Project between Bay Avenue/Porter Street and State Park Drive, with RTC as the implementing agency and Caltrans providing oversight; and, awarding the attached professional engineering services agreement to the top ranked firm, Mark Thomas & Company, Inc. for the environmental phase of the Highway 1 Auxiliary Lanes Project between Bay Avenue/Porter Street and State Park Drive.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Resolution – Cooperative Agreement with Caltrans
2. Resolution – Consultant Contract Award
3. Draft Contract, Scope of Services, Fee Estimate, and CPM Schedule
RESOLUTION NO.

Adopted by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
on the date of June 6, 2019
on the motion of Commissioner
duly seconded by Commissioner

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO ENTER INTO A
COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT WITH CALTRANS FOR THE PROJECT
APPROVAL/ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT (PA/ED) PHASE FOR THE HIGHWAY 1 AUXILIARY
LANES PROJECT BETWEEN BAY/PORTER AND STATE PARK

WHEREAS, Highway 1 is the most heavily traveled highway in Santa Cruz County, is
often congested and has safety concerns; and

WHEREAS, Highway 1 serves as the backbone for the movement of people and goods
through the majority of the urban area in Santa Cruz County, providing access to schools,
commercial, residential, and recreational destinations;

WHEREAS, the Measure D expenditure plan approved by voters of Santa Cruz County
in 2016 included auxiliary lanes between the Soquel Avenue/Drive and State Park Drive
interchanges;

WHEREAS, the Highway 1 Final Environmental Impact Report/Environmental
Assessment for the Tier I project was certified in January 2019, allowing Tier II project-
level analysis to begin;

WHEREAS, in January of 2019 the Commission adopted a preferred scenario for the
Highway 1, Branch Line, and Soquel Drive/Freedom Boulevard corridors as part of the
Unified Corridor Investment Study, which included implementation of auxiliary lanes and
bus on shoulder projects on Highway 1;

WHEREAS, $1.83 Million for the PA/ED phase of this project have been programmed by
the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) for FY 19/20; and

WHEREAS, in June of 2018 the RTC approved the Measure D 5-year plan for the
Highway Program which allocates funds to begin the PA/ED phase of the project in this
fiscal year;

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

1. The Executive Director is authorized to negotiate and enter into a cooperative
agreement with Caltrans for $1.83 Million in STIP funds for the Project
Approval/Environmental Document (PA/ED) phase subject to final review by RTC
Legal Counsel.

AYES: COMMISSIONERS
NOES: COMMISSIONERS

ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS

ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS

__________________________
Ed Bottorff, Chair

__________________________
Guy Preston, Secretary

Distribution: RTC Fiscal, RTC Engineer, Caltrans Project Manager
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RESOLUTION NO.

Adopted by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
on the date of June 6, 2019
on the motion of Commissioner
duly seconded by Commissioner

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO ENTER INTO A CONTRACT
WITH MARK THOMAS & COMPANY, INC. FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES FOR THE PROJECT
APPROVAL/ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT (PA/ED) PHASE FOR THE HIGHWAY 1 AUXILIARY
LANES PROJECT BETWEEN BAY/PORTER AND STATE PARK

WHEREAS, Highway 1 is the most heavily traveled highway in Santa Cruz County, is
often congested and has safety concerns; and

WHEREAS, Highway 1 serves as the backbone for the movement of people and goods
through the majority of the urban area in Santa Cruz County, providing access to schools,
commercial, residential, and recreational destinations;

WHEREAS, the Measure D expenditure plan approved by voters of Santa Cruz County
in 2016 included auxiliary lanes between Soquel Avenue/Drive and State Park Drive;

WHEREAS, the Highway 1 Final Environmental Impact Report/Environmental
Assessment for the Tier I project was approved by Caltrans in December of 2018, allowing
Tier II project-level analysis to begin;

WHEREAS, the RTC conducted procurement for professional engineering services and
selected Mark Thomas & Company, Inc for engineering services for the PA/ED phase, with
an option to amend the contract for the final design phase at a later date; and

WHEREAS, in January of 2019 the Commission adopted a preferred scenario for the
Highway 1, Branch Line, and Soquel Drive/Freedom Boulevard corridors as part of the
Unified Corridor Investment Study, which included implementation of auxiliary lanes and
bus on shoulder projects on Highway 1;

WHEREAS, in June of 2018 the RTC approved the Measure D 5-year plan for the
Highway Program which allocates funds to begin the PA/ED phase of the project in this
fiscal year; and

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

1. The Executive Director is authorized to negotiate and enter into an agreement with
Mark Thomas & Company, Inc. for an amount up to $1.83M for the PA/ED phase of
the project; and

2. The Executive Director is authorized to negotiate and execute amendments to this
agreement provided that the amendments are consistent with the RTC’s approved
budget and work program.

3. The Executive Director is authorized to negotiate and enter into a contract with the
second highest ranked consultant team, in the event that negotiations with the highest rank consultant are unsuccessful.

AYES: COMMISSIONERS

NOES: COMMISSIONERS

ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS

ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS

__________________________
Ed Bottorff, Chair

ATTEST:

__________________________
Guy Preston, Secretary

Distribution: RTC Fiscal, RTC Engineer, and Consultant Project Manager
ARTICLE I INTRODUCTION

A. This AGREEMENT is between the following named, hereinafter referred to as, CONSULTANT and the following named, hereinafter referred to as, COMMISSION:

The name of the “CONSULTANT” is as follows:
(NAME OF CONSULTANT)

Incorporated in the State of (NAME OF STATE)
The Project Manager for the “CONSULTANT” will be (NAME)

The name of the “COMMISSION” is as follows:
SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
The Contract Administrator for COMMISSION will be (NAME)

B. The work to be performed under this AGREEMENT is described in Article III Statement of Work and the approved CONSULTANT’s Cost Proposal dated (DATE). The approved CONSULTANT’s Cost Proposal is attached hereto (Attachment #) and incorporated by reference. If there is any conflict between the approved Cost Proposal and this AGREEMENT, this AGREEMENT shall take precedence.

C. CONSULTANT agrees to the fullest extent permitted by law, to indemnify, protect, defend, and hold harmless COMMISSION, its officers, officials, agents, employees and volunteers from and against any and all claims, damages, demands, liability, costs, losses and expenses of any kind, including without limitation, court costs and reasonable attorneys’ and expert witness fees, arising out of any failure to comply with applicable law, any injury to or death of any person(s), damage to property, loss of use of property, economic loss or otherwise, to the extent they arise out of, pertain to, or relate to the negligence, recklessness, or willful misconduct of CONSULTANT. The provisions of this section shall survive termination or suspension of this AGREEMENT.

D. CONSULTANT in the performance of this AGREEMENT, shall act in an independent capacity. It is understood and agreed that CONSULTANT (including CONSULTANT’s employees) is an independent contractor and that no relationship of employer-employee exists between the Parties hereto. CONSULTANT’s assigned personnel shall not be entitled to any benefits payable to employees of COMMISSION.

E. COMMISSION is not required to make any deductions or withholdings from the compensation payable to CONSULTANT under the provisions of the AGREEMENT, and is not required to issue W-2 Forms for income and employment tax purposes for any of CONSULTANT’s assigned personnel. CONSULTANT, in the performance of its obligation hereunder, is only subject to the control or direction of the COMMISSION as to the designation of tasks to be performed and the results to be accomplished.

F. Any third party person(s) employed by CONSULTANT shall be entirely and exclusively under the direction, supervision, and control of CONSULTANT. CONSULTANT hereby indemnifies and holds COMMISSION harmless from any and all claims that may be made against COMMISSION based upon any contention by any third party that an employer-employee relationship exists by reason of this AGREEMENT.

G. Except as expressly authorized herein, CONSULTANT’s obligations under this AGREEMENT are not assignable or transferable, and CONSULTANT shall not subcontract any work, without the
prior written approval of the COMMISSION. However, claims for money due or which become
due to CONSULTANT from COMMISSION under this AGREEMENT may be assigned to a
financial institution or to a trustee in bankruptcy, without such approval. Notice of any assignment
or transfer whether voluntary or involuntary shall be furnished promptly to the COMMISSION.

H. CONSULTANT shall be as fully responsible to the COMMISSION for the negligent acts and
omissions of its contractors and subcontractors or subconsultants, and of persons either directly or
indirectly employed by them, in the same manner as persons directly employed by
CONSULTANT.

I. No alteration or variation of the terms of this AGREEMENT shall be valid, unless made in writing
and signed by the parties authorized to bind the parties; and no oral understanding or agreement not
incorporated herein, shall be binding on any of the parties hereto.

J. The consideration to be paid to CONSULTANT as provided herein, shall be in compensation for all
of CONSULTANT’s expenses incurred in the performance hereof, including travel and per diem,
unless otherwise expressly so provided.

ARTICLE II CONSULTANT’S REPORTS OR MEETINGS

A. CONSULTANT shall submit progress reports at least once a month. The report should be
sufficiently detailed for the COMMISSION’s Contract Administrator to determine, if
CONSULTANT is performing to expectations, or is on schedule; to provide communication of
interim findings, and to sufficiently address any difficulties or special problems encountered, so
remedies can be developed.

B. CONSULTANT’s Project Manager shall meet with COMMISSION’s Contract Administrator, as
needed, to discuss progress on the AGREEMENT.

ARTICLE III STATEMENT OF WORK

(Insert Appropriate Statement of work including a Description of the Deliverables)

ARTICLE IV PERFORMANCE PERIOD

A. This AGREEMENT shall go into effect on (DATE), contingent upon approval by COMMISSION,
and CONSULTANT shall commence work after notification to proceed by COMMISSION’S
Contract Administrator. The AGREEMENT shall end on (DATE), unless extended by
AGREEMENT amendment.

B. CONSULTANT is advised that any recommendation for AGREEMENT award is not binding on
COMMISSION until the AGREEMENT is fully executed and approved by COMMISSION.

ARTICLE V ALLOWABLE COSTS AND PAYMENTS

A. The method of payment for this AGREEMENT will be based on actual cost plus a fixed fee.
COMMISSION will reimburse CONSULTANT for actual costs (including labor costs, employee
benefits, travel, equipment rental costs, overhead and other direct costs) incurred by CONSULTANT
in performance of the work. CONSULTANT will not be reimbursed for actual costs that exceed the
estimated wage rates, employee benefits, travel, equipment rental, overhead, and other estimated
costs set forth in the approved CONSULTANT’S Cost Proposal, unless additional reimbursement is
provided for by AGREEMENT amendment. In no event, will CONSULTANT be reimbursed for
overhead costs at a rate that exceeds COMMISSION’s approved overhead rate set forth in the Cost
Proposal. In the event, that COMMISSION determines that a change to the work from that specified
in the Cost Proposal and AGREEMENT is required, the AGREEMENT time or actual costs reimbursable by COMMISSION shall be adjusted by AGREEMENT amendment to accommodate the changed work. The maximum total cost as specified in Paragraph “I” of this Article shall not be exceeded, unless authorized by AGREEMENT amendment.

B. The indirect cost rate established for this AGREEMENT is extended through the duration of this specific AGREEMENT. CONSULTANT’s agreement to the extension of the 1-year applicable period shall not be a condition or qualification to be considered for the work or AGREEMENT award.

C. In addition to the allowable incurred costs, COMMISSION will pay CONSULTANT a fixed fee of $(AMOUNT). The fixed fee is nonadjustable for the term of the AGREEMENT, except in the event of a significant change in the scope of work and such adjustment is made by AGREEMENT amendment.

D. Reimbursement for transportation and subsistence costs shall not exceed the rates specified in the approved Cost Proposal.

E. When milestone cost estimates are included in the approved Cost Proposal, CONSULTANT shall obtain prior written approval for a revised milestone cost estimate from the Contract Administrator before exceeding such cost estimate.

F. Progress payments will be made monthly in arrears based on services provided and allowable incurred costs. A pro rata portion of CONSULTANT’s fixed fee will be included in the monthly progress payments. If CONSULTANT fails to submit the required deliverable items according to the schedule set forth in Article III Statement of Work, COMMISSION shall have the right to delay payment or terminate this AGREEMENT.

G. No payment will be made prior to approval of any work, nor for any work performed prior to approval of this AGREEMENT.

H. CONSULTANT will be reimbursed promptly according to California Regulations upon receipt by COMMISSION’s Contract Administrator of itemized invoices in duplicate. Invoices shall be submitted no later than thirty (30) calendar days after the performance of work for which CONSULTANT is billing. Invoices shall detail the work performed on each milestone and each project as applicable. Invoices shall follow the format stipulated for the approved Cost Proposal and shall reference this AGREEMENT number and project title. Final invoice must contain the final cost and all credits due COMMISSION including any equipment purchased under the provisions of Article XI Equipment Purchase. The final invoice should be submitted within sixty (60) calendar days after completion of CONSULTANT’s work. Invoices shall be mailed to COMMISSION’s Contract Administrator at the following address:

SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION/
(NAME OF CONTRACT ADMINISTRATOR)
1523 Pacific Avenue
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

I. The total amount payable by COMMISSION including the fixed fee shall not exceed $(Amount).

J. Salary increases will be reimbursable if the new salary is within the salary range identified in the approved Cost Proposal and is approved by COMMISSION’s Contract Administrator.
K. For personnel subject to prevailing wage rates as described in the California Labor Code, all salary increases, which are the direct result of changes in the prevailing wage rates are reimbursable.

ARTICLE VI TERMINATION
A. This AGREEMENT may be terminated by COMMISSION, provided that COMMISSION gives not less than thirty (30) calendar days’ written notice (delivered by certified mail, return receipt requested) of intent to terminate. Upon termination, COMMISSION shall be entitled to all work, including but not limited to, reports, investigations, appraisals, inventories, studies, analyses, drawings and data estimates performed to that date, whether completed or not, and in accordance with Article XXVI OWNERSHIP OF DATA.

B. COMMISSION may temporarily suspend this AGREEMENT, at no additional cost to COMMISSION, provided that CONSULTANT is given written notice (delivered by certified mail, return receipt requested) of temporary suspension. If COMMISSION gives such notice of temporary suspension, CONSULTANT shall immediately suspend its activities under this AGREEMENT. A temporary suspension may be issued concurrent with the notice of termination provided for in subsection A of this section.

C. Notwithstanding any provisions of this AGREEMENT, CONSULTANT shall not be relieved of liability to COMMISSION for damages sustained by COMMISSION by virtue of any breach of this AGREEMENT by CONSULTANT, and COMMISSION may withhold any payments due to CONSULTANT until such time as the exact amount of damages, if any, due COMMISSION from CONSULTANT is determined.

D. In the event of termination, CONSULTANT shall be compensated as provided for in this AGREEMENT, except as provided in Article XI, subsection C. Upon termination, COMMISSION shall be entitled to all work, including but not limited to, reports, investigations, appraisals, inventories, studies, analyses, drawings and data estimates performed to that date, whether completed or not, and in accordance with Article XXVI OWNERSHIP OF DATA.

ARTICLE VII COST PRINCIPLES AND ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENTS
A. The CONSULTANT agrees that 48 CFR Part 31, Contract Cost Principles and Procedures, shall be used to determine the allowability of individual terms of cost.

B. The CONSULTANT also agrees to comply with Federal procedures in accordance with 2 CFR Part 200, Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards.

C. Any costs for which payment has been made to the CONSULTANT that are determined by subsequent audit to be unallowable under 48 CFR Part 31 or 2 CFR Part 200 are subject to repayment by the CONSULTANT to COMMISSION.

D. When a CONSULTANT or Subconsultant is a Non-Profit Organization or an Institution of Higher Education, the Cost Principles for Title 2 CFR Part 200, Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards shall apply.

ARTICLE VIII RETENTION OF RECORD/AUDITS
For the purpose of determining compliance with Gov. Code § 8546.7, the CONSULTANT, Subconsultants, and COMMISSION shall maintain all books, documents, papers, accounting records, Independent CPA Audited Indirect Cost Rate workpapers, and other evidence pertaining to
the performance of the AGREEMENT including, but not limited to, the costs of administering the AGREEMENT. All parties, including the CONSULTANT’s Independent CPA, shall make such workpapers and materials available at their respective offices at all reasonable times during the AGREEMENT period and for three (3) years from the date of final payment under the AGREEMENT. COMMISSION, Caltrans Auditor, FHWA, or any duly authorized representative of the Federal government having jurisdiction under Federal laws or regulations (including the basis of Federal funding in whole or in part) shall have access to any books, records, and documents of the CONSULTANT, Subconsultants, and the CONSULTANT’s Independent CPA, that are pertinent to the AGREEMENT for audits, examinations, workpaper review, excerpts, and transactions, and copies thereof shall be furnished if requested without limitation.

ARTICLE IX AUDIT REVIEW PROCEDURES

A. Any dispute concerning a question of fact arising under an interim or post audit of this AGREEMENT that is not disposed of by AGREEMENT, shall be reviewed by COMMISSION’S Chief Financial Officer.

B. Not later than thirty (30) calendar days after issuance of the final audit report, CONSULTANT may request a review by COMMISSION’S Chief Financial Officer of unresolved audit issues. The request for review will be submitted in writing.

C. Neither the pendency of a dispute nor its consideration by COMMISSION will excuse CONSULTANT from full and timely performance, in accordance with the terms of this AGREEMENT.

D. CONSULTANT and subconsultant AGREEMENTs, including cost proposals and Indirect Cost Rates (ICR), may be subject to audits or reviews such as, but not limited to, an AGREEMENT audit, an incurred cost audit, an ICR Audit, or a CPA ICR audit work paper review. If selected for audit or review, the AGREEMENT, cost proposal and ICR and related work papers, if applicable, will be reviewed to verify compliance with 48 CFR Part 31 and other related laws and regulations. In the instances of a CPA ICR audit work paper review it is CONSULTANT’s responsibility to ensure federal, COMMISSION, or local government officials are allowed full access to the CPA’s work papers including making copies as necessary. The AGREEMENT, cost proposal, and ICR shall be adjusted by CONSULTANT and approved by the COMMISSION Contract Administrator to conform to the Work Paper Review recommendations included in the management letter or audit recommendations included in the audit report. Refusal by the CONSULTANT to incorporate the Work Paper Review recommendations included in the management letter or audit recommendations included in the audit report will be considered a breach of AGREEMENT terms and cause for termination of the AGREEMENT and disallowance of prior reimbursed costs.

E. CONSULTANT’s Cost Proposal may be subject to a CPA ICR Audit Work Paper Review and/or audit by Caltrans Audits and Investigation (A&I). Caltrans A&I, at its sole discretion, may review and/or audit and approve the CPA ICR documentation. The Cost Proposal shall be adjusted by the CONSULTANT and approved by the COMMISSION Contract Administrator to conform to the Work Paper Review recommendations included in the management letter or audit recommendations included in the audit report. Refusal by the CONSULTANT to incorporate the Work Paper Review recommendations included in the management letter or audit recommendations included in the audit report will be considered a breach of the AGREEMENT terms and cause for termination of the AGREEMENT and disallowance of prior reimbursed costs.
1. During Caltrans A&I’s review of the ICR audit work papers created by the CONSULTANT’s independent CPA, Caltrans A&I will work with the CPA and/or CONSULTANT toward a resolution of issues that arise during the review. Each party agrees to use its best efforts to resolve any audit disputes in a timely manner. If Caltrans A&I identifies significant issues during the review and is unable to issue a cognizant approval letter, COMMISSION will reimburse the CONSULTANT at an accepted ICR until a FAR (Federal Acquisition Regulation) compliant ICR {e.g. 48 CFR Part 31; GAGAS (Generally Accepted Auditing Standards); CAS (Cost Accounting Standards), if applicable; in accordance with procedures and guidelines of the American Association of State Highways and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) Audit Guide; and other applicable procedures and guidelines} is received and approved by A&I.

Accepted rates will be as follows:

a. If the proposed rate is less than one hundred fifty percent (150%) - the accepted rate reimbursed will be ninety percent (90%) of the proposed rate.

b. If the proposed rate is between one hundred fifty percent (150%) and two hundred percent (200%) - the accepted rate will be eighty-five percent (85%) of the proposed rate.

c. If the proposed rate is greater than two hundred percent (200%) - the accepted rate will be seventy-five percent (75%) of the proposed rate.

2. If Caltrans A&I is unable to issue a cognizant letter per paragraph E.1. above, Caltrans A&I may require CONSULTANT to submit a revised independent CPA-audited ICR and audit report within three (3) months of the effective date of the management letter. Caltrans A&I will then have up to six (6) months to review the CONSULTANT’s and/or the independent CPA’s revisions.

3. If the CONSULTANT fails to comply with the provisions of this paragraph E, or if Caltrans A&I is still unable to issue a cognizant approval letter after the revised independent CPA audited ICR is submitted, overhead cost reimbursement will be limited to the accepted ICR that was established upon initial rejection of the ICR and set forth in paragraph E.1. above for all rendered services. In this event, this accepted ICR will become the actual and final ICR for reimbursement purposes under this AGREEMENT.

4. CONSULTANT may submit to COMMISSION final invoice only when all of the following items have occurred: (1) Caltrans A&I accepts or adjusts the original or revised independent CPA audited ICR; (2) all work under this AGREEMENT has been completed to the satisfaction of COMMISSION; and, (3) Caltrans A&I has issued its final ICR review letter. The CONSULTANT MUST SUBMIT ITS FINAL INVOICE TO COMMISSION no later than sixty (60) calendar days after occurrence of the last of these items. The accepted ICR will apply to this AGREEMENT and all other agreements executed between COMMISSION and the CONSULTANT, either as a prime or subconsultant, with the same fiscal period ICR.

ARTICLE X SUBCONTRACTING
A. Nothing contained in this AGREEMENT or otherwise, shall create any contractual relation between the COMMISSION and any Subconsultants, and no subagreement shall relieve the CONSULTANT of its responsibilities and obligations hereunder. The CONSULTANT agrees to be as fully responsible to the COMMISSION for the acts and omissions of its Subconsultants and of persons either directly or indirectly employed by any of them as it is for the acts and omissions of persons
directly employed by the CONSULTANT. The CONSULTANT's obligation to pay its Subconsultants is an independent obligation from the COMMISSION's obligation to make payments to the CONSULTANT.

B. The CONSULTANT shall perform the work contemplated with resources available within its own organization and no portion of the work shall be subcontracted without written authorization by the COMMISSION Contract Administrator, except that which is expressly identified in the CONSULTANT’s approved Cost Proposal.

C. Any subagreement entered into as a result of this AGREEMENT, shall contain all the provisions stipulated in this entire AGREEMENT to be applicable to Subconsultants unless otherwise noted.

D. CONSULTANT shall pay its Subconsultants within Fifteen (15) calendar days from receipt of each payment made to the CONSULTANT by the COMMISSION.

E. Any substitution of Subconsultants must be approved in writing by the COMMISSION Contract Administrator in advance of assigning work to a substitute Subconsultant.

ARTICLE XI EQUIPMENT PURCHASE AND OTHER CAPITAL EXPENDITURES

A. Prior authorization in writing by COMMISSION’s Contract Administrator shall be required before CONSULTANT enters into any unbudgeted purchase order, or subcontract exceeding five thousand dollars ($5,000) for supplies, equipment, or CONSULTANT services. CONSULTANT shall provide an evaluation of the necessity or desirability of incurring such costs.

B. For purchase of any item, service, or consulting work not covered in CONSULTANT’s approved Cost Proposal and exceeding five thousand dollars ($5,000), with prior authorization by COMMISSION’s Contract Administrator, three competitive quotations must be submitted with the request, or the absence of bidding must be adequately justified.

C. Any equipment purchased with funds provided under the terms of this AGREEMENT is subject to the following:

1. CONSULTANT shall maintain an inventory of all nonexpendable property. Nonexpendable property is defined as having a useful life of at least two years and an acquisition cost of five thousand dollars ($5,000) or more. If the purchased equipment needs replacement and is sold or traded in, COMMISSION shall receive a proper refund or credit at the conclusion of the AGREEMENT, or if the AGREEMENT is terminated, CONSULTANT may either keep the equipment and credit COMMISSION in an amount equal to its fair market value, or sell such equipment at the best price obtainable at a public or private sale, in accordance with established COMMISSION procedures; and credit COMMISSION in an amount equal to the sales price. If CONSULTANT elects to keep the equipment, fair market value shall be determined at CONSULTANT’s expense, on the basis of a competent independent appraisal of such equipment. Appraisals shall be obtained from an appraiser mutually agreeable to by COMMISSION and CONSULTANT, if it is determined to sell the equipment, the terms and conditions of such sale must be approved in advance by COMMISSION.

2. Regulation 2 CFR Part 200 requires a credit to Federal funds when participating equipment with a fair market value greater than five thousand dollars ($5,000) is credited to the project.
ARTICLE XII STATE PREVAILING WAGE RATES

A. No CONSULTANT or Subconsultant may be awarded an AGREEMENT containing public work elements unless registered with the Department of Industrial Relations (DIR) pursuant to Labor Code §1725.5. Registration with DIR must be maintained throughout the entire term of this AGREEMENT, including any subsequent amendments.

B. The CONSULTANT shall comply with all of the applicable provisions of the California Labor Code requiring the payment of prevailing wages. The General Prevailing Wage Rate Determinations applicable to work under this AGREEMENT are available and on file with the Department of Transportation's Regional/District Labor Compliance Officer (http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/construc/LaborCompliance/documents/District-Region_Map_Construction_7-8-15.pdf). These wage rates are made a specific part of this AGREEMENT by reference pursuant to Labor Code §1773.2 and will be applicable to work performed at a construction project site. Prevailing wages will be applicable to all inspection work performed at COMMISSION construction sites, at COMMISSION facilities and at off-site locations that are set up by the construction contractor or one of its subcontractors solely and specifically to serve COMMISSION projects. Prevailing wage requirements do not apply to inspection work performed at the facilities of vendors and commercial materials suppliers that provide goods and services to the general public.

C. General Prevailing Wage Rate Determinations applicable to this project may also be obtained from the Department of Industrial Relations Internet site at http://www.dir.ca.gov.

D. Payroll Records
1. Each CONSULTANT and Subconsultant shall keep accurate certified payroll records and supporting documents as mandated by Labor Code §1776 and as defined in 8 CCR §16000 showing the name, address, social security number, work classification, straight time and overtime hours worked each day and week, and the actual per diem wages paid to each journeyman, apprentice, worker, or other employee employed by the CONSULTANT or Subconsultant in connection with the public work. Each payroll record shall contain or be verified by a written declaration that it is made under penalty of perjury, stating both of the following:
   a. The information contained in the payroll record is true and correct.
   b. The employer has complied with the requirements of Labor Code §1771, §1811, and §1815 for any work performed by his or her employees on the public works project.

2. The payroll records enumerated under paragraph (1) above shall be certified as correct by the CONSULTANT under penalty of perjury. The payroll records and all supporting documents shall be made available for inspection and copying by COMMISSION representative’s at all reasonable hours at the principal office of the CONSULTANT. The CONSULTANT shall provide copies of certified payrolls or permit inspection of its records as follows:
   a. A certified copy of an employee's payroll record shall be made available for inspection or furnished to the employee or the employee's authorized representative on request.
   b. A certified copy of all payroll records enumerated in paragraph (1) above, shall be made available for inspection or furnished upon request to a representative of COMMISSION, the Division of Labor Standards Enforcement and the Division of Apprenticeship Standards of the Department of Industrial Relations. Certified payrolls submitted to COMMISSION, the Division
of Labor Standards Enforcement and the Division of Apprenticeship Standards shall not be altered or obliterated by the CONSULTANT.

c. The public shall not be given access to certified payroll records by the CONSULTANT. The CONSULTANT is required to forward any requests for certified payrolls to the COMMISSION Contract Administrator by both email and regular mail on the business day following receipt of the request.

3. Each CONSULTANT shall submit a certified copy of the records enumerated in paragraph (1) above, to the entity that requested the records within ten (10) calendar days after receipt of a written request.

4. Any copy of records made available for inspection as copies and furnished upon request to the public or any public agency by COMMISSION shall be marked or obliterated in such a manner as to prevent disclosure of each individual's name, address, and social security number. The name and address of the CONSULTANT or Subconsultant performing the work shall not be marked or obliterated.

5. The CONSULTANT shall inform COMMISSION of the location of the records enumerated under paragraph (1) above, including the street address, city and county, and shall, within five (5) working days, provide a notice of a change of location and address.

6. The CONSULTANT or Subconsultant shall have ten (10) calendar days in which to comply subsequent to receipt of written notice requesting the records enumerated in paragraph (1) above. In the event the CONSULTANT or Subconsultant fails to comply within the ten (10) day period, he or she shall, as a penalty to COMMISSION, forfeit one hundred dollars ($100) for each calendar day, or portion thereof, for each worker, until strict compliance is effectuated. Such penalties shall be withheld by COMMISSION from payments then due. CONSULTANT is not subject to a penalty assessment pursuant to this section due to the failure of a Subconsultant to comply with this section.

E. When prevailing wage rates apply, the CONSULTANT is responsible for verifying compliance with certified payroll requirements. Invoice payment will not be made until the invoice is approved by the COMMISSION Contract Administrator.

F. Penalty
1. The CONSULTANT and any of its Subconsultants shall comply with Labor Code §§1774 and §1775. Pursuant to Labor Code §1775, the CONSULTANT and any Subconsultant shall forfeit to the COMMISSION a penalty of not more than two hundred dollars ($200) for each calendar day, or portion thereof, for each worker paid less than the prevailing rates as determined by the Director of DIR for the work or craft in which the worker is employed for any public work done under the AGREEMENT by the CONSULTANT or by its Subconsultant in violation of the requirements of the Labor Code and in particular, Labor Code §§1770 to 1780, inclusive.

2. The amount of this forfeiture shall be determined by the Labor Commissioner and shall be based on consideration of mistake, inadvertence, or neglect of the CONSULTANT or Subconsultant in failing to pay the correct rate of prevailing wages, or the previous record of the CONSULTANT or Subconsultant in meeting their respective prevailing wage obligations, or the willful failure by the CONSULTANT or Subconsultant to pay the correct rates of prevailing wages. A mistake, inadvertence, or neglect in failing to pay the correct rates of prevailing wages is not excusable if the CONSULTANT or Subconsultant had knowledge of the obligations under the Labor Code. The CONSULTANT is responsible for paying the appropriate rate, including any escalations that take place during the term of the AGREEMENT.
3. In addition to the penalty and pursuant to Labor Code §1775, the difference between the prevailing wage rates and the amount paid to each worker for each calendar day or portion thereof for which each worker was paid less than the prevailing wage rate shall be paid to each worker by the CONSULTANT or Subconsultant.

4. If a worker employed by a Subconsultant on a public works project is not paid the general prevailing per diem wages by the Subconsultant, the prime CONSULTANT of the project is not liable for the penalties described above unless the prime CONSULTANT had knowledge of that failure of the Subconsultant to pay the specified prevailing rate of wages to those workers or unless the prime CONSULTANT fails to comply with all of the following requirements:

a. The AGREEMENT executed between the CONSULTANT and the Subconsultant for the performance of work on public works projects shall include a copy of the requirements in Labor Code §§ 1771, 1775, 1776, 1777.5, 1813, and 1815.

b. The CONSULTANT shall monitor the payment of the specified general prevailing rate of per diem wages by the Subconsultant to the employees by periodic review of the certified payroll records of the Subconsultant.

c. Upon becoming aware of the Subconsultant’s failure to pay the specified prevailing rate of wages to the Subconsultant’s workers, the CONSULTANT shall diligently take corrective action to halt or rectify the failure, including but not limited to, retaining sufficient funds due the Subconsultant for work performed on the public works project.

d. Prior to making final payment to the Subconsultant for work performed on the public works project, the CONSULTANT shall obtain an affidavit signed under penalty of perjury from the Subconsultant that the Subconsultant had paid the specified general prevailing rate of per diem wages to the Subconsultant’s employees on the public works project and any amounts due pursuant to Labor Code §1813.

5. Pursuant to Labor Code §1775, COMMISSION shall notify the CONSULTANT on a public works project within fifteen (15) calendar days of receipt of a complaint that a Subconsultant has failed to pay workers the general prevailing rate of per diem wages.

6. If COMMISSION determines that employees of a Subconsultant were not paid the general prevailing rate of per diem wages and if COMMISSION did not retain sufficient money under the AGREEMENT to pay those employees the balance of wages owed under the general prevailing rate of per diem wages, the CONSULTANT shall withhold an amount of moneys due the Subconsultant sufficient to pay those employees the general prevailing rate of per diem wages if requested by COMMISSION.

G. Hours of Labor

Eight (8) hours labor constitutes a legal day's work. The CONSULTANT shall forfeit, as a penalty to the COMMISSION, twenty-five dollars ($25) for each worker employed in the execution of the AGREEMENT by the CONSULTANT or any of its Subconsultants for each calendar day during which such worker is required or permitted to work more than eight (8) hours in any one calendar day and forty (40) hours in any one calendar week in violation of the provisions of the Labor Code, and in particular §§1810 to 1815 thereof, inclusive, except that work performed by employees in excess of eight (8) hours per day, and forty (40) hours during any one week, shall be permitted upon compensation for all hours worked in excess of eight (8) hours per day and forty (40) hours in any week, at not less than one and one-half (1.5) times the basic rate of pay, as provided in §1815.

H. Employment of Apprentices
1. Where either the prime AGREEMENT or the subagreement exceeds thirty thousand dollars ($30,000), the CONSULTANT and any subconsultants under him or her shall comply with all applicable requirements of Labor Code §§ 1777.5, 1777.6 and 1777.7 in the employment of apprentices.

2. CONSULTANT and subconsultants are required to comply with all Labor Code requirements regarding the employment of apprentices, including mandatory ratios of journey level to apprentice workers. Prior to commencement of work, CONSULTANT and subconsultants are advised to contact the DIR Division of Apprenticeship Standards website at https://www.dir.ca.gov/das/, for additional information regarding the employment of apprentices and for the specific journey-to-apprentice ratios for the AGREEMENT work. The CONSULTANT is responsible for all subconsultants’ compliance with these requirements. Penalties are specified in Labor Code §1777.7.

ARTICLE XIII CONFLICT OF INTEREST

A. During the term of this AGREEMENT, the CONSULTANT shall disclose any financial, business, or other relationship with COMMISSION that may have an impact upon the outcome of this AGREEMENT or any ensuing COMMISSION construction project. The CONSULTANT shall also list current clients who may have a financial interest in the outcome of this AGREEMENT or any ensuing COMMISSION construction project which will follow.

B. CONSULTANT certifies that it has disclosed to COMMISSION any actual, apparent, or potential conflicts of interest that may exist relative to the services to be provided pursuant to this AGREEMENT. CONSULTANT agrees to advise COMMISSION of any actual, apparent or potential conflicts of interest that may develop subsequent to the date of execution of this AGREEMENT. CONSULTANT further agrees to complete any statements of economic interest if required by either COMMISSION ordinance or State law.

C. The CONSULTANT hereby certifies that it does not now have nor shall it acquire any financial or business interest that would conflict with the performance of services under this AGREEMENT.

D. The CONSULTANT hereby certifies that the CONSULTANT or subconsultant and any firm affiliated with the CONSULTANT or subconsultant that bids on any construction contract or on any Agreement to provide construction inspection for any construction project resulting from this AGREEMENT, has established necessary controls to ensure a conflict of interest does not exist. An affiliated firm is one, which is subject to the control of the same persons, through joint ownership or otherwise.

ARTICLE XIV REBATES, KICKBACKS OR OTHER UNLAWFUL CONSIDERATION

The CONSULTANT warrants that this AGREEMENT was not obtained or secured through rebates, kickbacks or other unlawful consideration either promised or paid to any COMMISSION employee. For breach or violation of this warranty, COMMISSION shall have the right, in its discretion, to terminate this AGREEMENT without liability, to pay only for the value of the work actually performed, or to deduct from this AGREEMENT price or otherwise recover the full amount of such rebate, kickback or other unlawful consideration.
ARTICLE XV PROHIBITION OF EXPENDING COMMISSION, STATE, OR FEDERAL FUNDS FOR LOBBYING

A. The CONSULTANT certifies, to the best of his or her knowledge and belief, that:

1. No State, Federal, or COMMISSION appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid, by or on behalf of the CONSULTANT, to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any local, State, or Federal agency, a Member of the State Legislature or United States Congress, an officer or employee of the Legislature or Congress, or any employee of a Member of the Legislature or Congress in connection with the awarding or making of this AGREEMENT, or with the extension, continuation, renewal, amendment, or modification of this AGREEMENT.

2. If any funds other than Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a member of Congress in connection with this AGREEMENT, the CONSULTANT shall complete and submit Standard Form-LLL, “Disclosure Form to Report Lobbying,” in accordance with its instructions.

B. This certification is a material representation of fact upon which reliance was placed when this transaction was made or entered into. Submission of this certification is a prerequisite for making or entering into this transaction imposed by 31 U.S.C. §1352. Any person who fails to file the required certification shall be subject to a civil penalty of not less than ten thousand dollars ($10,000) and not more than one hundred thousand dollars ($100,000) for each such failure.

C. The CONSULTANT also agrees by signing this document that he or she shall require that the language of this certification be included in all lower tier subagreements, which exceed one hundred thousand dollars ($100,000), and that all such subrecipients shall certify and disclose accordingly.

ARTICLE XVI NON-DISCRIMINATION CLAUSE AND STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE

A. The CONSULTANT’s signature affixed herein and dated shall constitute a certification under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the CONSULTANT has, unless exempt, complied with the nondiscrimination program requirements of Gov. Code §12990 and 2 CCR § 8103.

B. During the performance of this AGREEMENT, CONSULTANT and its subconsultants shall not deny the AGREEMENT's benefits to any person on the basis of race, religious creed, color, national origin, ancestry, physical disability, mental disability, medical condition, genetic information, marital status, sex, gender, gender identity, gender expression, age, sexual orientation, or military and veteran status, nor shall they unlawfully discriminate, harass, or allow harassment against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, religious creed, color, national origin, ancestry, physical disability, mental disability, medical condition, genetic information, marital status, sex, gender, gender identity, gender expression, age, sexual orientation, or military and veteran status. CONSULTANT and subconsultants shall insure that the evaluation and treatment of their employees and applicants for employment are free from such discrimination and harassment.

C. CONSULTANT and subconsultants shall comply with the provisions of the Fair Employment and Housing Act (Gov. Code §12990 et seq.), the applicable regulations promulgated there under (2 CCR §11000 et seq.), the provisions of Gov. Code §§11135-11139.5, and the regulations or standards adopted by COMMISSION to implement such article. The applicable regulations of the
Fair Employment and Housing Commission implementing Gov. Code §12990 (a-f), set forth 2 CCR §§8100-8504, are incorporated into this AGREEMENT by reference and made a part hereof as if set forth in full.

D. CONSULTANT shall permit access by representatives of the Department of Fair Employment and Housing and the COMMISSION upon reasonable notice at any time during the normal business hours, but in no case less than twenty-four (24) hours’ notice, to such of its books, records, accounts, and all other sources of information and its facilities as said Department or COMMISSION shall require to ascertain compliance with this clause.

E. CONSULTANT and its subconsultants shall give written notice of their obligations under this clause to labor organizations with which they have a collective bargaining or other Agreement.

F. CONSULTANT shall include the nondiscrimination and compliance provisions of this clause in all subcontracts to perform work under this AGREEMENT.

G. The CONSULTANT, with regard to the work performed under this AGREEMENT, shall act in accordance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. §2000d et seq.). Title VI provides that the recipients of federal assistance will implement and maintain a policy of nondiscrimination in which no person in the United States shall, on the basis of race, color, national origin, religion, sex, age, disability, be excluded from participation in, denied the benefits of or subject to discrimination under any program or activity by the recipients of federal assistance or their assignees and successors in interest.

H. The CONSULTANT shall comply with regulations relative to non-discrimination in federally-assisted programs of the U.S. Department of Transportation (49 CFR Part 21 - Effectuation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964). Specifically, the CONSULTANT shall not participate either directly or indirectly in the discrimination prohibited by 49 CFR §21.5, including employment practices and the selection and retention of Subconsultants.

ARTICLE XVII DEBARMENT AND SUSPENSION CERTIFICATION

A. The CONSULTANT’s signature affixed herein shall constitute a certification under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California, that the CONSULTANT or any person associated therewith in the capacity of owner, partner, director, officer or manager:

1. Is not currently under suspension, debarment, voluntary exclusion, or determination of ineligibility by any federal agency;

2. Has not been suspended, debarred, voluntarily excluded, or determined ineligible by any federal agency within the past three (3) years;

3. Does not have a proposed debarment pending; and

4. Has not been indicted, convicted, or had a civil judgment rendered against it by a court of competent jurisdiction in any matter involving fraud or official misconduct within the past three (3) years.

B. Any exceptions to this certification must be disclosed to COMMISSION. Exceptions will not necessarily result in denial of recommendation for award, but will be considered in determining
responsibility. Disclosures must indicate the party to whom the exceptions apply, the initiating agency, and the dates of agency action.

C. Exceptions to the Federal Government Excluded Parties List System maintained by the U.S. General Services Administration are to be determined by FHWA.

ARTICLE XVIII DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS ENTERPRISES (DBE) PARTICIPATION

A. This AGREEMENT is subject to 49 CFR Part 26 entitled “Participation by Disadvantaged Business Enterprises in Department of Transportation Financial Assistance Programs”. CONSULTANTS who enter into a federally-funded agreement will assist the COMMISSION in a good faith effort to achieve California's statewide overall DBE goal.

B. The goal for DBE participation for this AGREEMENT is __________ %. Participation by DBE CONSULTANT or subconsultants shall be in accordance with information contained in Exhibit 10-O1: Consultant Proposal DBE Commitment, or in Exhibit 10-O2: Consultant Contract DBE Commitment attached hereto and incorporated as part of the AGREEMENT. If a DBE subconsultant is unable to perform, CONSULTANT must make a good faith effort to replace him/her with another DBE subconsultant, if the goal is not otherwise met.

C. CONSULTANT can meet the DBE participation goal by either documenting commitments to DBEs to meet the AGREEMENT goal, or by documenting adequate good faith efforts to meet the AGREEMENT goal. An adequate good faith effort means that the CONSULTANT must show that it took all necessary and reasonable steps to achieve a DBE goal that, by their scope, intensity, and appropriateness to the objective, could reasonably be expected to meet the DBE goal. If CONSULTANT has not met the DBE goal, complete and submit Exhibit 15-H: DBE Information – Good Faith Efforts to document efforts to meet the goal. Refer to 49 CFR Part 26 for guidance regarding evaluation of good faith efforts to meet the DBE goal.

D. DBEs and other small businesses, as defined in 49 CFR Part 26 are encouraged to participate in the performance of AGREEMENTs financed in whole or in part with federal funds. The COMMISSION, CONSULTANT or subconsultant shall not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, or sex in the performance of this contract. The CONSULTANT shall carry out applicable requirements of 49 CFR part 26 in the award and administration of DOT-assisted contracts. Failure by the CONSULTANT to carry out these requirements is a material breach of this AGREEMENT, which may result in the termination of this AGREEMENT or such other remedy as the COMMISSION deems appropriate, which may include, but is not limited to:

(1) Withholding monthly progress payments;
(2) Assessing sanctions;
(3) Liquidated damages; and/or
(4) Disqualifying the contractor from future bidding as non-responsible

E. A DBE firm may be terminated only with prior written approval from COMMISSION and only for the reasons specified in 49 CFR §26.53(f). Prior to requesting COMMISSION consent for the termination, CONSULTANT must meet the procedural requirements specified in 49 CFR §26.53(f). If a DBE subconsultant is unable to perform, CONSULTANT must make a good faith effort to replace him/her with another DBE subconsultant, if the goal is not otherwise met.
F. Consultant shall not be entitled to any payment for such work or material unless it is performed or supplied by the listed DBE or by other forces (including those of Consultant) pursuant to prior written authorization of the COMMISSION’s Contract Administrator.

G. A DBE is only eligible to be counted toward the AGREEMENT goal if it performs a commercially useful function (CUF) on the AGREEMENT. CUF must be evaluated on an agreement by agreement basis. A DBE performs a Commercially Useful Function (CUF) when it is responsible for execution of the work of the AGREEMENT and is carrying out its responsibilities by actually performing, managing, and supervising the work involved. To perform a CUF, the DBE must also be responsible, with respect to materials and supplies used on the AGREEMENT, for negotiating price, determining quality and quantity, ordering the material and installing (where applicable), and paying for the material itself. To determine whether a DBE is performing a CUF, evaluate the amount of work subcontracted, industry practices, whether the amount the firm is to be paid under the AGREEMENT is commensurate with the work it is actually performing, and other relevant factors.

H. A DBE does not perform a CUF if its role is limited to that of an extra participant in a transaction, AGREEMENT, or project through which funds are passed in order to obtain the appearance of DBE participation. In determining whether a DBE is such an extra participant, examine similar transactions, particularly those in which DBEs do not participate.

I. If a DBE does not perform or exercise responsibility for at least thirty percent (30%) of the total cost of its AGREEMENT with its own work force, or the DBE subcontracts a greater portion of the work of the AGREEMENT than would be expected on the basis of normal industry practice for the type of work involved, it will be presumed that it is not performing a CUF.

J. CONSULTANT shall maintain records of materials purchased or supplied from all subcontracts entered into with certified DBEs. The records shall show the name and business address of each DBE or vendor and the total dollar amount actually paid each DBE or vendor, regardless of tier. The records shall show the date of payment and the total dollar figure paid to all firms. DBE prime CONSULTANT’s shall also show the date of work performed by their own forces along with the corresponding dollar value of the work.

K. Upon completion of the AGREEMENT, a summary of these records shall be prepared and submitted on the form entitled, Exhibit 17-F: Final Report-Utilization of Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) First-Tier Subconsultants, certified correct by CONSULTANT or CONSULTANT’s authorized representative and shall be furnished to the Contract Administrator with the final invoice. Failure to provide the summary of DBE payments with the final invoice will result in twenty-five percent (25%) of the dollar value of the invoice being withheld from payment until the form is submitted. The amount will be returned to CONSULTANT when a satisfactory “Final Report-Utilization of Disadvantaged Business Enterprises (DBE), First-Tier Subconsultants” is submitted to the Contract Administrator.

L. If a DBE subconsultant is decertified during the life of the AGREEMENT, the decertified subconsultant shall notify CONSULTANT in writing with the date of decertification. If a subconsultant becomes a certified DBE during the life of the AGREEMENT, the subconsultant shall notify CONSULTANT in writing with the date of certification. Any changes should be reported to COMMISSION’s Contract Administrator within thirty (30) calendar days.

M. Any subcontract entered into as a result of this AGREEMENT shall contain all of the provisions of this section.
ARTICLE XIX INSURANCE

A. Prior to commencement of the work described herein, CONSULTANT shall furnish COMMISSION a Certificate of Insurance stating that there is presently in effect for CONSULTANT:
   1. General comprehensive liability insurance with a combined single limit (CSL) of not less than one million dollars ($1,000,000) per occurrence.
   2. Worker’s Compensation insurance in the minimum statutorily required coverage amount.
   3. Professional Liability Insurance in the minimum amount of $1,000,000 combined single limit.
   3. Automobile Liability Insurance for each of CONSULTANT’s vehicles used in the performance of this Agreement, including owned, non-owned (e.g. owned by CONSULTANT’s employees), leased or hired vehicles, in the minimum amount of $500,000 combined single limit per occurrence for bodily injury and property damage.

B. The Certificate of Insurance will provide:

1. That the insurer will not cancel the insured’s coverage without thirty (30) calendar days prior written notice to COMMISSION.

2. All required Automobile and Comprehensive or Commercial General Liability Insurance shall be endorsed to contain the following clause:

   “Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission, its officials, employees, agents and volunteers are added as an additional insured as respects the operations and activities of, or on behalf of, the named insured performed under Agreement with the Commission.”

3. That COMMISSION will not be responsible for any premiums or assessments on the policy.

C. CONSULTANT agrees that the insurance herein provided for, shall be in effect at all times during the term of this AGREEMENT. In the event said insurance coverage expires at any time or times during the term of this AGREEMENT, CONSULTANT agrees to provide at least thirty (30) calendar days prior notice to said expiration date; and a new Certificate of Insurance evidencing insurance coverage as provided for herein, for not less than either the remainder of the term of the AGREEMENT, or for a period of not less than one (1) year. New Certificates of Insurance are subject to the approval of COMMISSION. In the event CONSULTANT fails to keep in effect at all times insurance coverage as herein provided, COMMISSION may, in addition to any other remedies it may have, terminate this AGREEMENT upon occurrence of such event.

D. If any insurance coverage required in this Agreement is provided on a “Claims Made” rather than “Occurrence” form, CONSULTANT agrees to maintain the required coverage for a period of three (3) years after the expiration of this Agreement (hereinafter “post agreement coverage”) and any extensions thereof. CONSULTANT may maintain the required post agreement coverage by renewal or purchase of prior acts or tail coverage. This provision is contingent upon post agreement coverage being both available and reasonably affordable in relation to the coverage provided during the term of this Agreement. For purposes of interpreting this requirement, a cost not exceeding 100% of the last annual policy premium during the term of this Agreement in order to purchase prior acts or tail coverage for post agreement coverage shall be deemed to be reasonable.
ARTICLE XX FUNDING REQUIREMENTS
A. It is mutually understood between the parties that this AGREEMENT may have been written before ascertaining the availability of funds or appropriation of funds, for the mutual benefit of both parties, in order to avoid program and fiscal delays that would occur if the AGREEMENT were executed after that determination was made.

B. This AGREEMENT is valid and enforceable only, if sufficient funds are made available to COMMISSION for the purpose of this AGREEMENT. In addition, this AGREEMENT is subject to any additional restrictions, limitations, conditions, or any statute enacted by the Congress, State Legislature, or COMMISSION governing board that may affect the provisions, terms, or funding of this AGREEMENT in any manner.

C. It is mutually agreed that if sufficient funds are not appropriated, this AGREEMENT may be amended to reflect any reduction in funds.

D. COMMISSION has the option to terminate the AGREEMENT pursuant to Article VI Termination, or by mutual agreement to amend the AGREEMENT to reflect any reduction of funds.

ARTICLE XXI CHANGE IN TERMS
A. This AGREEMENT may be amended or modified only by mutual written agreement of the parties.

B. CONSULTANT shall only commence work covered by an amendment after the amendment is executed and notification to proceed has been provided by COMMISSION’s Contract Administrator.

C. There shall be no change in CONSULTANT’s Project Manager or members of the project team, as listed in the approved Cost Proposal, which is a part of this AGREEMENT without prior written approval by COMMISSION’s Contract Administrator.

ARTICLE XXII CONTINGENT FEE
CONSULTANT warrants, by execution of this AGREEMENT that no person or selling agency has been employed, or retained, to solicit or secure this AGREEMENT upon an agreement or understanding, for a commission, percentage, brokerage, or contingent fee, excepting bona fide employees, or bona fide established commercial or selling agencies maintained by CONSULTANT for the purpose of securing business. For breach or violation of this warranty, COMMISSION has the right to annul this AGREEMENT without liability; pay only for the value of the work actually performed, or in its discretion to deduct from the AGREEMENT price or consideration, or otherwise recover the full amount of such commission, percentage, brokerage, or contingent fee.

ARTICLE XXIII DISPUTES
Prior to either party commencing any legal action under this AGREEMENT, the parties agree to try in good faith, to settle any dispute amicably between them. If a dispute has not been settled after forty-five (45) days of good-faith negotiations and as may be otherwise provided herein, then either party may commence legal action against the other.

A. Any dispute, other than audit, concerning a question of fact arising under this AGREEMENT that is not disposed of by agreement shall be decided by a committee consisting of COMMISSION’s Contract Administrator and (Insert Department Head or Official), who may consider written or verbal information submitted by CONSULTANT.
B. Not later than thirty (30) calendar days after completion of all work under the AGREEMENT, CONSULTANT may request review by COMMISSION Governing Board of unresolved claims or disputes, other than audit. The request for review will be submitted in writing.

C. Neither the pendency of a dispute, nor its consideration by the committee will excuse CONSULTANT from full and timely performance in accordance with the terms of this AGREEMENT.

ARTICLE XXIV INSPECTION OF WORK
CONSULTANT and any subconsultant shall permit COMMISSION, the State, and the FHWA if federal participating funds are used in this AGREEMENT; to review and inspect the project activities and files at all reasonable times during the performance period of this AGREEMENT.

ARTICLE XXV SAFETY
A. CONSULTANT shall comply with OSHA regulations applicable to CONSULTANT regarding necessary safety equipment or procedures. CONSULTANT shall comply with safety instructions issued by COMMISSION Safety Officer and other COMMISSION representatives. CONSULTANT personnel shall wear hard hats and safety vests at all times while working on the construction project site.

B. Pursuant to the authority contained in Vehicle Code §591, COMMISSION has determined that such areas are within the limits of the project and are open to public traffic. CONSULTANT shall comply with all of the requirements set forth in Divisions 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15 of the Vehicle Code. CONSULTANT shall take all reasonably necessary precautions for safe operation of its vehicles and the protection of the traveling public from injury and damage from such vehicles.

D. CONSULTANT must have a Division of Occupational Safety and Health (CAL-OSHA) permit(s), as outlined in Labor Code §6500 and §6705, prior to the initiation of any practices, work, method, operation, or process related to the construction or excavation of trenches which are five (5) feet or deeper.

ARTICLE XXVI OWNERSHIP OF DATA
A. It is mutually agreed that all materials prepared by CONSULTANT under this AGREEMENT shall become the property of COMMISSION, and CONSULTANT shall have no property right therein whatsoever. Immediately upon termination, COMMISSION shall be entitled to, and CONSULTANT shall deliver to COMMISSION, reports, investigations, appraisals, inventories, studies, analyses, drawings and data estimates performed to that date, whether completed or not, and other such materials as may have been prepared or accumulated to date by CONSULTANT in performing this AGREEMENT which is not CONSULTANT’s privileged information, as defined by law, or CONSULTANT’s personnel information, along with all other property belonging exclusively to COMMISSION which is in CONSULTANT’s possession. Publication of the information derived from work performed or data obtained in connection with services rendered under this AGREEMENT must be approved in writing by COMMISSION.

B. Additionally, it is agreed that the Parties intend this to be an AGREEMENT for services and each considers the products and results of the services to be rendered by CONSULTANT hereunder to be work made for hire. CONSULTANT acknowledges and agrees that the work (and all rights therein, including, without limitation, copyright) belongs to and shall be the sole and exclusive
property of COMMISSION without restriction or limitation upon its use or dissemination by COMMISSION.

C. Nothing herein shall constitute or be construed to be any representation by CONSULTANT that the work product is suitable in any way for any other project except the one detailed in this Contract. Any reuse by City for another project or project location shall be at City’s sole risk.

D. Applicable patent rights provisions regarding rights to inventions shall be included in the contracts as appropriate (48 CFR 27 Subpart 27.3 - Patent Rights under Government Contracts for federal-aid contracts).

E. COMMISSION may permit copyrighting reports or other agreement products. If copyrights are permitted; the AGREEMENT shall provide that the FHWA shall have the royalty-free nonexclusive and irrevocable right to reproduce, publish, or otherwise use; and to authorize others to use, the work for government purposes.

ARTICLE XXVII CLAIMS FILED BY COMMISSION’s CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTOR

A. If claims are filed by COMMISSION’s construction contractor relating to work performed by CONSULTANT’s personnel, and additional information or assistance from CONSULTANT’s personnel is required in order to evaluate or defend against such claims; CONSULTANT agrees to make its personnel available for consultation with COMMISSION’S construction contract administration and legal staff and for testimony, if necessary, at depositions and at trial or arbitration proceedings.

B. CONSULTANT’s personnel that COMMISSION considers essential to assist in defending against construction contractor claims will be made available on reasonable notice from COMMISSION. Consultation or testimony will be reimbursed at the same rates, including travel costs that are being paid for CONSULTANT’s personnel services under this AGREEMENT.

C. Services of CONSULTANT’s personnel in connection with COMMISSION’s construction contractor claims will be performed pursuant to a written contract amendment, if necessary, extending the termination date of this AGREEMENT in order to resolve the construction claims.

ARTICLE XXVIII CONFIDENTIALITY OF DATA

A. All financial, statistical, personal, technical, or other data and information relative to COMMISSION’s operations, which are designated confidential by COMMISSION and made available to CONSULTANT in order to carry out this AGREEMENT, shall be protected by CONSULTANT from unauthorized use and disclosure.

B. Permission to disclose information on one occasion, or public hearing held by COMMISSION relating to the AGREEMENT, shall not authorize CONSULTANT to further disclose such information, or disseminate the same on any other occasion.

C. CONSULTANT shall not comment publicly to the press or any other media regarding the AGREEMENT or COMMISSION’s actions on the same, except to COMMISSION’s staff, CONSULTANT’s own personnel involved in the performance of this AGREEMENT, at public hearings, or in response to questions from a Legislative committee.
D. CONSULTANT shall not issue any news release or public relations item of any nature, whatsoever, regarding work performed or to be performed under this AGREEMENT without prior review of the contents thereof by COMMISSION, and receipt of COMMISSION’S written permission.

E. All information related to the construction estimate is confidential, and shall not be disclosed by CONSULTANT to any entity, other than COMMISSION, Caltrans, and/or FHWA. All of the materials prepared or assembled by CONSULTANT pursuant to performance of this Contract are confidential and CONSULTANT agrees that they shall not be made available to any individual or organization without the prior written approval of COMMISSION or except by court order. If CONSULTANT or any of its officers, employees, or subcontractors does voluntarily provide information in violation of this Contract, City has the right to reimbursement and indemnity from CONSULTANT for any damages caused by CONSULTANT releasing the information, including, but not limited to, COMMISSION’s attorney’s fees and disbursements, including without limitation experts’ fees and disbursements.

ARTICLE XXIX NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD CERTIFICATION

In accordance with Public Contract Code §10296, CONSULTANT hereby states under penalty of perjury that no more than one final unappealable finding of contempt of court by a federal court has been issued against CONSULTANT within the immediately preceding two-year period, because of CONSULTANT’s failure to comply with an order of a federal court that orders CONSULTANT to comply with an order of the National Labor Relations Board.

ARTICLE XXX EVALUATION OF CONSULTANT

CONSULTANT’s performance will be evaluated by COMMISSION. A copy of the evaluation will be sent to CONSULTANT for comments. The evaluation together with the comments shall be retained as part of the AGREEMENT record.

ARTICLE XXXI RETENTION OF FUNDS

The COMMISSION shall hold retainage from the CONSULTANT and shall make prompt and regular incremental acceptances of portions, as determined by COMMISSION, of the AGREEMENT work, and pay retainage to CONSULTANT based on these acceptances. The CONSULTANT, or subconsultant, shall return all monies withheld in retention from a subconsultant within thirty (30) calendar days after receiving payment for work satisfactorily completed and accepted including incremental acceptances of portions of the AGREEMENT work by the COMMISSION. Federal law (49 CFR §26.29) requires that any delay or postponement of payment over thirty (30) calendar days may take place only for good cause and with COMMISSION’s prior written approval. Any violation of this provision shall subject the violating CONSULTANT or subconsultant to the penalties, sanctions and other remedies specified in Business and Professions Code §7108.5. These requirements shall not be construed to limit or impair any contractual, administrative, or judicial remedies, otherwise available to the CONSULTANT or subconsultant in the event of a dispute involving late payment or nonpayment by the CONSULTANT, deficient subconsultant performance, or noncompliance by a subconsultant. This provision applies to both DBE and non-DBE CONSULTANT and subconsultants.
ARTICLE XXXII NOTIFICATION

All notices hereunder and communications regarding interpretation of the terms of this AGREEMENT and changes thereto, shall be effected by the mailing thereof by registered or certified mail, return receipt requested, postage prepaid, and addressed as follows:

CONSULTANT:

(CONSULTANT)

(NAME) Project Manager

(ADDRESS)

COMMISSION:

SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

(NAME) Contract Administrator

1523 PACIFIC AVENUE

SANTA CRUZ, CA 95060

ARTICLE XXXIII CONTRACT

The two parties to this AGREEMENT, who are the before named CONSULTANT and the before named COMMISSION, hereby agree that this AGREEMENT constitutes the entire AGREEMENT which is made and concluded in duplicate between the two parties. Both of these parties for and in consideration of the payments to be made, conditions mentioned, and work to be performed; each agree to diligently perform in accordance with the terms and conditions of this AGREEMENT as evidenced by the signatures below.

ARTICLE XXXIV SIGNATURES

SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

(Name of CONSULTANT)

GUY PRESTON
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

(Signature)

(Name of Signer)

Date: ______________________  Date: ______________________
SCOPE OF WORK

TASK 1. PROJECT MANAGEMENT
Mark Thomas will manage the project team, which includes managing the team, general project coordination with Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC), preparing contract paperwork, memo's, letters and e-mail, making phone calls, preparing invoices and monthly progress report and maintaining project files. We will update the Critical Path Schedule (CPM) on a monthly basis to track performance and identify issues that could either delay or accelerate the schedule. Each submittal will clearly be shown in the CPM and tracked for internal progress and external review periods. The CPM will be presented as a discussion item at each Project Development Team (PDT) meeting. Other managerial duties include keeping the Project History file up to date.

Task 1.1. Caltrans Project Development Team Meetings
Mark Thomas will establish a Caltrans Project Development Team (PDT) including members of the design team, City of Capitola, Caltrans, Santa Cruz County (if desired) and other individuals critical to the project delivery. This task includes preparing agendas and summarizing the meeting notes, including action items. Action items will be tracked until resolved. This scope assumes a total of 20 face-to-face meetings over the anticipated 20-month schedule.

Task 1.2. Agency/ Subconsultant Coordination
This task includes Mark Thomas' internal management of the subconsultant's work to insure we are one team submitting work products to the RTC. This task also includes attending and preparing presentation materials for up to two presentations at scheduled RTC meetings or Transportation Policy Workshop meetings. We have assumed we will meet up to three times with other stakeholders, such as the City of Capitola, Santa Cruz County or community groups.

Task 1.3. Quality Assurance / Quality Control
Mark Thomas will prepare a project specific work plan to identify the work products, the Quality Assurance Manuals to be used and the deliverables to be reviewed. We will complete and document an independent technical review of each major submittal. Review comments will be addressed prior to submittal to the RTC.

Task 1.4. Additional Caltrans Coordination
This task includes non-PDT meetings with Caltrans that focus on one subject matter, rather than including the entire PDT team. We have assumed up to six Caltrans focus meetings on subjects such as Traffic Operations or Environmental technical studies.

TASK 1 DELIVERABLES:
- Meeting notes and agendas
- Monthly Invoices and Progress Reports
- Project Schedule
- QA/QC Plan and Reviews
- Submittal Log

GENERAL ASSUMPTIONS:
- All deliverables will be in electronic format, except where hardcopies are noted
TASK 2. DATA COLLECTION

Task 2.1. Data Collection
Mark Thomas will identify and assemble existing data, such as the topographic and digital terrain mapping, as-built drawings, GIS information and existing studies/reports. As part of this task Mark Thomas will keep a record of files submitted.

Task 2.2. Supplemental Topographic Survey
Perform supplemental field surveys to identify and locate key features within the project limits that are not clearly shown on the aerial topographic mapping, such as, topography of existing structures, points of structure minimum clearances, drainage pipe types and utility features. This information will be added to the base mapping. We have assumed no more than 3 days of survey crew time will be used.

Task 2.3. Utility Coordination
Mark Thomas will prepare Utility “A” Letters to request updated utility information for their facilities. We assume Mark Thomas will mail the “A” letters and track the responses.

TASK 2 DELIVERABLES:
- Utility "A" Letters
- Base Map with mapped utility locations

GENERAL ASSUMPTIONS:
- Potholing of utilities will be an extra work item if RTC desires this effort to be advanced prior to the final design phase

TASK 3. PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING

Task 3.1. Conceptual Alignments
Mark Thomas will refine the alternative that was identified in the Tier 1 Document based on the topographic mapping obtained under Task 2.1. The purpose of the concept alignments is to better identify the project design features and establish the critical design issues to refine the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for environmental studies. The concepts will be delineated on aerial photos to show the PDT and stakeholders the general scope of work.

Task 3.2. Geometric Approval Drawings
For the Draft and Final Project Report, Mark Thomas will prepare Geometric Approval Drawings (GADs) for Caltrans review and approval. The purpose of the GADs is to identify geometric design features, environmental impacts, right of way footprint and necessary design exceptions. The GAD’s will show alignment, superelevation, profile and typical cross sections. The profile will be sufficient for the PA&ED phase but may need to be refined with additional survey data during final design phase.

Task 3.3. DIB 78/Design Decisions
During the refinement of the project alternatives Mark Thomas will identify features that do not meet current Caltrans Design Standards. Design exceptions will be required. Mark Thomas will prepare a draft Design Standard Decision
Task 3.4. Structure Advance Planning Studies
Mark Thomas will develop Structure Advance Planning Studies (APS) for the replacement of Capitola Avenue Overcrossing, non-standard retaining walls and noise barriers. An APS Design Memo will document structure alternatives considered, construction staging, proposed aesthetics, constructability, and assumed foundation type. A Preliminary Foundation Memo and square-foot cost estimates for each structure alternative will be included. Two alternative structure types are assumed for the Capitola Avenue Overcrossing. Each APS will be submitted to Caltrans for review and approval. The approved APS will be included as part of the Project Report.

Task 3.5. Life Cycle Cost Analysis
Mark Thomas will prepare the Life-Cycle Cost Analysis (LCCA) using the current RealCost Version. We will follow the flowchart Figure 2-2 for Lane Widening to select the design life and pavement type.

Assumptions:
- Pavement rehabilitation of mainline SR 1 is assumed to not be required for the LCCA analysis. Per Caltrans policy, if pavement rehabilitation is required, Caltrans will perform the defection study and provide pavement recommendations. Caltrans is currently working on a SHOPP project to overlay the existing pavement through the project limits.

Task 3.6. Geotechnical Review
Preliminary Geotechnical Report (PGR) and Preliminary Foundation Reports (PFR)
A Preliminary Geotechnical Report is proposed for the roadway pavement, retaining walls, sound walls, slopes and other civil design features. Proposed scope of the work will be to review readily available materials and prepare a Preliminary Geotechnical Report as per Caltrans guidelines. The review will be based on readily available data including as-built Log of Test Borings from the existing projects and other Agency records. The potential geotechnical/geologic impacts and mitigations will be discussed on a broad basis including but not limited to slope stability, geology, seismic impacts, erosion, groundwater conditions, etc. for the proposed project. Wall foundation types will also be covered in this report.

Preliminary Foundation Report will be prepared for the Capitola Avenue Overcrossing. Retaining walls are assumed to be covered within the Preliminary Geotechnical Report. If necessary, a separate report can be prepared as a PFR document. The PFR will be prepared in accordance with Caltrans guidelines and will include discussions on potential geotechnical/geologic impacts and mitigations on a broad basis including but not limited to slope stability, geology, seismic impacts, erosion, groundwater conditions, etc. for the proposed bridge structure. Certain design assumptions are made as to the type of foundations, approximate pile length.

Task 3.7. Drainage Report
Mark Thomas will obtain all relevant drainage information, including storm drain facilities, ditches, pipe location and sizes, local rainfall intensities and flows. A hydrologic analysis will be completed to develop watershed boundaries for the areas draining to this project, flows based on Caltrans standards, and preliminary drainage concepts.
A drainage report will be developed based on Caltrans guidelines. The report will include, but not be limited to, detailed discussions of the following: existing conditions, off-site hydrology and hydraulics, onsite roadway drainage, existing and post project drainage patterns, storm water quality, and other topics of significance.

**Task 3.8. Location Hydraulic Study**

Based on preliminary qualitative assessments, the project may potentially result in a floodplain encroachment. WRECO will work with the RTC to obtain the current effective hydraulic models of Soquel Creek and Nobel Creek from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). WRECO will update the hydraulic model with topographic data within the Project vicinity. WRECO will simulate the proposed condition and assess the potential impacts the project may have on the floodplain. Minimization measures and/or mitigation measures will be suggested to minimize project impacts.

WRECO will prepare a Floodplain Evaluation Report, which will include the Technical Information for the Location Hydraulic Study and Floodplain Evaluation Report Summary forms, to document the investigation, model results, and determine the specific impacts to the floodplain and necessary avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures.

In addition, WRECO will verify the impacts of Sea Level Rise (SLR) for the Project and will confirm tidal datum and predicted SLR elevations (low, medium, or high) per Caltrans and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration’s guidelines. WRECO will discuss the Project’s design life/timeframe, adaptive capacity, and risk tolerance to assess the Project impacts and will include it in the Floodplain Evaluation Report.

Assumptions:

- It is anticipated that this model will be in HEC-RAS format. The design flows and the boundary conditions will be established by this effective model.
- WRECO will help to prepare the FEMA Data Request for the Flood Insurance Backup Data. The request will be submitted by the RTC. The RTC will pay the fees for recovering the data.
- Conditional Letter of Map Revision application or no rise certification is excluded.

**Task 3.9. Water Quality Report**

In order to provide the existing physical and regulatory environment information for water quality, WRECO will:

- Identify and describe the current and upcoming laws that relate to water quality;
- Describe the beneficial uses as detailed by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) Basin Plan for all potentially affected waters;
- Discuss water quality objectives for all potentially affected waters;
- Collect and present any monitoring data from other agencies;
- List potential sources of pollutants, and;
- Describe the watershed, existing drainage, and hydrologic conditions.

WRECO will evaluate the water quality impacts for each proposed alternative and will recommend possible best management practices (BMP) or project features to address water quality issues. WRECO will document our findings in a technical report.

**Task 3.10. Storm Water Data Report**

Mark Thomas will prepare a Storm Water Data Report in accordance with Caltrans procedures using information developed under Tasks 3.7, 3.8 & 3.9.
Task 3.11. Landscape Assessment
Mark Thomas will prepare a draft and final Landscape Assessment memo for improvements related to the landscape of the Highway 1 corridor. The memo will include a description of existing conditions and site setting and provide recommendations regarding plant types, placement, physical character, and visual impacts of landscape improvements.

Task 3.12. Value Engineering
Mark Thomas will perform an internal Value Engineering (VE) Evaluation. This is an abbreviated version of the more formal Value Analysis Study required by the Federal Highway Administration for projects costing more than $50 Million. Mark Thomas will assemble senior level managers/designers to review the Concept Plans, GADs, Typical Cross Sections, Construction Staging, Pavement Structural Section Design, Traffic Management and Structures. The purpose of the review is to identify potential cost saving design concepts and also verify the constructability of the project. The results of the VE will be summarized in a memo and presented to PDT. Recommendations for design will also be evaluated in the Risk Management Plan in Task 7.2.

Task 3.13. Right of Way Data Sheet
The scope of work for preparing the Caltrans Right of Way (R/W) Data Sheets involves reviewing the delineated geometric plans for each alternative, preparing a list of all affected properties and owners including the current uses and improvements on each parcel, and physically inspecting each proposed R/W impact to help determine the magnitude of each acquisition. Real estate values for each property type are derived from public sales sources and from interviews with local real estate brokers. The probable value of each proposed taking is estimated from the derived values and severance damages are estimated based on costs to cure or reproduction calculations. Business or residential relocations are noted as well as the costs associated with the relocations, and loss of business goodwill, appraisals, escrows, title and other associated costs. The utility relocations are described and the costs of utility relocations (provided by the utility relocation consultant) are incorporated into the R/W Data Sheets. Monument will provide costs in the appropriate Caltrans format and will assist the engineering team with cost effective solutions to potential problems that could escalate the total project costs.

The scope of work will be performed and delivered in the form of a report containing a textual description of the project areas studied, a summary of total probable costs of the study area itemized by major component and will include detailed spreadsheets showing how the summary sheets were calculated. The spreadsheets contain a parcel-by-parcel breakdown of all probable costs.

The final cost information determined from the accumulation of data will then be transferred into the appropriate format for application to the Right of Way Data Sheets, or other format required by the project.

Task 3.14. Utility Conflict Analysis
Mark Thomas will use the information gathered by the Utility "A" Letter process to identify potential utility conflicts. We will contact the utility companies to help identify the costs of relocations and also make a preliminary determination of "prior rights" to establish the cost to be used in the Right-of-Way Data Sheet. Any potential utility policy exceptions will be identified in this phase, however processing the actual utility encroachment exception will be a final design task.

TASK 3 DELIVERABLES
- Concept Plans on Aerial Photo background (1 Submittal, 2 hardcopies and 1 electronic copy)
- Draft and Final GADs (1 Submittal for each, 2 hardcopies and 1 electronic copy)
- Draft and Final DIB 78 (1 Submittal for each, 2 hardcopies and 1 electronic copy)
• Advance Planning Studies for Retaining Walls and Structure replacement (1 Submittal for each, 2 hardcopies and 1 electronic copy)
• LCCA Summary Memo (1 Submittal, 1 electronic copy)
• Draft and Final Preliminary Geotechnical Report (PGR) (1 Submittal for each, 1 hardcopy and 1 electronic copy)
• Draft and Final Preliminary Foundation Reports (PFR) (1 Submittal for each, 1 hardcopy and 1 electronic copy)
• Draft and Final Location Hydraulic Study (1 Submittal for each, 1 hardcopy and 1 electronic copy)
• Draft and Final Water Quality Assessment Report (1 Submittal for each, 1 hardcopy and 1 electronic copy)
• Draft and Final Drainage Report (1 Submittal for each, 1 hardcopy and 1 electronic copy)
• Draft and Final Storm Water Data Report (1 Submittal for each, 1 hardcopy and 1 electronic copy)
• Draft and Final Landscape Assessment Memo (1 Submittal for each, 1 electronic copy)
• VE Memo summarizing recommendations (1 Submittal, 1 electronic copy)
• Draft and Final R/W Data Sheets (1 Submittal for each, 1 electronic copy)

TASK 4. TRAFFIC ANALYSIS

CDM Smith will use Caltrans’ Traffic Engineering Performance Assessment (TEPA) guidelines in the development of the TOAR. The traffic operations analysis will be conducted for AM and PM peak periods on the freeway mainline in the immediate vicinity of the Project auxiliary lanes and overcrossing reconstruction. The task will include:

• Updating traffic classification counts;
• Collecting peak period speed, travel time, reliability and lane utilization information;
• Collecting signal control information;
• Updating traffic collisions data;
• Updating traffic forecasts and induced demand estimates; and
• Updating the FREQ freeway operations model used for the 2017 traffic analysis to include existing, existing plus build, horizon year no build and horizon year build conditions.

The task will consist of the following sub-tasks:

Task 4.1. Traffic Methodology Memorandum

CDM Smith will develop a draft traffic operations analysis methodology memorandum detailing the locations, data collection procedures, and methods for traffic operations analysis. Upon approval by SCCRTC, CDM Smith will perform the following data collection and modeling activities:

• Infrastructure: CDM Smith will prepare an inventory of roadways, signals and key ITS infrastructure at and near the project location.
• Traffic Counts: 2016 peak period traffic counts on CA 1 mainline and ramps in the CDM Smith technical memorandum dated July 14, 2017 will form the starting point for current analysis. The Consultant will update by scaling up these traffic counts using traffic volume changes observed from Caltrans PeMS and Average Daily Traffic Counts on the CA 1 mainline. The Consultant will contact the city of Capitola and Santa Cruz County to collect the latest traffic counts on the arterials. Additional traffic counts at up to four locations will be conducted by the Consultant at locations missing recent count data. The Consultant understands that congested/saturated conditions on CA 1 during peak periods may result in observed departure counts using Caltrans PeMS detector stations being lower than the arrival demand volumes. Therefore, upstream mainline counts will be used in relatively uncongested locations and intermediate on- and off- ramp counts will be used to derive the arrival demand volumes at the Project location.
• Speed/Travel Time: The Consultant has access to 2016 speed/travel time data on INRIX traffic message channel (TMC) segments on CA 1 mainline. The Consultant will use both INRIX and Caltrans PeMS speed data to analyze
congestion at the weave sections. The Consultant also has access to travel time surveys on Capitola Avenue, however, the data is old. A limited number (up to six) of new travel time runs will be conducted to understand operations on the overcrossing street, and on- and off-ramp movements at the weaving section.

- **Collisions and Crash Reduction Factors:** SCCRTC will coordinate with Caltrans to collect and provide to the Consultant the traffic collision reports over a five-year period for the Project location based on the Traffic Accident Surveillance and Analysis System (TASAS) database. The collision data will be plotted on a map of the project area with coding to indicate the type and severity of the incident. The resulting data profile will be reviewed to identify locations with a high number of accidents and also the frequency of the various types of accidents in the study corridor. Special attention will be given to collisions due to weaving. Crash reduction factors for addition of auxiliary lanes and provision of bike lanes will be collected from state and federal sources. This information will be used to provide a qualitative assessment of existing traffic safety conditions.

- **Traffic Forecasts:** 2004 and 2014 AMBAG Model forecasts and 2035 AMBAG Travel Demand Model results have been used in the past studies. The Consultant will utilize these forecasts to be consistent with the past analysis.

- **Field Observations:** CDM Smith will also collect a single day field observation of peak period traffic operations, including mainline/ramp conflicts, incidents, queues and other traffic operations and safety issues.

- **Induced Demand Calculation:** The National Center for Sustainable Transportation at the University of California, Davis has developed an induced demand calculator for adding general-purpose or high-occupancy-vehicle (HOV) lane miles on roadways managed by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). The Consultant will use the calculator to estimate induced demand due to the Project.

- **Existing Traffic Volumes Balancing:** Based on the aforementioned traffic counts collected, the Consultant will develop balanced traffic volumes to be used for traffic analysis.

- **Traffic Modeling:** Past studies on CA 1 used FREQ as the traffic simulation model. It was last updated in 2017 for this corridor. The Consultant will use this model, updated with the current traffic count and speed data for the analysis.

- **Draft Traffic Operations Data Collection and Analysis Methodology Memorandum:** A draft data collection and analysis methodology memorandum will be prepared. Comments received on the draft will be addressed in the final TOAR.

**Task 4.2. Existing Conditions**

Using the various data collected in Task 4.1, the Consultant will perform LOS analyses for two freeway segments (three interchanges, overcrossing arterial (Capitola Avenue). The analysis results will be summarized in the Existing Conditions Memorandum. This will include performance in terms of traffic operations (level of service and delay under existing and existing plus build scenarios for up to a total of three scenarios plus the No Build. This will support the purpose and need for the Project and inform benefits from the Project in current context. A draft existing conditions memorandum will be prepared. Comments received on the draft will be addressed in the final TOAR.

**Task 4.3. Future Conditions (Traffic Forecasting)**

CDM Smith will use the updated traffic count information as a basis to update the traffic forecasts developed in the previous traffic operations studies. New traffic forecast modeling is not anticipated. The Consultant will use the FREQ freeway operations model to perform the LOS analyses for the freeway segments. Synchro traffic analysis software will be used to analyze the traffic conditions on the Capitola Avenue overcrossing. The analysis results will be summarized in the Future Conditions Memorandum to describe performance in terms of traffic operations under horizon year no build and horizon year build conditions. Future level of service, delay and queuing conditions will be analyzed for each of up to three build scenarios. A qualitative assessment of potential impacts on traffic safety will also be provided for each scenario. This will further support the purpose and need for the Project and inform benefits from the Project in a future context. A future conditions memorandum will be prepared. Comments received on the draft will be addressed in the final TOAR.
Task 4.4. Bus-on-Shoulder Operations Support
CDM Smith will serve as an advisor on the development of the concept for bus-on-shoulder operations for the project. This will include the review of the description of the bus-on-shoulder conceptual plan, review of the signing and striping concept, development of the operations plans. This work will build upon work performed by the Consultant in the Highway 1 Auxiliary Lane - 41st Avenue to Soquel Drive Design Services contract include the Concept of Operations Report for Bus-on-Shoulder Operations. A draft bus-on-shoulder operations memorandum will be prepared. Comments received on the draft will be addressed in the final TOAR.

Task 4.5. Traffic Operations Analysis Report
A final TOAR report will be developed that includes the key findings from the prior task deliverables, as well as, shortcomings or deficiencies (if any) of the concept plan developed for the Project. The report will also include suggestions that may improve the effectiveness of the Project in terms of traffic operations and safety. An executive summary to the report containing the purpose, need and quantitative benefits of the Project will be prepared to be easily incorporated into the Project Approval/Environmental Clearance document.

TASK 4 DELIVERABLES
- Draft and Final Traffic Analysis Project Management Plan (1 Submittal for each, 1 electronic copy)
- Draft Traffic Operations Data Collection and Analysis Methodology Memorandum (1 Submittal, 1 hardcopy and 1 electronic copy)
- Draft Existing Conditions Memorandum (1 Submittal, 1 hardcopy and 1 electronic copy)
- Draft Future Conditions Memorandum (1 Submittal, 1 hardcopy and 1 electronic copy)
- Draft Bus-on-Shoulder Operations Analysis Report (1 Submittal, 1 hardcopy and 1 electronic copy)
- Administrative Draft Traffic Operations Analysis Report (1 Submittal, 1 hardcopy and 1 electronic copy)
- Draft and Final Traffic Operations Analysis Report (1 Submittal for each, 1 hardcopy and 1 electronic copy)

TASK 5. ENVIRONMENTAL TECHNICAL STUDIES

Task 5.1. Scoping Memo
As a first step to kicking-off the technical report updates and addenda, ICF will prepare a Scoping Memo to enable a discussion with Caltrans regarding the level of update necessary for each technical area. Since the technical reports for Tier I environmental document were originally prepared in 2013 and last updated in 2018, it is important to revisit the information, obtain concurrence on the methodology and appropriate level of effort, understand Caltrans’ concerns and expectations, and carry out updates in the most cost effective and timely manner.

Task 5.2. Prepare Technical Studies
All technical studies will be consistent with meeting the requirements of NEPA and CEQA, as well as those of related environmental statutes and regulations. The technical studies will be prepared to cover both related statutory documentation requirements and to support preparation of a joint NEPA and CEQA document required for project approval.

Preparation of all technical analyses and reports will follow local, state, and federal environmental guidelines, primarily consisting of the Caltrans Standard Environmental Reference (SER) website, Caltrans Local Assistance Procedures Manual, local and FHWA Technical Advisory 6640.81 Guidance on Preparing and Processing Environmental and Section 4(f) Documents. The formats to be used for the technical studies will follow the guidance available on the Caltrans SER website as of the date that those studies are initiated.
For this scope of work, the technical studies for which a specific scope of work has been included have been assumed based on a review of existing project information. If additional studies are identified during the environmental phase of the project a scope of work and cost will be submitted for approval prior to their initiation. The deliverable for each technical study is as follows.

The following assumptions have been made with regard to the technical studies that are to be prepared.

- A maximum of one build alternative will be evaluated.
- NEPA/404 integration process will not be required.
- Relocations will not be required.

**Task 5.3. Air Quality Report**

TAHA will prepare the Air Quality Report based on methodology provided by Caltrans in Chapter 11 of the Standard Environmental Reference. The Air Quality Report will also comply with the Caltrans Annotated Outline, which was recently updated on December 15, 2017. To the extent practical, TAHA will incorporate the analysis completed for the Tier I/Tier II Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Assessment.

The purpose of the Air Quality Report will be to inform the National Environmental Policy Act and California Environmental Quality Act decisions with background information and regionally-specific analysis related to the project. Pollutants of concern include carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, nitrogen oxides, volatile organic compounds, reactive organic gases, ozone, particulate matter, mobile source air toxics, and greenhouse gases. The Air Quality Report will include a comprehensive discussion of the existing setting and regulatory framework. The existing setting discussion will identify land uses sensitive to air pollution and present historic air pollutant concentrations from the nearest monitoring station. The regulatory framework will present information from federal, State, regional, and local agencies with a focus on federal and State criteria pollutant attainment status. Notably, the County of Santa Cruz is located in the North Central Coast Air Basin, which is designated as an attainment area for all federal standards.

The impact analysis of the Air Quality Report will quantify short-term construction emissions using either the Roadway Construction Emissions Model or the Caltrans Construction Emissions Tool. Criteria pollutant emissions will be estimated based on equipment exhaust, fugitive dust emissions, and vehicle trips. Project-related regional changes in long-term mobile source emissions will be quantified using emission factors from CT-EMFAC2017 and traffic data provided by the project team (i.e., vehicle miles traveled and vehicle speeds). The Air Quality Report will also assess the potential for exposure to asbestos, lead, mobile source air toxic emissions in accordance with current Federal Highway Administration guidance, and cumulative impacts. The Highway 1 Bay-Porter/State Park Auxiliary Lanes Project is exempt from all Transportation Conformity requirements because of the attainment status designations. See Task 5.12 for discussion of greenhouse gasses.

**Task 5.4. Noise Technical Memoranda**

It is our understanding that a Noise Study Report (NSR) was approved in 2013 by Caltrans District 5 for the Tier I document which included analysis of the auxiliary lanes along this project alignment under the HOV and TSM Alternatives. Additionally, the Tier I project and NSR included analysis of High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes throughout the larger project alignment (including the 2.5-mile stretch discussed above). It is also understood that the NSR identified sound walls within this 2.5-mile project alignment. The bus on shoulder (BOS) was not evaluated in the 2003 NSR. While there are no impacts anticipated with the BOS operations, the operations will be included in the analysis.

ICF will review the Tier I NSR and will confirm that the proposed project was included under the analysis included in the NSR. For the purposes of this analysis it is assumed that ICF will review the project description from the Tier I project.
and the proposed auxiliary lanes project and confirm that the proposed auxiliary lanes project matches the project
description with respect to the extent and location of the auxiliary lanes. ICF will prepare a noise technical
memorandum discussing the consistency between the analysis in the Tier I NSR and the proposed auxiliary lanes project
and will identify all walls which were found to be feasible and reasonable.

A list of assumptions is included below:

- It is assumed that the findings in the NSR were appropriate for the Tier I project which included the proposed
auxiliary lanes project. As such no TNM modeling or remodeling of this portion of the project alignment will
be conducted.
- It is assumed that ICF will not review any of the original TNM modeling for the NSR and will not QA/QC any of
the NSR.
- Additionally, from a review of the NSR, it appears that the analysis was conducted using the requirements of the
2006 Caltrans protocol. ICF will not conduct any sort of analysis to identify consistency with the updated 2011
Caltrans Protocol.
- It is assumed that no additional development has occurred within the portion of the project alignment. As such
for the purposes of this scope and cost, ICF will not conduct any additional analysis, including but not limited to
TNM modeling, feasibly requirements, and/or reasonability determinations. Should new development be
identified, additional scope and cost will be necessary.
- It is assumed that no field work will be conducted as part of the project.
- It is assumed that no figures will be recreated for the purposes of this analysis. Any sound wall figures that
show the location, extent, and height of proposed sound walls will be repurposed from the original NSR
document.

Additionally, ICF will review and provide a 2nd separate noise technical memorandum which analyzes the impacts from
the proposed bus on shoulder movements located within the proposed auxiliary lanes project alignment. Since this bus
on shoulder feature was not included in the 2013 NSR, a separate memorandum is proposed to streamline the review
process. Using the project traffic data regarding buses from Tier I and proposed project scenario, ICF will do a
comparative analysis looking at the total volume of bus movements during the worst noise hour compared to the total
traffic volume and provide a comparison of the volumes. The purpose of the analysis will be to demonstrate that the
inclusion of a limited volume of buses along this stretch of highway would have minimal influence and that this
influence would not degrade the performance of the proposed sound walls located within the project area.

A list of assumptions is included below:

- No TNM modeling will be conducted for this portion of the project alignment;
- It is assumed that a simple volumetric comparison with a doubling of source resulting in a 3-dB increase, will be
conducted to determine if the inclusion of the bus on shoulder project would result in a measurable increase in
noise levels.

**Task 5.5. Natural Environmental Study**

For the proposed PA-ED phase of the Highway 1 Auxiliary Lanes (Bay Street/Porter Street to State Park Drive) Project,
SWCA assumes that Caltrans would require the preparation of Natural Environment Study, rather than an Addendum to
the existing NES (April 2014; updated 2015) that was used to support the Tier I/Tier II EIR-EA-FONSI. The previous work
conducted for the Tier I/Tier II EIR-EA-FONSI would be utilized where practical. At a minimum, the previous work would
be incorporated into the project history and previously identified impacts and general measures that were included as
part of the EIR-EA-FONSI process would be incorporated. However, field surveys and mapping would need to be
updated, as well as the species lists utilized to provide the master list of species to be evaluated in the document.
Per Caltrans requirements, the USFWS and NOAA Fisheries official species list must be acquired within 6 months of submitting the NES for review. It is expected that the species list will be either identical, or nearly identical, to those species reviewed by SWCA in the past. Because the request for an official species list by a federal agency is the first step of the Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA) Section 7 consultation, and triggers a consultation code with USFWS, the official species lists will be formally requested by Caltrans, acting on behalf of FHWA. SWCA will coordinate with SCCRTC staff to arrange any species list requests from Caltrans.

Following the database search and a literature review, field surveys will be conducted to provide baseline information on vegetation communities, habitat types, and plant and wildlife species in the study area. SWCA also intends to update the tree survey report (SWCA 2010) to determine which trees (if any) would be slated for removal. Resources identified during field surveys will be mapped with Global Positioning System (GPS)/Geographic Information System (GIS) and will be overlain on plans and/or aerials provided by Mark Thomas.

In order to comply with agency protocol for botanical resources, SWCA is currently in the process of completing three botanical surveys within the study area to accommodate the range of blooming periods (i.e., the identification periods) for the numerous special-status plant species with potential to occur. These studies are being completed under a separate contract with the SSCRTC. Therefore, no additional fees are included for this scope. The results will be utilized for the preparation of the Natural Environment. Reconnaissance wildlife surveys will be conducted concurrently with the botanical surveys and all plant and wildlife species (or evidence of, such as scat or tracks) will be identified to the lowest possible taxonomic level.

In addition to the floristic surveys, SWCA would also update the tree survey data that was previously collected by SWCA staff in August of 2010 (formerly as Morro Group, Inc.). A tree in the County of Santa Cruz, regardless of species, is deemed significant when it has a diameter-at-breast height (DBH) at or greater than twenty inches; or if it is a clumping tree with greater than four stems, where each stem is greater than or equal to twelve inches DBH. The purpose of the survey will be to re-evaluate trees within the study area which may potentially be impacted as a result of the proposed project. Information from this will not only be included in the NES, but ultimately the environmental document, and appropriate mitigation will be applied as necessary.

Topics of discussion in the NES will include a description of each project alternative under consideration; regulatory overview; study methods; documentation of existing conditions; special-status plant and animal species, sensitive habitats, and jurisdictional features (wetlands/other waters) with potential for occurrence; evaluation of permanent, temporary, direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts; and recommended avoidance and minimization measures. The NES will also adequately address all federal laws, regulation, and guidance, as described in Chapter 1 of the Caltrans Environmental Handbook. Appendices to the NES will include the project plans; results of the USFWS, NOAA Fisheries, and CNDDB queries; a dewatering and diversion plan (as needed); and a list of species observed within the BSA.

**Jurisdictional Delineation and Assessment**

The Jurisdictional Delineation and Assessment would be prepared as a stand-alone report that would be included as an appendix the NES. The report would include both federal and state jurisdictional information, as currently defined at the time of report preparation. The soil, vegetative, and hydrological characteristics of all identified wetland areas will be examined and categorized according to the 1987 Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual and the 2008 Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Arid West Region (Version 2.0). Identified jurisdictional boundaries and biological habitats will be mapped with a Trimble GPS unit, capable of determining positional accuracy to ±0.5 meter and the resulting acreages quantified using ArcGIS. If the project schedule allows, SWCA will coordinate with the survey team in the field to have the jurisdictional boundaries included during NES survey efforts. This will reduce any anomalies that may result from GPS data collection.
Based on SWCA’s previous work with the study area, the areas of concern are focused at Soquel Creek and Nobel Creek. There is potential for federal wetlands to occur within the study area, but this determination will require a focused field investigation which is included in this scope and budget. State jurisdictional boundaries would extend to the top of bank/furthest extent of riparian vegetation. CDFW also would consider their jurisdiction to extend to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) 100-year flood mark. For ease of future permitting efforts (and at the request of regulatory staff in the past), SWCA would also propose to have separate graphics within the report that graphically depict federal and state jurisdiction independent of each other.

Impacts to these jurisdictional areas will be quantified within the NES based on the most current design available at the time (at least 30% design). Permit applications will eventually be required during the PS&E phase of the project and updated calculations of permanent and temporary impacts to jurisdictional areas should be updated based on the final project designs.

**Biological Assessment**
A Biological Assessment (BA) is required for formal or informal consultation with the USFWS and/or NOAA Fisheries. The BA will be restricted to a discussion of federally listed species with potential for occurrence within or adjacent to the project area and will be prepared pursuant to the most recent Caltrans template preferred by District 5. Federally listed species anticipated to be considered include South-Central California Coast steelhead (Federal Threatened), California red-legged frog (Rana draytonii; Federal Threatened), least Bell’s vireo (Vireo bellii pusillus; Federal Endangered), and southwestern willow flycatcher (Empidonax traillii extimus; Federal Endangered).

Should there be a need to contact USFWS and NOAA Fisheries for information gathering purposes regarding federally listed species, SWCA would route all questions and inquiries to the SCCRTC. SWCA would strongly adhere to the communication protocol set forth by the project team and SCCRTC and at no time would SWCA communicate with Caltrans or the resources agencies without prior consent from the project team or staff. Once the Final BA is submitted to Caltrans, all contact/coordination with USFWS and NOAA Fisheries shall be directly led by Caltrans, acting on behalf of FHWA.

**Conceptual Habitat Mitigation and Monitoring Plan**
As part of the BA, Caltrans requires that a Conceptual Habitat Mitigation and Monitoring Plan (CHMMP) be provided to address proposed mitigation based on the most current design of the selected alternative. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), CDFW, and Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) will require the submittal of this plan with the permit application packages during PS&E.

The CHMMP outlines the methods proposed to restore and monitor the impacted jurisdictional areas and presents a suggested mitigation ratio. Generally, a CHMMP consists of a 3-year restoration maintenance program and a 5-year monitoring program. The combined programs would amount to 5 years of restoration work and monitoring following construction activities within Paso Robles Creek. SWCA will prepare the CHMMP and submit it to the City for review and approval as an appendix to the BA. During the permitting process, resource agencies will be able to review and comment on the plan. Once the CHMMP is approved by the federal and state agencies during the permitting phase, SWCA and the Mark Thomas team will revise (if necessary) and produce a final HMMP for the plan, specification and estimate (PS&E) phase of the project.

The CHMMP will also include mitigation for any tree removals that may occur. SWCA has a certified arborist on staff to help evaluate any tree removal impacts and to help develop adequate mitigation to meet the federal, state, and local requirements.
It is assumed that the CHMMP will allow for on-site mitigation in or near the project site without the need for significant additional fieldwork. If a CHMMP must be prepared for an off-site location, additional fieldwork, mapping, and data collection may be required, and this must be prepared under an amended scope of work. The consultant team will consider any off-site mitigation (if needed) early in the process in the event that secondary impacts to cultural resources may occur.

**Task 5.6. Initial Site Assessment**

The purpose of an Initial Site Assessment (ISA) is to evaluate the project area for the presence of Recognized Environmental Conditions (REC). WRECO will prepare the ISA in general accordance with American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) Standard E-1527-13 per Caltrans Standard Environmental Reference, Environmental Handbook, Volume 1, Chapter 10, “Guidelines for Hazardous Materials, Hazardous Waste, and Contamination,” and Environmental Protection Agency Standards and Practices for All Appropriate Inquiries (AAI) (40 CFR Part 312). Exceptions to the ASTM standard with regard to this particular Project will include the following: no title searches, property appraisals, or interviews will be performed for the Project area.

**Database Review** - WRECO will review all pertinent data, including previous studies provided by the RTC and the Project Team, site investigation reports, groundwater monitoring reports, and federal and state records within 1 mile of the project area.

As part of the study, WRECO will order an Environmental Data Resources (EDR) database search for the project, which is a database search of all regulated underground storage tanks, active and closed case files of cleanup operations, hazardous materials treatment, storage, and disposal facility, historical cleaners and auto shops, and regulated sites.

The following sources will be reviewed for the purpose of determining the potential for RECs within the project limits that may impact the proposed improvements:

- EDR Radius Map™ Report with GeoCheck®, EDR Aerial Photo Decade Report, EDR Historical Topo Map Report, EDR Certified Sanborn Map Report, and the EDR City Directory Image Report
- Department of Toxic Substances Control’s EnviroStor Database
- Regional Water Quality Control Board GeoTracker Database
- United States Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Service Web Soil Survey
- County Land Use and Zoning Maps, Assessor/Recorder records, Building and Planning Department records, and County Department of Environmental Health records
- California Environmental Reporting System (CERS) records and Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA) records

WRECO will review these available records to determine the potential presence of RECs based on previous land usage and any historical operations at or near the project area. This research will also be used to help support the lack of RECs at the project area.

**Field Reconnaissance** - WRECO will conduct a field reconnaissance to assess the existing conditions at and in the vicinity of the project area, and to visually observe any indications of RECs within the project limits. The visual observations of the site conditions at the time of the visit will be documented with field notes and photographs. The data from the site reconnaissance will be compared to the historical information and EDR database findings to determine if there are existing or potential RECs at the project area.

**ISA Report** - The results of the database search and site reconnaissance will be summarized and presented in a report of the findings, describing the existing or potential RECs at the project area. WRECO will submit a Draft ISA Report to the
Client, and then incorporate the comments received into the Final ISA Report. The report will comply with the California Environmental Quality Act/National Environmental Policy Act requirements. If there are existing or potential RECs at the Project area, WRECO will provide recommendations in the ISA Report to conduct specific sampling at the project area.

The ISA will recommend field sampling to be performed as part of the Preliminary Site Investigation (PSI) to confirm the presence or lack of suspected RECs. Field sampling and testing will not be performed as part of the ISA due to the unknown extent of testing needed. Field sampling and testing and the preparation of a PSI can be performed as extra work under a contract amendment.

Task 5.7. Cultural Resources

SWCA understands that the Archaeological Survey Report (ASR) prepared for the Tier I Corridor identified one archaeological site (CA-SCR-179) that is located within the current proposed Tier II project alignment. As a first step in addressing archaeological resources, SWCA will review the previously prepared cultural resources documentation and conduct an updated California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) records search for the area of potential effects (APE) and a 0.5-mile radius at the Northwest Information Center at Sonoma State University, which houses records for Santa Cruz County. The results of the records search and the review of background documentation will be summarized in an Addendum ASR, which will be submitted to Caltrans for review and approval. It is our current understanding that portions of CA-SR-179 within the project are unevaluated and therefore, will likely require field investigation. The level of effort to conduct this work will be dependent upon the final proposed project design.

SWCA will coordinate directly with Caltrans to develop the next steps regarding the need for a Phase II evaluation of CA-SCR-179 to assess its National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) eligibility. The Phase II would focus on the previously unevaluated portion(s) of the site as it relates to proposed Tier II project disturbance area(s). Given the disturbed and partially developed nature of the project’s setting, the Phase II would employ site-specific excavation methods that may include a variety of manual test units and mechanical exposures or trenches. SWCA will rely on its extensive experience conducting archaeological excavations within developed and dynamic environments to focus the field efforts on locating and characterizing the nature of the archaeological deposits. If the site is found eligible for listing in the NRHP or CRHR, avoidance and minimization, and/or mitigation measures would be required, which would be stipulated in a Memorandum of Agreement. If required, support for Phase II evaluation, preparation of a Finding of Effect document, preparation of a Memorandum of Agreement, and/or Phase III data recovery would be provided under an amendment once the scale of the level of effort is clearly defined through the project design process and coordination with Caltrans.

With regard to built environment resources, additional buildings affected by the Project may be 50 years or older at the time of construction and are required to be evaluated during environmental review for Tier II projects. To satisfy the need for additional building surveys, SWCA will review the previously written and Caltrans-accepted Historic Resources Evaluation Report (HRER) for the Tier I Corridor. This document outlines the property ages of each built environment resource that intersect the previously-established Indirect (built environment) APE (I-APE). Any buildings within the I-APE that have come of age (defined as 50 years are older) during the last nine years would require evaluation for NRHP and CRHR eligibility. SWCA will review these background materials alongside the Caltrans Section 106 Programmatic Agreement in order to identify any properties which can be exempted, and any that require intensive evaluation to assess their eligibility for listing on the NRHP or CRHR. Based on this review, SWCA will recommend an approach to address built environment resources to fulfill the requirements of CEQA, NEPA, and Section 106 pursuant to Caltrans guidelines. If field survey and intensive evaluation of resources are required, they would be completed under a contract amendment once the level of effort is clearly defined. If any resources are identified which are eligible for the CRHR or NRHP, a Finding of Effect document and/or support for preparation of a Memorandum of Agreement would be provided at additional cost.
Section 4(f) Memorandum

A memo will be prepared to identify the potential Section 4(f) Resources and assess the potential for use under Section 4(f) of the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) Act (49 U.S.C. Section 303 and 23 U.S.C. Section 138). It is anticipated that the project would not incorporate land from nor would any staging/construction activities occur on any publicly owned public park and recreation areas (e.g. New Brighton State beach). It is anticipated that cultural resources technical studies will confirm that there are no National Register-listed or eligible built resources that would be affected by the proposed project. Section 4(f) applies to archaeological sites that are listed or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places and that warrant preservation in place. For the purposes of this scope, it is assumed that there will be no archaeological sites within the Area of Potential Effects for this project that will require preservation in place and thus considered a Section 4(f) resource.

Assumptions:

- SWCA assumes that no more than 10 architectural resources will need to be updated, recorded, or evaluated for the project. No Addendum HRER or Historic Properties Survey Report (HPSR) is included in this scope of work.
- SWCA assumes that the cost for the CHRIS records search will not exceed $750.
- SWCA will prepare a draft Addendum ASR and transmit it electronically to Mark Thomas. We will respond to one round of consolidated comments. No hard copies will be provided.
- No field work, either for archaeological or built environment resources, is included in this scope of work. If field work is necessary, it will be provided at additional cost once the scope of work is clearly defined in order to be cost efficient.
- No support for preparation of an Extended Phase I (XPI) Proposal, XPI Investigation, Archaeological Evaluation Proposal, Phase II Testing, preparation of a Finding of Effect document, preparation of a Memorandum of Agreement, and/or Phase III data recovery is included in this scope and cost. If these services are required, they can be provided at additional cost once the scope of work is clearly defined in order to be cost efficient.


Paleo Solutions will provide technical services to analyze and assess project impacts on paleontological resources. All work will be completed in compliance with applicable federal, state, and local regulations. Work will be performed in accordance with the requirements of the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) Standard Environmental Reference (SER) Volume 1 Chapter 8 – Paleontology.

Paleo Solutions will conduct a paleontological record search with the University of California Museum of Paleontology (UCMP). Paleo Solutions will also review previously prepared PER from 2008 and available online databases. Paleo Solutions will map the project area onto high resolution geologic maps and will conduct a paleontological survey that will consist of confirming the geologic units as mapped, recordation of any new fossil localities, and re-evaluation of previously recorded fossil localities identified in the record search as well as earlier documentation. The field survey will include a windshield survey of most of the Project area, with a pedestrian survey conducted in areas where sensitive geologic sediments are present and are safe to inspect. The results of the geologic map review, record search, and background research, and survey will be used to evaluate the significance of paleontological resources and to perform a paleontology sensitivity analysis using Caltrans’ tripartite system. The results will be compiled in a combined Paleontological Identification Report (PIR) and Paleontological Evaluation Report (PER). The PIR/PER will also include a discussion of potential project impacts on paleontological resources, and a summary of recommendations, constraints, and coordination requirements. Based on the findings of the prior 2008 PER, it is likely that a Paleontological Mitigation Plan (PMP) will be required prior to construction. This scope and cost does not include preparation of a PMP.
Task 5.9. Moderate Visual Impact Analysis

Based on Caltrans’ Visual Impact Assessment Guide (available: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/16_la_design/via/outlines/index.htm.), a Moderate Visual Impact Analysis (MVIA) will be required for the project. The analysis will be performed using methods and protocol developed by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and adopted by the Caltrans and will utilize Caltrans’ MVIA template. ICF will utilize information provided in the July 2013 Tier 1 Visual Impact Analysis to aid in preparing the visual impact analysis for this project. The analysis will define the project location and setting; describe visual resources and resource change and viewer groups and viewer responses associate with the project; and evaluate potential visual impacts caused by the proposed project, including any proposed mitigation measures to reduce impacts. ICF will utilize visualizations included in the Tier 1 Visual Impact Analysis to aid in the visual impact analysis. During the project scoping, ICF will determine if any new visualizations are needed for the proposed project.

Task 5.10. Land Use and Community Impact Memorandum/Assessment

For the purposes of NEPA, a Community Impact Assessment was prepared for the Tier II (Bay/Porter to State Park) project study area on a programmatic level in 2015, and the findings were incorporated into the CEQA document. The scope of work proposed would include the preparation of an updated memorandum for NEPA that would focus on the Tier II (Bay/Porter to State Park) project study area and evaluate community impacts (if any) that may occur as a result of necessary right-of-way acquisitions and changes in access, and circulation. An analysis of temporary and long-term impacts on local businesses and residents will be conducted to determine potential effects associated with short-term construction activities (i.e., detours and construction noise) and the anticipated permanent right-of-way acquisitions within the project area as a result of the proposed interchange improvements. The analysis will also identify the need for relocation of public utilities and will consider the potential for secondary impacts associated with potential for delays or loss of access for emergency vehicles. The analysis of social impacts will include a discussion of any beneficial effects that would result from the proposed Tier II improvements. As necessary, appropriate mitigation measures will be developed to reduce impacts through consultation with the SCCRTC and the design engineers.

Task 5.11. Greenhouse Gas

The environmental document will summarize the quantitative findings from the Air Quality Report and will follow the Interim Guidance: Determining CEQA Significance for Greenhouse Gas Emissions for Projects on the State Highway System published in March 2019 and CEQA updates to the Climate Change Annotated Outline that become effective on April 27, 2019. The Climate Change Section will also discuss consistency with the Regional Transportation Plan and local policies related to greenhouse gas emissions reductions. Importantly, the Climate Change Section will incorporate the detailed sea level rise analysis from the Tier I/Tier II Final Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Assessment.

Task 5.12. Energy Report

TAHA will prepare the Energy Report based on methodology provided by Caltrans in Chapter 13 of the Standard Environmental Reference. To the extent practical, TAHA will incorporate the analysis completed for the Tier I/Tier II Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Assessment.

The Energy Report will determine if the project will result in the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary use of energy, or wasteful use of energy resources. The analysis will include direct energy use during construction and long-term use of the facility, as well as indirect energy usage in terms of ongoing maintenance. Regarding short-term energy consumption, construction-related effects on energy from most highway projects would be greatest during the site preparation and concrete paving phases because the excavation, handling, and transport of materials requires equipment and truck fuels. Fuel use will be estimated using the Caltrans Construction Emissions Tool. Regarding long-term energy consumption, transportation-related activities account for approximately half of all the petroleum products consumed in California, which makes the energy analysis an important component of the Draft Environmental
Document. Similar to the air quality analysis, fuel use in the corridor will be estimated using emission factors from CT-EMFAC2017 and traffic data provided by the project team (i.e., vehicle miles traveled and vehicle speeds). The Energy Report will also include a discussion of indirect energy consumption from roadway maintenance, direct energy consumption from lighting, and consistency with local and State Energy Conservation Plans. This scope does not include significant new quantitative analyses, such as new calculations related changes in regional vehicle miles traveled or the construction scenario.

**TASK 5 DELIVERABLES**

- Administrative Draft Scoping Memo RTC
- Draft Scoping Memo to Caltrans (4 hard copies)
- Final Scoping Memo to RTC and Caltrans (4 hard copies each)
- Administrative draft technical memoranda to RTC
- Draft technical memoranda to Caltrans (3 hard copies each)
- Final technical memoranda for concurrence to Caltrans (3 hard copies each)
- Final approved technical memoranda (5 hard copies each = 2 RTC and 3 Caltrans)

**TASK 6. ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT**

It is assumed that the appropriate document for the proposed project would be an Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Assessment (EIR/EA) leading to a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) under NEPA. Below are our assumptions on the environmental clearance for the project.

- The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) document will be a routine Environmental Assessment (EA).
- The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) document will be an Environmental Impact Report (EIR). A joint EIR/EA will be prepared utilizing the most current annotated outline available on the Caltrans website.
- The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) will be the lead agency under NEPA and CEQA.
- The project will assess one Build Alternative in the environmental document.
- All the improvements would be undertaken within the existing right-of-way. No permanent right-of-way would be required.
- To the extent feasible, the Tier I environmental document will be utilized with updates, as necessary, for any changes in existing environmental or regulatory setting.
- One scoping meeting and one public meeting for the Draft EIR/EA is assumed or included.
- ICF will utilize the latest templates for the environmental document. Updates to the Annotated Outlines are expected to be released on April 27, 2019 to incorporate recent revisions to State CEQA Guidelines.
- The templates will comply with California Web Access for All (CAWA) requirements.
- Only those items specifically identified in this scope of work are included. No other effort is assumed or implied.

**Task 6.1. Notice of Availability/Notice of Intent & Scoping Meeting**

A notice of preparation of an EIR and Notice of intent to prepare an EA will be prepared. For the proposed project, ICF will work with RTC and Caltrans to prepare an agency distribution list. ICF will prepare the notices in accordance with Caltrans requirements for publication in a newspaper of local circulation (both English and Spanish), for posting at the Santa Cruz County Clerk’s office, and for distribution to anyone who has filed a written request with RTC. This notice would also serve as a notice of the scoping meeting. A draft notice will be provided to the RTC and Caltrans for review and approval. Convey, Inc. will coordinate publication of the notice with the appropriate newspapers (2 newspapers assumed). It is assumed that an Initial Study Checklist will not be required. A hard copy of the NOI will be provided to other agencies and officials included on the distribution list (and anyone else who specifically requests a copy of the
document), and a copy of the NOP/NOI will be provided to property owners and residences/businesses within 500 feet of the proposed project. Convey, Inc. will coordinate printing and mailing of the NOP/NOI to residences and businesses. A Draft State Clearinghouse Form (Notice of Completion & Environmental Document Transmittal) will be prepared and submitted to the RTC and Caltrans for review. 15 copies of the final form will be submitted by ICF to the State Clearinghouse.

Two ICF Staff will attend one (1) scoping meeting. ICF will assist with preparation for the scoping meeting, up to 8 hours of preparation assumed. ICF will assist with reviewing scoping materials and providing feedback.

Task 6.2. Draft EIR/EA

The EIR/EA will be prepared by ICF using a Caltrans-approved annotated outline for an EIR/EA. To reduce iterations of the document, ICF will conduct a revision workshop with RTC and/or Caltrans, if needed, to facilitate completion of the document.

ICF will prepare an Administrative Draft EIR/EA which will be submitted along with an External QC Certification, and ED Review Checklist, and forward to RTC first and then to Caltrans for review. Following this review, a 2nd Administrative Draft EIR/EA will be prepared along with the Comment/Response matrix. A Screencheck Draft EIR/EA will be prepared with External QC Certification and ED Review Checklist, and forwarded to RTC and Caltrans for their concurrence and then NEPA Quality Control (QC) and Environmental Branch Chief Review.

Following this review the document will be revised and the Final Draft EIR/EA will be prepared along with the Comment/Response matrix, External QC Certification, and ED Review Checklist, and forwarded to RTC and Caltrans for their final concurrence and approval. It is assumed that only minor comments will be received on the Screencheck Draft EIR/EA and that those revisions would be made and the Final Draft EIR/EA would be approved by RTC and Caltrans for public availability with no further comment. To reduce iterations of the document ICF will conduct a revision workshop with RTC and Caltrans to facilitate completion of the document following the review of the 2nd Administrative Draft and the second NEPA QC review, if comments still remain after either of these reviews.

The Draft EIR/EA will include an Environmental Commitment Record (ECR). The ECR will be provided in table format. It is assumed that the ECR will be reviewed as part of the environmental document. The matrix table will include a description of each avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measure from the environmental document and technical studies, organized by topic and numbered to correspond with the impacts. For each measure, the Reporting Process, Timing of Measure, Responsible Party, and Verification of Compliance will be identified.

An administrative record will be prepared for all sources and references used in the document.

Public Circulation of the Draft EIR/EA: ICF will utilize the mailing list prepared for the NOP and add any persons/agencies that commented on the NOP to the mailing list for the Draft EIR/EA public circulation. ICF will prepare a Notice of Availability of the Draft EIR/EA in accordance with Caltrans requirements for publication in a newspaper of local circulation (both English and Spanish), for posting at the Santa Cruz County Clerk’s office, and for distribution. This notice could also serve as a notice of the public meeting. A draft notice will be provided to the RTC and Caltrans for review and approval. Convey, Inc. will coordinate publication of the notice with the appropriate newspapers (2 newspapers assumed). Hardcopies of the document and NOA will be provided to the availability locations (RTC, Caltrans and 2 libraries), CDs containing the document and a hard copy of the NOA will be provided to other agencies and officials included on the distribution list (and anyone else who specifically requests a copy of the document), and a copy of the NOI will be provided to property owners and residences/businesses within 500 feet of the proposed project. Convey, Inc. will coordinate printing and mailing of the NOI to residences and businesses. A Draft State Clearinghouse Form (Notice of Completion & Environmental Document Transmittal) will be prepared and submitted to the RTC and Caltrans for review. The final form, NOA along with 15 copies of the summary of the Draft EIR/EA, will be submitted by ICF to the State Clearinghouse.
Public Meeting for the Draft EIR/EA: One public meeting is assumed during the public review of the Draft EIR/EA. It is assumed that the format of the public meeting will follow the open house format. Convey, Inc will provide meeting logistics support. Two ICF Staff will attend one (1) public meeting. ICF will assist with preparing materials related to environmental impacts. ICF staff will be available to present on environmental resource topics as needed.

Task 6.3. Response to Comments on the Draft IS/MND
At the close of the public comment period for the Draft EIR/EA, ICF will review and respond to all comments received. ICF will assemble and organize the comment letters received for distribution to members of the project team for review and response. The public comments and responses to those comments will be included in the Final EIR/EA as a separate chapter. It is assumed for the purposes of the cost proposal that not more than 40 individual comments will be received and that comments will not require additional research or technical analysis, and that no comments requiring legal review or requiring new analyses or comments from lawyers will be received). Form letters/repeated comments will be consolidated and responded to together. The comments will be responded to and incorporated directly into the Final EIR/EA. For each comment, ICF will identify the appropriate respondent and disseminate the comments to the team for preparation of responses. If comments remain after the revised draft Responses to Comments then a revision workshop will be held to address any remaining comments.

Task 6.4. Final EIR/EA
Upon approval of the responses to comments by RTC and Caltrans, ICF will prepare the 1st Administrative Draft Final EIR/EA to respond to the comments, to document the circulation period and coordination, and if any changes to the project have occurred. Also, included will be a Draft Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI). The QA/QC form and checklist are assumed to be included with each submittal. Following the incorporation of one set of comments from RTC, the revised 2nd Administrative Draft Final EIR/EA will be submitted to Caltrans. A Screencheck Draft Final EIR/EA/FONSI with comment matrix will be prepared and submitted to RTC and Caltrans for concurrence and for conducting the NEPA QC review. Following the Caltrans NEPA QC review the Final EIR/EA/FONSI will be prepared and submitted to RTC and Caltrans for review. It is assumed that no additional comments will be received. Documentation of compliance with Section 4(f) will be included in the Final EIR/EA. The final resolution of compliance with the Federal Endangered Species Act will be completed at this time and incorporated into the Final Environmental Document. A Final Administrative Record and ECR will be provided to RTC and Caltrans.

Task 6.5. CEQA Notice of Determination/NEPA Finding of No Significant Impact
ICF prepare the Notice of Determination (NOD) in compliance with CEQA and Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) under NEPA. If needed, a Statement of Overriding Considerations (SOC) and Findings of Fact will also be prepared for review and approval. ICF will prepare a Draft FONSI for completion and approval by Caltrans Department Authority (per NEPA Assignment). It is assumed that ICF will file the NOD and FONSI with the Office of Planning and Research (OPR). The NOD and FONSI would also be posted with the Santa Cruz County Clerk ($50 filing fee). This notice starts a statute of limitations period under CEQA. Along with the NOD a California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) filing fee would also be filed. The CDFW filing fee has been included in the submitted cost estimate and is assumed to not exceed $3,271 (2019).

Task 6.6. Public Outreach
Convey will lead the outreach effort. It consists of:

- **Community/ Open House Meetings** - Convey will arrange and facilitate two (2) open house style meetings before the publication of the Environmental Document. They will arrange for a public meeting location and notify residents, stakeholders and public officials. They will assist Mark Thomas in preparing meeting presentation materials and obtain Caltrans approval of the materials. They will prepare a summary of comments provided at the meetings.
Stakeholder Meetings - Convey will compile a stakeholder list and will arrange and facilitate two (2) stakeholder meetings. They will prepare a summary of comments provided at the meetings.

Environmental Noticing - Convey will prepare and obtain Caltrans approval of Newspaper advertisements for the availability of the environmental document (ED) and will work with Mark Thomas on printing and distribution of the ED.

**TASK 6 DELIVERABLES**

- Draft NOP/NOI (assumed to be transmitted electronically with no hard copies)
- Final NOP/NOI (50 hard copies – printing and mailing for agencies)
- Draft and Final Notice of Preparation & Environmental Document Transmittal (15 copies to State Clearinghouse)
- Attendance at the Scoping Meeting
- 1st Administrative Draft EIR/EA (electronic copy to RTC)
- 2nd Administrative Draft EIR/EA (2 hardcopies and 1 electronic copy each to RTC and Caltrans)
- Screencheck Draft EIR/EA (2 hardcopies and 1 electronic copy each to RTC and Caltrans)
- Final Draft EIR/EA for RTC and Caltrans approval (10 hard copies and electronic copy each to RTC and Caltrans)
- Environmental Commitments Record (ECR) (included as an appendix in each submittal of the EIR/EA)
- Environmental Document Checklist and External QC Form (electronic copy to Caltrans)
- Admin Record (pdf files)
- 25 hard copies and one electronic (pdf) final Draft EIR/EA for public circulation and website postings
- Draft NOA for review (assumed to be transmitted electronically with no hard copies)
- Final NOA (50 hard copies)
- CDs of the EIR/EA (50 copies) and electronic copy for website
- Draft and Final Notice of Completion & Environmental Document Transmittal
- Admin Draft #1 Responses to comments
- Admin Draft #2 Responses to Comments
- 1st Administrative Draft Final EIR/EA (electronic copy to RTC)
- 2nd Administrative Draft Final EIR/EA (2 hardcopies and 1 electronic copy each to RTC and Caltrans)
- Screencheck Draft Final EIR/EA (2 hardcopies and 1 electronic copy each to RTC and Caltrans)
- Final EIR/EA for RTC and Caltrans approval (10 hard copies and electronic copy each to RTC and Caltrans)
- Environmental Commitments Record (ECR)
- Final Admin Record
- Draft and Final NOD and FONSI (all transmittals assumed to be done electronically)
- Draft and Final SOC and Findings of Fact
- Newspaper Advertisements
- Stakeholder List

**TASK 7. PROJECT REPORT**

**Task 7.1. Cost Estimates**

Mark Thomas will prepare quantities and unit costs for the build alternative and complete the 11-page Caltrans Preliminary Project Cost Estimate Summary. Approximate quantities will be developed, and unit costs determined based on Caltrans Contract Cost Data and recent applicable bid results. The 11-page estimate will also include supplemental items, state furnished materials and an estimate of Capital Outlay Support Costs.
Task 7.2. Traffic Management Plan
Consistent with Caltrans standards, Mark Thomas will prepare a Traffic Management Plan (TMP) checklist and for inclusion in the PR. This will include a review of traffic control restrictions, recommendations for anticipated lane closures, construction staging/traffic requirements, COZEEP requirements, and a review of construction strategies. The TMP will be submitted to Caltrans for approval and will be included as an attachment to the Project Report.

Task 7.3. Risk Management Plan
The plan will be prepared to PA&ED phase standards and submitted to Caltrans for approval as part of the draft and Final Project Report. Risks identified in the PID phase will be retired as appropriate and new risks added as identified. The Risk Management Plan is a tool to be used to keep RTC and Caltrans informed of risks and what efforts can be utilized to reduce risks and costs.

Task 7.4. Project Report
Mark Thomas will prepare the Draft and Final Project Report (PR) for distribution, review and approval by RTC, Caltrans, and selected PDT members.

Concurrent with environmental document submittals, we will prepare the Project Report (PR) for distribution, review and approval by Caltrans, and the rest of the PDT. The PR will be prepared in conformance with Caltrans Project Development Procedures Manual latest guidelines and format style will include the supporting information (GADs, Traffic Studies, Cost Estimates, etc.) listed above.

The report will be prepared and approved in two versions: The Draft PR requests approval to circulate environmental document, and the Final PR requests approval of project. Each version of the above reports will be submitted in Draft Form (full District circulation), Draft Final (limited, management review) and Final Form (District circulation copies), for a total of six submittals.

**TASK 7 DELIVERABLES**
- Draft and Final 11-page Cost Estimate (1 Submittal for each, 1 electronic copy)
- Draft and Final TMP (1 Submittal for each, 1 electronic copy)
- Draft, Periodic Updates and Final Risk Management Plan (1 Submittal for each, 1 electronic copy)
- First draft of Draft Project Report (1 Submittal, 1 hardcopy and 1 electronic copy)
- Second Limited draft of Draft Project Report (1 Submittal, 1 hardcopy and 1 electronic copy)
- Draft Project Report (One hardcopy with Attachments and 1 electronic copy)
- First draft of Final Project Report (1 Submittal, 1 hardcopy and 1 electronic copy)
- Second Limited draft of Final Project Report (1 Submittal, 1 hardcopy and 1 electronic copy)
- Final Project Report (One Hardcopy with Attachments and 1 electronic copy)
### Subconsultants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Firm/Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landscape Architect</td>
<td>ICF Jones &amp; Stokes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Accountant</td>
<td>SWCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. Project Assistant</td>
<td>Parikh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Technician</td>
<td>Principal/Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Engineer I</td>
<td>Technical Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paleo Solutions</td>
<td>Sr. Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Engineer</td>
<td>Monument ROW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>$258</td>
<td>$258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$258</td>
<td>$258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$216</td>
<td>$216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$177</td>
<td>$177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$162</td>
<td>$26,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$66,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>QA/QC</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$26,456</td>
<td>$26,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td>$66,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>$26,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
<td>$26,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$19,276</td>
<td>$19,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>$19,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td>$19,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>$13,964</td>
<td>$13,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>$13,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>DIB/Design Decisions</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$52,440</td>
<td>$52,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td>$52,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>$52,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$24,680</td>
<td>$24,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>380</td>
<td></td>
<td>$24,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Water Quality Study</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$2,838</td>
<td>$2,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$2,838</td>
<td>$2,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>Storm Water Data Report</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$40,812</td>
<td>$40,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>$40,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td>$40,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>$40,812</td>
<td>$40,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td>$40,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>324</td>
<td></td>
<td>$40,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>Utility Conflict Analysis</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$16,924</td>
<td>$16,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>$16,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>$16,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>$16,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>$16,924</td>
<td>$16,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$16,924</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Subtotal

#### Phase 3
- $258,635
- $0
- $68,920
- $80,474
- $7,596
- $0
- $0
- $0
- $0
- $0
- $0
- $537,674

#### Phase 5
- $24,160
- $16,000
- $0
- $0
- $0
- $0
- $0
- $0
- $0
- $0
- $0
- $0
- $285,144

#### Phase 6
- $25,947

#### Subtotal

- $380,684
- $0
- $0
- $111,912
- $17,422
- $0
- $0
- $0
- $0
- $0
- $0
- $6,354
- $34,538
- $285,144

### Environmental Engineer Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>CEQA Notice of Determination/NEPA FONSI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,756</td>
<td>$3,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$1,756</td>
<td>$3,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Outreach</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$6,018</td>
<td>$12,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>$12,036</td>
<td>$72,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,036</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Subtotal

#### Phase 8
- $111,912
- $17,422
- $0
- $0
- $0
- $0
- $0
- $0
- $0
- $0
- $0
- $0
- $34,538
- $285,144
- $285,144

### Additional Costs

- Anticipated Salary Increases: $12,329
- Other Direct Costs: $22,190
- Total Cost: $145,512

### TOTAL COST

- $821,510
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Name</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Finish</th>
<th>Predecessors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DATA GATHERING</td>
<td>3/10</td>
<td>3/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTICE TO PROCEED</td>
<td>3/10</td>
<td>3/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATA ACQUISITION</td>
<td>3/10</td>
<td>3/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING</td>
<td>3/10</td>
<td>3/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORTATION ANALYSIS</td>
<td>3/10</td>
<td>3/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATA COLLECTION AND METHODOLOGY FRAME</td>
<td>3/19</td>
<td>3/26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXISTING CONDITIONS MEMO</td>
<td>3/19</td>
<td>3/26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUTURE CONDITIONS MEMO</td>
<td>3/19</td>
<td>3/26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS ON SHOULDER OPERATIONS ANALYSIS REPORT</td>
<td>3/26</td>
<td>3/29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRAFT TRAFFIC OPERATIONS ANALYSIS REPORT (TDRA)</td>
<td>3/29</td>
<td>5/30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDT/CT REVIEW</td>
<td>3/29</td>
<td>3/30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVISE REPORT</td>
<td>3/30</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRAFT FINAL REVIEW</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINAL PTOA</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOMETRIC APPROVAL DRAWINGS</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREPARE GEOMETRIC ALTERNATIVES</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/9/19</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDT/CT REVIEW</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVISE/UPDATE GEOMETRICS</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDT/CT FINAL REVIEW</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPROVED GEOMETRICS</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVANCE FLOORING STUDIES</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRELIMINARY DRAINAGE STUDIES</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INITIAL SITE ASSESSMENT</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W DATA SHEETS</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC OUTREACH</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC WORKSHOP #1</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC WORKSHOP #2</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECT SCOPING</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREPARE NOP</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDT REVIEW</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC REVIEW</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CREATE NOP</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATURAL ENVIRONMENT STUDY/BIOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULTURAL RESOURCE STUDIES</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRS and PNP</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOISE STUDY TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIR QUALITY TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVIEW OF ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDT/CT REVIEW</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVISE/UPDATE</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDT/CT REVIEW</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINAL TECHNICAL STUDIES</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECTION 7 CONSULTATION</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGENCY REVIEW</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVISE/UPDATE</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGENCY REVIEW</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOLOGICAL OPINIONS ISSUED</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQA DOCUMENTIZATION</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMIN DRAFT EIR/EQA</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDT/CT REVIEW</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINISH ADMIN DRAFT EIR/EQA</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRAFT EIR/EQA</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC REVIEW</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRAFT FINAL EIR/EQA</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEO APPROVES EIR</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINISH EIR/EQA</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AERIA DOCUMENTIZATION</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVISE REPORT</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPA DOCUMENTIZATION</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPROVE NEPA</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT REPORT</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREPARE DRAFT REPORT</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDT/CT REVIEW</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESPONSE TO COMMUNITY/PREPARE DRAFT REPORT</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT CIRCULATION</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVISE/UPDATE</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRAFT COLLECTOR</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPROPRIATE DRAFT</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREPARE FINAL PR</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDT/CT REVIEW</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVISE/UPDATE</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVISE/UPDATE</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPROVE FINAL PR</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td>3/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Regional Transportation Commission

FROM: Shannon Munz, Communications Specialist

RE: Fiscal Years 16/17 and 17/18 Measure D Annual Report

RECOMMENDATIONS

Receive the Measure D Taxpayer Oversight Committee report to the public regarding Fiscal Years (FY) 16/17 & 17/18 expenditures and audits.

BACKGROUND

In November 2016, Santa Cruz County voters approved the Measure D transportation sales tax. The tax went into effect in April 2017, with the state making the first payments of revenues collected to the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC) in summer 2017. The Measure D Ordinance recognizes that accountability is of utmost importance and includes several safeguards to ensure accountability, transparency and public oversight of all funds collected and allocated (Ordinance Section 32).

Funding agreements with recipient agencies require each agency receiving Measure D revenues to annually provide an expenditure report and audited financial statements showing how Measure D funds were spent in the prior fiscal year. Agencies that receive allocations of Measure D funds include: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC), cities of Capitola, Santa Cruz, Scotts Valley, and Watsonville, the County of Santa Cruz, Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (METRO), and Community Bridges/Lift Line.

The purpose of the audits and expenditure reports is to help confirm that the expenditure of funds is in accordance with the Measure D Ordinance and Expenditure Plan adopted by the voters and Measure D Funding Agreement with recipient agencies.

Per Section 32C of the voter approved Ordinance, Measure D requires establishment of an oversight committee. The oversight committee is tasked with the following responsibilities:

- Reviewing Expenditure Plan expenditures on an annual basis to ensure they conform to the Ordinance
- Reviewing the annual audit and report prepared by an independent auditor, describing how funds were spent
- Producing a publicly available Annual Report of oversight activities
DISCUSSION

Earlier this year, the Measure D oversight committee reviewed audits and expenditure reports from each of the agencies allocated Measure D revenues. The audits and reports covered the last three months of FY16/17, just after the ordinance went into effect, and the entire FY17/18. The audits and expenditure reports are available online at: https://sccrtc.org/funding-planning/measured/taxpayer-oversight/

Based on the oversight committee’s review of the audits and expenditure reports from recipient agencies, committee members prepared an annual report that includes a letter from them commenting on whether the provisions and requirements have been complied with through FY17/18. The annual report focuses on the financials and findings of the audits, and also includes highlights of some of the projects that are funded by Measure D funds. Attachment 1 is the FY16-17 & 17-18 Measure D Annual Report. Staff recommends that the commission receive the Measure D annual report for FY’s 16/17 and 17/18 (Attachment 1) and make the report publicly available.

FISCAL IMPACTS: There are no fiscal impacts associated with receiving the Measure D Taxpayer Oversight Committee annual report regarding FY’s 16/17 and 17/18 expenditures and audits.

SUMMARY

The Measure D Ordinance requires the oversight committee to report to the public regarding the FY’s 16/17 and 17/18 expenditures and annual audits. The Measure D Annual Report has concluded that the expenditure of Measure D funds has been in accordance with the Measure D Ordinance and Expenditure Plan for the period of April 1, 2017 through June 30, 2018.

Attachments:
  1. FY16/17 & 17/18 Measure D Annual Report

\rtcserv2\shared\rtc\tc2019\tc0619\regular\measuredannualreport\measd-annualreport-toc-sr.docx
In November 2016, over 2/3rd of the voters of Santa Cruz County approved Measure D, a comprehensive and inclusive package of transportation improvements to be developed in the County that would be funded by the imposition of a Retail Transactions and Use Tax of one-half of one percent (0.5%) for a period of 30 years. The tax became effective on April 1, 2017. The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) allocates, administers and oversees the expenditure of all Measure D revenues which are not directly allocated by formula annually to other agencies, consistent with the Expenditure Plan. The RTC has been designated as the Local Transportation Authority (the Authority) to implement the provisions of Measure D.

Section 32 of the ordinance that governs the expenditure of Measure D funds specifies that an Independent Oversight Committee be formed by the Commission’s Board of Directors to review the annual independent fiscal audit of the expenditure of Transportation Tax funds and issue an annual report on its findings regarding compliance with the requirements of the Expenditure Plan and the ordinance to the Authority Board of Directors. The independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee shall not exceed five members who will be residents of Santa Cruz County who are neither elected officials of any government nor employees from any agency or organization that oversees or implements projects funded from the proceeds of the sales tax.

The Oversight Committee members were appointed by the RTC Board of Directors in 2018 after an application process was concluded. The Oversight Committee members are as follows:

- Supervisorial District 1: Janet Edwards, Vice Chair
- Supervisorial District 2: Michael W. Machado CPA, Chair
- Supervisorial District 3: Abel Rodriguez
- Supervisorial District 4: Carmen Herrera Mansir
- Supervisorial District 5: Todd Guin

The Committee held its first meeting on October 29, 2018, its second meeting on March 25, 2019, and its third meeting on May 13, 2019. Minutes of the meetings are available for review on the RTC Website.

At its March 25, 2019 meeting, the Committee reviewed the audited Measure D Financial Statements that were audited by independent CPA firms. Independent audits of the Measure D Funds of the following agencies were reviewed:

- Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
- County of Santa Cruz
- City of Capitola
- City of Santa Cruz
- City of Scotts Valley
- City of Watsonville
- Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District
- Community Bridges

None of the audits had any negative findings as to the expenditure of the Measure D funds nor were any incidents of non-compliance with the Ordinance noted.
A summary of Measure D Funds received and expended from April 1, 2017 (the effective date) through June 30, 2018 follows:

**Fund Distribution and Expenditures: Fiscal Years 16/17 & 17/18**
(includes revenues received since the effective date of April 1, 2017 through June 30, 2018.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment Category</th>
<th>Measure D Revenue Allocation</th>
<th>Interest Earned</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Measure D Balance&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Cash Basis - there is a 2-month accrual lag)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Neighborhood</strong></td>
<td>$2,055,853</td>
<td>$241,866</td>
<td>$269,719</td>
<td>$28,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highway Corridors - RTC</strong></td>
<td>$5,046,542</td>
<td>$201,555</td>
<td>$5,248,097</td>
<td>$32,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit/Paratransit - METRO&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</strong></td>
<td>$3,229,787</td>
<td>$128,995</td>
<td>$3,358,782</td>
<td>$19,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit/Paratransit - misc&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</strong></td>
<td>$1,180</td>
<td>$1,180</td>
<td>$642,324</td>
<td>$1,047,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paratransit - Lift Line</strong></td>
<td>$807,447</td>
<td>$32,249</td>
<td>$839,696</td>
<td>$209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Active Transportation-RTC</strong></td>
<td>$3,431,648</td>
<td>$137,057</td>
<td>$3,568,705</td>
<td>$20,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rail Corridor-RTC</strong></td>
<td>$1,614,893</td>
<td>$64,497</td>
<td>$1,679,390</td>
<td>$9,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Admin. salaries &amp; benefits</strong></td>
<td>$207,365</td>
<td>$11,462</td>
<td>$218,827</td>
<td>$2,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation &amp; Oversight</strong></td>
<td>$342,915</td>
<td>$328,537</td>
<td>$671,452</td>
<td>$3,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$20,736,450</td>
<td>$1,146,218</td>
<td>$21,882,668</td>
<td>$118,062</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: This table includes a combination of information from RTC and local agency audited financial information and project expenditure reports. For most agencies, information represents cash, rather than accrual, basis. Audited financials are typically presented on a modified or full accrual basis which means revenues are recognized when earned, not when received. For example, while revenue earnings are based on transactions in May 2017, if it was received in July 2017, it is shown in FY17/18 because that is when cash was received. Unexpended balances or reserved funds carryover to future years. Several projects started in FY17/18 and incurred majority of costs in FY18/19.

1-City of Santa Cruz expenditures include $1,863 allowance for gains/loses which is included in their audited financial statement.

2-METRO also set aside on accrual (not cash) basis $532k for capital vehicle replacements. Funds will be shown as expenditures in future.

3-Interest earnings not yet transferred to Lift Line and METRO at end of FY17/18.

4-For Community Bridges, revenues reflect amounts paid by RTC to Lift Line in FY17/18, though Lift Line did not account for them until FY18/19.

5-Net Revenues, after state Board of Equalization fees.

6-Carryover balances, includes funds allocated to recipient agencies, to be expended in future years.
As noted in the table, total Measure D revenues collected from April 2017 through June 2018 by the RTC were $21,882,668. The RTC distributed $9,954,526 to direct recipient agencies and the RTC expended $2,008,198 on regional projects, administrative and implementation tasks. Measure D funds totaling $16,775,511 are being carried over to future years for use on approved projects.

Measure D continues to serve as a crucial source of local transportation funding for the Santa Cruz County community. The Committee looks forward to continuing to work with the community to ensure the ongoing success of the Measure D program.

The Measure D Taxpayer Oversight Committee hereby finds that the Authority is proceeding in accordance with the Measure D Ordinance and the Expenditure Plan for the period from April 1, 2017 through June 30, 2018.

Michael W. Machado CPA, Chair

Measure D Taxpayer Oversight Committee
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
On November 8, 2016 67.78% of Santa Cruz County voters approved Measure D, a 1/2 cent sales tax measure to improve, operate and maintain Santa Cruz County’s transportation network.

Projects will provide safer routes to schools for local students; maintain mobility and independence for seniors and those with disabilities; invest in bicycle and pedestrian pathways and bridges on an unprecedented scale; repave roadways, repair potholes and improve safety on local streets; ease congestion; and invest in transportation projects that reduce the pollution that causes global warming.

**Measure D Recipients**
- Measure D revenues are distributed by voter-approved formulas to the cities of Capitola, Santa Cruz, Scotts Valley, Watsonville, the County, the RTC, METRO and Lift Line. Measure D recipients may also program funds (via 5-year plans) to projects implemented by other agencies, such as Caltrans and non-profit organizations.

**Committed to Voters:**
- Each recipient agency solicits public input and approves updated 5-year plans identifying specific projects annually.
- Annual audits of the expenditure of all funds generated by the measure are conducted by an independent auditor and publicly available.
- The Measure D Oversight Committee reviews the independent annual audit and issues a report regarding compliance with the Expenditure Plan.
- Recipient agencies are required to use new Measure D funds to supplement, not replace, existing revenues used for transportation.
HIGHLIGHTS OF PROJECTS FUNDED
in FY’s 16/17 & 17/18

Local Neighborhood Projects
In FY17/18, city and county public works departments used their apportionments of Measure D funds to repair local roads and improve bicycle and pedestrian facilities throughout the county.

County of Santa Cruz
- Casserly Road bridge replacement
- Countywide 2018 roadway resurfacing design
- Bicycle safety education and outreach programs

Capitola
- Enhanced green bike lanes at Highway 1 on/off ramps
- Citywide slurry seal along 2.6 miles of roadway, including portions of: 46th Avenue, Wharf Road, Prospect Avenue, Beverly Avenue, Burlingame Avenue, Capitola Avenue, Del Monte Avenue, Pilgrim Drive, Pine Street, Plum Street; and crack seal along Bay Avenue

Santa Cruz
- San Lorenzo River Trestle trail widening
- Downtown bike locker replacements
- Citywide roadway repairs, reconstruction, and overlays

Scotts Valley
- Measure D funds were reserved for use on future projects

Watsonville
- Bicycle Safety Improvements – signage and traffic markings along bicycle corridors and bicycle safety training in schools
- Downtown complete streets revitalization (Main Street from Beach Street to Freedom Boulevard)
- Pedestrian and Traffic Safety - contracted with a traffic engineer to analyze collision data to assist with implementing pedestrian safety programs and improvements
Lift Line – Paratransit Services

- Lift Line used its Measure D allocation in FY17/18 to expand service to seven days per week.

Santa Cruz METRO

- Measure D was used to sustain fixed-route services on routes 35, 40, 41, 68, 69A, 71, 72, 75, 79, and 91X; and to provide additional weekend service on route 71.
- Sustain ParaCruz service levels – 1 operator.
- Vehicle replacements – Measure D being used to leverage state and federal grants to reduce the backlog of METRO vehicles needing replacement from 60% to 30%.

Active Transportation - Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network (MBSST) Rail

During FY17/18 the RTC and the City of Santa Cruz used Measure D funds on environmental review, permitting, design, coordination and other actions required for the following projects:
- New bike/walk bridge at the San Lorenzo River Trestle near the Boardwalk. The project was completed in May 2019.
- Rail Trail between Natural Bridges Drive and Bay Street/California Avenue (Phase 1 of Segment 7) in Santa Cruz, scheduled to start construction in 2019.
- Rail Trail between Bay Street/California Avenue and the Wharf intersection roundabout in Santa Cruz (Phase 2 of Segment 7), scheduled to start construction in 2020.
- North Coast Rail Trail project from Davenport to Wilder Ranch State Park (Segment 5), construction scheduled in 2021/22.
- Watsonville trail (Segment 18) from Lee Road to Walker Street, construction scheduled in FY20/21.

Highway 9/SLV Corridor and Highway 17 Wildlife Crossing

- FY17/18 Measure D funds designated for the Highway 9/SLV Corridor and Highway 17 Wildlife Crossing were held in reserve for use in future years. Planning and preconstruction work for Highway 9/SLV Corridor and the Highway 17 Wildlife Crossing was conducted with other funds in FY17/18.
Highway Corridors

- Cruz511 Traveler Information System - $50,000 in Measure D funds were spent in FY17/18 to provide traffic, roadway closure, carpool, vanpool, bus, and other information to travelers via www.Cruz511.org, 429-POOL, and public events.

- The balance of FY17/18 Measure D funds designated for Highway Corridors were held in reserve for use in future years on projects identified in the Measure D 5-year plans, including Highway 1 auxiliary lanes between 41st Avenue and Soquel Drive, and a bicycle/pedestrian overcrossing at Chanticleer Avenue; auxiliary lanes from Bay/Porter in Capitola/Soquel to State Park Drive in Aptos; and a bicycle/pedestrian crossing near Mar Vista in Seacliff/Aptos is expected to use future Measure D funds.

Rail Corridor

- Measure D helped fund the Unified Corridor Investment Study (UCS), which evaluated rail and non-rail options in the rail corridor. On January 17, 2019, the RTC approved a preferred scenario and affirmed the RTC’s commitment to include trail and transit, and freight and recreational rail uses in the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line corridor.

- Ongoing storm damage repairs and preventative maintenance, including vegetation and drainage work on the rail corridor.

Administrative and Implementation Activities in FY17/18

- Agreements were established between the RTC and the state to collect the sales (use) tax and to receive the revenues.

- Policies and procedures were established to safeguard taxpayer dollars and ensure they are expended per voter direction.

- Accounting and fiscal systems were set up to manage each of the accounts and disburse funding to direct recipients per voter approved formulas.

- Agreements and guidelines were established with recipient agencies.

- Five-year plans were prepared to delineate projects planned for the first five years of revenues.

- Ongoing outreach and community engagement was conducted via website updates (www.sccrtc.org/move), Facebook, eNews, and NextDoor.

- Oversight Committee was established.