



Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission's
Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC)

AGENDA

Note Early Start Time:
Thursday, November 18, 2010
1:00 p.m.

SCCRTC Conference Room
1523 Pacific Ave.
Santa Cruz, CA

1. Call to Order
2. Introductions
3. Oral communications

The Committee will receive oral communications during this time on items not on today's agenda. Presentations must be within the jurisdiction of the Committee, and may be limited in time at the discretion of the Chair. Committee members will not take action or respond immediately to any Oral Communications presented, but may choose to follow up at a later time, either individually, or on a subsequent Committee agenda.

4. 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 Committee or public wishes an item be removed and discussed on the regular agenda. Members of the Committee 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 committee member objects to the change.

5. Approve Minutes of the August 19, 2010 ITAC meeting - Page 3

REGULAR AGENDA

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

7. Draft Highway 1 Corridor System Management Plan (CSMP) - Page 7
 - a. Staff report
 - b. Presentation from Caltrans District 5 Planning
 - c. Excerpts from the CSMP
8. Draft State and Federal Legislative Program - Page 18
 - a. Staff report
 - b. Draft State Legislative Program
 - c. Draft Federal Legislative Program
9. Overview of the AMBAG Regional Travel Demand Model Improvement Plan - Page 35
 - a. Memorandum from Bhupendra Patel, Ph.D., AMBAG Senior Transportation Modeler
 - b. Presentation
10. American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Status Report - Page 37
 - a. Staff report
 - b. Outstanding ARRA projects
11. Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (SCMTD) Bus Stop Improvement Project - Page 39
 - a. Staff report
 - b. Presentation from Tove Beatty, SCMTD staff

NEXT MEETING: The next ITAC meeting is scheduled for **January 20, 2011** at **1:00 PM** in the SCCRTC Conference Room, 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA. There is no meeting planned for December.

HOW TO REACH US: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission

1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA 95060

phone: (831) 460-3200 / fax (831) 460-3215; email: info@scrtc.org / website: www.scrtc.org

AGENDAS ONLINE: To receive email notification when the Committee meeting agenda packets are posted on our website, please call (831) 460-3200 or email rmoriconi@scrtc.org to subscribe.

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

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



Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC)

DRAFT MINUTES

Thursday August 19, 2010
1:00 p.m.

SCCRTC Conference Room
1523 Pacific Ave, Santa Cruz, CA

ITAC MEMBERS PRESENT

Angela Aitken, Santa Cruz Metro
Tove Beatty, Santa Cruz Metro
Teresa Buika, UCSC
Jennifer Calate, Caltrans District 5
Piet Canin, Ecology Action
Russell Chen, County of Santa Cruz Public Works
Mark Dettle, City of Santa Cruz Public Works and Planning Proxy
Dave Fairchild, MBUAPCD
David Koch, City of Watsonville Public Works
Maria Esther Rodriguez, City of Watsonville Planning Proxy
Steve Wiesner, County of Santa Cruz Planning Proxy

STAFF PRESENT

Rachel Moriconi
Kim Shultz

OTHERS PRESENT

Adam Fukushima, Caltrans District 5
Dan Herron, Caltrans District 5
David Murray, Caltrans District 5
Brandy Rider, Caltrans District 5

1. Call to Order – Chair Rodriguez called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m.
2. Introductions – Self introductions were made.
3. Oral communications

Jennifer Calate announced that Caltrans will be closed on Fridays due to furloughs; Brandy Rider will take over as the District 5 Planning Branch Chief with Dave Murray's retirement; Jennifer Calate will be moving to Systems Planning, with Dan Herron taking over as the new regional planner for Santa Cruz County.

On behalf of Garin Schneiter (District 5 Local Assistance Engineer), Rachel Moriconi reminded members that Local Assistance Procedures Manual Exhibit 9-C –"Local Agency ADA Annual Certification Form" must be on file with District 5 by October 1, 2010 in order to access federal funds in FFY10/11. Members noted that the annual Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) forms and forms for projects under construction that will continue past October 1 also need to be submitted.

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

CONSENT AGENDA (Buika/Rodriguez) approved.

5. Approved minutes of the June 17, 2010 meeting. - *Attendees not present June 17, 2010 abstained*

REGULAR AGENDA

6. Status of ongoing transportation projects, programs, studies and planning documents

Project sponsors gave updates on their projects.

Caltrans – Jennifer Calate reported that the Highway 1 Transportation Management System and Highway 9 Guardrails construction projects are complete. A microsurfacing project in Ben Lomond area will be done in September. Highway 129 pavement rehabilitation is underway, with one-way traffic control. Highway 9 repairs are expected to be completed and the road reopened by October. County Public Works staff stated that the closure has significantly impacted Graham Hill and Mt. Hermon Roads. At the request of Piet Canin, Jennifer Calate agreed to investigate if bicyclists could be allowed through the construction zone on Highway 9.

Ecology Action - Piet Canin reported that Ecology Action is preparing for Fall Bike to Work/School events and working on a new program called "Boltage" that counts the number of bike and walk trips taken by elementary school students and incentivizes more trips by bike and walking, with kickoff of the program planned at Gault School in October.

SCMTD - Angela Aitken reported that SCMTD has completed its maintenance building, with the operations building on hold until the state budget is passed, at which point the Request for Proposals (RFP) for construction will be issued. New fare boxes are expected to arrive in September/October and new paratransit vehicles will arrive in September. Metro has developed a preliminary list of bus stop improvements to be funded with State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds and will share the list with the ITAC once it is refined. She noted that Tove Beatty will be working on legislation and grants at Metro and serve as the representative to the ITAC. Tove noted that Metro will be starting a Transit Planning Study in Watsonville, using funds from a Caltrans Planning Grant. Dan Herron suggested the Bus Stop Improvement project be coordinated with the Safe Paths to Transit project.

Watsonville – Maria Rodriguez reported that the ARRA-funded Green Valley Road Rehabilitation project is under construction. Design of the RSTPX-funded Freedom Boulevard Rehab project is nearing completion with construction scheduled for early 2011. A Safe Routes to Schools-funded project targeting pedestrian improvements at three locations is under design. The Proposition 1B Traffic Light Synchronization construction project, which includes Airport Blvd, Freedom Blvd, and Green Valley Road, will be awarded next month. Work on the Report of Conceptual Approval for the Freedom Blvd/Main St.-SR152 Roundabout is nearing completion. Once a cooperative agreement between Caltrans and the City is completed, the City will determine the next steps for the Harkins Slough Road/Highway 1 Interchange project.

County of Santa Cruz – Steve Wiesner reported that construction began on the second round of ARRA road repairs on roadways throughout the county, including Freedom Blvd, Holohan, Mt. Hermon, Jamison Creek. Construction is also underway as part of the countywide pavement management program which includes chip seals on more than ten roadways, RDA-funded overlays in Live Oak, and CSA slurry seal projects. Work continues on storm damage repairs from 2006 including repairs on East Zayante, Eureka Canyon, Kings Creek, Redwood Lodge Road, and Glenwood Drive. The East Cliff Bluff project is 90% done and expected to reopen in September, with the parkway project along East Cliff expected to begin next summer. Road repairs on Soquel Avenue near 17th Ave, including curb, gutter, and sidewalks, will begin soon. The Green Valley/Holohan/Airport Blvd intersection project is scheduled to start construction after the County Fair. The County plans to go out to bid for construction of the Graham Hill Safety Project in October, with award in December. The Calabasas Road Improvements project, including curb, gutter, and sidewalks, is scheduled for construction next summer. Information on County roadways under construction is on the County Public Works website (<http://www.sccroadclosure.org/>).

City of Santa Cruz – Mark Dettle reported that the Roundabouts project is scheduled to start construction in September. The Coastal Commission is expected to consider additional information on the Broadway-Brommer Bicycle/Pedestrian path this fall.

7. Update on Highway 1 Projects

Kim Shultz reported that at the Policy Workshop the RTC approved a cooperative agreement with Caltrans which will make the RTC the lead agency for managing construction of the Highway 1 Soquel-Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes project. He noted that experience gained from managing the Auxiliary Lanes project will benefit future rail and trail projects. He reported that the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Highway 1 HOV Lanes project is scheduled for release in the summer of 2011. Work continues for the STARS analysis of the HOV Lanes project, including development of a list of credits/measures to be used to evaluate the project.

8. Highway 1 Corridor System Management Plan (CSMP) Update

Dave Murray reported that District 5 is finishing work on a Corridor System Management Plan (CSMP) for Highway 1 aimed at maximizing mobility and safety, and reducing congestion between Highway 1/Mission St at King Street in Santa Cruz through Highway 68W and along Highway 183 in Monterey County. He noted that five scenarios are being analyzed in the plan – including ITS/TDM/Ramp metering, HOV lanes, and alternative mode analysis. Caltrans is scheduled to present the draft plan to the ITAC in September, with review by the RTC in October.

Due to limited data, model microsimulations were constrained. In the future, with additional real-time data/better vehicle detection equipment for Highway 1, parallel and adjacent local roadways, additional modeling could be done. The PEMS website includes examples of similar data available in other areas. Data from new Highway 1 detection equipment should be available online soon. Additional data will be collected through the SHOPP program. Corridor system management information is likely to be incorporated into future Route Concept Reports. Mark Dettle requested that local roads be considered in corridor studies, including the impact of ramp meters on local streets and roads.

9. 511 Traveler Information System Survey

Tegan Speiser reported that the RTC and Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC) received a Caltrans Planning grant to prepare a Feasibility and Implementation Plan for a Monterey Bay Area 511 Traveler Information System. The plan is scheduled for completion in November 2011. The committee watched videos on 511 and reviewed a survey prepared for the public outreach phase of the project to better assess the type of information people would like to have available through a 511 system. The survey will be available soon online at: www.511montereybay.org.

In response to questions from ITAC members, Ms. Speiser confirmed that the system will cover Highway 17 and the plan will evaluate options for integrating with 511 systems in the Bay Area, San Luis Obispo County, and the San Joaquin Valley. ITAC members and Ms. Speiser discussed methods for seeking input on the 511 system including Public Service Announcements; outreach to First Responders, the trucking industry, monolingual Spanish-speakers and people without internet access; playing the videos on community TV before city council and other board meetings; providing surveys at the County planning department; postcards inviting people to take the survey; information at public libraries; reaching out to resources centers used by transit riders; having information at gas stations; and adding links to the survey from the RTC, Caltrans, and Metro websites.

10. 2010 State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) Project List

Rachel Moriconi encouraged ITAC members to review the list of programmed SHOPP construction projects on the State Route system and to inform Caltrans project managers if there are concerns or questions about specific projects, including opportunities to coordinate local projects.

11. 2010 Regional Surface Transportation Exchange Program (RSTPX)

Rachel Moriconi reported that as a relatively small county, the RTC is allowed to exchange its annual apportionment of federal Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds for state funds (RSTPX). The state RSTPX funds are then made available for use by projects previously approved for federal RSTP funds that will be implemented within the next year. It was noted that the annual amount of RSTPX funds changes depending on the number of projects that use federal RSTP funds and the Federal Appropriations bill. She provided a recommended list of projects for this year's RSTPX program. She also provided a list of projects approved for RSTPX funds in prior years that have not yet submitted invoices for their RSTPX funds.

The ITAC unanimously approved a motion (Dettle/Koch) recommending the RTC exchange federal RSTP for state RSTPX for \$377,000 in projects that will be implemented within the next 12 months.

Chair Rodriguez adjourned the meeting at 2:23 p.m. The next ITAC meeting is scheduled for **September 16, 2010 at 1:00 PM** in the RTC's Conference Room, 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA.

Minutes Prepared by: Rachel Moriconi, SCCRTC

\\rtcserver2\Shared\ITAC\2010\Aug2010\ITACminAug10.doc

Meeting Date: November 18, 2010

TO: Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC)
FROM: Rachel Moriconi, Senior Planner and Caltrans District 5 Planning
RE: Draft State Route 1 Corridor System Management Plan

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC) receive a presentation from Caltrans on the Draft *State Route 1 Corridor System Management Plan* and provide input on the plan.

BACKGROUND

Caltrans is required to prepare Corridor System Management Plans for corridors associated with projects funded from the Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA) of Proposition 1B: the *Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality, and Port Security Bond Act* of 2006. A Corridor System Management Plan (CSMP) is a planning tool meant to maximize efficient and effective mobility in a corridor. It is partnership-based and integrates management of various travel modes (transit, cars, trucks, bicycles) and infrastructure (roads, highways, information systems, bike routes). The CSMP establishes a process to manage a set of transportation components within a corridor as a system rather than as independent units. As California shifts towards more performance-based planning documents, CSMPs are expected to be used as a tool to protect current and future infrastructure investments, as well as coordinate a multi-modal approach to corridor improvements. The CSMP will evolve with changing development patterns, travel demands, and technological innovations.

DISCUSSION

The draft State Route 1 Corridor System Management Plan is currently being circulated for review and comment. This CSMP for State Route 1 aims to maximize benefits from Proposition 1B funded projects in this region: construction of auxiliary lanes from Soquel Drive to Morrissey Boulevard and the Salinas Road interchange. Maximizing the throughput on the mainline and providing local connectivity will prolong the need for capital investments along the corridor. The limits for the State Route 1 CSMP extend from the junction of State Route 68 West in Monterey to King Street in the City of Santa Cruz, and include State Route 183 (see map, [Attachment 1](#)).

Staff from the Transportation Planning Branch of Caltrans District 5 will be making a brief presentation on the CSMP at this meeting. The draft document was emailed to committee members on October 28, 2010. **Comments on the draft document are due by November 26, 2010** and should be sent to Adam.Fukushima@dot.ca.gov. The RTC and Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC) boards are scheduled to review and accept the plan in December.

The CSMP is based on technical information that is divided into three chapters:

- Chapter 1: Provide an overview of the corridor system management planning process. Provide a definition of the CSMP transportation network, including rationale for the selection of the specific corridor limits and modes to be included in the corridor planning process.
- Chapter 2: Describe existing corridor management activities, including all facilities and services currently in use to maximize mobility within and through the corridor, such as traffic operations system elements, traveler information services, and transportation demand management programs.
- Chapter 3: Provide an assessment of current corridor performance by identifying the major problems inhibiting efficient corridor operations for each element (mode) of the CSMP transportation network.

The Table of Contents and Executive Summary are attached (Attachment 2). The plan is available online at: http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist05/planning/pdf/draftplan_sr1_Oct%202010.pdf This CSMP is the "first generation CSMP," to be followed by updates as information is collected over time.

SUMMARY

Caltrans District 5 staff will be making a brief presentation on the State Route 1 Corridor System Management Plan (CSMP) at this meeting. ITAC members are encouraged to provide input on the plan by November 26, 2010.

Attachments:

1. *Map of SR 1 CSMP Segmentation*
2. *CSMP Executive Summary*

||rtcserver2\Shared\ITAC\2010\Nov2010\DraftCSMP.doc



Figure 2.1 State Route 1/183 CSMP Segmentation

STATE ROUTES 1 & 183 CORRIDOR SYSTEM MANAGEMENT PLAN



MONTEREY & SANTA CRUZ COUNTIES
OCTOBER 2010

DRAFT



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	i
Corridor Characteristics	iii
Corridor Performance	iii
Recommendations	iv
Chapter 1 Introduction to the State Routes 1 and 183 Corridor System Management Plan.....	1
1.1 What is a Corridor System Management Plan?	1
1.2 The Importance of the Corridor for Economic Development.....	2
1.3 Need, Purpose, Goal and Objectives.....	3
1.4 Relationship to Other Plans	4
1.5 Stakeholder Participation	9
Chapter 2 Corridor & Transportation System Characteristics	10
2.1 State Highway System Characteristics	10
2.1.1 Route Segments	10
State Route 1	12
State Route 183.....	18
2.1.2 Route Designations	20
2.1.3 Goods Movement.....	22
2.2 Corridor Characteristics	23
2.2.1 Environmental Setting	23
2.2.2 Community Demographics	24
2.3 Regional & Local Transportation Characteristics.....	26
2.3.1 Parallel Routes and Local Connections	26
2.3.2 Bicycle Access	29
2.3.3 Transit	29
Local Transit	29
Paratransit	33
Intercity Transit / Rail.....	33
2.3.4 Aviation.....	36
2.3.5 Transportation Demand Management.....	38
Commuter Programs	38
Park and Ride Lots.....	39
2.3.6 Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Strategies	39
Traffic Management Center	39
Existing ITS Elements	41
Chapter 3 Comprehensive Corridor Performance Assessment.....	43
3.1 Mobility.....	44
3.1.1 Methodology	46
3.1.2 Corridor Analysis.....	47
Segment 1.....	47
Segment 2.....	52
Segment 3A & 3B.....	54
Segment 4.....	64
Segment 5.....	65
3.2 Bottlenecks.....	68

3.3	Safety	70
3.4	Incident Management.....	79
3.5	Recommendations.....	80
Appendix A	Glossary	85
Appendix B	Technical Analysis.....	87
Appendix C	Modeling.....	106

Executive Summary

Caltrans and our partners are taking a new direction in transportation planning with the creation of Corridor System Management Plans (CSMPs) for corridors associated with the Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA) funds. CSMP development recognizes the importance of multi-jurisdictional collaboration, to best support and manage multi-modal transportation services and facilities for the traveling public. Californians rely on transportation facilities and services to get to business, recreational, and service destinations, regardless of which agency may operate or fund a facility or service.

The CSMP approach is consistent with the goals and objectives of the Governor's *Strategic Growth Plan*, including public accountability for bond funded projects. Approved by voters in 2006, Proposition 1B created a funding mechanism for large transportation infrastructure projects. The CSMP outlines a foundation to support partnership based, integrated corridor management of various travel modes (passenger rail, transit, cars, trucks, bicycles) and infrastructure (railroad tracks, stations, roads, highways, information systems, bike routes), to provide mobility in the most efficient and effective manner possible. This approach brings facility operations and transportation service provision together with capital projects into a coordinated system management strategy that focuses on high demand travel corridors such as State Routes 1 & 183. This CSMP directly supports the implementation of two projects in the corridor: 1) a new interchange construction at the intersection of Salinas Road and State Route 1 in Monterey County and 2) auxiliary lane construction in Santa Cruz County between the Morrissey and Soquel interchanges. Additionally, proposed extension and station improvement to the Cal Train system along the SR 183 corridor will facilitate coordination between modes.

The objectives of the CSMP are to reduce travel time or delay on all modes, reduce traffic congestion, improve connectivity between modes and facilities, and expand mobility options along the corridor in a cost effective manner. The CSMP identifies key stakeholders, the managed network, current management strategies, existing travel conditions, major challenges to maintaining and improving mobility, and potential future management strategies and capital improvements. The managed transportation network for this SR 1 & SR183 CSMP includes the segment of SR 1 between the junction of SR 68 West in Monterey County and King Street in the City of Santa Cruz. It also includes SR 183 from Lincoln Street to the junction of SR 1, as well as select parallel and connecting roadways, transit facilities that include express and regional bus services, and bike routes that are located roughly parallel to the corridor.



Figure E.1 State Route 1 / 183 CSMP in District 5

Corridor Characteristics

The Monterey Bay region is one of the largest generators of economic activity in California and the nation with robust sectors in tourism, agricultural production, education, and high technology.

The SR 1 & SR 183 corridor has a mixed urban and rural character. SR 1 serves as the main connection between the communities of Santa Cruz and Monterey counties. Employment is concentrated near the cities of Santa Cruz, Monterey and Salinas to the east. As a result, in Santa Cruz there is more commute period traffic congestion northbound in the morning and southbound in the evening. In Monterey there is more commute period traffic congestion southbound in the morning and northbound in the evening.

The corridor is also the primary coastal route between the San Francisco Bay Area and the Big Sur Coast and is an important transportation link for long-distance travel for both business and leisure. In addition, it is an important route for freight movement by truck and rail. Truck traffic ranges from 10-15%.

SR 1 and many of the major parallel streets in each county are at or near capacity during some part of the peak commute periods. Even small variations in traffic volume or incidents can greatly increase congestion and delay. Because of the scenic beauty in the corridor and the attraction of the corridor beaches, the traffic on the weekends, during the summer, or for special events can be much more congested.

There have been significant efforts to provide alternative modes of travel for commute and non-commute travel in the two counties. These include local and express bus service, demand-responsive paratransit services, bicycle routes, multi-use trails, ridesharing services, employer-based flexible work schedules, and other trip reduction programs. Passenger rail service is also provided by Amtrak (the Coast Starlight service between Los Angeles to Seattle via Salinas), but the existing intercity service schedule does not offer a meaningful option for commute travel. Along the SR 183 corridor significant efforts are underway by the Transportation Association of Monterey County (TAMC) to develop and expand the existing Caltrain system from the southern terminus at Gilroy to the City of Salinas rail station with a new station planned in Pajaro.

Corridor Performance

Traffic congestion on SR 1 in Monterey County is concentrated by time of day with many southbound commuters traveling from Santa Cruz County to work on the Monterey Peninsula during the morning peak and returning home in the northbound afternoon peak. Within Monterey County, the Transportation Agency of Monterey County (TAMC) in its 2010 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and the 2008 Regional Development Impact Fee identifies projects that will significantly help to decrease the amount and frequency of projected corridor delay.

Morning congestion northbound along SR 1 in Santa Cruz County is caused mainly by the commute north to jobs in the Santa Cruz urban area and the San Francisco Bay Area via SR 17. Southbound morning traffic is affected by commute travel to the Monterey Peninsula and

Salinas. The improvements recently constructed, anticipated for construction, or planned in Santa Cruz County include the SR1/SR17 Interchange Improvements and the Morrissey to Soquel Auxiliary Lanes Project. In addition, the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC) has programmed the addition of high-occupancy vehicle lanes which will reduce the congestion. These projects will decrease the amount and frequency of delay within the corridor.

Recommendations

The primary purpose of SR 1 & SR 183 CSMP is to develop strategies to manage the corridor and sustain existing transportation investments. The following management strategies will be used to manage SR 1 & 183 over the next 20 years:

Maintenance and Preservation: Continue cost-effective maintenance of the roadway to ensure safe and comfortable use of the corridor. This would include maintenance and preservation designed to get full return on system investments, as well as reduce traveler costs and delay. Work in this area would include continued identification of pavement needs through the pavement condition survey and addressing those needs through the State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP).

Transit/Rail: The stakeholder agencies in the corridor should continue to support the improvement of transit service. Adding new express bus service and/or frequency could take advantage of the new high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes planned for the Santa Cruz corridor. Stakeholder agencies should also consider enhancing the attractiveness and convenience of the passenger rail service between the San Francisco Bay Area and the Monterey Peninsula.

Land Use & Transportation Connection: The way communities are planned and designed has an impact on travel behavior. Land use and transportation must be more closely linked. To achieve this strategy, Caltrans will partner with local agencies and participate in the development review process. This process has two main elements: general plans and development projects. An additional opportunity to partner and facilitate a connection between land use and transportation is the Regional Blueprint Program: *AMBAG Blueprint Planning*. The program was designed to integrate long-range planning for transportation, land use, housing, environmental resources, and infrastructure. The ultimate goal of blueprint planning is to facilitate consensus around a regional vision and preferred land use scenario that will enable the region to accommodate future growth while minimizing adverse impacts. The emphasis of the land use and transportation planning connection is becoming a priority for the State and new legislation such as SB 375 is implemented in the MPO areas.

Transportation Demand Management: The focus is to reduce congestion by encouraging programs that increase the use of transit, improve bicycle and pedestrian access and encourage programs such as carpools, ridesharing, telecommuting, and park-and-ride facilities to reduce the demand.

Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) /Traveler Information / Traffic Management / Incident Management: Collisions and incidents can be a major source of delay along a corridor. Reducing the time required to clear these collisions and incidents and restore full flow

within the corridor reduces delay and reduces diversion of traffic onto the local arterials. The need for Freeway Service Patrol (FSP) is determined by congestion in an area. Improving system monitoring could provide the necessary information to determine a need for FSP. Local agencies can consider FSP as an option once the need has been identified. In addition, it is recommended to upgrade communication and enable deployment of advanced transportation systems, to improve safety, incident response, and traveler information. Real time traveler information allows travelers to make more informed decisions regarding trip planning, route choices and mode selection. Traffic management reduces congestion through the use of technologies such as collision warning systems and advanced traffic management systems. Incidents are the primary cause of unexpected and variable delay. By improving incident management and response time, reductions occur in congestion and travel delay.

Modal Options: The focus is to provide viable transportation options for all users. Greater opportunity to use other transportation modes will reduce demand on SR 1 & SR 183. Continued effort that supports the development of the Cal Train system will provide connection to a multi-modal option within the corridor. This includes facilitating and supporting the integration of transit, bicycle, and pedestrian transportation into a coordinated multimodal transportation system.

Ramp Metering: Ramp metering has the potential to maximize the productivity of the freeway. When combined with other recommended strategies, ramp metering accommodates greater vehicle through put on the freeway and local arterials. A ramp metering plan should identify the capacity of on-ramps and install ramp-metering hardware on appropriate ramps.

Operational Improvements: The focus is to add auxiliary lanes, intersection improvements, and other system refinements in order to reduce delay, preserve and enhance existing services.

Intersection Upgrades: Traffic studies demonstrate that the existing intersections are projected to provide lower level of service. The focus is to redesign and modernize the intersections to reduce delay, which would maximize State Highway throughput. These upgrades may include improving the parallel local road network, adding turn-movement storage, deceleration and/or acceleration lanes to the intersection, and converting at-grade intersections to grade-separated interchanges.

Parallel Road Network Development: The focus is to increase the capacity and connection on the parallel road network to reduce local traffic demand on SR 1. Emphasis on east-west connections that have bearing on the SR-1 north-south congestion should be closely monitored through increased detection. East-west connectors, such as SR 68, SR 156, SR 129, and County Road G-12 in Monterey County will need detection and system monitoring to understand the causality of bottlenecks in the region.

Facility Expansion: The focus is to improve mobility and reliability, reduce congestion, improve safety and facilitate goods movement by expanding and managing the existing system. Existing studies have demonstrated that SR 1 and SR 183 will need to be widened to improve capacity and accommodate future anticipated growth in the region.

TO: Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC)
FROM: Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner
REGARDING: Draft 2011 State and Federal Legislative Programs and Legislative Update

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC):

1. Review and provide input on the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission's draft 2011 State and Federal Legislative Programs (Attachments 1 & 2, respectively).
-

BACKGROUND

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

DISCUSSION

2011 Legislative Program

With the November 2, 2010 election and impacts it may have on transportation funding, as well as the ongoing issue that transportation revenues fall far below the needs of the system, the RTC will continue to focus on preserving funds dedicated to transportation and generating new, more stable revenue sources. Key legislative issues for the RTC in 2011 include:

- Ensure there is a stable funding source for the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), transit, & local streets and roads, especially in light of Proposition 26, which may invalidate the "gas tax swap" which increased the per gallon excise tax on gasoline, dedicated the state sales tax on diesel to transit, and eliminated the sales tax on gasoline (Proposition 42).
- Expand the RTC's possibility to raise revenues, specifically through clean up of SB83 which inappropriately restricted the definition of county transportation agencies to Congestion Management Agencies; and increase the Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (SAFE) vehicle registration fee by \$1 in order to provide a variety motorist aid services, including the Freeway Service Patrol.
- Ensure there is flexibility to fund transit projects in the STIP, by ensuring there is budget authority allowing a variety of funding sources (not just Public Transit Account) to be

used; as well as continuing to push for local road projects and any other projects prioritized by the RTC to be programmed and allocated in the STIP.

- Oppose efforts to require local agencies to pay for Caltrans oversight on projects that locals are funding with non-state funds.

The Preliminary Draft 2010 State and Federal Legislative Programs for the RTC are attached (Attachments 1 & 2, respectively). Staff recommends very few changes from 2010. New or deleted items are shown in underline and strikeout. Changes include removal of items that were addressed last year, are unlikely to be addressed by the legislature in 2011, or are no longer relevant. Staff is meeting with the Commission's advisory committees, local entities, and transportation agencies statewide over the next few weeks and will present any additional recommended changes to the programs to the Regional Transportation Commission for approval at its December meeting. **Staff recommends that the ITAC provide input on the RTC's 2011 Legislative Programs at this meeting and identify any additional issues the RTC should monitor or pursue in 2011.**

Effects of November 2010 Ballot Measures on Transportation and the State Budget

Three major budget-related measures were approved by voters at the November 2 general election. Proposition 22 restricts the Legislature's ability to use certain local funds to help balance the budget. Proposition 26 raises the vote threshold for passing certain fees from a simple majority to two-thirds. Proposition 25 changes the vote threshold needed to send a budget bill to the Governor from two-thirds to a simple majority of each house of the Legislature. This may make it easier for the Legislature to pass an on-time budget each year.

As outlined in a memorandum prepared by the California Transit Association (Attachment 3), the impact of Propositions 22 and 26 on the state budget and transportation funding could go many different ways.

Proposition 22 closes loopholes and prevents the State from borrowing, raiding or otherwise redirecting local government revenues (local taxes, property taxes, redevelopment) and transportation funds. The measure is meant to prevent State borrowing, taking or redirecting revenues, such as Highway User Tax on gasoline (HUTA) funds, and transit funds that are dedicated to transportation. The California Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) estimates that Proposition 22 will increase the General Fund deficit by \$800 million in FY10/11 by prohibiting \$400 million of not-yet-executed loans (as of November 3, 2010) from the HUTA and prohibiting use of \$400 million in transportation funds to pay bond debt service.

The LAO assumes that for FY2011-12, Proposition 26 fully reverses the "fuel tax swap" adopted by the Legislature in March 2010, beginning November 2011 (one year after voter approval). The LAO believes state sales taxes on gasoline will resume (thereby increasing General Fund revenues), excise taxes on gasoline decline, and the General Fund's payments for transportation programs resume pursuant to Proposition 42 (2002).

A major focus of the RTC's draft 2011 Legislative Program is to ensure there is a stable funding source for the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), transit, & local streets and roads, especially in light of Proposition 26.

State Budget Updates

On October 8, 2010, Governor Schwarzenegger signed the 2010/11 State Budget into law. The 2010 State Budget includes staffing reductions to Caltrans' Capital Outlay Support (COS) program and the Planning Program which is responsible for development of project initiation documents (such as Project Study Reports - PSR). Caltrans has indicated that as a result of these cuts they will have limited staff available to provide oversight on project initiation documents prepared by local agencies for state highway projects. As such it will be the responsibility of the local agency to provide more extensive quality control. While not included in the current State Budget, there has been an ongoing push to charge local agencies for Caltrans' review time. Opposing efforts to charge locals for Caltrans oversight on local-lead projects remains part of the RTC's draft 2011 legislative program.

On November 10, 2010, the LAO released a new forecast of California's General Fund revenues and expenditures. It shows that the state must address a budget problem of \$25.4 billion between now and the time the Legislature enacts a 2011-12 state budget plan. The budget problem consists of a \$6 billion projected deficit for 2010-11 (\$800 million resulting from Proposition 22, as described above) and a \$19 billion gap between projected revenues and spending in 2011-12. The LAO projects annual budget problems of about \$20 billion each year through 2015-16 and recommends that the Legislature initiate a multiyear approach to addressing California's recurring structural budget deficit.

Federal Legislation

Development of the new federal transportation act, the FY2011 appropriations bills, and climate change legislation will continue to be priorities for the 2011 Federal Legislative Program ([Attachment 2](#)). As reported at past meetings, the Federal Transportation Act, SAFETEA-LU expired in September 2009 and has been extended through continuing resolutions. Reauthorization is not expected to be a priority for Republicans in 2011, especially with the larger question of how the bill will be funded still unresolved. In the event that new special federal funding opportunities arise, such as earmarks in the annual appropriations bill or federal transportation act, the RTC's Federal Legislative Program includes a list of projects to prioritize for special funding opportunities that may become available (Item 1.c. of the Federal Legislative Program).

SUMMARY

This report provides the initial Draft 2011 State and Federal Legislative Programs for review and comment. Staff is meeting with the Commission's advisory committees, local entities, and transportation agencies statewide over the next few weeks and will present any additional recommended changes to the programs to the Regional Transportation Commission for approval in December.

Attachments:

1. Draft 2011 State Legislative Program
2. Draft 2011 Federal Legislative Program
3. CTA summary of Proposition 22 & 26 issues.

||rtcserv2\Shared\ITAC\2010\Nov2010\draftLegProgram2011.doc



PRELIMINARY
DRAFT

Santa Cruz County
Regional Transportation Commission

2011 State Legislative Program - DRAFT

FOCUS AREAS FOR 2011:

1. **Funding Priority Projects:** Seek and preserve funding for priority transportation projects and programs in Santa Cruz County, including:
 - Highway 1 Soquel-Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes
 - Highway 1 HOV Lanes
 - Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line
 - Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District projects
 - Local Street and Roadway Preservation
 - Bicycle and Pedestrian facilities
2. **Expand revenue-raising opportunities** and innovative financing options beyond the traditional gas tax.
 - **Sponsor legislation** to authorize Service Authorities for Freeway Emergencies (including the RTC) to increase SAFE vehicle registration fees by \$1 in order to support motorist aid programs.
 - **Sponsor legislation** to expand the authority of the RTC and local jurisdictions to increase taxes and fees for transportation projects, including new vehicle registration fees (*SB83 cleanup*).
 - Work with a coalition of entities to lower the voter threshold for local transportation sales tax ballot measures from the 2/3 supermajority to a simple majority, 55% or 60% majority vote.
3. **Protect and Augment Transportation Funding:** Pursue policy and/or legislative changes to restore, preserve and augment funding for all modes of transportation:
 - Support legislation and other efforts to provide stable funding for transit, local streets and roads, and STIP projects – especially in light of potential impacts of Proposition 22 (2010) and Proposition 26 (2010) on the “gas tax swap”; support reinstatement of the sales tax on gasoline (Proposition 42, 2004).
 - Index the gas tax to inflation.
 - Seek early allocation of Proposition 1B bonds for projects in Santa Cruz County.
 - Ensure State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds are programmed and allocated to regions based on SB 45 formulas and the region’s priorities. Ensure State Budget allows flexibility to fund transit projects in the STIP.
 - Increase funding for Safe Routes to Schools, Bicycle Transportation Account and other bicycle and pedestrian programs.
 - Support increased funding for local streets and roads, as highlighted in the statewide comprehensive Local Streets and Roads Needs Assessment.
4. **Address Air Quality/Climate Change:**
 - Support legislation to provide funding to reduce green house gas emissions, including funds needed to implement SB375 and AB32.

General Legislative Platform

1. Preserve Existing Transportation Funding and Formulas.

Preserve and protect against deferral, borrowing or taking of state funding designated for the transportation system. Retain and enhance California's funding formulas based on the increased costs to maintain and address deficiencies to the existing transportation system. Specifically:

- a) Oppose proposals to shift transportation funds to non-transportation purposes and the State General Fund
 - Protect existing highway and transit funds, including Highway Users Tax Revenue (gas tax), sales taxes for transportation, Public Transportation Account (PTA) and "spillover" revenues, against suspension, transfer or expenditure for non-transportation uses.
 - Support legislation that expedites repayment of funds previously diverted to the State General Fund.
- b) Support State Budget Reform that will bring fiscal discipline and predictability to the state budget. ~~Reforms could include reducing two-thirds vote requirement to pass the state budget, preventing the diversion of additional funding sources to the State General Fund.~~
- c) Ensure that transportation planning funds are available to agencies throughout the year and are not withheld due to delays in enacting the state budget.
- d) Support the continuation of ~~recent~~ transportation funding programs dedicated to specific categories of projects such as transit, Safe Routes to Schools, paratransit and Freeway Service Patrol.
- e) Support early and timely sale of bonds for transportation and allocation of Proposition 1B and Proposition 116 bond funds for projects in Santa Cruz County. Support extension of legislative deadlines previously established for bond programs to coincide with the state's bonding ability. (*Focus area for 2011*)
- f) STIP Modernization
 - Ensure State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds are equitably programmed and allocated to regions, based on SB 45 (1998) formulas and regions' priorities, which may include local road rehabilitation and transit projects.
 - Ensure the State Budget and STIP Fund Estimate allows flexibility to fund a variety of projects in the STIP with a variety of funding sources, ~~Include a combination of Federal and State funding sources in the STIP, in order to ensure the STIP is not wholly dependent on Proposition 42 revenues or Proposition 1B bond sales,~~ increase flexibility for funding STIP projects, and allow STIP projects to access GARVEE bonds.
 - Ensure that transit projects remain eligible for regional STIP funds, even if Public Transit Account formulas are modified to remove state transit funds from the STIP.



2. Support New Transportation Funding. Support countywide and statewide efforts to raise needed funds to maintain and enhance the transportation system, including:

- a) Increase and index state gas and fuel taxes and other sources of transportation revenues so that transportation revenues keep pace with inflation/increased cost. Dedicate revenues to transportation projects and programs.
- b) Support efforts to address and expand revenue-raising opportunities and innovative financing options beyond the traditional gas tax, especially in recognition of the fact that vehicle miles traveled increasingly exceed fuel consumption. *(Focus area for 2011)*
- c) Support the development of a steady stream of new transportation funds dedicated to local road rehabilitation and maintenance, especially for roadways utilized by bicyclists.
- d) Support legislative efforts to expand the authority of the RTC and local jurisdictions to increase taxes and fees for transportation projects, including gas taxes and fees, vehicle registration fees, congestion pricing, and fees relating to the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. *(Focus area for 2011)*
 - Seek amendment to SB 83 (2009) to ensure all regional transportation agencies, not just Congestion Management Agencies (CMA), are authorized to seek voter approval to increase vehicle registration fees by up to \$10 to fund transportation programs and projects. *(Focus area for 2011)*
 - Support legislation that would allow the County of Santa Cruz to pursue a sales tax measure for transportation improvements.
- e) Work with local elected officials, local agencies and interest groups to address continuing gaps in funding for local transportation projects and pursue new local funding sources.
- f) Support legislation that lowers the voter threshold for local transportation funding measures.
- g) Work to assure that state transportation programs provide the maximum amount of revenues for the Santa Cruz County region. If special state funding programs are developed, support funding of projects in Santa Cruz County.
- h) Advocate that any new state revenues created for transportation be locally controlled and include safeguards to prevent diversion to the State General Fund.

3. Support Efforts that Improve Government Efficiency and Expedite Project Delivery.

- a) Support organizational reform efforts that streamline and otherwise improve transportation funding, programming or project delivery processes and eliminate unnecessarily and/or duplicative requirements.
- b) Support greater flexibility in contracting methods.
- c) Support initiatives that increase opportunities to trade federal funds for state funds, as currently exists for Santa Cruz County's share of Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds.
- d) Grant preaward spending authority for transit projects, especially those funded by STIP.
- e) Support efforts to streamline Project Initiation Documents (PIDs) for projects on the State Route System in order to lower the overall cost of PID development. Oppose efforts to transfer the State costs of PID development and oversight to local entities that take the lead on highway projects. *(Focus area for 2011)*
- f) Oppose unfunded mandates on local and regional government.



4. Air Quality/Climate Change (*Focus area for 2011*)

- a) Support efforts to reduce the number of vehicle miles traveled and encourage smart-growth practices, which also preserve the authority and flexibility of local agencies. Ensure the region's needs are incorporated in emerging climate change and sustainability programs, legislation, and regulations, including meeting the goals of AB 32 – the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, and SB375.
- b) Ensure adequate funding is made available to fulfill the requirements of AB 32 and SB 375, including funds for transit, bicycle, pedestrian, and other projects that reduce greenhouse gas emissions and resources to prepare plans in compliance with SB 375.
- ~~e) Oppose efforts that make regional blueprints a conditioned or required factor in the allocation of funds. Deleted since region now has a Blueprint.~~

5. Specifics

a) Transit:

- Support efforts to restore, protect, and enhance funding for public transit, especially in light of AB32 goals to reduce greenhouse gases (GHG).
- Support introduction and passage of legislation designed to preserve and enact additional sources of transit operating and capital assistance, including legislation aimed at reducing greenhouse gas emissions.
- Support funding programs that promote transit-oriented development and transit villages. Ensure that state-supported housing projects near transit facilities provide safe and convenient access for disabled persons from the housing to transit and are available to smaller regions.
- Support measures to allow the use of gas taxes for transit capital purposes, including purchases of rolling stock.
- Support development of the Coast Daylight train and Transportation Agency for Monterey County's CalTrain extension projects.
- Increase flexibility to use state transit funds on both operations and capital expenses.

b) Bicycling & Walking

- Support legislative initiatives and modifications to the CA Vehicle Code that would improve conditions for bicyclists and pedestrians.
 - Seek and support legislation and local ordinances prohibiting parking in designated bicycle lanes, to allow law enforcement to ticket vehicles parked in bicycle lanes even if specific "no parking" signage is absent.
 - Support measures that would require bicycle and pedestrian facilities as a part of newly constructed roads and streets.
- Support increased funding for bicycle and pedestrian projects and programs, including education and awareness programs, the Bicycle Transportation Account, Safe Routes to Schools, Complete Streets programs, and audible pedestrian signals.
- Support the inclusion and expansion of bicycle education programs (e.g. helmet laws, how to ride safely, etc.) in public and private schools, including high schools.



- Seek and support legislation to create a “Share the Road” license plate, with proceeds dedicated to bicycling-related activities.
- Support Incentive Programs for Bicycle and Pedestrian Commuters. Support efforts to extend the transportation fringe benefits in the state tax code to bicycle and pedestrian commuters.
- Support efforts to include bicycle projects within General Plans and land use policies.
- Support efforts to modify California Vehicle Code that will improve bicycle safety.

c) Transportation for Seniors and People with Disabilities

- Support transportation programs that are beneficial to communities with limited means.
- Increase funding levels for elderly and disabled transportation, including funds to meet increasing service requirements for ADA paratransit.
- Support continuation of competitive process, rather than formula distribution, of FTA5310 funds and allow transit agencies to apply for FTA5310 grants for ADA paratransit vehicles.
- Advocate for funding transportation to dialysis and other medically necessary appointments; Support Medicaid funding for transit and paratransit and oppose reductions in Medi-Cal funding for transportation.
- Support funding to ensure universal access, including access for paratransit vehicles within new developments, fully accessible transit stops and safe travel paths (accessible pedestrian facilities, including audible pedestrian signals), especially between senior and/or disabled living areas, medical facilities, educational facilities, employment locations, and bus stops.



d) Transportation Demand Management/Carpooling:

- Oppose measures to remove existing or restrict future High Occupancy Vehicle lanes.
- Support legislation to provide incentives for both employers and employees, to encourage use of alternatives to driving alone, such as state tax incentives.
- Support efforts to secure new funding for regional rideshare programs.

e) SAFE Callbox and Freeway Service Patrol

- Support proposals to increase state funding of Freeway Service Patrol programs.
- Support increased flexibility for compatible expenditures of SAFE funds.
- Seek authorization to increase SAFE vehicle registration fees by \$1.00 to fund Freeway Service Patrol and other motorist aid programs. (*Focus area for 2011*)

f) Safety

- Support legislative initiatives to improve safety for motorists, bicyclists and pedestrians.

6. Coordinate with Local, Regional and State Agencies and Organizations on legislative principles of mutual interest.

Please contact us at 831-460-3200 with any questions about the RTC Legislative Agenda.

\\rtcserv2\Shared\LEGISLAT\2011\LegProgram2011\StLegAgenda2011draft.doc



PRELIMINARY
DRAFT

**Santa Cruz County
Regional Transportation Commission
2011 Federal Legislative Program**

1. Next Federal Transportation Act: (Focus Area for 2011)

The RTC will work with local entities, regional agencies, the State of California and the Federal Government to advance SCCRTC's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) policy priorities in development of the next Federal Transportation Act.

- a) Advocate for increased funding levels for all modes, as needed to bring transportation infrastructure up to a good state of repair and meet the growing transportation needs in Santa Cruz County. Give top priority to preservation and maintenance of the existing system of roads, highways, bridges, sidewalks, and transit.
- b) Support a bill which allows agencies in Santa Cruz County to replace crumbling infrastructure, minimize traffic congestion, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, improve safety, and expand travel options available to citizens and visitors.
- c) Increase direct subventions to counties and Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO).
- d) Ensure equitable distribution of funds to California and Santa Cruz County and oppose proposals which restrict funds to large metropolitan areas or megaregions.
- e) Support development of new funding mechanisms for transportation to ensure the financial integrity of the Highway Trust Fund and Mass Transportation Account. Support development of new funding mechanisms, such as raising and indexing gas taxes and fees and collecting fees based on vehicle miles traveled, given that current per-gallon gasoline fees are insufficient to address transportation infrastructure needs.
- f) Streamline project delivery. Support regulations to streamline federal project delivery requirements and integrate planning, project development, review, permitting, and environmental processes to reduce project costs and delays.
- g) Provide procurement preference for building and paving materials that have a lower emissions footprint than conventional materials but demonstrate comparable performance. (New)

2. Maximize Funding for Local Area Projects. Support increased revenues for transportation projects in the Santa Cruz County region. Oppose any efforts to reduce transportation funding to California or the region. Work with congressional representatives to obtain additional funding for Santa Cruz County highway projects, rail corridor, transit operations and capital projects, paratransit service, local streets and roads, and pedestrian and bicycle facilities and programs.

- a) Promote inclusion of funding for transportation infrastructure and transit operations in any new national funding programs, including climate change, cap and trade, or economic stimulus legislation. Advocate that those funds be available to deliver state, regional, and local projects. Advocate for flexibility to use the funds to accelerate delivery of existing projects.
- b) Support annual allocations at the maximum levels allowed for programs authorized by the federal transportation act in order to meet growing transportation needs for local streets and roads, improving transit, relieving traffic congestion, encouraging alternative modes of transportation, and meeting increased paratransit demands.
- c) Seek federal funds for high priority projects in Santa Cruz County through the next federal transportation authorization, annual appropriations, stimulus, or other special funding bills or programs. Priority projects include (not shown in priority order):
 - Projects on Highway 1
 - Infrastructure improvements to the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line
 - Local road repair and sidewalk projects

- Intelligent Transportation System (ITS)/511 program
 - Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District's priority transit projects
 - Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSST)
 - Watsonville/Pajaro Rail Station
 - Projects otherwise delayed due to state funding shortfalls
- d) Oppose unfunded mandates on local and regional governments, reducing project costs and maximizing funding for infrastructure projects.
- e) Oppose proposals that would combine Santa Cruz, Watsonville, and Salinas into one urbanized area, given that they are not one continuous urban area, but rather separated by large rural areas. This reclassification could otherwise significantly reduce funding available for transit in the region.
3. **Job Creation:** ~~Support efforts to include increased federal highway and transit funding in any federal proposals designed to reduce unemployment. The transportation infrastructure needs of the Santa Cruz region are great, and there are a number of local projects covering all modes of transportation (such as those listed in Section 1) that could be undertaken in a relatively short period of time and would result in significant local job creation. (Focus Area for 2010) Addressed under #2a~~
4. **Air Quality and Climate Change:**
- a) Advocate for federal action on climate change and energy policy to ensure that any legislation to reduce greenhouse gas emissions be structured in such a way as to assist the region and the state in achieving greenhouse gas reduction and mobility goals, not dilute state efforts. Ensure that any new environmental requirements are accompanied by additional funding necessary to implement those requirements.
 - b) Support research and development of renewable energy sources that reduce the amount of emissions from the combustion of fossil fuels and development of more fuel efficient vehicles.
 - c) Support a multi-pronged approach to addressing global warming, including carbon taxes or cap-and-trade systems and direct revenues to transportation projects that reduce reliance on automobiles, including but not limited to public transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities.
5. **Support Legislative and Administrative Proposals to Streamline the Process for Federally Funded Projects.** Support regulations to streamline federal project delivery requirements (including cooperative agreements, pre-award audits, disadvantaged business enterprise regulations and duplicative federal environmental review laws) while maintaining the substance of environmental laws, either through regulatory or statutory changes. Support provisions that better integrate state and federal environmental laws.
6. **Support Improved Elderly and Disabled Transportation.**
- a) Support increased funding for transportation services required by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), as well as services beyond those required by ADA.
 - b) Require that all interstate transportation providers comply with ADA provisions, including wheelchair accessibility requirements.
 - c) Advocate for federal rule changes to reimburse non-emergency medical transportation through Medicare as a less costly alternative to ambulances and provide funding for medical dialysis transportation.
7. **Support Expansion of Incentive Programs for Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Carpool Commuters and Funding for Improvements.** Expand the transportation fringe benefits in the tax code and grant programs to decrease single-occupancy vehicle trips, and thereby reduce congestion, pollution, and wear and tear on roads.
8. ~~Assist Local Efforts to Secure Federal Emergency Management Agency Funds for storm damage repair projects. Require full reimbursement, within one calendar year, for the completion of Disaster Aide Federal (DAF) projects. While something the RTC will do when needed, not a focus for the Leg Program.~~
9. **Freight and Passenger Rail**
- a) Support measures that will provide sufficient funding for AMTRAK and that will facilitate the shared use of tracks by passenger and freight rail.

- b) Support full funding for the combined Federal and State funding program for rail capital projects in which federal funds are used for 80% of the project's cost and state funds for the remaining 20% similar to highway capital projects.
- c) Support federal funding for the California High Speed Rail project.
- d) Support the ongoing extension of Section 45G Railroad Track Maintenance Credit that provides 50 percent tax credit to short line railroads conducting qualified railroad track maintenance.
- e) Support funding for freight and passenger railroad capacity expansion and safety improvement projects

Please contact us at 831-460-3200 with any questions about the RTC Legislative Agenda.

\\rtcserver2\Shared\LEGISLAT\2011\LegProgram2011\FedLegAgenda2011draft.doc



November 7, 2010

To: Members, California Transit Association

Fm: Joshua W. Shaw, Executive Director

Re: Interaction Between Propositions 22 & 26 and the Gas Tax Swap

With the passage last week of both Propositions 22 and 26, we've received many questions about how they interact with this year's "gas tax swap" legislation. The most common question seems to be, "*Does Prop 26 automatically repeal the gas tax swap?*" And if so, "*What remaining transit or transportation funding is protected by Proposition 22?*"

The quick answer is: **We don't yet know.** This memo attempts to provide some guidance on these and related questions. Please note, however, that while we are working with all parties to analyze the situation, **no definitive answers have yet been formulated.**

In fact, the ultimate impact of these measures on transportation funding will not be known until the legislature, new governor and possibly even the courts have acted ; the final resolution may take more than a year to take shape. In the meantime, your California Transit Association's Executive Committee has already begun planning the strategies and tactics necessary to maximize public transit funding in the face of the various scenarios that may play out over this period.

Proposition 26

Sponsored by the California Chamber of Commerce and various individual businesses and taxpayers groups, Proposition 26 was supported primarily by the following groups: California Chamber of Commerce; Small Business Action Committee; Chevron; American Beverage Association; Philip Morris; Anheuser-Busch; MillerCoors; Occidental Petroleum. Opponents of Prop 26 included: American Cancer Society; American Lung Association; California Nurses Association; California Teachers Association; League of Women Voters; Natural Resources Defense Council; Planning and Conservation League; Sierra Club California; and, Union of Concerned Scientists.

Prop 26 amends the California constitution to require any change in state statute resulting in any taxpayer paying a higher tax to be passed by a 2/3 vote of legislature. (The measure also contains a parallel provision relative to local government tax measures.)

The measure also defines “tax” as any levy, charge or exaction of any kind imposed by the State, but includes several exceptions. For our purposes, the most important exception to note is, “A charge imposed for a specific benefit conferred or privilege granted directly to the payor that is not provided to those not charged, and which does not exceed the reasonable costs to the State of conferring the benefit or granting the privilege to the payor.”

In other words, Prop 26 allows the legislature to continue to enact *some* state fees with a simple majority vote of the legislature : those which charge specific taxpayers and whose proceeds are then used to benefit those taxpayers charged, and *only* those taxpayers.

Finally, Prop 26 repeals any tax adopted this year if not adopted in compliance with the measure’s new definition of taxes. Specifically, the measure states:

“Any tax adopted after January 1, 2010, but prior to the effective date of this act, that was not adopted in compliance with the requirements of this section is void 12 months after the effective date of this act unless the tax is reenacted by the Legislature and signed into law by the Governor in compliance with the requirements of this section.”

Thus, the question is begged: *Did the gas tax swap of March, 2010, enact a tax that is not a tax under Prop 26, and that therefore must be repealed?*

To begin to understand, we first look back at the gas tax swap.

Gas Tax Swap

A package of two bills (ABx8 6 and ABx8 9) passed by the legislature and signed by the governor on March 22, 2010, the so-called “gas tax swap” *exempted* gasoline from the state sales tax. That *eliminated* about \$2.5 billion a year in public transit, streets & roads, and highways funding (i.e. by eliminating Proposition 42 funding – 40% of which was available for highways, 40% of which was available for streets & roads, and 20% of which was available for the Public Transportation Account; and, by eliminating two other sources of PTA funding – the spillover and the sales tax on nine cents of the historic excise tax on gas).

At the same time, the bills *increased* two different taxes – the excise tax on gasoline, and the rates of the sales tax on diesel fuel.

The amount projected to be collected annually under the new excise gas tax / diesel fuel sales tax scheme is calibrated to equal the amount of annual lost funding under the old sales tax on gas.

The amount now collected from the increased gas tax is designed to first pay for the bond debt service on existing and future highway bonds, as well as replace the old Prop 42 funding for highway expansion projects and streets & roads, plus provide new highway safety and preservation funding.

The amount now collected from the increased sales tax on diesel fuel is designed to enhance the State Transit Assistance program, plus pay for other expenses of the PTA, such as the intercity passenger rail program.

Proposition 26 and the Gas Tax Swap

Because the new tax increases enacted in the gas tax swap were calibrated to produce new revenue equal to the replaced / lost sales tax on gas revenue that the swap legislation eliminated, the legislature used an interpretation of the California constitution to enact the bills with a simple majority vote.

Thus, we now wonder if the passage of Prop 26 repeals the gas tax swap.

While there is no definitive answer yet, here are some points to keep in mind:

- First, when people ask if “the gas tax swap will be repealed,” it’s important to figure out if they mean “the taxes increased in the swap” or “everything in each bill, including the elimination of the sales tax on gas, as well as the increases in the excise gas tax and the rate of sales tax on diesel fuel.” Some argue that the passage of Prop 26 can be used to overturn not only the new tax increases in the gas tax swap, but also to throw out the bill that exempted gasoline from sales tax in the first place, thus restoring the sales tax on gas.
- On the one hand, Prop 26 *seems* only to speak to the definition of a tax or a tax *increase* – it does not seem to speak to the exemption of a product from taxation. That line of reasoning would support the notion that Prop 26 can be used to overturn the excise tax on gas increase and the increase in the rate of sales tax on diesel fuel contained in the gas tax swap bills, while retaining all other aspects those bills, including the exemption of gasoline from the sales tax. Under this scenario, there would be no new revenue from the excise tax on gas or the sales tax on diesel, and there would be no restoration of the old sales tax on gas revenue.
- On the other hand, there is case law that *might* suggest that when an initiative repeals one section of law – in this case, the new taxes increased with the simple majority vote used to pass the gas tax swap – that the entire bill in which that now-illegal tax increase was continued is now itself repealed. Under this scenario, there would be no new revenue from the excise tax on gas or the sales tax on diesel, but there *would* be a restoration of the old sales tax on gas revenue.

- There is some guidance already promulgated on this question, by the Legislative Analyst’s Office. The LAO wrote the analysis of Prop 26 contained in the Official Voter Information Guide sent to every voter and posted on the Secretary of State’s web site, which included the following excerpt:

“State Laws in Conflict With Proposition 26

Repeal Requirement. Any state law adopted between January 1, 2010 and November 2, 2010 that conflicts with Proposition 26 would be repealed one year after the proposition is approved. This repeal would not take place, however, if two-thirds of each house of the Legislature passed the law again.

Recent Fuel Tax Law Changes. In the spring of 2010, the state increased fuel taxes paid by gasoline suppliers, but decreased other fuel taxes paid by gasoline retailers. Overall, these changes do not raise more state tax revenues, but they give the state greater spending flexibility over their use.

Using this flexibility, the state shifted about \$1 billion of annual transportation bond costs from the state's General Fund to its fuel tax funds. (The General Fund is the state's main funding source for schools, universities, prisons, health, and social services programs.) This action decreases the amount of money available for transportation programs, but helps the state balance its General Fund budget. Because the Legislature approved this tax change with a majority vote in each house, this law would be repealed in November 2011—unless the Legislature approved the tax again with a two-thirds vote in each house.

Other Laws. At the time this analysis was prepared (early in the summer of 2010), the Legislature and Governor were considering many new laws and funding changes to address the state's major budget difficulties. In addition, parts of this measure would be subject to future interpretation by the courts. As a result, we cannot determine the full range of state laws that could be affected or repealed by the measure.”

- A key point made by the LAO is that the original sales tax on gasoline was paid (to the state) by fuel retailers. And, the new taxes created in the gas tax swap are paid (to the state) by fuel suppliers. Thus, even though the same amount of revenue is generated overall that was lost, the fact that different taxpayers pay the new taxes versus the old taxes suggests that the new taxes contained in the gas tax swap do not meet Prop 26’s definition of exempted charges (i.e. because they have a differential impact on taxpayers).
- To understand when some resolution of this whole question of Prop 26’s impact on the gas tax swap may occur, we must first understand that the “repeal” clause in Prop 26 states that a noncomplying tax enacted earlier this year “is void 12 months after the effective date of this act **unless the tax is reenacted by the Legislature and signed into law by the Governor in compliance** with the requirements of” Prop 26 [emphasis added]. In other words, if the tax increases contained in the gas tax swap are, in fact, now illegal pursuant to Prop 26, the legislature *still* has 12 months to reenact the same tax increases through a new statute; but, this time, to qualify as a tax as defined by Prop 26, the statute increasing the excise gas tax and new sales tax on diesel fuel would have to be

passed with a 2/3 vote of the legislature, not with a simple majority vote. The point is: We may not know for at least one year whether the legislature *must* or *is able* to reenact the tax increases legally.

- As a matter of law, we may not even know the outcome unless some party chooses to first sue under Prop 26 and the courts decide, thus compelling the legislature to act. In other words, just because Prop 26 may seem to suggest the tax increases in the gas tax swap (if not the entire bills themselves) are now illegal, there is no reason to believe the legislature will come back into session and immediately try to reenact tax increases that no court has found to be illegal. We are currently not aware of any party planning to sue to repeal the gas tax swap increases, including Prop 26's sponsors. And, even if such a suit were pending, it seems like the party or parties would not have standing to sue until 12 months have passed from now, the effective date of Prop 26 – i.e. until after the time the legislature is granted to bring all noncomplying tax increases into compliance with passage of a 2/3 vote bill.
- In the meantime, why would the legislature either act to make the new tax increases go away, or, act to pass a new statute increasing taxes with a politically difficult 2/3 vote, if it doesn't have to take either action?

Proposition 22 and Prop 26 / Gas Tax Swap

Notwithstanding all the caveats pointed out above, *what if* the new taxes in the gas tax swap are someday deemed to be illegal – what would Proposition 22 protect?

Assuming just the tax increases are deemed illegal (i.e. and not every other aspect of the bills originally authorizing the gas tax swap), for this example we will assume that Prop 26 does *not* restore the old sales tax on gas. We would then need to know whether the legislature is able to reenact the gas tax swap's tax increases.

- If the legislature *does* legally reenact with a 2/3 vote bill the excise tax on gasoline and the sales tax on diesel originally authorized in the gas tax swap legislation, then Prop 22 is interpreted to protect and determine the method of expenditure of those two new sources, under Prop 26's amendments of Article XIX of the constitution.
- On the other hand, if the gas tax swap's tax increases are deemed illegal, and the legislature is unable (or chooses not) to muster the 2/3 vote threshold necessary to reenact the taxes legally, then about \$2.5 billion in gas tax swap revenue would not exist to be protected by Prop 22, including about \$120 million a year in new sales taxes on diesel fuel intended by the gas tax swap legislation to flow through the Public Transportation Account. (On the other hand, Prop 22 would still protect the historic sales tax on diesel fuel which existed before the gas tax swap, and dedicate those revenues – about \$315 million a year – to the PTA.)

And, if Prop 26 were somehow used to overturn not only the gas tax swap's tax increases, but *also* to repeal the elimination of the sales tax on gas in the first place, and if the legislature were unable (or chose not) to muster the 2/3 vote threshold necessary to reenact the taxes legally and to re-exempt gasoline from the sales tax, then about \$2.5 billion in sales tax on gas revenue would be restored, while the excise gas tax and sales tax on diesel fuel increases in the gas tax swap would be lost. The new / old sales tax on gas would be protected by Prop 22, with the spillover, the sales tax on nine cents of the gas tax, and 20% of the Prop 42 revenue all flowing to the Public Transportation Account and available only for expenditure on public transit as defined by Prop 22; and, the other 80% of the Prop 42 revenue would be protected by Prop 22 and would have to flow to highways and streets & roads. (In this scenario Prop 22 would also still protect the original sales tax on diesel, another \$315 million for the PTA.)

Analysis Continues

We are working with a coalition of public agencies and transportation interest groups to monitor, analyze and respond to the various Prop 26 / gas tax swap / Prop 22 scenarios. As more information comes to light, we will provide that to you.

For a short PowerPoint presentation staff recently made to the Association's Legislative and Executive Committees on these topics, [please click here](#). We urge you to be circumspect in making any definitive statements to your governing board, the press or the public at this time relative to the impact of Proposition 26, and we appreciate your judicial use of this presentation.

In the meantime, please let us know if you have additional questions.

Memorandum

To: Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC), SCCRTC

From: Bhupendra Patel, Ph.D. Senior Transportation Modeler, AMBAG

Meeting Date: November 18, 2010

Subject: Overview of the AMBAG Regional Travel Demand Model Improvement Plan

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Receive presentation on AMBAG Regional Travel Demand Model Improvement Plan.

BACKGROUND

The Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) is the federally designated Metropolitan Planning Organization for the tri-county (Monterey, San Benito and Santa Cruz County) Monterey Bay region, consisting of 18 cities in three counties. To carry out Metropolitan Transportation Planning activities as well as Blueprint planning, the AMBAG works closely with the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC), the Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC), the Council of San Benito County Governments (SBtCOG), the Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District (MBUAPCD), Monterey-Salinas Transit (MST), the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (SCMTD), Caltrans, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and all jurisdictions (18 cities and 3 counties) within the tri-county Monterey Bay Region.

AMBAG maintains a conventional 4-step Regional Travel Demand Model (RTDM) covering Monterey, Santa Cruz and San Benito counties. AMBAG's Regional Travel Demand Model also includes Santa Clara County's transportation model (as developed and maintained by the Valley Transportation Authority) to better predict regional travel demand. The existing AMBAG RTDM was developed and calibrated for the base year 2005 and forecast year 2035 to meet federal, state, and regional agencies transportation planning requirements.

DISCUSSION

AMBAG has developed a Model Improvement Plan (MIP) to develop AMBAG's integrated land use and transportation models with various customized modeling and visualization / postprocessor tools to analyze the impact of specific developments (residential, commercial, industrial and mixed-use developments) and their realistic impacts on Greenhouse Gas (GHGs) emissions and also to meet the SB375 requirements. These sophisticated models/tools and their data resources are crucial for planners, policy makers and the general public in understanding the relationships between land use and transportation planning activities.

AMBAG and the three Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs) use the regional travel demand model in the development of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Regional Transportation Plans. The proposed modeling tools and data will provide great support in developing and planning for sustainable communities throughout the Monterey Bay region.

At this meeting, the Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC) will receive a presentation on AMBAG Regional Travel Demand Model Improvement Plan.

The following are the main priorities as identified in the Model Improvement Plan (MIP):

- Data acquisition, monitoring and forecasting
- Development of a parcel based land use model that integrates with the AMBAG RTDM
- Improvements to transportation models for various applications as illustrated above
- Development of a sketch planning tools for public outreach

SUMMARY

AMBAG has developed a Regional Travel Demand Model Improvement Plan. ITAC members will receive a presentation on the plan and provide assistance in making improvements to the model.

\\rtcserver2\Shared\ITAC\2010\Nov2010\AMBAG_MIP_ITAC.docx

TO: Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC)
FROM: Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner
RE: American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Delivery

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that project sponsors provide updates on projects approved to receive American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funds (Attachment 1), invoice for federal funds every six months, and close out completed projects.

BACKGROUND

At its February 5, 2009 and June 4, 2009 meetings the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) selected projects to receive \$12.1 million in funds from the "highway" portion of the federal economic stimulus bill - the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA). Based on cost savings, some funds were shifted between projects. A list of outstanding projects programmed to receive ARRA funds is shown in Attachment 1.

DISCUSSION

Federal and state deadlines have been established for the use of ARRA funds. If those deadlines are missed, funds will be lost to the project, as well as the region and the state. Project sponsors are reminded of the following rules regarding ARRA (and other federal-FHWA funds):

- Project sponsors must submit invoices at least every six months in order for projects to remain "active". It typically takes sixty days, from the date submitted to district 5, for invoices to register with FHWA. Get your invoices in early and often.
- Close out completed projects. Once projects are closed out you no longer have to complete monthly ARRA status reports. If projects are not closed out, funds will have to be repaid.

Staff recommends that the Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC) provide updates on the status of ARRA projects that have not yet expended all of their funds (Attachment 1).

Additionally, several other non-ARRA federal projects are at risk of becoming inactive if invoices are not submitted at least every six months. Staff will distribute a list of those projects at this meeting. **Project sponsor must work with their accounting staff to submit invoices for those projects before deadlines are missed and funds lost.**

SUMMARY

Federal highway funds are subject to extremely strict deadlines. In order to ensure no funds are lost, project sponsors must regularly submit invoices and close out completed projects.

Attachment: Outstanding ARRA Projects Approved by the RTC

ARRA Project Expenditures --- as of 10/27/10 (per FHWA)

Invoices must be sent at least every 6 months in order for projects to remain active.

Agency	Project No	State Project Number	Project Description	Latest Payment Date	Latest Auth Date	Obligation Amount	Expenditure Amount	Oblig. & Unexpended	6 Month Deadline	Last date to send invoice to D5 to make 6mo deadline (45 days in advance)
Santa Cruz	5025046	'05930164L'	IN THE CITY OF SANTA CRUZ ON MARKET STEET, ROAD REPAIR	02/03/2010	4/30/2009	\$272,211.00	\$244,989.88	\$27,221.12	8/2/2010	6/18/2010
Santa Cruz	5025045	'05930163L'	MORRISSEY BLVD, ROADWAY REPAIR	02/09/2010	4/30/2009	\$388,682.00	\$325,157.15	\$63,524.85	8/8/2010	6/24/2010
Santa Cruz	5025050	'05930236L'	ON PACIFIC AV(CENTER ST-W. CLIFF), CONSTRUCT ROUNDABOUT & PAVE RE	08/05/2010	1/14/2010	\$750,000.00	\$5,064.22	\$744,935.78	2/1/2011	12/18/2010
Santa Cruz	5025049	'05930235L'	IN CITY OF SANTA CRUZ: PACIFIC, 2ND & 3RD, ROADWAY PRESERVATION	08/05/2010	12/22/2009	\$1,000,000.00	\$818,428.95	\$181,571.05	2/1/2011	12/18/2010
Santa Cruz	5025047	'05930165L'	WEST CLIFF DR IN THE CITY OF SANTA CRUZ, ROADWAY REPAIR	08/31/2010	4/30/2009	\$689,107.00	\$551,000.00	\$138,107.00	2/27/2011	1/13/2011
Santa Cruz	5025052	'05930261L'	WITH IN THE CITY OF STANTA CRUZ ON WEST CLIFF DR FROM ALAMAR TO SWANTON BLVD, OVERLAY ROADWAY	never	8/10/2010	\$300,000.00	\$0.00	\$300,000.00	2/6/2011	12/23/2010
Santa Cruz County	5936076	'05930171L'	VARIOUS ROADWAY WITH IN THE COUNTY OF SCR, ROAD PRESERVATION AND REHAB	12/09/2009	4/30/2009	\$2,132,932.00	\$1,395,089.37	\$737,842.63	6/7/2010	4/23/2010
Santa Cruz County	5936081	'05930238L'	VARIOUS ROADS (SEE COMMENTS), ROADWAY PRESERVATION	never	12/17/2009	\$3,679,068.00	\$0.00	\$3,679,068.00	6/15/2010	5/1/2010
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission	6149062	'05930166L'	FREEWAY SERVICE PATROL ALONG SR 1&17 , FREEWAY SERVICE PATROL	09/28/2010	7/10/2009	\$180,000.00	\$114,597.41	\$65,402.59	3/27/2011	2/10/2011
Scotts Valley	5400014	'05930170L'	VARIOUS ROADS , ROAD PRESERVATION	08/31/2010	12/22/2009	\$115,000.00	\$75,000.00	\$40,000.00	2/27/2011	1/13/2011
Scotts Valley	5400015	'05930214L'	BEAN CREEK ROAD: SCOTTS VALLEY DR.-BLUEBONNET , ROAD REHABILITATION	08/31/2010	8/6/2009	\$160,000.00	\$126,313.40	\$33,686.60	2/27/2011	1/13/2011
Watsonville	5031019	'05930296L'	GREEN VALLEY ROAD IN THE CITY OF WATSONVILLE, ROADWAY PRESERVATION & PED/BIK	08/24/2010	1/14/2010	\$2,000,240.00	\$1,219.91	\$1,999,020.09	2/20/2011	1/6/2011

TO: Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC)
FROM: Rachel Moriconi, Senior Planner
RE: SCMTD Bus Stop Improvement Project

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC) receive a presentation from Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (SC Metro) staff on the Bus Stop Improvement Project.

BACKGROUND

In January 2010, the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) programmed \$500,000 in State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds to the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District's (Metro) Bus Stop Improvement Project.

DISCUSSION

Several bus stops in the county are in need of repairs and improvements. Metro staff has surveyed all of its bus stops and compiled lists of needs that have been identified over the past several years by transit users, a variety of groups, including the RTC's Elderly/Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee, Metro's Bus Stop Advisory Committee and other members of the public. Metro staff then screened each location for potential modifications, estimated costs, and determined whether they required right-of-way or non-construction activities. Improvements planned for stops throughout the county vary by location and include lighting, installation of bus shelters, modification and improvements to existing shelters, and new benches.

Metro plans to modify bus stops at over 100 locations. The attached list breaks out locations to be improved using STIP funds and those to be funded with other Metro revenues, including repairs that are not eligible for STIP funds. Some of the construction will be done by the capitalized labor of Santa Cruz METRO staff. Some construction, such as concrete pads, will be contracted out. Since bus stops are located on streets and roads and highways throughout the region, **staff recommends that the Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC) receive a presentation on the project at this meeting.**

Community members are invited to attend a December 2, 2010 "final input" meeting, from 9:00 - 11:00AM at Santa Cruz METRO, 110 Vernon Street, Santa Cruz, CA.

SUMMARY

Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District staff will make a presentation on Bus Stop Improvement project at this meeting.

Attachment: List of Planned Bus Stop Improvements

||rctserv2\Shared\ITAC\2010\Nov2010\BusStopProject.doc

Recommended by	Stop ID#	Street	Cross Street	Direction	Routes in Use	Explanation of Status	District	Improvements for this funding	Estimated Cost (incl. labor)
UTU	1267	Brommer	17th	out	66	needs shelter, light	1st	Measure. Look into adding shelter	\$8,500
UTU	1269	Brommer	17th	in	66	needs shelter, light	1st	Light	\$3,000
EDTAC	1291	Capitola Rd	Jose	in	69SD, 69SE		1st	Flip seat bench. Light	\$4,000
EDTAC	1299	Capitola Rd	30th	out	69WD, 69WE		1st	Check roof	\$2,000
SCMTD	1301	Capitola Rd	Thompson	out	69WD, 69WE	concrete pad not large enough	1st	Light	\$3,000
UTU	1302	Capitola Rd	41st	out	53, 66, 69WD, 69WE	ready to install. Needs new shelter, light (visibilty poor, old wood shelter)	1st	New shelter w/ bench and light	\$9,000
SCMTD	1347	County Hospital	Emeline	out	4, 9	Needs all new shelter screens	1st	Light	\$3,000
SCMTD	1384	Emeline	Sutphen	in	4, 9	concrete pad not large enough	1st	Move the site, coordinating with County.	\$45,000
UTU	1571	Highway 17	Pasatiempo	in	17, 35	needs shelter, light	1st	Beacon light	\$3,000
EDTAC	1685	Portola	24th	out	66, 68D		1st	New roof. Light	\$4,000
SCMTD	1688	Portola	30th	out	66, 68D, 68N	needs new upper shelter screens	1st	Light	\$3,000
UTU	1807	Soquel Drive	Mission Dr	in	53, 70, 71SD, 71SE	concrete pad not large enough. Needs shelter, light (UTU)	1st	Light	\$3,000
EDTAC	1809	Soquel Drive	Thurber Lane	in	53, 70, 71SD, 71SE		1st	New roof. Light.	\$4,000
UTU	1817	Soquel Drive	41st	in	53, 70, 71SD, 71SE	Needs new shelter, light (visibility poor, wood shelter) (UTU)	1st	This stop is conditioned upon redevelopment. Light	\$3,000
SCMTD	1921	7th	Cambria	out	66	Needs one new shelter screen	1st	Light	\$3,000
EDTAC	2173	17th	Matthew	in	66		1st	Light. New shorter bench	\$4,000
UTU	2177	Portola	Corcoran	in	12, 66, 68	Needs shelter, light	1st	Light	\$3,000
SCMTD	2340	Capitola Rd	Foster Ct	in	69SD, 69SE	Needed shelter	1st	Light	\$3,000
EDTAC	2367	Soquel	Chanticleer	out	70, 71WD, 71WE		1st	Light	\$3,000
UTU	2377	Capitola Rd	Clares	in	69SD, 69SE	needs shelter, light	1st	Light	\$3,000

Recommended by	Stop ID#	Street	Cross Street	Direction	Routes in Use	Explanation of Status	District	Improvements for this funding	Estimated Cost (incl. labor)
EDTAC	2551	17th	Tremont	out	66		1st	Light	\$3,000
EDTAC	2575	Soquel Drive	Terrace	in	54, 55, 56, 71		1st	New roof, New shorter bench, beacon light	\$5,000
SCMTD	1425	Freedom	Soquel Dr	in	71SD, 71SE	needs all new shelter screens except rear lower	2nd	Light with beacon	\$3,000
SCMTD	1426	Freedom	Aptos Pines MHP	out	71WD, 71WE	needs all new shelter screens	2nd	Light	\$3,000
SCMTD	1428	Freedom	Apto High School	out	71WD, 71WE	needs all new shelter screens	2nd	Light	\$3,000
UTU	1431	Freedom	McDonald	in	71SD, 71SE	no concrete pad. Needs shelter, light	2nd	Rural lighting	\$3,000
UTU	1432	Freedom	McDonald	out	71WD, 71WE	needs serious tree trimming, very poor visibility	2nd	Rural lighting	\$3,000
SCMTD	1433	Freedom	Parkhurst Terrace	in	71SD, 71SE	needs new upper shelter screens	2nd	Rural lighting	\$3,000
SCMTD	1447	Freedom	Corralitos Rd	out	71WD, 71WE, 76	no pad no ramp no curb	2nd	Light with beacon	\$3,000
UTU	1453	Freedom	Filipino Comm Ctr	out	71WD, 71WE, 76	no pad no ramp no curb. Needs landing, rural lighting (UTU)	2nd	Light	\$3,000
UTU	1852	Soquel Drive	Trout Gulch	in	71SD, 71SE	no pad no ramp. Needs shelter, light (UTU)	2nd	Condition this site upon Redevelopment. Add light. Add a no parking zone	\$3,000
SCMTD	2012	Park Ave	Cabrillo	in	54, 55, 69SD	no pad no ramp	2nd	Ask property owners.Light	\$3,000
UTU	2013	Park Ave	#600	in	54, 55, 69SD	no pad no ramp. UTU says unable to view stop	2nd	Light	\$3,000
EDTAC	2280	Seascape	Sumner	out	54, 56		2nd	New shorter bench	\$1,500
SCMTD	2409	Freedom	#2672	in	71SD, 71SE	no pad no ramp	2nd	Light	\$3,000
SCMTD, UTU	2410	Freedom	#2672	out	71WD, 71WE, 76	no pad no ramp no curb, identified by MB for shelter, needs landing (UTU)	2nd	Light	\$3,000

Recommended by	Stop ID#	Street	Cross Street	Direction	Routes in Use	Explanation of Status	District	Improvements for this funding	Estimated Cost (incl. labor)
EDTAC	2480	Nielson	Watsonville Hospital	in	69WD, 69WE, 74, 76		2nd	New shorter bench. New roof. Light	\$5,000
SCMTD, UTU	2596	Freedom	#2716	in	71SD, 71SE	identified by MB and UTU for shelter, rural light (UTU)	2nd	Rural light	\$3,000
UTU	2599	Capitola Rd	49th	in	54, 55, 69	needs shelter, light	2nd	Light	\$3,000
EDTAC	2620	Soquel Drive	Heather Terrace	out	54, 55, 56, 71		2nd	New shorter bench. Light	\$4,500
SCMTD, UTU	2643	Freedom	#2716	out	71WD, 71WE, 76	no pad no ramp no curb, identified by MB and UTU for shelter, rural light (UTU)	2nd	Light	\$3,000
EDTAC	2681	Via Pacifica	Cabo Court	out	54, 56	needs red paint, bench	2nd	Bench	\$1,500
EDTAC	1219	721 Bay	Columbia	in	53, 54		3rd	New shorter bench, light	\$4,000
EDTAC	1220	721 Bay	Columbia	out	3, 19		3rd	Light with beacon	\$3,000
SCMTD	1226	Bay St	Mission St	out	19, 41	needs new upper shelter screens	3rd	Light	\$3,000
SCMTD	1227	Bay St	King St	out	12, 13, 15, 16N, 19, 19N	Accessibility by adding passenger pad	3rd	Consider for larger improvement. Space to add shelter and full pad.	\$45,000
BSAC#4, UTU	1590	Laurel	Blackburn	in	12, 15, 16, 40, 41, 42	Lighting	3rd	Light	\$3,000
EDTAC, UTU	1591	Laurel	Center	out	12, 15, 16, 40, 41, 42	Move parking spaces, has no bench (UTU)	3rd	Recommend for larger improvement. Move sign. Add concrete to pad. Add shelter	\$45,000
UTU	1629	Mission	Laurel	in	12, 13, 15, 16, 40, 41, 42	needs shelter, light	3rd	Light	\$3,000
UTU	1658	Murray	Seabright	out	68D, 68N	pad seems to be on private property . Needs shelter, light (UTU)	3rd	Light	\$3,000
EDTAC	1779	2nd	Pacific	in	07, 19		3rd	Drop seating	\$1,500

Recommended by	Stop ID#	Street	Cross Street	Direction	Routes in Use	Explanation of Status	District	Improvements for this funding	Estimated Cost (incl. labor)
EDTAC	1783	Soquel	Ocean	out	69WD, 69WE	looks to have enough space for a shelter. Near EDTAC identified site	3rd	Lighting, signal, curb painting. Look into adding a shelter here. LARGER IMPROVEMENT	\$45,000
UTU	1799	Soquel Ave	Park Way	in	66, 69SD, 69SE, 70, 71SD, 71SE	Needs light (no room for shelter, more area needed) (UTU)	3rd	Light	\$3,000
SCMTD	1802	Soquel Ave	La Fonda	out	70, 71WD, 71WE	needs new upper shelter screens	3rd	Light	\$3,000
SCMTD	1916	7th	Brommer	out	66	Needs one new shelter screen	3rd	Light	\$3,000
EDTAC	2422	Grandview	Arroyo Seco	out	3		3rd	New shorter bench	\$1,500
UTU, EDTAC	2592	Pacific	Viaduct	out	3, 19, 20	Needed shelter	3rd	Request city to move sign to allow easier access for drivers.	\$0
EDTAC	2593	Pacific	2nd	in	3, 19, 20		3rd	Dropseat bench	\$1,500
UTU	2715	Natural Bridges Dr	Mission Ext	In	20	Needed shelter	3rd	Light	\$3,000
UTU	2716	Natural Bridges Dr	Mission Ext	out	20	Needed shelter	3rd	Light	\$3,000
UTU	2717	Natural Bridges Dr	Delaware	out	20	needs shelter, light	3rd	Light	\$3,000
UTU	2718	Natural Bridges Dr	Delaware	in	20	needs shelter, light	3rd	Light	\$3,000
EDTAC	1086	Freedom	Airport	in	69SD, 69SE, 72, 74, 75		4th	move trashcan. Can METRO Pave dirt space for landing for mobility device	
SCMTD	1087	Freedom	Emme	out	71WD, 71WE, 76	concrete pad not large enough	4th	Light	\$3,000
SCMTD	1136	Main St	Rodriguez	out	71WD, 71WE, 75, 91XW	no concrete pad no ramp	4th	Light	\$3,000
SCMTD	1137	Main St	Auto Center Dr	out	71WD, 71WE, 72, 75, 76	no concrete pad, accessibility by adding passenger pad MB	4th	Light	\$3,000

Recommended by	Stop ID#	Street	Cross Street	Direction	Routes in Use	Explanation of Status	District	Improvements for this funding	Estimated Cost (incl. labor)
BSAC#6, SCMTD, UTU	1139	Main St	Pennsylvania	out	69WD, 69WE, 71WD, 71WE, 72, 75, 76, 91XW	5'x10' CALTRANS pad, bench, shelter, encroachment permit, ADA stop OK. Identified as cost prohibitive. Needs shelter, light (UTU)	4th	Replace bench	\$1,500
BSAC, SCMTD, UTU	1141	Main St	Clifford	in	69SD, 69SE, 71SD, 71SE, 72, 75, 76	Accessibility by adding pasenger pad, needs shelter, light (UTU)	4th	Light	\$3,000
UTU	1142	Main St	Clifford	out	69WD, 69WE, 71WD, 71WE, 72, 75, 76	needs new roof	4th	Roof repair. Light	\$4,750
EDTAC	2224	Freedom	Roche	out	69WD, 69WE, 72		4th	Bench	\$1,500
SCMTD, UTU	2334	Mark	Arroyo	out	75	Accessibility by adding pasenger pad, needs concrete	4th	Light	\$3,000
EDTAC	2467	Freedom	W High	out	71WD, 71WE		4th	Bench	\$1,500
EDTAC, UTU	2469	Main St	5th	out	71WD, 71WE, 75	UTU says: needs shelter, light	4th	Bench	\$1,500
BSAC#1, UTU	2637	Freedom	Crestview	out	69WD, 69WE, 71WD, 71WE	concrete pad not large enough, needs shelter/light (UTU)	4th	Light	\$3,000
EDTAC	2638	Freedom	Crestview	in	69SD, 69SE, 71SD, 71SE		4th	Light	\$3,500
BSAC#5, EDTAC	2691	Main St	Ford	in	71SD, 71SE, 75	concrete pad not large enough	4th	Beacon light	\$3,000
EDTAC	1238	Big Basin	Redwood		35WD, 35WE		5th	Drop seat bench	\$1,500
SCMTD	1463	Glen Arbor	Quail Hollow	out	35A	no concrete pad	5th	Light	\$3,000
SCMTD	1472	Glen Arbor	Hihn	out	35A	no pad no ramp	5th	New bench	\$1,500

Recommended by	Stop ID#	Street	Cross Street	Direction	Routes in Use	Explanation of Status	District	Improvements for this funding	Estimated Cost (incl. labor)
SCMTD	1536	Highway 9	Highlands	in	35WD, 35WE	no bench, no shelter, only has a sign	5th	ITAP list. Light	\$3,000
SCMTD	1537	Highway 9	Highlands	out	35AD, 35AE	no concrete pad , no shelter	5th	ITAP list. Light	\$3,000
SCMTD	1548	Highway 9	California	in	35	no pad no ramp no curb	5th	Light	\$3,000
UTU	1664	Ocean	Water	out	04, 09, 17SJ, 31, 32, 35AD, 35AE	pad seems to be on private property. Needs shelter, light (UTU)	5th	Light	\$3,000
EDTAC, UTU	1666	Ocean	Hubbard	out	4, 9, 31, 32, 35, 35A	needs shelter, light	5th	Light	\$3,000
SCMTD	2376	Bay St	High St	in	12, 13, 15, 16N, 16, 19, 19N, 27X	Needs all new shelter screens	5th	Light	\$3,000
EDTAC	2514	Highway 9	Big Basin	in	35WD, 35WE		5th	Bench	\$1,500
UTU	2515	Highway 9	Highway 236	out	35, 35A	Needed shelter	5th	Light	\$3,000
EDTAC	2517	Lockwood Lane	Mount Hermon	out	32		5th	New shorter bench. Replace roof. Remove third party trashcan	\$2,000
UTU, EDTAC	2682	Ocean	Dakota	in	04, 09	Needs shelter, light (space concerns from UTU)	5th	Dropseat bench	\$1,500
SCMTD	2692	SLV High	Highway 9	out	33, 34, 35AD	no shelter, old pad	5th	Light	\$3,000
									\$434,750
								15% construction contingency	\$65,250
								TOTAL ESTIMATED COST	\$500,000

By Who	Stop ID#	Street	Cross Street	Direction	Routes in Use	District	Improvements with this Project
SCMTD	1840	Soquel Drive	Cabrillo College TC	out	54, 55, 56, 69WD, 69WE, 71WD, 71WE, 91XW	2nd	Replace shelter screens
SCMTD	1843	Soquel Drive	Mar Vista School	out	54, 55, 56, 71WD, 71WE	2nd	Replace all shelter screens
EDTAC	1805	Soquel Drive	Dominican Hospital	in	53, 70, 71SD, 71SE, 91XS	3rd	Red curb. Reposition bench for 60"
SCMTD	1795	Soquel Ave	Frederick	out	66, 69WD, 69WE, 70, 71WD, 71WE	3rd	Replace all shelter screens
BSAC#2, UTU	1081	Freedom	Sydney	out	69WD, 69WE, 71WD, 71WE	4th	Red curb
BSAC#3, UTU	1091	Green Valley	Main	in	71, 72, 74, 75, 76	4th	Red curb
EDTAC	2193	Arthur	Watsonville Care Center	out	71SD, 71SE	4th	Red curb
SCMTD	2220	Green Valley	Maranatha	in	71SE, 72, 75	4th	Vegetation maintenance
UTU	2335	Mark	Hathaway	out	75	4th	Red curb
UTU	2336	Mark	Ponderosa	out	75	4th	Weed abatement and graffiti removal

By Who	Stop ID#	Street	Cross Street	Direction	Routes in Use	District	Improvements with this Project
EDTAC	2465	Freedom	Stanford	out	71WD, 71WE	4th	Red curb, straighten pole
SCMTD	1471	Glen Arbor	Hihn	in	35	5th	Landscaping
SCMTD	1530	Highway 9	SLV HS	in	35WD, 35WE	5th	Replace screens, grafitti abatement
SCMTD	1531	Highway 9	SLV HS	in	35AD, 35AE	5th	Replace screens, grafitti abatement
SCMTD	1543	Highway 9	Main	in	35WD, 35WE	5th	Replace all shelter screens
SCMTD	1544	Highway 9	Main	out	35AD, 35AE	5th	Replace all shelter screens
SCMTD	1561	Highway 9	Lomond	in	35WD, 35WE	5th	Replace all shelter screens
SCMTD	1896	Water	Market	out	09, 66, 70, 71WD, 71WE	5th	Red curb