



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

---

## **AGENDA**

**Note Special Date and Early Start Time:**

**Thursday, January 27, 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 November 18, 2010 ITAC meeting ! 'DU[Y'

### **REGULAR AGENDA**

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

7. Sustainable Transportation Access Rating System (STARS) Update ! 'DU[ Y' +
  - a. Staff Report
  - b. Summary STARS Credits
  - c. Timeline for STARS application to HOV Lanes project
8. State Budget Update ! 'DU[ Y'%%
  - a. Staff report
  - b. Summary of Governor's Budget
  - c. Fact Sheet: Comprehensive Transportation Tax Swap
9. Caltrans Planning Grants Overview ! 'DU[ Y'%'
  - a. Presentation from Caltrans District 5 Planning
  - b. Summary of Caltrans Planning Grant programs
10. State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) Projects Update ! 'DU[ Y'%'
  - a. Staff Report
  - b. Amended 2010 SHOPP Project List
11. Statewide Local Streets and Roads Needs Assessment
  - a. Verbal Update
12. Chair and Vice Chair Elections

**NEXT MEETING:** The next ITAC meeting is scheduled for **February 17** at **1:00 PM** in the SCCRTC Conference Room, 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA.

**HOW TO REACH US**

*Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission  
 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA 95060  
 phone: (831) 460-3200 / fax (831) 460-3215  
 email: [info@sccrtc.org](mailto:info@sccrtc.org) / website: [www.sccrtc.org](http://www.sccrtc.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@sccrtc.org](mailto:rmoriconi@sccrtc.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, November 18, 2010  
1:00 p.m.

SCCRTC Conference Room  
1523 Pacific Ave, Santa Cruz, CA

**ITAC MEMBERS PRESENT**

Angela Aitken, SCMTD  
Taylor Bateman, City of Scotts Valley Planning  
Tove Beatty, SCMTD  
Teresa Buika, UCSC  
Mark Dettle, City of Santa Cruz Public Works  
David Fairchild, MBUAPCD  
Dan Herron, Caltrans District 5  
Steve Jesberg, City of Capitola Public Works  
Bhupendra Patel, AMBAG  
Maria Esther Rodriguez, City of Watsonville Public Works  
Todd Sexauer, County Planning  
Steve Wiesner, County Public Works  
Majid Yamin, City of Scotts Valley Public Works

**STAFF PRESENT**

Rachel Moriconi  
Kim Shultz  
Gini Pineda  
George Dondero

**OTHERS PRESENT**

Russell Chen, County Public Works  
Donn Miyahara, Caltrans District 5  
Adam Fukushima, Caltrans District 5  
Alan Romero, MBUAPCD  
David Murray, Caltrans District 5

1. Call to Order – Chair Rodriguez called the meeting to order at 1:02 p.m.
2. Introductions – Self introductions were made.
3. Oral communications -None
4. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agendas - None

**CONSENT AGENDA (Dettle/Rodriguez) approved unanimously**

5. Approved minutes of the August 19, 2010 ITAC meeting

**REGULAR AGENDA**

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

Project sponsors gave updates on their projects.

*City of Scotts Valley* – Majid Yamin reported that the city's two ARRA projects were finished. Caltrans conducted an informal audit of their ARRA projects in October.

*MBUAPCD* – Dave Fairchild reported that the agency is updating CEQA guidelines to include GHG emissions and set thresholds that will allow projects to stay within targets. Changes will mainly affect larger projects that may be considered for an Environmental Impact Report.

*County of Santa Cruz* – Steve Wiesner reported that ARRA- and RSTP-funded road repair projects are near completion. A chip seal repair project using Proposition 1B funds is done. The Live Oak overlay project is finishing this week. Several storm damage repair projects are completed, with the Glenwood Drive project still outstanding. He said that the East Cliff bluff protection project is finished and the parkway improvement project is slated for construction in spring 2011. A curb, gutter and drainage project on Soquel/17<sup>th</sup> Avenue is 50% complete as is construction on the Green Valley Rd/Holohan/Airport Blvd project. The County is still working on the Calabazas Rd project design and is planning to award a construction contract for the Graham Hill Rd improvement project by the end of the year.

*SCMTD* – Tove Beatty reported that SCMTD is installing new fareboxes and ticket vending machines that will allow more ticket options, including rolling 30 day passes. SCMTD is about 50% finished with scheduling/dispatching software updates. SCMTD recently received a Caltrans grant to fund the Watsonville Transit Planning Study. A decision on the Greyhound property adjacent to the Metro Center will be made soon. Three ARRA funded paratransit vehicles are due to arrive soon.

*SCCRTC* – Rachel Moriconi reported that the California Transportation Commission is expected to allocate funds to purchase the Santa Cruz Branch rail line in January. The RTC has finished negotiating an agreement with a shortline operator. The Soquel-Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes project design is nearing completion and the project is expected to go out to bid Spring 2011.

*Caltrans* – Dan Herron reported that although Caltrans will continue to have furloughs, they will not be closed on Fridays. He announced that Safe Routes to School grant funds were recently awarded to the Cities of Watsonville and Santa Cruz. He said that March 30 is the deadline to apply for next round of transportation planning funds.

*City of Santa Cruz* – Mark Dettle reported that the City of Santa Cruz is asking the Coastal Commission for permission to resubmit the Arana Gulch project for approval. The Depot Park roundabouts are under construction and should be completed by spring break 2011. The City's draft Climate Action Plan is available for review and comment. Transportation is a key component of the plan, with increasing transit use and reducing single occupancy vehicle trips by 30% recommended. Sidewalk improvements on Soquel Ave in front of Staff of Life are finished; the Park Ave turn on Soquel Drive is in design; and the Water St sewer project will be completed this month.

*AMBAG* – Bhupendra Patel reported that the Blueprint plan is now available for public review, with comments due December 15. MTIP amendment #1 will be on the January AMBAG agenda. New JARC/New Freedom projects and any other changes to federally-funded projects should be submitted to AMBAG for the MTIP by early December. Rachel Moriconi will send links to the documents and deadlines to the ITAC.

*USCS* – Teresa Buika reported that the signal light at the west campus entrance is complete. Three

ARRA funded disability vans arrived in late September. The Ecology Action administered ZipCar program is expanding with more cars available in Santa Cruz at Laurel and Blackburn Streets, Mission Street at the CVS, and in the parking lot behind the RTC offices. Mark Dettle asked for an update to be given to the Downtown Commission.

*City of Capitola* – Steve Jesberg reported that the city is redesigning improvements at Capitola Rd and 41<sup>st</sup> Ave. Right-of-way work at 38<sup>th</sup> Ave is underway. This project will have sidewalks and bike lanes.

*City of Watsonville* – Maria Rodriguez reported that Green Valley Rd is under construction for at least six weeks. Preparations are being made for spring construction on Freedom Blvd. The Safe Routes to School grant funds will be used for sidewalks, traffic calming and school pick up sites.

Rachel Moriconi reminded everyone that HSIP (safety) grant applications are due December 9<sup>th</sup>. Donn Miyahara added that there will be tight timelines to construct projects and you cannot have delayed older projects.

7. Draft Highway 1 Corridor System Management Plan (CSMP)

Dave Murray reported on the CSMP saying it was designed to be a tool to manage the corridor and describing the boundaries of the corridor. He acknowledged that the corridor is too long to be truly analyzed without additional real time data collection and that they were unable to use the microsimulation model to analyze different scenarios for the corridor.

Mark Dettle suggested that the northern boundary of the corridor be changed from King St to Bay Avenue to more fully incorporate the traffic to and from UCSC.

Mr. Murray said that future plans would be designed for smaller segments of the corridor.

Members discussed shortening and widening the corridor description to factor parallel arterials and cross streets into the equation and the need for better detection equipment on and off the highway. Caltrans will make a presentation on PeMS data website at a future meeting.

Comments on the draft plan are due to Caltrans 11/24/10.

8. Draft State and Federal Legislative Program

Rachel Moriconi gave an overview of key legislative issues for 2011. She noted the possible impacts that Proposition 26 could have on transportation funding, especially related to the "gas tax swap". She said that while SB 1418 to increase the vehicle registration fee to support the Freeway Service Patrol (FSP) program did not make it through the legislature in 2010, staff recommends again making it a priority for the RTC in 2011. She also reported that Caltrans' budget for oversight and planning was cut and there is a push to pass the cost of oversight for highway projects implemented by local agencies along to local agencies.

On the federal front, it is unclear when the federal transportation act will be approved as it requires additional funding, but there is little political interest to increase gas and other taxes.

Ms. Moriconi asked for comments on the legislative program to be submitted by Friday in order to be presented to the RTC at its next meeting.

Dan Herron said that he would like to see federal transit funding become more flexible to be used on operations, as well as capital.

9. Overview of the AMBAG Regional Travel Demand Model Improvement Plan

Bhupendra Patel provided an overview of the Regional Travel Demand Model (RTDM) and Implementation Plan for the next model update. He said that Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) is required to update the model every five years. Any capacity project in the region must be included in the model.

Angela Aiken asked how data that was relevant in 2005 was updated for the model to reflect SCMTD's decrease in service due to budget cuts, saying that the supposition in the model is an increase in service and growth. Discussion ensued about the accuracy of scenarios if the base year is 2005.

Mr. Patel said it was up to local jurisdictions to inform AMBAG of changes before running future updates. He said that the 2010 base year model would incorporate census data, parcel level land use data, the California Household Travel Survey and traffic counts. It was suggested that local jurisdictions provide funding for Household Travel Surveys.

Ms. Aiken asked AMBAG to solicit information annually from each entity using the model to ensure that AMBAG has the correct information to share with all the other entities.

In response to questions, Mr. Patel noted that unemployment and gas price fluctuations were factored into the model and agencies noted how they use the model.

10. American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Status Report

Rachel Moriconi said that most ARRA projects have outstanding balances and that invoices must be submitted for reimbursement at least every six months.

11. Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (SCMTD) Bus Stop Improvement Project

Tove Beatty reported that \$500,000 in STIP funding was programmed for bus stop repairs. SCMTD will add some funding to make sure that improvements are equitable throughout the county. Members received a list of planned improvements.

Rachel Moriconi suggested that local jurisdictions review the list and coordinate with SCMTD if they intend on making improvements in the same areas. Ms. Beatty will send a map of planned bus stop improvements to local jurisdictions.

Mark Dettle noted that SCMTD may need a use permit for projects within the city.

The meeting adjourned at 3:04 pm.

The next ITAC meeting is scheduled for **January 27, 2011** at **1:00 PM** in the SCCRTC Conference Room, 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA. There is no meeting planned for December.

*Minutes prepared by: Gini Pineda*

\\Rtcserv2\shared\ITAC\2010\Nov2010\Nov10ITACminutes.doc

AGENDA: January 27, 2011

TO: Interagency Technical Advisory Committee  
FROM: George Dondero, Executive Director  
RE: Sustainable Transportation Access Rating System (STARS) Update

---

### **RECOMMENDATION:**

This item is for information only.

---

### **BACKGROUND**

Over the past year, the RTC has been working with the non-profit North American Sustainable Transportation Council (STC), made up of professionals in the public and private sectors, to develop a Sustainable Transportation Access Rating System (STARS). Inspired by the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) green building rating system, STARS is being developed as a points-based rating system and planning tool for the transportation field. Although other scorecard type systems have been developed for transportation projects, STARS is taking a more comprehensive approach to incorporating a broad array of sustainability measures at both the planning and project level over the full life of a project. The primary goals of STARS are to improve access for all people, maximize cost effectiveness, and cut transportation climate pollution and energy use.

The Highway 1 HOV Lanes Project is being used as a candidate test-bed project for STARS. The RTC intends to use STARS to analyze and inform the many elements of the Highway 1 HOV Lanes Project such as:

- Clarify which project elements and potential strategies produce the greatest access, climate and energy, and cost-effective benefits
- Identify which project elements can be improved
- Incorporate elements into the project that better meet the performance goals over the full life cycle
- Provide a deeper understanding of potential benefits and costs of project options.

### **DISCUSSION**

#### STARS Evaluation Tool

The STC has been working with RTC staff, project consultants and a community based technical advisory committee (TAC) to develop credits and their potential application to the HOV Lanes project. The STARS team has developed 12 credits for use in this pilot phase of STARS. A summary of those credits is attached (Attachment 1). The RTC STARS TAC spent many hours reviewing, analyzing and

critiquing each credit. The work product of this first phase of RTC's engagement with STARS is the Pilot Project Application Manual, available online at: <http://www.sccrtc.org/packet/2010/1012/1012-23c.pdf>

The [STARS Pilot Project Application Manual](#) (version 1.0) provides the basic framework about the sustainability evaluation process, an understanding of the four core credits (Integrated Process, Access, Climate and Energy, and Cost Effectiveness) and descriptions of the remaining credit options. This document is a work in progress and will be amended as new credits are developed and refinements are made. For the reader wishing to understand the STARS framework at a basic level, the introduction (pages 1-10) should serve that purpose. The core required credits include Integrated Process-1, Access-1, Climate and Energy-1 and Cost Effectiveness Analysis-1. The manual provides many supportive references to assist any potential user of STARS in completing an analysis.

A more fully robust framework of 29 credits will eventually be developed, but until then, project sponsors wishing to use the first 12 credits to inform a project and make it more sustainable, can take their project through this pilot level process.

### Applying STARS to the HOV Lanes Project

The Pilot Project Application Manual has been given to the Highway 1 HOV Lanes Project Development Team (PDT) and the RTC has directed staff to apply the 12 STARS credits, as well as overall principles, strategies and programs identified in the manual to the Highway 1 HOV Lanes project. The RTC approved a \$100,000 contract with the STC to assist with this phase.

This work will involve specific tasks for the Project Development Team (RTC staff, consultants, Caltrans), the STC team, and a Corridor Stakeholder Committee, the successor to the RTC STARS TAC that would work with the Project Development Team in applying the STARS credits to the Highway 1 HOV Lanes project. The RTC will maintain authority over any decisions to modify project elements based on the STARS analysis. The draft timeline for this phase is attached ([Attachment 2](#)), although STARS-based recommendations will follow the schedule for release of the draft EIR, expected late this year.

### **SUMMARY**

Twelve credits for application under the STARS program have been developed and published in the STARS Pilot Project Application Manual. The North American Sustainable Transportation Council will facilitate the analysis and application of STARS credits to the Highway 1 HOV Lanes project and Pilot Project Certification of the Highway 1 HOV Lanes project.

Attachments:

1. Summary of 12 STARS Credits
2. Timeline (draft)



## STARS Project Version 0.6

**Project Name: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission - State Route 1**

**Subject: Credits Recommended by the STARS TAC and Approved by the RTC  
for Application to the Highway 1 HOV Lanes Project**

**Version/Date: March 10, 2010**

Proposed Credits - 12	Program Categories and Credit Descriptions
<b>1</b>	<b>Integrative Process</b>
>	IP 1 <b>Comprehensive Project Goals &amp; Objectives</b> - Review the Purpose and Need of the project to ensure an interdisciplinary and multi-stakeholder approach to the addressing the issues and concerns of the community and includes measures of success..
<b>5</b>	<b>Access</b>
>	A 1 <b>Establish Access Goal</b> - Evaluate mode options and establish access goals that result in effective, high quality access for a range of trip purposes and needs for residents, employees and visitors.
>	A 2 <b>Evaluate Expanded TDM Strategies</b> - Evaluate high-impact Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies and establish realistically aggressive project TDM goals.
>	A 3 <b>Evaluate Expanded TSM Strategies</b> - Evaluate high-impact Transportation System Management (TSM) and establish realistically aggressive project TSM goals.
>	A 4 <b>Evaluate Expanded Transportation Options</b> - Could include opportunities for expansion of existing systems (ex. express bus service) or new options (ex. Bus Rapid Transit) to help achieve access, climate, and energy goals.
>	A 6 <b>Expanded Lanes &amp; Ramps</b> - Evaluate a range of expanded road infrastructure improvements (lanes, ramps, metering) to help achieve access, climate, and energy goals.
<b>5</b>	<b>Climate + Energy</b>
>	CE 1 <b>Establish Climate &amp; Energy Goal</b> - Significantly reduce the project's life cycle greenhouse gas emissions and energy consumption.
>	CE 2 <b>Vehicle Mile Reduction Goals &amp; Evaluation</b> - Determine which strategies are most likely to reduce energy use and climate pollution from reducing vehicle mile traveled (VMT).
>	CE 3 <b>Construction Materials &amp; Methods Goals &amp; Evaluation</b> - Identify the availability and effectiveness of alternative building materials (embodied and transport) and practices that reduce climate pollution and energy use.
>	CE 4 <b>Improved Flow Goal &amp; Evaluation</b> - Optimize vehicle operating efficiencies using the facility to minimize climate pollution and energy use on the corridor.
>	CE 5 <b>Renewable Energy Goal &amp; Evaluation</b> - Determine which strategies are most likely to reduce energy use and climate pollution from use of on-site renewable energy.
<b>1</b>	<b>Benefit/Cost</b>
>	BC 1 <b>Analyze Life Cycle Benefit Cost</b> - Determine the access-to-cost ratio of the full range of access strategies (recognizing the challenge of including all possible externalities, so that decision makers may make an informed decision).

**Highway 1 Corridor STARS Pilot Project  
Preliminary Timeline**

	Winter 2011			Spring 2011			Summer 2011			Fall 2011		
<b>RTC Board</b>	Approve STARS Phase 2 contract (Jan 13)	Form Corridor Stakeholder Committee		Representative(s) participate in Sustainability Workshop		Review (& adopt) STARS project goals & objectives				Receive PDT & CSC recommendations from STARS evaluation		
<b>RTC's Project Development Team (PDT)</b>	Work w/STC on Project Study Boundary, CSC representation and credit data/methodology/strategies to evaluate	STC & RTC: Develop Sustainability Workshop goals; draft access, climate-energy goals for STARS Hwy 1 corridor project	Participate in STARS training and educate STARS team about Highway 1 project	Participate in Sustainability Workshop PDT & STC process workshop results & develop preliminary strategy list	PDT & STC develop potential STARS project objectives based on CSC goals PDT develops pre-analysis proposal for each credit (data, methodologies, strategies) based on outcomes from Sustainability Workshop, with input from STC/STARS team	Evaluate project-level strategies		Propose new projects to complement HOV Lane project and add to RTP Present to RTC board for approval	Submit certification documentation			
<b>Sustainable Transportation Council (STC)</b>	Following contract approval, work w/RTC on Project Study Boundary, CSC representation and credit data/methodology/strategies to evaluate	STC & RTC: Develop Sustainability Workshop goals; draft access, climate-energy goals for Highway 1 corridor	Develop and host STARS training for PDT. Learn about Highway 1 (as part of webinar or in-person workshop?)	STC facilitate Sustainability Workshop PDT & STC process workshop results & develop preliminary strategy list	PDT & STC develop potential STARS project objectives based on CSC goals PDT develops pre-analysis proposal for each credit (data, methodologies, strategies) based on outcomes from Sustainability Workshop, with input from STC/STARS team	Provide credit evaluation guidance & interpretation to PDT		Participate in discussion & presentation of evaluation results	Advise PDT on certification documentation submittal	Potential Pilot Project Certification review		
			Refine Sustainability Workshop content & format, with RTC & PDT input Conduct CSC stakeholder interviews									
<b>Corridor Stakeholder Committee (CSC)</b>		RTC forms Corridor Stakeholder Committee (Feb 2011)		Sustainability Workshop & STARS goals recommendation	Provide feedback on project-level strategies to evaluate				Review evaluation results & make recommendations to RTC Board			

**TO:** Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC)  
**FROM:** Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner  
**RE:** State Budget Update – Transportation Funds

---

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

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

1. Discuss impacts State Budget proposals may have on local transportation projects ([Attachment 1](#)); and
  2. Support the comprehensive transportation tax swap proposal ([Attachment 2](#)) to address impacts of Propositions 22 and 26 on transportation funds previously established as part of the “fuel tax swap” (AB X8 6 and AB X8 9).
- 

## **BACKGROUND**

Each January, the Governor of California releases proposals for the State Budget.

In March 2010, the State Legislature approved a “fuel tax swap” (AB X8 6 and AB X8 9), which eliminated the state sales tax on gasoline and replaced it with a 17.3 cent increase in the excise tax on gas and 1.75% increase in the sales tax on diesel. It also codified the allocation formula of the increased gas tax funds: \$1 billion for General Fund Relief (off the top to repay transportation bond debt service), State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) (44%), local streets and roads (44%), the State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) (12%); and dedicated the 1.75% sales tax on diesel to transit. On November 2, 2010 state voters approved Propositions 22 and 26 that impact transportation funding and would eliminate the taxes approved in the “swap” starting November 2011.

## **DISCUSSION**

### Governor’s Budget Proposal

On January 10, 2011 Governor Brown released his proposal for the State Budget. A summary of aspects of the proposals which could impact transportation locally and statewide is attached ([Attachment 1](#)). **Staff recommends that the ITAC discuss the impacts State Budget proposals may have on local transportation projects.**

## Comprehensive Transportation Tax Swap

In order to ensure state funding continues to flow to essential transportation programs despite Proposition 26, a coalition of public and private transportation stakeholders developed a proposal that would provide the State, highways, local streets and roads, and transit the same level of funding as promised under the tax swap. The coalition is asking the Legislature to comprehensively enact a package of cleanup measures early this year in order to retain current funding levels and protect transportation projects around the state. This package consists of the following:

1. Reenact the excise and diesel sales tax provisions as contained in AB X8 6 with a two-thirds vote of the Legislature (the vote threshold now required by Proposition 26).
2. Approve the transfer of Transportation Weight Fees from the State Highway Account to the general fund, in order to preserve a significant amount of the general fund relief for bond debt service repayments; and,
3. Reenact a revised AB X8 9 (allocations formulas) that allows the new 17.3-cent gas excise tax and 1.75 percent sales tax rate increase on diesel to be allocated for its intended uses and achieves the same fiscal results anticipated in March.

A one page summary of the proposed package and why it is needed, prepared by the California State Association of Counties (CSAC), League of Cities, California Transit Association (CTA), California Alliance for Jobs, and other public and private groups is attached (Attachment 1).

A comprehensive package that restores general fund relief and certainty in transportation funding is critical for the state budget and transportation programs locally and statewide. This proposal is consistent with key issues identified in the RTC's 2011 Legislative Program. At its January 13, 2011 meeting, the RTC took action to support this effort to ensure that there is stable funding for the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), transit, & local streets and roads. **Staff recommends that ITAC members solicit support from their boards for this effort.** This proposal was included in the Governor's January 10 budget.

### **SUMMARY**

Staff recommends the ITAC discuss state budget proposals.

### Attachments:

1. Summary of Governor's Budget Proposal
2. Comprehensive Transportation Tax Swap Proposal

**Preliminary Summary**  
**Governor Brown's January 2011 State Budget Proposal: Transportation**

On January 10, 2011, Governor Brown released his State Budget proposal. Based on a preliminary review of the budget, RTC staff has prepared the following summary of proposals that may impact local transportation programs and projects.

1. **Tax Swap for Transportation:** The Governor's budget recognizes that with passage of Prop 26 the "gas tax swap" will need to be reenacted by 2/3rds of the legislature. As described in the staff report for the RTC's January 13 meeting, if this swap is not reenacted, State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), local streets and roads, and transit funding will be severely reduced. Staff recommends that the RTC support the Governor's proposal. If it is not approved, the following could be impacted locally:
  - a. STIP Projects: RTC planning and programming functions and rail line acquisition and improvements
  - b. Local Streets and Roads: approx. \$3.8M/year to cities and County
  - c. Transit: Metro's share of diesel sales tax revenues
  
2. **Bond sales:** The Governor's budget includes \$2.3B for Proposition 1B bond projects. We are awaiting additional information on how this compares to the backlog of needs/programmed projects statewide. The Governor indicated at his press conference that there would be no spring 2011 bond sale. If a bond sale is not forthcoming, the CTC may postpone the release of funds to some projects and will not have funds for other projects anticipating allocations in the next few months. Outstanding Proposition 1B bond-funded projects in our region include:
  - a. Prop 1B CMIA Program: Soquel-Morrissey Aux Lane construction - \$16.2M
  - b. Prop 1B PTMISEA Program: Santa Cruz Metro projects – approx. \$20M
  - c. Prop 1B State-Local Partnership Program: Metro's share \$6.8M
  - d. Proposition 1B Bridge projects: Murray Street Bridge and Cabrillo Pedestrian bridge over Soquel
  
3. **Planning Program Project Initiation Document (PID) Workload:** The Governor proposes to shift the cost of development of these preliminary planning documents onto local agencies. This is a carryover of Schwarzenegger's line item veto last fall. It will immediately impact projects which the Cities of Santa Cruz and Watsonville are working on (San Lorenzo River Bridge widening and Main Street/Hwy 152 - Freedom Blvd Roundabout). The RTC's 2011 Legislative Program notes that it is opposed to this shift of oversight costs onto locals.
  
4. **Elimination of Redevelopment Agencies (RDA):** The Governor's proposal to eliminate RDA could impact transportation programs and projects. Locally many transportation projects are funded through RDAs, including roadway repairs, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and the planned Highways 1/9 intersection modifications.

\\Rtcserv2\shared\LEGISLAT\2011\StateBudget2011\PrelimSummary2011budget.doc



CALIFORNIA STATE ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES



LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA CITIES



REGIONAL COUNCIL OF RURAL COUNTIES



ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS (AGC)



January 4, 2011

To: Members of the Legislature

From: Associated General Contractors  
California Alliance for Jobs  
California State Association of Counties  
California Transit Association  
League of California Cities  
Regional Council of Rural Counties  
Transportation California

Re: **Comprehensive Fix to Address Propositions 22 & 26 and the March 2010 Transportation Tax Swap**

**The Problem**

The passage of Proposition 22 and Proposition 26 have many implications for the Transportation Tax Swap (AB 8X 6: Tax Provisions and AB 8X 9: Allocation Formulas) enacted in March 2010. Recall, the swap made the following major changes:

1. Eliminated the sales tax on gas and replaced it with a 17.3-cent excise tax increase on gasoline, indexed to keep pace with what the sales tax on gasoline would have generated in a given fiscal year to ensure true revenue neutrality. Revenues are allocated as follows:
  - 44% State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)
  - 44% Local Streets and Roads
  - 12% State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP)
2. Reduced the excise tax on diesel to 13.6-cents and replaced it with an increase in the sales tax rate on diesel by 1.75 percent, and provided an exemption to hold harmless entities that would be impacted from the change (SB 70).

A primary reason for enacting the swap was to remove transportation funding from the general fund and the annual budget debate. Equally important is the state general fund savings estimated at approximately \$1 billion annually from the replacement 17.3-cent excise tax or Highway User Tax Account (HUTA) dedicated to transportation bond debt service.

However, Prop 22 limits the use of HUTA funds for bond debt and general fund relief as required in the swap. Further, Proposition 26 invalidates the replacement taxes contained in AB 8X 6 within 12-months of its passage and is self-executing in November 2011.

**The Solution**

In order to address these issues with the Transportation Tax Swap, we urge the Legislature to enact a comprehensive solution that addresses state general fund, state and local transportation, and transit concerns. The comprehensive package should:

1. Validate the replacement tax provisions as contained in AB 8X 6 with a 2/3rds vote of the Legislature (Prop 26 fix);
2. Approve the transfer of Transportation Weight Fees from the State Highway Account (SHA) to a fund to provide the General Fund relief and backfill any losses to the SHA with a portion of the replacement 17.3-cent excise tax (Prop 22 fix); and
3. Reenact a revised AB 8X 9 (Allocations Formulas) that allows the new 17.3-cent gas excise tax and 1.75 percent sales tax rate increase on diesel to be allocated for its intended uses and achieves the same fiscal results anticipated in March 2010 (Prop 22 fix). This includes:
  - a. Language to allocate the new Section 2103 Highway User Tax Account (HUTA) funds for the STIP, SHOPP, and Local Streets and Roads; and
  - b. Language to achieve something closer to the originally-intended split of Public Transportation Account revenues that recognized the importance of funding local transit operations.

### **The Imperative**

The loss of \$2.5 billion in revenue jeopardizes transportation projects across California, threatens thousands of jobs, and negatively impacts the overall economic wellbeing of the State given the multiplier affects from infrastructure investment. This loss of transportation revenue would be devastating to California's transportation programs effecting state, regional and local projects across all systems and modes.

The most effective path to provide certainty and avoid the risk of losing these transportation funds and provide the State this much needed and promised general fund relief is to pass a comprehensive package to fix the issues with the Transportation Tax Swap from Propositions 22 and 26.

### **Contact Information**

Dave Ackerman, Associated General Contractors – [dackerman@theapexgroup.net](mailto:dackerman@theapexgroup.net) or (916) 444-9601

Jim Earp, California Alliance for Jobs – [jearp@rebuildca.org](mailto:jearp@rebuildca.org) or (916) 446-2259

DeAnn Baker, California State Association of Counties – [dbaker@counties.org](mailto:dbaker@counties.org) or (916) 650-8104

Josh Shaw, California Transit Association – [josh@caltransit.org](mailto:josh@caltransit.org) or (916) 446-4656

Jennifer Whiting, League of California Cities – [jwhiting@cacities.org](mailto:jwhiting@cacities.org) or (916) 658-8249

Paul Smith, Regional Council of Rural Counties – [psmith@rcrcnet.org](mailto:psmith@rcrcnet.org) or (916) 445-4806

Mark Watts, Transportation California – [mwatts@smithwattsco.com](mailto:mwatts@smithwattsco.com) or (916) 446-5508

cc: The Honorable Jerry Brown, Governor, State of California  
Anna Manasantos, Director, Department of Finance  
Mark Hill, Program Budget Manager, Department of Finance

Applications Due March 31, 2011

**Transportation Planning Grant Summary Chart**

GRANT	FUND SOURCE	PURPOSE	WHO MAY APPLY	LOCAL MATCH
<b>Community-Based Transportation Planning (CBTP)</b>	State Highway Account  <b>Budget</b> \$3 million  <b>Grant Cap</b> \$300,000	Fund coordinated transportation and land use planning that promotes public engagement, livable communities, and a sustainable transportation system, which includes mobility, access, and safety.	The following may apply <b>directly or as a sub-recipient</b> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Metropolitan Planning Organizations and Regional Transportation Planning Agencies</li> <li>• Cities and Counties</li> <li>• Transit Agencies</li> <li>• Native American Tribal Governments</li> </ul> The following may apply only as a <b>sub-recipient</b> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Universities and Community Colleges</li> <li>• Community-Based Organizations</li> <li>• Non-Profit Organizations (501.C.3)</li> <li>• Public Entities**</li> </ul>	10% minimum (in non-federal funds). At least 7.5% of the amount requested must be cash match and the rest may be in-kind.*
<b>Environmental Justice (EJ)</b>	State Highway Account  <b>Budget</b> \$3 million  <b>Grant Cap</b> \$250,000	Promote community involvement in planning to improve mobility, access, and safety while promoting economic opportunity, equity, environmental protection, and affordable housing for low-income, minority, and Native American communities.	The following may apply <b>directly or as a sub-recipient</b> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Metropolitan Planning Organizations and Regional Transportation Planning Agencies</li> <li>• Cities and Counties</li> <li>• Transit Agencies</li> <li>• Native American Tribal Governments</li> </ul> The following may apply only as a <b>sub-recipient</b> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Universities and Community Colleges</li> <li>• Community-Based Organizations</li> <li>• Non-Profit Organizations (501.C.3)</li> <li>• Public Entities**</li> </ul>	10% minimum (in non-federal funds). At least 7.5% of the amount requested must be cash match and the rest may be in-kind.*
<b>Partnership Planning (Partner)</b>	FHWA*** State Planning and Research, Part 1  <b>Budget</b> Federal funds \$1,000,000  <b>Grant Cap</b> \$300,000	Fund transportation planning studies of multi-regional and statewide significance in partnership with Caltrans.	The following may <b>only</b> apply as an <b>applicant</b> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Metropolitan Planning Organizations and Regional Transportation Planning Agencies</li> </ul> The following may <b>only</b> apply as a <b>sub-recipient</b> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Universities and Community Colleges</li> <li>• Native American Tribal Governments</li> <li>• Cities and Counties</li> <li>• Community-Based Organizations</li> <li>• Non-Profit Organizations (501.C.3)</li> <li>• Public Entities**</li> </ul>	20% minimum (in non-federal funds or an in-kind* contribution). The entire minimum 20% local match may be in the form of an in-kind contribution. Additional local funds above the minimum local match are desired.



## Transportation Planning Grant Summary Chart (Continued)

GRANT	FUND SOURCE	PURPOSE	WHO MAY APPLY	LOCAL MATCH
<b>Statewide or Urban Transit Planning Studies (Urban)</b>	FTA*** Section 5304  <b>Budget</b> Federal funds \$2,000,000  <b>Grant Cap</b> \$300,000	Fund studies on transit issues having statewide or multi-regional significance to assist in reducing congestion.	The following may <b>only</b> apply as an <b>applicant</b> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Metropolitan Planning Organizations and Regional Transportation Planning Agencies</li> </ul> The following may <b>only</b> apply as a <b>sub-recipient</b> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transit Agencies</li> <li>• Universities and Community Colleges</li> <li>• Native American Tribal Governments</li> <li>• Cities and Counties</li> <li>• Community-Based Organizations</li> <li>• Non-Profit Organizations (501.C.3)</li> <li>• Public Entities**</li> </ul>	11.47% minimum (in non-federal funds or an in-kind* contribution). The entire minimum 11.47% local match may be in the form of an in-kind contribution.
<b>Rural or Small Urban Transit Planning Studies (Rural)</b>	FTA*** Section 5304  <b>Budget</b> Federal funds \$1,000,000  <b>Grant Cap</b> \$100,000	Fund public transportation planning studies in rural or small urban areas of California (transit service area with population of 100,000 or less).	The following may <b>only</b> apply as an <b>applicant</b> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Metropolitan Planning Organizations and Regional Transportation Planning Agencies</li> </ul> The following may <b>only</b> apply as a <b>sub-recipient</b> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transit Agencies</li> <li>• Universities and Community Colleges</li> <li>• Native American Tribal Governments</li> <li>• Cities and Counties</li> <li>• Community-Based Organizations</li> <li>• Non-Profit Organizations (501.C.3)</li> <li>• Public Entities**</li> </ul>	11.47% minimum (in non-federal funds or an in-kind* contribution). The entire minimum 11.47% local match may be in the form of an in-kind contribution.
<b>Transit Planning Student Internships (Intern)</b>	FTA*** Section 5304  <b>Budget</b> Federal funds \$500,000  <b>Grant Cap</b> \$50,000	Fund student internship opportunities in transit planning at public transit agencies.	The following may <b>only</b> apply as an <b>applicant</b> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Metropolitan Planning Organizations and Regional Transportation Planning Agencies</li> </ul> The following may <b>only</b> apply as a <b>sub-recipient</b> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transit Agencies</li> <li>• Universities and Community Colleges</li> <li>• Native American Tribal Governments</li> <li>• Cities and Counties</li> <li>• Community-Based Organizations</li> <li>• Non-Profit Organizations (501.C.3)</li> <li>• Public Entities**</li> </ul>	11.47% minimum (in non-federal funds or an in-kind* contribution). The entire minimum 11.47% local match may be in the form of an in-kind contribution.

\* In-kind contribution can include a documented, quantified amount of equipment, supplies, or other tangible resources, space, or staff time.

\*\* Public entity includes the State, the Regents of the University of California, a county, city, district, public authority, public agency, and any other political subdivision or public corporation in the State. (Government Code Section 811.2)

\*\*\* FHWA is the Federal Highway Administration. FTA is the Federal Transit Administration.

AGENDA: January 27, 2011

TO: Interagency Technical Advisory Committee  
FROM: Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner  
RE: Caltrans SHOPP Construction Projects

---

### **RECOMMENDATION:**

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

1. Receive the updated list of State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) projects planned for the State Route system in Santa Cruz County (Attachment 1) and inform Caltrans project managers if there are concerns or questions about specific projects, including opportunities to coordinate local projects such as transit, pedestrian, and intersection improvements.
- 

### **BACKGROUND**

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) is responsible for maintaining and operating the 50,000 lane mile State Highway System (SHS). Caltrans identifies maintenance and operating needs for the state highway system in the State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP). In general, the purpose of the SHOPP is to provide funding "to preserve and protect the state highway system." SHOPP programming categories include: traffic safety/collision reduction, roadway rehabilitation, roadside rehabilitation, and mobility/operational improvements. Projects identified by Caltrans district offices compete statewide and are selected for funding based on need, rather than on geographical distribution.

### **DISCUSSION**

Attached is an updated list of projects in Santa Cruz County that have been programmed in the 2010 SHOPP as of January 2011 (Attachment 1). This list includes information on the current status of active, programmed projects. Please contact the project managers for further information regarding these projects. Caltrans also asks that agencies direct calls from the public, or other agencies, to the appropriate project manager for the most current and detailed information.

The projects reflected in the list include projects carried over from the 2008 SHOPP, projects amended into the 2010 SHOPP, Caltrans Minor A projects, and emergency projects in progress. Completed programmed projects are not included on this list. Additional general and/or project specific information is online at: <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/transprog/shopp.htm>. You can also review more detailed project specific information online by clicking on "Project Status" at the District 5 webpage: <http://www2.dot.ca.gov/dist05/projects/>.

As discussed at prior meetings, local entities should **inform Caltrans early in the project development process of any potential modifications a local agency may wish to have coordinated with the construction of a state highway project.** In some instances, elements beyond the scope of the Caltrans' project or project funding may be incorporated through cooperative agreements with local entities.

## **SUMMARY**

Caltrans semi-annually provides information on the status of projects that have been programmed to receive State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) funds.

Attachments:

1. Amended SHOPP Project List

\\Rtcserv2\shared\ITAC\2011\Jan2011\SHOPPUpdate2011.doc

Santa Cruz County  
**PROGRAMMED/FUNDED SHOPP PROJECTS/Jan 2011 Semi-Annual List**

Route	Post Miles	EA	PPNO	Project Description	Project Name	Current Project Phase	Ready To List (Target)	Project Manager Phone # Email	Cost (\$1,000) CON/RW
-------	------------	----	------	---------------------	--------------	-----------------------	------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------

**Programmed in 08/09 FY**

17	7.0/7.3	0P810 0500000271	8100	In Santa Cruz County near Scotts Valley from 0.1 mile south of West Vinehill Road to 0.1 mile south of Vinehill road. Construct soldier pile wall.	Vinehill Wet Weather Improvements	CON	12/2/2008 (A)*	Doug Hessing 805-549-3386 doug_hessing@dot.ca.gov	\$1,788 Award/ \$11
----	---------	---------------------	------	--	-----------------------------------	-----	-------------------	--	------------------------

**Programmed in 09/10 FY**

17	6.0/12.6	0L70U 0500000151	7007	In Santa Cruz in and near Scotts Valley at various locations from Santa's Village Road to the Santa Cruz/Santa Clara County line. Upgrade guard rail , crash cushions, end treatments& retaining walls for guard rail. (Combines 05-0L700 & 05-0L760)	SCR 17 Guard Rail Upgrades	CON	7/28/2009 (A)*	Doug Hessing 805-549-3386 doug_hessing@dot.ca.gov	\$6,160 Award/\$17
1	0.0/8.3	0N250 0500000209	4025	In Santa Cruz County near Watsonville at various locations from 0.2 miles south of Route 1/29 separation to Larkin Valley Road Undercrossing. Construct Transportation Management System (TMS) (Bond funded project)	SCR 1 TMS Freedom Blvd South	CON	3/13/2009 (A)*	Doug Hessing 805-549-3386 doug_hessing@dot.ca.gov	\$571 Award/\$8
9	1.8/1.8	0P650 0500000263	1953	Near Santa Cruz, at 0.2 miles south of Rincon Creek Bridge (No 36-37). Extend existing retaining wall.	SCR 9 1.8 Retaining Wall	CON	12/22/2009 (A)*	Steve Digrazia 805-549-3437 steve_digrazia@dot.ca.gov	\$629 Award/\$11
1	4.1	0S750 0500000459	2268	Near Watsonville, at Buena Vista Road. Replace culvert/storm sewer.		CON	N/A	Lance Gorman (805) 549-3315 lance_gorman@dot.ca.gov	\$980 ER Deleg Award/\$0

**Programmed in 10/11 FY**

17	6.1/6.6	0G400 0500000059	4001	On State Route 17 in Santa Cruz County near the City of Scotts Valley from 0.3 mile north of Santa's Village Road to 0.02 mile south of Crescent Drive. Construct concrete guard rail.	Santa Village Road Guard Rail	PS&E/RW	3/25/2010 (A)*	Doug Hessing 805-549-3386 doug_hessing@dot.ca.gov	\$1,227 Vote/\$113
1	R0.0/R10.2	0M750 0500020234	0075	Near the city of Santa Cruz, from Pajaro River Bridge to North Aptos Underpass. Rehabilitate pavement.	Watsonville CAPM	PS&E/RW	10/1/2010	Luis Duazo 805-542-4678 luis_duazo @dot.ca.gov	\$24,760/\$15

**Programmed in 11/12 FY**

9	8.0/8.8	0K230 0500000108	1937	On Route 09 between south of Ben Lomond and the Highland County Park, and just south of Holiday Lane. Guard rail upgrade and shoulder widening.	Holiday Lane Viaduct	PS&E/RW	1/3/2012	Doug Hessing 805-549-3386 doug_hessing@dot.ca.gov	\$2,193/\$4
1	17.4/26.0	0M970 0500000203	1963	On Route 1 in and near Santa Cruz between San Lorenzo River Bridge and Laguna Road. Install guardrails and crash cushions.	Santa Cruz 1 Guardrail Upgrade	PS&E/RW	2/28/2012	Doug Hessing 805-549-3386 doug_hessing@dot.ca.gov	\$2,769/\$14

NOTE: For general informaton about the SHOPP program contact Cindy Simeroth at (805) 549-3050 or by email at cindy\_simeroth@dot.ca.gov  
 \*List is provided in January and July of each year.

Santa Cruz County  
**PROGRAMMED/FUNDED SHOPP PROJECTS/Jan 2011 Semi-Annual List**

Route	Post Miles	EA	PPNO	Project Description	Project Name	Current Project Phase	Ready To List (Target)	Project Manager Phone # Email	Cost (\$1,000) CON/RW
1	26.8/36.3	0M980 0500000204	1964	On State Route 1 in Santa Cruz County between Laguna Road and Waddell Creek Bridge. Install new guardrail , upgrade existing guardrail, end treatments and crash cushions and improve drainage facilities.	Laguna Road Guardrail Upgrade	PS&E/RW	7/9/2012	Doug Hessing 805-549-3386 doug_hessing@dot.ca.gov	\$2,437/\$14
1	17.5/18.2	0S310 0500000420	2246	In Santa Cruz County on Cabrillo Hwy from Rte 1/9 Intersection to Mission Street Intersection. Install concrete median barrier.	Santa Cruz Highway 1 Median Barrier, 9 to Mission	PS&E/RW	8/1/2011	Doug Hessing 805-549-3386 doug_hessing@dot.ca.gov	\$1,604/\$3

**Programmed in 12/13 FY**

1	VAR	0P250 0500000245	1987	Near the city of Santa Cruz, from the MON county line to Rte 17; also in MON Cunty from Carmel River Bridge to the Santa Cruz county line. Upgrade guardrail, guardrail end treatments and crash cushions.	SCR 1 Guardrail Upgrades	PS&E/RW	3/1/2011	Luis Duazo 805-542-4678 luis_duazo @dot.ca.gov	\$4,182/\$15
9	1.7/23.9	0Q590 0500000317	1988	Near Boulder Creek, from 0.3 mile south of Rincon Creek Bridge to the San Mateo County line at various locations. Storm water mitigation.	SCr 9 San Lorenzo River Source Control	PA&ED	12/3/2012	Doug Hessing 805-549-3386 doug_hessing@dot.ca.gov	\$4,673/\$132
VAR	VAR	0R510 0500000363	2235	In Santa Cruz and Monterey counties at various locations on routes 1, 9, 17, 68, 129, 218, and 236. Upgrade pedestrian curb ramps.	Santa Cruz/Monterey ADA	PA&ED	3/16/2013	Doug Hessing 805-549-3386 doug_hessing@dot.ca.gov	\$4,103/\$833
1	9.0/17.6	0R910 0500000387	2271	Near Aptos, from South Aptos Underpass to Roaring Camp RR crossing. Upgrade guardrail, guardrail end treatments, and drainage features.	Santa Cruz 1, ENV, RR, Guardrails	PA&ED	1/2/2013	Doug Hessing 805-549-3386 doug_hessing@dot.ca.gov	\$1,351/\$75

**Programmed in 13/14 FY**

1	8.0/17.5	0C901 0500000029	9000	Near Santa Cruz, from 0.4 mile south of Freedom Blvd to 0.4 mile north of Ocean Street. Install CCTV and signs.	SCR Traffic Surveillance Station-CC TV	PA&ED	2/1/2013	Luis Duazo 805-542-4678 luis_duazo @dot.ca.gov	\$2,957/\$13
---	----------	---------------------	------	---	--	-------	----------	---	--------------

**MISCELLANEOUS**

1	31.6/36.3	0F990 0500000053	9900	In Santa Cruz County on Route 1 at Scott Creek Bridge #36-0031 and Waddell Creek Bridge #36-0065. Bridge replacement. <b>LONG LEAD</b>	Scott Creek and Waddell Creek Bridge Replacement	PA&ED	10/1/2015	Steve Digrazia 805-549-3437 steve_digrazia@dot.ca.gov	\$21,200/\$0
---	-----------	---------------------	------	--	--	-------	-----------	--	--------------

(A)\* = Actual date RTL was achieved.

Minor A Projects

Note: Construction Award or Vote costs are actuals; otherwise Construction costs are estimates.