



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

AGENDA

Note Special Date/Start Time:
Thursday, September 22, 2011
1:30 p.m.

SCCRTC Conference Room
1523 Pacific Ave.
Santa Cruz, CA

Teleconference locations are listed at the bottom of this agenda.

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 4, 2011 ITAC meeting - Page 3

REGULAR AGENDA

6. Status of ongoing transportation projects, programs, studies and planning documents - Verbal updates from project sponsors
7. Priority Projects - Page 8
 - a. Staff report, Rachel Moriconi
 - b. Priority Projects List

8. Update on the *2012 Regional Transportation Improvement Program Development* - Page 13
 - a. Staff report, Rachel Moriconi
 - b. Call for Projects
 - c. Draft Application
 - d. 2012 RTIP Development Recommendations from September 15, 2011
9. Legislative Update - Page 29
 - a. Staff report, Rachel Moriconi

NEXT MEETING: The next ITAC meeting is scheduled for **October 20, 2011 at 1:30 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 / website: 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 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).

TELECONFERENCE MEETING LOCATIONS:

Caltrans District 5, VTC room
50 Higuera St. San Luis Obispo, CA

As allowed by the Brown Act, one or more Committee Member(s) will participate in this meeting at the teleconference sites listed above. Each teleconference location is accessible to the public and the public will be given an opportunity to address the ITAC at each teleconference location. The public teleconference site will be as noticed in this agenda; all votes will be taken by roll call; and at least a quorum of the members of the legislative body will be located within the boundaries of the territory over which it exercises jurisdiction (§ 54953(b)).

\\Rtcserv2\shared\ITAC\2011\Sept2011\Sept11ITACagenda.doc



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

DRAFT MINUTES

Thursday, August 4, 2011

2:00 p.m.

(Special Date/Start Time)

SCCRTC Conference Room
1523 Pacific Ave, Santa Cruz, CA

ITAC MEMBERS PRESENT

Angela Aitken, Santa Cruz METRO

Taylor Bateman, City of Scotts Valley Planning

Tove Beatty, Santa Cruz METRO

Russell Chen, County Planning Proxy

Dan Herron, Caltrans District 5

Maria Esther Rodriguez, City of Watsonville Public Works and Community Development Proxy

Bhupendra Patel, AMBAG

Chris Schneiter, City of Santa Cruz Public Works and Community Development Proxy

Steve Wiesner, County Public Works

Majid Yamin, City of Scotts Valley Public Works

STAFF PRESENT

George Dondero

Luis Mendez

Rachel Moriconi

Kim Shultz

1. Call to Order – Chair Chris Schneiter called the meeting to order at 2:03 p.m.
2. Introductions – Self introductions were made
3. Oral communications – Rachel Moriconi thanked the committee for adjusting their schedules to move the August ITAC meeting date so that their input could be provided at RTC's Transportation Policy Workshop.
4. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agendas – None.

CONSENT AGENDA (Rodriguez/Wiesner) approved unanimously

5. Approved minutes of the March 17, 2011 ITAC meeting.

REGULAR AGENDA

6. Highway 1 Tiered Environmental Document

Action taken: The Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC) unanimously approved (Yamin/Rodriguez) the staff recommendation to recommend that the RTC approve development of a combined tiered environmental document that will provide

program level documentation for the Highway 1 HOV Lane Project (Tier 1) and project level documentation for the 41st Avenue/Soquel Drive Auxiliary Lanes and Chanticleer Bike/Pedestrian Crossing Project (Tier 2).

Kim Shultz provided an overview of the proposal to transform the Highway 1 HOV Lane environmental document to a tiered environmental document. In response to questions from Chris Schneider, Mr. Shultz stated that in order to meet the schedule for delivering a two-tiered environmental document, work needs to start immediately. Based on Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) rules, the RTC needs to show it is making a good faith effort to complete the environmental document and initiate right-of-way acquisition by fall 2013. He noted that FHWA is now participating in project development team meetings. He confirmed that cost estimates for the Highway 1 41st Avenue/Soquel Drive Auxiliary Lanes and Chanticleer Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge (Tier 2) include design, right-of-way, construction, construction management, and contingencies.

Mr. Schneider asked if there was a risk of opponents of the Tier 2 project arguing segmentation and filing a lawsuit against the project. Kim Shultz responded that a legal challenge is possible, but the principle argument against the project related to segmentation would be better addressed through the tiered environmental document, providing information on cumulative impacts of the entire HOV lanes project (Tier 1).

Mr. Schneider also questioned how critical the bicycle/pedestrian bridge and Sustainable Transportation Analysis Rating System (STARS) application are in light of the large number of other needs in the region and limited funding that would be left for those other projects if the Tier 2 project and STARS are fully funded. Executive Director George Dondero and Mr. Shultz responded that while the project could proceed without the STARS analysis, it would be a loss given the RTC's commitment to sustainability and direction to staff to implement STARS. Staff will be bringing a breakout of the cost of STARS to the RTC. Mr. Schneider stated that APWA is also developing a sustainability analysis for transportation projects which may be less costly than STARS.

Mr. Shultz noted that the bicycle/pedestrian bridge at Chanticleer could be broken out of the Tier 2 project, but that bicycle and pedestrian facilities, including this bridge, have always been part of the Highway 1 HOV lanes project; inclusion of this facility could help reduce non-motorized travel through the interchanges and provide safer bicycle/pedestrian access in the area. Mr. Schneider suggested that less costly bicycle and pedestrian improvements could be made in the area to improve access for bikes and pedestrians and stated that he did not know if the Chanticleer Bridge is the highest priority bicycle/pedestrian improvement for the area.

Majid Yamin, City of Scotts Valley Public Works, requested clarification regarding changes at the federal level that resulted in the need for a two tiered environmental document. Kim Shultz responded that FHWA has made new determinations that future sales tax revenues cannot be assumed in California given the 2/3 vote requirement and that FHWA's 10-year rule, requires initiation of right-of-way or construction phases within 10-years of federal authorization of preliminary engineering work.

Mr. Schneider noted that in concept he supports the RTC developing a two-tiered environmental document in order to address FHWA concerns and that 41st-Soquel Auxiliary Lanes are the logical next project for Highway 1.

7. 2012 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) Preliminary Proposals

Actions Taken:

1. The ITAC approved a motion (Yamin/Schneider) to recommend that the RTC

indicate its intent to program State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds to the 41st Avenue-Soquel Drive Auxiliary Lanes project, on a vote of 6 (Herron, Rodriguez (2), Schneider (2), Yamin), with 2 opposed (Chen, Wiesner) and 4 abstentions (Aitken, Bateman, Beatty, Patel).

2. The ITAC approved a motion (Wiesner/Schneider) to recommend that the RTC issue a call for projects for \$2.5 million in FY11/12 Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds, rather than designate funds for RTC projects, with a vote of 7 (Chen, Rodriguez (2), Patel, Schneider (2), Wiesner, Yamin), with 4 abstentions (Aitken, Bateman, Beatty, Herron). *This action was taken in contrast to the staff recommendation that the RTC indicate its intent to program RSTP funds to the tiered highway environmental review documents, STARS analysis of the HOV Lanes project, and other RTC projects.*
3. The ITAC approved a motion (Wiesner/Schneider) to continue the discussion on whether to redirect funds from the Mar Vista Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge to the 41st Avenue-Soquel Drive Auxiliary Lanes/Chanticleer Bike/Ped Bridge or other projects, on a vote of 7 (Chen, Rodriguez (2), Patel, Schneider (2), Wiesner, Yamin), with 1 opposed (Herron) and 3 abstentions (Aitken, Bateman, Beatty). *This action was taken in place of the staff recommendation that the RTC indicate its intent to redirect \$7.5 million from the Mar Vista Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge to the 41st Ave-Soquel Auxiliary Lanes/Chanticleer Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge project.*

After receiving information from Rachel Moriconi on available funds, priority projects, and preliminary recommendations for development of the 2012 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), ITAC members provided the following input:

Chris Schneider questioned if other non-RSTP funds might be available to fund design and construction of rail projects and he expressed concern that funding the 41st Avenue/Soquel Drive Auxiliary Lanes and Chanticleer Bike/Pedestrian Crossing Project would leave almost no funds for other projects. He suggested that more of an emphasis should be placed on local jurisdictions' very important projects. He also requested clarification that Planning, Programming and Monitoring was for RTC staff; which staff confirmed is true.

Steve Wiesner reported that the County of Santa Cruz has extensive storm damage and that the county's average pavement condition index is under 50 (poor), which makes it difficult to vote for RSTP funds to be used for the state highway, especially when compounded by the loss of Redevelopment Agency (RDA) funding for road repairs. He stated that local streets and roads carry more vehicles than highways.

Rachel Moriconi and Director Dondero responded that the RTC and staff recognize the importance of local projects and that if the region wants to maintain the existing system, as well as make other improvements, there needs to be additional funding. Director Dondero stated that staff is looking at options for generating revenues, in part to backfill reduced funding for local streets and roads with a more stable revenue source. These include a ballot measure for 2014 and opting back into becoming a Congestion Management Agency and then seek 2/3 voter support for a vehicle registration fee of up to \$10. He noted that if the Tier 2 project moves forward, but there are no new revenues generated, it might be the last major improvement done on the highway for many years.

Santa Cruz Metro staff reported that they would be abstaining from voting on any recommendations for the 2012 RTIP or raising revenues through a ballot measure.

Majid Yamin stated that there is a need for funding for local road projects and expressed concern that large projects continually need additional funds, but that City of Scotts Valley residents use Highway 1, it needs to be widened, and the Highway 1 41st Avenue/Soquel Drive Auxiliary Lanes is a good project. Director Dondero noted that a 5% cost overrun on a large project is more significant than on smaller projects.

In response to a question on what would happen if the RTC does not approve funds for the 41st Avenue/Soquel Drive Auxiliary Lanes project, George Dondero stated that the RTC could decide to fund just one portion of the project or would have to pay back to FHWA the \$5.5 million in federal funds that have been used on environmental review of the HOV Lanes, which would likely come out of future RSTP shares.

Mr. Schneider stated that he does not recommend funding the Chanticleer Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge, but suggested making funds from the Mar Vista Bridge available to other projects. Mr. Wiesner responded that he could not take a position on funding the Chanticleer bridge over the Mar Vista bridge at this meeting and suggested taking more time to evaluate options, which might include redirecting funds from Mar Vista to other regional and local needs.

Angela Aitken noted that the list of priority projects is not in priority order. Committee members suggested additional projects be added to the list, suggested the list note which projects are already fully funded, and delete projects that are almost done. Committee members agreed to submit any other changes to the priority project list to Rachel Moriconi by noon on Monday August 8.

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

County of Santa Cruz – Russell Chen and Steve Wiesner reported that the East Cliff Parkway, Graham Hill Road safety project, and Highland Way storm damage projects are under construction. Several pavement management and storm damage repair projects are scheduled to begin over the next month, including on Bear Creek Road at PM 5.05 and East Zayante Road.

City of Watsonville – Maria Rodriguez reported that the Freedom Blvd. rehabilitation project, including bicycle lanes, is scheduled for construction this month.

City of Santa Cruz – Chris Schneider reported that the roundabout at Depot Park and the West Cliff Drive rehabilitation projects are nearly complete. He reported that the City may seek a grant for the Mission Street extension project.

SC Metro – Tove Beatty reported that Metro will be receiving new buses soon, funded by a federal State of Good Repair grant, and they have applied for a second round of funding to replace additional diesel buses with CNG vehicles. She noted that the AB2766 and STIC/5307-funded second CNG tank project is going out to bid. Planning studies on Watsonville area transit service and countywide ridership are underway. The Bus Stop Improvement project is under construction and will modify 107 bus stops and Metro Center. She noted that Metro anticipates that Congress will first extend SAFETEA-LU, the federal surface transportation act, followed by a short term act, rather than a long term bill. She asked other entities to contact her if they might be interested in partnering on future federal grant opportunities, which might include a fourth TIGER grant cycle.

9. Update on the AMBAG Regional Travel Demand Model (RTDM) Peer Review and Model Improvement Plan

Bhupendra Patel, AMBAG reported that the peer review of the Model Improvement Plan includes recommendations for short, mid and long term improvements to the model. Work done by Caltrans maybe used to build the activity based model. Data is being collected for the State Household Travel Survey (HTS) and AMBAG will also be kicking off the Origin and Destination study soon. AMBAG will be seeking input from local agencies on an ongoing basis as improvements are made to the model.

Tove Beatty left the meeting.

10. Central Coast Intelligent Transportation System (CCITS) Architecture Update

Bhupendra Patel reminded members that a Central Coast Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) regional architecture plan exists and that federally-funded ITS projects must be included in architecture updates. He noted that training is being held on maintaining a regional ITS architecture plan and after September AMBAG will provide information to local agencies on how to input their ITS project information in the web-based program.

11. Project Initiation Documents for Highway Projects Update

Rachel Moriconi reported that due to reduced state funding for Project Initiation Document (PID) development and oversight at Caltrans, local agencies will be required to reimburse Caltrans for Caltrans' oversight of locally-produced PIDs. She recommended that ITAC members identify projects on the state highway system that they intend to pursue for inclusion in the Caltrans 3-Year PID Strategic Plan. ITAC members identified the following projects:

Project	Sponsor	Year for PID
SCR-1-San Lorenzo Bridge Widening	Santa Cruz	In process
SCR-152/Main St/Freedom Blvd (Roundabout)	Watsonville	FY11/12-12/13; Fact Sheet underway
SCR-09 Bicycle lanes and sidewalks near Felton	County	FY14/15
SCR-01/Mission St/ Bay St Intersection - modify signal, bus stop and turn-lanes.	Santa Cruz	FY14/15
SCR-01 Mission/Chestnut/King St Intersection improvements	Santa Cruz	FY14/15

12. Legislative Update

ITAC members received a written report on state and federal legislative activities.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m. The next ITAC meeting is scheduled for **September 22, 2011 at 1:30 PM** in the SCCRTC Conference Room, 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA.

Minutes prepared by: Rachel Moriconi

\\Rtcserv2\shared\ITAC\2011\Aug2011\Aug11ITACminutes.doc

TO: Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC)
FROM: Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner
RE: Priority Projects

RECOMMENDATIONS

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

1. Review and provide updates on projects that are the highest priorities for implementation over the next five years ([Attachment 1](#)).
-

BACKGROUND

As discussed at the August Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC) meeting and September 15 Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) meeting, there are many important transportation projects in our region, but existing revenues are insufficient to fund most of them. With RTC-discretionary funds making up less than 10% of all available transportation funding in the county and funds from other resources also insufficient to meet those needs, it is necessary to periodically revisit the list of priority needs to ensure that limited funds are focused on the highest priority projects. While the long range Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) identifies general priorities and evaluation measures for the transportation system, the RTP does not prioritize specific projects. At the May 2011 Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC) meeting, ITAC members were asked to identify the highest priority projects for the region.

DISCUSSION

In response to the May 2011 request, nearly all local agencies provided RTC staff with a list of some of their agencies' very highest priority projects for implementation over the next five years, including, but not limited to, those projects that may have already been programmed to receive RTC-funding or that a project sponsor may request funding for from the RTC in the future.

At its August meeting, the Bicycle Committee identified a few specific bicycle projects that they would like local jurisdictions to prioritize for funding – such as local funds, Transportation Development Act (TDA), Safe Routes to Schools, Bicycle Transportation Account, RTC-discretionary programs, or other funding opportunities. The Elderly/Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee also identified priority projects at its August meeting. Those projects have been added to the list ([Attachment 1](#)).

The list includes a wide range of multimodal needs of all users – including system preservation, bicycle, pedestrian, transit, highway, local road, and transportation demand management projects and programs.

Staff presented the list to the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) at its September 15, 2011 meeting. While the list is intended to represent near-term priorities for a variety of potential transportation funding sources, the RTC requested additional information regarding which projects are eligible for State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds and which are funded. Nearly all capital transportation project types and transportation demand management programs are eligible for STIP funds. Transit operations and general road maintenance are not eligible for STIP funds. While most capital projects are eligible, when state funding is constrained (most recent years) the CTC has not released funding for local road projects. Additionally, with nearly no Public Transit Account funds going into the STIP, programming new transit projects in the STIP may be challenging. Transit projects are now restricted to fixed guideway mass transit projects (commuter rail) that are eligible for State Highway Account funds and transit projects that can be federalized, but using highway funds on transit projects may be given lower priority if revenues do not match the fund estimate year to year.

Staff requests that the ITAC review the full list, provide any updates, and confirm if a project is fully funded (or not) at this meeting.

How well a project addresses one or more of the following criteria are oftentimes considered when identifying priorities:

- Safety (reduce collisions)
- Mobility (reduce congestion, delay, travel times)
- Accessibility (increase travel options, reduce number or distance of trips)
- Reliability (reduce travel time variability, non-recurrent delay)
- Productivity (increase throughput, vehicle occupancy/passengers per vehicle mile)
- System Preservation (fix distressed facilities)
- Environment (air quality and climate change)
- Deliverability (if there are barriers to the schedule)
- Funding (if all other funding is secured)
- Number of people served

SUMMARY

Given severe funding constraints facing the state, local agencies, and the region, staff has asked the ITAC to assist in identifying multimodal transportation projects that are the most critical to pursue, construct, or otherwise implement in the next 5-10 years. Staff is seeking updates to projects on the list from the ITAC.

Attachment 1: Priority Needs List

||Rtcserv2\shared\ITAC\2011\Sept2011\ProjPriorities.doc

Priority Needs List (not in priority order)

List identifies a few key projects that local agencies and/or RTC are focused on implementing in the next 5-10 years. This list includes ongoing programs and priorities identified by project sponsors. Some are fully funded, while others may seek RTC-Discretionary funds or other funds in the near term.

<u>Project</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Eligible for STIP?</u>	<u>Funds Needed</u>
<u>Highway</u>			
Hwy 1 HOV Lane project: Environmental Review - including Tier 2 (Soquel-41st) and STARS analysis, RTC	\$13.3M	Additional STIP not available	\$370k for Tier 2, \$250k for STARS, \$250k for legal
Hwy 1 Aux Lanes: 41st Ave and Soquel, RTC	\$28M	Yes	all
Hwy 1 HOV Lane project - Construction, RTC	\$500M	Yes	all
Hwy 1 Aux Lanes: Park Ave and Bay/Porter	\$30M	Yes	all
Hwy 1/Hwy 9 Intersection, City of SC	\$4M	Yes	\$2M
Hwy 1 San Lorenzo River Bridge, City of SC	\$20M	Yes	all
Hwy 1/Mission St/Chestnut/King/Union Intersection Improvements, City of SC	\$2.4M	Yes	all
Hwy 1/Mission St/Bay St Intersection Improvements, City of SC	\$2M	Yes	all
Hwy 1/ Harkins Slough Road Interchange, Watsonville	\$9.8M	Yes	Funded
Hwy 152 (Main St)/Freedom Roundabout, Watsonville	\$1.25M	Yes	Some
Hwy 152/Holohan/College Intersection - bike lanes on Holohan, sidewalks, additional turn lanes, County of SC	\$1.6M (funded)	Yes	Funded
Hwy 17/Mt. Hermon Rd. Ramps: Intersection Operations Project, SV	\$1M	Yes	all

Misc. Multi-Jurisdictional Projects

Freeway Service Patrol (FSP)	\$300k/year	Yes, but not CTC priority	\$125-250/year
Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line Improvements: Design	\$350k-\$1M	Yes, but CTC not willing to fund	TBD
Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line Improvements: Construction	\$5.35M	Yes- Funded	\$615k RSTP match
Planning, Programming, and Monitoring (PPM)	\$150-\$300k/year	\$475 (12/13-14/15)	\$319 (FY15/16-16/17)
Commute Solutions Rideshare Program	\$150-200/year	Yes, but not CTC priority	\$250k/year starting 13/14
Ecology Action Transp Program (PVTMA not funded since 2009)	\$60/yr past	Maybe, but not CTC priority	\$60/yr future
511 Implementation	\$10M	Maybe, but not CTC priority	\$10M

Local Streets/Roads

Countywide Local Street and Road Pavement Maintenance (cost reflects funding needs beyond city/co revenues)	\$12M/year	Only rehab and reconstruction, not CTC priority	Varies
Storm Damage Repair - Countywide (unincorporated)	\$3.5M	Only rehab and reconstruction, not CTC priority	Varies

Project	Cost	Eligible for STIP?	Funds Needed
Soquel Drive - Soquel Avenue to Freedom Boulevard - traffic signals, turn lanes, sidewalks, County	\$3.5M	Yes, but not CTC priority	Paritally funded
Murray Street Bridge, City of Santa Cruz	\$11M (funded)	Yes, but not CTC priority	Funded
Wharf Roundabout, City of Santa Cruz	\$1M (funded)	Yes, but not CTC priority	Funded
Riverside Avenue Improvements, City of Santa Cruz	\$3M	Yes, but not CTC priority	
West Cliff Path - Phase 2, City of Santa Cruz	\$400k	Yes- TE	
Soquel/Park Way Intersection Safety Project, City of Santa Cruz	\$800k (1/2 funded)	Yes, but not CTC priority	Paritally funded
Mt. Hermon Rd./Scotts Valley Dr. Intersection Operations Improvement Project, City of Scotts Valley	\$1M	Yes, but not CTC priority	
Airport Blvd Improvements, City of Watsonville	\$1.5M	Yes, but not CTC priority	
Freedom Boulevard Reconstruction (Lincoln to Alta Vista), Watsonville	\$1.5M	Yes, but not CTC priority	
Freedom Boulevard Reconstruction Ph 3 (Alta Vista to Davis), Watsonville	\$1.5M	Yes, but not CTC priority	
Neighborhood Traffic Plan Implementation, City of Watsonville	\$500k	Yes, but not CTC priority	
Ohlone Parkway Improvements (UPRR to W Beach), City of Watsonville	\$500k	Yes, but not CTC priority	

Transit/Paratransit

Maintain Existing Fixed Route and Specialized Transportation Service	\$37M/year	No	
Ongoing bus and paratransit vehicle replacements	\$3-4M/year	Yes, only Federal \$	
Increase Transit Service: (at minimum restore to 2009 service levels, provide access to La Posada/Gault area)	\$8M/year	No	\$8M/year
Increased transit/paratransit subsidies for very low income passengers	TBD	No	
MetroBase Final Project: Photovoltaics, parking and water harvesting	\$11.5 million	Yes, only Federal \$	
ParaCruz Operations Building (10-year goal) with a price tag of \$12 million	\$12 million	Yes, only Federal \$	
Pacific Station Renovation (10-year goal)	\$12 million	Yes, only Federal \$	

Bicycle/Pedestrian

Countywide Bicycle Lane Maintenance, restriping, sweeping, vegetation removal	TBD	No	
Countywide Sidewalk Maintenance, vegetation removal, sidewalk repairs	TBD	No	
Sidewalk/pedestrian improvements that provide access between transit stops and senior/disabled activity centers	TBD	Yes, TE	
Fill gaps in bicycle network, low cost striping and/or signage projects	TBD	Yes, TE	
Countywide railroad crossing grade improvements	TBD	Yes, TE	
Countywide signal modifications to sense bicycles	TBD	Yes, TE	
Community Traffic Safety Coalition	\$150K/yr	Yes, TE	
Bike to Work/School Program, countywide	\$140K/yr	Yes, TE	
Bike Secure bike parking program, countywide	\$15k/yr	Yes, TE	
Bike Route Signage, countywide	\$500k	Yes, TE	

Project	Cost	Eligible for STIP?	Funds Needed
Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network (MBSST) - <i>sections to be prioritized through Master Plan</i>	\$30M	Yes, TE	\$23M
Hwy 1 Bike/Ped Xing @ Chanticleer (also included in 41st-Soquel Aux)	\$9M	Yes, TE	
Hwy 1 Bike/Ped Xing @ Mar Vista	\$7.5M	Yes, TE	
Capitola Avenue Bike Lanes, City of Capitola	\$150k	Yes, TE	
Monterey Avenue Bicycle Lanes and Sidewalks, City of Capitola	\$350k	Yes, TE	
Wharf Road Bike Lanes, City of Capitola to Soquel	TBD	Yes, TE	
Arana Gulch-Broadway Brommer Bike/Ped Path, City of Santa Cruz	\$4.8M (fully funded)	Yes, TE	Funded
Branciforte Creek Bike/Ped Crossing, City of Santa Cruz	\$2.5M	Yes, TE	
King Street Bicycle Facilities	\$500k	Yes, TE	
Widen San Lorenzo River Bike/Ped Bridge adjacent to RR bridge	\$3M	Yes, TE	
Bean Creek Road Sidewalks (SVMS to Blue Bonnet), City of Scotts Valley	\$400k	Yes, TE	
Casa Way Bike Lanes, City of Scotts Valley	TBD	Yes, TE	
Green Hills Road Bike Lanes, City of Scotts Valley	\$700k	Yes, TE	
Sidewalks Vine Hill School Road and Tabor Drive, City of Scotts Valley	\$500k	Yes, TE	
Citywide Pedestrian Facilities, City of Watsonville	\$1.9M	Yes, TE	
Beach St Bicycle Lanes (San Andreas Rd through Watsonville)	TBD	Yes, TE	
Freedom Boulevard Bike Lanes, City of Watsonville	\$1M	Yes, TE	
Lincoln St Bicycle Lanes, City of Watsonville	TBD	Yes, TE	
Main Street Bicycle Lanes (fill gaps), City of Watsonville	TBD	Yes, TE	
38th Avenue - Portola to UPRR Xing, sidewalks, County	\$250k	Yes, TE	
41st Avenue - Hwy 1 to Soquel Drive, sidewalks, County	\$500k	Yes, TE	
East Cliff Drive - 5th to 12th Avenue, sidewalks, County	\$1M	Yes, TE	
Hwy 9 - Graham Hill to SLV Schools - sidewalks, County	\$1M	Yes, TE	
Graham Hill Road Bicycle Lanes, County to City of Santa Cruz	TBD	Yes, TE	
Lomond St., Laurel St., & Harmon St. - pedestrian safety improvements for BC Elementary	\$800k	Yes, TE	
Main Street - Soquel Drive to Sevilla - sidewalks, bike lanes	\$1.2M	Yes, TE	
Soquel Avenue - City of SC to Gross Road - sidewalks	\$1.5M	Yes, TE	
Trout Gulch/Valencia Road Improvements - to Valencia School Road - bike lanes, sidewalks	\$1M	Yes, TE	
Wilder Ranch Bike Path - Phase 2	\$4M	Yes, TE	

\\10.10.10.11\internal\RTIP\2012 STIP\PrioritiesNearTerm.xlsx]PriorityProj

TO: Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC)
FROM: Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner
RE: *2012 Regional Transportation Improvement Program Development*

RECOMMENDATIONS

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

1. Receive an update on development of the 2012 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP);
 2. Submit preliminary information on projects proposed for up to \$9.25 million in State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds by October 10, 2011 ([Attachment 1](#)); and
 3. Provide input on the draft application for STIP and RSTP funds ([Attachment 2](#)).
-

BACKGROUND

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) is responsible for selecting projects to receive a variety of state and federal funding sources. Those projects are programmed in the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP). For the 2012 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) the region's targeted share of State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds through FY16/17 is \$9.25 million and the RTC can request, but is not guaranteed, an advance of FY17/18-19/20 funds (\$12 million) for a large project, equaling a total of up to \$21 million STIP. While the region's target for the 2012 STIP is \$9.25 million, the California Transportation Commission (CTC) is only required by state law (SB 45) to make \$5.1 million in STIP funds available for programming. \$2.5 million in new RSTP funds are also available through FY11/12. Staff anticipates the RTC will program future years' RSTP funds after reauthorization of the federal transportation act.

Projects selected by the RTC to receive STIP funds are subject to concurrence from the CTC. The RTC's proposal for STIP funds is due to the CTC by December 15, 2011. As part of development of the RTIP, the RTC considers how much funding to program, determines a process for programming those funds, and selects projects to receive those funds following a public hearing. The ITAC initially provided input on development of the 2012 RTIP at its August 4, 2011 meeting.

DISCUSSION

At its September 15, 2011 meeting, the RTC discussed options for development of the 2012 RTIP, indicated its intent to program \$4 million in State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds to the Highway 1 41st Avenue/Soquel Drive Auxiliary Lanes project, and directed staff to return with additional information on the impact of designating \$4 million for the auxiliary lanes on other staff recommendations.

While the RTC indicated its intent to program \$4 million of the region's \$9.25 million in STIP fund to the 41st/Soquel Auxiliary Lanes project (Tier 2), the RTC also issued a call for proposals from project sponsors should up to \$9.25 million in STIP be made available (Attachment 1). In order to provide information to the RTC by its October policy workshop, project sponsors need to submit preliminary project information to RTC staff by October 10. We recognize that for some agencies, proposals may be subject to their boards' approvals. The RTC may also program \$1-2.5 million in RSTP funds as part of the 2012 RTIP. Final applications are tentatively due October 27, 2011. Staff recommends that the ITAC provide input on the draft application at this meeting (Attachment 2).

2012 RTIP Process – outstanding issues

Based on the assumption that addressing congestion on Highway 1 is the RTC's highest priority, Attachment 3 reflects the staff recommendations for the development of 2012 RTIP, as presented to RTC at its September 15, 2011 meeting. The RTC will consider additional options for the 2012 RTIP at its October meetings. Regardless of which options are pursued by the RTC, RTC formal action to adopt the 2012 RTIP to program funds to specific projects will occur following a noticed public hearing, scheduled for December 2011. Information that the RTC will likely consider in discussing additional options for the RTIP include:

1. The RTC's priority to address congestion on Highway 1.
2. The RTC decision to produce a tiered environmental document for the Highway 1 HOV lanes project and that \$370,000 is needed to complete the environmental analysis.
3. If \$4 million is programmed to design and right-of-way of the Tier 2 project in the Highway 1 HOV Lanes project, a funding plan may be necessary for construction of the Tier 2 project.
 - a. Should some of the STIP funds be reserved for future programming to construction as part of the 2014 STIP?
 - b. Should the RTC deprogram funds from some projects or scale back the Auxiliary lanes project in the 2014 STIP in order to move forward with construction prior to 2020?
4. Other regional projects or priorities which require funding to proceed.
5. Local priority projects which require funding to proceed
6. Reconstruction and repair needs resulting from winter storms.
7. If the RTC should program up to \$2.5 million in FY 11-12 RSTP funds for regional and local projects.

Next Steps

Proposed next steps for development of the 2012 RTIP are as follows:

1. October 10, 2011: Local jurisdictions provide preliminary information on proposed projects
2. October 27, 2011: Final proposals for the 2012 RTIP due from project sponsors
3. November 2011: Committees review Draft RTIP (staff recommendations)
4. December 2011: Public hearing, RTC adoption and submittal of the 2012 RTIP proposal for STIP funds to CTC (*due to CTC December 15, 2011*)
5. February 8, 2012: CTC STIP Hearing on RTIP proposals

6. March 8, 2012: CTC publishes CTC Staff Recommendations for STIP funds
7. March 28, 2012: CTC adopts 2012 STIP
8. May 2012: RTC amends RTIP as needed to reflect CTC actions

SUMMARY

Every other year the RTC prepares a Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) which proposes projects to receive various state and federal funds. For the 2012 RTIP, \$9.25 million in STIP funds are projected for Santa Cruz County through FY16/17. The RTC can also request, but is not guaranteed, an advance of FY17/18-19/20 funds (\$12 million) for a large project, for a total of \$21 million STIP. \$2.5 million in new Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds are also available for programming through FY11/12.

Attachment 1: Call for Projects

Attachment 2: Draft Application

Attachment 3: 2012 RTIP Development Recommendations, from September 15, 2011 RTC meeting

\\10.10.10.11\shared\ITAC\2011\Sept2011\RTIPdevtP2itac.docx



MEMORANDUM

Date: September 16, 2011

To: Transportation Project Sponsors

Subject: Call for Projects for Potential *State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)* Funds

From: George Dondero, Executive Director

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission is hereby issuing a call for projects to receive up to \$9.25 million in State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) through FY16/17. Preliminary information for proposed projects is due October 10, 2011. While, the RTC has indicated its intent to program \$4 million of the \$9.25 million to the new Highway 1 41st Avenue/Soquel Drive Auxiliary Lanes project, the RTC has not finalized this decision and is interested in seeing what project sponsors propose for these funds.

Eligible Projects: Funds are available for highway, local street/road improvements and reconstruction/rehabilitation, transit capital, transportation system management, transportation enhancement, and transportation demand management projects. Funds are not available for road or transit maintenance and operations. For transit projects, STIP funds are only available to projects that are eligible for federal funds; STIP funds from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) would need to be transferred to an FTA program and the projects would need to provide a non-federal match from a source other than the STIP.

Notably, STIP funding is subject to concurrence from the California Transportation Commission (CTC). CTC staff has indicated that if funds are limited they will prioritize projects on state highways. Of local road projects, while local road rehabilitation is eligible for STIP, CTC staff said they may be more likely to program STIP projects that address safety or are eligible for federal transportation enhancement funds (though if the federal TE program is abandoned in SAFETEA-LU reauthorization, that could change).

Deadline: Email a list of projects for which you will be seeking STIP funds to rmoriconi@sccrtc.org by October 10, 2011. Include project name, description, amount of funds requested, total project cost, and project schedule. For local road projects provide information on any safety issues that would be remedied by the project. Also indicate which projects are a result of storm damage which resulted in the state's declaration of an emergency after 2010-11 winter storms.

Applications for funds, within which project sponsors will be expected to provide additional information, will be distributed following the September 22, 2011 Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC) meeting. The due date for submittal of final proposals/applications is tentatively scheduled for October 27, 2011.

Timeline:

September 16, 2011	Call for Projects issued
September 23, 2011	Applications distributed to interested parties
October 10, 2011	Preliminary information about proposed projects due
October 27, 2011	Applications due
November 2011	RTC committee review of proposals/preliminary staff recommendations
December 1, 2011	Public hearing, RTC adopts program of projects
March 2012	California Transportation Commission (CTC) considers proposals from the RTC for STIP funds

C:\Documents and Settings\rmoriconi\Desktop\Telecommute\2012RTIP\Call4Projects2012RTIP.doc

DRAFT

FUNDING REQUEST PACKET

2011

For FY12/13-16/17 STIP and FY11/12 RSTP

CONTENTS

1. Project Information Form and List of Required Attachments
 - a. Exhibit A: Project Budget and Funding Plan
 - b. Exhibit B: Sample Engineers Estimate
 - c. Exhibit C: Project Benefits
 - d. Exhibit D: Certification

SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

**1523 PACIFIC AVENUE
SANTA CRUZ, CALIFORNIA, 95060
TELEPHONE: 831-460-3200; FAX 460-3215
Attn: Rachel Moriconi
rmoriconi@scrctc.org**



PROJECT INFORMATION FORM

If you have any questions about this application or would like an electronic copy of the funding request packet, please call the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission at 460-3200.

A. Project Information

1. Project Title:
2. Amount of RTC Funding Requested: \$ _____
3. Type of Funding Requested (check both boxes if you would accept either funding source):
 - State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) – Project eligible for State Highway Account funds
 - State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) – Transportation Enhancement
 - State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) – Federal Transit project
 - RSTP – can account for up to 88.53% of project cost.
4. Implementing Agency:
5. Sponsoring Public Agency that has Master Agreement with Caltrans for federal-aid funds (if different from implementing agency):
6. This is priority number ____ of ____ projects. *(If requesting funds for more than one project)*
7. Project Description/Scope: *(Please describe the scope of work for the project, including all capital improvements or program characteristics. Please describe the improvements associated with each mode of transportation as applicable. Attach additional information if needed.)*

8. Project Cost by Mode:

Please list the approximate percentage of total project costs related to different transportation modes in the chart below. Project description (#4) must include explanation of what will be done related to each applicable mode.

Road Rehab	Road –Auto Serving	Bicycle	Pedestrian	Transit	TDM*	TSM*	Planning	TOTAL
%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	100%

**TDM=Transportation Demand Management (ex. rideshare programs); TSM=Transportation System Management (ex. ITS, signal sync)*

9. Project Location/Limits (attach an 8 1/2" x 11" map and/or photos if available/applicable, include street names):
10. *For road projects* – Is this a federal-aid route, as defined by FHWA?

Is this a storm damage project?

11. Project Length in miles (if applicable):



12. Contact Person/Project Manager Name: _____
 Telephone Number: _____ E-mail: _____

B. Project Delivery Milestones - Complete either #13 or 13b
 (Enter the proposed schedule or actual completion of various project milestones):

13. Capital Projects - Schedule:

Project Milestone	Date
Begin Environmental (PA&ED) Phase	
Circulate Draft Environmental Document Document Type (ex. EIR)	
End Environmental Phase (PA&ED Milestone)	
Begin Design (PS&E) Phase	
End Design Phase (complete PS&E)	
Begin Right of Way Phase	
End Right of Way Phase (Right of Way Certification Milestone)	
Request Authorization to Proceed with Construction (completion of all prior tasks)	
Award Contract	
End Construction Phase (Construction Contract Acceptance Milestone)	
End Closeout Phase (Closeout Report)	

13b. Non-Capital Projects - Schedule:

	Activity 1*	Activity 2*	Activity 3*
Start Activities (month/year)			
End Activities (month/year)			

*Please state the activity to be completed (ex. preliminary planning, project implementation, project completion).

C. Project Cost - Complete either #14 or 14b

14. Capital Projects – Total Cost Estimate:

Environmental (PA/ED)	Design (PS&E)	ROW	Construction	Other*	Contingency	Total Project Cost

*What is included in other? _____

14b. Non-Capital Projects - Cost Estimate: (these are sample categories, modify to match your project implementation plan)

Administration/Staffing	Operations/Staffing	Consultant	Materials	Other

E. Required Attachments

- Attached is the *Project Budget* documentation. (Exhibit A)
- Attached is the *Engineers Estimate (Sample Exhibit B)* for capital projects; or detailed project cost estimate for non-capital/planning projects.
- Attached is the *Performance Information (Exhibit C)*
- Attached is the signed certification by the project-administering agency (*sample Exhibit D*) relating to agency administrative requirements.

DRAFT

EXHIBIT A
Project Budget & Funding Plan
Project Cost by Phase

Capital Projects:

*Enter the amount to be expended for each project phase in each fiscal year by funding source.
 Totals should calculate automatically if electronic file is used.*

Round figures to the nearest thousand dollars

Sources (Specify fund source type - ex. RSTP,STIP, AB2766, Local, TDA, etc)	Source Total	Phase of Work			
		Env'l (PA/ED)	Design (PS&E)	Right-of-Way (ROW)	Construction
New Funds Requested from RTC:	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Source 2:	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Source 3:	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Source 4:	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Source 5:	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Source 6:	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Source 7:	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Scheduled start of each Phase (Fiscal Year) - New STIP funds available FY12/13-16/17					
		Env'l (PA/ED)	Design (PS&E)	Right-of-Way (ROW)	Construction

Pending Funds: Highlight any funds that are yet not secured, describe below status/anticipated receipt date:

- Pending Source 1:
- Pending Source 2:
- Pending Source 3:

EXHIBIT A
SAMPLE Project Budget & Funding Plan
Project Cost by Phase

DRAFT

Non-Capital Projects:

*Provide information on the amount to be expended for each project phase by funding source.
 Totals should calculate automatically if electronic file is used.*

Component - sample only, modify to match your project							
Sources (Specify fund source type - ex. RSTP, Local, TEA, STIP, AB2766, etc)	Staff - Admin	Staff - Operations	Consultant Services	Other Services (specify)	Materials	Other (specify)	Source TOTAL
<i>Total Cost by component</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
New Funds Requested from RTC:	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Source 2:	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Source 3:	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Source 5:	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Source 6:	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Source 7:	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Source 8:	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Fiscal Year each component to begin							

Pending Funds: Highlight any funds that are yet not secured, describe below status/anticipated receipt date:



EXHIBIT B
SAMPLE ENGINEERS ESTIMATE
CAPITAL PROJECTS ONLY

Cost Estimate Breakdown	<u>Cost</u>
<u>ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES AND PERMITS</u>	_____
<u>PLANS, SPECIFICATIONS, AND ESTIMATE</u>	_____
<u>RIGHT OF WAY</u>	
Right of Way Acquisition	_____
Right of Way Support	_____
Utility Relocation (exclude if included in construction)	_____
TOTAL RIGHT OF WAY COMPONENT COST	_____
 <u>CONSTRUCTION</u>	
<u>Pavement Structural Section Work</u>	
AC Overlay	<u>Lane-Miles</u> _____ <u>Cost</u> _____
Other AC	_____
Remove & replace localized failed areas	_____
Base materials	_____
Shoulder backing	_____
Other structural section work (Identify)	_____
 <u>Hardware Upgrades</u>	
Guardrail	_____
Signals and lighting	_____
Other (describe)	_____
 <u>Bridge Upgrades</u>	_____
<u>Grading</u>	_____
<u>Drainage Rehabilitation</u>	_____
<u>Utility Relocation</u>	_____
<u>Traffic Control</u>	_____
<u>Traffic stripes, pavement markers and markings</u>	_____
<u>Other</u> (Identify: e.g., Mobilization Cost, Hazardous Waste Mitigation, Force Account, day labor, etc.)	_____
SUBTOTAL	_____
20% Contingency	_____
TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST	_____
 <u>Construction Support</u>	_____
TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COMPONENT COST	_____



Exhibit C
Project Benefits

Indicate how your project will contribute towards the achievement of regional, state, and/or federal transportation goals using the following measurements. State and federal laws, as well as the RTC’s own policies, require the RTC to prioritize projects based on a variety of criteria. Please provide quantitative information where available. If quantitative information is not available, please provide qualitative information which indicates the anticipated level of achievement. For example, a description of the impact or an explanation such as “increases or decreases” is sufficient. Simply state “not applicable (n/a)” for each indicator that is not addressed by the project.

What are the benefits of this project? (ex. goal/purpose/benefit of project; problem to be addressed; importance to the community):

Benefits of project – please expand cells if needed.

General Information/ Regional Significance	Project/facility will be used by/serves more than 75% of county multiple times per year (yes/no)_____ Average number of travelers served by/to benefit from this project/day _____ ADT _____ Other (e.g. avg. number of people directly served/day; number of users of facility/day, TDM-direct participants and indirect beneficiaries) _____ Population served/to benefit from project _____ Other: _____
Safety (Hazard elimination)	Is there a demonstrated safety need (incidents)? _____ Will project reduce fatal and injury collisions? _____ Pedestrian safety and pedestrian collisions: _____ Bike safety and bike collisions: _____ Other safety hazard: _____
Mobility (Provides congestion relief, support for alternative modes)	Vehicle hours of delay: _____ Commute times: _____ Peak period travel times: _____ Non-peak period travel time: _____ The number of pedestrian facilities and bike lane miles: _____ The number of bike lane or bike path miles: _____ Congestion: _____ Other mobility benefits: _____
Accessibility (Opportunity and ease of reaching desired destinations.)	Will project increase travel options and opportunities? _____ Paratransit rides: _____ Access to transit: _____ Serving major activity or job centers: _____ Provides bike or pedestrian access to schools _____ Provides new pedestrian access to transit _____

	Other accessibility benefits:
Reliability	Does the project ensure on time trips and service? _____ Travel time variability (non-recurring congestion): _____ Transit times: _____ Other: _____
Productivity (throughput)	Does the project increase throughput? _____ Total daily vehicle trips: _____ Total peak period trips: _____ Peak period vehicle occupancy rates: _____ Daily vehicle occupancy rates: _____ Reducing single occupancy vehicles: _____ Transit ridership: _____ Other: _____
System Preservation	Reducing the back log of road maintenance or bus facilities overdue for maintenance: _____ Current PMI (for road rehab projects) _____ Other: _____
Air Quality/ Global Warming/Environment	Reducing smog forming pollutants: _____ Will project reduce/increase/not change the number of vehicle miles traveled? _____ Other Environmental Benefits of project: _____ Other: _____
Return on Investment/Lifecycle Cost	Extending the lifecycle of existing roads (please indicate the number of years) _____ _____ Other: _____
Deliverability/ Risks to Project Cost, Funding or Schedule	Are there barriers to delivering this project? <i>Describe any potential reasons the project cost may increase, matching funding may be jeopardized or the schedule could be delayed. Examples of risks may include insufficient staff, known environmental concerns, permits needed from other agencies, utility relocations needed, pending funding, public controversy.</i> _____ _____
Project funding	Is the project fully funded? _____ If not, what additional funds are being sought to fully fund the project? _____ _____ Are local funds identified in the project cost information currently budgeted/reserved/available? _____
Economic Benefits of Project	Estimated # of Jobs Created or Saved by project _____ Use by visitors _____ Other economic benefits _____ _____



Projects seeking STIP Transportation Enhancement Activities (TE) funds.

For projects that are transportation enhancements (ex. bicycle facilities, pedestrian facilities, acquisition of scenic or historic sites, landscaping and other scenic beautification, historic preservation, rehabilitation and operation of historic transportation buildings, structures or facilities; control and removal of outdoor advertising, archaeological planning and research, or mitigation of water pollution due to highway runoff), AB3x20 and SB286 mandate that the RTC prioritize projects that employ the services of conservation corps. If no projects involve conservation corps, the RTC is required to prioritize bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

1. Have you partnered with or do you commit to employ the services of, a community conservation corps or the California Conservation Corps to construct or undertake the any portions of the project?

2. Does your project include any work that could be done by a community conservation corps or the California Conservation Corps?

3. Would you commit to discussing with the either the state or community corps if they could construct portions of your project?



EXHIBIT D –
AGENCY CERTIFICATION & ASSURANCES

I, _____, as authorized representative of _____ (agency) hereby certify that the information contained in this application, including required attachments, is accurate and hereby certify the following:

1. The project implementing agency possesses legal authority to nominate federal-aid projects and to finance, acquire, construct, and/or implement the proposed project and I am authorized to nominate projects for funding from the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC);
2. This project is among the highest priorities for this agency;
3. The proposed transportation investments have received the full review and vetting required by law;
4. Such investments are an appropriate use of taxpayer dollars. The agency shall adhere to principles and policies that ensure government oversight and management of the contracting process to ensure taxpayer funds are spent wisely; contracts are not wasteful, inefficient, or subject to misuse; unnecessary no-bid and cost-plus contracts are avoided; and contracts are awarded according to the best interests of California taxpayers;
5. The agency will maintain and operate the property acquired, developed, rehabilitated, or restored for the life of the resultant facility(ies) or activity. I understand that with the approval of the California Department of Transportation, the Administering Agency or its successors in interest in the property may transfer the responsibility to maintain and operate the property;
6. The agency will commit the funds necessary to ensure this project is fully funded;
7. If these new funds are used to replace funds previously committed to this project, the agency will maintain its effort with regard to redirecting those funds to similar transportation projects;
8. The agency will give the California Department of Transportation's representative access to and the right to examine all records, books, papers, or documents related to the project;
9. Work on the project shall commence within a reasonable time after receipt of notification from the State that funds have been approved by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) or California Transportation Commission (CTC) and that the project will be carried to completion with reasonable diligence;
10. The agency will comply where applicable with provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act, the National Environmental Policy Act, the Americans with Disabilities Act, the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archaeology and Historic Preservation, and any other federal, state, and/or local laws, rules and/or regulations; and
11. The agency shall comply with all reporting requirements outlined by FHWA, CTC, RTC and/or Caltrans, as applicable.

Signed _____ Date _____
Printed (Name and Title) _____
Agency _____

\\10.10.10.11\internal\RTIP\2012 STIP\ProjNominationPkt.doc

Attachment 3: Staff Recommendations for 2012 RTIP Development
As presented at the September 15, 2011 meeting

1. Plan to program the region's targeted share of 2012 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds (\$9.25 million), seek an advance of STIP funds through FY19/20 (up to \$12 million), program the region's FY11/12 Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds (\$2.5 million), and redirect funds previously programmed to the Mar Vista bicycle/pedestrian overcrossing (\$6.56 million STIP and \$967,000 RSTP), as part of the 2012 RTIP process;
2. Indicate its intent to program STIP funds as follows:
 - a. \$27 million to the proposed 41st Avenue/Soquel Drive Auxiliary Lanes and Chanticleer Bike/Pedestrian Crossing Project for design, right-of-way, and construction phases; and
 - b. \$300,000 for state and federally-mandated RTC planning, programming and monitoring activities;
3. Indicate its intent to program some of the region's FY 11/12 RSTP funds, plus \$967,000 in RSTP redirected from the Highway 1 Mar Vista Bicycle Pedestrian Bridge, as follows:
 - a. \$370,000 for the tiered Highway 1 HOV Lanes environmental document, not including legal defense and completion of STARS analysis;
 - b. \$615,000 for rail structures rehabilitation to match federal STIP funds already programmed to the project;
 - c. Up to \$215,000 to the Freeway Service Patrol (FSP) program;
 - d. Funds for design and engineering for rail structures rehabilitation, if needed;
 - e. Issue a call for projects for the balance of RSTP funds (approximately \$2 million);
4. Approve the proposed schedule for *2012 RTIP* adoption, which includes submittal of final project proposals from local agencies by October 27, 2011 and holding a public hearing on project funding proposals at the December RTC meeting.

TO: Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC)
FROM: Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner
RE: Legislative Update

RECOMMENDATIONS

This item is for information only.

BACKGROUND

Each 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 in Sacramento and Washington, D.C., as well as transportation entities statewide, the RTC implements the RTC legislative program, monitoring bills and other federal and state actions that could impact transportation in Santa Cruz County.

DISCUSSION

Federal Transportation Act Update

On September 13, 2011 and September 15, 2011 the U.S. House and Senate respectively approved bills that provide a short-term extension of the surface transportation bill (SAFETEA-LU) and maintain current funding levels for transit, highway and aviation programs until March 30, 2012; the most recent extension was set to expire September 30, 2011. The legislation also includes an extension of the excise tax on fuel (gas tax) as well as an extension to January 31, 2012 of aviation (FAA) authorization. The Senate initially considered the "clean" extension on September 14, but Senator Tom Coburn (R-OK) placed a "hold" on the transportation extension. Senator Coburn was seeking an amendment that would eliminate the 1.5% of federal transportation funds that go to Transportation Enhancements (TE). In California TE makes up approximately 10% of the STIP. Santa Cruz County receives over \$17 million in SAFETEA-LU funds annually for a variety of transportation projects. Senator Coburn later relented, leaving TE funds in the extension, but will push again for elimination of TE in the full reauthorization.

Congressional leaders hope that the March 30, 2012 extension will provide ample time for Congress to enact a long-term reauthorization of surface transportation programs. While many favor a two-year reauthorization bill at current funding levels, many details must still be worked out and, as Coburn's actions this week illustrate, there is not concurrence on what should be included in the next transportation act.

President's "American Jobs Act" Proposals for Transportation

In his September 8 speech before a joint session of Congress, President Obama cited the nation's crumbling infrastructure—including public transportation—as a major priority in his proposal to lower U.S. unemployment levels and return people to work. The President's plan calls for \$50 billion in "up-front" federal investments for transportation, including \$9 billion for public transportation; \$4 billion for high-speed rail corridors; \$2 billion for other intercity passenger rail; and \$5 billion for the multimodal Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) and Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (TIFIA) programs. It also calls for a National Infrastructure Bank and includes enhancements to infrastructure-related job training opportunities for individuals from underrepresented groups to ensure that small businesses can compete for infrastructure contracts. Republican lawmakers who control the House have promised quick review of the legislation and seem open to the tax-cutting elements, but some have already rejected new spending. If approved, Caltrans officials anticipate strict deadlines will be set to use the funds. For instance, on Monday, September 19, 2011, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) staff requested a list of projects that could start construction within 90-120 days.

Additional information on the transportation proposals in the Jobs Bill, as provided by the RTC's federal assistants Capital Edge, include:

Highways

The \$27 billion in highway funding would be allocated by formula, 50 percent according to the Surface Transportation Program formula and 50 percent according to population. The states would have to set aside three percent, rather than the usual 10 percent, of the highway funds for Transportation Enhancements and would have to sub-allocate 30 percent of the funds to metropolitan planning organizations. States would have to obligate 50 percent of the highway funds in 180 days and all of the highway funds within one year. The funds would not require the usual 20 percent non-federal match.

Transit

In the transit area, \$3 billion would be allocated according to the regular urbanized area and rural area transit formulas. Grantees would have to obligate 50 percent of the funds in 180 days and all of the funds within one year. The funds would not require a match and all grantees would be allowed to use up to 10 percent of their allocation to cover operating costs. The remaining \$6 billion of the transit funding would go to a State of Good Repair Program for rail transit modernization, bus repair and replacement projects and transit facility modernization projects. Seventy-five percent of the funds would be allocated according to the rail modernization formula and 25 percent would be allocated according to the urbanized area transit formula; however, the bill does not require that grantees spend any specific amount on any particular mode. The transit funds would not require the usual 20 percent non-federal match.

High-Speed Rail & Passenger Rail

Of the passenger rail funds, \$4 billion would go to high-speed and intercity passenger rail capital projects. Grantees would have to obligate 50 percent of the funds in 180 days and all of the funds within two years, with unobligated funds recaptured and redistributed to timely grantees. The funds would not require a match and, unlike previous grant rounds, projects would not have to be on a state rail plan to be eligible for funding. The remaining \$2 billion would go to Amtrak capital projects.

TIGER Grants

The American Jobs Act includes \$5 billion for another round of TIGER Grants. Highway, bridge, transit, passenger rail freight rail and port projects would be eligible for funding, with priority given to projects that can be completed within three years. The grants would not require a match, but in the past preference has been given to projects with substantial non-federal funding.

Aviation

After administrative expenses, the entire \$2 billion in the President's proposal would be for Airport Improvement discretionary grants. The Federal Aviation Administration would have to obligate 50 percent of funds within 180 days and all funds within two years. The funds would not require a non-federal match.

SUMMARY

This report provides an update on federal legislative activities.

\\Rtcserv2\shared\ITAC\2011\Sept2011\LegUpdateSept11srITAC.docx