

Exhibit A

Attachment 2

2014 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP)

Proposed Amendments to Previously Approved Projects

April 3, 2014

REVISIONS requested by County of Santa Cruz Public Works on 4/1/14 are underlined

Project #	Project	Proposed Amendment
CAP 16	Bay Avenue/Capitola Avenue Roundabout Intersection Modification (design)	Shift STIP design funds to FY14/15.
WAT 01	Hwy 1/ Harkins Slough Road Interchange	Shift STIP funds to later years. RTC to consider significant scope changes proposed by the City of Watsonville once a new state-mandated Project Initiation Document (PID) is completed (est. 6-12 months).
WAT 38	Airport Blvd Improvements: Freedom Blvd to City limits	Shift STIP construction funds to FY15/16, update match to reflect HSIP (federal) grant.
WAT 40	Airport Boulevard Improvements (east of Westgate Drive/Larkin Valley Rd to east of Hanger Wy)	Shift STIP construction funds to FY16/17.
CO 55	2010 Lump Sum Road Repairs	Shift \$234,671 unspent RSTP to CO 61 and CO 71
CO 61	Davenport Resurfacing	Add \$173,933 RSTP deprogrammed from CO 55. <u>Modify description to change from "cape seal" to "fiberized and double fiberized slurry seals"</u>
CO 62	Nelson Road Storm Damage Repair	Update description: Reopen roadway or Build permanent bypass around 350 ft debris that has closed road.
<u>CO 67</u>	<u>Empire Grade Chip Seal 2-layer Seal (Santa Cruz City Limits to 130'N of Heller Dr)</u>	<u>Modify title and description to change from "chip seal" to "2-layer seal" (budget amendment)</u>
CO 67B	Empire Grade Chip Seal	Shift \$28k RSTP from Design to Construction. <u>Modify title and description to change from "chip seal" to "2-layer seal" (budget amendment)</u>
<u>CO 68</u>	<u>Green Valley Road Chip Seal 3-Layer Seal (Devon Ln to Melody Ln)</u>	<u>Modify title and description to change from "chip seal" to "3-layer seal" (budget amendment)</u>
CO 69	<u>Mt Hermon Road Overlay (Graham Hill Rd to 1000' N of Locatelli Ln)</u>	<u>Modify title and description to change from "cape seal overlay" to "3 layer seal". Combine CO 69 and CO 75 = same project. (budget amendment)</u>
CO 71	Bear Creek Rd Chip Seal <u>Surface Seal</u> (PM4.75-PM 7.0)	Add \$60,738 RSTP deprogrammed from CO 55. Amend project name and description to show 3-layer surface seal, rather than asphalt digout chip seal to be used. <u>(budget amendment)</u>
CO 72	Capitola Road Cape Seal <u>Slurry Seal</u> (30th to 17th Ave)	Shift \$34k RSTPX from Design to Construction. increase total local match to \$105k. <u>Modify title and description to change from "Asphalt digout, cape seal" to "double fiberized slurry seal" (budget amendment)</u>
CO 74	Freedom Blvd Cape Seal (Hwy 1 to Pleasant Valey)	Reflect CTC shifted STIP funds from FY14/15 to FY15/16.
CO 76	Portola Dr. Cape Seal <u>Slurry Seal</u> (E. Cliff/17th to 24th Ave)	Shift \$27k RSTP from Design to Construction. <u>Modify title and description to change from "Asphalt digout, cape seal" to "double fiberized slurry seal"</u>
CO 78	Summit Road Chip Seal (E. Cliff/17th to 24th Ave)	Shift \$62k RSTP from Design to Construction
EA 01	South County Youth Bike Safety Training	Change lead public agency from City of Watsonville to RTC (budget amendment) in order to streamline invoicing and oversight process.
RTC 02	Commute Solutions Rideshare	Shift \$200k previously approved RSTP to FY15/16.
RTC 24	Hwy 1 Corridor HOV Lanes and Tier 2 environmental	Shift \$500k previously approved RSTP to FY14/15.

SCCRTC April 3, 2014
Item 16

Add-on Pages

Luis Mendez

From: bikerick [bikerick@att.net]
Sent: Tuesday, April 01, 2014 8:08 AM
To: Regional Transportation Commission
Cc: Luis Mendez
Subject: Comments on Rules and regulations -- Commission meeting of April 3, 2014 Item #16

Dear SCCRTC Commissioners:

With regard to proposed changes to the Rules and Regulations that you will be voting on:

Please do not eliminate the requirement for the Bicycle Committee to review the design of TDA-funded bicycle projects.

Also, please do not strictly limit Bicycle Committee meetings to every other month (i.e., 6 annually).

Project Review:

The current TDA rules, in place for many years, require Bicycle Committee review of both claims (containing project descriptions) and then project design (if the design is ready when the initial claim is submitted then these can be reviewed concurrently). The proposed Rule revision retains the requirement for the Bicycle Committee to review the claim, but make optional the requirement to review design (Section VI.G.2 proposes to change "shall review" to "may review"). There have been numerous instances where the Committee has recommended design improvements to proposed projects. Committee members do not second guess engineering principles, but sometimes suggest adding or revising elements that the designers have overlooked, based on the members' intimate experiences of riding in the project area. For example, there was an otherwise well-designed intersection project that lacked a stenciled area for left-turning cyclists to trigger the traffic signal that the Committee brought to the sponsor's attention during such design review.

The way the proposed Rule change is worded would require the Commission to review project design itself if the Bicycle Committee did not. Nothing in the current Rules precludes you from overruling the Committee's design review; but making it optional then puts a burden on Commission members to address a matter better suited to your advisory committee. Please do not make the Bicycle Committee's project design review optional, but retain the current requirement.

Committee Meetings:

The current rules state that the Bicycle Committee is to meet monthly. Indeed for three decades the Committee had met monthly. So had the your Commission, so that the Committee could give timely input. This became a little more challenging when your Commission began to meet twice a month. Then, after budget constraints following the recession a few years ago, you decided that the Committee should cut back the number of meetings. Although this reduction was mandated to lessen the burden on staff, there could be times when more meetings with fewer items on each would actually be less stressful on staff. The Committee responded by canceling most every other meeting, but by retaining the flexibility to be able to meet more frequently to address time-sensitive matters. For example, in 2013 it met seven times. These meetings have generally been packed with items, but, even so, several important matters have not had consideration. One useful item that was eliminated was an annual discussion with each jurisdiction's staff as to their upcoming bicycle project plans. Other recent items that went to the Commission before the Bicycle Committee had a chance to comment included the revision to Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network, the grant application to CALTRANS for a New Bicycle/Pedestrian Transportation Improvements Partnership Model, the preliminary scoping of the bicycle route signing program and the preliminary STIP allocation (in this case, the Committee had a chance to make recommendations before your final decision, but you had already set preliminary allocation priorities before the Bicycle Committee meeting).

The current proposal would appear to lock in only bimonthly meetings, by setting the meeting time as the second Monday of every other month under "Meeting Frequency and Time." The Rules do allow the meeting time to be changed, but not the frequency. This means that the Committee would meet once per every four of your meetings. That would mean that the Committee would not be able to provide input on some matters that the Committee is charged with reviewing, especially time-sensitive ones.

An example of the problem that this will cause is this very item to change the Committee's operations. All past Rule changes were first brought to the Committee for input. This was not. It was mentioned at the Committee's last meeting (in February) that changes were going to be considered by the Budget and Administration/Personnel Committee, but the

proposed changes were not available for review. The Bicycle Committee was able to add an item to its agenda to form an ad hoc committee to attend the Budget Committee and request more Bicycle Committee input in project review. What should have happened is that this matter should have then been agendaized for the next (April) Bicycle Committee meeting in order for the ad hoc committee to report back and for the Bicycle Committee as a whole to review the proposed Rule changes and provide input to you. But, your Commission meeting is occurring before the Bicycle Committee's next meeting. Therefore, you will not have the benefit of the comments of the Committee as a whole. If the Committee had known that its next meeting would come too late, it could have uncanceled its March meeting to discuss this issue. Under the proposed Rule change that would not appear possible.

I thus recommend that you leave the current monthly meeting frequency in place. You can add the phrase "if needed," as is proposed for the Interagency Technical Advisory Committee meeting frequency. And, you can continue to request that the Bicycle Committee generally cancel every other meeting without locking this inflexibility into the Rules.

Because the Committee has not acted as a whole on this matter, these recommendations are mine personally. I have not shared them with any other members of the Bicycle Committee because to do so could be improper under the Brown Act.

Thank you for your consideration,
Rick Hyman

County.

2. The performance of the Executive Director shall be evaluated by the Regional Transportation Commission once every year, ~~consistent with the procedure described in Exhibit 1.~~ The Commission shall ~~include~~ refer a summary of their written evaluation ~~to the County Personnel Department for inclusion in the Executive Director's Personnel file, and to the County Administrative Officer, who shall incorporate the Commission's evaluation into an annual evaluation consistent with County requirements.~~

G. Agenda

1. All reports, communications, resolutions, or other matters to be submitted to the Commission and included in the meeting packet should be submitted to the Executive Director not later than 5 pm on the Friday, thirteen days preceding a regular Commission meeting. Materials that are relevant to an agenda item and are received by noon on the day before the meeting will ~~may~~ be copied by RTC staff and distributed at the meeting on the following day if received by noon the day before the meeting. Members of the public may provide materials for distribution at the meeting.
2. The Executive Director shall arrange the agenda and shall ~~furnish~~ make a copy available ~~of it~~ to each member of the Commission, to all the cities within Santa Cruz County, to the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District, to the County Counsel, to the County of Santa Cruz ~~Administrative Officer~~, and to the public at least 72 hours prior to the meeting.
3. Consistent with the provisions of the Ralph M. Brown Act, Government Code Sections 54950 through 54963~~4~~, no action or discussion shall be undertaken on any item not appearing on the posted agenda except that members of the Commission may briefly respond to statements made or questions posed by persons exercising their public testimony rights or ask a question for clarification, refer the matter to staff or to other resources for factual information, or request staff to report back at a subsequent meeting concerning any matter. Notwithstanding the foregoing, action may be taken on an item of business not appearing on the posted agenda upon a determination by a two-thirds vote of the membership of the Commission, or if less than two-thirds of the members are present, by unanimous vote of those members present, that there is a need to take immediate action and that the need for action came to the attention of the Commission subsequent to the agenda being posted.

H. Public Hearings

and education, specialized transportation planning, transportation systems management, budget and work program development, plan coordination, and public information, consistent with the Commission's adopted annual work program and budget. The Commission may, at its discretion, contract with other entities to accomplish portions of its adopted work program.

V. CLAIMS FOR PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION FUNDS: TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT (TDA) ARTICLE 4 CLAIMS AND STATE TRANSIT ASSISTANCE (STA) CLAIMS

A. Submission of Claims

The Transportation Development Act and the applicable California Administration Code Title 21, Chapter 3, subchapter 2, provide regulations for the submission of claims for Public Transportation. By this reference, they are incorporated in the rules and regulations of the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission.

B. Claims by the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District

1. Claims may be filed under PUC Sections 99260 and 99313 for the support of public transportation systems and for aid to public transportation research and demonstration projects by the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District, consistent with the Commission's adopted budget and work program.
2. In accordance with Transportation Development Act regulations, Public Utilities Code Section 6645 (relating to operators in urbanized and non-urbanized areas), the Transit District shall meet 1) a ratio of fare revenue to operating cost-ratio of no less than 15% and 2) a ratio of fare revenue plus local support to operating cost shall be as established by Public Utilities Code Section 6633.2. The size and density of the service area as well as the proportion of the ridership that is transit dependent have been considered prior to the adoption of this ratio.
3. ~~3.~~ The Transit District shall submit a written report of its current and upcoming activities along with its annual claim.
4. The annual claim shall be submitted utilizing the SCCRTC's TDA Claim Form.
54. The Commission shall transfer one-quarter of the Transit District's annual