



**SANTA CRUZ METROPOLITAN TRANSIT DISTRICT (METRO)
CAPITAL PROJECTS STANDING COMMITTEE AGENDA
REGULAR MEETING
APRIL 10, 2017 – 2:00 PM
METRO ADMIN OFFICES
110 VERNON STREET
SANTA CRUZ, CA 95060**

The Capital Projects Standing Committee Meeting Agenda Packet can be found online at www.SCMTD.com and is available for inspection at Santa Cruz Metro's Administrative offices at 110 Vernon Street, Santa Cruz, California.

This document has been created with accessibility in mind. With the exception of the Structural Deficit Workshop materials, certain 3rd party and other attachments, it passes the Adobe Acrobat XI Accessibility Full Check. If you have any questions about the accessibility of this document, please email your inquiry to accessibility@scmttd.com

COMMITTEE ROSTER

Director Ed Bottorff
Director Cynthia Chase
Director Bruce McPherson

City of Capitola
City of Santa Cruz
County of Santa Cruz

Alex Clifford
Julie Sherman

METRO CEO/General Manager
METRO General Counsel

AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT

METRO does not discriminate on the basis of disability. Any person who requires an accommodation or an auxiliary aid or service to participate in the meeting, or to access the agenda and the agenda packet, should contact the Executive Assistant, at 831-426-6080 as soon as possible in advance of the Committee meeting. Hearing impaired individuals should call 711 for assistance in contacting Santa Cruz METRO regarding special requirements to participate in the Committee meeting. For information regarding this agenda or interpretation services, please call Santa Cruz METRO at 831-426-6080.

MEETING TIME: 2:00PM

NOTE: THE COMMITTEE CHAIR MAY TAKE ITEMS OUT OF ORDER

- 1 CALL TO ORDER**
- 2 ROLL CALL**

3 ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS FROM AGENDA / ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTATION TO SUPPORT EXISTING AGENDA ITEMS

4 COMMUNICATIONS TO THE CAPITAL PROJECTS STANDING COMMITTEE

This time is set aside for Directors and members of the general public to address any item not on the Agenda, but which is within the matter jurisdiction of the Committee. Each member of the public appearing at a Committee meeting shall be limited to three minutes in his or her presentation, unless the Chair, at his or her discretion, permits further remarks to be made. Any person addressing the Committee may submit written statements, petitions or other documents to complement his or her presentation. When addressing the Committee, the individual may, but is not required to, provide his/her name and address in an audible tone for the record.

5 APPROVAL OF DECEMBER 19, 2016 CAPITAL PROJECTS STANDING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

6 REVIEW OF ITEMS TO BE DISCUSSED IN CLOSED SESSION

7 RECESS TO CLOSED SESSION

8 CLOSED SESSION

CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL – PENDING LITIGATION

Government Code Section 54956.9 (d) – Parties: Lewis C. Nelson and Sons, Inc. and RNL Design, Inc.

9 ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to Section 54954.2(a)(1) of the Government Code of the State of California, this agenda was posted at least 72 hours in advance of the scheduled meeting at a public place freely accessible to the public 24 hours a day. The agenda packet and materials related to an item on this Agenda submitted after distribution of the agenda packet are available for public inspection in the Santa Cruz METRO Administrative Office (110 Vernon Street, Santa Cruz) during normal business hours. Such documents are also available on the Santa Cruz METRO website at www.scmtcd.com subject to staff's ability to post the document before the meeting.



**SANTA CRUZ METROPOLITAN TRANSIT DISTRICT (METRO)
CAPITAL PROJECTS STANDING COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
DECEMBER 19, 2016 – 3:00 PM
METRO ADMIN OFFICES
110 VERNON STREET
SANTA CRUZ, CA 95060**

The Capital Projects Standing Committee convened a meeting as referenced above. The Meeting Agenda Packet can be found online at www.SCMTD.com and is available for inspection at Santa Cruz Metro's Administrative offices at 110 Vernon Street, Santa Cruz, California.

This document has been created with accessibility in mind. With the exception of certain 3rd party and other attachments, it passes the Adobe Acrobat XI Accessibility Full Check. If you have any questions about the accessibility of this document, please email your inquiry to accessibility@scmttd.com

COMMITTEE ROSTER

Director Dene Bustichi	City of Scotts Valley
Director Cynthia Chase, Committee Chair	City of Santa Cruz
Director Bruce McPherson	County of Santa Cruz
Alex Clifford	METRO CEO/General Manager
Julie Sherman	METRO District Counsel

MEETING TIME: 3:00PM

NOTE: THE COMMITTEE CHAIR MAY TAKE ITEMS OUT OF ORDER

1 CALL TO ORDER

Meeting was called to order at 3:07PM by Committee Chair Chase.

2 ROLL CALL: The following Directors were **present**, representing quorum:

Director Cynthia Chase	City of Santa Cruz
Director Bruce McPherson	County of Santa Cruz

Director Dene Bustichi was not present.

METRO EMPLOYEES AND MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC WHO VOLUNTARILY INDICATED THEY WERE PRESENT (IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER) WERE:

Erron Alvey, SCMTD	Stanley Sokolow, Self
Dana Bagshaw, Self	Bill Tysseling, SC Chamber
Antonio Castillo, SEIU VMU	

3 ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS FROM AGENDA / ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTATION TO SUPPORT EXISTING AGENDA ITEMS

None.

4 COMMUNICATIONS TO THE CAPITAL PROJECTS STANDING COMMITTEE

Hearing none, the meeting continued to the next agenda item,

5 PACIFIC STATION UPDATE

Barrow Emerson, Planning and Development Manager, distributed the 4 page document attached.

Bonnie Lipscomb, City of Santa Cruz, spoke of the funding partnership between the City of Santa Cruz and METRO. The City procured \$6M specifically targeted for housing on the site from the RDA; currently in negotiations with NIAC for the property site.

Director McPherson asked how much FTA funding is limited to the METRO site. Mr. Emerson answered there is approximately \$200K in 5309 funding. Mr. Tom Hiltner, Grants/Legislative Analyst, added these 5309 program grant funds don't have a specific expiration date; however, if there is no movement in 5 years or no spending in 18 months, it is subject to return to the FTA. PTMISEA funding was also discussed.

CEO Clifford noted we should be mindful that we are showing expenditures on those dollars or they can be withdrawn.

The Committee members, METRO staff and attendees discussed the theory, pros and cons of 'barbell staging' versus the current one station scenario. For example, would a site nearer UCSC be considered? Discussions continued regarding various station locations, configurations such as a mixed residential/business configuration, housing needs, benefits to the public and the local businesses with intent to target appropriate recommendations to the METRO board. CEO Clifford went on to explain the history of the project and lack of investigating alternatives. As a result, the focus of the project has been to keep Pacific Station in its current location. At this point, it appears that we should explore alternatives (e.g., barbell approach, 75 River Street, which comes with time constraints) using consultants with expertise in this area.

Ms. Lipscomb said the City would be happy to work with METRO on a new MOU but asked that everyone be mindful of the time sensitivities with some of their partners; e.g., the Santa Cruz Health Center. As such, they would appreciate a policy decision prior to July 2017. Mr. Emerson suggested that a thorough investigation of alternative sites and/or operating protocols (2-staging area "barbell" approach) could take a year. Directors McPherson and Chase encouraged METRO and the City to move forward to the best of their ability. CEO Clifford agreed to participate in an expedited process and to develop a new MOU.

After further discussion regarding the various proposals, etc. the following was agreed to:

- METRO's Planning and Development staff will conduct an initial review of 75 River Street logistics;
- METRO Planning and Development staff will also update the Committee regarding METRO's downtown ancillary needs;
- Develop an MOU to explore options A (existing site) and B (alternative operating protocol/new site);
- METRO will explore 75 River Street as an option;

- METRO will consider procuring consultant support related to Option A (existing site) pending funding and MOU agreement;
- METRO and the City will consider procuring consultant support for Option B (alternative operating protocols/sites) once Option A work has begun; and,
- The Capital Projects Standing Committee will continue to meet every two months.

Public comment:

Ms. Dana Bagshaw said the most important goal to her is the expansion of public transit while making it attractive to the public and drawing more riders both to the buses and to the station/downtown area.

Mr. Stanley Sokolow spoke of another potential complication in the rail corridor plans which call for a station near the beach area. Can this be integrated into the plan to serve both the rail corridor and the bus station to transport the public from the rail to the bus?

Committee Chair Chase responded that these types of options will be considered.

6 ANNOUNCEMENT OF NEXT MEETING

Committee Chair Chase asked that the next meeting be scheduled for February 2017.

7 ADJOURNMENT

Committee Chair Chase adjourned the meeting at 4:35PM.

Pursuant to Section 54954.2(a)(1) of the Government Code of the State of California, this agenda was posted at least 72 hours in advance of the scheduled meeting at a public place freely accessible to the public 24 hours a day. The agenda packet and materials related to an item on this Agenda submitted after distribution of the agenda packet are available for public inspection in the Santa Cruz METRO Administrative Office (110 Vernon Street, Santa Cruz) during normal business hours. Such documents are also available on the Santa Cruz METRO website at www.scmtd.com subject to staff's ability to post the document before the meeting.

- THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK -

Attachment

METRO Capital Projects Standing Committee Agenda Monday, December 19, 2016 3pm

1. METRO responses to September 20, 2016 letter from City (See Attachment A)
2. Financial Partnership (Existing MOU expired)
 - a. METRO
 - i. METRO - FTA funding limited to Pacific Station site and no environmental tasks
 - b. City – TBD (See Item #4, a below)
3. Bus Facility alternatives
 - a. Pacific Station site – 25 bays (14 active, 7 layover, 4 future growth)
 - b. “Hybrid” – Pacific Station with less than 25 bays onsite and remaining bays adjacent to Station on Front St.
 - c. Vacate existing Pacific Station, alternatives include
 - i. Alternative Station locations (ex. 75 River Street)
 - ii. Barbell staging sites on each side of downtown creating on-street stops in both directions along a City street (ex. Front)
 - iii. Other non-station thru-service concepts
4. Consultant engagement (Preliminary assumption - one-year timeframe) – This would be a two-part action;
 - a. City led Pacific Station implementation planning, hopefully leading to an RFP in a year looking for a turn-key developer. METRO would have consultant support participating on this effort
 - b. METRO led general downtown transit service concept planning exercise. City would participate on this team
 - c. METRO scope

Attachment

- i. Pacific Station implementation planning, including “Hybrid” versions – 500 hours
 - ii. General downtown transit service concepts - 500 hours
 - 1. Peer review visits (Riverside, Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo, etc.)
 - d. City scope
 - i. Pacific Station implementation planning – TBD
 - ii. General downtown transit service concepts - TBD
 - 5. Other Issues
 - a. Environmental Work Plan to meet County requirements
 - i. Scope
 - 1. Work Plan to County includes outline of recommended steps necessary to meet County requirements (METRO cost \$3,500) by April 30, 2017.
 - 2. Assuming County approval of Work Plan, METRO would then move forward with recommended steps, including:
 - 1. Air quality analysis of NIAC property
 - 2. Shallow coring on 920 Pacific (METRO Station) property
 - 3. Draft and Final report on remediation plan (if necessary)
 - 4. METRO cost (\$10-\$20,000)
6. Discussion of Project Charter/ Letter of Intent/ new MOU
7. Confirmation of METRO ancillary facilities/services requirement (25 bus bays required w/o technology support)
8. Initial review of 75 River St concept (assumes intersection redesign)
9. METRO Capital Projects Committee oversight – recommended every two months

Attachment

METRO responses to September 20, 2016 letter from City - Attachment A

1. Does every single route need to service Pacific Station?

Analysis shows that all routes that currently serve downtown Santa Cruz do need to do so. However, they all don't necessarily need to serve the existing Pacific Station. The proposed analysis of downtown service concepts will establish alternative scenarios on how downtown Santa Cruz could be served.

2. Is a transit station necessary for operations?

No, as noted above, the proposed analysis of downtown service concepts will establish alternative scenarios on how downtown Santa Cruz could be served.

Alternative downtown service concepts could involve significant policy considerations/consequences for the METRO Board and the Santa Cruz City Council; including issues related to increased METRO operating/capital costs, patron legibility/ridership, parking impacts/additional on-street bus bays, traffic implications, property zoning, etc.

3. Would technology improvements such as AVL/APC enable berthing efficiencies?

As was outlined in the METRO presentation on 9/20, depending on a station concept configuration, AVL could

Attachment

have the opportunity to reduce total bay requirements. For example, in the Front St proposal (rejected by METRO due to traffic, on and off-site bus maneuverability, and on-site pedestrian safety issues conflicts) it was suggested that the use of technology to dynamically organize bus bay assignments and to direct patrons to departure bays could have the value of reducing required bays by up to a maximum of 25%.

This feature, which has a significant initial capital and ongoing operating cost, will be considered in the development of alternative downtown operating concepts. Automatic Passenger Counting (APC) is not relevant to this question.

4. What is the most efficient use of resources for both the City and METRO, including capital, operating, and land use?

This question of efficient use of resources will possibly have different answers depending on the different party's context. It would be the goal of the proposed analysis (both a new Pacific Station redevelopment concept and alternative downtown service concepts) to quantify the values of proposals relative to each party's goals.