City of Watsonville:
Fastest Growing City Looking for Leadership and a Fire Truck

Solicited Respondent	Proxy Respondent	Item	Item text	Response	Explanation
City of Watsonville City Manager		F1	The purchasing procedure used by the City to buy the fire truck appears ad hoc and incomplete. It bypasses commonly used financial controls that would protect the buyer and provide accountability of public officials.	DISAGREE	The Watsonville City Charter, Municipal Code and Administrative Procedures fully comply with procedures recommended in Financial Management for Elected Officials and the California Society of Municipal Finance Officers best practices. The purchase of the Fire Truck met the criteria for a sole source purchase and was approved in a public meeting by the City Council. The invoice from the vendor represented a binding legal contract for the Fire Truck with the City. The City sent a mechanic and Fire Department personnel to inspect the fire truck prior to purchase and during the refurbishment process. The purchase of a used fire truck versus a new truck saved tax payers over $700,000. The fire truck was purchased with a Federal Grant and represents an excellent value for the Watsonville community. • City Council approved the purchase and clearly identified that the purchase was exempt from bidding due to sole source criteria. • February 9, 2006, City Council approved Phase 1 of a 3 phase Vehicle Replacement Plan that included in Phase 2 adding a new ladder truck. • April 22, 2008, City Council approved the Phase 2 purchase of a ladder truck as a “sole source” using Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds. [see next page] • The City long ago adopted purchasing best practices policies (bidding requirements codified) and regularly updates these to improve procedures (last updated the ordinance in Dec 2006). • City maintains for staff a “Purchasing Home Page” that contains purchasing guidelines in a consolidated review with links to more detailed processes on the City’s intranet (posted in 2008, last updated in Jan 2011).
City of Watsonville City Manager		F2	The fire truck transaction appears suspect due to contradictory documents.	DISAGREE	There are three invoices involved in the transaction, the original invoice for the 1992 Pierce Fire Truck, a corrected copy backing out non-taxable labor items, and an invoice for the KME Fire Truck. The invoice serves as a binding contract between the City and Fire Trucks Plus for the fire truck. There was a comprehensive, detailed list for all refurbishment items based on a physical inspection by City of Watsonville staff.
City of Watsonville City Manager		F3	The City Manager has not provided the City Council with regular updates that reflect changes in the fire truck transaction in the three years since the issuance of the payment.	PARTIALLY AGREE	The City Council approved the Vehicle Replacement Plan and the purchase of the Fire Truck. Updates on the progress of the transaction could have been provided more frequently by City staff to the City Council.

City of Watsonville City Manager		F4	The City of Watsonville Community Development Department issues land use and building permits without consideration of the presence of hazardous materials or recorded land use restrictions.	PARTIALLY AGREE	The minor patio project referenced by the Grand Jury was not of size or scope large enough to trigger an initial study that may have identified the hazardous issue on this site. It is the responsibility of the owner/developer to make the City aware of known contamination on the site. Furthermore, as in the specific case cited in the report, the information is included in the title of the property, thus it is a known problem to the property owner. In the event that it is a commonly known fact that a property has some contamination, or, the Watsonville Community Development Department (CDD) is notified by the owner of the same regarding the contamination, then CDD will make sure the issues have been resolved prior to issuing land use and building permits. If the project is large enough to trigger an initial study then the City will take further steps to determine potential contamination of a site. This process is consistent with other jurisdictions in the area. It would not be practical or cost effecitve for the City to conduct an initial study for each building permit (regardless of size) issued. The regulation of Hazardous Materials is the responsibility of the Santa Cruz County Environmental Health Division.
City of Watsonville City Manager		F5	No permit application review procedure exists at the Community Development Department to identify known documented hazardous materials sites.	PARTIALLY AGREE	The minor patio project referenced by the Grand Jury was not of size or scope large enough to trigger an initial study that may have identified the hazardous issue on this site. It is the responsibility of the owner/developer to make the City aware of known contamination on the site. Furthermore, as in the specific case cited in the report, the information is included in the title of the property, thus it is a known problem to the property owner. In the event that it is a commonly known fact that a property has some contamination, or, the Watsonville Community Development Department (CDD) is notified by the owner of the same regarding the contamination, then CDD will make sure the issues have been resolved prior to issuing land use and building permits. If the project is large enough to trigger an initial study then the City will take further steps to determine potential contamination of a site. This process is consistent with other jurisdictions in the area. It would not be practical or cost effecitve for the City to conduct an initial study for each building permit (regardless of size) issued. The regulation of Hazardous Materials is the responsibility of the Santa Cruz County Environmental Health Division.
City of Watsonville City Manager		F6	The full costs of litigation to justify future development surrounding the airport have not been disclosed to the public.	DISAGREE	The cost of the General Plan litigation was released to the public on November 16, 2010 and reported widely in local newspapers.
City of Watsonville City Manager		F7	The City has spent over $1 million in scarce funds on litigation resulting from attempts to increase development around the airport.	PARTIALLY DISAGREE	While the City has expended over $1 million in legal fees, the decision to pursue litigation was to defend the General Plan and Measure U, which provides for a long-term growth plan and establishes an urban limit line. Measure U outlines the areas of future growth which include the Buena Vista area. Measure U was a citizen initiative and was approved by the voters by over sixty percent in 2002. The legal action was taken to uphold Measure U and the proposed General Plan. The question of where and how Watsonville will grow in the future is of utmost importance to the community as evidenced by the fact that one third of Watsonville residents are under the age of eighteen. As in most areas of California, growth is both contentious and controversial.

City of Watsonville City Manager		F8	City Staff has repeatedly failed to provide complete and accurate information to the City Council, Planning Commission, and the public.	DISAGREE	The General Plan adoption process included the provision of extensive information to the City Council and Planning Commission and provided numerous opportunities for public input. There is no evidence that the decision-making bodies failed to receive adequate or complete information during the adoption process that included the following: • 14 member General Plan Steering Committee formed by City Council on October 28, 2003. • 11 public General Plan Steering Committee meetings conducted between 12/16/2003 and 4/20/2005. • 2 public workshops conducted by General Plan Steering Committee during this process. • May 27, 2004 General Plan Steering Committee directed that an Airport consultant be used to help define land use around the airport. • August 10, 2004 City Council hired Walter Gillfillan to prepare airport option report and appointed three member City Council ad hoc Committee (Doering-Neilson, Rivas, Skillicorn) to overview process. • City Council Subcommittee met for two months on airport land use issues. R. Austin Wiswell, Chief of Caltrans Division of Aeronautics at the time, attended a meeting of the Council Subcommittee and verbally gave his support to the City Council Subcommittee's report. The City Council Subcommittee report was presented to the City Council on 10/26/2004. • City Council adopts Resolution 74-05 to modify the 2001-2020 Airport Master Plan. • 4/20/2005 General Plan Steering Committee forwarded Plan to Public Hearing process. • 12 Public Hearings conducted on the plan by the Planning Commission between July 12, 2005 and December 6, 2005. • 8 Public Hearings conducted on the plan by the City Council between February 14, 2006 and May 23, 2006. • Final EIR Certified and 2030 Watsonville General Plan adopted at a public hearing May 23, 2006. • The City Council will have a full public discussion of the 2030 General Plan amendments to address court directives and has a process that the City Council approved at their March 8, 2011 meeting. • The General Plan litigation was agendized for discussion at 51 Closed Session meetings and deliberated by the City Council. At each of the 51 meetings members of the public were provided an opportunity to comment on the litigation before the City Council met in Closed Session and began to deliberate.

City of Watsonville City Manager		F10	The City of Watsonville does not provide a publicly available summary of WRDA activities, revenues, or expenses.	DISAGREE	Significant information is readily available to the public regarding the activities of the Watsonville Redevelopment Agency. The Redevelopment Agency prepares an Implementation Plan which contains detailed statistics and a comprehensive summary of Agency activities and accomplishments. The Agency also prepares a Mid-term review of the Implementation Plan which discusses the progress on Agency goals and accomplishments. The City Budget also contains information on agency activities and accomplishments. Additionally, the Agency prepares and publishes an annual comprehensive summary of revenues, expenses, and activities in the Redevelopment Annual Financial Report (Audit). All of these documents are presented to the City Council\Redevelopment Agency Board and can be found on the City's website at www.ci.watsonville.ca.us. The Agency also maintains the website www.growinwatsonville.com that includes extensive information about the many programs the Agency administers for the residents and business-owners of Watsonville. The recent accomplishments of the Redevelopment Agency are apparent. They include the new downtown Main Library, downtown Courts, two parking structures, partnership with Cabrillo College to bring the downtown campus to Watsonville, and providing assistance to hundreds of working families to secure decent, safe, and affordable housing units which they otherwise could not afford.
City of Watsonville City Manager		F12	The City Staff misrepresented the plans to finance the Manabe-Ow project prior to the City Council's approval in 2010.	DISAGREE	The need for Redevelopment funding for the Manabe-Ow project has been discussed extensively for more than a decade. The City of Watsonville Staff Report for the July 29, 1999 LAFCO Hearing from the City states, "…the feasibility of including this area within the existing Redevelopment Project Area will be explored." The oral testimony from Watsonville Redevelopment Director Jan Davison at the July 29, 1999 LAFCO hearing states, "The first element of this plan is to incorporate the Manabe-Burgstrom (later Manabe-Ow) property into a redevelopment area." The City Council approved the designation of an amended survey area for study purposes on August 24, 1999 that included the Manabe-Ow property which is the preliminary step to including additional property into the Redevelopment Project Area. More recently, The Manabe-Ow Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) had extensive discussions on infrastructure financing which are documented in Chapter 5 of the Manabe-Ow Specific Plan report. A section in Chapter 5 titled "Financing Mechanisms" discusses the need for Redevelopment and other funding sources under the title, "Redevelopment Tax Increment". The Manabe-Ow Specific Plan report was forwarded to the Planning Commission and City Council well in advance of the approval of the project. On February 26, 2010 (9 months before the project was approved by the City Council) City staff spoke extensively at the City Council Legislative Luncheon about the need for special legislation to include the Manabe-Ow project in the Redevelopment Project Area. This is an agendized public meeting with members of the City Council, press, public and State Legislators present and is documented in the meeting minutes. The Manabe-Ow Specific Plan and related documents including minutes of the TAC can be found on the City's website at www.ci.watsonville.ca.us.

City of Watsonville City Manager		F13	The City Staff favored securing WRDA funding to finance the project but withheld this information from the City Council and the public prior to project approval.	DISAGREE	The need for Redevelopment funding for the Manabe-Ow project has been discussed extensively for more than a decade. The City of Watsonville Staff Report for the July 29, 1999 LAFCO Hearing from the City states, "…the feasibility of including this area within the existing Redevelopment Project Area will be explored." The oral testimony from Watsonville Redevelopment Director Jan Davison at the July 29, 1999 LAFCO hearing states, "The first element of this plan is to incorporate the Manabe-Burgstrom (later Manabe-Ow) property into a redevelopment area." The City Council approved the designation of an amended survey area for study purposes on August 24, 1999 that included the Manabe-Ow property which is the preliminary step to including additional property into the Redevelopment Project Area. More recently, The Manabe-Ow Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) had extensive discussions on infrastructure financing which are documented in Chapter 5 of the Manabe-Ow Specific Plan report. A section in Chapter 5 titled Financing Mechanisms discusses the need for Redevelopment and other funding sources under the title, "Redevelopment Tax Increment". The Manabe-Ow Specific Plan report was forwarded to the Planning Commission and City Council well in advance of the approval of the project. On February 26, 2010 (9 months before the project was approved by the City Council) City staff spoke extensively at the City Council Legislative Luncheon about the need for special legislation to include the Manabe-Ow project in the Redevelopment Project Area. This is an agendized public meeting with members of the City Council, press, public and State Legislators present and is documented in the meeting minutes. The Manabe-Ow Specific Plan and related documents including minutes of the TAC can be found on the City's website at www.ci.watsonville.ca.us.
City of Watsonville City Manager		F14	City Staff withheld information regarding the requirement for legislative action to include the Manabe-Ow property in the WRDA prior to project approval.	DISAGREE	The need for Redevelopment funding for the Manabe-Ow project has been discussed extensively for more than a decade. The City of Watsonville Staff Report for the July 29, 1999 LAFCO Hearing from the City states, "…the feasibility of including this area within the existing Redevelopment Project Area will be explored." The oral testimony from Watsonville Redevelopment Director Jan Davison at the July 29, 1999 LAFCO hearing states, "The first element of this plan is to incorporate the Manabe-Burgstrom (later Manabe-Ow) property into a redevelopment area." The City Council approved the designation of an amended survey area for study purposes on August 24, 1999 that included the Manabe-Ow property which is the preliminary step to including additional property into the Redevelopment Project Area. More recently, The Manabe-Ow Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) had extensive discussions on infrastructure financing which are documented in Chapter 5 of the Manabe-Ow Specific Plan report. A section in Chapter 5 titled Financing Mechanisms discusses the need for Redevelopment and other funding sources under the title, "Redevelopment Tax Increment". The Manabe-Ow Specific Plan report was forwarded to the Planning Commission and City Council well in advance of the approval of the project. On February 26, 2010 (9 months before the project was approved by the City Council) City staff spoke extensively at the City Council Legislative Luncheon about the need for special legislation to include the Manabe-Ow project in the Redevelopment Project Area. This is an agendized public meeting with members of the City Council, press, public and State Legislators present and is documented in the meeting minutes. The Manabe-Ow Specific Plan and related documents including minutes of the TAC can be found on the City's website at www.ci.watsonville.ca.us.

City of Watsonville City Manager		R1	The City Manager should make regular reports to the City Council, in open session, regarding the performance of significant contracts, i.e., $50,000 or greater.	WILL NOT BE IMPLEMENTED	The request to establish a regular report to the City Council on contracts exceeding $50,000 is neither reasonable nor necessarily informative. The City holds numerous contracts at this monetary level but are very routine in nature and don't necessarily warrant regular reporting. The City Manager will continue to bring the approval of contracts to the City Council and will report back on the status of these contracts on a case-by-case basis depending on the nature of the contract and as specifically requested by the Mayor or City Council.
City of Watsonville City Manager		R2	The City should adopt a "best practices" government procurement policy. The California Society of Municipal Finance Officers is a particularly useful resource for the development of such a policy.[25]	HAS BEEN IMPLEMENTED	The Watsonville City Charter, Municipal Code and Administrative Procedures fully comply with procedures recommended in Financial Management for Elected Officials and the California Society of Municipal Finance Officers best practices. • The City long ago adopted purchasing best practices policies (bidding requirements codified) and regularly updates these to improve procedures (last updated the ordinance in Dec 2006). • City maintains for staff a “Purchasing Home Page” that contains purchasing guidelines in a consolidated review with links to more detailed processes on the City’s intranet (posted in 2008, last updated in Jan 2011).
City of Watsonville City Manager		R3	City Staff with purchasing authority and responsibility should receive adequate training to successfully execute contracts and process transactions.	HAS BEEN IMPLEMENTED	City Staff with purchasing authority and responsibility receive adequate training to execute contracts and process transactions that fully comply with the City's procurement procedures. The City of Watsonville long ago adopted the purchasing best practices policies (bidding requirements codified) and regularly updates these to improve procedures (last updated the ordinance in December, 2006). The City of Watsonville maintains a "Purchasing Home Page" for staff that contains the purchasing guidelines in a consolidated review with links to more detailed processes on the City's intranet (posted in 2008 and last updated in January, 2011), so they can easily refer to the procedures at any time and can stay up to date with any changes.
City of Watsonville City Manager		R4	In collaboration with EHS, the City of Watsonville Community Development Department should develop a procedure to alert staff to the presence of hazardous materials on a site prior to the issuance of land use or building permits.	WILL NOT BE IMPLEMENTED	The City of Watsonville Community Development Department will not assume the liability, currently assigned to the property owner or developer, who are to notify the City of potential or known contamination on the site proposed for development. Although the Grand Jury Report identifies some databases that can be used to determine if a parcel has contamination, were the City to assume this responsibility, and were a certain parcel not listed in the database, the City may then be considered at fault for issuing the permit. Local government is not intended to assume all responsibilities of property owners. However, if a project is large enough to trigger an initial study the City would be willing to review a hazardous materials data base as part of the environmental analysis. This approach is consistent with the procedures used by other cities in Santa Cruz County.

City of Watsonville City Manager		R5	The City Council should have a public discussion regarding future development surrounding the airport, including full disclosure by City Staff of all issues and potential costs, solutions, and compromises, to avoid another round of costly litigation. This public discussion should be held prior to development of the revised City General Plan 2030.	HAS BEEN IMPLEMENTED	The City Council has had extensive public discussions regarding future development around the airport and will continue to do so during the development of the revised City General Plan 2030. Staff will continue to fully disclose all issues and potential costs, solutions, and compromises during this process to the best of their knowledge. The adoption process of the intial City General Plan 2030 included the provision of extensive information to the City Council and Planning Commission and provided numerous opportunities for public input as follows: • 14 member General Plan Steering Committee formed by City Council on October 28, 2003. • 11 public General Plan Steering Committee meetings conducted between December 16, 2003 and April 20, 2005. • 2 public workshops conducted by General Plan Steering Committee during this process. • May 27, 2004 General Plan Steering Committee directed that an Airport consultant be used to help define land use around the airport. • August 10, 2004 City Council hired Walter Gillfillan to prepare airport option report and appointed three member City Council ad hoc Committee (Doering-Neilson, Rivas, Skillicorn) to overview process. • City Council Subcommittee met for two months on airport land use issues. R. Austin Wiswell, Chief of Caltrans Division of Aeronautics at the time, attended a meeting of the Council Subcommittee and verbally gave his support to the City Council Subcommittee's report. The City Council Subcommittee report was presented to the City Council on October 26, 2004. • City Council adopts Resolution 74-05 to modify the 2001-2020 Airport Master Plan. • April 30, 2004 General Plan Steering Committee forwarded Plan to Public Hearing process. • 12 Public Hearings conducted on the plan by the Planning Commission between July 12, 2005 and December 6, 2005. • 8 Public Hearings conducted on the plan by the City Council between February 14, 2006 and May 23, 2006. • Final EIR Certified and 2030 Watsonville General Plan adopted at a public hearing May 23, 2006. • The City Council will have a full public discussion of the 2030 General Plan amendments to address court directives and has a process that the City Council approved at their March 8, 2011 meeting. • The General Plan litigation was agendized for discussion at 51 Closed Session meetings and deliberated by the City Council. At each of the 51 meetings members of the public were provided an opportunity to comment on the litigation before the City Council met in Closed Session and began to deliberate.

City of Watsonville City Manager		R6	The City of Watsonville should publish on its website, a current record of activities of the WRDA, including projects proposed, approved, in progress, and completed, along with related revenue, bond obligations and expense information.	HAS BEEN IMPLEMENTED	Significant information is readily available to the public regarding the activities of the Watsonville Redevelopment Agency. The Redevelopment Agency prepares an Implementation Plan which contains detailed statistics and a comprehensive summary of Agency activities and accomplishments. The Agency also prepares a Mid-term review of the Implementation Plan which discusses the progress on Agency goals and accomplishments. The City Budget also contains information on agency activities and accomplishments. Additionally, the Agency prepares and publishes an annual comprehensive summary of revenues, expenses, and activities in the Redevelopment Annual Financial Report (Audit). All of these documents are presented to the City Council\Redevelopment Agency Board and can be found on the City's website at www.ci.watsonville.ca.us. The Agency also maintains the website www.growinwatsonville.com that includes extensive information about the many programs the Agency administers for the residents and business-owners of Watsonville. The recent accomplishments of the Redevelopment Agency are apparent. They include the new downtown Main Library, downtown Courts, two parking structures, partnership with Cabrillo College to bring the downtown campus to Watsonville, and providing assistance to hundreds of working families to secure decent, safe, and affordable housing units which they otherwise could not afford.
City of Watsonville City Manager		R7	The City Manager should implement a process to ensure transparency, completeness and accuracy in the information provided to the City Council, City Commissions and the Public.	HAS BEEN IMPLEMENTED	The City Manager will continue to ensure transparency, completeness, and accuracy in the information provided to the City Council, City Commissions and the Public. The City of Watsonville adheres to a thorough staff report preparation process which includes many levels of review. Information for all City meetings can be found on the City's website at www.ci.watsonville.ca.us which includes agendas, staff reports, supporting information, and minutes for the meetings. City Council agenda packets are provided to Council members on the Thursday prior to the Tuesday meeting and posted on the City website.
City of Watsonville Redevelopment Agency Executive Director		F9	It was not possible to evaluate the effectiveness of the WRDA because adequate information is not provided to the public.	DISAGREE	Significant information is readily available to the public regarding the activities of the Watsonville Redevelopment Agency. The Redevelopment Agency prepares an Implementation Plan which contains detailed statistics and a comprehensive summary of Agency activities and accomplishments. The Agency also prepares a Mid-term review of the Implementation Plan which discusses the progress on Agency goals and accomplishments. The City Budget also contains information on agency activities and accomplishments. Additionally, the Agency prepares and publishes an annual comprehensive summary of revenues, expenses, and activities in the Redevelopment Annual Financial Report (Audit). All of these documents are presented to the City Council\Redevelopment Agency Board and can be found on the City's website at www.ci.watsonville.ca.us. The Agency also maintains the website www.growinwatsonville.com that includes extensive information about the many programs the Agency administers for the residents and business-owners of Watsonville. The recent accomplishments of the Redevelopment Agency are apparent. They include the new downtown Main Library, downtown Courts, two parking structures, partnership with Cabrillo College to bring the downtown campus to Watsonville, and providing assistance to hundreds of working families to secure decent, safe, and affordable housing units which they otherwise could not afford.

City of Watsonville Redevelopment Agency Executive Director		F10	The City of Watsonville does not provide a publicly available summary of WRDA activities, revenues, or expenses.	DISAGREE	Significant information is readily available to the public regarding the activities of the Watsonville Redevelopment Agency. The Redevelopment Agency prepares an Implementation Plan which contains detailed statistics and a comprehensive summary of Agency activities and accomplishments. The Agency also prepares a Mid-term review of the Implementation Plan which discusses the progress on Agency goals and accomplishments. The City Budget also contains information on agency activities and accomplishments. Additionally, the Agency prepares and publishes an annual comprehensive summary of revenues, expenses, and activities in the Redevelopment Annual Financial Report (Audit). All of these documents are presented to the City Council\Redevelopment Agency Board and can be found on the City's website at www.ci.watsonville.ca.us. The Agency also maintains the website www.growinwatsonville.com that includes extensive information about the many programs the Agency administers for the residents and business-owners of Watsonville. The recent accomplishments of the Redevelopment Agency are apparent. They include the new downtown Main Library, downtown Courts, two parking structures, partnership with Cabrillo College to bring the downtown campus to Watsonville, and providing assistance to hundreds of working families to secure decent, safe, and affordable housing units which they otherwise could not afford.
City of Watsonville Redevelopment Agency Executive Director		R6	The City of Watsonville should publish on its website, a current record of activities of the WRDA, including projects proposed, approved, in progress, and completed, along with related revenue, bond obligations and expense information.	HAS BEEN IMPLEMENTED	Significant information is readily available to the public regarding the activities of the Watsonville Redevelopment Agency. The Redevelopment Agency prepares an Implementation Plan which contains detailed statistics and a comprehensive summary of Agency activities and accomplishments. The Agency also prepares a Mid-term review of the Implementation Plan which discusses the progress on Agency goals and accomplishments. The City Budget also contains information on agency activities and accomplishments. Additionally, the Agency prepares and publishes an annual comprehensive summary of revenues, expenses, and activities in the Redevelopment Annual Financial Report (Audit). All of these documents are presented to the City Council\Redevelopment Agency Board and can be found on the City's website at www.ci.watsonville.ca.us. The Agency also maintains the website www.growinwatsonville.com that includes extensive information about the many programs the Agency administers for the residents and business-owners of Watsonville. The recent accomplishments of the Redevelopment Agency are apparent. They include the new downtown Main Library, downtown Courts, two parking structures, partnership with Cabrillo College to bring the downtown campus to Watsonville, and providing assistance to hundreds of working families to secure decent, safe, and affordable housing units which they otherwise could not afford.

City of Watsonville City Council		F4	The City of Watsonville Community Development Department issues land use and building permits without consideration of the presence of hazardous materials or recorded land use restrictions.	PARTIALLY AGREE	The minor patio project referenced by the Grand Jury was not of size or scope large enough to trigger an initial study that may have identified the hazardous issue on this site. It is the responsibility of the owner/developer to make the City aware of known contamination on the site. Furthermore, as in the specific case cited in the report, the information is included in the title of the property, thus it is a known problem to the property owner. In the event that it is a commonly known fact that a property has some contamination, or, the Watsonville Community Development Department (CDD) is notified by the owner of the same regarding the contamination, then CDD will make sure the issues have been resolved prior to issuing land use and building permits. If the project is large enough to trigger an initial study then the City will take further steps to determine potential contamination of a site. This process is consistent with other jurisdictions in the area. It would not be practical or cost effecitve for the City to conduct an initial study for each building permit (regardless of size) issued. The regulation of Hazardous Materials is the responsibility of the Santa Cruz County Environmental Health Division.
City of Watsonville City Council		F5	No permit application review procedure exists at the Community Development Department to identify known documented hazardous materials sites.	PARTIALLY AGREE	The minor patio project referenced by the Grand Jury was not of size or scope large enough to trigger an initial study that may have identified the hazardous issue on this site. It is the responsibility of the owner/developer to make the City aware of known contamination on the site. Furthermore, as in the specific case cited in the report, the information is included in the title of the property, thus it is a known problem to the property owner. In the event that it is a commonly known fact that a property has some contamination, or, the Watsonville Community Development Department (CDD) is notified by the owner of the same regarding the contamination, then CDD will make sure the issues have been resolved prior to issuing land use and building permits. If the project is large enough to trigger an initial study then the City will take further steps to determine potential contamination of a site. This process is consistent with other jurisdictions in the area. It would not be practical or cost effecitve for the City to conduct an initial study for each building permit (regardless of size) issued. The regulation of Hazardous Materials is the responsibility of the Santa Cruz County Environmental Health Division.
City of Watsonville City Council		F6	The full costs of litigation to justify future development surrounding the airport have not been disclosed to the public.	DISAGREE	The cost of the General Plan litigation was released to the public on November 16, 2010 and reported widely in local newspapers.

City of Watsonville City Council		F10	The City of Watsonville does not provide a publicly available summary of WRDA activities, revenues, or expenses.	DISAGREE	Significant information is readily available to the public regarding the activities of the Watsonville Redevelopment Agency. The Redevelopment Agency prepares an Implementation Plan which contains detailed statistics and a comprehensive summary of Agency activities and accomplishments. The Agency also prepares a Mid-term review of the Implementation Plan which discusses the progress on Agency goals and accomplishments. The City Budget also contains information on agency activities and accomplishments. Additionally, the Agency prepares and publishes an annual comprehensive summary of revenues, expenses, and activities in the Redevelopment Annual Financial Report (Audit). All of these documents are presented to the City Council\Redevelopment Agency Board and can be found on the City's website at www.ci.watsonville.ca.us. The Agency also maintains the website www.growinwatsonville.com that includes extensive information about the many programs the Agency administers for the residents and business-owners of Watsonville. The recent accomplishments of the Redevelopment Agency are apparent. They include the new downtown Main Library, downtown Courts, two parking structures, partnership with Cabrillo College to bring the downtown campus to Watsonville, and providing assistance to hundreds of working families to secure decent, safe, and affordable housing units which they otherwise could not afford.
City of Watsonville City Council		F11	The City Council failed to fully consider project costs prior to Manabe-Ow project approval.	DISAGREE	The City Council established a 14 member Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) in 2007 which met for over one year, conducted 11 public meetings and had extensive discussions on the project costs of Manabe-Ow. The TAC had a number of City Council representatives. The findings and recommendations of the TAC are contained in a report titled the Manabe-Ow Specific Plan which was forwarded to the Planning Commission and the City Council well in advance of the project being approved. Information about the TAC meetings and the report can be found at on the City's website at www.ci.watsonville.ca.us. Chapter 5 of the report titled "Financing Mechanisms" contains a detailed discussion of costs, financing and discusses the need for Redevelopment and other funding sources. Table 5-4 lists in detail the projected Infrastructure Costs. • 14 member Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) appointed by City Council February 13, 2007 • 11 Public TAC meetings were conducted between May 2007 and September 2008 (all packets and agendas including financial information (discussed March 10, 2008) and potential funding sources are listed on City's website) • 1 public workshop conducted during this process • Forwarded by TAC for Planning Commission (PC) review in September 2008 • Jan 20, 2009 PC public hearing directed additional work and information to be prepared for further review • May 4, 2010 PC public hearing recommended City Council approval of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and the Specific Plan • September 9, 2010 Public Workshop conducted before City Council consideration • October 26, 2010 City Council Public hearing to consider final EIR and Specific Plan

City of Watsonville City Council		R2	The City should adopt a "best practices" government procurement policy. The California Society of Municipal Finance Officers is a particularly useful resource for the development of such a policy.[25]	HAS BEEN IMPLEMENTED	The Watsonville City Charter, Municipal Code and Administrative Procedures fully comply with procedures recommended in Financial Management for Elected Officials and the California Society of Municipal Finance Officers best practices. • The City long ago adopted purchasing best practices policies (bidding requirements codified) and regularly updates these to improve procedures (last updated the ordinance in Dec 2006). • City maintains for staff a “Purchasing Home Page” that contains purchasing guidelines in a consolidated review with links to more detailed processes on the City’s intranet (posted in 2008, last updated in Jan 2011).
City of Watsonville City Council		R3	City Staff with purchasing authority and responsibility should receive adequate training to successfully execute contracts and process transactions.	HAS BEEN IMPLEMENTED	City Staff with purchasing authority and responsibility receive adequate training to execute contracts and process transactions that fully comply with the City's procurement procedures. The City of Watsonville long ago adopted the purchasing best practices policies (bidding requirements codified) and regularly updates these to improve procedures (last updated the ordinance in December, 2006). The City of Watsonville maintains a "Purchasing Home Page" for staff that contains the purchasing guidelines in a consolidated review with links to more detailed processes on the City's intranet (posted in 2008 and last updated in January, 2011), so they can easily refer to the procedures at any time and can stay up to date with any changes.
City of Watsonville City Council		R4	In collaboration with EHS, the City of Watsonville Community Development Department should develop a procedure to alert staff to the presence of hazardous materials on a site prior to the issuance of land use or building permits.	WILL NOT BE IMPLEMENTED	The City of Watsonville Community Development Department will not assume the liability, currently assigned to the property owner or developer, who are to notify the City of potential or known contamination on the site proposed for development. Although the Grand Jury Report identifies some databases that can be used to determine if a parcel has contamination, were the City to assume this responsibility, and were a certain parcel not listed in the database, the City may then be considered at fault for issuing the permit. Local government is not intended to assume all responsibilities of property owners. However, if a project is large enough to trigger an initial study the City would be willing to review a hazardous materials data base as part of the environmental analysis. This approach is consistent with the procedures used by other cities in Santa Cruz County.

City of Watsonville City Council		R5	The City Council should have a public discussion regarding future development surrounding the airport, including full disclosure by City Staff of all issues and potential costs, solutions, and compromises, to avoid a other round of costly litigation. This public discussion should be held prior to development of the revised City General Plan 2030.	HAS BEEN IMPLEMENTED	The City Council has had extensive public discussions regarding future development around the airport and will continue to do so during the development of the revised City General Plan 2030. Staff will continue to fully disclose all issues and potential costs, solutions, and compromises during this process to the best of their knowledge. The adoption process of the intial City General Plan 2030 included the provision of extensive information to the City Council and Planning Commission and provided numerous opportunities for public input as follows: • 14 member General Plan Steering Committee formed by City Council on October 28, 2003. • 11 public General Plan Steering Committee meetings conducted between December 16, 2003 and April 20, 2005. • 2 public workshops conducted by General Plan Steering Committee during this process. • May 27, 2004 General Plan Steering Committee directed that an Airport consultant be used to help define land use around the airport. • August 10, 2004 City Council hired Walter Gillfillan to prepare airport option report and appointed three member City Council ad hoc Committee (Doering-Neilson, Rivas, Skillicorn) to overview process. • City Council Subcommittee met for two months on airport land use issues. R. Austin Wiswell, Chief of Caltrans Division of Aeronautics at the time, attended a meeting of the Council Subcommittee and verbally gave his support to the City Council Subcommittee's report. The City Council Subcommittee report was presented to the City Council on October 26, 2004. • City Council adopts Resolution 74-05 to modify the 2001-2020 Airport Master Plan. • April 30, 2004 General Plan Steering Committee forwarded Plan to Public Hearing process. • 12 Public Hearings conducted on the plan by the Planning Commission between July 12, 2005 and December 6, 2005. • 8 Public Hearings conducted on the plan by the City Council between February 14, 2006 and May 23, 2006. • Final EIR Certified and 2030 Watsonville General Plan adopted at a public hearing May 23, 2006. • The City Council will have a full public discussion of the 2030 General Plan amendments to address court directives and has a process that the City Council approved at their March 8, 2011 meeting. • The General Plan litigation was agendized for discussion at 51 Closed Session meetings and deliberated by the City Council. At each of the 51 meetings members of the public were provided an opportunity to comment on the litigation before the City Council met in Closed Session and began to deliberate.

City of Watsonville City Council		R6	The City of Watsonville should publish on its website, a current record of activities of the WRDA, including projects proposed, approved, in progress, and completed, along with related revenue, bond obligations and expense information.	HAS BEEN IMPLEMENTED	Significant information is readily available to the public regarding the activities of the Watsonville Redevelopment Agency. The Redevelopment Agency prepares an Implementation Plan which contains detailed statistics and a comprehensive summary of Agency activity and accomplishments. The Agency also prepares a Mid-term review of the Implementation Plan which discusses the progress on Agency goals and accomplishments. The City Budget also contains information on agency activities and accomplishments. Additionally, the Agency prepares and publishes an annual comprehensive summary of revenues, expenses, and activities in the Redevelopment Annual Financial Report (Audit). All of these documents are presented to the City Council\Redevelopment Agency Board and can be found on the City's website at www.ci.watsonville.ca.us. The Agency also maintains the website www.growinwatsonville.com that includes extensive information about the many programs the Agency administers for the residents and business-owners of Watsonville. The recent accomplishments of the Redevelopment Agency are apparent. They include the new downtown Main Library, downtown Courts, two parking structures, partnership with Cabrillo College to bring the downtown campus to Watsonville, and providing assistance to hundreds of working families to secure decent, safe, and affordable housing units which they otherwise could not afford.
City of Watsonville City Council		R8	The City Council should exercise due diligence and demand that it receives adequate information to make informed decisions. "Financial Management for Elected Officials: Questions to Ask, "published by the Institute for Local Governments is a useful resource.	HAS BEEN IMPLEMENTED	The City Council receives extensive information on all issues brought before it through staff reports presented prior to all City meetings. Additionally, members of the City Council may request additional information from the City Manager and his staff to adequately answer any questions prior to making any decisions. The City Council has made fiscally responsible decisions by adopting a balanced budget for FY 2011-2013 before any other city in the region and without tapping into City reserves to do so. Furthermore, the City has secured Memorandums of Understanding that include continued employee concessions for the next two years as well as structural changes to the employee retirement system. These actions exemplify that the City Council has made sound decisions in the area of financial management and a review of the City Council agenda packets and minutes found on the City website at www.ci.watsonville.ca.us support that extensive information was provided to the Council prior to approving these items.

City of Watsonville City Council		R9	The City Council should have a public discussion of the Manabe-Ow project with full disclosure of all funding options.	HAS BEEN IMPLEMENTED	The need for Redevelopment funding for the Manabe-Ow project has been discussed extensively in public for more than a decade. The City of Watsonville Staff Report for the July 29, 1999 LAFCO Hearing from the City states, "…the feasibility of including this area within the existing Redevelopment Project Area will be explored." The oral testimony from Watsonville Redevelopment Director Jan Davison at the July 29, 1999 LAFCO hearing states, "The first element of this plan is to incorporate the Manabe-Burgstrom (later Manabe-Ow) property into a redevelopment area." The City Council approved the designation of an amended survey area for study purposes on August 24, 1999 that included the Manabe-Ow property which is the preliminary step to including additional property into the Redevelopment Project Area. More recently, The Manabe-Ow Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) had extensive discussions on infrastructure financing which are documented in Chapter 5 of the Manabe-Ow Specific Plan report. A section in Chapter 5 titled "Financing Mechanisms" discusses the need for Redevelopment and other funding sources under the title, "Redevelopment Tax Increment". The Manabe-Ow Specific Plan report was forwarded to the Planning Commission and City Council well in advance of the approval of the project. On February 26, 2010 (9 months before the project was approved by the City Council) City staff spoke extensively at the City Council Legislative Luncheon about the need for special legislation to include the Manabe-Ow project in the Redevelopment Project Area. This is an agendized public meeting with members of the City Council, press, public and State Legislators present and is documented in the meeting minutes. The Manabe-Ow Specific Plan and related documents including minutes of the TAC can be found on the City's website at www.ci.watsonville.ca.us. As the project continues to move forward, additional financing considerations will be brought before the City Council for review and approval.
City of Watsonville Redevelopment Agency Board of Directors		F9	It was not possible to evaluate the effectiveness of the WRDA because adequate information is not provided to the public.	DISAGREE	Significant information is readily available to the public regarding the activities of the Watsonville Redevelopment Agency. The Redevelopment Agency prepares an Implementation Plan which contains detailed statistics and a comprehensive summary of Agency activities and accomplishments. The Agency also prepares a Mid-term review of the Implementation Plan which discusses the progress on Agency goals and accomplishments. The City Budget also contains information on agency activities and accomplishments. Additionally, the Agency prepares and publishes an annual comprehensive summary of revenues, expenses, and activities in the Redevelopment Annual Financial Report (Audit). All of these documents are presented to the City Council\Redevelopment Agency Board and can be found on the City's website at www.ci.watsonville.ca.us. The Agency also maintains the website www.growinwatsonville.com that includes extensive information about the many programs the Agency administers for the residents and business-owners of Watsonville. The recent accomplishments of the Redevelopment Agency are apparent. They include the new downtown Main Library, downtown Courts, two parking structures, partnership with Cabrillo College to bring the downtown campus to Watsonville, and providing assistance to hundreds of working families to secure decent, safe, and affordable housing units which they otherwise could not afford.

City of Watsonville Redevelopment Agency Board of Directors		F10	The City of Watsonville does not provide a publicly available summary of WRDA activities, revenues, or expenses.	DISAGREE	Significant information is readily available to the public regarding the activities of the Watsonville Redevelopment Agency. The Redevelopment Agency prepares an Implementation Plan which contains detailed statistics and a comprehensive summary of Agency activities and accomplishments. The Agency also prepares a Mid-term review of the Implementation Plan which discusses the progress on Agency goals and accomplishments. The City Budget also contains information on agency activities and accomplishments. Additionally, the Agency prepares and publishes an annual comprehensive summary of revenues, expenses, and activities in the Redevelopment Annual Financial Report (Audit). All of these documents are presented to the City Council\Redevelopment Agency Board and can be found on the City's website at www.ci.watsonville.ca.us. The Agency also maintains the website www.growinwatsonville.com that includes extensive information about the many programs the Agency administers for the residents and business-owners of Watsonville. The recent accomplishments of the Redevelopment Agency are apparent. They include the new downtown Main Library, downtown Courts, two parking structures, partnership with Cabrillo College to bring the downtown campus to Watsonville, and providing assistance to hundreds of working families to secure decent, safe, and affordable housing units which they otherwise could not afford.
City of Watsonville Redevelopment Agency Board of Directors		R6	The City of Watsonville should publish on its website, a current record of activities of the WRDA, including projects proposed, approved, in progress, and completed, along with related revenue, bond obligations and expense information.	HAS BEEN IMPLEMENTED	Significant information is readily available to the public regarding the activities of the Watsonville Redevelopment Agency. The Redevelopment Agency prepares an Implementation Plan which contains detailed statistics and a comprehensive summary of Agency activities and accomplishments. The Agency also prepares a Mid-term review of the Implementation Plan which discusses the progress on Agency goals and accomplishments. The City Budget also contains information on agency activities and accomplishments. Additionally, the Agency prepares and publishes an annual comprehensive summary of revenues, expenses, and activities in the Redevelopment Annual Financial Report (Audit). All of these documents are presented to the City Council\Redevelopment Agency Board and can be found on the City's website at www.ci.watsonville.ca.us. The Agency also maintains the website www.growinwatsonville.com that includes extensive information about the many programs the Agency administers for the residents and business-owners of Watsonville. The recent accomplishments of the Redevelopment Agency are apparent. They include the new downtown Main Library, downtown Courts, two parking structures, partnership with Cabrillo College to bring the downtown campus to Watsonville, and providing assistance to hundreds of working families to secure decent, safe, and affordable housing units which they otherwise could not afford.

Back to the Future:

Regional Gridlock and Local Planning Paralysis

Solicited Respondent	Proxy Respondent	Item	Item text	Response	Explanation
Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors		F1	Traffic congestion on Highway 1 corridor is problematic.	AGREE	Traffic congestion creates air pollution and inefficiencies in travel.
Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors		F2	Local jurisdictions do not implement the regional transportation plan created by the RTC.	DISAGREE	The creation and implementation of the regional transportation plan is directly supported by the County. RTC's Regional Transportation Plan is used by the County to make more informed decisions regarding local transportation programs and services. The County of Santa Cruz refers to the RTP goals and policies in the development of capital improvement transportation projects, construction or expansion of roadways; state highways; principal arterials; routes that provide primary access to major activity centers, such as government centers, regional shopping centers, colleges, airports and ports; goods movement routes, including both truck routes and rail lines; intermodal transfer facilities, such as transit centers, rail stations, airports and ports; and fixed transit routes, such as heavy rail and commuter rail. Any project involving transportation improvements is reviewed to determine whether such improvements comply with the RTP. Plan changes, policies, goals, projects and programs with regional significance are reviewed to determine consistency with the adopted regional transportation plan.
Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors		F3	Lack of consensus between the local jurisdictions and the RTC staff obstructs the coordination of the local transportation plans with the Regional Transportation Plan.	DISAGREE	The County and local planning agencies collaborate with RTC staff to successfully monitor the implementation of local transportation programs, plans and strategies. The County and other local jurisdictions work closely with RTC staff to identify and describe projects that are proposed for inclusion in the regional transportation improvement program (RTIP). The County participates in the RTP update process which requires a plan update every few years (i.e., 2005, 2010). The County contributes to the RTIP by providing a detailed listing that includes proposed funding amounts and proposed implementation years for projects recommended for implementation in the region during the five or six year period covered by the document. The County and other local jurisdictions also participate in the public participation effort required by passage of SAFETEA-LU (Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: a Legacy for Users) in 2005. More recently, the County has supported RTC in its goal of creating an integrated multimodal transportation network, to provide a variety of services to support pedestrian and bicycle uses in Santa Cruz County, sustainable transportation planning, greenhouse gas reduction strategies and acquisition of the Union Pacific (UP) rail line. The County will involve RTC staff and provide funding of RTC participation in the Proposition 84 Sustainable Communities Plan. The RTC's direct involvement with other regional transportation planning agencies will be a key component of the Sustainable Communities (Prop. 84) agency participation plan. The RTC will be asked to evaluate the County's planning efforts regarding long-term mobility policies for the movement of people and goods, (including congestion relief strategies) and to evaluate the performance of other transportation modes, including transit.

Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors		F4	Each agency's General Plan is an integrated document that includes housing and transportation as elements. There is no mandated link between the local agency's General Plans and the Regional Transportation Plan.	PARTIALLY DISAGREE	Although state law does not require direct linkage between the RTP and the County's General Plan, the County's Circulation Element and Land Use Element are closely aligned to the RTP by land use and transportation policies that direct new development to areas of the County already well served by public transportation services. Both General Plan Elements contain land use and transportation policies and goals that emphasize the importance of transit-oriented design in new development. The Circulation Element emphasizes the importance of making more efficient use of the existing transportation systems. The relationship between the RTP and County Elements is also evident in the correlation between the RTP Maps and Land Use Diagram and the Circulation Element Maps, which identify the major vehicular, transit, bicycle, and emergency evacuation routes throughout the County. The County's public outreach process and planning efforts for regionally significant developments involves early notification of RTC and inclusion of mitigation measures that are consistent with RTP goals and objectives. While preparing General Plan updates and studies, the County consults with RTC staff to ensure that proposed revisions do not affect long-term regional transportation strategies.

Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors		R1	Transportation sections of all county and city general plans should be written by Regional Transportation Commission staff.	WILL NOT BE IMPLEMENTED	Preparation of the County's transportation policies, programs and objectives requires that equal consideration be given to land use and transportation/infrastructure issues. General Plan preparation requires that a balanced and integrated planning process be provided. Section 65032(b) of the State law requires that the Circulation (transportation) Element policies, goals and objectives are correlated and internally consistent with, and thus support, the goals and policies of the Land Use Element. Government Code Section 65032(b)) notes that "the general location and extent of existing and proposed major thoroughfares, transportation routes, terminals, and other local public utilities and facilities, must be all correlated with the Land Use Element of the General Plan". The comprehensive nature of the Circulation Element requires that it relate to and correlate foremost with the Land Use Element but also be internally consistent with other elements of the General Plan. The Land Use Element is most directly related to the Circulation Element. For example, the amount, distribution, and timing of population and job growth expressed within the Land Use Element must correlate with the anticipated road capacity and performance standards established in the Circulation Element. Similarly, the location and density of uses prescribed in the Land Use Element are integrally linked to policies regarding transit design and development. The Circulation Element also provides opportunities for adequate land use in order to support economic growth and regional housing needs that are established through the County's annual "Growth Management Goal". Each year the County is required, through implementation of a Growth Management System, to set an annual growth goal for the upcoming year. Adoption of the Growth Goal in turn allows County staff to properly plan for the provision of basic public infrastructure including circulation element roads and transit improvements. The County's comprehensive and long-term general plan goes beyond addressing the correlation between land uses and transportation and addresses various aspects of the circulation system in relation to the Housing, Noise, Conservation and Open Space, Parks and Recreation, and Public Safety Elements. Through a broad understanding of the seven mandatory general plan elements and practical application, the County ensures that the General Plan reflects the true relationship between land use and transportation. Delegating this aspect of the planning process to RTC would preclude development of an integrated circulation element that correlates with the Land Use Element and remaining elements. To ensure that the General Plan reflects the relationship between transportation and land use, the legislature established California Government Code Section 65300 that requires that each "planning agency" adopt a General Plan to guide the long-term physical development of the County. Under Section 65100, the legislative body must assign by ordinance the functions of the planning agency to a planning department, one or more planning commissions, administrative bodies or hearing officers , the legislative body itself, or any combination thereof, as it deems appropriate and necessary. By Ordinance No. 13.01 .040, the Planning Department has been assigned responsibility for preparation and processing of the County's comprehensive long-term General Plan. The plan is "intended as a long-term planning tool for the orderly physical development of the land and the preservation of resources and open space in the County according to Section 65300 et. seq., of the California Government Code, the State General Plan Guidelines and any other applicable state statutes and guidelines as may be created and amended form time to time." Regional transportation planning provided by the RTC is governed by

					Regional transportation planning provided by the RTC, is governed by Government Code Section 67940 (together with Section 29535) that establishes the formation of a local area transportation planning agency to provide regional transportation planning and development for the area of Santa Cruz County, with a purpose that differs from the "planning agency". Section 29535 authorizes the local area commission to conduct activities necessary to fulfill its responsibilities as a regional transportation planning agency and local transportation commission. Section 67941 authorizes the local area commission to preserve, acquire, construct, improve, and oversee multimodal transportation projects and services on rail rights-of-ways within Santa Cruz County in any manner that facilitates recreational, commuter, inter-city, and inter-county travel. Consideration of RTC jurisdictional transportation issues alone would potentially yield a document that is inconsistent with the Government Code and the local General Plan. The process of adopting or amending the County General Plan requires public participation that includes RTC input. The RTC will continue to be consulted with during General Plan updates. The County's transportation vision and planning takes into consideration outreach to the public including residents, business leaders, community leaders, transit users, and elected officials. Among others, outreach includes several standing advisory committees, the County Public Works Director and directors from each city in the County, and regular meetings with transit stakeholders through project based community meetings. Additional local agency collaboration is provided through the California State Association of Counties, Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG), Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), the Santa Cruz County Planning Director's Working Group and other local transportation organizations. Extensive outreach and coordination with private sector stakeholders such as the Santa Cruz County Business Council, chambers of commerce, Santa Cruz County Architects Association and other groups is provided as the County develops policies, programs and measures to deliver a high-quality transportation system in Santa Cruz County. Support from RTC, the County and all cities in Santa Cruz County, is necessary to ensure limited tax dollars are spent appropriately.

Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors		R2	The local jurisdictions should review the transportation sections developed by RTC staff for adequacy every two years and RTC staff should be required to revise when necessary.	WILL NOT BE IMPLEMENTED	Transportation planning influences patterns of growth and economic activity throughout the County. The biennial re-examination of the RTP could interfere with County development of long-term growth and economic forecasts, system performance analysis, infrastructure planning, and implementation of transportation measures that are included in the Land Use Element and Circulation Element. The update by RTC every two years is not warranted and would require the County Planning Department and other planning agencies to adjust transportation and land use documents, forecasts and program measures biennially. Given that long-term transportation growth forecasts and program measures adopted by the County reasonably capture the real levels of annual transportation growth and uses, the need does not exist to re-examine or modify transportation sections biennially. A two-year re-examination of transportation sections would require a concurrent reexamination of land use and transportation documents by County staff. The reexamination would interrupt the long-term planning process, require annual work plans to be modified and cause confusion among planning and transportation agencies. A two-year re-examination would not provide adequate time for staff document review and analysis, would not allow consultants adequate time to perform transportation modeling, perform model calibrating and validating, or to consider program alternatives, measures and outcomes included in County Elements and transportation documents. As an example, the population, vehicle trips and housing growth forecasts that are interrelated would require revisions based on revisions made by RTC staff to transportation forecasts. Most General Plan Elements require about a three to four year planning cycle for completion and a two year re-examination of General Plan transportation policies and measures would interrupt the normal planning cycle and affect the completion of documents. Provision of a two year re-examination of the General Plan Element transportation sections would be costly, ineffective and affect completion of other planning programs and services including preparation of environmental (California Environmental Quality Act) documents that rely on RTP published long-term forecasts and data. The County participates in the RTP update process which requires a plan update every few years (currently about five or six years). The County participated in public meetings and agency review of RTC documents for the 2005 and 2010 RTP(s), and plans to participate in the next review that will likely be more extensive. An interim re-examination of transportation sections would require revised forecasts, modified transportation system performance measures, and require the additional assessment of transportation plan recommendations. Effective advancement of long-term transportation goals will not be provided by a biennial review. The development of strategies for operating, managing, maintaining, and financing the area's transportation system to advance the area's long-term transit goals is best achieved by adherence to the current RTP process.
Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors		R3	The RTC should develop cost estimates and pursue stable funding sources to implement recommendations one and two.	Not applicable	The County defers to the Regional Transportation Commission to respond to this recommendation.

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission		F1	Traffic congestion on Highway 1 corridor is problematic.	AGREE	The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC), Caltrans and the local jurisdictions and other agencies have been working to address traffic congestion along the Highway 1 corridor and parallel roads that are used as alternate routes to the highway by implementing congestion reducing projects and programs.. These include: 1. Highway 1/Mission Street project – completed in 2002 2. Highway 1/17 Merge Lanes project – completed in 2007 3. Highway 1 Freeway Service Patrol (FSP) program – ongoing 4. Traffic Operations System (changeable message signs, highway advisory radio) - ongoing 5. Capitola Road Widening 6. Commute Solutions program - ongoing Congestion on the Highway 1 corridor continues to be problematic and impacts not only the highway but also local streets. Therefore, work continues on future projects which include: 1. Highway 1 - Soquel to Morrissey Auxiliary Lanes: Construction anticipated to begin in early 2012 2. Highway 1 HOV Lanes from Morrissey Boulevard to Larkin Valley Road: includes auxiliary lanes, bicycle and pedestrian overcrossings, and transit improvements to facilitate express bus service; completion of environmental document anticipated in 2013; an approved local sales tax measure will likely be required to fund the construction of this $500 million project. 3. Highway 1 Million Gallon Challenge: Funding is being sought for targeted strategies to reduce fuel consumption and congestion by increasing vehicle occupancy on the most congested sections of Highway 1. 4. Highway 1 San Lorenzo River Bridge Widening: Project development documents are being produced; funding is yet to be identified for this $20 million project and an approved local sales tax measure would help to provide funding for this and other projects.

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission		F2	Local jurisdictions do not implement the regional transportation plan created by the RTC.	PARTIALLY AGREE	Regional Transportation Plans (RTP) are developed by the RTC with the active participation of the cities, the county, Santa Cruz Metro, Caltrans and other partners. The RTP provides a listing of transportation projects, programs and strategies that the Santa Cruz County community desires to implement to ensure a sound transportation system. Many of the projects and strategies included in the RTP were recommended for approval based on a selection and vetting process though each jurisdiction. Because the document also is focused on regional transportation issues, much of the detailed local project information is more appropriately contained in local jurisdiction General Plans and other documents. As shown in the RTP, there are sufficient funds to implement only a fraction of the transportation projects, programs and strategies listed in the RTP. Therefore, the RTC, the local jurisdictions and others cannot implement a significant portion of the RTP due to insufficient transportation funding. Some of the reasons for insufficient transportation funding include: 1. Funding from state and federal sources for transportation projects, programs and planning has been decreasing, while the needs and requirements are increasing; 2. One of the main sources of funding is based on the quantity of motor vehicle fuel sold, which decreases as vehicles become more efficient and inflation decreases the value of revenues relative to costs; and 3. Efforts to secure local funds have not been successful due to the economy, the super majority requirement, and diverse community opinions If more transportation funding became available possibly through a local sales tax or other funding mechanism approved through a ballot measure with a 2/3 vote, a much more significant portion of the RTP could be implemented by the local jurisdictions and others. In addition, the RTP uses a 25-30 year planning horizon. Projects included in the RTP could be constructed in the short, medium or long term.
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission		F3	Lack of consensus between the local jurisdictions and the RTC staff obstructs the coordination of the local transportation plans with the Regional Transportation Plan.	DISAGREE	The local jurisdictions actively participate with the RTC and other agencies in the production of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). In addition, there are many opportunities for public input into the development of the RTP insuring that community members are able to weigh in on the direction of the plan and ensure that it meets local needs. Therefore, the RTP is not just a work product of the RTC but of the community as a whole including the local jurisdictions. The RTP must be updated every four or five years. The local transportation plans are included in the local jurisdictions' general plans and those general plans do not require updates as often as the RTP. Therefore, there can be discrepancies between the local jurisdictions' general plans and the RTP because the general plans may not be updated for 20 years or more.
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission		F4	Each agency's General Plan is an integrated document that includes housing and transportation as elements. There is no mandated link between the local agency's General Plans and the Regional Transportation Plan.	PARTIALLY AGREE	General plans are indeed integrated documents that include housing and transportation or circulation elements. Traditionally there has not been a mandated link between general plans and the RTC other than consistency between the two. However, statewide efforts that resulted in AB32 and SB375, recognized this weak link between transportation planning and other planning and resulted in requirements for more interagency coordination and cooperation to address our transportation, land use, air quality and global warming concerns. As a result transportation planning and land use planning agencies are required to increase cooperation levels to produce regional transportation plans that will include a sustainable community strategy. Unfortunately, AB32 and SB375 did not include the funding necessary to implement the more coordinated regional transportation plans and the sustainable community strategy.

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission		F5	No consistent long-term funding source is currently available for RTC planning.	PARTIALLY AGREE	The RTC uses a variety of federal, state and local funding sources for the transportation planning work that it performs. Some of the regular on-going funding sources are more consistent than others but they are always insufficient for all the work already required and the additional work that becomes required periodically. The RTC augments the on-going funding sources with one-time grants that it has successfully secured through competition with other applicants. Projects and programs identified through the planning work face an even more significant funding challenge. The amount of federal, state and local funds available to the Santa Cruz County region for transportation projects and programs is a small fraction of the amount needed. As a result it can take a very long time to fund and complete projects, especially the larger ones and by the time they are completed, they no longer suffice.
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission		R1	Transportation sections of all county and city general plans should be written by Regional Transportation Commission staff.	WILL NOT BE IMPLEMENTED	Local jurisdictions are well suited to write their general plans based on the local needs, as expressed by constituents, local input processes and local decision makers. RTC is well suited to analyze and plan for regional needs, in coordination with local jurisdictions and neighboring counties. A number of regional and local efforts demonstrate the increased coordination that is already taking place in our area without the need for the RTC to write the transportation sections of the local jurisdictions' general plans. These efforts include: 1. The Blueprint Plan developed through a collaborative process by local agencies to determine a regional growth and conservation strategy called Envisioning the Monterey Bay Area. This effort, otherwise known as the "Blueprint," focuses on improved mobility, accessibility and coordinated transportation and local land use for the region's future population while preserving the most important agricultural lands and conservation areas; 2. Development of a Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS) as part of the 2014 Regional Transportation Plan to reduce per capita vehicle miles traveled and related GHG through coordinated land use and transportation planning; 3. Application of the Sustainable Transportation Analysis and Rating System (STARS) to the development of the 2014 Regional Transportation Plan; 4. The Santa Cruz County Sustainable Community and Transit Corridor Plan (Santa Cruz County Planning Department secured a state grant for this plan which includes the participation of the RTC, Santa Cruz Metro and other agencies to help ensure coordination); and 5. Development of the City of Santa Cruz General Plan (RTC staff was invited by City of Santa Cruz Planning Department staff and participated in discussing items in the circulation element of the general plan and the EIR). Since the early work on the Blueprint Plan began in 2008 there has been a much greater degree of communication and coordination between city and county planning staff and the staff at the RTC. Awareness of planning, growth and transportation issues has grown across traditional boundaries between agencies.
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission		R2	The local jurisdictions should review the transportation sections developed by RTC staff for adequacy every two years and RTC staff should be required to revise when necessary.	WILL NOT BE IMPLEMENTED	Since R1 above will not be implemented, there is no need to implement this recommendation. See response to R1 above.

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission		R3	The RTC should develop cost estimates and pursue stable funding sources to implement recommendations one and two.	WILL NOT BE IMPLEMENTED	Since R1 and R2 above will not be implemented, there is no need to implement this recommendation. See responses to R1 and R2 above.
County of Santa Cruz Planning Department	Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors	F2	Local jurisdictions do not implement the regional transportation plan created by the RTC.	DISAGREE	The creation and implementation of the regional transportation plan is directly supported by the County. RTC's Regional Transportation Plan is used by the County to make more informed decisions regarding local transportation programs and services. The County of Santa Cruz refers to the RTP goals and policies in the development of capital improvement transportation projects, construction or expansion of roadways; state highways; principal arterials; routes that provide primary access to major activity centers, such as government centers, regional shopping centers, colleges, airports and ports; goods movement routes, including both truck routes and rail lines; intermodal transfer facilities, such as transit centers, rail stations, airports and ports; and fixed transit routes, such as heavy rail and commuter rail. Any project involving transportation improvements is reviewed to determine whether such improvements comply with the RTP. Plan changes, policies, goals, projects and programs with regional significance are reviewed to determine consistency with the adopted regional transportation plan.
County of Santa Cruz Planning Department	Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors	F3	Lack of consensus between the local jurisdictions and the RTC staff obstructs the coordination of the local transportation plans with the Regional Transportation Plan.	DISAGREE	The County and local planning agencies collaborate with RTC staff to successfully monitor the implementation of local transportation programs, plans and strategies. The County and other local jurisdictions work closely with RTC staff to identify and describe projects that are proposed for inclusion in the regional transportation improvement program (RTIP). The County participates in the RTP update process which requires a plan update every few years (Le., 2005, 2010). The County contributes to the RTIP by providing a detailed listing that includes proposed funding amounts and proposed implementation years for projects recommended for implementation in the region during the five or six year period covered by the document. The County and other local jurisdictions also participate in the public participation effort required by passage of SAFETEA-LU (Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: a Legacy for Users) in 2005. More recently, the County has supported RTC in its goal of creating an integrated multimodal transportation network, to provide a variety of services to support pedestrian and bicycle uses in Santa Cruz County, sustainable transportation planning, greenhouse gas reduction strategies and acquisition of the Union Pacific (UP) rail line. The County will involve RTC staff and provide funding of RTC participation in the Proposition 84 Sustainable Communities Plan. The RTC's direct involvement with other regional transportation planning agencies will be a key component of the Sustainable Communities (Prop. 84) agency participation plan. The RTC will be asked to evaluate the County's planning efforts regarding long-term mobility policies for the movement of people and goods, (including congestion relief strategies) and to evaluate the performance of other transportation modes, including transit.

County of Santa Cruz Planning Department	Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors	F4	Each agency's General Plan is an integrated document that includes housing and transportation as elements. There is no mandated link between the local agency's General Plans and the Regional Transportation Plan.	PARTIALLY AGREE	Although state law does not require direct linkage between the RTP and the County's General Plan, the County's Circulation Element and Land Use Element are closely aligned to the RTP by land use and transportation policies that direct new development to areas of the County already well served by public transportation services. Both General Plan Elements contain land use and transportation policies and goals that emphasize the importance of transit-oriented design in new development. The Circulation Element emphasizes the importance of making more efficient use of the existing transportation systems. The relationship between the RTP and County Elements is also evident in the correlation between the RTP Maps and Land Use Diagram and the Circulation Element Maps, which identify the major vehicular, transit, bicycle, and emergency evacuation routes throughout the County. The County's public outreach process and planning efforts for regionally significant developments involves early notification of RTC and inclusion of mitigation measures that are consistent with RTP goals and objectives. While preparing General Plan updates and studies, the County consults with RTC staff to ensure that proposed revisions do not affect long-term regional transportation strategies.

County of Santa Cruz Planning Department	Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors	R1	Transportation sections of all county and city general plans should be written by Regional Transportation Commission staff.	WILL NOT BE IMPLEMENTED	Preparation of the County's transportation policies, programs and objectives requires that equal consideration be given to land use and transportation/infrastructure issues. General Plan preparation requires that a balanced and integrated planning process be provided. Section 65032(b) of the State law requires that the Circulation (transportation) Element policies, goals and objectives are correlated and internally consistent with, and thus support, the goals and policies of the Land Use Element. Government Code Section 65032(b)) notes that "the general location and extent of existing and proposed major thoroughfares, transportation routes, terminals, and other local public utilities and facilities, must be all correlated with the Land Use Element of the General Plan". The comprehensive nature of the Circulation Element requires that it relate to and correlate foremost with the Land Use Element but also be internally consistent with other elements of the General Plan. The Land Use Element is most directly related to the Circulation Element. For example, the amount, distribution, and timing of population and job growth expressed within the Land Use Element must correlate with the anticipated road capacity and performance standards established in the Circulation Element. Similarly, the location and density of uses prescribed in the Land Use Element are integrally linked to policies regarding transit design and development. The Circulation Element also provides opportunities for adequate land use in order to support economic growth and regional housing needs that are established through the County's annual "Growth Management Goal". Each year the County is required, through implementation of a Growth Management System, to set an annual growth goal for the upcoming year. Adoption of the Growth Goal in turn allows County staff to properly plan for the provision of basic public infrastructure including circulation element roads and transit improvements. The County's comprehensive and long-term general plan goes beyond addressing the correlation between land uses and transportation and addresses various aspects of the circulation system in relation to the Housing, Noise, Conservation and Open Space, Parks and Recreation, and Public Safety Elements. Through a broad understanding of the seven mandatory general plan elements and practical application, the County ensures that the General Plan reflects the true relationship between land use and transportation. Delegating this aspect of the planning process to RTC would preclude development of an integrated circulation element that correlates with the Land Use Element and remaining elements. To ensure that the General Plan reflects the relationship between transportation and land use, the legislature established California Government Code Section 65300 that requires that each "planning agency" adopt a General Plan to guide the long-term physical development of the County. Under Section 65100, the legislative body must assign by ordinance the functions of the planning agency to a planning department, one or more planning commissions, administrative bodies or hearing officers , the legislative body itself, or any combination thereof, as it deems appropriate and necessary. By Ordinance No. 13.01 .040, the Planning Department has been assigned responsibility for preparation and processing of the County's comprehensive long-term General Plan. The plan is "intended as a long-term planning tool for the orderly physical development of the land and the preservation of

					resources and open space in the County according to Section 65300 et. seq., of the California Government Code, the State General Plan Guidelines and any other applicable state statutes and guidelines as may be created and amended form time to time." Regional transportation planning provided by the RTC, is governed by Government Code Section 67940 (together with Section 29535) that establishes the formation of a local area transportation planning agency to provide regional transportation planning and development for the area of Santa Cruz County, with a purpose that differs from the "planning agency". Section 29535 authorizes the local area commission to conduct activities necessary to fulfill its responsibilities as a regional transportation planning agency and local transportation commission. Section 67941 authorizes the local area commission to preserve, acquire, construct, improve, and oversee multimodal transportation projects and services on rail rights-of-ways within Santa Cruz County in any manner that facilitates recreational, commuter, inter-city, and inter-county travel. Consideration of RTC jurisdictional transportation issues alone would potentially yield a document that is inconsistent with the Government Code and the local General Plan. The process of adopting or amending the County General Plan requires public participation that includes RTC input. The RTC will continue to be consulted with during General Plan updates. The County's transportation vision and planning takes into consideration outreach to the public including residents, business leaders, community leaders, transit users, and elected officials. Among others, outreach includes several standing advisory committees, the County Public Works Director and directors from each city in the County, and regular meetings with transit stakeholders through project based community meetings. Additional local agency collaboration is provided through the California State Association of Counties, Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG), Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), the Santa Cruz County Planning Director's Working Group and other local transportation organizations. Extensive outreach and coordination with private sector stakeholders such as the Santa Cruz County Business Council, chambers of commerce, Santa Cruz County Architects Association and other groups is provided as the County develops policies, programs and measures to deliver a high-quality transportation system in Santa Cruz County. Support from RTC, the County and all cities in Santa Cruz County, is necessary to ensure limited tax dollars are spent appropriately.

					Transportation planning influences patterns of growth and economic activity throughout the County. The biennial re-examination of the RTP could interfere with County development of long-term growth and economic forecasts, system performance analysis, infrastructure planning, and implementation of transportation measures that are included in the Land Use Element and Circulation Element. The update by RTC every two years is not warranted and would require the County Planning Department and other planning agencies to adjust transportation and land use documents, forecasts and program measures biennially. Given that long-term transportation growth forecasts and program measures adopted by the County reasonably capture the real levels of annual transportation growth and uses, the need does not exist to re-examine or modify transportation sections biennially. A two-year re-examination of transportation sections would require a concurrent reexamination of land use and transportation documents by County staff. The reexamination would interrupt the long-term planning process, require annual work plans to be modified and cause confusion among planning and transportation agencies. A two-year re-examination would not provide adequate time for staff document review and analysis, would not allow consultants adequate time to perform transportation modeling, perform model calibrating and validating, or to consider program alternatives, measures and outcomes included in County Elements and transportation documents. As an example, the population, vehicle trips and housing growth forecasts that are interrelated would require revisions based on revisions made by RTC staff to transportation forecasts. Most General Plan Elements require about a three to four year planning cycle for completion and a two year re-examination of General Plan transportation policies and measures would interrupt the normal planning cycle and affect the completion of documents. Provision of a two year re-examination of the General Plan Element transportation sections would be costly, ineffective and affect completion of other planning programs and services including preparation of environmental (California Environmental Quality Act) documents that rely on RTP published long-term forecasts and data. The County participates in the RTP update process which requires a plan update every few years (currently about five or six years). The County participated in public meetings and agency review of RTC documents for the 2005 and 2010 RTP(s), and plans to participate in the next review that will likely be more extensive. An interim re-examination of transportation sections would require revised forecasts, modified transportation system performance measures, and require the additional assessment of transportation plan recommendations. Effective advancement of long-term transportation goals will not be provided by a biennial review. The development of strategies for operating, managing, maintaining, and financing the area's transportation system to advance the area's long-term transit goals is best achieved by adherence to the current RTP process.
County of Santa Cruz Planning Department	Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors	R2	The local jurisdictions should review the transportation sections developed by RTC staff for adequacy every two years and RTC staff should be required to revise when necessary.	WILL NOT BE IMPLEMENTED	
City of Santa Cruz City Council		F1	Traffic congestion on Highway 1 corridor is problematic.	AGREE	

City of Santa Cruz City Council		F2	Local jurisdictions do not implement the regional transportation plan created by the RTC.	DISAGREE	The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Regional Transportation Improvement Plan (RTIP) are developed and implemented with local jurisdiction input and participation. The Regional Transportation Commission is made up of local agency City Council and Board of Supervisor members. Individual agency staff, with their City Council or Board of Supervisor approval, submit projects and programs for inclusion in the RTP and RTIP. Local agency staff are members of the Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC), Bicycle Committee, Elderday and Disabled Committee, and the SAFE on 17 Committee. Committees review and make recommendations on priorities and funding for these projects and programs from the local and regional perspective. The recommendations are brought forward to the Regional Transportation Commission for action.
City of Santa Cruz City Council		F3	Lack of consensus between the local jurisdictions and the RTC staff obstructs the coordination of the local transportation plans with the Regional Transportation Plan.	PARTIALLY DISAGREE	There is often consensus on projects and programs from local jurisdictions and the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) at the staff and RTC level, but not always. A stumbling block is more often how to fund a project or program when there are many needs. This is common to all agencies: local, state, and national.
City of Santa Cruz City Council		F4	Each agency's General Plan is an integrated document that includes housing and transportation as elements. There is no mandated link between the local agency's General Plans and the Regional Transportation Plan.	AGREE	

City of Santa Cruz City Council		R1	Transportation sections of all county and city general plans should be written by Regional Transportation Commission staff.	WILL NOT BE IMPLEMENTED	The City of Santa Cruz is not in agreement with recommendation R1 of the Grand Jury report. California State law requires the "planning agency" for each city and county to adopt a General Plan "for the physical development of the county or city and any land outside its boundaries which bears relation to its planning" (Gov. Code §65300). The Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) is not a "planning agency" for purposes of the statute and the statute does not authorize the City to delegate this statutorily imposed responsibility to a non-elected regional transportation agency which is created and functions pursuant to another State statute (Gov. Code §29352) and has statutorily assigned duties which do not include the drafting of city and county General Plan circulation elements (Gov. Code §65080 et seq.). In addition it bears emphasis that the General Plan circulation element must correlate directly with the other elements of the General Plan. Each General Plan element, including such elements as the housing element, the environmental quality element, the community design element, the land use element, the climate action element, and the parks and recreation element in addition to the circulation element, is required to be integrated and internally consistent with the other General Plan elements so as to result in a General Plan that constitutes a compatible statement of city or county policy (Gov. Code §65300.5). The circulation element thus has a direct relationship to other General Plan elements that entail policy considerations for which a regional transportation commission has neither legal responsibility nor practical expertise. Accordingly, we believe that City elected officials are best qualified to, and legally required to, determine whether or not a proposed General Plan is consistent with the community's political values and represents the most comprehensive local expression of the general welfare for persons who live in, work in, and visit the City. The RTC is welcome and encouraged to participate in the City's General Plan promulgation and adoption process. The City however cannot delegate its responsibility for any portion of this process to the RTC.

City of Santa Cruz City Council		R2	The local jurisdictions should review the transportation sections developed by RTC staff for adequacy every two years and RTC staff should be required to revise when necessary.	WILL NOT BE IMPLEMENTED	If this recommendation refers to the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) developing the City's General Plan, then it will not be implemented for the reasons stated in respnse to Recommendation R1. The RTC does review the City's General Plans and the City reviews the Regional Transportation Plan and the Regional Transportation Improvement Plan, as well as other documents related to transportation. Furthermore, local jurisdictions have representation on the RTC board, which ensures an ongoing local oversight and collaboration link to regional transportation policy
City of Santa Cruz Planning Department		F2	Local jurisdictions do not implement the regional transportation plan created by the RTC.	DISAGREE	The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Regional Transportation Improvement Plan (RTIP) are developed and implemented with local jurisdiction input and participation. The Regional Transportation Commission is made up of local agency council and board of supervisors members. Individual agency staff, with their Council or Board approval, submit projects and programs for inclusion in the RTP and RTIP. Local agency staff are members of the Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC), Bicycle Committee, Elderely and Disabled Comittee, and the SAFE on 17 Committee. Committees review and make recommendations on priorties and funding for these projects and programs from the local and regional perspective. The recommendations are brought forward to the Commission for action.
City of Santa Cruz Planning Department		F3	Lack of consensus between the local jurisdictions and the RTC staff obstructs the coordination of the local transportation plans with the Regional Transportation Plan.	PARTIALLY DISAGREE	There is often consensus on projects and programs from local jurisdictions and RTC at the staff and Commission level, but not always from the public or special interest groups. A stumbling block is often how to fund a project or program when there are many needs. This is common to all agencies; local, state and national.
City of Santa Cruz Planning Department		F4	Each agency's General Plan is an integrated document that includes housing and transportation as elements. There is no mandated link between the local agency's General Plans and the Regional Transportation Plan.	AGREE	

City of Santa Cruz Planning Department		R1	Transportation sections of all county and city general plans should be written by Regional Transportation Commission staff.	WILL NOT BE IMPLEMENTED	The City of Santa Cruz is not in agreement with recommendation R1 of the Grand Jury report. California state law requires the "planning agency" for each city and county to adopt a general plan "for the physical development of the county or city and any land outside its boundaries which bears relation to its planning" (Gov. Code 65300). The Regional Transportation Commission ("RTC") is not a "planning agency" for purposes of the statute and the statute does not authorize the City to delegate this statutorily imposed responsibility to a non-elected regional transportation agency which is created and functions pursuant to another state statute (Gov. Code 29352) and has statutorily assigned duties which do not include the drafting of city and county general plan circulation elements (Gov. Code 65080 et seq). In addition it bears emphasis that the general plan circulation element must correlate directly with the other elements of the general plan. Each general plan element, including such elements as the housing element, the environmental quality element, the community design element, the land use element, the climate action element and the parks and recreation element in addition to the circulation element, is required to be integrated and internally consistent with the other general plan elements so as to result in a general plan that constitutes a compatible statement of city or county policy (Gov. Code 65300.5) The circulation element thus has a direct relationship to other general plan elements that entail policy considerations for which a regional transportation commission has neither legal responsibility nor practical expertise. Accordingly we believe that City elected officials are best qualified to, and legally required to, determine whether or not a proposed general plan is consistent with the community's political values and represents the most comprehensive local expression of the general welfare for persons who live in, work in and visit the City. The RTC is welcome and encouraged to participate in the City's general plan promulgation and adoption process. The City however cannot delegate its responsibility for any portion of this process to the RTC.
City of Santa Cruz Planning Department		R2	The local jurisdictions should review the transportation sections developed by RTC staff for adequacy every two years and RTC staff should be required to revise when necessary.	WILL NOT BE IMPLEMENTED	If this recommendation refers to the RTC developing the City's general plan, then no it will not be implemented. The RTC does review the City's general plans and the City reviews the RTP and RTIP, as well as other documents related to transportation.
City of Watsonville City Council		F1	Traffic congestion on Highway 1 corridor is problematic.	AGREE	The City of Watsonville recognizes that the congestion on Highway 1 is problematic. The problem is not found in the Watsonville area of the corridor, but it impacts Watsonville residents who must travel through the corridor.
City of Watsonville City Council		F2	Local jurisdictions do not implement the regional transportation plan created by the RTC.	DISAGREE	The City of Watsonville recognizes the goals of the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) and includes the same in the construction of infrastructure by the City and by others. City projects aim to implement the goals including the preservation of existing transportation infrastructure, increasing multi-modal transportation systems, making the most of limited transportation funds and coordinating land use and transportation decisions. The City of Watsonville is very interested in making sure that the transportation decisions, together with land use decisions, ensure the region's social, cultural and economic vitality is sustained for current and future generations.

City of Watsonville City Council		F3	Lack of consensus between the local jurisdictions and the RTC staff obstructs the coordination of the local transportation plans with the Regional Transportation Plan.	DISAGREE	The City of Watsonville has actively supported the regional proposals considered by the RTC. The City has actively participated in the Transportation Funding Task Force (TFTF), has adopted resolutions supporting the widening of Highway 1, collaborated and participated actively on the Highway 1 Construction Authority, and supported the acquisition of the rail line. Furthermore, the City actively participates in the Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC), serving as chair of the same for several years.
City of Watsonville City Council		F4	Each agency's General Plan is an integrated document that includes housing and transportation as elements. There is no mandated link between the local agency's General Plans and the Regional Transportation Plan.	AGREE	Although there is no mandated link between the local agency's General Plans and the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), it does not mean that local jurisdictions do not aim to create some consistency between the two documents. Since the RTP is generally derived from projects and input provided by the local agencies, the documents themselves reflect the vision and input of local residents. Watsonville's General Plan includes policies and implementation measures that specifically refer to the RTP and the Regional Transportation Commission.
City of Watsonville City Council		R1	Transportation sections of all county and city general plans should be written by Regional Transportation Commission staff.	WILL NOT BE IMPLEMENTED	The City of Watsonville does not agree with this recommendation. Per Gov. Code 65300, the City of Watsonville is required to adopt a general plan. The Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) is governed by a different Government Code section, and is not considered a viable, lawful alternative to the "Planning Agency" of a city. Furthermore, the statute governing local agencies (cities) does not allow for this agency's responsibility to be assigned to an alternate agency. Were the transportation element of a General Plan be prepared by a different agency than the City adopting the same, it would be difficult to achieve the legal mandate that all elements be compatible with each other.
City of Watsonville City Council		R2	The local jurisdictions should review the transportation sections developed by RTC staff for adequacy every two years and RTC staff should be required to revise when necessary.	WILL NOT BE IMPLEMENTED	As the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) prepares and adopts a regional transportation plan, it would have taken into consideration both the regional and local needs. Local needs are represented in the form of transportation projects submitted by cities for funding in addition to extensive public input during the preparation of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).
Watsonville Community Development Department	City of Watsonville City Council	F2	Local jurisdictions do not implement the regional transportation plan created by the RTC.	DISAGREE	The City of Watsonville recognizes the goals of the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) and includes the same in the construction of infrastructure by the City and by others. City projects aim to implement the goals including the preservation of existing transportation infrastructure, increasing multi-modal transportation systems, making the most of limited transportation funds and coordinating land use and transportation decisions. The City of Watsonville is very interested in making sure that the transportation decisions, together with land use decisions, ensure the region's social, cultural and economic vitality is sustained for current and future generations.
Watsonville Community Development Department	City of Watsonville City Council	F3	Lack of consensus between the local jurisdictions and the RTC staff obstructs the coordination of the local transportation plans with the Regional Transportation Plan.	DISAGREE	The City of Watsonville has actively supported the regional proposals considered by the RTC. The City has actively participated in the Transportation Funding Task Force (TFTF), has adopted resolutions supporting the widening of Highway 1, collaborated and participated actively on the Highway 1 Construction Authority, and supported the acquisition of the rail line. Furthermore, the City actively participates in the Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC), serving as chair of the same for several years.

Watsonville Community Development Department	City of Watsonville City Council	F4	Each agency's General Plan is an integrated document that includes housing and transportation as elements. There is no mandated link between the local agency's General Plans and the Regional Transportation Plan.	AGREE	Although there is no mandated link between the local agency's General Plans and the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), it does not mean that local jurisdictions do not aim to create some consistency between the two documents. Since the RTP is generally derived from projects and input provided by the local agencies, the documents themselves reflect the vision and input of local residents. Watsonville's General Plan includes policies and implementation measures that specifically refer to the RTP and the Regional Transportation Commission.
Watsonville Community Development Department	City of Watsonville City Council	R1	Transportation sections of all county and city general plans should be written by Regional Transportation Commission staff.	WILL NOT BE IMPLEMENTED	The City of Watsonville does not agree with this recommendation. Per Gov. Code 65300, the City of Watsonville is required to adopt a general plan. The Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) is governed by a different Government Code section, and is not considered a viable, lawful alternative to the "Planning Agency" of a city. Furthermore, the statute governing local agencies (cities) does not allow for this agency's responsibility to be assigned to an alternate agency. Were the transportation element of a General Plan be prepared by a different agency than the City adopting the same, it would be difficult to achieve the legal mandate that all elements be compatible with each other.
Watsonville Community Development Department	City of Watsonville City Council	R2	The local jurisdictions should review the transportation sections developed by RTC staff for adequacy every two years and RTC staff should be required to revise when necessary.	WILL NOT BE IMPLEMENTED	As the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) prepares and adopts a regional transportation plan, it would have taken into consideration both the regional and local needs. Local needs are represented in the form of transportation projects submitted by cities for funding in addition to extensive public input during the preparation of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).
City of Capitola City Council		F1	Traffic congestion on Highway 1 corridor is problematic.	AGREE	Congestion on Highway 1 corridor is problematic and will require federal, state, and regional coordination to address long-term solutions.
City of Capitola City Council		F2	Local jurisdictions do not implement the regional transportation plan created by the RTC.	DISAGREE	The City of Capitola includes the goals and policies of the RTP in the development of capital improvement transportation projects. Specifically, preserving and maintaining existing transportation systems, incorporating multi-modal design elements in the projects, making efficient use of very limited transportation funding, seeking broad public input on local transportation plans. Unfortunately, due to on-going financial restraints, the number of transportation related improvement projects has been quite small over the past 5 years and remain limited in the near future.
City of Capitola City Council		F3	Lack of consensus between the local jurisdictions and the RTC staff obstructs the coordination of the local transportation plans with the Regional Transportation Plan.	DISAGREE	There is no lack of consensus between the City of Capitola and RTC staff that obstructs coordination or implementation of transportation plans. The City has supported the RTC's efforts in acquiring the Union Pacific Railroad corridor; in addition the City joined and participated in the Highway 1 Construction Authority and in the Transportation Funding Task Force. City staff participates in the RTC's Integrated Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC) where local and regional transportation issues are discussed and policy recommendations are made.

City of Capitola City Council		F4	Each agency's General Plan is an integrated document that includes housing and transportation as elements. There is no mandated link between the local agency's General Plans and the Regional Transportation Plan.	PARTIALLY AGREE	General Plans are required by California Government Code Section 65300.7 to be internally consistent. California Government Code Section 65080 requires regional transportation plans to consider and incorporate as appropriate the transportation plans of cities, counties, districts, private organizations and state and federal agencies. SB #375 has shifted the paradigm whereby impending updates of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) will need to achieve measured and quantifiable trip reductions with associated decreases in greenhouse gas emissions. The Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) will be likely be allocated to AMBAG jurisdictions based on greenhouse gas (GHG) and trip reduction goals. The Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) is required to demonstrate how the Santa Cruz region will meet its greenhouse gas reduction target through integrated land use, housing and transportation planning. Once adopted by AMBAG, the SCS will be incorporated into the region's federally enforceable RTP.
City of Capitola City Council		R1	Transportation sections of all county and city general plans should be written by Regional Transportation Commission staff.	WILL NOT BE IMPLEMENTED	The City of Capitola does not agree with this recommendation. California state law requires the "planning agency" for each city and county to adopt a general plan "for the physical development of the county or city and any land outside its boundaries which bears relation to its planning" (Gov. Code 65300). The Regional Transportation Commission ("RTC") is not a "planning agency" for purposes of the statute and the statute does not authorize the City to delegate this statutorily imposed responsibility to a non-elected regional transportation agency which is created and functions pursuant to another state statute (Gov. Code 29352) and has statutorily assigned duties which do not include the drafting of city and county general plan circulation elements (Gov. Code 65080 et seq). In addition it bears emphasis that the general plan circulation element must correlate directly with the other elements of the general plan and not just regional transportation goals. Each general plan element, including such elements as the housing element, the land use element, and the circulation element, is required to be integrated and internally consistent with the other general plan elements so as to result in a general plan that internally consistent (Gov. Code 65300.5). The circulation element thus has a direct relationship to other general plan elements that entail policy considerations for which a regional transportation commission has neither legal responsibility nor practical expertise. Accordingly we believe that City elected officials are best qualified to, and legally required to, determine whether or not a proposed general plan is consistent with the community's values and represents the most comprehensive local expression of the general welfare for persons who live in, work in and visit the City. The RTC has been and will continue to be encouraged to participate in the City's general plan update process. The City however cannot delegate its responsibility for any portion of this process to the RTC.

City of Capitola City Council		R2	The local jurisdictions should review the transportation sections developed by RTC staff for adequacy every two years and RTC staff should be required to revise when necessary.	WILL NOT BE IMPLEMENTED	Current law, specifically California Government Code Section 65080 requires each transportation planning agency to " prepare and adopt a regional transportation plan directed at achieving a coordinated and balanced regional transportation system...." Chapter One of the 2010 RTP outlines the steps that the Regional Transportation Commission has taken to integrate local and regional plans and summarizes both public and regional agency input that goes into developing the RTP. As warranted, the City of Capitola may update its Circulation Element so that it can implement regional transportation improvements. Local participation in developing the RTP has been and will continue to be important. As noted in the RTP, the biggest challenge facing the region is the availability of funding for transportation projects, rather than regional coordination.
Capitola Community Development Department		F2	Local jurisdictions do not implement the regional transportation plan created by the RTC.	DISAGREE	The City of Capitola includes the goals and policies of the RTP in the development of capital improvement transportation projects. Specifically, preserving and maintaining existing transportation systems, incorporating multi-modal design elements in the projects, making efficient use of very limited transportation funding, seeking broad public input on local transportation plans. Unfortunately, due to on-going financial restraints, the number of transportation related improvement projects has been quite small over the past 5 years and remain limited in the near future.
Capitola Community Development Department		F3	Lack of consensus between the local jurisdictions and the RTC staff obstructs the coordination of the local transportation plans with the Regional Transportation Plan.	DISAGREE	There is no lack of consensus between the City of Capitola and RTC staff that obstructs coordination or implementation of transportation plans. The City has supported the RTC's efforts in acquiring the Union Pacific Railroad corridor; in addition the City joined and participated in the Highway 1 Construction Authority and in the Transportation Funding Task Force. City staff participates in the RTC's Integrated Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC) where local and regional transportation issues are discussed and policy recommendations are made.
Capitola Community Development Department		F4	Each agency's General Plan is an integrated document that includes housing and transportation as elements. There is no mandated link between the local agency's General Plans and the Regional Transportation Plan.	PARTIALLY AGREE	General Plans are required by California Government Code Section 65300.7 to be internally consistent. California Government Code Section 65080 requires regional transportation plans to consider and incorporate as appropriate the transportation plans of cities, counties, districts, private organizations and state and federal agencies. SB #375 has shifted the paradigm whereby impending updates of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) will need to achieve measured and quantifiable trip reductions with associated decreases in greenhouse gas emissions. The Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) will be likely be allocated to AMBAG jurisdictions based on greenhouse gas (GHG) and trip reduction goals. The Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) is required to demonstrate how the Santa Cruz region will meet its greenhouse gas reduction target through integrated land use, housing and transportation planning. Once adopted by AMBAG, the SCS will be incorporated into the region's federally enforceable RTP.

Capitola Community Development Department		R1	Transportation sections of all county and city general plans should be written by Regional Transportation Commission staff.	WILL NOT BE IMPLEMENTED	The City of Capitola does not agree with this recommendation. California state law requires the "planning agency" for each city and county to adopt a general plan "for the physical development of the county or city and any land outside its boundaries which bears relation to its planning" (Gov. Code 65300). The Regional Transportation Commission ("RTC") is not a "planning agency" for purposes of the statute and the statute does not authorize the City to delegate this statutorily imposed responsibility to a non-elected regional transportation agency which is created and functions pursuant to another state statute (Gov. Code 29352) and has statutorily assigned duties which do not include the drafting of city and county general plan circulation elements (Gov. Code 65080 et seq). In addition it bears emphasis that the general plan circulation element must correlate directly with the other elements of the general plan and not just regional transportation goals. Each general plan element, including such elements as the housing element, the land use element, and the circulation element, is required to be integrated and internally consistent with the other general plan elements so as to result in a general plan that internally consistent (Gov. Code 65300.5). The circulation element thus has a direct relationship to other general plan elements that entail policy considerations for which a regional transportation commission has neither legal responsibility nor practical expertise. Accordingly we believe that City elected officials are best qualified to, and legally required to, determine whether or not a proposed general plan is consistent with the community's values and represents the most comprehensive local expression of the general welfare for persons who live in, work in and visit the City. The RTC has been and will continue to be encouraged to participate in the City's general plan update process. The City however cannot delegate its responsibility for any portion of this process to the RTC
Capitola Community Development Department		R2	The local jurisdictions should review the transportation sections developed by RTC staff for adequacy every two years and RTC staff should be required to revise when necessary.	WILL NOT BE IMPLEMENTED	Current law, specifically California Government Code Section 65080 requires each transportation planning agency to " prepare and adopt a regional transportation plan directed at achieving a coordinated and balanced regional transportation system...." Chapter One of the 2010 RTP outlines the steps that the Regional Transportation Commission has taken to integrate local and regional plans and summarizes both public and regional agency input that goes into developing the RTP. As warranted, the City of Capitola may update its Circulation Element so that it can implement regional transportation improvements. Local participation in developing the RTP has been and will continue to be important. As noted in the RTP, the biggest challenge facing the region is the availability of funding for transportation projects, rather than regional coordination.
City of Scotts Valley City Council		F1	Traffic congestion on Highway 1 corridor is problematic.	AGREE	Congestion on Highway 1 corridor is problematic and will require federal, state, and regional coordination to address long-term solutions.
City of Scotts Valley City Council		F2	Local jurisdictions do not implement the regional transportation plan created by the RTC.	DISAGREE	The City of Scotts Valley includes the goals and policies of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) in the development of capital improvement transportation projects. Specifically, preserving and maintaining existing transportation systems, incorporating multi-modal design elements in the projects, making efficient use of very limited transportation funding, seeking broad public input on local transportation plans. Unfortunately, due to on-going financial restraints, the number of transportation related improvement projects has been quite small over the past five years and remain limited in the near future.

City of Scotts Valley City Council		F3	Lack of consensus between the local jurisdictions and the RTC staff obstructs the coordination of the local transportation plans with the Regional Transportation Plan.	DISAGREE	There is no lack of consensus between the City of Scotts Valley and Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) staff that obstructs coordination or implementation of the City's General Plan Circulation Element (referred to as "transportation plan" in the Grand Jury Final Report) or the RTP. City staff participates in the RTC's Integrated Technical Advisory Committee where local and regional transportation issues are discussed and policy recommendations are made to the RTC Board.
City of Scotts Valley City Council		F4	Each agency's General Plan is an integrated document that includes housing and transportation as elements. There is no mandated link between the local agency's General Plans and the Regional Transportation Plan.	DISAGREE	The City objects to the statement on page 33 of the Grand Jury Final Report that "cities have chosen not to integrate their transportation plans with those provided by the Regional Transportation Commission." General Plans are required by California Government Code Section 65300.7 to be internally consistent. Therefore, the goals, objectives, policies, and actions in a local agency's General Plan Housing Element must be consistent with those in the General Plan Circulation Element (referred to as "transportation plan" in the Grand Jury Final Report) and other elements in the local agency's General Plan. Furthermore, California Government Code Section 65080 requires regional transportation plans to consider and incorporate as appropriate the transportation plans (aka General Plan Circulation Elements) of cities, counties, districts, private organizations and state and federal agencies. Therefore, there is a required "link" between the RTP and local agency's General Plan Circulation Element. Additionally, several General Plan Circulation Element policies and actions call for regional coordination to promote an integrated transportation system. For example, General Plan Policy CP-95 states that "City shall coordinate its transportation planning effort with appropriate agencies to promote an integrated transportation system which favors public transit and alternatives to the single occupancy vehicle." The City's General Plan, Capital Improvement Plan, and development and environmental review processes achieve many of the RTP's goals, policies, and sub-policies. Lastly, Senate Bill 375 has shifted the paradigm whereby impending updates of the RTP will need to achieve measured and quantifiable trip reductions with associated decreases in greenhouse gas emissions. The Regional Housing Needs Assessment will be allocated to Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) jurisdictions based on greenhouse gas and trip reduction goals. The Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) is required to demonstrate how the Santa Cruz region will meet its greenhouse gas reduction target through integrated land use, housing and transportation planning. Once adopted by AMBAG, the SCS will be incorporated into the region's federally enforceable RTP.

City of Scotts Valley City Council		R1	Transportation sections of all county and city general plans should be written by Regional Transportation Commission staff.	WILL NOT BE IMPLEMENTED	The City of Scotts Valley does not agree with this recommendation. California Government Code Section 65300 requires the "planning agency" for each city and county to adopt a general plan "for the physical development of the county or city and any land outside its boundaries which bears relation to its planning". The RTC is not a "planning agency" for purposes of the statute. Furthermore, this statute does not authorize the City to delegate this statutorily imposed responsibility to a non-elected regional transportation agency which is created and functions pursuant to California Government Code Section 29352 and has statutorily assigned duties which do not include the drafting of city and county general plan circulation elements pursuant to California Government Code Section 65080 et seq. Additionally, the General Plan Circulation Element must correlate directly with the other elements of the General Plan and not just regional transportation goals. In addition to the Circulation Element, each Element in the General Plan such as the Housing Element and Land Use Element, is required to be integrated and internally consistent with the other General Plan Elements so as to result in a General Plan that constitutes a compatible statement of city or county policy, per California Government Code Section 65300.5. Thus, the Circulation Element has a direct relationship to other General Plan Elements that entail policy considerations for which a regional transportation commission has neither legal responsibility nor practical expertise. Accordingly we believe that City elected officials are best qualified to, and legally required to, determine whether or not a proposed General Plan is consistent with the community's values and represents the most comprehensive local expression of the general welfare for persons who live in, work in and visit the City. The RTC has been and will continue to be encouraged to participate in the City's General Plan process. The City however will not delegate its responsibility for any portion of its General Plan process to the RTC.
City of Scotts Valley City Council		R2	The local jurisdictions should review the transportation sections developed by RTC staff for adequacy every two years and RTC staff should be required to revise when necessary.	WILL NOT BE IMPLEMENTED	Current law, specifically California Government Code Section 65080, requires each transportation planning agency to "prepare and adopt a regional transportation plan directed at achieving a coordinated and balanced regional transportation system .... ". As stated in our response to Recommendation R1 above, the General Plan Circulation Element has a direct relationship to other General Plan Elements that entail policy considerations for which a regional transportation commission has neither legal responsibility nor practical expertise. Accordingly, we maintain that City elected officials are best qualified to, and legally required to, determine whether or not a proposed General Plan is consistent with the community's values and represents the most comprehensive local expression of the general welfare for persons who live in, work in and visit the City. Nevertheless, Chapter One of the 2010 RTP outlines the steps that the Regional Transportation Commission has taken to integrate local and regional plans and summarizes both public and regional agency input that goes into developing the RTP. Therefore, as warranted, the City of Scotts Valley may update its General Plan Circulation Element so that it can implement regional transportation improvements. Local participation in developing the RTP has been and will continue to be instrumental. As noted in the RTP, the biggest challenge facing the region is the availability of funding for transportation projects, rather than regional coordination.

Scotts Valley Planning Department		F2	Local jurisdictions do not implement the regional transportation plan created by the RTC.	DISAGREE	The City of Scotts Valley includes the goals and policies of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) in the development of capital improvement transportation projects. Specifically, preserving and maintaining existing transportation systems, incorporating multi-modal design elements in the projects, making efficient use of very limited transportation funding, seeking broad public input on local transportation plans. Unfortunately, due to on-going financial restraints, the number of transportation related improvement projects has been quite small over the past five years and remain limited in the near future.
Scotts Valley Planning Department		F3	Lack of consensus between the local jurisdictions and the RTC staff obstructs the coordination of the local transportation plans with the Regional Transportation Plan.	DISAGREE	There is no lack of consensus between the City of Scotts Valley and Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) staff that obstructs coordination or implementation of the City's General Plan Circulation Element (referred to as "transportation plan" in the Grand Jury Final Report) or the RTP. City staff participates in the RTC's Integrated Technical Advisory Committee where local and regional transportation issues are discussed and policy recommendations are made to the RTC Board.
Scotts Valley Planning Department		F4	Each agency's General Plan is an integrated document that includes housing and transportation as elements. There is no mandated link between the local agency's General Plans and the Regional Transportation Plan.	DISAGREE	The City objects to the statement on page 33 of the Grand Jury Final Report that "cities have chosen not to integrate their transportation plans with those provided by the Regional Transportation Commission." General Plans are required by California Government Code Section 65300.7 to be internally consistent. Therefore, the goals, objectives, policies, and actions in a local agency's General Plan Housing Element must be consistent with those in the General Plan Circulation Element (referred to as "transportation plan" in the Grand Jury Final Report) and other elements in the local agency's General Plan. Furthermore, California Government Code Section 65080 requires regional transportation plans to consider and incorporate as appropriate the transportation plans (aka General Plan Circulation Elements) of cities, counties, districts, private organizations and state and federal agencies. Therefore, there is a required "link" between the RTP and local agency's General Plan Circulation Element. Additionally, several General Plan Circulation Element policies and actions call for regional coordination to promote an integrated transportation system. For example, General Plan Policy CP-95 states that "City shall coordinate its transportation planning effort with appropriate agencies to promote an integrated transportation system which favors public transit and alternatives to the single occupancy vehicle." The City's General Plan, Capital Improvement Plan, and development and environmental review processes achieve many of the RTP's goals, policies, and sub-policies. Lastly, Senate Bill 375 has shifted the paradigm whereby impending updates of the RTP will need to achieve measured and quantifiable trip reductions with associated decreases in greenhouse gas emissions. The Regional Housing Needs Assessment will be allocated to Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) jurisdictions based on greenhouse gas and trip reduction goals. The Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) is required to demonstrate how the Santa Cruz region will meet its greenhouse gas reduction target through integrated land use, housing and transportation planning. Once adopted by AMBAG, the SCS will be incorporated into the region's federally enforceable RTP.

Scotts Valley Planning Department		R1	Transportation sections of all county and city general plans should be written by Regional Transportation Commission staff.	WILL NOT BE IMPLEMENTED	The City of Scotts Valley does not agree with this recommendation. California Government Code Section 65300 requires the “planning agency” for each city and county to adopt a general plan “for the physical development of the county or city and any land outside its boundaries which bears relation to its planning”. The RTC is not a “planning agency” for purposes of the statute. Furthermore, this statute does not authorize the City to delegate this statutorily imposed responsibility to a non-elected regional transportation agency which is created and functions pursuant to California Government Code Section 29352 and has statutorily assigned duties which do not include the drafting of city and county general plan circulation elements pursuant to California Government Code Section 65080 et seq. Additionally, the General Plan Circulation Element must correlate directly with the other elements of the General Plan and not just regional transportation goals. In addition to the Circulation Element, each Element in the General Plan such as the Housing Element and Land Use Element, is required to be integrated and internally consistent with the other General Plan Elements so as to result in a General Plan that constitutes a compatible statement of city or county policy, per California Government Code Section 65300.5. Thus, the Circulation Element has a direct relationship to other General Plan Elements that entail policy considerations for which a regional transportation commission has neither legal responsibility nor practical expertise. Accordingly we believe that City elected officials are best qualified to, and legally required to, determine whether or not a proposed General Plan is consistent with the community’s values and represents the most comprehensive local expression of the general welfare for persons who live in, work in and visit the City. The RTC has been and will continue to be encouraged to participate in the City’s General Plan process. The City however will not delegate its responsibility for any portion of its General Plan process to the RTC.
Scotts Valley Planning Department		R2	The local jurisdictions should review the transportation sections developed by RTC staff for adequacy every two years and RTC staff should be required to revise when necessary.	WILL NOT BE IMPLEMENTED	Current law, specifically California Government Code Section 65080, requires each transportation planning agency to “prepare and adopt a regional transportation plan directed at achieving a coordinated and balanced regional transportation system....". As stated in our response to Recommendation R1 above, the General Plan Circulation Element has a direct relationship to other General Plan Elements that entail policy considerations for which a regional transportation commission has neither legal responsibility nor practical expertise. Accordingly, we maintain that City elected officials are best qualified to, and legally required to, determine whether or not a proposed General Plan is consistent with the community’s values and represents the most comprehensive local expression of the general welfare for persons who live in, work in and visit the City. Nevertheless, Chapter One of the 2010 RTP outlines the steps that the Regional Transportation Commission has taken to integrate local and regional plans and summarizes both public and regional agency input that goes into developing the RTP. Therefore, as warranted, the City of Scotts Valley may update its General Plan Circulation Element so that it can implement regional transportation improvements. Local participation in developing the RTP has been and will continue to be instrumental. As noted in the RTP, the biggest challenge facing the region is the availability of funding for transportation projects, rather than regional coordination.

Delinquent Property Tax Penalty Cancellations:

"A Day Late and a Dollar Short"

Solicited Respondent	Proxy Respondent	Item	Item text	Response	Explanation
County Treasurer-Tax Collector		F1	The Tax Collector's use of discretion in evaluating the reason to grant tax delinquency penalty cancellations appears inconsistent.	DISAGREE	The very notion of discretion carries with it the idea of making decisions based on the facts of an individual case, and then applying the relevant section of the Revenue and Taxation Code. Each and every application for a waiver of late fees and/or penalties carries with it an individual circumstance. If the applicant's facts are reasonably within the construct of the statute's guidance for approving a waiver, then the waiver is granted; if not, it is not.
County Treasurer-Tax Collector		F2	The filing system used in the Tax Collector's Office does not allow tax penalty cancellation documents to be easily located.	PARTIALLY AGREE	The filing system used in the Treasurer-Tax Collector's Office regarding tax penalty cancellation documents is in full compliance with the Revenue and Taxation Code of the State of California. The filing system has two elements. First, the filing system retains the original documents and any supporting documents in paper form. The filing system retains such records in batch order, and, again is in full compliance with the applicable law. In addition to the paper filing system of such documents, the Tax Division staff make electronic notes on the taxpayer's electronic file, which can be accessed by Assessor's Parcel Number, taxpayer name, and/or street address.
County Treasurer-Tax Collector		F3	No records are retained of denied requests for tax penalty cancellations.	PARTIALLY AGREE	Lest there be any misunderstanding on this point, it should be made entirely clear that this office is in full compliance with the Revenue and Taxation Code of the State of California on the issue of retention of records concerning tax penalty cancellations. For those tax penalty cancellations that are approved, please refer to F2 above. Regarding those tax penalty cancellation requests that are not approved, the Revenue and Taxation Code does not require the retention of records. Again, in both instances, this office is in full compliance with the relevant sections of California law.
County Treasurer-Tax Collector		F4	The Tax Collector's Office does not appear to be consistently following the audit recommendations made by the Auditor-Controller Office.	DISAGREE	The implication of the Grand Jury's finding is that this office is under an obligation to follow or adopt the audit recommendations made by the Auditor-Controller Office. The two reports that the Grand Jury uses in making this finding are the August 24, 2005 Inter-Office Correspondence from then-Auditor-Controller Gary Knutson, and the December 10, 2008 Inter-Office Correspondence from Auditor-Controller Mary Jo Walker. In both cases, the Auditor-Controller found NO non-compliance by this office with the relevant sections of the Revenue and Taxation Code of the State of California. The recommendations contained in those two documents are of a procedural nature, and four of the six recommendations were adopted by this office. Of the two that were not adopted, one will be adopted upon implementation of the new Automated Property Tax system, and the other is a recommendation about how an outside vendor should configure their electronic payment system, and is, therefore, outside the scope of responsibility of this office.
County Treasurer-Tax Collector		F5	The Tax Collector's Office staff has no written procedure to follow for the processing of penalty cancellations.	PARTIALLY DISAGREE	The implication of this finding is that there are no written procedures regarding penalty cancellations. That is simply not the case. There are two basic written policies. The first is the Revenue and Taxation Code of the State of California. That body of law is always the written policy that this office uses to guide our actions. The second written policy is the PENALTY WAIVER: DECLARATION OF REMITTANCE/BEYOND TAXPAYER'S CONTROL form used by this office for the last several years. Together, these written documents provide clear written policy on this point.

County Treasurer-Tax Collector		F6	Information regarding delinquent tax penalty cancellation processes is not adequately publicized within the County.	PARTIALLY AGREE	The issue raised by this finding of the Grand Jury is that there is some objective standard against which this office has been measured, and found “not adequate.” No such objective standard exists. The California Revenue and Taxation Code provides the guidance on this point, and this office is in full compliance with the law. If the Grand Jury is using some other standard, it is not one that is in the law, or any regulation or other practice under law. This office provides personal, individual responses to any and all taxpayers who inquire about the tax penalty cancellation options available to them, consistent with the law.
County Treasurer-Tax Collector		F7	The new computer system has the capability to track details regarding tax penalty cancellations if requested by the Tax Collector or Auditor-Controller.	AGREE	
County Treasurer-Tax Collector		R1	The Tax Collector should create a form for taxpayers requesting the cancellation of tax penalties that includes the recommendations of the internal audit reports, an explanation of the Tax Code,[1][2][3] and the Tax Collector’s response (i.e. granted or denied and reason).	HAS BEEN IMPLEMENTED	Again, the Grand Jury is raising the notion of inconsistent application of tax penalty cancellations. The Grand Jury and I do not agree on this point. There is not inconsistency, there is exercise of discretion within the context of the Revenue and Taxation Code of the State of California, and the Grand Jury has not found otherwise.
County Treasurer-Tax Collector		R2	It should be compulsory for taxpayers to complete the new Waiver Form with supporting documentation when requesting a tax penalty cancellation.	HAS BEEN IMPLEMENTED	
County Treasurer-Tax Collector		R3	The Tax Collector should maintain a separate file containing copies of records of all tax penalty cancellation applications, with associated documentation, whether denied or approved.	HAS BEEN IMPLEMENTED	
County Treasurer-Tax Collector		R4	The Tax Collector should broadly publicize the delinquent tax penalty cancellation process.	HAS BEEN IMPLEMENTED	The Santa Cruz County Treasurer-Tax Collector’s website contains a form entitled “Procedure for Requesting Waiver of Interest, Penalty and/or Costs”. That form provides a complete and clear procedure for requesting a tax penalty cancellation.
County Treasurer-Tax Collector		R6	The Tax Collector should publish a semi-annual report documenting the number of requests and the dollar value of the cancelled tax penalties. The report should include a summary of reasons why tax penalties cancellations were approved and denied.	HAS BEEN IMPLEMENTED	This report is provided by the Tax Division staff to the Treasurer-Tax Collector on a quarterly basis, not on a semi-annual basis.

County Treasurer-Tax Collector		R7	The Tax Collector and the Auditor-Controller Office should direct ISD to enable the new IT system to track tax penalty cancellation transactions, both granted and denied.	WILL NOT BE IMPLEMENTED	The Grand Jury should understand that this office does not direct ISD to do anything. This office is administered by a directly elected countywide official, the Treasurer-Tax Collector. The Information Services Department is managed by a department head, appointed by the County Administrative Officer. This office has no jurisdiction or other authority to direct ISD, its department head, or its employees.
County Treasurer-Tax Collector		R8	The Tax Collector should act in a more transparent manner when applying the State Code.	WILL NOT BE IMPLEMENTED	As a directly elected countywide official, I am required to take an oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of the State of California. That same oath requires me to uphold the laws of the state, and, by implication, the laws of the County of Santa Cruz. I am in full compliance with that oath, and nothing in the Grand Jury report, its findings or its recommendation suggests otherwise. The “State Code”, using the Grand Jury’s wording, is the governing law for this office. This office has not ever, during my tenure, been found to be in anything other than full compliance with the Revenue and Taxation Code. There is not a single ordinance of the County of Santa Cruz that relates to this office where any entity (including the Grand Jury) has found non-compliance by this office. Therefore, I will continue to administer this office in full compliance with the federal and state Constitutions, the laws of the State of California, and the relevant ordinances of the County of Santa Cruz.
County Auditor-Controller		F4	The Tax Collector's Office does not appear to be consistently following the audit recommendations made by the Auditor-Controller Office.	AGREE	The Auditor-Controller’s Office issued two audit reports concerning tax penalty cancellations, one released in 2005 and another released in 2009. Each report contained a number of recommendations for improvements in the tax penalty cancellation process, some of which were cited in the Grand Jury report. The Tax Collector’s Office did implement some of the recommendations, but a number of recommendations have not been implemented. The Auditor-Controller’s Office has not performed a review of penalty waivers since our 2009 report, but based upon our understanding and the findings of the Grand Jury, it appears that the some of the recommendations which have not been implemented include the development and review of a summary report, and a list of specific documents that taxpayers must submit before a penalty is waived. The Tax Collector did modify the penalty waiver form as recommended in our 2009 audit report, but the report also recommended that the form contain a list of required documents, be completed by those seeking the waiver, and be posted on the County’s website, and it appears that these recommendations were not completely or consistently implemented.
County Auditor-Controller		R5	The County Auditor-Controller should add a review of tax penalty cancellations to the regular audit of the Tax Collector's Office.	REQUIRES FURTHER ANALYSIS	The Auditor-Controller’s Office does not do a “regular” review of any department, including the Tax Collector’s Office. Due to our extremely limited staffing, we are only able to perform some level of review in each County department every few years. However, if the Tax Collector complies with all of the Grand Jury’s recommendations, including recommendation #6 which is to publish a semi-annual report documenting the number and amount of waiver requests which were approved and denied, the Auditor-Controller’s Office could review that report on a semi-annual basis.
County Auditor-Controller		R7	The Tax Collector and the Auditor-Controller Office should direct ISD to enable the new IT system to track tax penalty cancellation transactions, both granted and denied.	HAS NOT BEEN IMPLEMENTED BUT WILL BE IMPLEMENTED IN THE FUTURE	The Auditor-Controller agrees that this would be a valuable report. The County is in the process of developing a new property tax system, which should be operational within one year. The report which the Grand Jury suggests is not one of the new system’s basic reports, but the Auditor-Controller will join the Tax Collector in requesting that such a report be specially programmed. It is not practical to request a report from the existing property tax system since it will soon be replaced.

County Information Services Director	Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors	F7	The new computer system has the capability to track details regarding tax penalty cancellations if requested by the Tax Collector or Auditor-Controller.	AGREE	
County Information Services Director	Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors	R7	The Tax Collector and the Auditor-Controller Office should direct ISD to enable the new IT system to track tax penalty cancellation transactions, both granted and denied.	REQUIRES FURTHER ANALYSIS	The County is in the process of developing a new property tax system, which should be operational within one year. The report which the Grand Jury suggests is not one of the new system's basic reports, but the Auditor-Controller will join the Tax Collector in requesting that such a report be specially programmed in the new system.

Pajaro Valley Unified School District Insurance Vendor Selection:

Are There Options?

Solicited Respondent	Proxy Respondent	Item	Item text	Response	Explanation
PVUSD Superintendent		F3	During the initial interviews, PVUSD Board of Trustees and administrators appeared to be unaware of ongoing litigation concerning Keenan & Associates.	AGREE	At the time Grand Jury members visited with district officials, district staff was unaware of specific litigation involving Keenan and Associates (Keenan) and other school districts. This fact is not, in our opinion, that significant. We are curious as to why it warrants a finding. The district works with a wide array of statewide vendors for specific services. It is possible that any one of them could be involved in some form of litigation. As a large public organization, the district itself is involved in several litigation matters at any one time. District staff will always be concerned regarding litigation involving district vendors and/or consultants, but we will carefully investigate the matter and provide that entity the due process afforded to it by law before reaching conclusions. In this case, district staff conducted a thorough review of the litigation involving Keenan. We found that it had no direct bearing on Keenan's work and relationship with the district. A majority of the litigation referenced in the Grand Jury's report has been addressed, dropped, and/or thrown out by the court. Nevertheless, district staff will continue to monitor this matter until it comes to final completion.
PVUSD Superintendent		F4	The services that Keenan & Associates provide PVUSD go beyond an advisory and consultative capacity for health benefits to also include brokering a wide variety of insurance, prescription management, early retirement planning and administration of several JPA's.	AGREE	The district concurs with this finding. The district provides a complete range of health and welfare benefits to its employees. It is not uncommon for school districts to contract consultant services for these matters. We note, however, that the law clearly stipulates that fees for consultant and broker services must be listed and accounted for separately. The board's publically adopted contract with Keenan clearly stipulates the range of services provided and fees charged by Keenan to the district. In addition, these fees and services are reviewed annually for accuracy and appropriateness by district staff.
PVUSD Superintendent		F5	Even though PVUSD requested proposals from five qualified vendors for Medical, Dental and Vision Consulting Services, and followed California Code and district purchasing policies, the process does not appear to encourage multiple bids.	PARTIALLY AGREE	The district partially agrees with this finding. It is true that only one qualified vendor submitted a proposal during the 2010 contract renewal process. Another vendor submitted a proposal that appeared to meet minimum proposal requirements, but was one hour past the official deadline noticed in the district's Request for Proposals (RFP) process. District staff disagrees with part of the jury's finding that "the process does not appear to encourage multiple bids." As a public agency, the district is required to adhere to public procurement statutes when determining the purchase of particular goods and/or services with public resources. These statutes and subsequent review process require strict adherence to specific processes and communications between the public agency and possible vendors/consultants. In this case, district staff closely followed all state and federal public procurement requirements and best practices. Members of the jury's review team concurred with this assessment. In addition, the Grand Jury did not, in our opinion, completely understand the nature and specificity of the services being sought by the district. These are not normal health insurance services commonly provided to private sector organizations and individuals. There are only a handful of firms in the state that are experienced and qualified to handle this large of a public contract and for these types of services. The contract is up for renewal in 2012 and the district is currently conducting its bi-annual RFP process. This time the district invited nine vendors to respond, but only four submitted proposals.

PVUSD Superintendent		F6	The Medical, Dental and Vision Consulting Services contract discloses that Keenan & Associates receives direct compensation from PVUSD and indirect compensation from brokered vendors, which is a conflict in that it diminishes the incentive for Keenan & Associates to always recommend vendors offering PVUSD the best deals.	DISAGREE	District staff does not agree with this finding. Upon issuance of the Grand Jury's report, district staff conducted a thorough review of the district's contracted services by Keenan. Our review found no instance where Keenan did not closely analyze all possible options to maximize district-provided employee services in a cost effective manner. District staff oversees and administers all aspects of the district's employee health and welfare benefits systems. The program and fiscal management of such services are subject to state, federal and independent reviews and audits. No significant finding or exception has been identified in recent memory. To this end, we have found that Keenan and its staff have conducted their work on behalf of the district in a highly professional manner.
PVUSD Superintendent		R2	PVUSD should include in their purchasing process an Internet background check on prospective vendors, relating to litigation or other issues.	HAS BEEN IMPLEMENTED	The district concurs with this finding and has taken steps to implement the recommendation in subsequent RFP processes. These steps include internet research, contacting other school districts, seeking input from professional associations' list serves. The district notes, however, that Internet searches are not, by themselves, a completely accurate source of information. A significant portion of data on the Internet may produce inaccurate, outdated, or unsubstantiated claims.
PVUSD Superintendent		R3	PVUSD should review their purchasing process and identify possible changes that would increase the number of qualified bids.	HAS BEEN IMPLEMENTED	The district supports with this recommendation. Staff analysis found that the district procurement and RFP processes comply with state, federal, and board-adopted policies. The Grand Jury report noted that the district was in compliance with these requirements and made note of the extra steps district staff implemented to maximize transparency and accountability before the public. Staff has implemented practices to further encourage competitive bidding processes that adhere to state and federal statutory requirements. These include publishing notices in various trade journals and alerting state and national professional associations as to pending RFP processes and dates.
PVUSD Superintendent		R4	PVUSD should consider the nature of the issues raised in the Fourth Amended Class Action Complaint to determine if they apply to their district. Following that, they should exercise clause 4-D in the Medical, Dental and Vision Consulting Services contract, to review both total direct and indirect compensation received by Keenan & Associates and the potential impact to PVUSD's overall costs.	WILL NOT BE IMPLEMENTED	District staff conducted a complete examination of the issued raised by the Grand Jury's report on this specific matter. The issues raised in the Fourth Amended Class Action Complaint brought in the name of other public agencies do not apply to PVUSD. District staff closely monitors all services, billing, and fees provided by Keenan under contract. Staff has found no discrepancies to date, but will continue to monitor this matter for further developments. Should it be warranted, district staff will initiate an immediate review of the vendor's contract performance like it has with other vendors and/or consultants.

PVUSD Board of Trustees		F2	It appears that the PVUSD Board of Trustees has relied heavily on the administration for information and recommendations on vendor selection and contract approval.	PARTIALLY AGREE	The Board of Trustees partially agrees with this finding. The board's primary responsibility, like that of other local government elected boards, is to provide policy direction and oversight for the district on behalf of the voters, taxpayers, and students they represent. Board members rely on district administrative staff to implement policy directives, analyze policy alternatives, and recommend possible policy actions. But the board balances its oversight responsibilities by holding administrative staff directly accountable under the direction and oversight of the district's superintendent. The superintendent is appointed by the board and serves at their will. This accountability is determined and weighed against the board's adopted goals and objectives for the district. In addition, the board will provide direction and input to the superintendent and administrative staff on matters requiring board action and direction. The board will, if necessary, require specific follow-up according to a specified timeline. This is a common and recommended governance structure followed by a majority of local governments throughout the state and nation.
PVUSD Board of Trustees		F3	During the initial interviews, PVUSD Board of Trustees and administrators appeared to be unaware of ongoing litigation concerning Keenan & Associates.	PARTIALLY AGREE	The Board of Trustees partially agrees with this finding. Board members and administrators were not aware of the specific litigation concerning Keenan and Associates at the time representatives of the Grand Jury met with district officials. However, administrative staff immediately investigated the matter. District officials remain curious as to why this fact warrants a finding? The district, like any other large local government agency, works with a wide array of vendors for specific services. It is possible that any one of them could be involved in some form of litigation. As a large public organization, the district itself is involved in several litigation matters at any one time. The board and district administration will always be concerned regarding litigation involving district vendors and/or consultants, but we will instruct administrative staff to carefully investigate the matter and provide the board feedback on the relevancy of such matters. In this case, district staff conducted a thorough review of the litigation involving Keenan. They found that it had no direct bearing on Keenan's work and relationship with the district. A majority of the litigation referenced in the Grand Jury's report has been addressed, dropped, and/or thrown out by the court. Nevertheless, district will continue to monitor this matter until it comes to final completion.
PVUSD Board of Trustees		R1	PVUSD Board of Trustees should act more independently of the administration when reviewing and approving significant contracts and vendors.	HAS BEEN IMPLEMENTED	This recommendation has been implemented but not as a result of the Grand Jury's findings and/or recommendations on this report. The board has, and will continue to, perform its duties as prescribed to it under California law. Among these are public procurement statutes when conducting formal requests for proposals (RFP). The role and responsibilities of the board in the RFP process are clearly spelled out in the Government and Education codes. In this instance, the board adhered to these statutes and acted according to how it was suppose to operate during a formal RFP process. The jury noted this fact in its report and subsequent findings. The board expresses concern with the Grand Jury's recommendation. The PVUSD Board of Trustees has consistently retained its core role of setting policy independent of administrative staff and any other outside influences. All of its actions are deliberated in public and are subject to majority vote. But the board will continue to rely on its appointed leadership staff for policy analysis and recommendations. These staff are carefully selected for their professional expertise in such matters. They report directly to the superintendent and/or board, and are evaluated and held accountable for their professional performance.

Santa Cruz County Correctional Facilities:

Are They Effectively Utilized and What Are the Options?

Solicited Respondent	Proxy Respondent	Item	Item text	Response	Explanation
Santa Cruz County Sheriff		F1	The overcrowded conditions of Santa Cruz County Main Jail will be exacerbated with the transfer of state prisoners back to their originating county.	PARTIALLY DISAGREE	Athough we do have concerns about ongoing funding, the Corrections Bureau has developed a strategic plan to comply with AB109 (Criminal Justice realignment), while properly managing our inmate population. Corrections staff will utilize a multi-tiered approach in managing inmate population by expanding Work Release, incorporating an Electronic Monitoring Program and utilizing Sheriffs Parole to place low level offenders into alternative forms of incarceration.
Santa Cruz County Sheriff		F2	Rountree and Blaine facilities are not fully utilized with respect to capacity.	PARTIALLY AGREE	The female population in the Main Jail and Blaine Street has diminished to about 6% of the total inmate population. Corrections staff is working diligently to move pre-sentenced females to Blaine Street to better use that facility. However, because the female population has shifted to such a low number there are not enough females to fully populate Blaine Street. The Rountree Medium Jail is at full capacity. The Rountree Minimum Jail was closed about a year ago due to budget constraints and there are no immediate plans to re-open the minimum facility.
Santa Cruz County Sheriff		F3	Security, staff and vehicles are required to transport inmates to the Main Jail for medical/dental needs due to limited medical services at the Rountree Facility.	AGREE	At this time, funding is not available to provide additonal medical personnel that could be deployed to the Rountree facility. Inmates needing medical services are transported to the Main Jail or area medical centers for treatment.
Santa Cruz County Sheriff		F4	The lack of sophisticated dental equipment at the Main Jail requires secure transportation to off-site facilities for those inmates requiring more complex dental work.	PARTIALLY AGREE	Due to cost and need the Corrections Bureau does not have a full time dentist on duty. Basic dental procedures are completed by a contract dentist inside the Main Jail. More complicated procedures are performed off site, when needed.
Santa Cruz County Sheriff		F5	There are no program performance assessment tools, which prevents staff from evaluating the effectiveness of the educational programs.	DISAGREE	There are program assessment tools in place for all contracted programs. Each contractor is required to report the hours of service, complete a course evaluation, and provide the number of students who completed the class. Each of our program partners require program evaluations, such as how many students are employed or pursuing careers in the vocational programs they attended. The Program Manager reviews lesson plans, course evaluations and outcomes to modify program performance. Inmates also complete course evaluations.
Santa Cruz County Sheriff		F6	Due to a lack of consistent communication from jail personnel, not an inmates are aware of reentry programs offered at the time of their release.	PARTIALLY DISAGREE	All inmates have access to the Friends Outside Resource guide, which is the most up to date resource list available. Programs such as the Recidivism Reduction Through Research-Based Rehabilitation And Reentry (R5) and Gemma place inmates in direct communication with outside resources. In the future, we intend to add this information as part of the Inmate Rules video which is shown daily at noon in each unit.

Santa Cruz County Sheriff		F7	There are inadequate programs and resources to assist inmates in their reentry into society, such as job skill training, treatment programs, counseling, and transitional housing.	PARTIALLY DISAGREE	The Corrections Bureau offers job skills training at all facilities, counseling at all facilities, substance abuse education is available at the minimum security facilities, and aftercare is available. Female inmates are encouraged to attend the Gemma Program, which offers transitional housing. Unfortunately, a "bridge" piece is lacking for inmates to seamlessly transition into services out of custody, as there is a lack of treatment beds, counseling, and transitional housing.
Santa Cruz County Sheriff		R1	Conversion of the Blaine Street Facility into a transitional housing facility or consolidation with another facility should be considered.	REQUIRES FURTHER ANALYSIS	Blaine Street is the only all female custody facility in the county. The Corrections Bureau will continue to monitor the inmate population trends and examine if other housing alternatives should be researched.
Santa Cruz County Sheriff		R2	The Sheriff's Office should perform a cost-benefit analysis of re-opening the housing portion of the minimum security facility at Rountree to reduce overcrowding at the Main Jail.	WILL NOT BE IMPLEMENTED	At this time, funding is not available to re-open the Rountree Minimum Facility. The Corrections Bureau has developed a strategic plan to comply with AB 109 (Criminal Justice realignment), while properly managing our inmate population. Corrections staff will utilize a multi-tiered approach in managing inmate population by expanding Work Release, incorporating an Electronic Monitoring Program and utilizing Sheriffs Parole to place low level offenders into alternative forms of incarceration, thus reducing the need for minimum security bed space.
Santa Cruz County Sheriff		R3	The Sheriffs Office should perform a cost-benefit analysis of providing medical services at Rountree, such as staffing a physician assistant, nurse practitioner or a physician on site, versus the current need for secured transportation costs and associated risks.	HAS NOT BEEN IMPLEMENTED BUT WILL BE IMPLEMENTED IN THE FUTURE	Within the next year, we anticipate providing a comprehensive review and external recommendation for complete medical services.
Santa Cruz County Sheriff		R4	The Sheriff's Office should perform a cost-benefit analysis of the acquisition and installation of more sophisticated dental equipment for the Main Jail versus the current method of securely transporting inmates off-site for dental care.	WILL NOT BE IMPLEMENTED	Due to cost and need this can not be accomplished at this time. The Corrections Bureau complies with Title 15 to ensure that emergency and medically required dental care is provided to each inmate, upon request, under the direction and supervision of a dentist, licensed in the state. Should funding become available in the future the Corrections Bureau would re-examine this recommendation.
Santa Cruz County Sheriff		R5	The Sheriff's Office should implement a mechanism to track the effectiveness of educational programs within the 2011-12 fiscal year.	HAS NOT BEEN IMPLEMENTED BUT WILL BE IMPLEMENTED IN THE FUTURE	The Corrections Bureau offers job skills training at all facilities, counseling at all facilities, substance abuse education is available at the minimum security facilities, and aftercare is available. Female inmates are encouraged to attend the Gemma Program, which offers transitional housing. Research must be completed on how to accurately track the effectiveness of the offered programs, as well as how recidivism is tracked and calculated. Our inmate population is highly transitory and inmates often re-offend in other counties, which is difficult to track. AB 109 (Public Safety Realignment) and the Community Corrections Partnership has this task as one of their core responsibilities.

Santa Cruz County Sheriff		R6	Based upon analysis of the tracking data, the Sheriffs Office should modify their existing educational pro grams where warranted or consider implementing successful educational programs in use in other jurisdictions, such as Santa Barbara County.	HAS BEEN IMPLEMENTED	The Corrections Bureau offers Substance Abuse Counseling and Education to all inmates at the Medium and Minimum Security facilities. We have expanded our intensive counseling to a highly recidivist population at the Main Jail through a Second Chance grant. The project, Recidivism Reduction Through Research-Based Rehabilitation And Reentry (R5) combined actual-based risk and needs assessment, evidence-based practice, multi-disciplinary case management, extensive reentry planning and preparation, and a comprehensive array of services to address criminogenic needs in the areas of employment, housing, substance abuse, anti-social thinking/behavior, gang affliation, education, and positive social supports. R5 is an advanced collaboration between nine governmental agencies and community-based non-profit service providers. Thorough evaluation of this program will provide on-going feedback, document implementation, and provide support for effort to sustain and replicate project strategies which are shown effective.
Santa Cruz County Sheriff		R7	Inmates should be better informed of post-release resources, such as job skill training, treatment programs, counseling, and transitional housing.	HAS NOT BEEN IMPLEMENTED BUT WILL BE IMPLEMENTED IN THE FUTURE	The Corrections Bureau offers Friends Outside "How to" class at all of our facilities and copies of the resource guide are always available. The Corrections Bureau provides workshops on getting a job post incarceration and job skills. The Probation Department has recently been offering a class titled, "How to Succeed on Probation", which is taught in the Main Jail. AB 109 (Public Safety Realignment) and the Community Corrections Partnership has this task as one of their core responsibilities.
Santa Cruz County Sheriff		R8	Santa Cruz County should perform a cost-benefit analysis of the implementation of additional programs and resources to assist inmates in their re-entry into society.	HAS BEEN IMPLEMENTED	The Corrections Bureau is continually examining new ways to help inmates re-enter society. Many of our programs focus on ways to effect behavior change that will carry over to the outside. These classes include Job Skills, Life Skills, Parenting, Substance Abuse, Compassionate Communication, Thinking for A Change, GED and ESL. Additionally, our wrap around services for R5 participants contribute to inmates success on the outside.
Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors		F1	The overcrowded conditions of Santa Cruz County Main Jail will be exacerbated with the transfer of state prisoners back to their originating county.	PARTIALLY DISAGREE	While it is possible that the transfer of state prisoners to their home counties may exacerbate overcrowding at the Main Jail, the Sheriff's Department has developed strategic plan to comply with AB109 (Criminal Justice realignment), while properly managing our inmate population. Staff in the Sheriff's Department will utilize a multi-tiered approach in managing inmate population by expanding Work Release, incorporating an Electronic Monitoring Program and utilizing Sheriff's Parole to place low level offenders into alternative forms of incarceration. It is hoped that these actions will avoid increasing the population in the facility.
Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors		F2	Rountree and Blaine facilities are not fully utilized with respect to capacity.	PARTIALLY AGREE	The female population in the Main Jail and Blaine Street has diminished to about 6% of the total inmate population. Corrections staff is working diligently to move pre-sentenced females to Blaine Street to better use that facility. However, because the female population has shifted to such a low number there are not enough females to fully populate Blaine Street. The Rountree Medium Jail is at full capacity. The Rountree Minimum Jail was closed about a year ago due to budget constraints and there are no immediate plans to re-open the minimum facility.
Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors		F3	Security, staff and vehicles are required to transport inmates to the Main Jail for medical/dental needs due to limited medical services at the Rountree Facility.	AGREE	At this time, funding is not available to provide additional medical personnel that could be deployed to the Rountree facility. Inmates needing medical services are transported to the Main Jail or area medical centers for treatment.

Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors		F4	The lack of sophisticated dental equipment at the Main Jail requires secure transportation to off-site facilities for those inmates requiring more complex dental work.	AGREE	The County does not have a full time dentist on duty. Basic dental procedures are completed by a contract dentist inside the Main Jail. More complicated procedures are performed off site, when needed.
Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors		F5	There are no program performance assessment tools, which prevents staff from evaluating the effectiveness of the educational programs.	DISAGREE	The Sheriff utilizes program assessment tools for all contracted programs. Each contractor is required to report the hours of service, complete a course evaluation, and provide the number of students who completed the class. Each program is required to provide program information on the number of students who are employed or pursuing careers in the vocational programs they attended. The Sheriff's Office reviews lesson plans, course evaluations and outcomes to modify program performance. Inmates also complete course evaluations.
Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors		F6	Due to a lack of consistent communication from jail personnel, not all inmates are aware of reentry programs offered at the time of their release.	PARTIALLY DISAGREE	The Sheriff's Department provides information to inmates about reentry programs in a variety of ways. Inmates receive copies of the Friends Outside Resource guide and other programs such as the Recidivism Reduction Through Research-Based Rehabilitation And Reentry (R5) and Gemma place inmates in direct communication with outside resources. The department plans to implement additional methods of informing inmates of resources available to them.
Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors		F7	There are inadequate programs and resources to assist inmates in their reentry into society, such as job skill training, treatment programs, counseling, and transitional housing.	PARTIALLY DISAGREE	The Sheriff’s Department offers job skills training and counseling at all facilities, substance abuse education at the minimum security facilities, and aftercare. Female inmates are encouraged to attend the Gemma Program, which offers transitional housing support. There is a need in the community for additional treatment beds, counseling, and transitional housing services for inmates who have been released.
Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors		R1	Conversion of the Blaine Street Facility into a transitional housing facility or consolidation with another facility should be considered.	WILL NOT BE IMPLEMENTED	Blaine Street is the only all female custody facility in the county and provides a more appropriate space for female inmates to begin their rehabilitation.
Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors		R2	The Sheriff’s Office should perform a cost-benefit analysis of re-opening the housing portion of the minimum security facility at Rountree to reduce overcrowding at the Main Jail.	WILL NOT BE IMPLEMENTED	The County does not currently have the resources necessary to re-open the Rountree Minimum Facility. The Sheriff’s Department and the Probation Department are working with other county departments and community groups to develop a variety of strategies to reduce overcrowding. These strategies include expanding Work Release, incorporating an Electronic Monitoring Program and alternatives to Incarceration.
Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors		R3	The Sheriffs Office should perform a cost-benefit analysis of providing medical services at Rountree, such as staffing a physician assistant, nurse practitioner or a physician on site, versus the current need for secured transportation costs and associated risks.	HAS NOT BEEN IMPLEMENTED BUT WILL BE IMPLEMENTED IN THE FUTURE	The Sheriff's Department Is planning to conduct such an analysis within the next year and develop a recommendation for the provision of medical services.

Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors		R4	The Sheriff's Office should perform a cost-benefit analysis of the acquisition and installation of more sophisticated dental equipment for the Main Jail versus the current method of securely transporting inmates off-site for dental care.	WILL NOT BE IMPLEMENTED	This recommendation will not be implemented due to cast of equipment and staffing compared to the need of inmates. The Sheriff's Department is in compliance with Title 15 in ensuring that emergency and medically required dental care is provided to each inmate, upon request, under the direction and supervision of a dentist, licensed in the state. Should funding become available in the future the department will re-examine this recommendation.
Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors		R5	The Sheriff's Office should implement a mechanism to track the effectiveness of educational programs within the 2011-12 fiscal year.	HAS BEEN IMPLEMENTED	The Sheriff's Department offers Substance Abuse Counseling and Education to all inmates at the Medium and Minimum Security facilities and has expanded the provision of intensive counseling to a highly recidivist population at the Main Jail through a Second Chance grant. The project, Recidivism Reduction Through Research-Based Rehabilitation And Reentry (R5), combines actual-based risk and needs assessment, evidence-based practice, multi-disciplinary case management, extensive reentry planning and preparation, and a comprehensive array of services to address criminogenic needs in the areas of employment, housing, substance abuse, anti-social thinking/behavior, gang affiliation, education, and positive social supports. R5 is an advanced collaboration between nine governmental agencies and community-based non-profit service providers. Thorough evaluation of this program will provide on-going feedback, document implementation, and provide support for effort to sustain and replicate project strategies which are shown effective.
Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors		R6	Based upon analysis of the tracking data, the Sheriffs Office should modify their existing educational pro grams where warranted or consider implementing successful educational programs in use in other jurisdictions, such as Santa Barbara County.	HAS BEEN IMPLEMENTED	See response above to Recommendation 5:
Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors		R7	Inmates should be better informed of post-release resources, such as job skill training, treatment programs, counseling, and transitional housing.	HAS BEEN IMPLEMENTED	The Sheriff's Department offers Friends Outside "Howto" class at all facilities and copies of the resource guide are always available. The department provides workshops on getting jobs and job skills. The Probation Department has recently been offering a class titled, "How to Succeed on Probation", which is taught in the Main Jail.
Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors		R8	Santa Cruz County should perform a cost-benefit analysis of the implementation of additional programs and resources to assist inmates in their re-entry into society.	HAS BEEN IMPLEMENTED	The County is continually examining new ways to help inmates re-enter society. Many programs focus on ways to effect behavior change that will carry over to the outside. These classes include Job Skills, Life Skills, Parenting, Substance Abuse, Compassionate Communication, Thinking for A Change, GED and ESL. Additionally, wrap around services for R5 participants contribute to inmates' success on the outside.