Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission

AGENDA

Thursday, February 4, 2016
9:00 a.m.

NOTE LOCATION THIS MONTH
Watsonville City Council Chambers
275 Main St., Ste 450
Watsonville, CA

AGENDAS ONLINE
To receive email notification when the RTC meeting agenda packet is posted on our website, please call (831) 460-3200 or email info@sccrtc.org to subscribe.

COMMISSION MEMBERSHIP

Caltrans (ex-officio) Tim Gubbins
City of Capitola Dennis Norton
City of Santa Cruz Don Lane
City of Scotts Valley Randy Johnson
City of Watsonville Jimmy Dutra
County of Santa Cruz Greg Caput
County of Santa Cruz Ryan Coonerty
County of Santa Cruz Zach Friend
County of Santa Cruz John Leopold
County of Santa Cruz Bruce McPherson
Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District Karina Cervantez
Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District Cynthia Chase
Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District Ed Bottorff

The majority of the Commission constitutes a quorum for the transaction of business.
1. Roll call

2. Oral communications

Any member of the public may address the Commission for a period not to exceed three minutes on any item within the jurisdiction of the Commission that is not already on the agenda. The Commission will listen to all communication, but in compliance with State law, may not take action on items that are not on the agenda.

Speakers are requested to sign the sign-in sheet so that their names can be accurately recorded in the minutes of the meeting.

3. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agendas

CONSENT AGENDA

All items appearing on the consent agenda are considered to be minor or non-controversial and will be acted upon in one motion if no member of the RTC or public wishes an item be removed and discussed on the regular agenda. Members of the Commission may raise questions, seek clarification or add directions to Consent Agenda items without removing the item from the Consent Agenda as long as no other Commissioner objects to the change.

MINUTES

4. Approve draft minutes of the December 3, 2015 Regional Transportation Commission meeting

5. Accept draft minutes of the December 8, 2015 Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee meeting

6. Accept draft minutes of the December 14, 2015 Bicycle Advisory Committee meeting

7. Accept draft minutes of the January 14, 2016 Interagency Technical Advisory Committee meeting

POLICY ITEMS

No consent items

PROJECTS and PLANNING ITEMS

8. Approve request for FY 15/16 Cap and Trade-Low Carbon Transit Operations Program (LCTOP)

BUDGET AND EXPENDITURES ITEMS

9. Accept status report on Transportation Development Act (TDA) revenues
ADMINISTRATION ITEMS

10. Approve contract for the Transportation Investment Plan Public Information Consultant

11. Approve reappointments and appointment of members to the Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee

INFORMATION/OTHER ITEMS

12. Accept monthly meeting schedule

13. Accept correspondence log

14. Accept letters from RTC committees and staff to other agencies
   a. Letter to the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District regarding the RTC November 2016 Transportation Ballot Measure from the Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee
   b. Letter to Caltrans District 5 regarding the Highway 1 Corridor Tier I and Tier II Document Comments from the Bicycle Advisory Committee

15. Accept miscellaneous written comments from the public on RTC projects and transportation issues

16. Accept information items
   a. Letter to the California Transportation Commission regarding Cycle 3 of the Active Transportation Program from the Central Coast Coalition

REGULAR AGENDA

17. Commissioner reports – oral reports

18. Director’s Report – oral report  
   (George Dondero, Executive Director)

19. Caltrans report and consider action items
   a. District Director’s report for January and February
   b. Santa Cruz County project updates for January and February

20. City of Santa Cruz Rail Trail Project update and contract authorizations  
   (Cory Caletti, Senior Transportation Planner)
   a. Staff report
   b. Resolution authorizing the Executive Director to enter into agreements for implementation of Coastal Rail Trail Projects
   (George Dondero, Executive Director)
   a. Staff report
   b. Transportation Investment Plan
   c. Investment Plan Sample Distribution Formulas to Local Jurisdictions

22. 2016 Legislative Program and Funding Updates
   (Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner)
   a. Staff report
   b. Draft Legislative Program
   c. Governor’s 2016-17 State Budget Summary – Memorandum from Gus Kbori
   d. Comparison of State Funding Proposals
   e. Santa Cruz County State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Projects
   f. California Transportation Commission (CTC) STIP Priorities

23. Review of items to be discussed in closed session

   CLOSED SESSION

24. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL-EXISTING LITIGATION. (Paragraph (1) of subdivision (d) of Section 54956.9 of the Government Code) Santa Cruz Superior Court Case No. CV182123

25. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL-ANTICIPATED LITIGATION. Significant exposure to litigation pursuant to paragraph (2) of subdivision (d) of Section 54956.9 of the Government code: two case

   OPEN SESSION

26. Report on closed session

27. Next meetings

   The next RTC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, March 3, 2016 at 9:00 a.m. at the County Board of Supervisors Chambers, 701 Ocean Street, 5th floor, Santa Cruz, CA.

   The next Transportation Policy Workshop meeting is scheduled for Thursday, February 18, 2016 at 9:00 a.m. at the RTC Offices, 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA.
HOW TO REACH US
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA 95060
phone: (831) 460-3200 / fax: (831) 460-3215

Watsonville Office
275 Main Street, Suite 450, Watsonville. CA 95076
phone: (831) 460-3205
email: info@sccrtc.org / website: www.sccrtc.org

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC
Written comments for items on this agenda that are received at the RTC office in Santa Cruz by noon on the day before this meeting will be distributed to Commissioners at the meeting.

HOW TO STAY INFORMED ABOUT RTC MEETINGS, AGENDAS & NEWS
Broadcasts: Many of the meetings are broadcast live. Meetings are cablecast by Community Television of Santa Cruz. Community TV’s channels and schedule can be found online (www.communitytv.org) or by calling (831) 425-8848.

Agenda packets: Complete agenda packets are available at the RTC office, on the RTC website (www.sccrtc.org), and at the following public libraries:

- Aptos Library
- Boulder Creek Library
- Branciforte Library
- Capitola Library
- Felton Library
- Garfield Park Library
- La Selva Beach Library
- Live Oak Library
- Santa Cruz Downtown Library
- Scotts Valley Library
- Watsonville Main Library

For information regarding library locations and hours, please check online at www.santacruzpl.org or www.watsonville.lib.ca.us.

On-line viewing: The SCCRTC encourages the reduction of paper waste and therefore makes meeting materials available online. Those receiving paper agendas may sign up to receive email notification when complete agenda packet materials are posted to our website by sending a request to info@sccrtc.org. Agendas are typically posted 5 days prior to each meeting.

Newsletters: To sign up for E-News updates on specific SCCRTC projects, go to www.sccrtc.org/enews.

HOW TO REQUEST
ACCcommodations for People with Disabilities
The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission does not discriminate on the basis of disability and no person shall, by reason of a disability, be denied the benefits of its services, programs, or activities. This meeting location is an accessible facility. If you wish to attend this meeting and require special assistance in order to participate, please contact RTC staff at 460-3200 (CRS 800/735-2929) at least three working days in advance of this meeting to make arrangements. People with disabilities may request a copy of the agenda in an alternative format. As a courtesy to those person affected, Please attend the meeting smoke and scent-free.
**SERVICIOS DE TRADUCCIÓN/ TRANSLATION SERVICES**

Si gusta estar presente o participar en esta junta de la Comisión Regional de Transporte del Condado de Santa Cruz y necesita información o servicios de traducción al español por favor llame por lo menos con tres días laborables de anticipo al (831) 460-3200 para hacer los arreglos necesarios. (Spanish language translation is available on an as needed basis.) Please make advance arrangements (at least three days in advance) by calling (831) 460-3200.

**TITLE VI NOTICE TO BENEFICIARIES**

The RTC operates its programs and services without regard to race, color and national origin in accordance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act. Any person believing to have been aggrieved by the RTC under Title VI may file a complaint with RTC by contacting the RTC at (831) 460-3212 or 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA 95060 or online at www.sccrtc.org. A complaint may also be filed directly with the Federal Transit Administration to the Office of Civil Rights, Attention: Title VI Program Coordinator, East Building, 5th Floor-TCR, 1200 New Jersey Ave., SE, Washington, DC 20590.

**AVISO SOBRE EL TITULO VI A BENEFICIARIOS**

La RTC conduce sus programas y otorga sus servicios sin considerar raza, color u origen nacional de acuerdo al Titulo VI del Acta Sobre los Derechos Civiles. Cualquier persona que cree haber sido ofendida por la RTC bajo el Titulo VI puede entregar queja con la RTC comunicándose al (831) 460-3212 o 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA 95060 o en línea al www.sccrtc.org. También se puede quejar directamente con la Administración Federal de Transporte en la Oficina de Derechos Civiles, Atención: Coordinador del Programa Titulo VI, East Building, 5th Floor-TCR, 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE, Washington, DC 20590.
1. Roll call

The meeting was called to order at: 9:02 a.m.

Members present:
John Leopold  Don Lane
Zach Friend  Ryan Coonerty
Greg Caput  Bruce McPherson
Jimmy Dutra  Randy Johnson
Dennis Norton  Cynthia Chase
Ed Bottorff  Karina Cervantez
Brandy Rider  Virginia Johnson (alt.)
Tony Gregorio (alt.)

Staff present:
George Dondero  Luis Mendez
Yesenia Parra  Jennifer Rodriguez
Rachel Moriconi  Karena Pushnik
Cory Caletti  Kim Shultz

2. Oral communications

Jack Nelson, Campaign for Sensible Transportation, quoted President Obama’s speech about embracing responsibility for global warming. Mr. Nelson said that our atmosphere has a record level of CO₂, surpassing 400 parts per million, and the heat is not vanishing. He stated that if we destroy creation, creation will destroy us, and urged the Commission to consider a balance in all transportation projects.

Nancy Faulstich, Watsonville Climate Action Network, said that world leaders are currently meeting and discussing climate change issues. Ms. Faulstich stated that over 50% of carbon emissions are from transportation and pollution is the cause of rising rates of asthma. She noted that policies need to be made for preservations and to help people make good decisions.
Pam Stearns, Santa Cruz Climate Action Network, stated that she is opposed to highway widening because continuous highway widening will still lead to congestion. She said the use of fossil fuels in transportation needs to be limited.

Carey Pico, said he’s had many jobs, in which he specialized in troubleshooting issues, and suggested that a Citizens Advisory Board be formed so members of the public can contribute to solving transportation issues and so that the community could be assured of the RTC’s transparency.

Kirk Ance, Lift Line, stated that the Community Bridges board had voted to support the expenditure plan and sales tax measure and distributed a letter to Commissioners.

Amelia Conlen, Bike Santa Cruz County, said she appreciates the recognition of the Bicycle Advisory Committee’s 40th anniversary and thanked Caltrans for their work to improve the rumble strips project.

3. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agendas

A handout for Item 15, a replacement page for Items 18 and 19, and additional pages for Items 12, 17, 18, and 19 were distributed.

CONSENT AGENDA

Commissioner Norton moved and Commissioner McPherson seconded the consent agenda. The motion passed unanimously with Commissioners Leopold, Lane, Friend, Coonerty, Caput, McPherson, Dutra, Johnson, Norton, Chase, Bottorff, and Cervantez voting “aye”.

MINUTES

4. Approved draft minutes of the November 5, 2015 Regional Transportation Commission meeting

5. Approved draft minutes of the November 19, 2015 Transportation Policy Workshop meeting

POLICY ITEMS

No consent items

PROJECTS and PLANNING ITEMS

No consent items

BUDGET AND EXPENDITURES ITEMS

6. Accepted status report on Transportation Development Act (TDA) revenues

7. Approved out-of-state travel for one Transportation Planning Technician
ADMINISTRATION ITEMS

No consent items

INFORMATION/OTHER ITEMS

8. Accepted monthly meeting schedule
9. Accepted correspondence log
10. Accepted letters from RTC committees and staff to other agencies - None
11. Accepted miscellaneous written comments from the public on RTC projects and transportation issues
12. Accepted information items - None

REGULAR AGENDA

13. Commissioner reports – oral reports

Chair Leopold reported on his attendance at a Caltrans Highway 17 Access Management Plan (AMP) public meeting and the Summit community’s appreciation for being included.

Commissioner McPherson stated that he also attended an AMP meeting and noted that although the federal committee recently approved a transportation bill, the state funding is not looking very promising for 2016.

14. Election of 2016 RTC chair and vice-chair

Commissioner Leopold said that the appointing committee nominated Commissioner Don Lane as Chair and Commissioner Zach Friend as Vice Chair.

Commissioner Bottorff moved and Commissioner McPherson seconded a motion to approve the nominations of Commissioner Lane as Chair and Commissioner Friend as Vice Chair. The motion passed unanimously with Commissioners Leopold, Lane, Friend, Coonerty, Caput, McPherson, Dutra, Johnson, Norton, Chase, Bottorff, and Cervantez voting “aye”.

15. Director’s report – oral report

George Dondero, Executive Director, reported on several items, including: the federal bill, Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST) Act; he reminded everyone that the Highway 1 Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Assessment (EIR/EA) is available for public review, with a comment period through January 18, 2016: he invited all to attend the DEIR/EA open house this evening from 6:00 p.m. – 8:30 p.m. at Live Oak Elementary School and to the Land Trust of Santa Cruz County presentation, “All About Your Local Rail Trail”, next Tuesday, December 8th, 2016 from 7:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m. at Hotel Paradox.
He noted that the Bicycle Advisory Committee was recognized for their 40th anniversary, as well as being a nominee for a 2015 Wheelie Award. The award winners will be announced at Bike Santa Cruz County’s Annual Dinner on December 6th, 2016 at 5:00 p.m. – 7:00 p.m. at the Food Lounge in Santa Cruz.

Mr. Dondero welcomed Nestor Guevara, who recently joined the RTC as the new Temporary Transportation Planning Technician. Nestor is from Puerto Rico and has his Masters in Community and Regional Planning from the University of Oregon.

16. Caltrans report and consider action items

Brandy Rider said that Caltrans is seeking input for the 2016 State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP). The draft is available online and the comment period is open until December 15th. Ms. Rider noted that Caltrans is currently winterizing the transportation infrastructure to accommodate the rainy season.

18. November 2016 Transportation Ballot Measure – Expenditure Plan – Taken out of order before Item 17

George Dondero, Executive Director, presented his staff report and handed out an additional page showing the current Transportation Development Act (TDA) and tax measure allocations for Santa Cruz Metro and Community Bridges.

Commissioners discussed: rail corridor maintenance and repair; operating expenses and funding; Monterey County considering a tax measure; responsibilities in providing the best representative investments; overall balance versus victory for specific groups; simplifying allocation priorities; choke points on Highway 1 after the auxiliary lanes end; the Highway 1 EIR; the importance of becoming a self help county for increased state and federal participation; sustainable transportation; a possible friendly amendment to the staff recommendation to increase funding for Santa Cruz Metro; support of the measure to ensure future transportation issues are addressed; the need for congestion relief specifically for South County commuters; working with the needs of every jurisdiction; the rail not deterring from the progress of the trail; the Climate Action Plan; corridor efficiency for reduced emissions; alternatives to lower carbon footprints; how fighting a specific cause hurts the most vulnerable; disproportionate number of votes, impacts, and needs; maintaining quality of life; adapting to climate changes; support being critical to help the most vulnerable that need transit services; examining future possibilities of the rail; fracking banned in Santa Cruz County to reduce global warming; and Santa Cruz Metro zero emission fleets.

Jack Nelson, read a letter of comments on the Highway 1 Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and distributed a copy to Commissioners. Mr. Nelson noted that he supports most of the proposed allocation of funds, with the exception of Highway 1 auxiliary lanes. He asked the Commission to consider postponing allocating funds to highway projects to allow for more time for alternatives to be evaluated.
Carey Pico, said rail option needs to be studied rather than advocated for because the trail can be made without a rail. He stated that there are unjustified projects included in the expenditure plan. He also noted that the State of California gave a lower estimate on the cost to build Pajaro Station.

Nancy Faulstich, said the cost of cleaning up climate changes is higher than preventing them and policies need to be made to lower carbon emissions. Ms. Faulstich suggested incentivizing pools for transportation and stated that promoting single occupancy vehicles is selfish. She said that we have a responsibility to use alternative transportation to build communities and the convenience in using cars is endangering the planet.

Joe Martinez, Trail NOW, stated that the RTC should not approve the ballot measure with the proposed expenditure plan, and does not agree with the allocations for the rail. He said he believes the tax measure will fail and eliminate the funding needed for other projects needing attention. Mr. Martinez included a written statement of his comment to be added to the handouts.

Mark Mesiti-Miller, said this county that has become congested and the relatively balanced expenditure plan is needed to get everyone moving. He stated that he supports the opportunity to become a self-help county and that the rail is valuable to the community.

Roland Saher, said we have to think about the future that is beginning right now with climate change happening. Mr. Saher stated that the Highway 1 EIR is a direct contradiction to the Climate Action Plan and encouraged the Commission to stick with the plan’s goals of reducing green house gas emissions and not invite more single occupancy vehicles to drive on the highway.

Rick Longinotti, stated that it will take skill and creativity to come up with a measure that everyone could support. He said we need to wait before investing money in Highway 1 because it can no longer be argued that auxiliary lanes will relieve congestion, and alternatives will continue to be advocated for.

Terry Corwin, Land Trust of Santa Cruz County, said she supports the allocation plan as is, even if it means not everyone will be supporting it, because the plan will provide an overall benefit of community.

Paul Elerick, Campaign for Sensible Transportation, noted that the business community funded the voter survey. Mr. Elerick said the sales tax measure is needed to fix local roads, but believes the lack of merit in the Highway 1 EIR will cause the sales tax measure to fail and we should think twice before casting percentages in stone.

Robert Singleton, Santa Cruz County Business Council, said he supports the expenditure plan because doing something is better than doing nothing. Mr. Singleton stated that there is a dire need for transportation improvements and we should use the plan that is most likely to pass to become a self help county, because specialized groups can easily defeat the measure.
Piet Canin, Ecology Action, said the expenditure plan is a balanced compromise and provides significant funding for active transportation, transit, and rail.

Dana Bagshaw, said she finds public transportation very useful and is in favor of transportation improvements that will reduce carbon emissions.

Bruce Van Allen, noted that a recent report from Caltrans said widening the highway will not reduce congestion and he supports the other expenditure plan projects. He said to consider the 2/3 votes needed for the sales tax measure to pass because the rail needs to be made available so we aren’t dependent on driving on the freeway.

Eduardo Montecino, said that we need to work together in moving the community in the right direction to become a self help county. He stated that with the economy getting better and more jobs available, working families having a little bit of extra time to be with their families makes a difference.

Bill Tysseling, Santa Cruz Area Chamber of Commerce, told of Santa Barbara’s experience of polling and the outcome of votes, and said the polling results should be considered to have the sales tax measure pass. Mr. Tysseling stated that the time constrained retail workforce has impacted the economy and transportation needs to be improved.

Commissioner Friend moved and Commissioner McPherson seconded the staff recommendation to adopt the expenditure plan for a local ½ cent sales tax ballot measure for the presidential election of November 8, 2016 as shown on Attachment 1 to the written staff report for this item.

Commissioner Lane moved a friendly amendment to increase the mobility access allocation to 16% and reduce the rail corridor allocation to 14% with a distribution of the mobility access allocation as 15% to Santa Cruz Metro and 1% to Community Bridges. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Chase. The friendly amendment was accepted by the maker and the second of the main motion. The motion passed with Commissioners Leopold, Lane, Friend, Coonerty, Dutra, Norton, Chase, McPherson, Bottorff, and Cervantez, voting “aye” and Commissioners Caput and Johnson voting “nay”.

Chair Leopold called for a 5 minute break at 11:18 a.m.

Commissioner Caput left the meeting during the break and was replaced by Commissioner Alternate Gregorio.

Commissioner McPherson left the meeting during the break and was replaced by Commissioner Alternate Johnson.

Chair Leopold resumed the meeting at 11:29 a.m.
17. Rail Transit Study – final report – Taken out of order after Item 18

Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner, presented her staff report. Ms. Moriconi introduced the consultants Lindsey Hilde and Bob Grandy, from Fehr and Peers, who provided updated information and clarification on the final report of the Rail Transit Feasibility Study on the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line. A summary of addressed public comments received from the draft study was provided, as well as suggested parameters for phased implementation steps.

Commissioners discussed: the evaluation of service scenarios and composite scores; service to Watsonville during peak hours; parking constraints; community input for long term plans to have park and ride facilities; political and job access components; developing ridership forecasts for local colleges transit ridership; increase in housing density and investing in infrastructure; narrowing options with public input; compatibilities with noise and train technology; current allocations of funding to rail projects; and train technology advancing faster than projects are being implemented.

**Rick Longinotti**, Campaign for Sensible Transportation, said electric cars are becoming more popular and redesigning the Santa Cruz Metro system, to have a unified plan, needs to be considered.

Commissioner Lane moved and Commissioner Coonerty seconded to accept staff recommendation to accept the Rail Transit Feasibility Study for the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line and to direct staff to seek funding to conduct environmental review, preliminary engineering, and other analysis needed to answer questions regarding potential rail transit options. The motion passed with Commissioners Leopold, Lane, Friend, Coonerty, Dutra, Norton, Chase, Bottorff, Cervantez and Commissioner Alternates V. Johnson and Gregorio voting “aye” and Commissioner R. Johnson voting “nay”.

19. Adoption of the 2016 Regional Transportation Improvement Program

Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner, presented her staff report. With the reduction in gas prices, there will be no new funding and projects programmed in Santa Cruz County will be unable to move forward this year.

Commissioners discussed the ITAC conversations, the importance of credibility, commitment to priorities, maintaining timelines, and funding availability; and having the bridge component separate from the highway corridor projects.

**Amelia Conlen**, said the Mar Vista bridge is a very popular project in the community and urged the Commission to continue moving the project forward.

Commissioner Norton moved and Commissioner Lane seconded to adopt **(Resolution 08-16)** approving the 2016 Regional Transportation Improvement Program and amending project listings for previously programmed projects. The motion passed unanimously with Commissioners Leopold, Lane, Friend, Coonerty, Dutra, Johnson, Norton, Chase, Bottorff, Cervantez, and Commissioner Alternates Johnson and Gregorio voting “aye”.

20. Review of items to be discussed in closed session

Commissioners adjourned to closed session at: 12:09 p.m.

CLOSED SESSION

21. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL-EXISTING LITIGATION. (Paragraph (1) of subdivision (d) of Section 54956.9 of the Government Code) Santa Cruz Superior Court Case No. CV182123

22. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL-ANTICIPATED LITIGATION. Significant exposure to litigation pursuant to paragraph (2) of subdivision (d) of Section 54956.9 of the Government code: one case

23. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL-ANTICIPATED LITIGATION. Initiation of litigation pursuant to paragraph (4) of subdivision (d) of Section 54956.9 of the Government code: one case

OPEN SESSION

24. Report on closed session - no report

25. Next meetings

The next RTC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, January 21, 2016 at 9:00 a.m. at the City of Santa Cruz Council Chambers, 809 Center St., Santa Cruz, CA.

The next Transportation Policy Workshop meeting is scheduled for Thursday, February 18, 2016 at 9:00 a.m. at the RTC Offices, 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA.

The meeting adjourned at: 12:41 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Rodriguez, Staff

Attendees:

Alex Clifford  Santa Cruz Metro
Amelia Conlen  Bike Santa Cruz County
Bill Tysseling  Santa Cruz Area Chamber of Commerce
Bob Grandy  Fehr and Peers Consulting
Bruce Van Allen
Carey Pico
Claire Fliesler  City of Santa Cruz
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dana Bagshaw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eduardo Montecino</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erick Friedrich</td>
<td>Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Merrill</td>
<td>Santa Cruz County Business Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Voss</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Nelson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Swofford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Williamson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Martinez</td>
<td>Trail Now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly McClendon</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk Ance</td>
<td>Community Bridges/Lift Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Diaz</td>
<td>Community Bridges/ Lift Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindsey Hilde</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Mesiti-Miller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles Reiter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Faulstich</td>
<td>Watsonville Climate Action Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pam Stearns</td>
<td>Santa Cruz Climate Action Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Stoll</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Elerick</td>
<td>Campaign for Sensible Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piet Canin</td>
<td>Ecology Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Longinotti</td>
<td>Campaign for Sensible Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Singleton</td>
<td>Santa Cruz County Business Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roland Saher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell Chen</td>
<td>County of Santa Cruz Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Corwin</td>
<td>Land Trust of Santa Cruz County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Padula</td>
<td>Solar Rail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Call to Order: 1:32 pm

2. Introductions

   **Members Present:**
   - Pam Arnsberger, 2nd District
   - Lisa Berkowitz, CTSA
   - John Daugherty, Metro Transit
   - Veronica Elsea, 3rd District
   - Sally French, Social Services Provider - Disabled
   - Cara Lamb, Potential Transit User

   **Excused Absences:**
   - Debbi Brooks, Social Service Provider - Persons of Limited Means

   **Unexcused Absences:**
   - Michael Molesky, Social Service Provider - Disabled
   - Greta Kleiner, Potential Transit User - Disabled

   **Alternates Present:**
   - Brent Gifford, 1st District
   - Laura Diaz, Community Bridges, Lift Line
   - Patty Talbott, Senior Services Provider

   **RTC Staff Present:**
   - Grace Blakeslee
   - George Dondero
   - Ginger Dykaar
   - Cathy Judd
   - Rachel Moriconi

   **Others Present:**
   - Raymon Cancino, Community Bridges
   - Daniel L Zaragoza, SCMTD

3. Oral Communications
   - Metro Headways available in large print
   - Metro offers free stoke securement straps upon request
   - Metro is revising its bylaws and will change the frequency of its meetings which will affect how items are added to Metro Board and committee agendas

4. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agenda
   - Move Item 10, 2016 Transportation Ballot Measure-Expenditure Plan Update from the Consent Agenda to Item 14a on the Regular Agenda
   - Add on pages provided for Item 8, E&D TAC Member Reappointments, and Item 14a, 2016 Transportation Ballot Measure-Expenditure Plan Update
CONSENT AGENDA

Action: The motion (Arnsberger/Daugherty) - - to approve the minutes from the October 13, 2015, E&D TAC meeting - - carries.

Ayes: Pam Arnsberger, Lisa Berkowitz, John Daugherty, Veronica Elsea, Sally French, Cara Lamb, Brent Gifford, Laura Diaz, Patty Talbott
Nays: None
Abstain: None

Action: The motion (Daugherty/Lamb) - - to approve the consent agenda Items 6 through 13, moving Item 10 from the Consent Agenda to Item 14a on the Regular Agenda - - carries.

Ayes: Pam Arnsberger, Lisa Berkowitz, John Daugherty, Veronica Elsea, Sally French, Cara Lamb, Brent Gifford, Laura Diaz, Patty Talbott
Nays: None
Abstain: None

5. Approved minutes from October 13, 2015 meeting
6. Received Transportation Development Act Revenues Report
7. Received RTC Meeting Highlights
8. Recommend RTC Approve E&D TAC Member Reappointments
9. Received Information Regarding the Highway 1 Project – Tier I and Tier II Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Assessment
11. Received Information Items
   a. Letter on October 23, 2015 from E&D TAC to City of Watsonville Regarding Support for Funding City of Watsonville Complete Streets Plan
12. Received Agency TDA Reports
   a. CTSA FY14-15 Final Report
   b. Volunteer Center FY14/15 Final Report
   c. Volunteer Center FY 15/16 1st Quarter Report
13. Received Agency Updates
   a. Santa Cruz Metro
      i. ParaCruz Report for August & September 2015
      ii. Accessible Service Report for July, August & September 2015

REGULAR AGENDA

14a. Received November 2016 Transportation Ballot Measure-Expenditure Plan Update (moved from the Consent Agenda)

George Dondero, RTC Executive Director discussed the November 2016 Transportation Ballot Measure-Expenditure Plan Development. At the December 3, 2015 meeting, the Regional Transportation Commission approved a Transportation Expenditure Plan for a ½ cent sales tax measure for the November 2016 ballot, including percentages of revenues for five transportation
investment categories: Neighborhood Projects, Highway Corridors, Mobility Access, Active Transportation, and Rail Corridor.

Members discussed:
- How funds are apportioned to Metro
- How Metro will decide how funds are used
- If TDA funds would be freed up to apply to paratransit
- How and when the E&D TAC could express input/provide comment
- Invite Metro to the February E&D TAC meeting to discuss the Expenditure Plan

14b. Provided Input on Draft 2016 State and Federal Legislative Programs

Rachel Moriconi, Senior RTC Transportation Planner discussed the Draft 2016 State and Federal Legislative Programs and reported on Fixing Americas Surface Transportation, FAST Act. E&D TAC members were asked to provide input on Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) Draft 2016 State and Federal Legislative Programs and identify any legislative issues or shortfalls in funding that the RTC should pursue or monitor in 2016. The Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) is schedule to approve the Legislative Programs in early 2016.

15. Received Rail Transit Feasibility Study – Final Report

Rachel Moriconi, Senior RTC Transportation Planner discussed the Rail Transit Feasibility Study – Final Report. The Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) was awarded a transit planning grant to analyze rail transit service along the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line. The study included cost, ridership, and funding information for a range of public transit service scenarios within the most populated sections of the rail corridor. Based on comments received on the draft study, the study was updated to provide clarification and additional information on several topics.

16. Provided Input on 2040 Regional Transportation Plan Update

Ginger Dykaar, RTC Transportation Planner discussed the 2040 Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Plan. The Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) is responsible for developing the Regional Transportation Plan for Santa Cruz County. The next RTP will be a minor update to the 2014 RTP and is planned for adoption in June 2018 in coordination with AMBAG and the 2040 MTP/SCS. RTC staff requests input from Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC) on the draft goals, policies and targets for the 2040 RTP. RTC staff request that the E&D TAC review the 2014 RTP project list for which at least 10% of the estimated project cost related to pedestrian, transit, or paratransit and provide new project ideas for the 2040 Regional Transportation Plan. Comments are due to Ms. Dykaar by December 22 and she will come back to the Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC) in February.

Members offered:
- That they would like to see an option included in public transportation of the need for riders to carry groceries or packages on the bus
- If there would be an upgrade or change to parking facilities due to changes in how people drive
- To include a county-wide policy to increase awareness of accessible components (pedestrian beacons, etc.) considered during construction

17. Pedestrian Safety Workgroup Update

Veronica Elsea, Chair for the Pedestrian Safety Workgroup mentioned that the committee continues its work on What Bicyclists and Pedestrians Want Each Other to Know brochure. The Committee will be working with the Bicycle Advisory Committee on input for this brochure. The Workgroup also continues plans for distribution options for What Pedestrian and Motorists Want Each Other to Know brochure. The next meeting of the Pedestrian Safety Workgroup is Tuesday, December 15th from 9:30 am to 11:30 am in the RTC conference room. Ms. Elsea continues her representation of the Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC) for the Active
Transportation Plan Committee for the City of Santa Cruz, and the State Caltrans Accessibility Committee and the Class IV Bikeways Design Committee. Ms. Elsea mentioned that this Committee has a vacancy and encourages members to consider attending the next meeting.

18. Adjourn 3:20 pm

Respectfully submitted, Cathy Judd, RTC Staff
Minutes - Draft

Monday, December 14, 2015
6:00 p.m. to 8:30 pm

RTC Office
1523 Pacific Ave
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

1. Call to Order: 6:05 pm

2. Introductions

Members Present:
Kem Akol, District 1
David Casterson, District 2, Chair
Jim Cook, District 2 (Alt.)
Peter Scott, District 3
Will M enchine, District 3 (Alt.)
Amelia Conlen, District 4
Rick Hyman, District 5
Melissa Ott, City of Santa Cruz
Gary Milburn, City of Scotts Valley (Alt.)
Andy Ward, City of Capitola
Daniel Koste lec, City of Capitola (Alt.)
Leo Jed, CTSC, Vice-Chair
Emily Gomez, Ecology Action/Bike to Work

3. Announcements – None

4. Oral communications – Andy Ward indicated that he had submitted hazard reports that were not identified in the usual summary. Cory Caletti indicated that she’d investigate.

5. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agendas – None

Unexcused Absences:

Excused Absences:
Holly Tyler, District 1 (Alt.)
Bill Fieberling, City of Santa Cruz (Alt.)
Myrna Sherman, City of Watsonville
Lex Rau, City of Scotts Valley
Piet Canin, Ecology Action/Bike-to-Work (Alt.)
Jim Langley, CTSC (Alt.)

Guests:
Robin Kraut, Member of the Public
Barry Scott, Member of the Public

Vacancies:
District 4 and 5 – Alternates
City of Watsonville – Alternate
CONSENT AGENDA

A motion (Ward/Jed) to approve the consent agenda passed unanimously with members Akol, Casterson, Scott, Conlen, Hyman, Ott, Ward, Jed and Gomez voting in favor. No votes were cast in opposition.

6. Accepted draft minutes of the October 19, 2015 Bicycle Advisory Committee meeting
7. Accepted summary of Bicycle Hazard reports
8. Accepted support letter from the Bicycle Advisory Committee for a Caltrans planning grant for a Highway Complete Streets comprehensive plan
9. Accepted support letter from the Bicycle Advisory Committee for a Caltrans planning grant submitted by the Health Services Agency for a Santa Cruz County safe Routes to School project
10. Accepted report submitted by Bicycle Advisory Committee member Rick Hyman on “A Brief History of Santa Cruz County Bicycle Advisory Committee.”

REGULAR AGENDA

11. 2016 Sales Tax Measure Consideration – George Dondero, RTC Executive Director, summarized the process to bring a sales tax measure to the 2016 ballot, the package of projects that would receive funding, how this package was arrived at, and what recent polling indicated in terms of anticipated public support. Mr. Dondero reported that another poll would be conducted in the February/March time frame and that many public agencies and private entities are considering, and providing, endorsements.

12. Final Rail Feasibility Summary and Next Steps – Rachel Moriconi, RTC Senior Transportation Planner, summarized the recently completed Rail Feasibility Study and outlined that the next steps to analyzing the possibility of future passenger rail service would be through an Environmental Impact Report that is expected to take 3 years once funding is identified.

13. 2016 State and Federal Legislative Programs – Rachel Moriconi, RTC Senior Transportation Planner, provided the staff report. Members recommended that legislative priorities include the following: support increased funding for the Active Transportation Program and Complete Streets programs; repeal the requirement for cyclists to ride as far to the right as practicable; repeal the requirement for cyclists to ride in the Bike Lane where one is available; and permit motorists to ride across a double yellow line in order to pass.

14. Chanticleer Bicycle and Pedestrian Overcrossing and Highway 1 Draft Environmental Impact Report – Kim Shultz, RTC Senior Transportation Planner, provided an overview of the project and reminded members of previous improvement suggestions that were incorporated in the project, the most important of which being ensuring that the Chanticleer overcrossing accommodate both bicycle riding and pedestrian access. Ad-Hoc Committee members Rick Hyman, Amelia Conlen and Will Menchine, provided an overview of the memo they submitted which outlined recommended comments. A motion was made (Hyman/Scott) to submit the memo with minor changes as official comment on behalf of the Bicycle Advisory Committee to Caltrans and the RTC, with copy to be sent to the Santa Cruz County Public Works Department. The motion passed unanimously with members Akol, Casterson, Scott, Conlen, Hyman, Ott, Ward, Jed and Gomez voting in favor.
15. Development of 2040 Regional Transportation Plan – Ginger Dykaar, RTC Transportation Planner provided an update on the 2040 Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Plan and sought input on the Goals, Policies and Targets and New Project Ideas. Rick Hyman suggested that, at a minimum, the representative from each jurisdiction review the list and provide input on projects in their jurisdiction. Rick Hyman also suggested including a project to monitor performance over time. Amelia Conlen suggested to separate the bike and walk targets and to have a vision zero target for bike/pedestrian fatalities.

16. Highway 1 Rumble Strips – Leo Jed, Bicycle Advisory Committee. A motion was made (Jed/Akol) to send the letter drafted by the Ad-Hoc Committee and submitted as an ad-on item. The motion passed unanimously with members Akol, Casterson, Scott, Conlen, Hyman, Ott, Ward, Jed and Gomez voting in favor.

17. Member updates related to Committee functions – Will Menchine indicated that he was still pursuing improvements to Graham Hill Road and is in communication with County Public Works. He will follow-up with the Committee at a future date when more information is available.

18. Adjourned – 8:32 p.m.

**NEXT MEETING:** The next Bicycle Committee meeting is scheduled for **Monday, February 8, 2016**, from 6:00 pm to 8:30 pm at the RTC office, 1523 Pacific Ave, Santa Cruz, CA.

Minutes respectfully prepared and submitted by:

Cory Caletti, Senior Transportation Planner
Santa Cruz County
Regional Transportation Commission
Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC)

DRAFT MINUTES

Thursday, January 14, 1:30 p.m.
SCCRTC Conference Room
1523 Pacific Ave, Santa Cruz, CA

ITAC MEMBERS PRESENT
Teresa Buika, UCSC
Piet Canin, Ecology Action
Russell Chen, County Planning Proxy
Barrow Emerson, Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (METRO)
Claire Fliesler, Santa Cruz Planning
Murray Fontes, Watsonville Public Works and Planning Proxy
Erich Friedrich, AMBAG
Scott Hamby, Scotts Valley Public Works and Planning Proxy
Josh Spangrud, Santa Cruz Public Works
Steve Wiesner, County Public Works

STAFF PRESENT
Grace Blakeslee
Rachel Moriconi

OTHERS PRESENT
Eric Child, Public
Mark Dettle, Santa Cruz Public Works
Kelly McClendon, Caltrans (by phone)

1. **Call to Order:** Chair Wiesner called the meeting to order at 1:35pm.

2. **Introductions:** Self introductions were made.

3. **Oral Communications:** None.

4. **Additions/Changes to consent and regular agenda:** None.

CONSENT AGENDA

5. Approved minutes of the November 19, 2015 ITAC meeting. Fliesler moved and Fontes seconded approval of the minutes. The motion passed unanimously by members present.

6. Received 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy: Notice of Preparation for an Environmental Impact Report

REGULAR AGENDA

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

    METRO: Barrow Emerson reported that the METRO board would receive reports on possible service reductions starting next month. METRO is interested in meeting with everyone
involved in the project development process regarding implementation of the METRO Bus Stop Guide.

Watsonville: Murray Fontes reported Watsonville’s citywide Safe Routes to Schools pedestrian project is nearly finished; that the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) signal upgrade and pedestrian facilities project will go to bid in the spring; a signal synchronization project is scheduled for Summer 2016; STIP allocation request for design of the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network (MBSST) Lee Road section has been submitted; and design options continue to be evaluated for the Freedom Blvd. (Broadis to Alta Vista) project.

Scotts Valley: Scott Hamby reported that proposals for design of the Scotts Valley Drive/Mt. Hermon Rd/Whispering Pines intersection project are due January 15; Granite Creek bridge design is under review by Caltrans; storm drain projects are also underway.

County: Russell Chen reported the Old County Road bridge replacement, Redwood Lodge storm damage repairs, and El Rancho Road storm damage repairs projects will be completed in February and March. The contractor is onboard, awaiting arrival of materials, for the Felton Covered Bridge project. Steve Wiesner reported that the County awarded a contract in December for its Safe Routes to School Active Transportation Program (ATP) countywide flashing beacon/speed feedback sign project. The County is seeking a STIP allocation for the Freedom Blvd rehabilitation project from the CTC in March.

RTC: Grace Blakeslee reporting that work is beginning on the grant-funded User Oriented Transit Marketing and Bike Route Signage projects. The Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC) is interested in providing input on intersection/signal projects. Rachel Moriconi reminded attendees that comments on the Highway 1 Environmental Impact Report are due January 18. She noted that the RTC also approved the transportation investment plan for a November sales tax ballot measure at its December meeting and is considering formulas for distribution of funds. She requested updates from public works departments regarding local street and road statistics. Local agencies will be considering the investment plan at their board meetings.

AMBAG: Erich Friedrich reported that comments are due January 29 on the 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) EIR Notice of Preparation, with a public meeting being held on January 27 in Aptos. AMBAG will also be working on Overall Work Plan updates and is working on the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) implementation plan for rural transit.

Santa Cruz: Josh Spangrud reported there will be an open house on the City’s Rail Trail project on January 28. Pavement Management projects go to bid at the end of the rainy season. Improvements for bicyclists are planned on King Street from Bay St to Mission Street. The grand opening of the River Levy lighting project is January 22. Claire Fliesler reported that circulation and parking background information for the Corridor Planning project is coming soon, with recommendations regarding circulation, parking, and zoning anticipated to be considered by City Council this fall. Mark Dettle reported that work is underway on the citywide adaptive signalhead and safety project.

UCSC: Teresa Buika reported that construction of the ATP-funded Bike Path safety project is scheduled for this summer.

Ecology Action: Piet Canin reported that Safe Routes to Schools education programs continue, with worked focused in the Watsonville area. Ecology Action is working on an Alternative Fuel
Planning Grant and is fiscal sponsor for Friends of the Rail & Trail (FORT), doing work in support of the transportation ballot measure, and raising funds for the Seabright to Live Oak section of the Rail Trail.

Caltrans: Kelly McClendon reported there is a workshop on the Sustainable Freight Action Plan on January 28 in Marina. The plan is a joint effort of the Energy Commission, ARB, and Caltrans to make freight transportation more efficient.

8. Complete Streets Checklist Updates

Grace Blakeslee provided an overview of the Monterey Bay Area Complete Streets Guidebook developed in 2014, which provides resources for road design in the Monterey Bay Area that consider the needs of all users, including non-drivers of all ages and abilities. ITAC members were asked to provide input on the Complete Streets Project Review Checklist and use of the Guidebook, which were developed to assist local agencies in ensuring complete streets components are incorporated into the design and implementation of projects. Barrow Emerson reported that METRO will suggest checklist updates that incorporate the METRO Bus Stop Guide for local agencies to use during development of projects. Claire Fliesler reported that the City of Santa Cruz has used the Guidebook to identify appropriate design features for different types of roadways. Josh Spangrud noted there has not been much new development. Steve Wiesner stated it is a good reminder, especially for new staff, of items to consider during project design.

9. Legislative Update

Rachel Moriconi presented and requested input on draft RTC legislative priorities for 2016, which focus on preserving funds designated for transportation and generating new, more stable revenue sources. She also provided a summary of the Governor’s January State Budget proposal, AB1591 (Frazier), and the federal Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act (FAST). Members expressed interest in learning more about how much funding from the Governor’s proposal might be available to local jurisdictions, including the proposed new “Low Carbon Road Program”.

10. 2016 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Update

Rachel Moriconi provided an update on State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funding shortfalls and the 2016 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP). She reported that on the day before the ITAC meeting, regions were informed that the California Transportation Commission (CTC) would be considering a revised Fund Estimate due to falling gasoline prices and associated gas tax revenues. Up to 40% of programmed projects may need to be deleted statewide to match updated revenue projections. Staff will meet with project sponsors once additional information is provided by the CTC and Caltrans. Revised proposals from regions will be due to the CTC by February 26. Staff will present staff and project sponsor recommendations to the RTC at its February Policy Workshop. Staff and the committee discussed options to minimize impacts to previously programmed projects. Mark Dettle suggested the RTC consider the number of people impacted by projects. The committee also discussed seeking alternative funding, considering project readiness, reducing funds across all projects, backfilling projects that are deleted by the CTC with Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds. Eric Child and Teresa Buika noted that the unreliable nature of STIP funds emphasizes the need for a local sales tax measure.
3:00pm - Hamby left the meeting.

11. **Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) Draft Application**

Rachel Moriconi requested input from the ITAC regarding criteria for evaluating projects, the draft application, and the proposed schedule for the next Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) call for projects.

Wiesner, Fontes, Spangrud, Fliesler, and Emerson suggested that system preservation, number of people served, and safety are the most important criteria. Buika and Canin suggested that reducing greenhouse gas emissions and vehicle miles traveled should be priorities. Friedrich suggested that safety and reducing greenhouse gas emissions be priorities. Blakeslee suggested that deliverability should also be considered. Moriconi noted that given extreme funding shortfalls it will be important to focus on providing funds to the most vital projects. Some committee members expressed support for the application, while others requested a shorter application or simple project selection process. Staff reminded members that by law funds cannot be distributed on a formula basis and the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) must be considered when evaluating projects.

3:25pm - Buika left the meeting.

In light of STIP revenue shortfalls, the committee approved a motion (Fontes/Spangrud) recommending that the RTC postpone the call for projects until more is known about how previously approved STIP projects will be affected (Voting yes – Chen, Emerson, Fliesler, Fontes, Friedrich, Spangrud, and Wiesner; Abstention – Canin).

12. **Funding Program Updates**

The Committee received updates on several state and local funding programs:
- Active Transportation Program (ATP) –California Transportation Commission (CTC) Cycle 3 Call for Projects may be released as soon as March 2016, with applications due in June. CTC staff is seeking input on the draft guidelines and application.
- Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities Program (AHSC) – Call for projects was released earlier in the month.
- FY15/16 Low Carbon Transit Operations Program applications due February 1, 2016

13. **Adjournment:** The meeting adjourned at 3:40 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for February 18, 2016 at 1:30pm in the SCCRTC Conference Room.

Minutes prepared by: Rachel Moriconi
TO: Regional Transportation Commission (RTC)

FROM: Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner

RE: FY15/16 Cap and Trade-Low Carbon Transit Operations Program (LCTOP)

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) designate the RTC’s share of Low Carbon Transit Operations Program (LCTOP) funds ($263,123) to the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (Santa Cruz METRO) to purchase an electric bus and infrastructure to serve the Watsonville area; and authorize staff to sign and execute any agreements necessary to pass LCTOP funds through to Santa Cruz METRO.

BACKGROUND

Assembly Bill 32 (2006) established goals to significantly reduce Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions in California and authorized the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to develop Cap and Trade programs to reduce greenhouse gases. The Low Carbon Transit Operations Program (LCTOP) is one of several Cap and Trade funding programs, established in 2014 as part of the Transit, Affordable Housing, and Sustainable Communities Program (SB 862).

The LCTOP provides operating and capital assistance to transit agencies to reduce greenhouse gas emission and improve mobility. Eligible projects include those that support new or expanded bus or rail transit services, expand intermodal transit facilities, and may include equipment acquisition, fueling, maintenance and other costs to operate those services or facilities. For agencies whose service area includes disadvantaged communities, at least 50 percent of the total moneys received must be expended on projects that will benefit disadvantaged communities. The program is administered by Caltrans in coordination with Air Resources Board and the State Controller’s Office (SCO). SB 862 continuously appropriates five percent (5%) of the annual Cap and Trade auction proceeds to the LCTOP, though there are several legislative proposals which could increase the level of Cap and Trade revenues designated for this program.

DISCUSSION

Revenue appropriated to the LCTOP is distributed to transit operators and regional transportation planning agencies (RTC) using the State Transit Assistance (STA) distribution formula. As the regional entity designated under PUC 99313, the RTC
can act as a lead agency on eligible projects or act as a “contributing sponsor” and pass funds to a transit operator to support an eligible project. This year the RTC is not proposing to serve as the lead for a LCTOP project and staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) approve a request from Santa Cruz METRO (Attachment 1) to serve as a “contributing sponsor” and release its FY16 share of LCTOP funds ($263,123) to Santa Cruz METRO to purchase an electric bus and infrastructure; and authorize staff to sign and execute any agreements necessary to pass these funds through to Santa Cruz METRO.

As a formulaic program, agencies are expected to select projects that maximize public benefits related to transit ridership, greenhouse gas reduction, disadvantaged community benefit, and other co-benefits (e.g. land use and transportation coordination). METRO has determined that purchasing electric buses would be the most productive use of Santa Cruz County’s FY16 allocation of LCTOP funds. METRO’s board approved seeking funds for this project at its January 22 meeting. This project is consistent with the RTC’s Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) which focuses on sustainability – including system preservation and reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

RTC responsibilities as contributing sponsor (as established by state guidelines):
- At least 50 percent of the transferred funds must benefit a Disadvantaged Community (DAC) as defined by the California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal EPA). This electric bus will serve the only CalEPA identified DAC in Santa Cruz County (Watsonville south of Main Street).
- The contributing sponsor must sign off on the Project Description and Allocation Request form indicating the dollar amounts to be contributed, or provide a signed letter detailing this information.
- The contributing sponsor is responsible for ensuring the project is completed as described in the Project Description and Allocation Request form and in compliance with all items included in the Certifications and Assurances document.

Santa Cruz METRO responsibilities as Project Lead include:
- Developing the Project Description and Allocation Request and compliance with Certifications and Assurances.
- Overseeing or performing all work through completion of the project.
- The project lead will receive all LCTOP funds directly from the SCO and is accountable for all reporting.
- All project documentation (i.e., Project Description and Allocation Request, Reports, Transportation Development Act Audits, Corrective Action Plans, Reassignment of GGRFs requests, Final Reports, and any additional information needed in case of an audit) is the responsibility of the project lead.

2015 Funds
For FY14/15, the RTC’s share of LCTOP was $88,497 and Santa Cruz METRO’s direct share was $94,197, for a Santa Cruz County total of $182,694. Santa Cruz METRO
submitted an application to Caltrans in 2015 to construct new customer service and ADA paratransit eligibility offices at the Watsonville Transit Center and to fund new customer service positions in Watsonville. The California Air Resources Board chose not to approve Santa Cruz METRO’s proposed project for FY15 LCTOP funds, citing questions regarding the greenhouse gas reductions of the project. Lacking any mechanism to propose an alternative project or roll over the funds into this year, Santa Cruz METRO and SCCRTC transferred Santa Cruz County’s FY15 LCTOP allocations of $182,694 to Monterey-Salinas Transit (MST) for use on its approved project, Transit Service in East Salinas. In return, MST and the Transportation Agency for Monterey County (TAMC) agreed to transfer $182,694 from their FY16 LCTOP allocations to Santa Cruz METRO. METRO is proposing to use these funds on this same electric bus project. Staff recommends that the RTC support this use of LCTOP funds.

SUMMARY

The California Legislature has established a Low Carbon Transit Operations Program (LCTOP) to distribute revenue from the sale of carbon emission credits (Cap & Trade funds) to implement transit projects which reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Funds are distributed by formula to regional agencies (RTC) and transit agencies (Santa Cruz METRO). Staff recommends that the Commission designate the RTC’s FY15/16 share of funds to the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (Santa Cruz METRO) to purchase an electric bus and infrastructure.

Attachments:
   1. Request Letter from Santa Cruz METRO

   s:\rtc\tc2016\tc0216\ctop2016\capntradetransit2016_sr.docx
January 6, 2016

Mr. George Dondero, Executive Director
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Avenue
Santa Cruz, CA 95060-3911

RE: Request for SCCRTC to Sponsor METRO’s FY2015-16 Low Carbon Transit Operations Program Funds

Dear George:

This purpose of this letter is to request that the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) adopt a resolution to delegate its FY2015-16 allocation of Low Carbon Transit Operations Program (LCTOP) funds to Santa Cruz METRO. The Low Carbon Transit Operations Program allows an LCTOP recipient to request the allocation of funds from other recipients who choose to sponsor a project. The SCCRTC would sign the METRO’s LCTOP allocation request as a sponsor, and the 99313 funds which the State Controller’s Office designated for the SCCRTC would be included in METRO’s allocation request and used for the approved project. METRO would be the lead agency for the project and would be responsible for implementation, adherence to all guidelines, data collection and reporting.

The State Controller’s Office allocated FY16 LCTOP funds to both the SCCRTC and to Santa Cruz METRO in the same proportion that STA funds are allocated under Public Utilities Code 99313 and 99314. Accordingly, the SCCRTC will receive $263,123 and METRO will receive $263,475 for a total of $526,598 in FY2015-16 LCTOP funds. METRO requests that the SCCRTC designate its FY2015-16 funds as a sponsor for METRO’s project.

Santa Cruz METRO will use the FY16 LCTOP funds to purchase one electric bus to replace a fossil-fueled bus in the Watsonville Urbanized Area. This bus would directly serve the disadvantaged community (DAC) in Watsonville and would operate from the Watsonville Transit Center located on the boundary of the DAC. This one bus also serves as the local match to leverage five more federally funded buses from the Low- and No-emission Bus Program. METRO will pay any expenses above the grant funding from its reserve funds.

If the RTC concurs with the proposed Low Carbon Transit Operations Program project using FY2015-16 allocations funds, please provide a signed letter addressed to Alex Clifford, CEO/General Manager. The SCCRTC Executive Director will then be asked to sign the allocation request as a contributing sponsor.

110 Vernon Street, Santa Cruz, CA 95060 (831) 426-6080. FAX (831) 426-6117
Santa Cruz METRO OnLine at http://www.scmtd.com
Please call me if you would like to discuss any part of the proposed electric bus project for Watsonville.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Alex Clifford
CEO/General Manager
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>FY14 - 15 ACTUAL REVENUE</th>
<th>FY15 - 16 ESTIMATE REVENUE</th>
<th>FY15 - 16 ACTUAL REVENUE</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE AS % OF PROJECTION</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE % OF ACTUAL TO PROJECTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JULY</td>
<td>591,100</td>
<td>602,922</td>
<td>601,300</td>
<td>-1,622</td>
<td>-0.27%</td>
<td>99.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUGUST</td>
<td>788,200</td>
<td>803,964</td>
<td>801,800</td>
<td>-2,164</td>
<td>-0.27%</td>
<td>99.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPTEMBER</td>
<td>791,871</td>
<td>807,709</td>
<td>872,384</td>
<td>64,675</td>
<td>8.01%</td>
<td>102.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTOBER</td>
<td>616,700</td>
<td>629,034</td>
<td>617,500</td>
<td>-11,534</td>
<td>-1.83%</td>
<td>101.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOVEMBER</td>
<td>822,300</td>
<td>838,746</td>
<td>823,300</td>
<td>-15,446</td>
<td>-1.84%</td>
<td>100.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECEMBER</td>
<td>719,449</td>
<td>733,838</td>
<td>917,127</td>
<td>183,289</td>
<td>24.98%</td>
<td>104.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANUARY</td>
<td>601,300</td>
<td>580,629</td>
<td>631,600</td>
<td>50,971</td>
<td>8.78%</td>
<td>105.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEBRUARY</td>
<td>801,800</td>
<td>758,764</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCH</td>
<td>739,331</td>
<td>835,900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRIL</td>
<td>524,400</td>
<td>524,826</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>699,200</td>
<td>699,732</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE</td>
<td>853,689</td>
<td>812,340</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>8,549,340</td>
<td>8,628,404</td>
<td>5,265,011</td>
<td><strong>268,169</strong></td>
<td>3.11%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
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RECOMMENDATION

RTC staff recommends that the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) authorize the Executive Director to negotiate and execute consultant agreements:

1) To perform public outreach activities associated with the Transportation Investment Plan with TBWB Strategies, and
2) To perform other specific outreach activities associated with the Investment Plan with Miller Maxfield, Inc.

BACKGROUND

Investment in local transportation infrastructure has been stymied both by unavailable and unpredictable funding, as well as community debates focused on particular projects, rather than a multi-modal approach that meets the needs of all in the county. Existing transportation revenues make up less than 50% of what is required to maintain, let alone enhance, roads, highways, bridges, sidewalks, bicycle facilities, and public transit to the levels necessary to sufficiently provide for a transportation system that is safe, reliable, and which moves people and goods efficiently.

Based on sustainability metrics in the long-range Regional Transportation Plan, the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) approved a Transportation Investment Plan in December 2015 that would allocate funding from a proposed November 2016 ballot measure to meet the most pressing needs in our community.

DISCUSSION

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission designated an Ad Hoc committee to pursue activities related to the Transportation Investment Plan. The committee developed a Request for Qualifications for consultant assistance to develop and implement a strategic outreach plan to increase public awareness and understanding of transportation needs and funding challenges.

Consultant Contract

On December 23, 2015 the RTC issued a request for qualifications (RFQ) to professional consulting firms for professional services to develop, manage, and implement a strategic public outreach plan to increase public awareness and understanding of transportation needs and funding challenges in Santa Cruz County.

As shown in the Scope of Work included with the RFQ, tasks to be completed by the consultants are organized around the following activities (Attachment 1):

1. Developing Public Outreach Plan and Messaging
2. Managing Public Outreach Plan
3. Supporting RTC’s Public Outreach Activities
4. Facilitating consensus building related to broad support of the measure  
5. Coordinating messaging across all media

Responses for the Santa Cruz County Public Information Outreach Activities were due January 19, 2016. Eight responses to the RFQ were submitted to perform the work as specified in the request for qualifications.

Consultant Proposal Review
An evaluation team, comprised of two members of the Ad Hoc Committee and two RTC staff, reviewed the eight proposals for completeness and content and interviewed four firms. The evaluation team analyzed the response based on the following criteria: Experience of the key personnel assigned to the project in California sales tax measures and transportation issues, knowledge of Santa Cruz County transportation and related issues including understanding of the project and its particular challenges and constraints, Creativity in proposing strategies and messages, evaluation and references from past clients and cost. The evaluation team concluded that two of the firms demonstrated a strong ability to achieve the project goals, although the firms proposed different approaches to accomplish them.

The evaluation team determined that the approach proposed by the firm TBWB would be most advantageous to advance toward the goal of a successful Transportation Investment Plan measure on the November 2016 ballot due to their work with successful tax and bond measures, their understanding of specific issues in Santa Cruz County and their approach. A contract for $50,000 with TBWB is recommended.

In addition, the locally-based firm of Miller-Maxfield has a deep understanding of local culture, the political landscape and locally successful community engagement techniques. A contract for $15,000 is recommended for Miller Maxfield to boost effectiveness of local outreach efforts. Both contracts would be billed based on hourly rates.

Staff and the Evaluation Committee recommend that the RTC authorize the Executive Director to negotiate and execute a consultant agreement with TBWB for an amount not to exceed $50,000 and a consultant agreement with Miller Maxfield for an amount not to exceed $15,000. The Executive Director is authorized to negotiate and execute a contract with the second highest ranked firm, if negotiations with the top ranked company are unsuccessful. Funds for the two contracts are covered in the current RTC budget under Planning Expenditures; Engineering and Other Technical Consultants.

SUMMARY

Based on direction from the Regional Transportation Commission at their December 2015 meeting, staff and the consultant evaluation team have selected consultants to help with public outreach activities for the Transportation Investment Plan to be on the November 2016 ballot. The firms TBWB and Miller-Maxfield are recommended for a combined amount not to exceed $65,000.

Attachment 1: RFQ Scope of Services
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SCOPE OF WORK

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC), Santa Cruz County’s regional transportation planning agency, is a state designated agency responsible for planning and funding transportation projects. The RTC has a responsibility to provide information on its projects, plans and activities to the public, invite participation and foster public understanding of its function. The RTC is seeking qualified consultant(s) to develop and manage a Transportation Sales Tax Public Outreach Plan and support to develop the Expenditure Plan.

Consultant(s) will work with RTC staff to develop and implement a strategic public outreach plan consistent with the goals identified below, that leads to the development of a Transportation Expenditure Plan for a sales tax measure in 2016. The plan must be designed to address the diverse interests, demographic and geographic community interests of Santa Cruz County. Consultant(s) must also collaborate with the RTC’s other project consultants as needed.

**Goals:**
The goal of the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission is to have a transportation sales tax pass in November 2016. In order for that to happen, the RTC must gain community-wide support to meet the 2/3 “supermajority” threshold required by state law. The proposed public outreach plan must include an educational and awareness raising component that includes:

- RTC mission and its success
- The federal and state transportation funding crisis
- The concept of Santa Cruz County becoming a “self-help” county
- An Expenditure Plan of transportation projects that will be funded with the passage of a transportation sales tax

Individuals or firms responding to this RFP should have a demonstrated expertise in strategic public outreach, particularly related to transportation, and knowledge of Santa Cruz County. Respondents should include the assigned project team’s demonstrated knowledge of, expertise and experience with completing similar types of contracts by specified deadlines. Consultants should have the direct experience necessary to provide services that include, but are not limited to, the following tasks:
1) Work with RTC staff to identify key stakeholders for direct outreach and engagements, and help tailor messages and information where needed.

2) Develop and assist in the development of messaging materials, talking points for briefing documents and presentations to the public and media.

3) Present information at RTC committees and public workshops, as necessary.

4) Craft content for our website.

5) Provide ongoing advice and guidance to ensure that development of the Outreach Plan and ballot measure stays on schedule.

The RTC intends to recommend budgeting Fifty Thousand Dollars ($50,000) toward the cost of these services. The following is a general overview of services that may be requested:

**SCOPE OF SERVICES**

Sales Tax Public Outreach services cover a broad range of needs and can involve providing key transportation outreach delivery activities described below, but not limited to:

1. Developing Public Outreach Plan and Messaging
2. Managing Public Outreach Plan
3. Supporting RTC’s Public Outreach Activities
4. Facilitating consensus building related to broad support of the measure.
5. Coordinating messaging across all media
TO: Regional Transportation Commission
FROM: Grace Blakeslee, Transportation Planner
RE: Reappointments and Appointment to the Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee

RECOMMENDATION

The Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC) and staff recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission:

1. Approve seven reappointments (Attachment 1) to E&D TAC member and alternate positions; and
2. Approve Brent Gifford (Attachment 2) for the E&D TAC member position representing 1st Supervisorial District;
3. Nominate members for vacant positions as shown in the revised membership roster (Attachment 3).

BACKGROUND

The Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC) functions best when all committee membership and alternate positions are filled. Committee members, staff, Commissioners and the community are partners in this endeavor.

DISCUSSION

At its December 2015 meeting, the E&D TAC recommended that the RTC approve reappointments for seven positions (Attachment 1):

- Reappointment to the member position representing Santa Cruz Metro: John Daugherty - Mr. Daugherty is the Metro’s Accessible Services Coordinator and serves as the vice-chair of the E&D TAC. In addition to serving on the E&D TAC, Mr. Daugherty also serves on its subcommittee, the Pedestrian Safety Work Group.

- Reappointment to the member position representing Social Service Providers-Seniors: Clay Kempf - Mr. Kempf is the Executive Director of the Seniors Council, the local Area Agency on Aging responsible for funding and delivering a wide range of services for seniors in Santa Cruz and neighboring counties.

- Reappointment to the member alternate position representing Social Service Providers-Disabled: Patty Talbot – Ms. Talbot is the Assistant Director of the Seniors Council. Among other tasks, Ms. Talbot develops the long range plan for addressing the needs of local seniors.

- Reappointment to the member position representing Social Service Providers-Disabled: Sally French – Ms. French is the Director of the local branch of Hope
Services, an agency that assists individuals with developmental disabilities to live and participate in their communities. In addition to serving on the E&D TAC, Ms. French also serves on its subcommittee, the Pedestrian Safety Work Group.

- Reappointment to the member position Coordinated Transportation Services Agency- Community Bridges: **Lisa Berkowitz** - Ms. Berkowitz is the program manager for Meals on Wheels at Community Bridges and manages both group dining at senior meal sites as well as meals delivered to home-bound seniors.

- Reappointment to the member position representing Social Service Provider-Persons of Limited Means: **Debbie Brooks** - Ms. Brooks has been with the Volunteer Center since 1989 and is a program director and coordinator for their transportation program.

- Reappointment to the member position representing the 3rd Supervisorial District: **Veronica Elsea** - Ms. Elsea is a business owner, chair of the Pedestrian Safety Work Group and uses a guide dog. She currently serves as the chair of the E&D TAC.

**The E&D TAC and staff recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission approve reappointments for member and alternate positions for John Daugherty, Clay Kempf, Patty Talbot, Sally French, Lisa Berkowitz, Debbi Brooks, and Veronica Elsea.**

At its August 2015 meeting, the E&D TAC recommended that the RTC approve Brent Gifford (Attachment 2) for the E&D TAC member position representing 1st Supervisorial District. Mr. Gifford previously served as the E&D TAC member alternate position representing the 1st Supervisorial District. Mr. Gifford is a client of paratransit and fixed route service. He has experience working with public transportation agencies training drivers to use equipment designed to serve disabled individuals. Mr. Gifford also has participated in review of public transit safety policies. Mr. Gifford is a resident of Live Oak.

**The E&D TAC and staff recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission approve Brent Gifford for the member position representing 1st Supervisorial District.**

Although several member vacancies were filled as a result of the 2015 outreach campaign to recruit members, there are still vacant positions on the E&D TAC. Active recruitment is underway for the following E&D TAC representatives:

- 4th Supervisorial District – member and alternate
- 5th Supervisorial District – member and alternate
- Social Service Provider Representing Seniors (County) – member and alternate
- 1st Supervisorial District- alternate
- 2nd Supervisorial District – alternate
- Social Service Provider Representing People with Disabilities (County) – alternate
- Potential Transit User 60+ - alternate
- Potential Transit User Disabled - alternate
Staff would appreciate assistance from commissioners in filling the vacant positions, both member and alternate positions. An E&D TAC membership application can be found at www.sccrtc.org/edtac-app.

SUMMARY
The E&D TAC and staff recommend that the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission approve seven reappointments, the appointment of Brent Gifford to member position representing the 1st Supervisorial District, and assist with nominations for vacant positions.

Attachments:
1. Committee Reappointment Applications for:
   - John Daugherty
   - Clay Kempf
   - Patty Talbot
   - Sally French
   - Lisa Berkowitz
   - Debbi Brooks
   - Veronica Elsea
2. Committee Application for Brent Gifford
3. E&D TAC Roster
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COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT APPLICATION

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC)  
Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC)

Meetings are scheduled for the second Tuesday of every other month at 1:30 p.m. in the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission conference room, located at 1523 Pacific Avenue in downtown Santa Cruz. At least one meeting each year is scheduled for an alternate location. Please refer to the Committee description, bylaws and recruitment process for more information.

If you are interested in serving on this committee, please complete this application, and return it to the Regional Transportation Commission office.

PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY

Name: Augustus John Daugherty Jr.
Home address: 
Mailing address (if different): Santa Cruz METRO, 920 Pacific Avenue, Suite 21, Santa Cruz, CA. 95060
Phone: (home) (business/message) 
E-mail: 

Length of residence in Santa Cruz County: 36 years
Position(s) I am applying for: Any appropriate position

X SCMTD representative on the Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC)

Previous experience on a government commission or committee (please specify)  
1999 to Present: SCMTD representative on E&D TAC; April 2006 to April 2013: Elected by membership to serve as E&D TAC Chair; April 2015 to present; Elected by membership to serve as E&D TAC Vice Chair
1988 to 2000, 2009 to present: Appointment by Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors to serve on the Santa Cruz County Commission on Disabilities
# Relevant Work or Volunteer Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Town or Address</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (SCMTD, METRO)</td>
<td>Administration: 110 Vernon Street, Santa Cruz, CA. 95060</td>
<td>1) Customer Service Representative 2) Accessible Services Coordinator</td>
<td>1) 1989 to 1998 2) 1998 to Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Coast Center for Independent Living (CCCIL) Board of Directors</td>
<td>Salinas, CA.</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>1991 to 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Statement of Qualifications:** Please attach a brief statement indicating why you are interested in serving on this committee and why you are qualified for the appointment. If you have served on this committee in the past, please summarize your accomplishments on the committee and indicate which of the committee’s potential future endeavors most interest you.

**Certification:** I certify that the above information is true and correct and I authorize the verification of the information in the application in the event I am a finalist for the appointment.
Statement of Qualifications and Interest

I have relied on Santa Cruz METRO since moving to Santa Cruz in 1979. My work at METRO since 1989 includes assisting seniors/older adults, people with disabilities and persons with limited means to access METRO services and ride buses. In April 2015 fellow E&D TAC members elected me to serve a current term as Vice Chair. For over six years I have also served on the E&D TAC subcommittee, the Pedestrian Safety Work Group. I look forward to assisting the Work Group’s current round of outreach.
COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT APPLICATION

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC)
Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC)

Meetings are scheduled for the second Tuesday of every other month at 1:30 p.m. in the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission conference room, located at 1523 Pacific Avenue in downtown Santa Cruz. At least one meeting each year is scheduled for an alternate location. Please refer to the Committee description, bylaws and recruitment process for more information.

If you are interested in serving on this committee, please complete this application, and return it to the Regional Transportation Commission office.

PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY

Name: Clay Kempf
Home address: 
Mailing address (if different): 

Phone: (home) (business/message) 
E-mail: 

Length of residence in Santa Cruz County: 37 yrs.

Position(s) I am applying for: □ Any appropriate position
☑ Social Service Provider for Seniors □

Previous experience on a government commission or committee (please specify)

 đã Thic Since 1997

Long Term Care Commission SCCRTC, 1991 - 2005
Seniors 2000 - present
2005 White House Conference on Aging Alternate
Calif. Commission on Aging Transit Task Team 2002-2006
### Relevant Work or Volunteer Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Town or Address</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seniors Council of Santa Cruz &amp; San Benito Counties</td>
<td>Aptos CA (operating in Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Benito &amp; Santa Clara Counties)</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>2000 to present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lift Line / Food &amp; Nutrition Services</td>
<td>236 Santa Cruz Ave, Aptos, CA</td>
<td>Transportation Division - Director</td>
<td>1990-1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Statement of Qualifications:** Please attach a brief statement indicating why you are interested in serving on this committee and why you are qualified for the appointment. If you have served on this committee in the past, please summarize your accomplishments on the committee and indicate which of the committee’s potential future endeavors most interest you.

**Certification:** I certify that the above information is true and correct and I authorize the verification of the information in the application in the event I am a finalist for the appointment.

 signature

10/21/15

**How did you learn about this opportunity?**

- ____ newspaper
- ____ radio
- ____ internet
- ____ flyer
- ____ friend/family member
- X other

**Return Application to:**

SCCRTC
Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee
1523 Pacific Avenue
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
fax: 460-3215 email: gblakeslee@sccrtc.org

**Questions or Comments:** (831) 460-3200
E&D TAC Statement of Qualifications

Without access to work, services, and socialization, seniors and people with disabilities quickly become isolated and at-risk of numerous threats to their independence. Specialized transportation is an essential element of keeping people connected with their community, and living a healthy and independent life. The Area Agency on Aging supports the delivery of specialized transportation services, including contributing funding for the transportation of older adults to various congregate meal sites in the County. The E&DTAC continues to be the most effective local forum to discuss these issues.

As the Director of the Area Agency on Aging and the Executive Director of the Seniors Council, serving on the E&D TAC provides the opportunity to continue to provide input into our local transportation delivery models. Besides discussing regularly scheduled items and plans, I remain available to assist in activities and special projects as staff and the Committee deems appropriate.
COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT APPLICATION

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRRTC)
Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC)

Meetings are scheduled for the second Tuesday of every other month at 1:30 p.m. in the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission conference room, located at 1523 Pacific Avenue in downtown Santa Cruz. At least one meeting each year is scheduled for an alternate location. Please refer to the Committee description, bylaws and recruitment process for more information.

If you are interested in serving on this committee, please complete this application, and return it to the Regional Transportation Commission office.

PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY

Name: Patty Talbot
Home address: 
Mailing address (if different): 
Phone: (home) 
(business/message) 
E-mail: 

Length of residence in Santa Cruz County: 30+ years

Position(s) I am applying for: □ Any appropriate position

• alt. for Clay Kempf

Previous experience on a government commission or committee (please specify)

I have served as alternate for Clay Kempf for 10 years. I am the planner for the Area Agency on Aging and also worked at Lifeline when it was the ADA Paratransit provider.
Relevant Work or Volunteer Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Town or Address</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior Council/ Area Agency</td>
<td>Aptos, CA</td>
<td>Associate Director</td>
<td>2005-present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on Aging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1990-93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LiftLine</td>
<td>Aptos</td>
<td>Program Analyst</td>
<td>1995-97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement of Qualifications: Please attach a brief statement indicating why you are interested in serving on this committee and why you are qualified for the appointment. If you have served on this committee in the past, please summarize your accomplishments on the committee and indicate which of the committee’s potential future endeavors most interest you.

Certification: I certify that the above information is true and correct and I authorize the verification of the information in the application in the event I am a finalist for the appointment.

Signature: ________________________________ Date: 11/12/15

How did you learn about this opportunity?

- newspaper                   - flyer
- radio                       - friend/family member
- internet                    - other

Return Application to: SCCRTC
Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee
1523 Pacific Avenue
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
fax: 460-3215 email: gblakeslee@sccrtc.org

Questions or Comments: (831) 460-3200
Patty Talbott

Position Applying for: Alternate for Clay Kempf, Social Services Provider

I have been involved in the delivery of services to seniors in Santa Cruz County since 1990. I have worked at the Seniors Council/Area Agency on Aging as Assistant Director on two different occasions, most recently from 2005 to the present. In that capacity, I serve as the agency Planner and I am the Contracts Manager for contracts totaling $1.8 million with our 8 contracted services providers in Santa Cruz and San Benito Counties. I was also a Program Analyst at LiftLine from 1995-97 during a time when it was the ADA Paratransit provider.
COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT APPLICATION

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC)  
Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC)  

Meetings are scheduled for the second Tuesday of every other month at 1:30 p.m. in the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission conference room, located at 1523 Pacific Avenue in downtown Santa Cruz. At least one meeting each year is scheduled for an alternate location. Please refer to the Committee description, bylaws and recruitment process for more information.

If you are interested in serving on this committee, please complete this application, and return it to the Regional Transportation Commission office.

PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY

Name: Sally French

Home address: 

Mailing address (if different): 

Phone: (home) (business/message) 

E-mail: 

Length of residence in Santa Cruz County: 10 years

Position(s) I am applying for: □ Any appropriate position

□ Some Service Provider, □ for people with disabilities

Previous experience on a government commission or committee (please specify)

I have been on this committee for about 5 years.
## Relevant Work or Volunteer Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Town or Address</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Center of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Program Coordinator</td>
<td>25 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transp. E-d Tac Committee</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Statement of Qualifications:** Please attach a brief statement indicating why you are interested in serving on this committee and why you are qualified for the appointment. If you have served on this committee in the past, please summarize your accomplishments on the committee and indicate which of the committee’s potential future endeavors most interest you.

**Certification:** I certify that the above information is true and correct and I authorize the verification of the information in the application in the event I am a finalist for the appointment.

[Signature]

Nov 21, 2015

**How did you learn about this opportunity?**

- [ ] newspaper
- [ ] flyer
- [ ] radio
- [ ] friend/family member
- [ ] internet
- [ ] other

**Return Application to:** SCCRTC
Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee
1523 Pacific Avenue
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
fax: 460-3215 email: gblakeslee@sccrtc.org

**Questions or Comments:** (831) 460-3200

---

"Attachment 1"
COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT APPLICATION

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC)
Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E/D TAC)

Meetings are scheduled for the second Tuesday of every other month at 1:30 p.m. in
the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission conference room,
located at 1523 Pacific Avenue in downtown Santa Cruz. At least one meeting each
year is scheduled for an alternate location. Please refer to the Committee description,
bylaws and recruitment process for more information.

If you are interested in serving on this committee, please complete this application,
and return it to the Regional Transportation Commission office.

PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY

Name: Lisa Berkowitz
Home address: [Redacted]
Mailing address (if different): [Redacted]

Phone: (home) [Redacted] (business/message) [Redacted]
E-mail: [Redacted]

Length of residence in Santa Cruz County: 38 years

Position(s) I am applying for: · Any appropriate position
X CTSA Community Bridges ·

Previous experience on a government commission or committee (please specify)
SCCRTC Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee
Area on Aging Advisory Council
Relevant Work or Volunteer Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Town or Address</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Bridges</td>
<td>236 Santa Cruz Avenue</td>
<td>Meals on Wheels Program</td>
<td>7/79-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aptos, CA 95003</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement of Qualifications: Please attach a brief statement indicating why you are interested in serving on this committee and why you are qualified for the appointment. If you have served on this committee in the past, please summarize your accomplishments on the committee and indicate which of the committee’s potential future endeavors most interest you.

Since 1976 I have worked in the field of aging. I have worked for organizations whose mission it has been to address the challenges faced by adults as we age. Maintaining independence is a common component of many of those challenges. Transportation services are a key concern and frequently play a pivotal role in determining the success of many other life choices and decisions. I hope to stay involved in the committee’s efforts to ensure that transportation services for seniors and disabled adults remain an important issue in our community.

Certification: I certify that the above information is true and correct and I authorize the verification of the information in the application in the event I am a finalist for the appointment.

[Signature] 11/19/2015

Return Application to: SCCRTC
Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee
1523 Pacific Avenue
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
fax: 460-3215  email: gblakeslee@sccrtc.org

Questions or Comments: (831) 460-3200
COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT APPLICATION

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRRTC)
Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC)

Meetings are scheduled for the second Tuesday of every other month at 1:30 p.m. in the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission conference room, located at 1523 Pacific Avenue in downtown Santa Cruz. At least one meeting each year is scheduled for an alternate location. Please refer to the Committee description, bylaws and recruitment process for more information.

If you are interested in serving on this committee, please complete this application, and return it to the Regional Transportation Commission office.

PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY

Name: Debbi Brooks

Home address: [Redacted]

Mailing address (if different):

Phone: (home) [Redacted] (business/message) [Redacted]

E-mail: [Redacted]

Length of residence in Santa Cruz County: 42 years

Position(s) I am applying for: □ Any appropriate position
□ E&D TAC

Previous experience on a government commission or committee (please specify)

I've been on this committee for over 10 years representing the Volunteers Centers' Transportation Program.
### Relevant Work or Volunteer Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Town or Address</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kiwanis</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>2015/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope Services</td>
<td>220 Lincoln St So.</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>1978/present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Statement of Qualifications:** Please attach a brief statement indicating why you are interested in serving on this committee and why you are qualified for the appointment. If you have served on this committee in the past, please summarize your accomplishments on the committee and indicate which of the committee’s potential future endeavors most interest you.

**Certification:** I certify that the above information is true and correct and I authorize the verification of the information in the application in the event I am a finalist for the appointment.

---

**How did you learn about this opportunity?**

- newspaper
- radio
- internet
- flyer
- friend/family member
- other

**Return Application to:**
SCCRTC
Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee
1523 Pacific Avenue
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
fax: 460-3215  email: gblakeslee@sccrtc.org

**Questions or Comments:** (831) 460-3200
COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT APPLICATION

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC)
Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E/D TAC)

Meetings are scheduled for the second Tuesday of every other month at 1:30 p.m. in the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission conference room, located at 1523 Pacific Avenue in downtown Santa Cruz. At least one meeting each year is scheduled for an alternate location. Please refer to the Committee description, bylaws and recruitment process for more information.

If you are interested in serving on this committee, please complete this application, and return it to the Regional Transportation Commission office.

PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY

Name: Veronica Elsea
Home address: ___________________________________________
Mailing address (if different): ____________________________________

Phone: (home) __________________ (business/message) ____________
E-mail: _____________________________

Length of residence in Santa Cruz County: 35 years
Position(s) I am applying for: E&DTAC 3rd district rep.

Previous experience on a government commission or committee (please specify)
Served for the past 2 4-year terms on E&DTAC, current chair; chairing Pedestrian Safety Work group subcommittee; Serving as charter member of the CalTrans Accessibility Advisory Committee; member of the Class IV Bikeway design subcommittee; member of Santa Cruz County voter Accessibility advisory committee; currently chair of Metro Advisory committee; served on Mission Street Widening Task Force 1998-its end in 2002.
Relevant Work or Volunteer Experience (see separate sheet as I had difficulty inserting into the table below.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Town or Address</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement of Qualifications: Please attach a brief statement indicating why you are interested in serving on this committee and why you are qualified for the appointment. If you have served on this committee in the past, please summarize your accomplishments on the committee and indicate which of the committee’s potential future endeavors most interest you. (See attached page.)

Certification: I certify that the above information is true and correct and I authorize the verification of the information in the application in the event I am a finalist for the appointment.

__________________________________  __________________________
Signature Veronica Elsea        Date
11/09/2015

Return Application to: SCCRTC
Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee
1523 Pacific Avenue
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
fax: 460-3215    email: kpushnik@sccrtc.org
Questions or Comments:  (831) 460-3200

Relevant Volunteer Experience

Organization: E&DTAC committee and Pedestrian Safety Work Group
Subcommittee 2008-2015
CalTrans Accessibility Advisory committee: 2013 to present: Appointed as a result of my work with E&DTAC and PSWG.
Metro Advisory Committee: 2013 to present: currently chair. Allows me to share information among groups and be a more informed member of both committees.
Soroptimist International of Capitola-by-the-Sea: held many different offices, guided many fund-raising and service projects to successful completion.
American Federation of Musicians: Held several offices, headed contract negotiation team.
Guide Dog Users, Inc. Served as chair of many different committees; organized many presentations, fund raisers and performed administrative and contract tasks.

Statement of Qualifications:
During my first term as a member of E&DTAC, I was able to act on one of my main concerns by helping to reinvigorate a pedestrian subcommittee, The Pedestrian Safety Work Group. During my two-term tenure, the PSWG has been very active in securing grants and producing reports and projects related to sidewalk safety and accessibility in Santa Cruz County. We have created a brochure designed to foster better relationships and increased safety among motorists and pedestrians with additional emphasis on the needs and behaviors of those with disabilities. We are currently beginning work on a similar brochure for pedestrians and bicyclists. I have chaired this group and given many of its public presentations, as well as participated in workshops as a representative of the PSWG.
I am currently serving as chair of the E&DTAC.
My attendance record has been very good and I believe that my level of participation, in the pedestrian subcommittee, at meetings, and in the public demonstrates my commitment to the issues facing this committee, my ability to do what I say I'll do, and the contributions I've been able to bring to this committee.
I'm very proud of what I've been able to accomplish as a member of the E&DTAC and firmly believe that I could not have made this much of a difference as an individual citizen, without the wisdom, resources and staff working together. I very much look forward to continuing my efforts on behalf of the E&DTAC to improve access throughout Santa Cruz County for all residents, especially for seniors and the disabled.
Thanks for considering my application renewal.
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COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT APPLICATION

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC)
Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E/D TAC)

Meetings are scheduled for the second Tuesday of every other month at 1:30 p.m. in the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission conference room, located at 1523 Pacific Avenue in downtown Santa Cruz. At least one meeting each year is scheduled for an alternate location. Please refer to the Committee description, bylaws and recruitment process for more information.

If you are interested in serving on this committee, please complete this application, and return it to the Regional Transportation Commission office.

PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY

Name: Brent A. Gifford
Home address: [Redacted]
Mailing address (if different): [Redacted]

Phone: (home) [Redacted] (business/m) [Redacted]
E-mail: [Redacted]

Length of residence in Santa Cruz County: 12 yrs
Position(s) I am applying for: □ Any appropriate position
☑ ED TAC Committee Member
□

Previous experience on a government commission or committee (please specify)

Please see attached.
### Relevant Work or Volunteer Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Town or Address</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Blind Center</td>
<td>Oakland, CA</td>
<td>Senior Program Coordinator / Coordinated ADA Training for BART &amp; AC Transit Employees</td>
<td>1999-2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.C.S.C. - Computer/Assistive Technology Dept.</td>
<td>Santa Cruz, CA</td>
<td>Research &amp; Development for Assistive Technology</td>
<td>2005-Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista Center for the Blind</td>
<td>Santa Cruz, CA</td>
<td>Support Group Coordinator</td>
<td>2003-2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDI</td>
<td>Santa Cruz, CA</td>
<td>Volunteer Project Management for Various Local Projects &amp; Events</td>
<td>2002-Current</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Statement of Qualifications:
Please attach a brief statement indicating why you are interested in serving on this committee and why you are qualified for the appointment. If you have served on this committee in the past, please summarize your accomplishments on the committee and indicate which of the committee’s potential future endeavors most interest you.

#### Certification:
I certify that the above information is true and correct and I authorize the verification of the information in the application in the event I am a finalist for the appointment.

---

**Signature**  
**Date**

**Return Application to:**  
SCCRTC  
Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee  
1523 Pacific Avenue  
Santa Cruz, CA 95060  
fax: 460-3215  
email: kpushnik@scrcrct.org

**Questions or Comments:**  
(831) 460-3200
August 4, 2014  EDTAC Aplication Attachment

My name is Brent Gifford, I live at 265545 Brommer St.#45 Santa Cruz CA 95062., (Antonelli’s Senior Community) I have lived in SANTA Cruz County since 2002. I have been a provisional client of Metro Paracruise and have used the fixed route system when I lived close enough to a stop. I have a disease which affects my bones and muscles as well as causing the loss of my sight.

I believe that I would be a good fit on the EDTAC due to my experience in the disabled services industry for the past 35 years. I was one of the first people ever to hear and help create the voice and the mechanical speech which we all take for granted now. I have been part of a number of research and development projects designed to make the quality of life comparable for persons with disabilities. At present at UCSC, I am involved with a project which will utilize any phones camera to read aloud SCMTD signage including posted schedules at the stops themselves and the bus numbers at a reasonable distance from the stop. I also am consulting with a large telecommunications company to help make the products more user friendly for persons with disabilities.

I have consulted with safety committees on 6 different public transit companies around the country. I reviewed policies and procedures as they related to serving (pwd) from how to move them around in the systems to specific evacuation procedures in case of emergencies. I was trained as an evacuation specialist years ago and spent some of my time as an accident victim and evaluating the EMT’s process and procedures,

As part of my employment with Lighthouse for the Blind in San Francisco and Lions Blind Center in Oakland, my duties included training drivers and platform personnel for BART, Munin, and AC Ttrans. I taught how to deal with those impossible people who make your day longer with all those special needs requests. I also was the ADA advocate once that came to pass.

I don’t necessarily agree with everything included in the ADA, but what I do believe in is a level playing field. I think that people who need help from "public" transportation deserves the right to transportation whether or not they live directly on a fixed route system which is the only responsibility of paracruz. I do understand that we are fortunate in this county to also have Liftline to pick up some of the slack. I am looking forward to getting to know and understand the SCMTD system better to better serve my community. Thank you for your time and consideration.  Brent Gifford.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Representing</th>
<th>Alternate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clay Kempf</td>
<td>Social Service Provider - Seniors</td>
<td>Patty Talbot (2019)-pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2019) -pending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vacant</td>
<td>Social Service Provider - Seniors (County)</td>
<td>vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally French</td>
<td>Social Service Provider - Disabled</td>
<td>Sheryl Hagemann (2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2019)-pending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Molesky</td>
<td>Social Service Provider - Disabled (County)</td>
<td>vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2017)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Brooks</td>
<td>Social Service Provider - Persons of Limited Means</td>
<td>Donna Patters (2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2019) -pending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Berkowitz</td>
<td>CTSA (Community Bridges)</td>
<td>Bonnie McDonald (2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2019) -pending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk Ance</td>
<td>CTSA (Lift Line)</td>
<td>Laura Diaz (2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2017)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Daugherty, vice chair</td>
<td>SCMTD (Metro)</td>
<td>April Warnock (2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2019)- pending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Lamb</td>
<td>Potential Transit User (60+)</td>
<td>vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2018)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greta Kleiner</td>
<td>Potential Transit User (Disabled)</td>
<td>vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2018)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Year in Parentheses) = Membership Expiration Date
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission’s
ELDERLY & DISABLED TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE (ED/TAC)
and SOCIAL SERVICES TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COUNCIL (SSTAC)

Membership Roster –January 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Representing</th>
<th>Alternate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervisory District Representatives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brent Gifford  -  (2019)-pending</td>
<td>1st District (Leopold)</td>
<td>vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pam Arnsberger  (2018)</td>
<td>2nd District (Friend)</td>
<td>vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vacant</td>
<td>4th District (Caput)</td>
<td>vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vacant</td>
<td>5th District (McPherson)</td>
<td>vacant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Staff**

Grace Blakeslee, Transportation Planner, RTC 460-3219, gblakeslee@sccrtc.org
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## Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
### THREE MONTH MEETING SCHEDULE

**February 2016 Through April 2016**

All meetings are subject to cancellation when there are no action items to be considered by the board or committee. Please visit our website for meeting agendas and locations [www.sccrtc.org/meetings/](http://www.sccrtc.org/meetings/)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Meeting Day</th>
<th>Meeting Type</th>
<th>Meeting Time</th>
<th>Meeting Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/4/16</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Commission</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>City of Watsonville Council Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/8/16</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Bicycle Advisory Committee</td>
<td>6:00 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/9/16</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Elderly &amp; Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/11/16</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Budget &amp; Administration/Personnel Committee</td>
<td>3:00 pm</td>
<td>CAO Conference Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/18/16</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Transportation Policy Workshop</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/18/16</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Interagency Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/3/16</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Commission</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>County Board of Supervisors Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/9/16</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>TOS/Safe on 17</td>
<td>10:00 am</td>
<td>CHP Office in San Jose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/17/16</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Transportation Policy Workshop</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/17/16</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Interagency Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/7/16</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Commission</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>County Board of Supervisors Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/11/16</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Bicycle Advisory Committee</td>
<td>6:00 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/12/16</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Elderly &amp; Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Watsonville Community Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/14/16</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Budget &amp; Administration/Personnel Committee</td>
<td>3:00 pm</td>
<td>CAO Conference Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/21/16</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Transportation Policy Workshop</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/21/16</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Interagency Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Watsonville Community Room – 275 Main St Ste 400 – Watsonville, CA**

**Board of Supervisors Chambers/CAO/RDA Conference room – 701 Ocean St-5th floor – Santa Cruz, CA**

**City of Capitola-Council Chambers – 420 Capitola Ave – Capitola, CA**

**City of Santa Cruz-Council Chambers – 809 Center St – Santa Cruz, CA**

**City of Scotts Valley-Council Chamber – 1 Civic Center Dr – Scotts Valley, CA**

**City of Watsonville-Council Chambers – 275 Main St Ste 400 – Watsonville, CA**

**CHP Office in San Jose – 2020 Junction Ave - San Jose, CA**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Letter Rec’d/Sent</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Incoming/Outgoing</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Last</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Last</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08/28/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>KP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hal</td>
<td>Stanger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Raymon</td>
<td>Cancino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/20/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/20/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/21/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/21/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Liz</td>
<td>Levy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/21/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec’d/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/21/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>11/23/15</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td></td>
<td>Security Encryption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/22/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>11/23/15</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td></td>
<td>Democratic Political System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/22/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>11/23/15</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td></td>
<td>Carbohydrates and Diet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/23/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Raymon</td>
<td>Cancino</td>
<td>Community Bridges</td>
<td>Specialized Transportation Needs in RTC Ballot Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/23/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>11/23/15</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Islamic State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/24/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>JR</td>
<td>11/24/15</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Motor Voter&quot; DMV Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/24/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>JR</td>
<td>11/24/15</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>Shippen</td>
<td></td>
<td>RTC Handouts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/24/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>YP</td>
<td>11/24/15</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Sheri</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Watson-Riley</td>
<td>Split and Leaning Pine Tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec’d/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/24/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/25/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Loss of Middle East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/24/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Peoples</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/30/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trail Now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/25/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Bennecke</td>
<td>SouthStar Engineering</td>
<td>Project Management Firm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/26/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/30/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Islamic Terrorist Tribes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/28/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/30/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Global Warming Radiative-Exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/28/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/30/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Obama's Guantanamo Bay Detentions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/30/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>Roblin</td>
<td>Seacliff Improvement Association</td>
<td>RTIP Project #30: Route 1 Bike/Pedestrian Overcrossing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/30/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Rick</td>
<td>Hyman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/30/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expenditure Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec'd/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/30/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>11/30/15</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>Korb</td>
<td></td>
<td>Final Rail Transit Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/30/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>KP</td>
<td>12/02/15</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Benvenuti</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bus Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/01/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Micah</td>
<td>Posner</td>
<td></td>
<td>Expenditure Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/01/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>KP</td>
<td>12/02/15</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Ratbert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Highway 1 Public Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/01/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>12/02/15</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Hibble</td>
<td>Aptos Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>Santa Cruz County 2016 STIP Proposal, RTIP Project # RTC 30 Highway 1 Bicycle Pedestrian Overcrossing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/01/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>12/02/15</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Dixson</td>
<td></td>
<td>Expenditure Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/01/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>12/02/15</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Carey</td>
<td>Pico</td>
<td></td>
<td>Final Rail Transit Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/01/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>12/02/15</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Larry</td>
<td>Laurent</td>
<td>Adoption of the 2016 Regional Transportation Improvement Program - Mar Vista Pedestrian Bridge RTIP # RTC 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec'd/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/01/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Zach</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Santa Cruz County 2016 STIP Proposal, RTIP Project # RTC 30: Rt 1 Mar Vista Bike/Ped Overcrossing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/02/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Lucy</td>
<td>Dunn</td>
<td>CTC</td>
<td>George Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>STIP Allocation Plan - Tab 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/02/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>Sawhill</td>
<td>Amelia Conlen</td>
<td>Proposed 2016 Regional Transportation Improvement Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/02/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Donna</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Support of the Passenger Rail Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/02/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>O'Kelly</td>
<td>Light Rail is the Only Option</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/02/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Support for Rail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/02/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Barry</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Support of More Funding for Passenger Rail, Less for Highway Widening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec’d/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/02/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Rick</td>
<td>Longinotti</td>
<td></td>
<td>CFST Letter on Support for Sales Tax Ballot Measure in 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/02/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Gail</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sales Tax Measure for Highway 1 Widening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/02/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Karl</td>
<td>Heiman</td>
<td></td>
<td>Endorsing New Tax Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/02/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sharia Law and Influences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/02/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Geri</td>
<td>Lieby</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/03/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Peoples</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Tax Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/03/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Chuck</td>
<td>Strelitz</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rail Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/04/15</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reinie</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>Caltrans, District 5</td>
<td>Luis Mendez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec'd/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/04/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jimmy</td>
<td>Dutra</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Nancy A</td>
<td>Bilicich</td>
<td>City of Watsonville</td>
<td>Beach Road and Holohan Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/04/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>LM 12/04/15</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Sally</td>
<td>Hopkins</td>
<td></td>
<td>05-0R9101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/04/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ 12/04/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cabal Terrorism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/04/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>KP 12/04/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Johanna</td>
<td>Bowen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rail Transit Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/05/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ 12/21/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>Beckett</td>
<td></td>
<td>Electric Trains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/05/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>KP 12/05/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Pureheart</td>
<td>Steinbruner</td>
<td></td>
<td>Niles Canyon Railway Move to Santa Cruz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/05/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ 12/07/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Dann</td>
<td></td>
<td>Final Rail Transit Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/05/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ 12/07/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Silvera</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trail Now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec'd/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/05/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>12/07/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>Final Rail Transit Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/05/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>12/07/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Eve</td>
<td>Eden</td>
<td>Trail Now</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/05/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>12/07/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Lizann</td>
<td>Keyes</td>
<td>Final Rail Transit Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/06/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>12/07/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>Morici</td>
<td>Sales Tax</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/06/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>12/07/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td>Islamic Jihad and Reductions of Human Greenhouse Gases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/07/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>KP</td>
<td>12/16/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Manheim</td>
<td>511</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/07/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>12/16/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Reed</td>
<td>Searle</td>
<td>Rail Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/07/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>JR</td>
<td>12/07/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Barrett</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec’d/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/07/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>JR</td>
<td>12/07/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Angela</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/07/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>JR</td>
<td>12/07/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jody</td>
<td>Healy</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/08/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Wallace</td>
<td>Fehr &amp; Peers</td>
<td>Ginger</td>
<td>Dykaar</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Santa Cruz Countywide Transportation Modeling Tools Contract - Amendment #2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/08/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>McClendon</td>
<td>Caltrans, District 5</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Final Invoice #6 for the Rail Passenger Study Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/08/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>12/08/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td></td>
<td>Countering Terrorism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/08/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>12/09/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Sabra</td>
<td>Cossentine</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/08/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>12/09/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Curt</td>
<td>Simmons</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/08/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>12/09/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Karl</td>
<td>Fraser</td>
<td>RTP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Correspondence Log

**February 4, 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Letter Rec’d/Sent</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Incoming/Outgoing</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Last</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Last</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/09/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Kathy</td>
<td>Previsich</td>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Reimbursement for Unified Corridor Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/09/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>12/09/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td></td>
<td>Human Race Termination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/09/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td>12/16/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Todd</td>
<td>Mayer</td>
<td></td>
<td>Soundwall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/10/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Donna</td>
<td>Berry</td>
<td>Department of Transportation</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>2016 SHOPP - Highway 17 Wildlife Crossing Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/11/15</td>
<td>Notice</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Sneddon</td>
<td>City of Capitola</td>
<td>Notice of Capitola City Council Reorganization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/11/15</td>
<td>Invoice</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>McClendon</td>
<td>Caltrans, District 5</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Invoice #11 for the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line Improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/11/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Inns by the Sea, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Lease of Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line Premises with Assigned Lease Audit No. 221068 for Vehicle Parking Purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/11/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Jesberg</td>
<td>City of Capitola</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Lease of Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line Premises with Assigned Lease Audit No. 194279 for Vehicle Parking Purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec’d/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/11/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Ow</td>
<td></td>
<td>University Business Park LLC</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Lease for Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line Premises with Assigned Lease Audit No. 194279 for Vehicle Parking Purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/11/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Tricia</td>
<td>Proctor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Seabright Station Partnership</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Lease of Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line Premises with Assigned Lease Audit No. 210084 for Beautification Purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/11/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>R.J. Frambrini and Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Lease of Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line Premises with Assigned Lease Audit No. 194399 for Agricultural Purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/11/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Russell</td>
<td>Gross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Lease for Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line Premises with Assigned Lease Audit No. 179286 for Open Storage Purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/11/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Leinau</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trifid Properties</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Lease of Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line Premises with Assigned Lease Audit No. 708710 for Beautification Purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/11/16</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Aptos Station Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendes</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Lease of Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line Premises with Assigned Lease Audit No. 193091 for Beautification Purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/11/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Neallany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Lease of Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line Premises with Assigned Lease Audit No. 192493 for Storage and Hobby Purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/13/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Lesh</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trail Now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec’d/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/13/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td>Islam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/13/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td>Islamic Jihad and Global Warming Politics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/13/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Evans</td>
<td>Trail Now</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/14/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Lockhorn</td>
<td>Trail Now</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/14/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Gdy</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Penny</td>
<td>Ellis</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/14/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Peoples</td>
<td>Rail Corridor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/14/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Cj</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td>Radical Wahhabism Islam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/14/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>Evans</td>
<td>City of Santa Cruz Rail Trail East of the San Lorenzo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec’d/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/14/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>Evans</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trail Now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/15/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Laurel Janssen</td>
<td>CTC</td>
<td>George Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>2016 RTIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/15/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Peoples</td>
<td>Rail Corridor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/15/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>KP</td>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>Maus</td>
<td>Dinner Train</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/16/15</td>
<td>Notice</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Alisa</td>
<td>Klaus</td>
<td>Filing of Notice of Determination in Compliance with Section 21108 or 21152 of the Public Resources Code</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/16/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>McCoy</td>
<td>2040 RTP Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/16/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>KP</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Haworth</td>
<td>Rail/Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/17/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>Clifford</td>
<td>Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District</td>
<td>Veronica</td>
<td>Elsea</td>
<td>SCCRTC, E&amp;D TAC, Chair</td>
<td>RTC November 2016 Transportation Ballot Measure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec'd/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/17/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Duazo</td>
<td>Caltrans, District 5</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>SR1 Auxiliary Lanes Construction Invoice #27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/18/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Don Lane</td>
<td>12/18/15</td>
<td>Don</td>
<td>Lane</td>
<td>City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>Trail Now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/18/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>12/21/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>Trail Now</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/18/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>12/21/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td>Transportation Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/18/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td>12/11/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>Boos</td>
<td>Soquel to 41st Auxiliary Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/19/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>12/21/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Kathryn</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>Trail Now</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/19/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>12/21/15</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td>The Human Race - SOLD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec’d/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/19/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>Hansen</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trail Now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/20/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Ginger</td>
<td>Dykaar</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>Boutelle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2040 RTP Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/21/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>Alisa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trail Now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/21/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>Alisa</td>
<td>Case</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2040 RTP Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/22/15</td>
<td>Notice</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Bren</td>
<td>Lehr</td>
<td>City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Notice of City of Santa Cruz Council Reorganization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/22/16</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Erlinda</td>
<td>Corpuz</td>
<td>Coastal Conservancy</td>
<td>Grant Agreement No. 14-085, Amendment No. 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/22/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Beaudoin</td>
<td>Caltrans, District 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCR 05-1C8500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/23/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Nathaniel</td>
<td>James</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trail Now</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec'd/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/24/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>01/05/16</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Amoral Drift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/28/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Aileen K</td>
<td>Loe</td>
<td>Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Fiscal Year 2015-2016 Overall Work Program Agreement (OWPA) Amendment for the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/28/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Brandy K</td>
<td>Rider</td>
<td>Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) Notice to Proceed for the Sustainable Transportation Prioritization Plan for Santa Cruz County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/30/15</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Veronica</td>
<td>Elsea</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC, Chair, Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&amp;D TAC)</td>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>Clifford</td>
<td>SCMTD</td>
<td>RTC November 2016 Transportation Ballot Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/30/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>01/05/16</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td></td>
<td>Decline of Politics and World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/31/15</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>KP</td>
<td>01/04/16</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Becky</td>
<td>Steinbruner</td>
<td></td>
<td>Progress Re: Steam Train Museum in Santa Cruz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/03/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>01/05/16</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td></td>
<td>Common-Good Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/04/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>01/05/16</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trail Now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec'd/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>TO</td>
<td>FROM</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/05/16</td>
<td>Notice</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>City of Watsonville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City of Watsonville Council Reorganization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/06/16</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>George Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Alex Clifford</td>
<td>SCMTD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Request for SCCRTC to Sponsor METRO's FY2015-16 Low Carbon Transit Operations Program Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/07/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Gdy 01/07/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Steve Piercy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Correction to Bike Map</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/07/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ 01/08/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David Eselius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/08/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>KS 01/08/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jody Healy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bart Along Highway 1 and Connecting to Bay Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/08/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>KS 01/08/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Brian Miller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Highway 1 Future Developments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/08/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>KS 01/08/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Robert Bixby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Highway 1 Widening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/08/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>KS 01/08/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Patti Shimokawa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Highway 1 Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Correspondence Log
### February 4, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Letter Rec’d/Sent</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Incoming/Outgoing</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Last</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Last</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01/09/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Laurie</td>
<td>Jacobs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trail Now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/10/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Wegrich</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bicycle Overpass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/12/16</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>McClendon</td>
<td>Caltrans, District 5</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>FY2015-2016 Invoice #1 for the Rural Planning Assistance Funds (State Highway Account) in Accordance with OWPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/12/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td>Whitelaw</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rail-With-Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/12/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Pauline</td>
<td>Seales</td>
<td></td>
<td>No Highway Widening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/12/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jeffrey</td>
<td>Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td>Highway 1 Corridor Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/13/16</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Candy</td>
<td>Yu</td>
<td>Department of Transportation</td>
<td>PPM13-6149(078)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/14/16</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Duazo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Caltrans, District 5</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>SR1 Auxiliary Lanes Construction Invoice #27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec'd/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/18/16</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Gandesbery</td>
<td>Cory</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network Segments 5 and 7 - Request for Scope and Budget Approval (Grant Number 14-085)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/21/16</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Donna</td>
<td>Miyahara</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Final Project Expenditure Report (For STIP Planning, Programming &amp; Monitoring)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/21/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td>Barry</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>The NEED Project 2040 RTP Goals Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/21/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>McDougal</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>2040 RTP Goals Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/21/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Schneider</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>2040 RTP Goals Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/21/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>Toldi</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>2040 RTP Goals Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/21/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Stem</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>2040 RTP Goals Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/21/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gail</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>2040 RTP Goals Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/21/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>Domash</td>
<td></td>
<td>2040 RTP Goals Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/21/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Dan</td>
<td></td>
<td>2040 RTP Goals Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/21/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td></td>
<td>2040 RTP Goals Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/21/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Russell</td>
<td>Weisz</td>
<td></td>
<td>2040 RTP Goals Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/22/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Fairchild</td>
<td></td>
<td>2040 RTP Goals Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/22/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>Siddens</td>
<td></td>
<td>2040 RTP Goals Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/22/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Chrissie</td>
<td>Klinkowski</td>
<td></td>
<td>2040 RTP Goals Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/22/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Alan</td>
<td>Speidel</td>
<td></td>
<td>2040 RTP Goals Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec’d/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/22/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>☑ 01/25/16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Thole</td>
<td></td>
<td>2040 RTP Goals Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/22/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>☑ 01/25/16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Heathorn</td>
<td></td>
<td>2040 RTP Goals Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/22/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>☑ 01/25/16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>Weldon</td>
<td></td>
<td>2040 RTP Goals Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/22/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>☑ 01/25/16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Kyle</td>
<td>Carter</td>
<td></td>
<td>2040 RTP Goals Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/22/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>☑ 01/25/16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Dario</td>
<td>Caloss</td>
<td></td>
<td>2040 RTP Goals Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/22/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>☑ 01/25/16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Pall</td>
<td>Marten</td>
<td></td>
<td>2040 RTP Goals Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/23/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>☑ 01/25/16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Neil</td>
<td>Schaefer</td>
<td></td>
<td>2040 RTP Goals Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/23/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>☑ 01/25/16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Fortson</td>
<td></td>
<td>2040 RTP Goals Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec’d/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/24/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>Hansen</td>
<td></td>
<td>2040 RTP Goals Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/25/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Steinbruner</td>
<td></td>
<td>2040 RTP Goals Comments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
December 17, 2016

Alex Clifford  
Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District  
110 Vernon St.  
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

RE: RTC November 2016 Transportation Ballot Measure  

Dear Mr. Clifford:

The Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC) advises the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC), the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (Metro), and other service providers on transportation needs for people with disabilities, seniors and persons with limited means.

At its meeting on December 8, 2015, the E&D TAC received a presentation on the November 2016 Transportation Ballot Measure. The November 2016 Transportation Expenditure Plan approved by the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) at the December 3, 2015 meeting, estimated a distribution of 2.25 million dollars per year to the Santa Cruz Metro for paratransit services. The purpose of this letter is to invite Santa Cruz Metro to the February 9, 2016 E&D TAC meeting to provide information about how the Transportation Ballot Measure funding distributed to Santa Cruz Metro would impact the provision of services provided by Santa Cruz Metro ParaCruz, if approved by voters.

The Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee looks forward to working with RTC and Santa Cruz Metro to identify priority paratransit needs in Santa Cruz County that may be eligible for funding under a new local funding sources.

Sincerely,

Veronica Elsea, Chair  
Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee
January 22, 2016

Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Ave
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Caltrans
Matt Fowler, Central Coast Environmental Analysis, Caltrans District 5
Via email

RE: Highway 1 Corridor Tier I and Tier II Document Comments

Dear Regional Transportation Commissioners and Caltrans:

The Bicycle Advisory Committee welcomes the opportunity to review the Highway 1 Tiered Draft Environmental Documents and offers the following comments pertaining to cycling. We are appreciative and generally supportive of the bicycle projects planned for both the immediate (Tier II) alternative (i.e., the Chanticleer crossing) and for either long-term (Tier I) alternative, such as the Trevethan and Mar Vista crossings. Furthermore, we are gratified that the Draft EIR commits to installing a Class 1 bicycle and pedestrian facility on Morrissey Boulevard over Highway 1 and bike lanes on Rio Del Mar Boulevard if no long-term highway project happens (Tier I No Project Alternative).

**Tier II Comments – Chanticleer bicycle and pedestrian overcrossing**

We are thankful for and supportive of several aspects of the Chanticleer crossing plans and staff assurances made to date. Your staff and its consultants are to be commended for having already responded to our earlier request to ensure that bicyclists can conveniently ride across the freeway without dismounting. Please ensure that such design elements are retained in the final plans:

- Sloped curbs around the entire corner to provide 180 degree bike access,
- 12 -14 foot wide bridge;
- Rideable 5 percent or less grade; and
- Negotiable curvature.

Our major long-standing and remaining concern is how northbound Chanticleer cyclists (who will be riding in the bike lane at the right side of the road) will cross Chanticleer to access the new bridge. Cyclists will have to cross both the north and southbound travel lanes close to or at the intersection with Soquel Avenue, which could cause conflicts with motorists. Also, there is the potential for conflict with Soquel eastbound motorists making a right turn onto Chanticleer exactly where cyclists will be crossing onto and off the bridge.

In order to address this and other concerns, we request that the following elements be included in the final project design:

- Pathway lighting (e.g., inset into structure, similar to that on the Arana Gulch bridges);
- Center line striping on the overcrossing;
- Entrance designs, including signing and pavement markings that make clear that motor vehicles are not allowed;
• Railing and structure design that does not obscure sight distance for eastbound drivers on Soquel Avenue approaching Chanticleer; and
• Pavement markings and signing (including green bike lane treatments and green bike boxes) that both alert motorists to cyclists crossing Soquel Avenue and Chanticleer and show cyclists the appropriate crossings;
• Stop sign or traffic signal on eastbound Soquel at Chanticleer to prevent free right turns;
• Consideration of extending a two way bike path on the west side of Chanticleer from the bridge landing at Soquel Avenue south to where a clearly visible and cyclist maneuverable crossing of Chanticleer can be installed (such as at the Staples parking lot entrance intersection with Chanticleer).

In order to ensure that the proposed bridge be bike friendly in these regards, we recommend that the process leading to implementation includes the following:
• Coordination with County Public Works as to Soquel Ave/Chanticleer intersection modifications, such as signing and pavement markings;
• Preparation of two alternative signing and striping plans – one for the current stop sign configuration, one for if the intersection becomes signalized;
• Completion of at least preliminary intersection design before bridge plans are finalized to ensure that the approaches are designed in sync with the pavement marking and signing plans and that any additional right of way needed to ensure smooth transition and access to the overcrossing is concurrently identified and acquired;
• RTC’s Bicycle Advisory Committee review of final bridge and street plans;
• If entry for northbound Chanticleer cyclists remains right at the intersection with Soquel, monitoring of potential conflicts with motorists as described above, and if conflicts arise, installing a two way bike path along the first block of Chanticleer so that a crossing of Chanticleer be established further south of the Soquel Avenue intersection where site distances may be better (ex. a 4 way intersection at the Staples driveway);
• Finishing the bridge design and certifying the environmental review of it as soon as possible so that it could be constructed as a stand-alone project (if funding is available) if the remainder of the auxiliary lane is delayed or cancelled;
• Conversely, ensuring that if the Soquel-to-41st Ave auxiliary project is constructed, that this bridge remain an integral part of that project’s funding and final design and be concurrently constructed.

Finally, an aesthetically appealing design, worthy of the great Santa Cruz County community, should be designed and utilized.

**Tier I comments – HOV, TMS or no project alternatives – Mar Vista and Trevethan and other crossings**

At this time we only have some general suggestions for you to consider as the process unfolds. We understand that there will be further environmental review and plan refinement on all project components of whatever long-term alternative is chosen.

**Mar Vista bike-ped bridge:** Since this project to connect the elementary school with a neighborhood it serves across the freeway is mostly funded, we suggest adding it (and a discussion of any of its impacts) into Tier II (the immediate projects category). Then it could proceed once this EIR was completed. As design progresses we suggest that elements similar to those listed above for Chanticleer be included, again with the objective that cyclists can ride over the freeway without dismounting.

**Trevethan bike-ped bridge:** We reiterate our long standing recognition of the need to improve or replace the current Morrissey Boulevard crossing. If the Trevethan location remains the preferred replacement and can occur soon, then again we would hope to work with your staff on an appropriate bike-friendly design. If
not, we would look to both short- and long-term improvements for cyclists (and pedestrians) to the Morrissey crossing itself.

Work affecting roads adjacent to and across the freeway: We note that several roads that cross or parallel Highway One will be impacted by future work and some will be partially rebuilt. We recommend that any work done on any of these roads maintain, improve or add bike lanes.

Attached are specific recommendations for EIR revisions to address these concerns.

We look forward to seeing our suggestions incorporated in the final EIR and project plans. The Committee appreciates your pursuit of these highly valuable cycling projects. Please feel free to contact the RTC’s Bicycle Program Manager and staff to the Bicycle Advisory Committee Cory Caletti at (831) 460-3201 or by email at ccaletti@sccrtc.org for any further discussion about the projects and suggestions mentioned in this letter.

Sincerely,

David Casterson
Bicycle Advisory Committee

Attachment 1:

cc: Santa Cruz County Public Works Department
RTC Bicycle Advisory Committee
p. 2.1.5-12 Comment: The description of the current bike lane network is slightly misleading.  
Suggested Revision: “Connecting the communities of Live Oak, Soquel, and Aptos to the cities of Santa Cruz and Capitola is a series of Class II bikeways that runs from the University of California at Santa Cruz campus to Watsonville. Within the study area this network is along major streets including Soquel Avenue, Soquel Drive, and Freedom Boulevard, sometimes running close to and parallel to the freeway while other times being a considerable distance away. Some portions of this route have heavy traffic, on-street parking and/or poor shoulder conditions that can impede safe and efficient bicycle travel. An alternate network of Class II route connects Soquel Drive to Watsonville along San Andreas Road, except that the Bonita Drive segment lacks bike lanes.”

p. 2.1.5-12 Comment: As indicated in the paragraph preceding this one, alternate routes on the map are not official designations.  
Suggested revision: “Clares Street within Capitola is designated shown as an alternate route for bicycles seeking access to the Capitola Mall Transit Facility, but lacks bike lanes.”

pp. 2.1.5-12, 2.1.5-20 Comment: The EIR does not discuss interchange crossing issues.  
Suggested Revision: Add a discussion about conflicting cyclists and motorists movements at surface street intersections with highway interchanges due to free right turn lanes and vehicle movements and associated ingress and egress speeds, potentially becoming more problematic as freeway traffic increases.

pp. 2.1.5-20 and 2.1.5-28. Comment: As stated, the three new bridges would improve bicycle travel across the freeway, but not along the freeway route. We note that the project plans show work would be done on several of the parallel streets.  
Suggested Revision: add a sentence to the bicycle impact discussion: “However, bicycle travel would not be improved along the corridor and may be impacted by any reconfiguration of parallel streets, such as Rooney St., Soquel Ave., Soquel Dr., Kennedy Dr., McGregor Dr., and Bonita Dr., that may occur as part of the highway widening project.”

p. 2.1.5-30 Comment: As indicated, the new Chanticleer bridge “would have a positive effect on multimodal connectivity.” However, effectiveness depends on the final design plans, the corresponding roadway plans that County Public Works has jurisdiction over and whether and when it actually gets built.  
Suggested Revision: add a sentence: “However, it will be important to ensure that final overcrossing design plans and corresponding roadway signing, striping and signalization plans allow for cyclists to safely and conveniently ride to, from and on the bridge.”

p. 2.1.5-36 Comment: We are appreciative of the commitment to install “a Class 1 bicycle and pedestrian facility on Morrissey Boulevard overpass at Route 1” if neither the HOV lanes or TSM/auxiliary lanes are built. However, when this may happen is not clear. The EIR time frame is to 2035. We know that there is no money to build the HOV lanes by 2035. Furthermore, the draft sales tax expenditure plan for 30 years (i.e., 2017-2047) would only fund the Chanticleer and Mar Vista overcrossings, not a new one at Trevethan. So, when and with what funding would the Morrissey Class I overcrossing occur?  
Suggested Revision: add more discussion of the current, inadequate conditions for bicyclists and pedestrians at the Morrissey overcrossing; the history of proposals for
improvements at either Morrissey or a new crossing at Trevethan; what improvements might occur in the short, medium and long term; and a realistic time frame for such improvements.

p. 2.1.5-36 Comment: As indicated above there could be some adverse impacts on bicycle travel that would require mitigation.

Suggested Revision: add the following mitigation measures:
1. “Final design plans for the Chanticleer overcrossing and nearby roadways should ensure that cyclists can ride safely and conveniently to, from and on the new bridge, pursuant to the recommendations in the 1/22/2016 letter from the Bicycle Committee.”
2. “Any work performed on or affecting roads parallel to Highway One should maintain and improve, if necessary, existing bike lanes and add bike lanes or paths where there are gaps in a continuous bicycle network along the corridor.”
3. “Where freeway on and off ramps intersect streets, employ sufficient and innovative measures to minimize conflicts between cyclists and motorists, such as green lanes, bike boxes or other pavement markings across intersections; redesigned free right turn lanes; and bicycle-friendly adjustments to traffic signals and detections.”
4. “Ongoing coordination should occur among the RTC, Caltrans and the City of Santa Cruz regarding improvements to make at the current Morrissey overcrossing (or a substitution at Trevethan) for bicyclists and pedestrians in the short, medium and long term.”

p. 2.3.4 #5 Comment: The mitigation measure to “identify nearby alternate routes” “in the event of temporary obstruction of … bicycle paths” during construction is insufficient. If a bike path is obstructed or a road (with or without a bike lane) is completely closed then this measure should apply; otherwise, routing through the construction zone needs to be provided in accordance with state regulations.

Suggested Revision: “In the event of temporary obstruction of pedestrian walkways or bicycle paths or streets, the Transportation Management Plan would identify nearby alternate bicycle and pedestrian routes, including pedestrian routes that meet Americans with Disabilities Act requirements, as appropriate. In the event of temporary obstruction of streets the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices for Streets and Highways PART 6 Temporary Traffic Control and the Community Traffic Safety Coalition Recommended Guidelines to Protect the Safety of Bicyclists, Pedestrians, and Disabled Travelers during Road Construction” would be followed.

Appendix G Tier I Corridor HOV Drawing HOV4 Comment: This drawing does not have the latest version of the Chanticleer bridge plans.

Suggested Revision: Revise drawing to include the updated rideable curved design that is shown on Sheet T2-L2 in Appendix I.

Appendix G Tier I Corridor HOV Drawing HOV 2 and HOV 12 Comment: The zig zag design illustration for the Mar Vista and Trevethan overcrossings would not be rideable and hence are not acceptable.

Suggested Revision: Revise the bridge designs to look like the latest Chanticleer one, i.e., with enough space and gentle curvature so that riders will not need to dismount.
Where is it in the plan to resurface and really fix Beach Road and Holohan Road? These roads are used daily by numerous commuters. We need some assistance in South County too.

Nancy
Dr. Nancy A. Bilicich, Mayor
City of Watsonville
275 Main Street, Suite 400
Watsonville, CA 95076
(831) 768-3008

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission Regional Transportation Commission
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
phone: (831) 460-3200 ~ fax: (831) 460-3215
email: info@sccrtc.org; website: www.sccrtc.org

CONTRACTS: George Dondero, Executive Director
Karena Pushnik, Senior Planner/Public Information Coordinator

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC)
December 3, 2015 Meeting Highlights

Appointment of 2016 RTC Chair and Vice Chair
The new RTC chair for 2016 will be Commissioner Don Lane. The Vice Chair will be Commissioner Zach Friend. Congratulations to both.

November 2016 Transportation Ballot Measure – Expenditure Plan
After public input and thoughtful discussion, the Regional Transportation Commission approved an Expenditure Plan with five transportation investment categories. This action follows approval of a Long Range Transportation Plan that identified a severe funding shortfall and the benefit of becoming a “self help” county to be more competitive for state and federal funding. Commissioners emphasized that this package of projects is fair and balanced, represents the diverse transportation needs in our community, and provides an opportunity to invest in our infrastructure, our environment, our economy and our future. The 30 year, ¼ cent sales tax funded Transportation Funding Measure to be placed on the November 2016 presidential ballot would include:

- Neighborhood Projects 30% – Funding to cities and county for their high priority eligible projects such as repair and maintenance of local streets and roads; school traffic safety and safe routes to school; bicycle and pedestrian facilities; and other safety improvement projects. Also included are Highway 9 projects in the San Lorenzo Valley; and the Highway 17 Wildlife Undercrossing to improve safety for wildlife and motorists.

- Highway Corridors 25% – Funding for the three auxiliary lane projects on Highway 1 including 41st Ave to Soquel Dr, Bay/Porter to Park Ave, and Park Ave to State Park; two bicycle/pedestrian highway crossings; transportation systems management programs to inform travelers of real-time traffic conditions and encourage carpool/vanpooling; and Safe on 17 programs and Freeway Service Patrol to help reduce congestion and collisions.

- Mobility Access 16% - Funding primarily for specialized transportation services to meet the needs of the area’s aging and disabled populations including Santa Cruz METRO’S paratransit and Community Bridges transportation service.

- Coastal Rail Trail 15% – Funding to construct, operate and maintain sections of the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail.

- Rail Corridor 14% – Funding to maintain the track and bridge infrastructure; environmental analysis of passenger rail transit options; Watsonville/Pajaro Valley Train Station connection with the Capital Corridor and Coast Daylight train services; improvement, upgrade and installation of signals at railroad crossings; and underground conduit and/or pipes to facilitate utilities including Internet service.
Rail Transit Study – final report
The Regional Transportation Commission received the Rail Transit Feasibility Study: Final Report (www.sccrtc.org/rail), prepared by the transit consultant Fehr & Peers. The study evaluates a range of potential public transportation options between Watsonville and Santa Cruz using the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line, includes cost, ridership, and funding information, and suggests parameters and steps for phased transit service. Based on the many comments received from the public on the draft report earlier this year, the study was updated to provide clarification and additional information on several topics. Prior to deciding whether to implement service on the rail line, more detailed environmental analysis and preliminary design work would be done.

Adoption of the 2016 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP)
The Regional Transportation Commission approved schedule, scope, and other information updates to projects previously approved by the RTC for certain state and federal transportation funds, as part of adoption of the 2016 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP). Due to lowered state gas tax revenues and diversion of transportation funds to repay state bond debt service, no new State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funding is available and the California Transportation Commission (CTC) will be delaying many projects through 2021. The RTC is urging the state to minimize delays to projects in Santa Cruz County.

Mayor Bilicich –
The Transportation Investment Plan for the November 2016 ballot includes funding to each jurisdiction for their high priority local road, safe route to school and other eligible neighborhood transportation projects. The City of Watsonville will determine their top projects to receive the estimated annual amount of $500,000 from the measure.

Regarding your specific questions, the County is working with Caltrans on a project in the Holohan/East Lake Beach Road (not West or Each Beach Street) also appears to be the county and would be part of their project prioritization to receive an estimated $2,300,000 annually from the November 2016 transportation measure. The County Public Works Assistant Director Steve Wiesner is copied, should he have additional information.

In addition, RTC staff is working with local jurisdictions to determine a list of Vital Projects that they would like to pursue with funds from the transportation measure.
Thank you.

Karena Pushnik, Senior Planner/Public Information Coordinator
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Santa Cruz Office (main) 831.460.3210
1523 Pacific Avenue | Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Follow our social networks for the latest RTC news
From: Dan [mailto:dbt33@hotmail.com]
Sent: Friday, December 18, 2015 7:50 AM
To: Karena Pushnik
Subject: Re: New submission from Contact Form-Benvenuti,D

Karena
I think I have been very patient but I still have not received an answer to my question how many people use the bus service from Santa Cruz to Watsonville on a daily bases using the same criteria used for proposed rail service. A response would be appreciated. Thank You

Sent from my iPhone

______________________________

Dear Mr. Benvenuti –
As stated in the previous email, the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District/Metro (not our agency) collects this data and has the most current figures.

A quick check of Metro’s website, found this summary of historical ridership per route between Santa Cruz and Watsonville (see page 14).
Also attached from their website is Metro’s September report with that month’s totals for all their routes.

I hope this is helpful. If you have follow up questions, please contact Metro directly at:
Thank you.

Karena Pushnik
@ the RTC | 831.460.3210
From: Johanna Bowen [mailto:jobowen@cabrillo.edu]
Sent: Friday, December 04, 2015 4:40 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: My concern with the Rail Transit plan

Please distribute this article to the Regional Transportation Commission. After many, many years of free walking on the tracks I believe there is a concern for safety of pedestrians as well as a concern regarding a potential suicide venue.


--
Johanna Bowen
jobowen@cabrillo.edu

Johanna Bowen –
Your email and article to the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) regarding your concerns about safety in the rail corridor we’re received and will be made available to the board for their consideration. As a designated active rail line, you are correct that safety is a prime concern in the rail corridor.

The RTC purchased the 32-mile rail corridor with voter approved funding made available to expand the passenger rail network throughout the state. In addition to recreation and transit service, the corridor may also be used to move goods. Additionally a bicycle and pedestrian trail is planned in the rail corridor in conjunction with rail operations. Please see the approved Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network Master Plan for more information. Three sections of trail are currently being designed and construction is expected to be complete in the next two years.

Until sections of the trail including associated buffers are constructed, pedestrian and bicycle access in the rail corridor is prohibited. Similar to freeways and expressways, ownership of the rail corridor by a public agency does not equate to full multimodal public access.

For more information about this and other projects, please visit the RTC’s website: www.sccrtc.org
Thank you.

Karena Pushnik, Senior Planner/Public Information Coordinator
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Santa Cruz Office (main) 831.460.3210
1523 Pacific Avenue | Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Follow our social networks for the latest RTC news
From: Henry Searle [mailto:hrsearle@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, December 07, 2015 10:57 AM
To: scrtc
Subject: rail trail

A recent comment on the rail trail says: If the train is built, there will not be a trail from Boardwalk to Manresa because the corridor is not wide enough for both.

Can you please either verify, qualify or refute this?

Thanks

Reed Searle
114 Swift St
Santa Cruz, Ca. 95060
831-425-8721
hrsearle@sbcglobal.net

Dear Mr. Searle,

Thank you for your inquiry. The trail is being built adjacent to the railroad tracks. The existing rail right-of-way is wide enough to include both the trail and rail in all but 1/3 mile of the 32-mile rail line. Solutions have been identified for those few spots and will be explored as projects are funded. Already 8 miles of the trail are undergoing design and environmental review, with construction scheduled to begin in 2017. The multi-use path is being designed as a 12 foot wide facility. A typical bike lane is 4-5 feet (two way would total 8-10 feet), enough for two riders to ride side by side. A typical sidewalk is approximately 4 feet. A 12 foot trail (or more where width is available) makes for a high quality bicycle and pedestrian facility.

The RTC purchased the rail corridor in 2012 in order to expand transportation options for the community now and into the future. The rail line is located along the most heavily traveled sections of Santa Cruz County, connecting Santa Cruz – Live Oak – Capitola – Aptos/Seacliff – Watsonville. The corridor can be used to provide quality bicycle, walking and transit options; reduce both vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas emissions; advance sustainable transportation options; and reduce congestion and travel times, by moving goods and people efficiently.

The RTC has not made any determination as to train service type, vehicle technology or frequency of service, and has only committed to explore public rail transit options for the future to serve the diverse transportation needs of our community. Keeping reliable travel options open for the future is sound policy and paramount to providing mobility for all, regardless of ability or travel distance. Check out the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network (MBSST) Master Plan for the bicycle & pedestrian path and Rail Transit Feasibility Study web pages for more information.

Please visit the SCCRTC website at www.sccrtc.org for information on the Commission and its activities.

Thank you,

............................................................

Cathy Judd, Administrative Assistant, Art Exhibit Coordinator
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Avenue | Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Main Office 831.460.3200 | Watsonville 831.460.3205
Follow our social networks for the latest RTC news
From: Todd Mayer [mailto:toddmayer@msn.com]
Sent: Wednesday, December 09, 2015 5:49 PM
To: John Leopold
Subject: Soundwall

John,

According to your transportation newsletter: “Lastly there would be approximately $113 million to add auxiliary lanes on Highway 1 from Soquel Drive to State Park Drive.” Does this include soundwalls on both sides of the freeway improvement area?

Thanks,
Toddd

From: Tony Sloss [mailto:Tony.Sloss@santacruzcounty.us]
Sent: Wednesday, December 16, 2015 10:28 AM
To: ‘info@sccrtc.org’
Subject: FW: Soundwall question

RTC,

Could Kim Shultz or someone familiar with the proposed auxiliary lanes project on Hwy 1 to State Park Drive provide me an answer to this constituent’s question?

Thank you,

Tony Sloss, Analyst
Supervisor John Leopold
701 Ocean St., Room 500
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
(831) 454-2200
tony.sloss@santacruzcounty.us

Hello Tony,

There are no sound walls proposed as part of the 41st Ave to Soquel Drive Auxiliary Lanes project. Preliminarily, there are sound walls proposed as part of the auxiliary lane project between the State Park and Bay/Porter Interchanges. Through this latter section, final determination of the need and benefit of sound walls will be dependent on a noise impact analysis conducted as part of a detailed project level environmental impact report.

Please feel free to give me a call or invite the constituent to call me with any questions, comments or concerns.

Regards,

Kim Shultz
Highway 1 Project Manager
Direct Phone: (831) 460-3208
Mass transportation can be a wonderful thing, but only if it is designed and implemented correctly. I support TRAIL NOW, an organization that is promoting using our existing rail corridor for a trail, without a train. The corridor is simply not suited for efficient rail transportation. It’s not correctly positioned geographically. The corridor could be used to build a pedestrian and bike trail that we can be proud of—a trail that our kids can enjoy, a trail designed and used by the disabled and our Senior citizens. A trail that connects our neighborhoods, not separates them. A world-class trail from Watsonville to Santa Cruz. I respectfully ask you to halt the passenger train idea. I respectfully ask you to build a trail. Now.

Sincerely,
Michael Lesh

Dear Mr. Lesh,

Thank you for your inquiry. The trail is being built adjacent to the railroad tracks. The existing rail right-of-way is wide enough to include both the trail and rail in all but 1/3 mile of the 32-mile rail line. Solutions have been identified for those few spots and will be explored as projects are funded. Already 8 miles of the trail are undergoing design and environmental review, with construction scheduled to begin in 2017. The multi-use path is being designed as a 12 foot wide facility. A typical bike lane is 4-5 feet (two way would total 8-10 feet), enough for two riders to ride side by side. A typical sidewalk is approximately 4 feet. A 12 foot trail (or more where width is available) makes for a high quality bicycle and pedestrian facility.

The RTC purchased the rail corridor in 2012 in order to expand transportation options for the community now and into the future. The rail line is located along the most heavily traveled sections of Santa Cruz County, connecting Santa Cruz – Live Oak – Capitola – Aptos/Seacliff – Watsonville. The corridor can be used to provide quality bicycle, walking and transit options; reduce both vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas emissions; advance sustainable transportation options; and reduce congestion and travel times, by moving goods and people efficiently.

The RTC has not made any determination as to train service type, vehicle technology or frequency of service, and has only committed to explore public rail transit options for the future to serve the diverse transportation needs of our community. Keeping reliable travel options open for the future is sound policy and paramount to providing mobility for all, regardless of ability or travel distance. Check out the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network (MBSSST) Master Plan for the bicycle & pedestrian path and Rail Transit Feasibility Study web pages for more information.

Please visit the SCCRTC website at www.sccrtc.org for information on the Commission and its activities.

Thank you,

Cathy Judd, Administrative Assistant, Art Exhibit Coordinator
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Avenue | Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Main Office 831.460.3200 | Watsonville 831.460.3205

Follow our social networks for the latest RTC news
Hi,

My name is Jessica Evans and I live with my family in the city of Santa Cruz on the lower West Side. I'm a rail-trail supporter and I'm very excited about the prospect of the rail trail and the positive changes it can make in the health, well-being and quality of life for people and visitors in Santa Cruz County. Wonderfull Stay tuned for an Open House announcement for the West Side rail trail project that's currently being designed. I'm writing in the hopes that you can bring some clarity to questions that I have and questions that have been raised by other people in the community.

On the published fact sheet regarding the width of the right-of-way at http://sccrtc.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/05/Fact_Sheet_and_Current_Projects_Oct_2015.pdf you state that "94% of the rail corridor is wide enough for a 12 foot trail next to the existing railroad tracks, with most other sections wide enough for at least an 8 foot trail.*"

However, in the footnote is says "Right-of-way width evaluations are based on planning level right-of-way maps and not field surveys. Not factored in the analysis are street crossings..."

What I am trying to understand is whether you have looked at areas such as the concrete underpass where the rail line passes under East Cliff Drive next to the San Lorenzo River. I haven't measured it but it seems like that concrete tunnel is not 25' wide. In a situation like this, what can the trail planners do? We aren't able to survey exact right-of-way, or perform final design and engineering for segments until projects are funded. While I'm not an engineer and can't describe footing adjustments or relocations or other solutions required, we will hire engineers to perform those tasks when the project is funded. The right-of-way in that location is approx 65 feet wide.

The bigger-picture question is that the Trail Now people keep saying the right-of-way isn't wide enough to support the rail and trail both without using eminent domain to demolish existing structures and the SCCRTC keeps saying it is plenty wide. But you also say that the street crossings haven't been figured in. So if there are all these street crossings, including things like underpasses, that haven't been factored in, how do you know it is wide enough? Street crossings are not figured in because they are within the public rights-of-way and therefore available for use to the fullest width required. It's a public entity/jurisdictional nuance that factors into calculations. Sorry for the confusion. Please see the maps online for the right of way widths of the rail corridor: http://sccrtc.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=693ef37a1f0d4423b2c32133ab12cdf3

Here is another question. The Trail Now people keep saying we should tear out the rail line and build a trail only solution. The SCCRT says that we can't do that because we used rail grant money to buy the right of way. So, what if we really can't build a trail and keep the rail running? What if the numbers come back and the train isn't financially feasible? Can we fundraise and return the railroad grant money, tear out the track and build a trail only? Is that a legal option? What would our legal options be in this situation? The simple answer is that it's premature to remove the option of future transit use in the rail corridor. The fact is that our community needs to be thinking about mobility needs for the long term, regardless of age, income, ability and distance traveled. The corridor is a valuable, continuous transportation right of way that if lost, could never be reacquired.

As a resident I am personally very strongly invested in the trail and only weakly invested in the railroad line. I think it would be neat to have a recreational or light passenger rail line running, but I am concerned it would be a big financial drain and I don't think it would make much difference to our quality of life or to the local economy. On the other hand I think that having a continuous, uninterrupted off-street trail connecting Davenport to Watsonville would create a huge positive impact on our local quality of life and on our local economy. For over a decade, the RTC has been working to make this transportation corridor into public ownership to expand transportation options for all in the community. The goal has always been to maximize use by having a range of options including: the bicycle/pedestrian trail, transit, goods movement and recreational train activities. Many in our community are looking forward to the rail trail project and an off-street alternative to get around by walking or biking. Our agency needs to consider the needs of those that can't get around by human power or who travel longer distances and is committed to maintaining as many options for the future as possible.
So I am concerned when it seems that the SCCRT is so strongly invested in creating a recreational/passenger rail service but is fuzzy on the details of how a trail would fit with that. Not looking at street crossings seems like a pretty big hole in the plan. And I really wish I understood what the SCCRT plans to do if significant barriers arise to the building of the trail in the right-of-way, or if the recreational/passenger rail service doesn't pan out. Is paying back the grant and removing the rail line a possible legal option, or is that a fantasy? If that isn't possible, what other options do we have in a situation where rail service isn't financially viable? Due to the county’s physical constraints, there are few ways for people to travel longer distances in the county, as evidenced by Highway 1 in the peak periods. To prepare for the mobility needs of our community well into the future, it is important to plan viable rail or transit options that take people long distances, that can carry people with mobility challenges, and that have reliable travel times. There are many more steps of environmental and engineering analysis before a decision is made about the type of transit vehicle technology, and frequency/type of service. For the trail, eight miles of the 32 mile trail system are underway. With this momentum we are confident that additional funding will be secured for more trail sections.

Respectfully,
Jessica Evans
921 Seaside Street
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Hello Jessica: Thank you for your interest and for your detailed questions. You've done some good research and we provided some answers in red below. We hope those help.

Best, Cory Caletti

Cory Caletti, Senior Transportation Planner/Rail Trail Program Manager
Regional Transportation Commission
831.460.3201
From: penellis17@gmail.com [mailto:penellis17@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, December 14, 2015 1:59 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Transportation

Hi Ginger,

I got your email address from the SCCRT website. I’m not sure if you are the right person for me to be contacting but if not, would appreciate it if you would forward my request to the proper department / person. Thanks so much.

I have been researching different modes of travel that address public and personal transportation issues and would like to connect with someone in SCCRT about a new form of transportation that I think would work for our county.

Let me know if your department has a format for the public to present their ideas to the transit commission.

Thank you and I will look forward to hearing back from you,

Penny Ellis
831-332-1935

---

Dear Penny,

Your email is very timely as the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) has started work on the 2040 Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The RTP is a long range transportation plan that identifies multi-modal transportation needs (highway, local road, transit, bicycle, pedestrian, etc), and identifies a financially constrained list of priority transportation projects. The 2040 RTP is scheduled to be completed in June 2018.

Your input on two items for the 2040 RTP would be greatly appreciated.

- Please provide your comments on the draft goals, policies, and targets of the 2040 RTP to achieve a sustainable transportation system. A major re-visioning of the goals, policies and targets took place in the 2014 Regional Transportation Plan. The draft goals, policies and targets for the 2040 RTP include only minor revisions to the 2014 RTP goals, policies and targets. Please provide your input by January 30, 2016.
- **Share your ideas** on specific transportation projects that you think could improve the transportation network (automobile, bus, bicycle, pedestrian, truck movement, etc) in Santa Cruz County. Your ideas will be sent to the project sponsor that would most likely construct/maintain/own the project to encourage them to add it to their list. Please provide your ideas for transportation projects by January 30, 2016.

This information will be used to help us determine which projects to prioritize for the 2040 Regional Transportation Plan in order to make the best use of limited transportation dollars. For more information about the 2040 Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Plan, please go to [http://sccrtc.org/funding-planning/long-range-plans/2040-rtp/](http://sccrtc.org/funding-planning/long-range-plans/2040-rtp/).

You are also always welcome to attend the commission meetings to provide your input during oral communications. Information on the meeting dates and times can be found at the following links.

[http://sccrtc.org/meetings/commission/agendas/](http://sccrtc.org/meetings/commission/agendas/)
[http://sccrtc.org/meetings/calendar/](http://sccrtc.org/meetings/calendar/)

I have added your name to the RTP eNews distribution list so that you can stay informed on the development of the 2040 Regional Transportation Plan. If you would prefer to not be on this list please let me know.

Thank you,

Ginger Dykaar

-------------

Ginger Dykaar
RTC | 831.460.3213
From: Jessica Evans [mailto:jesseevansfiddler@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, December 14, 2015 5:19 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Another question

Hi Mr. Caletti,

Sorry to spam you with questions. Here is another one based on a statement by the Trail Now folks. They say that assuming the tracks are centered on the right-of-way, the RTC cannot build a trail without moving the rail tracks to one side of the right of way even where the widths are theoretically sufficient. They also say that without money to build a new commuter rail (and there is none available in the foreseeable future) the tracks will not be moved, and thus the trail will be built only in places where the right-of-way exceeds 50 feet.

My question is, do you have a plan to deal with instances where the right-of-way is, for example, 25 or 35 feet in width but the rail line is in the center of the right of way and would need to be moved to the side in order to accommodate a trail? Is shifting the rail to one side a realistic solution? Or will this become an insurmountable stumbling block for the construction of the trail between, for example, the San Lorenzo river and the city of Capitola, or the city of Capitola and the city of Watsonville? I have in mind again the tunnel under Eastcliff Drive at the San Lorenzo River, but there are lots of other places where the rail would presumably need to be shifted to the side of the right of way.

Another way to ask this question is to ask, have costs for shifting the rail line to one side of the right of way been factored into the cost estimates for building the trail?

Thanks and best wishes,
Jessica Evans
921 Seaside St.
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Hello Jessica: Yes, we have factored in the cost of shifting the rail lines to one side of the rail corridor a 1 mile segment in Live Oak where that will be needed. It is not an insurmountable challenge.

The claim that “without money to build a new commuter rail (and there is none available in the foreseeable future) the tracks will not be moved, and thus the trail will be built only in places where the right-of-way exceeds 50 feet” is not correct. First of all, the tracks can be moved when that section of the trail project in question is funded and moves forward to construction (after design, environmental analysis, public input, etc). The segment is identified as Segment 10 in the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Master Plan. The rail trail is the spine of the MBSSST project. See chapter 4 of the Master Plan for segment by segment descriptions of approved high-altitude plans on the project website: http://sccrtc.org/projects/multi-modal/monterey-bay-sanctuary-scenic-trail/. Additionally, the minimum width needed for a rail-with-trail system is 25 feet (which would provide the minimum width of 8 feet for the trail), not 50 feet as claimed. Approximately 95% of the corridor is 32 feet or wider, enough room for a 12-foot path and 20 feet for any future train operations. Twelve feet is the size of a typical highway lane.

And last, I just want to reiterate that no decision has been made about pursuing rail transit service, the types of vehicles, street crossing Quiet Zones, frequency, etc. Because this is more of a long range transportation option, the RTC board has numerous expressed the intent to preserve this as a potential best case option for future public transit. Additional environmental review and preliminary engineering would help answer questions and determine if there is a preferred alternative. Meanwhile, keeping a diverse set of transportation options available in this real-estate constrained county, especially those with reliable travel times, seems to be a prudent strategy to serve the long term needs of our community.

I hope that answers your question,

Cory (as in Corina)

Cory Caletti, Senior Transportation Planner
Regional Transportation Commission
831.460.3201
From: Ken Maus [mailto:kenrrjoo@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, December 15, 2015 10:16 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Dinner Train

Do you have any information about when dinner train from Watsonville, to Santa Cruz or Davenport will begin?

Pictured advertising for the Santa Cruz & Monterey Bay Railway Dinner Train has been listed monthly in Trains Magazine Directory of Tourist Lines for over a year.

Thanks for any information you may have.

Ken Maus
kenrrjoo@gmail.com

Hello Ken Maus –
Thank you for your inquiry about plans for dinner trains or other excursion services on the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line.

Your best bet is to contact the rail operator, the Santa Cruz & Monterey Bay Railway directly. I am copying their company representatives, with a request that they copy me on their reply.

Our contract with the company requires that plans for new passenger service on the branch line be approved by the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) board. At the present time, no proposal other than the Train to Christmastown has been submitted.

You may also be interested in the Final Rail Transit Study that was completed by consultants and RTC staff with input from the public (click on the Final Study from the Quick Links sidebar on the right side of the screen). The RTC board accepted the Final Study at their December 3, 2015 meeting.

Thank you.

Karena Pushnik, Senior Planner/Public Information Coordinator
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
Santa Cruz Office (main) 831.460.3210
1523 Pacific Avenue | Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Follow our social networks for the latest RTC news
This Contact Request Form has been submitted by a member of the public to http://sccrtc.org/contact-us/.

**Name**

Peter Haworth

**Email**

pete@haworths.org

**Subject**

Rail/Trail

**Your Message**

Lots of opinions in the Sentinel recently regarding the proposed sales tax increase to fund various projects. Some of them advocate against the rail portion of the rail/trail. I am under the impression that the county is obliged to provide passenger rail service as a condition of receiving the funds that were used to purchase the right of way or we will have to repay those funds. Is that the case? If so, is there any sort of time limit by which the passenger service must be provided?

Thanks for any clarification you can provide.

Peter Haworth –
Your email regarding the requirements of Proposition 116 was received and will be made available for consideration by the Regional Transportation Commission.

The Regional Transportation Commission used Proposition 116 funding approved by California and Santa Cruz County voters with the intent to expand the passenger rail network throughout the state. A 9/8/2015 letter from the California Transportation Commission clarified that “Proposition 116 requires that the allocated funds be used to establish passenger rail service to facilitate recreational, commuter, intercity and intercounty travel in Santa Cruz County” and that the state statute precludes the use of Proposition 116 funds for a ‘trail only.’ Trail only use of the line would require RTC to refund the Proposition 116 funds allocation by the CTC. No time limit is specified.

Thank you for your interest.

************************************************************

**Karena Pushnik**, Senior Planner/Public Information Coordinator  
**Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission**  
Santa Cruz Office (main) 831.460.3210  
1523 Pacific Avenue | Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Follow our social networks for the latest RTC news
From: marshall@alohaantacruz.com [mailto:marshall@alohaantacruz.com]
Sent: Friday, December 18, 2015 11:53 AM
To: Don Lane; info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Trail Now - Marshall Miller

Mass transportation can be a wonderful thing, but only if it is designed and implemented correctly. I support TRAIL NOW, an organization that is promoting using our existing rail corridor for a trail, without a train. The corridor is simply not suited for efficient rail transportation. It's not correctly positioned geographically. The corridor could be used to build a pedestrian and bike trail that we can be proud of—a trail that our kids can enjoy, a trail designed and used by the disabled and our Senior citizens. A trail that connects our neighborhoods, not separates them. A world-class trail from Watsonville to Santa Cruz. I respectfully ask you to halt the passenger train idea. I respectfully ask you to build a trail. Now.

Sincerely,
Marshall Miller

Dear Marshall

Thanks for writing about trail.

I'm sorry to report that I do not share all of your views on the rail line.

I've included three links below that show:

1) The trail has already been laid out pretty carefully (in the fully approved Monterey Bay Scenic Trail master plan) and that layout was done while leaving the tracks intact so that the possibility of running train service is not precluded.

2) The population density along most of the rail corridor is very high and the corridor connects most of our main population centers.

(This does not prove that rail transit is financially viable but it does show that the rail line is well-situated to have real potential for transit in the long run.)

Rail feasibility study: http://sccrtc.org/projects/rail/passenger-rail/

It's important to note that we have already secured funding to build 25% of the mileage of the entire county trail—demonstrating that we can proceed without closing out the possibility of train service in the distant future.

I think history is a good guide for me on how to approach this issue: Many, including me, wish we had train service that ran directly over the hill from Santa Cruz to San Jose. 40 years ago, the inactive rail line that traveled that route was still intact. Unfortunately, because there were no immediate plans to activate that rail service, the tracks were removed and the land was sold off. Now, there is no way to create train service over the hill, though it would be a terrific service to have now.

So... I am not willing to close out the possibility of ever creating train service along our coastal rail line. The rail corridor is a very valuable public transportation asset and I think we need to use it to its maximum public benefit.

Thanks again for writing... I'd be happy to discuss this further if you'd like... but want to reinforce this point: we are building the trail now.

Don

Don Lane
City Councilmember
City of Santa Cruz
831-420-5022
From: Ed Boos [mailto:EdB@thresholdent.com]
Sent: Friday, December 18, 2015 1:21 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Soquel to 41st auxiliary lane

Hi,

Can you please tell me when the much needed Soquel Ave to 41st Ave auxiliary lane will be completed?

Thanks,
-Ed

---

Hello Ed,

Construction of the 41st Ave to Soquel Avenue auxiliary lane project is currently programmed to start in Winter 18/19 with construction anticipated to take 1 year (completed in Fall 2019). This schedule is subject to the availability of funds. At the moment, the most secure source of funds for this project would be locally generated through a proposed transportation sales tax measure proposed for the November 2016 ballot.

If you have further questions, give me a call or drop me a line at this address.

Happy Holidays,
Kim

--------------------------------------------
Kim Shultz, Highway 1 Project Manager/Senior Planner
Regional Transportation Commission
831.460.3208
This Contact Request Form has been submitted by a member of the public to http://sccrtc.org/contact-us/.

Name
Jody Healy

Email
jody.healy@gmail.com

Subject
Bart along Hy 1 & connecting to Bay Area

Your Message
Hi Are there any plans to run bart to the bay area and down the coast. I commuted to Palo Alto and would have gladly taken bart.

Also for tourism I don't know anyone who enjoys driving Hy 17.

Jody Healy

Hello Jody,

No, there are no current plans to extend BART service to the Santa Cruz area. There is a plan to build a passenger rail station in Pajaro, immediately east of Watsonville, that would be serviced by a proposed passenger rail line connecting Monterey and San Jose. There is no current schedule for constructing that station or the beginning of passenger rail service between Monterey and San Jose.

However, you may be aware that the RTC recently completed a passenger rail feasibility study using the rail corridor through Santa Cruz County – information regarding that study and next steps can be found here: http://sccrtc.org/projects/rail/

I hope this helpful.

Kim

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
Kim Shultz, Highway 1 Project Manager/Senior Planner
Regional Transportation Commission
831.460.3208
Kim,

I am in favor of the widening of Highway One. That is not what I'm writing about. There are two things that I think would improve the impact on both the neighborhoods and traffic in the section of highway between the fishhook and Soquel.

1. Delaveaga Elementary. In the morning parents dropping off children at Delaveaga Elementary cause a huge backup on Rooney St., the overpass ramp to Rooney and the northbound exit ramp. If there were a freeway overpass footbridge at Trevethan or Park Way, it would provide a location on the south side of the freeway for parents to drop children without having to cross the freeway.

2. This idea seems extremely difficult to execute, but there is a large amount of traffic that crosses Goss St. in the morning and afternoon to get from neighborhoods in Happy Valley/Granite Creek and from Santa Cruz. It is a terrible bottleneck and has a terrible impact on the neighbors. In fact, all drivers from Glen Canyon/Happy Valley/Granite Creek going south on One have to pass through Goss/Rooney and Fairmount. It would be ideal to have ramps at Market St. It is far too late, but I think a Market St. onramp southbound and offramp northbound would have been far more useful than the northbound Emeline ramp.

Robert Bixby
180 Pear Creek Lane
Santa Cruz, CA 95065

---

From: Kim Shultz
Sent: Friday, January 08, 2016 5:27 PM
To: 'robert@cirbpu.com'
Subject: FW: Highway 1 widening-Bixby,R

Hello Robert,

Thank you for your comment and interest in the Hwy 1 project. Following are responses to your comments:

1. As part of the long term Highway 1 Corridor Investment Program (referred to as the Tier I project in the Draft EIR) there is a plan to build a bike/pedestrian overcrossing in proximity to Trevethan (exact location to be determined in the engineering design phase). There is also a plan to reconstruct the Morrissey Boulevard interchange that should also help address the traffic backup associated Delaveaga Elementary.

2. Points well taken re Emeline v Market Street ramps.

Hope all is well for you in the New Year,
Kim

Kim Shultz, Highway 1 Project Manager/Senior Planner
Regional Transportation Commission
831.460.3208
-----Original Message-----
From: mark wegrich [mailto:wegrich@comcast.net]
Sent: Sunday, January 10, 2016 5:17 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: bicycle overpasses

Your attention please,
The recent article in the Sentinel calling for comments on the Hwy 1 widening project notes that
28 million dollars would be spent for a crossing at Chanticleer as part of the work. Is this correct?
The Plan states the estimated cost of the Mar Vista project to be 8 million dollars. Is Chanticleer that much more expensive? It seems 28 million is enough to do all three of the overpasses.
I did the initial public petition for the construction of an overpass at Mar Vista Dr in '98 and of the thousand signatures I collected and submitted to the County Supervisors exactly one person thought it would be nice to have one at Chanticleer. It seems someone in the transportation department has moved this project ahead of the Mar Vista project for personal reasons. Did the County receive that much support for the Chanticleer project?
Due to the adjacency of Cabrillo College, Mar Vista School, etc. the Mar Vista Overpass would be much more beneficial to the commuters, school children and seniors in the mid county than the Chanticleer project.
Please reply asap as this project is very important to myself and the mid county.
Thanks,
Mark

Hello Mark,

The $28 million cost cited in the Sentinel article is for the combined Highway 1 41st Avenue to Soquel Drive Auxiliary Lanes and Chanticleer Avenue Pedestrian/Bicycle Overcrossing. Approximately 75% of that total cost (including design engineering, right-of-way, construction management...) is attributed to the auxiliary lanes portion of the combined project.

Work on the preliminary design and environmental clearance of the Mar Vista Overcrossing will begin this Spring. The order of the project development process was the result of direction from the Federal Highway Administration which mandated the tiered environmental approach in analyzing proposed improvements to the Highway 1 corridor. With the focus on relieving traffic congestion on Highway 1, the decision to include the Chanticleer Overcrossing as part of the auxiliary lanes work was to realize economies of scale in engineering and minimize construction related impacts to traffic that will be realized by combining the projects.

The RTC remains committed to the Mar Vista Pedestrian/Bicycle overcrossing for the very reasons cited in your comments. Thank you for your continued interest and support of this project and I look forward to meeting and working with you in the next few months. In the meantime, if you have further questions please do not hesitate to send me a note or give me a call.

Sincerely,
Kim

--------Original Message--------
Kim Shultz, Highway 1 Project Manager/Senior Planner
Regional Transportation Commission
831.460.3208
RTC,

I’m writing to you and the Commissioners of the RTC at the recommendation of Roger Clugston, Deputy Director of the Office of Railroad Safety with the California Public Utilities Commission. I spoke with Mr. Clugston at length yesterday in regards to the proposed rail-with-trail for Santa Cruz County. At the end of the conversation, Mr. Clugston agreed that there is reason for concern. Namely, the setbacks for the proposed trail are **not safe** and pose **increased liability** when combined with the passenger rail service.

The lack of safety for the proposed rail-with-trail is attributed primarily to the geographic confines of the corridor. While much has been discussed with regards to the overall width of the corridor, setbacks are the primary factor to consider when determining the safety of a rail-with-trail project.

In August 2002, the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) published the document Rails-With-Trails: Lessons Learned. This document remains the most comprehensive and authoritative resource for rail-with-trail development. I’ve included a link to the USDOT document below. Trail design is discussed beginning on page 57.

**Rails-With-Trails: Lessons Learned**

Per the USDOT document, trail designers should consider the type, speed, and frequency of a train when determining the appropriate setback. However, nowhere in the Master Plan for the trail does it mention any of these variables. A very likely cause for these oversights is the timing: the Master Plan for the trail was developed approximately three years prior to the Rail Feasibility Study. Additionally, the EIR for the trail does not mention the type, speed, or frequency of the trains involved. Will the train be going 10 miles per an hour, or 100 miles per an hour? Will it be going by twice a day, or 60 times a day? These details are crucial to understanding setbacks, and critical to the overall trail design and sizing constraints.

As part of the Master Plan, the trail designer relied on input from the current operator, Iowa Pacific. I believe this to be a significant error. Keep in mind, Iowa Pacific operates seasonal **tourist trains** and **limited freight**, which is very different from providing **passenger rail** service to the general public. This is the equivalent of consulting with the Watsonville Municipal Airport prior to building a brand new International Terminal.

The result is several miles of trail with 8.5 to 10.0 foot setbacks, which is not a reasonably safe distance. Please note that an 8.5 foot minimum setback is meant to accommodate railroad workers. The Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) has concluded that these minimum setbacks are not appropriate for rail-with-trail design, and the setback distance for the general public should be **much greater** than that allowed for railroad workers (reference page 63 of USDOT document).

What would have been more appropriate is to seek input from passenger rail service providers analogous to what’s being planned. It's unlikely the Master Plan would exist in its current form had the RTC consulted with CalTrain, SMART, SCRA, or any other operator that provides passenger service to the general public. In Healdsburg, Sonoma-Marin Area Rail Transit (SMART) concluded that the Foss Creek Trail needs a minimum setback of 15 feet in places where the train is going 25 miles per an hour or less. The setback increases to 25 feet if the speed is above 25 miles per hour. The Southern California Regional Rail Authority (SCRRRA) determined a minimum setback of 25 feet when the trail is next to a train going 40 miles per hour or under. Attached to this email is a list of trail
guidelines that I was able to compile from various railroad operators. As you will see, the railroad operators have concluded that trail setbacks are a function of train speed.

While we may disagree on variables such as cost and design, we should all agree that public safety is of utmost concern. Ultimately, I believe that meaningful passenger train service and the proposed trail cannot safely commingle in our corridor. While I appreciate your due diligence in analyzing a variety of use models, any additional studies or investigation into rail service is seen as a waste of valuable time, resources, and taxpayer dollars.

Currently, the notion is to build the trail today, and figure out rail service down the road. In my opinion, this is exceptionally poor planning that will eventually create a situation ripe for conflict. Prior to moving forward, a critical question that the RTC must answer is: Are the setbacks proposed in the MBSST reasonable, relative to the speed and frequency required to operate meaningful passenger rail service?

Regards,

Ryan J. Whitelaw, MAI
Pacific Appraisers
Commercial | Residential | Consulting
o: 831.465.6518 | c: 831.704.6204 | f: 408.516.5500

www.pacificappraisers.com
Dear Mr. Whitelaw:

Thank you for your comments. They will be provided to the Commission for its consideration. This email reply comes from RTC staff and Steve Hill, Iowa Pacific’s Vice President of Engineering and Chief Engineer, who was consulted during the design phase of the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Master Plan and in crafting this response. As you may know, Iowa Pacific is the federally designated common carrier and rail operator on the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line.

As information, Mr. Hill has over 43 years of railroad track and structures maintenance, construction and design experience and was, until 2013, Caltrain’s Chief Engineer Track and Structures. Among many other safety related duties he was closely involved with the development and specifications for Caltrain’s right of way and safety fencing program.

The RTC and its operator most certainly share your concern for public safety and have identified the desire to provide as much separation between train operations and tracks, and the bicycle and pedestrian trail. We addressed this goal within the context of utilizing the corridor for use by a multitude of people wishing to travel various distances, and of varying physical capabilities.

Before the RTC adopted the Trail Master Plan and certified the Environmental Impact Report (EIR), a number of experts were consulted. Comments on the EIR were submitted by Caltrans and the California Public Utilities Commission, local jurisdictions, the California Coastal Commission and individuals. It has always been made clear that further analysis at an engineering level would have to be conducted as each trail segment is funded, designed, permitted and constructed.

As you are aware, the RTC has made no determination as to future train operations. Due to the fact that the RTC made the commitment to move forward with trail implementation, the owner (the RTC) and operator (Iowa Pacific) agreed as part of development of the Trail Master Plan and through design of current projects, that the CPUC statutory minimum of an 8’6” setback is acceptable on an exception basis. The attachments you provided also cite this minimum as being acceptable by the Federal Railroad Administration. Locally, the determination was deemed acceptable if other constraints required due to the fact that those minimums would be needed in just a few pinch points
consisting of less than a third of a mile in total along the 32 mile corridor. Ten (10) feet is the design minimum. Wherever there is available width, the trail will be located as far from the track as is feasible.

Finally, as you can see from a more released Rails-to-Trails report surveying America’s rail-with-trail projects there are some locations where the setback is less than 8’ 6” (page 25). You will also see some photos exemplifying uses in the report.

The Master Plan recommends fencing of various robustness levels to ensure the very safety issues you share concern about. You may refer to the Section Five (pages 5-21 and 5-22), for discussion of that topic.

Please visit the SCCRTC website at www.sccrtc.org for information on the Commission and its activities.

Thank you,

Cory Caletti and Karena Pushnik, RTC Senior Transportation Planners
Steve Hill, Iowa Pacific VP of Engineering

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Avenue | Santa Cruz, CA 95060
Main Office 831.460.3200 | Watsonville 831.460.3205
Follow our social networks for the latest RTC news
**Foss Creek Trail – Sonoma-Marin Area Rail Transit (SMART)**

http://www.railstotrails.org/resourcehandler.ashx?id=4285

5.1 Railroad Setbacks

The NCRA and SMART both require that the pathway be located to comply with the railroad setbacks listed in the table below. The intent of the setback is to protect pathway users from hazards associated with train operations, including dragging or loose equipment and wind-borne debris. Preferred setback distances vary between 15 and 40 feet, based on train speed. In no case may the railroad setback be less than 15 feet and then only if there is a solid barrier or fence between the pathway and the track. Most of the pathway will be located between 15 and 25 feet from the track because most of the NWP right-of-way through the City is 40 feet or less. Given that trains will travel through the City at speeds exceeding 25 mph, much of the pathway will have to be developed with an adjoining solid barrier to protect the users from train hazards. Solid barriers can a six-foot high wire fence with climbing vines as well as six-foot high wood and masonry walls.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Train Speed</th>
<th>Preferred Design</th>
<th>State-Mandated Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum setback</td>
<td>Minimum setback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-80 mph</td>
<td>40 feet Solid, 6 feet high</td>
<td>15 feet Solid barrier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-50 mph</td>
<td>25 feet Solid, 6 feet high</td>
<td>15 feet Solid barrier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;25 mph</td>
<td>15 feet Solid, 6 feet high</td>
<td>15 feet Solid, 6 feet high</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Southern California Regional Rail Authority (SCRRA)**

**Rail-With-Trail Guidelines**


4.3 **Clearances**

4.3.1 Rail-with-Trail shall be designed along the outer edges of the right-of-way adjacent to the property line, to the extent feasible.

4.3.2 Rail-with-Trail shall be designed so as to maximize the Setback between the centerline of the nearest track (existing or future) and the closest edge of the Rail-with-Trail to the extent feasible. The Setback clearance shall take into consideration the type, speed and frequency of trains; separation technique, topography; sight distances; and SCARRA’s maintenance requirements.

4.3.3 The recommended minimum Setbacks are 45 feet of any main line track where the train speeds exceed 90 mph; 40 feet where main line speed is between 90 mph and 79 mph; 35 feet where main line speed is between 78 mph and 60 mph; 30 feet where main line speed is between 69 mph and 40 mph; and 25 feet where mainline speed is below 40 mph.

4.3.4 It may not be possible to provide recommended minimum Setbacks at certain points. While a railroad right-of-way may be sufficiently wide, the tracks may be within a narrow cut or fill section or adjacent to bluffs making placement of Rail-with-Trail very difficult. Safety shall not be compromised at such points. Additional barriers, vertical separation or other methods shall be employed.
City of Fremont - Union Pacific Railroad Corridor Trail Feasibility Study

https://fremont.gov/DocumentCenter/Home/View/2721

Minimum Setback Standards. State public utilities commissions and the Federal Railroad Authority publish minimum setback standards (also known as 'clearance standards' for fixed objects next to active railroad tracks, the distance between two active tracks, and adjacent walkways (for railroad switchmen). These published setbacks represent the legal minimum setbacks based on the physical size of the railroad cars (light rail cars are typically smallest type), and are commonly used along all railroads and at public grade crossings.

The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) has such standards. Minimum distance from the centerline of an active railroad to the outside edge of a RWT should be 2.6 m (8.5 ft) on tangent, and 2.9 m (9.5 ft) on curved track. However, for safety and liability protection, Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) officials recommend that the setback distance for the general public should be much greater than that allowed for railroad workers.

The U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration and Federal Railroad Administration in the 2004 report Rails-with-Trails: Lessons Learned specifies that the minimum rail-with-trail setback (offset) for unconstrained flat sections of a high-speed, high-frequency rail corridor is 25 feet.

Train Speed and Frequency. The active portions of the UPRR alignment contain a high-volume, high-speed corridor. Union Pacific freight runs frequently, ranging in speed from 25 miles per hour to 45 miles per hour. The ACE commuter rail (south of Clarke Drive) runs nine eastbound and nine westbound trains per day, weekdays only, for a total of 18 trains.
SEDACOG Joint Rail Authority

https://www.railstotrails.org/resourcehandler.ashx?id=4523

**TYPICAL CROSS-SECTIONS:**

*Where the SEDA-COG Joint Rail Authority has property in excess of 50 feet from centerline - no fence required*

Minimum 50 feet of clear area

Track centerline

*Where the SEDA-COG Joint Rail Authority has property LESS THAN 50 feet from centerline - fence required*

To be approved only as per “Exceptions to Standards” enumerated below

No less than 25 feet of clear area

Track centerline

FENCE

TRAIL

Standard R/W is 30-33 feet from track centerline. Where the Authority R/W extends beyond 30-33 feet and there is no other parallel track, a trail may be considered. If accepted by the Authority, separation by a chain link fence (minimum 60 inches high) installed no less than 25 feet from track center shall be required.

**Exceptions to Standards:**

If a trail does not meet the above standards, and there is a constriction with no other reasonable option, then the standards may be relaxed for an extremely limited distance. The exemption will be of a longitudinal distance no greater than 400 yards, and not less than 25 feet separation distance with a fence or vegetative barrier required. Special exceptions for a separation distance of 20 feet will be considered by the JRA on a case-by-case basis.
Rail-with-Trail

A rail-with-trail (RWT) multi-use path is where rail is likely to remain in place, a multi-use pathway is feasible in conjunction with the operating rail, and alignment options adhere to generally accepted rail-with-trail design guidelines. As with the rail-to-trail, the recommended total width is a minimum of 12 feet paved surface. Chapter 3 provides detail on primary design characteristics for RWT facilities including setback distance from the centerline of active railroad tracks, barrier separation requirements, railroad crossing design, and roadway crossing standards. Generally, privately operated freight railroads and high-speed commuter rail have higher setback and separation requirements from 25 feet to as much as 50 feet, as is the case with the UPRR. Low-speed freight spurs and some light-rail and commuter-rail facilities exist with extremely narrow setback (10 feet or less) at constrained segments and roadway crossings. Figure ES-5 shows a typical rail-with-trail setback. This study assumes a minimum 12-foot wide facility with limited separation fencing at a cost of $1.2 Million per mile not including major roadway crossing improvements.
Trail Setbacks and Separation from Railroad
In areas without retaining walls separating the rail and trail, minimum horizontal "clear zones" between the rail centerline and the trail's inside edge range from 15 to 50 feet. Where retaining walls exist, the minimum clear zone is 12 feet, 8 inches. Depending on location, Capital Metro requires a continuous landscape hedge, fence or retaining wall to separate rail and trail traffic. Fences and retaining walls must be at least 4 feet tall. In areas constrained by topography, slopes between the rail and trail must not exceed a 2:1 ratio, and sufficient drainage must be provided.

Although several factors influence minimum trail setbacks from railroads, train speed plays a major role. To address crosswinds created by moving trains, setbacks are typically shorter in areas where trains travel at lower speeds (e.g., near stations or where trains travel along city streets), and are longer in higher-speed areas. In several locations, Capital Metro's existing setback requirements could preclude trail development within the railroad right-of-way, thereby impacting the feasibility of creating a trail. Setbacks however could be reduced through the use of other effective means to address train crosswinds while maintaining physical separation between trains and trail users. Potential treatments include higher barriers or less-porous barriers (e.g., walls) to deflect train crosswinds. Applying such treatments could allow some flexibility in setback requirements, and could enable more trail segments to be constructed within the rail right-of-way while maintaining rail and trail safety.
St. Johns County Rails with Trails Study (Florida)
http://www.railstotrails.org/resourcehandler.ashx?id=4543

Based on a Data Needs memo developed by the project consulting team and the FECP, the following baseline information was identified for the purposes of this study:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Railroad Classification:</th>
<th>Class 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary Function:</td>
<td>Freight, all types</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Trains per week:</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Trains per day:</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track Speed Rating:</td>
<td>25 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Speed:</td>
<td>20 mph</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. In constrained areas where the trade-off is between rail proximity and documented significant environmental impact and/or significant construction cost, locate the trail no closer than 10.5 feet from the track centerline (8.14 feet from the nearest track). Wherever possible, the trail should be located no closer than 25 feet from the track centerline.
From: Contact Request Form [mailto:admin@sccrtc.org]
Sent: Tuesday, January 12, 2016 5:32 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: New submission from Contact Form

Name

Jeffrey Hill

Email

jhill@cruzio.com

Subject

Highway 1 Corridor Project

Your Message

I have looked over the Tier I/Tier II plans and have only this comment. You need to extend the Tier II widening plans all the way to State Park Drive, now. It is painfully obvious to anyone who drives this route regularly that the highway traffic is over capacity and that thousands of people are inconvenienced, delayed, and forced to waste fuel chugging along at very slow speeds during the period from 3:00 PM to 5:30 PM every weekday. Doing this project in little chunks over a period of years is going to be much more expensive than biting the bullet and getting on with the whole job.

What you have currently planned is more a lengthy exercise in social research and planning, rather than a highway widening. I would like to see what percentage of the costs of this overall project are going to keep social scientists employed vs. engineers and construction workers.

Hello Jeffrey,

Thank you for your comment on the Highway 1 Tiered Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR). I forwarded your comments to Caltrans for inclusion and thorough response in the Final Environmental Document.

In the meantime, I wanted to share with you the reason a more limited section was selected for the Tier II project. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) applies a “reasonable assured funding” criteria to approve environmental documents. The estimated cost of extending auxiliary lanes from Soquel Drive to State Park Drive is over $85 million (in 2015$). As discussed on page 1-3 of the DEIR, the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) is the primary existing source of funding for regional projects on the state highway system. STIP funds are programmed every 2 years and can vary from $3 million to $5 million per year, which means that over 25 years (approximately 12 STIP cycles), this source would yield approximately $75 million to $125 million (unescalated). The 25 year timeframe needed fully fund the construction of auxiliary lanes to State Park Drive is beyond the timeframe allowed for approval of a project level environmental document by FHWA or Caltrans.

In agreement with your premise that extending the auxiliary lanes to State Park Drive would provide meaningful congestion relief on Highway 1, the RTC has proposed to expedite projects by raising new local funding for this work as part of a proposed Transportation Investment Plan measure to be placed on the 2016 ballot. Unfortunately, funding from a prospective sales tax measure does not meet FHWA’s reasonable funding test either, which is why the Tier II project was proposed as it was (to meet the “reasonable assured funding” criteria). However, with approval of the Transportation Investment Plan measure in November 2016, three sections of Highway 1 projects would be funded and work could begin immediately on extending the current proposed Tier II project to State Park Drive with the goal of maximizing the amount of funds dedicated to engineering and construction to reduce traffic congestion on Highway 1.

Thank you for your interest in improving Highway 1. If you have further questions or comments, please drop me a note or give me a call.

Sincerely,
Kim

Kim Shultz, Highway 1 Project Manager/Senior Planner
Regional Transportation Commission
831.460.3208
January 14, 2016

Mr. Will Kempton  
Executive Director  
California Transportation Commission  
1120 N Street, Room 2233 (MS-52)  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Kempton:

The Central Coast Coalition would like thank the California Transportation Commission for the opportunity to provide input on Cycle 3 of the Active Transportation Program. The Coalition consists of the regional transportation planning agencies in San Benito, Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Luis Obispo, and Santa Barbara counties and the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments. Our coalition members compete for ATP funding from the small urban/rural program in addition to the Statewide program.

We applaud the expeditious work by the CTC and Caltrans to program projects during Cycles 1 and 2 of the Active Transportation Program; however, we do have several suggestions that we believe will improve the effectiveness of the program. Below are our recommendations for Cycle 3 for consideration by the Commission.

1. **Maintain the statutory schedule for Cycle 3 which requires that funds be awarded to projects by April 2017.**

   There is a significant backlog of bicycle and pedestrian projects and it is important to deliver a message to the legislature that more transportation funding of all kinds is sorely needed now. This message is best delivered by maintaining the ATP schedule set in statute, especially as the Governor and legislature develop the 2016-2017 budget. Delaying Cycle 3 of the ATP would require legislation and carries a significant risk of conveying the wrong message to the legislature that there is no urgency in providing funding for projects that support active transportation.

The Active Transportation Program is also a critical funding source for the small urban and rural counties we represent. The phase out of the STIP’s Transportation Enhancement program eliminated a reliable, formula funding source for active transportation projects that were prioritized and selected by our boards following a community-based public outreach process and delivered by our local agencies. Instead, we must now compete via the Statewide and Small Urban/Rural components of the ATP to secure funding for critical projects in our regions as we do not receive a direct share funding like large MPOs. Being entirely reliant on statewide competitions to secure funding makes it challenging to plan for and deliver projects that are needed to meet the safety, environmental, and active-lifestyle goals of our communities. However, the rapid pace of the first two cycles coupled with the sheer magnitude of funding available has helped mitigate our loss of discretionary control over project selection and the loss of formula funding. So we encourage the Commission to stay the course and move forward with Cycle 3.
While many of projects have been funded through Cycles 1 and 2, there continues to be very high demand for ATP funding in our regions, and across the state. The CTC received nearly 1,400 applications requesting over $2 billion in the first two cycles, while only $720 million has been available for programming. Many of our Coalition’s priority projects remain unfunded through Cycles 1 and 2; we have applications ready to be submitted for Cycle 3. It is critical that with this level of demand, the CTC move forward with conducting a call for projects in 2016.

2. If additional time is necessary to incorporate revisions, delay adoption of the guidelines by no more than two months.

An additional three months to adopt the Cycle 3 guidelines compared to prior cycles provides the Commission with the latitude to streamline the application and incorporate minor changes to the guidelines and project evaluation process, such as those we suggest below. However, if necessary, the CTC could consider adoption of the guidelines in May 2016 rather than March 2016 to accommodate minor changes. This schedule would still allow the CTC to adopt projects by the statutory deadline of April 1, 2017.

3. Ensure all of the goals of the Program are being advanced by making adjustments to the Project Scoring Criteria for Disadvantaged Communities and Non-Motorized Traveler Safety in Cycle 3

*Reduce the Weight Given to Projects in Disadvantaged Communities:* We acknowledge that a goal of the ATP is to ensure that disadvantaged communities share in the benefits of the program. We believe that the first two ATP cycles have been successful in this regard. The CTC has programmed over 80% of ATP funds to projects that benefit Disadvantaged Communities over the first two cycles which far exceeds the 25% statutory requirement for the program. We believe it is reasonable in Cycle 3 to reduce the weight given to Disadvantaged Communities to provide more geographic equity, and ensure that other goals of the program are met.

As part of the scoring criteria for the program, ten points have been available to applicants that can demonstrate their project serves a Disadvantaged Community (DAC). These ten points, in such a highly competitive program, can be a barrier to projects that may not necessarily serve a DAC but still meet the goals of the Active Transportation Program by increasing the proportion of biking/walking trips, increasing safety and mobility for non-motorized users and advancing the efforts of regional agencies to achieve greenhouse gas reduction goals. **We recommend that the points for the Disadvantaged Communities section of the scoring be reduced from ten points to five points and that the criteria for increasing walking and bicycling/Section 1 be increased by five points.** With this approach, points will still be available to projects that serve Disadvantaged Communities and more points will be made available to the highest priority of the program which is to increase walking and bicycling among users.

*Prioritize Projects that Reduce the Risk of Fatalities and Injuries to Non-Motorized Users:* Finally, we also recommend that the CTC revise the scoring criteria for Safety/Section 2 to award points to projects whose purpose is to reduce the risk of collisions resulting in
fatalities and injuries to non-motorized users. It seems unreasonable to us to award points only after a record of fatalities and injuries have occurred. Critical safety projects that could prevent a loss of life or injury are at a disadvantage in the evaluation process with the present wording. Bicyclists and pedestrians are significantly more vulnerable to conflicts with cars and trains and perceived safety risks are a significant deterrent for active transportation. Relying solely on historical accident rates does not account for the potential increased usage of bike and pedestrian facilities when perceived safety risks are reduced.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments and suggestions. If you have any further questions, please contact Sarkes Khachek at the Santa Barbara County Association of Governments at 805-961-8913.

Sincerely,

Jim Kemp, Executive Director  
Santa Barbara Association of Governments  
Ron DeCarli, Executive Director  
San Luis Obispo Council of Governments

Debra L. Hale, Executive Director  
Transportation Agency for Monterey County  
George Dondero, Executive Director  
Santa Cruz Co. Regional Transportation Commission

Mary Gilbert, Interim Executive Director  
San Benito Council of Governments  
Maura Twomey, Executive Director  
Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments

cc: The Honorable Katcho Achadjian, Assembly Member, 35th District  
The Honorable Luis Alejo, Assembly Member, 30th District  
The Honorable Anthony Canella, Senator, 12th District  
The Honorable Hannah-Beth Jackson, Senator, 19th District  
The Honorable Bill Monning, Senator, 17th District  
The Honorable Mark Stone, Assembly Member, 29th District  
The Honorable Das Williams, Assembly Member, 37th District  
Mr. Bill Higgins, CalCOG  
Mr. Jerry Barton, Chair, Rural Counties Task Force  
Ms. Laurel Janssen, California Transportation Commission  
Ms. Laurie Waters, California Transportation Commission  
Ms. April Nitsos, Caltrans, Chief, Active Transportation Program and Special Programs
Highway 46 Project Awarded Excellence

The second five-mile segment of the Highway 46 widening in San Luis Obispo County, also known as Whitley 1, was recently recognized with a Caltrans Excellence in Transportation Award in the rural category.

Over the years, several high-profile injury and fatal collisions occurred along Highway 46. To address safety, the route is being converted from a two-lane conventional highway to a four-lane divided expressway. In all, nearly 63 miles will be widened from US 101 near Paso Robles to Interstate 5 in Kern County with two lanes in each direction, separated by a wide, unpaved median.

A unique and innovative feature of Whitley 1 is the use of landform grading allowing the roadway to blend with the natural rolling topography and rural setting. A network of frontage and connector roads in the Whitley Gardens community was also constructed, eliminating conflicts with traffic crossing the highway. Caltrans’ partners on the project include San Luis Obispo Council of Governments, Fix 46 Committee and Papich Construction Inc.

New Maintenance & Operations Leader

Sara von Schwind is now the Deputy District 5 Director of Maintenance and Traffic Operations. She has acted in this position since January 2015. Before that, she served as Deputy District Director of Program Project Management since 2012.

Von Schwind is a licensed civil engineer and has served 23 years in various Caltrans positions, including Project Management. She holds a Bachelor’s degree in civil engineering and a Master’s in the same field with coastal and geotechnical emphases. She previously worked in the Geotechnical Division and is experienced in bridge foundations, retaining walls, slope stabilization, rock scaling and storm damage repairs.

$25K for Innovative Ideas

Caltrans is one of three state agencies offering $25,000 each for the most innovative ideas addressing the following:

• Improving the state’s transportation system (Caltrans).
• Improving sustainable government practices to address climate change (Department of General Services).
• Helping to prevent underage drinking (Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control).

All California residents are encouraged to apply. State employees and their immediate families are ineligible to compete. Applications are available online until 5 p.m. Tuesday, Oct. 13, 2015. http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/paffairs/news/pressrel/15pr080.htm.
**Connected Vehicles Pilot Program**

Caltrans and its partners are working to improve transportation safety and mobility, and reduce environmental impacts using connected vehicle technology. This state-of-the-art system has the potential to transform the way Americans travel through a safe, interoperable wireless communication network connecting cars, buses, trucks, trains, traffic signals, smart phones and other devices. These vehicles would feature safety warnings alerting motorists of upcoming road hazards such as collisions, icy conditions and sharp curves. This technology has the potential to address crashes caused by non-impaired drivers, but more research is needed to determine effectiveness, according to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

Caltrans, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) of the San Francisco Bay Area, the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (METRO), and the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) together are proposing a robust connected vehicle pilot program in San Francisco, Los Angeles and San Diego. The program, titled, One California, focuses on safety, mobility, the environment, and agency efficiency. It also furthers the California Transportation Plan 2040 goals by creating a sustainable, interconnected transportation system encouraging economic vitality, protecting natural resources, and promoting the health and well-being of all Californians. More information is available at: [http://www.dot.ca.gov/research/operations/one_california/](http://www.dot.ca.gov/research/operations/one_california/).

**Mile Marker Fall Edition Released**

The Mile Marker: A Caltrans Performance Report edition is now available online. The plain language report addresses how well Caltrans is protecting and improving California’s transportation system.

The latest issue discusses Caltrans’ project delivery at 98 percent, greenhouse gas reductions, using greener pavements, daily hours of vehicle delay and incident clearance. It also features corporate efficiency efforts, high-technology pavement monitoring, and travel behavior and options. More information is available at: [http://www.dot.ca.gov/MileMarker/2015-3/files/1.html](http://www.dot.ca.gov/MileMarker/2015-3/files/1.html)

**Proposition 1B – Good Investment Return**

Since voters passed Proposition 1B in 2006, more than 2,000 projects statewide have improved California’s transportation infrastructure, including roads, bridges, and rail and transit systems.

Proposition 1B, totaling nearly $20 billion, represents the state’s largest expenditures on transportation since the 1950s. These include:

- $4.5 billion – 90 corridor projects to reduce congestion.
- $2.5 billion – 87 projects improving freight movement on state highways, rail systems and ports.
- $3.6 billion – Nearly 1,200 transit and rail system improvements, including upgraded transit services, modernized transit stations and cleaner-running buses.
- $1 billion – 23 projects to improve SR 99 in the state’s Central Valley.

In District 5, Proposition 1B provided $96 million for widening 13 miles of Highway 46 East in San Luis Obispo County, and $28 million for constructing the US 101/San Juan Road interchange in Monterey County. To date, this funding has provided more than $18 billion to improve transportation statewide. More information is available at: [http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/paffairs/news/pressrel/15pr088.htm](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/paffairs/news/pressrel/15pr088.htm)
## CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Construction Timeline</th>
<th>Construction Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Implementing Agency</th>
<th>Project Manager (Resident Engineer)</th>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hwy. 1/17 Shoulder Widening (1A870)</td>
<td>On Route 1 from the NB merge with Route 17 to the NB off-ramp to Ocean Street (PM 16.9-17.2)</td>
<td>Extend the SR 1 NB #1 lane to extend the merge with the SR 17 SB #2 lane</td>
<td>January 4, 2016-Spring 2016, weather permitting</td>
<td>$1.1 Million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Luis Duazo (KB)</td>
<td>Granite Construction, Watsonville, CA</td>
<td>Construction began January 4, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy. 1 North County Pavement Preservation and Rumble Strips (1C8604)</td>
<td>Near City of Santa Cruz from Western Drive to San Mateo C/L (PM 20.2-37.4)</td>
<td>Pavement preservation and install rumble strips</td>
<td>May 13, 2015 – Winter 2016</td>
<td>$10.7 Million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Doug Hessing (PD)</td>
<td>Granite Construction, Watsonville, CA</td>
<td>Anticipated completion in winter, 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy. 9 Pollution Source Control (0Q5904)</td>
<td>At and near Boulder Creek at various locations from 0.9 mile south of Glengarry Rd to 0.2 mile north of Mcgaffigan Mill Rd (PM 3.7-18.7)</td>
<td>Construct retaining wall &amp; viaduct structure. Replace drainage pipes. Rehab maintenance turnaround.</td>
<td>Winter 2014-September 5, 2015 (One year plant establishment starting Nov. 2015)</td>
<td>$1.8 Million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Doug Hessing (KB)</td>
<td>Granite Rock Company, San Jose, CA</td>
<td>Construction completed on Sept. 5, 2015. Plant establishment beginning in November for one year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey-Santa Cruz ADA (0R510)</td>
<td>On SR 1 and SR 9 at various locations (other locations in Monterey County)</td>
<td>Construct curb ramps, sidewalks, and modify signal and lightings</td>
<td>Fall 2015 – Fall 2016</td>
<td>$1.2 Million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Kathy DiGrazia (BR)</td>
<td>Pacific Infrastructure, Vacaville, CA</td>
<td>SCR County locations: SR 1 at Freedom Blvd SR 1 at Graham Hill Rd SR 9 at SLV High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy. 17 Shoulder Widening and Concrete Guardrail (0T9804)</td>
<td>In Santa Cruz County near Scotts Valley from 0.4 mile South of Sugarloaf to 0.1 mile South of Laurel Road (PM 8.3-9.4)</td>
<td>Shoulder widening and concrete guardrail</td>
<td>Winter 2015-Fall 2016</td>
<td>$6.2 Million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Doug Hessing (KB)</td>
<td>Granite Construction Inc. of Watsonville</td>
<td>Project went out to bid on Nov. 13. Contract to be awarded and accepted on December 22, 2015.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PROJECTS IN DEVELOPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Construction Timeline</th>
<th>Construction Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Implementing Agency</th>
<th>Project Manager (Resident Engineer)</th>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hwy. 129/Carlton Rd Intersection Improvements (IF350)</td>
<td>Near Watsonville from 0.1 mile west to 0.2 mile east of Carlton Rd (PM 3.2-3.5)</td>
<td>Construct accel/decel and 2-way left turn lanes</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$2 Million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Doug Hessing</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>On schedule for July, 2016 PA&amp;ED.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy. 129 Curve Realignment (0T540)</td>
<td>East of Watsonville between 0.4 mile west of Old Chittenden Rd and 0.1 mile east of Chittenden underpass (PM 9.5-10.0)</td>
<td>Curve realignment</td>
<td>Spring, 2016</td>
<td>$5 Million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Doug Hessing (KB)</td>
<td>Granite Rock Company, San Jose, CA</td>
<td>Most of the roadwork will be done with one-way signal traffic control with about 7-10 days of full closures at the end of the project. Construction start delayed until spring due to weather.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy. 152 ADA (1E020)</td>
<td>Near Watsonville from Wagner Avenue to south of Holohan Road (PM 1.3-R2.0)</td>
<td>ADA compliance (install sidewalks)</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$1.9 Million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Kathy DiGrazia</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>On schedule for February, 2016 PA&amp;ED.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy. 152 Accessible Pedestrian Signals (1G280)</td>
<td>14 intersections in Santa Cruz County</td>
<td>Install accessible pedestrian signals</td>
<td>Winter, 2016</td>
<td>$1.3 Million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Kathy DiGrazia</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Equipment order pending.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Locations:
- SR 1 in Santa Cruz (3)
- SR 17 in Scotts Valley (2)
- SR 129 in Watsonville (3)
- SR 152 in Watsonville (6)
Preparation for El Niño

Maintaining rapid and appropriate response to storm damages and keeping the traveling public informed are top priorities for the Caltrans Maintenance Division. This year’s efforts are a bit more extensive than during an average rainy season, according to Senior Maintenance Engineer Lance Gorman, P.E.

Highway 1 at Big Sur frequently sustains winter storm damage, especially between San Carpoforo Creek, just south of Ragged Point in San Luis Obispo County, and the Carmel River Bridge in Monterey County. This location has a high concentration of endangered and protected resources requiring multi-agency emergency preparation. Every year, Maintenance crews diligently prepare for winter storms by doing the following:

- Keeping the public informed.
- Monitoring, clearing and repairing all highway culverts and drainage structures.
- Coordinating with emergency responders to expediently open closed roadways.
- Working collaboratively with local resource agencies on specific area needs.
- Providing a uniform approach regarding maintenance forces overseeing a major damage site.

Mile Marker

Winter Edition Released

The Mile Marker: A Caltrans Performance Report is now available online. This edition features closing the carpool lane gap on Interstate 215 in Southern California, the demolition of the largest pier on the old Bay Bridge and the new 2015 Strategic Highway Safety Plan addressing reduced fatalities and severe injuries on all public roads. For more information: http://www.dot.ca.gov/MileMarker/2015-4/index.html.

Rosales leads Program Project Management

Richard Rosales is the new Deputy District Director of Program Project Management. He has served Caltrans for more than 29 years, including 15 years as a project manager in four of the District’s five counties. He’s experienced in encroachment permits, construction, design and hydraulics, and holds a Bachelor’s degree in civil engineering from CSU-Cal Poly, Pomona. He enjoys spending time with his family, basketball, hunting, and golfing.
Highway 17 Access Management Plan

Addressing mobility, access and safety in coordination and partnership are the main goals for the multi-agency Highway 17 Access Management Plan. The study presents unique challenges as it considers access in a rural area carrying heavy traffic with mountainous terrain. So far, Caltrans has hosted three workshops in the communities of Happy Valley, Loma Prieta and Scotts Valley, garnering public comment from those traversing the highway daily.

The second round of workshops, scheduled in the spring, will present potential concepts for addressing the public’s identified needs and issues from the earlier sessions.

The plan focuses on preserving both the function and operation of the highway corridor and local road network, reducing conflict points, and coordinating land use and transportation planning. Ultimately, the plan will allow Caltrans and its partners to proactively manage the highway's existing and future access from the Granite Creek Road interchange to the Santa Cruz-Santa Clara county line.

Caltrans’ partners on this planning effort include Santa Cruz County Supervisor John Leopold, District 1; Santa Cruz County Supervisor Bruce McPherson, District 5; Santa Cruz County; Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission; California Highway Patrol; and the City of Scotts Valley. Caltrans invites public input on this plan, which is available online at: http://www.ca-hwy17amp.org/.

Concrete pavement for Highway 46

The Highway 46 East (Whitley 2B) project will widen the highway to four lanes for more than four miles near Shandon in San Luis Obispo County. This is District 5's first project to feature Continuously Reinforced Concrete Pavement, which provides the following major benefits:

- Sustainable and minimal maintenance.
- Reduced worker safety risks, future maintenance costs and traffic closures.
- Tighter transverse cracks and fewer joints, resulting in smoother pavement and reduced water penetration and potential base damage.
- Lower life cycle costs despite higher initial costs.
- Ability to handle heavier truck loading and volumes.

Concrete pavement is now being installed across the nation and around the world, according to the Federal Highway Administration. It has the potential to provide a sustainable, long-term, zero maintenance, service life under heavy traffic loadings and challenging environmental conditions. Currently, the $47 million project is being advertised for construction. It is scheduled for completion in summer 2018. More information on concrete pavement is available at: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/maint/Pavement/Offices/Pavement_Engineering/PDF/JCRCP-Design_Const-Guide-Jun-07.pdf.
## Construction Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Construction Timeline</th>
<th>Construction Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Implementing Agency</th>
<th>Project Manager (Resident Engineer)</th>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Hwy. 1/17 Shoulder Widening (1A870)</td>
<td>On Route 1 from the NB merge with Route 17 to the NB off-ramp to Ocean Street (PM 16.9-17.2)</td>
<td>Extend the SR 1 NB #1 lane to extend the merge with the SR 17 SB #2 lane</td>
<td>January 4, 2016-Spring 2016, weather permitting</td>
<td>$1.1 Million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Luis Duazo (KB)</td>
<td>Granite Construction, Watsonville, CA</td>
<td>Construction began January 4, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Hwy. 9 Pollution Source Control (0Q5904)</td>
<td>At and near Boulder Creek at various locations from 0.9 mile south of Glengarry Rd to 0.2 mile north of Megaffigan Mill Rd (PM 3.7-18.7)</td>
<td>Construct retaining wall &amp; viaduct structure. Replace drainage pipes. Rehab maintenance turnaround.</td>
<td>Winter 2014-September 5, 2015 (One year plant establishment starting Nov. 2015)</td>
<td>$1.8 Million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Doug Hessing (KB)</td>
<td>Granite Rock Company, San Jose, CA</td>
<td>Construction completed on Sept. 5, 2015. Plant establishment beginning in November for one year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Monterey-Santa Cruz ADA (0R510)</td>
<td>On SR 1 and SR 9 at various locations (other locations in Monterey County)</td>
<td>Construct curb ramps, sidewalks, and modify signal and lightings</td>
<td>Fall 2015 – Fall 2016</td>
<td>$1.2 Million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Kathy DiGrazia (BR)</td>
<td>Pacific Infrastructure, Vacaville, CA</td>
<td>SCR County locations: SR 1 at Freedom Blvd SR 1 at Graham Hill Rd SR 9 at SLV High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Hwy. 17 Shoulder Widening and Concrete Guardrail (0T9804)</td>
<td>In Santa Cruz County near Scotts Valley from 0.4 mile South of Sugarloaf to 0.1 mile South of Laurel Road (PM 8.3-9.4)</td>
<td>Shoulder widening and concrete guardrail</td>
<td>Winter 2015-Fall 2016</td>
<td>$6.2 Million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Doug Hessing (KB)</td>
<td>Granite Construction Inc. of Watsonville</td>
<td>Contract accepted on January 13, 2016.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Projects in Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Construction Timeline</th>
<th>Construction Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Implementing Agency</th>
<th>Project Manager (Resident Engineer)</th>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Hwy. 129/Carlton Rd</td>
<td>Near Watsonville from 0.1 mile west to 0.2 mile east of Carlton Rd (PM 3.2-3.5)</td>
<td>Construct accel/decel and 2-way left turn lanes</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$2 Million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Doug Hessing</td>
<td>Granite Rock Company, San Jose, CA</td>
<td>On schedule for July, 2016 PA&amp;ED.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Hwy. 129 Curve Realignment</td>
<td>East of Watsonville between 0.4 mile west of Old Chittenden Rd and 0.1 mile east of Chittenden underpass (PM 9.5-10.0)</td>
<td>Curve realignment</td>
<td>Spring, 2016</td>
<td>$5 Million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Doug Hessing (KB)</td>
<td>Granite Rock Company, San Jose, CA</td>
<td>Most of the roadwork will be done with one-way signal traffic control with about 7-10 days of full closures at the end of the project. Construction start delayed until spring due to weather.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Hwy. 152 ADA</td>
<td>Near Watsonville from Wagner Avenue to south of Holohan Road (PM 1.3-R2.0)</td>
<td>ADA compliance (install sidewalks)</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$1.9 Million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Kathy DiGrazia</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>On schedule for February, 2016 PA&amp;ED.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Hwy. 152 Accessible Pedestrian Signals</td>
<td>14 intersections in Santa Cruz County</td>
<td>Install accessible pedestrian signals</td>
<td>Winter, 2016</td>
<td>$1.3 Million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Kathy DiGrazia</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Equipment order pending. Locations: SR 1 in Santa Cruz (3) SR 17 in Scotts Valley (2) SR 129 in Watsonville (3) SR 152 in Watsonville (6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
From: Cory Caletti, Senior Transportation Planner
Re: City of Santa Cruz Rail Trail Project Update and Contract Authorizations

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC):

1. Receive an update from the City of Santa Cruz on the 2.1-mile rail trail project being developed; and

2. Approve the attached resolution [Attachment 1] authorizing the Executive Director to enter into necessary agreements and amendments to fund and implement the City of Santa Cruz project as well as other funded rail trail projects.

BACKGROUND

At its November 2013 meeting, the RTC adopted a Master Plan for the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSST) Network and certified the final Environmental Impact Report. The Master Plan defines the “coastal rail trail,” a proposed bicycle and pedestrian trail adjacent to the tracks on the 32-mile Santa Cruz branch rail line right-of-way, as the spine of a broader network of trails that will provide connections to activity centers, coastal access points, and other key destinations. The Master Plan has since received four awards for planning excellence and has been adopted by all the local jurisdictions through which the project traverses.

In December 2013 the RTC allocated funding to three rail trail projects. One project that received funding is within the City of Santa Cruz, extending from Natural Bridges Drive to Pacific Ave. The $4,060,000 allocation towards the $5.3M project will construct a 2.1-mile segment which was defined as the highest priority trail section in the MBSST Master Plan. The City of Santa Cruz is providing $1,080,000 toward the project and the California Coastal Conservancy is contributing $50,000 to be passed through the RTC. An additional $100,000 is provided by Ecology Action, Friends of the Rail and Trail, and Bike Santa Cruz County.

Three additional rail trail projects include:

- The City of Watsonville’s 1.2 mile rail trail from Walker Street to Lee Road towards which the RTC contributed $1,040,000. Additional funding was provided by the Land Trust of Santa Cruz County ($335,000), the state Active Transportation Program ($600,000), the City of Watsonville
($64,000) and Friends of the Rail and Trail ($11,000).

- The City of Capitola’s upper Pacific Cove Parking Lot to Monterey Avenue rail trail towards which the RTC contributed $250,000 and the City of Capitola provided a $50,000 match.
- The 5-mile north coast project for which the RTC received $6,300,000 in Federal Access Lands Program (FLAP) funds. The project will be implemented by Federal Highway Administration’s Central Federal Lands division. Additional funding was provided by the Land Trust of Santa Cruz County ($3,300,000) and the California Coastal Conservancy ($950,000).

In total, 8 miles of rail trail projects have been funded and are being developed with construction scheduled for 2017 and 2018.

DISCUSSION

Following approval of funding from the RTC, the Cities of Santa Cruz, Capitola and Watsonville solicited and engaged consultant teams for design and environmental review.

City of Santa Cruz Rail Trail Project

The City of Santa Cruz has been working closely with the RTC and its rail operator, Iowa Pacific (doing business locally as Santa Cruz and Monterey Bay Railway), to design a 2.1-mile bicycle and pedestrian rail trail project from Natural Bridges Drive to Pacific Avenue. The City of Santa Cruz and its consultant developed and vetted designs and preliminary engineering documents through agency coordination and at a January 28th, 2016 public Open House. The trail is designed as a 12 to 16-foot paved bicycle and pedestrian facility. Setbacks from the tracks range from 9 to 45 feet. The minimum clearance of 8’6” spans only 150 linear feet, or 1.3% of the total project length, near the roundabout. Designs and solutions to challenging areas will be presented to the RTC by Chris Schneiter, City of Santa Cruz Assistant Public Works Director/City Engineer and City Project Manager Nathan Nguyen.

The RTC has been assisting the City with issues related to design, public coordination, right-of-way encroachments, identification and remediation of hazards, and other aspects of project implementation. As the City moves into the right-of-way phase of the project, agreements are needed with involved partners. Partners include, but are not limited to, the City, Santa Cruz and Monterey Bay Railway, the County’s Environmental Health Services Department, and the California Coastal Conservancy.

Staff recommends that the RTC receive a presentation on the City of Santa Cruz rail trail project.
Cities of Watsonville and Capitola, and North Coast Rail Trail Projects

Rail Trail projects in Cities of Watsonville and Capitola, as well as the north coast, are in various stages of design and environmental review. The RTC is working closely with all agencies, facilitating coordination and public outreach. Materials will be shared when available.

Staff recommends that the RTC approve a resolution authorizing the Executive Director to enter into agreements and amendments as necessary to implement current and future rail trail projects.

SUMMARY

The City of Santa Cruz is implementing a 2.1-mile rail trail project from Natural Bridges Drive to Pacific Avenue. Three other rail trail projects are in various stages of development and designs will be available for public review in the near future. Staff recommends approval of the attached resolution authorizing the Executive Director to enter into necessary agreements and amendments to implement trail projects as they are approved and funded.

Attachment 1: Resolution
RESOLUTION NO. 09-16

Adopted by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission on the date of February 4, 2016 on the motion of Commissioner duly seconded by Commissioner

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO ENTER INTO AGREEMENTS FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF COASTAL RAIL TRAIL PROJECTS

WHEREAS, in October, 2012, the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) became the owner of the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line (Rail Line) right-of-way; and,

WHEREAS, the RTC is charged with implementing the Santa Cruz County portion of the 2-county Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (MBSST) Network;

WHEREAS, in November, 2013, the RTC adopted an award-winning MBSST Master Plan that defines a 50-mile bicycle and pedestrian trail system and outlines design, implementation, maintenance and operation guidelines;

WHEREAS, the spine of the trail will be built within the 32-mile RTC-owned railroad right-of-way from Davenport to Pajaro;

WHEREAS, in December, 2013, the RTC programmed $4,060,000 to a rail trail project within the City of Santa Cruz; $1,040,000 to a rail trail project within the City of Watsonville; and $250,000 to a rail trail project in the City of Capitola;

WHEREAS, the Cities contributed matching funds to the three projects, as did private funding partners,

WHEREAS, local jurisdictions’ public works departments are implementing the three projects;

WHEREAS, an additional north coast project received a Federal Access Lands Program grant and will be implemented by the Federal Highway Administration’s Central Federal Lands (CFL) Division;

WHEREAS, in addition to private and public funding sources that were contributed to the various trail projects, the California Coastal Conservancy has committed to providing $50,000 to the City of Santa Cruz project and $950,000 towards the north coast project with funding to be passed through the RTC; and

WHEREAS, since that time, local jurisdictions and CFL have begun work on design and environmental documentation;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION THAT:
1. The Executive Director, or his designee, is authorized to enter into agreements with the Cities of Santa Cruz, Watsonville and Capitola, the County of Santa Cruz, and other partners as needed, to implement rail trail projects;

2. The Executive Director, or his designee, is authorized to enter into amendments to agreements or contracts as needed, as long as they are consistent with other RTC actions or approved budgets.

AYES: COMMISSIONERS
NOES: COMMISSIONERS
ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS
ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS

__________________________________________
Don Lane, Chair

ATTEST:

__________________________________________
George Dondero, Secretary

Distribution: RTC Fiscal
RTC MBSST Planner
City of Santa Cruz Public Works
City of Watsonville Public Works
City of Capitola Public Works
County of Santa Cruz Public Works
TO: Regional Transportation Commission  
FROM: George Dondero, Executive Director  
RE: Distribution Formulas to Local Jurisdictions – Neighborhood Projects in the Investment Plan for a 2016 Transportation Ballot Measure

RECOMMENDATION

The RTC Ad-hoc Committee for the Transportation Ballot Measure and RTC staff recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) approve a distribution formula to allocate funds for local jurisdictions’ projects in the Investment Plan for the 2016 proposed ballot measure. The recommended formula is based on 50% population and 50% centerline miles of roadway.

BACKGROUND

In the ballot measure Transportation Investment Plan adopted by the RTC on December 3, 2015 (Attachment 1) 30% of the projected revenue from the measure will be designated to local projects. It was not determined how the funds designated to the County and four cities would be allocated.

DISCUSSION

On January 13 the RTC Ad-hoc Committee on the Transportation Ballot Measure met to discuss the recently adopted Investment Plan and, more specifically, to determine a specific formula to allocate funds from the “Neighborhood Projects” category in the Plan. Of the $135 million projected revenue to this category, $5 million is set aside for a wildlife undercrossing project on Highway 17, and $10 million is set aside for improvements in the Highway 9 corridor in the San Lorenzo Valley. The remaining $120 million is to be distributed on an annual basis to the four cities and the County. Staff provided some example formulas, based on population, lane miles of roadway, centerline miles of roadway, and a combination of population and centerline miles of roadway (Attachment 2).

After some discussion, the Ad-hoc Committee agreed unanimously that a formula based on 50% population and 50% centerline miles would provide a reasonable and equitable way to allocate these funds. Both population and centerline miles of roadway data are readily available each year. Population figures are updated each year by the state Department of Finance. Centerline miles are reported by each jurisdiction to the League of Cities and California State Association of Counties (CSAC) every two years, as part of the statewide report on the condition of local streets and roads (www.SaveCaliforniaStreets.org). The RTC and other regions in the state contribute funds to cover about half of the cost of the report, with cities and counties sharing in the remaining cost.
The Ad-hoc Committee and RTC staff recommend that the RTC adopt an allocation formula based on 50% population and 50% centerline miles of roadway to administer the portion of new revenue described as “Neighborhood Projects” in the proposed transportation ballot measure going to the voters in November 2016. The distribution amounts would be adjusted annually using this formula, based on the latest population and centerline mile information.

SUMMARY

The RTC adopted an expenditure plan to guide investment of revenue to be generated by a proposed ballot measure. The Ad-hoc Committee and staff recommend that the RTC approve an allocation formula based on 50% population and 50% centerline miles of roadway to allocate the portion of revenue going to Neighborhood Projects.

Attachments:
1. Transportation Investment Plan (Approved by RTC 12/3/15)
2. Investment Plan Sample Distribution Formulas to Local Jurisdictions

\rtcserv2\shared\rtc\itc0216\regular agenda\allocation formula\sr_rtc_feb2016-allocation formulas.docx
New transportation investments are needed throughout Santa Cruz County.
Revenues available to operate, maintain and improve our transportation system have not kept up with the needs of our community. State and federal funding has dropped severely in recent years and those funds are increasingly unreliable. Over the term of this Plan, Santa Cruz County’s population will grow and the senior population will almost triple. This means more demand on our streets, highways and transit. Without new funding, Santa Cruz County will lose job opportunities, experience increased traffic on degraded streets and highways, suffer service cuts on buses and see more costly transportation services for youth, seniors and people with disabilities.

In November 2016, voters will be asked to approve a ½ cent sales tax to address these needs. Communities that have local transportation funds are able to do more themselves and are more successful in competing for funding, levering a larger share of state and federal dollars.

This Plan benefits people who live in Santa Cruz County. Whether you’re headed to work, school, the grocery store or doctor, we all need to get around. This detailed Plan will preserve our existing transportation system, increase access and mobility options, and decrease greenhouse gas emissions. It will fill potholes, provide transit for seniors and people with disabilities, provide traffic relief on city streets and highways using new technology, improve safety for bicyclists and people walking, improve air quality, and create good quality, local jobs. It supports an environmentally sustainable future, transforming our transportation network over the coming decades to meet our growing needs, while supporting jobs as our local economy continues to recover.

Transportation projects create jobs. Transportation investments create good quality, local jobs while delivering transportation solutions. This measure will fund local street maintenance, bicycle and walking safety programs for youth and seniors, bus operations and maintenance, and highway efficiency projects to relieve traffic and provide commuter choices. The Expenditure Plan will undergo ongoing reviews through independent audits and a citizens watchdog committee made up of County residents.

This Plan will:

- Preserve existing infrastructure and improve neighborhoods, including funds to every city and the County to repave streets, fill potholes, and upgrade local transportation infrastructure.
- Provide clean transportation, by reducing pollution using innovative technology and expanding bike and pedestrian paths, including the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network (MBSST) Rail Trail and two new bicycle and pedestrian bridges over Highway 1.
- Keep fares affordable for seniors and people with disabilities, including reliable and inexpensive transportation for people with disabilities, as well as affordable senior shuttles, vans and services that help keep seniors and people with disabilities independent.
- Provide traffic relief, invest in our aging highway corridors to upgrade on and off ramps, improve reliability for how long it takes to get places, use modern technology to manage traffic and improve safety.
- Create good jobs that support residents and businesses in Santa Cruz County.
# SUMMARY OF PROPOSED INVESTMENTS
(Transportation Expenditure Plan)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment Category</th>
<th>Percent of Funds</th>
<th>Fund Allocation ($millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighborhood Projects</strong></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>$135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible projects include:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Local Street/Road - Maintenance and Repairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- School Traffic Safety Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Bike and Pedestrian Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Neighborhood Safety - reduce speeding and cut-through traffic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Operational Improvements (signal timing, intersections)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLV/Highway 9 Corridor Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife Undercrossing on Hwy 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highway Corridors</strong></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>$113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 3 Auxiliary Lane projects: 41st Ave-Soquel Dr; Bay/Porter-Park; State Park-Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 2 Bicycle/Pedestrian over-crossings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 17:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Safe on 17 Program and Freeway Service Patrol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mobility Access</strong></td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>$72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly/Disabled/Veterans Paratransit and Bus Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Active Transportation</strong></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>$68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail (aka Rail Trail)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rail Corridor</strong></td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>$63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Corridor Maintenance and Repairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Management - graffiti &amp; trash removal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental analysis of rail transit options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watsonville Junction/Pajaro Train Station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduit for internet and/or utility lines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Dollar amounts shown in millions reflect amount from a ½ cent sales tax generating $15M/year for 30 years; while percent per category would not change, actual amount generated by a local sales tax per year would fluctuate based on inflation and local retail sales.

**Strict accountability and performance measures ensure delivery.** The 30-year Plan will include strict accountability measures to ensure the funds are spent as directed by voters. It requires open and transparent public processes to allocate funds, annual independent audits, an independent watchdog committee made up of people who live in Santa Cruz County, and annual compliance reports distributed to the public that detail costs and how specific performance measures are met.
### Investment Plan Sample Distribution Formulas: Local Jurisdictions Neighborhood Projects

*(Total available for formula distribution will be adjusted annually based on actual revenues generated by a half cent sales tax)*

**Available funds (est. 30 years):** $120,000,000  
**Annual available (estimate):** $4,000,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Capitola</th>
<th>Santa Cruz</th>
<th>Scotts Valley</th>
<th>Watsonville</th>
<th>Unincorporated</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population 1/1/15</td>
<td>10,052</td>
<td>63,789</td>
<td>11,928</td>
<td>52,087</td>
<td>133,790</td>
<td>271,646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% population</td>
<td>3.70%</td>
<td>23.48%</td>
<td>4.39%</td>
<td>19.17%</td>
<td>49.25%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 year total</td>
<td>$4,440,485</td>
<td>$28,178,880</td>
<td>$5,269,211</td>
<td>$23,009,505</td>
<td>$59,101,919</td>
<td>$120,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual allocation</td>
<td>$148,016</td>
<td>$939,296</td>
<td>$175,640</td>
<td>$766,984</td>
<td>$1,970,064</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Lane Miles | 63.8 | 273.8 | 77 | 203 | 1,193.97 | 1,812 |
| % lane miles | 3.52% | 15.11% | 4.25% | 11.21% | 65.91% | 100.00% |
| 30 year total | $4,226,168 | $18,136,754 | $5,100,548 | $13,446,900 | $79,089,629 | $120,000,000 |
| Annual allocation | $140,872 | $604,558 | $170,018 | $448,230 | $2,636,321 |

| Total (center line) miles | 24.66 | 140.33 | 36.19 | 89.73 | 599 | 890 |
| % miles | 2.77% | 15.77% | 4.07% | 10.08% | 67.31% |
| 30 year total | $3,325,280 | $18,922,812 | $4,880,044 | $12,099,651 | $80,772,213 | $120,000,000 |
| Annual allocation | $110,843 | $630,760 | $162,668 | $403,322 | $2,692,407 |

| 50% pop; 50% centerline miles | 3.24% | 19.63% | 4.23% | 14.63% | 58.28% | 100.00% |
| 30 year total | $3,882,883 | $23,550,846 | $5,074,627 | $17,554,578 | $69,937,066 | $120,000,000 |
| Annual allocation | $129,429 | $785,028 | $169,154 | $585,153 | $2,331,236 |
RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC):

1. Approve State and Federal Legislative Priorities for 2016 (Attachment 1), to assist in analyzing the transportation impacts of legislative activities; and

2. Provide input on options for previously approved State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) projects, given severe STIP revenue shortfalls and the California Transportation Commission's (CTC) request that regions identify projects to delete from the STIP.

BACKGROUND

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC), as the state-designated Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for Santa Cruz County, is responsible for state-mandated planning efforts and selecting projects to receive certain state and federal transportation revenues, including State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP), Low Carbon Transit Operations Program (LCTOP), and State Transit Assistance funds. STIP proposals are subject to concurrence from the California Transportation Commission (CTC). On December 3, 2015 the RTC approved a proposal to the CTC to delay several STIP-funded projects, based on current project schedules and statewide funding shortfalls.

Each year the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) adopts legislative platforms to guide its analysis of state and federal legislative or administrative actions that could impact transportation funding or implementation of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), and transportation projects in Santa Cruz County. Working with the Central Coast Coalition (regional transportation agencies from Monterey, San Benito, Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo, and Santa Cruz Counties), the California Association of Councils of Governments (CALCOG), other transportation entities, and its federal legislative assistant, the RTC notifies state and federal representatives of the RTC’s analysis of key issues, monitors legislative proposals, and provides input on other federal and state actions.
DISCUSSION

2016 Legislative Priorities

Staff worked with RTC committee members, other agencies in California, and its federal assistant (Capital Edge) to develop the RTC’s 2016 State and Federal Legislative Programs. Draft 2016 legislative priorities for the RTC are attached (Attachment 1). The Legislative Program guides RTC staff and board member comments on legislative and administrative proposals that are raised throughout the year. **Staff recommends that the RTC review the draft legislative priorities (Attachment 1), identify any additional issues that the RTC should monitor or pursue, and adopt the 2016 Legislative Program.**

As in prior years, the focus of the legislative program is on preserving funds designated for transportation and generating new, more stable revenue sources. Key issues in 2016 include supporting state legislative proposals that would increase funds for local roadway preservation, transit, and the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), maximize cap-and-trade revenues for Santa Cruz County projects and programs, and proposals that support long term stabilization of transportation funding.

Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act (FAST Act)

On December 4, 2015, President Obama signed a new 5-year federal transportation act, authorizing funding for ongoing highway and public transit systems. The FAST Act maintains the core highway and transit funding programs that were already established by its predecessor, MAP 21 or Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (passed in 2012). Two new programs established by the FAST Act are the National Highway Freight Program, a formula program focused on goods movement, and a competitive Nationally Significant Highway and Freight Projects program. Because these programs are focused on major freight networks, it is unclear if projects in Santa Cruz County will benefit from the new programs.

Relative to FY 2015 spending, the FAST Act boosts transit funding by 10 percent in FY 2016, while highway funding is increased by 5 percent. Thereafter, the annual growth rate for both highways and transit is slightly above 2 percent. In lieu of raising the gas tax to close the gap between annual expenditures and annual revenue deposited in the Highway Trust Fund (HTF), the bill is paid for by a variety of budgetary actions that enable a transfer to the HTF of approximately $70 billion in General Fund revenue. The federal gas tax is a flat rate of 18.4 cents per gallon and has not been raised since 1993.

For Santa Cruz County, the FAST Act is expected to result in a slight increase of transit formula funding. With respect to highway formula funding, no increase is anticipated for Santa Cruz County. Under both transit and highway programs, projects in Santa Cruz County should be able to compete for a larger pot of funds designated for non-formula programs, especially safety and bridge projects. The FAST Act also expands low-cost federal financing options for local jurisdictions.
through the Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (TIFIA) and Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (WIFIA) programs.

Rules and guidelines to implement the FAST Act will be forthcoming from federal agencies. Staff will be monitoring proposals for implementation in California, as part of the RTC’s legislative program.

State Budget

On January 7, 2016, Governor Brown released his state budget proposal (Attachment 2). Earlier that week, Assemblyman Frazier, chair of the Assembly Transportation Committee, released AB1591, a transportation funding proposal which combines elements of proposals that have been floated in the legislature over the past year, including a proposal from Senator Beall. Governor Brown’s proposed transportation package is in line with the mix of taxes, fees and cap-and-trade money he previously proposed to generate about $3.6 billion annually, including a $65-per-vehicle highway user fee. Attachment 3 provides a comparison of the three transportation funding proposals. New stable funding is desperately needed, especially since the drop in gasoline and diesel prices is resulting in severe reductions in tax revenues designated for Local Streets and Roads, the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and the State Transit Assistance (STA) program. Unfortunately, many Sacramento insiders are skeptical that a deal can be reached, making a new local sales tax, which cannot be taken away by the state, critical for funding transportation projects in Santa Cruz County.

STIP Funding Updates

As discussed at prior meetings, due to a drop in the price of gasoline, the “gas tax swap” of 2010 - under which transportation bond debt service is repaid off the top from diminishing price-based excise tax on gasoline, and California Transportation Commission (CTC) decisions to prioritize the State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) for other flexible state and federal transportation revenues, funding available through the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) has dropped significantly.

The 2016 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Fund Estimate adopted by the CTC in August 2015 showed no new funding available for programming through FY2021. At first, the CTC anticipated that many previously programmed would just need to be delayed, and at its December 3 meeting, the RTC identified projects that could be shifted to later years based on current project schedules and ITAC recommendations (Attachment 4).

However, lower than expected gas prices mean that revenues projected in the Fund Estimate that was adopted by the CTC in August 2015 are not materializing. Due to a corresponding anticipated drop in the price-based excise tax on gasoline and state budget uncertainties, the California Transportation Commission (CTC) adopted a revised five year Fund Estimate for the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) at its January 21, 2016 meeting. The revised Fund Estimate
The CTC is asking regions, including RTC, to submit revised proposals - identifying projects to be deleted from the STIP - by February 26. The CTC has not committed to spread the deprogramming pain statewide, but if they were to follow STIP County Share formulas, Santa Cruz County’s share of the deficit would be approximately $4 million. The RTC currently has about $24 million in STIP funds programmed toward various projects. Since the region already has an unprogrammed balance of $2.5 million, RTC staff would argue that only $1.5 million would have to be deprogrammed in Santa Cruz County if the deficit was spread statewide. However, the CTC will consider the priorities it established for FY15/16 allocations when deciding which projects to delete (Attachment 5). Under this scenario, up to a third of the funds programmed in Santa Cruz County could be eliminated, with pre-construction, bicycle and pedestrian, and local street and road projects most at risk. Making the STIP even less reliable, the shortage of funds may be even worse given many economists’ projections for oil prices. The greatest shortfalls are anticipated in FY16/17 and FY17/18.

Staff is meeting with agencies with STIP projects (Attachment 4) to discuss possible impacts, discuss options, and develop recommendations for consideration at the February Transportation Policy Workshop. Staff recommends that the RTC provide input on options for previously approved STIP projects, in response to the CTC’s request that regions identify projects to delete from the STIP.

Options the RTC may consider at its Policy Workshop include:
1. Identify $1.5 million, $4 million, or up to 35% (over $8 million) of STIP projects in Santa Cruz County to delete;
2. Substitute RSTP for STIP funds, especially for projects that are ready to be implemented in FY16/17, but are low priorities for the CTC;
3. Apply for more reliable Active Transportation Program and other funds for eligible projects;
4. Delete STIP projects in the later years of the STIP, then consider reprogramming those projects if additional STIP funding becomes available (for instance, if the California legislature approves a funding package that addresses STIP funding shortfalls and gasoline prices stabilize);
5. Reduce the scope and funding for projects proportionally;
6. Focus on retaining projects that match the CTC’s priorities;
7. Prioritize projects based on project readiness – no risks to project schedule, 100% of matching funds secured, environmental review done, etc.
8. Prioritize projects based on project benefits, including number of people served by a project and how well they advance regional and state goals (safety, system preservation, greenhouse gas emission reductions, etc).

At its January 14 meeting, the Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC) recommended that the RTC hold off on issuing a call for projects for Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds until more is known about which projects will be affected by the STIP funding shortfall. CTC staff will release its staff
recommendations by April 22, 2016. Final CTC approval of the 2016 STIP has been postponed to May 18-19, 2016.

SUMMARY

Each year the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) adopts legislative priorities to guide its analysis of state and federal legislative or administrative actions that could impact transportation projects in Santa Cruz County. Given that traditional revenue sources, such as gas taxes, are unpredictable and generate less than half of what is needed to operate, maintain, and improve the transportation system, the recommended legislative priorities for 2016 focus on increasing and stabilizing transportation funding.

Due to a significant drop in the price of oil, revenues generated from gas and diesel taxes in California have plummeted. In response, the California Transportation Commission (CTC) adopted a new State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Fund Estimate on January 21 which requires $750 million in projects programmed statewide to be deleted from the STIP. The CTC is requesting regions submit revised proposals for STIP funds, deleting projects, by February 26. Staff is meeting with local project sponsors and will present staff recommendations at the February 18 policy workshop.

Attachments:
1. Draft Legislative Program
2. Governor’s 2016-17 State Budget Summary - Memorandum from Gus Khori
3. Comparison of State Funding Proposals
4. Santa Cruz County STIP projects
5. CTC STIP Priorities
Transportation Funding

- **Stabilize Funding**: Support legislation and other efforts to increase and stabilize funding for transit, local streets and roads, and State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) projects.
  - Protect transportation funds, including Highway Users Tax Account (HUTA), transit, and regional funds, from diversion to other State programs, including General Fund debt repayment.
  - Restore the price-based excise tax to 18-cents per gallon and eliminate annual adjustments.
  - Constitutionally protect all current and future taxes and fees imposed on motor vehicles from being loaned to the General Fund, used to pay general obligation bond debt service, or diverted to other non-transportation purposes.
  - Protect and expand the funding and decision making role of local and regional agencies, rather than the State making top-down funding decisions that are not community-based.

- **Increase State Funding for Transportation**: State investments have not kept pace with the demand and cost to maintain and operate California’s transportation system. Immediate and long-term sustainable solutions are needed.
  - **Immediate measures**: Support measures that immediately increase funds for transportation - index and increase state gas tax; support new transportation bonds and new vehicle license or vehicle registration fees.
  - **New funding systems**: Phase in new funding systems which are tied to system use, rather than fuel consumption or fuel prices. May include new user fees, such as a Road User Charge or Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) fee and other alternative funding mechanisms.
  - **Redirect and Increase Weight Fees**: Restore the $1 billion/year in truck weight fees that have been diverted to pay for General Fund bond debt obligations and restore all of the price-based gas tax to STIP and Local Streets and Roads.
  - **Cap & Trade**: Increase percent of revenues from the Cap & Trade program allocated to transportation projects/programs that help reduce greenhouse gas emissions in Santa Cruz County. Broaden the definition of “disadvantaged communities” to ensure areas in Santa Cruz County that are recognized as such under most understandings of the term are not excluded from the definition used for the Cap and Trade program.
  - **Support options to replace the loss of redevelopment funding**, to support economic development and affordable housing consistent with sustainable communities strategies.
  - **Distribution**: For any statewide or federal revenues, ensure a strong role for regional agencies in planning and determining transportation investment priorities; ensure funds are distributed equitably and not disproportionately distributed to large regions.
  - **Support multimodal transportation system**: Support legislation that increases funding for and supports implementation of complete streets, active transportation projects, and transit-oriented development.
• **Expand local revenue-raising opportunities** and innovative financing options to address the significant backlog of transportation needs. Provide locals with the ability to supplement and leverage state funding for investments that protect state and local transportation assets
  - **Expand the authority of the RTC and local entities to increase taxes and fees** for transportation projects, including new gas taxes and vehicle registration fees.
  - **Lower Vote Threshold**: Support efforts to amend the constitution to lower the voter threshold for local transportation funding measures, such as local sales tax or vehicle registration fee ballot measures, from the 2/3 supermajority to a simple majority or 55% vote.

• **Increase and Preserve Funding for Priority Projects in Santa Cruz County**:
  - Projects on Highway 1
  - Local Street and Roadway Preservation
  - Transit projects
  - Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line
  - Bicycle and Pedestrian facilities, including the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network (MBSST)

**Project Implementation**

• **Streamlining & Expediting**: Support legislation and other efforts that modernize and accelerate project delivery and the creation of jobs.

• **Advanced Mitigation**: Support implementation of “advanced mitigation” environmental programs, including approving up-front environmental mitigation funding for projects, such as the Highway 17 Wildlife Crossing.

• **FAST Act Implementation**: Support legislation and administrative strategies to implement the FAST federal authorization bill, in a way that ensures the best possible outcome for transportation projects in Santa Cruz County.

• **SHOPP Program**: Support Caltrans’ efforts to provide more outreach regarding State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) projects and to include measureable targets for improving the state highway system. Support clarification of existing laws to permit the expenditure of SHOPP funds for operational projects on state highways.

• **Encroachments**
  Support legislation that clarifies the authority under which rail property owners may remove, or by notice may require the removal of encroachments.

• **Active Transportation Facilities**: Support modification to rules, regulations, and government codes that will make roadways more bicycle and pedestrian-friendly, including laws associated with sharing the road; ensuring complete streets components (e.g. accessible pedestrian signals) are considered during the design of all projects; increasing funds for pedestrian safety countermeasures; providing additional direction and consistency for accessible pedestrian design.
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
2016 FEDERAL Legislative Program

• **Priority Projects:** Seek and preserve funding for priority transportation projects and programs in Santa Cruz County, including:
  - Projects on Highway 1
  - Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line
  - Transit operations and capital projects
  - Local street and roadway preservation
  - Bicycle and pedestrian facilities, including the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network (MBSST)
  - 511 implementation

• **Stabilize and Increase Funding**
  - **Increase funding levels** for all modes to bring transportation infrastructure up to a good state of repair and meet growing transportation needs in Santa Cruz County.
  - **Develop new funding mechanisms** that ensure the financial integrity of the Highway Trust Fund and Mass Transportation Account; current per-gallon gasoline fees are insufficient.

• **Streamline Project Delivery:**
  Support regulations to streamline and integrate federal project delivery requirements for project planning, development, review, permitting, and environmental processes in order to reduce project costs and delays.

• **Reauthorization of the Older Americans Act (OAA):** Support Title IIIIB, which includes funding for transportation programs for seniors.

• **FAST Implementation**
  - Support legislation and administrative strategies to implement the FAST federal authorization bill, in a way that ensures the best possible outcome for transportation projects in Santa Cruz County. Ensure that DOT implementation of MAP-21 and FAST Act rules and regulations do not have a negative impact on projects.
  - **Active Transportation:** Support continued funding for pedestrian and bicycle projects
  - **Transit:** Support continued growth of the Small Transit Intensive Cities Program (STIC), funding for acquisition of transit capital (Bus and Bus Facilities, and Low and No Emissions Bus)
  - Programs, and increase funds for ADA implementation.

• **Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions:** Support development of new funding programs to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from transportation or expand eligibility for CMAQ to Santa Cruz County.

• **Performance Measures:** Support development of performance measures which are consistent with RTC approved goals, policies, and targets and which recognize data limitations of many regions.

• **TIGER:** Maintain the TIGER program

• **Marketplace Fairness:** Allow states and local governments to collect sales taxes on out-of-state online purchases, which would increase TDA & ½ cent transit sales tax revenues.
January 7, 2016

TO: Central Coast Coalition
FROM: Gus Khouri, Principal
Khouri Consulting

RE: STATE LEGISLATIVE UPDATE – Governor’s 2016-17 State Budget

On January 7, Governor Brown released his proposed 2016-17 State Budget. After several years of chronic deficits ($20 billion shortfalls for the better part of the past decade including $26.6 billion when Brown took office in 2011), Governor Brown announced that the state has turned the corner thanks to the surge of capital gains revenue (an all-time high in 2015) due to the recovery of the stock market and the passage of Proposition 30, which increases the state sales tax rate and personal income tax on high-income earners, as well as a reduction in the unemployment rate from 12.1% (2011) to 6.0%. The Budget remains precariously balanced for the long term after paying for existing obligations and the Proposition 30 temporary tax revenues expire. The economy is finishing its seventh year of expansion, already two years longer than the average recovery, and the Governor wants to plan ahead for that outcome. The Governor warns that a recession could cost up to $55 billion in lost revenues.

As a result, the Governor’s $122.6 billion spending plan is an modest increase of $6 billion from last year’s $116 billion plan, and it includes $2 billion set aside for the Rainy Day Fund to bring that balance to $8 billion, but the Governor is emphatic in his call for restraint due to the volatility of revenues. The unpredictability of the stock market and imminent expiration of Proposition 30 revenues will require the state to exercise fiscal restraint in the years to come.

This coming year will be the last one with the full revenues of Proposition 30. The quarter- cent sales tax increase under the measure will expire at the end of 2016, and the income tax rates on the state’s wealthiest residents will expire at the end of 2018. As it was intended, the measure has provided the state with increased resources on a short- term basis to give the economy time to recover. Under the measure, the state has been able to restore funding for education and the safety net, expand health care coverage, and pay off its budgetary borrowing.

The passage of Proposition 2 in the November election gives the state a critical opportunity to avoid repeating the boom- and- bust cycle of the past two decades. Recent budget shortfalls have been driven by making ongoing commitments based upon temporary spikes in revenues from capital gains. Under Proposition 2, these spikes in capital gains will instead be used to save money for the next recession and to pay down the state’s debts and liabilities.

The state has $224 billion in long- term costs, debts, and liabilities. The vast majority of these liabilities—$220 billion—are related to retirement costs of state and University of California employees. For the next 15 years, Proposition 2 provides a dedicated funding source to help address these liabilities, but that funding alone will not eliminate the liabilities. In addition, the state faces $77 billion more in identified deferred maintenance on its infrastructure and $257 million to reimburse local jurisdictions for mandate claims. Under a projection of current policies,
the state would begin to spend more than it receives in annual revenues by 2018-19 (by about $1 billion).

Impact on Transportation
The Governor acknowledges that the state’s largest deferred maintenance is on its highways, roads and bridges and that annual maintenance and repairs are billions more than can be funded annually within existing resources, especially with the expiration of Proposition 1B and dwindling gas tax revenues. The budget proposes that the state must address deferred maintenance on the state’s highways and key freight corridors through expanded and ongoing funding sources.

The Budget reflects the Governor’s transportation funding and reform package, including reforms first outlined in September 2015. The package includes a combination of new revenues, additional investments of Cap and Trade auction proceeds, accelerated loan repayments, Caltrans efficiencies and streamlined project delivery, accountability measures, and constitutional protections for the new revenues.

The Governor’s package of revenues will be split evenly between state and local transportation priorities. The ten-year funding plan will provide a total of $36 billion for transportation with an emphasis on repairing and maintaining the existing transportation infrastructure. It also includes a significant investment in public transit. Specifically, the proposal includes annualized resources as follows:

- **Road Improvement Charge**—$2 billion from a new $65 fee on all vehicles, including hybrids and electrics.
- **Stabilize Gasoline Excise Tax** — $500 million by setting the gasoline excise tax beginning in 2017-18 at the historical average of 18 cents and eliminating the current annual adjustments. The broader gasoline tax would then be adjusted annually for inflation to maintain purchasing power.
- **Diesel Excise Tax**—$500 million from an 11-cent increase in the diesel excise tax beginning in 2017-18. This tax would also be adjusted annually for inflation to maintain purchasing power.
- **Cap and Trade**—$500 million in additional cap and trade proceeds.
- **Caltrans Efficiencies** — $100 million in cost-saving reforms.

Additionally, the Budget includes a General Fund commitment to transportation by accelerating $879 million in loan repayments over the next four years. These funds will support additional investments in the Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program, trade corridor improvements, and repairs on local roads and the state highway system. Without this commitment, these funds would be paid back over the next 20 years.

Over the next ten years, the $36 billion transportation package will provide $16.2 billion for highway repairs and maintenance, and invest $2.3 billion in the state’s trade corridors. Local roads will receive more than $13.5 billion in new funding. Transit and intercity rail will receive over $4 billion in additional funding. Because the state’s disadvantaged communities are often located in areas affected by poor air quality, a minimum of $2 billion (50 percent) of these funds will be spent on projects that benefit these communities.
2016-17 Spending
For 2016-17, the Budget reflects partial first-year resources from the transportation package of over $1.7 billion (including nearly $1.6 billion from new revenues and $173 million from loan repayments), which will be distributed as follows:

- **Local Streets and Roads**—An increase of $342 million in Shared Revenues to be allocated by the Controller to cities and counties for local road maintenance according to existing statutory formulas. The Budget also includes an additional $148 million from loan repayments to reimburse cities and counties for funds already spent on Traffic Congestion Relief Program projects.
- **Low Carbon Road Program** — $100 million Cap and Trade for Caltrans to implement a new Low Carbon Road Program for local projects that encourage active transportation such as bicycling and walking, and other carbon-reducing road investments, with at least 50 percent of the funds directed to benefit disadvantaged communities.
- **Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program**—An increase of $409 million Cap and Trade (also includes $9 million from loan repayments) for transit capital investments that provide greenhouse gas reductions, with at least 50 percent of the funds directed to benefit disadvantaged communities.
- **Highway Repairs and Maintenance** — An increase of $515 million ($5 million from loan repayments) for Caltrans to fund repairs and maintenance on the state highway system.
- **Trade Corridor Improvements** — An increase of $211 million ($11 million from loan repayments) for Caltrans to fund projects along the state’s major trade corridors, providing ongoing funding for a program originally established with $2 billion in one-time Proposition 1B bond funding.

Project Reforms and Caltrans Efficiencies
The transportation package also includes the following reforms and efficiencies at Caltrans to streamline project delivery and advance projects more quickly:

- **State Highway Performance Plan**—Establish measurable targets for improvement including regular reporting to California Transportation Commission, the Legislature, and the public.
- **Streamlined Project Delivery**—Provide a limited California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) exemption; remove the sunset date for the federal delegation of environmental reviews so they can be completed concurrent with the state review; advance project environmental mitigation to get early buy-in on activities and reduce late challenges that delay projects; and implement more innovative procurement methods, such as combining design and construction management elements to accelerate project delivery, commonly known as Construction Manager/General Contractor (CMGC) procurements.
- **Staffing Flexibility**—Permit Caltrans to deliver projects funded with new revenue by doubling contract staff over the next five years.
- **Extend Public-Private Partnership Authority**—Allow for these partnerships through 2027 by extending the current sunset date by ten years.

Cap and Trade
The $3.1 billion Expenditure Plan reflects the balance of auction proceeds that were not appropriated in 2015-16, as well as the expenditure of projected proceeds in 2016-17. The
proposed plan expends at least 10 percent of the proceeds within disadvantaged communities and at least 25 percent of the proceeds to projects that benefit those communities.

Consistent with existing law, the Budget reflects that 60 percent, or $1.2 billion, of 2016-17 projected auction proceeds are continuously appropriated to support public transit, sustainable communities, and high-speed rail. To further support the Governor’s goal to reduce statewide petroleum use by 50 percent by 2030, the Cap and Trade Expenditure Plan includes an additional $1 billion for the following programs that will reduce emissions in the transportation sector:

- **$500 million** for the Air Resources Board’s Low Carbon Transportation Program to provide incentives for low carbon freight and passenger transportation, including rebates for zero-emission cars, vouchers for hybrid trucks and zero-emission trucks and buses.

- **$400 million** for the Transportation Agency’s Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program for additional competitive grants to support capital improvements to integrate state, local and other transit systems, including those located in disadvantaged communities, and to provide connectivity to high-speed rail. This proposal is consistent with the Administration’s transportation package.

- **$100 million** for the Department of Transportation to administer the Low Carbon Road Program, which will prioritize disadvantaged communities, and provide competitive grants for improvements to local streets and roads that encourage active transportation, such as walking and bicycling, transit, and other carbon-reducing road investments. This proposal is consistent with the Administration’s transportation package.

Please see the attached to view a breakdown of the Governor’s proposed Cap and Trade allocations.

**State Transit Assistance Program**

The program is estimated to be funded at $315 million in FY 16-17, which is roughly a decrease of $72 million from last January ($387 million) and $36 million less than the May Revise from FY15-16 ($351 million).
### Preliminary Comparison of Three Transportation Funding and Reform Proposals as of January 8, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>SB 1x1 (Beall) as of Aug 25, 2015</th>
<th>AB 1591 (Frazier) as of Jan 6, 2016</th>
<th>Governor’s Proposal from Sep 6, 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas Excise Tax Increase</td>
<td>12 cents ($2b)</td>
<td>22.5 cents ($3.5b)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price-Based Excise Tax Adjustment Reset</td>
<td>17.3 cents ($900m)</td>
<td>17.3 cents ($900m)</td>
<td>18 cents ($900m)^1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>CPI adjustment</strong></td>
<td>Every 3 years</td>
<td>Every 3 years</td>
<td>Every year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Excise Tax Increase</td>
<td>22 cents ($600m)</td>
<td>30 cents ($800m)</td>
<td>11 cents ($300m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>CPI adjustment</strong></td>
<td>Every 3 years</td>
<td>Every 3 years</td>
<td>Every year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Registration Fee Increase</td>
<td>$35 ($1b)</td>
<td>$38 ($1b)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Access Fee/Highway User Fee</td>
<td>$35 ($1b)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>$65 ($2b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZEV-specific Fee</td>
<td>$100 ($25m)</td>
<td>$165 ($35m)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>Total Vehicle Fee Increase</strong></td>
<td>$70 ($170 for ZEVs)</td>
<td>$38 ($203 for ZEVs)</td>
<td>$65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund (Cap &amp; Trade)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>TIRCP^2 from 10% to 20% ($200m)</td>
<td>TIRCP - $400m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TCIF – 20% ($400m)</td>
<td>Complete Streets - $100m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight Fees</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Returned immediately^3</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund Loan Repayments</td>
<td>Over 3 yrs, to RMRA^4</td>
<td>Over 2 yrs, directly to locals</td>
<td>By 6/30/19, to various accts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans Efficiencies</td>
<td>Up to 30% ($500m)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>$100m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Total Annual Funding Increase</strong></td>
<td>~ $6 billion</td>
<td>~ $7 billion</td>
<td>~ $3.7 billion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 The Governor’s proposal doesn’t reset the price-based excise tax until the 2017-18 fiscal year.

2 Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program, a competitive grant program administered by the Transportation Agency.

3 The weight fees would not be transferred from the State Highway Account and instead be available for traditional uses including SHOPP, STIP, and local roads through existing formulas. Therefore they are not included in the Estimated Total Annual Funding Increase, but would result in roughly $1 billion more funding.

4 The Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account, created in SB 1x1.

5 Roughly estimated, annualized over ten years. Figures may not add up due to rounding.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>SB 1x1 (Beall) as of Aug 25, 2015</th>
<th>AB 1591 (Frazier) as of Jan 6, 2016</th>
<th>Governor’s Proposal from Sep 6, 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gas Excise Tax Increase</td>
<td>RMRA</td>
<td>RMRA</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel Excise Tax Increase</td>
<td>10 cents to RMRA</td>
<td>All to TCIF</td>
<td>RMRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPI Adjustment Revenues</td>
<td>To the respective programs</td>
<td>To the respective programs</td>
<td>RMRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Fee Increases</td>
<td>RMRA</td>
<td>RMRA</td>
<td>RMRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund (Cap &amp; Trade)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$200m to rail and transit</td>
<td>$400m to rail and transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund Loan Repayments</td>
<td>RMRA</td>
<td>Cities and Counties</td>
<td>Various accounts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Annual Expenditures on:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Rehab and Maintenance</td>
<td>$5.5 billion</td>
<td>$5.8 billion</td>
<td>$2.9 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight Mobility</td>
<td>$500 million</td>
<td>$1.2 billion</td>
<td>$200 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail and Transit or Complete Streets</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$200 million</td>
<td>$500 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditure Split Between State/Local Needs</strong></td>
<td>52% state/48% percent local</td>
<td>55% state/45% percent local</td>
<td>50% state/50% percent local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accountability and Reforms</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting to the Commission</td>
<td>Both Caltrans and the locals report to the Commission on the efficacy of expenditures from the RMRA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Both Caltrans and the locals report to the Commission on the efficacy of expenditures from the RMRA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Maintenance of Effort Requirements</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Included</td>
<td>Included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission Allocation of SHOPP Support Costs</td>
<td>Requires by Feb 2017</td>
<td>Requires by Feb 2017</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COS State Staff vs. Contract Staff</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>80%/20% by Jul 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM/GC Project Delivery</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Expands authority for Caltrans from 6 to 12 projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Private Partnerships Project Delivery</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Extends sunset from 2017 to 2027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQA Exemption</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Exempts projects in existing rights of way in certain circumstances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPA Delegation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Eliminates the sunset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Advance Mitigation Program</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Included</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Santa Cruz County STIP Projects

*Reflects RTC action December 3, 2015*

All figures in 000's (thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Rte</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>RTIP #</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>TOTAL STIP</th>
<th>STIP by Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Totals by Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>SR1/9</td>
<td>4658</td>
<td>SC 25</td>
<td>Rt 1/9 Intersection modifications</td>
<td>1,329</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>loc</td>
<td>2551</td>
<td>TRL07SC</td>
<td>Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network: Segment 7 Natural Bridges Dr to Pacific Ave</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz Co</td>
<td>loc</td>
<td>2557</td>
<td>CO 73</td>
<td>Casserly Rd Bridge Replacement</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz Co</td>
<td>loc</td>
<td>2558</td>
<td>CO 74</td>
<td>Freedom Blvd Cape Seal (northeast from Highway 1)</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watsonville</td>
<td>loc</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>WAT 01</td>
<td>Rt 1 Harkins Slough Rd interchange (10S-041)</td>
<td>7,340</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watsonville</td>
<td>loc</td>
<td>2366</td>
<td>WAT 38</td>
<td>Airport Blvd at Freedom Blvd modifications</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watsonville</td>
<td>loc</td>
<td>2555</td>
<td>WAT 40</td>
<td>Airpoort Boulevard Improvements (east of Westgate Drive/Larkin Valley Road to east of Hanger Way)</td>
<td>1,195</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watsonville</td>
<td>loc</td>
<td>2556</td>
<td>WAT 41</td>
<td>Sidewalk Infill Harkins Slough Rd &amp; Main St</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watsonville</td>
<td>loc</td>
<td>2552</td>
<td>TRL18L</td>
<td>Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network: Lee Rd to Slough Trail Connection</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>loc</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>RTC 04</td>
<td>Planning, programming, and monitoring</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>loc</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>RTC 01</td>
<td>Freeway Service Patrol</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>loc</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>RTC 30</td>
<td>Rt 1 Mar Vista bike/ped overcrossing</td>
<td>6,564</td>
<td>1,635</td>
<td>4,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>SR1</td>
<td>73A</td>
<td>RTC 24F</td>
<td>Rt 1, 41st Ave/Soquel Av Aux Lns &amp; bike/ped bridge; could maybe shift design</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposed 2016 STIP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>24,842</th>
<th>899</th>
<th>9,574</th>
<th>1,935</th>
<th>5,565</th>
<th>6,878</th>
<th>Reserve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Current 2014 STIP**

|               | 24,844 | 2,360 | 10,826 | 11,482 | 174   | 0     | 0       |

**Change**

|               | -1470  | -1,252 | -9,547 | -5,391 | 6,878 | 2,539 |

**Notes/Acronyms:**

Components - R/W: Right-of-way; Const: Construction; E&P: Environmental and Project Report; PS&E: Plans, Specifications, and Engineering (design)

RTIP: Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP)

STIP: State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)
2015-16 STIP ALLOCATION PRIORITIES
Resolution G-15-25

STIP projects programmed in 2015-16 or extended into 2015-16 will be recommended for allocation based on criteria chosen to reflect statewide goals and policies, including Governor’s executive orders. Agencies will receive allocations for projects on a first come, first served basis so long as additional capacity remains, using the following criteria, in priority order:

- AB 3090 cash reimbursements
- Planning, Programming and Monitoring
- Projects funded with both STIP and other competitively selected fund
- Projects at risk of losing federal funding if not allocated
- Project Allocations for:
  - Required mitigation projects for construction projects previously allocated
  - Safety projects on the state highway system (that cannot be funded by SHOPP)
  - Operational improvements on the state highway system
  - Capacity expansion intercity rail projects
  - Operational improvements on intercity rail system
  - Capacity expansion urban transit projects with intercity rail benefit or significant regional benefit
  - Operational improvements to transit with intercity rail benefit or significant regional benefit
  - Capacity expansion projects on state highways with freight benefit or that demonstrate significant economic impact, and that incorporate multiple corridor elements (rail, transit and/or active transportation)
  - Capacity expansion projects on state highways with freight benefit or that demonstrate significant economic impact
  - Local road rehabilitation and reconstruction
  - Operational improvements on local road and transit operational improvements
  - Active Transportation projects
  - Capacity expansion projects on state highways (other than those detailed above)
  - Capacity expansion local road projects and capacity expansion transit projects without intercity rail or significant regional benefit
  - Preconstruction funding for projects on the state highway system (excluding preconstruction components for projects funded with both STIP and other competitively selected funds)
  - Preconstruction funding for projects on local roads (excluding preconstruction components for projects funded with both STIP and other competitively selected funds)