Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission

AGENDA
Thursday, September 1, 2016
9:00 a.m.

NOTE LOCATION THIS MONTH
County Board of Supervisors Chambers
701 Ocean St., 5th floor
Santa Cruz, CA

NOTE
See the last page for details about access for people with disabilities and meeting broadcasts.

En Español
Para información sobre servicios de traducción al español, diríjase a la última página.

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

CONSEN T 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 August 4, 2016 Regional Transportation Commission meeting

5. Approve draft minutes of the August 4, 2016 Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies meeting

6. Accept draft minutes of the August 8, 2016 Bicycle Advisory Committee meeting

7. Accept draft minutes of the August 9, 2016 Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee meeting

8. Approve draft minutes of the August 18, 2016 Transportation Policy Workshop meeting

9. Accept draft minutes of the August 18, 2016 Interagency Transportation Advisory Committee meeting

POLICY ITEMS

No consent items

PROJECTS and PLANNING ITEMS

No consent items
BUDGET AND EXPENDITURES ITEMS

10. Accept status report on Transportation Development Act (TDA) revenues

ADMINISTRATION ITEMS

No consent items

INFORMATION/OTHER ITEMS

11. Accept monthly meeting schedule

12. Accept correspondence log

13. Accept letters from RTC committees and staff to other agencies - none

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

15. Accept information items
   a. Article from the August 20, 2016 Sentinel “Getting Santa Cruz moving” by Don Lane and Zach Friend

REGULAR AGENDA

16. Commissioner reports – oral reports

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

18. Caltrans report and consider action items
   a. District Director’s report
   b. Santa Cruz County project updates
   c. Update of the State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) for District 5

19. 9:15 PUBLIC HEARING: Adoption of the 2016 Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG)
   (Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner)
   a. Staff report
   b. Resolution amending the 2016 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) and the Fiscal Year (FY) 2016-17 Budget and Work Program
   c. Recommendations for 2016 STBG Grant Cycle
   d. Proposed Budget Amendment
   e. Summary of Project Benefits
20. Roadmap for Rail Corridor development
   (George Dondero, Executive Director)
   a. Staff report

21. Amendments to the Fiscal Year (FY) 2016-17 Budget and Work Program
   (Luis Mendez, Deputy Director)
   a. Staff report
   b. Resolution amending the FY 2016-17 RTC Budget and Work Program
   c. Letter from Caltrans notifying the RTC of grant awards
   d. Highway 9 San Lorenzo Valley Corridor Transportation Plan Fact Sheet
   e. Unified Corridor Investment Study – Phase 2 Fact Sheet

22. Review of items to be discussed in closed session

**CLOSED SESSION**

23. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL-EXISTING LITIGATION. (Paragraph (1) of subdivision (d) of Section 54956.9 of the Government Code) Santa Clara Superior Court Case No. 16CV293441

**OPEN SESSION**

24. Report on closed session

25. Next meetings

   The next RTC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, October 6, 2016 at 9:00 a.m.
   at the County Board of Supervisors Chambers, 701 Ocean St., 5th floor, Santa Cruz, CA.

   The next Transportation Policy Workshop is scheduled for Thursday, September 15, 2016 at 9:00 a.m. at the RTC Offices, 1523 Pacific Ave., 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

ACCOMMODATIONS FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES

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

SERVICIOS DE TRADUCCIÓN/ TRANSLATION SERVICES

Si gusta estar presente o participar en esta junta de la Comisión Regional de Transporte del Condado de Santa Cruz y necesita información o servicios de traducción al español por favor llame por lo menos con tres días laborables de anticip o 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 y 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.
Minutes
Thursday, August 4, 2016
9:00 a.m.
Scotts Valley City Council Chambers
1 Civic Center Dr.
Scotts Valley, CA

1. Roll call

The meeting was called to order at 9:03 a.m.

Members present:
Don Lane  Randy Johnson
Zach Friend  Ryan Coonerty
John Leopold  Bruce McPherson
Jimmy Dutra  Cynthia Chase
Ed Bottorff  Karina Cervantez
Dennis Norton  Greg Caput
Brandy Rider (ex-officio)

Staff members:
George Dondero  Luis Mendez
Yesenia Parra  Jenn Rodriguez
Cory Caletti  Ginger Dykaar
Karena Pushnik  Amy Naranjo
Kim Shultz

2. Review of items to be discussed in closed session

Commissioners adjourned to close session at 9:04 a.m.

CLOSED SESSION

3. 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

4. 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. CV178849

5. 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. 16CV00335
OPEN SESSION

6. Report on closed session

Commissioners reconvened to open session at 9:40 a.m. and there was no closed session report.

7. Oral communications - None

8. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agendas

Additional pages for Item 29, handouts for Items 17, 24, 28, and 29, and a replacement page for the SAFE Agenda were distributed.

CONSENT AGENDA

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

MINUTES

9. Accepted draft minutes of the April 11, 2016 Bicycle Advisory Committee meeting

10. Approved draft minutes of the June 2, 2016 Regional Transportation Commission meeting

11. Accepted draft minutes of the June 6, 2016 Bicycle Advisory Committee meeting

12. Accepted draft minutes of the June 14, 2016 Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee

13. Approved draft minutes of the June 16, 2016 Transportation Policy Workshop meeting

POLICY ITEMS

No consent items

PROJECTS and PLANNING ITEMS

14. Approved designation of 2016 Proposition 1B Transit Security funds to Santa Cruz METRO (Resolution 27-16)

BUDGET AND EXPENDITURES ITEMS

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

16. Amendments for public outreach consultant contracts
Item moved to the regular agenda at the request of Commissioner Johnson. Chair Lane moved the item to the end of the regular agenda after Item 29.

ADMINISTRATION ITEMS

17. Approved Railroad Crossing Agreement for Trout Gulch Road in Aptos

INFORMATION/OTHER ITEMS

18. Accepted monthly meeting schedule
19. Accepted correspondence log
20. Accepted letters from RTC committees and staff to other agencies
21. Accepted miscellaneous written comments from the public on RTC projects and transportation issues
22. Accepted information items
   a. Graffiti Removal Project June Newsletter: Westlake Charter Students Clean Up Aptos Rail Corridor
   b. Article from the Washington Post “Is the car culture dying?” by Robert J. Samuelson

REGULAR AGENDA

23. Commissioner reports – oral reports

   Commissioner McPherson reported that Santa Cruz Metro has received the biggest grant in California in the amount of $3.8 million to fund new electric buses and charging stations.

   Commissioner Johnson welcomed everyone to Scotts Valley.

24. Director’s Report – oral report

   George Dondero, Executive Director, reported on: the progress of the Mar Vista bike/pedestrian crossing project, with a target date of construction to begin in summer 2019; a partnership with the City of Santa Cruz, Santa Cruz County, and the Land Trust of Santa Cruz County to fund the feasibility analysis to widen the walkway on the San Lorenzo river bridge; City Arts Santa Cruz and Santa Cruz Arts Commission initiating a plan to have public arts be displayed along the City of Santa Cruz’s rail trail segments; and a roadmap for future steps in assessing options for the rail corridor being presented at the September 1st RTC meeting.
25. Caltrans report and consider action items

Kelly McClendon, Caltrans District 5 Transportation Planner, reported on: an update to the release of the California Transportation Plan (CTP 2040), a long-range policy framework to meet future mobility needs and reduce emissions; Caltrans’ new Bike and Pedestrian Safety Chief, Rachel Carpenter; and the Performance Measurement System (PeMS) detectors on Highway 17 installed recently.

26. City of Scotts Valley Public Works presentation – oral report

Scott Hamby, City of Scotts Valley Public Works Director, gave a presentation on transportation projects in Scotts Valley. Mr. Hamby reported on: the crosswalk improvements near schools and the post office with Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds; the Mount Hermon/Scotts Valley Drive and Whispering Pines intersection project to relieve congestion and improve traffic flow; and the Eastern Corridor Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG) application to repave, restripe, and add bicycle lanes and sidewalks on Green Hills Road and Glen Canyon Road.

Commissioners discussed: the success of the Safe Routes to School project, and how funding allocations to Scotts Valley from the Transportation Improvement Plan will assist with the overlay budget to fund the city’s transportation projects.

27. Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 8 allocation request from the County of Santa Cruz

Cory Caletti, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the staff report. Ms. Caletti reported that the County of Santa Cruz has requested $386,000 in funding for three bicycle and pedestrian projects: bike lane maintenance, the Boulder Creek Elementary School Pedestrian Safety Project, and the Twin Lakes State Beach Beachfront project within the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network (MBSST). She clarified that that MBSST project costs are funded by a range of grants and local funds, along with TDA funding, and also noted that a formalized parking configuration will restrict current unchecked use and will enhance pedestrian access and bicycle safety.

Commissioners discussed: appreciation for the Boulder Creek Elementary School Pedestrian Safety Project; whether it is appropriate for TDA funds to be utilized to provide vehicular access to the coast; the longevity of the project’s design development and balances required due to various stakeholders and resources agencies; satisfying the demand for parking near Twin Lakes Beach while still preserving the integrity of the scenic area; the needs of pedestrians and the harbor and being people friendly versus automobile friendly; and bike and pedestrian paths located on the coastal side while balancing parking areas so cars do not park haphazardly.

Commissioner McPherson moved and Commissioner Coonerty seconded staff recommendations to approve (Resolution 28-16) to allocate Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 8 funds to the County of Santa Cruz for bicycle and pedestrian improvement projects that include:
1. Bike Lane Maintenance – $150,000  
2. Boulder Creek Elementary School Pedestrian Safety Project - $150,000  
3. Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail/Twin Lakes State Beach spur - $86,069  
The motion passed with Commissioners Lane, Johnson, Friend, Leopold, Coonerty, Dutra, Chase, Bottorff, Cervantez, and McPherson voting “aye” and Commissioners Norton and Caput voting “no”.

28. Project list for 2040 Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Plan

Ginger Dykaar, Transportation Planner, presented the staff report. Ms. Dykaar reported that the complete list of transportation needs for the 2040 Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) are currently being developed and includes: goals, targets, and policies that are used to prioritize funding, identify the area’s transportation needs, and estimate the amount of funds that may be available for transportation projects. The approved priority project lists for Santa Cruz County will be submitted for inclusion in the 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan - Sustainable Communities Strategy (2040 MTP-SCS). She noted that the 2040 RTP and 2040 MTP-SCS are scheduled for approval in June 2018.

Commissioners discussed: prioritizing the compiled list of transportation projects; financial feasibility to fund over $6 billion needed for transportation projects; incoming revenue and available funding for the constrained and unconstrained project lists; and the outreach efforts for comments from the public for their input on the transportation needs in Santa Cruz County.

Dana Bagshaw, stated that she is inspired by the 2040 RTP’s vision to improve public transit and that funding should be redirected from the highway to other projects that support sustainable transportation.

Commissioner Coonerty moved and Commissioner Leopold seconded staff recommendations to:
1. Identify any additional projects or gaps in the transportation system that should be considered for the 2040 Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP);
2. Approve the preliminary draft project list for the 2040 Santa Cruz County RTP; and
3. Direct staff to submit the approved project list to the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) for inclusion in the project list for the 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy.

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

29. Polar Express Operating Plan and License

Luis Mendez, Deputy Director, presented the staff report. Mr. Mendez reported that Iowa Pacific Holdings (IPH)/Santa Cruz and Monterey Bay Railway (SC&MB) have proposed an operating plan to run a Polar Express from the Santa Cruz Boardwalk to the Capitola area on the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line for the 2016 holiday season.
Kevin Busath, Iowa Pacific Holding (IPH), introduced Matt Abbey and Mike Edwards with IPH/Santa Cruz & Monterey Bay Railway (SC&MB), and gave a presentation on the operating plan for the proposed Polar Express excursion. Mr. Busath stated that Polar Express is an hour long train ride that has been declared by Warner Brothers as the biggest and best Polar Express franchise train in the United States. He noted that the excursion would: replace the Train to Christmas Town in Watsonville; have a North Pole set built somewhere in Capitola; not impact the Big Trees holiday train; and is projected to attract up to thirty thousand passengers, with employment opportunities for over 100 Santa Cruz County locals.

Commissioners discussed: replacing the Watsonville train to Christmas Town; outreach to the Capitola City Council and stakeholders; minimizing the noise impact of the train horn at grade crossings; optimistic calculations of revenue numbers and estimated ridership projections; outreach to the neighbors within range of the excursion; balancing mindfulness of the community and the RTC’s obligation for use of the rail line and the license agreement with IPH; maintenance costs on the rail line; troubleshooting any parking and safety issues from the train going through Capitola; the affordability of the Polar Express; how the excursion is a business decisions on how to use the rail line; past communication challenges and history of working with IPH; the importance of utilizing the rail line with a feature that will be well liked by the community; the past ridership numbers of the Christmas train; and support for public process and community outreach.

**Dana Bagshaw,** said that she is concerned about parking issues and traffic congestion near the wharf and inquired about the Polar Express’ hours of operation, frequency, and coordination with the Big Trees operation.

**Grace Voss,** stated that neighbors near the rail line of the proposed excursion are sensitive to loud noises. Ms. Voss inquired if electric engines are being considered and if reducing the decibel of the train horn is possible.

Commissioner Bottorff made a motion to postpone the decision on approving an operating plan and license agreement for the Polar Express until the August 18th Transportation Policy Workshop, pending further coordination with the City of Capitola and other key stakeholders. Commissioner Norton seconded and the motion passed with Commissioners Lane, Johnson, Friend, Coonerty, Dutra, Chase, Bottorff, Cervantez, Norton, and McPherson voting “aye” and Commissioner Caput voting “no”.

Commissioner Caput left the meeting.

Previously Item 16 - Approve amendments for public outreach consultant contracts

In response to Commissioner Johnson’s concerns to the contracts being over the initially approved budget, George Dondero, Executive Director, clarified that the funds were in the budget and there was an oversight in the procedural inclusion of the resolution that was not in the original contract authorization.

Commissioner Friend moved and Commissioner Leopold seconded staff recommendations to authorize amendments to the contracts with TBWB Strategies and Miller Maxfield, Inc. to pay for the work done by these consultants and
adequately close out the contracts for public outreach and deliverables associated with the RTC’s development of an expenditure plans and transportation sales tax measure. The motion passed with Commissioners Lane, Friend, Leopold, Coonerty, Dutra, Chase, Bottorff, Cervantez, Norton, and McPherson voting “aye” and Commissioner Johnson voting “no”.

Commissioner Leopold and Commissioner Norton left the meeting.

30. Adjourn to special meeting of the Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies

The Regional Transportation Commission meeting adjourned at 11:29 a.m.

31. Next meetings

The next RTC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, September 1, 2016 at 9:00 a.m. at the County Board of Supervisors Chambers, 701 Ocean St., 5th floor, Santa Cruz, CA.

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

The meeting adjourned at 11:32 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jenn Rodriguez, Staff

Attendees:

Dana Bagshaw
Kelly McClendon       Caltrans
Kevin Busath         Iowa Pacific
Matt Abbey           Iowa Pacific
Mike Edwards         Santa Cruz & Monterey Bay Railway
Sharon Miles
Jack Sohriakoff       Santa Cruz County Public Works
Pamela Cox
Howard Cohen
Ed Silveira     B40
Erich Friedrich     Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments
Scott Hamby         City of Scotts Valley Public Works
Kate Giberson       Harris Association
The meeting convened at 11:29 a.m., immediately following the completion of the regular RTC meeting.

Members present:
Don Lane  Zach Friend  
Randy Johnson  Ryan Coonerty  
Jimmy Dutra  Cynthia Chase  
Ed Bottorff  Karina Cervantez  
Bruce McPherson  Brandy Rider (ex-officio)

1. Oral communications - None

2. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agendas - None

CONSENT AGENDA

No consent items

REGULAR AGENDA

3. Call Box Call Answer Center Contract

Luis Mendez, Deputy Director, presented the staff report.

Commissioner Friend moved and Commissioner Coonerty seconded staff recommendations to approve (Resolution 29-16) authorizing the Executive Director to enter into a 3-year agreement with CDS Net for call box answering services. The motion passed unanimously with Commissioners Lane, Johnson, Friend, Coonerty, Dutra, Chase, Bottorff, Cervantez, McPherson, voting “aye”.

4. The special meeting of the Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jenn Rodriguez, Staff
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission’s
BICYCLE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes
Monday, August 8, 2016
6:00 p.m. to 8:30 p.m

RTC Office
1523 Pacific Ave
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

1. Call to Order: 6:05 pm

2. Introductions

Members Present:
Grace Voss, District 1
Kem Akol, District 1 (Alt.)
David Casterson, District 2, Vice-Chair
Peter Scott, District 3
Will Menchine, District 3 (Alt.)
Amelia Conlen, District 4, Chair
Lex Rau, City of Scotts Valley
Andy Ward, City of Capitola
Emily Gomez, Ecology Action/Bike to Work
Leo Jed, CTSC

Guests:
Murray Fontes, City of Watsonville
Scott Hamby, City of Scotts Valley
Jessica Kahn, City of Scotts Valley
Claire Fliesler, City of Santa Cruz
John Mills, RTC E&D TAC

Unexcused Absences:

Excused Absences:
Jim Cook, District 2 (Alt.)
Rick Hyman, District 5
Gary Milburn, City of Scotts Valley (Alt.)
Melissa Ott, City of Santa Cruz
Piet Canin, Ecology Action/Bike to Work (Alt.)
Daniel Kostelec, City of Capitola (Alt.)
Jim Langley, CTSC (Alt.)

Vacancies:
City of Santa Cruz – Alternate
District 4 and 5 – Alternates
City of Watsonville – Voting and Alternate

Staff:
Cory Caletti, Sr Transportation Planner
Rachel Moriconi, Sr Transportation Planner

3. Announcements - Cory Caletti announced that request for proposals (RFP) was released for preliminary design and environmental work for the Mar Vista Drive bicycle and pedestrian crossing. Proposals are due Thursday, August 11th.

4. Oral communications – Amelia Conlen announced that she accepted a position with the City of Santa Cruz as the Transportation Coordinator. She will continue serving on the Committee as Chair. Kem Akol requested that an item be agendized related to naming a future bridge in honor of former Committee member and long-time City of Santa Cruz Public Works Director Bill Fieberling who recently passed away. John Mills, a member of the Elderly & Disabled
Transportation Advisory Committee, commented on the draft brochure about what bicyclists and pedestrians want one another to know, suggested wording revisions, and encouraged committee members to provide input on the brochure. Staff reminded members that the draft brochure was reviewed at a previous meeting and that the item may be brought back to the committee should significant revisions be considered. A discussion followed about local ordinances related to riding on sidewalks. Cory Caletti indicated that a summary of said ordinances has been compiled and is available on the RTC’s website and that she will also email members a link to that site.

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

CONSENT AGENDA

A motion (Ward/Scott) was made to approve the consent agenda. The motion passed unanimously with members Voss, Casterson, Scott, Conlen, Rau, Ward, and Gomez voting in favor. No votes were cast in opposition.

6. Accepted final minutes of the April 11, 2016 Bicycle Advisory Committee meeting

7. Approved draft minutes of the June 6, 2016 Bicycle Advisory Committee meeting

8. Accepted summary of Hazard Reports

REGULAR AGENDA

9. 2016 Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG) Recommendations – Rachel Moriconi, RTC Senior Transportation Planner, summarized the staff report, which included a list of projects for which applications were submitted, criteria used to evaluate project applications, and preliminary staff recommendations. A handout, submitted by Rick Hyman regarding the City of Santa Cruz’s proposed sidewalk project on Pacific Avenue, was distributed. Scott Hamby of the City of Scotts Valley summarized the Glen Canyon/Green Hills Road project and thanked staff for the funding recommendation. Murray Fontes, Principle Engineer for the City of Watsonville summarized the two City projects submitted for funding consideration. Claire Fliesler of the City of Santa Cruz provided a summary of her agency’s projects and added that the City of Santa Cruz would be able to contribute a greater match to the Pacific Avenue project, reducing the minimum STBG funds needed to $240,000. After questions, voices of support for projects recommended and for a few not recommended, and some discussion, a motion was unanimously approved (Scott/ Casterson) to recommend the RTC adopt the staff recommendation with the additional recommendation that the City of Santa Cruz’s Pacific Avenue sidewalk project be funded at a $240K level.

10. 2016 Transportation Improvement Plan Ballot Measure Update – Rachel Moriconi, RTC Senior Transportation Planner, updated members on the transportation sales tax measure that has been placed on the November ballot. She highlighted the changes in the funding allocations and conditions made since the Committee received a presentation in April. A campaign committee has been established and RTC staff is only providing information, as available and requested. Discussion included local agency distribution formulas approved by the RTC at its May 2016 meeting and the ability to utilize local funds as match to secure grants.

11. Coastal Rail Trail/Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network Update – Cory Caletti, RTC Senior Transportation Planner/Trail Program Manager, provided the following updates:

"
• The Land Trust of Santa Cruz County provided funding for an analysis of the San Lorenzo River pedestrian crossing and feasibility of widening the existing 4’ wide pathway to a 9’-10’ multi-use facility. Widening was deemed feasible at a considerably lower cost that the Master Plan’s proposal for a new separated bike/pedestrian crossing at that location.

• The City of Santa Cruz partnered with the County to submit an Active Transportation Program (ATP) grant application for the design and environmental services for the Rail Trail from the Wharf Roundabout to 17th Ave. Estimated cost of services for design and environmental services is $4.7M with $3.2M requested from ATP and a $1.5M local match provided by the Land Trust of Santa Cruz County. Grant awards will be announced at the end of this year with fund availability/programming in fiscal years 19/20 and 20/21.

• A width constraint at the New Leaf parking lot at Fair Street has been resolved enabling the City of Santa Cruz’s current trail project (from Natural Bridges Drive to the Wharf) to be on the coastal side of the track throughout its length.

• City Arts Santa Cruz/the Santa Cruz Arts Commission have begun planning for public art along the City’s portion of the rail trail. The first public brainstorming meeting for an Art Master Plan will be held Thursday, August 11 6:00pm-7:30pm in the Swift St. Courtyard in front of Kelly’s French Bakery. At this meeting local artists are invited to help us identify themes, key opportunities and public art projects. Art will be installed as projects are implemented and funding becomes available.

• The North Coast rail trail project received a significant boost. As additional 2 miles of the trail, bringing the trail all the way to Davenport, received preliminary design and environmental clearance funding. This will bring the project to a shovel-ready state and will realize economies of scale by being combined with the current Wilder to Yellowbank beach project. Construction funding however is not yet secured for the 2-mile portion. It is hoped that by the 2018 construction year for the Wilder to Yellowbank beach portion, construction funding will be secured so that the 7-mile project can be built in its entirety. The $1M cost for preliminary design and environmental work was provided by the Land Trust of Santa Cruz ($700K) and the RTC ($300K).

• The City of Watsonville’s trail project is making progress with geotechnical work completed and coordination with the California Public Utilities Commission continuing.

A motion was made (Casterson/Voss) to present the Land Trust of Santa Cruz County with a certificate of appreciation for the organization’s commitment to rail trail implementation and unprecedented funding contribution.

12. Updates related to Committee functions – Lex Rau indicated his pleasure at the City of Scotts Valley’s Green Hill Road application and reported signal light problems on Spring Hills Road. Grace Voss announced that the Santa Cruz Cycling Club is offering a $100 reward for information leading to the location of a stolen porta-potty which was rented for a recent century ride.

13. Adjourned – 7:30 p.m.

NEXT MEETING: The next Bicycle Committee meeting is scheduled one week later than usual, Monday, October 17, 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
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Minutes
Tuesday, August 9, 2016

RTC Offices
1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, 95060

1. Call to Order: 1:30 pm

2. Introductions

Members Present:
Kirk Ance, Community Bridges, Lift Line, CTSA
Pam Arnsberger, 2nd District
Lori Bettencourt, 5th District
Lisa Berkowitz, CTSA
John Daugherty, Metro Transit
Veronica Elsea, 3rd District
Sally French, Hope Services
Cara Lamb, Potential Transit User

Excused Absences:
Debbi Brooks, Social Service Provider - Persons of Limited Means
Clay Kempf, Social Service Provider - Seniors
Greta Kleiner, Potential Transit User (Disabled)

Unexcused Absences:
Brent Gifford, 1st District
Michael Molesky, Social Service Provider
Disabled (County)

Alternates Present:
Tom Duncanson, 2nd District
John Mills, Potential Transit User
April Warnock, Metro Transit/ParaCruz

RTC Staff Present:
Cathy Judd
Rachel Moriconi

Others Present:
Claire Fliesler, City of Santa Cruz
Scott Hamby, City of Scotts Valley
Dulce Lizarraga-Chagolla, CCCIL

3. Oral Communications

- Area Agency on Aging Advisory Council is listed among the endorsers of TRIP
- Copies of the current Headways are available
- Metro has not had to lay off any employees and service reductions are smaller than previously discussed. Service changes go into effect September 8th. Information is available on Metro website.

4. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agenda - None
CONSENT AGENDA

Action: A motion (Berkowitz/Lamb) was made to approve the Consent Agenda with corrections to the minutes of June 14, 2016. The motion passed unanimously with members Ance, Arnsberger, Bettencourt, Berkowitz, Daugherty, Elsea, French and Lamb voting in favor. No votes were cast in opposition.

5. Approved Minutes from June 14, 2016 with the following corrections:
   - Item 5 - correct the spelling of Veronica Else to Veronica Elsea
   - Item 16 – second paragraph "grant program to fund...” change the content from "mobility impaired persons” to read “visually and mobility impaired persons”
   - Item 18 – correct the content from “Bicycles” to “Bicyclists”

6. Received Transportation Development Act Revenues Report

7. Received Information Items
   a. Plan for Art along the Coastal Rail Trail in Santa Cruz Flyer
      Meeting will be held by City of Santa Cruz Arts Department on August 11 at Kelly’s French Bakery on Ingalls St. Committee members suggested that outreach for art planning include schools and senior groups, such as the I-You Venture.

8. Received Agency Updates - None

REGULAR AGENDA

9. 2016 Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG) Recommendations

Rachel Moriconi, RTC Senior Transportation Planner, summarized the staff report, which included a list of projects for which applications were submitted, criteria used to evaluate project applications, and preliminary staff recommendations for $7 million in Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG) funds.

Members discussed some of the projects on the list of recommendations.

Action: A motion (Ance/Lamb) was made to recommend that the RTC board approve the staff recommendations for STBG funding as presented, including a friendly amendment to the motion (Berkowitz) that evaluation criteria be added in future funding cycles for projects in rural areas that serve as the single option for ingress/egress. The motion passed unanimously with members Ance, Arnsberger, Bettencourt, Berkowitz, Daugherty, Elsea, French and Lamb voting in favor. No votes were cast in opposition.

10. 2016 Transportation Improvement Plan Ballot Measure Update

Rachel Moriconi, RTC Senior Transportation Planner, updated members on the transportation sales tax measure that has been placed on the November ballot. She highlighted the changes in the funding allocations and conditions made since the Committee last reviewed the draft Expenditure Plan. A campaign committee has been established and RTC staff is only providing information. Discussion included the unmet
transportation needs for low income individuals and that LiftLine would use measure funds to increase service.

11. Pedestrian Safety Workgroup Verbal Update – Draft Brochure “What Pedestrian and Bicyclist Want Each Other to Know”

Veronica Elsea, Pedestrian Safety Workgroup Chair, mentioned that the group continues to work on the brochure and at their July meeting looked at the suggestions from the Bicycle Advisory Committee, additional suggestions from the South County Pedestrian and Bicycle Program, the Community Traffic Safety Coalition, and others. The group is working on the language and grouping items into similar categories and will come back to the E&D TAC with the next draft. In response to member questions Ms. Elsea mentioned that the group is getting input from CHP, County Sheriff, and local police. The next meeting of the Pedestrian Safety Work Group will be Tuesday, August 23 from 10:00 am to noon in the RTC conference room.

12. Adjourn 3:00 pm

Respectfully submitted, Cathy Judd, RTC Staff
Minutes

Thursday, August 18, 2016
9:00 a.m.

SCCRTC Conference Room
1523 Pacific Ave
Santa Cruz, CA

Chair Friend called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

1. Introductions

Members present:
  Zach Friend    Ed Bottorff
  Don Lane       Cynthia Chase
  Randy Johnson  John Leopold
  Jimmy Dutra    Dennis Norton
  Greg Caput     Dene Bustichi (alt.)
  Ryan Coonerty  Bruce McPherson

Staff present:
  George Dondero Luis Mendez
  Yesenia Parra  Karena Pushnick
  Cory Caletti

2. Oral communications

Commissioner Caput noted that a request from Amelia Conlen would be coming before the Commission requesting funding for Open Streets.

3. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agendas - none

CONSENT AGENDA

No consent agenda items this month
REGULAR AGENDA

4. Polar Express Operating Plan and License

Executive Director George Dondero noted that this item was heard by the Capitola City Council the previous Thursday night and the Council supported the Polar Express Operating Plan by a unanimous vote. Commissioner Bottorff expressed appreciation for giving the City of Capitola the opportunity to consider this item before the RTC made its final decision.

Kevin Busath, Santa Cruz and Monterey Bay (SC&MB) Railway noted that they are negotiating a lease agreement with the State for the North Pole set location.

**Brian Peoples** said that he opposes the SC&MB Polar Express proposal due to noise, pollution, traffic impacts, and use of public funding. He added that the RTC’s charge is to reduce congestion not to add amusement park rides and should be focused on passing the ballot measure.

**Tom Haid** said that he lives along the track in Live Oak and that it is very noisy and dirty. He noted that he could not find one neighbor who wanted this proposal to pass. This is wasteful spending of tax payer money and promotes a Christian Holiday. He would prefer a trail not a train.

**Christine Martin** a Santa Cruz resident asked about what impact analysis was done. She said there would be 64 train crossings per day with the four round trips of the Polar Express. This is an opposition to mobility. She noted that the horn noise required is equivalent to a jack hammer. She also asked what the benefit trade off of disturbing the community along the route was with this train event.

**Eric Child**, Santa Cruz resident does not see where tax payer dollars are being committed to this event. He said that we are a tourist town. This is a tourist attraction and will bring in funds to this community. Polar Express is very successful. Interrupting traffic would be the same with a trail. This is a win win for Santa Cruz. One of the benefits is that the rail line will be improved.

**Dianna Adamic** said that the horn noise is unbearable and that traffic is a major issue. She is a resident in the west side and it already takes her up to 1 hour to get to Capitola on a regular day. The Polar Express is a religious train and does not support her religion. Santa Cruz needs a train that supports the whole community and invests in something that is going to last, like an electric train. She noted that many communities have quiet transportation options.

Deputy Director Luis Mendez noted that the Polar Express will not be subsidized with any funds from the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) and that the RTC would receive revenue generated through their ridership. Executive Director George Dondero also noted that the Polar
Express is not the same as the Christmas Town train, that it is a recognized book well known worldwide.

Commissioners discussed the disappointment in moving the event from Watsonville and how Watsonville was described in the operating plan; the need to ensure Watsonville residents are well informed about the job opportunities Polar Express will bring to the community; benefits to the community from revenue generated by rider spending in the community; clarified that tax payer dollars have not been requested or allocated to the Polar Express. They noted that this is a good opportunity for the community to see what it will be like to have trains running through their communities. They also reminded the community that the Santa Cruz & Monterey Bay (SC&MB) Railway has made a commitment to keep the train horn as low as the Federal Railroad Administration will permit.

Commissioner Lane moved and Commissioner Norton seconded to approve:

1. The passenger rail service operating plan (Attachment 1) for Polar Express operations from the Santa Cruz Boardwalk to the Capitola area for the 2016 holiday season; and

2. A passenger service license for Santa Cruz & Monterey Bay (SC&MB) Railway to operate Polar Express from the Santa Cruz Boardwalk (milepost 19.7) to just past Capitola (milepost 14.0) on the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line for the 2016 holiday season.

The motion also included the request that SC&MB Railway reach out to the City of Watsonville to fill job openings and work to make low cost tickets available to low income families and to families in Watsonville.

The motion passed with Commissioners Norton, Lane, Johnson, Coonerty, Friend, Leopold, McPherson, Chase, Bottorff and Commission Alternate Bustichi voting “aye” and Commissioners Caput and Dutra voting no.

5. Review of items to be discussed in closed session. Commissioners adjourned to closed session at 10:03 am.

CLOSED SESSION

6. CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL COUNSEL—ANTICIPATED LITIGATION. Significant exposure to litigation pursuant to paragraph (3) of subdivision (d) of Government Code Section 54956.9: one potential case

OPEN SESSION

7. Report on closed session

The Commission reconvened to public session at 10:17 am and there was no closed session report.
8. Meeting adjourned at 10:18 am. Next meetings

The next SCCRTC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, September 1, 2016 at 9:00 a.m. at the County Board of Supervisors Chambers, 701 Ocean St., 5th floor, Santa Cruz, CA.

The next Transportation Policy Workshop is scheduled for Thursday, September 15, 2016 at 9:00 a.m. at the RTC Offices, 1523 Pacific Ave., Santa Cruz, CA.

Respectfully submitted,

Yesenia Parra, Staff

Attendees:

Kevin Busath  Iowa Pacific
Mark Westerfield  Iowa Pacific
Mike Edwards  Santa Cruz & Monterey Bay Railway
Howard Cohen
Pamela Cox
Diana Adamic
Roland Reuben
Eric Child
Tom Haid
Christine Martin
Eric Friedrich  AMBAG
1. **Call to Order:** Chair Wiesner called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

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

3. **Oral Communications:**
   - Pete Rasmussen reported that METRO service reductions will be going into effect on September 8.
   - Rachel Moriconi provided a summary of the Frazier – Beall transportation funding proposal, which would increase funding for the State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP), local streets and roads, the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), transit, and active transportation. The committee discussed elements of the bill and that the bill would require approval by 2/3rds of the legislature. Angela Gile noted that Assemblyman Stone is supportive of the proposal.
   - Kelly McClendon reported that the next call for projects for the Caltrans Planning Grant is scheduled for release on August 26, with application due in early November. A teleconference on the application will be held on August 31.

4. **Additions or deletions to consent and regular agendas:** None.
CONSENT AGENDA

5. **Approved Minutes of the April 21, 2016 ITAC meeting (Fliesler/Fontes).** The motion passed unanimously by all members present.

6. **Received State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) Semi-Annual Project List.** Steve Wiesner appreciated that Caltrans project managers have been very communicative about upcoming projects.

REGULAR AGENDA

7. Status of ongoing transportation projects, programs, studies and planning documents

*Regional Transportation Commission (RTC):* Luis Mendez reported that the transportation measure on the November 2016 ballot has been assigned the letter “D”. He shared that resources are available regarding public agency work related to ballot measures. Rachel Moriconi reported that that RTC has received several consultant proposals for the Mar Vista Drive Bike/Pedestrian Crossing of Highway 1 project preliminary design and environmental analysis. The RTC approved a request from Iowa Pacific to operate special “Polar Express” trains in November/December generally between Santa Cruz and Capitola. The RTC also approved the draft Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) project list at its August 4, 2016 meeting.

*Caltrans* - Kelly McClendon reported that Caltrans has updated the Highway 9 Transportation Concept Report (TCR) based on input received from local agencies. The TCR for Highway 1 is under development and work on the TCR for Highway 152 will begin in the fall.

*Scotts Valley* – Scott Hamby introduced the city’s new engineer Jessica Kahn. He also reported that the storm damage repair at the Granite Creek/Highway 17 overpass approach will begin soon and includes sidewalk repairs and retaining walls. Microsurfacing for Mount Hermon Road from the city limits to Highway 17 is currently out to bid, with construction to begin this fall. The city work with METRO on striping plans near the Lockhart Gulch bus stop, in order to add bicycle lanes. Design for the Scotts Valley Dr./Mt. Hermon Rd./Whispering Pines intersection project continues.

*METRO* – Pete Rasmussen reported that new bus schedules which start September 8 are available online. He requested agencies contact him if any development projects are planned along bus lines to ensure that bus stops are considered.

*AMBAG* – Erich Friedrich reported that AMBAG is seeking input on draft Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) Implementation Plan toolkits. He reported that AMBAG is also working on a high-level rural transit planning for the tri-county region and the Financial Element for the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)/Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP).

*Santa Cruz* – Mark Dettle and Claire Fliesler reported that the city is finishing up Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)-funded signal upgrades; cape seal and repaving projects. The city will be going to bid for cold in-place recycling paving projects soon. In total through the City Sales Tax Measure H, the city has issued $14 million in bonds in the past two years for pavement projects. Design for the Highway 1/9 project is finishing up. The Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network (MBSST) Segment 7 project will be reviewed by
the city’s public works committee and highlighted during the City Hall to You event in September. Authorization to bid and award the Branciforte Creek bridge project is being considered by City Council. Rezoning work is underway for major corridors in the city. Additional community meetings will be held on the draft Active Transportation Plan. Amelia Conlen has been hired as the new city Transportation Coordinator.

Watsonville – Murray Fontes reported that the roundabout for the new FedEx building is completed. Freedom Boulevard will be reconstructed soon. The MBSST survey and geotechnical work is done and in-house design work has begun.

County of Santa Cruz – Russell Chen and Steve Wiener reported that storm damage repairs on Highland Way, El Rancho Road, and Felton-Empire Road are expected to finish construction in October. Emergency culvert repairs on West Hilton, Freedom Boulevard chip seal, Boulder Creek Elementary Safe Routes to Schools, and Active Transportation Program (ATP) speed feedback signs and crosswalks near schools projects are nearly complete. Groundbreaking for the Twin Lakes/East Cliff Dr. project between 5th and 7th Avenues is scheduled for September 15. The County is evaluating options for a portion of the Aptos Village project, for which only one bid was received. Several sanitation projects are also planned or underway near Neary Lagoon, Hidden Beach, and Noble Gulch. Utility undergrounding in Seacliff is scheduled to being after Labor Day, with the Seacliff Village transportation project scheduled to go to bid in Spring 2017, pending completion of the utility work. The committee discussed adding extra conduit during construction as part of “dig once” policies and standards. The County is also working on the HSIP-funded guardrail and striping projects.

8. 2016 Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG) – Preliminary Staff Recommendations

Rachel Moriconi presented preliminary staff recommendations for $7 million from the Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG), highlighting the ITAC- and RTC-approved criteria used to evaluate projects. She noted that the RTC board is scheduled to select projects to receive the funds following a public hearing at its September 1, 2016 meeting.

Steve Wiesner noted that everyone is challenged to keep up with unmet needs and that without new funding from Measure D county roadways will go from bad to worse. He suggested that since the County of Santa Cruz is responsible for nearly 70% of the maintained roadway lane miles that they should receive more funds and that geographic and economic equity should be considered. Several committee members noted that they submitted applications for projects that would be more competitive based on the criteria established for the call for projects and stated that the criteria should not be changed after applications were due. Ms. Moriconi noted that approximately $2.8 million is recommended for regional projects. She invited suggestions for criteria to use for ranking projects in future grant cycles.

The committee unanimously approved a motion (Dettle/Fliesler) accepting the staff recommendations with the option for the County to re-spread recommended funds among other County Public Works projects, with all members present voting “yes.” Staff noted that since these are the region’s share of funds through FY17/18, that reduced funding amounts should only be distributed to projects that can be scaled back and/or otherwise still be delivered by June 2018.
9. Caltrans California Transportation Plan

Kelly McClendon provided an overview of the California Transportation Plan 2040 (CTP) which includes information on meeting SB 391 greenhouse gas (GHG) reductions goals, consolidates information from several other Caltrans plans, and sets basic criteria that will be used in evaluating planning grant and other project proposals. The plan also modeled GHG reductions from Regional Transportation Plans statewide. Mark Dettle suggested that the state should also be considering GHG released from fires and forest management practices when looking at ways to achieve GHG reduction goals.

10. Integrating Complete Streets and Climate Change Considerations in Caltrans Projects

Kelly McClendon reported on Caltrans’ ongoing efforts toward integrating Complete Streets and climate change considerations into projects. Caltrans has prepared an assessment checklist, similar to the Monterey Bay Area’s Complete Streets Checklist, for use during system planning and specific project development to identify how complete streets and climate change components could be incorporated into State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) and other projects. It includes consideration of bicycle, pedestrian, transit, and local conditions and plans; as well as susceptibility to climate change factors such as increased flooding, sea level rise, and sensitive habitat areas. He noted that in some instances it may not be possible to address everything, but that bus turn outs, curb extensions, wider shoulders, and pedestrian crossings are among the examples of types of features that might be added to projects. Caltrans will work with local agencies to complete the assessment.

11. November 2016 Transportation Ballot Measure Update

Rachel Moriconi presented the final Ordinance and Expenditure Plan that were approved by the RTC since the last ITAC meeting. She highlighted sections of the Measure D Ordinance, including the operative date, implementation, amendment, maintenance of effort, annual reporting and taxpayer safeguards, audits and accountability clauses. Committee members discussed agencies that have endorsed the measure, unfunded needs and projects that could be funded from the measure.

12. The next ITAC meeting is scheduled for September 15, 2016 at 1:30pm in the SCCRTC Conference Room, 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA.

13. The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

Minutes prepared by: Rachel Moriconi
### SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
#### TDA REVENUE REPORT
##### FY 2016-2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTH</th>
<th>FY15 - 16 ACTUAL REVENUE</th>
<th>FY16 - 17 ESTIMATE REVENUE</th>
<th>FY16 - 17 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>601,300</td>
<td>618,978</td>
<td>629,500</td>
<td>10,522</td>
<td>1.70%</td>
<td>101.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUGUST</td>
<td>801,800</td>
<td>825,373</td>
<td>839,400</td>
<td>14,027</td>
<td>1.70%</td>
<td>101.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPTEMBER</td>
<td>872,384</td>
<td>898,032</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTOBER</td>
<td>617,500</td>
<td>635,655</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOVEMBER</td>
<td>823,300</td>
<td>847,505</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECEMBER</td>
<td>917,127</td>
<td>762,375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JANUARY</td>
<td>631,600</td>
<td>637,176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEBRUARY</td>
<td>842,100</td>
<td>849,639</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCH</td>
<td>763,406</td>
<td>783,442</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRIL</td>
<td>559,000</td>
<td>555,688</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>745,400</td>
<td>740,917</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE</td>
<td>795,139</td>
<td>904,623</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>8,970,056</td>
<td>9,059,403</td>
<td>1,468,900</td>
<td><strong>24,549</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.27%</strong></td>
<td><strong>16%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
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## Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
### THREE MONTH MEETING SCHEDULE

**September 2016 Through November 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>9/1/16</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Commission</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>County Board of Supervisors Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/8/16</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Budget &amp; Administration/Personnel Committee</td>
<td>3:00 pm</td>
<td>CAO Conference Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/14/16</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Safe on 17/Traffic Operations Systems</td>
<td>10:00 am</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/15/16</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Transportation Policy Workshop</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/15/16</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Interagency Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/6/16</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Commission</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>County Board of Supervisors Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11/16</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Elderly &amp; Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/17/16*</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Bicycle Advisory Committee *Note meeting date 1 week later</td>
<td>6:00 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/20/16</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Transportation Policy Workshop</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/20/16</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Interagency Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/3/16</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Commission</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>City of Watsonville Council Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/10/16</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Budget &amp; Administration/Personnel Committee</td>
<td>3:00 pm</td>
<td>CAO Conference Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/17/16</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Transportation Policy Workshop</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/17/16</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Interagency Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RTC Commission Offices – 1523 Pacific Ave. – Santa Cruz, 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**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Letter Rec’d/Sent</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Incoming/Outgoing</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>TO First</th>
<th>TO Last</th>
<th>TO Organization</th>
<th>FROM First</th>
<th>FROM Last</th>
<th>FROM Organization</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05/11/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Patsy</td>
<td>Wilkes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>North Coast Rail Trail Project Open House Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/16/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Heather</td>
<td>Shupe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Equestrian Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/26/16</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Delaney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Human Care Alliance</td>
<td>Transportation Improvement Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/27/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>KP</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>Cummings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3D Visualizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/28/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Christy</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Polar Express</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/28/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>KP</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Denevan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trail North of Santa Cruz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/29/16</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Metropolitan Transportation Commission - SAFE</td>
<td>Ginger</td>
<td>Dykaar</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Safe on 17 Invoice Estimate: April 1, 2016 - June 30, 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/29/16</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2015/2016 Surface Transportation Program (STP) Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>In/Out</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>07/29/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Peoples</td>
<td></td>
<td>No Train from Boardwalk to Capitola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/29/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>Morici</td>
<td></td>
<td>Please Stop Iowa Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/29/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Grabill</td>
<td></td>
<td>No Train</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/29/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Kristin</td>
<td>Tosello</td>
<td></td>
<td>No Dinner Train</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/29/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Peoples</td>
<td></td>
<td>No New Railroad Cross-Guards in Aptos Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/29/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Zoe</td>
<td>Kunstenaar</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dinner Trains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/29/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>Martinez</td>
<td></td>
<td>Polar Express</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/29/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Chick</td>
<td>Webb</td>
<td></td>
<td>Polar Express</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>Subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>07/29/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Killamey, Clary</td>
<td>Train</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/29/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jessica, McElveny</td>
<td>No Trains Please</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/29/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Annanana</td>
<td>Local Transportation Investment Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/29/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Derek R, Whaley</td>
<td>Polar Express</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/29/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Mick &amp; Jan, Adamson</td>
<td>Polar Express</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/29/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jim, Middleton</td>
<td>Train Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/29/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David, Van Brink</td>
<td>Polar Express</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/29/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Paul, Nolan</td>
<td>Polar Express</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>TO First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>FROM 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>07/29/16 Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CI 08/01/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Janie</td>
<td>Soito</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Polar Express</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/29/16 Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CI 08/01/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Support the Train</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/30/16 Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CI 08/01/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Glen</td>
<td>Aby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trails Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/30/16 Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CI 08/01/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>G Craig</td>
<td>Vachon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Please Don’t Let the Trains Happen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/30/16 Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CI 08/01/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>Crane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tax Payer Dollars for New Cross-Guards?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/30/16 Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CI 08/01/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Global Warming Under Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/30/16 Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CI 08/01/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Barry</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Letter of Support for the Iowa Pacific Planned Polar Express Excursion Trains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/30/16 Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CI 08/01/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Bicoff Nielsen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Crossing Guard Arms</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>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>07/30/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Crossing Guard and Dinner Train Opposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/31/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Reddington</td>
<td></td>
<td>Polar Express Train</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/31/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Owen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Please No Tourist Trains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/31/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Peoples</td>
<td></td>
<td>No to Excursion Trains from Boardwalk to Capitola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/31/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Kambitsch</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tourist Train</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/31/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td></td>
<td>A Political Suicide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/31/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>Donald</td>
<td>Hicks</td>
<td></td>
<td>No Polar Express</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/31/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Toldi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong Opposition to Proposed Holiday Train</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>Subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>07/31/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Shelle Thomas</td>
<td>Tourist Train in Capitola</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/31/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Bill Gray</td>
<td>Theme Train</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/31/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Gina Colfer</td>
<td>Tourist Train Proposal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/31/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David French</td>
<td>Yes - Polar Express Train</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/31/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Michael Lesh</td>
<td>No Polar Express Train from the Boardwalk to Capitola!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/31/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Andrea Miller</td>
<td>Capitola Train - RAIL SUCKS!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/31/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Rob Martin</td>
<td>Tourist Train Concern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/31/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Steven Henderson</td>
<td>Against a Tourist Train</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Rec’d/Sent</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>TO</td>
<td>FROM</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>07/31/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>J Norene Huber</td>
<td>Train from SC to Capitola</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/31/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Caryl Smith</td>
<td>No Train Please</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/31/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Lynne Strud</td>
<td>Holiday Train</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/31/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Randall Nacamuli</td>
<td>No Polar Express</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/31/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Carla Carstens</td>
<td>WE DO NOT WANT A TRAIN ON THE RAILS THIS HOLIDAY SEASON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/01/16</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bruce Ryan McPherson Coonerty County of Santa Cruz Pamela H Silkwood Horan Lloyd</td>
<td>Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network master Plan - Santa Cruz Branch Line Rail Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/01/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Bonnie Keet</td>
<td>Holiday Train Extended to Capitola</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/01/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Will Mayall</td>
<td>Polar Express Train Endangers TRIP</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>TO</td>
<td>FROM</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>08/01/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>Martinez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Polar Express Operation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/01/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Lynne</td>
<td>Dunn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No Holiday Train Rides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/01/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Kathy</td>
<td>Sinnott</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SC to Capitola Dinner Train</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/01/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Chick</td>
<td>Webb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Polar Express Train Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/01/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Vicki</td>
<td>Malandra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Train from SC to Capitola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/01/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Ray</td>
<td>Wolfe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Train Santa Cruz to Capitola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/01/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Leslie</td>
<td>Jaquith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concerned Citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/02/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td>Whitelaw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Polar Express Train</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>08/02/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Peoples</td>
<td></td>
<td>2040 Santa Cruz Transportation Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/02/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Devries</td>
<td></td>
<td>No Train Rides Through Our Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/02/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Claire</td>
<td>Devos</td>
<td></td>
<td>Polar Express Train</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/02/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Steinbruner</td>
<td></td>
<td>Iowa Pacific Christmas Train to Capitola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/02/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>Maus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trains for Tourists from Santa Cruz To...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/02/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Criswell</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tourist Train</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/03/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td></td>
<td>Railroad RW Drainage W of 30th Ave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/03/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>Bagshaw</td>
<td></td>
<td>2040 Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec’d/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>TO First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>FROM 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>08/03/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Faulkner</td>
<td>Jerry</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Coastal Rail Corridor: Innovations to Meet a Much Wider Set of Needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/03/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Delaney</td>
<td>Deb</td>
<td>Molina</td>
<td>Polar Express</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/03/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td>Lyn</td>
<td>Hood</td>
<td>Lead and Water Pollution Funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/04/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Deb</td>
<td>Molina</td>
<td>Lyn</td>
<td>Hood</td>
<td>Commission Meeting to Discuss Transportation Plan Project List</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/04/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Dee</td>
<td>Vogel</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Lavigne</td>
<td>Late/Incorrect Notice, Commission Meeting to Discuss Transportation Plan Project List</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/05/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Lavigne</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>TO First</td>
<td>TO Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>FROM First</td>
<td>FROM 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>08/05/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Craig</td>
<td>Treckeme</td>
<td>Hwy 9 / Felton Transportation Project Question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/05/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td>Controlled Substance Act Scheduling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/06/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Peoples</td>
<td>2040 Santa Cruz Transportation Plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/06/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>Polar Express</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/06/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Michele</td>
<td>Litchfield</td>
<td>2016 Holiday Train Between Santa Cruz and Capitola</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/06/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Gustav</td>
<td></td>
<td>Polar Express</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/06/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Dixie</td>
<td>Guzzo</td>
<td>Polar Express Train</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/07/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Juliet</td>
<td>Goldstein</td>
<td>New Cross Guards in Aptos for Train Track is Wrong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>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>
</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>08/08/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>08/08/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Larry</td>
<td>Freitas</td>
<td>Train Trolley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/08/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>08/08/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Tourist Train</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/08/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>08/09/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td>Comments on Road Priorities as Suggested in the Sentinel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/09/16</td>
<td>Verification</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Kimberly</td>
<td>Chin</td>
<td>Kimberly Y. Chin Attorney At Law</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Verification of Discovery Responses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/09/16</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Pamela H</td>
<td>Silkwood</td>
<td>Horan Lloyd</td>
<td>Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/09/16</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Yesenia</td>
<td>Parra</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Pamela H</td>
<td>Silkwood</td>
<td>Horan Lloyd</td>
<td>Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/09/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>08/09/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Lani</td>
<td>Roberts</td>
<td>Holiday Train</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/10/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>08/11/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Christy</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>Polar Express</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>08/10/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>Carma</td>
<td>Haston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trail Now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/10/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Advancing Global Warming Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/11/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>LM</td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>Bruce R</td>
<td>Holloway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Existing Facts and Circumstances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/11/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>Christy</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Polar Express Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/12/16</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bruce D</td>
<td>Swanger</td>
<td>Caltrans, District 5</td>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Shultz</td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>Standard Encroachment Permit Application - Traffic Counts State Route 1 Widening HOV Lanes Project - PA/ED Parent Permit #0503 N0V 0623 Rider # 0507 NFT 0064 Cooperative Agreement #05-CA-0155-A3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/13/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Eselius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Watsonville's Major Issue is Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/14/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Peoples</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cory Caletti's Public Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/14/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>Sauer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Polar Express</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Correspondence Log

**September 1, 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Letter Rec’d/Sent</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Incoming/Outgoing</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>TO</th>
<th>FROM</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08/14/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>08/15/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Melinda Powers</td>
<td>Tourist Train</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/14/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>08/15/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Elena N Cohen</td>
<td>Concern About Additional Taxpayer-funded Tourist Train</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/14/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>08/15/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Carma Haston</td>
<td>Train/Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/14/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>08/15/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Gary Griggs</td>
<td>Tourist Train and Other Subsequent Trains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/14/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>08/15/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Rmbl2010</td>
<td>Trail Now?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/14/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>08/15/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Bill Gray</td>
<td>Please, Stop the Train Now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/14/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>08/15/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Scott Walecka</td>
<td>Newsletter - Do You Support Tax Measure?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/04/00</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>08/22/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Kate Alm</td>
<td>Rail Trail Question</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/14/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>08/15/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Cynthia Dzendzel</td>
<td>Do Not Remove the Tracks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/14/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>08/15/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Kristin Tosello</td>
<td>Track Removal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/14/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>08/15/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Michele Claussen</td>
<td>No Holiday Train!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/14/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>08/15/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Tim Landeck</td>
<td>No Tourist Train</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/14/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>08/15/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Robert Bixby</td>
<td>Rail Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/14/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>08/15/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Kelley Filbin</td>
<td>No Polar Train Please!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/14/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>08/15/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Bruce Sawhill</td>
<td>Polar Express</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/14/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>08/15/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Pamela Simmons</td>
<td>Polar Express and the Rail With Trail</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/14/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>08/15/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>Martinez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/14/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>08/15/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Cari</td>
<td>Moore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/14/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>08/15/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>Engel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/14/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>08/15/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>Martinez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/14/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>08/15/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Iveagh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/14/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>08/15/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>Mayall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/14/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>08/15/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Johanna</td>
<td>Bowen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/15/16</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>08/15/16</td>
<td>Priscilla</td>
<td>Martinez-Velez</td>
<td>California Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Rec'd/Sent</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>TO</td>
<td>FROM</td>
<td>Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/15/16</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Charlton Bonham</td>
<td>Wildlife Conservation Board</td>
<td>George Dondero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/15/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Larry Bercovich</td>
<td>Remove the Tracks Now and Build a Trail Now!!!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/15/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Larry Bercovich</td>
<td>Work with North Coast Farmers!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/15/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Michelle Miranda</td>
<td>Trail Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/15/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Cara Lamb</td>
<td>Polar Express</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/15/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Brian Brunelli</td>
<td>Polar Express</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/15/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Andrea Miller</td>
<td>Remove the TRACKS!!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/15/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Paul Nolan</td>
<td>Keep Rail for the Future</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Correspondence Log
### September 1, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Letter Rec’d/Sent</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Incoming/Outgoing</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>TO</th>
<th>FROM</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>08/15/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>Boutelle</td>
<td>I Support the Rail with Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/15/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>Mick</td>
<td>Adamson</td>
<td>The Sentinel Article (Nonsense)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/15/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Grundeman</td>
<td>Trail with Rail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/15/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>Tawn</td>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>Rail with Trail is What's Up!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/15/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>Rail and Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/16/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>Grace</td>
<td>Voss</td>
<td>Rail with Trail is Best</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/16/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>Preserve Our Rail Transportation Option</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/16/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Lustgarden</td>
<td>Trail with Rail</td>
<td></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 Date</td>
<td>TO First</td>
<td>TO Last</td>
<td>TO Organization</td>
<td>FROM First</td>
<td>FROM Last</td>
<td>FROM 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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/15/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>08/16/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rail Issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/15/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>08/16/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Gina</td>
<td>Colfer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trail Now</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/15/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>08/16/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>Sawhill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Support of Rail WITH Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/15/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>08/16/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Deanna</td>
<td>Seagraves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rail-Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/15/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>08/16/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Iverson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Cruz Rail+Trail is Win+Win</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/15/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>08/16/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Roland</td>
<td>Saher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rail &amp; Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/15/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>08/16/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Lynda</td>
<td>Francis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Support the Rail Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/15/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>08/15/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Larry</td>
<td>Bercovich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Work with North Coast Farmers!</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>
<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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/15/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>08/16/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Richter</td>
<td>In Support of Rail and Trail As Part of TRIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/15/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>08/16/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Logan</td>
<td>Cartwright</td>
<td>Trail Now</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/16/16</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>Fillmore</td>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Environmental Assessment of Segment 7 of the Coastal Rail Trail (Rail Corridor Between Natural Bridges Dr and Pacific Ave Near the Wharf)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/16/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>08/16/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>Support of Rail Trail Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/16/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>08/16/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Barry</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Nelson/Nygaard Trail Only Report. Letter Writing Campaigns by Rail Opponents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/16/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>08/16/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Ken</td>
<td>Maus</td>
<td>Yes, Polar Express</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/16/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>08/17/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Faulstich</td>
<td>I Fully Support Rail with Trail!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/16/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>08/17/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Maura</td>
<td>Noel</td>
<td>Please Continue a Trail with Rail Plan!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Correspondence Log
### September 1, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date/Rec’d/Sent</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>In/Out</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th></th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Last</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Last</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08/16/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>08/22/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rail and Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/17/16</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Giovanni</td>
<td>Difabio</td>
<td>Metropolitan Transportation Commission - SAFE</td>
<td>Ginger</td>
<td>Dykaar</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Barry</td>
<td>Bergman</td>
<td>Save on 17 Invoice: April 1, 2016 - June 30, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/17/16</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Barry</td>
<td>Bergman</td>
<td>Rails-to-Trails Conservancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comments on the Great Santa Cruz Trail Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/17/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Van Brink</td>
<td>I Support Preserving the Train Tracks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/17/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Piet</td>
<td>Canin</td>
<td>Coastal Rail Trail and Rail Options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/17/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Brandon</td>
<td>Kett</td>
<td>My Article Regarding Rail-Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/17/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Junker</td>
<td>Rail and Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/17/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Mesiti-Miller</td>
<td>Polar Express Operating Plan and License</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>TO First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>FROM First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/17/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td>Polar Express Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/18/16</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>C Patrick</td>
<td>Stoll</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>George Dondero</td>
<td>George Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>RGW Construction v. Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission Santa Cruz Superior Court Case No. CV182123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/18/16</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>T. Brooke</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Pamela H Silkwood</td>
<td>Horan Lloyd</td>
<td>Public Records Act Request</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/18/16</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dana T. Brooke</td>
<td>McRae Miller</td>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Pamela H Silkwood</td>
<td>Horan Lloyd</td>
<td>Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/18/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Diana Adamic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stop the Polar Express</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/18/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Luz Kroft</td>
<td></td>
<td>Question About Aptos Rail Line</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/18/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Christy Martin</td>
<td></td>
<td>RTC’s Decision on Polar Express Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/18/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Simon Fisher</td>
<td></td>
<td>In Support of Rail and Trail As Part of TRIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec’d/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response First</td>
<td>Last</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/18/16 Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ 08/19/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Horton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In Support of Rail and Trail As Part of TRIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/18/16 Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ 08/19/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>Muir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rail and Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/19/16 Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ 08/19/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Elise</td>
<td>Ehrheart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thank You for Keeping the Train Tracks for Now</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/22/16 Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alan Kwong</td>
<td>Caltrans, District 5</td>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Shultz</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Santa Cruz SR 1 Corridor PA/ED Project - OC7300 Standard Encroachment Permit Application</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Mr. Denevan:

Thank you for your inquiry. It will be made available to the Regional Transportation Commission for their consideration.

Similar to your previous question, there are currently no plans to remove the tracks.

Passage of the transportation improvement measure on the November 2016 ballot would provide funding to analyze and conduct environmental review of possible future transit and other transportation uses of the rail corridor through a transparent public process. Other uses could include a “trail only” option. There are no plans to study non-rail uses of the rail corridor outside of what is stipulated as part of the 2016 Transportation Ballot 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: Craig Treckeme  
Sent: Friday, August 05, 2016 12:21 PM  
To: info@sccrtc.org  
Subject: Hwy 9 / Felton transportation project question

Hello. I was reading the Garden of Eden story (overcrowding, traffic issues on Hwy 9) on the Sentinel website. This part of the story was intriguing: "Although the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission received a $249,000 state grant in June for more crosswalks, lighting and other improvements along Highway 9..."

I tried to find info on that Hw9 9-specific block grant on the SCCRTC website but couldn't locate it. Could you forward me the link with info specific to that grant? I'm curious what specific projects have been approved are are being reviewed.

Of course, I have a project in mind. In Felton, at the "main" crosswalk linking the big tree with New Leaf Market, because of the planters at New Leaf and the elevated deck at the tree, pedestrians come out blindly. That crosswalk really needs a signal button to activate flashing lights embedded in the roadway. I'll assume that this is not a project in the current block grant, so please advise on your process for me to follow to get this on a project list when funds become available in the future.

Thank you,
Craig Treckeme
Felton

Mr. Treckeme:

Thank you for your interest in the Highway 9/SLV Corridor Plan. There is strong recognition of the need for improvements to Highway 9, especially for pedestrians and bicyclists through San Lorenzo Valley. Given that funding available for capital projects is very limited, the focus of this plan is to work with the community to identify and prioritize projects, such as the one you mentioned in Felton.

The plan will include documenting and evaluating current and future multimodal travel patterns and evaluation of a range of options, strategies, specific safety, asset management, traffic operations, complete streets- bicycle, pedestrian, transit, goods movement, streetscape, parking, drainage, and mobility projects. The RTC will be working closely with Caltrans, County Public Works, County Planning, and Supervisor McPherson, and Santa Cruz METRO on this evaluation. We hope to receive authorization from Caltrans (the grant funder) to kick-off this planning effort within the next month.

So that you can follow this process, I have added you to the email list to receive periodic updates about this planning effort – including public meetings, review of the draft plan, etc.

In the interim, Caltrans has also been working to implement some pedestrian upgrades on Highway 9 and we have shared your idea for adding a flashing crosswalk in Felton with Caltrans.

Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner  
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission  
1523 Pacific Ave, Santa Cruz, CA 95060  
831-460-3203; fax 460-3215  
www.sccrtc.org
-----Original Message-----
From: Jennifer Shaw
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2016 9:21 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Comments on road priorities as suggested in the Sentinel

I've lived in the County (Aptos and Capitola) since 1971. I emphatically request that you NOT put any funds toward railroad acquisition, repair, start-up, etc. We need the funds for MAINTENANCE OF OUR EXISTING ROADS, which we all know are falling apart. I do not believe a rail line would relieve the road congestion at all, but mostly I do not believe that should be a priority for use of our limited funds!
Let's all hope the ballot measure passes in November. I greatly appreciate your dedicated work on our roadways.

Jennifer Shaw

Dear Ms. Shaw,

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review.

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: Brian Peoples [mailto:brian@trailnow.org]
Sent: Sunday, August 14, 2016 1:27 AM
To: Regional Transportation Commission
Cc: casey.beyer@sccbusinesscouncil.com; Zach Friend; ebottorff167@yahoo.com; Alex Clifford; rij12@comcast.net; dlane@cityofsantacruz.com; lmenendez@sccrtc.org
Subject: Cory Caletti’s public statement

RTC Staff,

Below is the recent Trail Now Newsletter that will be distributed to our readers. In the letter, you will see that we are beginning to not trust RTC on their commitments. The recent public statements by Cory Caletti are very disturbing in trusting that RTC is not going to shove a train onto our community. Let’s hope you all see the tax measure is more important than the train.

TOURIST TRAIN FROM BOARDWALK TO CAPITOLA

On August 18th, the RTC is meeting to vote on the approval of a new tourist train service from the Santa Cruz Boardwalk to Capitola during the 2016 holiday season. The train operator, Iowa Pacific, is proposing “Roaring Camp” type train excursions from 1 pm to 7:30 pm. This tourist train, named the Polar Express, will not only create major noise and air pollution, but will actually result in more traffic congestion across the county.

The RTC’s charter is to find solutions to reduce traffic congestion, not sponsor amusement park rides that actually create more traffic. Santa Cruz County already has a privately operated train to Christmas Town (Roaring Camp) - we do not need taxpayers to fund a second train. Please voice your opinion and send an email to info@sccrtc.org. You can find a video of the train here.

NORTH COAST FARMERS AGAINST TRAIN & TRAIL

RTC is designing and building a trail that is parallel to the tracks north of Santa Cruz that will cost the North Coast farmers millions of dollars in infrastructure changes and operations. The North Coast farmers have reached out to Trail Now for help. We find so many flaws in the proposed plan to build parallel to tracks. First, running parallel to the tracks, is not ideal for pedestrians or bicyclists since tractors will cross over the trail putting dirt and mud on the trail. Most important, the cost is more than $6M per mile to build trail parallel to tracks versus less than $1M per mile to build with the removal of the tracks. The fact is, the current tracks are not usable and there are no plans for tourist or commuter trains running to Davenport, but RTC continues to invest in design and engineering work to build an expensive trail that is against the wishes of local farmers. We believe the RTC should work with the North Coast farmers for a win-win solution that will result in a more practical and economical trail. Please voice your support of the North Coast farmers. Ask the RTC to work with them on a win-win solution. Send an email to info@sccrtc.org.

RTC STAFF LOYALTY TO TRAIN

The Sentinel published an article on the proposed “Trail Only” Plan. We find the statements by Cory Caletti at the RTC very disturbing. She appears to dismiss the study out of hand which is remarkable since—as far as we know—the RTC has not publicly said one word about the viability of train as determined by the study they commissioned many months ago. In less than a month, she has apparently determined that the trail-only study can be dismissed and has made public statements to that effect. It is quite clear from her statements that she does not expect the money to be returned and that a train will run on the rail corridor. Deciding the best use of the corridor does not appear to be on the agenda.

SUPPORT OF 2016 TRANSPORTATION TAX MEASURE

Currently, Trail Now supports the Transportation Tax Measure because our community needs to invest in our infrastructure to improve mobility across the County. Unfortunately, there are
growing concerns about the RTC’s ability to judiciously manage a budget of $600 million, and make good transportation decisions for our County. Why? We are seeing the RTC support new tourist trains through our community that actually create more traffic. We are seeing the RTC disregard the property rights of local farmers. We are seeing RTC Staff (Cory Caletti) make public statements that the train is a requirement of the purchase and the tracks cannot be removed. And we are seeing the RTC promise to further study the best use of the rail corridor—but then delay the study and its findings until AFTER the November election. It seems as if the RTC is moving in the wrong direction when it comes to managing our taxpayer dollars and making good transportation decisions.

So, what, specifically, are we doing? Trail Now is asking the RTC to remove the tracks now and use the rail corridor today for a trail while they study future train service. We are asking the RTC to approve removal of the old tracks before the November elections. We are attempting to get RTC to allow us to trust them and support the tax measure. And what can you do? Please tell RTC to remove the tracks now and build trail now (info@sccrtc.org).

Dear Mr. Peoples,

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review.

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
-----Original Message-----
From: Carma Haston
Sent: Sunday, August 14, 2016 6:41 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Train/trail

Please consider removal of tracks and building of a trail. There are so many transportation options on a paved path. We don't need to be saddled with only rail ties.

I also have much concern about the traffic congestion, noise and pollution a train brings. I will not be supporting any tax measures that include rail study, or rail/trail. I would support a tax measure to improve our current infrastructures including Hwy 1 but not if a train is buried in there.

Dear Ms. Haston,

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review.

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: rmbl2010
Sent: Sunday, August 14, 2016 8:08 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Trail now?

It seems to me that the "Trail Now" folks are all in a big hurry to remove our train tracks before we are able to best decide how they will be used. "Remove them now until such time as we can decide how to best utilize them?" Call me crazy, but this makes zero sense.

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review.

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: Bill Gray
Sent: Sunday, August 14, 2016 8:17 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Please, stop the train now

Too much money has been spent on this ego project; one that will never be supported by the demographics of the area.

Bill Gray
Capitola

Dear Mr. Gray,

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review.

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
Great message. I have lost all faith in the RTC. If they can't develop an unbiased rail trail analysis and effectively respond to feedback when given, how can I expect them to manage the transportation strategy for the county? Until our elected officials make some changes to the RTC, I cannot support the sales tax increase.

A couple of other points.

1) **Whats with the Sentinel?**
Kara Guzman's article made the headline on the front page. Why isn't the article online? Was it suppressed or is finding a wood pipe really more relevant to the citizens of Santa Cruz? What's going on here?

2) **Respond to RTC staff (info@sccrtc.org) or RTC Commissioners?**
You suggest that folks respond to the RTC staff. Clearly the RTC staff does not seem to be listening. Elected officials typically do a great job of listening. I can't imagine Ryan Coonerty not responding to the needs of north coast farmers.

Simple back of the envelope calculations would show that buying back the rail with the sales tax component and offering a proper bike trail would be far superior to the long term costs of a commuter train. You could throw in free e-bike service and still come out ahead. Yes it more work but its the right thing to do. My fear is that there is a "There is always more money" mentality going on here with the RTC. The problem is that "more money" is our money.

Thanks for the effort you are putting into making the right thing happen.

Scott Walecka

---

Dear Mr. Walecka,

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review.

Please visit the SCCRTC website at [www.sccrtc.org](http://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*
-----Original Message-----
From: CYTHIA DZENDZEL  
Sent: Sunday, August 14, 2016 9:10 AM  
To: info@sccrtc.org  
Subject: Do not remove the tracks

Trail now is asking people to use this email address to voice their concerns about the tracks being removed.

As stated previously, I am opposed to any attempt to remove the tracks before a new rail system has been planned and implemented.

We should NOT pull up tracks and give up the possibility of a future rail system.

I am not familiar with any opposition from farmers in North County to leaving the tracks in place. Why would they suddenly be opposed to something that is already there?

I particularly appreciated the article by Cory Caletti, stating that the plan that was established over 20 years with public input and the cooperation of many organizations will move forward, and that there is no plan to remove the tracks.

Cythia Dzendzel  
Felton 95018

Dear Ms. Dzendzel,

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review.

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
-----Original Message-----
From: Kristin Tosello
Sent: Sunday, August 14, 2016 9:15 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Track removal

I support Trail Now's plan to remove the tracks now. Let the community use the corridor NOW instead of it sitting idle while a decision of how best to use the corridor is used.

Kristin Tosello

Dear Ms. Tosello,

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review.

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: Robert Bixby  
Sent: Sunday, August 14, 2016 11:17 AM  
To: Info@sccrtc.org  
Cc: info@trailnow.org  
Subject: Rail planning

Dear Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission,

I understand there is a vocal group that wants to convert the rail corridor to a trail only. I strongly oppose this concept. We continue to lose valuable and irreplaceable rail corridor across the country. In Santa Cruz County we have a continuously worsening traffic situation with limited options for improvement. Alternative travel routes have dramatically impacted neighborhood roads in many areas of the County. It would be a tragic loss of an incredibly valuable transportation corridor to make the rail line a trail. In addition, converting the corridor to a trail would have the greatest economic impact on the majority latino population of south county. There is a very large percentage of the south county population that commute to Santa Cruz for work and it would be an outstanding option to someday have an alternative form of transportation for this commute path.

The assertion that having a holiday train would negatively impact the County is unfounded and short sited. We have a strong tourist economy that supplies many jobs to local residents. The winter holidays do not have nearly the impact that the summer holidays have. With declining retail tax revenues during the holidays, tourism represents a welcome alternative tax source.

Robert Bixby  
Former member Transportation Systems Management Taskforce, Santa Cruz County  
Former Chairman, Transportation Management Association of Santa Cruz County

---

Dear Mr. Bixby,

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review.

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: Ellen Martinez  
Sent: Sunday, August 14, 2016 2:30 PM  
To: info@sccrtc.org  
Subject: Front Page Article in Sentinel on Saturday, August 13

Gentlemen and Ladies,

Yesterday, I read the Sentinel’s front page article about the independent trail study done on behalf of the Great Santa Cruz Trail Group. The report, released by the Nelson/Nygaard consulting group, asserts that a trail only approach would move more people at a lower cost versus a multi-use trail and passenger rail plan. Cory Caletti, a senior planner with the RTC, was quoted in the article.

Although Caletti said that the commission will conduct an in depth review of its railway before making any decisions on what rail service to provide, she negates her authenticity when she states that the RTC has already determined that it would be futile to try to refund $11 million to Iowa Pacific.

=""The Great Santa Cruz Trail Group asserts that the commission could refund the $11 million. But that’s unlikely, said Caletti. Purchasing the rail corridor took 20 years, with collaboration from several agencies, lawyers, contractual agreements, policy obligations... I mean, there’s volumes of items that tether us to the scenario that the commission adopted”

==

Caletti has clearly stated the RTC’s position and direction. And that’s tragic. The RTC has violated my trust in its ability to manage and execute an open, transparent process in any future studies and findings. And now, I must question the RTC’s overall ability to manage our taxpayer dollars and make good transportation decisions.

Please demonstrate to me and the taxpayers of Santa Cruz County your sincerity in managing an open and transparent conversation and process when it comes to the usage of the rail corridor. How? You can begin by removing the existing tracks and using the rail corridor for a trail, while simultaneously studying future train service. And begin this process prior to the November election.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Ellen Martinez
Santa Cruz County Taxpayer and Resident

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

Dear Ms. Martinez,

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review.

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: joe martinez  
Sent: Sunday, August 14, 2016 6:28 PM  
To: info@sccrtc.org; 'Bruce McPherson'; 'Cynthia Chase'; 'Dennis Norton'; 'Don Lane'; 'Ed Bottorff'; 'Greg Caput'; 'Harriet L Foster'; 'Jimmy Dutra'; 'John Leopold'; 'Karina Cervantez'; 'Randy Johnson'; 'Ryan Coonerty'; 'Tim Gubbins'; 'Zach Friend'  
Subject: Saturday Sentinel Article - Group touts trail-only plan for rail corridor

Commissioners,

Yesterday, I read the Sentinel’s article about an independent trail study done on behalf of the Great Santa Cruz Trail Group. The report asserts that a trail only approach would move more people at a lower cost versus a multi-use trail and passenger rail plan. I agree with this assertion.

Cory Caletti was quoted in the article. And although Caletti says that the commission will conduct an in depth review of its railway before making any decisions on what rail service to provide, she negates this when she says that the RTC has already determined that it would be futile to try to refund $11 million to Iowa Pacific. This statement says to me that a train will be implemented on the corridor, regardless of any study findings—and regardless of what the people in Santa Cruz County want.

It seems to me that the RTC is going through the motion of trying to appear as if it plans to manage an open, transparent process to study future rail corridor options. But, Caletti’s statements in the Sentinel article clearly indicate otherwise.

Please demonstrate to me your sincerity in managing an open and transparent process when it comes to the usage of the rail corridor. First, assemble a task force that is representative of your county’s constituency and begin the study—prior to the November election. Second, publicly announce your plan to remove the existing tracks and use the rail corridor for a trail while the study is in progress—prior to the November election.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Joe Martinez
Santa Cruz County Voter and Taxpayer

Dear Mr. Martinez,

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review.

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
-----Original Message-----
From: Will Mayall
Sent: Sunday, August 14, 2016 8:46 PM
To: John Leopold; Bruce McPherson; Ed Bottorff; Karina Cervantez; Dennis Norton; Jimmy Dutra; Greg Caput; Zach Friend; Tim Gubbins; Cynthia Chase; Don Lane; SCCRTC
Cc: Bud Colligan
Subject: RTC Staff Member Statements Affect TRIP

It was with profound dismay that I read the Sentinel’s article on the Great Santa Cruz Trail Study. What should have been an encouraging article was instead hijacked by an RTC staff member with a clear bias towards train.

Those of us who think that studying the trail-only option is not just reasonable but responsible, truly believed the RTC was finally ready to look at other realistic options. Instead, it is clear that the RTC is not serious about an objective evaluation. The impression is instead of a pervasive belief within the staff that train is not just the goal but inevitable.

It is the responsibility of the management team of an organization to make sure that the staff properly understands the objective. In this case, to determine the best use of the rail corridor. If such an objective was clear, an informed staff would have been very careful when publicly discussing a study that is both reasonable and professional. Since that was not the case, I must assume that the RTC has intentionally mislead the public in proposing an "open and transparent" process that will study all options for the rail corridor.

Perhaps I’m naive, I trust our government. This is the first time I have experienced firsthand how untrustworthy government can be.

I can no longer trust that the RTC is objectively working towards the best interests of our county and therefore can no longer support TRIP.

Will Mayall

Dear Mr. Mayall,

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review.

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
Dear Mr. Bercovich,

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review.

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
Dear Mr. Bercovich,

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review.

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: Paul Nolan  
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2016 11:56 AM  
To: info@sccrtc.org  
Subject: Keep Rail for the future

Keeping the railroad tracks for future use is a must. Widening highways can only do so much. What happens when you run out of room to widen...? This is the problem we face, our need for faster and more consistent transportation is slowed by the limits we currently have. Adding commuter rail would be another great option to reduce general transportation congestion. We need to keep our options open because once they’re gone... They’re gone for good and we loose another option. It should never be a goal to limit ourselves when we have the ability to create something useful. Do not remove the tracks and keep our options open.

Dear Mr. Nolan,

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review.

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: Philip Boutelle  
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2016 12:02 PM  
To: info@sccrtc.org  
Subject: I support the rail with trail

RTC,

I'm writing to voice my support for the current RTC plan to keep the tracks in place on the rail corridor. There is no single silver bullet solutions to the transportation issues facing our county; solving these problems will require many combined approaches, including improved metro service, better pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, and having a rail system that traverses the entire county.

I'll note that many of the transportation ills we face are due to traffic on Highway 1, and much of that is because housing is less expensive, but jobs are more plentiful and better paying either in Santa Cruz or over the hill. Removing the rail and making it a trail only solution does very little to address this pattern, but installing a rail system could actually make a significant impact on that traffic (especially if someday it is paired with a train to connect Santa Cruz to BART/CalTrain/CAHSR).

I'll also comment that I read the Nelson\Nygaard study as commissioned by the Great Santa Cruz Rail Group. The report reads more like a marketing piece instead of an objective look at what is best for the county, and repeats many of the sometimes inaccurate talking points used in local anti-rail arguments. The report slant makes sense given the context, as it was commissioned by a group who doesn't want the rail, no matter what.

It seems like most of these points could be countered with some better data, instead of the high-level conservative estimates that were used for the Prop 116 funds. I'd like the RTC to commission an objective and in-depth feasibility study for using the rail corridor with rail and trail, and my understanding is that the TRIP tax expenditures would cover such a study.

Thank you for your great work on this so far.

-Phil Boutelle  
Santa Cruz

Dear Mr. Boutelle,

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review.

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: Mick Adamson  
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2016 12:05 PM  
To: info@sccrtc.org  
Subject: The Sentinel article (nonsense)

To whom it may concern:

I just wanted to voice my support for the work you guys are doing, what with the paid for consulting that Trail Now got Nelson Nygaard to spew forth and now this singularly bias anti-train rhetoric in the Sentinel, I want you to know there are many supporters of the Rail AND Trail, which would be a much more forward thinking and longer term approach than a bike track for a minority of lycra-clad health nuts, and be of much greater use to a much wider proportion of the community, including those with very young families and our aging population.

So, I appreciate the RTC's decision to keep our transportation options open for the future and keep studying the passenger rail choice which and would also allow folks who use bicycles as their primary mode of transportation to travel greater distances throughout the county. Currently Hwy 1 is our only route through the county - with the economy in good shape and gas so cheap, traffic has already become almost unbearable and will only get worse - passenger rail would provide an alternative to driving and vastly improve travel times. With the pace of innovation that is going on in transportation power, to deny us the option of a future, efficient, and cleaner transport choice would be negligent.

The fact that rail line was purchased with Prop 116 funds for rail service, I'm so glad RTC continues to fulfill its their legal obligation to pursue passenger rail, the biggest investment is done, the Rail is there, let's not allow such a small but vocal group to dominate the discussion.

Sincerely

Mick Adamson

Aptos, CA 95003

Dear Mr. Adamson,

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review.

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
-----Original Message-----
From: Dan Grundeman
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2016 12:52 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Trail with rail

I believe that a trolley system, with a bike trail, is the best use of the corridor. Trolleys are relatively quiet with small diesel electric engines. Operating hours could be determined so as to maximize service. They would take a lot of traffic off surface streets and hwy 1. The tracks are there please use them.
Dan

Dear Mr. Grundeman,

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review.

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
My mother always told me to watch out for the vocal minority.

I'm sorry that you have to deal with all of this misinformation being flung at an amazing project.

I for one am grateful to the RTC for keeping our community's options open, and not throwing the tracks out just because of a well-funded campaign by people who think trains are archaic.

Firstly, not everyone has a car, and cars cost a lot to operate and maintain. Many folks in the South County rely on public transportation. Only having a trail run the length of the county means that the South County pretty much gets cut off from most of the benefits of the Rail with Trail option. How many MBSS(R) Trail users would realistically come from the south county all the way to say, Aptos? Or Capitola? Santa Cruz? Not too many I'd posit.

Combining the trail with the possibility of having a train means that more users who do not have cars, or just don't like to drive, can enjoy the benefits of the trail, both for recreation and transportation. Lord knows that we could use a transportation alternative to Highway 1!

So, for that and many other reasons, I am grateful that the RTC is committed to weathering the storm of naysayers and NIMBYs, and maintaining the integrity of your amazing plan for the Rail Trail.

Best wishes,
--

Tawn Kennedy

Director, Green Ways to School

A project of Bike Santa Cruz County

Dear Tawn Kennedy,

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review.

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
Dear RTC,

In response to the front page Sentinel article on Saturday: I am an **enthusiastic supporter** of the RAIL and trail concept. I absolutely want to keep alternatives open to mass transit in Santa Cruz County. Highway One will NEVER be a solution to cross-county transit--and congestion on it will ONLY worsen. The rail/trail will allow my family options to visit both Santa Cruz and Watsonville. We use our bikes for around town errands. We want a safe option to get on our bikes and take a ride into Santa Cruz to shop/go to a movie, visit a cultural event. My kids will use the trail to move around safely. My wife and I will use the trail to walk and ride our bikes as a viable means to move and tend to our family needs. We live in Live Oak; 1/4 mile from the rail and we will use public transit on that rail line. We want electric, efficient, quiet and dependable service along that route. It is the future of transportation in the County. Use Prop 116 funds for their intended use. It will be challenging to bring new thinking to SC, but STAY THE COURSE! BE COURAGEOUS!

Bob Morgan
Santa Cruz

---

Dear Mr. Morgan,

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review.

Please visit the SCCRTC website at [www.sccrtc.org](http://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: Carol Long  
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2016 2:16 PM  
To: info@sccrtc.org  
Subject: Preserve our Rail Transportation Option

I appreciate the RTC decision to keep our transportation options open for the future and keep studying the options for passenger rail.

Passenger rail trail would allow folks who use bicycles as their primary mode of transportation to travel longer distances throughout the county.

Hwy 1 is our only route through the county - traffic is bad and will only get worse - passenger rail would provide an alternative to driving.

The RTC must recognize that the rail line was purchased with Prop 116 funds for rail service. RTC needs to fulfill their legal obligation to pursue passenger rail.

Thank you.

Carol Long

Dear Ms. Long,

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review.

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  
Follow our social networks for the latest RTC news
From: Steve Lustgarden  
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2016 2:20 PM  
To: Regional Transportation Commission  
Subject: trail with rail

Dear RTC,
We are writing today to thank the RTC for your hard work over the years on the rail trail and keeping the County's options open for future rail development.
We have seen numerous times in California's history (including our own county) where rail lines are removed, to the regret of future generations.
Let's not make that mistake again here.
Not only might passenger rail trail be a valuable and climate friendly means of moving people around our own county, it would also allow bicycle riders a means of traveling longer distances throughout the county, and beyond.
Widening Hwy 1 is not the answer, and passenger rail just might be a better, cheaper, cleaner option. Let's not foreclose on that possibility.
Besides, the County used Prop 116 funds to purchase the rail line, and we are obligated to pursue passenger rail options as a result.

Many thanks for your hard work on these issues!
Steve Lustgarden  
Susan Kauffman  
Santa Cruz

Dear Mr. Lustgarden,

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review.

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: Grace Voss [mailto:gracevoss@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2016 2:22 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: rail with trail is best

dear RTC…it is imperative to keep the railroad tracks in place while working
towards completion of the 32-mile monterey bay sanctuary scenic trail!...while
nobody can predict the future, it is safe to say that santa cruz county will continue
to grow its population, while the county’s transportation choices are limited...in
the early years of the 20th century, a train took people between santa cruz and
san jose, but this train was discontinued...too bad!...imagine how that train today
relieve some congestion from busy highway 17 while also providing safe travel for
commuters!...the RTC has promised to study passenger train travel for the
future...it would be short sighted to remove this option...a rail with trail means the
citizens of santa cruz county may walk, bike, drive a car or take a train if
passenger rail is adopted in the future...three of these four options will take
pressure off congested highway one...let's not repeat the mistake from the
past...rail with trail is the best plan for now...

Dear Ms. Voss,

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for
their review.

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: Robert Jones  
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2016 3:23 PM  
To: info@sccrtc.org  
Subject: Rail issues

RTC,

I'm extremely disappointed in the RTC regarding the several steps and attitudes re: the rail corridor.

1. The approval of the Polar Express from Santa Cruz to Capitola is poorly advised. Has an environmental assessment been made considering noise, traffic disruption, pollution and safety been conducted? (And don't drag out some ancient EIA that was done for a different ill-advised project). Is this just another way to shore up the failing economics of rail corridor ownership? Per the RTC, the corridor will be self-sustaining economically yet the November tax measure contains a huge taxpayer subsidy for maintenance. You broke your pledge. For shame.

2. The Trail Now economic/feasibility rail corridor study was conducted by a nationally-recognized firm in the business and is a quality product. Despite this, at least one member of the RTC (Caletti) has dismissed it outright and has worked to deny it a fair hearing. Of course, no other corridor utilization study by the RTC is forthcoming. November voters need to see what their options are before a huge tax commitment.

The only reasonable and COST EFFECTIVE plan is to remove the tracks and build a world-class trail. The RTC should make valid feasibility/economic arguments for ITS plan (i.e., the RTC is not unbiased in this matter) and let the public decide how its money should be spent.

Robert Jones  
Aptos

Dear Mr. Jones,

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review.

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: Gina Colfer  
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2016 3:53 PM  
To: info@sccrtc.org  
Subject: Trail now

Hello,  
I am a concerned citizen that would love to see a world class trail built in place of 
a train that would never alleviate traffic, only add to it! Please consider the 
environment, social impact and economics of a train. Few people from 
our community would benefit from a train, but a lot of people would benefit from a 
world class trail. Children and adults alike could use the trail and get off of the 
dangerous surface streets!  
Please listen to our voices and wishes! Improve our beautiful area, don't ruin it 
with a train!  
Thank you.  
Gina Bella Colfer  
4th generation Aptos resident

Dear Ms. Colfer,

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for 
their review.

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: Bruce Sawhill
Date: August 15, 2016 at 3:56:45 PM PDT
To: nfo@sccrtc.org
Subject: Support of rail WITH trail

I am writing to support the RTC's initiative of keeping the rail option open.

The fact is, we don't know what a rail system would look like at this point because a proper study hasn't been done. No decisions should be made until this has happened.

I personally believe that an efficient, quiet and well-used system will prove to be workable over some segment of the rail line. We have the demographics and density to support a system.

I also take issue with the recent 'study' of a trail only option, since it is funded by agricultural interests that have a vested interest in maintaining a low wage labor force with few options. A rail system would give this labor force access to better jobs and education, hence it would cost agricultural interests more to keep their labor force.

Keep the Tracks! Then use them.

Best,

Bruce Sawhill
Santa Cruz, CA

Dear Mr. Sawhill,

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review.

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
-----Original Message-----
From: Paul Iverson
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2016 5:18 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Santa Cruz rail+trail is win+win

Hello Ms. Caletti:

I am sending this email in support of SCCRTC’s decision to preserve the railroad line to Santa Cruz.

The recent critique by Brian Peoples's TRAIL NOW and Great Santa Cruz Trail groups of the RTC's plans for the corridor are classist, xenophobic and ableist. It unfortunate that this small group of cycling elitists find it necessary to discredit the work of RTC in order to serve their own selfish needs when there are already a wealth of trails in the region.

Though it is important to focus on the hollow talking points the trail-only group promotes as truth and promptly discredit them, it is hard to ignore the members themselves and their ulterior movies. Ryan Whitelaw is real estate agent who was foolish enough to buy a home whose property line abuts the railroad. Bud Colligan is a well known public figure whose wealth regularly buys political influence (the group's alleged benefactor who funded the critique masquerading as a study), Will Menchine is a member of the SCCRTC bike committee (a clear conflict of interest). Under the guidance of Brian Peoples' purposely confusing falsities, both the organization and its close observers are believing the lies.

Most insulting is the elimination of Watsonville from the critique. The cycling group seems to think that Watsonville commuters will forego the usage of their auto to ride 20+ miles to work on their bikes vs. a passenger train.

There is little question that building a rail + trail is a less expensive and more sustainable alternative to widening Highway 1, the only route through the county whose traffic will only get worse. The win-win situation passenger will allow those who use bicycles as their primary mode of transportation to travel longer distances throughout the county.

I commend you and the SCCRTC for the continued hard work put into the rails with trails effort as well as dealing with the daily onslaught of fearful xenophobia exhibiting by local residents.

Thank you kindly.

Paul Iverson
Dear Mr. Iverson,

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review.

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: Roland Saher  
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2016 7:48 PM  
To: info@sccrtc.org  
Subject: rail & trail

RTC members, thank you for deciding to preserve the railway along with the trail. It is important to have the option of a train running on the railway. Vehicular traffic on Hiwy 1 is only going to get worse and people will want to have the option of taking public transportation from north to south county and vice versa. This will also allow bicyclists to commute because they would be able to take their bike along on the train. We need to do everything to encourage alternative modes of transportation to the use of only too often single occupant cars. You have my full support to stand against any opposition against the train!
Roland Saher

Dear Mr. Saher,

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review.

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
-----Original Message-----
From: Lynda Francis
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2016 7:57 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Support the Rail Trail

I would like to go on record as supporting the rail. It would be heavenly to get tourists off the roads in summertime and on a train going north and south. I am hoping that we can have electric trains that run efficiency and quietly.

Thank you for continuing with the original plan. Lynda Francis

Dear Ms. Francis,

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review.

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
-----Original Message-----
From: Larry Bercovich
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2016 10:23 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Re: Work with north coast farmers!-Bercovich,L

If you plan to share comments, please share this: I am a married man age 58 who has lived my life in the Bay Area. I moved to Aptos 5 yrs ago.

I love the Santa Cruz area, and have often visited, vacationed, and now live here. For many years it's been so obvious that this area needs a safe, fun, family-oriented bike path. For many years I lived near the Iron Horse trail in the East Bay. That trail provides such a wonderful, safe, family-oriented path to travel among the east bay cities such as San Ramon, Danville, and Walnut Creek. That is what this area needs.

So, please help enable a world-class, family-oriented, bike path. One that your children and grand children will be proud to say: "My [grand] father/mother helped build this."

Resident - Larry and Ruth Bercovich

Dear Larry and Ruth Bercovich,

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review.

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
To the Staff of the SCCRTC

I’m writing to reiterate my support for development of a rail+trail corridor as part of the TRIP initiative. Sensible development of this corridor is essential to the long-term viability and sustainability of our community, and I hope to see this initiative pass on the November ballot.

Thank you.

-Eric Richter

Eric Richter  
Brand Development Manager | Giro Sport Design

GIRO

5550 Scotts Valley Drive | Scotts Valley, CA 95066

Dear Mr. Richter,

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review.

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: Logan Cartwright  
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2016 11:26 PM  
To: info@sccrtc.org; Trail Now  
Subject: Trail ONLY

The train idea is built on special interest money of big railroad barons. The folks of Santa Cruz don't want to fund or have noisy, big behemoths steel rattling, teeth jarring, smoke belching, dangerous monsters racing through some of the nicest & quietest residential area neighborhoods of Santa Cruz County.
Take a look at Monterey's trail, it does not have a train or want one running along it's beautiful Trail ONLY route.
WAKE UP.
Be brave, Stop the train barons in their tracks.
logan cartwright
Home owner
Live Oak district.
40 + years in Santa Cruz County

Dear Mr. Cartwright,

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review.

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
08/16/16

Dear SCCRTC,

I am writing to support the concept of both rail and trail. Sometime in the future we will look back and be relieved that we kept our options open for a rail component. There is a project from Cloverdale to Larkspur that would be a good model to look at and consider for the future. If Marin County residents are supporting rail, that’s a good sign we can do it in this county too.

Sincerely,

Susan Cook
Santa Cruz

08/22/16

Dear Ms. Cook,

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review.

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
-----Original Message-----
From: Julie Montgomery
Sent: Tuesday, August 16, 2016 12:54 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Support of Rail Trail Project

Dear SCCRTC,

In light of the recent article in the Sentinel, I'd like to thank you for your dedication to improving mass transit and for having a vision to provide real transit alternatives to Santa Cruz county. The rail and trail plan for the corridor is a perfect balance to address both long-term and short-term needs of the community. I look forward to using the trail in the very near future and will vote for the transit tax to help ensure that the rest of the trail can be constructed.

Best regards,
Julie Montgomery

Dear Ms. Montgomery,

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review.

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: Barry Scott  
Sent: Tuesday, August 16, 2016 8:56 AM  
To: Regional Transportation Commission  
Cc: greg.caput@co.santa-cruz.ca.us; bruce.mcpherson@co.santa-cruz.ca.us;  
jimmy.dutra@cityofwatsonville.org; rli12@comcast.net; dnortondesigns@msn.com;  
diane@cityofsantacruz.com; karina.cervantez@cityofwatsonville.org;  
cchase@cityofsantacruz.com; ebottorff167@yahoo.com; tim_gubbins@dot.ca.gov; Karena  
Pushnik; John Leopold; ryan.coonerty@santacruzcounty.us; shf177@santacruzcounty.us;  
shf236@santacruzcounty.us; Zach Friend; George Dondero  
Subject: Re: Nelson/Nygaard Trail Only report. Letter writing campaigns by rail  
opponents.

Commissioners and staff,

**GSCT Trail Only study:**

This report is terribly flawed and the bias in its methodology is evident. Errors in fact are  
too numerous to mention but it’s easy to spot many of them:

Page 14 from the "report" uses three bits of speculation to reach a conclusion designed to  
mislead readers about the current parallel trail plan:  
• "Should the design challenges prove insurmountable";  
• "it is unclear how many detours off the trail will be required";  
• "out-of-direction travel is unlikely to attract the interested users".

The truth is that the design challenges all have solutions and no detours will be required  
in the final design, but they don’t want you to know that. Thus, all of the data they report  
about levels of trail use is based on faulty assumptions like the ones above that were  
found on just one of the pages in this "report". Those "stressful detours" shown on the three maps of this page? They don’t exist.

Page 26: Footnotes indicate that Nelson\Nygaard made up narrow trail widths for the  
existing Rail with Trail plan rather than accept wider RRM and RTC design widths so that  
lower Level Of Service scores would be generated for our design while high scores are  
generated for their imaginary design. This is not professionally acceptable.

I appreciate the difficult task commissioners and staff have in maintaining neutrality but I  
hope you all take into account the relative worthlessness of this document and consider  
your mission and mandate which includes meeting the transportation needs of the  
community well into the future and serving the greatest number of potential users of  
design solutions for the Santa Cruz Branch Line.

**Letter writing campaigns waged by Trail Now, et al:**

Transparency requires that public comment via websites and email be collected,  
considered, and published. Thank you for that.

While it’s comforting to know that none of you take the number of pro or anti rail  
messages to be representative of the larger communities you serve, I hope you’re all  
aware of the robust efforts by Trail Now to use public media and automated email  
generation applications to mislead their base, to tell outright lies, to attack the character  
of the Commission and partner organizations and their staff.
We hope to counter this activity with similarly robust public commentary, use of social media, etc., but are committed to publishing factual materials, clarifying documents with sources, and to keep the public discussion as honest and civil as possible. Two Facebook pages that support the RTC and rail trail are here: https://www.facebook.com/groups/Aptos.Rail.With.Trail/ and https://www.facebook.com/CoastalRail/

Thank you for your enduring dedication to continued progress on the Monterey Bay Scenic Sanctuary Trail Network master plan and the other important work that you do.

Warmest regards,

Barry

Barry Scott
Coastal Rail Santa Cruz
Aptos, CA 95003

Dear Mr. Scott,

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review.

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: Nancy Faulstich  
Sent: Tuesday, August 16, 2016 3:04 PM  
To: info@sccrtc.org  
Subject: I fully support rail with trail!

Dear RTC Commissioners and Staff,  
I fully support the rail with trail!  
I would love to have rail service throughout our County.

My understanding is the rail with trail option is the only way to proceed legally.

We badly need another corridor throughout the County besides highway 1 and Soquel Drive.

There's plenty of room for both rail and trail and I think it's selfish to propose eliminating the rail option which would help so much with commuters.

Sincerely,  
Nancy Faulstich

Dear Ms. Faulstich,  
Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review.

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

Thank you,
From: Maura Noel  
Sent: Tuesday, August 16, 2016 6:48 PM  
To: info@sccrtc.org  
Subject: Please continue a Trail with Rail plan!

Hello RTC,

Just a quick note to say that the Santa Cruz County Cycling Club is hoping you are continuing your efforts to create both a trail AND rail option connecting Santa Cruz County to Monterey County (and beyond!).

Many of us saw the article in the Sentinel recently and the "study" paid for by the Trail Now extremists. We were saddened to see that it did not appear that that study group had met with the RTC, or that they did not do a more balanced and neutral presentation of all possible options. The imagined urgency of the Trail Now plans and the exclusionary vision that their proposal contains is not something that the cycle club supports. While we certainly look forward to cycling away from traffic, many of us would like to load our bikes on a commuter train and expand our non motorized reach. Concepts that include ripping out the tracks or covering them over, that put a trail use in front of all others, seem rash. Every day hundreds of residents from south county and Monterey county commute into Santa Cruz to work. The Cycle Club heartily supports the idea of some sort of rail service that non cycling hard working residents would benefit from.

Please continue the exemplary and professional work that you have been doing. I know it must be exhausting.

kind regards,
Maura Noel  
President, Santa Cruz County Cycling Club

---

Dear Ms. Noel,

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review.

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

Thank you,
August 17, 2016

Regional Transportation Commissioners and Staff  
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission  
1523 Pacific Avenue  
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Dear Commissioners and Staff,

On behalf of Rails to Trails Conservancy, I would like to submit comments on the Great Santa Cruz Trail report, which studies the potential for a trail-only option along the Santa Cruz Branch Line as an alternative to the rail-with-trail project that has been moving forward. The report raises some important issues to be considered by local policymakers. Our America’s Rails with Trails report, which reviews the experience of rail-with-trail projects from across the country, was cited several times. I would like to clarify several items in the report where our study was cited, as they may lead readers to an incorrect understanding of our position on the Santa Cruz project and on rail-with-trail projects in general.

Rails-to-Trails Conservancy strongly supports the development of all rail trail projects, including both rail-to-trail and rail-with-trail, but we do not take a position on whether rail service is appropriate for a particular community. America’s Rails-with-Trails was undertaken to demonstrate that in corridors where jurisdictions have elected to operate rail service that trails may also be viable, and to document the practices that have been employed on these projects throughout the country.

Regarding the references to our report in the Great Santa Cruz Trail report:

- 90% of rail-trails are in trail-only corridors (p. 21) – This is accurate, but should not be taken to mean that trail-only projects are inherently preferable. As our study found, the number of rail-with-trail projects around the country has grown significantly.

- “The average setbacks between rail and trail is 20-30 ft. in Rail-with-Trails corridors, with higher speed trains yielding larger setbacks or safety separations.” (p. 22) This is accurate as a general statement, but it should be noted that there are numerous examples of trails located immediately adjacent to light rail corridors (e.g. Minneapolis and Denver), where rail service operates at high frequency and relatively high speed. As with other rail-with-trail projects, project designs have incorporated measures to address safety concerns (typically fencing).

- Sidebar on p. 31: These comments are incorrectly attributed to our America’s Rails-with-Trails Report. Rails-to-Trails Conservancy has not taken a position on the viability of transit service in Santa Cruz County.
We at Rails-to-Trails Conservancy are very excited about the development of the coastal trail in Santa Cruz County. It has the potential to become a major destination and provide significant benefits to the community, and we look forward to supporting this effort as the development of the trail continues.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Barry Bergman
Manager of Trail Development
Rails-to-Trails Conservancy, Western Region Office
From: david van brink
Sent: Wednesday, August 17, 2016 5:09 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: I support preserving the train tracks

Just a note to weigh in. I'm a 28 year Santa Cruz resident, and absolutely support preserving the option for rail service along side our bicycle and pedestrian trail. I live near the tracks, and am thrilled that it's in my back yard.

Highway 1 will remain saturated with automobile traffic; additional non-car routes must be added.

(Personally, especially supportive of possibility for bicycle/rail multimodal transportation to get to all areas of Santa Cruz and maybe even Watsonville.)

--> David Van Brink

Dear Mr. Van Brink,

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review.

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: Piet Canin
Sent: Wednesday, August 17, 2016 8:35 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Coastal Rail Trail and Rail Options

Dear RTC Commissioners,
I wanted to send a note of appreciation and support of the RTC Commission and staff for your work to complete up to 10 miles of the 32-mile Coastal Rail Trail. It is truly amazing that over 25% of the trail miles, designed to be alongside rail, have been funded and will be built in the next few years. Ecology Action also commends the RTC for keeping open the options for rail transit. We look forward to the comprehensive EIR analysis and study of transit options in the corridor.
The transformation of the coastal rail corridor into a true public asset will be greatly accelerated with the passage of Measure D and EA supports the ballot measure to improve sustainable transportation in our county.

Thank you for your work to get Santa Cruz County moving.

Piet Canin | Vice President Transportation
EcologyAction | EcoAct.org

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

Dear Mr. Canin,

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review.

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: Scott Junker  
Sent: Wednesday, August 17, 2016 11:04 AM  
To: INFO@SCCRTC.ORG  
Cc: Scott Junker  
Subject: Rail and Trail

Commissioners and Staff of the SCCRTC,

I'm writing to convey my fervent support for development of a rail/trail corridor as part of the TRIP initiative.

Sensible development of this corridor and support for the infrastructure within it are essential to the long-term viability and sustainability of our community. I hope to one day see and use a commuter rail line through Santa Cruz as I have in many other parts of the country and world. Eliminating the existing rail line would crush this dream which has been realized by so many other communities facing the same constraints of limited land area and expanding populations.

I hope to see this initiative pass on the November ballot and will gladly vote for it if you keep the rail line in the plan.

Thank you,

Scott Junker  
Homeowner  
Child-raiser  
Soquel

Scott Junker  
Product Manager  
Giro Cycling

---

Dear Mr. Junker,

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review.

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: Simon Fisher
Sent: Thursday, August 18, 2016 4:03 PM
To: INFO@SCCRTC.ORG
Subject: In support of Rail and Trail as part of TRIP

Commissioners and Staff,

I’m writing to reiterate my support for the rail+trail corridor as part of the TRIP initiative. As a lifelong resident of Santa Cruz and Capitola plus being a daily bike rider I feel it would not only provide a safe bike lane across the county but also stimulate business along the route and put that land to better transportation use. I hope to see this pass on the November ballot.

Thanks,
Simon

Simon Fisher
Sr. Product Marketing Manager
Giro Sport Design

GIRO
Scotts Valley, CA 95066

---

Dear Mr. Fisher,

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review.

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: Eric Horton
Sent: Thursday, August 18, 2016 4:49 PM
To: INFO@SCCRTC.ORG
Subject: In Support of Rail and Trail as part of TRIP

To the Staff of the SCCRTC

I’m writing to show my support for the development of a rail+trail corridor as part of the TRIP initiative. The corridor is a tremendous asset to Santa Cruz County and keeping ALL options open for the future is a top priority for me. Sensible development of this corridor is essential to the long-term viability and sustainability of our community. I will be voting yes on measure D and hope to see this initiative pass on the November ballot.

Thank you.

Eric Horton

Eric Horton
Creative Director - Giro
Scotts Valley CA 95066

Dear Mr. Horton,

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review.

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: Joshua Muir
Sent: Thursday, August 18, 2016 9:04 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Rail And Trail!

Hello Friends at the RTC-

Thanks for all of your hard work over the years. It has come to my attention that there are forces attempting to remove the rail from our recently purchased rail corridor- If the rail were stripped from our already beleaguered transportation infrastructure, we would never get it back.

It is of utmost importance that the county maintain the rail corridor for future use. We know that we can have rail with trail (it’s been studied). Do not allow short-sighted desires of a small group of locals to squander our precious infrastructure resources!

RAIL AND TRAIL!

Keep up the great work!

Josh Muir

--
Joshua Muir
Frances Cycles

Dear Mr. Muir,

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review.

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: Elise Ehrheart
Sent: Friday, August 19, 2016 7:48 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Thank you for keeping the train tracks for now

Hello RTC,

As a local Santa Cruz resident and regular bike commuter I wanted to express my support of your decision to preserve the train tracks. Although I’m unsure how used the potential commuter train would be, I think it deserves thorough consideration. The passenger trail stands to allow folks who use bicycles as their primary mode of transportation to travel longer distances throughout the county.

Thanks for all the work you do for furthering transportation for all Santa Cruz County residents! Lets get Measure D passed!

Sincerely,

Elise Ehrheart

Dear Ms. Ehrheart,

Thank you for your comments. They will be made available to the Commission for their review.

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
Don Lane and Zach Friend: Getting Santa Cruz County moving

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission owns the rail line that runs between Davenport and Watsonville.

Shmuel Thaler/Sentinel

By Don Lane and Zach Friend, Special to the Sentinel

POSTED: 08/20/16, 6:09 PM PDT

There is a healthy discussion going on in our county about the long-term use of the Watsonville-to-Davenport rail corridor.

Because the rail line is owned by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission, the commission is charged with overseeing the community decision-making process to determine the preferred long-term use of this community asset. It’s potential must not be underestimated. With the many transportation challenges our residents face, the corridor represents a significant opportunity to improve the movement of people between Santa Cruz, Mid-County and Watsonville. Aside from Highway 1, the rail line is the only linear transportation corridor to traverse our county.
The RTC has committed to a thoughtful, transparent and engaging community process to determine the best use of the corridor. Everyone agrees there is great potential for meeting transportation needs on this corridor. This agreement led to the RTC purchasing the line. And there seems to be consensus on having a bicycle and pedestrian path on the corridor, which is why the RTC is proceeding with creation of that path.

Where there is not consensus is on the question of rail or other transit service. Some envision rail transit or some other transit service on the line. Others envision removing the tracks and building an even wider bike and pedestrian trail. This is where more work needs to be done.

The RTC recently adopted this element in its Transportation Improvement Plan: “Analysis (including environmental and economic analysis) to answer important community questions about possible future transit and other transportation uses of the corridor through an open, transparent public process.” In September, the RTC will map out specific details for the public process on making this critical decision.

That process will take into account the recently completed report from the “Great Santa Cruz Trail” advocates. It will also take into account the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line Rail Transit Feasibility Study and the work of rail-service advocates. We applaud these community-based efforts and look forward to a lively discussion where a wide range of perspectives are carefully considered. Ultimately, the corridor presents one of the greatest transportation opportunities in our county for the foreseeable future. Ensuring a complete analysis of the possibilities is essential.

Whichever approach the community chooses, it’s important to note it will be difficult to get any projects completed without a local, stable source of revenue. State and federal transportation funding has become very unreliable and that lack of investment in our roads, highway and transit system becomes more evident every day. As our community sits in traffic, watches neighborhood streets deteriorate, seeks safer walking and biking options to school and reliable options for seniors to get to medical appointments, we know the need is acute.

As RTC commissioners we often hear we should invest more in these needs. We agree. After all, we know what it looks like to not have a stable funding measure — we’re living it. We’re hopeful the community will come together in support of Measure D and provide a reliable local funding source, so we can make a measurable impact on our transportation needs. Let’s invest in our local transportation network and get Santa Cruz County moving.

*Don Lane and Zach Friend are chair and vice chair of the Regional Transportation Commission.*
District Director’s Report
A quarterly publication for our transportation partners

Vista Points Project Enhances Livability

Four granite mosaics and an inlaid picnic table—all designed by Caltrans Landscape Architecture—were recently installed at the following District 5 vista points:

- (SB) SR154, Rancho Cielo
- (SB) US 101, Arroyo Hondo
- (MON) SR 1, Julia Pfeiffer Burns

Caltrans produced the initial artwork for the life-sized animal mosaics. The fabricator’s artist then transformed the concepts into computerized drawings used to water-jet cut the multi-colored stone pieces. The $700,000 project installed interpretive elements at seven vista points in four counties. It also featured 40 porcelain enamel displays on natural stone boulders and free standing stone-veneer walls. The exhibits inform the public on local history, cultural importance and unique area natural resources.

Continued on back

Latest Mile Marker Released

The 2016 second quarter Mile Marker is now available online. This report provides a transparent, plain-language accounting of Caltrans’ performance. The latest edition features: how the new Asset Management has directed $250 million to key projects, new elements in two of the Department’s largest funding sources, and how value analysis has saved billions of dollars on hundreds of projects since 2000.

Other topics include an innovative design in an iconic San Francisco parkway protecting the environment, and how California motorists may soon benefit from wireless technology to estimate their travel times. More information: http://www.dot.ca.gov/milemarker/docs/2016/MileMarker_v3Iss2_final.pdf.

Input Sought on SR 68 Plan

The Transportation Agency for Monterey County’s SR 68 Scenic Highway Plan is under way and gathering input on proposed transportation improvements and wildlife connectivity along the highway between Salinas and the Monterey Peninsula.

The plan will analyze current and future travel patterns along the corridor, develop a preferred corridor concept and identify sustainable operational and capacity improvements for the next 20 years.

The proposed improvements include a roundabout; bypass; bicycle, pedestrian and transit facilities; advanced traffic management system; and systemic safety evaluation. The comprehensive study will also incorporate performance-based planning and programming, a benefit/cost analysis, and extensive public outreach. The second public workshop is planned for later this year.

The planning effort is funded by a Caltrans Sustainable Transportation Planning Grant and is scheduled for completion in 2017. More information: http://www.sr68sceniccorridorstudy.com/.

Please Submit Maintenance Service Requests at the Following Link: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/maint/msrsubmit/
Vista Project continued

To ensure interpretive accuracy, Caltrans conducted extensive stakeholder outreach to tribal representatives, historians, biologists, and various local agencies. More than 300 photographers, artists, map makers and museum groups enthusiastically donated images to the project either for free or minimal costs.

Other vista point project locations:
- (SLO) SR 1, San Simeon Bay
- (SLO) SR 1, Piedras Blancas
- (MON) SR 1, Big Creek
- (SCR) SR 1, La Selva

Sustainable Freight Plan

The California Sustainable Freight Action Plan features a long-term 2050 vision and guiding principles to improve the freight system’s efficiency while reducing pollution and enhancing the state’s competitiveness in goods movement. The plan’s key goals include the following:
- Improve freight system efficiency 25 percent by 2030
- Deploy 100,000 plus zero-emission vehicles/equipment and maximize near zero-limits by 2020
- Foster future economic growth for freight and goods movement

The draft plan is available online. Public comments are due to Caltrans by July 6, 2016. More information:

Social Media Connections

District 5 posts daily to Facebook and has 1,500 plus likes, so far. We tweet real time traffic/roadwork information daily with 1,000 followers. Check us out on Twitter, Facebook and You Tube.

Sustainable Cocoon Planter Saves Water

Innovative technology increases efficiency and minimizes impacts

Caltrans is experimenting with alternative planting methods in remote sites and difficult terrain to reduce water use and planting costs. So far, the District has installed 30 plants using a self-irrigating system called Cocoons along Highway 46 east of the Estrella River in San Luis Obispo County. An additional 30 will soon be placed along Highway 1 near Post Ranch in Monterey County.

The Cocoon produces independent, strong trees, which do not rely on external irrigation and can survive harsh conditions, according to the Land Life Company. Mycorrhizal fungi are added to the soil surrounding a plant’s roots, increasing the surface absorbing area from 100 to 1,000 times while improving access to soil moisture and nutrients. The Cocoon is 100 percent biodegradable and requires no follow-up irrigation or maintenance after planting.

The planters cost $9 each and annually save about 50 gallons of water per plant. They last underground up to three years depending upon soil type and area conditions—the timeframe it will take to determine how well the product performs in establishing plants.

Statewide, Landscape Architecture is committed to finding alternative ways to reduce water use while meeting permit requirements. Reducing labor costs and materials related to irrigation watering systems helps sustain our planting projects. Increasing efficiency and minimizing environmental impacts with innovative techniques also helps the Department meet its mission, vision and goals. More information on Caltrans’ water conservation efforts:
http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/16_la_design/water_conserv/
## 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>Project Manager (Resident Engineer)</th>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<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 Mcaffigan 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>Doug Hessing (KB)</td>
<td>Granite Rock Company, San Jose, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Monterey-Santa Cruz ADA (0R5104)</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>Kathy DiGrazia (HB)</td>
<td>Pacific Infrastructure, Vacaville, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<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>May 11, 2016-Summer 2017</td>
<td>$6.2 Million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Doug Hessing (DP)</td>
<td>Granite Construction Inc. of Watsonville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Hwy. 129 Curve Realignment (0T5404)</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-Spring 2017</td>
<td>$5 Million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Doug Hessing (KB)</td>
<td>Graniterock Company, Watsonville, CA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS (Cont’d.)

<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>Project Manager (Resident Engineer)</th>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hwy. 152 Accessible Pedestrian Signals (1G2804)</td>
<td>14 intersections in Santa Cruz County</td>
<td>Install accessible pedestrian signals</td>
<td>Fall, 2016</td>
<td>$1.3 Million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Kathy DiGrazia (LB)</td>
<td>PTM General Engineering Services, Inc. Riverside, CA</td>
<td>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>
<tr>
<td>Hwy. 152 Centerline Rumble Strip (1G4004)</td>
<td>In Santa Cruz County from the Casserly/Carlton Rd. Intersection to the SCr/SCI County line</td>
<td>Open grade overlay and metal beam guardrail upgrade</td>
<td>Summer 2016</td>
<td>$9.6 Million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Doug Hessing (TBD)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Project bids opened on July 19—contract award expected in August.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## PROJECTS IN DEVELOPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Construction Timeline</th>
<th>Estimated Construction Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hwy. 129/Carlton Rd Intersection Improvements (1F350)</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>Doug Hessing</td>
<td>Phase I</td>
<td>On schedule and in design phase.</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>Kathy DiGrazia</td>
<td>PS&amp;E/ROW</td>
<td>Project Report and Environmental Document approved in February 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROGRAMMED/FUNDED SHOPP PROJECTS in Santa Cruz County

July 2016 Semi-Annual List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Post Miles</th>
<th>EA Project Identifier</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Current Project Phase</th>
<th>Ready To List (Target)</th>
<th>Project Manager Phone #</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Cost ($1,000)</th>
<th>CON/RW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.8/18.7</td>
<td>0Q590 0500000317</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>At and near Boulder Creek at various locations, from 0.9 mile south of Glengarry Road to 0.2 mile north of McCalligan Mill Road. Pollution source control.</td>
<td>Hey 9 Source Control</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>5/13/2014(A)</td>
<td>Doug Hessing 805-549-3386</td>
<td><a href="mailto:doug.hessing@dot.ca.gov">doug.hessing@dot.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>$2,000 Award/$46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.2/37.4</td>
<td>1C860 0513000004</td>
<td>2436</td>
<td>Near the city of Santa Cruz, from north of Western Avenue to the San Mateo County line. Rehabilitate pavement. <em>(Note: Includes work from 05-1C310)</em></td>
<td>Santa Cruz 1 North CAPM</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>6/4/2014(A)</td>
<td>Doug Hessing 805-549-3386</td>
<td><a href="mailto:doug.hessing@dot.ca.gov">doug.hessing@dot.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>$10,951 Award/$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Programmed in 13/14 FY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Post Miles</th>
<th>EA Project Identifier</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Current Project Phase</th>
<th>Ready To List (Target)</th>
<th>Project Manager Phone #</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Cost ($1,000)</th>
<th>CON/RW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VAR</td>
<td>VAR</td>
<td>0R510 0500000363</td>
<td>2235</td>
<td>In Monterey and Santa Cruz counties at various locations on Routes 1, 9, 68, and 218. Upgrade pedestrian curb ramps. <em>(Project in SCr; some work in MON)</em></td>
<td>Monterey - Santa Cruz ADA</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>4/2/2015(A)</td>
<td>Kathy DiGrazia 805-542-4718</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kathy.digrazia@dot.ca.gov">kathy.digrazia@dot.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>$1,226 Award/$300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.9/17.1</td>
<td>1A870 0512000004</td>
<td>2341</td>
<td>In the city of Santa Cruz, from the northbound on-ramp from southbound Route 17 to the northbound off-ramp to Ocean Street. Restripe and widen shoulders.</td>
<td>Santa Cruz 1/17 Shoulder Widening</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>5/22/2015(A)</td>
<td>Luis Duazo 805-542-4678</td>
<td><a href="mailto:luis.duazo@dot.ca.gov">luis.duazo@dot.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>$1,279 Award/$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>9.5/10.0</td>
<td>0T540 0500000857</td>
<td>2285</td>
<td>In Santa Cruz County, west of Chittenden Road. Improve roadway alignment.</td>
<td>Hey 129 Realignment</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>4/1/2015(A)</td>
<td>Doug Hessing 805-549-3386</td>
<td><a href="mailto:doug.hessing@dot.ca.gov">doug.hessing@dot.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>$5,456 Award/$101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR</td>
<td>VAR</td>
<td>1G190 0514000123</td>
<td>2589</td>
<td>In Santa Barbara, Monterey, San Benito, San Luis Obispo and Santa Cruz counties at various locations. Replace overhead signs with retro-reflective sheeting. <em>(Project in SB; some work in MON)</em></td>
<td>Replace Overhead Signs</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>5/26/2015(A)</td>
<td>Aaron Henkel 805-549-3084</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aaron.henkel@dot.ca.gov">aaron.henkel@dot.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>$1,871 Award/$5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR</td>
<td>VAR</td>
<td>0J490 0514000120</td>
<td>4900</td>
<td>In Santa Barbara, Monterey, San Benito, San Luis Obispo counties at various locations. Upgrade highway signs and lighting. <em>(Project in SB; some work in MON)</em></td>
<td>Exit Retrofit Signs</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>5/12/2015(A)</td>
<td>Lisa Lowerison 805-542-4764</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lisa.lowerison@dot.ca.gov">lisa.lowerison@dot.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>$6,576 Award/$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR</td>
<td>VAR</td>
<td>1G280 0514000134</td>
<td>2592</td>
<td>In Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo, Monterey, and Santa Cruz counties at various intersections. Upgrade signalized intersections to include Accessible Pedestrian System (APS) push buttons and countdown pedestrian heads. <em>(Project in SB; some work in SCr)</em></td>
<td>Accelerated APS</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>6/16/2015(A)</td>
<td>Kathy DiGrazia 805-542-4718</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kathy.digrazia@dot.ca.gov">kathy.digrazia@dot.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>$1,251 Award/$20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Programmed in 14/15 FY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Post Miles</th>
<th>EA Project Identifier</th>
<th>PPNO</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Current Project Phase</th>
<th>Ready To List (Target)</th>
<th>Project Manager Phone #</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Cost ($1,000)</th>
<th>CON/RW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.7/1.4</td>
<td>OQ600 0500002090</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>In Santa Cruz, from 0.7 mile north of Route 1/17 Separation to Buell Park Undercrossing. Storm water mitigation.</td>
<td>Hey 17 Storm Water Mitigation</td>
<td>PS&amp;E/RW</td>
<td>5/2/2016(A)</td>
<td>Doug Hessing 805-549-3386</td>
<td><a href="mailto:doug.hessing@dot.ca.gov">doug.hessing@dot.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>$8,543/$37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# PROGRAMMED/FUNDED SHOPP PROJECTS in Santa Cruz County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Contact Person</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Public Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>R7.2/17.4</td>
<td>1C100 0512000074</td>
<td>2368 In and near the city of Santa Cruz, on Route 1, also on Route 17 (PM 0.963) at various locations. Construct roadside paving, access gates, and relocate facilities.</td>
<td>Santa Cruz Worker Safety</td>
<td>PS&amp;E/RW</td>
<td>6/15/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.3/9.4</td>
<td>0T980 0500002044</td>
<td>2311 Near Scotts Valley, from south of Sugarloaf Road to 0.1 mile south of Laurel Road. Shoulder widening and concrete guardrail.</td>
<td>Hey 17 Shoulder Widening and Concrete Guardrail</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>6/25/2015(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 17</td>
<td>VAR</td>
<td>1H200 0516000036</td>
<td>N/A In Santa Cruz County at various locations on Routes 1 &amp; 17. Replace/repair failed drainage systems at various locations.</td>
<td>Repair Failed Drainage Systems</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>R7.8/9.5</td>
<td>1G800 0515000107</td>
<td>2616 In and near the city of Santa Cruz and Scotts Valley on Routes 17 at various locations; also in Monterey County on Route 101 in Salinas (PM 85.7/R89.8). Drought conservation improvements.</td>
<td>Upgrade Irrigation Systems for Drought Conservation</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>1.8/9.5</td>
<td>1F030 0513000037</td>
<td>2476 Near Watsonville, from east of Lakeview Road to west of Old Chittenden Road; also from the Santa Cruz/San Benito County line to School Road (PM 0.0/0.4). Place open graded friction pavement and upgrade guardrail.</td>
<td>129 Open Grade Overlay and MBGR Upgrade</td>
<td>PS&amp;E/RW</td>
<td>12/15/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>3.7/8.3</td>
<td>1G400 0515000009</td>
<td>2598 Near Watsonville, from the Casasady/Carlton Road intersection to the Santa Clara County line. Construct rumble strip and place pavement striping and marking.</td>
<td>SCI 152 Centerline Rumble Strip</td>
<td>PS&amp;E/RW</td>
<td>5/6/2016(A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.9/4.2</td>
<td>1H700 0516000143</td>
<td>In Santa Cruz County on Route 1 at Buena Vista Undercrossing. Repair failed drainage system and install erosion control measures.</td>
<td>Buena Vista Drainage Repair</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon, SCR, SBT, Var</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>1G910 0515000136</td>
<td>N/A In Monterey, Santa Cruz and San Benito Counties, on various routes at various locations. Signs.</td>
<td>North District One Way Signs</td>
<td>PS&amp;E/RW</td>
<td>12/20/2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Programmed in 16/17 FY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Contact Person</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Public Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>3.9/4.2</td>
<td>1G910 0515000136</td>
<td>N/A In Monterey, Santa Cruz and San Benito Counties, on various routes at various locations.</td>
<td>North District One Way Signs</td>
<td>PS&amp;E/RW</td>
<td>12/20/2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Programmed in 17/18 FY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Contact Person</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Public Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.2/17.5</td>
<td>1C670 0512000194</td>
<td>2422 Near the city of Santa Cruz, from southbound exit ramp to Route 1 to entrance ramp from Pasatiempo Drive. Widen shoulder and construct retaining wall.</td>
<td>Pasatiempo Shoulder Widening</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>4/2/2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** For general information about the SHOPP program contact Cindy Simeroth at (805) 549-3788 or cindy.simeroth@dot.ca.gov

*List is provided in January and July of each year.*
# PROGRAMMED/FUNDED SHOPP PROJECTS in Santa Cruz County

**NOTE:** For general information about the SHOPP program, contact Cindy Simeroth at (805) 549-3788 or cindy.simeroth@dot.ca.gov

*List is provided in January and July of each year.*

### Programmed in 18/19

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>9</td>
<td>22.1/23.8</td>
<td>1C650</td>
<td>0512000185</td>
<td>2418</td>
<td>In Castle Rock State Park, from 5 miles south to 3.3 miles south of Route 35. Widen shoulders, replace guardrail and construct centerline rumble strips.</td>
<td>Hey 9 Shoulder Widening, Guardrail Upgrades, and Center Rumble Strips</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>6/28/2018</td>
<td>Doug Hessing 805-549-3386</td>
<td><a href="mailto:doug.hessing@dot.ca.gov">doug.hessing@dot.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>$7,658/$10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>129</td>
<td>3.0/3.5</td>
<td>1F350</td>
<td>0513000103</td>
<td>2506</td>
<td>Near Watsonville, realign Carlton Road. Construct a new intersection and a left-turn channelization.</td>
<td>Hey 129/Carlton Rd. Accel and Decel Lanes</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>3/20/2018</td>
<td>Doug Hessing 805-549-3386</td>
<td><a href="mailto:doug.hessing@dot.ca.gov">doug.hessing@dot.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>$2,700/$135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.7/1.4</td>
<td>00601</td>
<td>0514000145</td>
<td>1989Y</td>
<td>In Santa Cruz, from 0.7 mile north of Route 1/17 Separation to Beulah Park Undercrossing. Landscape mitigation for PPNO 1989.</td>
<td>Hey 17 Source Control Landscape Split</td>
<td>PS&amp;E/RW</td>
<td>3/5/2018</td>
<td>Doug Hessing 805-549-3386</td>
<td><a href="mailto:doug.hessing@dot.ca.gov">doug.hessing@dot.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>$507/$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Programmed in 19/20

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<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>9</td>
<td>0.1/7.5</td>
<td>1F920</td>
<td>0514000075</td>
<td>2569</td>
<td>In and near the city of Santa Cruz, from Route 1 to north of Fall Creek Drive. Stormwater improvements.</td>
<td>SCR 9 South Drainage and Erosion Control Improvements</td>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td>5/4/2020</td>
<td>Doug Hessing 805-549-3386</td>
<td><a href="mailto:doug.hessing@dot.ca.gov">doug.hessing@dot.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>$2,356/$214</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(A) = Actual date RTL was achieved.

**Minor A Projects**

Note: Construction Award or Vote costs are actuals; otherwise Construction costs are estimates.
---Public Hearing Scheduled for 9:15 a.m.---

AGENDA: September 1, 2016

TO: Regional Transportation Commission (RTC)

FROM: Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner

RE: Adoption of 2016 Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG)

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC):

1. Hold a public hearing to receive comments on proposed projects for Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG) funds and consider any written comments received;

2. Consider staff, Bicycle Committee, Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&DTAC), and Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC) project recommendations;

3. Adopt a resolution (Attachment 1) to program approximately $7 million in Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG) funds in the 2016 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), as recommended by staff (Attachment 2); and amend the RTC Budget and Work Program to exchange the federal STBG funds for state funds (RSTPX) for those projects that will be implemented within the next twelve months, as shown in Attachment 3 and apply the funds to the corresponding RTC projects in the RTC budget, as applicable; and

4. Request that the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) incorporate these funding actions into the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP), as applicable.

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 selecting projects to receive certain state and federal funds. This includes the region’s share of Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG) funds from the federal transportation act (FAST Act) –previously known as the Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP).

STBG funds can be used on a variety of projects, as outlined in the federal transportation act. These include: highway, local streets and roads, transit and paratransit capital, bicycle, pedestrian, rail, carpool, safety, and bridge projects that are consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Funds cannot be used for general operations or maintenance. The RTC selects projects to receive funds through a competitive application process based on criteria approved by the RTC and state and federal requirements. The RTC also considers input received from RTC’s advisory
committees and during a public hearing. Approved projects are programmed in the RTC’s Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP).

Approximately $7 million of the region’s share of Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG) funds are available for programming to new projects through FY17/18. This is the balance of the region’s FY15/16-17/18 shares remaining after subtracting $224,813 per year that the County of Santa Cruz receives directly from the state (approximately $675,000 over three years) and reserving funds that may be needed to prevent delays through FY17/18 to projects previously programmed State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds. Due to the volatility of state gasoline taxes, the California Transportation Commission (CTC) recently deleted over $750 million in STIP projects statewide and delayed most other projects.

In May 2016 the RTC issued a call for projects for the available STBG funds, with applications due July 14, 2016. The Bicycle Committee, Elderly/Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E/DTAC), and Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC) reviewed proposals for STBG funds at their August 2016 meetings.

**DISCUSSION**

The RTC received applications for 22 projects requesting $13.7 million in Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG) funds. While all of the projects are consistent with RTC approved goals, policies, and targets for improving the Santa Cruz County transportation system, given limited funds, it is not feasible to fund all of the projects. Attachments 2 and 4 summarize the projects that were submitted, as well as staff recommendations. Project applications, which provide expanded project descriptions, maps, support letters and other information submitted by applicants, are online at: [http://sccrtc.org/funding-planning/project-funding/](http://sccrtc.org/funding-planning/project-funding/).

**Project Evaluation**

The RTC selects projects to receive STBG funds on a competitive basis; funds cannot be suballocated based on a formula distribution. While $7 million is a significant amount of funding, Santa Cruz County transportation agencies have identified an immediate backlog of over $500 million needed to preserve existing infrastructure, fill gaps in the transportation network, reduce injury and fatal collisions, and meet regional, state, federal, and local mandates. Through 2035 the total funding deficit increases to over $2 billion, as discussed in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Additionally, due to a drop in gas tax revenues available for projects, this is the first time the RTC has programmed state or federal funds to projects since 2013. Given the very limited amount of funding available, it is important to ensure that funds are directed to projects that maximize improvements to the region’s multimodal transportation network. Consistent with federal and state requirements, in May 2016, the RTC approved several factors to be considered when evaluating projects for this year’s STBG program. The RTC directed staff to give the highest priority to projects that address one or more of the first four criteria.

1. **Number of people served by project**
2. **Safety**
3. **Preservation of existing infrastructure**
4. **Reduce vehicle miles traveled, air pollution, greenhouse gas emissions and/or fuel consumption**
5. **Improve access for all modes, especially to and within key destinations**
6. Change in travel times and travel time reliability and efficiency of the transportation system, including transit
7. Change in passenger, freight and goods movement efficiency
8. Change in disparities in safety and access for people who are transportation disadvantaged due to age, income, disability or minority status
9. Inclusion in the 2014 RTP “constrained” project list, which implements the SB375-mandated Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS)
10. Consistency with the Monterey Bay Area Complete Streets Guidebook
11. Public engagement, in identification of the project as a priority and during project planning and implementation
12. Funding (if all other funding is secured and amount of match)
13. Deliverability (if there are barriers to project schedules)

Recommendations

Staff recommends that the RTC program $7 million in Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG) funds to projects as shown in Attachment 2. The staff recommendation takes into consideration benefits identified by project sponsors in the applications (summarized in Attachment 4). Consistent with the RTC-approved evaluation criteria noted above, the staff recommendations considered the degree to which projects help achieve regional goals and targets. **Staff recommends that the RTC focus these limited funds to projects that serve the greatest number of users, have demonstrated safety needs, preserve existing transportation infrastructure and programs, and/or would do the most to reduce the number of miles driven and associated air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions.** For roadway system preservation projects, staff also considered the extent of which roadways serve multiple modes (e.g. also serve buses, bicyclists and/or pedestrians).

The RTC’s Bicycle, Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC) and Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC) unanimously agreed with staff recommendations with the following changes:

- The Bicycle Committee recommends that the RTC also approve $240,000 for the City of Santa Cruz’s Pacific Avenue Sidewalk project.
- The ITAC recommends the County of Santa Cruz be given the option to re-spread funds (approximately $2 million) recommended for its projects. **Subsequently, the County Public Works Department informed staff that they do not have specific recommendations for re-spreading funds.**
- The E&D TAC recommends that in future grant cycles, the RTC also add criteria which would give additional consideration to projects [roadways] in rural areas where they are the only option for accessing that area.

Staff generally recommends maximizing the number of projects funded, by partially funding several projects. For some projects, project sponsors have indicated that they may need to reduce the project scope to match reduced funding. Projects proposed for funds this grant cycle will initiate work by June 2018. In most instances project sponsors will be using matching funds to initiate capital projects, with the STBG funds used for the construction phase.
Exchange of Federal Funds for State Funds

State law allows RTC to exchange its share of these federal funds for state funds. State Exchange funds are subject to fewer requirements and therefore can be useful for expediting project delivery. Through the RTC’s Budget, the RTC allocates available state RSTPX funds to projects selected to receive STBG/RSTP funds that will initiate STBG-funded phases of the project in that fiscal year. Projects that will begin STBG-funded work by June 2017 would be included in the FY16/17 RTC budget. Projects that will begin work after June 2017 could be considered for exchange funds in future budgets (FY17/18).

Public Hearing

Consistent with RTC Rules and Regulations, a public hearing has been scheduled for 9:15 a.m. to receive public input on the proposed program of projects. Public notices have been posted in major newspapers and a news release on the hearing was sent to local media and interested parties. Written comments received by 12:00 p.m. on August 31, 2016 will be distributed at the meeting.

Staff recommends that the RTC hold a public hearing, consider advisory committee recommendations, and adopt a resolution (Attachment 1) to program approximately $7 million in Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG) funds in the 2016 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), as recommended by staff (Attachment 2). Staff recommends that the RTC amend the RTC Budget and Work Program to exchange state funds (RSTPX) for federal STBG funds for those projects that will be implemented by June 2017, as shown in Attachment 3 and apply the approved funds to the corresponding RTC projects in the RTC budget. The proposed budget amendment also reflects the carryover of balances from the FY15/16 budget for previously approved projects.

Projects which are regionally significant or are approved for federal funds must also be included in the federal programming document, the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) which is adopted by the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG). Staff recommends that the RTC request that AMBAG incorporate these funding actions into the MTIP, as appropriate.

SUMMARY

Approximately $7 million in Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG) funds are available for programming. After holding a public hearing and considering input from the RTC committees, staff recommends that the RTC approve programming these funds to projects as shown on Attachment 2.

Attachments:
1. Resolution
2. Recommendations for 2016 STBG Grant Cycle
3. Proposed Budget Amendment
4. Summary of Project Benefits
RESOLUTION NO.

Adopted by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
on the date of September 1, 2016
on the motion of Commissioner
duly seconded by Commissioner

A RESOLUTION AMENDING THE
2016 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
FOR SANTA CRUZ COUNTY TO
PROGRAM SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM (STBG) FUNDS
AND AMENDING THE FISCAL YEAR (FY) 2016/17 BUDGET AND WORK PROGRAM TO ALLOCATE
FEDERAL APPORTIONMENT EXCHANGE PROGRAM (RSTPX) FUNDS

WHEREAS, the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) prepared
the 2016 Regional Transportation Improvement Program consistent with the 2014 Santa Cruz
County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and state law, and in consultation and cooperation
with local project sponsors and Caltrans District 5;

WHEREAS, Santa Cruz County has a balance of $7 million from the region's share of
federal Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG) funds available for programming
through FY17/18; and

WHEREAS, the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission has sufficient
Federal Apportionment Exchange Program (RSTPX) state funds available to trade for federal
STBG funds for projects that can be implemented in FY16/17; and

WHEREAS, the Commission is responsible for programming federal STBG funds and
allocating exchange funds received from Caltrans to project sponsors in Santa Cruz County
whose projects participate in the exchange program;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION:

1. The 2016 Regional Transportation Improvement Program for Santa Cruz County is
   hereby amended to:

   a. Program Santa Cruz County's regional apportionment of Surface Transportation
      Block Grant Program (STBG) funds to projects as shown in Exhibit A; and
   b. Exchange these federal funds for state RSTPX funds for projects that will be
      implemented in FY16/17 as shown in Exhibit B.

2. As projects are designed, projects with bicycle and/or pedestrian components shall
   undergo review by the RTC's Bicycle Committee and/or Elderly and Disabled
   Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC) and project sponsors shall incorporate
   complete streets components where feasible and/or appropriate.

3. The FY 16/17 RTC Budget is hereby amended to include new Exchange allocations and
   carryover projects previously programmed, as shown on Exhibit B, and to apply the new
   exchange allocations for RTC projects to the corresponding projects within the RTC
budget.

4. The Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments is hereby requested to incorporate these amendments into the *Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP)*.

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

---

Don Lane, Chair  

George Dondero, Secretary

**Distribution:** AMBAG, Project Sponsors, RTIP file
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Funds Requested</th>
<th>RTC Staff &amp; Committee Recommendations</th>
<th>RTC Staff Comments, Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Aptos Village Phase 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>Construct new traffic signals and railroad crossings. Includes road widening, center turn lane, sidewalks (750 feet), bike lanes, drainage infrastructure, new street (Parade St), and pavement overlay of Soquel Dr (Spreckels to Trout Gulch) and Aptos Creek Rd.</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
<td>High use, major arterial (Soquel Dr), multi-modal, community revitalization project. Includes improved safety and access for bikes, pedestrians, and transit riders; system preservation. RTC has previously awarded $690k RSTPX to project. Condition: Include bike parking racks as part of project. Consider transit prioritization for signal. At county's request, scope modified to include Phase 1 and funds may be used on either phase 1 or 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Branciforte Drive Chip Seal</td>
<td>Asphalt Digouts, Chip Seal, and restriping of 0.62 miles of Branciforte Drive from Granite Creek to PM 2.4.</td>
<td>$197,000</td>
<td>$174,000</td>
<td>$174,000</td>
<td>Modest traffic volumes providing alternate route between Scotts Valley and Santa Cruz. Some bicyclist use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Casserly Rd at Spring Hills Creek Bridge Replacement</td>
<td>Replace a deteriorating bridge on Casserly Road over Spring Hills Creek near the intersection of Smith Road (approx. 4 miles north of Watsonville city limits)</td>
<td>$752,281</td>
<td>$307,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Bridge does need to be replaced, but due to very low traffic volumes (500 per day) it is less competitive for regional funds. RTC has previously awarded $125k STIP to project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Empire Grade Chip Seal</td>
<td>Asphalt Digout, Chip Seal, and restriping of 0.53 miles of Empire Grade from PM13.86 to PM14.38.</td>
<td>$137,000</td>
<td>$121,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Low use compared to other projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Glen Arbor Road Recycle, Overlay, &amp; Chip Seal</td>
<td>Pavement Recycling, Asphalt Overlay, Chip Seal, and restriping 0.52 miles of Glen Arbor Road from Hwy 9 at bridge to Quail Hollow Rd. The project will also include a subdrain at a point where a natural spring is causing subgrade destabilization.</td>
<td>$467,000</td>
<td>$413,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>Moderate traffic volumes. Primary roadway for Ben Lomond residents, bus route and used by bicyclists. Condition: Consider wider shoulders, bike sharrows and/or &quot;share the road&quot; signs given neighborhood character.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Granite Creek Road Recycle &amp; Overlay</td>
<td>Pavement Recycling, Asphalt Overlay, and restriping of 1.85 miles of Granite Creek Road from Scotts Valley city limits to PM 0.56.</td>
<td>$1,038,000</td>
<td>$919,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>Modest traffic volumes, popular with bicyclists. Partially fund construction, project can be scaled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Seacliff Village Streetscape Project</td>
<td>Construct sidewalks, bike lanes, bus stops, central plaza, electrical vehicle charging stations, on street parking, landscaping, and drainage infrastructure.</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$425,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>A strong, complete streets project, however Aptos Village more regionally significant. RTC has previously awarded $587k RSTPX, plus TDA for project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Upper East Zayante Road Chip Seal</td>
<td>Asphalt Digouts, Chip Seal, and restriping of 3.74 miles of Upper East Zayante Road from Summit Road to East Zayante Road.</td>
<td>$649,000</td>
<td>$575,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Very low use compared to other projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>City of Santa Cruz/Caltrans</td>
<td>State Routes 1/9 Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>Adds lanes to the Highway 1 and 9 intersection to improve operations and safety. The intersection will be upgraded to include standard lane widths, transitions, shoulders, bike lanes, lighting, sidewalks and access ramps.</td>
<td>$7,850,000</td>
<td>$1,770,600</td>
<td>$950,000</td>
<td>Very high use, multimodal, regionally significant project. Some of bike/ped components of project were constructed earlier as the Highway 1 undercrossing. RTC has previously awarded $1,329,000 STIP to project. Project requires Caltrans oversight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Pacific Avenue Sidewalk</td>
<td>Construct new sidewalk and crossing on Pacific Avenue between Front Street and 55 Front St (170 ft near 2nd St/Wharf), including installation of a new accessible crossing at Front and Pacific.</td>
<td>$317,690</td>
<td>$285,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>City's 4th priority. Serves fewer people, sidewalk available on one side of road - unclear would increase walking rates. Low collision rate. Could consider for TDA in future. City requires min. STBG of $240k to implement otherwise project would be delayed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>Funds Requested</td>
<td>RTC Staff &amp; Committee Recommendations</td>
<td>RTC Staff Comments, Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>River Street Pavement Rehabilitation between Water Street and Potrero Street</td>
<td>Pavement rehabilitation of River Street between Water Street and Potrero Street.</td>
<td>$841,733</td>
<td>$745,186</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Lower priority for city and meets fewer evaluation criteria than other projects in City of Santa Cruz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Water Street Pavement Rehabilitation between North Branciforte Avenue and Ocean Street</td>
<td>Pavement rehabilitation of Water Street between North Branciforte Avenue and Ocean Street.</td>
<td>$1,453,769</td>
<td>$1,287,022</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>Important multimodal corridor, including several transit routes. Consider reducing length of project. <strong>Condition:</strong> Add bicycle and pedestrian treatments at intersections, especially at Branciforte to reduce conflicts between motorized and non-motorized users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>City of Scotts Valley</td>
<td>Glen Canyon Road/Green Hills Road/S. Navarra Drive Bike Corridor and Roadway Preservation</td>
<td>Repave two roads, add bike lanes, and signage. Includes road markings like sharrows and green lane treatments to assist commuters, students, and recreational bikers.</td>
<td>$1,265,703</td>
<td>$1,114,293</td>
<td>$711,000</td>
<td>Moderate traffic volumes, complete streets project. City may reduce scope to Green Hills Road and reduced section of Glen Canyon if partially funded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Watsonville</td>
<td>Green Valley Road Reconstruction from Struve Slough to Freedom Boulevard</td>
<td>Reconstruct existing roadway and bike lanes and install pedestrian improvements</td>
<td>$1,198,000</td>
<td>$1,047,000</td>
<td>$795,000</td>
<td>Significant traffic volumes and sidewalk upgrades needed. <strong>Condition:</strong> increase sidewalk width. Consistent with Complete Streets Guidebook should ideally be 6 feet. City would have to reduce existing roadway lane widths in order to provide wider sidewalks due to existing guardrails outside of new sidewalk location; may repave roadway instead of reconstruction or may reduce limits of reconstruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Watsonville</td>
<td>Freedom Boulevard Plan Line</td>
<td>Preparation of a plan line for Freedom Boulevard between Green Valley Road and Buena Vista Drive.</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>$141,000</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>Important planning effort to support all modes on a highly traveled - almost regionally significant- arterial. Serves transportation disadvantaged and is a transit corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Freeway Service Patrol: Highway 1 and Highway 17</td>
<td>Peak period tow trucks dedicated to patrolling highways and assisting disabled vehicles, removing incidents/collisions with CHP, and clearing obstacles impeding traffic flow.</td>
<td>$300K/year</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>Serves peak period travelers on Hwy 1 and Hwy 17; high cost/effectiveness rating. Staff recommendation funds only 1 year of program, rather than 2. $150k STIP programmed in FY17/18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Cruz511 TDM and Traveler Information Program</td>
<td>Cruz511 provides services and information about availability and benefits of alternative transportation modes, including sharing rides, transit, walking, bicycling, telecommuting, alternative work schedules, alternative fuel vehicles, park-n-ride lots and trip planning using various modes, and also provides traveler information services on traffic conditions, incidents, road and lane closures, etc. Information provided via website and traveler help desk available for personalized assistance by email or phone (429-POOL).</td>
<td>$313k/year; 2 years $626k</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>Partial funding for continued traveler assistance programs with focus on electronic resources and outreach to reduce cost. Work with partner agencies such as MTC and TAMC on developing methods to continue to provide the services in a ways that takes advantage of more recently technologies and alternatives that could reduce costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>Funds Requested</td>
<td>RTC Staff &amp; Committee Recommendations</td>
<td>RTC Staff Comments, Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Caltrans/SCCRTC</td>
<td>Hwy 1 Corridor/HOV and Soquel-41st Aux Tiered Environmental Document</td>
<td>Funds for the Tier 1 (HOV) program-level and Tier 2 Soquel-41st Ave Aux Lanes environmental document. Additional funds needs to update technical studies &amp; respond to comments on Draft EIR</td>
<td>$920,000</td>
<td>$830,000</td>
<td>$13.2M; $600M total project cost</td>
<td>Most heavily used transportation facility in Santa Cruz County. Provides long term vision for the corridor, upgrades design standards and adds new bicycle and pedestrian facilities. STBG is only source available to complete environmental work/respond to comments received on draft environmental. $13.2M CMAQ, RSTP, and STIP previously approved. <strong>Condition:</strong> Reduce contingency and work closely with Caltrans, FHWA, and consultant to limit extent of work to essential mandated items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>County of SC with RTC &amp; FHWA-CFL</td>
<td>Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail - North Coast Rail Trail Phase 2 - (environmental and preliminary engineering)</td>
<td>Develop the preliminary engineering and environmental compliance for 2.1 miles of Class 1, 8 to 12 foot wide multi-use bicycle/pedestrian paved path with decomposed granite shoulders within the rail line right of way along the north coast of Santa Cruz County from Yellowbank Beach to Davenport. Project also includes preliminary engineering and environmental compliance for parking lots at Yellowbank Beach and Davenport Beach and a path from the Bonny Doon parking lot to the rail trail.</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$1M for environmental and design phase</td>
<td>Strong safety benefits. Earlier this year the RTC committed to secure $300k in order to leverage $700k in private funds and realize approx. $400k in cost savings for environmental analysis and preliminary design. Additional funds will need to be secured for future phases, including final design and construction. If RTC were to program less than $300k it would need to identify other funds for the balance of this commitment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Ecology Action (RTC sponsor)</td>
<td>Ecology Action Countywide SRTS Youth Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Education</td>
<td>EA will serve approximately 34 second grade classrooms with ‘feet on the ground’ pedestrian safety education and 24 fifth grade classrooms with bike safety education and ‘rodeos’ serving a total of 58 classrooms at 11 local schools.</td>
<td>$65,735</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>Effective program for improving safety countywide, serves transportation disadvantaged areas. RTC has funded similar programs in the past, but none for this specific effort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Bike Santa Cruz County (County HSA sponsor)</td>
<td>Open Streets Events – Watsonville, Live Oak and Scotts Valley</td>
<td>Free public events that temporarily transform roadways into parks for people to bike, walk, skate and play in a safe and festive environment by temporarily blocking automobile traffic. Open Streets events in Watsonville, Live Oak and Scotts Valley, with exact locations to be determined.</td>
<td>$107,415</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Relatively low use, unknown effect in meeting evaluation criteria/stimulating increased bicycling and walking. $50k RSTPX approved by RTC 2/7/13 for events in Watsonville and Capitola.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Santa Cruz METRO</td>
<td>3 CNG Replacement Buses</td>
<td>Replace three 1998, 40’ low-floor diesel buses with 40’ low-floor CNG buses.</td>
<td>$1,650,000</td>
<td>$1,402,500</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>Relatively low use (575/day), but consider funding one bus. METRO subsequently noted it does not have local funds available, so a minimum of $550,000 STBG may be needed for one bus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total: $13,656,601</td>
<td>$7,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### RSTP Exchange Program: 722000

**City of Watsonville**

- **Soquel Ave at Frederick St Intersection Modifications**: 188,000 (188,000) - Carried over from FY 2015-16

**City of Scotts Valley**

- **Mt. Hermon Rd/Scotts Valley Dr/Whispering Pines Dr Intersection Improvement**: 346,000 (346,000) - Carried over from FY 2015-16

**County of Santa Cruz**

- **Freedom Blvd Reconstruction (Broadis to Alta Vista Ave)**: 587,000 (587,000) - Carried over from FY 2015-16

**City of Capitola**

- **Clares Street Traffic Calming**: 100,000 (100,000) - Carried over from FY 2015-16

**City of Santa Cruz**

- **State Park Drive Improvement**: 587,000 (587,000) - Carried over from FY 2015-16

**City of Watsonville**

- **Mt. Hermon Rd/Scotts Valley Dr/Whispering Pines Dr Intersection Improvement**: 346,000 (346,000) - Carried over from FY 2015-16

**City of Watsonville**

- **Freedom Blvd Plan Line (Green Valley to Buena Vista)**: 140,000 (140,000) - New - Exchange of STBG proposed 9/1/16

**County of Santa Cruz**

- **Aptos Village Plan Improvements - Phases 1 & 2**: 650,000 (650,000) - New - Exchange of STBG proposed 9/1/16

**Santa Cruz METRO**

- **CNG Bus Replacements**: 500,000 (500,000) - New - Exchange of STBG proposed 9/1/16

**SCCRTC**

- **Highway 1 Corridor Environmental Review**: 830,000 (830,000) - New - Exchange of STBG proposed 9/1/16

**Total**

- **Total Expenditures**: 4,438,620 (11,520,293) 7,081,673 (7,081,673)

---

**Note:**

- **Unobligated Funds**: 3,031,620 (2,162,457) (869,163)
- Reserve for STBG projects to be implemented in FY17/18
## Attachment 4
### Summary of Project Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Summary of Benefits</th>
<th>Estimated Daily Use</th>
<th>Sponsor Priority #</th>
<th>Construction/Implementation schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Aptos Village Phase 2</td>
<td>Create a pedestrian friendly environment to encourage use of the businesses and community facilities throughout the Village and the new Village Common; create new infrastructure to access the Village core area for new businesses and residences; provide multi-modal facilities; and, maintain Aptos Villages’ historical character.</td>
<td>22,000 (20k ADT + 5% bike and 5% ped)</td>
<td>Not Available (NA)</td>
<td>Summer 2017-Dec 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Branciforte Drive Chip Seal</td>
<td>Extend the life of this road so that it may continue to benefit the community.</td>
<td>4657</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Spring-Fall 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Casserly Rd at Spring Hills Creek Bridge Replacement</td>
<td>Would open up bridge to 2 lanes and remove the stop signs that had to be placed on either end of the bridge. It will also remove the possibility that the bridge may have to be completely closed down in the near future due to the failing structure.</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Spring 2018- Fall 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Empire Grade Chip Seal</td>
<td>Extend the life of this road so that it may continue to benefit the community.</td>
<td>2329</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Spring-Fall 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Glen Arbor Road Recycle, Overlay, &amp; Chip Seal</td>
<td>Extend the life of this road so that it may continue to benefit the community.</td>
<td>7720</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Spring-Fall 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Granite Creek Road Recycle &amp; Overlay</td>
<td>Extend the life of this road so that it may continue to benefit the community.</td>
<td>4,249</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Spring-Fall 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Seacliff Village Streetscape Project</td>
<td>Provide gateway to Seacliff Village and the Seacliff State Beach, improve multi-modal access to and through the Village, increase landscaping, formalize parking, and create a public plaza.</td>
<td>12k/day (10,700 ADT, plus 5% bike and 5% ped)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Summer 2017- Spring 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Upper East Zayante Road Chip Seal</td>
<td>Extend the life of this road so that it may continue to benefit the community.</td>
<td>1719</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Summer 2017-Spring 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>City of Santa Cruz/Caltrans</td>
<td>State Routes 1/9 Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>Improve access and safety, reduce congestion and bottleneck, energy use and emissions. Heavily traveled, provides access for the university, Santa Cruz west side, Harvey West Area and Downtown.</td>
<td>Over 85,000 vehicles/day</td>
<td>1 of 4</td>
<td>Spring 2017-June 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Pacific Avenue Sidewalk</td>
<td>Improve pedestrian safety and walking levels through construction of new sidewalk and an improved crossing in a highly traveled corridor. Solve conflict between pedestrians and bikes, autos, and transit vehicles and creates a safer environment for all roadway users.</td>
<td>Over 85,000 vehicles/day</td>
<td>4 of 4</td>
<td>Feb 2018-Aug 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Summary of Benefits</td>
<td>Estimated Daily Use</td>
<td>Sponsor Priority #</td>
<td>Construction/Implementation schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>River Street Pavement Rehabilitation between Water Street and Potrero Street</td>
<td>Preserves existing infrastructure and improves accessibility for a multimodal arterial for all users: auto, trucks, transit, bikes and pedestrians. The method of paving may include cold-in-place recycling which is a more sustainable paving practice.</td>
<td>10,535 ADT</td>
<td>3 of 4</td>
<td>Spring 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Water Street Pavement Rehabilitation between North Branciforte Avenue and Ocean Street</td>
<td>Preserves existing infrastructure and improves accessibility for a multimodal arterial for all users: auto, trucks, transit, bikes and pedestrians. The method of paving may include cold-in-place recycling which is a more sustainable paving practice.</td>
<td>22,184 (20,448 AADT; 1,742 transit trips)</td>
<td>2 of 4</td>
<td>Summer 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>City of Scotts Valley</td>
<td>Glen Canyon Road/Green Hills Road/S. Navarra Drive Bike Corridor and Roadway Preservation</td>
<td>Pavement preservation, increase active transportation (biking), reduce GHG and vehicle use, increase safety, enhance public health.</td>
<td>8943/day</td>
<td>1 of 1</td>
<td>August 2017-May 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Watsonville</td>
<td>Green Valley Road Reconstruction from Struve Slough to Freedom Boulevard</td>
<td>Extend service life of arterial roadway and ensure safe, drivable surface for motorists and bicyclists. Replacement of existing striping and signage shall enhance safety of motorists and bicyclists. Replacement of existing paved path with concrete curb, gutter and sidewalk and replacement of non-ADA compliant curb ramps and driveways shall improve existing pedestrian facilities and extend service life.</td>
<td>20,181 (20,100 ADT + bikes and peds)</td>
<td>1 of 2</td>
<td>Summer 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Watsonville</td>
<td>Freedom Boulevard Plan Line</td>
<td>Vehicle, bicycle, pedestrian and transit facilities within the project area are inconsistent, incomplete, outdated and/or in need of reconstruction. Some parcels are undeveloped. Preparation of a plan line that delineates the improvements supported and needed by the community would aid in City efforts to improve and develop this segment of Freedom Boulevard.</td>
<td>10,500 (at Airport Blvd) to 20,100 (at Green Valley Rd)</td>
<td>2 of 2</td>
<td>Spring 2017-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Freeway Service Patrol: Highway 1 and Highway 17</td>
<td>Reduce non-recurrent congestion, which is estimated to cause 30-50% of congestion; reduce emissions caused by idling; improve safety by reducing likelihood of secondary collisions; reduce delay.</td>
<td>Average of 3 motorist directly per day, but thousands indirectly.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>FY17/18-18/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Cruz511 TDM and Traveler Information Program</td>
<td>Reduce traffic congestion, trips, VMT, greenhouse gases and improve health and air quality. Make more efficient use of the existing transportation system by shifting SOV trips to carpool, vanpool, transit, bike and walk. Provide real-time traveler information (traffic), and info on transit, carpool, bicycle and walkways.</td>
<td>100-350/day; website has 2500-3500 unique visitors/month</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>FY17/18-18/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Summary of Benefits</td>
<td>Estimated Daily Use</td>
<td>Sponsor Priority #</td>
<td>Construction/Implementation schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Caltrans/ SCCRTC</td>
<td>Hwy 1 Corridor/HOV and Soquel-41st Aux Tiered Environmental Document</td>
<td>Analysis of options, impacts and benefits of modifying Highway 1 corridor. Reduce delay and congestion; improve travel times - especially for transit, carpools; improve pedestrian/bike access across highway. Heavily traveled - over 100,000 vehicles per day. Daily congestion results in by-pass traffic on local arterials.</td>
<td>Over 100,000 travelers/day</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Complete environmental phase in FY17/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>County of SC with RTC &amp; FHWA-CFL</td>
<td>Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail – North Coast Rail Trail Phase 2 - (environmental and preliminary engineering)</td>
<td>Provide active transportation access along the north coast of Santa Cruz County to and from Davenport, San Vicente Redwoods and BLM Coast Dairies. The benefits of this project are to improve safety of bicyclists and pedestrians by providing a safe path off of Hwy 1, reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve health by providing a safe alternative to driving, and improve bicycling and pedestrian access to schools, community centers, beaches, parks, and other recreation areas. Many residents and visitors already visit this beautiful area of the north coast with access to beaches, surfing, tidepooling, hiking and birding and this will only increase as San Vicente Redwoods and BLM Coast Dairies are open to the public.</td>
<td>800/day; 292k/year</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Fall 2016-Feb. 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Ecology Action (RTC sponsor)</td>
<td>Ecology Action Countywide SRTS Youth Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Education</td>
<td>Reduce bicycle and pedestrian crash rates; increase helmet use; reduce 'distracted' pedestrian incidents</td>
<td>1536 students</td>
<td>1 of 1</td>
<td>9/16-3/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Bike Santa Cruz County (County HSA sponsor)</td>
<td>Open Streets Events – Watsonville, Live Oak and Scotts Valley</td>
<td>Help communities achieve key sustainable transportation goals; reduce SOV trips, mitigate traffic congestion, reduce carbon emissions, and increase access and safety</td>
<td>5,000 per event; 15k total</td>
<td>1 of 1</td>
<td>Sept 2016-June 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Santa Cruz METRO</td>
<td>3 CNG Replacement Buses</td>
<td>The diesel buses are beyond their useful lifespan of 12 years, and the new CNG replacements will reduce GhG emissions, be more reliable, safer and have lower maintenance costs than the diesel buses being replaced.</td>
<td>575 for 3 buses based on systemwide avg use.</td>
<td>1 of 1</td>
<td>Spring 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Regional Transportation Commission (RTC)
FROM: George Dondero, Executive Director
RE: Roadmap for Rail Corridor Development

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) review this draft “roadmap” for rail corridor development and provide input to staff.

BACKGROUND

At the June 16 Transportation Policy Workshop (TPW), the RTC directed staff to prepare a draft “roadmap” to define how the RTC will engage key stakeholders and the community to make a decision on whether or not to pursue rail transit service on the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line, and bring that draft for consideration by the full commission. This report is submitted to the Commission as an outline that can serve to answer many of the questions that come to staff and commissioners on the future analysis of the rail corridor. This report is not proposed to be exhaustive of all possible steps or elements to be considered during the process. It is submitted to the RTC as a beginning point of discussion, and may be amended as appropriate.

DISCUSSION

Before undertaking a complete environmental review process, the Commission will need to familiarize itself with the context wherein the study will be conducted. In addition, certain assumptions will guide the process. These include:

1. November 2016 transportation ballot measure passes
2. Tax revenue begins accruing April 2017
3. Decisions are consistent with the policies, goals and targets in the RTC’s Regional Transportation Plan RTP Chapter 4
4. The RTC continues with multi-use projects currently under design so as to not lose funding allocations and deliver on community commitments

Context – Relevant Work to Consider

Several planning documents recently completed or underway will shape the approach taken to conduct the environmental study of potential uses of the rail corridor. These include the following RTC documents:
Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network Master Plan
The Master Plan was completed in 2014 after three years of extensive research, mapping, analysis and public outreach. The Plan won four planning awards from recognized professional organizations. It provides the policies, goals and objectives upon which the design work is developed. Mapping of twenty segments provides much contextual information and direction for the detailed design work to be done as each segment is funded. Design standards provide guidance on a variety of issues including regulatory framework, trail crossings and intersections, amenities, universal access, Coastal Commission accessibility standards, and user conflict strategies to name a few. A chapter on operation and maintenance is provided, as well as numerous appendices on costs, typical crossing descriptions, funding sources, and Rails with Trails supporting documents.

Rail Transit Feasibility Study
Much exploratory work was completed in the feasibility analysis of 2015. This study was limited in scope, and began a community discussion around the question of how rail transit could be developed, what kinds of service could be offered, and the magnitude of capital and operating costs involved. Various scenarios were developed, based on technology available at that time that, to test different assumptions and priorities. The RTC did not choose a preferred alternative or “plan” for future service. Rather, the study was accepted as a tool that may inform future work. It can help frame questions that were not answered in the study, points to areas that need further definition and detail, and reassesses new technologies before commitments are made to bring rail transit into the mix of options comprising our transportation infrastructure. The study concluded with a series of next steps that the RTC should pursue when considering rail transit for the county. The first step would be a thorough environmental review under CEQA and possibly NEPA. That process is estimated to cost five to seven million dollars and funds for this analysis are included in Measure D.

2014 RTP & 2040 RTP Update
The regional transportation plan (RTP) provides the basis for most RTC planning and project activities. In addition to an inventory of existing conditions, trends and demographic data for the region, the RTP provides basic policies to guide future decisions that will influence transportation performance and outcomes in the county. The 2014 RTP is now being updated, and will be titled the 2040 RTP, to be adopted in 2018 (note: the current version was titled for the year adopted; the next version will be titled for the horizon year covered by the plan).

Unified Corridors Study (in progress)
The RTC secured two planning grants from Caltrans to conduct a higher level look at how the RTC might prioritize future investments in three parallel corridors – Highway 1, Soquel Drive/Ave. and the rail corridor - to best serve the needs of travelers and to meet state targets for greenhouse gas reductions. The first grant funded the building of a countywide travel demand model (Phase I) that would be capable of modeling trips by automobile, public transit and bicycle. This first phase of work is complete. Funding was recently secured for the second phase, which will utilize the model to conduct analysis of the corridors and examine how various
strategies might perform. Phase II is just beginning and includes a robust process to engage stakeholders and the community.

**Sustainable Transportation Prioritization Plan (in progress)**
This project is also funded by a Caltrans planning grant. It proposes to develop a toolkit that will assist planners and the public in prioritizing transportation projects and land use changes associated with those projects. The toolkit includes visualization tools that will help the community to better visualize potential transportation projects and decisions.

**Highway 1 Corridor Tier I Final Environmental Document (2017)**
This major study is now in draft form, and is expected to be finalized in mid to late 2017.

**Existing Agreements and Legal Obligations**
During its decades’ long process to secure the necessary funding and acquire the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line, the RTC entered into funding agreements with the California Transportation Commission (CTC) to commence passenger rail service after acquisition and abide by the legal requirements associated with the funds used. Additionally, the RTC entered into a 10-year license agreement with Santa Cruz & Monterey Bay (SC&MB) Railway/Iowa Pacific Holdings to be the train operator on the Branch Line. Also, SC&MB Railway owns an easement for freight operations and is the designated common carrier on the Branch Line as regulated by the federal Surface Transportation Board. These obligations will have to be considered and addressed as the Commission determines the long-term use of the corridor and the rail line.

Other projects and planning efforts will likely contribute to the consideration of options for the rail corridor in Santa Cruz County. These efforts include:

**Multi-Use Trail**
Three trail projects are currently under design with two likely to have finished design and environmental compliance mid-next year. Those projects are expected to go out to bid for construction in the fall of next year. The projects are being designed and environmental analysis is being conducted for the trail to be located adjacent to the tracks and that the track footprint (and whatever lies underneath) would remain functional consistent with the RTC’s Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Master Plan and final environmental document.

**Great Santa Cruz Trail Report**
This report was privately funded by a group of local cycling enthusiasts who are supporting an approach for use of the rail line that would remove the railroad tracks and build a trail. The report claims that more people would be served by this option, than by including both rail service and a trail.

**2018 Ca. State Rail Plan (in progress)**
The State of California has initiated a major planning effort to consider both passenger and freight rail service throughout the state and assemble a plan that
takes an integrative approach to providing service, especially in the realm of
intercity passenger service. This is a significant change from past practice at the
state level, which took a more piecemeal approach. Funding may shift toward these
investments if they can assist with the state’s mobility and GHG reduction goals.

California Air Resources Board setting of new GHG reduction targets (in progress)
In 2006, the Legislature passed the California Global Warming Solutions Act of
2006 (Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32); Stats. 2006, chapter 488). AB 32 created a
comprehensive, multi-year program to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in
California. AB 32 requires Air Resources Board (ARB) to convene an environmental
justice advisory committee to advise it in developing the Scoping Plan and any
other pertinent matter in implementing AB 32. The First Update to the Climate
Change Scoping Plan was approved by the Board on May 22, 2014. In April 2015,
Governor Brown set a new interim statewide target to reduce greenhouse gas
emissions to 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030 and directed ARB to further
update the Scoping Plan. The ARB is in the process of setting new GHG emissions
reductions targets for each Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) in the state,
including AMBAG. The new targets are expected to be more aggressive than
existing targets, and will thus require counties within each MPO jurisdiction to
demonstrate in their next RTP update how they will meet the new target.

Analysis of Transportation Options for the Rail Corridor

It is important to have the information, tools and resources necessary to
adequately reach, inform and engage the public to the fullest extent possible to
ensure that the community as a whole is included in the decisions that shape its
future. The relevant work listed above will help to establish that. The Unified
Corridors Plan will effectively begin that public process as it works to engage the
community in a discussion and analysis of the Highway 1 corridor, the Soquel
Drive/Ave. corridor and the rail corridor to help meet the future transportation
needs of the community. The public engagement process will include:

- workshops,
- various traditional and non-traditional methods and technologies with diverse
  opportunities for public participation,
- interactive public engagement methods,
- direct outreach to traditionally underrepresented and hard-to-reach groups
  who typically are able to participate in public workshops and meetings,
- electronic information and input methods, and
- bilingual English and Spanish information and engagement.

At the conclusion the Unified Corridors Study, the community should have a list of
priority projects, programs and policies for the use of the Highway 1 corridor, the
Soquel Drive/Ave. corridor, and the rail corridor to best meet the mobility needs of
the community. The RTC should have enough useful information to consider the
best approach going forward. Although not a substitute for a fully developed
environmental impact study, the UCS may provide enough clarity on some key
transportation issues for the County’s future, that the RTC could pause at this point
before deciding how best to proceed. In essence, this would be a milestone in the process of examining the rail corridor and could inform the RTC on which alternatives to study after that point.

If passed, Measure D will provide the funding necessary for an environmental and economic analysis of transportation options for the rail corridor with a robust public engagement process. The results of the Unified Corridor Study and lessons learned from its public engagement process along with the visualization tools developed as part of the Sustainable Transportation Prioritization Plan will help to ensure a complete, public, transparent and engaging environmental and economic analysis process for rail corridor projects.

The environmental review of rail corridor options will provide the public forum to conduct a thorough analysis and evaluation of possible ways to use the rail corridor. It will involve forming stakeholder groups, a technical advisory group, hiring a consultant team to design the alternatives to be studied (30% design) and evaluate each for its impacts. Because revenues from the tax measure will not begin accruing until April 2017, it is reasonable to assume that after procurement of the consultant team, the actual planning work will begin in late 2017.

If the RTC selects a preferred alternative to operate rail transit, then a funding mechanism will need to be identified. Unless state or federal funding programs change significantly from the current situation, the RTC would likely have to go to the voters with a ballot initiative to fund most of the capital cost and all of the operating cost of the service. If two thirds of the voters support the measure, then work could begin on building the system. Completing the design, acquiring ROW, if necessary, and construction would then proceed. If the RTC selects an option that does not include operating rail transit, then new funding may not be necessary.

SUMMARY

At its June TPW meeting, the RTC directed staff to prepare a draft “roadmap” for analysis of potential uses of the rail corridor. Staff recommends that the RTC review this draft “roadmap” and provide input to staff.
AGENDA: September 1, 2016

TO: Regional Transportation Commission (RTC)
FROM: Luis Pavel Mendez, Deputy Director
RE: Amendments to the Fiscal Year (FY) 2016-17 Budget and Work Program

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) approve the attached resolution (Attachment 1):

1. Amending the FY 2016-17 Budget and Work Program as shown on Exhibit A to Attachment 1 to add newly secured grant funds and the corresponding work program elements; and

2. Authorizing the Executive Director to solicit necessary consultant services and enter into necessary agreements with partner agencies to produce the work funded by the newly secured grants.

BACKGROUND

At its March and June 2016 meetings, the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) approved a budget and a work program for fiscal year (FY) 2016-17. The RTC was successful in securing grants to produce a Highway 9 corridor transportation plan and phase 2 of the unified corridors investment study Attachment 2. To begin that planning work, the RTC must amend its FY 2016-17 budget and work program to add the new grant funds and corresponding work program elements.

DISCUSSION

Highway 9 San Lorenzo Valley Complete Streets Corridor Transportation Plan: The RTC secured $249,000 in grant funds with a local match requirement of $32,450 to produce a complete streets corridor plan for Highway 9 through the San Lorenzo Valley. The plan will include the towns of Felton, Ben Lomond, Brookdale and Boulder Creek. Elements to be analyzed as part of this plan include safety for all users; access to schools, business and bus stops; traffic operations; pavement condition; and drainage. Funds will be used for consultant services, RTC staff work and participation of County of Santa Cruz and Santa Cruz METRO staff. METRO and County staff will be assisting with the consultant selection, public outreach, review of technical analysis, and evaluation and prioritization of projects for implementation in the short and mid-term. Next steps include meeting with stakeholders and procurement of consultant services with expertise in the development of complete streets corridor plans. The project team will gather input from the community throughout development of the
plan using a range of activities. See the attached fact sheet (Attachment 3) for more information.

Santa Cruz County Unified Corridor Investment Study – Phase 2: The RTC secured $286,647 in grant funds with a local match requirement of $37,138 for phase 2 of the unified corridors investment study for Santa Cruz County’s three primary transportation routes – Highway 1, Soquel Avenue/Drive and the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line. This study will identify the multimodal transportation investments that will provide the greatest benefit based on a performance-based decision making process. Goals and performance measures for this corridor will be based on input from the public, partner agencies, decisions-makers and stakeholders as well as consistency with federal, state and local goals. Funds will be used for consultant services, RTC staff work and to help ensure a robust public engagement process. See the attached fact sheet (Attachment 4) for more information.

Staff recommends that the RTC approve the attached resolution (Attachment 1) amending the FY 2016-17 budget and work program as shown on Exhibit A to Attachment 1 and authorizing the Executive Director to solicit consultant services and enter into agreements with partner agencies to produce the work funded by the newly secured grants.

SUMMARY

Due to recently secured grants, it is necessary to amend to the FY 2016-17 budget and work program to add the newly secured funds and corresponding work program elements. Thanks to the secured grant funds the RTC will be able to produce a complete streets corridor transportation plan for the Highway 9 in the San Lorenzo Valley and complete the second phase of the unified corridor investment study for Highway 1, Soquel Drive/Avenue and the rail line. Staff recommend that the RTC approve the attached resolution (Attachment 1) amending the FY 2016-17 budget and work program and authorizing the Executive Director to solicit consultant services and enter into agreements with partner agencies for the work funded with these grants.

Attachments:
1. Resolution Amending the FY 2016-17 RTC Budget and Work Program
2. Letter from Caltrans notifying the RTC of grant awards
3. Highway 9 San Lorenzo Valley Corridor Transportation Plan Fact Sheet
4. Unified Corridor Investment Study –Phase 2 Fact Sheet
RESOLUTION NO.
Adopted by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission on the date of September 1, 2016 on the motion of Commissioner duly seconded by Commissioner

A RESOLUTION AMENDING THE FY 2016-17 BUDGET AND WORK PROGRAM FOR THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

WHEREAS, the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) adopts and periodically amends a budget and work program for each fiscal year to guide its expenses and work;

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION:

1. The FY 2016-17 Budget and Work Program for the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) are hereby amended as shown in Exhibit A;

2. The Executive Director is authorized to solicit consultant services and enter into agreements with partner agencies to produce the work funded by the newly secured planning grants.

AYES: COMMISSIONERS

NOES: COMMISSIONERS

ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS

ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS

____________________________
Don Lane, Chair

ATTEST:

____________________________
George Dondero, Secretary

Attachments: Exhibit A - SCCRTC FY 2016-17 Budget and Work Program as amended

Distribution: RTC Fiscal
## PROJECTED REVENUE SUMMARY

### FY 2016-2017 BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>APPROVED 03/03/16</th>
<th>PROPOSED 09/01/16</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation Development Act (TDA):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditor’s 1/4 Cent Sales Tax Estimate</td>
<td>9,059,403</td>
<td>9,059,403</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous FY Revenues Budgeted</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Estimate</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total TDA Apportioned</strong></td>
<td>9,071,403</td>
<td>9,071,403</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Transit Assistance (STA)</strong></td>
<td>1,995,440</td>
<td>1,995,440</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning Grant Funds/Others:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State planning funds (RPA and STIP PPM)</td>
<td>512,000</td>
<td>512,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP Exchange</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Trust</td>
<td>127,473</td>
<td>127,473</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Conservancy</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit &amp; Transportation Planning grants</td>
<td>198,314</td>
<td>595,221</td>
<td>396,907</td>
<td>New planning grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC Funds Budgeted</td>
<td>339,021</td>
<td>292,776</td>
<td>-46,245</td>
<td>Updated estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning/Other Total</strong></td>
<td>1,726,808</td>
<td>2,077,470</td>
<td>350,662</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rideshare:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP &amp; RSTP Exchange</td>
<td>263,010</td>
<td>263,010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFE Funds</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service Authority for Freeway Emergency (SAFE):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMV Fees and interest</td>
<td>241,000</td>
<td>241,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other - MTC SAFE &amp; RTC SAFE</td>
<td>158,300</td>
<td>158,300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freeway Service Patrol (FSP):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans Grant</td>
<td>170,598</td>
<td>170,598</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP Exchange, STIP, Reserves &amp; Interest</td>
<td>208,902</td>
<td>208,902</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rail/Trail Authority:</strong></td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP Exchange</td>
<td>527,822</td>
<td>527,822</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer - in from TC Planning</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail/Trail Funds Budgeted</td>
<td>167,188</td>
<td>167,188</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highway 1:</strong></td>
<td>956,247</td>
<td>956,247</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMIA, STIP &amp; Other</td>
<td>229,298</td>
<td>229,298</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RSTP Exchange Program</strong></td>
<td>4,438,620</td>
<td>4,438,620</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>20,769,636</td>
<td>21,120,298</td>
<td>350,662</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPORTIONMENT SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLAIMANTS</th>
<th>FY16-17 APPROVED 03/03/16</th>
<th>FY16-17 PROPOSED 09/01/16</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Development Act (TDA): (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA Reserve Fund</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC Reserve Fund</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC Planning</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC:</td>
<td>565,923</td>
<td>565,923</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>517,863</td>
<td>517,863</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike to Work</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike &amp; Pedestrian Safety (CTSC)</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,233,786</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,233,786</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz METRO</td>
<td>6,701,163</td>
<td>6,701,163</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Transit (Community Bridges/CTSA)</td>
<td>658,360</td>
<td>658,360</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Center</td>
<td>78,376</td>
<td>78,376</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Capitola</td>
<td>14,791</td>
<td>14,791</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Santa Cruz - Non Transit</td>
<td>93,863</td>
<td>93,863</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Scotts Valley</td>
<td>17,552</td>
<td>17,552</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Watsonville</td>
<td>76,644</td>
<td>76,644</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>196,868</td>
<td>196,868</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,837,617</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,837,617</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL TDA APPORTIONED</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,071,403</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,071,403</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Transit Assistance (STA) - SCMTD</td>
<td>1,995,440</td>
<td>1,995,440</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Grant Funds/Others:</td>
<td>1,726,808</td>
<td>2,077,470</td>
<td>350,662</td>
<td>New planning grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rideshare</td>
<td>313,010</td>
<td>313,010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFE</td>
<td>399,300</td>
<td>399,300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway Service Patrol (FSP)</td>
<td>379,500</td>
<td>379,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail/Trail Authority</td>
<td>890,010</td>
<td>890,010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 1</td>
<td>1,185,545</td>
<td>1,185,545</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Singnage Project</td>
<td>370,000</td>
<td>370,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP Exchange Program</td>
<td>4,438,620</td>
<td>4,438,620</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>20,769,636</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,120,298</strong></td>
<td><strong>350,662</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) TDA apportionments are based on formulas in the RTC's Rules and Regulations. Balance not used for Planning and Administration is allocated to other TDA claimants as follows: 85.5% to SCMTD, 8.4% to Community Bridges and 1% to the Volunteer Center; remaining funds are proportionally allocated to cities and the county according to population.
PLANNING REVENUES: 721600/721700/721750

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCES</th>
<th>APPROVED 03/03/16</th>
<th>PROPOSED 09/01/16</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TDA Planning</td>
<td>667,863</td>
<td>667,863</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Planning Assistance (RPA)</td>
<td>337,000</td>
<td>337,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP for Planning (PPM)</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP Exchange</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Trust</td>
<td>127,473</td>
<td>127,473</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Planning Grants</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>486,907</td>
<td>396,907</td>
<td>- New planning grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Conservancy</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Transportation Planning Grant</td>
<td>108,314</td>
<td>108,314</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC Funds Budgeted</td>
<td>245,444</td>
<td>199,199</td>
<td>-46,245</td>
<td>- Updated estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL REVENUES</td>
<td>2,301,094</td>
<td>2,651,756</td>
<td>350,662</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENDITURES</th>
<th>FY16-17 APPROVED 03/03/16</th>
<th>FY16-17 PROPOSED 09/01/16</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>NOTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff &amp; Overhead by Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Regional Planning Coordination</td>
<td>137,118</td>
<td>127,918</td>
<td>-9,200</td>
<td>- Updated estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Unified Corridor Study Phase II</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35,344</td>
<td>35,344</td>
<td>- New planning grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Work Program</td>
<td>34,535</td>
<td>34,535</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Public Information</td>
<td>62,172</td>
<td>41,914</td>
<td>-20,258</td>
<td>- Updated estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Bicycle/Pedestrian Planning</td>
<td>70,753</td>
<td>70,753</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 MBSST Network</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 MBSST Projects</td>
<td>127,473</td>
<td>127,473</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Specialized Transportation</td>
<td>69,753</td>
<td>69,753</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 User Oriented Transit Travel Planning</td>
<td>66,527</td>
<td>66,527</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Sust Transp Prioritization Plan</td>
<td>77,165</td>
<td>77,165</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Highway 9 Study</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27,159</td>
<td>27,159</td>
<td>- New planning grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Regional Transportation Plan for MTP</td>
<td>210,291</td>
<td>210,291</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Regional Travel Demand Model</td>
<td>21,557</td>
<td>21,557</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)</td>
<td>250,749</td>
<td>220,487</td>
<td>-30,262</td>
<td>- Updated estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Highway &amp; Roadway Planning</td>
<td>108,080</td>
<td>105,297</td>
<td>-2,783</td>
<td>- Updated estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Staff and Overhead</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,286,173</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,286,173</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services &amp; Supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Bike To Work Program (Ecology Action)</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Bike &amp; Ped Safety (Comm. Traffic Safety Coalition)</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services (contracts)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Sacramento Assistant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Washington Assistant</td>
<td>44,600</td>
<td>44,600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Engineering and Other Technical Consultants</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 User Oriented Transit Travel Planning</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Environmental Documents for RTP/MTP</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 MBBST Projects - services and materials</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Sust Transp Prioritization Plan</td>
<td>45,188</td>
<td>45,188</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Highway 9 study consultant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>144,000</td>
<td>144,000</td>
<td>- New planning grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 SC METRO &amp; DPW for Hwy 9 study</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24,262</td>
<td>24,262</td>
<td>- New planning grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Unified Corridor Study Consultant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>182,400</td>
<td>182,400</td>
<td>- New planning grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC Work Element Related Items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Traffic Monitoring services</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Printing Documents and Pub Info Materials</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 User Oriented Transit Travel Planning Materials</td>
<td>8,133</td>
<td>8,133</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 Transfer to Rail/Trail Authority</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Services &amp; Supplies</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,014,921</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,365,583</strong></td>
<td><strong>350,662</strong></td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,301,094</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,651,756</strong></td>
<td><strong>350,662</strong></td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

## PLANNING FUNDS SOURCE DETAIL

### FY 2016-2017 BUDGET

#### 1 PLANNING DETAIL: 721600/721700/721750

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENDITURES</th>
<th>FY16-17 PROPOSED 09/01/16</th>
<th>TDA</th>
<th>RTC FUND</th>
<th>RPA</th>
<th>Sust Transp Ping</th>
<th>FTA5304 SustComm Ping</th>
<th>FTA5304 Trust for SustComm</th>
<th>STIP</th>
<th>PPM</th>
<th>Land Trust</th>
<th>Coastal Conserv</th>
<th>RSTPX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff &amp; Overhead</strong></td>
<td></td>
<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>Regional Planning Coordination</td>
<td>127,918</td>
<td>30,338</td>
<td>11,163</td>
<td>86,417</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unified Corridor Study Phase II</td>
<td>35,344</td>
<td>9,284</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26,060</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Program</td>
<td>34,535</td>
<td>11,818</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>21,882</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Information</td>
<td>41,914</td>
<td>23,132</td>
<td>18,782</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian Planning</td>
<td>70,753</td>
<td>36,429</td>
<td>4,324</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBSST Network</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBSST Projects</td>
<td>127,473</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>127,473</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Transportation</td>
<td>69,753</td>
<td>44,445</td>
<td>25,308</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User Oriented Transit Travel Planning</td>
<td>66,527</td>
<td>7,630</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>58,897</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sust Transp Prioritization Plan</td>
<td>77,165</td>
<td>6,851</td>
<td>68,314</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 9 Study</td>
<td>27,159</td>
<td>6,974</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,185</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan for MTP</td>
<td>210,291</td>
<td>95,159</td>
<td>16,528</td>
<td>98,604</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Travel Demand Model</td>
<td>21,557</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>16,557</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)</td>
<td>220,487</td>
<td>8,371</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>145,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway &amp; Roadway Planning</td>
<td>105,297</td>
<td>42,316</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>62,981</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Staff &amp; Overhead</strong></td>
<td>1,286,173</td>
<td>313,266</td>
<td>109,978</td>
<td>337,000</td>
<td>68,314</td>
<td>26,060</td>
<td>20,185</td>
<td>58,897</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>127,473</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Services & Supplies | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bike To Work Program (Ecology Action) | 50,000 | 50,000 | - | | | | | | | | | |
| Bike & Ped Safety (Comm. Traffic Safety Coalition) | 100,000 | 100,000 | - | | | | | | | | | |
| **Professional Services** | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sacramento Assistant | - | - | - | | | | | | | | | |
| Washington Assistant | 44,600 | 4,600 | 40,000 | | | | | | | | | |
| Engineering and Other Technical Consultants | 50,000 | 37,779 | 12,221 | | | | | | | | | |
| User Oriented Transit Travel Planning | 27,000 | - | 3,097 | 23,903 | | | | | | | | |
| Environmental Documents for RTP/MTP | 25,000 | 25,000 | - | | | | | | | | | |
| MBBST Projects - services and materials | 500,000 | - | 500,000 | | | | | | | | | |
| Sust Transp Prioritization Plan | 45,188 | 5,188 | 40,000 | | | | | | | | | |
| Highway 9 study consultant | 144,000 | - | 144,000 | | | | | | | | | |
| SC METRO & DPW for Hwy 9 study | 24,262 | - | 24,262 | | | | | | | | | |
| Unified Corridor Study Consultant | 182,400 | - | 182,400 | | | | | | | | | |
| **Subtotal Services & Supplies** | 1,365,583 | 354,597 | 89,221 | - | 40,000 | 182,400 | 168,262 | 31,103 | - | - | 500,000 | - |

| RTC Work Element Related Items | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Traffic Monitoring services | 15,000 | 15,000 | - | | | | | | | | | |
| Printing Documents and Pub Info Materials | 40,000 | 12,218 | 27,782 | - | | | | | | | | |
| User Oriented Transit Travel Planning Materials | 8,133 | - | 933 | 7,200 | | | | | | | | |
| Transfer to Rail/Trail Authority | 110,000 | 110,000 | - | | | | | | | | | |
| **Subtotal Services & Supplies** | 1,365,583 | 354,597 | 89,221 | - | 40,000 | 182,400 | 168,262 | 31,103 | - | - | 500,000 | - |

| TOTAL EXPENDITURES | 2,651,756 | 667,863 | 199,199 | 337,000 | 108,314 | 208,460 | 188,447 | 90,000 | 175,000 | 127,473 | 500,000 | 50,000 |
WORK ELEMENT NUMBER 128a  Unified Corridor Investment Study - Phase II

Agency: SCCRTC  Project Manager: Grace Blakeslee, Sr. Transportation Planner  Ginger Dykaar, Sr. Transportation Planner  Total Budget: $323,785

ESTIMATED EXPENDITURE AND ANTICIPATED REVENUE: FY 2016-2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENDITURES</th>
<th>REVENUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agency</strong></td>
<td><strong>Amount ($)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>239,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual</td>
<td>80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; supplies</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>323,785</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Federal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Description
This work element is to identify transportation investments that optimize usage of three parallel transportation corridors in Santa Cruz County: Highway 1, Soquel Avenue/Drive and the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line, while advancing sustainability targets. Highway 1 and Soquel Avenue/Drive are two of the most heavily traveled and congested roadways in Santa Cruz County. Recent acquisition of the rail line provides a unique opportunity to create a corridor investment plan that best utilizes these facilities. A "Unified Corridor Investment Study" will identify the transportation investments that optimize usage of the Highway 1, Soquel Ave/Dr and rail line corridor while advancing STARS sustainability targets developed for Santa Cruz County. A scenario analysis will assess how well the sustainability targets are advanced for each scenario. The modeling tools that were developed in Phase 1 will allow for use of sophisticated methods to analyze transportation investments that advance the sustainable transportation goals of our region.

Project Product(s)
Unified Corridor Investment Study - Phase II

Previous Accomplishments
Phase I of this project developed the modeling tools to perform the Phase II work. A subregional travel demand model for Santa Cruz County, a transit model and a bike model are tools that have been developed and will be used for Phase II of this project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Project Initiation and Partnership Development - Initiate project with partner agencies, produce a request for proposals (RFP) to secure consultant services and secure consultant.</td>
<td>Final funding agreement and OWP amendment, Meeting agendas, List of stakeholder participants, RFP and executed consultant contract</td>
<td>02/28/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Stakeholder and Public Participation - Outreach to public, stakeholders, RTC Committees and RTC for input at key project junctures.</td>
<td>Workshop notices, meeting agendas, news releases, eNews, and staff reports</td>
<td>01/31/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Identify Transportation Improvements for Highway1, Soquel and Rail Corridor - This task includes defining performance measures, data needs, data collection, list of projects, scenario development and technical analysis.</td>
<td>Corridor goals, policies and performance measures, list of data needs, results of mode split &quot;what if&quot; analysis, project list recommended for analysis, scenario themes, performance dashboard, recommended list of transportation investments</td>
<td>06/30/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Summary Report of Phase II of Unified Corridors Investment Study - Develop administrative draft, draft and final reports</td>
<td>Administrative draft of Unified Corridors Investment Study, Draft document, Final Report</td>
<td>02/28/19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Grant Administration - This task includes invoicing, reporting and closeout of grant contract.
ESTIMATED EXPENDITURE AND ANTICIPATED REVENUE: FY 2016-2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>108,000</td>
<td>108,000</td>
<td>FTA Section 5304</td>
<td>249,000</td>
<td>249,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual</td>
<td>169,000</td>
<td>169,000</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>26,350</td>
<td>26,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials &amp; supplies</td>
<td>4,450</td>
<td>4,450</td>
<td>In-kind: METRO and</td>
<td>6,100</td>
<td>6,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>County of SC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>281,450</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>281,450</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% Federal</td>
<td><strong>88.47%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Description**

This work element is to prepare a completes streets plan that identifies, prioritizes and enables implementation of critical and cost effective transportation projects through the State Route 9/ San Lorenzo Valley (SLV) travel corridor, in partnership with Caltrans, the County of Santa Cruz Public Works and Planning Departments, Santa Cruz METRO, residents, businesses, schools, and other stakeholders. Plan focuses on addressing multimodal needs of all users; includes documenting and evaluating current and future multimodal travel patterns and evaluation of a range of options, strategies, specific infrastructure and phasing of safety, asset management, traffic operations, complete streets, goods movement, streetscape, parking, drainage, and mobility projects. Includes extensive public engagement and stakeholder coordination.

**Project Product(s)**

Final SR9/San Lorenzo Valley Corridor Transportation Plan

**Previous Accomplishments**

Meetings between the County of Santa Cruz, Caltrans and community members since 2013 accentuated the need for a comprehensive plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Initiate project with partner agencies, produce a request for proposals (RFP) to secure consultant services and secure consultant</td>
<td>Partner meetings, agendas, RFP and consultant agreement</td>
<td>12/31/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Corridor Plan Development: includes review of prior studies and planning efforts, defining goals, objectives and evaluation criteria with the community, corridor travel analysis and needs assessment, evaluation of investment options, and preparation of plan document.</td>
<td>Needs assessment, project evaluation and corridor plan.</td>
<td>02/28/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Public Engagement: development of public participation plan, ongoing outreach, public meetings</td>
<td>List of stakeholders, meeting agendas, minutes and notes, presentation materials</td>
<td>02/28/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Coordinate and manage project (RTC)</td>
<td>Agreements, Quarterly reports, OWP, agendas, invoices and billing</td>
<td>04/01/18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
June 8, 2016

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

Dear Mr. Dondero:

On behalf of the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), Division of Transportation Planning, I am pleased to offer my congratulations to the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission for the recent award of the following Federal transportation planning grants for Fiscal Year (FY) 2016–17:

Grant Program: FTA Section 5304, Sustainable Communities
Grant Title: Santa Cruz County Unified Corridor Investment Study - Phase II
Grant Award: $286,647.00
Local Match: $37,138.00
Total Project Amount: $323,785.00

Grant Program: FTA Section 5304, Sustainable Communities
Grant Title: SR 9/San Lorenzo Valley Complete Streets Corridor Transportation Plan
Grant Award: $249,000.00
Local Match: $32,450.00
Total Project Amount: $281,450.00

Please see the list below which identifies specific conditions for a grantee to accept grant funding, to program funds, and to begin work. All conditions must be fulfilled no later than May 1, 2017. Failure to fulfill conditions of grant acceptance by the afore-mentioned date will result in forfeiture of grant funds. Also, please note that final products must be completed no later than June 30, 2019. Final requests for reimbursements must be submitted to Caltrans by August 31, 2019.

"Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability"
Conditions of Grant Acceptance
These Federal grant funds cannot be encumbered until the following conditions are fulfilled:

1. The revised final Scope of Work, Project Timeline, and Grant Application Cover Sheet are submitted to the Caltrans District 5 Liaison for approval.

2. If applicable, a Third Party In-kind Valuation Plan is submitted for the use of in-kind contributions to satisfy the federal minimum local match requirement. Third party in-kind contributions are goods and services donated from outside the grantee’s agency. Examples of third party in-kind contributions include donated printing, facilities, interpreters, equipment, advertising, time and effort, staff time, and other goods and services. The Third Party In-kind Valuation Plan Checklist and Sample Third Party In-Kind Valuation Plan can be found at the following webpage:


3. The FY 2016–17 Overall Work Program (OWP) and OWP Agreement (OWPA) are amended to incorporate the grant project including the full grant amount and full local match. The OWP/OWPA amendment includes the OWPA, OWP Budget Summary, and a standalone Work Element. The Work Element name/number must remain unchanged until the project is completed. These three items must show consistent funding information for the grant project. Caltrans District staff will send a formal notice to proceed after the OWP/OWPA amendment is processed.

Once the project is underway, quarterly status updates will be required as part of the OWP Quarterly Progress and Expenditure Report, including a transmittal memo noting the percentage of project work completed. If this reporting method is not adequately satisfied, a separate narrative quarterly progress report will be required to monitor project activities.

Please contact Kelly McClendon, your Caltrans District 5 Liaison, at (805) 549-3510 or Tyler Monson, your Caltrans Headquarters Liaison, at (916) 653-8699 if you have any questions concerning these grant funds or program requirements.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

KATHERINE BENOUAR
Chief, Division of Transportation Planning

"Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability."
c: Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner, Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
   Aileen Loe, Deputy District Director, Caltrans, District 5
Project Summary
A complete streets plan for a ten mile section of Highway 9 through San Lorenzo Valley (SLV) that identifies, prioritizes, and enables implementation of the most critical and cost effective transportation projects. This mountainous roadway serves as the “Main Street” and economic center for the towns of Felton, Ben Lomond, Brookdale, and Boulder Creek and as an interregional arterial connecting Silicon Valley and Santa Cruz. This plan will focus on safety for pedestrians, bicyclists and motorists; access to schools, businesses, and bus stops; traffic operations, pavement conditions, drainage and other needs in this important travel corridor.

Why is this plan needed?
A comprehensive multimodal transportation needs assessment and evaluation of a range of options to address transportation challenges is needed to identify and prioritize transportation investments for this important corridor, especially since state, federal, and local revenues are severely constrained. This comprehensive plan for Highway 9 through San Lorenzo Valley will:

- build on past public input and planning activities,
- document existing conditions,
- identify infrastructure gaps,
- answer questions about what can be done within Caltrans’ right-of-way, and
- provide data, evaluation, analysis, and public deliberation to make informed decisions.

This effort will help prioritize transportation projects that can be implemented in the short and mid-term to address transportation challenges on the corridor.

This corridor-specific plan will be a stepping stone to securing funding for priority investments and provide a framework for partnering with Caltrans to implement investments that promote complete streets, implement sustainable communities strategies, and improve multi-modal access, connectivity, safety, security, system preservation, economic
vitality and environmental quality. The plan should also advance other local, regional, state and federal transportation planning goals and objectives. The completed plan will include conceptual complete street designs and be used to facilitate subsequent design, environmental review and construction of improvements.

Public Outreach
San Lorenzo Valley residents, businesses, community groups, parents and school administrators regularly express concerns about Highway 9. Meetings held since 2013 have accentuated the need for a comprehensive plan. Building upon past public outreach efforts, the project team will gather input from community members, including organizations who serve low-income individuals and families, monolingual Spanish speakers, seniors, persons with disabilities, and youth throughout development of the plan using a range of collaborative activities, including surveys, Town Hall meetings, and grassroots outreach.

- The community can sign up for the Highway 9 E-news List by emailing info@sccrtc.org, calling 831-460-3200 or signing up on the RTC website: http://sccrtc.org/about/esubscriptions/
- Comments can be sent to SCCRTC: info@sccrtc.com or 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA 95060.

Major Milestones
- Define Goals, Objectives and Evaluation Criteria: Early on, the public will help establish common goals and objectives for the corridor. Evaluation criteria, based on goals and objectives identified by the community, will be used to analyze and prioritize a range of investment options to address deficiencies and goals for the corridor.
- Corridor Travel Analysis and Needs Assessment: Includes review of existing and projected future conditions, identification of multimodal projects (investment options) that would advance goals and objectives, including improve access, mobility, safety, and operations.
- Evaluation and Prioritization of Investment Options: Includes identification of potential funding sources, metrics to evaluate the degree to which different projects address issues and advance goals for the corridor, and development of a prioritized list of short-term and mid-term projects that are reasonable to implement in consideration of financial realities.
- Corridor Plan: The final plan is expected to reflect community consensus on investment priorities.

Project Team
The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC) is the lead agency for this project, to be implemented in partnership with Caltrans, the County of Santa Cruz, Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (METRO), residents, businesses, schools, and other stakeholders. A consultant team will help prepare the plan.

This planning effort is funded through a $249,000 Caltrans’ Sustainable Communities Transportation Planning Grant (FTA 5304) and local funds.
Project Summary

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission and Caltrans will work in conjunction with stakeholders to develop a Unified Corridor Investment Study for Santa Cruz County's three primary transportation routes – Highway 1, Soquel Avenue/Drive and the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line (see project area map below). This corridor serves as the backbone of the county’s transportation network. This study will identify the multimodal transportation investments that will provide the greatest benefit based on a performance-based decision making process. Goals and performance measures for this corridor will be based on input from the public, partner agencies, decisions-makers and stakeholders as well as consistency with federal, state and local goals. A scenario analysis will be performed to analyze a number of alternative groups of projects using the modeling tools that were developed in Phase 1.

Why is this study needed?

Highway 1 and Soquel Avenue/Drive are the two main transportation routes through the urbanized area of central Santa Cruz County. Highway 1 serves as an important local, regional and interregional route, connecting communities within and between the City of Santa Cruz and the City of Watsonville and other communities throughout the Monterey Bay. Soquel Ave/Dr is an important facility for the local network and also often serves as the regional route when Highway 1 is congested. These routes are heavily traveled, are often congested and have safety concerns. The recent acquisition of the rail line provides a third transportation facility along this corridor that has unused capacity. Santa Cruz County has one of the highest rates of fatalities and severe injuries in the state, greenhouse gas emissions from transportation are of great concern and the equity of transportation planning decisions need to be evaluated.
Public Outreach

Santa Cruz County residents regularly express concerns about roadway congestion, safety, transportation equity and the environmental effects of transportation. The project team will utilize outreach methods that offer diverse opportunities for members of the public to participate in the development of the performance measures and project/program input for the Unified Corridors Investment Study. Additional outreach efforts will be taken to solicit input from organizations who serve low-income individuals, seniors, persons with disabilities, monolingual Spanish speakers and youth.

- The community can sign up for the Unified Corridors Investment Study E-news List by emailing info@sccrtc.org, calling 831-460-3200 or signing up on the RTC website: http://sccrtc.org/about/esubscriptions/
- Comments can be sent to SCCRTC: info@sccrtc.com or 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA 95060.

Major Milestones

- Define Corridor Goals and Performance Measures: Corridors goals and performance measures will be developed based on recommendations from partner agencies, the public, businesses, RTC Committees, and RTC. Federal, state and local transportation planning goals will also be considered including the 2014 Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Plan, the 2040 California Transportation Plan, the FAST Act, State Transportation Improvement Program Guidelines, and the Smart Mobility 2010 Framework.
- Collect and Compile Corridor Specific Data: Collect and compile additional data based on performance measures chosen and data availability.
- Mode Shift “What If” Analysis: Determine the effects on Highway 1 and Soquel Ave/Dr congestion assuming various combinations of transit/bike/pedestrian/carpool mode shift within the project area.
- Project List Development: Develop the list of transportation projects, programs and policies for analysis, and determine funding assumptions.
- Scenario Development: Group projects, programs and policies into three or four alternatives for initial performance measure analysis and select one final scenario for more detailed analysis.
- Develop Priority Project List: In consultation with partners, stakeholders, and decision makers develop a recommended package of priority projects, programs and policies to best achieve corridor goals cost effectively.
- Summary Report of Unified Corridors Investment Study

Project Team

The Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC) is the lead agency for this project, to be implemented in partnership with Caltrans. Other stakeholders include the City of Watsonville, City of Scotts Valley, City of Santa Cruz, City of Capitola, County of Santa Cruz, Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (METRO), residents, businesses, and schools. A consultant team will help perform the analysis.

This planning effort is funded through a $286,647 Caltrans’ Sustainable Communities Transportation Planning Grant (FTA 5304) and local funds.