Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission

AGENDA
Thursday, January 19, 2017
9:00 a.m.

NOTE LOCATION THIS MONTH
Santa Cruz City Council Chambers
809 Center Street
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 Jacques Bertrand
City of Santa Cruz Sandy Brown
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 Cynthia Chase
Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District Ed Bottorff
Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District TBD

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

2. Review of items to be discussed in closed session

**CLOSED SESSION**

3. 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**

4. Report on closed session

5. 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.

6. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agendas

**CONSENT AGENDA**

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

**MINUTES**

7. Approve draft minutes of the December 8, 2016 Regional Transportation Commission meeting

8. Approve draft minutes of the December 8, 2016 Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies meeting

9. Accept draft minutes of the December 12, 2016 Bicycle Advisory Committee meeting

10. Accept draft minutes of the December 13, 2016 Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee meeting

11. Accept draft minutes of the December 15, 2016 Interagency Transportation Advisory Committee meeting
POLICY ITEMS

No consent items

PROJECTS and PLANNING ITEMS

No consent items

BUDGET AND EXPENDITURES ITEMS

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

13. Approve City of Santa Cruz Article 8 Transportation Development Act allocation request (Resolution)

ADMINISTRATION ITEMS

14. Approve Executive Director’s Employment Agreement

INFORMATION/OTHER ITEMS

15. Accept monthly meeting schedule

16. Accept correspondence log

17. Accept letters from RTC committees and staff to other agencies - None

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

19. Accept information items
   a. Article from the December 2016 ITE Journal magazine “Implications of Autonomous Vehicles: A Planner’s Perspective” by Ryan Snyder
   b. Article from the January 3, 2017 Sacramento Bee newspaper “Why California can’t afford more delay on roads” by Matt Cate and Carolyn Coleman
   c. Memo dated on January 10, 2017 from the Self Help Counties Coalition (SHCC) regarding Governor’s and Legislative Funding Proposals

REGULAR AGENDA

20. Commissioner reports – oral reports

   (George Dondero, Executive Director)

22. Caltrans report and consider action items
   a. District Director’s report
   b. Santa Cruz County project updates

23. Presentation from City of Santa Cruz Public Works – oral report
   (Chris Schneiter, City of Santa Cruz Assistant Public Works Director)
24. Agreement with the State Board of Equalization for Administrative Functions Related to the New Measure D Transportation Sales Tax Program
   (Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner)
   a. Staff report
   b. Resolution authorizing RTC managers to execute agreements with the State Board of Equalization
   c. Resolution authorizing examination of tax records

25. Cruz511 Program Update
   (Amy Naranjo & Tegan Speiser, Transportation Planners)
   a. Staff report
   b. Program Report

26. Next meetings

   The next RTC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, February 2, 2017 at 9:00 a.m. at the Watsonville City Council Chambers, 275 Main St., Ste 450, Watsonville, CA.

   The next Transportation Policy Workshop meeting is scheduled for Thursday, February 16, 2017 at 9:00 a.m. at the RTC Offices, 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA.

HOW TO REACH US

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA 95060
phone: (831) 460-3200 / fax: (831) 460-3215

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

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

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

HOW TO STAY INFORMED ABOUT RTC MEETINGS, AGENDAS & NEWS

Broadcasts: Many of the meetings are broadcast live. Meetings are cablecast by Community Television of Santa Cruz. Community TV’s channels and schedule can be found online (www.communitytv.org) or by calling (831) 425-8848.

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

- Aptos Library
- Boulder Creek Library
- Branciforte Library
- Capitola Library
- Felton Library
- Garfield Park Library
- La Selva Beach Library
- Live Oak Library
- Santa Cruz Downtown Library
- Scotts Valley Library
- Watsonville Main Library
For information regarding library locations and hours, please check online at www.santacruzpl.org or www.watsonville.lib.ca.us.

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

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

HOW TO REQUEST

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

The meeting was called to order at 9:07 a.m.

Members present:

Don Lane  Zach Friend
Ryan Coonerty  Bruce McPherson
Cynthia Chase  Randy Johnson
Dennis Norton  Greg Caput
John Leopold  Mike Rotkin (alt)
Norm Hagan (alt)  Aileen Loe (ex-officio)

Staff present:

George Dondero  Luis Mendez
Yesenia Parra  Jenn Eames
Grace Blakeslee  Amy Naranjo
Karena Pushnik  Kim Shultz
Cory Caletti  Rachel Moriconi
Ginger Dykaar  Daniel Nikuna

Commissioner Jimmy Dutra attended via teleconference pursuant to Government Code Section 54953(b)

Chair Lane moved Item 12 of the regular agenda to the beginning of the meeting and moved oral communications to follow Item 13.

12. Measure D – Transportation Improvement Program

Karena Pushnik, Senior Transportation Planner, presented the staff report. Ms. Pushnik reported that Measure D passed with a super-majority of over 83,000 yes votes, making Santa Cruz County a transportation self-help county. The RTC will develop an Implementation Plan, which is to be updated every 5 years and will include public input. Funding allocations outlined in the Expenditure Plan include: neighborhood projects, highway corridors, transit for seniors and people with disabilities, active transportation, and the rail corridor. The 30-year Transportation Improvement Plan half-cent sales tax will go into effect on April 1, 2017, with the first funds anticipated to be received by summer.
Commissioners discussed: their appreciation for the voters, campaign committee, consultants, business councils, labor councils, RTC staff, Commissioners, jurisdictions and city council endorsements, fundraisers, and the many entities that supported Measure D; the impact on the community’s quality of life with the success of Measure D; having a transportation package where people can see that their priorities are being met; the amount of money that was raised for the campaign; their excitement to get Santa Cruz County moving forward with transportation infrastructure improvements; how additional funding for Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (METRO) will now help decrease additional service cuts and bus driver lay-offs; the need to improve South County’s current transportation situation; Santa Cruz County becoming a self-help county; and the significance of people coming together in a collaborative effort to pass Measure D, despite their differences.

Rick Longinotti, said that he has mixed feelings about Measure D passing, but is glad for the funding allocated toward fixing roads and to the rail trail project. He stated that taxpayer’s money should be spent responsibly and alternative transportation should be studied further before expanding the highway.

Jack Nelson, expressed his interest in an exit poll for voter feedback on Measure D and said that he hopes that funds will be used to get Santa Cruz County moving towards sustainable transportation.

Micah Posner, congratulated the Commission on the success of Measure D and expressed his appreciation for the support of the rail trail.

Veronica Elsea, said that she is very proud to support Measure D and noted that it is important to think about the significance of the measure passing and to shop locally.

David Date, expressed his frustration on the impact that traffic congestion has had on his family’s quality of life. He noted that the pressing issue is the need for development in South County.

Becky Steinbruner, said that she hopes the Measure D oversight committee will ensure a transparent and inclusive process. She stated that land use changes along the rail corridor could combat dense communities and traffic congestion, and in order for the rail to be useful, rail services would need to extend outside the County.

Brett Garret, said that he is torn on Measure D because he disagrees with widening Highway 1 and noted that there is no mandate in the measure to widen the highway.

Ray Cancino, shared his appreciation for the volunteers’ leadership and hard work, and said that the impact from the support for Measure D will make a huge difference to transportation options in the community.

Cary Pico, noted that the Pajaro Station was an expensive project and was not included in the Expenditure Plan because there was a lack of support to fund the station.
Barry Scott, stated that he supports the coastal rail trail and noted that Measure D funds were specifically allocated for a trail parallel to a rail.

Kirsten Listy, said that up to 20% of the community is biking as their primary mode of transportation and that there needs to be a unified engagement campaign for sustainable transportation to reduce greenhouse gases.

Dana Bagshaw, expressed her appreciation to the Commission for including the community in transportation issues because transportation is an important need. She said that although she opposed Measure D, she is grateful for the opportunity to communicate.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

Commissioner Alternate Rotkin moved and Commissioner McPherson seconded the consent agenda. The motion passed unanimously with Commissioners Lane, Friend, Coonerty, Caput, McPherson, Chase, Dutra, Leopold, Johnson, Norton and Commissioner Alternates Hagan and Rotkin voting “aye”, with Commissioner Friend abstaining from the approval for the draft minutes of the November 3, 2016 Regional Transportation Commission meeting.

**MINUTES**

4. Approved draft minutes of the November 3, 2016 Regional Transportation Commission meeting

**POLICY ITEMS**

No consent items

**PROJECTS and PLANNING ITEMS**

No consent items

**BUDGET AND EXPENDITURES ITEMS**

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

6. Approved Fiscal Year (FY) 2016-17 State Transit Assistance (STA) Claim for Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (METRO) (Resolution 11-17)

**ADMINISTRATION ITEMS**

No consent items

**INFORMATION/OTHER ITEMS**

7. Accepted monthly meeting schedule

8. Accepted correspondence log

9. Accepted letters from RTC committees and staff to other agencies - none

10. Accepted miscellaneous written comments from the public on RTC projects and transportation issues

11. Accepted information items – none
REGULAR AGENDA

13. Options for use of the rail corridor

George Dondero, Executive Director, presented the staff report. Mr. Dondero reported on three possible uses for the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line rail corridor: rail with trail, trail only, and bus rapid transit (BRT); and included legal considerations, cost estimates, and an estimated timeline for each option. He noted that the RTC is currently working on two projects that include analysis of the rail corridor: the Unified Corridor Investment Study (UCS) and the Sustainable Prioritization Plan.

Commissioner Friend proposed a possible motion to establish an ad-hoc committee to discuss the options on the use of the rail corridor. The ad-hoc committee would be comprised of community groups with differing opinions, to advise and to provide legitimacy for greater community involvement that represent different views.

Commissioners discussed: that the information provided by staff was to help understand the legal elements and costs of the options; the rail corridor being an underused asset; the need to collect additional information before forming an ad-hoc committee; the UCS timeline and projected June 2018 completion; a timeline for an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for all rail corridor options; appreciation to the Land Trust of Santa Cruz County for matching funds for the Monterey Bay Scenic Sanctuary Trail (MBSST); the importance of sending a clear message to potential funders about plans with the rail corridor; forming a committee to discuss the future of transportation infrastructures that will be impacted by technological advancements and driverless car use; how there was no mandate in Measure D to have a rail service, but rather a commitment to research and preserve the option to have a rail; the success of the community’s involvement in working together to pass Measure D; connecting Watsonville with the rest of the County with passenger rail service; traffic impacts on Highway 1 if the rail line is unavailable for freight use; how the rail line was not purchased to be abandoned and the expense to replace the tracks if they were removed; the cancelled Suntan Special train service; the importance of the community and stakeholder groups finding a consensus; and making informed decisions before administering policies.

Lowell Hurst, stated that he supports the rail trail and said that because there have already been many discussions about the rail corridor, plans for the trail should move forward sooner not later. He noted that the Coast Starlight Train Service goes through Pajaro Train Station.

Stanley Sokolow, said that a BRT feasibility study comparable to the passenger rail study should be conducted because BRT is safe to have adjacent to a trail and is cost efficient.

Commissioner Friend left the meeting and Commissioner Alternate Mulhearn joined the meeting.

David Date, expressed his unhappiness with the Polar Express and the need for maintenance of the tracks. He stated that communities need relief now and the tracks should be removed and alternatives be considered instead.
Brian Peoples, stated that there is a transportation crisis and the rail corridor is a key asset that should be utilized temporarily until a decision on a permanent efficient use has been determined. He noted that Trail Now supports having an ad-hoc committee.

Lee Otter, expressed his support for the RTC to proceed with the course of actions outlined in Measure D.

Paul Schoellhamer, said that the RTC should not re-evaluate the use of the rail corridor, but should stay on course with the rail trail plans. He stated that keeping the tracks is a matter of economic security for the community and options should be preserved for unforeseen future needs.

Tawn Kennedy, said that the rail trail should be built as quickly as possible. He stated that the rail option would bring opportunities to all areas of the County and that a trail only option would disconnect South County.

Peter Scott, stated that he supports forming an ad-hoc committee and that plans for the trail should continue moving forward. He noted that the tracks should not be removed because it would limit future options.

Steven Slade, said that the Land Trust of Santa Cruz County committed $5.8 million in matching funds toward the rail trail master plan and that there is an expectation for the RTC to be a reliable partner and proceed forward with the current policy and MBSST plans. He stated that Measure D funds should be used to build a trail alongside the tracks.

Bob Caletti, stated that there is no need for further committees and deliberations, and the RTC should move forward with the current plans. He said that there is a golden opportunity to provide better quality of life in Santa Cruz County with the rail property ownership that can reduce gridlock, provide transportation options, and reduce emissions.

Ryan Whitelaw, stated that there is an opportunity to do something special and every option should be vetted.

Bruce Sawhill, said that he supports staying the course with the rail with trail plan and stated that further studies are needed because the rail is a golden asset.

Mark Messiti-Miller, stated that the community voted for the rail with trail with Measure D and the RTC should stay the course of the Expenditure Plan. He noted that an EIR and the Unified Corridor Investment Study should be completed before an ad-hoc committee is established.

Janneka Strauss, said that she supports the rail with trail plan and is concerned that further studies may jeopardize the progress of the coastal rail trail. She stated that she is interested in multi-modal transportation to benefit the community and those without cars.

Glen Schaller, stated that he supports the rail with trail options and is proud of the Monterey Bay County Labor Council’s efforts to support transportation measures.
Brett Garret, said that public transportation is a priority and bus rapid transit (BRT) should be considered while keeping the course with the plans for a rail with trail.

Becky Steinbruner, said that she supports the rail trail option and moving forward with building a trail now, but alternative transportation should still be considered to keep the door open for future technologies. She noted that having a steam train would bring in tourist dollars because people love steam engines.

Kem Akol, stated that infrastructure is tied to development and options should be kept available for the future. He said that Santa Cruz County should move forward with expediting the development of the trail.

Eric McRew, said that an ad-hoc committee is not needed and he supports the plans for a rail with trail. He stated that the lack of connectivity in the County is a transportation crisis that needs to be addressed now, and noted that transportation is critical to economic development.

Ron Goodman, said that he supports having an ad-hoc committee and appreciates the communication and discussions had concerning options for the best use of the rail corridor. He stated that although there are trade-offs, he supports rail transportation and wants to see a good bike path built with the trail.

Jack Nelson, stated that the EIR process and the data it produces is supported by science, and that he regards the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process well because it considers alternatives.

Micah Posner, said that a train would be good for the community and is unique compared to BRT and other alternatives. He noted that more development along the rail line is needed.

Mark Clee, congratulated the Commission on the success of Measure D and expressed his concern with widening Highway 1. He stated that there should be a continued study of the rail corridor options and an ad-hoc committee should be established.

Commissioner Coonerty moved and Commissioner Leopold seconded the staff recommendation to accept the staff report with the added direction that staff release a Request for Proposals (RFP) for an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) on the options for the rail corridor as soon as possible and to provide a future status update. The motion passed unanimously with Commissioners Lane, Dutra, Leopold, McPherson, Johnson, Caput, Chase, Norton, Coonerty, and Commissioner Alternates Mulhearn, Hagan, and Rotkin voting “aye”.

2. Oral communications

Lowell Hurst, reported that it took him an hour to drive from Watsonville to Santa Cruz this morning.

Commissioner Dutra left the meeting and Commissioner Alternate Hurst joined the meeting.
3. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agendas
   Additional pages for Items 12 and 13, a replacement page for Item 12, and a
   handout for Item 17 were distributed.

14. Commissioner reports – oral reports
   Commissioner Leopold congratulated Cory Caletti for earning Bike Santa Cruz
   County’s Lifetime Achievement Award.

15. Appreciation of departing Commissioners for their service – oral presentation
   Chair Lane presented certificates of appreciation to departing Commissioners
   Cervantez and Norton and thanked them for their years of dedication serving
   on the board of the RTC. Commissioner Norton expressed his appreciation for
   the opportunity to represent the City of Capitola and for the support received
   from the Commission.

   Commissioner Coonerty thanked departing Chair Lane for his service
   representing the City of Santa Cruz and presented him with a certificate of
   appreciation. Chair Lane expressed his appreciation for the opportunity to
   serve on the Commission and said that he is proud to have been part of the
   collaboration effort to provide transportation options in the community.

   Commissioner Johnson left the meeting.

16. Election of 2017 RTC chair and vice-chair
   Commissioner Leopold reported that the appointing committee nominated
   Commissioner Zach Friend as Chair and Commissioner Cynthia Chase as Vice
   Chair. The nomination passed unanimously with Commissioners Lane, Leopold,
   McPherson, Caput, Chase, Norton, Coonerty, and Commissioner Alternates
   Mulhearn, Hagan, Lowell, and Rotkin voting “aye”

17. Director’s Report – oral report
   George Dondero, Executive Director, reported on: the Highway 9 Complete
   Streets Corridor Plan Request for Proposals (RFP) being issued with proposals
   due on January 17, 2017, and a contract to be awarded to the selected firm in
   February 2017; the San Lorenzo River Bridge Trestle Walkway widening
   project being partially funded by a grant; the California Transportation
   Commission (CTC) Active Transportation Program (ATP) awarded to the Rail
   Trail segments 8 and 9 in the amount of $3.166 million; and an update on the
   seasonal Polar Express excursion train.

   Commissioners discussed: correspondence with the Federal Railroad
   Administration (FRA) and Iowa Pacific regarding the Polar Express operation.

18. Caltrans report and consider action items
   Aileen Loe, Caltrans District 5 Deputy Director, reported on: the Federal
   Highway Administration (FHWA) report that there is a 2.5% increase in
   driving; the 2016 Zero Emissions Plan; and the installation of fast charging
   stations for electric vehicles.
Commissioners discussed their interest of the locations for the fast charging stations.

19. Unified Corridor Investment Study – Public Participation Plan and Project Update

Grace Blakeslee, Transportation Planner, presented the staff report. The Unified Corridor Investment Study (UCS) will identify multimodal transportation investments on three parallel transportation corridors in Santa Cruz County: Highway 1, Soquel Avenue/Drive, and the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line. Ms. Blakeslee noted that there will be a public workshop on January 12, 2017 at 6:00 p.m. at the Simpkins Swim Center.

Commissioners discussed: costs associated with the services offered by MetroQuest; the traffic congestion on Highway 1; and the need to clarify the areas studied versus the actual areas impacted.

Jack Nelson, asked about the areas that are to be included in the study.

Stanley Sokolow, said that he is concerned that the map of the areas to be studied do not include Watsonville.

Commissioner Norton moved and Commissioner Alternate Rotkin seconded the staff recommendation to adopt (Resolution 12-17) authorizing the Executive Director to enter into an agreement with MetroQuest for services required to provide interactive survey tools for the purposes of soliciting public input on the Unified Corridor Investment Study. The motion passed unanimously with Commissioners Lane, Coonerty, McPherson, Leopold, Chase, Norton, Caput, and Commissioner Alternates Hagan, Hurst, Mulhearn, and Rotkin voting “aye”.

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

The meeting of the Regional Transportation Commission was adjourned at 12:16 p.m.

21. Reconvene to the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission meeting

The meeting reconvened at 12:18 p.m.

22. Review of items to be discussed in closed session

Commissioners said there will be no closed session report and therefore the meeting will not reconvene afterwards. The meeting was adjourned to closed session at 12:19 p.m.

CLOSED SESSION

23. Public Employee Performance Review: Executive Director pursuant to Government Code Section 54957(b)
24. 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

25. Report on closed session
   There was no closed session report

26. Next meetings
   The next RTC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, January 19, 2017 at 9:00 a.m. at the City of Santa Cruz Council Chambers, 809 Center Street, Santa Cruz, CA.

   The next Transportation Policy Workshop is scheduled for Thursday, February 16, 2017 at 9:00 a.m. at the RTC Offices, 1523 Pacific Ave., Santa Cruz, CA.

Respectfully submitted,

Jenn Eames, Staff

Attendees:
Barry Scott Coastal Rail Santa Cruz
Stanley Sokolow
Eric Child
Stephen Slade Land Trust of Santa Cruz County
Dana Bagshaw
Neil Weldhauer
Will Mayall
Lowell Hurst City of Watsonville
Erich Friedrich Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments
Rosemary Sarka Roaring Camp
Lee Otter California Coastal Commission
Jack Nelson Campaign for Sensible Transportation
Tawn Kennedy Bike Santa Cruz County
Janneke Strause Bike Santa Cruz County
Glen Schaller Monterey Bay County Labor Council
Brett Garrett
Peter Scott Campaign for Sensible Transportation
Micah Posner
David Date
Nate Goodman
Bob Caletti
Rick Longinotti
Veronica Elsea
Cary Pico
Brian Peoples Trail Now
Kem Akol
Eric McRew
Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies

MINUTES

Thursday, December 8, 2016

City of Santa Cruz Council Chambers
809 Center Street
Santa Cruz, CA

The meeting was called to order immediately following the conclusion of the regular agenda of the RTC meeting at 12:16 p.m.

1. Oral communications - None

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

CONSENT AGENDA

No consent items

REGULAR AGENDA

3. Release of Request for Proposals for Freeway Service Patrol Towing Service on Highway 1 and Highway 17

Luis Mendez, Deputy Director, presented the staff report.

Commissioner Coonerty moved and Commissioner Alternate Rotkin seconded staff recommendations to approve the release of a request for proposals (RFP) for Freeway Service Patrol (FSP) towing service on Highway 1 and Highway 17 to encourage potential towing contractors to submit a proposal. The motion passed unanimously with Commissioners Lane, Leopold, Coonerty, McPherson, Caput, Norton, and Commissioner Alternates Hagan, Hurst, Mulhearn, and Rotkin voting “aye”.

4. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 12:18 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jenn Eames, Staff
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  
Will Menchine, District 3 (Alt.)  
Rick Hyman, District 5  
Amelia Conlen, City of Santa Cruz, Chair  
Lex Rau, City of Scotts Valley  
Andy Ward, City of Capitola  
Murray Fontes, City of Watsonville  
Piet Canin, Ecology Action/Bike to Work  
Leo Jed, CTSC

**Unexcused Absences:**
Jim Cook, District 2 (Alt.)
Peter Scott, District 3
Melissa Ott, City of Santa Cruz
Gary Milburn, City of Scotts Valley (Alt.)
Daniel Kostelec, City of Capitola (Alt.)
Emily Gomez, Ecology Action/Bike-to-Work (Alt.)
Jim Langley, CTSC (Alt.)

**Excused Absences:**
Jim Burr, City of Santa Cruz

**Vacancies:**
District 4 – Voting and Alternate  
District 5 – Alternate  
City of Watsonville – Alternate

**Guests:**
Janneke Strause, Bike Santa Cruz County  
Jim Burr, City of Santa Cruz

**Staff:**
Cory Caletti, Sr Transportation Planner  
Ginger Dykaar, Transportation Planner  
Grace Blakeslee, Transportation Planner  
Nestor Guevara, Transportation Planning Tech

3. Announcements – Murray Fontes is the new voting member representing the City of Watsonville; Amelia Conlen is now representing the City of Santa Cruz as the voting member; and Melissa Ott is serving as the alternate. The RTC received a report regarding options for the rail corridor that may impact rail trail design. The RTC took action to proceed with environmental review of rail transit and other options of the rail corridor.
4. Oral communications – Amelia Conlen introduced Janneke Strause, the new Executive Director of Bike Santa Cruz County, who has served as the organizations’ Event Coordinator working on events like Run to the Sea and Open Streets. Janneke plans to attend future committee meetings on a regular basis. She noted that at the recent annual fundraising dinner, County Supervisor John Leopold presented a proclamation honoring Bike Santa Cruz County for 25 years of service to the community. Lifetime achievement awards were also presented to notable individuals Berry Michel, Micah Posner, Ron Goodman, Piet Canin and Cory Caletti.

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

CONSENT AGENDA

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

6. Accepted final minutes of the August 8, 2016 Bicycle Advisory Committee meeting

7. Accepted summary of Hazard Reports

8. Accepted roster

9. Accepted 2017 Draft Meeting Schedule

REGULAR AGENDA

10. Unified Corridor Investment Study – Draft Goals, Performance Measure and Projects for Scenario Analysis – Ginger Dykaaar and Grace Blakeslee presented a summary of the staff report to solicit input on the goals, performance measures and the projects to be analyzed in the scenario analysis. Members recommended to include bike miles traveled and to capture the difference between multi-use trails and dedicated bike trails in the performance measures. Members also suggested to include a “no project” scenario in the scenario analysis, and to consider protected bike lanes along Soquel Ave/Drive as a project to be analyzed.

11. Draft “What Pedestrians and Bicyclists Want Each Other to Know” Brochure – Cory Caletti submitted an add-on page to the staff report containing public comment. Grace Blakeslee, RTC Transportation Planner, presented the most recent version of the brochure and received feedback. Input will be considered by the Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee’s Pedestrian Safety Work Group.

12. Transportation Development Act Claim from the City of Santa Cruz – Amelia Conlen, as City of Santa Cruz staff, summarized the TDA claims under review. Vice-Chair Casterson served as chair during this item. A motion (Hyman/Ward) to recommend that the RTC approve the allocation requests passed with members Voss, Casterson, Menchine, Hyman, Conlen, Rau, Ward, Fontes, and Canin voting in favor. Leo Jed voted against the motion and requested that the record reflect the reason for his opposition being design features of the Pacific Avenue Contra Flow Bike Lane, not funding of the project itself. Members indicated overall support for the project and its benefits in light of the likelihood to reduced wrong-way and sidewalk riding on Pacific Avenue.

13. Coastal Rail Trail/Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network Update – Cory Caletti summarized progress made on the north coast rail trail project. Jim Burr, City of Santa Cruz
staff, provided a summary of the materials provided in the packet related to updates on the City's rail trail project. Given discussion of costs increases, notable comments from committee members included how Measure D funding allocations to trail projects would be made in the future. Of debate should be whether cost increases of projects underway would be covered over funding of projects in areas of the county that would ensure equitable distribution of resources. RTC staff indicated that an in-depth discussion of Measure D funding prioritizations will be agendized in the near future. Murray Fontes, City of Watsonville staff, provided an update on the south county rail trail project.

14. 2017 State and Federal Legislative Programs – Rachel Moriconi provided an overview of the draft 2017 RTC state and federal legislative programs and requested feedback. Members provided input, appreciating RTC support for any efforts to increase Active Transportation Program and Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network (MBSST) funding. In recognition that several state programs favor larger regions, Leo Jed suggested looking for a comparison of how funds from a range of programs (cap and trade, STIP, ATP and others) are distributed statewide.

15. 2016 Measure D Transportation Improvement Program Update (as presented at the December 8, 2016 RTC meeting) – Cory Caletti summarized the staff report outlining the vast amount of effort put into the passage of Measure D. The measure, approved by a 2/3- majority of the voters, will provide locally controlled funds to be divided according to the voter approved expenditure plan. Significant funds will be allocated to bicycle and pedestrian projects. Again, members indicated that a future discussion should take place regarding criteria by which rail trail projects would be prioritized for funding.

16. Highway 1 Mar Vista Bicycle/Pedestrian Overcrossing – Cory Caletti summarized the staff report and solicited volunteers to serve on an ad-hoc committee to be made up of project stakeholders. Ad-hoc committee members will review design features and consider operational features. A motion was made (Hyman/Jed) to appoint the following individuals to serve on the committee: David Casterson, Will Menchine, Kem Akol, Piet Canin and Bike Santa Cruz County's Janneke Strause. The motion passed unanimously with Voss, Casterson, Menchine, Hyman, Conlen, Rau, Ward, Fontes, Canin, and Jed voting in favor.

17. Updates related to Committee functions – 1) Members discussed redesign of the Sunset Inn on Mission Street and the possible addition of a bicycle project at the back of the property that would connect King Street to Swift St. Such a connection would enable bicyclists to avoid travel on Mission Street. Rick Hyman and Will Menchine will serve on an ad-hoc committee and will bring an update to a future meeting, possibly February. 2) Kem Akol proposed that the Committee request that the City of Santa Cruz honor long-time Bicycle Committee member and former City of Santa Cruz Public Works Director through the naming of a significant public works structure after him. David Casterson will be the signatory on behalf of the Committee. A motion was made (Jed/Akol) to send such a request which passed unanimously with members Voss, Casterson, Menchine, Hyman, Conlen, Rau, Ward, Fontes, Canin and Jed voting in favor. 3) A letter of appreciation to County of Santa Cruz Public Works Department was suggested in recognition of the installation of Freedom Boulevard green bike lanes across Highway 1. A motion to send such a letter was made (Voss/Ward) and passed unanimously with members Voss, Casterson, Menchine, Hyman, Conlen, Rau, Ward, Fontes, Canin and Jed voting in favor. 4) Lex Rau indicated that progress was being made on Mt Hermon bicycle and vehicular improvements. Piet Canin also indicated that an Active Transportation Group was being formed for the City of Scotts Valley that will be meeting monthly. 5) Amelia Conlen updated members regarding the City of Santa Cruz Active Transportation Plan which will be coming for consideration to City of Santa Cruz Council in January or February. The plan is being
recommended for approval by the City’s Planning Commission. If the plan will be brought to the February council meeting, it will be agendized for the February Bicycle Committee so that members may consider sending a letter of support.

18. Adjourned – 8:30 p.m.

**NEXT MEETING:** The next Bicycle Committee meeting is scheduled for, February 13, 2017, 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
Minutes
Tuesday, December 13, 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 Arnberger, 2nd District
Lisa Berkowitz, CTSA
John Daugherty, Metro Transit
Veronica Elsea, 3rd District
Sally French, Hope Services
Clay Kempf, Social Service Provider, Seniors

Alternates Present:
Tom Duncanson, 2nd District
April Warnock, Metro Transit/ParaCruz

Excused Absences:
Lori Bettencourt, 5th District
Cara Lamb, Potential Transit User

Unexcused Absences:
Michael Molesky, Social Service Provider Disabled (County)

RTC Staff Present:
Grace Blakeslee
Ginger Dykaar
Nestor Guevara
Cathy Judd
Rachel Moriconi
Karena Pushnik
Kim Shultz

Others Present:
Jean Brocklebank
Jim Burr, City of Santa Cruz
Sylvia Caras
Natalie Diaz, City of Watsonville
Patrick Fung, City of Santa Cruz
Michael A. Lewis
Dulce Lizarraga-Chagolla, CCCIL
Sean Vienna, AMBAG

3. Oral Communications

- Pedestrian hazard of debris spray by buses on Capitola Road between Soquel Avenue and 7th was reported. Referred to the Pedestrian Safety Work Group and the Metro Advisory Committee.
- Metro service changes to begin on December 15, 2016 and new Metro Headways guide is available.
- Area Agency on Aging services is out to bid and the letter of intent is due on December 27, 2016.
- Veronica Elsea serves on the Caltrans Accessibility Advisory Committee and for 2017 the Committee will focus on Design Bulletin #89 Class IV Bikeway Guidance (Separated Bikeways/Cycle Tracks) and pedestrian islands. Talking pedestrian beacon signals were installed by Caltrans on Mission Street at various locations. A new signal at Mission and Bay needs volume adjustment.
4. Additions or deletions to consent and regular agenda

Grace Blakeslee supplied 2 add on pages for Item 12b, 1 replacement page for Item 13, and 3 hand out pages for Item 18.

CONSENT AGENDA

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

5. Approved Minutes from August 9, 2016

6. Received Transportation Development Act Revenues Report

7. Received RTC Meeting Highlights

8. Recommend the RTC approve Dulce Lizarraga-Chagolla for the member position representing Social Service Provider – Seniors (County)

9. Received resignation from Brent Gifford

10. Received E&D TAC Roster

11. Received Information Items
   
   a. Report – Mineta Transportation Institute, Improving Pathway to Transit for Persons with Disabilities, August 2016
   c. Article – On-Call Partners with Lyft for Enhanced Customer Experience in Non-Emergency Transportation – One Call Care Management, August 2016
   d. Article – Pedestrian May Run Rampant in a World of Self Driving Cars UCSC News, October 2016

12. Received Agency Updates
   
   a. Volunteer Center – FY15/16 4th Quarter TDA Report
   b. Community Bridges – FY15/16 3rd Quarter TDA Report, 4th Quarter and Final Report
   c. Santa Cruz Metro
      i. ParaCruz Report from April – May 2016

REGULAR AGENDA

13. Measure D

Karen Pushnik, Senior Transportation Planner communicated that Measure D – Transportation Improvement Program, passed. The RTC board will be receiving reports about Measure D implementation in the coming months.

14. City of Watsonville Airport Boulevard Improvements

Natalie Diaz, City of Watsonville, presented the City of Watsonville Airport Boulevard Improvement Project. The project includes new transit and pedestrian amenities. Members thanked the City of Watsonville and discussed the need for safety components including audible signals, correct driveway slope and safe access from the street to businesses.
15. City of Santa Cruz Pacific Avenue Contra Flow Bike Lane Project

Patrick Fung, City of Santa Cruz, presented the Pacific Avenue Contra Flow Bike Lane Project, and is seeking $85,000 in Transportation Development Act (TDA) funding. The project does not include new pedestrian facilities: therefore, review by the E&D TAC is not required. This is presented in response to a request from members of the Pedestrian Safety Work Group. The Committee members discussed the following safety concerns about the project as proposed:

- the potential for conflicts between pedestrians crossing Pacific Avenue and bicyclists traveling southbound in a cycle track where the cycle track is located on the west side of Pacific Avenue and automobile travel is limited to the northbound direction;
- the potential for conflicts between pedestrians crossing Pacific Avenue and bicyclists at various locations as a result of the lack of consistency in the configuration of bicycle travel on Pacific Avenue;
- the potential for conflicts between bicyclists and pedestrians who are blind or visually impaired and who may not be aware that bicyclists will be traveling in the opposite direction of automobile travel on Pacific Avenue; and,
- the potential for conflicts between bicyclists and motorists as a result of the shortened line-of-sight for motorists exiting parking spaces on the west side of the cycle track and crossing the cycle track before entering the automobile travel lane.

Action: A motion (Daugherty/Arnsberger) was made for the E&D TAC to oppose the project in its current form and recommend that committee’s safety concerns be addressed. The motion passed unanimously with members Ance, Arnsberger, Berkowitz, Daugherty, Elsea, French and Kempf voting in favor. No votes were cast in opposition.

16. Unified Corridor Investment Study – Project Update & Draft Goals

Ginger Dykaar and Grace Blakeslee, Transportation Planners, reported that Caltrans funded the Unified Corridor Investment Study to indentify multimodal 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 goals. Phase 1 of the UCS to develop the modeling tools was completed. Phase 2 of the UCS to perform scenario analysis to identify projects that provide the greatest benefit is currently underway. The committee members discussed daily peak travel periods in Santa Cruz County and requested that seasonal travel be considered. Committee members provided ideas for soliciting input from Santa Cruz County’s elderly and disabled residents and suggested providing the public with the opportunity to submit survey responses on paper and not limit responses to online survey responses.

17. Mar Vista Bicycle and Pedestrian Overcrossing Design

Kim Shultz, Senior Transportation Planner reported on the development of the Mar Vista Bicycle and Pedestrian Overcrossing. The firm Moffat and Nichol was hired to complete the project design and environmental review. The scope of services includes work with stakeholders to identify areas of concern and project priorities. RTC staff recommends that the E&D TAC identify committee members to participate in a stakeholder group for the purposes of providing input on the Mar Vista Bicycle and Pedestrian Overcrossing design features and operational considerations.

Action: A motion (Kempf/Daugherty) was made to appoint Veronica Elsea and Tom Duncanson to serve on the stakeholder committee. The motion passed unanimously with members Ance, Arnsberger, Berkowitz, Daugherty, Elsea, French and Kempf voting in favor. No votes were cast in opposition.
18. Pedestrian Safety Workgroup Update – Draft Brochure What Pedestrians and Bicyclists Want Each Other to Know

Veronica Elsea, E&D TAC and Pedestrian Safety Workgroup Chair, provided an update on development of the brochure What Pedestrians and Bicyclist Want Each Other to Know and asked the E&D TAC for input. Input on the brochure was also solicited from the Bicycle Advisory Committee. Comments received on the draft brochure will be reviewed at the December 16 Pedestrian Safety Work Group meeting.

19. State and Federal Legislative Programs Report

Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner said that RTC staff is in process of developing the RTC’s 2017 State and Federal Legislative Programs. Staff recommends that the RTC’s advisory committees provide input on the draft legislative priorities and identify any additional issues that the RTC should consider, monitor or pursue in 2017. Following committee reviews of the draft legislative program, the RTC is expected to approve the Legislative Programs at its January or February 2017 meeting.

20. Section 5310 Grant Cycle

Grace Blakeslee, Transportation Planner provided a report on Section 5310: Elderly & Disabled Specialized Transit Program. The Section 5310 grant applications are due March 1, 2017 to Caltrans.

Ms. Blakeslee asked for volunteers for the Section 5310 local review committee. The local review committee will develop preliminarily scores for the Section 5310 grant applications from Santa Cruz County and a regional project prioritization list for consideration by the RTC. Clay Kempf and April Warnock agreed to serve on that committee.

21. Adjourn 4:00 pm

Respectfully submitted, Cathy Judd, RTC Staff
Santa Cruz County
Regional Transportation Commission
Interagency Technical Advisory Committee (ITAC)

DRAFT MINUTES
Thursday, December 15, 2016 1:30 p.m.
SCCRTC Conference Room
1523 Pacific Ave, Santa Cruz, CA

ITAC MEMBERS PRESENT
Teresa Buika, University of California at Santa Cruz (UCSC)
Chris Schneiter, Santa Cruz Public Works
Barrow Emerson, Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (METRO)
Claire Fliesler, Santa Cruz Planning
Murray Fontes, Watsonville Public Works and Planning Proxy
Erich Friedrich, Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG)
Steve Jesberg, Capitola Public Works
Pete Rasmussen, Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (METRO)
Steve Wiesner, County Public Works and Planning Proxy

RTC STAFF PRESENT: Grace Blakeslee, George Dondero, Ginger Dykaar, Rachel Moriconi

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: Steve Wiesner reported that at the California State Association of Counties (CSAC) annual meeting he learned that transportation is a priority for state leaders and counties statewide are struggling to maintain local roads.

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

CONSENT AGENDA

5. Approved Minutes of the September 15, 2016 ITAC meeting (Fontes/Buika). The motion passed with Buika, Emerson, Fliesler, Fontes, Friedrich, Jesberg, and Wiesner voting yes. Members Schneiter and Rasmussen abstained.

REGULAR AGENDA

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

Santa Cruz – Chris Schneiter reported that council approved design schematics for Segment 7 of the Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail Network (MBSST) and an agreement with RTC regarding trail maintenance and liability. The Highway 1/9 intersection project is at 65% design, with right-of-way to begin in 2017. Claire Fliesler reported that 21 signalized
intersection pedestrian safety upgrades were approved for HSIP funds; and other pedestrian-head upgrades are done.

**Regional Transportation Commission (RTC):** Rachel Moriconi reported that the RTC released the Request for Proposals (RFP) for the Highway 9 Corridor Plan and awarded a contract for environmental review of the Highway 1/Mar Vista bike/pedestrian crossing.

**METRO** - Pete Rasmussen and Barrow Emerson reported that new service changes went into effect on December 15, adding in 5 new trips. Ridership has dropped 7%, as compared to the 12-15% service reductions. METRO has had some challenges due to driver shortages, buses breaking down, and Highway 17 buses being full. Mr. Emerson reported that METRO plans to evaluate options for Measure D funds January - March. METRO is also evaluating options for the Pacific Station renovation, given current funding shortfalls. METRO and City of Santa Cruz will also be evaluating commuter benefit/transportation demand management/trip reduction ordinance options for downtown Santa Cruz. METRO is also evaluating bus on shoulders, articulated buses; and working with RTC on several planning efforts; and working on administrative policies for bus stops.

**Capitola** - Steve Jesberg reported that the city has finished several roadway rehabilitation projects; and widening sidewalks along Park Ave, Kennedy, and Monterey Avenue. The city is also working on signal synchronization on 41st Avenue from Jade St/Brommer to Clares; and a complete streets project on Clares from Wharf Road to 41st Ave.

**UCSC** - Teresa Buika reported that bus schedules have been modified due to shifting class schedules and growing enrollment. UCSC is also looking at EV charging for Level 1 and Level 2 facilities; and possible new bike share and TDM programs with the City of Santa Cruz.

**Watsonville** - Murray Fontes reported that the Freedom Boulevard reconstruction project is finishing up; Main Street pedestrian improvements, including wider sidewalks are under development.

**County of Santa Cruz** - Steve Wiesner reported on El Rancho Road, Highland Way, Granite Creek Road, Glen Haven Drive, and other storm damage and bridge scourer projects. The county is seeking a Caltrans grant to develop a Complete Streets/Active Transportation plan. Noting challenges in securing funds from the state Active Transportation Program (ATP), committee members discussed meeting to identify opportunities to collaborate on and seek modifications to future grant applications. Mr. Wiesner noted that construction continues on the Twin Lakes/East Cliff Dr. beach front project; a contract has been awarded for the Aptos Village project, which includes traffic signals and other multimodal components; and green bike lanes near Paul Sweet Road/Highway 1 on Soquel Drive.

7. Unified Corridor Investment Study - Draft Goals, Performance Measures and Projects for Scenario Analysis

Ginger Dykaar provided an overview of the Unified Corridor Investment Study for three parallel routes between Aptos and Santa Cruz: Highway 1, Soquel Avenue/Drive, and the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line. The project will include scenario analysis of how different groups of projects meet a range of performance measures. Public outreach will include online surveys, stakeholder meetings, and a public workshop on January 12. Grace Blakeslee
solicited input on draft goals, performance measures and projects for the scenario analysis. A consultant is being hired to conduct the technical analysis. Committee members provided comments and suggestions, including suggestions that the study look at quality of life criteria, the range of uses of the rail corridor, Highway 1 San Lorenzo River Bridge and Mission St/Chestnut St intersection improvements, the impact lane reductions have on parallel roadways and throughput, Santa Cruz METRO’s priority project list, including automated vehicle location (AVL), the economic impact of proposals, including removal of parking, policy-level projects – such as no parking or left turns during certain hours, new technology and TNCs, and congestion near schools.

8. Draft 2017 RTC Legislative Program

Rachel Moriconi solicited input on the draft 2017 state and federal legislative programs for the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC). Committee members emphasized the need for a fix to the diminishing gas tax and transportation funding overall and the need for better coordination and funding for electrification infrastructure. Barrow Emerson suggested that ITAC member agencies meet in the early fall each year to discuss legislative priorities and develop consistent legislative programs countywide.

9. Measure D – Transportation Improvement Plan (TRIP) Update

Rachel Moriconi reported on the passage of Measure D, highlighted requirements in the Ordinance, and the general timeline for implementing Measure D. Committee members suggested that the 5-Year Program of Projects for recipient agencies (cities, county, and transit) might be developed in the spring, with annual reports on prior year expenditures provided in the fall after the close of each fiscal year. Recipient agencies requested that RTC provide revenue estimates and direction on use of the funds as soon as possible.

10. Regional Transportation Plan - Preliminary Local Revenues Financial Projections

Rachel Moriconi reported that the Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) and the RTC are developing the Financial Element for the 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) and Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), which estimates how much revenue will be available to operate, maintain, and improve the multimodal transportation system. She requested that local agencies review and provide updates for local revenue sources.

11. Options for Use of the Rail Corridor – Item presented and discussed after Item 7

George Dondero provided information on possible uses of the Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line, including a rail with trail, rail transit, trail-only, and bus rapid transit. Committee members mentioned challenges with bridges, importance of transit options, range of responses to locomotive-driven holiday trains, right-of-way needs for bus rapid transit, Express BRT possibilities to the University from Bay/California and Delaware/Western, the need for mass transit analysis of cost and ridership for BRT. Committee members suggested that the RTC start with a screening process for different options, rather than conducting California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) environmental review of the range of options. In response to questions from the committee, Director Dondero reported that the Unified Corridor Study will inform the evaluation of rail corridor options, that the rail corridor analysis will cover the
entire rail line. The detailed analysis, including CEQA, is expected to take two to three years. Work on sections of the trail now in progress should continue as planned.

12. Next meeting: The next ITAC meeting is scheduled for January 19, 2017 at 1:30pm in the SCCRTC Conference Room, 1523 Pacific Avenue, Santa Cruz, CA. That meeting was subsequently cancelled.

The meeting adjourned at 3:50 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>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>872,266</td>
<td>-25,766</td>
<td>-2.87%</td>
<td>99.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTOBER</td>
<td>617,500</td>
<td>635,655</td>
<td>657,500</td>
<td>21,845</td>
<td>3.44%</td>
<td>100.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOVEMBER</td>
<td>823,300</td>
<td>847,505</td>
<td>876,700</td>
<td>29,195</td>
<td>3.44%</td>
<td>101.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECEMBER</td>
<td>917,127</td>
<td>762,375</td>
<td>813,479</td>
<td>51,104</td>
<td>6.70%</td>
<td>102.20%</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><strong>8,970,056</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,059,403</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,688,845</strong></td>
<td><strong>100,927</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.11%</strong></td>
<td><strong>52%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**

I:\FISCAL\TDA\MonthlyReceipts\FY2017\[FY2017 TDA Receipts.xlsx]FY2017
Agenda: January 19, 2017

To: Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
From: Cory Caletti, Senior Transportation Planner/Bicycle Program Manager
Re: City of Santa Cruz Article 8 Transportation Development Act Allocation Request

RECOMMENDATION

The Regional Transportation Commission’s Bicycle Advisory Committee and staff recommend that the Regional Transportation Commission approve by resolution the City of Santa Cruz Article 8 Transportation Development Act Allocation Claim for $30,000 for bikeway striping and minor improvements and $85,000 for the Pacific Avenue Contra-Flow Bike Lane.

BACKGROUND

The Transportation Development Act (TDA) was established by the State Legislature in 1971. The TDA provides one of the major funding sources for public, specialized, bicycle and pedestrian transportation in California.

Each year the Regional Transportation Commission allocates Article 8 TDA funds for bikeway and pedestrian projects to local jurisdictions according to the RTC Rules & Regulations using a population formula. TDA funds allocated to a local jurisdiction may be rolled over from one fiscal year to the next.

As stated in the Rules and Regulations, a TDA Article 8 claim from local jurisdictions shall include a description of the project adequate for review by the RTC and its advisory committees; justification for the project including a statement regarding its consistency and relationship with the Regional Transportation Plan; estimated cost of the project including other funding sources; and a statement agreeing to maintain the funded project in the condition outlined in the submitted plans for a period of 20 years.

Allocation requests with pedestrian components must be reviewed by the Elderly and Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC) and requests for bicycle facilities must be reviewed by the Bicycle Advisory Committee prior to consideration by the RTC.

DISCUSSION

The City of Santa Cruz submitted a letter and Article 8 FY 16/17 Transportation
Development Act allocation claims for $30,000 for bikeway striping and minor improvements and $85,000 for the Pacific Avenue Contra-Flow Bike Lane (Exhibits A-C). The bikeway striping and minor improvements allocation would provide annual maintenance of the city’s 30 miles of bikeways. Funding for the Pacific Avenue Contra-Flow project would extend from Church Street to Cathcart Street and include bike lanes from Cathcart Street to Laurel Street, as well as sharrows from Water Street to Church Street. The City of Santa Cruz has sufficient funds in the unallocated budget for these claims.

At the December, 2016 meeting, the Bicycle Advisory Committee reviewed the claim, as per the committee’s charge, and recommended that the RTC approve the City’s allocation request.

While the E&D TAC was not required to review this claim, the committee requested and received a presentation from City of Santa Cruz staff regarding the Pacific Avenue Contra Flow Bike Lane Project at their meeting on December 13, 2016. Committee members discussed the safety concerns for pedestrians and motorists if the project is implemented as proposed. The Committee took action to send a letter (Attachment 2) to oppose the project in its current form and recommend that the committee’s safety concerns be addressed. The City of Santa Cruz provided the attached response (Attachment 3) that addresses those concerns.

The Bicycle Advisory Committee reviewed the safety considerations that the Contra Flow Bike Lane project is meant to address and took the position that overall safety improvements offered override design imperfections. The Bicycle Advisory Committee, as the Committee designated to review bicycle related items, recommends that the RTC approve by resolution (Attachment 1) the City of Santa Cruz’s TDA claim. Staff also recommends approval due to the project’s likelihood to reduce wrong way bicycle travel and sidewalk riding on Pacific Avenue. Staff understands that the City of Santa Cruz council initiated this project and directed implementation. City staff will monitor the project carefully post installation and will be compiling collision data in order to fine tune the design if needed. Collision data and other available monitoring reports will be shared with the E&D TAC.

SUMMARY

The City of Santa Cruz submitted a TDA Article 8 allocation request for $30,000 for bicycle striping and minor improvements and $85,000 for the Pacific Avenue Contra-Flow Bike Lane project. The City has sufficient funds in the unallocated budget for these claims. Staff and the Bicycle Advisory Committee recommend approval of the attached resolution.
Attachment 1: Resolution
  Exhibits:
  A. Article 8 TDA Allocation Request Letter from the City of Santa Cruz
  B. City of Santa Cruz Allocation Claim Form for Bikeway Striping and Minor Improvements
  C. City of Santa Cruz Allocation Claim Form for the Pacific Avenue Contra-Flow Bike Lane project

Attachment 2: Letter from the E&D TAC to the City of Santa Cruz
Attachment 3: Response letter from the City of Santa Cruz to the E&D TAC
RESOLUTION NO. 13-17

Adopted by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
on the date of January 19, 2017
on the motion of Commissioner
duly seconded by Commissioner

A RESOLUTION ALLOCATING $30,000 IN ARTICLE 8 TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT ACT (TDA) FUNDS TO THE CITY OF SANTA CRUZ FOR BIKEWAY STRIPING AND MINOR IMPROVEMENTS

WHEREAS, the City of Santa Cruz submitted a letter (Exhibit A) for two FY 16/17 claims for: 1) $30,000 for Bikeway Striping and Minor Improvements (Exhibit B) and 2) $85,000 for the Pacific Avenue Contra-Flow Bike Lane project (Exhibit C);

WHEREAS, the City of Santa Cruz has sufficient unallocated Article 8 TDA revenues;

WHEREAS, the Bicycle Advisory Committee has reviewed the TDA project funding request pertaining to their charge and recommend approval; and

WHEREAS, the proposed project is consistent with the 2014 Regional Transportation Plan and the claimant agrees to maintain funded projects for a period of 20 years;

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

1. Hereby allocates $30,000 in TDA Article 8 funds to the City of Santa Cruz for Bikeway Striping and Minor Improvements and $85,000 for the Pacific Avenue Contra-Flow bike Lane project.

AYES: COMMISSIONERS

NOES: COMMISSIONERS

ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS

ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS

____________________________
Zach Friend, Chair

ATTEST:

_____________________________
George Dondero, Secretary

Exhibit A-C: TDA Article 8 Allocation Request Letter from the City of Santa Cruz and Claim Forms

Distribution: City of Santa Cruz Public Works
RTC Fiscal
RTC Bicycle Planner
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August 30, 2016

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

RE: City of Santa Cruz – FY 2016-17 TDA Article 8 Allocation Request

Dear Mr. Dondero:

Please accept this letter as a FY 2016-17 TDA Article 8 allocation request for the following project:

1. **Bikeway Striping and Minor Improvements ($30,000):** This project provides for the annual restriping of the City’s 30 miles of bikeways, maintenance of bikeways and minor bikeway improvements. This project is entirely supported with TDA funds.

2. **Pacific Avenue Contra-Flow Bike Lane ($85,000):** This project provides a contra-flow bike lane on Pacific, from Church to Cathcart, bike lanes from Cathcart to Laurel, and sharrow from Water to Church. The project has been approved by City Council and is included in the FY17 Capital Improvement Program.

The City’s remaining unallocated balance will be used to match grant applications, under funded projects, and future bikeway striping and parking projects.

As with all City claims, the City will commit to maintain any facilities provided with these funds for 20 years and will prepare all necessary environmental review for these projects. All of the projects above are consistent with the City Bicycle Transportation and Pedestrian Plans, and the RTP.

Please call me at 420-5422 if you have any questions or need additional information.

Sincerely,

Christophe J. Schneiter
Assistant Public Works Director/City Engineer

Attachments: Claim Forms

cc: Transportation Coordinator (AC)
    Finance Department (CF)
Transportation Development Act (TDA) – Local Transportation Funds
CLAIM FORM
for Bike/Ped Projects

If you have any questions about this claim form or would like an electronic copy of the form, please contact the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission at 460-3200.

Project Information

1. Project Title: Bikeway Striping and Minor Improvements

2. Implementing Agency: City of Santa Cruz

3. Sponsoring Agency (if different) – must be a TDA Eligible Claimant:

4. TDA funding requested this claim: $30,000

5. Fiscal Year (FY) for which funds are claimed: FY _16_/ _17_

6. General purpose for which the claim is made, identified by the article and section of the Act which authorizes such claims: ☒ Article 8 Bicycle and/or Pedestrian Facility

7. Contact Person/Project Manager: Jim Burr
   Telephone Number: 831-420-5522 E-mail: jburr@cityofsantacruz.com

   Secondary Contact (in event primary not available): Rich Smith
   Telephone Number: 831-420-5522 E-mail: rsmith@cityofsantacruz.com

8. Project/Program Description/Scope (use additional pages, if needed, to provide details such as work elements/tasks):

   Annual restriping of the City’s 30 miles of bikeways and minor bikeway improvements.

9. Number of people to be served/anticipated number of users of project/program:

10. Project Location/Limits (attach a map and/or photos if available/applicable, include street names):

    Those streets most in need will be striped.

11. Justification for the project. (Why is this project needed? Primary goal/purpose of the project; problem to be addressed; project benefits; importance to the community):

    Traffic safety

12. Consistency and relationship with the 2014 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) – please reference Project or Policy:

    2014 RTP Sustainability Policies p. 4-3, see attachment.
13. Measures of performance, success or completion to be used to evaluate project/program:

Traffic safety

14. Impact(s) of project on other modes of travel, if any (ex. parking to be removed):

N/A

15. Project Cost/Budget, including other funding sources, and Schedule:

**Capital Projects – OR ATTACH PROJECT BUDGET**

Project Start Date: 9/2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHEDULE (Month/Yr) Completion Date</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Design/Engineering</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Contingency</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost/Phase</td>
<td>na</td>
<td></td>
<td>na</td>
<td>4/16</td>
<td>Na</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please describe what is included in "Other":*

16. Preferred Method and Schedule for TDA fund distribution, consistent with the RTC Rules and Regulations (a. 90% prior to completion/10% upon completion; or b. 100% after completion):

100% AFTER COMPLETION

17. TDA Eligibility:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES? / NO?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Has the project/program been approved by the claimant’s governing body? Attach resolution to claim. (If &quot;NO,&quot; provide the approximate date approval is anticipated.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Has this project previously received TDA funding?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. For capital projects, have provisions been made by the claimant to maintain the project or facility, or has the claimant arranged for such maintenance by another agency for the next 20 years?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Has the project already been reviewed by the RTC Bicycle Committee and/or Elderly/Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee? (If &quot;NO,&quot; project will be reviewed prior to RTC approval.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. For &quot;bikeways,&quot; does the project meet Caltrans minimum safety design criteria pursuant to Chapter 1000 of the California Highway Design Manual? (Available on the internet via: <a href="http://www.dot.ca.gov">http://www.dot.ca.gov</a>).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Documentation to Include with Your Claim:

All Claims
☐ A letter of transmittal addressed to the SCCRTC Executive Director that attests to the accuracy of the claim and all its accompanying documentation.
☐ Resolution from the TDA Eligible Claimant indicating its role and responsibilities.

Article 8 Bicycle/Pedestrian Claims
☐ Evidence of environmental review for capital projects

Local Agency Certification:

I certify that the information provided in this form is accurate and correct. I understand that if the required information has not been provided this form may be returned and the funding allocation may be delayed.

Signature: [Signature]  Title: [Title]  Date: [Date]

This TDA Claim Form has been prepared in accordance with the SCCRTC's Rules and Regulations, and Caltrans TDA Guidebook (http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/MassTrans/State-TDA.html).

[Path to file]
Transportation Development Act (TDA) – Local Transportation Funds
CLAIM FORM
for Bike/Ped Projects

If you have any questions about this claim form or would like an electronic copy of the form, please contact the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission at 460-3200.

Project Information

1. Project Title: Pacific Avenue Contraflow Bike Lane Project

2. Implementing Agency: City of Santa Cruz

3. Sponsoring Agency (if different) – must be a TDA Eligible Claimant:

4. TDA funding requested this claim: $85,000

5. Fiscal Year (FY) for which funds are claimed: FY _16/_17_

6. General purpose for which the claim is made, identified by the article and section of the Act which authorizes such claims: Article 8 Bicycle and/or Pedestrian Facility

7. Contact Person/Project Manager: Jim Burr
   Telephone Number: (831) 420-5426   E-mail: jimburr@cityofsantacruz.com

   Secondary Contact (in event primary not available): Nathan Nguyen
   Telephone Number: (831) 420-5188   E-mail: nnguyen@cityofsantacruz.com

8. Project/Program Description/Scope (use additional pages, if needed, to provide details such as work elements/tasks):

   A southbound contraflow bike lane will be installed on Pacific Avenue between Church and Cathcart Streets. Green striping will be applied to 4’ of the bike lane to increase visibility of the bike lane and direct cyclists away from the door zone, with an additional 2’ between the bike lane and parking stalls. White bike lane striping will be installed through the intersections at Walnut and Lincoln, and a new island will be installed at Pacific and Lincoln to prevent wrong-way vehicle traffic. Sharrows will be installed in the northbound direction to alert drivers that people on bikes may be riding with vehicle traffic. Cyclists traveling in the southbound contraflow lane will be controlled by stop signs at Lincoln and Cathcart.

   Class II bike lanes will also be installed in both directions on the two-way portion of Pacific Avenue between Cathcart and Laurel Streets, and sharrows will be installed on Pacific between Locust and Church.

   Following City Council’s approval of the project in June 2016, Public Works has completed design/engineering for the project. We are applying for funds for construction.
9. Number of people to be served/anticipated number of users of project/program:

To determine current ridership on Pacific Avenue, bicycle counts were performed on weekdays during three time frames; 7:30-9:00am, 11:30am-1:00pm, and 4:30-6:00pm. Of these periods, 4:30-6:00pm saw the most cyclists present on Pacific Avenue, ranging from 86 at Pacific and Lincoln to 104 at Pacific and Church.

While it would be difficult to estimate the number of people on bikes who will use the Pacific Avenue contraflow lane, our counts confirm heavy daily traffic on Pacific Avenue. Staff also witnessed large numbers of cyclists riding the wrong way on Pacific, an issue that the contraflow lane will address.

10. Project Location/Limits (attach a map and/or photos if available/applicable, include street names):

Pacific Avenue between Church and Laurel Streets.

11. Justification for the project. (Why is this project needed? Primary goal/purpose of the project; problem to be addressed; project benefits; importance to the community):

The contraflow bike lane will allow 2-way bike traffic on Pacific Avenue between Church and Cathcart Streets. This will increase bicycle access downtown, and help reduce illegal wrong-way riding and sidewalk riding. Santa Cruz PD has commented that wrong-way riding is a frequent occurrence on this section of Pacific Avenue, and sidewalk riding has been brought up by members of the public as a safety issue downtown, especially for seniors and people with disabilities. The project will also create a new bike lane on Pacific Avenue between Cathcart and Laurel Streets, providing dedicated road space for people on bikes, and add sharrows on Pacific between Church and Locust.

12. Consistency and relationship with the 2014 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) – please reference Project or Policy:

Project: SC-P75, City of Santa Cruz Lump Sum Bike Projects
Policy: Transportation Infrastructure Policies
- Improve multimodal access to and within key destinations.
- Ensure network connectivity by closing gaps in the bicycle, pedestrian and transit networks.
- Design system to reduce the potential for conflict between bicyclists, pedestrians, and vehicles.

13. Measures of performance, success or completion to be used to evaluate project/program:

Bike counts before and after project installation will be used to measure change in ridership. We will also monitor collision data before and after installation of the new lane.

14. Impact(s) of project on other modes of travel, if any (ex. parking to be removed):

The travel lane will be narrowed from 20’ to 14’. There are no parking impacts.
15. Project Cost/Budget, including other funding sources, and Schedule:

*Capital Projects – OR ATTACH PROJECT BUDGET*

**Project Start Date: **June 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHEDULE (Month/Yr) Completion Date</th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Design/Engineering</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Other*</th>
<th>Contingency</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>9/2016</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2/2017</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2/2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost/Phase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>76,500</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STDA Requested (this claim)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>76,500</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior TDA:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 3:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source 4:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please describe what is included in “Other”:

16. Preferred Method and Schedule for TDA fund distribution, consistent with the RTC Rules and Regulations (a. 90% prior to completion/10% upon completion; or b. 100% after completion):

100% after completion

17. TDA Eligibility:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Has the project/program been approved by the claimant's governing body? Attach resolution to claim. (If &quot;NO,&quot; provide the approximate date approval is anticipated.)</th>
<th>YES/NO?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Has this project previously received TDA funding?</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. For capital projects, have provisions been made by the claimant to maintain the project or facility, or has the claimant arranged for such maintenance by another agency for the next 20 years?</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D. Has the project already been reviewed by the RTC Bicycle Committee and/or Elderly/Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee? (If &quot;NO,&quot; project will be reviewed prior to RTC approval).</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Documentation to Include with Your Claim:**

**All Claims**

X A letter of transmittal addressed to the SCCRTC Executive Director that attests to the accuracy of the claim and all its accompanying documentation.

X Resolution from the TDA Eligible Claimant indicating its role and responsibilities.
TDA Claim

Article 8 Bicycle/Pedestrian Claims
X Evidence of environmental review for capital projects: Project is exempt

Local Agency Certification:

I certify that the information provided in this form is accurate and correct. I understand that if the required information has not been provided this form may be returned and the funding allocation may be delayed.

Signature [Signature Here] Title: [Title Here] Date: 9/23/16

This TDA Claim Form has been prepared in accordance with the SCCRTC's Rules and Regulations, and Caltrans TDA Guidebook (http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/MassTrans/State-TDA.html).
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RESOLUTION NO. NS-29,109

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SANTA CRUZ
ADOPTING A BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017

BE IT RESOLVED, by the City Council of the City of Santa Cruz, that the budget of the City of Santa Cruz for Fiscal Year (FY) 2017, as proposed in that certain document entitled "City of Santa Cruz Proposed Annual Budget Fiscal Year 2017," on file with the City Clerk, is hereby adopted for FY 2017, effective July 1, 2016, with the amendments and addenda thereto as determined by the City Council and detailed in the attached Exhibits:

(1) Exhibit A - FY 2017 Schedule of Budget Changes
(2) Exhibit B - Summary of Projected Revenues and Other Financing Sources
(3) Exhibit C - Summary of Projected Expenditures and Other Financing Uses

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Finance Director is authorized to create additional appropriations in order to provide for necessary commitments carried over from the prior fiscal year, including contract and purchase order encumbrances and unexpended project balances, so long as there is a sufficient fund balance to finance these commitments.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 14th day of June, 2016, by the following vote:

AYES:  Councilmembers Noroyan, Lane, Terrazas, Posner, Comstock; Vice Mayor Chase; Mayor Mathews.

NOES:  None.

ABSENT:  None.

DISQUALIFIED:  None.

APPROVED:

Mayor

ATTEST:  City Clerk Administrator
### GENERAL FUND: Additions &/or Changes (as of 5/25/16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Program &amp;/or GL Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Requested Amount</th>
<th>One time or Recurring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/21/16</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Contract with outside agency for a program manager/community liaison</td>
<td>38,943</td>
<td>recurring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/24/16</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Communication efforts to reduce summer season beach litter (split 50/50 with General Fund and Clean River)</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>one time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/24/16</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Professional services to support Council projects and interoperability with City Manager's office (to be added to $10k already budgeted)</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>one time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/24/16</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Add approved ranger(s) to replace downtown Host/Security (cost neutral- approved 5/24/15)</td>
<td></td>
<td>recurring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/25/16</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Additional support to Neighborhood safety team with special attention for Ocean Street</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>one time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/25/16</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>New contract with County for Mental Health Liaison support services within PD ($12k would be folded into existing PD budget)</td>
<td></td>
<td>recurring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/14/16</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Return with specific funding to purchase, install, and maintain a 24 hour, year- round public restroom; $25k for interim measure</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>recurring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER FUNDS: Additions &/or Changes (as of 5/25/16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GL Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Requested Amount</th>
<th>One time or Recurring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/25/16</td>
<td>Contra-Flow bike lane for Pacific Avenue ($40k-$60k)</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>one time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/17/16</td>
<td>[PW Admin correction] Parks temp ranger and weekend employees submitted but omitted in Proposed Budget (clean river, creek banks and levees)</td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td>recurring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/24/16</td>
<td>Communication efforts to reduce summer season beach litter (split 50/50 with General Fund and Clean River...)</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>one time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successor Agency</td>
<td>Wharf pilings project was confirmed to be added to the proposed budget; fully funded by 2011 Redevelopment Bond Proceeds</td>
<td>1,450,000</td>
<td>one time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## RESOLUTION NO. NS-29,109 EXHIBIT B

### EXHIBIT B

Summary of Projected Expenditures and Other Financing Uses

### BY FUND TYPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2015 Actuals</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2016 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>Amended Budget</th>
<th>Estimated Actual</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2017 Adopted Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary General Fund</td>
<td>82,611,924</td>
<td>86,158,085</td>
<td>88,949,613</td>
<td>84,863,325</td>
<td>92,907,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund - Assigned &amp; Committed for Special Programs</td>
<td>6,224,716</td>
<td>6,856,326</td>
<td>8,191,635</td>
<td>7,776,298</td>
<td>5,765,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Public Trust</td>
<td>2,011,665</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total General Funds</strong></td>
<td>90,848,305</td>
<td>93,014,411</td>
<td>97,141,247</td>
<td>92,639,623</td>
<td>99,172,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Revenue Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Special Revenue Funds</td>
<td>45,924</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Highway Funds</td>
<td>6,262,048</td>
<td>2,052,267</td>
<td>25,368,250</td>
<td>26,752,759</td>
<td>5,276,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Impact Funds</td>
<td>2,051,620</td>
<td>52,182</td>
<td>2,217,468</td>
<td>2,175,782</td>
<td>1,394,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean River, Beaches &amp; Ocean Tax Fund</td>
<td>874,814</td>
<td>919,797</td>
<td>2,049,155</td>
<td>1,954,535</td>
<td>617,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation Funds</td>
<td>615,223</td>
<td>766,000</td>
<td>1,446,893</td>
<td>1,421,894</td>
<td>185,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing &amp; Community Development Funds</td>
<td>1,096,607</td>
<td>1,308,154</td>
<td>4,367,263</td>
<td>2,772,655</td>
<td>2,363,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Low &amp; Mod Income Housing Funds</td>
<td>166,586</td>
<td>164,200</td>
<td>164,200</td>
<td>89,316</td>
<td>164,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Development Funds</td>
<td>707,737</td>
<td>701,164</td>
<td>701,164</td>
<td>701,164</td>
<td>701,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Special Revenue Funds</strong></td>
<td>11,820,559</td>
<td>6,073,764</td>
<td>36,424,393</td>
<td>35,978,105</td>
<td>10,811,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Improvement Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General and Other Capital Improvement Funds</td>
<td>11,499,772</td>
<td>14,076,128</td>
<td>40,789,995</td>
<td>38,229,912</td>
<td>12,990,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Capital Improvement Funds</strong></td>
<td>11,499,772</td>
<td>14,076,128</td>
<td>40,789,995</td>
<td>38,229,912</td>
<td>12,990,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Debt Service Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Obligation and Lease Revenue Bond Funds</td>
<td>896,199</td>
<td>906,115</td>
<td>906,115</td>
<td>906,115</td>
<td>916,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Debt Service Funds</strong></td>
<td>896,199</td>
<td>906,115</td>
<td>906,115</td>
<td>906,115</td>
<td>916,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enterprise Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Enterprise Funds</td>
<td>34,082,616</td>
<td>35,601,075</td>
<td>48,392,426</td>
<td>43,221,337</td>
<td>41,892,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater Enterprise Funds</td>
<td>20,228,745</td>
<td>24,364,456</td>
<td>27,408,978</td>
<td>25,459,529</td>
<td>25,068,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuse Enterprise Funds</td>
<td>19,124,535</td>
<td>18,754,340</td>
<td>22,526,617</td>
<td>19,941,218</td>
<td>21,365,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Enterprise Funds</td>
<td>4,058,279</td>
<td>4,725,789</td>
<td>7,785,750</td>
<td>7,783,284</td>
<td>6,822,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Water Enterprise Funds</td>
<td>1,195,949</td>
<td>1,188,778</td>
<td>2,264,833</td>
<td>2,236,110</td>
<td>1,487,623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Course Enterprise Funds</td>
<td>2,318,703</td>
<td>2,220,697</td>
<td>2,401,068</td>
<td>2,292,772</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Enterprise Funds</strong></td>
<td>81,008,827</td>
<td>86,855,135</td>
<td>110,779,671</td>
<td>100,934,250</td>
<td>96,636,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal Service Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers’ Compensation Insurance</td>
<td>3,403,259</td>
<td>3,152,844</td>
<td>3,165,947</td>
<td>3,115,068</td>
<td>3,026,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Health Insurance Internal Service Fund</td>
<td>1,707,340</td>
<td>1,946,483</td>
<td>1,946,483</td>
<td>1,846,466</td>
<td>1,907,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liability Insurance Internal Service Fund</td>
<td>2,601,993</td>
<td>3,453,286</td>
<td>3,626,446</td>
<td>3,141,919</td>
<td>3,432,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Internal Service Funds</strong></td>
<td>11,055,248</td>
<td>12,084,249</td>
<td>12,304,117</td>
<td>12,320,493</td>
<td>12,478,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total:</strong></td>
<td>207,128,910</td>
<td>213,009,802</td>
<td>298,345,539</td>
<td>281,008,498</td>
<td>233,006,996</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Summary of Projected Revenues and Other Financing Sources

### By Fund Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Type</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2015 Actuals</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2016 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2016 Amended Budget</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2016 Estimated Actual</th>
<th>Fiscal Year 2017 Adopted Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary General Fund</td>
<td>80,440,596</td>
<td>85,245,264</td>
<td>85,912,878</td>
<td>85,627,990</td>
<td>91,291,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund - Assigned &amp; Committed for Special Programs</td>
<td>7,113,464</td>
<td>7,472,141</td>
<td>7,472,141</td>
<td>7,152,362</td>
<td>7,389,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Public Trust</td>
<td>472,197</td>
<td>461,757</td>
<td>461,757</td>
<td>2,299,170</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total General Funds</strong></td>
<td>88,026,257</td>
<td>93,179,162</td>
<td>93,846,776</td>
<td>95,079,522</td>
<td>98,691,607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Revenue Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Special Revenue Funds</td>
<td>129,609</td>
<td>130,180</td>
<td>130,180</td>
<td>131,000</td>
<td>131,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Highway Funds</td>
<td>5,465,088</td>
<td>1,545,856</td>
<td>17,629,558</td>
<td>21,758,616</td>
<td>4,794,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Impact Funds</td>
<td>461,408</td>
<td>543,924</td>
<td>543,924</td>
<td>123,010</td>
<td>125,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean River, Beaches &amp; Ocean Tax Fund</td>
<td>643,427</td>
<td>638,198</td>
<td>1,682,274</td>
<td>1,678,820</td>
<td>636,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Recreation Funds</td>
<td>264,298</td>
<td>747,117</td>
<td>747,117</td>
<td>306,020</td>
<td>1,146,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing &amp; Community Development Funds</td>
<td>1,184,710</td>
<td>802,904</td>
<td>2,225,286</td>
<td>1,095,704</td>
<td>853,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Low &amp; Mod Income Housing Funds</td>
<td>80,259</td>
<td>95,718</td>
<td>95,718</td>
<td>185,120</td>
<td>96,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Development Funds</td>
<td>707,736</td>
<td>701,164</td>
<td>701,164</td>
<td>701,164</td>
<td>701,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Special Revenue Funds</strong></td>
<td>8,936,535</td>
<td>5,205,061</td>
<td>23,755,222</td>
<td>25,979,454</td>
<td>8,485,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Improvement Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General &amp; Other Capital Improvement Funds</td>
<td>23,200,022</td>
<td>12,788,052</td>
<td>31,667,206</td>
<td>29,593,637</td>
<td>12,100,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Capital Improvement Funds</strong></td>
<td>23,200,022</td>
<td>12,788,052</td>
<td>31,667,206</td>
<td>29,593,637</td>
<td>12,100,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Debt Service Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Obligation &amp; Lease Revenue Bond Funds</td>
<td>897,239</td>
<td>915,970</td>
<td>915,970</td>
<td>914,610</td>
<td>925,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Debt Service Funds</strong></td>
<td>897,239</td>
<td>915,970</td>
<td>915,970</td>
<td>914,610</td>
<td>925,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enterprise Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Enterprise Funds</td>
<td>24,730,742</td>
<td>58,278,250</td>
<td>58,279,300</td>
<td>27,606,586</td>
<td>53,713,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater Enterprise Funds</td>
<td>20,112,060</td>
<td>23,244,020</td>
<td>23,839,577</td>
<td>20,686,657</td>
<td>21,442,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuse Enterprise Funds</td>
<td>19,107,298</td>
<td>16,810,794</td>
<td>16,961,852</td>
<td>17,342,545</td>
<td>16,683,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Enterprise Funds</td>
<td>4,579,017</td>
<td>4,238,246</td>
<td>5,759,246</td>
<td>6,116,822</td>
<td>4,509,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Water Enterprise Funds</td>
<td>1,057,742</td>
<td>920,432</td>
<td>1,310,413</td>
<td>1,305,515</td>
<td>916,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Course Enterprise Funds</td>
<td>2,353,453</td>
<td>1,990,731</td>
<td>2,082,125</td>
<td>2,392,387</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Enterprise Funds</strong></td>
<td>71,940,312</td>
<td>105,482,473</td>
<td>108,232,513</td>
<td>75,450,512</td>
<td>97,265,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal Service Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Operations Internal Service Fund</td>
<td>3,210,625</td>
<td>3,650,900</td>
<td>3,650,900</td>
<td>3,587,314</td>
<td>3,797,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers' Compensation Insurance Fund</td>
<td>3,547,950</td>
<td>3,709,329</td>
<td>3,709,329</td>
<td>3,606,479</td>
<td>3,742,939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Health Insurance Internal Service Fund</td>
<td>2,046,441</td>
<td>2,049,766</td>
<td>2,049,766</td>
<td>2,079,127</td>
<td>2,079,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liability Insurance Internal Service Fund</td>
<td>2,898,506</td>
<td>2,868,290</td>
<td>2,868,290</td>
<td>2,874,076</td>
<td>2,874,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Internal Service Funds</strong></td>
<td>11,703,521</td>
<td>12,278,285</td>
<td>12,278,285</td>
<td>12,146,996</td>
<td>12,494,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>204,703,886</td>
<td>229,849,003</td>
<td>270,695,972</td>
<td>239,164,731</td>
<td>229,963,213</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SUSTAINABILITY POLICIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OUTCOMES ADVANCED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEOPLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access &amp; Mobility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Transportation System Management: Implement Transportation System Management (TSM) programs and projects on major roadways across Santa Cruz County that increase the efficiency of the existing transportation system.

- **Outcomes**: X

### Transportation Demand Management: Expand demand management programs that decrease the number of vehicle miles traveled and result in mode shift.

- **Outcomes**: X X X X X

### Transportation Infrastructure:

- **Outcomes**: X X X X X X

### Land Use: Support land use decisions that locate new facilities close to existing services, particularly those that service transportation disadvantaged populations.

- **Outcomes**: X X X X X

### Safety:

- **Outcomes**: X

### Emergency Services: Support projects that provide access to emergency services.

- **Outcomes**: X X X

### Cost Effectiveness & System Maintenance: Maintain and operate the existing transportation system cost-effectively and in a manner that adapts the current transportation system to maximize existing investments.

- **Outcomes**: X X X

### Coordination: Improve coordination between agencies in a manner improves efficiencies, and reduces duplication (e.g. paratransit and transit; road repairs; signal synchronization; TDM programs).

- **Outcomes**: X
December 28, 2016

Jim Burr
City of Santa Cruz Public Works Department
809 Center Street, Room 201
Santa Cruz, California 95062

RE: Pacific Avenue Contra Flow Bike Lane Project

Dear Mr. Burr,

The Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee (E&D TAC) advises the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (RTC), the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (Metro), and other service providers on transportation needs for people with disabilities, seniors and persons of limited means. The Pedestrian Safety Work Group (PSWG) is a subcommittee of the E&D TAC. The mission of the PSWG is to ensure safe and accessible pedestrian travel and access throughout the county for the benefit of all residents.

At its meeting on December 13, 2016, the E&D TAC received a presentation from Patrick Fung of the City of Santa Cruz regarding the Pacific Avenue Contra Flow Bike Lane Project. The E&D TAC discussed the project design following the staff presentation. Committee members discussed the following safety concerns about the project as proposed:

- the potential for conflicts between pedestrians crossing Pacific Avenue and bicyclists traveling southbound in a cycle track where the cycle track is located on the west side of Pacific Avenue and automobile travel is limited to the northbound direction;
- the potential for conflicts between pedestrians crossing Pacific Avenue and bicyclists at various locations as a result of the lack of consistency in the configuration of bicycle travel on Pacific Avenue;
- the potential for conflicts between bicyclists and pedestrians who are blind or visually impaired and who may not be aware that bicyclists will be traveling in the opposite direction of automobile travel on Pacific Avenue; and,
- the potential for conflicts between bicyclists and motorists as a result of the shortened line-of-sight for motorists exiting parking spaces on the west side of the cycle track and crossing the cycle track before entering the automobile travel lane.

At their December 13, 2016 meeting, the E&D TAC took action to oppose the project in its current form and recommend that the committee’s safety concerns be addressed.
Thank you for seeking input from the E&D TAC on the Pacific Avenue Contra Flow Bike Lane project and for considering the needs of all modes and users of the transportation system.

Sincerely,

Veronica Elsea, Chair
Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee
January 10, 2017

Dear Members of the Elderly & Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee,

Thank you for your letter of December 28th, and for providing feedback on the designs for the Pacific Avenue Contraflow Bike Lane project.

Our goals for the project are to provide connectivity and access to bicyclists traveling both directions, reduce dangerous wrong-way riding, and decrease sidewalk riding. The Santa Cruz Police Department has commented that wrong-way riding is a frequent occurrence on this section of Pacific Avenue, which can cause a safety hazard for pedestrians. Sidewalk riding has been brought up by members of the public as a safety issue downtown, especially for seniors and people with disabilities. While conducting bicycle counts, staff also observed wrong-way riding and sidewalk riding to be frequent occurrences on Pacific Avenue.

However, we acknowledge that the project may create new conflicts, particularly between cyclists and pedestrians crossing mid-block or drivers who must cross the bike lane when entering and exiting parking spaces. In order to increase the visibility of the new contraflow bike lane as much as possible, we will be striping the entire bike lane using a green thermoplastic treatment to increase awareness of the new roadway configuration. Please let us know if you can suggest ways to reach out to visually impaired residents to let them know about the new contraflow lane.

As at any intersection, cyclists traveling in the contraflow lane will be required to yield to pedestrians in crosswalks, and two of the three intersections will have stop signs installed for cyclists. City staff will enlist the help of the Police Department for enforcement if there are frequent occurrences of cyclists not following traffic laws.

Thanks again for your input,

James Burr, P.E.
Transportation Manager
TO: Regional Transportation Commission (RTC)
FROM: Zach Friend, Chair
RE: Executive Director’s Employment Agreement

RECOMMENDATIONS

The ad-hoc Committee on the Executive Director’s performance recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) approve the following changes in the RTC Executive Director’s contract:

1. One time merit increase of 4%, effective January 1, 2017.
2. One additional week of vacation per year.

BACKGROUND

RTC Executive Director, George Dondero has been employed by the RTC as an at-will employee under a contract executed on March 7, 2006 and amended June 4, 2015. On December 6, 2016 the ad-hoc performance evaluation committee appointed by the Chair met to discuss the Executive Director’s performance and to consider changes to his contract.

DISCUSSION

The ad-hoc performance evaluation committee, comprised of Chair Don Lane and Commissioners McPherson and Friend, collected evaluation forms from other commissioners and discussed his performance with the Executive Director. The committee unanimously agreed to recommend the following changes to the Executive Director's contract:

1. RTC agrees to pay a one time merit increase of 4%, effective January 1, 2017.
2. The Executive Director will receive one additional week (40 hours) of paid vacation per year.
3. RTC will maintain the same level of benefits as outlined in the existing contract.
4. RTC agrees to pay same percentage of benefit premiums as outlined in the labor agreements based on premiums for each year.
5. These terms to remain in effect through December 31, 2019.

All other terms of the existing contract shall remain effective for the period of this extension.

The ad-hoc committee recommends that the RTC approve the above changes to the Executive Director’s compensation and authorize the RTC Chair to sign a contract amendment incorporating these changes. As with the existing contract there is no termination date.
SUMMARY

The RTC Chair appointed an ad-hoc committee to discuss changes in compensation for the Executive Director. The committee recommends that the RTC approve changes to the compensation package to include a merit increase of 4% and one additional week of vacation per year, effective January 1, 2017.
# Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission

## THREE MONTH MEETING SCHEDULE

### January 2017

**Through**

**March 2017**

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>1/19/17*</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Commission</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>City of Santa Cruz Council Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Note meeting date 2 weeks later</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/19/17*</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Transportation Policy Workshop</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>CANCELLED due to holiday schedule</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/19/17</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Interagency Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/2/17</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Commission</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>City of Watsonville Council Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/9/17</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Budget and Administration/Personnel Committee</td>
<td>3:00 pm</td>
<td>CAO Conference Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/13/17</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>Bicycle Advisory Committee</td>
<td>6:00 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/14/17</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>Elderly &amp; Disabled Transportation Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/16/17</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Transportation Policy Workshop</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/16/17</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Interagency Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/2/17</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Regional Transportation Commission</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>County Board of Supervisors Chambers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/15/17</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>Traffic Operations Systems Committee/ Safe on 17 Task Force</td>
<td>10:00 am</td>
<td>CHP Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/16/17</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Transportation Policy Workshop</td>
<td>9:00 am</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/23/17*</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>Interagency Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td>1:30 pm</td>
<td>Commission Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Note meeting date 1 week later</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RTC Commission Offices** – 1523 Pacific Ave. – Santa Cruz, CA

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

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

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

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

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

**CHP Office** – 2020 Junction Ave – San Jose, CA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Letter Rec'd/Sent</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Incoming/Outgoing</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Last</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Last</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/15/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Peoples</td>
<td></td>
<td>RTC Using Tax Dollars for New Railroad Upgrades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Randall</td>
<td>Nacamuli</td>
<td></td>
<td>Measure D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Woutje</td>
<td>Swets</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rail Road Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Rick</td>
<td>Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td>Against Railroad Upgrades to Aptos Village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Rosewood</td>
<td></td>
<td>Measure D and Rail Improvements: Yes!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Barry</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td></td>
<td>Upgrades to Rail Line at Aptos Village... Thank you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jeanie</td>
<td>Bell</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCC Supervisors Meeting 11/15 - Agenda Item 54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/13/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Kristin</td>
<td>Tosello</td>
<td></td>
<td>No Money for Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec’d/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<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>11/14/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Gray</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Please, Stop the RR Construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/14/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Cynthia</td>
<td>Dzendzel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rail Trail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/16/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Nikolas</td>
<td>Greenson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Measure D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/17/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>G Dy 11/22/16</td>
<td>Ginger</td>
<td>Dykaar</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Stanley</td>
<td>Sokolow</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-Proposal Meeting on 11/29/16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>G Dy 11/22/16</td>
<td>Ginger</td>
<td>Dykaar</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td>Whitelaw</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unified Corridor Investment Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/20/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Morrow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rail Corridor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/21/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Denevan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>North Coast Trail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/23/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Gina</td>
<td>Colfer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trail Now</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec’d/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response Date</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>11/25/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>G Dy 12/01/16</td>
<td>Ginger</td>
<td>Dykaar</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>Winston</td>
<td>Economic Development Research Group, Inc.</td>
<td>Unified Corridor Investment Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/25/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ 11/30/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Geddes</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Dustin</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>Polar Express</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/27/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Dustin</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>Coastal Rail Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/01/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>RM 12/20/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Rodrigo A</td>
<td>Byerly</td>
<td>Contract Award May/June 2016 Santa Cruz County Voter Survey on Transportation Projects and Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/02/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ 12/05/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Christy</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>Unsuccessful and Unsafe Polar Express</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/05/16</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>CDM Smith</td>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Shultz</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Executed Agreement - AMBAG Travel Demand Use Model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/05/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ 12/05/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Peoples</td>
<td>Options for Rail Corridor Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/06/16</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>Caltrans, District 5</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Nikuna</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>FY2016 Certification of Expenditure by Fund Source and Final Statement of Expenditures for RPA, FTA 5304 and SPR Grants</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>First</td>
<td>Last</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>12/06/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Woutje</td>
<td>Swets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No Trains!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/06/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Werner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Please Support the Rail with Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/06/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Colleen</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Please Support the Rail with Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/06/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>Boutelle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rail with Trail: YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/06/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>Sanoff</td>
<td></td>
<td>NOT in Support of Rail/Trail Option</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/06/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Piet</td>
<td>Canin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EA Letter to RTC - Build the Trail &amp; Save the Tracks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/06/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Kristin</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rail with Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/06/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jaime</td>
<td>Garfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Use of Rail Corridor</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>
<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>12/06/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>Strumpell</td>
<td>KP</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Trail Only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/06/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Bud</td>
<td>Colligan</td>
<td>JE</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>Mayall</td>
<td>Comments for Corridor Use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/06/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>JE</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>Mayall</td>
<td>JE</td>
<td>Ross</td>
<td>Levy</td>
<td>Use of Rail Corridor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/06/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>JE</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Ross</td>
<td>Levy</td>
<td>JE</td>
<td>Wandis</td>
<td>Wilcox</td>
<td>Rail/Trail Supporter!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/06/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>JE</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Wandis</td>
<td>Wilcox</td>
<td>JE</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Caletti</td>
<td>Please Support the Rail with Trail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/06/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>JE</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Cynthia</td>
<td>Dzendzel</td>
<td>JE</td>
<td>Cynthia</td>
<td>Dzendzel</td>
<td>Keep the Rails!</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>First</td>
<td>Last</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>12/06/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>JE 12/06/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Doug</td>
<td>Urbanus</td>
<td>Rail/Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/06/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>JE 12/06/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Johanna</td>
<td>Bowen</td>
<td>Absurdity of the Train</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/06/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>JE 12/06/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>McFarland</td>
<td>Support for Trail Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/06/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ 12/07/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Glen</td>
<td>Stribling</td>
<td>Trail Not Train</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/06/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ 12/07/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>Graham-Waldon</td>
<td>Tram for the Rail Line</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/06/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ 12/07/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Deanna</td>
<td>Seagraves</td>
<td>Trail Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/06/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ 12/07/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Randall</td>
<td>Nacamuli</td>
<td>Trail Now</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/06/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ 12/07/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>Martinez</td>
<td>Use of Rail Corridor</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>
<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>12/06/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Goodman</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Lynch</td>
<td>Rail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/06/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Criswell</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Curt</td>
<td>Simmons</td>
<td>Rail Trail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/06/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>Letter to Note My Support for a Trail Only Solution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/07/16</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Leinau</td>
<td>Trifid Properties, c/o Lawrene Kavalenko</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Lease of Santa Cruz Branch Rail Line Premises with Assigned Lease Audit No. 708710 for Beautification Purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/07/16</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Dondero</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Carl</td>
<td>California Coastal Commission</td>
<td>December 8, 2016 Special Meeting Agenda Item #13: Options for Use of the Rail Corridor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/07/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>LeBlanc</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>LeBlanc</td>
<td>No Train</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Correspondence Log
### January 19, 2017

<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>12/07/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CI 12/07/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Michelle Bradley</td>
<td>No Train Please</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/07/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CI 12/07/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Susan Sweeney</td>
<td>No Train</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/07/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CI 12/07/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Donna Murphy</td>
<td>Options for Use of Rail Corridor -- Item 13, December 8, 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/07/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CI 12/07/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Grace Voss</td>
<td>Please Support the Rail with Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/07/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CI 12/07/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>Rails</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/07/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CI 12/07/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>G Craig Vachon</td>
<td>Please Pull the Tracks and Build the Trail Now!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/07/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CI 12/07/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Roman Ceja</td>
<td>Trail Now</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/07/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CI 12/07/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Sue Holt</td>
<td>No Rails, Please</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec’d/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/07/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Mann</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Molly</td>
<td>Graessle</td>
<td>Bike Path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/07/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>Rimicci Jr.</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>Korb</td>
<td>Measure D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/07/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Kinst</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Brady</td>
<td>Bike Path Instead of Train</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/07/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Smallman</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Mesiti-Miller</td>
<td>Options for Use of Rail Corridor -- Item 13, December 8, 2016</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>12/07/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>☑️ 12/07/16</td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>Denise</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Adriana</td>
<td>Novack</td>
<td>Register-Pajaronian</td>
<td>Bike Path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/07/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>☑️ 12/07/16</td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>Adriana</td>
<td>Novack</td>
<td>Chuck</td>
<td>Bruffey</td>
<td>Measure D</td>
<td>Measure D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/07/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>☑️ 12/07/16</td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>Chuck</td>
<td>Bruffey</td>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Brady</td>
<td>No Train! Build a Pedestrian/Bike Path</td>
<td>No Train! Build a Pedestrian/Bike Path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/07/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>☑️ 12/07/16</td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>Tamarah</td>
<td>Minami</td>
<td>Stanley</td>
<td>Sokolow</td>
<td>Options for Use of Rail Corridor</td>
<td>Options for Use of Rail Corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/07/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>☑️ 12/07/16</td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>Stanley</td>
<td>Sokolow</td>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Livingston</td>
<td>Comments Regarding BRT in Items 12, 13,</td>
<td>Comments Regarding BRT in Items 12, 13,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/07/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>☑️ 12/07/16</td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Livingston</td>
<td>Rhonda</td>
<td>Howard-Vachon</td>
<td>Trail Now</td>
<td>Trail Now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/07/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>☑️ 12/07/16</td>
<td>SCCRTTC</td>
<td>Rhonda</td>
<td>Howard-Vachon</td>
<td>Rhonda</td>
<td>Howard-Vachon</td>
<td>Please Remove the Tracks ... Trail NOW</td>
<td>Please Remove the Tracks ... Trail NOW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Correspondence Log  
### January 19, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Letter Rec’d/Sent</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Incoming/Outgoing</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Last</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Last</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/07/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12/07/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Carma Haston</td>
<td>Rail Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/07/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12/07/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Margaret Rosa</td>
<td>Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/07/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12/08/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Heather Hedstrom</td>
<td>Measure D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/07/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12/08/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Kevin Delaney</td>
<td>Not to Rail - Yes to Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/07/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12/08/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jennifer Willoughby</td>
<td>Please Build the Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/07/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12/08/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Linda Wilshusen</td>
<td>SCCRTC Meeting of December 8, 2016, Comments on Item 13, Options for Use of the Rail Corridor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/07/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12/08/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>John Schaupp</td>
<td>December 8, 2016 Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/07/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12/08/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Stacey Falls</td>
<td>Keep the Railroad Tracks!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec’d/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Last</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/08/16</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Marsue</td>
<td>Morrill</td>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Mendez</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission FY 2017 (July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2017) Indirect Cost Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/08/17</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>12/08/16</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Wright</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Trail Now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/08/19</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>12/08/16</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Tish</td>
<td>Denevan</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Measure D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/08/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>12/08/16</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Barry</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Rail Corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/08/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>12/09/16</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>Campos</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Measure D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/11/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>KP</td>
<td>12/11/16</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Schaupp</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>December 8th RTC Meeting Highlights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/11/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>KP</td>
<td>12/11/16</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Unsafe Track Conditions Still Persist Even After Polar Express Has Started Again</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/12/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>JE</td>
<td>12/13/16</td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Peoples</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>MBSST (Rail Trail) - Segment 7 (c401413) - Final Schematic Plan, Phasing Plan, Cooperative Agreement and Contract Amendment No. 2 (PW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Letter Rec'd/Sent</td>
<td>Format</td>
<td>Incoming/Outgoing</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/12/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>JE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/12/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>JE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/12/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>JE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/12/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>JE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/12/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>JE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/12/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>JE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/13/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>JE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/13/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>JE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/13/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>JE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TO First</th>
<th>TO Last</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>FROM First</th>
<th>FROM Last</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Brett</td>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Rosalie</td>
<td>Bruning</td>
<td>Trail Now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Bruning</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Evan</td>
<td>Siroky</td>
<td>Build a Trail Now!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Peoples</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Morrow</td>
<td>Please Consider/Support a True Rail Trail (Not Rail with Trail)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>Mahoney</td>
<td>No Support for a Rail With Trail Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>Mahoney</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>Mahoney</td>
<td>Trail Only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correspondence Log
January 19, 2017
<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>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>12/13/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>JE</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Michael Orrendurff</td>
<td>Trail Along the Rail Line</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/13/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>JE</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Spencer Hays</td>
<td>Rail - Trail or Trail Now!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/13/17</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>JE</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Diana Adamic</td>
<td>Rail Only Option - YES!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/13/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>JE</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Josh Stephens</td>
<td>Coastal Rail Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/13/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>JE</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Brian Peoples</td>
<td>Trail Now Recommendation on Segment 7 Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/13/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>JE</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Maren Sinclair Hurn</td>
<td>Rail Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/13/17</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>JE</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Joe Martinez</td>
<td>Proposed Rail with Trail Project is to Expensive ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/13/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>JE</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Jessica Hansen</td>
<td>No Commuter Train</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>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>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/15/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>12/16/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Kierstin</td>
<td>Testorff</td>
<td>Rail/Trail</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Revised FY2016/2017 Planning, Programming and Monitoring (PPM) Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/16/16</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>Snowden</td>
<td>Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Nikuna</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fund Transfer Agreement No: PPM14-6149(096)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/18/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>12/20/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Keiji</td>
<td>Muramoto</td>
<td>Golden Gate Railroad Museum in Santa Cruz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/19/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>JE</td>
<td>12/20/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td>Whitelaw</td>
<td>Trail-Only Rebuttal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/21/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>12/22/16</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Chuck</td>
<td>Bruffey</td>
<td>Unified Corridor Study Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/23/16</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>01/03/17</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Selesa</td>
<td>Webster</td>
<td>Trail Now</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/28/16</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>Burr</td>
<td>City of Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Veronica</td>
<td>Elsea</td>
<td>SCCRTC, Chair E&amp;D TAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pacific Avenue Contra Flow Bike Lane Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/04/17</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>01/06/17</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Peoples</td>
<td>YELP Review of Polar Express</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Letter Type</td>
<td>Format</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>
<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>01/05/17</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Lively</td>
<td>Hopkins Carley</td>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Shultz</td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Extension of Tolling Agreement - SCCRTC and Parsons Brinkerhoff, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/05/17</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Bud</td>
<td>Colligan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Polar Express Reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/09/17</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Peoples</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trail Now Newsletter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/09/17</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Christy</td>
<td>Martin</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lesson Learned From Chicago Pedestrian/Bike Path</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/09/17</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SCCRTC</td>
<td>Mari Jo</td>
<td>Pezzi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Congestion on Roadways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

-----Original Message-----
From: John Schaupp
Sent: Wednesday, December 07, 2016 6:27 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Cc: John Schaupp
Subject: December 8, 2016 Meeting

I am unable to attend the meeting due to my work schedule, however I do want to document my support for a train. I have commuted in this county for over 30 years, and there is no question in my mind that we need to look at alternative transportation in addition to Highway one improvements. I would like to be kept posted on the status of a future train as it develops.

Thank you,
John Schaupp

Dear Mr. Schaupp,

Thank you for your comments, however your comments did not arrive before the deadline for the December 8 RTC meeting. We will provide your comments to the Commission for their review for the January RTC meeting.

We will be happy to add your email address to our database to keep you updated on the status of service along the rail line.

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: Stacey Falls
Sent: Wednesday, December 07, 2016 6:46 PM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: New submission from Contact Form

Name
Stacey Falls

Subject
Keep the railroad tracks!

Your Message

To the Members of the RTC,

In the summer of 1995, the summer before my freshman year of college, my mother bought me a train ticket to Colorado to visit my best friend who had graduated the year before and enrolled at the University of Colorado, Fort Collins. It was the first time I had ever travelled by train, and I absolutely loved the freedom. I could get where I was going while reading my book, writing letters, and sitting on the viewing car watching the amazing sunset over the mountains. Even today, I love the train. Not owning a car means I have many opportunities to take public transportation. My twin sister and only nephew live in Oakland, and I go to visit every chance I get, loving the opportunity to take the Amtrak. I bring school work (I am a teacher), my laptop, or a book, and I buy a snack or drink from the café car and sit back and enjoy the ride. I particularly love the scenery heading up the peninsula near Fremont.

But my love of the train isn’t just nostalgia. I firmly believe our society needs to fight the threat of global climate change, and offering a wide variety of public transportation options is the best way to do that. I am not alone in my belief. The Federal Transit Administration states, “Transportation accounts for 29 percent of greenhouse gas emissions in the United States. By moving more people with fewer vehicles, public transportation can reduce greenhouse gas emissions. National averages demonstrate that public transportation produces significantly lower greenhouse gas emissions per passenger mile than private vehicles. Heavy rail transit such as subways and metros produce on average 76% lower greenhouse gas emissions per passenger mile than an average single-occupancy vehicle (SOV). Light rail systems produce 62% less and bus transit produces 33% less...Moreover, by reducing congestion, transit reduces emissions from cars stuck in traffic.”

Unfortunately, I think the average commuter doesn’t agree with me. I attended the RTC’s spring meeting where the language for Measure D was agreed upon. I saw the presentation given by staff indicating that the vast majority of trips people take are in personal vehicles with a single occupant.

However, we are going to need to make some major changes to the way we get around. With a 2 degree change in the global temperatures looming, dramatically reducing our emission of greenhouse gases is essential. Global climate change threatens coastal towns like Santa Cruz with flooding, severe weather, and in some scenarios prolonged drought. Our current planning decisions should be decisions that lay the groundwork for a sustainable future.

The city’s climate action plan notes that most of our greenhouse gases come from travel, and has set a goal of reducing overall car trips. The plan specifically says that Santa Cruz should “Expand and offer new travel choices for people who live, work, play and visit Santa Cruz [and] Provide relief for City-wide vehicle traffic congestion.” To that end, the plan
recommends as one of its investment priorities: “Preserving and maintaining all transportation modes, services, and infrastructure.” The plan goes on to say, “The rail corridor provides the most significant new alternative transportation infrastructure opportunity within the City and County. The General Plan 2030 recognizes the value of the rail corridor and has policies and objectives within the Land Use section to support its development and use as part of the City’s transportation system. Policies encourage the preparation of a Rail Transit Land Use Plan and the expansion of existing neighborhood facilities within easy walking distance of areas well-served by transit...the City has continued to support and advocate for the rail corridor to become a cost-effective, viable transportation alternative to Highway 1 for north/south travel.

I agree with the Climate Action Plan. The RTC should maintain the railroad tracks because sometime in the near future, others will come to learn what I have learned, commuting by train is the best way to travel. Even if they don’t love trains as much as I do, the danger imposed by global climate change will necessitate that we have as many energy efficient options as possible available to us. Removing the tracks will permanently put us on a train-less path, and that is a path the environment can’t afford.

Sincerely
Stacey Falls
Santa Cruz, CA

Dear Stacey Falls,

Thank you for your comments, however your comments did not arrive before the deadline for the December 8 RTC meeting. We will provide your comments to the Commission for their review for the January RTC meeting.

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: Mike Wright
Sent: Thursday, December 08, 2016 6:41 AM
To: info@sccrtc.org
Subject: Trail now

I want to urge you to consider the trail only option at your meeting. Please, start building the trail now.
Sincerely, Birgit Wright
Corralitos, CA

---

Dear Ms. Wright,

Thank you for your comments, however your comments did not arrive before the deadline for the December 8 RTC meeting. We will provide your comments to the Commission for their review for the January RTC meeting.

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
IMPLICATIONS OF AUTONOMOUS VEHICLES: A PLANNER’S PERSPECTIVE

By Ryan Snyder

As an urban planner, I am particularly interested in what Automated Vehicle technology can do for our transportation systems and our cities. With evolving AV technology, we can already imagine some of the prospects. This article focuses on potential benefits and drawbacks of Autonomous Vehicles (AV), along with a call for policy action that attempts to speed the potential benefits while minimizing detrimental impacts.

Levels of Autonomous Vehicle Technology

The Society of Automotive Engineers (SAE International) defines the following six levels of Automated Vehicle technology.

- **Level 0** – Human driver does everything.
- **Level 1** – Vehicle assists with some parts of driving (lane assist, park assist, crash avoidance, adaptive cruise control, etc.).
- **Level 2** – Vehicle does some of the driving, while human driver monitors the driving environment and performs the rest of the driving.
- **Level 3** – Vehicle conducts parts of the driving and sometimes monitors the driving environment, but the human must drive when the system requests.
- **Level 4** – The vehicle drives and monitors the driving environment, while the human does not need control, but the vehicle can only operate in certain environments and under certain conditions.
- **Level 5** – The automated system performs all the driving tasks.

Most cars sold today have Level 1 technology. Adaptive cruise control, park assist, lane assist, automatic braking, and crash avoidance are becoming more common place. The Insurance Institute of Highway Safety (IIHS) reports that 27 percent of vehicles sold today have automatic emergency braking available, while 52 percent have forward crash alerts. In 2015, NHTSA and IIHS reached an agreement with 10 auto manufacturers (Audi, BMW, Ford, General Motors, Mazda, Mercedes Benz, Tesla, Toyota, Volkswagen, and Volvo) to make automatic emergency braking a standard feature on all new vehicles. Nissan and Tesla expect to sell Level 3 vehicles by 2020. Ford plans to sell fully driverless vehicles by 2025. While it will take some time for the fleet of vehicles to turnover, self-driving vehicles are on the way within the foreseeable future.

Technological Possibilities

The following are emerging AV concepts that I believe are within the range of possibility that could yield significant benefits.

Lane Clearance

With Vehicle-to-Infrastructure (V2I) and Vehicle-to-Vehicle (V2V) capabilities, we could clear a lane for preferred vehicles. Instead of having dedicated bus lanes, the lane could be cleared when a bus is coming and then be used by other vehicles once the bus has passed. When an emergency responder needs access, the lane could also be cleared. This technology could provide the same advantages of fixed rights-of-way without expensive infrastructure.

Coordinated and Optimized Traffic Flow

V2I technology could allow for optimized traffic flow. Once drivers have given up direct operating control of their vehicles, coordinating the traffic flow for everyone would make sense. This would be most effective when every vehicle is part of the system. In the early stages, not every vehicle would be. However, the advantage of being in the system should entice everyone to join, as being outside the system could leave one stuck in a slower travel pattern. Central coordination could optimize flow and signals. Coordination could also regulate speed.

Enhanced Detection of Pedestrians and Bicyclists

AV technology could protect pedestrians by creating safe, convenient pedestrian crossings. Crash avoidance technology already detects people walking. This could be strengthened with sensors or smart phone apps. With sensors in pedestrians’ pockets or a simple button for pedestrians to push, traffic would stop and allow people to cross the street. Older adults or those with disabilities could be detected crossing the street and allowed time to cross safely. Similar technology could help ensure bicyclists’ safety.

Economics

Ridesharing programs like Uber and Lyft can be more cost effective than owning a car for some trips. With today’s “Uber Pool” or “Lyft Line,” people can ride with other passengers and the fare is divided. This option is more cost competitive when one skips paying for parking. Remove the greatest cost of the service, the driver, and many more trips would be cheaper by sharing with others. As more people join the system, the opportunities for sharing grow. At some point, why own a
car? For more people, it could become cheaper, more convenient, and less stressful to give up a personal car and let an AV do the driving.

Bus drivers account for 54 percent of bus operating expenses. Thus, transit agencies may be among the early adopters of driverless technology.

### Potential Benefits
AVs potentially offer many benefits. The most salient are described in the following areas.

#### User Conveniences
AVs offer many advantages to users, including:
- **Mobility for People Who Don’t Drive:** People who are too young or too old to drive safely, or unable to drive would have much greater mobility. AVs could relieve parents of driving children to school, soccer practice, or other activities. People who cannot afford to own cars would have more options.
- **Better Use of Time:** If we didn’t have to drive, we could use our time in the car differently. We could read, eat, work, watch TV or respond to email. Cars could be equipped with reclining seats for sleeping.
- **Less Stress:** Not having to drive would eliminate the stress associated with this task.
- **Deliveries:** Without drivers, the cost of deliveries would come down. One could go online to order groceries, dinner, or other goods.
- **Ability to Select the Appropriate Vehicle for the Trip:** People could choose an AV most appropriate for a particular need. Many daily trips could be made in a small utilitarian vehicle that is sufficient to transport one or two people. For families, a larger vehicle could be chosen when needed. If someone needed to carry large items, he or she may choose a pick-up truck.

#### Safety
Even the Level 1 and Level 2 vehicles sold today likely provide safety benefits in the form of fewer and less severe crashes. Removing human error from the equation could eliminate the vast majority of crashes and their severity. Crashes will still occur with autonomous vehicles, especially in the early years. But the standard for tolerating that shouldn’t be zero crashes—the standard used for policy making should be when driverless vehicles are safer than those driven by humans.

Among the first beneficiaries of AVs on streets should be bicyclists and pedestrians. With crash avoidance technology, these vulnerable users will gradually become less so.

#### Capacity
Human drivers have to leave space between vehicles to prevent crashes. AVs could move much closer to each other with crash avoidance and V2V technology. One study estimates that freeway capacity could increase from 2,200 to 4,000 vehicles per lane per hour if all vehicles on the freeway were equipped with cooperative adaptive cruise control. City streets could experience similar benefits. This would reduce congestion.

Today planners looking to reallocate space in the street with “road diets” often use a rule of thumb that 4-lane streets can be converted to 2-lane streets without losing capacity at 20,000 vehicles per day or less. With AVs, this guideline might increase to 35,000 or 40,000 vehicles per day. Moreover, the width of travel lanes could be reduced. Many more streets could be candidates for road diets and partially converted to public space.

#### Land Use
Much of our land is taken by parking. The average car is parked about 95 percent of the time. As few people own their cars, the need for parking will decrease. Perhaps someday very few people, or even no one, will own a car.

With little need for parking, a much smaller fleet of vehicles would pick people up. We could reallocate surface parking and on-street parking to other uses. We could convert parking structures to other uses as well.

#### Greenhouse Gas Reduction
A study published in *Nature Climate Change* concludes that AVs could reduce greenhouse-gas (GHG) emissions by 87 percent to 94 percent below 2014 conventional vehicles, and 63 percent to 82 percent below expected 2030 hybrid vehicles. This reduction would occur through:
- Decreases in GHG electricity emissions;
- Use of smaller vehicles; and
- Higher annual vehicle miles using electric technology.

As more attractive options for public transit and ridesharing become available, a larger portion of our trips could be made in
higher occupancy vehicles. Also, as walking and bicycling become safer, more people will do so. As we need less space for cars, we could further improve conditions for walking and bicycling with more and wider bike lanes, wider sidewalks, and safer street crossings.

Transit
Transit could benefit in several ways through AV technology.

- **Increased Service:** As mentioned earlier, driverless buses eliminate the most expensive part of operating the bus: the driver. Transit operators might be able to offer twice as many buses for the same budget. Increasing travel speeds would also enable buses to run their routes in less time, improving service with no additional cost. Buses could further save time by adding pre-board fare payment systems to reduce dwell time at bus stops. Adding these advantages, transit operators might increase service by 250 percent to 300 percent with the same operating budget they now use.

- **Faster Service:** Lane clearance could reduce the travel time of buses. Increasing travel speed would make buses more competitive vis-à-vis travelling in a lower-occupancy vehicle. This should attract new passengers and improve service for those now using buses.

- **New Ridesharing Services:** Many of our trips take place on multiple streets and do not lend themselves to fixed-route transit. Shared-ride trips match our scattered travel patterns well. As more people join services like Lyft Line, more people will find matches of people to share rides with. If coupled with public policy that favors HOVs with time and cost advantages, more people would opt for this type of service.

- **High-Speed Buses:** With the safety benefits of lane clearance technology and crash avoidance technology, we can imagine buses that go faster, thereby providing another time advantage in travelling by bus. Our urban and suburban freeway systems could become transit corridors with stops every two to three miles, and transfer points at interchanges.

  What if buses could be built to travel 120 or 150 miles per hour? This could make regional travel faster. Stations along the freeways could link with surface street buses, shared-ride services, driverless taxis, and bike sharing to take people to and from their destinations and origins.

  Such buses could also service intercity travel. This might perform the same function as high-speed rail without the infrastructure costs. Greyhound sells tickets very inexpensively. With no driver, passengers could travel for a very low fare. We might see 18-passenger luxury buses with airline-like first-class seats that recline for sleeping, restrooms, and other comforts that travels at high speeds for very low fares.

  As the number of people in the public system grows, which could be privately or publically operated, their autonomous travel options will grow. The advantages of not owning a car could outstrip those of owning for many people.

Emergency Access
As mentioned earlier, the lane clearance function could work to the advantage of emergency responders. The system could be optimized to reduce or eliminate the congestion emergency responders normally have to contend with. This adds up to faster response times.

Potential Drawbacks
As with any new disruptive technology, AV has potential drawbacks that may impact people in the following areas.

Lost Jobs
The largest drawback to widespread use of AVs may be the loss of jobs. This includes bus drivers, taxi drivers, truck drivers, and delivery drivers. Many of these jobs pay better than minimum wage and are available to people without college degrees. Moreover, AVs would put more than drivers out of work. The U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that the total number of people employed in auto manufacturing, trade, and services was 6,986,900 in July 2015. While we would still have some of these jobs with autonomous vehicles, a future with fewer vehicles would mean fewer related jobs.

The loss of jobs would not only affect those directly employed, but would impact the economy as a whole. We will need to replace these with jobs that pay comparable wages. AV technology will create some new jobs. But we will a need deliberate effort to create new industries and to retrain people for these jobs.

Encouraging Driving and Long Commutes
AVs could induce driving and longer commutes, thereby exacerbating suburban sprawl. However reducing the lost time in long commutes can be replaced with time more productively spent. We need to introduce policies to help offset these potential disadvantages.
The Politics of Algorithms
As vehicles on the streets yield more control to central computing systems, determining which vehicles receive priority will become both a policy and a political process. Ensuring that decisions made reflect good public policy, rather than the will of politically powerful groups, will be extremely important. The outcome could determine the direction and impact AVs have on society, with a broad spectrum of possibilities.

It will be important to avoid a tragedy of the commons situation where drivers travelling alone take precedence over multi-occupant vehicles, bicyclists, and pedestrians. If the forces lobbying to maintain primacy of the solo driver win, the whole system could break down, leaving severe congestion. On the other hand, everyone stands to benefit, including those driving alone, if we prioritize movement of higher-occupancy vehicles.

Policies
We need an active effort to create policies speeding the advent of AVs and to ensure that their impact is positive. Some of these suggested policies follow.

Pricing Strategies
Many benefits of AV technology will result from people driving less and using greener vehicles. If people choose buses, high-occupancy vehicles, bicycles, and walking for many trips, the benefits described above will be realized. As fewer vehicles use gasoline, we have to switch to other methods of taxing users for the use of vehicles. A pricing mechanism that provides incentives for people to travel with the least impact will bring more benefits. Ideally, pricing should be based on miles driven/ridden, the number of people in the vehicle, emissions, and energy consumption. This would be the most equitable and most neutral form of pricing—you pay for what you use and the impact your use creates.

Time Advantages
Door-to-door travel time can be a powerful motivator when selecting a mode of transportation. Lane clearance and central coordination could provide a time advantage to buses and HOVs and could be scaled to the number of passengers. The more people in the vehicle, the more favored treatment the vehicle could receive.

Liability Issues
Somehow we will need to assign responsibility and liability when a crash occurs. Public policy makers should take this up and develop the policy with manufacturers, technology experts, and other key stakeholders.

MUTCD Issues
The National Committee on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (NCUTCD) works with the Federal Highway Administration to write the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD), which sets standards and guidelines for signs, pavement markings, and signals. A task force to the NCUTCD has just been formed to address issues related to AVs. What can be done with our streets to better accommodate AVs? Nothing to date has been done. Preliminary information suggests that well maintained lane stripes will be valuable.

Conclusions
AVs offer many potential advantages over human-driven vehicles. They bring promise to address some of the most important policy issues of our time. Improvements in safety, mobility for non-drivers, reduction in greenhouse gases, and opportunities to improve our streets should be seen as opportunities to seize. If we can significantly improve public transit with existing funds, and not have to invest in expensive infrastructure, this should be seen as something worth pursuing. AVs offer the opportunity to circumvent local political squabbles over competition for street space through much more efficient use of the space.

AVs can change the way we live and travel. Policymakers should consider this for the long run and how it impacts assumptions and decisions we make today. Does it make sense to invest in billions of dollars’ worth of freeway improvements and road widening, when AVs may significantly reduce the need for these?

Many debate how AVs will impact our cities and our daily lives. I urge policymakers to speed AV development, working toward the positive outcomes and protecting the future from negative outcomes. Let’s take the wheel to control policy development; this is where we need drivers.
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Why California can’t afford more delay on roads
BY MATT CATE AND CAROLYN COLEMAN
Special to The Bee

Crews work last February on a joint construction project between Caltrans and the city of Sacramento near Capitol Mall. The governor and Legislature haven’t been able to agree yet on a transportation funding plan. Rich Pedroncelli Associated Press

Local governments spent the last two years sounding the alarm about our crumbling transportation network and educating policymakers about the poor condition of our streets and highways and the cost to fix them.

Unfortunately, California still does not have a solution to provide the funding needed to maintain our critical transportation network in the condition that residents, visitors and businesses deserve, and that moving goods and people throughout the state requires.

The governor, Assembly speaker and Senate president pro tempore acknowledged that the special session the governor called in July 2015 would expire Nov. 30 without a plan. Instead, they promised to address transportation funding early in the new legislative session that begins this week. We expect them to keep that promise, and we remain hopeful that they will.

We have eight years of research that shows the continual decline of our local road system. The backlog of deferred maintenance has become critical. Many roads are past the point of simple maintenance and need to be completely replaced at about ten times the cost. For instance, Stanislaus County used to resurface about 100 miles of road a year. Now, the county has funds for just three miles.

This is about more than just potholes. Californians are subjected to some of the worst infrastructure conditions in the nation. Pavement with chunks of asphalt missing is unsafe, punishing to vehicles and increases smog emissions.

Many local governments are trying to encourage alternatives to driving. But without money for basic maintenance, retrofitting streets and sidewalks to make them safer for walking and biking is out of reach. Current revenue simply has not kept pace with the need. The state highway system and local road system both have backlogs estimated at more than $70 billion over the next decade.

While more counties and cities are supporting local measures to fund their streets and roads, it is not enough. Between increasingly fuel-efficient vehicles, lower gas prices and a gas tax that hasn’t changed since 1994, local governments have just half as much funding to maintain their streets and roads as they did a generation ago, even before adjusting for inflation.

Gov. Jerry Brown and legislative leaders have been working on legislation that includes modest increases to existing revenue sources and some commonsense reforms that can streamline the project approval process. We commend our champions in the Legislature, especially Sen. Jim Beall, a San Jose Democrat who is chairman of the Senate Transportation Committee, and Assemblyman Jim Frazier, an Oakley Democrat who is chairman of the Assembly Transportation Committee.

However, we cannot afford any more distractions or delays in passing legislation for transportation investment and reform. The governor and legislative leaders must keep their promise to help local governments and the state invest in fixing our roads. Anything less will put our residents at risk and cost millions more in the long run.

January 10, 2017

MEMO THE GOVERNOR’S & LEGISLATIVE FUNDING PROPOSALS

Governor’s Proposal for Revenues to Support New Investment:

The Governor today introduced a 10-year-funding plan that would provide approximately $43 billion (over 10 years) in new funding and redirected savings from efficiencies for transportation priorities. Specifically, the Governor’s proposal includes annualized resources as follows:

- Road Improvement Charge—$2.1 billion from a new $65 fee on all vehicles, including hybrids and electrics.
- Stabilize Gasoline Excise Tax—$1.1 billion by setting the gasoline excise tax at the 2013-14 rate of 21.5 cents and eliminating the current annual adjustments. The broader gasoline tax would then be adjusted annually for inflation to maintain purchasing power.
- Diesel Excise Tax—$425 million from an 11-cent increase in the diesel excise tax. This tax would also be adjusted annually for inflation to maintain purchasing power.
- Cap and Trade—$500 million in additional Cap and Trade proceeds.
- Caltrans Efficiencies — $100 million in cost-saving reforms.
- $706 million in loan repayments over the next three years. The funds will support additional investments in the Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program, trade corridor improvements, and repairs to the state highway system.
- Active Transportation Program—$1 billion Cap and Trade for Caltrans to expand the grant program for local projects that encourage active transportation such as bicycling and walking, with at least 50 percent of the funds directed to benefit disadvantaged communities.
- Local Streets and Roads/Local Partnership Funds—About $11.4 billion in Shared Revenues to be allocated by the Controller to cities and counties for local road maintenance according to existing statutory formulas, and over $2.2 billion in state-local partnership grants.
- Sustainable Transportation Grants — An increase of $25 million annually for competitive planning grants to assist regions and local governments in achieving the sustainable transportation requirements in Chapter 728, Statutes of 2008 (SB 375), and other State objectives.
• Corridor Mobility Improvements — An increase of over $2.7 billion for multi-modal investments on key congested commute corridors that demonstrate best practices for quality public transit and managed highway lanes such as priced express lanes or high-occupancy vehicle lanes. Included is also $25 million annually to expand the freeway service patrol program.

• Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program—An increase of over $4.2 billion (including $4 billion in additional Cap and Trade as well as $256 million from loan repayments) for transit capital investments that provide greenhouse gas reductions, with at least 50 percent of the funds directed to benefit disadvantaged communities.

• Highway Repairs and Maintenance — An increase of almost $18 billion (including $1 billion from Caltrans efficiency savings) for Caltrans to fund repairs and maintenance on the state highway system.

• State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) — An augmentation and stabilization to the STIP, which should not only allow the California Transportation Commission to restore funding for $750 million worth of projects cut from the program in 2016, but also program approximately $800 million in new projects in the 2018 STIP.

• Trade Corridor Improvements — An increase of over $2.8 billion (including $2.5 billion in new revenues and $323 million from loan repayments) for Caltrans to fund projects along the state’s major trade corridors, providing ongoing funding for a program originally established with $2 billion in one-time Proposition 1B bond funding.

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

SB 1 and AB 1

$6 Billion Transportation Funding Proposals Introduced, by Senator Beall and Assembly Member Frazier introduced similar transportation funding proposals on December 5, 2016, under SB 1 and AB 1, respectively.

Upon full implementation, AB 1 and SB 1 would generate approximately $6 billion annually.

Additional Revenues (Approximate)

• $1.8 billion from a 12 cent increase to the gasoline excise tax, adjusted every 3 years for inflation. The revenue generated from this particular increase would help restore the gas tax’ lost purchasing power due to inflation. The funds attributable to the 12 cent increase would be transferred to the newly created Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account (RMRA) for distribution.

• **Key Difference: SB 1 (Beall) phases in the 12 cent increase over 3 years, while AB 1 (Frazier) does not include a phase in period.**

• $1.1 billion from ending the Board of Equalization (BOE) “true up” and resetting the rate to the historical average of 17.3 cents per gallon, adjusted every 3 years for inflation. This
provision would “reset” the priced based excise tax on gasoline to its original rate of 17.3 cents. Funds would be distributed using current formulas.

- $1.3 billion from a $38 increase to the Vehicle Registration Fee, adjusted every 3 years for inflation. After the California Department of Motor Vehicles deducts their administrative costs from imposing and collecting the fee, the funds from the increase would be deposited into the RMRA for distribution.

- $500 million from restoration of half the truck weight fees to transportation projects. Restoration of truck weight fee revenue would be phased-in over a five-year period and half would no longer be allowed to be transferred out of the state highway account (SHA) after the 2020-21 fiscal years. The funds would remain in the SHA, which would prevent HUTA funds from the variable gas tax from having to offset the SHA weight fee transfer.

- **Key Difference: SB 1 phases in a percentage of the truck weight fees back to transportation projects, while AB 1 phases in specific weight fee amounts every year. SB 1 caps the weight fee transfer at 50% in FY 2020-21, while AB caps the weight fee transfer at $500,000,000 in FY 2020-21.**

- $600 million from a 20 cent per gallon increase to the diesel excise tax, adjusted every 3 years for inflation. The funds attributable to the 20 cent increase to the diesel excise tax would be transferred to the Trade Corridors Improvement Fund (TCIF). Federal FAST Act funds for freight would also be deposited into the TCIF.

- $300 million from unallocated cap and trade funds. This continuous appropriation of cap and trade funds would essentially double the amount going towards the Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program (TIRCP) and the Low Carbon Transit Operations Program (LCTOP).

- $263 million from 3.5 Percent Increase to the diesel sales tax. The funds generated through the additional 3.5 percent increase to the diesel sales tax would deposit $263 million into the State Transportation Account for transit and intercity rail purposes.

- **Key Difference: SB 1 would impose an additional 0.5 percent to this sales tax which would generate a $40 million set aside for intercity rail and commuter rail.**

- $60 million from miscellaneous transportation revenues. The bills delete the transfer of miscellaneous revenues to the Transportation Debt Service Fund and instead redirect the funds to the RMRA.

- $20 million from Vehicle Registration Fee on zero emission vehicles, starting in the 2nd year of ownership, adjusted every 3 years for inflation. Per the authors, this provision will help make up for the fact that owners of zero emission vehicles do not pay any gas tax to maintain the roads they drive on. Revenues would be deposited into the RMRA for distribution.
• Key Difference: SB 1 imposes a $100 Vehicle Registration Fee on zero emission vehicles generating, while AB 1 (Frazier) imposes a $165 Vehicle Registration Fee

The revenues generated from these proposals, would provide the following allocations:

From the $3.2 billion in the RMRA:

• State Highway System -$1.45 billion annually for maintenance and rehabilitation of the state highway system.
• Local Streets and Roads – $1.45 billion annually for maintenance and rehabilitation of local streets and roads.
• Self-help counties – $200 million for existing and aspiring self-help counties.
• Active Transportation Programs – $80 million annually for Active Transportation and up to an additional $70 million through Caltrans efficiencies.
• Advanced Mitigation – $120 million one-time funds for implementation of the Advanced Mitigation program over the first four years.
• California State University – $2 million for transportation research and workforce training.
• Key Difference: University of California – $3 million under AB 1 (Frazier) for the Institutes for Transportation Studies.

From restoration/returned revenue from the HUTA

• State Transportation Improvement Program -$770 million annually for capital projects and improvements on the state’s highway system.
• State Highway Operation and Protection Program – $210 million annually for maintenance and rehabilitation of the state highway system.
• Local Streets and Roads -$770 million annually for local streets and roads.

From Cap and Trade revenues and diesel tax increase

• Transit and Intercity Rail – $563 million annually for transit and intercity rail capital projects and operations, $40 million additionally set aside for intercity and commuter rail under SB 1 (Beall).

From the TCIF

• Freight, trade corridors, and goods movement – $600 million annually for freight, trade corridors, and goods movement.

From loan Repayments

• $706 million one-time funds for transportation loan repayment.
**Proposed Reforms**

- Establishes local reporting requirements. Cities and counties would be required to send the CTC a list of projects they propose to fund with Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account (RMRA) funds, specifying the location, description, proposed schedule, and estimated useful life for each project each fiscal year.

- Makes permanent the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) delegation authority. Permanently extends the authority for Caltrans to participate in the federal NEPA delegation pilot program, which allows projects involving federal funds to be delivered faster.

- Promotes employment and training opportunities through pre-apprenticeship. Requires state and local agencies to create programs that promote employment in advanced construction through pre-apprenticeship as a condition of receiving RMRA funds.

- Incorporates “complete streets” design concept into the Highway Design Manual. Requires Caltrans to incorporate the “complete streets” design concept into the Highway Design Manual.

- Restores independence to the California Transportation Commission (CTC). The bills move the CTC out from under the California State Transportation Agency, establishing it as its own entity within state government to help it fulfill its oversight role.

- Creates the Office of Transportation Inspector General as an independent entity and office within state government. Its role will be to ensure that all other state agencies that receive state transportation funds are operating efficiently, effectively, and in compliance with federal and state laws. The Inspector General would be appointed by the Governor to a six-year term and would have the authority to conduct audits and investigations involving state transportation funds with all affected state agencies.

- Permanently extends and expands the limited CEQA exemption for transportation repair, maintenance, and minor alteration projects to existing roadways. The bills delete the January 1, 2020 sunset of the existing law and expand the exemption to cities and counties with populations greater than 100,000 and apply the exemption to state roadways.

- Creates an Advanced Mitigation program for transportation projects. The bills authorize the Natural Resources Agency to prepare, approve, and implement advance mitigation plans for one or more planned transportation projects. An advanced mitigation plan is defined as a regional or statewide plan that estimates the potential future mitigation requirements for one or more transportation projects and identifies mitigation projects, sites, or credits that would fulfill some or all of those requirements. The Agency would be authorized to administer the program, establish mitigation banks, secure areas for the purpose of providing mitigation, and allow transportation agencies to use mitigation credits to fulfill mitigation requirements. The program’s intention is to supplant existing CEQA requirements, not substitute for them.
The California Transportation Plan 2040 provides a framework for transportation to help meet the state’s climate goals by promoting livable communities, economic growth, greenhouse gas emission reduction, and a fix-it-first approach for highways, roads and bridges. It features the following six major goals for a whole system approach:

- Improve multimodal mobility and accessibility for all people
- Preserve the multimodal transportation system
- Support a vibrant economy
- Improve public safety and security
- Foster livable and healthy communities and promote social equity
- Practice environmental stewardship

**Continued on back**

**US 101 Linden/Casitas interchanges**

Caltrans recently joined its local partners to celebrate the groundbreaking of the US 101 Linden/Casitas interchanges project in Santa Barbara County. Caltrans Director Malcolm Dougherty noted the project will improve traffic flow and reduce congestion on this busy corridor.

The $60 million project will reconstruct and widen the US 101 overcrossings at Linden Avenue and Casitas Pass Road, install a new landscaped median, sidewalks and bicycle paths, and extend the adjacent frontage road—connecting the community to local streets for in-town trips.

The Carpinteria Creek overcrossing will be widened to accommodate the highway’s future widening in this area. Security Paving Company of Sylmar, Calif. is the contractor for the project scheduled for completion in 2020.

**Origin-Destination Survey**

Studying travel behaviors of regional and interregional trips on US 101 in and between Ventura, Santa Barbara and San Luis Obispo counties is the primary goal of the recently completed 2016 Central Coast Origin-Destination Survey. The survey collected travel data to help calibrate Santa Barbara County Association of Governments’ (SBCAG) regional travel demand model and support planning efforts to improve regional transit and rail services.

Key study findings confirm previous planning assumptions, including the heavy peak hour congestion across the Santa Barbara-Ventura county line and prevailing truck traffic using US 101 over SR 154. They also show a major awareness gap regarding some regional transit services.

**CTP 2040 continued**

The plan builds upon the state’s Interregional Plan, Freight Plan, Rail Plan, Aviation Plan, Transit Plan, Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan and Regional Transportation Plans. It also includes 15 strategies addressing mode shift, transportation alternatives, pricing and operational efficiency.

The state’s first priorities for sustainable mobility is investing in bicycle/pedestrian infrastructure and transit. Caltrans aims to triple bicycling and double walking and transit use statewide by 2020. This supports the state’s goal to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by 2020, and 80 percent below those levels by 2050.

Caltrans conducted extensive public outreach statewide for the plan’s development. This included two public comment periods, focus groups, public workshops, interactive website, news releases, social networking and webinars. Continued collaboration between Caltrans, local agencies, communities and all transportation stakeholders is essential to successfully achieving the state’s high priority goals. The plan and more information is available at: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/californiaTransportationPlan2040/index.shtml

**Sustainable Grants**

A call for projects is under way for the 2017-2018 Sustainable Transportation Planning grants. About $7.8 million is available statewide for the Sustainable Communities grants, and $1.5 million for Strategic Partnerships.

These grants promote a balanced, comprehensive multimodal transportation system supporting Caltrans’ key objectives of sustainability, preservation, mobility, safety, innovation, economy, health and equity. Applications are due to Caltrans Friday, November 4, 2016. Applications, guidebook and more information is available at: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/grants.html

**Federal Transit Funding**

Providing more modern, reliable bus service nationwide is a top priority for the Federal Transit Administration’s Bus and Bus Facilities Grant Program. Sixty-one projects across the country will receive about $211 million to replace, rehabilitate and purchase transit buses and related equipment/facilities. These include $4.3 million to Caltrans to construct a new maintenance facility in the Monterey-Salinas area, $4 million to the San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority for a new transit center, $5.7 million to the Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit District to purchase new buses, and $3.7 million to Monterey-Salinas Transit to replace buses and provide workforce development training. More information at: https://www.fta.dot.gov/grants/2016-metro-grant-programs

**Transit Plans Coordinate City/Regional Services**

The San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority (RTA) and the City of San Luis Obispo recently released their jointly developed 2016 Short Range Transit Plans. Both plans provide operational, capital, institutional and implementation guidelines for the agencies to better coordinate their services. Caltrans funded the five-year plans with a Transit Planning for Sustainable Communities grant.

**Critical Rural Freight Corridors**

California is the nation’s largest gateway for international trade and domestic commerce with an interconnected system of ports, railroads, highways and roads facilitating freight movement nationwide. The system supports one-third of the state’s economic product and jobs. In 2014, freight-dependent industries provided more than $740 billion in gross domestic product and more than five million jobs.

US 101 and Highways 46 and 156 are integral to this system. Caltrans is recommending their designation as critical rural freight corridors within the Interim National Multimodal Freight Network. Working in partnership with local agencies, Caltrans recently submitted this recommendation, among others, to the U.S. Department of Transportation for consideration.

Countywide, 77 percent of residents live within one-half mile of a public transit route, contributing to more than one million riders annually. In fact, RTA ridership increased 270 percent in 2013 from the previous decade and the city’s, 64 percent.

To meet future travel demand, both plans recommend enhancing, modifying and expanding daily transit services—including evening runs—as well as purchasing new buses, improving bus stops and operations/maintenance facilities and providing a new downtown transit center. More information at: http://slocog.org/sites/default/files/SLORTA-SRTP-2016-Final-web.pdf

## CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Construction Timeline</th>
<th>Construction Cost</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Project Manager (Resident Engineer)</th>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. State Route (SR) 17 Storm Water Mitigation (0Q600)</td>
<td>From 0.74 miles north of the fishhook to Sims Road (Rd) (Post Mile (PM) 0.7-1.4).</td>
<td>Construct multiple storm water mitigation improvements.</td>
<td>Fall 2016-Spring 2017</td>
<td>$7.4 Million</td>
<td>State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPP)</td>
<td>Doug Hessing (SG)</td>
<td>Graniterock, Watsonville, CA</td>
<td>Project in winter suspension due to weather. Periodic closures expected in the right southbound lane will be confined to the following times and on weekdays only: Labor Day – Memorial Day 8 pm to 7 am / 9 am to 1 pm Memorial Day – Labor Day 8 pm to 7 am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. SR 17 Shoulder Widening and Concrete Guardrail (0T980)</td>
<td>Near Scotts Valley from 0.4 miles south of Sugarloaf Rd to 0.1 miles south of Laurel Rd (PM 8.3-9.4).</td>
<td>Widen shoulder and install concrete guardrail.</td>
<td>Spring 2016-Summer 2017</td>
<td>$6.2 Million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Doug Hessing (DP)</td>
<td>Granite Construction, Watsonville, CA</td>
<td>Construction began on May 11, 2016 and work consists of shoulder widening and drainage improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. SR 129 Curve Realignment (0TS40)</td>
<td>East of Watsonville between 0.4 miles west of Old Chittenden Rd and 0.1 miles east of Chittenden underpass (PM 9.5-10.0).</td>
<td>Realign curve.</td>
<td>Spring 2016-Spring 2017</td>
<td>$5 Million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Doug Hessing (KB)</td>
<td>Graniterock, Watsonville, CA</td>
<td>Work on the westbound side of the highway is complete. Work on the eastbound side of the highway is nearing completion. A 5-day full closure is scheduled for January 15 at 10 pm through January 20 at 11 pm (weather permitting). Construction is scheduled for completion in February, 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. SR 152 Centerline Rumble Strip (1G400)</td>
<td>From the Casserly Rd/Carlton Rd intersection to the SCR/Santa Clara County line (PM 3.7-8.3).</td>
<td>Install centerline rumble strip.</td>
<td>Fall 2016-Spring 2017</td>
<td>$9.6 Million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Doug Hessing (SG)</td>
<td>Chrisp Company, Fremont, CA</td>
<td>Project acceptance date has been extended due to temperature requirements for striping. Construction is scheduled for completion in April, 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. SR 236 Resurfacing (1F340)</td>
<td>From Boulder Creek to Waterman Gap (PM 0.0-16.0).</td>
<td>Resurface the existing roadway.</td>
<td>Fall 2016-Spring 2017</td>
<td>$3.5 Million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Kelly McClain (KB)</td>
<td>Graniterock, Watsonville, CA</td>
<td>Project near completion but in winter suspension through April, 2017. In April, miscellaneous paving will be completed.</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>6. SR 129/Carlton Rd Intersection Improvements (1F350)</td>
<td>Near Watsonville from 0.1 miles west to 0.2 miles east of Carlton Rd (PM 3.2-3.5).</td>
<td>Realign Carlton Rd and construct a new intersection with left-turn channelization.</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$2 Million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Doug Hessing</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>On schedule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. SR 152 Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) (1E020)</td>
<td>Near Watsonville from Wagner Ave to south of Holohan Rd (PM 1.3-R2.0).</td>
<td>Install sidewalks for ADA compliance.</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$1.9 Million</td>
<td>SHOPP</td>
<td>Kathy DiGrazia</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>On schedule.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TO: Regional Transportation Commission

FROM: Rachel Moriconi, Senior Transportation Planner

RE: Agreements with the State Board of Equalization for Administrative Functions Related to the New Measure D Transportation Sales Tax Program

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) adopt resolutions (Attachments 1 and 2) approving the State Board of Equalization agreements for the Measure D program, and authorizing staff to execute the agreements.

BACKGROUND

On November 8, 2016, Santa Cruz County voters approved Measure D - a new half cent sales tax dedicated to transportation projects outlined in the Ordinance Expenditure Plan.

DISCUSSION

The California State Board of Equalization (BOE) administers the collection of transportation transaction and use taxes on behalf of local transportation authorities. The BOE requires that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) execute its standard agreements for administration of the New Measure D sales tax program that will take effect on April 1, 2017. Staff recommends that the RTC approve the attached resolutions (Attachments 1 and 2) to approve the agreements (Exhibits a & b), authorize the Executive Director to sign agreements, and authorize the examination of tax records.

The agreements (included as exhibits to the resolutions) set forth basic administrative details. The costs to be charged by the State Board of Equalization for its services are set by state law. Set up costs will be no more than $175,000, with annual fees anticipated to be approximately $230,000, based on information from other agencies.

Staff continues to work on other tasks associated with Measure D implementation, including development of agreements and guidelines for agencies receiving direct formula allocations and the 30-year Implementation Plan. Staff will provide an update on those and other implementation tasks in February.
SUMMARY

RTC is required to enter into agreements with the California BOE for collection and administration of Measure D sales tax revenues.

Attachments:

1. Resolution Authorizing RTC Managers to Execute Agreements with the State Board of Equalization
   Exhibits:
   a. Preparatory Agreement
   b. Administrative Agreement

2. Resolution Authorizing Examination of Tax Records
RESOLUTION NO. 14-17

Adopted by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
on the date of January 19, 2017
on the motion of Commissioner
duly seconded by Commissioner

A RESOLUTION OF THE SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION (SCCRTC) AS THE LOCAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY FOR SANTA CRUZ COUNTY AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO EXECUTE AGREEMENTS WITH THE STATE BOARD OF EQUALIZATION FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF A LOCAL TRANSACTIONS AND USE TAX

WHEREAS, on June 16, 2016, the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC), serving as the Local Transportation Authority for Santa Cruz County, approved Ordinance No. 2016-01 providing for a local transactions and use tax; which was also approved by a supermajority of voters in Santa Cruz County on November 8, 2016 in accordance with state law; and

WHEREAS, the State Board of Equalization (BOE) administers and collects the transactions and use taxes for all applicable jurisdictions within the state; and

WHEREAS, the BOE will be responsible to administer and collect the transactions and use tax for the SCCRTC; and

WHEREAS, the BOE requires that the SCCRTC enter into a “Preparatory Agreement” and an “Administration Agreement” prior to implementation of said taxes, and

WHEREAS, the BOE requires that the RTC authorize the agreements;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC), serving as the Local Transportation Authority, that the attached “Preparatory Agreement” and “Administration Agreement” are hereby approved and the Executive Director, Deputy Director and Fiscal Officer are hereby authorized to execute each agreement.

The foregoing resolution was introduced and adopted at a regular meeting of the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission held on January 19, 2017, by the following vote, to wit:

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

ATTEST:
______________________________  ____________________________
Zach Friend, Chair     George Dondero, Secretary

Exhibits:
A. Preparatory Agreement
B. Administrative Agreement
AGREEMENT FOR PREPARATION TO ADMINISTER AND OPERATE
SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION’S (RTC)
TRANSACTIONS AND USE TAX ORDINANCE

In order to prepare to administer a transactions and use tax ordinance adopted in accordance with the provision of Part 1.6 (commencing with Section 7251) of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission, hereinafter called \textit{County}, and the STATE BOARD OF EQUALIZATION, hereinafter called \textit{Board}, do agree as follows:

1. The Board agrees to enter into work to prepare to administer and operate a transactions and use tax in conformity with Part 1.6 of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code which has been approved by a majority of the electors of the County and whose ordinance has been adopted by the County.

2. County agrees to pay to the Board at the times and in the amounts hereinafter specified all of the Board's costs for preparatory work necessary to administer the County's transactions and use tax ordinance. The Board's costs for preparatory work include costs of developing procedures, programming for data processing, developing and adopting appropriate regulations, designing and printing forms, developing instructions for the Board's staff and for taxpayers, and other appropriate and necessary preparatory costs to administer a transactions and use tax ordinance. These costs shall include both direct and indirect costs as specified in Section 11256 of the Government Code.

3. Preparatory costs may be accounted for in a manner which conforms to the internal accounting and personnel records currently maintained by the Board. The billings for costs may be presented in summary form. Detailed records of preparatory costs will be retained for audit and verification by the County.

4. Any dispute as to the amount of preparatory costs incurred by the Board shall be referred to the State Director of Finance for resolution, and the Director's decision shall be final.

5. Preparatory costs incurred by the Board shall be billed by the Board periodically, with the final billing within a reasonable time after the operative date of the ordinance. County shall pay to the Board the amount of such costs on or before the last day of the next succeeding month following the month when the billing is received.

6. The amount to be paid by County for the Board's preparatory costs shall not exceed one hundred seventy-five thousand dollars ($175,000) (Revenue and Taxation Code Section 7272.)
7. Communications and notices may be sent by first class United States mail. Communications and notices to be sent to the Board shall be addressed to:

State Board of Equalization
P.O. Box 942879, MIC: 27
Sacramento, California 94279-0027

Attention: Administrator,
Local Revenue Branch

Communications and notices to be sent to County shall be addressed to:

George Dondero, Executive Director
1523 Pacific Ave
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
Attn: Fiscal Officer

8. The date of this agreement is the date on which it is approved by the Department of General Services. This agreement shall continue in effect until the preparatory work necessary to administer County's transactions and use tax ordinance has been completed and the Board has received all payments due from County under the terms of this agreement.

SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

By _______________________________
George Dondero
Executive Director

STATE BOARD OF EQUALIZATION

By _______________________________
Administrator

(Rev. 11/16)
AGREEMENT FOR STATE ADMINISTRATION
OF DISTRICT TRANSACTIONS AND USE TAXES

The Transportation Authority of the County of Santa Cruz has adopted, and the voters of the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (hereafter called “District”) have approved by the required majority vote, the Measure D Transactions and Use Tax Ordinance (hereafter called “Ordinance”), a copy of which is attached hereto. To carry out the provisions of Part 1.6 of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code and the Ordinance, the State Board of Equalization, (hereinafter called the “Board”) and the District do agree as follows:

ARTICLE I
DEFINITIONS

Unless the context requires otherwise, wherever the following terms appear in the Agreement, they shall be interpreted to mean the following:

1. "District taxes" shall mean the transactions and use taxes, penalties, and interest imposed under an ordinance specifically authorized by Revenue and Taxation Code Section 7251 et seq., and in compliance with Part 1.6, Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code.

2. "District Ordinance" shall mean the District's Transactions and Use Tax Ordinance referred to above and attached hereto, Ordinance #2016-01, as amended from time to time, or as deemed to be amended from time to time pursuant to Revenue and Taxation Code Section 7262.2.

ARTICLE II
ADMINISTRATION AND COLLECTION
OF DISTRICT TAXES

A. Administration. The Board and District agree that the Board shall perform exclusively all functions incident to the administration and operation of the District Ordinance.
B. Other Applicable Laws. District agrees that all provisions of law applicable to the administration and operation of the State Sales and Use Tax Law which are not inconsistent with Part 1.6 of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code shall be applicable to the administration and operation of the District Ordinance. District agrees that money collected pursuant to the District Ordinance may be deposited into the State Treasury to the credit of the Retail Sales Tax Fund and may be drawn from that Fund for any authorized purpose, including making refunds, compensating and reimbursing the Board pursuant to Article IV of this Agreement, and transmitting to District the amount to which District is entitled.

C. Transmittal of money.

1. For the period during which the tax is in effect, and except as otherwise provided herein, all District taxes collected under the provisions of the District Ordinance shall be transmitted to District periodically as promptly as feasible, but not less often than twice in each calendar quarter.

2. For periods subsequent to the expiration date of the tax, whether by District’s self-imposed limits or by final judgment of any court of the State of California holding that District’s ordinance is invalid or void, all District taxes collected under the provisions of the District Ordinance shall be transmitted to District not less than once in each calendar quarter.

3. Transmittals may be made by mail or electronic funds transfer to an account of the District designated and authorized by District. A statement shall be furnished at least quarterly indicating the amounts withheld pursuant to Article IV of this Agreement.

D. Rules. The Board shall prescribe and adopt such rules and regulations as in its judgment are necessary or desirable for the administration and operation of the District Ordinance and the distribution of the District taxes collected thereunder.

E. Preference. Unless the payor instructs otherwise, and except as otherwise provided in this Agreement, the Board shall give no preference in applying money received for state sales and use taxes, state-administered local sales and use taxes, and District transactions and use taxes owed by a taxpayer, but shall apply moneys collected to the satisfaction of the claims of the State, cities, counties, cities and counties, redevelopment agencies, other districts, and District as their interests appear.
F. **Security.** The Board agrees that any security which it hereafter requires to be furnished by taxpayers under the State Sales and Use Tax Law will be upon such terms that it also will be available for the payment of the claims of the District for District taxes owing to it as its interest appears. The Board shall not be required to change the terms of any security now held by it and District shall not participate in any security now held by the Board.

G. **Records of the Board.**

When requested by resolution of the legislative body of the District under section 7056 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, the Board agrees to permit authorized personnel of the District to examine the records of the Board, including the name, address, and account number of each seller holding a seller’s permit with a registered business location in the District, pertaining to the ascertainment of transactions and use taxes collected for the District. Information obtained by the District from examination of the Board's records shall be used by the District only for purposes related to the collection of transactions and use taxes by the Board pursuant to this Agreement.

H. **Annexation.** District agrees that the Board shall not be required to give effect to an annexation, for the purpose of collecting, allocating, and distributing District transactions and use taxes, earlier than the first day of the calendar quarter which commences not less than two months after notice to the Board. The notice shall include the name of the county or counties annexed to the extended District boundary. In the event the District shall annex an area, the boundaries of which are not coterminous with a county or counties, the notice shall include a description of the area annexed and two maps of the District showing the area annexed and the location address of the property nearest to the extended District boundary on each side of every street or road crossing the boundary.

**ARTICLE III**

**ALLOCATION OF TAX**

A. **Allocation.** In the administration of the Board's contracts with all districts that impose transactions and use taxes imposed under ordinances, which comply with Part 1.6 of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code:
1. Any payment not identified as being in payment of liability owing to a designated district or districts may be apportioned among the districts as their interest appear, or, in the discretion of the Board, to all districts with which the Board has contracted using ratios reflected by the distribution of district taxes collected from all taxpayers.

2. All district taxes collected as a result of determinations or billings made by the Board, and all amounts refunded or credited may be distributed or charged to the respective districts in the same ratio as the taxpayer's self-declared district taxes for the period for which the determination, billing, refund, or credit applies.

B. Vehicles, Vessels, and Aircraft. For the purpose of allocating use tax with respect to vehicles, vessels, or aircraft, the address of the registered owner appearing on the application for registration or on the certificate of ownership may be used by the Board in determining the place of use.

ARTICLE IV
COMPENSATION

The District agrees to pay to the Board as the Board's cost of administering the District Ordinance such amount as is provided for by law. Such amounts shall be deducted from the taxes collected by the Board for the District.

ARTICLE V
MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

A. Communications. Communications and notices may be sent by first class United States mail to the addresses listed below or to such other addresses as the parties may from time to time designate. A notification is complete when deposited in the mail.
Communications and notices to be sent to the Board shall be addressed to:

State Board of Equalization  
P.O. Box 942879, MIC: 27  
Sacramento, California 94279-0032

Attention: Administrator  
Local Revenue Branch

Communications and notices to be sent to the District shall be addressed to:

Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission  
1523 Pacific Avenue  
Santa Cruz, CA 95060  
Attention: Executive Director

Unless otherwise directed, transmittals of payment of District transactions and use taxes will be sent to the address above.

B. Term. The date of this Agreement is the date on which it is approved by the Department of General Services. The Agreement shall take effect on April 1, 2017. This Agreement shall continue until December 31 next following the expiration date of the District Ordinance, and shall thereafter be renewed automatically from year to year until the Board completes all work necessary to the administration of the District Ordinance and has received and disbursed all payments due under that Ordinance.

C. Notice of Repeal of Ordinance. District shall give the Board written notice of the repeal of the District Ordinance not less than 110 days prior to the operative date of the repeal.
ARTICLE VI
ADMINISTRATION OF TAXES IF THE
ORDINANCE IS CHALLENGED AS BEING INVALID

A. Impoundment of funds.

1. When a legal action is begun challenging the validity of the imposition of the tax, the District shall deposit in an interest-bearing escrow account, any proceeds transmitted to it under Article II. C., until a court of competent jurisdiction renders a final and non-appealable judgment that the tax is valid.

2. If the tax is determined to be unconstitutional or otherwise invalid, the District shall transmit to the Board the moneys retained in escrow, including any accumulated interest, within ten days of the judgment of the trial court in the litigation awarding costs and fees becoming final and non-appealable.

B. Costs of administration. Should a final judgment be entered in any court of the State of California, holding that District's Ordinance is invalid or void and requiring a rebate or refund to taxpayers of any taxes collected under the terms of this Agreement, the parties mutually agree that:

1. Board may retain all payments made by District to Board to prepare to administer the District Ordinance.

2. District will pay to Board and allow Board to retain Board's cost of administering the District Ordinance in the amounts set forth in Article IV of this Agreement.

3. District will pay to Board or to the State of California the amount of any taxes plus interest and penalties, if any, that Board or the State of California may be required to rebate or refund to taxpayers.
4. District will pay to Board its costs for rebating or refunding such taxes, interest, or penalties. Board's costs shall include its additional cost for developing procedures for processing the rebates or refunds, its costs of actually making these refunds, designing and printing forms, and developing instructions for Board's staff for use in making these rebates or refunds and any other costs incurred by Board which are reasonably appropriate or necessary to make those rebates or refunds. These costs shall include Board's direct and indirect costs as specified by Section 11256 of the Government Code.

5. Costs may be accounted for in a manner, which conforms to the internal accounting, and personnel records currently maintained by the Board. The billings for such costs may be presented in summary form. Detailed records will be retained for audit and verification by District.

6. Any dispute as to the amount of costs incurred by Board in refunding taxes shall be referred to the State Director of Finance for resolution and the Director's decision shall be final.

7. Costs incurred by Board in connection with such refunds shall be billed by Board on or before the 25th day of the second month following the month in which the judgment of a court of the State of California holding District's Ordinance invalid or void becomes final. Thereafter Board shall bill District on or before the 25th of each month for all costs incurred by Board for the preceding calendar month. District shall pay to Board the amount of such costs on or before the last day of the succeeding month and shall pay to Board the total amount of taxes, interest, and penalties refunded or paid to taxpayers, together with Board costs incurred in making those refunds.

SANTA CRUZ COUNTY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION (District)                      STATE BOARD OF EQUALIZATION
By__________________________________                     By__________________________________
(Signature)                                                            Administrator
Typed Name: George Dondero
Title: Executive Director
RESOLUTION NO. 15-17

Adopted by the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission
on the date of January 19, 2017
on the motion of Commissioner
duly seconded by Commissioner

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE EXAMINATION OF
TRANSACTIONS (SALES) AND USE TAX RECORDS

WHEREAS, pursuant to Ordinance No. 2016-01 of the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC) hereinafter called District and Section 7270 of the Revenue and Taxation Code, the District entered into a contract with the State Board of Equalization to perform all functions incident to the administration and operation of the Transactions and Use Tax Ordinance; and

WHEREAS, the District deems it desirable and necessary for authorized representatives of the District to examine confidential transactions and use tax records of the State Board of Equalization pertaining to transactions and use taxes collected by the Board for the District pursuant to that contract; and

WHEREAS, Section 7056 of the Revenue and Taxation Code sets forth certain requirements and conditions for the disclosure of Board of Equalization records and establishes criminal penalties for the unlawful disclosure of information contained in or derived from, the transactions and use tax records of the Board;

NOW, THEREFORE IT IS RESOLVED AND ORDERED AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. That the Executive Director, Deputy Director, Administrative Services Officer and Fiscal Officer or other officer or employee of the District designated in writing by the Executive or Deputy Director to the State Board of Equalization (hereafter referred to as Board) is hereby appointed to represent the District with authority to examine transactions and use tax records of the Board pertaining to transactions and use taxes collected for the District by the Board pursuant to the contract between the District and the Board. The information obtained by examination of Board records shall be used only for purposes related to the collection of the District’s transactions and use taxes by the Board pursuant to the contract.

Section 2. That the Executive Director, Deputy Director, Fiscal Officer, Administrative Services Officer, Senior Transportation Planner or other officer or employee of the District designated in writing by the Executive or Deputy Director to the Board of Equalization is hereby appointed to represent the District with authority to examine those transactions and use tax records of the Board for purposes related to the following governmental functions of the District:
   a) Budget and administration
   b) Fiscal and auditing
   c) Transportation planning

The information obtained by examination of Board records shall be used only for those governmental functions of the District listed above.
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the information obtained by examination of Board records shall be used only for purposes related to the collection of District’s transactions and use taxes by the Board pursuant to the contracts between the District and Board.

Introduced, approved and adopted this 19th day of January, 2017.

AYES: COMMISSIONERS

NOES: COMMISSIONERS

ABSTAIN: COMMISSIONERS

ABSENT: COMMISSIONERS

ATTEST:

______________________________  ____________________________
Zach Friend, Chair     George Dondero, Secretary
RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) accept this program update on Cruz511.

BACKGROUND

For more than 35 years, the RTC has offered the Santa Cruz County community a service that helps travelers use the transportation system to access the things they want and need. Recently, the RTC revitalized and rebranded its transportation demand management (TDM) programs and streamlined service offerings for online access and delivery. Cruz511 is the umbrella brand under which all RTC’s TDM and traveler information services now take place including those previously delivered through RTC’s Commute Solutions Program.

This report provides highlights of Cruz511 activities in 2016. A more thorough program update is provided in Attachment 1, which includes information about the development and implementation of the 511 system in Santa Cruz County and Cruz511 TDM and outreach activities for the coming year.

DISCUSSION

The focus of the RTC’s TDM efforts with Cruz511 is to deliver traveler information and referral services and market the availability of travel options. As the umbrella brand for TDM services, Cruz511 also includes an online traveler information presence at the website Cruz511.org, on Facebook at @Cruz511 and on Twitter @Cruz_511. Cruz511.org is a self-serve, mobile-responsive, centralized online resource for multi-modal traveler information featuring a traffic map with real-time information. Many of the key TDM activities previously offered through Commute Solutions are now available with expanded resources online at Cruz511.org, including ride matching, trip planning for all travel modes, park and ride lot
coordination, and employer assistance for workplace based commute programs. The Cruz511 presence on Facebook and Twitter are intended to drive traffic to the Cruz511.org website where the transportation resources and tools are offered.

**Carpool and Vanpool Matching**

Cruz511 continues to partner with the Bay Area’s Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) to offer online carpool and vanpool matching services at http://rideshare.511.org/ to people who live or work in Santa Cruz County. This is popular among those with long commutes into Silicon Valley and the Bay Area. As of January 1, 2017, there are 1,553 active and new participants who live or work in Santa Cruz County and who are seeking to find a carpool or vanpool partner through the Bay Area 511 ridematch program. Since Cruz511.org launched in July 2015, 106 new profiles were created by Santa Cruz County commuters seeking carpool partners in the RMS. There appears to be limited interest in vanpools, and there are currently no vanpool formation subsidy programs available to Santa Cruz County commuters.

**Capitalize on Private Sector Innovation**

Advancements in technology and the transportation industry have provided individuals with more tools than ever to access and consider their travel choices. Cruz511 has been exploring options to capitalize on private sector innovations and improve how commuters find carpool matches. Building off of MTC’s 511.org experimental strategy to encourage, promote and incentivize behavior change, regardless of the technology used, efforts are currently underway to partner with and promote private-sector carpool matching apps on Cruz511.org. Waze, Scoop, and Muv have recently expanded beyond the Bay Area test market and are now available in Santa Cruz County for carpool-matching, although with a limited pool of potential carpool riders and drivers.

**Transportation Help Desk - Personal Trip Planning**

Many trip planning resources are now always available on Cruz511.org, including a self-serve database to find carpool partners, the latest countywide bike maps, and a multi-modal trip planner, to name a few. As a result of centralizing services and traveler resources online, the need for personal trip planning services by phone and email has been declining. Cruz511’s Help Desk team receives between 2-5 calls weekly from members of the public; however, the number of calls tends to increase during inclement weather. Common inquiries include questions about real-time traffic conditions, getting to the Bay Area using transit, and requests for print copies of the RTC’s bicycle map. In addition, the Help Desk frequently refers callers requesting paratransit services to the appropriate service provider.

**Park and Ride Lot Coordination and Development**
Annual park and ride lot surveys are taken each spring to determine use and capacity.

The June 2016 survey counted a total of 440 spaces available in 7 lots along Highways 1 and 17. A total of 282 spaces were occupied, yielding an overall usage rate of 64.1%. This is the lowest observed usage rate since 2011. The percentage of occupied spaces at the Scotts Valley Transit Center lot decreased more than 30% in 2016 compared to counts taken between 2013-2015. Meanwhile, the percentage of occupied spaces at Soquel/Paul Sweet Road off of Highway 1 increased more than 70% in 2016 compared to the same period. Capacity counts for all park and ride facilities from 2004 to 2016 are included in Attachment 1.

Organizational Assistance
In addition to traveler information, Cruz511 also advises and supports schools, colleges, employers and organizations with their transportation needs. Employers can get assistance implementing commute and rideshare programs, applying for green business certification, or developing customized programs. Staff participates and promotes Cruz511’s offerings at community events, festivals, and local business, environmental, and wellness fairs. During the past year, staff limited its assistance to employers and other organizations while focusing efforts on developing, launching, and building awareness for the new Cruz511.org web service. Efforts are currently underway toward identifying and forming new relationships with major employers, including organizations in Santa Cruz County that generate large numbers of trips and with companies in the Bay Area that have high concentrations of employees commuting over Highway 17.

SUMMARY
For most of its existence, RTC has offered local transportation users a service that helps them to successfully use all modes within the existing transportation system. Cruz511 is the new umbrella brand under which all TDM activities take place at the RTC, and includes Cruz511.org. Cruz511.org is a self-serve, mobile-responsive, centralized online resource for multi-modal traveler information featuring a traffic map with real-time information. More efficient and streamlined methods of online delivery now allow more people to access and benefit from this information under the centralized Cruz511 traveler information service. Work will continue into 2017 for a new user-oriented transit travel planning project aimed at garnering new Metro bus riders and publishing a toolkit for implementing such programs and to upgrade and expand park and ride facilities for Santa Cruz County commuters.

Attachments:
1. Program Update
2016 Program Update

January 19, 2017

Prepared for the Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission (SCCRTC)

By:
Amy Naranjo, Transportation Planner
Tegan Speiser, Sr. Transportation Planner
INTRODUCTION

For more than 35 years, the RTC has offered the Santa Cruz County community a service that helps travelers use the transportation system to access the things they want and need. Recently, the RTC revitalized and rebranded its rideshare and transportation demand management (TDM) programs and streamlined service offerings for online access and delivery. Cruz511 is the umbrella brand under which all RTC’s TDM and traveler information services now take place including those previously delivered through RTC’s Commute Solutions Program.

This report provides a program update on Cruz511 as well as insights into new RTC initiatives such as the User-Oriented Transit Travel Planning project that aims to expand and allow greater access to local traveler information resources and services and supports people’s interest and willingness to use travel options more frequently for business and recreation.

In December 2013, the RTC completed an extensive feasibility study and implementation plan for developing a 511 traveler information service for Santa Cruz County. At that time, the Commission approved moving forward with implementing such a service for our community. In early 2014, RTC planning staff and management evaluated the strengths and weaknesses of the then Commute Solutions Program and began planning for how best to integrate RTC’s TDM efforts into the new 511. As a result of that review, two core competencies emerged: 1) delivering traveler information and referral services and 2) marketing the availability of travel options. It was agreed that these two areas should be the focus of the RTC’s TDM efforts moving forward with Cruz511.

In addition to being the umbrella brand for the RTC’s TDM activities, Cruz511 also includes RTC’s online traveler information presence at the website Cruz511.org, on Facebook at @Cruz511 and on Twitter @Cruz_511. Cruz511.org is a self-serve, mobile-responsive, centralized online resource for multi-modal traveler information featuring a traffic map with real-time information. Many of the key TDM activities previously offered through Commute Solutions are now available with expanded resources online at Cruz511.org, including ride matching, trip planning for all travel modes, park and ride lot coordination, and employer assistance for workplace based commute programs. The Cruz511 presence on Facebook and Twitter are intended to drive traffic to the Cruz511.org website where the transportation resources and tools are hosted.
LOOKING BACK

Carpool and Vanpool Matching
Cruz511 continues to partner with the Bay Area’s Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) to offer online carpool and vanpool matching services to people who live or work in Santa Cruz County. This ridematching service (RMS), delivered through the Bay Area’s Regional Rideshare Program http://rideshare.511.org/, is popular among those with long commutes into Silicon Valley and the Bay Area. In early 2016, MTC began implementing a strategy to take advantage of new private-sector ridematching services with the intention of eventually phasing out the Bay Area’s long-standing publically-sponsored RMS. To date, the emerging field of transportation networking businesses is quite dynamic and it is not yet clear which of these potential services carpoolers will favor. During this transition period, most public agencies in the region including MTC, VTA and the RTC are suggesting that carpool seekers conduct their searches for potential rideshare partners utilizing services offered by private-sector companies as well as through the existing public RMS system.

As of January 1, 2017, there are 1,553 active and new participants who live or work in Santa Cruz County and who are seeking to find a carpool or vanpool partner through the Bay Area 511 ridematch program. Since Cruz511.org launched in July 2015, 106 new profiles were created by Santa Cruz County commuters seeking carpool partners in the RMS. There continues to be limited interest in vanpools and there are currently no vanpool formation subsidy programs available to Santa Cruz County commuters.

Transportation Help Desk - Personal Trip Planning
Many trip planning resources are now always available on Cruz511.org, including a self-serve database to find carpool partners, the latest countywide bike maps, and a multi-modal trip planner, to name a few. As a result of centralizing services and traveler resources online, the need for personal trip planning services by phone and email has been declining. Cruz511’s Help Desk team receives between 2-5 calls weekly from members of the public. Common inquiries include questions about real-time traffic conditions, getting to the Bay Area using transit, and requests for print copies of the RTC’s bicycle map. In addition, the Help Desk frequently refers callers requesting paratransit services to the appropriate service provider. Inquiries to the Help Desk will likely continue to decline as improvements and enhancements are made to Cruz511.org. This trend away from calls and toward greater use of the online resources also reflects growing consumer preferences for instant access to information that they can look up themselves using smart phones and tablets.
Park and Ride Lot Coordination and Development

Cruz511 plays a coordinating role in terms of local park and ride lots, communicating the location and availability of these facilities to the public and securing lease agreements and providing insurance for commuter use of shared-use facilities in the program. Annual park and ride lot surveys are taken each spring to determine use and capacity.

The June 2016 survey counted a total of 440 spaces available in 7 lots along Highways 1 and 17. A total of 282 spaces were occupied, yielding an overall usage rate of 64.1%. This is the lowest observed usage rate since 2011. The percentage of occupied spaces at the Scotts Valley Transit Center lot decreased more than 30% in 2016 compared to counts taken between 2013-2015. Meanwhile, the percentage of occupied spaces at Soquel/Paul Sweet Road off of Highway 1 increased more than 70% in 2016 compared to the same period. Attachment 1 shows capacity counts for all park and ride facilities from 2004 to 2016.

An RTC project to upgrade signage at existing facilities and to develop new shared-use park and ride lots especially in South County is underway.

Cruz511.org Website Development and Launch

Following the Commission’s direction to develop and implement a web-based 511 service for travelers in Santa Cruz County that would serve as a centralized online resource for all types of transportation information, staff worked with a local consultant between mid-to-late 2014 to design and develop a mobile-responsive website with many interactive features. The website includes search engine optimization and usage tracking that features new and enhanced tools. Content previously hosted on the Commute Solutions website was updated for the new website along with new information and features. Development was completed in early 2015 and user and accessibility testing took place throughout the month of May. The site was soft-launched on June 5th with final testing and fine-tuning prior to the public launch on July 7, 2015.

Cruz511.org features the following traveler information resources:

- Interactive traffic map that includes travel speeds, incident locations, traffic camera images, changeable message sign alerts, and construction lane closures. As a statewide map, it can also be used for travel outside of our region.
- Alerts and detour information about emergencies affecting the transportation system
• Free online ridematching connecting people with potential carpool, vanpool, and bike partners and links to private-sector ridematching and transportation network companies
• Trip Planner – personalized directions for riding the bus, biking, walking and driving including routes, cost and estimated travel times
• Countywide bike map
• Park and ride lots and EV charging station locations
• True cost of driving calculator
• Accessible travel options
• Local weather conditions

Organizational Assistance
In addition to traveler information, Cruz511 also advises and supports schools, colleges, employers and organizations with their transportation needs. Employers can get assistance implementing commute and rideshare programs, applying for green business certification, or developing customized programs. Staff participates and promotes Cruz511’s offerings at community events, festivals, and local business, environmental, and wellness fairs. During the past year, staff limited its assistance to employers and other organizations while focusing efforts on developing, launching, and building awareness for the new Cruz511.org web service. Efforts are currently underway toward identifying and forming new relationships with major employers, including organizations in Santa Cruz County that generate large numbers of trips and with companies in the Bay Area that have high concentrations of employees commuting over Highway 17.

GROWING USER BASE FOR CRUZ511.ORG

Public Information & Awareness
Promoting awareness is an integral part of implementing and launching any web based service, especially a regionally oriented informational site such as Cruz511.org. Cruz511’s marketing efforts currently focus on print, online, and social media, and promotional literature. Marketing efforts will be tracked and evaluated quarterly to monitor effectiveness in terms of cost and staff time in comparison to web traffic volumes (discussed in depth in the following section) and activity. (See discussion under Looking Forward section of this report.)

Digital Media
Digital media has proven to be Cruz511’s most powerful public awareness tool for the site. Cruz511.org was viewed more than 3,000 times after press releases were picked up and published by local media, including Santa Cruz Sentinel (online version) and Patch.com. Web traffic spiked again when staff announced Cruz511’s launch on Nextdoor, a free private social platform for neighborhood communities –
cruz511.org was viewed more than 700 times in one day and over 40 people participated in a discussion about the service.

**Social Media**
Social media, including Facebook and Twitter, have been equally important in growing the ‘Cruz511’ brand. Social media offers flexibility (share late-breaking news about roadway closures), cost-savings (print fewer brochures/flyers/etc.), and engagement (followers can tell their own stories). Social media also provides a platform to share new and updated web content, promote TDM strategies, and target those who can benefit most from alternative forms of transportation free of charge. Paid or targeted advertising to specific audiences, locations, demographics, and interests are also available on Facebook and Twitter.

In May 2016, staff tested a month-long targeted advertisement on Facebook using a $150 budget with the dual objective to raise awareness of the traveler information service for people living in Santa Cruz County and to drive web traffic to Cruz511.org. The ad (Figure 1) was shown to 22,379 people living in the county and resulted in 1,647 website visits to Cruz511.org at a cost of $0.09 per visit. Daily average web traffic nearly doubled throughout the duration of the ad campaign.
Other ideas for paid advertisements include driving web traffic to specific content pages and measuring outcomes based on predefined goals (for example, create an ad about finding a carpool partner, link to the carpool info page, and then track the number of new carpool registrations) and promoting social media pages to increase the number of page followers and increase interaction/engagement with existing followers.

Table 1 summarizes Cruz511’s social media activity in 2016.
Table 1: Social Media Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Platform</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>138 likes; engagement highest for highway/maintenance related posts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitter</td>
<td>135 followers; up 45% since September when automated CHP traffic incident feed integrated with Twitter account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nextdoor</td>
<td>8 posts; engagement highest for highway/maintenance related posts; potential to reach and engage 32,000 county residents with each message posted to the network.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Print Media**

Marketing and outreach is also supported by print collateral pieces that are intended to be: multi-purpose, cost-efficient, widely distributed and have a long shelf-life. Staff created bilingual rack cards and complementary businesses cards for distribution at visitor centers, airports, rental car companies, hotels, attractions, restaurants, cafes, libraries, and other locations that enjoy significant foot traffic. A QR code (a type of barcode) is printed on both cards and when scanned using a compatible smartphone app, directs users to the Cruz511.org homepage. QR codes are another way to track offline marketing campaigns (when paired with Google Analytics), such as advertising in print media like newspapers or on posters and fliers. The rack card and business card are included in Attachment 2 and Attachment 3.

**Coordinated Marketing**

Cruz511 participates in MTC’s Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Working Group. The purpose of this quarterly meeting is to share carpool, rideshare, and 511 activities and updates between local and regional agencies throughout the Bay Area. Given that approximately 1/5th of Santa Cruz County commuters travel to the Bay Area for work, consistency in messaging across county lines is important. Efforts are currently underway to coordinate and align Cruz511 marketing messages with regional campaigns in order to efficiently promote mobility options to all travelers and optimize program impacts.

**Performance Measures**

Web metrics are especially valuable in marketing and outreach activities and for fine-tuning how information is organized and presented on a website. Digital metrics allow staff to track and measure the effectiveness of web, mobile, and social media marketing efforts. They detail how well a website and other digital services are performing, and are typically derived from tools that measure usage,
traffic, site quality, and performance. Web analytics help gauge user response and engagement with services, and enable comparisons to similar systems.

Cruz511 uses Google Analytics, a free web analytics service, to track and report website traffic. In the last half of 2016, Cruz511.org was visited more than 36,000 times (sessions) by over 16,000 users. Over 55% of site visits were from repeat users and nearly 75% exited the site after viewing the homepage (bounce rate). Almost 90% of page views are for traffic conditions and travel alert notices. This underscores an opportunity to improve and highlight other modes of travel besides driving alone, including carpooling and other rideshare options. More than half of all users accessed Cruz511.org via a mobile or tablet device. Nearly half of all users visited Cruz511.org directly, while 37% came from search engines like Google and Yahoo, 6% were referred from Caltrans Quickmap, 5% from Facebook links, and 11% from various other sources.

Table 2 identifies metrics staff will use to track performance and includes a description for each metric. Usage statistics for the last six months are also included.

**Table 2: Cruz511.org Website Analytics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>BASELINE First 6-months Count</th>
<th>CURRENT Last 6-months Count</th>
<th>Difference (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sessions</td>
<td>A session is the period of time a user is actively engaged with your website, app, etc.</td>
<td>25,856</td>
<td>36,539</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New sessions %</td>
<td>An estimate of the percentage of first time visits.</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>43.28%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Users</td>
<td>Users that have had at least one session within the selected date range. Includes both new and returning users.</td>
<td>10,978</td>
<td>16,274</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pageviews</td>
<td>Pageviews is the total number of pages viewed. Repeated views of a single page are counted.</td>
<td>42,852</td>
<td>59,957</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pages/session</td>
<td>Pages/Session (Average Page Depth) is the average number of pages viewed during a session. Repeated views of a single page are counted.</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>-1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. session duration</td>
<td>The average length of a Session.</td>
<td>1 min 52 seconds</td>
<td>1 min 53 seconds</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bounce rate %</td>
<td>Bounce rate is the percentage of single-page visits (i.e. visits in which the person left your site from the entrance page without interacting with the page).</td>
<td>73.18%</td>
<td>74.60%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data collected through the end of 2016 will be analyzed and used to create quarterly performance targets for 2017 and beyond. These metrics will help measure different elements of performance, such as how many people are visiting the site, how much time they’re spending on the site, how often they return, etc. By tracking, using and analyzing the results frequently, staff can optimize content and make adjustments to online marketing efforts.

OTHER TDM INITIATIVES

User-Oriented Transit Travel Planning
In keeping with the focus of marketing travel options, in July 2014, RTC in partnership with Santa Cruz Metro, was awarded a Caltrans Planning grant to conduct a User-Oriented Transit Travel Planning project. The project began in December 2016. The plan is to develop and test an individualized marketing and research program for Santa Cruz County that empowers people who usually drive alone to switch modes for at least some of their travel with a special emphasis on attracting new transit riders. Individualized marketing (also called personal travel planning) identifies people who are interested and willing to make changes in their travel behavior, and provides them with the information, tools, and support that they need to make changes. This project develops and conducts pilot testing of personalized travel planning in two neighborhoods, one in the Watsonville area and one in the City of Santa Cruz, that are near bus stops or along high quality transit corridors with the aim of attracting new Metro bus riders.

Based on the findings of the pilot testing and analysis, a toolkit will be produced that can be used to implement such programs more broadly in Santa Cruz County and in other California communities seeking to meet their SB 375 greenhouse gas and vehicle miles traveled reduction targets.

Capitalize on Private Sector Innovation
New travel alternatives enabled by new technology and business models have provided individuals with more tools than ever to access and consider their travel choices. MTC’s 511 program, for example, is taking advantage of innovations in transportation services and began promoting private-sector carpool matching apps to match commuters into carpools. These partnerships build on MTC’s strategy to encourage, promote and incentivize behavior change, regardless of the technology used. It is an experimental approach and comes with its challenges, particularly when it comes to securing a critical mass of participants. Maintaining a critical mass of participants is needed to create a self-sustaining, flexible carpooling system and if lacking participants, it may be difficult to find matches for certain trips or areas.
In the last year, MTC entered into partnerships through a request for partnership process with carpool matching apps Waze Carpool (waze.com/carpool), Scoop (takescoop.com), and MüV (muv2work.com). Carma and Lyft Carpool also had partnerships with MTC but struggled and/or did not adequately invest to reach and maintain a critical mass of participants. As a result, they shifted their business models away from dynamic carpool matching to focus more on car sharing and on-demand taxi services.

Cruz511 continues to explore options that capitalize on private sector innovations and improve how commuters find carpool matches. Partnerships with the likes of Waze, Scoop, and MüV may prove to be appealing alternatives to traditional carpooling and have the potential to increase ridesharing in Santa Cruz County, as they become available locally.

LOOKING FORWARD

Cruz511 Online
Keeping content fresh, current and relevant will be essential for Cruz511 users to adopt the Cruz511.org website as their go-to place for information about getting around our community. Posting new content on a regular schedule, guest bloggers, contests, etc... are all techniques that will be used to stimulate users to return to a website to find out what’s new. Strengthening communication channels with partner agencies can also ensure that Cruz511 has the latest, hot off the press news about upcoming transportation events, incidents and emergencies. With the foundation of Cruz511 firmly in place, a number of planned features that were put on hold during the initial roll-out can also be completed.

Marketing and Outreach Efforts
Making the community and visitors aware of the valuable traveler resources found through Cruz511 is a priority in the upcoming year. While the first phase relied heavily on social media, going forward, a combination of online advertising such as the sponsored post that was tested on Facebook in 2016 and a range of other methods to promote Cruz511 will be used, including:

- **Presentations:** Making presentations to gatherings and meetings of community service groups, workplaces and other organizations will be an important outreach tool. A shelf-ready presentation that includes a live demo of Cruz511 will be produced to deliver presentations quickly upon request.

- **Print Literature:** Systematic distribution of both rack cards and business cards to locations where there is a high amount of foot traffic by both visitors
and locals and Cruz511 tabling at community events, fairs, and markets will continue.

- **Media releases and Public Service Announcements (PSAs):** Given the spikes in visitors to Cruz511 in response to news releases about Cruz511, PSAs and media releases are a free publicity option that will be used regularly to promote Cruz511. Tie in Cruz511 press releases and PSAs with travel related stories related to special events, holidays and calendar items such as back to school and Halloween. Holding media events for new Cruz511 system features, rollouts or upgrades will be considered.

- **Cruz511/Rideshare Signs:** In 2016, Caltrans has replaced all of the Rideshare signs on Santa Cruz County highways with new ones. This is a vast improvement as most of the signs were quite old, worn and faded. Roadways signs must follow strict guidelines outlined in the MUTCD manual. To date, the MUTCD limits signs promoting 511 services to messages that direct drivers to “Call 511”. As Cruz511 does not provide a call-in option, this signage does not apply. Staff will continue to explore other roadway signage options to publicize Cruz511.

- **User Survey:** Feedback from users of Cruz511.org (and its respective FB and Twitter sites) is very important for fine-tuning existing content and features and creating new resources on the site. Staff is researching options for conducting such a survey in the next year.

- **Guerilla Marketing:** Unconventional, inexpensive techniques will be explored such as signs on gas pumps at gas stations and coffee cup jackets distributed at local coffee shops.

**TDM Activities**

While the vast majority of resources that RTC Commute Solutions staff used to deliver in person are now available online, there is still value in working directly with organizations and individuals on improving transportation efficiency. Organizations that contribute significantly to the economic health and vitality of the community also generate large amounts of traffic in the form of employees, customers, vendors, and deliveries. Cruz511 will focus on the following areas in the upcoming year.

- **Employer Assistance:** Locally, RTC has worked with employers and schools to conduct travel surveys, produce GIS cluster maps to show where employees live, educate employees about travel options, table at environmental and
wellness fairs, and develop commute programs. Most of the recent interest in these programs has been as a response to addressing parking problems, green business certification, and meeting sustainability goals. These services will continue to be available to employers.

• **Employer Newsletter/Blog/FB page:** While the best media for exchanging information has not been selected, establishing current contact lists of employee transportation coordinators (or those with transportation duties) at local companies and having regular communications with these contacts will ensure that each organization does not need to reinvent the wheel with regards to addressing transportation issues at their workplaces. Since employer efforts are voluntary, a steady stream of information about resources available through Cruz511, local travel options and how to implement a TDM program could stimulate employer interest in playing their part to address traffic challenges on the highway and local streets and roads. It can also strengthen relationships with organizations which benefits the RTC as a whole.

• **TDM Roundtables and Trainings:** Bringing people together for educational gatherings allows Cruz511 to demonstrate how some of the tools offered (GIS maps, surveys, etc…) can be used to organize carpools and interest employees in travel options. One way to offer this is for Cruz511 to register for online trainings offered by other organizations around the county on topics of common interest, invite local employers to view the training at the RTC office and follow with a discussion and local application of the information. RTC hosting 2 or 3 events requires much less effort than developing the content.

• **Emergency Ride Home (ERH):** A psychological safety net for people who have used a travel option to get to work, these low cost programs remove a common barrier to taking the bus, carpooling, riding a bike or walking, “What do I do in an emergency?” Various grant funded programs have been offered over the years to provide this service to the general public. (Ecology Action offers an ERH program to employees of its employer members.) In light of current new transportation networking options, it is worthwhile to revisit offering this commuter support service locally.

• **Bay Area Requirements:** Since September 2014, Bay Area employers with an average of 50 or more employees are required to offer a commute benefits program for employees. This Bay Area Commute Benefits Program, SB 1339, was signed into law in 2012 and the implementing Regulation 14, Rule 1 was adopted by the Air District (BAAQMD) and MTC’s governing board in 2014. The legislation is meant to encourage employees to use some form of commute transportation other than driving alone. Employee commuter costs include
transit passes, vanpool, and bicycle commuting expenses. With 20% of Santa Cruz County commuters working at companies based over the hill who are offering these benefits, it is important to stay abreast of developments with this Bay Area program. Some Santa Cruz County employers with facilities in the Bay Area already comply with the program at their Bay Area locations. A flyer outlining requirement options is attached as Attachment 4.

- **Travel Options to Events:** As local trip planning experts, Cruz511 staff will work with event producers to promote using ridesharing and other travel options to get to special events. This assistance can help event planners to include travel option information in early publicity about events and help prevent major traffic tie-ups.

**SUMMARY**

For most of its existence, RTC has offered local transportation users a service that helps them to successfully use all modes within the existing transportation system. Cruz511 is the new umbrella brand under which all TDM activities take place at the RTC, and includes Cruz511.org. Cruz511.org is a self-serve, mobile-responsive, centralized online resource for multi-modal traveler information featuring a traffic map with real-time information. More efficient and streamlined methods of online delivery now allow more people to access and benefit from this information under the centralized Cruz511 traveler information service. Work will continue into 2017 for a new user-oriented transit travel planning project aimed at garnering new Metro bus riders and publishing a toolkit for implementing such programs and to upgrade and expand park and ride facilities for Santa Cruz County commuters.

**Attachments:**

1. Park and Ride Lot Counts 2004-2016
2. Cruz511 Rack Card
3. Cruz511 Business Card
4. SB 1339 Commute Benefit Program Requirements
<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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quaker Meetinghouse</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasatiempo (estimated capacity)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resurrection Church East &amp; West</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resurrection Church East</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resurrection Church West</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotts Valley Transit Center</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soquel/Paul Sweet Road **</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit Road (estimated capacity)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL OCCUPIED SPACES</strong></td>
<td><strong>440</strong></td>
<td><strong>440</strong></td>
<td><strong>336</strong></td>
<td><strong>334</strong></td>
<td><strong>332</strong></td>
<td><strong>335</strong></td>
<td><strong>307</strong></td>
<td><strong>268</strong></td>
<td><strong>270</strong></td>
<td><strong>258</strong></td>
<td><strong>269</strong></td>
<td><strong>219</strong></td>
<td><strong>296</strong></td>
<td><strong>241</strong></td>
<td><strong>257</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL LOT CAPACITY</strong></td>
<td><strong>440</strong></td>
<td><strong>440</strong></td>
<td><strong>437</strong></td>
<td><strong>437</strong></td>
<td><strong>437</strong></td>
<td><strong>437</strong></td>
<td><strong>439</strong></td>
<td><strong>438</strong></td>
<td><strong>447</strong></td>
<td><strong>498</strong></td>
<td><strong>474</strong></td>
<td><strong>447</strong></td>
<td><strong>441</strong></td>
<td><strong>441</strong></td>
<td><strong>437</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% OCCUPIED SPACES</strong></td>
<td><strong>64.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>76.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>76.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>76.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>76.7%</strong></td>
<td><strong>69.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>61.2%</strong></td>
<td><strong>60.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>51.8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>56.8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>49.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>67.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>54.6%</strong></td>
<td><strong>58.8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>62.4%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Capacity increased in 2009 due to Metro opening up more spaces at Soquel/Paul Sweet lot and Caltrans restriping and more accurate measuring of unmarked spaces with a survey wheel at Pasatiempo.

** Capacity at Soquel and Paul Sweet Rd fluctuates widely due to SCMTD moving the chain to cordon off excess spaces (available spaces range between 55 and 121 spaces). Back area of lot used for bus driver training.

*** To verify accuracy, the SV Transit Center PnR was counted three times in Spring 2013 given the large increase in use observed during the first count on April 23, 2013. The figure used here is the average of the three counts. In April 2014, Metro advised RTC that Kings Village Shopping Center owners were no longer allowing commuters to park all-day in the shopping center lot. Also increased use by employees boarding private tech buses.

NOTE: Caltrans closed a 10-space PnR lot they owned at Freedom Boulevard x Hwy 1 in 2004.
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Bay Area Commuter Benefits Program

NEW REQUIREMENT FOR EMPLOYERS • NEW REQUIREMENT FOR EMPLOYERS • NEW REQUIREMENT FOR EMPLOYERS

Employers with 50 or more full-time employees in the Bay Area are now required to offer commuter benefits to their employees.

WHO

Employers with 50 or more full-time employees in the Bay Area

Must offer employees one of the following four options:

WHAT

Pre-Tax Benefit

Employer-Provided Subsidy

Employer-Provided Transit

Alternative Commuter Benefit

WHEN

SEPT 30

Employers subject to the Program must select and implement one of the four Commuter Benefit options by September 30, 2014.

WHY

The Commuter Benefits Program is mandatory for all employers in the Bay Area with 50 or more full-time employees, per Senate Bill 1339, codified in California Government Code section 65081.

The Program will help to reduce air pollution and traffic congestion by decreasing single-occupant vehicle commute trips to Bay Area worksites, while providing tax savings for employees and employers.

HOW

To get started, visit: 511.org

Employer outreach staff are available to provide assistance and support to employers. Call 511 and say “Commuter Benefits” or visit 511.org to locate assistance.

The Bay Area Commuter Benefits Program is a partnership led by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District.
How the Commuter Benefits Program Works

The Bay Area Commuter Benefits Program requires employers with 50 or more full-time employees in the Bay Area to offer commuter benefits to their employees. Employers subject to the Program must select and implement their program by September 30, 2014.

**STEP 1:** Evaluate the four commuter benefit options and select one (or more) of the options to offer to your employees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 1: Pre-Tax Benefit</th>
<th>Allow employees to exclude their transit or vanpooling expenses from taxable income, up to $130 per month.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 2: Employer-Provided Subsidy</td>
<td>Provide a subsidy to reduce or cover employees' monthly transit or vanpool costs, up to $75 per month.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3: Employer-Provided Transit</td>
<td>Provide a free or low-cost transit service for employees, such as a bus, shuttle or vanpool service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 4: Alternative Commuter Benefit</td>
<td>Provide an alternative commuter benefit that is as effective in reducing single-occupancy commute trips as Options 1, 2 or 3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STEP 2:** Designate a Commuter Benefits Coordinator.

*For the purpose of the Program, this is simply the person who will complete the registration form and report to the Air District/MTC.*

**STEP 3:** Go to the Program webpage and register at 511.org.

**STEP 4:** Notify employees of the commuter benefit that your company will provide. Make the benefit available and let employees know how to take advantage of it.

**STEP 5:** Keep records to document implementation of your commuter benefits program and make the records available to the Air District and/or MTC upon request.

More information about the Commuter Benefits Program and employer requirements can be found in the "Employer Guide" at 511.org.